

The London School of Economics and Political Science

Nationalism in Japan's Contemporary Foreign Policy: A Consideration of the Cases of China, North Korea, and India

Maiko Kuroki

A thesis submitted to the Department of International Relations of the London School of Economics for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, London, February 2013

Declaration

I certify that the thesis I have presented for examination for the MPhil/PhD degree of the London School of Economics and Political Science is solely my own work other than where I have clearly indicated that it is the work of others (in which case the extent of any work carried out jointly by me and any other person is clearly identified in it).

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. Quotation from it is permitted, provided that full acknowledgement is made. This thesis may not be reproduced without my prior written consent.

I warrant that this authorisation does not, to the best of my belief, infringe the rights of any third party.

I declare that my thesis consists of <88,7630> words.

Statement of use of third party for editorial help

I can confirm that my thesis was copy edited for conventions of language, spelling and grammar by Josh Collins and Greg Demmons.

Abstract

Under the Koizumi and Abe administrations, the deterioration of the Japan-China relationship and growing tension between Japan and North Korea were often interpreted as being caused by the rise of nationalism. This thesis aims to explore this question by looking at Japan's foreign policy in the region and uncovering how political actors manipulated the concept of nationalism in foreign policy discourse. The methodology employs discourse analysis on five case studies. It will be explored how the two administrations both used nationalism but in the pursuit of contrasting policies: an uncompromising stance to China and a conciliatory approach toward North Korea under the Koizumi administration, a hard-line attitude against North Korea and the rapprochement with China by Abe, accompanied by a friendship-policy toward India. These case studies show how the nationalism is used in the competition between political leaders by articulating national identity in foreign policy. Whereas this often appears as a kind of assertiveness from outside China, in the domestic context leaders use nationalism to reconstruct Japan's identity as a 'peaceful nation' through foreign policy by highlighting differences from 'other's or by achieving historic reconciliation. Such identity constructions are used to legitimize policy choices that are in themselves used to marginalize other policy options and political actors. In this way, nationalism is utilized as a kind of political capital in a domestic power relationship, as can be seen by Abe's use of foreign policy to set an agenda of 'departure from the postwar regime'. In a similar way, Koizumi's unyielding stance against China was used to calm discontents among right-wing traditionalists who were opposed to his reconciliatory approach to Pyongyang. On the other hand, Abe also utilized a hard-line policy to the DPRK to offset his rapprochement with China whilst he sought to prevent the improved relationship from becoming a source of political capital for his rivals. The major insights of this thesis is thus to explain how Japan's foreign policy is shaped by the attempts of its political leaders to manipulate nationalism so as articulating particular forms of national identity that enable them to achieve legitimacy for their policy agendas, boost domestic credentials and marginalize their political rivals.

Table of Contents

Declaration	pp.2
Abstract	pp.3
Table of Contents	pp.4
Chapter 1. Introduction	pp.9
1.1 Introduction	pp.9
1.2 Conventional explanations of nationalism in the study of Japan's foreign policy	pp.11
1.2.1 Studies on Japan's foreign policy within IR theory	pp.12
1.2.2 Studies on Japan's nationalism	pp.15
1.3 Nationalism and foreign policy in the subject of IR	pp.20
1.4 Alternative Conceptual Framework on Foreign Policy	pp.24
1.5 Research Questions	pp.30
1.6 Hypotheses	pp.31
1.7 The Selection of Case Studies	pp.35
1.8 Methodology	pp.39
1.9 Chapter Outline	pp.46
Chapter 2. Political History of Postwar Japan and Factional Politics	pp.50
2.1 The division between the progressives and the conservatives	pp.53
2.2 The sub-division among the conservatives: mainstream versus anti-mainstream	pp.59
2.2.1 The Division between the Yoshida Line and anti-mainstream on the security issue	pp.60
2.2.2 The Division between the Yoshida Line and the anti-mainstream on the history issue until the 1980s	pp.62
2.2.3 The Division between the Yoshida Line and the anti-mainstream on the history issue in the 1990s	pp.66
2.2.3.1 The strategy of historic reconciliation	pp.67
2.2.3.2 The rise of 'neo-revisionism	pp.74
2.3 Factional politics within the LDP	pp.78
2.4 Koizumi and Abe in factional politic	pp.85

2.5 Conclusion	pp.89
Chapter 3. Case Study 1: Nationalism and Foreign Policy toward China under the Koizumi administration	pp.91
3.1 Conventional explanation of the Yasukuni Shrine issue	pp.93
3.1.1 Chronology	pp.93
3.1.2 The rise of nationalism in Japanese society	pp.94
3.1.3 domestic political factor	pp.95
3.2 The division on the Yasukuni Shrine issue in the Parliament	pp.97
3.2.1 Background of the issue	pp.98
3.2.2 Discourse of the opponents against the prime ministerial visit to the Yasukuni Shrine	pp.99
3.2.3 Discourse of the supporters of the prime ministerial visit to the Yasukuni Shrine	pp.100
3.3 Discourse analysis of Koizumi's argument	pp.102
3.3.1 Commonalities and differences of the two groups	pp.104
3.3.1.1 Perception of history	pp.104
3.3.1.2 Perception to China	pp.106
3.3.2 The link between the visit to the Yasukuni Shrine and Japan's 'peace country' identity	pp.107
3.4 Construction of national identity in foreign policy discourses	pp.109
3.4.1 The Representation of Japan's Identity in China's criticism	pp.110
3.4.2 The Reconstruction of Japan's identity in Koizumi's policy toward China	pp.111
3.4.3 The Reproduction of China's identity in Koizumi's policy toward China	pp.113
3.5 The construction of reality	pp.117
3.6 The legitimization of Koizumi's policy toward China	pp.122
3.7 Conclusion	pp.125
Chapter 4. Case Study 2: Nationalism and Foreign Policy toward North Korea under the Koizumi administration	pp.128
4.1 The divisions on the North Korea issue in the Parliament	pp.130

4.1.1 The Dialogue School	pp.130
4.1.2 The Pressure school	pp.131
4.2 Koizumi's policy toward North Korea	pp.132
4.2.1 The policy for diplomatic normalization	pp.132
4.2.2 Emphasis on dialogue	pp.134
4.2.3 The Pyongyang Declaration and the 'comprehensive approach'	pp.136
4.3 The construction of national identity in foreign policy discourse	pp.138
4.3.1 The constructions of North Korea in the dialogue school discourse	pp.139
4.3.2 The construction of Japan's identity and differences from the pressure school	pp.141
4.4 The construction of a 'reality'	pp.146
4.5 The legitimization of policy	pp.148
4.5.1 Normalization	pp.149
4.5.2 Emphasis on dialogues	pp.155
4.5.3 Conciliatory approach	pp.156
4.6 North Korean issue as political capital	pp.158
4.7 Conclusion	pp.160
 Chapter 5. Analysis of the post-2000 'neo-revisionist' Discourse	 pp.162
5.1 Historical context	pp.164
5.2 Basic arguments	pp.164
5.2.1 The Constitution	pp.165
5.2.2 Pacifism	pp.167
5.2.3 The History verdict of the Tokyo Tribunal	pp.168
5.2.4 The Yoshida Line	pp.170
5.2.5 Postwar democracy	pp.173
5.3 Key concepts and Identity Construction	pp.178
5.3.1 Peace	pp.178
5.3.2 Democracy	pp.182
5.3.3 Independence/autonomy	pp.187
5.4 The construction of domestic 'Others'	pp.190

5.5 Conclusion	pp.194
Chapter 6. Case Study 3 and 4: Nationalism and Foreign Policy toward China and North Korea under the Abe administration	pp.196
6.1 China Policy	pp.198
6.1.1 Chronology	pp.198
6.1.2 Background of Abe's rapprochement with China	pp.199
6.1.3 The Rapprochement with China as Political Capital	pp.200
6.1.4 Obstacles to the rapprochement	pp.203
6.1.5 Identity Construction and policy legitimization	pp.204
6.1.5.1 Abe's shift from a past anti-Chinese stance to a more moderate stance	pp.204
6.1.5.2 Easing the frustration among Abe's anti-Chinese supporters	pp.206
6.1.5.3 The Yasukuni Shrine issue and social antagonism	pp.210
6.1.6 Conclusion	pp.215
6.2. Policy toward North Korea	pp.216
6.2.1 Chronology	pp.217
6.2.2 Background of Abe's hard-line policy	pp.219
6.2.2.1 North Korea's provocation	pp.219
6.2.2.2 Personnel Affairs	pp.220
6.2.2.3 High Popularity and political capital	pp.221
6.2.3 Identity constructions: 3 binary oppositions	pp.222
6.2.3.1 Japan and North Korea: construction of external radical 'other'	pp.223
6.2.3.2 'Postwar regime' and ideal Japan	pp.231
6.2.3.3 political Rivalry in domestic politics	pp.233
6.3 Conclusion	pp.237
Chapter 7. Case Study 5: Nationalism and Abe's Foreign Policy toward India and the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity	pp.240
7.1 Case Selection	pp.242
7.2 Theoretical framework	pp.245

7.3 Abe's policy toward India	pp.247
7.3.1 Chronology: The development of Japan-India relationship in the 2000s	pp.247
7.3.2 Foreign Policy toward India in the wider context under the Abe administration	pp.248
7.3.2.1 Abe's 'Proactive Diplomacy' and 'value-oriented diplomacy'	pp.249
7.3.2.2 The Arc of Freedom and Prosperity	pp.254
7.3.3 Policy to India as political capital	pp.258
7.3.4 The Construction of national identities	pp.261
7.3.5 The constructions of 'reality' and the legitimization of Abe's policy toward India	pp.268
7.4 Conclusion	pp.271
 Chapter 8. Conclusion	pp.273
8.1 Summaries of the argument	pp.274
8.2 Findings from case studies: the role of nationalism	pp.279
8.2.1 Japan's multiple nationalisms	pp.280
8.2.2 The reconstruction of national identity in foreign policy	pp.282
8.2.3 Nationalism as political capital	pp.284
8.3 The Nationalisms of Koizumi and Abe	pp.287
8.3.1 A 'peaceful country'	pp.281
8.3.2 A closure of the 'postwar era'	pp.290
8.3.3 A negative cycle of nationalism and foreign policy	pp.294
8.4 Implications and prospects for future research	pp.296
 Bibliography	pp.301

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The general topic of this research is Japan's nationalism and its role in contemporary foreign policy toward Asia. Recently, the resurgence of nationalism in Japan from the 1990s has drawn attention among academics and practitioners within and outside the country. Rozman (2002) discusses Japan's foreign policy after the Cold War in terms of the rise of right-wing nationalism with emphasis on its 'great power identity'. The foreign policy led by former Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi (2001-2006), in particular was characterized as more proactive and assertive than conventional policy and has been widely criticized as 'distorted by nationalism.' For example, the Prime Minister's visit to the Yasukuni Shrine, in which Class-A War Criminals in WWII are enshrined, fueled international tensions between Japan and China and led to the deterioration of the bilateral relationship. In addition, Koizumi's successor, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe (2006-2007), who is well known as a 'staunch nationalist' with a revisionist historical view, insisted on launching a more assertive diplomacy in the region and took a hard-line policy toward North Korea. Combined with a series of changes in its security policy toward a 'normal country' from the mid-1990s¹, including the 'reaffirmation of the US-Japan Alliance', a commitment to human security activities, and the participation in the 'War on Terror', there can be seen a growing skepticism that nationalistic actors and a nationalistic agenda have gradually gained influence in Japanese society (Soeya 2011: 73).

¹ There are enormous amounts of relevant literature, but the recent notable work is Soeya, Tadokoro, and Welch (2011), *Japan as a 'Normal Country'?*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

In this context, it has become a subject of controversy how nationalism and foreign policy are interlinked with each other in post-Cold War Japan. In the subject of International Relations (IR), nationalism might be considered as one of the major causes of war as well as one of the main factors shaping the emergence of an international society (Mayall 1990). From this standpoint, the ‘emotional’ and ‘irrational’ aspects of nationalism tend to be illuminated as Cottam and Cottam (2001: 25) argue that states, which have a stronger propensity to emphasize nationalism ‘will engage in aggressive behavior’. Yet, nationalism is also an ideology that shapes the modern nation state, making liberal ideas of citizenship and civil society possible (Smith 1995).

Likewise, although the rise of Japan’s nationalism is likely to be regarded as a destabilizing factor in East Asia, it might be too early to conclude whether this is an over-simplistic judgment to make about the relationship between domestic politics and foreign policy. In the case of recent Japan, although it is clear that the visit to the Yasukuni Shrine by Prime Minister Koizumi created a hostile atmosphere between Japan and China, at the same time, he took a conciliatory approach toward North Korea. On the other hand, Prime Minister Abe took a hard-line approach toward North Korea, which was largely supported by nationalism, whereas, at least on the surface, his foreign policy toward China might not have been seen as confrontational. Rather, he tried to improve and stabilize the relationship with China and South Korea when he came into office. Thus, the case of Japan’s foreign policy might demonstrate that the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy may not be explained as one of simple causality. Instead, it seems that nationalism in foreign policy is closely interrelated with domestic power relationships in more complex ways. In this context, this thesis aims to explore the role of nationalism in contemporary Japan’s foreign policy towards Asia, using the relationships with China, North Korea, and India as case studies.

1.2 Conventional explanations of nationalism in the study of Japan's foreign policy

In the subject of IR, it has often been argued that Japan has been a 'passive' and 'reactive' state, which has single-mindedly pursued economic gains, eschewing the use of military forces, as an instrument of state policy and relying on the US for handling its security affairs (Calder 1988, Pyle 1997)². It also is described as a country, which adopts a 'low-cost, low-risk, and benefit-maximizing strategy' in pursuit of its national interests (Pharr 1993). Heginbotham and Samuel (1998) describe postwar Japan's national strategy as 'mercantile realism', which is a deliberate, conscious promotion of Japan's power through the accumulation of economic wealth rather than the expansion of military capability. However, in the mainstream of IR theories, neither neorealism nor neoliberalism, has been able to provide a satisfactory explanation for how the politics of nationalism relates to Japan's foreign policy. Furthermore, even constructivism has not fully explained the relationship between foreign policy and nationalism in Japan. In addition, the existing literature on Japan's nationalism does not tell us much about the conduct of contemporary foreign policy. While there has also been a proliferation of research on the Japan-China and the Japan-North Korea relationship during the Koizumi and Abe administrations and most works point out the rise of nationalism in Japan, there appears to be little coherent discussion of the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy. In short, it can be argued that the issue of nationalism in Japan has not been systemically studied in relation to foreign

² Calder (2004) calls features of Japan's national strategy 'the San Francisco System'. This system consists of (1) a defense network of bilateral alliances, (2) an absence of multilateral security structures, (3) strong asymmetry in alliance relations in both the security and economic domains, (4) precedence for Japan, and (5) liberal access to the US market, coupled with limited development assistance.

policy so far.

1.2.1 Studies on Japan's foreign policy within IR theory

Neorealism emphasizes material capabilities and the structural pressures imposed by the international system; it downplays ideational and domestic factors³. Ideational factors such as ideology and historical experience would have little impact in neorealism because interests of states are similar. (Peou 2002: 121). States are assumed to be unitary rational actors with exogenously determined and intrinsically given interests and unchanging identities (Kubalkova 2001: 31). It overwhelmingly focuses on material circumstances at the international system level as a source of explaining state behavior (Waltz 1979, Roy 2000: 168). Thus, in neorealist theory, there would be no need to look into the black box of the foreign policy making because state foreign policy would be primarily shaped by the external environment such as its position in the international system and the distribution of material power capabilities (Smith 2001: 51). Neorealism tends to regard nationalism as having no role in system theory and to put it into the black box as a domestic factor, although some neorealists like Mearsheimer (1990) refer to it (Ruggie 1998: 865). However, Lapid and Kratochwil (1996:13) argue that they are likely to focus exclusively on the role of nationalism as a source of conflict. Therefore, in addition to the fact that neorealism has long been suffering from a serious puzzle of Japan's foreign policy in some respect⁴, the conventional wisdom of neorealism cannot fully explain Japan's nationalism in relation to its contemporary

³ On neorealism, see Waltz (1979), Walt (1987), and Mearsheimer (2001).

⁴ A large number of scholars argue that Japan might not be a 'normal' state in realist terms. One of the most typical argument is that Japan has been modestly armed incommensurate with its economic super-power status and relied its security on the US since the end of the WWII (Buzan 1988).

foreign policy because it does not take nationalism into consideration as a source of international behavior, regarding it as a ‘domestic’ and ‘ideological’ factor. While recent works based on neorealism like Kawasaki (2001) and Lind (2004) have attempted to defend the utility of realism in explaining Japan’s foreign policy, they still seem to pay little attention to nationalism in Japan.

Another paradigm of mainstream IR theories is neoliberalism, which focuses its attention on the centrality of interests and the role of institutions⁵ and tends to neglect actors’ identities (Okawara and Katzenstein 2004: 98). As with neorealism, it sees states as ‘pre-given’ unitary actors with fixed identities. On the other hand, neoliberalism emphasizes the utility of international regimes to mitigate the destabilizing effects of anarchy and highlights the impact of a state’s domestic polity on its foreign relations. This theory has also recently developed in ways that illuminate the importance of ideas, norms, and the transparency of information. It can be utilized to explain institution-building and economic policy based on the highly interdependent relationship among states. Neoliberalism, however, seems to show only limited relevance in explaining the role of nationalism in Japan’s foreign policy in the region. This is because neoliberal institutionalism intrinsically shares the basic assumptions of neorealism that states are unitary actors with unchanging identities (Wæver 2001: 21) and pays little attention to the phenomenon of nationalism, taking for granted the preferences or identities of actors (Katzenstein, Keohane, and Krasner 2002: 33). With its emphasis on economics-first policy without much attention to domestic politics in depth, neoliberalism is not well equipped to explain the relationship between Japan’s nationalism and its foreign policy.

⁵ According to neoliberalism, in institutions, cooperation channels can facilitate communication, thereby reducing uncertainty and the costs of making and enforcing agreements, international institutions would help states achieve collective gains (Keohane 1988, Hurrell 1995).

The third theoretical approach to Japan's policy, which came to the forefront in the 1990s, is constructivism. Constructivists hold that norms and identities have a powerful effect on state policy and highlight domestic factors which are downplayed by mainstream IR theories. Although there can be seen divisions among constructivists, they share some core propositions. This is because constructivism rests on some basic assumptions; that normative and ideational structures are important as well as material structures because they construct identities and interests; that identities constitute interests and actions; and that agents and structures are mutually constructed (Houghton 2007: 27-28). In a nutshell, constructivists maintain that in contrast to the claims of neorealism and neoliberalism, the behavior of a state like Japan is determined not solely by the material structure of international politics, but also by domestic constraints and identity factors (Roy 2000: 160).

This constructivist turn is reflected in the work of scholars like Berger (1993, 1998), Katzenstein (1996), Soeya (1998-a), Hook, Hughes, Gilson and Dobson (2001), who have highlighted the normative and institutional constraints on the use of force, most notably the constitution and its legacy of history --- the use of force is highly contentious and strictly controlled by decision-makers considering the concerns of neighboring countries. Recently, in addition to Rozman (2002), drawing on identity theory, Catalinac (2007) maintains that the changing conceptions of the international role that Japan should play can explain its different responses to the Gulf War in 1991 and to the Iraq War in 2003.

Although a constructivist perspective can explain much about postwar Japanese foreign policy, however, so far it has failed to offer a satisfactory explanation of the role of nationalism. Firstly, while nationalism could possibly be explored through a constructivist framework due to its focus on ideational and domestic factors, detailed

analysis on the relationship between Japan's nationalism and its foreign policy has yet to emerge. Secondly, constructivism is likely to see identity as a stable factor, suggesting a strong theory of permanence that is likely to explain the robustness of the status quo rather than change. Thus, it might not be able to account for how contradictory foreign policies emerge from within the same cultural and historical background (Wæver 2001: 21).

Given these shortcomings, IR theories have not yet been able to explain much about the relationship between nationalism and Japan's foreign policy. The main reasons for this might be the tendency of the mainstream theories to downplay domestic and ideational factor such as culture and domestic politics. Furthermore, both of neorealism and neoliberalism regard the state as a pre-given unitary actor with exogenously given and fixed identities, which obviously impedes deliberate analysis of the role played by the politics of nationalism inside states. Even some branches of constructivism, such as that pioneered by Wendt also treat the state as a 'socially pre-given' actor. Those that do look at unit-level constructivism have so far not accounted for the specific issue of nationalism in state behavior. Thus, it can be argued that conventional IR theories have not been able to explain much about the relationship between Japan's nationalism and its foreign policy.

1.2.2 Studies on Japan's nationalism

This section reviews the development of research on postwar Japan's nationalism in English academic literature and explores in particular how nationalism has been discussed in relation to the foreign policy of Japan. In contrast to the abundance of literature on the prewar period, fewer English literatures have been written on postwar

nationalism, except for some short articles until the 1990s (Yoshino 1992: 2). Nakanishi (2012: 1) points out that there seems to be no research which focuses on the relationship between postwar nationalism and Japan's foreign policy including Japanese literatures. Heavily influenced by the high concern over prewar nationalism, Brown (1955) published one of the earliest studies on *Nationalism in Japan*, which discusses the development of nationalism in Japan from about the Seventh Century to the late 1940s. Morris (1960) further explores how right wing nationalism was related to the Occupation policy in *Nationalism and the Right Wing in Japan*. In these works, prewar and wartime nationalism is named 'ultra-nationalism' and its impacts after the defeat in WW II on postwar nationalism are examined by Maruyama (1963) in his book *Thought and Behavior in Japanese Politics*. The 1970s and 1980s witnessed a surge of interest in cultural nationalism triggered by the appearance of a vast array of literature on 'nihonjinron', a popular genre that seeks to rediscover, redefine and reaffirm Japanese uniqueness (Yoshino 1992: 203, Kowner 2002: 169). This rise of cultural nationalism in this period coincided with and was influenced by Japan's economic success. Thus, Yoshino (1992: 189-190) explains that, 'nihonjinron' attributes Japan's economic success to its 'uniqueness' and moral victory of Japanese. Publications on 'nihonjinron' and criticism of it occupy the mainstream of studies on Japan's nationalism in the 1980s and since.

This coincided with the emergence of the argument that Japan should play a greater role in international society, commensurate with its strong economic power. On the other hand, however, Japan's nationalism became a matter of concern among East Asian countries, which were the main victims of its aggression in the Asia Pacific War. Since the 'nationalism' of Japan can evoke memories of prewar militarism, it has come to be regarded as a destabilizing factor in the region. Buzan (1988: 559-560) goes so far

as to argue that it is the corresponding lack of a fully legitimized nationalism that prevents Japan from being able to play a full political role in the international community and impedes amicable relations between Japan and neighboring countries. The recognition among East Asian countries that Japan's nationalism can often be a source of friction and a tendency of the identification of the 'rise of nationalism' as the 'drift to the right' seems to be shared by academics until now, even though postwar Japan has not shown any signs of aggression in its foreign policy.

Since the 1980s, however, highly controversial historical problems such as the issue of textbook revisions and visits by politicians to the Yasukuni Shrine have caused diplomatic crises. The rise of a revisionist form of nationalism from the 1990s is thus said to have culminated in the Koizumi and Abe administrations. Prime Minister Koizumi's unconventional policies, including dispatch of the Self Defense Forces to the Iraq War and his visit to the Yasukuni Shrine, which led to the deterioration of the bilateral relationships with China and South Korea, have drawn much attention to the 'resurgence of nationalism' in the 2000s and its impact on foreign relations (Matthews 2003).

In the development of studies on postwar Japan's nationalism, some tendencies can thus be observed. In what follows, I would like to discuss these in relation to my interest in the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy. First of all, conventional studies on postwar Japan's nationalism tend to rely on the use of dichotomies such as 'civic' and 'ethnic', or 'political' and 'cultural' nationalism and to focus on the socio-cultural aspect of the subject. It is often argued that ethnic, political and state-oriented nationalism has been a predominant trait of Japan's nationalism from the prewar period, while its postwar nationalism can be characterized as a socio-cultural and non-official type (Stronach 1995, Doak 1997, Rose 2000). However, there are some

problems with this perspective. Firstly, the efficiency of the dichotomy depends on the idea of a ‘suppressed’ political nationalism. Although most academics who deal with ‘cultural nationalism’ seem to draw a clear line between political and cultural nationalism (Rose 2000, Yoshino 1992), these two aspects can hardly be separated in a strict sense, but are better understood as being mutually constitutive. For instance, the political nationalism in the 1980s espoused by Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone, was based on the rise of cultural nationalism and ‘*nihonjinron*’. Furthermore, the cultural nationalism manifested in the history textbook revisions had a political impact because it caused diplomatic crises with neighboring countries in the 1980s. The second problem is that political nationalism has been assumed to be suppressed as a ‘taboo’ phenomenon in postwar Japan (Rose 2000: 171). According to Pyle (1997: 58), political nationalism has largely disappeared or been marginalized in the success of postwar foreign policy under the Yoshida Doctrine. This might be because Japan’s political nationalism is often identified with prewar right-wing militarism. As will be explained later, however, it can be observed that Japan’s political nationalisms has been expressed in various ways, and it may be better to think in terms of nationalisms.

The second tendency concerns the overemphasis on a simplified version of Japan’s political nationalism, which tends to be identified with the prewar type of right-wing militarism (Morris 1960, Brown 1971) or ‘ultranationalism’ (Maruyama 1963) characterized as a mixture of statism, militarism, xenophobia and aggressive expansionism (McVeigh 2004: 3). Thus, the rise of Japan’s nationalism tends to be identified with the resurgence of right-wing militarism, which is a strong concern of neighboring countries. Matthews (2003: 75) argues that the rise of contemporary nationalism could be ‘an alarming consequence’ and that ‘the rise of militarized assertive, and nuclear-armed Japan, which would be a nightmare for the country’s

neighbors'. Buzan (1988: 566) also maintains that 'unconstrained Japanese nationalism might once again result in military aggression.' In sum, the nature of Japanese nationalism seems to be assumed as aggressive, competitive and militaristic as it was in pre-war period and holds revisionist history view that glorifies prewar Japan. It is not surprising that this perception can considerably influence the views on the impact of nationalism on Japan's relations with East Asian countries, presenting Japan's nationalism as an obstacle to building warm relationships and something that could bring diplomatic havoc.

Although it is certainly plausible that nationalism could destabilize the international relations of Japan, however, it might be premature to conclude that foreign policy shaped by nationalism is always aggressive and hostile against other countries and leads to the deterioration of relationships. If nationalism always helps to shape and create adversarial foreign policy, it is hard to explain how a 'staunch nationalist' Prime Minister like Abe tried to improve relations with China and South Korea after he came into office. In a similar vein, Rose (2000: 179) states that the extent to which nationalism threatens to affect the Japan-China relationship adversely is still open to question. This indicates that Japan's political nationalism might not be as monolithic as many analysts assume. As will be touched on in later chapter, Japanese academics do actually often recognize that there are different types of nationalism. 'Progressive nationalism', for example, can be opposed to the prewar type of right-wing nationalism. To explore this issue, it is necessary to not only highlight the right-wing prewar type of nationalism, but also to pay attention to what alternative kinds of nationalism have been represented in foreign policy.

The third tendency in the study of Japan's nationalism concerns the debate on the notion of the contemporary 'resurgence of nationalism'. As Matthews (2003: 78)

argues, recent English literature tends to focus exclusively on a few domestic issues like the history textbook revisions, the Yasukuni Shrine visits of political leaders, and an issue of the revision of the Constitution. Although these works are useful to grasp the some aspect of the nature of Japan's nationalism, however, the sources and manifestation of nationalism might not be limited only to the domestic arena but can also be found in the international field. Ahn (2004), for example, maintains that a clash between Japan's nationalism and Chinese nationalism is turning into rivalry over the FTA negotiations (Ahn 2004: 30). While his argument could have an important implication for exploring the linkage between nationalism and foreign policy, he does not explain how they interact with each other. Yamamoto (2005) notes that the North Korean issues concerning the missile problem and the abduction of Japanese citizens have caused the rise of nationalism among the Japanese people and have had an impact on policy towards North Korea. However, he does not account for how nationalism can shape a certain policy outcome and how this might be made possible. In sum, there has yet to be seen any significant research that can fully examine and explain how Japan's nationalism may exert an influence on its contemporary foreign policy towards East Asia.

1.3 Nationalism and foreign policy in the subject of IR

Despite the richness of existing literatures on nationalism, it might be argued that not much attention has been paid to the relationship between nationalism and the international behavior of states among mainstream IR scholars. Among specialists on nationalism, Mayall (1990) discusses how nationalism has influenced the development of international society. A.D. Smith (2001) also discusses the 'internalization of

nationalism’, which involves the trend in which the ‘normalization’ of nations and nationalism have proceeded to become the international norm of political organization. However, as Ruggie (1998) points out, under the premise of neorealism, nationalism has long been black-boxed into domestic factors as well as other ideational and cultural factors. Despite a critical and growing significance of nationalism as a hot global issue after the end of the Cold War, studies on the role of nationalism in foreign policy have enjoyed only limited success. This might be because the interest of neorealist scholars in nationalism is largely limited to understanding its role as a source of conflict or in affecting the capacity of existing or would-be states to wage war (Kratochwil 1998). At most, there does seem to be a shared understanding that nationalism can be a destabilizing factor in international relations. As Smith (2001: 139) argues, ‘it played a crucial role in the genesis of the two world wars.’ To take another example, Van Evera (1994) explores the causal nexus between nationalism and war, but only offers unproven hypotheses, which the author leaves untested. While the war-causing character of nationalism seems to be taken for granted among some IR scholars, as Van Evera put it (1994: 5), it is obvious that the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy needs further inquiry.

In contrast to the insufficient explanation in IR theory, recent years have witnessed the development of empirical researches on nationalism and foreign policy such as the case of China (Hughes 1997, 2002, 2006, Downs and Saunders 1998, Zhao 2004, Guang 2005), the United States (Citrin, Haas, Muste and Reingold 1994, McCartney 2004, 2006), and Ukraine (Furtado 1994). These empirical studies offer the opposite views to the expectation of the conventional IR wisdom, drawing the conclusion that nationalism need not always become a source of conflict nor make the international behavior of the state aggressive.

Although these empirical works could give some indications on the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy, they do not give sufficient insights into the role of nationalism in Japan's foreign policy towards East Asia. Firstly, this is because the case of contemporary Japan has not been fully examined yet. Although Prizel (1998) discerns five categories of relationships between national identity and the conduct of foreign policy, Japan's case does not seem to fit into any of these groups. Secondly, two propensities of the existing literature might hinder the full-understanding of the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy; the conceptualization of nationalism and foreign policy and the interaction between nationalism and foreign policy in the policy making process. This is because the existing literature tends to leave the conventional conceptualization of nationalism and foreign policy unquestioned, usually exclusively focused on whether nationalism can influence foreign policy. In what follows, I will discuss these propensities of the conventional framework in terms of exploring how to develop a new perspective on the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy.

The first point concerns how nationalism or national identity and foreign policy are conceptualized in order to grasp the relationship between them. First, existing research tends to assume that nationalism/national identity and foreign policy are ontologically independent concepts. As Campbell (1998: 40) points out, foreign policy is understood as 'the bridge between sovereign states existing in an anarchic world, a bridge that is constructed between two prior, securely grounded, and nominally independent realms'. If this is taken as given, then it allows an exclusive focus on the separation between them. Second, existing studies tend to assume that national identity, which is at the core of nationalism, is pre-given and stable. That is, it is unquestioned how the boundary between 'inside' and 'outside' --- who belongs to a certain political

community and which identities are attached to it --- is constructed and reconstructed. As Hall (1996: 34) argues, however, 'identity does not signal that stable core of the self' directly contrary to what appears to be. Rather, identities are 'subject to a radical historicization, and constantly in the process of change and transformation'. In addition to this, defining foreign policy as bridging the boundaries of sovereign states is also problematic as will be discussed later. In other words, an alternative conceptualization of nationalism and foreign policy is needed in order to analyze the relationship between them.

The second point is that, conventional research has sought to explore whether and to what extent nationalism can influence and shape foreign policy. However, it seems to be questionable that the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy is one-way, with the former unilaterally exerting impacts on the latter. Although the way in which foreign policy can influence nationalism has rarely been illuminated, such an aspect should not be ignored. Kaldor (2004: 165), for example, argues that war constructs nationalism rather than the other way round. Oguma (1995) points out that shifts in foreign policy and the international environment led to changes in nationalist discourse in Japan: from a 'multinational empire' to a 'single' and 'homogeneous' Japan. More specifically, Messari (2001) argues that foreign policy constructs the political aspect of national identity. Such insights indicate that the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy can be assumed not unilateral but interactive. Moreover, little work has been carried out to explore how and in what situations nationalism may be operative in foreign policy making. More specifically, it has not been fully examined how a particular policy which is shaped by nationalism was made possible while other options were precluded. Therefore, it is important to examine how nationalism and foreign policy interact with each other in the process of policy making. The third point is that

when scholars of foreign policy analysis look at whether nationalism can shape the foreign policy of a certain state, they tend to focus on whether actual policy coincides with nationalist rhetoric or not. The existing literature tends to conclude that if there is the separation between nationalist rhetoric and the actual practice of policy, it means that nationalism does not influence foreign policy making. This overlooks, however, what kind of influence such a separation between ideology and practice could have on nationalist consequently.

As will be argued in the next section, the reorientation of foreign policy analysis to take account of these dynamic and mutually constitutive relationships between nationalism and foreign policy is needed. In order to explore their relationship, this thesis should develop a perspective on the interaction between nationalism and foreign policy in the policy making process.

1.4 Alternative Conceptual Framework on Foreign Policy

Recently, attempts have been made to apply constructivism to foreign policy analysis by scholars like Kubálková (2001), Snyder (2005), and Houghton (2007). In accordance with these developments, efforts have been made to re-theorize ‘foreign policy’ within a constructivist framework by post-positivist scholars, such as Campbell (1992), Doty (1993, 1996) and Messari (2001). Their arguments reject the commonly accepted image that foreign policy is a bridge between preexisting states with secure identities. Instead, they propose that foreign policy can be conceptualized as ‘a specific sort of boundary-producing political performance’ and thus constructing and reconstructing national identities (Campbell 1998: 62). By adopting this idea, a new perspective on the interface between nationalism and foreign policy can be expected.

The following section will thus introduce some of the key works that adopt this post-positivist approach and try to draw insights from their central arguments.

Attempts to re-theorize Foreign Policy can be traced back to the 1980s. Neumann (1996: 156) states that Michael J. Shapiro introduced self/other theorizing in his *'The Politics of Representation'* (1988). What is notable is that Shapiro put forth the notion that foreign policy is about making an 'other'. This line of thought is further developed by David Campbell's landmark study *'Writing Security'* (1992, 1998). Campbell illuminated the performative constitution of identity and gave a thick description of US foreign policy as a seamless web of discourses and political practices, which continuously deal with others. He explained how the conventional understanding of foreign policy has long relied on a particular representation of history and how foreign policy has represented fear and danger, constructed the identity of states, and authorized practices of differentiation and hierarchization. In this argument, foreign policy is re-theorized as 'one of the boundary-making producing practices central to the production and reproduction of the identity in whose name it operates' (1998: 68). Doty (1993) analyzes US counterinsurgency policy in the Philippines in the 1950s within a constructivist framework that adopts a Discursive Practice Approach. Similar to Campbell, she maintains that US foreign policy is an important factor for the production and reproduction of the identity of the US and that this identity is created against 'other' states (1993: 310). Doty (1996) also analyzes the immigration policy of Britain and explains how the inside and outside boundary of nation is constructed through foreign policy. The boundary is not simply territorial but also concerns national identity; it attempts to stipulate fixed and stable meanings about who belongs and who does not belong to the nation. Along the same lines as Campbell, Messari (2001) rejects the conventional framework of foreign policy analysis and proposes that foreign policy can

be seen as ‘an identity-making tool that erects boundaries between the self and the other, defining in the process what are national interests’ (2001: 227). However, Messari considers ‘assimilation’ as a possible alternative in foreign policy making and maintains that national identity can be constructed not only through rejection but also by the assimilation or construction of similarities.

On the other hand, national identity of states can also be alternatively conceptualized, resting on three premises; that identities are not natural or essential but socially and discursively constructed; that they are relational and inextricably linked to the notion of the ‘other’; and that the relationship between the ‘self’ and the ‘other’, or between the ‘inside’ and the ‘outside’ is not only relational but also co-constitutive.

First of all, national identity is not completely consistent or stable but, to the contrary, dynamic, fragile and vulnerable (Wodak, Cillia, and Reisigli 1999: 154). Therefore, states are never finished as identities and always in the process of reconstruction and reproduction. Then, there might be hidden dualism and mutual construction of the self and the other in the notion of the ‘self’ national identity. As the representation of the ‘self’ inextricably indicates the existence of the ‘other’, national identity always needs constructing the ‘other’. Hall (1996: 4-5) explains the process of constitution of the ‘self’ in relation to the ‘other’ in detail:

Identities are constructed through, not outside, difference. This entails the radically disturbing recognition that it is only through the relation to the Other, the relation to what it is not, to precisely what it lacks, to what has been called its *constitutive outside* that the ‘positive’ meaning of any term – and thus its ‘identity’ – can be constructed (Derrida 1981, Laclau 1990, Butler 1993). ---The unity, the internal homogeneity, which the term identity treats as foundational is not a natural, but a

constructed form of closure, every identity naming as its necessary, even if silenced and unspoken other, that which it 'lacks'.

In addition, Triandafyllidou (1998: 596) argues that national identity can be defined from inside and outside: while it is a self-awareness of a community, which has a certain degree of community within the group, it can be defined 'through a process of differentiation from and in contrast to others'. That is, national identity cannot be constructed just by internal commonality. In IR literature, how the self and other, 'inside' and 'outside' are represented and linked with one another is central to the notion of the construction of identity. It has been widely accepted among most of IR scholars that there is a clear distinction between the inside of the national boundary and its outside. The former, the domestic realm is assumed to be 'secure' and 'peaceful' while the latter, an external realm tends to be regarded as 'insecure' and 'threatening'.

Post-positivist scholars such as Walker offer further insight into this dichotomy, by arguing that the relationship between the two realms is not only antagonistic in that the 'outside' could be a 'threat' to 'inside', but also co-constitutive. In this sense, national identity and the 'other' are mutually constructive as Hopf (2002: 288) noted that 'it is only in interaction with a particular other that the meaning of a state is established'. Doty (1996: 126-127) supports this idea arguing that it would be more useful to consider inside and outside as mutually constitutive rather than conceive them as dichotomous oppositions. Because of this co-constitutiveness, the self, who belongs to 'us', cannot be conceptualized independently of other, who does not belong to 'us'. Thus, states seek to articulate 'differences' and 'others' in order to establish its national identity (Campbell 1998). Campbell (1998: 99) explains that identities are constituted by inscribing boundaries 'that serve to demarcate an "inside" from an "outside", a "self"

from an “other”, a “domestic” from a “foreign”. These lines of thought can be underlined and enriched by the notion of political frontiers as found in theorists like Laclau and Mouffe (1985) and in Derrida’s notion of a ‘constitutive outside’ (Norval 1996: 65). Norval explains that political identities are constituted through externalizing and positioning the ‘other’ that is constructed symbolically as opposed to the identity of the Self. In short, ‘the positioning other is what allows for the closure which facilitates the individuation of a certain identity’ (Norval 1996: 65). As Campbell (1992: 12) demonstrates, to construct their identity, states are continuously urged to articulate threats and others, constituting ‘a range of differences as intrinsically evil, irrational, abnormal, mad, sick, primitive, monstrous, dangerous or anarchical’ (Connolly 1991: 209-210).

In such approaches, the relationship between national identity and foreign policy thus comes to the forefront of the theorizing effort. In this process, foreign policy plays a significant role as in the differentiation and exclusion that takes place in transforming ‘difference’ into ‘otherness’, thereby building boundaries between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ (Messari 2001: 233). As such, the boundaries which foreign policy creates stipulate stable and fixed meanings about who belongs and who does not belong to the nation. That is, foreign policy is a practice on the construction of national identity through drawing borders and maintaining the lines of difference. This deliberate construction of identity contributes to creating a particular ‘reality’ which appears as ‘normal’ and also serves to establish standards of domestic legitimacy, privilege a certain interpretive disposition and marginalize alternatives. Therefore, foreign policy is understood as a political practice, which constitutes, maintains and reproduces national identity.

With regard to identity making, there is another important role which foreign policy plays, transforming differences into otherness by explicitly drawing borders

between inside and outside as Campbell suggested. On the whole, the ‘other’ is more likely to be represented as a threat to what ‘the self is’ rather than just what ‘the self is not’. When inside is described as secure and peaceful and all the dangers would come from outside, any identity could always be threatened by something that is external to it (Howard 2000: 106). Torfing (1999: 124-129) argues that this radical otherness would precisely agree with ‘constitutive outside’ as they constitute and negate the identity of the inside. Furthermore, he regards ‘constitutive outside’ as coterminous with ‘social antagonism’, which is central a concept of discourse theory of Laclau and Mouffe (1985). Social antagonism would occur because social subjects are *unable* to attain their identities and they would construct an ‘enemy’ who is deemed responsible for this ‘failure’ (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, Howard 2000: 105). Thus, the negation or blockage of identity could highlight a friend-foe division between the self and other. Identity of the ‘self’ is reinforced through the specification of a threat of a radical other by focusing on differences.

Such attempts to re-theorize foreign policy promise to have some important implications for the analysis of the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy. Firstly, they assume that national identity is far from stable or fixed; it is in the process of reproduction and reconstruction, as Smith (2001: 18) describes. This indicates that states are continuously required to reconstruct and simultaneously reproduce what is ‘domestic’ and what is not, containing challenges to the constituted identity while this process of reproduction is never completed. Foreign policy makers are deliberately involved in this process in order to construct and maintain a national identity that sustains the foundations of domestic legitimacy (Messari 2001: 233).

Secondly, what is being proposed here is a shift in the understanding of foreign policy itself away from seeing it as a bridge between preexisting entities called states

with secured identities and toward something that constructs and reconstructs national identity by making differences between 'inside' and 'outside'. From this viewpoint, the state does not exist prior to policy. Instead, the boundary is reproduced and sustained in order to stabilize and naturalize a particular 'reality' which can serve to legitimate a certain policy and preclude any alternatives. Nationalism might also not independently exist because national identity, the core of nationalism, is constructed and reconstructed by foreign policy practice. Therefore, the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy might not be unilateral or one-way. Thirdly, when national identity and foreign policy are mutually constitutive, any political practice, even when it is seemingly separated from nationalist rhetoric, can essentially reconstruct national identity. Hansen (2006: 1) succinctly summarizes their relationship; 'Foreign policies rely upon representation of identity, but it is also through the formulation of foreign policy that identities are produced and reproduced'. Thus, it becomes necessary to pay attention to how national identity is represented in foreign policy discourse.

In this way, foreign policy, which could be conceptualized as the practice of states to erect a boundary between inside and outside would have a function to impose and fix meaning about 'inside' and 'outside' the boundary, thereby 'us' and 'them'. How the 'self' is constituted would be closely linked with how the 'other' is represented in foreign policy discourse. In other word, what kind of 'self' could be revealed through the definition of 'other' in foreign policy discourse. Therefore, foreign policy would be an identity-making practice by dealing with 'other' by which national identity is permanently reconstructed. It would be crucial to pay attention to how 'other' is articulated in foreign policy discourse to construct identity of the self.

1.5 Research Questions

Adopting the above theoretical perspective, this thesis seeks to answer the following research questions:

© What was the role of nationalism in Japan's foreign policy towards Asia during the Koizumi and Abe administrations?

- What kind of national identity was constructed in Japan's foreign policy?

- How did political leaders of Japan try to utilize national identity and nationalism in foreign policy?

The first and primary question concerns how nationalism can be defined in Japan's foreign policy in the region and how political leaders exploited it. In order to achieve an answer, this thesis sets some sub-questions. The first of these is to try to grasp what kind of nationalism is expressed in Japan's foreign policy and how a particular policy which is influenced by a certain version of nationalism becomes possible while others are precluded in the policy making process. The second sub-question explores how political leaders utilized nationalism in foreign policy in relation to power relationships in domestic politics. By exploring these questions, this research attempts to uncover a complex and multi-faced relationship between nationalism and foreign policy in Japan's politics. In this way, it seeks to develop a more comprehensive and convincing account of the role Japan's nationalism plays in its foreign policy towards East Asian countries.

1.6 Hypotheses

In accordance with the alternative conceptual framework on foreign policy and national identity discussed above, this thesis formulates hypotheses to be tested in order to explore the relationship between Japan's nationalism and foreign policy:

1) Japan's political leaders tried to reconstruct Japan's national identity in the post-Cold War era by using foreign policy towards Asia.

2) Japan's political actors tried to manipulate a certain version of 'nationalism', which seemed to be appropriate to legitimize their policy agendas by articulating national identity in foreign policy, in order to take advantages in domestic politics.

The first hypothesis can be tested by adopting the concepts presented by re-theorized foreign policy, because this theoretical orientation sees foreign policy as an identity-making practice rather than as a bridge-making tool between states. That is to say, foreign policy is used to construct and reconstruct national identity, which is in itself at the core of nationalism. By building boundaries between 'us' and 'them', and constructing the 'self' and the 'other', foreign policy produces identity and builds a particular 'reality', which in turn makes a certain policy possible and marginalizes other options. In other words, Japanese political leaders should be seen as trying to reconstruct and protect national identity through their foreign policy. In the case of post-Cold War Japan, mainstream conservative politicians sought a new national identity of Japan beyond the framework of the Yoshida Doctrine, which was based on the twin pillars of the alliance with the US and the Constitution. They adopted the strategy of historic reconciliation, which was as a part of a policy that aimed to remove obstacles, that is, history issue and distrust from the neighboring countries, against taking a more proactive leadership role in the region. On the other hand, the right-wing

traditionalists and neo-revisionists harshly opposed to the strategy arguing that it would harm Japan's national dignity. They alleged different national identity and diplomatic orientation in foreign policy making. In this way, those two schools of thought were behind each foreign policy toward China and North Korea under the administration of Koizumi and Abe.

In addition, it should be clarified what the term 'nationalism' would indicate in this thesis in order to explain the second hypothesis. As an abundance of literature demonstrates, 'nationalism' seems to be one of the most contested and unfixed concepts because it has a number of definitions and different usages such as ideology or political movement. For this reason, nationalism might make possible for various political leaders to appropriate it in order to obtain legitimacy for a variety of their policy agendas. In fact, nationalism in postwar Japan was far from monolithic despite the tendency that it is often identified with the 'traditional right-wing nationalism'. It would be wrong to assume that 'nationalism' in postwar Japan belongs to only one group or the other. As will be touched on in chapter 2, the progressives who embraced the pacifist constitution as a national value, tended to emphasize national identity to legitimize their argument and increase their credentials as well as the 'traditional right-wing nationalists'. Thus, all political actors were likely to contest and manipulate their 'nationalisms' so as to obtain legitimacy for their policy, to boost their domestic credibility, and to marginalize their political rivals.

In this contest, this thesis treats nationalism as '*a discourse on the continuous process of attaining, maintaining, and reproducing national identity*'. This conceptualization relies on the argument of Finlayson (1998) and Özkirimli (2005) in which nationalism was treated as a particular kind of discourse so as to go beyond the conventional typologies of nationalisms. In his article '*Ideology, Discourse and*

Nationalism', Finlayson argues that the discourse of nationalism 'oriented towards the production, exploration, clarification or furtherance of a nation and its identity (1998: 105)'. He also stated that nationalism should also be understood as a strategy of ideological legitimization. According to Finlayson, nationalism is always linked to other political ideologies and it is through association with 'nation' that these political ideologies are legitimated. By providing political ideologies with the appearance of natural origins, nationalism can convince people that the political ideology derived from their ancestry. Therefore, treating nationalism as a particular kind of discourse on national identity allows us to concentrate on how nationalism was manipulated in foreign policy making as a tool for legitimization. This thesis thus focuses on how nationalism is contested and manipulated among political actors within the process of foreign policy making, which was embedded in power relationship in Japanese politics, rather than integrating various definition of nationalism.

What is more, by conceptualizing nationalism as a discourse, it serves to focus on the relationship between nationalism in foreign policy and domestic power relationship among political actors. As Japan's nationalism is far from monolithic and always contested, as will be touched on in Chapter 2, various political actors can use it for different purpose because all political actors, who contend for power and influence in domestic politics, seek legitimacy to boost their domestic credentials. In this context, political actors attempt to utilize nationalism as a source of political capital so as to legitimize their policy agenda and to take advantages in domestic power struggles. In addition, as a 'discourse' reflects power relationships among subjects, treating nationalism as a discourse would contribute the examination of how nationalism in foreign policy was related to domestic power struggles. Therefore, this thesis will demonstrate the variety of ways in which political actors try to legitimize their position

and policy by appropriating the discourse of nationalism in their own way.

Taken together, my argument can be summarized as follows: Japan's political leaders tried to reconstruct Japan's national identity through foreign policy toward Asia and attempted to legitimize their policy program by a certain type of nationalism which was appropriate to their alleged national identity and marginalize other policy options proposed by their opponents. In this way, nationalism played an important role in each foreign policy initiative and domestic power relationship as well, because it would give political actors a source of political capital to legitimize each policy and to defeat their opponents.

In addition to these main hypotheses, this thesis proposes a theoretical hypothesis that not only defining the radical 'other' as 'inassimilable' by negative differences can construct the identity of the 'self,' but also positioning the 'other' as 'assimilable' with a series of juxtaposing positive signs as commonalities with the 'self'. The positive aspect of others would be assimilated in order to reproduce specific aspects of identity of the self. In the case study on Abe's India policy, I would attempt apply this theoretical framework to Japan's approach to India in the Abe administration. It intends to explore how a certain aspect of national identity of Japan is attempted to be reproduced and affirmed through constructing similarities with India in foreign policy discourse.

1.7 The Selection of Case Studies

This thesis will deal with five cases in which nationalism appears to have played a significant role in Japanese foreign policy making toward Asian countries: the deterioration of the relationship with China and a conciliatory approach toward North Korea under the Koizumi administration, the hard-line attitude against North Korea and

the improvement of the bilateral relationship with China by Prime Minister Abe, and finally, Abe's friendship-policy toward India. All of these cases seem to be related to the issue of nationalism, but they have quite different outcomes.

First of all, the Koizumi era witnessed a remarkable deterioration of the Japan-China relationship due to an unyielding attitude on the Yasukuni Shrine issue. While Japan needed to maintain close cooperation with both these countries with regard to a settlement of the North Korean issue and in order to attain a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council, the Koizumi government refused to make concessions on this issue and the diplomatic row was not resolved. Despite strong demands to improve the bilateral relationship from oppositions from inside and outside the party, Koizumi was coherent in his belief. Although it tends to be explained as an expression of right-wing nationalism, it might be doubted that Koizumi's policy was in fact shaped by traditional right-wing nationalism. Thus, this thesis aims to examine what kind of national identity and 'reality' was constructed, and how nationalism was utilized to legitimize his policy. In other words, this case study explores how Koizumi manipulated the Yasukuni Shrine issue as his political capital and legitimized it in accordance with 'nationalistic rhetoric' by articulating a certain version of national identity in foreign policy toward China.

On the other hand, contrary to his China policy, Koizumi did not take a tough stance against Pyongyang. He sought to normalize diplomatic ties with North Korea through dialogues rather than merely imposing sanctions as the pressure school insisted. In this sense, Koizumi's policy toward the DPRK would be notable in that it makes a sharp contrast with his tougher China Policy and Abe's hard-line policy. Therefore, the second case study would focus on what kind of national identity was represented in the foreign policy under the Koizumi administration and how Koizumi utilized the North

Korea issue to legitimize his position by articulating national identity in foreign policy.

To the contrary, Shinzo Abe, who is well known as a staunch nationalist, was able to exploit popular sentiment and to demonstrate a hard-line policy against North Korea. During his tenure, he put emphasis exclusively on the abduction issue in the whole North Korea policy and never made any concessions to break a stalemate of the negotiations. As Abe's stance coincided with the traditional right-wing group, it might be easy to argue that nationalism had an impact in the foreign policy making. However, it has not been fully examined how a particular policy could be made possible while other options were precluded as improper by the dynamics of nationalist politics. Hence, this section examines how the abduction issue was conceptualized and manipulated to raise his domestic credentials in accordance with his nationalism by articulating national identity in foreign policy toward North Korea.

In contrast with his hard-line North Korean policy, Abe attempted to improve the relationship with China when he came into office, reversing his hostile stance to China. In order to achieve rapprochement with China, Abe shelved the Yasukuni Shrine issue and adopted a 'strategic ambiguity'. As a result, he could improve the bilateral relationship with China and established a 'mutually beneficial relationship based on strategic interests'. If Abe was merely defined as the traditional right-wing nationalist, it is difficult to explain his policy shift toward China. This case can thus be used to explore how he tried to legitimate his change in political stance to China and utilize it as his political capital.

It might be better to explain a little bit more about the reason why Abe's policy toward India is selected as one of the case studies in this thesis. The primary reason is not only that India was an important country in Japan's Asian diplomacy under the Abe administration, but also that Abe's policy toward India seemed to be related to his other

policy, namely, the rapprochement with China. Although, it might be persuasive in geopolitical terms to argue for balancing China by strengthening ties with India, considerations for domestic politics seemed to be more plausible in this case. Simply put, the Abe administration had to ease the discontents among his anti-China and rightwing supporters against his policy of improving the bilateral relationship with China. In order to achieve his China policy without impediments from them and to retain their supports, Abe needed to offset his China policy by other foreign policy issues. In this context, a friendly-approach to India was selected in addition to a hard-line approach to North Korea. It was because India was regarded to be a perfect candidate for Abe; the country is perceived as a ‘Japan-friendly country’ without any history disputes unlike China; thus it would not polarize public opinion unlike North Korea. More importantly, India is the mother country of ‘Judge Pal’, who found all the Japanese defendants to be innocent at the Tokyo War Tribunal. As Judge Pal has had enormous popularity with Japanese people especially among the right-wingers, to enhance ties with India would strongly appeal to Abe’s supporters. In fact, Abe’s visit to Calcutta to meet Judge Pal’s family was significant because it indicated that Abe’s fundamental view of history did not change. It thus served to ease the frustration over his rapprochement with China and the shelving of history issues among his ‘conservative’ supporters. In fact, the existence of Judge Pal makes strengthening ties with India different from other foreign policy cases such as Australia or South Korea. Although those two countries are treated as sharing ‘universal values’ with Japan, they do not have historical icons like Pal and thus might not appeal to the right wing.

In addition, there is a reason not to focus on Koizumi’s policy for India. While he offsets the discontents of anti-Chinese groups against his conciliatory approach to North Korea by his uncompromising stance against China, he did not seek to balance his

policy to North Korea by policy to India. This was symbolized by his visit to the memorial of Mahatma Gandhi, not Pal. In this way, this thesis focuses on the policy toward India under the Abe administration as one of the case studies because it would have a great importance to analyze how political leaders try to offset their weakness in one foreign policy by choosing and conducting other foreign policies.

Taken together, these five case studies are supposed to be touchstones for examining the relationship between nationalism and the foreign policy of Japan in different situations; how nationalism is manipulated by political actors in order to legitimize their policy and boost their domestic credentials.

1.8 Methodology

Discourses construct “particular subject identities, positioning these subjects vis-à-vis one another and thereby constructing a particular “reality” in which this policy became possible, as well as a larger “reality” in which future policies would be justified in advance (Doty 1993:304-305).

As stated above, this thesis will be carried out within a constructivist framework with a new thinking of foreign policy drawing on post-positivist scholars such as Campbell (1998) Doty (1993, 1996), and Hansen (1996). The most suitable methodology for such an approach is discourse analysis. This section aims to show the advantages of applying this approach to my research. First, after a brief introduction of the method, three presuppositions of discourse analysis will be argued for. Then, analytical framework for this research will be explained. Next, I will discuss how a discursive approach offers certain advantages for this particular study.

Discourse analysis can be defined as a method to inquire into the articulations by which social reality and identities are constructed. In other words, Discursive practices construct social reality by inscribing identities for subjects and defining the relationship between them. Discourse is presumed to construct a particular 'reality' through shaping subjects and objects by differentiating them, creating their relations by making hierarchy among them, and defining the state of affairs by naturalizing these relations. In this conceptualization, discourses would include both linguistic and behavioral practices: not only a group of texts but also social practices to which those texts are linked. Doty (1996: 123) argues that 'the linguistic and behavioral aspects of social practices form a complex and inextricably connected whole that is a discourse.' This understanding of discourses is the one that Laclau and Mouffe (1985) suggest and Doty (1993, 1996), Wennersten (1999), and Diez (2001) have applied in foreign policy analysis. Although discourse analysis has not received much attention from mainstream IR scholars, recently it has become a more active area in IR (Milliken 1999: 225, Diez 2001: 5). This is partly because its focus on the knowledge/power nexus can challenge the 'scientism' of mainstream IR theories. According to Milliken (1999: 227), discourse analysis is 'a post-positivist project that is critically self-aware of the closures imposed by research programmes and the modes of analysis which scholars routinely use in their work and treat as unproblematic.'

Milliken (1999) discusses the application of discourse studies to the subject of IR and explains three theoretical presuppositions; discourse as system of significance, discourse productivity, and the play of practice. The first concept assumes discourses as 'structures of signification which construct social realities' through defining various subjects and objects and imposing relational distinctions on them (Milliken 1999: 227). Doty (1993: 302) refers to this idea as a 'linguistic construction of reality', drawing

from Shapiro (1984: 222) that ‘language can be seen as a set of signs which are part of a system for generating subjects, objects, and worlds.’ As Milliken (1999: 229) points out, it seems to be compatible with an idea of constructivism that material things by themselves might not have intrinsic meanings; their meanings would be socially constructed by ideas. Structures, which discourses would create, are largely formed in terms of binary oppositions in which one element is privileged over the other (Derrida 1981). These binary oppositions would constitute relations between subjects and objects or subjects and subjects so as to define identities of them. In this way, as Doty (1993: 303) puts it, discourses in various texts could produce meanings and in doing so actively create the ‘reality’ on which foreign policy is based.

The second theoretical presumption illuminates the aspect of *power as productive*. It emphasizes the power that might be inherent in discourses and by which actors, both subjects and objects, are constructed. Doty highlights the dimension in which ‘subjects are themselves constructed, defined as particular kinds of subjects, and given particular identities (Doty 1996: 129)’ in particular discourses. In addition to constructing various kinds of subjects, discourses ‘simultaneously position these subjects vis-à-vis one another (Doty 1993: 303)’ by creating hierarchy among them and thus constitute ‘particular interpretive dispositions which create certain possibilities and preclude others (1993: 298)’. As a result, they construct particular subjects with certain identities, which would be indeed socially constructed, such that certain practices would be made possible thereby create a way of operationalizing a particular ‘regime of truth’ while excluding other possible modes of identity and action. Applying this to foreign policy analysis means being concerned with the question of how particular subjects and identities are constructed so as to make possible a certain course of action while marginalizing other options.

The third presupposition is a concern for the vulnerability and the instability of the concept of an objective 'reality' which is constructed by hegemonic discourses. In spite of efforts to stabilize and fix dominant meanings and exclude alternative discourses, all discourses could be unstable and historically contingent. Thus, they would require continuous work for authorized actors to 'articulate and rearticulate their knowledge and identities' in order to fix the 'regime of truth' (Milliken 1990: 230). In sum, a discursive approach does not assume the pre-given and fixed identity of subjects and social reality but presumes that subjects are socially and discursively constructed and reconstructed in order to stabilize their hegemony. Foreign policy is thus treated as an integral part of this permanent process of reconstruction.

To be sure, it seems plausible that the discursive approach and re-theorized foreign policy analysis can be closely interrelated with each other given that a range of existing works have used this approach. In her analysis of US counterinsurgency policy with new thinking of foreign policy as social construction, for example, Doty (1993) takes the Discursive Practice Approach which uses three analytical concepts as a textual mechanism; *Presupposition*, *Predication*, and *Subject Positioning*. These three concepts will contribute to explaining how a 'reality' is constructed, producing positions among various subjects and endowing them with particular attributes. Wennersten (1999: 278) also analyzed how the foreign policy practices of the European Union (EU) have been stimulating the formation of a collective identity between the Baltic countries and the EU within a constructivist framework using the method of discourse analysis. He argues that discursive practices construct social reality by inscribing certain identities for certain subjects and that a collective identity was formed through a reconstruction of boundaries between the European/Western inside and outside. Diez (2001) similarly examines the discursive formation of European governance with an emphasis on the

concept of the discursive nodal point that is proposed by Laclau and Mouffe (1985). He maintains that powerful discursive practices are not only shaped by but also reproduced by their discursive context, simultaneously attempting to pin down specific meanings in the meta-narratives, which are often unquestioned or presented as ‘natural’ or taken for granted.

Moreover, foreign policy and national identity can be regarded as a product of discourse (Wodak, Cillia, Reisigl and Liebhart 1999: 22). One of the successful works of this line of thought is Hansen’s (2006) *‘Security as Practice’*. This conceptualizes identity as discursive, political, relational and social and argues that foreign policy discourse always articulates the self and the other. ‘It is only through the discursive enactment of foreign policy that identity comes into being, but this identity is at the same time constructed as legitimization for the policy proposed’ (Hansen 2006: 21). Özkirimli (2005: 33) also suggests that nationalism can be regarded a discourse which divides the world into ‘us’ and ‘them’, makes hierarchies, naturalizes itself, and is operated by various institutions. Given these, the discursive approach is supposed to be a suitable method for the framework of this thesis.

Looking at the particular question of how policy makers construct a particular national identity in foreign policy discourse, Hansen (2006: 28) argues that as the goal of a foreign policy maker is ‘to present a foreign policy that appears legitimate and enforceable to its relevant audience’, they seek to construct ‘a link between policy and identity that makes the two appear consistent with each other’. Following this approach, this thesis will highlight two analytical concepts; the dual process of identity production; assimilation/ dissimulation, and intertextuality. When a particular construction of identity underlies or proscribes a certain policy, dual boundary-making practices for identity formation come into play. While the process of assimilation forms

'homogeneous' nations and consolidates national unity, it also engages with the process of dissimilation that externalizes any difference that is opposed to the self (differentiation). By positioning the 'other' as a 'threat' with a series of juxtaposing negative signs, the morality and legitimacy of the 'other' is devalued (hierarchized) and a policy to externalize the 'other' can be authorized (normalized). In this process, 'threat' plays the role of legitimizing policy that externalizes the 'other' and plays the role of promoting national unity to counter itself. Thus, political elites deliberately manipulate a 'threat' to construct national identity, which in turn comes to underpin their foreign policy. Hansen (2006) thus depicts how subjects are constructed through positive signs on the one hand (linking), and negative ones on the other hand (differentiation). These juxtapositions would form binary oppositions that constitute the relationship between subjects and objects.

In addition, when conceptualizing foreign policy as a discursive product, Julia Kristeva's conception of 'intertextuality' is useful both methodologically and analytically. This means that all texts including foreign policy texts do not exist separately from a wider web of societal discourse. As Hansen (2006: 55) explains, 'texts are situated within and against other texts' and 'they draw upon them in constructing their identities and policies.' To construct a particular identity in foreign policy discourse for the official narratives, and to attain legitimacy, foreign policy texts thus have to make references to previous texts. Policy makers deliberately choose which facts and knowledge are to be drawn from which texts and how to locate them within a particular discourse. Thus, as foreign policy discourse is constructed through a larger body of texts, this thesis will pay attention to its intertextuality as well as how 'threat' is constructed within it.

Finally, it needs to be explained here what the advantages are in applying a

discursive approach to the analysis of the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy. Firstly, the discursive approach can offer a new perspective on the analysis of Japan's foreign policy because exploration of this topic in terms of discourse analysis has been limited so far. While traditional IR theories have not been able to provide a satisfactory explanation of Japan's foreign policy, the discursive approach could cast some light on it from a different viewpoint that can be expected to either supplement or challenge them. Secondly, it could help to maintain a degree of coherence between the theoretical framework and the methodology of this thesis. This is because the conception of national identity and foreign policy as discursive practice implies that policy and identity can be seen as ontologically interlinked. As identities are produced and reproduced through foreign policy discourse, there might be no national identity prior to and independent from foreign policy (Hansen 2006: 21, 28). Thirdly, the discursive approach can uncover power relations and hierarchies among subjects behind a particular construction of national identity, and thus denaturalize an objective 'reality' on which foreign policy is based. Therefore, it would be appropriate to reveal how political actors utilized nationalism as political capital to raise their domestic credentials and defeat their rivals in domestic politics. In addition, this has an advantage over conventional foreign policy analysis, which tends to take as unproblematic the possibility that a particular decision or course of action could take place and neglect exploration of an important aspect of power as productive by posing *why*-questions (Doty 1993: 298). On the other hand, the discursive approach poses *how-possible* questions that examine particular constructions of identity by which certain practices are made possible (Doty 1993: 298-303). Therefore, by adopting discourse analysis, this research focuses on how a certain policy becomes possible while others are excluded as improper in foreign policy making and how it is legitimized in domestic power

relationships.

What should be noted here is that this thesis analyzes a number of texts, which are mainly cited from the congressional record, articles and books written by policy makers, and newspaper articles. It also examines wordings in speeches, interviews, and press conferences of politicians and diplomats. It is because those texts represent official viewpoints of each political actor and are intended to appeal to the public to strengthen their credentials.

In sum, discourse analysis offers the possibilities for developing an original thesis because it is a highly critical approach insofar as it makes more elements of policy making problematic and takes less as given by focusing on the particular ways in which identity is constructed. Through the examination of representational practices, which rely on a series of relations between subjects, the discursive approach can be used to explore how certain practices are made possible and others are precluded by the hierarchy of subjects. Therefore, it can offer a new perspective on the analysis of the relationship between Japan's nationalism and its foreign policy.

1.9 Chapter Outline

This thesis will consist of 8 chapters including introduction and conclusion. The first chapter aims to clarify research questions and hypothesis, looking at existing literatures on Japan's nationalism and foreign policy, and explaining the theoretical framework, methodology and selection of case studies. The primary question, which this thesis seeks to answer, is to explore the role of nationalism in Japan's foreign policy toward Asia during the Koizumi and Abe administrations, focusing on the relationship between national identity and foreign policy. In order to explore this question, this

thesis adopts an alternative conceptual framework based on post-positivist thinking and uses discourse analysis approach.

The second chapter will offer a brief explanation of basic information of postwar Japanese politics after WW II with emphasis on the division in domestic power politics. Foreign policy of postwar Japan was rebuilt and developed on the basis of the ‘Yoshida Doctrine’, which relied upon the twin pillars of the war-renouncing Constitution and the Japan-US Security Treaty. On the domestic front, power struggles between the progressives and the conservatives formulated the ‘1955 system’ at the same time with confrontations among factions within the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP). This chapter describes how political actors contended for power and legitimacy by upholding and manipulating national values in postwar Japanese politics, which was behind the power relationship surrounding Prime Minister Koizumi and Abe.

The third and fourth chapters will examine Japan’s foreign policy toward China and North Korea under the Koizumi administration: the first case is the deterioration of Japan-China relationship focusing on the Yasukuni Shrine issue in the Koizumi era, and his conciliatory approach toward North Korea, aiming at diplomatic normalization, is examined in the second case study chapter.

The following chapter discusses on the discourse of ‘neo-revisionists’, who are Abe and his supporters, with special emphasis on what kind of national identity and national values were constituted through making domestic others in Abe’s political slogan of the ‘departure from the postwar regime’ and ‘Toward a beautiful country’. Abe’s argument focuses primarily on dismantling the discourse of ‘postwar democracy’, which has been dominant in Japanese society since 1945. At the same time, he seems to transform, redefine, and fix the meanings of the core of identities established in ‘postwar democracy’ discourse, such as ‘peace’, ‘autonomy’ and ‘democracy’. In the

process, he constructs radical others on the domestic front and alleges the legitimacy of his policy. Chapter 6 deals with two case studies on Abe's unexpected rapprochement with China and on his hard-line approach against the DPRK, emphasizing the abduction issue.

The fifth case study in Chapter 7 concerns the enhancement of the partnership with India under the Abe administration. Abe's India policy, as a part of a policy of the 'Arc of Freedom and Prosperity', is discussed in relation to his 'departure from the postwar regime' and his China policy. The construction of India as a 'Japan-friendly' country without a history issue, which shares universal values, and respect Japan's contribution for peace served to highlight the radical 'otherness' of China. This made the fundamental improvement of the bilateral relationship with China less likely because it was an 'inassimilable other'. In addition, the emphasis on 'value-oriented diplomacy' was treated as a source of political capital of political leaders to offset discontents among anti-Chinese groups and to consolidate support for the Abe administration in order to realize the 'departure from the postwar regime'.

Finally, the last chapter will conclude what kind of role Japan's nationalism played in foreign policy and how it was associated with domestic power relationships. As Japan's nationalism is not monolithic, not only radical politicians but also all political actors endeavor to utilize nationalism as a source of political capital over different issues. They tried to contest a version of nationalism by articulating and reconstructing a certain national identity in foreign policy discourse in order to legitimize their footings, to offset weakness of a policy, and to marginalize opponents in domestic politics by constructing the self/other nexus. Nationalism thus could be bound up with various political thoughts and has played an important role as a source of political capital to legitimize different policy programs by producing subjects and the

hierarchical relationship among them. In this sense, nationalism is more than just a vote-gathering machine at the election. Instead, it can be regarded as a discourse: it produces power relationships among subjects and naturalizes them. Therefore, this thesis might be contributory to the development of a study of nationalism by confirming effectivity in treating nationalism as a discourse. In addition, this thesis argues that although both Koizumi and Abe sought for ‘a closure of the history issues’ and diplomatic autonomy by upholding a ‘peaceful country’ as national identity, they became trapped into a negative cycle of nationalism and foreign policy. Therefore, the termination of the vicious cycle might be necessary for Japan to obtain leadership and diplomatic autonomy in the region.

Chapter 2. Political History of Postwar Japan and Factional Politics

After the defeat of WW II, the dominant discourse in Japanese policy making was based on the theme of reconstruction while showing ‘deep remorse over its aggression’ in Asia. The result was outstanding economic growth while embracing the postwar Constitution. Despite the economic and diplomatic success of this formula, however, postwar Japan has never reached domestic consensus on how to define its national identity, except for the ambiguous representation that being a ‘peaceful country’ is a national virtue. In this context, a number of political actors sought to fulfill their policy, expand their domestic credentials, and defeat their rivals. In order to realize this, they tried to juggle various issues, from domestic to international, and to legitimize their policy through the consistency with alleged national identity. Put another way, political actors would attempt to legitimize their stance and policy by utilizing the construction of the self/other nexus over diversified issues. Therefore, all power struggles in domestic politics would take the form of contests over the orthodoxy of national identity. In this sense, not only foreign policy but also domestic power relationships might closely be associated with the construction of national identity. In particular, domestic controversy over the Constitution or the history issue were linked with international concerns over the Japan-US Security Treaty or the relationship with China and contested in terms of what kind of national identity postwar Japan should express.

For this reason, it would be wrong to assume that ‘nationalism’ in postwar Japan belongs to only one group or the other. Actually, the progressives who embraced the pacifist constitution and rejected the conservative tendency emphasized a version of national identity and national values to legitimize their argument and increase their credentials as well as ‘traditional right-wing nationalists’. For instance, when the progressives insisted on unarmed

neutrality and the abolition of the Japan-US Security Treaty in the 1950s and 1960s, it was expressed as a national desire for the restoration of Japan's 'autonomy' from the US. The Japan Communist Party, which has been identified as a typical 'progressive group', claimed 'patriotism' as a part of their political slogan immediately after WW II as Oguma (2002) pointed out. In this sense, the progressives can be as 'nationalistic' as the conservatives, who advocate 'traditional cultures' and the 'sacred' Emperor system. Therefore, it can be argued that postwar Japan's nationalism has not been limited to 'traditional rightwing' nationalism; it has been not monolithic but multi-dimensional. All political actors, whether progressives or right-wing traditionalists, are thus likely to manipulate their 'nationalisms' so as to obtain legitimacy for their policy, to boost their domestic credibility, and to marginalize their political rivals.

In this context, as a background for the case studies in later chapters, this chapter primarily discusses the linkage between nationalism in foreign policy and domestic power struggle, by demonstrating that postwar Japan's nationalism was not monolithic and that political actors utilized various 'nationalisms' to appeal their legitimacy of power. It thus focuses on what kind of political actors formed power relationships in domestic politics by deploying discourse by deploying national identity discourse and what kind of issues could be utilized as political capital for them.

My argument is as follows: under the '1955 system' during the Cold War, the conservatives and the progressives competed against each other for the legitimacy of their claimed version of national identity. Despite the dominance of the conservative camp in the Diet, postwar pacifism, which was rooted in the peace Constitution, became firmly embedded in postwar Japanese society, and national identity as a 'peaceful country' was established as a national value. At the same time as the confrontation between the progressives and the conservatives, there was an unremitting row among factions within the

Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), especially between mainstream conservatives and anti-mainstream conservatives. These included longstanding divisions over security and history issues in the form of debates over the revision of the Constitution and foreign policy toward neighboring countries. Within these, foreign policy toward China polarized the LDP between a pro-Taiwan group and a pro-China group. As the importance of the bilateral relationship increased and the history issue with China intensified, both the pro-China stance and anti-China stance became sources of political capital in domestic politics.

After the end of the Cold War, various political leaders continued to seek to reconstruct the national identity of Japan. Although the rise of a ‘neo-revisionist’ movement among young politicians of anti-mainstream conservatives from the 1990s drew international attention as it was seen as the ‘resurgence of Japan’s nationalism’, however, it was actually aimed at countering the ‘historic reconciliation strategy’ conducted by mainstream conservatives, which attempted to reconstruct Japan’s identity as a more active contributor to regional and world peace and to take political initiatives in the region by coming to terms with its past. Yet, this conservative effort at reconciliation did not proceed smoothly because of resentment against China’s manipulating the ‘history card’ and its rapid economic and military growth. In this context, both the settlement of the history issue and the anti-China stance became political capital for political actors. Prime Ministers Koizumi and Abe were both operating in this context and pursuing their foreign policy towards China and North Korea by utilizing these themes as political capital.

In order to discuss this, this chapter provides explanation firstly of the political division between the progressives and the conservatives. It then examines the division between conservative groups, which revolves around factional rivalry and polarization over the China issue. Explanations of the two Prime Ministers, Koizumi and Abe, in factional politics are followed by a history of factional politics in the LDP.

2.1 The division between the progressives and the conservatives

The '1955 system' represented a situation of postwar Japan in which domestic politics was divided between the two major camps, the 'progressives' and the 'conservatives'. Those two groups conflicted with each other over various issues such as security policy and war interpretation, in particular, and the Japan-US Security Treaty. Among them, the controversy over Article 9 of the new Constitution, which renounces the right to use force in the conduct of foreign affairs, represented the division of different versions of postwar nationalisms. The progressives including the Socialist Party, the Japan Communist Party (JCP), many labor unions and major mass media, adhered to the war-renouncing Constitution, advocated the ideal of unarmed neutrality, and preferred non-alignment policy to deepening ties with the US. On the other hand, those who sympathized with the prewar traditional values questioned the legitimacy of the Constitution because it was 'foreign-written' and 'imposed' by the US. They thus insisted on the necessity to recreate the Constitution by the Japanese people and to regain the right to protect the nation. The latter group consisted of right-wing traditionalists and right-center conservatives who insisted on full-fledged rearmament. This polarization of domestic politics can be traced back to the reaction to the early Occupation reforms after WW II, and formed a basic structure of postwar Japanese society during the Cold War.

It was the issue of rearmament that caused severe disagreement between the two camps. Along with the intensification of the Cold War, the US began to press Japan on rearmament as a part of a reverse course of the Occupation policy. The growing concern over the spread Communism with the outbreak of the Korean War and the establishment of Communist China urged the US to promote the rearmament of Japan. However, Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida refused drastic rearmament for several reasons, most notably, the restraint of the Constitution. According to Otake (2005: 33), Yoshida refused drastic

rearmament for four reasons as follows; the rearmament would considerably delay Japan's economic recovery, cause alarm among neighboring countries and the opposition parties and lead to widespread anti-militarism among Japanese people, as well as risk the revival of militarism.

The rearmament issue caused a heated debate because it was not just a defense problem, but touched on the fundamental issues of the domestic regime and national identity, such as choosing the revival of the emperor system and militarism or the preservation of a liberal democratic system (Sakamoto 1963: 123, Otake 2005: 3). In the discourse of both the Yoshida government and right-wing traditionalists, 'rearmament' was promoted as a symbol of the 'restoration of Japan's independence'. On the other hand, the progressive groups severely criticized the gradual rearmament policy, being vigilant against the revival of militarism and maintaining that the SDF was unconstitutional.

What is interesting is that both the progressives and the traditionalists regarded the SDF as unconstitutional and attacked the 'limited and gradual' rearmament policy of the Yoshida government as evidence of subordination to the US, only for diametrically opposite reasons. While the progressives espoused the 'unarmed neutrality' policy, the leaders of the traditionalists claimed that the constitution should be revised to have its own full-fledged army to protect the country, emphasizing autonomy from the US and patriotism. Whereas only the Yoshida government presumed the SDF to be constitutional, however, the progressives shared its pro-Constitution stance for their own reasons. The progressives had an ideal of pacifism based on the constitution, while Yoshida used it as a pretext to avoid US pressure for burden sharing. In this way, Yoshida's policy was attacked by both the progressives and right-wing traditionalists (Kosaka 1969-d: 123). The conservatives tended to use this policy as an internal Cold War strategy, that is, anti-communism and anti-progressivism. Therefore, it was not surprising that the progressives regarded

rearmament policy as a part of the reverse course to restore prewar social order and a crisis of postwar 'democracy'. In this way, as Sakamoto (1963: 123-4) noticed through the reverse course especially on the issue of rearmament, the polarization of Japanese society, that is the contest of Japanese nationalist discourse, was reproduced and intensified.

Furthermore, the anti-Security treaty demonstration of 1960 became a watershed for the development of postwar nationalism in Japan. Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi, a grandfather of Abe, set out to revise the Japan-US security Treaty, motivated to revise the one-sided and unequal nature of the treaty as infringing on Japan's independence as a sovereign state (Soeya 2005: 68). Kishi insisted on 'autonomy' from and 'equality' with the US as symbols of nationalism. However, the progressives, supported by intellectuals, mass media, and public opinion, clearly opposed the revision of the Security Treaty, arguing that it would strengthen Japan's dependency on the US. Their opposition was directed not just to the revision of the Treaty itself, but against Kishi's reactionary policy toward the 'internal Cold War' and his 'authoritarian' method to force the treaty through the Diet, which was regarded as a threat to democracy. In this circumstance, the slogans of the anti-Security Treaty movement were "to protect 'peace', 'the Constitution' and 'democracy'" which were core values of progressive nationalism. However, the anti-Security Treaty movement could appeal not only to the progressives but also to a wider range of people and called for the 'restoration of Japan's autonomy'. In this sense, it can be argued that the anti-Security Treaty movement of 1960 would exemplify the expression of progressive nationalism of postwar Japan. Although progressive nationalism failed to inhibit the revision of the Security Treaty and was toned down to some extent after the movement, it has enjoyed long-term popular support as under the guise of 'postwar pacifism'. Its influence lasted to the extent that it was able to prevent the revision of the constitution in the Diet under the '1955 system' during the Cold War Era (Fujiwara 2001: 158).

In addition to the issues of the Constitution, rearmament, and the Japan-US Security Treaty, the question of how to recognize the nature of Japan's Asia-Pacific War¹ and its war responsibility drew a line between the progressives and the conservatives. The former denied the legitimacy of the 'Greater East War', regarding Japan's war as 'aggression' and condemning prewar militarism. They accepted the judgment of the Tokyo War Tribunal where prewar military and political leaders were prosecuted as Class-A War Criminals for the crimes against peace and humanity and the 'honorable' Japanese imperial army was accused of committing atrocities in East Asian countries. This perception of the war was later labeled as the 'historical view of the Tokyo War Tribunal'. On the other hand, the conservatives rejected this historical perception and glorified the war as a 'fight for the emancipation of Asian people from Western imperialism'. They questioned the legitimacy of the Tokyo War Tribunal and often cited Judge Pal's 'Dissentient Judgment', which had announced that all the Class-A War Criminals had been innocent, in order to deny the legitimacy of the tribunal itself. In this manner, whether they regarded the war as 'aggression' or not became the divisive point between the conservatives and the progressives as Yoshida (1995: 175) pointed out.

It is important to look at the historical understanding of Japanese people at the grass-roots level because politicians can use the dominant discourse in public opinion as political capital. As Seaton (2007:44) argues, the Occupation policy had a considerable impact in shaping the historical understanding of postwar Japanese people of the Asia Pacific War. As a result of the Tokyo War Tribunal, atrocities of the 'holy' imperial army were widely exposed and caused shock among the Japanese people, which led to a strong aversion to prewar militarism. Another important impact on the public view of history was the

¹ This research will call Japan's war from 1930 to 1945 as the Asia Pacific War to keep its neutral stance because conventional names would have connotations. The 'Pacific War' tends to focus on the aspect of war against the US and the 'Greater East Asia War' might emphasize fight against China and war in East Asian countries.

emergence of the 'leaders' responsibility view'. Demonstrated in the Tribunal, the GHQ took a policy of distinguishing 'political leaders' from 'ordinary people' and emphasized the war responsibility of the former. This 'leaders' responsibility view', was quickly accepted by Japanese people, who came to recognize that they had been victims of not only attack by foreign enemies, but also of their own leaders. The resentment for their prewar leaders waging war against the US with little opportunity to win then led to a distrust of prewar militarism and ultra-nationalists. The establishment of the 'view of leader's responsibility' contributed to the smooth acceptance of 'postwar democracy' and shelved a problem of war cooperation and war responsibility of the Japanese people (Yoshida 1995: 55). In this way, a strong aversion against prewar militarism and war itself was embedded in postwar Japanese society, which firmly supported a national value of 'peace'.

Therefore, postwar Japan could not build a nation-wide consensus on the interpretation of war, because this progressive-leaning historical understanding among the public made a stark contrast with the 'conservative' historical view, which was dominant in the ruling LDP. Japan's conservative leaders tended to emphasize the defensive motives and to neglect the wartime atrocities of Japan's imperial army in the narrative of the Asia Pacific War and complained about the limitations of the Tokyo War Tribunal. In addition, the fact that a large number of ruling prewar elites, who held the revisionist historical view, were brought back by the red purge and joined the LDP strengthening this propensity.

As a result of the mixture of the enhanced victim mentality of Japan's people, limitations of the Occupation policy on the history issue and tendency of conservative domestic narratives, a sort of 'double-standard' on war responsibility was formed in the mid 1950s. Yoshida (1995: 82, 1997: 172) explains that the double-standard is a way to separate how to deal with the war responsibility issue between domestic explanation and external posture; 'while externally Japan acknowledges minimum war responsibility by accepting

judgments of the Tokyo War Tribunal in article 11 of the San Francisco Peace Treaty’, however, ‘the Japanese government would have often denied the de facto war responsibility or shelved the issue’ (Yoshida 1995: 82). In so doing, it became a convention that conservative politicians, who were in governmental positions and had a revisionist historical view, tended to hesitate to categorize Japan’s wartime action as a definite ‘aggression’ in domestic discourse and to argue that ‘it should be left to the judgment to future historians’ like Prime Minister Abe. Such an attitude often invited a situation in which some ‘conservative’ politicians, more precisely they were ‘revisionists’, made a ‘gaffe’ on the history issue like denying war responsibility while Japanese Prime Ministers expressed deep remorse on wartime behavior. As a result, this ‘double-standard’ on history would make it difficult for Japan to achieve reconciliation with neighboring countries because it would give the impression that Japan has not come to terms with its past aggression in Asia. In this way, domestic disagreement on the historical view shaped the ‘double-standard’ of war interpretation, which made Japan’s history issue more complex and prolonged.

In this way, immediately after its defeat in WW II, the domestic politics of postwar Japan was split between the progressive camp and the conservative camp, which was called the ‘1955 system’. The two groups competed to realize their vision of how Japan should be constructed, causing disagreements on a number of issues concerning Japan’s national identity such as the legitimacy of the Constitution and historical perception. In this sense, there can be found a divided nationalism: ‘progressive’ or ‘pro-Constitution’ nationalism, which espoused ‘peace’, ‘democracy’ and ‘autonomy from the US’ and which was based on the ‘historical view of the Tokyo War Tribunal’ on the one hand, and ‘right-wing traditionalist’ or ‘revisionist’ nationalism which embraced the prewar value system centering on the Emperor and rejected the ‘historical view of the Tokyo War Tribunal’. In this situation, the government failed to unify this divided nationalism but seemed to consolidate

the division. In addition, while the progressive historical view was widespread among the public, the ‘double-standard’ on war responsibility emerged in political circles. As a result, the ideational structure of the ‘1955 system’ is one in which the progressives and the conservatives fight against each other, both calling themselves ‘guardian of the nation’ and defining the other as the ‘enemy of the nation’. This is a visible tension in Abe’s discourse, as will be discussed in later chapters. Furthermore, it can be argued that the emphasis on ‘peace’ came to be regarded as an important source of political capital because it became a national value in the public aversion to war.

2.2 The sub-division among the conservatives: mainstream versus anti-mainstream

Postwar Japanese politics is often described as a simple confrontation between the progressives and the conservatives represented as the ‘1955 system’. However, the conservative camp was far from monolithic; it was divided into mainstream conservatives (hoshu-honryu 保守本流) and anti- or minor-mainstream conservatives (hoshu-boryu 保守傍流). The former can roughly be regarded as the ‘Yoshida School’ in that the Kochi-kai (宏池会) was launched by Yoshida’s protégé, Hayato Ikeda, and the Keisei-kai (経世会) was originally established by Yoshida’s protégé, Eisaku Sato, followed by Kakuei Tanaka. On the other hand, the latter was descended from Ichiro Hatoyama, political rival of Yoshida². Mainstream conservatives tended to be right of center while minor-mainstreams were generally consisted of the right-wing traditionalists. As there was political rivalry and a number of disagreements between them, it developed a trilateral relationship among the progressives, the Yoshida School, and the traditionalist. This section focuses on the

² In this sense, the rivalry between mainstream and anti-mainstream conservative reflected the division before the unification of conservative camp (hoshu-godo 保守合同) into the LDP.

confrontation among conservatives because it constitutes important background factor of foreign policy making under Koizumi and Abe.

2.2.1 The Division between the Yoshida Line and anti-mainstream on the security issue

Among a number of disagreements, rearmament was one of the major topics, which the Yoshida School and anti-mainstream conservatives contested. First, the course of foreign policy, which aimed to attain early independence and achieve economic recovery, conducted by Prime Minister Yoshida was called the ‘Yoshida line’. It was based on close cooperation with the US though Yoshida skillfully avoided full-fledged rearmament for the US alliance by using the Constitution as a pretext. Although the presumption of the Yoshida line had collapsed due to Japan’s independence and economic recovery, it was re-established as a grand design of postwar Japanese foreign policy. Against this stance on rearmament, the traditionalists attacked the ‘limited and gradual’ rearmament policy of the Yoshida government and claimed that the constitution should be revised to allow a full-fledged army to protect the country, emphasizing autonomy from the US and patriotism. In this way, Yoshida’s policy was attacked by both the progressives and the right-wing traditionalists (Kosaka 1969-d: 123).

In this context, Nobusuke Kishi came into office and attempted to amend the ‘Yoshida line’ in foreign policy. Kishi set out to revise the Japan-US security Treaty, motivated by the desire of traditional nationalists to gain the autonomy of Japan because traditionalists often problematized the one-sided and unequal nature of the Treaty as infringing Japan’s independence as a traditional sovereign state (Soeya 2005: 68). For instance, the Treaty permitted the US the right to intervene in domestic affairs to maintain peace and stability. Thus, the revision of the Treaty was an answer from the traditionalists to the question of how

Japan could enhance its prestige in international society (Kosaka 1969-d: 179). Furthermore, being unable to ignore the anti-US feeling expressed by both the traditionalists and the progressives, Kishi insisted on 'autonomy' from and 'equality' with the US as symbols of nationalism.

The anti-Security Treaty demonstration of 1960 had some impact on right-wing traditionalists. Although Kishi could revise the Treaty, it meant the limitation of the request to achieve absolute 'autonomy' beyond the framework of the Japan-US alliance. They thus began to be incorporated into the mainstream Yoshida group and to express their desire for 'autonomy' within the framework of cooperation with the US (Soeya 2005: 81). This also had an impact on the centrist Yoshida School in the government. Hayato Ikeda, who replaced Kishi as Prime Minister, demonstrated a 'tolerant' and 'low posture' in order to prevent intensified polarization from causing political disturbance like the anti-security treaty demonstration of 1960. Instead of claiming 'autonomy' as a symbol of nationalism like his predecessors, he set out an economic-first policy attempting to reduce the national goal to 'economic growth'. His attempt turned out to be a success. From then on, Japan single-mindedly pursued a policy focused on its economic growth and achieved material prosperity as an economic 'major power' in the 1970s.

In this process, the Yoshida line was redefined as a grand design of Japan's foreign policy deliberately based both on the Constitution and the Japan-US Security Treaty. These two institutions were fundamentally conflicting because while the Constitution was a part of the postwar US strategy before the Cold War³, the latter was genuinely a product of the Cold War. Yoshida had no choice but to accept these two due to the relationship with the US, so they became the twin pillars of the Yoshida line. Iokibe (2005: 142-143) argued that

³ According to Koseki (2002), however, it was a pragmatic politico-military strategy of the US for MacArthur because it would enable evasion of the prosecution of the Emperor's war responsibility and Okinawa base at the same time with Japan's come back to international society. In this sense, Article 9 was a product of postwar strategy of the US in Asia-Pacific region.

accepting the necessity of both the constitution and the Japan-US Security Treaty became a national consensus among the Japanese people in the 1960s; Japan would not participate in international power politics with military means. At the same time it would not take an unarmed neutrality policy but rather would rely on cooperation with the US.

As a result, the Yoshida line just fixed the political divisions among the progressives, the mainstream conservatives and anti-mainstream conservatives. The 'dual identity' of postwar Japan was thus maintained by its foreign policy as Soeya (2005) argues. The progressives attempted to embody a 'peace state' Japan based on the Constitution, characterized by resistance to all-out armament and the rejection of nuclear weapons (Pyle 1997: 46). On the other hand, traditional right-wing revisionists aimed to enlarge Japan's autonomy as a 'major power', promoted the enhancement of SDF capabilities, and even the possession of nuclear weapons. The Yoshida line played a role of satisfying a part of the desires of both nationalisms and preventing them from transgressing the framework of the Japan-US security cooperation. Pyle (1997: 44) makes a similar point though he treats right-wing as only 'nationalists'; by describing how the Yoshida School 'navigated skillfully between the contending views of the progressives and the political nationalists, often coordinating elements of their agendas to maintain the consensus of the Japanese people'. It is more accurate to say that progressive nationalism and traditionalist nationalism began to coexist within the framework of the US-Japan Security Treaty in the Yoshida line, all the time maintaining their profound disagreements.

2.2.2 The Division between the Yoshida Line and the anti-mainstream on the history issue until the 1980s

Another major point of conflict in addition to the security issue was the history issue,

or more precisely, how to deal with Japan's war responsibility in international relations with neighboring countries. This problem was not treated as a domestic issue any more because it was closely associated with Japan's diplomacy in East Asia. Put simply, mainstream conservatives came to recognize that the history issue had become a delicate diplomatic problem, and began to take a strategy of 'historic reconciliation', which anti-mainstream revisionists harshly resisted.

Hatano (2004: 331) argues that the issue of war interpretation and the responsibilities of Japan came to be a diplomatic problem with South Korea and China due to the 1982 textbook crisis. This was triggered when several newspapers reported that the Ministry of Education had instructed the editors of history textbooks to change passages that originally referred to Japan's 'aggression' (*shinryaku*) to China to use the term 'advance into' (*shinshutsu*) China and to remove an article on the Nanjing Massacre. Although this later turned out to be misinformation, China and South Korea severely criticized the Japanese screening of textbooks. Against these protests, the right-wing traditionalist politicians in the LDP who were deeply associated with the Ministry of Education, such as Seisuke Okuno, claimed that if the government ordered a revision of textbooks, it would mean that Japan had yielded to foreign pressure. However, there were also counter arguments from the progressive side, which contended that textbooks should deal with the perception of victims of the Asia Pacific War.

As a result, Prime Minister Zenko Suzuki determined to settle the debate by expressing the public comments of Chief Cabinet Secretary, Kiichi Miyazawa, that 'the Japanese government is keenly aware that our country's act caused great hardship and extensive harm to Asian nations, including Korea and China (Miyazawa: 1982)'. The government also decided to add the 'neighboring country clause' to the screening system, which stipulated that descriptions of modern historical facts in textbooks should take into

consideration the sentiments of neighboring countries. This ‘neighboring country clause’ came to be used to express the official stance of the Japanese government on the history issue down to the present.

The 1980s witnessed another internationalized history issue, the prime ministerial visit to the Yasukuni Shrine. Prime Minister Nakasone’s worship at Yasukuni in 1985 caused a diplomatic crisis because of the fact that it enshrines Class-A War Criminals of the Asia Pacific War and the date, August 15th, is the anniversary day of the end of the War in Japan. China and South Korea thus problematized Japan’s war interpretation because they considered that Nakasone’s visit to the Yasukuni Shrine on that day could imply that he praised War Criminals who invaded China and Korea. In response, Nakasone relinquished his worship at the Yasukuni Shrine the year after out of consideration to neighboring countries⁴. Furthermore, Chief Cabinet Secretary, Gotoda issued an official comment that Japan ‘should emphasize international relations and adequately take the national sentiment of neighboring countries into consideration (Gotoda 1986)’.

Although Nakasone managed to handle the situation at this time, he faced the second textbook crisis immediately after the Yasukuni Shrine issue receded. The publication of the history textbook, ‘*New Edition: Japanese History*’ which explicitly played down Japan’s war responsibility triggered the controversy. Nakasone tried to bring the situation under control and to respond to protests from China and Korea. However, the political ‘gaffes’ of a cabinet member intensified the crisis. Masayuki Fujio, the Minister of Education, remarked at the briefing that compared to other aggressions like the Opium Wars, ‘I doubt if the Nanjing Massacre exemplifies an atrocity of Japan’s invasion because the truth of the event has not been revealed.’ Fujio also criticized the Tokyo Tribunal as a revenge of Western imperialism

⁴ Nakasone explained that criticism to Nakasone would have been used to attack Hu Yaobang for his drastic liberation and pro-Japan posture (Yokoyama 1994: 62-81).

in a journal by saying that the Japan-Korea annexation was agreed upon as a bilateral and legal consensus in both form and substance. Korea should thus bear some responsibility for the annexation because there had been a possibility for China and Russia to intervene in the Korean peninsula (Fujio 1986: 125). These remarks neatly summarize a revisionist view of the right-wing traditionalists. Prime Minister Nakasone asked Fujio to take back his remark, but he refused. As a result, Fujio was displaced from Nakasone's cabinet. Otake (1993: 393) points out that behind Fujio's statements, there were strong frustrations among the right-wing politicians in the LDP against Nakasone's policy shift such as unhappiness over the relinquishment of the Yasukuni worship.

As the history issue became internationalized in the 1980s, the double standard on war interpretation came to be questioned. As the Japanese government was urged to officially acknowledge that the war had been an 'aggression' in domestic narratives out of consideration to the national sentiment of neighboring countries, the discord with the revisionist group within the conservative camp intensified. In fact, the narratives of high-ranking government officials shifted to a progressive leaning in that they came to acknowledge Japan's wartime aggression. For instance, Education Minister Heiji Ogawa's remark that the war with China was Japan's aggression marked the first time that a cabinet minister called Japan's wartime behavior 'aggression' in the education committee of the Diet (National Diet, Records of Proceedings: 1982)⁵. In 1982, when asked about the character of the Asia-Pacific War, Prime Minister Nakasone merely stated that 'I believe that the verdict of history should be made by a large number of scholars and historians. But with respect to what Japan did, historians all over the world might agree that it was an aggressive war'. However, in 1986, on the second textbook crisis, he clearly stated that 'the fact of aggression cannot be denied (NDRP: 1985)' and that 'to have enshrined Class-A War Criminal together

⁵ This research hereafter abbreviates National Diet, Records of Proceedings as NDRP.

at Yasukuni Shrine would antagonize other nations' (Mainichi Shimbun: 1986). Chief Cabinet Secretary, Masaharu Gotoda, also argued that the Japanese government had accepted the judgments of the Far East Military Trial and admitted that the Fifteen years war (1930-1945) had been Japan's aggression (NDRP: 1986). In short, conservative politicians in the government who had shelved or had not admitted to the issue of their war interpretation in domestic discourse before, changed their domestic narratives because they understood that these could cause a diplomatic crisis with neighboring countries. They had come to recognize that the double standard of the Japanese government on the history issue might have a corrosive impact on regional affairs.

It can be argued that through a series of events in the 1980s, a certain pattern, which has endured in the 1990s and the 2000s, was formed on how the history issue could cause a diplomatic crisis with East Asian countries. Firstly, Japan's domestic narratives based on the double standard caused severe protests from other countries via reports of the Japanese mass media. Secondly, right-wing traditionalists became more outspoken as a reaction against not only protests from foreign countries but also against the progressive-leaning policy of their governments. Otake (1993: 397) thus concludes that the rise of right wing nationalism within the LDP politicians in the 1980s can be interpreted as a resistance to the policy shift of the government over the history issue. These patterns would reflect the fact that the mainstream conservatives failed to accept the orthodox historical view, which would be fundamental to constructing a unified national identity and that the division between mainstream and anti-mainstream within the conservative camp was reproduced through the history issue.

2.2.3 The Division between the Yoshida Line and the anti-mainstream on the history issue in the 1990s

2.2.3.1 The strategy of historic reconciliation

The confrontation between the mainstream conservatives and right-wing traditionalists on the history issue grew intense in the 1990s because the former launched the ‘strategy of historic reconciliation’ and the latter concentrated their effort on hampering this project. While the efforts of the revisionists in the 1990s, in which Abe emerged as a young leader of the new generation of the anti-mainstream camp, are often regarded as the rise of ‘nationalism’, this overlooks the fact that it was actually a reaction against the ‘strategy of historic reconciliation’ of the Japanese government. In this way, it should be clear that Abe and his supporters antagonized mainstream conservatives over the history view and constructed their rivals as the ‘enemy within’. What is more, because of the divided historical view, both reconciliation and confrontation towards neighboring countries over the history issue came to be used as political capital by political leaders. This is why politicians have to try to utilize foreign policy towards East Asian countries to boost their domestic credibility and defeat their rivals.

After the Cold War, Japan faced structural changes in its international relations and was urged to respond to an uncertain environment in the Asia-Pacific region. In order to survive and to expand its political role in the region, Japanese leaders became vividly aware that Japan’s coming to terms with its past was inevitable to regain trust from neighboring countries and to build amicable relationships with them. In addition, as Lind (2011: 309) argues, distrust among neighboring countries against Japan’s perceived failure to admit its past violence during the war obstructs Japan’s ability to contribute to international peacekeeping missions. In this context, a private advisory council of Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa, the ‘Commission on Japan’s goal in the Asia-Pacific Region in the 21st Century’ released its report in 1992. This report clearly stated that ‘Japan has to face various issues derived from an unhappy period of time with many countries in the region and to think of the

future of Japan in the Asia-Pacific region (Commission on Japan's goal in the Asia-Pacific Region in the 21st Century: 1992). In other words, this statement recognized that Japan's history issue should be resolved to build future-oriented relationships with Asian countries. It also argued that the Japanese government should deal with the issue of compensation 'with understanding of the mental suffering of the victims in the Asia-Pacific region' beyond the legal form of the settlement. Hatano (2004: 345) points out that behind this report is the idea that Japan could not expand its diplomatic horizon without sincerely responding to the war responsibility and compensation issues that had become established inside and outside the government.

In line with this idea, the 'strategy of historic reconciliation' was gradually formulated and initiated by mainstream conservatives. In this context, high-ranking government officials were more likely to demonstrate 'deep reflection' and 'apology' on Japan's past aggression in foreign affairs. This strategy can be defined as an attempt to reconcile with neighboring countries on the history issue and to complete the war settlement to regain trust from them, which would enable Japan to take leadership in the region and to expand its role as a 'responsible and respectable' member of international society. In this sense, this strategy expressed a desire to reconstruct Japan's identity from that of 'political dwarf' to become a 'major power' commensurate with its economic power without fuss over the history issue with neighboring countries. Therefore, a new form of nationalism emerged in post-Cold War Japan.

Following this reconciliation strategy, the Chief Cabinet Secretary under the Miyazawa administration, Yohei Kono released the 'Kono Statement' in 1993. This was regarded as a watershed for how Japan took its wartime responsibility, because Kono clearly admitted the Japanese imperial army's seizing of the 'comfort women' by force and officially made an apology to them (Kono: 1993). The long-standing effect of the Kono

Statement would be that it came to serve as a basis for the descriptions on the ‘comfort women’ in history textbooks after 1996. Immediately after that, Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa, who broke the LDP-rule of 38 years in Japanese politics, noted that ‘I believe that it was a war of aggression, which was wrong’ at a news conference (Asahi Shimbun: 1993). In addition, the Prime Minister stated in his first policy speech that

We would like to take this opportunity to clearly express our reflection to the past and a new determination to the world. Firstly, we would like to express our deep remorse and apology for the fact that invasion and colonial rule by our nation in the past brought to bear great sufferings and sorrow upon many people (NDRP: 1993).

The subsequent Prime Minister Tsutomu Hata also expressed deep remorse and apology for victims, admitting Japan’s aggression just after his inauguration (NDRP: 1994).

Followed by the short-lived Hata administration, Tomiichi Murayama, Prime Minister of the LDP-SDP coalition government, put forth efforts toward a no-war resolution in the parliament on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the end of the Asia-pacific War. The coalition government launched the ‘Project Team for a no-war resolution on the’ fifty years anniversary of the end of the war’ and tried to build a consensus within the government. At first, the ruling SDP insisted that the resolution should articulate Japan’s reflection on its aggression and colonial rule, apologies to neighboring countries, and pledge not to fight a war again. However, facing fierce opposition from the right-wing lobby groups and the anti-mainstream LDP politicians, the government was urged to make a concession on the issue of compensation so as to pass the resolution.

As a result, the ‘Resolution to Renew the Determination for Peace on the Basis of

Lessons Learned from History' was approved on 9 June 1995. It firstly expressed 'sincere condolences to those who fell in wars', which responded to the request of the LDP, and stipulated reflection on 'its colonial rule and acts of aggression in the modern history of the world, and recognizing that Japan committed those acts in the past', and demonstrated deep remorse for 'inflicting pain and suffering upon the peoples of Asian countries'. In order to alleviate the strong resistance from right-wing revisionists in the LDP, however, the resolution lacked any clear focus on the acknowledgement of 'aggression' and 'apology' compared with the original plan. For this reason, Prime Minister Murayama released the 'Statement on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the War's End' on 15 August 1995, which articulated his idea more clearly:

During a certain period in the not too distant past, Japan, following a mistaken national policy, advanced along the road to war, only to ensnare the Japanese people in a fateful crisis, and, through its colonial rule and aggression, caused tremendous damage and suffering to the people of many countries, particularly to those of Asian nations. In the hope that no such mistake be made in the future, I regard, in a spirit of humility, these irrefutable facts of history, and express here once again my feelings of deep remorse and state my heartfelt apology. Allow me also to express my feelings of profound mourning for all victims, both at home and abroad, of that history (Murayama: 1995).

Although the LDP government replaced the ruling coalition, the mainstream conservatives in the LDP succeeded with their strategy of historic reconciliation again, considering that all of the subsequent Prime Ministers clarified that they would follow the so-called 'Murayama Statement'. For instance, Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto made clear that he would take on the 'Murayama Statement' and offered 'apology from the bottom of the heart' to people

of the Asian countries and expressed 'deep remorse' for 'its aggression and colonial rule (Hashimoto 1997-a)'. Yasuo Fukuda, the Chief Cabinet Secretary under the Mori and Koizumi administrations, explained that the 'Murayama Statement' remained a basic understanding of the Japanese government on history in the textbook row in 2002 (Fukuda: 2001). Considering Abe, who was one of the staunch revisionists in the LDP, also took on the 'Murayama Statement' (NDRP: 2006-1), the historical perception of 'Japan's aggression' in the 'Murayama Statement' was institutionalized as an official view of the Japanese government.

Although these efforts of governments to focus on a satisfactory interpretation of 'Japan's aggression' and official apology to neighboring countries aimed at achieving closure on the history issue as a part of the strategy of historic reconciliation, efforts were also made in the area of foreign policy. When President Kim Dae Jung visited Tokyo in 1998 and had a meeting with Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi, the two leaders agreed to work on a draft declaration that would stipulate Japan's formal apology. Behind this, there was a political intention that when South Korea accepted Japan's apology, it would lead to an official statement of the closure of the history issue between Japan and South Korea. Despite strong objections from the right-wing traditionalists in the Diet, the 'Japan-Republic of Korea Joint Declaration: A New Japan-Republic of Korea Partnership towards the Twenty-first Century' was signed in October 1998, in which the Japanese government offered an 'apology' for its 'past' in the bilateral relationship for the first time (Obuchi: 1998-a). It stated:

Looking back on the relations between Japan and the Republic of Korea during this century, Prime Minister Obuchi regarded in a spirit of humility the fact of history that Japan caused, during a certain period in the past, tremendous damage and suffering to

the people of the Republic of Korea through its colonial rule, and expressed his deep remorse and heartfelt apology for this fact. President Kim accepted with sincerity this statement of Prime Minister Obuchi's recognition of history and expressed his appreciation for it. He also expressed his view that the present calls upon both countries to overcome their unfortunate history and to build a future-oriented relationship based on reconciliation as well as good-neighborly and friendly cooperation.

This was a critical moment for the settlement of the history issue with South Korea and the strategy of historic reconciliation. The success of this summit meeting and the Joint Declaration was interpreted as a 'real' normalization of the bilateral relationship, which had not been achieved at normalization in 1965 (Green 2003: 136).

In contrast, the bilateral summit with President Jiang Zemin, which also aimed at the settlement of the history issue, turned out to be a failure. Unlike the Joint Declaration between Japan and the ROK, the 'Japan-China Joint Declaration on Building a Partnership of Friendship and Cooperation for Peace and Development (Obuchi: 1998-b)' did not articulate Japan's 'apology' in writing while the Chinese side strongly demanded that it should do so. This was partly because both leaders were reluctant to make concessions on this point. In addition to Jiang's rigid insistence on the history issue, Foreign Minister Masahiko Komura at that time explained that it was because President Jiang did not promise that China would not pick on Japan's aggression/apology issue any more if Japan stipulated an 'apology' in the Joint Declaration unlike President Kim (Funabashi 2011: 58). Although the Obuchi administration failed to settle the history issue with China, it was clear that Obuchi attempted to finish the diplomatic dispute on the history issue with neighboring countries, especially China and South Korea, along with the strategy of historic

reconciliation.

In addition to this initiative, Prime Minister Obuchi also established the Commission on Japan's Goals in the 21st Century in October 1999 appointing sixteen leading intellectuals from diverse fields of expertise as its members. The commission aimed to discuss the 'desirable future direction of Japan to which the next generation of Japanese can aspire in the new century' and submitted its final report '*The Frontier Within: Individual Empowerment and Better Governance in the New Millennium* (Japan's Goals in the 21st Century: 1999)'. Motivated by a 'sense of urgency' and fear that 'as things stand Japan is heading for decline' because of the 'harsh environment' inside and outside Japan, the Commission tried to delineate Japan's long-term national objectives and its policy principles. Among them, one of the pillars of foreign policy orientation was 'Neighborly relations (*rinko*): Cooperation with Asian neighbors.' Assuming that it was a 'gross and lamentable folly of early modern Japanese history' that 'Japan forced its self-serving goals and order on surrounding countries, pursued aggrandizement of the Japanese empire at huge cost to other countries, and brought war and calamity to the Asia-Pacific region'. In this context, it argued that although to build constructive relations with neighboring countries, 'with which Japan has a long history of exchange and a more recent history of colonial rule and invasion', 'will be a valuable spiritual and tangible foundation for the Japanese people in the twenty-first century', and that historically 'Japan has been unable to build mature, mutually beneficial relations with its neighbors'. Therefore, the improvement of neighborly relations (*rinko*) was regarded as a major challenge in the new century.

In this way, it would be clear that the mainstream conservatives in power recognized the necessity to settle the history issue with neighboring countries based on the 'deep remorse for past aggression' in order to build trust from Asian countries. This was because it was essential for Japan to cultivate a new path for the contribution to regional peace, to take a

leadership in the region, and to expand Japan's international role. These efforts, that is, the strategy of historic reconciliation, were not interrupted during the non-LDP coalition regime, and rather promoted by Hosokawa's statement and the historic 'Murayama Statement'. Even the subsequent LDP regime followed the 'Murayama Statement' and advanced the cause of the 'apology for Japan's aggression' throughout the 1990s. This line of foreign policy was passed on to the mainstream conservative politicians in the 2000s, even though it might not have gone smoothly because of obstruction by the right-wing traditionalists. Due to the strategy of historic reconciliation, the division between mainstream conservatives and anti-mainstream conservatives was intensified and reproduced.

2.2.3.2 The rise of 'neo-revisionism'

Apart from the effort to build the strategy of historical reconciliation by mainstream conservatives, the 1990s witnessed the intensified activities of the anti-mainstream conservatives. In 1993, the three Councils of Diet members on the Yasukuni Shrine were merged into the Committee on History and Screening, which consisted of 107 Diet members of the LDP from the both chambers. They published the *'Review of the Greater East Asian war'* in 1995, arguing that it was an urgent task to revise the 'anti-Japanese' historical view and regain the 'authentic' understanding of history for the Japanese to restore national pride. On the occasion of the discussion on the Diet Resolution for no-war in 1995, anti-mainstream conservatives of the LDP opposed to the articulation of an 'apology', were backed by various right-wing lobby groups. They established the 'Diet Member Committee on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the End of the War' and claimed that the condolence and appreciation to war dead should be emphasized over the apology and that the Diet Resolution for the apology was unacceptable because it would lead to serious problems in

Japan's future (Hatano 2004: 342-3)⁶. Those anti-mainstream politicians insisted that this resolution would be against the national interest because it offended the feelings of the bereaved families, while the coalition government argued that it would serve the national interest to consider public opinion in Asian countries (Hatano 2004: 344). Although they failed to pass the Resolution, the right-wing traditionalists were able to put the coalition government at bay and pull its teeth.

In addition, the 1990s saw a series of 'gaffes' of traditionalist politicians on the historical view, such as Minister of Justice Shigeto Nagano, who noted that the 'Nanjing Massacre' was nothing but a 'fabrication' (Mainichi Shimbun 1994: 1). The Minister for the Environment, Shin Sakurai, mentioned that Asian countries could achieve independence from the Western colonial rule thanks to Japan (Asahi Shimbun 1994: 3). Takami Eto, a senior legislator of the LDP, stated that Japan had done good things for the Korean people during colonial days (Asahi Shimbun 1995: 2). Shoichi Nakagawa, the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries of Japan, remarked that the 'comfort women' issue was still open to question rather than a historical fact to put in children's textbooks⁷. With regard to the Joint Declaration with China, a strong objection was raised from the revisionist group in the LDP that Japan should not apologize to China because the issue had been settled in the 1972 Joint Statement and in the 1978 Peace and Friendship Treaty. In addition, the 'Young Diet Members Committee to Consider the Future of Japan and History Education' was launched in 1997 by young revisionist lawmakers of the LDP, initiated by Shoichi Nakagawa and Shinzo Abe. It published '*The Disputed history Textbooks*', in which the revisionists clearly demanded a retraction of the 'Kono Statement'. This Committee also collaborated closely with the Society for Writing a New Textbook on History in order to

⁶ According to Hatano (2004: 342), 205 members of the LDP joined this committee.

⁷ He retracted his remark and stated that he would follow the official government view on the same day.

break the ‘masochistic history view’ and opposed inclusion of any description of the ‘comfort women’ in textbooks.

In this way, active movements of right-wing traditionalists were salient throughout the 1990s and drew attention from home and abroad. At this point, there can be seen two features in these movements of revisionists. Firstly, there was a generational change in the camp of right-wing traditionalists. A majority of the young generation were hereditary politicians and motivated by frustration against the ‘postwar democracy’ inherited by their parent generation. Shinzo Abe or Shoichi Nakagawa would represent these ‘neo-revisionist’ politicians, who believed that their political mission was to renounce the Constitution and break the ‘postwar regime’. Sharing the ‘revisionist’ historical view with the traditionalists, they tended to be ‘hawkish’ on security policy and more prone to take a hard-line policy against China and North Korea. The most notable difference from the previous generation of revisionists was that they blindly promoted the enhancement of the Japan-US Alliance and strove to exploit the ties with the US to achieve their goals such as the revision of the Constitution or the expansion of military capability (Yamaguchi 2004: 53). Although their discourse on ‘the postwar regime’ and foreign policy will be examined in Chapter 5, it can be argued here that these ‘neo-revisionists’ took a pivotal role in constituting the division among conservatives within the LDP in the 2000s and had impacts on foreign policy making toward China and North Korea in the later administrations of Koizumi and Abe.

Second, it is important to point out that although the intensification in the activities of right-wing traditionalists and neo-revisionists is often interpreted as a sign of Japan’s drift to the right, it might be premature to conclude this because it was actually the reaction of the anti-mainstream camp against a series of official statements which acknowledged Japan’s ‘aggression’ and reiterated an ‘apology’ as a part of the strategy of historic reconciliation initiated by the government and mainstream conservatives. In other words, revisionists might

not have gained momentum without the rise of the reconciliation policy. For instance, the Committee on History and Screening was launched based on the resentment towards the remark of Prime Minister Hosokawa, cited above⁸. Considering that a series of ‘gaffes’ on the history issue coincided with the debate on the Diet Resolution for the fiftieth anniversary of the end of the war, these remarks were aimed to counter what they called the ‘masochistic view of history’. The purpose of the ‘Young Diet Members Committee to Consider the Future of Japan and History Education’ was obvious: it demanded the retraction of the ‘Kono Statement’. In short, the increased activity of right-wing traditionalists and revisionists in the 1990s would indicate not that the right-wing groups dominated Japan but that the confrontation between conservatives on the history issue became intensified.

As described above, the division lines between the progressives and the conservatives, between mainstream and anti-mainstream conservatives shaped Japan’s postwar politics. In particular, the confrontation among conservatives within the LDP was intensified over how to deal with the history issue with neighboring countries after the end of the Cold War. Although a major point of controversy was the different perspectives on the strategy of historic reconciliation, what should not be neglected was that it was an inextricable part of the power struggles in domestic politics. In other words, it is difficult to achieve a domestic consensus on the history issue not because of the divergent understandings of history, but because a certain perception of history tends to be bound up with a particular faction and utilized as a measure of their political maneuvering in domestic power struggles. In this sense, the history issue as well as foreign policy issues can be regarded as a bargaining chip in domestic politics. Therefore, as the view of history is associated with foreign policy toward China and North Korea and domestic power politics, the next section explores the

⁸ Tadashi Itagaki, the president of the Committee clarified in the ‘Review of the Greater East Asian war’ stated that the committee was established to demand the government to retract Hosokawa’s remark (1995: 443).

power relationships within the conservative camp of the LDP.

2.3 Factional politics within the LDP

Japan's political system is often characterized by the fact that the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) had maintained its dominance in the Diet for thirty-eight years since its inception until 1993. Even after the LDP regained control over the government in 1996, it remained the ruling party until the change of administration in 2009. However, the LDP is often said to be a loose alliance of factions in which a great amount of party affairs are managed (Hashimoto, Iida and Kato 2002: 142). These factions are not ideologically divided but usually formed as an instrument by which power politics within the party are carried out (Hrebendar 2000: 112). Despite much criticism against factional politics within the LDP, however, factions have played an important role in Japanese politics in various ways. This section aims to explore the political struggles among factions within the LDP, which provide the context of settings of foreign policy making toward China and North Korea under the Koizumi administration and the Abe administration.

The structure of a faction is essentially hierarchical: it comprises one leader, several senior officials, and a number of minor members. The faction leader provides political funds and opportunity to acquire cabinet posts and executive posts in the party in return for the support of rank and file members such as giving their votes in the party president elections. In addition, the LDP factions have long played a crucial role in party operations in terms of two aspects: the resolution of personnel matters and the support for election campaigns (Stockwin 1982: 126, Hashimoto, Iida and Kato 2002: 144). Personnel affairs are used as a form of leverage by the factions in order to expand their power and to consolidate factional unity. Above all, the selection of the party president, who would usually become Prime

Minister, is the most important personnel matter. In the party presidential election, faction members are usually supposed to vote for their leader or whom their leader supports in return for assistance they have received. Thus, unity and the relative size of the faction would surely be important instruments for power struggle in the party.

In addition to the selection of the party president, the LDP factions deeply involve the appointment of cabinet ministers and the three key posts in the LDP such as the secretary-general. The three posts of the secretary-general, the chairman of the Policy Affairs Research Council (PARC), and the chairman of the Executive Council are conventionally treated as the most important posts in the LDP. These key posts are distributed based on an unwritten code in which the seniority system, power balance among factions and consensus-building are subtly mixed (Sato and Matsuzaki 1986: 67). In this principle, a dominant faction can occupy a majority of key posts, which would surely make other factions frustrated and could lead to serious disruption within the party. In order to avoid too much concentration of power on one particular faction, the secretary-general, has often been selected from another faction. This transformation might be of great importance because the secretary-general in the LDP plays an important role in party management, bargaining with faction leaders on the distribution of cabinet posts, party executive posts, and financial aid.

It is said that the origins of LDP factions might be traced back to when political leaders of the LDP formed eight intra-party groups to compete over the successor of Ichiro Hatoyama as the party president in 1956⁹. Through a series of disruptions and absorptions, the number of factions gradually converged on five major factions in the 1970s. These factions were led by powerful leaders who were former or later Prime Ministers: Kakuei

⁹ In the 1960s, there were the Ikeda faction (Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda), the Yoshida/Sato faction (Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida and Eisaku Sato), the Kishi faction (Prime minister Nobusuke Kishi), the Kono faction (Ichiro Kono), and the Miki/Matsumura faction (Prime Minister Takeo Miki and Kenzo Matsumura).

Tanaka, Takeo Fukuda, Yasuhiro Nakasone, Masayoshi Ohira, and Takeo Miki¹⁰. In 2007 when Abe was a Prime Minister, there were nine factions, which were offshoots of those five factions in the 1970s¹¹. Today, there are seven major factions: the Seiwa Seisaku Kenkyu-kai (清和政策研究会)¹², the Kochi-kai (宏池会)¹³, the Heisei Kenkyu-kai¹⁴ (平成研究会)¹⁵, the Kinmirai Seiji Kenkyu-kai (近未来政治研究会)¹⁶, the Shisui-kai (志帥会)¹⁷, the Iko-kai (為公会)¹⁸ and the Miki faction or the Bancho Seisaku Kenkyu-kai (番長政策研究会)¹⁹. In terms of the number of factional members, the Seiwa-kai, the Keisei-kai and the Kochi-kai are often described as the ‘major three factions’. In addition, the latter two factions are sometimes called ‘mainstream conservatives (保守本流)’ in the LDP while the former, the Seiwa-kai, is labeled as ‘minor-mainstream conservatives (保守傍流)’ or ‘anti-mainstream’. In general, Shigeru Yoshida and Kakuei Tanaka, who emphasized Japan’s economic recovery and growth instead of remilitarization and comparatively stressed the importance of ties with Mainland China, represents ‘mainstream conservative’ politicians. On the other hand, Nobusuke Kishi and Takeo Fukuda, who insisted the necessity of

¹⁰ When a leader of faction is replaced, the name of faction is usually altered to the new leader’s name. For example, when Abe inherited the faction from Fukuda, the name of faction shifted from the Fukuda faction to the Abe faction. However, some factions have unaltered names other than leader’s name; the Keisei-kai (経世会) and the Seiwa-kai (清和会) are typical example. The Keisei-kai refers to the generic name of faction founded by Sato and inherited by Tanaka, Takeshita, Obuchi, Watanuki, Hashimoto, and Tsushima in order. Likewise, the Seiwa-kai refers to the generic name of the faction derived for the Kishi group and established by Fukuda, then succeeded by Abe, Mitsuzuka, Mori, Koizumi, and Machimura.

¹¹ There are the Machimura faction (Seiwa-kai), the Tsushima faction (Keisei-kai), the Koga faction, the Yamazaki faction, the Ibuki faction, the Komura faction, the Tanigaki faction, the Nikai Group, and the Aso faction.

¹² This is the Machimura faction and its progenitor was Nobusuke Kishi.

¹³ This is the Koga faction and is originated from Hayato Ikeda.

¹⁴ The Keisei-kai (経世会) changed its name to the Heisei-Kenkyu-kai (平成研究会) after Prime Minister Hashimoto’s resignation in 1996. Yet, as a large number of books and researches adopt the name of ‘Keisei-kai’, and otherwise tend to use various names such as ‘former Tanaka faction’, ‘former Takeshita faction’, or ‘former Obuchi faction’, this paper standardizes the name to the ‘Keisei-kai’.

¹⁵ This is now the Nukaga faction and was former Tanaka faction.

¹⁶ This is the Yamasaki faction and its originator was Ichiro Kono.

¹⁷ This is the Ibuki faction and is composed of three groups from several factions.

¹⁸ This is the Aso faction and was separated from the Kochi-kai.

¹⁹ This is the Komura faction and was originally formed by Takeo Miki.

constitutional reform and placed significance on the relationship with Taiwan, represented the Seiwa-kai. Both Koizumi and Abe belonged to the Seiwa-kai faction²⁰.

Until the mid-1970s, the factional political structure can be described as competition between ‘mainstream and anti-mainstream’, in which the mainstream faction tended to dominate the cabinet and party official posts (Curtis 1999: 82). Anti-mainstream factions sought to take an opportunity to replace the cabinet with their own members. The Setwa-kai (the Fukuda faction at that time) often played an anti-mainstream role while it also sometimes cooperated with mainstream factions to stabilize the dominance of the LDP (Hrebenar 2000: 109). Prime Ministers had relatively strong leadership over the government and controlled the party by appointing a member of their own faction or a close associate to the post of secretary-general for the effective control over the party (Shinoda 2000: 10). This concentration of power on the one faction, however, tended to intensify inter-factional conflict because of the discontent of non-mainstream factions over unequal treatment in terms of support for election campaign and the distribution of political funds.

After the mid-1970s, the political structure in the party is often characterized by the seniority system, power balance among factions and consensus-building, all of which were the basic principles on the resolution of personnel matters (Sato and Matsuzaki 1986: 67, Curtis 1999: 83). Whereas the Keisei-kai tended to dominate the party as the largest faction in the LDP, it did not put forward its members as a candidate for the party president except Takeshita himself²¹. Instead, the Keisei-kai usually sent one of its faction members as the

²⁰ Krauss and Pekkanen (2011: 138) pointed out that at the time of the Abe administration the largest faction was the Mori-Machimura faction, part of the Seiwa-kai.

²¹ One of the background factors might be involved in internal conditions of the Tanaka/Takeshita faction. To take an example, some powerful leaders who had been expected to become a candidate of the party president hence Prime Minister, such as Ichiro Ozawa and Shintaro Abe, had to give up their ambitions because of ill health. In addition, a number of powerful politicians who were potentially candidates of Prime Minister were reported that they had committed money scandals such as the Lockheed scandal, the Recruit scandal and the Sagawa Kyubin scandal. Therefore, the largest faction had to refrain from putting forward

secretary-general to seize real power over the party management²². As a result, the secretary-general from the Keisei-kai actually controlled party affairs and had a near-veto power over the policy-making process (Hrebenar 2000: 108). In this circumstance, it was only through obtaining support from the Keisei-kai, that LDP members who were not members of the largest faction were able to become the party president, hence Prime Minister. The establishment of administrations led by Nakasone, Ohira, Suzuki, Miyazawa and Kaifu would exemplify this situation (Curtis 1988: 82, 105, Curtis 1999: 86, Hrebenar 2000: 107-8). At the same time, to lose support of the Keisei-kai would mean the end of the administration for those Prime Ministers like Kaifu and Miyazawa (Otsuka 1992). Therefore, the support of the Keisei-kai was thought to be a vital political resource in party politics during this period.

What was notable in the development of factional politics here is that historical problems and foreign policy issues could be utilized as political capital, and they sometimes played an important role in the power relationship among the political leaders. As touched on before, there was a dividing line on the view of history among the LDP lawmakers. In general, members of the Seiwa-kai shared the revisionist view, while the majority of the Kochi-kai members were prone to have a more progressive-leaning view of history. On the other hand, the Keisei-kai politicians were likely to use the ‘double-standard’ during the Cold War period and then, adopting ‘Japan’s aggression/ apology’ view, relied on the strategy of historic reconciliation. Therefore, opposition movements of the anti-mainstream against the strategy of historic reconciliation took the form of the campaign by the Seiwa-kai members to topple the government led by the Keisei-kai. Therefore, a policy to advocate the strategy

‘tainted’ politicians of their factions as the party president (Otsuka 1992: 58). In addition, it became institutionalized from Miki administration that the LDP secretary-general was no longer selected from the president’s faction (Sato and Matsuzaki 1986: 67-72).

²² The purpose of this transformation might be to avoid too much concentration of power on mainstream, which could cause serious disruption within the party (Sato and Matsuzaki 1986: 70, Hashimoto, Iida and Kato 2002: 142).

of historic reconciliation could be a source of political capital to appeal to mainstream conservatives and the progressives, while the rejection of this line could be a source of political capital to maneuver lawmakers of the Seiwa-kai faction and other revisionists.

Furthermore, the perception of history was closely related to foreign policy in East Asia, especially China. Wakamiya (1999: 125) argued that the China problem was a ‘particularly contentious and serious bone of the contestation’ within the conservative camp. After independence in 1952, Japan was urged to abandon Mainland China and build ties with Taiwan due to the pressure from the US. However, as the international status of the People’s Republic of China overwhelmed Taiwan, and even the US sought a rapprochement with China, normalization of the relationship with China became an urgent task for Japan. In this circumstance, the China problem became a decisive factor in the succession race of Prime Minister Sato, and thereby in the presidential election of the LDP in 1972. At first, three of five candidates, Miki, Ohira and Nakasone, clarified their stance of promoting normalization, while the two candidates with the most potential to win, Kakuei Tanaka and Takeo Fukuda, did not articulate their stance. This was because Tanaka tended to concentrate on domestic politics rather than foreign affairs and Fukuda’s faction was composed of pro-Taiwan members. However, after Tanaka realized that the normalization policy would bring other candidates over to his side, he arranged to team up against Fukuda, promising that Tanaka would normalize the relationship with China. Therefore, it was to win the presidential election of the LDP for Tanaka that the policy of normalization with China was put forth²³. Furthermore, it was actually the stance on the China issue that had a decisive impact on the result of the election (Hattori 2011: 50). Tanaka defeated Fukuda and won the presidential election of the LDP in 1972.

²³ Ogata (1992) and Hattori (2011) provided a detailed explanation on the process of how the China issue affected the presidential election of the LDP in 1972.

Given these developments, the China issue has been treated as a source of political capital among the political actors. In this sense, the China issue was not only a foreign policy issue but also a ‘domestic political issue’. Prime Minister Kishi was the founder of the pro-Taiwan faction or the Taiwan lobby, who established a close relationship with Chiang Kai-Shek (Wakamiya 1999: 131). The pro-Taiwan lawmakers strongly resisted normalization of the Japan-China relationship, and some radical members of this group, such as Shintaro Ishihara, Ichiro Nakagawa²⁴ and Michio Watanabe formed the ‘Seiran-kai’ and advocated out-and-out resistance to normalization. Although those pro-Taiwan politicians, the majority of whom were concentrated on the Fukuda faction, could not block normalization with China, they maintained a significant influence on the governmental decision, considering the consensus-based policy-making process of the LDP (Ogata 1992: 182). The hawkish-Seirankai was harshly opposed to the bilateral airline negotiations, and according to Wakamiya (1999:137-8), ‘it was an open secret in the political community that Fukuda was pulling the strings’ because the Keisei-kai faction included a number of pro-Taiwan lawmakers and because ‘Fukuda undoubtedly wanted to make a nuisance of himself to the Tanaka cabinet over the controversial issue’. In this circumstance, the negotiations for the conclusion of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship with China were protracted under the Tanaka administration. Given these, the China issue was closely associated with factional politics within the LDP. The pro-China policy could thus become a source of political capital by which one could obtain support from the Keisei-kai and the Kochi-kai factions while the anti-Chinese policy would appeal to the Seiwa-kai members and other anti-mainstream politicians. In this manner, political leaders were likely to deploy this capital in order to defeat their political rival and to boost their credentials in domestic

²⁴ Ichiro Nakagawa was father of Shoichi Nakagawa, who represented ‘neo-revisionists’ and anti-Chinese politician in the LDP.

politics.

2.4 Koizumi and Abe in factional politics

In this context of factional politics, Junichiro Koizumi emerged as a new leader of Japan. It might be a less well-known fact that Koizumi is a third-generation politician. His grandfather, Matajiro Koizumi was the Telecommunication Minister and a vice-speaker of the House of Representatives, and his father Junya Koizumi was the Director General of the Defense Agency. Yet, not all had been smooth for Koizumi's political career. As Mishima (2007: 733) noted, Koizumi had never followed the 'elite course' for the LDP's leadership because he never held key posts in his cabinet such as Foreign Minister or Finance Minister²⁵. In addition, Koizumi had not been the leader of a strong faction, as Uchiyama (2010: 17) mentioned that Koizumi shared with Miki and Nakasone a lack of internal party support. There were other Prime Ministers who were not leaders of any large faction such as Miyazawa and Kaifu. However, they could become Prime Minister due to the consideration for factional balance or support of the largest faction, the Keisei-kai. Koizumi's novelty was not only that he became Prime Minister while he had not been a powerful faction leader but also without any support of mainstream factions of the LDP. Before the presidency election in 2001, factional support had almost determined the LDP presidency and thereby the Prime Minister. At that time, however, Koizumi could defeat Ryutaro Hashimoto, who was former Prime Minister and supported by the largest faction, the Keisei-kai²⁶. The weakness of

²⁵ When Koizumi stood for election to the Lower House in 1969 for the first time, he could not win a seat as a Diet member and was hired as a secretary to Takeo Fukuda, who was Koizumi's political mentor and became a Prime Minister in 1976. Koizumi gained his first cabinet seat as a Minister of Health and Welfare under Prime Minister Takeshita in 1988 and then became a Minister of Post and Telecommunications under Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa.

²⁶ A part of reasons for Koizumi's victory was changes in the selection rules of the LDP president. According to the LDP constitution, the party president should be elected by the party convention,

support from the Keisei-kai was not a disadvantage for Koizumi. Rather, Koizumi could be free from the constraints from and influence of the Keisei-kai. One of the notable instances might be his foreign policy toward China especially on the Yasukuni Shrine issue. Since Prime Minister Kakuei Tanaka restored diplomatic ties with the PRC in 1972, the Keisei-kai became the most Beijing-friendly faction within the LDP. Furthermore, the Keisei-kai has had a strong connection with China partly because Japan's ODA loans to China provided Keisei-kai politicians with lucrative business opportunities there (Taniguchi 2005: 452). Therefore, it conventionally might be difficult for Prime Ministers who could keep their administration in power to take a confrontational approach against China. However, as Koizumi eliminated the power of the Keisei-kai within the LDP and became uninhibited by intra-party power politics, he seemed to be able to take a tougher stance toward Beijing.

Furthermore, Koizumi nominated cabinet ministers and senior officials of the party without consulting with faction leaders, thereby breaking unwritten code of sharing out cabinet posts between factions (Kitaoka 2001: 280). Indeed, members of his faction, the Mori faction occupied most of the important posts and the Obuchi faction was greatly marginalized (Bowen 2003: 11)²⁷. As a result, its composition was far from factionally balanced, sending a strong signal of 'defactionalization' instead (Uchiyama 2010: 13)²⁸. However, while he exclaimed that he was going to 'smash the LDP', he never tried to deny

which is consisted of all Diet members of the party and delegates from each prefectural chapter. From the mid 1990s, the electoral rule of the party president was amended to extend the electorate to party members and increased the voting power of the prefectural chapters of the party. Kabashima and Steel (2007: 101) point out, Koizumi took advantage of changes in the selection rules for the LDP president. About the LDP president election, Lin (2009) discussed in detail.

²⁷ Koizumi's first cabinet included three members of the Mori faction, two from the Hashimoto faction, one each from the Eto, Kamei, Horiuchi, Yamasaki, Kato and former Komoto factions, two non-faction lawmakers, one lawmaker each from the Komeito and Conservative parties, and three non-lawmakers.

²⁸ In terms of the selection of secretary general, Koizumi assigned firstly Taku Yamasaki, who is a close friend of Koizumi and took over the Watanabe faction (former Nakasone faction), then Shinzo Abe from the same faction as Koizumi, and finally Tsutomu Takebe from the Yamasaki's faction, emphasizing their personal ties and coherent support for Koizumi.

factional politics itself; rather, he was a man of ‘power politics’ among factions and loyal to his faction, the Seiwa-kai. What he intended to ‘smash’ was not the LDP or factional politics, but the dominance of the Keisei-kai in the LDP.

On the other hand, Abe, the youngest Prime Minister since the end of WW II, comes from an extraordinarily well-established political family (Envall 2011: 150). His grandfather was former Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi, his granduncle was also former Prime Minister Eisaku Sato, and his father was former Foreign Minister and ex-leader of the Seiwa-kai, Shintaro Abe. In Abe’s case, his strong connection with the conservative camps in the LDP might unexpectedly contribute to the rapprochement with China. Conventionally, the China issue has been a focal point of domestic political struggle among factions within the LDP. The Seiwa-kai, which Abe belonged to, has been behind the pro-Taiwan and anti-China school in the LDP and often impeded the development of the Japan-China relationship. Actually, the opposition campaign of the pro-Taiwan camp successfully hampered the conclusion of the Japan-China Aviation Agreement (Ogata 1992: 145-146). Here, there can be seen interesting commonalities between former Prime Minister Fukuda and Abe. Firstly, it was a well-known fact that not only themselves but also the majority of their faction members took a pro-Taiwan and anti-Chinese stance. Generally speaking, it might be natural for a pro-Taiwan group leader to pursue a hard-line policy against China. Yet, these two Prime Ministers did the opposite. In fact, both of them achieved rapprochement with China; Fukuda could sign the Japan-China Peace and Friendship Treaty and Abe built a ‘Mutually Beneficial Relationship Based on Common Strategic Interests’. Pro-Taiwan members did not hamper their leader’s foreign policy. Therefore, it can be argued that given Fukuda’s case, a strong power base in the LDP especially in the pro-Taiwan group might actually serve Abe’s rapprochement policy toward China.

What is notable here is that both Koizumi and Abe explicitly or implicitly constructed

their political ‘enemy’ in their political discourse, and their target was mainly the Keisei-kai. It was rather obvious that Koizumi attempted to minimize Keisei-kai’s influence within the LDP by excluding lawmakers of the Keisei-kai from key cabinet and party positions. In addition, since the Keisei-kai traditionally served as the political home for many powerful Posts and Construction *zoku* lawmakers, Koizumi’s pursuit of ‘structural reforms’ like postal privatization and the reduction of public works expenditures were ‘poised to cut deeply into the vested interests of the bureaucracy and *zoku* lawmakers alike (Uchiyama 2010: 13-14)’. Furthermore, Koizumi labeled the *zoku* lawmakers who opposed his structural reforms ‘forces of resistance’. He constructed an oppositional framework in which Koizumi was ‘good’ and the ‘forces of resistance’ were ‘bad’. Uchiyama also explains that this was partly because of the ‘long-standing animosity’ between former Prime Minister Tanaka and former Prime Minister Fukuda, to whom Koizumi had attached himself as his political mentor.

In other words, Koizumi’s challenge of the ‘structure reform’ was an extension of power struggles between the Keisei-kai and the Seiwa-kai. When Koizumi exclaimed that he was going to ‘smash the LDP’, it really meant that he was going to break the rule of the Keisei-kai. Likewise, Abe’s political agenda of the ‘departure from the postwar regime’ had also an oppositional framework in it. As discussed in later chapters, Abe’s targets were those who had created and supported the ‘postwar regime’. According to Abe, they were ‘bad’ because they should be responsible for postwar Japan’s disgrace through actions such as ‘apology diplomacy’ in Asia, the endorsement of the ‘imposed Constitution’, and the rise of values of materialism without national pride among the public. In terms of factional politics, they were mainstream politicians in the LDP: the Kochi-kai and the Keisei-kai although it was not clearly named. In particular, the Keisei-kai was implicitly constructed as a kind of ‘fifth column’ because of its ‘friendship-first’ policy toward China. While Abe sought rapprochement with China when he took office, his discourse on the ‘departure of the

postwar regime' might indicate that he did not withdraw his antagonism towards his factional opponents.

2.5 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to provide an explanation of the domestic power politics of Japan behind foreign policies toward China and North Korea under the administrations of Koizumi and Abe. Historically, there can be seen two division lines in postwar Japan, which characterized domestic politics after the end of WW II: between the progressives and the conservatives, and between the mainstream and anti-mainstream conservatives. Both the progressives and the right-wing traditionalists criticized the 'Yoshida Line' initiated by the mainstream conservatives and expressed their national values. Failing to unify these different nationalisms, the mainstream government established the Yoshida Line, which was built on the twin-pillars of the Constitution and the Japan-US Security Treaty, and tried to incorporate the two nationalisms into the 'postwar regime'. However, the confrontation over historical perception made it impossible to bridge the gap between the progressives and the conservatives. Furthermore, after the end of the Cold War, the division among the conservatives was intensified because revisionists made vehement protests against the strategy of historic reconciliation, which aimed to regain trust from the neighboring countries by the closure of the history problems. These confrontations continued to structure Japan's domestic politics under the Koizumi and Abe administrations and provided a setting for their foreign policy.

In addition, factional politics within the LDP provide more explanation for the historical context of confrontations among conservatives, which was emerged in the narratives of Koizumi and Abe. Put simply, power rivalry over the dominance in the LDP

between the Seiwa-kai and the Keisei-kai was behind their construction of a 'domestic other'. This division was likely to be reproduced and intensified around foreign policy toward China. Political actors in the LDP manipulated the China issue as political capital to gain advantage in factional politics. In this way, the domestic power relationship surrounding Koizumi and Abe was formulated in postwar Japan in ways that were to have a radical impact on foreign policy.

Chapter3. Case Study 1: Nationalism and Foreign Policy toward China under the Koizumi Administration

Under the Koizumi administration, annual prime ministerial visits to the Yasukuni Shrine polarized Japanese society and prompted an international outcry. Since the Shrine honored the spirits of the Japanese war dead in the modern era, including fourteen Class A War Criminals, Koizumi's worship is often interpreted as a symbol of the rise of nationalism in contemporary Japan. From this perspective, it seems to be a highly irrational action, especially because Japan needed close cooperation with those countries to settle the North Korean issue and attain a permanent seat in the UN Security Council. Therefore, it is worth exploring how such a seemingly irrational policy in which Koizumi would not make a concession with China could be justified in foreign policy discourse. Two prominent explanations are often introduced to account for this matter, one focuses on the rise of nationalism as a broad social phenomenon and the other emphasizes domestic politics in the narrower sense of the actions of political parties and factions. Although these explanations seem to be persuasive to some extent, however, there are some points that they could not cover. Therefore, this thesis attempts to offer a different perspective to this issue by focusing on the discourse on national identity.

My argument can be summarized as follows: Koizumi's visits to the controversial Yasukuni Shrine resulted in an international outcry based on China's criticism over the history issues, in which Japan was described as an 'unrepentant, insensitive and irresponsible' country. In order to resist such representations of its identity and justify their positions, Japanese political leaders tried to construct

alternative 'self', around the identity of a 'victimized and trustworthy' Japan. This would require the construction of a 'victimizing and untrustworthy' 'other', a role that came to be performed by China. Behind this, there seemed to be Koizumi's intention to remove 'a spell of history' and to manipulate the Yasukuni Shrine issue as political capital to minimize frustrations with his other policies, especially toward North Korea.

From this perspective, a curious inversion took place in which the Yasukuni issue could be used not as a symbol of the rise of Japan's 'nationalism', but as evidence that shows postwar Japan reflects on its past and pledges not to commit war again. This can actually serve to construct and reinforce Japan's national identity as a 'peaceful country'. Thus, there was strong support for Koizumi not to make a concession on attitudes towards the Yasukuni issue because it was an identity problem. This marks a sharp contrast with his conciliatory approach toward North Korea on the abduction issue in order to achieve normalization of the relationship with Pyongyang.

In this context, this chapter aims to explore how foreign policy toward China under the Koizumi administration was used to construct a certain version of Japanese national identity and how the Koizumi administration manipulated the Yasukuni Shrine issue as political capital and legitimized it in accordance with 'nationalistic rhetoric' by articulating national identity. In doing so, this chapter firstly examines the shortcomings of conventional explanations and then introduces the competing discourses on the Yasukuni Shrine issue in the Japanese Parliament. After scrutinizing Koizumi's narrative on the Yasukuni Shrine issue, identity construction in foreign policy discourse become the focus. By examining foreign policy discourses, it scrutinizes the way in which China came to be represented as the radical 'other', how these representations could help to reconstruct Japan's national identity, how they were manipulated to provide rhetorical justification for policy toward China, and then what

role the Yasukuni Shrine issue played in the reconstruction of Japan's identity and Koizumi's identity politics.

3.1 Conventional explanation of the Yasukuni Shrine issue

3.1.1 Chronology

The bilateral relationship between Japan and China under the Koizumi administration started with tension. In addition to Prime Minister Koizumi's pledge to visit the Yasukuni Shrine, there were a series of diplomatic issues such as the government's approval of new history textbooks and the approval of a visa for Taiwan's former President Lee Teng-hui. Koizumi's first visit to the shrine in August 2001 further exacerbated relations, but he tried to improve the relationship by visiting China to meet with President Jiang and Premier Zhu Rongji. In October 2001, Koizumi visited the War Memorial, expressed his apology and regret for the victims of Japanese aggression and the determination of not going to war again. While the Yasukuni Shrine issue was not settled despite China's strong pressure, Koizumi's visit to Beijing seemed to be successful because it contributed to the alleviation of tensions between the two countries. A cozy relationship reached a climax at the Koizumi-Jiang meeting at the Boao Forum held in Shanghai in April 2002 when Koizumi described the rise of China not as a 'threat' but as a 'big opportunity'. Yet, his second visit to the Yasukuni Shrine as a Prime Minister caused China's vehement protest. Coupled with the Shenyang Incident, the bilateral relations was aggravated again despite efforts to improve it from both sides because of Koizumi's annual visit to the Yasukuni Shrine. High-level meetings were broken off in the rise and spread of anti-Japanese

movements across China, which was triggered by Japan's bid for a permanent seat in the UNSC. The soured relationship was never rectified until the end of the Koizumi administration and Abe's unexpected rapprochement with China.

3.1.2 The rise of nationalism in Japanese society

In the first conventional explanation of the Yasukuni Shrine issue, the prime ministerial worship at the Yasukuni Shrine might often be interpreted as a symbol of the rise of Japan's revisionist nationalism from the mid-1990s, or it reflected the 'right shift in Japanese society'. That is, Koizumi visited the Yasukuni Shrine because he wanted to manipulate the historical record to accord with certain nationalistic values. However, if Japan's nationalism is regarded as a right-wing ideology based on the revisionist historical view, it might actually conflict with his perception of history. In particular, revisionists would not agree with his view that the war dead sacrificed their lives 'against their own will', because they insist that all of them voluntarily and proudly sacrificed their lives to protect their motherland. A diplomat Mitoji Yabunaka stated that Koizumi himself did not have a historical view of the right wing and thus his intention of visiting the Yasukuni Shrine was far from supporting the revisionists view¹.

It has also been argued that the rise of nationalism in Japanese society might provide support for Koizumi's visits to the Yasukuni Shrine because nearly half the Japanese people favored his worships². According to an opinion poll conducted by the

¹ 15 March 2011, personal interview at the LSE. Hitoshi Tanaka (2009: 150) also argued that Koizumi's perception of history was almost the same as view in the Murayama Statement.

² Results of public opinion differed by periods and media. According to Asahi Shimbun on 28 June 2005, 52% of people were opposed to Koizumi's Yasukuni visit while 36% approved of it. However, 42% agreed on Koizumi's worship and 41% disagreed on 19 October 2005.

Asahi Shimbun in April 2006, it was true that Koizumi's worship had a 50% approval rate. However, the same poll also demonstrated that 70% of respondents, and a surprisingly 90% of young people in their twenties, did not know what had happened in the Tokyo War Crimes Tribunal. Therefore, although nearly half of respondents approved Koizumi's visits to the Yasukuni Shrine, it was not due to a common view on history or a prevalence of revisionist sentiment. Therefore, it is difficult to conclude that Koizumi's visit to the Yasukuni Shrine and the popular support for it indicated that Japan had become 'nationalistic' in a revisionist sense.

3.1.3 domestic political factor

The second explanation puts more emphasis on domestic electoral factors and appears to be more persuasive. More precisely, it explains that Koizumi manipulated his visit to the Yasukuni Shrine as political leverage to win the election of the LDP in national elections, as well his own election as party president because the prime ministerial visits to the Shrine would be favored by conservative constituencies in Japanese society. According to Hata (2002:13), Koizumi recognized the strong impact of the Japanese Association for the Bereaved Families of the War Dead (JABF) would have on the LDP presidential election from his experience in the previous two presidential elections against Ryutaro Hashimoto. As is well known, Koizumi had pledged that he would visit the Yasukuni Shrine as a Prime Minister in the presidential election of the LDP in April 2001. It is often pointed out that he intended to attain support from the JABF, an influential supporting organization of the LDP with more than 100,000 local party members that lobbies for the imperial and prime ministerial

visits to the Yasukuni Shrine³. An opposing candidate, former Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto, was considered to be in the lead of Koizumi because he had a much stronger support base inside and outside the party. For instance, Hashimoto had been a president of the Association and relied on its vote-gathering capacity. However, he visited the Yasukuni Shrine as Prime Minister only once in 1996 and gave up the practice after provoking criticism from neighboring countries.

Hiromu Nonaka, a powerful politician of the LDP, mentioned that ‘at the time of the presidential election Koizumi said he was going to visit the Yasukuni for the first time. It was because he was aware of the importance of votes from local members⁴. Koizumi intended to whittle away votes of the Association from Hashimoto (Nonaka 2007: 251)’. Therefore, it seemed to be plausible to think that the pledge of worship was Koizumi’s strategy for winning the presidential election. His second visit to the Shrine, in April 2002, was also aimed at winning three midterm elections, held a week later⁵. Of course, this might not be a decisive factor, but at least, it could be argued that Koizumi prioritized domestic politics over diplomatic consideration unlike Hashimoto and tried to utilize his Yasukuni visit as political capital to win an election.

³ About the Association for the Bereaved Families of War Dead and how this organization has maintained strong connection with the LDP, see TanakaN., Tanaka H., and Hata (1995), *Izoku to Sengo (Bereaved families of war dead and postwar)*, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, Tanaka, Tanaka and Hata (1995: 195-6) explained that the Association had two ways to exert influence on the LDP. The first one is to field candidates for the national election from their members and the second way is to support the LDP to win elections, functioning as a vote-gathering machine, in return for achieving their goals such as the legalization of backup of bereaved families. In sum, there have been basic ties between the Diet members and the Association in which the LDP members fulfill demands from the Association by the enactment of bills and the Association cooperate in the election campaign by gathering votes. Hata (2002: 11) also made clear about this point.

⁴ The number of votes from the local party members was 487, outnumbered members of parliament in the LDP, 346.

⁵ There was an Upper House by-election in Niigata prefecture, a Lower House by election in Wakayama prefecture No. 2 constituency, and Tokushima Prefecture’s gubernatorial election on the same day, 28 April 2002. As approval rate of the Koizumi Cabinet dropped to 40% and the LDP lost the Yokohama mayoral election in the previous month, it was reported that Koizumi and the LDP attempted to secure the organized support (Asahi Shimbun: 2002-a).

However, this election factor cannot provide a complete explanation either. This is because, during the presidential election of the LDP of September 2003, Koizumi did not pledge his annual visit to the Yasukuni Shrine on 15 August. Instead, he stated that this might be avoided due to consideration of various factors (Asahi Shimbun: 2003). Furthermore, on the worship on 1 January 2004, a confidant of the Prime Minister mentioned that if Koizumi had visited the Shrine in August, the cabinet could avoid an adverse effect on the Upper House election in July (Asahi Shimbun: 2004-a). In other words, by 2004 the prime ministerial visits to the Yasukuni had come to be regarded as a negative factor in elections. Thus, it could be argued that the explanatory power of the election might be limited though pervasive to some extent.

In this way, conventional explanations tried to answer ‘why Prime Minister Koizumi visited the Yasukuni Shrine’. However, as all of these explanations to answer the ‘why’ question are not enough to prove causal relationship, this thesis focuses on the ‘how’ questions. That is to say, rather than asking ‘why Koizumi visited the Yasukuni Shrine’, it is more informative to ask ‘how his worship could be possible’ or ‘how it was justified in foreign policy discourse’⁶. This involves an exploration of the kind of national identity that Koizumi was attempting to reconstruct through his rhetorical justification of a certain policy.

3.2 The division on the Yasukuni Shrine issue in the Parliament

Foreign policy debate in the Diet had been split over the Yasukuni issue and the relationship with China under the Koizumi administration. There were two main conflicting groups on China policy, namely the pro-Chinese school and the

⁶ About differences between ‘why’ question and ‘how’ question, See Doty (1993).

anti-Chinese or pro-Taiwan school. This division corresponded with divisions of attitudes towards the prime ministerial visit to the Yasukuni Shrine: the former disapproved and the latter supported the visit. Both camps had different definitions of what kind of crisis Japan was facing in the Yasukuni issue or in the entire Japan-China relationship. Along with their construction of these alternative ‘realities’, legitimate subjects for foreign policy choice were articulated and then, a certain policy choice was legitimated as a way to resolve the crisis.

3.2.1 Background of the issue

From a longer historical perspective, intensive debates on the prime ministerial visit to Yasukuni in the Diet started when former Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone relinquished his revisit to the Shrine in 1986. Because of harsh criticism from China and South Korea, it was confirmed that the Yasukuni issue was considered to be a measure of the extent to which Japan reflects on its past aggression and colonial rule. As an official explanation, the Chief Cabinet Secretary, Masaharu Gotoda released a statement:

While it would be an obvious responsibility for political leaders to respect the people and families of the war dead who wish to see an official visit of the prime minister, however, *as a peaceful nation*, our country should emphasize its international relations with other countries and consider the perceptions of people among neighboring countries (Gotoda: 1986).

Since then, this so-called ‘Gotoda Statement’ has been taken as the basis for the

abandonment of the prime ministerial worship at the Yasukuni Shrine. It is notable that this view might be based on such a historical perception that prewar Japan can be articulated as a ‘victimizing’ self and Asian countries are represented as ‘victimized’ others. Therefore, the Yasukuni visits could be interpreted as legitimization of Japan’s aggression towards Asia during WWII. As Zenmei Matsumoto of the Japan Communist Party maintained, the Yasukuni Shrine has been a spiritual pillar to supporting the Japanese aggression during war and was a typical and common criticism (NDRP: 2002-d). A ‘peaceful’ country should thus show reflection on its past ‘wrongdoings’ by relinquishing the visit to the Yasukuni Shrine. From then on, the essence of the Gotoda Statement has been the predominant official discourse in the Diet.

3.2.2 Discourse of the opponents against the prime ministerial visit to the Yasukuni Shrine

The pro-Chinese/anti-Yasukuni group argues that the Prime Minister should not visit the Yasukuni Shrine out of consideration for the national feelings of neighboring countries especially China and South Korea, in line with the Gotoda Statement and that official worship would damage the bilateral relationship with these countries. Such critics often define Japan’s international relations with China and other Asian countries as being ‘damaged by Prime Minister Koizumi’s visit to the Yasukuni Shrine’. Thus, the critical situation in Japan’s diplomacy in East Asia was ‘hot in economy and cold in politics’ with China and ‘Japan’s isolation in Asia’, which were all caused by the Yasukuni Shrine issue⁷. Particularly, it was often pointed out that soured relations with

⁷ For example, Azuma Konno of the DPJ, made the same point (NDRP: 2003-b). In addition,

China would not meet national interests giving the necessity to closely cooperate with China over the Six Party Talks on the North Korean issue and Japan's bid for a permanent seat in the UNSC⁸. In their argument, Koizumi can be represented as an inappropriate political leader to conduct foreign policy because his visits to Yasukuni Shrine seemed to prioritize his private feelings over national interests⁹. In addition, they criticized that the proponents of the prime ministerial worship would be inappropriate and irresponsible for foreign policy makers because they might lack the 'right' understanding of history and moral and rational diplomatic consideration. Furthermore, the prime ministerial visit to the Yasukuni Shrine was regarded as behavior which might show that Japan may not only have failed to reflect on its past, but also be liable to 'victimize' and harm Asian people once again (NDRP: 2001-b). This interpretation of 'a reality' and subjects can be used to legitimize urging Prime Minister Koizumi to discontinue the visit to the Shrine and immediately improve bilateral relationship with China.

3.2.3 Discourse of the supporters of the prime ministerial visit to the Yasukuni Shrine

In contrast, supporters of the prime ministerial visit to the Shrine insisted that the Prime Minister should go to the Yasukuni Shrine to console the souls of the war dead because they sacrificed their lives for our country. This thought has conventionally been based on the traditional right-wing nationalism and the revisionist historical view

Katsuya Okada of the DPJ, repeatedly criticized Koizumi on this matter (NDRP: 2003-d, 2005-n).

⁸ For instance, Katsuya Okada of the DPJ, repeatedly criticized the Koizumi administration on this point (NDRP: 2003-d, 2005-n). In the same way, Tsuyoshi Saitou of the DPJ (NDRP: 2004-g) and Satoshi Arai of the DPJ (NDRP: 2005-t) also raised this issue.

⁹ For example, Takashi Yamamoto of the DPJ, (NDRP: 2004-f) and Akihiro Ohata of the DPJ (NDRP: 2006-g) emphasized this point.

that Japan initiated the previous war to emancipate Asia from the great powers and thus it was completely innocent. According to this school of thought, China's criticism was nothing but 'intervention in Japan's domestic affairs', because it impairs the inherent right of the Japanese to console the souls of their war dead¹⁰. Masahiro Morioka maintained that "Class A War Criminals" are not 'criminals' and the Yasukuni Shrine is the only place to combine the war dead and living Japanese people (NDRP: 2005-o). Therefore, it is the responsibility of Japanese Prime Ministers to honor the Yasukuni Shrine, and other countries should not interfere.

Masayuki Fujishima, a member of the Liberal Party, stated in the Diet that at this point, the Japanese Prime Minister should keep in mind that China's insistence that this issue profoundly damages the national feelings of the 1.3 billion Chinese people was nothing but 'a menace and interference with our country.' Fujishima then insisted that Koizumi should not be submissive to China on this issue and should take a hard-line stance against such a foreign intervention (NDRP: 2002-m). From this point of view, Masahiro Morioka of the LDP argued that, to give up the Yasukuni worship in order to improve bilateral relations with China would not serve Japan's national interests, but rather would damage the long-term national interests (NDRP: 2005-o). In other words, the crisis situation with which Japan was now confronting could be one in which Japan's diplomacy may be too submissive to China's pressure, despite the military and political threat posed by the rise of China. Pro-Chinese politicians and diplomats were thus criticized for their conciliatory approach to China because their submissive attitude had been causing China's interference and damaging Japan's national interest. The DPJ lawmaker Ken Kishimoto thus accused the China School diplomats in MOFA

¹⁰ For instance, Masayuki Fujishima of Liberal Party (NDRP: 2002-m), Shozo Azuma of the DPJ (NDRP: 2002-p), and Toshio Yamauchi of the LDP (NDRP: 2005-q) described this issue as such.

of being primarily concerned with China's interests when diplomatic disputes occurred and asserted that they might have a cozy relationship with China's privileged ruling class and thus downgrade Japan's own national interest (NDRP: 2005-h). In other words, they were labeled as 'anti-Japanese', or an 'enemy within' in pro-Yasukuni discourse.

In this context, political actors have utilized the Yasukuni Shrine issue as political capital based on anti-Chinese sentiment in Japanese politics. Since the prime ministerial visit to the Shrine has been abandoned, it was used as political leverage by Prime Ministers who had a weaker power base within the conservative camp. As the case of Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa's visit to the Yasukuni Shrine demonstrated, the prime minister's worship can serve to ease or offset the opposition from the right-wingers against a conciliatory policy toward China and North Korea, or against any concessions on the history issue with those countries. In this respect, it can be argued that Koizumi could utilize this issue as political capital to not only to obtain support from the conservative groups but, more importantly, to appease frustrations among anti-Chinese groups over his North Korea policy. Yoshiyuki Wakamiya (2006: 19) pointed out that Koizumi told him that thanks to his Yasukuni worship in the previous year, backlash from the right wing against his visit to Pyongyang was less strenuous than he had expected. In short, Koizumi could minimize discontents among anti-Chinese and anti-DPRK groups over his policy for normalization by utilizing his visit to the Yasukuni Shrine. Therefore, the Yasukuni shrine issue can be manipulated as a source of political capital by political leaders to minimize opposition against their other policy choices.

3.3 Discourse analysis of Koizumi's argument

It should be discussed how Koizumi's argument could be interpreted or which school of thought he relied on to legitimize his actions. Koizumi typically attempted to explain his visit to the Yasukuni Shrine:

Japan has realized and maintained a wealthy society for 60 years after WW II , reflected the past prewar behavior and endorsed freedom and democracy as a peaceful country. It is the intention to visit the Yasukuni Shrine to pay respects to the war dead that based on the reflection of the previous war, we should never initiate a war again and that we should not forget that the present Japan owes its peace and prosperity to sacrifices of people who were victimized and lost their lives in the battle field. (NDRP: 2006-i)

There can be seen some notable points in Koizumi's insistence on continual visit to the Yasukuni Shrine. First, while Koizumi's repeated visits to the Yasukuni and little concession to China's criticism might often be regarded as an expression of traditional rightist nationalism, it does not depend exclusively on the traditional right-wing argument. Rather, his logic to justify the Yasukuni worship seems to mix and exploit ideas drawn from both of the schools of thought above. Second, there can be seen a linkage between Koizumi's visit to the Yasukuni Shrine and discourse of Japan's national identity as a 'peaceful country' in his argument, which could be developed in the foreign policy debate. This reconstruction of national identity as a 'peaceful country', coincides with the reproduction of Chinese national identity from the Japanese perspective and conventional postwar Japan's diplomatic relations with Asian countries, and would justify Koizumi's uncompromising attitude towards China.

In what follows, the next section explains each point in order.

3.3.1 Commonalities and differences of the two groups

3.3.1.1 Perception of history

Although Koizumi's stance is often identified with the anti-Chinese group and right-wing nationalist thought on the Yasukuni issue, it might be premature to reach such a conclusion because he also tried to make his argument compatible with the view of pro-Chinese groups and exploit both schools of thought. It is of course easy to find common arguments between Koizumi and the anti-Chinese group. First, both of them alleged that foreign criticism against prime ministerial visits to the Yasukuni Shrine would be an utter intervention with internal politics. In line with such a view, Koizumi himself mentioned that he reckoned other foreign countries would not interfere in Japan's way of commemorating the war dead because other countries would also have a feeling to commemorate the war dead (NDRP: 2005-k).

There should be different thoughts and ways of how to enshrine the war dead country by country. ----- Although I know that China might feel uneasy about this, as a Japanese, it would not be inadequate to respect and appreciate Japanese war dead. I also would be skeptical about whether I should follow foreign request just because they claim that the Japanese way of enshrinement of the war dead is different from theirs (NDRP: 2004-t).

However, it is important to note that Koizumi's argument also seems to be

different from the views of the supporters of the pro-Yasukuni group. One of the remarkable differences from the traditional pro-Yasukuni argument, for example, is Koizumi's perception of history. While people who support and demand the prime ministerial visit to the Yasukuni Shrine tend to hold a 'Yasukuni view of history', a typical right-wing idea that glorifies the Asia-Pacific War as a 'just war', Koizumi declared that he would follow the Murayama Statement, which describes the Asia-Pacific War as an aggression (NDRP: 2005-f) and holds that Japan should not have initiated the war (NDRP: 2004-f). According to Koizumi, his visits were made not for mourning the Class A War criminals, who were held responsible for the aggression in the Tokyo War Tribunal, but for the number of ordinary soldiers who had 'unwillingly' sacrificed their lives for their country (NDRP: 2004-c). At this point, the word 'unwillingly' might be seen as playing an important role insofar as it shows Koizumi's historical perception because it implies that ordinary Japanese people were unenthusiastic about their commitment to the war. This seems to be very different from the traditional right-wing nationalist discourse, in which all Japanese people should and would be willing to devote themselves thoroughly to their country and the Emperor. In addition, Foreign Minister Machimura in the Koizumi Cabinet stated that 'we must sincerely acknowledge the fact that Japan invaded and colonized neighboring countries during WW II and brought about big damage', adding that Japan should remark and behave taking into consideration the damaged national feelings of neighbouring countries (NDRP: 2005-d). He also emphasized that the intensification of Prime Minister Koizumi's worship was far from whitewashing prewar aggression or glorifying prewar militarism (NDRP: 2005-p). In that sense, Koizumi might not be identified with the right-wing traditionalists.

3.3.1.2 Perception to China

Another important point that differs from the anti-Chinese camp might be that Koizumi emphasized the importance of the Japan-China relationship and never described China as a ‘threat’ against Japan. Rather, he repeatedly emphasized that the rise of China would be not a ‘threat’, but an enormous ‘opportunity’ for Japan¹¹.

Some see the economic development of China as a threat. I do not. I believe that its dynamic economic development presents challenges as well as opportunity for Japan. I believe a rising economic tide and expansion of the market in China will stimulate competition and will prove to be a tremendous opportunity for the world economy as a whole (Koizumi: 2002-a).

It also sharply contrasts with Abe’s hard-line policy toward North Korea in which the DPRK was clearly articulated as a ‘threat’ to Japan. In this sense, although he came to criticize China’s relentless pressure against the Yasukuni Shrine visits and indicated that China negated Japan’s identity, which helped produce social antagonism, Koizumi’s stance on China was not as hostile as that of other anti-Chinese politicians. This is quite different from the stance taken by anti-Chinese schools, which often describes the neighboring country as a military, political, and economic threat to Japan. Taking these points together, Koizumi’s argument exploits the ideas of both the pro-Yasukuni-anti-Chinese group and the pro-Chinese-anti-Yasukuni group.

¹¹ Koizumi referred to this in the speech at the Boao Forum for Asia in April 2002 (Koizumi: 2002-a). In addition, he repeatedly emphasized this point in the National Diet (NDRP: 2003-d, 2004-t, 2004-u).

3.3.2 The link between the visit to the Yasukuni Shrine and Japan's 'peace country' identity

The second and most important point of Koizumi's logic is that he tried to establish a link between his visit to the Yasukuni Shrine and postwar Japan's national identity as a 'peace country'. That is, Koizumi indicated that his visit to the Yasukuni Shrine is public evidence of postwar Japan as a 'peaceful nation', which reflects its past and renews its pledge not to engage in war. This does not appear to be as natural as Koizumi insisted because his notion of 'a peaceful nation' did not completely coincide with the conventional usage of that term. The phrase '*Japan is a peaceful nation*' in the Gotoda Statement articulated that Japan should prioritize diplomatic consideration over domestic concern in order to show its repentance and legitimize Prime Minister Nakasone's discontinuation of his visits to the Yasukuni Shrine. Koizumi's usage of the term clearly conflicts with this idea. Instead, Koizumi established a new connection between the Yasukuni Shrine and the concept of a 'peaceful country'. First, he negated any link between postwar Japan and militarism emphasizing its 'peaceful' development:

While people refer to the resurgence of militarism, but where in the world could they find evidence to suggest that Japan is a militaristic country? As a "peaceful country", Japan has strived for peace building in international society in our own way. Japan was not involved in a war nor did it go to war, insomuch that there has been no loss of human life because of Japan's war in the region. Therefore, Japan as a 'peaceful country' is now highly praised by a number of countries. By taking this into consideration, how could it be possible to identify

my visits to the Yasukuni Shrine with the rise of militarism? (NDRP: 2005-n)

Put simply, postwar Japan was articulated as being completely distanced from militarism and being respected around the world. Coupled with a previous citation of Koizumi's statement, this globally esteemed way of the peaceful development is closely associated with Japanese people in the past because peace and prosperity in postwar Japan was firmly 'founded upon sacrifices of people who were victimized' in battlefield (NDRP: 2005-j). According to Koizumi, peace and prosperity of the present-day Japan is heavily indebted to the soldiers who were enshrined in the Yasukuni Shrine. The Japanese Prime Minister should thus pledge that Japan would not commit any acts of war in remembrance of those who unwillingly sacrificed their lives in the previous war. In this there can be seen a nationalistic logic, which unites the Japanese people of today with those of the past. Therefore, paying honor to its war victims was not to glorify militarism but to make an oath not to take such victims again. In other words, the condolences to the war dead were treated as equal confirmation of Japan's decisive break from militarism and the pledge of not going to war again. In this context, the Yasukuni Shrine was treated not as a place where prewar militarism was whitewashed and supported, but a place where Japanese political leaders renewed their pledge of abstaining from war. Therefore, according to Koizumi, his visit to the Yasukuni Shrine should be viewed as a sign, which signifies Japan's 'peaceful' identity.

Although this linkage to justify Koizumi's visit to the Yasukuni Shrine might not be self-evident or persuasive, it was manipulated and strengthened by supporters of visits to the Shrine by utilizing the concept of a 'peaceful country' in foreign policy discourses. As China's criticism became increasingly harsh, claiming that the

Yasukuni Shrine was a symbol of Japanese prewar militarism and that the prime ministerial visit might mean the resurgence of it, came to be regarded as more than ‘interference in domestic affairs’: it was treated as a negation of Japan’s ‘peaceful’ identity. It was especially after the anti-Japanese movement spread across China in the spring of 2005 that the issue of the Yasukuni visit, China policy and a ‘peaceful country’ became the subject of heated debate. In what follows, this thesis attempts to examine how the concept of a ‘peaceful country’ as postwar Japan’s identity was reconstructed over the Yasukuni and China Policy issue.

3. 4 Construction of national identity in foreign policy discourses

As Shogo Suzuki (2011: 52) puts it, controversies over the ‘history issue’ in Sino-Japanese relations can be regarded as ‘part of a quest for identity’. He provides new insights and observations on this rivalry focusing on the ‘othering’ of China in narratives of Japan’s rights, and argues that the Japanese right attempted to redraw moral boundaries between Japan and China. In doing so, they aimed to shore up Japan’s identity as ‘righteous, honorable’ and ‘ethical’ state, which has ‘legitimate’ membership within the society of states, portraying China as ‘irrational’ and ‘unethical’. Although Suzuki’s argument is convincing, this chapter focuses not on narratives of right-wing groups and anti-Chinese politicians but on discourse of the Koizumi administration because it seeks to explore how Koizumi aimed to legitimize his policy toward China.

It can be argued that discursive construction of Japan’s identity as a ‘peaceful nation’ could not be possible without a context in which China contributes to the construction of Japan’s identity in its criticism. In other words, Japan as a ‘peaceful

country' was reconstructed in the Japan-China war of words concerning a series of historical problems most notably the Yasukuni issue and Japan's bid for a permanent seat in the UN Security Council in spring 2005. The Chinese government blamed Japan on these issues and took up an international anti-Japanese campaign. In the campaign, Chinese discourse produced Japan's identity as, 'glorifying militarism', 'unrepentant on the past' and thus 'untrustworthy' for a great role in international community. It was against these representations of Japan that the Koizumi administration attempted to reconstruct and appeal Japan's 'peaceful' identity. In order to highlight a 'peaceful country' identity, China's identity was reshaped to illuminate differences from Japan.

3.4.1 The Representation of Japan's Identity in China's criticism

The two countries criticized each other over who should be blamed for a range of anti-Japanese behavior across China. Taking seriously these demonstrations, the Chinese government took a hard-line stance towards Japan's bid for a permanent seat in the UNSC. Premier Wen Jiabao stated that 'It is only a country which respects history and takes responsibility without reluctance that could assume greater responsibility in international society' (Asahi Shimbun: 2005-a). That is, Japan was constructed as a country, which could not be qualified for a greater role in international society because it avoided taking historical responsibility. He clearly indicated that Japan should review its stance on the history issues if it sought to become a permanent member of the UNSC. Chinese officials would not acknowledge their responsibility to control 'destructive activities' aimed at the Japanese embassy and shops in China. Vice Minister Wu Pawei told the Japanese press that the fundamental source of this problem

was Japan's incorrect understanding of history and that there was no reason for China to apologize. China's Ambassador to Tokyo, Wang Yi, also stated that it was Japan that had raised issues behind the current problems when he was summoned and protested to by Foreign Minister Machimura. In addition, against the remark of the LDP lawmaker Masahiro Morioka that the Class A War Criminals were 'no longer regarded as criminals in Japan', the Chinese spokesperson, Kong Quan, stated in response that 'it is highly arguable whether Japan can play a reasonable role in the international community'. According to the Chinese side, it was Japan which should be responsible for causing such a situation because the Japanese side stepped on the toes of the Chinese people by its failure to reflect on its past. In short, Japan was constructed as a country which would beautify militarism, fail to reflect on its past, and thus be irresponsible as a major power. It was in this context that new effort was made to reconstruct Japan's identity, in order to resist and reverse these representations created by China.

This construction of Japan's identity in Chinese discourse yielded two important reactions from the Japanese side: the reconstruction and reinforcement of postwar Japan's identity and the reproduction of China's identity in Japan. Put simply, in order to resist China's construction of Japan's identity as a militaristic, unrepentant, and untrustworthy country, Japan's political leaders tried to reconstitute Japan as a 'victim' and reshape China as a 'victimizer'.

3.4.2 The Reconstruction of Japan's identity in Koizumi's policy toward China

What would be constructed and reinforced as Japan's identity in foreign policy discourse might be the notion that Japan was a 'peaceful country'. Especially in order

to resist China's emphasis on Japan's lack of a 'proper understanding of history', which would recall Japan's past colonial rule and aggression as a 'victimizer', Japan's political leaders repeatedly referred to the 60-year path of peaceful development after WW II based on the 'deep reflection of its past'. Koizumi's speech at the Asia Africa summit in Jakarta would be a typical statement of such a narrative.

In the past, Japan, through its colonial rule and aggression, caused tremendous damage and suffering to the people of many countries, particularly to those of Asian nations. Japan squarely faces these facts of history in a spirit of humility. And with feelings of deep remorse and heartfelt apology always engraved in mind, Japan has resolutely maintained, consistently since the end of WW II, never turning into a military power but rather an economic power, its principle of resolving all matters by peaceful means, without recourse to the use of force (Koizumi: 2005-a).

In Koizumi's narrative there can be seen a discourse in which Japan was articulated as a non-military nation with deep remorse for its past, contrary to China's description. In addition, the primary emphasis of this speech, according to Foreign Minister Machimura, was not put exclusively on an apology for the history issue but rather on Japan's postwar achievements and its further contributions as a peaceful nation (NDRP: 2005-i). He also explained that the expression of deep remorse and heartfelt apology was used as a ground to express Japan's confidence in its development as a peaceful nation (NDRP: 2005-j). Therefore, it would be wrong to claim that Koizumi and his cabinet merely attempted to focus on an apology for the history issue. In fact, they just 'followed' the existing line of the Murayama Statement based on the 'strategy

of historic reconciliation' from the 1990s without clarifying further any war responsibility. It seems that the focus was exclusively put on resisting China's criticism that Japan would beautify its past aggression and militarism. By taking the position that Japan has fully reflected and apologized for the past, Koizumi was saying that Japan might be ready for playing a more proactive role as a 'peace country' in the region.

In this context, the representations of Japan's identity as a 'peaceful nation' were used as a foundation for seeking a permanent seat in the UN Security Council. Foreign Minister Nobutaka Machimura repeatedly argued that the Japanese government has demonstrated its primary posture that Japan pursues world peace based on reflection of its own prewar history and the principle of a 'peaceful country', such as an exclusive defensive policy and three non-nuclear principles. This, he contends, has contributed to world peace with a series of non-military means, such as the ODA program. It is because Japan takes pride in its postwar peaceful development and posture that Machimura hoped it might be rightly evaluated by many countries around the world, Machimura thus emphasized that Japan was qualified to seek a permanent seat in the UN Security Council (NDRP: 2005-p). It would thus be natural for Japan to desire to become a permanent member of the UN Security Council because it was a part of the expression of the reality of its national identity, a 'peaceful nation'.

In this way, the Japanese government tried to reconstruct Japan's identity as a 'non-militaristic' 'peaceful' country which sincerely reflects upon its past, and thus, is 'trustworthy' and 'suitable' to become a permanent member of the UNSC.

3.4.3 The Reproduction of China's identity in Koizumi's policy toward China

Another important reaction against China's construction of Japanese identity would be the reproduction of China's own identity in foreign policy debate. It was not only reconstituted as 'savage' and 'victimizing' 'other', but also used to articulate Japan's new identity by using binary oppositions. In other words, the articulation of China as a 'militaristic', 'interfering' and 'authoritarian' state might reinforce Japan's alleged new identity of a 'peaceful', 'respectful of rule of law', and 'democratic' nation.

In order to justify the Yasukuni visits of Prime Minister, any differences between Japan and China have been emphasized. At the first stage until late 2004, cultural differences rather than its political system or ideology were used to explain and justify conflicting understandings over the Yasukuni Shrine. For instance, Koizumi argued that the way to console the war dead should vary country to country (NDRP: 2004-t) and stated that contrary to China, there might be no idea that the sins of the dead could not be forgiven in Japanese traditional culture (NDRP: 2004-c). However, there can be seen a shift from this focus on cultural differences to the distinctions in ideology, values and political system between the two countries. Moreover, the reconstruction of China's radical 'otherness' and the emphasis on how it can be a 'threat' to Japan came to be the forefront in China policy discourse.

'Threatening' China had been discursively reformulated in foreign policy debate of the pro-Yasukuni group: it *is* a 'militaristic' country with a double-digit increase in military expenditure for more than a decade. Koki Kobayashi of the LDP clearly stated that this military expansion of China should be interpreted as a serious threat to not only Japan but also regional security (NDRP: 2001-a). Foreign Minister Aso stated of China in a press conference 'when one of our neighbors has more than one billion population and atomic bombs, and its military expenditure has increased for 17 years,

and its contents are extraordinarily opaque, what will happen? It is becoming a tremendous threat (Aso 2005-b).’ According to Shigeru Ishiba, a member of the Koizumi cabinet, in contrast to ‘democratic’ Japan where transparency concerning military and defense strength is always checked, ‘one-party ruled’ China lacks military transparency (NDRP: 2004-i). Thus, it was argued that China should be perceived as more militaristic and dangerous than Japan, even though it propagates the ‘mythical’ argument that militarism has been revived in Japan over the Yasukuni issue. This construction of a ‘savage’ and ‘threatening’ China is linked with and strengthened by its undemocratic and authoritarian regime.

In addition, the argument that universal values might not be shared with China would have a major importance in the reconstruction of China’s identity. It was described as an undemocratic country where freedom and human rights could easily be suppressed. This trait might be attributed to its ‘authoritarian’ and ‘single-party regime’ in a sharp contrast with ‘democratic’ Japan, which respects universal values. In particular, lack of freedom of speech and press was often highlighted when defining Chinese society. The LDP lawmaker Hiroshige Seko argued that anti-Japanese demonstrations in China showed that there was no freedom of speech or freedom of press, but only narratives controlled by the Chinese government (NDRP: 2005-e). Overall, China was articulated as a country in which all universal values were not respected but rather oppressed.

The negative image was further strengthened by the Shenyang incident, which took place in May 2002¹². The DPJ lawmaker Jin Matsubara asserted that the Chinese government clearly violated the Vienna Convention three times in the recent

¹² This was an incident in which a family of North Korean asylum seekers ran into the Japanese Consulate General in Shenyang, but was removed from the Consulate’s premises by Chinese police guards.

relationships with Japan: the intrusion into the Japanese Consulate General in Shenyang without warning, the abduction of a family of North Korean asylum seekers, and the destructive behavior against the buildings of the Japanese Embassy (NDRP: 2006-h). Hajime Nakatani of the LDP argued that anti-Japanese movements would downgrade China's international reputation and status because they might show that China did not possess the qualities of a responsible major country (NDRP: 2005-d). In short, China was articulated as a country, which did not hesitate to violate national sovereignty and infringe human rights. Japan's criticism against violent behavior in anti-Japanese demonstrations across China and the Chinese governmental response to them reinforced the view of China as 'unapologetic' and 'provocative' character and acting against international law. These constructions were sharply contrasted with Japan's repeated apologies on the history issue and respect for the rule of law. As a result, it was insisted that China should be regarded as an 'untrustworthy' and 'mindless' country.

Taken together, representations of China in foreign policy discourse seem to create binary oppositions that form a sharp contrast with Japan, such as militaristic-peaceful, authoritarian-democratic, untrustworthy-trustworthy. This had two important implications. Firstly, these representations reconstructed not only China's identity but also Japan's identity. By constructing these binary oppositions, it was possible to give meanings to and reconstitute Japan's identity. Although a concept of a 'peaceful country', for instance, can be empty as long as it was merely defined as a 'peace-loving' country, it can be clearly articulated by contrasting it with a 'militaristic' China. In a similar way, the tendency to stress its commitment to universal values like freedom and democracy would be all the more significant when some countries can share these values and some can not. It was this idea that led to the

policy of the ‘Arc of Freedom and Prosperity’ designed by the diplomat Shotaro Yachi and proposed by Foreign Minister Aso in the Abe administration.

3.5 The construction of reality

In accordance with identity constructions discussed above, a certain kind of ‘reality’ was constructed in foreign policy discourse. There can be seen double ‘realities’: that the Chinese government manipulated the Yasukuni Shrine issue as a ‘diplomatic card’ in a self-serving way and; that China disregarded the peaceful development and contribution of postwar Japan and thereby negated Japan’s identity as a ‘peaceful country’.

The constructions of China’s identity allowed the Koizumi administration to shape a certain reality that China maneuvered the history issue to hold Japan responsible for the deterioration of the Japan-China relationship and benefited from it. Some anti-China lawmakers claimed that China tended to exclusively focus on the prewar history issue and represent Japan as a ‘savage’ militaristic nation in order to emphasize the legitimacy of the CCP regime. In their thought, the soured relationship between Japan and China itself might not be a diplomatic crisis because they considered the conventional ‘friendship framework’ since the normalization in 1972 not to be at ‘normal’ relationship. As the Chinese side exploited the existing framework, according to Akira Imaizumi of the DPJ, the proponents of the Yasukuni Shrine group argued that it allowed China to interfere with Japan’s domestic issues, especially how history is viewed (NDRP: 2006-d). In addition, they also thought that the anti-Japanese demonstrations were an outlet for frustrations against tremendous material disparity and lack of freedom. Thus, it was China’s identity as ‘self-righteous’,

‘anti-Japanese’, and ‘authoritarian’ that caused anti-Japanese movements in order to blockade Japan’s identity. From this perspective, Japan might not be responsible for the deterioration of the bilateral Japan-Sino relationship because it was not the Yasukuni visit itself but China due to its manipulation of the Yasukuni issue or other history issues as a ‘diplomatic card’¹³.

While China blamed Japan for the deterioration of relations and the rise of the anti-Japanese movement, Foreign Minister Aso declared that ‘it cannot be acceptable to admit that Japan should take all the responsibility to improve the current situation (NDRP: 2006-f).’ Koizumi himself would not admit that his visit to the Yasukuni Shrine damaged the bilateral relationship with China (NDRP: 2004-h, 2004-u). He repeatedly criticized China by arguing that it would not be reasonable to hinder the Japan-China summits and damage the whole Japan-China relationship by only the Yasukuni issue (NDRP: 2004-w). At this point, Robert Novak (2004) reported that Koizumi told him ‘I think to advance this perception of Japan as a rival and to create a sense of “anti-Japanese” in China would be advantageous to the Chinese leadership.’ In other words, China deliberately utilized the Yasukuni Shrine issue to inflame the anti-Japanese feelings in its own country to take advantage in diplomatic relations with Japan. Thus, in Koizumi’s logic, it was not him but China that should take responsibility for the deterioration of Japan-China relationship and the Yasukuni issue.

In this articulation of a ‘reality’, China was represented as a country, which often interfered with Japan’s domestic affairs by utilizing the history issue as a ‘diplomatic card’, depicting Japan as a country whose sovereignty could be infringed upon because of its historical burden. In sum, Japan was represented as a ‘victim’ rather than ‘victimizer’ and, instead, China was depicted as a ‘victimizer’ of Japan. Therefore,

¹³ Michio Sato of the DPJ, for instance, claimed that anti-Japanese movements were ‘traps planned by the Chinese government.’ (NDRP: 2005-g).

these constructions of the ‘reality’ and subjects could marginalize any policy to make concessions on the Yasukuni issue to immediately improve the relationship with China and could be used to legitimize instead to advocate Koizumi’s visit to the Yasukuni Shrine.

Another construction of a ‘reality’ by the Koizumi administration was that China’s criticism against Koizumi’s visits to the Yasukuni Shrine was interpreted not only as the condemnation of the justification of prewar Japan’s aggression and the resurgence of militarism, but as the negation of postwar Japan’s development as a ‘peaceful country’. Until this time, the conventional counterargument against China’s criticism on the history issue had mainly been objection to China meddling with Japan’s internal affairs or the accusation that China’s argument might be based on distorted historical facts. At this moment, however, it came to be highlighted as a focus of a broader debate on how to evaluate the path of postwar Japan. According to this narrative, China might have misunderstood that Koizumi’s worship at the Yasukuni Shrine meant that militarism and aggression were romanticized because it refused to recognize that postwar Japan had followed a path of a ‘peaceful nation’.

Japan’s consequent frustration against the negation of its ‘pacifist’ development would be expressed even in diplomatic negotiations. When Chinese ambassador to Japan Wang Yi sharply criticized Japan on the history issue, Yukio Takeuchi, a vice minister of foreign affairs of the time, retorted that

I could not agree with you on China’s exclusive focus on the prewar history because postwar Japan also has a history of sixty years. Japan has devoted itself to world and regional peace. Which country in the world would have a fear of Japan’s military attack? It is impossible to gain wide support from Japanese

people on this matter without impartial appraisal of this fact (Yomiuri Shimbun Seizibu 2006: 259).

In addition, Foreign Minister Machimura reiterated Japan's 'peaceful' identity that justified its bid for the UNSC. In response to his counterpart Li Zhaoxing, who refused apology for the 'destructive activities' of the anti-Japanese movements and problematized Japan's stance on the history issues, Machimura countered that Japan's evaluation as a 'peaceful nation' had been established based on its sincere reflection on the past, which provided a firm enough reason for it to become a permanent member of the UNSC (Asahi Shimbun: 2005-b).

Furthermore, from Japan's point of view, China's criticism of the prime ministerial worship at the Yasukuni Shrine was interpreted by the Koizumi administration as a part of an international anti-Japanese campaign. For instance, Hitoshi Tanaka, a prominent diplomat in the administration, noticed that Prime Minister Koizumi's visit to the Yasukuni might provide China and South Korea with an excellent excuse to oppose Japan's bid for membership of the UNSC (Tanaka 2009: 152). He points out that China manipulated the Yasukuni issue and insisted that Japan was a provocative and self-righteous country which could not be trusted in order to hinder Japan's bid for the reform of the UN Security Council and a permanent seat in the UN Security Council in 2005 (Tanaka 2009: 151). In other words, it was interpreted that China attempted to block Japan's realization of its identity as a 'peaceful nation'.

In addition, there has been a growing frustration that postwar Japan's contribution to peace and stability in the region through initiatives such as its large amount of ODA programme towards China might not be rightly understood or

appreciated. For instance, Hiroshi Takano of the Komei Party argued that anti-Japanese movements might not have erupted in China if Japan's ODA had been profoundly appreciated by the Chinese people (NDRP: 2006-c). Since the ODA program was regarded as a central tool for Japan's international contribution as a 'peaceful country', China's ungratefulness could be interpreted as the negation of Japan's preferred identity. As a result, discontent that China would not recognize postwar Japan's identity as a 'peaceful nation' came to the forefront in the foreign policy argument.

This situation can be explained in theoretical terms by using the concept of 'social antagonism' that is introduced by Laclau and Mouffe (1985). This is something that occurs because subjects are not able to attain their identities when 'the presence of the 'other' prevents me from being totally myself (Laclau and Mouffe 1985: 125)'. In other words, the negation and the blockade of identity gave rise to social antagonism against the 'other' because social agents construct an 'enemy' who is deemed responsible for this 'failure' (Torfing 1999: 120, Howard 2000: 105). Playing a role of 'constitutive outside', antagonisms thus would shape a subject's identity, especially conflict with a radical 'other' with purely a negative identity, and social relations between social agents by emphasizing friend-foe divisions based on 'inside' and 'outside' formation. In this case, there can be seen an argument that the development and the realization of Japan's postwar identity as a 'peaceful nation' was negated and blocked by China's construction of its desired identity. Therefore, this negation and blockade of postwar Japan's identity formation by China might give rise to social antagonism in Japan, which constituted and strengthened the 'friend-foe' division line. In this context, Japan can be described as a 'victim' and China as a 'victimizer', which could legitimize Koizumi's policy choice of adopting an uncompromising attitude

towards China.

3.6 The legitimization of Koizumi's policy toward China

These representations of China above could allow Japanese political leaders to legitimize a certain policy toward it and marginalize other policy choice. In this case, representations of China were used to justify Koizumi's uncompromising attitude toward China despite the improvement of the bilateral relationship that was necessary to move forward on other critical issues on the diplomatic agenda, such as the bid for the UNSC. There were three main components in this foreign policy discourse used to legitimize Koizumi's uncompromising stance: self-victimization, social antagonism, and binary oppositions.

First of all, China was blamed for paralyzing the entire Japan-Sino relationship by clinging to the Yasukuni issue. In this discourse, the basic framework was that *Japan is victimized by China*; China manipulated the history issue for its own sake, violated Japan's sovereignty, promoted anti-Japanese education and even negated Japan's postwar identity; on the other hand, Japan was a genuinely 'innocent' 'victim'. Japan should not be blamed for triggering anti-Japanese demonstrations because the primary cause can be found not on Japan's side but in Chinese society; its anti-Japanese education to maintain the CCP legitimacy. On that point, it can be argued that Koizumi might seek to amend the conventional framework of the Japan-China relationship, in which the relationship was liable to be shaken by China's manipulation of the 'history card'. According to Funabashi (2011: 89), Koizumi refused to accept China's claim in order for China to relinquish its maneuver of the Yasukuni Shrine issue as a 'diplomatic card'. In order to achieve it, he believed that,

such an experience that Japan fall into temporal stagnation in diplomacy with China was necessary in the long run. Hitoshi Tanaka also mentioned that Koizumi insisted that he would continue to visit the Shrine to make China give up the manipulation of the history issue as a bargaining chip (Tanaka and Tahara 2007: 36, Tanaka 2009: 152). Furthermore, in November 2002, Koizumi's 'Task Force on Foreign Relations' released its report, '*Basic Strategies for Japan's Foreign Policy in the 21st Century New Era, New Vision, New Diplomacy*'. This report articulated that the relationship with China was 'the most important theme in Japan's foreign policy at the outset of the 21st century' (Task Force on Foreign Relations: 2002). Among its policy recommendations, the report called on the Japanese government to sincerely face the history issue, and the Chinese government to acknowledge postwar Japan's development and to quit anti-Japanese education. Most notably, it recommended to both governments that 'while drawing lessons from history, it is time they liberated themselves from an "enchantment with history" and aimed for a future oriented relationship'. From this, the primary focus of Koizumi's China policy was to make China abandon the 'history card' in its diplomatic relationship with Japan and establish a new framework. Therefore, his uncompromising stance on the Yasukuni issue was justified by claiming that it was necessary to overcome a conventionally fragile 'friendship' and to achieve a more firm and 'future-oriented' relationship with China.

Secondly, social antagonism produced by China's negation of postwar Japan's national identity as a peaceful country might play an important role to legitimize Koizumi's policy and marginalize other policy options. As the Yasukuni issue was regarded as a matter of how Japan's postwar development as a peaceful nation was evaluated in China, it was no longer just the history issue but an identity problem. Koizumi asserted that even if he had made a concession to China and relinquished a

visit to the Shrine, which might warm up the bilateral friendship, it might be inappropriate as Japan's diplomacy (NDRP: 2006-a). Japan should not concede to China because foreign policy was a practice of representing national identity. Koizumi later stated that his visit to Yasukuni might symbolize Japan as being a liberal and democratic country in which freedom of thought was guaranteed. Therefore, concession on the Yasukuni issue cannot be made because it would mean Japan admits the negation of its identity. In addition, this social antagonism provided an outlet for traditional resentment against China among the right-wing traditionalists on the history issue, which Koizumi could maneuver as his political capital. In this way, China's negation of Japan's identity gave rise to social antagonism in Japan, which would legitimize an uncompromising approach to China and marginalize a conciliatory policy to it.

Finally, according to anti-Chinese discourse, the differences between the two countries were interpreted to be so radical that the 'other' China could not be assimilated with the identity of the 'self' Japan. In addition, there might be a hierarchical relationship within the binary oppositions; 'peaceful' might be treated as morally superior to 'militaristic', 'democracy' can enjoy an advantage over 'authoritarian' and so forth. Therefore, it was argued that Japan was not only 'different' from China but also had a moral advantage. In this respect, Japan needed not underestimate itself in international society and should not make concession on the Yasukuni issue to China because it might hold a superior positioning from an ethical standpoint.

What should be noted here is that although binary oppositions were also used to justify conflicting attitudes mainly by the anti-Chinese group. However, the Koizumi cabinet seemed to be careful not to put too much emphasis on radical difference

between Japan and China. Koizumi and his cabinet members, even Shinzo Abe when he was a cabinet minister, did not explicitly focus on those radical differences. Although they seemed to exploit the effects of emphasizing such radical differences, they limited themselves to only highlighting representations of Japan as a liberal democracy. This might be because the Koizumi administration sought to find a way to improve the Japan-China relationship without making concessions on the Yasukuni issue. If radical differences and dissimilarity were exclusively stressed, there might have been no room to negotiate for the rapprochement. However, Koizumi's argument might imply that the improvement of the bilateral relationship could only be set out when the Chinese government would acknowledge Japan's postwar development as a 'peaceful nation'. Actually, from May 2005, the Koizumi administration started the 'Japan-China comprehensive policy dialogue' to get a foothold on the improvement of the Japan-Sino relations, which actually put in place the conditions for the remarkable rapprochement that took place in the next Abe administration. Taken together, from Tokyo's perspective, it can be argued that the rhetorical justification of the Koizumi administration and its uncompromising policy toward China might have actually been designed to make room for the rapprochement under Abe.

3.7 Conclusion

It has been a matter of debate why Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi was so uncompromising over visits to the controversial Yasukuni Shrine in the face of expected domestic and international criticism. The prime ministerial visits to the shrine might be irrational insofar as a diplomatic row might be unavoidable with those countries. From the diplomatic point of view, Japan needed close cooperation with

China and South Korea to settle the North Korean issue and to achieve a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council. This section has attempted to explain such apparent irrationality by exploring how Koizumi manipulated the Yasukuni issue and what kind of Japanese national identity was reconstructed in the rhetorical justification of his administration's uncompromising policy toward China. Through an intensive debate on the Yasukuni issue, China's criticism constructed a vision of a 'militaristic' 'unrepentant' and 'irresponsible' Japan, which was used to counter Japan's bid for the UNSC. In order to resist and reverse these representations, Japanese political leaders tried to articulate their country as a 'peaceful', 'responsible' democracy with deep remorse for its past. At the same time, they also reproduced China's identity as a 'militaristic', 'unapologetic', 'authoritarian' country, aiming at highlighting the sharp contrast with Japan. These binary schemes allowed Koizumi to provide a moral advantage to Japan, representing it as an 'innocent victim' of the 'savage' 'threatening' China. In addition, the Yasukuni Shrine was treated not as a place where prewar militarism was whitewashed and supported, but a place where Japanese political leaders renew their pledge of no war. In this context, Koizumi's visit to the Yasukuni Shrine was articulated as evidence that shows postwar Japan as a 'peaceful nation' which reflects its past and renews a pledge not to commit war again in front of the war victims.

This representation of the Yasukuni issue was regarded as more than just 'interference in domestic affairs', which was often claimed by the traditional right-wing nationalists of Japan. China's criticism against Koizumi's visit to the shrine was thus interpreted as a negation of postwar Japan's identity as a 'peaceful nation', which would give rise to social antagonism. Coupled with construction of China's identity as a country, which utilized the history issue as a 'diplomatic card', social

antagonism was manipulated to justify Koizumi's uncompromising policy to China and marginalize other policy choices, such as making concessions on the Yasukuni issue. Koizumi also manipulated this social antagonism as an outlet for frustrations of anti-Chinese groups, which could be utilized to offset their discontents against Koizumi's policy toward North Korea. From this perspective, the Yasukuni issue might not be a symbol of the rise of traditional right-wing nationalism. Rather, it seemed to be exploited as a catalyst to reconstitute and reinforce Japan's national identity as it seeks to expand its role in international society and Koizumi's political capital in domestic politics.

Chapter 4. Case study 2: Nationalism and Foreign Policy toward North Korea under the Koizumi administration

Japan's foreign policy toward North Korea had a great importance in Koizumi's East Asian diplomacy as well as the Yasukuni Shrine issue in relation to the rise of nationalism. Both the 'abduction issue' and the 'Yasukuni issue' have been regarded as symbols of the resurgence of Japan's nationalism in the 2000s. While some scholars and observers appreciate Koizumi's North Korean foreign policy including his visits to Pyongyang as notable diplomatic accomplishments (Tanaka 2007-b: 273), it is also pointed out that the North Korean problem, in particular, the abduction issue caused not only strong resentments against the country but also a sense of 'self-victimization' among the Japanese people (Lee 2004). As a result, the North Korean issue triggered a remarkable upsurge in debate over postwar foreign policy toward the DPRK and of how postwar Japan has developed. In such circumstances, public opinion was dominated by a hard-line approach claiming a need for stiff sanctions with an uncompromising attitude. The Koizumi administration, however, generally tended to adopt a conciliatory attitude toward North Korea while there could be seen a rise of hard-line discourse in the public and in the Diet. What is more, this made a stark contrast to his unyielding China policy. In short, he seemed to juggle apparently contradicting foreign policies in East Asia; taking a tough stance to China, which was supported by the right-wing or conservative camp, and pursuing a 'normalization' policy towards North Korea, which was opposed by the same group at the same time. Therefore, it can be argued that Koizumi used a different logic to legitimize his North Korea policy in manipulating the abduction issue and the entire North Korea issue.

From this perspective, this chapter tries to explore what made it possible for Koizumi to take this conciliatory approach toward North Korea, and how Koizumi manipulated the North Korea issue and legitimized it in accordance with nationalistic rhetoric by articulating national identity. My argument is as follows: it is true that a ‘dialogue school’ including Koizumi himself constructed the North Korean identity as a ‘threatening other’ like the ‘pressure school’. However, Koizumi did not treat the abduction issue as Japan’s identity crisis and treated North Korea as, at least, a ‘negotiable other’, with whom Japan could have common interests. Furthermore, he implied that Japan could realize its role as a ‘peaceful country’ with a more proactive initiative in Northeast Asia through normalization of Japan-DPRK relationships and its proactive engagement with a regional multinational security framework. Japan’s identity as a ‘peaceful nation’ might not be threatened but reinforced through engaging the North Korean issue, in a way very different from dealing with the Yasukuni Shrine issue with China. One reason may be that Japan could sustain a moral superiority in international society as Japan can be an ‘innocent victim’ of the North Korean missile, nuclear development, and abduction issues even when it made a concession towards Pyongyang. In sum, the Koizumi administration could assume a conciliatory attitude toward North Korea because it would not treat North Korea as an identity threat and considered it to be a measure to break a sense of diplomatic stagnation. In addition, by promoting the dialogue and negotiation on normalization of the Japan-North Korea relationship, it sought to reconstruct Japan’s identity, which might be suitable for playing a more proactive role in the region.

This section first explains the conflicting discourses over foreign policy toward North Korea in the Diet, and examines Koizumi’s policy. Then, it scrutinizes how the identity of Japan and North Korea were constituted in foreign policy discourse and

how a certain ‘reality’ was shaped. Finally, it looks at how Koizumi’s policy was legitimized relying on the construction of identities and a reality.

4.1 The divisions on the North Korea issue in the Parliament

4.1.1 The Dialogue School

There has existed two competing discourses on the North Korea issue in the foreign policy debate in the Japanese Diet: a pro-engagement group and a confrontation group. Funabashi (2007: 58) describes the former as a ‘dialogue school’ and the latter as a ‘pressure school’. The former group supported normalization of diplomatic ties with North Korea because it is the ‘only country with which postwar Japan has not restored its formal relationship’. Most members of this group opposed Koizumi’s worship at the Yasukuni Shrine because of diplomatic consideration. They insisted that the Japanese government should engage in dialogue with North Korea with patience based on the Japan-DPRK Pyongyang Declaration. They have taken a cautious stance toward the imposition of economic sanctions against North Korea considering its effectiveness on them. For instance, Natsuo Yamaguchi of the Komei Party insisted in the Diet session that the Japanese government should not be exclusively devoted to pressure and sanctions as the only policy options against North Korea (NDRP: 2002-c). Although sanctions might be effective to some extent, however, at the same time, the ‘dialogue school’ thought that it was more likely that North Korea might harden their attitude, which would result in a stalemate in the negotiations to resolve diplomatic issues. Katsuhiko Yokomichi of the SDP argued that the Japanese government should continue negotiations for normalization because it

might not be possible to uncover the full scope of the abduction issue and to urge North Korea to drop its nuclear program without dialogues (NDRP: 2002-k). While they recognized that the development and deployment of a North Korean missile system and nuclear weapons were direct and critical threats for Japan's security, the pro-engagement school sought a way to settle the problems by diplomatic dialogues in a bilateral and multilateral framework.

4.1.2 The pressure school

On the other hand, the 'pressure school' or confrontation school basically opposed to a normalized diplomatic relationship because of various 'threats', which the DPRK poses to Japan. Most members of this school are anti-Chinese and promote a prime ministerial visit to the Yasukuni Shrine. The main arguments and members of this school mostly coincide with those of the traditional rightwing nationalists. They specifically highlight the abductions of Japanese nationals by North Korea claiming that these cases would be the violation of Japan's sovereignty. They often claim that their government should not hesitate to implement economic sanctions as a form of diplomatic leverage. While Japan was, in their discourse, a genuine 'victim' of North Korea, the postwar Japanese governments just overlooked this fact at the expense of the security of their nationals. Hence, members of this school have insisted that the Japanese government should restore its sovereignty, national dignity, and ties between nations and the state by demonstrating an uncompromising attitude against North Korea. The imposition of economic sanction would be one of the most suitable measures for affirming Japan's stance. As Abe is a prominent member of the 'pressure school', a later chapter on North Korean policy of the Abe administration will explore

more on this discourse.

4.2 Koizumi's policy toward North Korea

Koizumi attempted to normalize relations with North Korea based on the Japan-DPRK Pyongyang Declaration with a 'comprehensive approach' emphasizing both 'dialogue and pressure'. Vice Foreign Minister Toshimitsu Motegi under the Koizumi administration explained Japan's basic principles toward North Korea saying that the Japanese government would put emphasis on both 'dialogue and pressure', as well as a peaceful and diplomatic resolution, as well as a multilateral approach, closely working with other countries (NDRP: 2005-m). This policy made sharp contrast with one of the hard-line camps and sometimes seemed to be more conciliatory than the policy toward China, or the policy of the Abe administration. In this respect, normalization of diplomatic relations with the DPRK might be interpreted as an effort to realize Japan's identity as a 'peacemaker' in the Korean Peninsula. The following section explains the policy the Koizumi administration pursued and how it was justified.

4.2.1 The policy for diplomatic normalization

The basic stance of Koizumi's foreign policy toward North Korea was 'to realize normalization through resolving concerns based on the Pyongyang Declaration' (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2002, 2003, 2004). Foreign minister Yoriko Kawaguchi clearly argued that the purpose of normalization between Japan and the DPRK was to correct the 'abnormal relations' and also to contribute to the peace and security of

Japan, the region and even the world (NDRP: 2002-n). While it generally tended to be thought of as more 'nationalistic', Koizumi's stance toward North Korea would actually be closer to the 'dialogue school' than to the 'pressure school,' considering this point. Koizumi repeatedly stressed that to achieve diplomatic normalization would be a 'seriously important task as an politician' (NDRP: 2004-n). In fact, an attempt to normalize relationships with North Korea itself would be the kind of policy that the traditional right-wing nationalists would find difficult to accept. Rather, as Funabashi (2007:14) points out, the right wing should be repugnant toward Koizumi's effort to seek normalization of diplomatic relations with DPRK. As noted earlier, Wakamiya (2006: 19) revealed that after the first visit to North Korea, Koizumi himself told him that his visit to North Korea had generated fewer backlashes from the right-wingers than had expected. Koizumi made a guess that it might be partly because they appreciated the fact that he had visited the Yasukuni Shrine. Put it in another way, effort to normalize relations with Pyongyang was regarded as an engagement policy, which was likely to cause vehemence from the traditional right-wingers. Therefore, Koizumi should offset those discontents among opponents by other foreign policy choices in order to achieve this policy.

Since the DPRK issue has been an important task for postwar Japan's diplomacy, the LDP governments in the postwar era tried to launch normalization negotiations several times but all of those attempts turned out to be failures. However, according to Hitoshi Tanaka, who was in charge of negotiations with North Korea during a large part of Koizumi's premiership, the Koizumi administration could enjoy a good opportunity for conducting normalization negotiations due to favorable domestic and international conditions. Tanaka argues that it was partly because of the fact that Japan obtained deterrent power to some extent. Japan had been able to prepare for the

possibility of a new war on the Korean Peninsula and had established basic deterrent power by way of the New Guideline for Japan-US defense cooperation in 1997, as well as the 'Law concerning Measures to Ensure Peace and Security of Japan in Situations in the Areas Surrounding Japan' in 1999 (Tanaka 2005: 24, 2009: 99)¹. This deterrent power made it possible for Japan to negotiate with North Korea toward normalization. In addition, rapprochement between North Korea and South Korea and the hard-line policy of the US worked to establish favorable conditions for Japan. As the North-South relationship was positive due to the 'Sunshine policy' of President Kim Dae Jung, the Japanese government held the view that South Korea might support Japan's rapprochement with North Korea (Tanaka 2005: 24-5). Akaha (2007: 300) argues that Japan was encouraged by a visible improvement in North-South Korean relations, which culminated in the summit between President Kim and Chairman Kim in June 2000. In contrast, US President Bush labeled North Korea as one of the 'axis of evil' in his State of the Union Address on 1 February 2002 and did not hesitate to express its unfavorable stance. This impelled North Korea to approach Japan to act as a go-between. Therefore, all those conditions could pave the way for negotiations for normalization with North Korea under the Koizumi administration.

4.2.2 Emphasis on dialogue

Another feature of North Korean policy of the Koizumi administration was its basic stance, which was called 'dialogue and pressure' (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2006). In sharp contrast with the pressure school, which has single-mindedly been

¹ Tanaka argues that it was not the Taiwan Strait Crisis in 1995 but the first Korean Peninsula Nuclear crisis that urged the Japanese government to pursue the New Guideline (Tanaka 2004: 24, 111). He also expressed that the New Guideline was intended to be a scenario for an emergency situation in the Korean Peninsula (2009: 99).

demanding tough sanctions against North Korea, the basic stance of the Koizumi administration was to put emphasis not only on ‘pressure’ but also on ‘dialogue’ with a ‘comprehensive approach’ although Koizumi stated that both dialogue and pressure would be necessary (NDRP: 2004-a). Koizumi was consistent in his emphasis on dialogues, arguing that economic sanction might be a possible option, but he never thought of ‘sanction first’ (NDRP: 2004-s and 2005-a). The Koizumi cabinet maintained a cautious stance on imposing economic sanctions even after the intensification of collisions between the dialogue school and the pressure school because of the withdrawal of North Korea from the NPT and when public opinion in Japanese society became hardened against the country over the abduction issue. Whereas the confrontation group insisted that the Japanese government should break off negotiation with North Korea when it demonstrated ‘dishonest behavior’ on the abduction issue and on the missile issue, Koizumi stated that the window for the negotiations would be kept open. It should be noted that when a hard-line policy was conducted, a conciliatory policy was implemented at the same time. For example, while the amendment of Japan’s Foreign Exchange and Foreign Trade Control Law, aimed at allowing economic sanctions against North Korea², but the Koizumi cabinet postponed the enforcement of this law and announced Koizumi’s second visit to Pyongyang. Furthermore, Koizumi declared that he would not exercise sanction as long as North Korea observes the Pyongyang Declaration. Isao Matsuyama, a Foreign Vice-Minister at that time, explained Koizumi’s decision that the imposition of economic sanction might not be the most effective option at the moment (NDRP: 2004-1). In this way, the Koizumi administration remained with a conciliatory attitude by putting emphasis on dialogue rather than sanctions.

² The amendment to the foreign exchange law enabled Japan to take sanctions against the DPRK if necessary without a UN resolution.

4.2.3 The Pyongyang Declaration and the ‘comprehensive approach’

It was the Japan-DPRK Pyongyang Declaration, which Koizumi and Kim Jong-Il signed after their first meeting in September 2002, and which had been a cornerstone of Koizumi’s foreign policy toward North Korea. Yet, it also was the subject of criticism from the pressure school in several respects. The hard-liners accused the Pyongyang Declaration of being too soft on North Korea because it did not contain any clause in which the DPRK promised to settle the abduction issue, the development of missiles and nuclear weapons. What is more, the confrontation school sharply criticized that the Declaration seemed to state that Japan would provide compensation acknowledging its responsibility for the prewar colonial rule. On the other hand, Koizumi seemed to be inclined to it even when North Korea’s ‘betrayal’ such as its withdrawal from the NPT regime was revealed. He promised at the second summit that Japan would not invoke sanctions on DPRK as long as it observes the Pyongyang Declaration (NDRP: 2004-j).

What is notable in on the Pyongyang Declaration might be that both governments should strive to resolve all the ‘concerns’ based on the Declaration. Foreign Minister Yoriko Kawaguchi explained that the word ‘concerns’ in the Declaration includes all the problems existing between Japan and North Korea such as the abduction issue, nuclear arms and the missile problem, and the settlement of prewar colonial rule (NDRP: 2002-l). Put in another way, this stance is often called a ‘comprehensive approach’. Hitoshi Tanaka (2009: 100, 108) explained that since North Korea issue contains a number of serious tasks directly connected with national interest, from the abduction issue to the past settlement, and national interest would not be

monolithic’, ‘settlement of all issues are vital’. This indicates that this word seemed to be used to demonstrate that the Japanese government would not leave any one of those problems unresolved. In other words, Japan would not focus exclusively on one issue and ignore others, which was different from the pressure school whose emphasis was put only on the abduction issue.

In this respect, it seems that the usage of a ‘comprehensive approach’ was manipulated depending on time and situation. Although the Koizumi administration focused on the abduction issue in the first phase, it started to highlight both the abduction issue and nuclear problems after the summit with president Bush and the meeting with the US Assistant Secretary of State, James Kelly (Sankei Shimbun: 2002). At this time, ‘comprehensive’ could be used to show that Japan would pay much attention not only to the abduction issue, which was of domestic importance, but also to the North Korean nuclear problem, which was an international security concern. Later, when security concerns came to the front it was used for domestic appeal, to ensure that the Japanese government would not set aside the abduction issue. For instance, Koizumi insisted to ‘comprehensively’ resolve concerns and stated that since the abduction issue was closely related to Japan’s security, Japan would not attempt to settle the nuclear problem first (Koizumi 2005-e). Thus, it can be argued that a ‘comprehensive approach’ was utilized by Koizumi to appeal to different actors.

Furthermore, a ‘comprehensive approach’ might be used to avoid making North Korea feel that Japan entered into negotiation only to resolve the abduction issue. Hitoshi Tanaka repeatedly emphasized that Japan should avoid giving the impression that its focus was exclusively on the resolution of the abduction issue not to hamper North Korea from moving toward negotiations (Tanaka 2005: 36). He explained that the exclusive focus on the abduction issue might not solve the entire Japan-DPRK

problem and even the abduction issue itself. It would be needed to ensure the benefit of normalization as a result of the resolution of the abduction issue because ‘mutual benefit is a premise of diplomacy’ (Tanaka 2005: 36). According to Tanaka, Japan should persuade North Korea to take a big step on the abduction issue or the nuclear issue, specifically demonstrating its benefit after normalization (2009: 204-5). In line with Tanaka’s idea, Koizumi also argued that North Korea’s becoming a member of international society, which might be necessary for normalization, would be beneficial for the DPRK itself, needless to say, for peace and stability of Japan and the world (NDRP: 2002-k). The Prime Minister repeatedly noted that he had told Chairman Kim that the biggest benefit for North Korea would be to become a responsible member of international society (NDRP: 2004-e)’. In other words, the Koizumi administration attempted to solve the abduction issue as a part of the whole diplomatic negotiation process with North Korea based on mutual benefits.

Taken together, it can be argued that the Koizumi administration primarily sought to achieve normalization of its diplomatic ties with North Korea based on the Japan-DPRK Pyongyang Declaration. Considering Koizumi’s emphasis on dialogue rather than imposing sanctions together, his approach seems closer to a stance of the engagement school rather than the pressure school. Therefore, Prime Minister had to deal with discontents among opponents by coping with other issues.

4.3 The construction of national identity in foreign policy discourse

It can be argued that Japan’s national identity was discursively reconstructed through the reconstruction of North Korea’s identity, similar to Chinese case discussed in the last chapter. In other words, Japan’s national identity was reshaped and

reinforced through binary oppositions concerning identities of the two countries. Although there were some common descriptions about North Korea between the dialogue school and the pressure school, however, the usage and connotations of these articulations were different from each other. In what follows, this section tries to uncover what kind of identities were constructed in foreign policy discourse, focusing on the arguments of the ‘dialogue school’, in which Koizumi, his cabinet member, and the MOFA made efforts to settle issues with North Korea through dialogues and to negotiate toward normalization.

4.3.1 The constructions of North Korea in the dialogue school discourse

The Koizumi cabinet and the dialogue school recognized the difference between the political regime of Japan and North Korea and described the latter as ‘authoritarian’ or ‘tyrannical’. For example, Katsuhiko Yoshimitsu, a lawmaker of the Social Democratic Party, who insisted on the importance of dialogues for the negotiations, also described North Korea as an ‘authoritarian’ (NDRP: 2002-k). In addition, looking at descriptions on North Korea in *the Diplomatic Blue Book 2003*, it argued ‘Kim Jong Il, general secretary of the Korea Worker’s Party, controls all of North Korea mainly through the Korea Worker’s Party and has been implementing a “military-first policy” (Songun Policy). Furthermore, the party advocates the construction of a “powerful nation “that is a major power in terms of ideology, politics, the military and the economy” (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2003: 24).

Indeed, it was true that members of the dialogue school depicted North Korea as a ‘military state’ and a ‘threat’ due to its nuclear proliferation and the Koizumi government observed that North Korea had implemented a ‘military-first policy’. The

MOFA stated that ‘The North Korean nuclear issue is not only a direct threat to the peace and stability of the Northeast Asian region, including Japan, but also a serious challenge to the international nuclear non-proliferation regime (MOFA 2005: 21).’ Koizumi himself also argued that the nuclear development by North Korea was a threat to Japan’s security and thus was unacceptable (NDRP: 2004-j). What should be mentioned here, however, is that it was not the identity of North Korea itself but its nuclear and military development that was represented as a ‘threat’ to Japan. Koizumi did not represent the current regime of North Korea as an ‘enemy’ or as an ‘identity threat’ to Japan. Therefore, he never argued that a regime change in the DPRK would be either desirable, or essential for normalization.

In addition to these points, there can be seen some representations which only the dialogue school employed. First, North Korea was the only country that Japan has not reached normalization of relations, which was a historical task of postwar Japan. The dialogue school tended to emphasize this point more than the other group. For example, a diplomat Hitoshi Tanaka, who was a Koizumi’s right hand on East Asian diplomacy in his tenure, argued that successive Directors for North East Asian Affairs of Japan’s MOFA have sought avenues for normalization of a relations with North Korea because it has been a major task of postwar Japan’s diplomacy (2009: 48). Lawmaker Seiken Akamine of the JCP maintained that North Korea was the only country with which Japan has not settle its past legacy, and that normalization with the DPRK should be considered as a question of ‘settlement of Japan’s colonial rule in the Korean Peninsula’ and thus ‘an issue of historical responsibility, in which prewar Japan committed aggressive war in the Asia-Pacific, causing WW II, and postwar Japan has not settled its past (NDRP: 2004-d)’. In this narrative, Japan was articulated as a ‘past colonial ruler’, who has not settle its history responsibility while North

Korea was a ‘victim of prewar Japan’. As referred to later, it is regarded as an underlying cause of the ‘abnormal relationship’ between the two countries. North Korea can be seen, in this context, rather as an ‘abnormal’ country.

In addition, economic grievances such as food and energy shortage in North Korea were often highlighted. According to the *Diplomatic Blue Book 2003* (MOFA 2004: 42), despite an effort to reconstruct its economy, economic conditions in North Korea remained in a difficult situation and the energy shortages were thought to be a ‘grave situation’. It continues to argue that ‘there continues to be a food shortage, and assistance from foreign countries is still necessary’. The increase in ‘North Korean defections’ because of severe food shortages and economic difficulties was thought to indicate how severe a situation it had been in North Korea (MOFA 2004: 40). This might lead to the rationalization that the Japanese government was also taking into account ‘humanitarian considerations’. In short, North Korea was described by the Koizumi government not only as a country that was a military threat and a ‘troubled neighbor’ of Japan, but also as a ‘poor’ country in need of international assistance.

4.3.2 The construction of Japan’s identity and differences from the pressure school

There can be seen some binary oppositions concerning the identities of Japan and North Korea in the narrative put forth by the Koizumi cabinet. For instance, Koizumi clearly stated that the political regime of North Korea is totally different from ‘democratic Japan’ (NDRP: 2005-c). However, there seemed to be less explicit representations of Japan’s identity compared to those of North Korea. Japan emerged as a ‘democratic’, ‘non-militaristic’, and ‘responsible and respectable member of international society’ in contrast with the representations of North Korea as

‘authoritarian’, ‘militaristic’, and a ‘wrongdoer’.

On this point, there can be seen some notable points which could distinguish it from the identity constructions made by the pressure school. First, unlike the pressure school and the Abe administration, the Koizumi administration did not put much emphasis on these binary oppositions. Although it admitted differences between the two countries, the Koizumi administration treat North Korea neither as an ‘inassimilable’ other nor as an ‘enemy’. For instance, differences in the political regime between Japan and North Korea, at least for the dialogue school, might not reduce the possibility to settle issues toward normalization through negotiations. Take the example of Koizumi, he justified his unconventional visit to Pyongyang by insisting that he himself should go because it was the only way to confirm the dictator’s will (NDRP: 2004-n)³. As it was an ‘authoritarian country’, all the important decisions should render only its dictator’s will (NDRP: 2004-k). In addition, although North Korea was ‘authoritarian’ state, not to mention that different from ‘democratic’ Japan, Koizumi assumed that the two countries could have a common interest by achieving normalization. Koizumi legitimized his second visit to Pyongyang saying that ‘My decision to visit North Korea for a second time is based on my belief that making another visit and talking face-to-face once more with Chairman Kim is the only way that we can expect to see any advance in the situation as it currently stands (Koizumi 2004-a)’. According to Koizumi, not only Japan but also North Korea could benefit from stabilization of the region as a result of normalization. He insisted that the Japanese government should work hard to encourage North Korea to understand that normalization with Japan would be most beneficial to North Korea. The Prime

³ Iijima also justified Koizumi’s visit to North Korea arguing that it was because the country is an ‘authoritarian’ country, where Kim Jong Ill would decide everything, there was no use negotiating with other people than Kim in the end (Tahara and Iijima 2007: 174).

Minister successively stated that North Korea had nothing to gain from isolation from the international community, and that it was the most promising security guarantee and the only way for economic development to become a responsible member of international society, and support North Korea to transform its attitude to do so (NDRP: 2004-f). It would mean that despite different and conflicting identity, the Koizumi government tried to treat North Korea not as an 'enemy' to be annihilated but a dialogue partner to cooperate with. It would thus indicate that the Koizumi administration considered that the regime change in North Korea might not be necessary for negotiations for normalization and for the settlement of all concerns between the two countries. Therefore, it can be thought that the binary oppositions played a smaller role in the reproduction of Japan's identity in foreign policy discourse of the Koizumi administration.

Second, relating to the above, while both group tended to argue that the DPRK was an 'isolated wrongdoer' in international society and a destabilizing factor in the region, members of the dialogue school were likely to assume that the North Korean identity could be changeable without a regime change. It was often emphasized by that North Korea was 'isolated' from international community and provoked a military crisis several times after World War II. For instance, the bombing of a KAL Airline and the withdrawal from the NPT can be cited as examples of North Korean international 'wrongdoing' and 'isolation'. Above all, the abduction issue and nuclear development problem has been the target of criticism in the context of regional and Japan's security. However, it seemed that the dialogue school including Koizumi did not consider that the identity of North Korea as a 'wrongdoer' was neither fixed nor unchangeable as the pressure school argued. As they thought that North Korea itself was not a threat to Japan but its nuclear weapons and missiles were the threats posed

by the country could be removed if it entered into and was involved with a multilateral framework of regional security. In short, it can be argued that the dialogue school seemed to assume that the identity of North Korea might be changeable; they took the position that the identity as a 'wrongdoer' can be transformed to a 'member of international community' through bringing North Korea into the circle of international society and changing its behavior. In this sense, binary oppositions came to play a minor role to highlight differences of the two countries for treating North Korea as the 'enemy'.

Third, the dialogue school might not have only exclusively focused on the current security situation but had also tried to apprehend it from the historical context. While the opposite group tended to simplify the relations of the two countries in a way that Japan was a 'victim' of North Korea, the Koizumi administration remained consistent in depicting North Korea as only a country with which Japan had not restored a diplomatic relations since World War II. From this, there emerged Japan's hidden identity as a 'victimizer in the past' as a colonial ruler that had not come to terms with its past. In this sense, normalization was considered to be the last task of 'war settlement'. Nevertheless, this 'past' image of self might not be used to discourage a 'peaceful' identity of postwar Japan. Moreover, Japan's 'peaceful country' identity was reinforced and realized by implementing a normalization policy as will be discussed later.

In addition, related to the third point, Japan was seen to be responsible for peace and stability in the region. It made a difference from a so-called 'one-country pacifism', in which Japan would not be enthusiastic about involving security issues even in its surrounding area. As normalization of the relations between Japan and North Korea was thought to be one of the pillars for peace and stability in the Korean Peninsula,

Japan can play an important role for peace making in the entire region. The fact that Japan was a party concerned with regional security affairs, as was stipulated in the Pyongyang Declaration, it could indicate that Japan demonstrated its will to play a central role as a 'peace-maker'. It seemed to assume that it would be useful to seek a 'peaceful resolution' and normalization could be a chance to achieve Japan's new 'peaceful identity'.

Furthermore, although the Koizumi government agreed that North Korea was a military threat, however, there seems to be no argument that claimed North Korea threatened Japan's 'peaceful' identity. This is a notable difference from the China's case. China's demand on the Yasukuni issue was not only identified with the violation of Japan's sovereignty but was regarded as a negation of postwar Japan's development as a 'peaceful nation.' On the other hand, the abduction issue and the security issues were not thought of as an identity threat to Japan. It might be partly because North Korea might not have much discursive power to deny postwar Japan's 'peaceful development'. Even though a North Korean broadcast repeatedly described Japan as a 'colonial militarist', it was not able to construct an internationally accepted discourse of present Japan as an 'imperial colonialist'. Thus, they could not deny Japan's 'peaceful country' identity. Moreover, it is easy to articulate Japan as a 'victim' and North Korea as a victimizer because of the abduction issue and missile problem. As it might be clear that Japan's security has been threatened by North Korean behavior, Japan is easily constructed as an 'innocent victim', which might give moral superiority to its identity in international society. In short, although Koizumi and the dialogue school recognized that North Korea could be a military threat to Japan's security, however, they did not treat it as a threat to Japan's identity. These differences in identity construction of North Korea would be closely related with the definition of a

‘reality’ and the rhetoric of legitimating foreign policy.

4.4 The construction of a ‘reality’

Both the pressure school and the dialogue school were likely to construct a ‘reality’ according to their point of views, often defined as a ‘crisis’, which subjects were facing. This construction of a certain ‘reality’ is deeply related to how the subjects, Japan and North Korea in this case, were articulated in their discourse so that they could legitimate a certain policy to overcome the crisis. In terms of this ‘crisis situation’ construction, debates seemed to be converged on the ‘abnormal relations’ and ‘exposed to the North Korean security threat’. In what follows, it discusses on how the Koizumi administration articulated a ‘reality’ concerning the North Korea issue.

It seems that the dialogue school agreed with the pressure school to define current relationships between the two countries as not ‘normal’. According to the Diplomatic Bluebook, ‘relations between Japan and North Korea continue to be abnormal since World War II (MOFA 2003: 39)’. Furthermore, it would also mean that negotiations to resume the normalization talks and to settle a series of issues have been obstructed because of the lack of diplomatic relations. What would be important is the recognition of the differences and the points that would make it ‘abnormal’. As will be discussed in detail in a later chapter, what would mean ‘abnormal’ relations for the pressure school was that Japan had been exposed to a series of threats imposed by North Korea such as the abduction issue and the missile tests. In addition, they were likely to blame the ‘untrustworthy’ and ‘insincere’ character of North Korea for the impasse of negotiation talks. To put it plainly, what would bring this ‘abnormal’ situation about was North Korea’s ‘abnormal’ identity.

On the other hand, what would generally mean to be an ‘abnormal’ relationship for Koizumi and the dialogue school was the severance of diplomatic ties between the two countries. Thus, it was often argued that stalemates in negotiations arose from lack of diplomatic relations. For instance, the Chief Cabinet Secretary Fukuda explained that ‘since North Korea lacks diplomatic relations with Japan and has a different political regime, it might be really difficult to proceed negotiations (NDRP: 2002-b)’. What is more, ‘abnormal’ relations might not be attributed to the identity of North Korea but might result from the fact that postwar Japan had not yet settled the issue of its colonial rule in the Korean Peninsula. Hitoshi Tanaka delivered an account of ‘abnormal relations’, arguing that Japan lacked diplomatic ties with North Korea and that ‘we have been in such an abnormal relationship in which Japan has not settle the past since its 36-years of colonial rule’ (NDRP: 2002-c). In their point of view, since postwar Japan has long failed to come to terms with its imperial and colonial past, it has not been able to restore a ‘normal’ relationship with the DPRK. In other words, it would not be North Korea itself but the postwar relationship between the two countries which has been ‘abnormal’, and which caused a stalemate of negotiations. This perception would lead the Koizumi cabinet to conduct a policy to encourage an engagement in normalization talks instead of pursuing regime change in North Korea. In addition, Foreign Minister Yoriko Kawaguchi argued that Japan had not restore its ties with North Korea for more than fifty years and it was because of these circumstances that all the cases happened such as the suspicious ship, missile problem and the abduction issue (NDRP: 2002-f).

Second, there can be observed a certain kind of ‘reality’ constitution in which Japan’s security was exposed to the North Korean threat. Even among the dialogue school and the Koizumi cabinet, the sense of a threat was shared with the pressure

group. For instance, the Diplomatic Bluebook published in 2005 clearly argued that ‘the North Korean nuclear issue is not only a direct threat to the peace and stability of the Northeast Asian region, including Japan, but also a serious challenge to the international nuclear non-proliferation regime (2005: 21)’. Prime minister Koizumi admitted that it would be natural for Japanese people to feel threatened by North Korean nuclear weapons more than the US because it was the closest neighbor (NDRP: 2005-1). What should be highlighted here is that although Koizumi showed a concern over North Korean nuclear weapons, but he also carefully picked his words; that the security threat would be the nuclear arsenal, not North Korea itself. For instance, Koizumi stated that ‘I emphasized that the nuclear development by North Korea is a threat to Japan’s security as it is simply unacceptable and demand to dismantle all nuclear arsenal under international verification’ (NDRP: 2004-j). In other words, what would be problematized was not the identity of North Korea, but the ‘wrong behaviors’ by it. This representation of ‘security crisis’ would also be reflected by a certain idea of the Koizumi cabinet that this crisis should be overcome by North Korea’s ‘change of behavior’. Therefore, Japan would pursue a settlement in a multilateral framework on regional security such as the six party talks instead of supporting a ‘regime change’ policy.

4.5 The legitimization of policy

It can be argued that these constructions of identities and the ‘reality’ served to legitimize foreign policy of the Koizumi administration toward North Korea. Promoting normalization of the bilateral relationship was legitimized as an only measure to overcome the ‘abnormal relationship’ because normalization was Japan’s

last ‘war settlement’. This policy was also made possible by constructing the identity of North Korea not as an ‘identity threat’ but as a ‘dialogue partner’. Furthermore, it was legitimized because Japan’s identity as a ‘peaceful nation’ was achieved through stabilization in the Korean Peninsula.

4.5.1 normalization

First of all, Koizumi’s policy for normalization of the bilateral relationship was legitimized as an only solution for the current ‘abnormal relationship’. As the ‘abnormal relationship’ derived not from the ‘hostile’ identity of North Korea but from Japan’s incomplete war settlement, the relationship can be transformed from ‘hostile’ to ‘cooperative’ through normalization (Koizumi 2004-b). The primary significance of normalization of the relationship with North Korea would be that it was a part of Japan’s war responsibility. This coincided with the construction of the identity of North Korea as the ‘only country which postwar Japan has not restored its diplomatic ties’ and the constitution of a ‘reality’ that the ‘abnormal relationship’ was caused by Japan’s ‘incomplete war settlement’. Masataka Akamine of the JCP, from the House of Representative, argued that ‘Japan could not finish its “postwar period” without establishing “normal relations” with North Korea. It might only be Japan’s historical responsibility’ (NDRP: 2004-d)⁴. As there was common view that its ‘incomplete war settlement’ has impaired Japan’s international credibility in the region, it would be vital for Japan to restore trust with neighboring countries by completing war settlement in order to obtain political initiatives. Hitoshi Tanaka (2009: 140) argued that as it would be vital for Japan to regain trust from neighboring countries in East Asia, the

⁴ Lawmaker Togashi from the Japan Communist Party also pointed out the necessity of the normalization in terms of the settlement of prewar colonial rule (NDRP: 2004-p).

negative legacy, that is, Japan's past issues, were clearly a major hurdle to pursuing such a policy. Normalization might be an important opportunity for Japan to settle its history issues, in which North Korea is the last one. In other words, normalization of diplomatic ties with the DPRK might mean Japan's coming to terms with its past, 'history issues', which would be an obstacle against Japan's proactive engagement with regional leadership. Therefore, normalization of the relationship with North Korea might be necessary for Japan to realize its 'peaceful' identity. Japan could not become free from the historical burden without completing war settlement. In this context, the normalization policy can be interpreted as a part of a conventional strategy of history reconciliation conducted by the LDP. Koizumi might seek to achieve history reconciliation in order for Japan to become a new 'peaceful' nation', which would be free from the 'spell of history'. In this way, normalization of diplomatic ties with North Korea was legitimized from the viewpoint of the realization of national identity.

Furthermore, normalization of the relationship between Japan and North Korea was justified by arguing that it can transform its identity and relationship with Japan. It was based on the idea that the identity of North Korea was considered to be positively changeable through normalization. In the congressional debate, Koizumi insisted that efforts should be made to encourage North Korea to change its hostile attitude and to become a responsible member of international society (NDRP: 2002-q). Koizumi stated that he was going to persuade Pyongyang that the security of North Korea could be guaranteed by becoming a responsible member of international society through the dismantlement of nuclear arms (NDRP: 2005-b and 2005-l). In other words, the Koizumi government implicitly assumed that the North Korean identity as a 'closed', 'isolated' 'wrongdoer' could be transformed to a 'responsible' member of international society like Japan.

Therefore, while there were a series of concerns like drug smuggling and unidentified suspicious vessels other than the abduction issue or missile problem, Koizumi did not treat North Korea as a mere security threat. This was corroborated by Tanaka's argument that problems between Japan and DPRK were not only a kind of military security issue but also that of war settlement. It was an idea that all of these problems can be seen as products of an incomplete settlement of WW II and that they could be resolved by normalization of the diplomatic relations. Hence, once normalization was achieved, North Korea would no longer be threat to Japan. In this context, Koizumi maintained that he did not take a stance of supporting the regime change and that every country should cooperatively work together to make North Korea change its mind with keeping the current regime and become a responsible member of international society (NDRP: 2002-q). In fact, members of the Koizumi government often implied the possibility to change the identity of North Korea. Koizumi repeatedly emphasized the importance of effort to encourage Pyongyang to become a responsible member of international society (NDRP: 2004-e and 2004-h). The Chief Cabinet Secretary Yasuo Fukuda also noted that the Japanese government would continue negotiations with North Korea, indicating possibility for it to have its own way to develop peacefully as a member of international society (NDRP: 2003-a). In addition, according to the Diplomatic Bluebook (MOFA: 2003), the purpose of Koizumi's visit to Pyongyang was 'to strongly urge North Korea to act responsibly as a member of the international community in order to wipe out the international community's concerns over security issues such as the nuclear issue and the missile issue and to resolve these issues by promoting dialogue with relevant countries such as the US and the ROK'. This would mean that the Koizumi administration had a recognition that North Korea can reshape its identity from an 'isolated wrongdoer' to a

‘responsible member of international society’ as a result of normalization, just like from ‘savage’ to ‘civilized’, which would belong to the same community as Japan. Hence, North Korea was presented not as an ‘enemy’ to be extinguished or identity threat to Japan’s national identity, but as a potential dialogue partner. Along with this reconstruction of North Korea’s identity, Koizumi also stressed that ‘a transformation of Tokyo-Pyongyang relationship from hostile to cooperative through negotiations, in tandem with the DPRK’s becoming a member of international society, might wipe out concerns on the abduction or security issues’ (NDRP: 2002-k). This transformation of identity and the bilateral relationship was expected to bring settlements of all concerns over bilateral and international issues so that the policy for normalization was legitimized.

The Koizumi administration assumed that in accordance with changes in identity and the bilateral relationship, military threat of North Korea could be diminished by normalization because it was carried out in the framework of the Japan-DPRK Pyongyang Declaration. Abiding by the Pyongyang Declaration and the agreement achieved in the Six Party talks, the complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement of nuclear weapons of North Korea can be accomplished, which would greatly contribute to regional and world peace. As it would be certain that the dismantlement of nuclear weapons of the DPRK was in line with Japan’s national interest, it can easily be legitimized. Foreign Minister Kawaguchi clarified that the most important merit of the normalization for Japan would be the denuclearization in the Korean Peninsula and the East Asia region (NDRP: 2004-o). In other words, normalization between Japan and North Korea might not only be a Japan’s concern but also a regional and even global security problem. Kawaguchi also mentioned that negotiations with the DPRK was an important channel not only for dealing with

various concerns between Japan and North Korea, but also for drawing the country into international society, which contributes to world peace' (NDRP: 2002-n). As 'normalization with Japan would surely lead to peaceful development of North Korea' (NDRP: 2004-e), according to Koizumi, Japan could significantly contribute to world peace. In short, Koizumi's policy for normalization with North Korea can be legitimized in relation to Japan's 'peaceful' identity.

To be more specific, Hitoshi Tanaka created an overview in which normalization of Japan-North Korea relationship can build peace in the Korean Peninsula and contribute to peace and stability of the entire region of Northeast Asia. It can be pointed out that the primary framework of foreign policy of the Koizumi administration toward North Korea was based on a 'grand picture', which was proposed by Hitoshi Tanaka. As mentioned before, Tanaka was in charge of negotiations with North Korea during a large part of Koizumi's premiership. Tanaka (2005: 40) explained his basic idea of 'grand picture' that Japan should voluntarily and actively build peace in the Korean Peninsula, as it was essential for Japan's peace and security. It means that Japan should play a major role for regional peace and stability in Northeast Asia not as a 'free-rider' but as the party concerned. Based on this 'grand picture', negotiations with North Korea were conducted on Tanaka's idea as follows; 'we demonstrated to the DPRK that our primary purpose was to achieve peace in the Korean Peninsula, suggested to build a roadmap for that, which should also be of benefit to North Korea, and insisted that Pyongyang should resolve the abduction issue when they recognized the settlement of this issue as its own interest (Tanaka 2005: 40). In this narrative, Tanaka depicted Japan as being ready for diplomatic initiatives in negotiations with North Korea, which served to settle both the security problem and the abduction issue.

Engaging North Korea and pursuing normalization meant that Japan would seek to be directly involved in regional security issues by establishing a multilateral security framework. While it is sometimes maintained that Japan did not play a major role in the Six Party Talks, Secretary Isao Iijima, Koizumi's right-hand man, highlighted Japan's proactive diplomatic effort and its result, arguing that the launch of the Six Party Talk itself was an accomplishment of Japan's diplomacy because the establishment of the Six Party Talks had been stipulated in the Pyongyang Declaration (Tahara 2007: 182). This concept that Japan's proactive engagement with North Korea follows its 'peace-maker' identity seemed to be shared by other politicians of the dialogue school. Quoting a statement of Lee Bu-young, a former Uri Party chairman, Yasuo Ogata of the JCP appreciated Koizumi's policy for normalization and applied the word 'peace initiative' to it (NDRP: 2004-v). Therefore, Koizumi's policy for normalization with North Korea was regarded as a political initiative of Japan to build peace in the Korean Peninsula and in East Asia. On the whole, Japan was described as an 'active peacemaker' in Northeast Asia and would proactively be responsible for the regional security issue. This would be a new expression of Japan's 'peaceful identity' and thus contribute the legitimization of policy for normalization. In short, to normalize the relation with North Korea was not only regarded as a solution for 'abnormal relationship' and war settlement but also legitimized as a vital step for the realization of a 'peaceful nation'.

In short, Koizumi's policy to normalize the relationship with North Korea was legitimized in discourse in which North Korea was constructed not as 'identity threat' based on the assumption that its identity is changeable from 'isolated wrongdoer' to 'a responsible member of international society'. Furthermore, it was considered that normalization would also reflect and realize Japan's identity as a 'peaceful' country,

by completing its ‘war settlement’, which is necessary to obtain trust from neighboring countries and then take political leadership in the regional framework on the security issue. Especially, normalization was treated as a key policy to express Japan’s willingness to proactively contribute to regional and world peace.

4.5.2 Emphasis on dialogues

Prime Minister Koizumi was consistent in emphasizing ‘dialogue’ than ‘pressure’ and tended to hesitate to imposing sanctions on North Korea. He articulated that continual dialogues and negotiations would be the only way to solve the abduction issue and other concerns (NDRP: 2002-k). When the pressure school called the Japanese government upon imposing sanctions on Pyongyang, he rebutted by saying that ‘while some says that the resumption of negotiations are too early because North Korea is untrustworthy, however, such an attitude will not solve the problems’ (NDRP: 2002-k). The dialogue school supported this opposition to sanctions against North Korea not only because it would worsen the situation but also because it would damage Japan’s international reputation. Lawmaker Keiji Kokuta of the JCP argued that as the Japanese government agreed to prevent the condition from deteriorated in the Six Party Talks, sanction policy, which would deteriorate the situation, was a violation of the international agreement (NDRP: 2004-l). In short, sanction policy was marginalized because it might damage Japan’s identity as a ‘responsible and respectable member of international society’.

This emphasis on dialogue was also legitimized by another identity construction. As a result of its identity construction as a ‘peaceful nation’, the Koizumi government argued that Japan should pursue peaceful resolution via diplomatic effort without the

use of force aiming at the regime change in North Korea. Defining the primary purpose of negotiations with North Korea as normalization of the relationship and peaceful resolution and describing the use of force as an undesirable last resort, Koizumi argued that ‘it is really important to achieve the purpose without taking measures of last resort’ (NDRP: 2004-e). He successively stated that ‘countries other than Japan can take every possible measure including the use of force. However, Japan renounces the use of force as a means of settling international disputes, and seeks a peaceful resolution. Therefore, it would be proper and best way to reach a negotiated settlement with North Korea, instead of imposing sanctions’. From this, the representation of Japan as a ‘peaceful country’ was used to marginalize a policy option of supporting the use of force and imposing sanctions against North Korea. Instead, it was used to legitimize ‘peaceful resolution’, which implies negotiated settlement in this case.

4.5.3 Conciliatory approach

As a result of policy stance, it has often been maintained that the Koizumi administration took a conciliatory approach to North Korea. Examples of policies criticized from the pressure school as too conciliatory were Koizumi’s two visits to Pyongyang, the continuation of negotiations for normalization, food and medical aid. For instance, in 2004 before the second of Koizumi’s visits, food, and medical aid was provided for North Korea in order to appeal for the resumption of normalization negotiations (Asahi Shimbun: 2004-b). In this appeal, the Japanese government indicated that it would provide ‘humanitarian aid’ if North Korea would return families of the abductees. The construction of North Korea as a country dealing with ‘economic grievances’ and ‘food and energy shortage’ was utilized to legitimize the aid policy of

Japan as a country that embraces ‘humanitarian support’. As Japan *is* a responsible member of the international community and enshrines basic human rights, it must cooperate with other countries to seek peaceful settlements and sometimes should provide ‘humanitarian aid’. Lawmaker Yasuo Ogata of the JCP argued in one Diet session that if Japan cuts off food aid carried out within the framework of ‘humanitarian aid’ with other countries such as the US, EU, and other international organization like FAO, it would undermine Japan’s international credibility (NDRP: 2004-x). Thus, it seems that ‘humanitarian aid’ is considered closely linked with Japan’s credibility as a ‘responsible and respectable member of international society’. In this context, to provide ‘humanitarian aid’ was legitimized in relation to the identity constructions of Japan.

Moreover, it can be argued that what enabled Japan’s concessions to North Korea is that Koizumi did not construct North Korea as an identity threat similar to China on the Yasukuni issue. It was true that he recognized it was threatening Japan’s security, but he did not think a concession toward North Korea might threaten Japan’s identity as a ‘peaceful nation’. It was partly because there was a strong argument in which Japan was the victim and North Korea was the victimizer concerning the abduction issue. This was in sharp contrast to the argument regarding the Yasukuni issue with China, in which Japan had been the aggressor against China during the Asia-Pacific War. Therefore, the Koizumi administration might think that to make concessions might not threaten Japan’s moral superiority, both domestically and internationally. As a result, the North Korean issue did not produce ‘social antagonism’ because Japan’s identity was not negated although there was increasing resentment against Pyongyang over the abduction issue. Due to this lack of ‘social antagonism’, a hard-line approach was not promoted under the Koizumi administration.

4.6 North Korean issue as political capital

As well as other foreign and domestic policy, it can be argued that the Koizumi administration tried to utilize the North Korean issue as political capital to take advantage in domestic politics. As mentioned before, Koizumi's policy to normalize relations with North Korea could cause harsh opposition from the traditional right-wingers and the pressure school in the Diet. Therefore, it should be offset by other foreign policy choices in order to pursue this policy. It was his uncompromising stance toward Beijing over the Yasukuni Shrine issue that offset his conciliatory approach toward Pyongyang. Although this might give the impression that the North Korean issue had only a negative effect on political capital, Koizumi attempted to manipulate this issue in a positive way.

First of all, it was intended to remove a sense of stagnation from Japanese diplomacy. While frustrations among anti-Chinese people could possibly be offset by an unyielding China policy, it was true that this caused diplomatic deadlock in Japan's foreign policy in East Asia. The advancement in normalization with North Korea was, ironically regarded as a measure to break this stagnation. Yasuo Fukuda, the Chief Cabinet Secretary in the Koizumi administration, reflected on that time and pointed out that there was a sense of stagnation on Japan's foreign policy with every country. For instance, Japan faced deadlock in 'the rise of China and the feud with China over Yasukuni Shrine' and he wished to 'break the overall diplomatic deadlock.

That's why I wanted to advance normalization of relations with North Korea, which would be provide Japan with a great opportunity to contribute to the

stability of northeast Asia. I believe that the prime minister's visit to Pyongyang made the Japanese people feel that something was moving and that Japan might be overcoming its deadlock with North Korea (Funabashi 2007: 69).

From this, it can be argued that the Koizumi administration tried to manipulate its policy toward North Korea as political capital to break a sense of diplomatic stagnation.

What is more, the advancement of the North Korean issue, especially the abduction issue, seemed to be directly linked to the buoyancy for the Koizumi administration. It was sometimes argued that the second visit to Pyongyang in 2004 was aimed at gaining an edge in the Upper House election two months later (Asahi Shimbun: 2004-c). Furthermore, a lot of people thought that there also was political intention behind the timing of this announcement because it drowned out the exposure of Koizumi's scandal over his failing to pay into the pension system for a period of time. One lawmaker Yokomitsu of the JCP expressed his doubt at the plenary session, 'I cannot get over the doubt that there might be political intention of diverting public attention from his failing to pay into the pension system and earning points before the election of the House of Councilor behind prime ministerial visit to Pyongyang this time' (NDRP: 2004-j). In addition, it was said that the Kantei voiced a strong desire to return the husband and two daughters of Hitomi Soga, one of the returned abductees, before the aforementioned election. It can be argued that the Koizumi administration needed visible achievement on the abduction issue to boost his declining popularity due to stalled 'structural reform' and a soured relationship with China.

4.7 Conclusion

There have been a series of diplomatic issues between Japan and the DPRK during the Koizumi administration, from the abduction issue to the nuclear development problems, just like with China. Nevertheless, Koizumi's stance seemed to be conciliatory due to its comprehensive approach and emphasis on dialogue based on mutual benefit rather than economic sanctions. There can be observed a notable difference in China's case in the identity reconstruction in foreign policy discourse. It was certain that the Koizumi administration and the dialogue school articulated that North Korea was an 'authoritarian', 'militarist', and 'isolated wrongdoer' in international society like the pressure school. However, there also were differences in recognition and representation of it, which might make it possible to conduct alternative policy from the pressure school. Although North Korea placed a military threat on Japan's security, the country itself was not represented as an identity threat that could produce 'social antagonism'. The transformation of North Korea's identity without regime change might be possible by a course of continued and persistent dialogues, which might enable changes in bilateral relations from 'abnormal' to 'normal', or from 'hostile' to 'cooperative', and the crisis situation could be overcome. These constructions made it possible for Koizumi to pursue the policy for normalization.

Another factor, which served to legitimize his conciliatory attitude, was the fact that the North Korean problem was treated as an issue of the 'settlement of postwar', which should be resolved for establishing Japan's identity as a 'peaceful country' under the Koizumi administration. Normalization of diplomatic ties with the DPRK might mean Japan's coming to terms with its past, which had long been an obstacle

against its proactive engagement in regional political and security framework. In this context, normalization of diplomatic ties with North Korea was regarded as a measure for Japan to take proactive initiatives to build peace in the Korean Peninsula, the entire region, and even the whole world. Therefore, Koizumi's policy was legitimized as creating a great opportunity to reconstruct and reinforce Japan's identity as a proactive 'peace-maker'.

Taken together, it can be argued that the Koizumi administration tried to legitimize its policy toward North Korea based on discourse of Japan's identity as a 'peaceful' country. In this sense, his rhetoric was 'nationalistic' as well as his China policy. In addition, it was ironic that although he tried to offset frustrations among anti-Chinese-anti-DPRK groups by his China policy, on the other hand, he attempted to manipulate the North Korean issue as a form of political capital to break a sense of stagnation in diplomacy and boost his domestic credibility.

Chapter 5 Analysis of the post-2000 ‘neo-revisionist’ Discourse

Prime Minister Shinzo Abe launched an over-arching concept, ‘a beautiful country’ to represent his ideal of Japan’s national identity when he published his book *‘Toward a Beautiful Country’* in the succession race for the LDP presidency. While ‘a beautiful country’ was a key concept of his vision, from domestic affairs to foreign policy, however, Abe did not give any clear definition to it in his books. Whereas, he encouraged Japan to be ‘a country that shows leadership and that is respected and loved by the countries of the world’, in his first speech as a Prime Minister to the Diet, he could not escape the vagueness of his vision (NDRP: 2006-j). According to an opinion poll by the *Yomiuri Shimbun* (Yomiuri Shimbun 2006), 64% of people answered that they could not have a substantial image of ‘a beautiful country’ from Abe’s statement.

Therefore, it is important to grasp the politics that give meaning to Abe’s concept of Japan’s national identity. As Ted Hopf (2002: 20) argues, identities and their meanings are established both contextually and intertextually — they could not be produced in a vacuum. Abe’s ‘beautiful country’ can also be understood with reference to his slogan, ‘a departure from the postwar regime’. His idea represents keynotes of the ‘neo-revisionists’, who inherited most of their political philosophy from the older right-wing traditionalists. Therefore, it is necessary to scrutinize Abe’s argument further in order to clarify what kind of nationalism he pursued.

Actually, Abe’s argument focused primarily on dismantling the discourse of ‘postwar democracy’, which has been dominant in Japanese society since the end of WW II. At the same time, he sought to transform, redefine, and fix the meanings of the core of identities established in ‘postwar democracy’ discourse, such as ‘peace’,

‘autonomy’ and ‘democracy’. What is particularly notable about his argument is the binarization of the domestic and the foreign. Thus, it is important to pay attention to how the ‘self’ is constructed through the articulation of domestic ‘others’ as well as foreign ‘others’. In this context, this chapter firstly aims to explore what kind of national identity might be constituted through domestic others in Abe’s discourse. Then, it also tries to uncover in what situations and in what context Abe and his supporters emphasized values of ‘peace’, ‘democracy’, and ‘autonomy’.

My argument is as follows: Abe’s theme of a ‘departure from the postwar regime’ was a cluster of domestic and foreign policies. He utilized values of ‘peace’, ‘democracy’, and ‘autonomy’ in order to bolster domestic credentials, to defeat political opponents, and to manipulate those values as political capital. While ‘postwar pacifism’ was rejected as ‘hypocritical’ ‘one-country pacifism’, which would neither protect Japanese people nor receive international acclaim, Abe insisted that a ‘peaceful’ Japan should proactively contribute to world peace by closer cooperation with the US and revising the Constitution. ‘Democracy’ was regarded as an integral part of Japan’s identity, which naturalized the enhancement of ties with the US, EU, Australia and India. It could also highlight differences from China, and could be utilized to ease frustrations among his anti-China supporters against rapprochement with China. Instead of the conventional arguments of the traditional right wing, according to Abe, it was not the US but the Constitution and China that impeded Japan’s true independence. In addition, Abe’s group constructed domestic ‘others’ as the ‘enemy within’ in his discourse of the ‘departure from the postwar regime’. These were mainly progressives, the Yoshida School politicians and the Keisei-kai politicians and political rivals of Abe’s group. By defining them as the ‘enemy within’ and ‘anti-Japanese’, Abe and his supporters tried to abandon their political rivals and to expand their power base in

domestic politics so as to achieve their ultimate goal, the revision of the Constitution.

5.1 Historical context

It is sometimes argued that nationalistic politicians and movements have gained momentum in Japan since the 1990s. The Committee on History and Screening, for instance, was established to offset a series of statements by top-level officials including Prime Minister Hosokawa. It officially acknowledged Japan's war responsibility and apologized to victims in neighboring countries. Younger members of this committee, such as Shinzo Abe and Shoichi Nakagawa, rallied and launched the Young Diet Members Committee to Consider the Future of Japan and History education in 1997. Those 'nationalistic' political actors were mainly hereditary politicians, who succeeded in ideals and agendas from the traditionalists and sought to achieve their goals like the revision of the Constitution. They insisted that the Nanjing Massacre and the comfort women were fabrications and that articulations in history textbook were distorted by pressure from China and South Korea. Although they were anti-mainstream in the LDP, their anti-China and anti-North Korea stance wielded a certain impact on foreign policy making. Those young nationalists were called 'neo-revisionists' distinguished from the traditional right-wing nationalists. As Abe was a major member of this group and his supporters coincided with members of this group, this thesis calls them 'neo-revisionists' or 'Abe's group' even though it was not an official 'faction' in the LDP.

5.2 Basic arguments

This section aims to examine what ‘the departure from the postwar regime’ would exactly mean in Abe’s discourse. Although he used the term ‘*rejimu*’ or ‘*taisei*’, both of which may be translated as ‘regime’ in English, his intention might not correlate to changes in the system of governance, such as move from a democratic political system to an authoritarian system. ‘The postwar regime’ for Abe was firstly a so-called ‘postwar democracy’ based on the ‘Peace Constitution’, ‘the Tokyo Tribunal view of history’, and ‘idealistic pacifism’, and secondly the ‘postwar democracy’, which the current Constitution and the Basic Education Law institutionalized. They were often regarded as a legacy of the Occupation policy of the US, so that the postwar regime could be seen as the ‘Occupation Regime’. The third component of the postwar regime was the Yoshida Line, a grand design for postwar society. Since the Yoshida Line was based both on the Constitution and the Japan-US Security Treaty, it was regarded as supporting and constituting the postwar regime.

5.2.1 The Constitution

The revision of the Constitution was a vital mission for the departure from the postwar regime. Indeed, a number of conservative debaters (revisionists) shared the view that the Constitution must be revised because it was ‘the root of all evil’ in postwar Japanese society. What was repeatedly emphasized is that the constitution was ‘written and imposed’ by the Occupation regime. Thus, this foreign-written constitution was regarded as a symbol of dependency, un-Japanese, and even anti-Japanese. Abe argued that it was impossible to ‘change the postwar regime offered by the Occupation Army without entirely revising the existing Constitution (Abe 2006-a: 78) and that one of the core missions of the LDP would be to remove the ‘postwar regime’ or ‘the

Occupation regime', that is, the revision of the Constitution (Abe 2006-a: 90). According to Abe's explanation, although Japan 'formally' restored its independence by adopting the San Francisco Peace Treaty in 1952, fundamental framework of postwar Japan, the Constitution, was created during the Occupation period and maintained since then (Abe 2006-b: 28). He claimed that Japan's true independence could not be achieved by 'enshrining and maintaining the Constitution and the Basic Education Law written by GHQ during the Occupation period (Abe 2006-a: 90)'.

Furthermore, he repeatedly proposed three reasons why Japan should revise the Constitution (Abe 2006-b: 121-126)¹. Firstly, Abe highlighted the fact that the Constitution was written by GHQ, and described the Constitution as 'imposed by the Occupation'. Secondly, he insisted that there could be found a separation between reality and what the Constitution stipulated, especially Article 9, which renounced war. Thirdly, according to Abe it would have significance for Japanese people to create their own Constitution by themselves in order to cultivate a bright future. Abe also expressed antipathy toward the preamble of the Constitution, arguing that the phrase 'we desire to occupy an honored place in an international society striving for the preservation of peace, and the banishment of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance for all time from the earth' as horribly servile (Abe 2006-a: 85, Abe 2006-b: 122-123).

Additionally, Abe's group questioned the legitimacy of the Constitution in terms of the discontinuity of national history and the constraints on Japan's sovereignty; that the Constitution was not based on Japan's traditional values because it was written and imposed by the GHQ. They also suggested that the Constitution restrained Japan's sovereignty as a 'normal state' because it was elaborated to avoid the resurgence of Japan as a great power against the US and its allied countries. In this way, the existing

¹ Abe reiterated this point in his books (Abe and Okazaki 2004: 217, Abe 2006-a: 33, 82, 131-132, 144, 233-234).

Constitution was depicted as both *un-Japanese* and *anti-Japanese*, and thus it should be revised. Hence, the significance of revising the ‘imposed’ Constitution seemed obvious to Abe’s group because “it is just the revision of the Constitution that symbolizes the ‘restoration of independence’” (Abe 2004-g: 94, 2006-b: 29).

5.2.2 Pacifism

What became the focus of criticism by Abe’s group was ‘postwar pacifism’, as established in the Constitution, especially Article 9. Abe condemned postwar pacifism as ‘idealistic’, ‘irresponsible’, and even ‘hypocritical’. It was just ‘idealistic’, which meant there was a wide gap between the ideal of the Constitution and reality surrounding Japan. Abe clearly argued that it was not the ‘peace constitution’ enshrined by the progressives, but the Japan-US Security Treaty and the SDF that had effectively protected Japan from regional turmoil since 1945 (Abe 2006-a: 134, 256). What is more, according to Abe, postwar pacifism did not contribute to the peace and security that Japan had enjoyed since WW II, but rather it was useless and did not serve to protect the life and property of the Japanese people. Revisionists (Abe 2006-b: 122) often pointed out that ‘progressive pacifists’ espoused a policy of disarmament depending on the phrase ‘We, the Japanese people, desire peace for all time and are deeply conscious of the high ideals controlling human relationship and we have determined to preserve our security and existence, trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world’ in the Preamble of the Constitution. However, this idea was nothing but an evasion of the responsibility to protect Japanese citizens (Abe 2006-a: 85). In this light, there seemed to be a difference between Koizumi and Abe on attitudes towards the Constitution. Koizumi argued that the dispatches of the SDF to Iraq for reconstruction

and humanitarian assistance would surely go along with the ideal of the Constitution, quoting the same phrase in the Preamble that Abe cited (Koizumi 2003-a). In other words, Koizumi did not question the authority of the Constitution but utilized it to legitimize his policy. Moreover, postwar pacifism, according to Abe, was hypocritical in that it only concerned Japan's peace and did not concern itself with world peace. In their argument, this logic would be totally unacceptable in international society (Abe and Okazaki 2004: 75, Abe 2006-b: 132, Abe 2006-a: 46). Given this, Abe and the revisionists concluded that postwar pacifism should be discarded because it was irresponsible to both the Japanese people and the international community.

5.2.3 The History verdict of the Tokyo Tribunal

The historical verdict of the Tokyo War Tribunal might be an important component to constitute the 'postwar regime' when combined with the Constitution and pacifism. Abe and his supporters tend to claim that the view is 'masochistic' and 'anti-Japanese'. As the traditional rightists argued, the historical view of the Tokyo Tribunal was a part of the policy of GHQ to 'psychologically disarm' the Japanese people and to deny them any healthy narratives on their 'national history'. They also asserted that the Tokyo War Tribunal denied the legitimacy of the 'Greater East Asian War' and condemned it as Japan's 'aggressive war'. At the Tribunal, prewar political leaders other than the Emperor were accused as war criminals that forced 'innocent' Japanese people to engage in war under militarism and ultra-nationalism. According to the revisionists, the view has played a role in brainwashing Japanese people into believing that what had been praised in the prewar society, statism, militarism, and ultra-nationalism, turned out to be genuinely vicious. As a result, they claimed, postwar

Japanese cannot be proud of their history, nor positively identify with their country. In addition, this ‘masochistic’ view makes it possible for China and South Korea to manipulate a ‘history card’ in political dealing with Japan. In other words, it forced Japan to abandon its national interest in diplomacy and to accept intervention in internal affairs. Given these, the history verdict of the Tokyo Tribunal should be discarded because it eroded the national pride of the Japanese people and damaged Japan’s national interests.

It is notable that Abe seemed to choose his narrative on history from a series of revisionist texts. They shared a common assumption that the ‘Greater East Asian War’ was *not* an ‘aggressive war’ and agreed with the accusation against the Tokyo War Tribunal. The Nanjing Massacre and the ‘comfort women’ were regarded as a ‘fabrication’ to incriminate Japan. However, there were wide ranges of narratives even within the conservative camp. For instance, Fusao Hayashi (1963) published his famous ‘*The Affirmation of the Greater East Asian War*’, arguing that it was inevitable that imperial Japan would resist Western imperialism to protect itself. In addition to those ‘self-defense war’ narratives, ‘the dual nature of the war’ narrative was also widespread among conservatives. It argued that the war had a twofold meaning: a war between imperialist states on the one hand, and a war to liberate Asia from Western colonial rule on the other. The former often led to a ‘conspiracy theory’ in which Stalin, the Chinese Communist Party, and Roosevelt are said to have conspired to drag Japan into war. In addition, some claimed that the US or other Western imperialist were equally guilty and thus they were not qualified to blame Japan because they had ruled colonies abroad as had Japan and committed atrocities such as the nuclear bombings at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The latter often claimed that Japan’s war contributed to independence of colonies in Asia. It highlighted positive aspect of Japan’s colonial rule in Asia and the

war, and emphasized how much Japan would be appreciated among Asian people.

Among these, the old revisionists tended to criticize the US because of its initiatives during the Tokyo War Tribunal. In this regard however, Abe's group did not sympathize with anti-American narratives, such as those against the nuclear bombings. This may be because sharing revisionist narratives offered him a strong base from the right-wingers, that is, it served as political capital for Abe. At the same time, however, to avoid criticizing the US would give him standing as pro-American, which might also be more important political capital for Abe. Although Abe's pro-US conservative group tended to criticize the Occupation policy, they distinguished GHQ, or SCAP from 'the US', arguing that even the GS had doubted on the adequacy of Article 9 (Abe 2006-b: 123). In other words, the Occupation Army and its policy before the reverse course was regarded as different from the current US, an alliance partner of Japan. By doing so, Abe struck a balance between the traditional right-wing, anti-US stance, and the neo-revisionist, pro-US stance. Given these, it can be argued that Abe selectively manipulated history narratives to maintain his power in domestic politics.

5.2.4 The Yoshida Line

Although the Yoshida line was launched and established by the same conservative camp as Abe's group, it was criticized as being indistinguishable from progressives in terms of going along with, or even supporting the postwar regime. As explained before, the Yoshida line was based on both the Constitution and the Japan-US Security Treaty. Criticism against the Yoshida line by right wing conservatives makes three points: security policy, diplomacy, and morality. The right-wingers and Abe's group have repeatedly condemned mainstream conservatives of the Yoshida school who

elaborately used the Constitution and the existence of ardent peace movements as a pretext for avoiding full-fledged rearmament. Though the government has often encouraged the ‘self-defense’ awareness of the Japanese people by emphasizing ‘a spirit to defend our nation’ in order to raise a sense of national unity, the national defense of Japan has indeed depended on American security guarantees. In other words, the Yoshida Line forced Japan to depend on the US security guarantee without full-fledged rearmament and allowed it to single-mindedly pursue its economic development without efforts to revise the ‘foreign-written’ Constitution (Abe 2006-a: 90, Abe 2006-b: 126). Abe believed that it was an ‘irresponsible’ attitude because the government waived the right to self-defense and the duty to protect its own people, which led to the decay of ‘national security thinking’. This would form part of the context for the North Korean abduction issue.

The second point of the criticism was aimed at the foreign policy toward East Asian countries, especially China and South Korea. In terms of postwar diplomacy, it seems to be obvious for Abe that the ‘self-constrained’ attitude of postwar diplomacy, fostered by the moral debt of WWII and ‘postwar-democracy’ toward East Asian countries, especially China and North Korea, had damaged national interests. He described the traits of such diplomacy as ‘lacking political initiatives’, ‘avoiding international frictions’, ‘waiting for passing tempests without any claims to justify itself’, and ‘making a humble apology’ in order to obtain returns (Abe 2006-a: 68-69, Abe 2006-b: 49). He criticized that it was extraordinarily ‘inactive diplomacy which neglected national interests’ and caused diplomatic error (Abe 2006-a: 69, 128). It might be the ‘price for defeat during the WWII’ that caused such a humble diplomacy, and consequently, Japan’s posture has given the impression that Japan should be blamed while repeatedly apologizing (Abe 2006-b: 150).

As for postwar foreign policy towards North Korea, Abe noted that little attention had been paid to the abduction issue because it might be an obstacle to the normalization of the bilateral relations. Abe insisted that if the Japanese government did not make a strong protest against the abductions, things would go as those who were heavily influenced by ‘postwar-democracy’ had hoped (Abe 2006-a: 201). In other words, supporters of ‘postwar-democracy’ were regarded as the ‘enemy-within’. He continuously referred to a certain atmosphere ‘which suppresses criticism against North Korea and communist countries’ (Abe and Okazaki 2004: 104). ‘The abduction issue has revealed’, as he put it, ‘hypocrisy’ of the JSP and the JCP by exposing their posture ‘to protect Article 9 of the Constitution while leaving the issue untouched (Abe 2006-a: 180)’.

Put another way, the JSP and the JCP damaged national interests and security by upholding the Article 9. Therefore, the Constitution was the primary cause of Japan’s security crisis and those who supported it were regarded as ‘enemies within’. In the case of the bilateral relations with China, he maintained that Japan has taken an ‘extraordinarily constrained’ attitude since the normalization in 1972 (Abe and Okazaki 2004: 161). ‘Japanese Politicians and diplomats had been obsessed with the friendship-first policy’, which urged them to compromise with China even when Japan should purport its own legitimacy (Abe and Okazaki 2004: 161). Abe evaluated this ‘over-constrained’ diplomacy as nothing but diplomatic error because ‘although Japan formally apologized for its past twenty-one times and offered more than three trillion yen in loans, anti-Japan movements and strong protests still occurred’ (Abe 2006-a: 68-69). Given these, Abe supported the view that Japan’s postwar diplomacy has been considerably restricted by ‘postwar-democracy’, which prevailed over long-term national interests.

In addition to security and diplomatic issues, the Yoshida line was criticized as a cause of moral degeneration in postwar society. In this context, one aspect of the Yoshida line, which highly prioritized economic development, was regarded as ‘mammonism’. Abe claimed that postwar Japan had single-mindedly pursued material prosperity at the expense of richness of spirit by revising the Constitution. This ‘mammonism’ can easily be connected to the pro-China group, which insisted on the importance of economic benefit from close ties with China and emphasized political consideration on history issue with China. They were regarded as a kind of ‘fifth column’ in that they only concerned themselves with economic gains and accepted the use of the ‘history card’ by neighboring countries instead of saving national dignity. It has also criticized that the mainstream has gone along with progressives and maintained a left-leaning ‘postwar democracy’. In that sense, the Yoshida School was treated as guilty as the progressive camp and thus should be abandoned.

5.2.5 Postwar democracy

Indeed, the term ‘postwar regime’ may imply more than just institutions like the Constitution and the Basic Education law expounded by Abe. He asserted that in addition to revising the Constitution, it might be ‘necessary to breakdown postwar ‘fixed beliefs’ to establish a brand-new Japan in the 21st century (Abe 2006-a: 78)’. Abe implied that it was the so-called ‘postwar-democracy’ that fostered and maintained a certain kind of social atmosphere and has been pervasive throughout Japanese society (Abe 2006-a: 201). In this ‘postwar-democracy’, even the LDP could not escape from its societal ‘constraints’ and thus their thinking and behaviour has also been restricted by ‘the loss of the war’ and the ‘reaction against prewar society’ (Abe 2006-a: 40).

From his point of view, ‘postwar democracy’ might include a conventional social framework in which ‘conservatives’ conflict with ‘progressives’ and in which the latter has been predominant. In his book, ‘conservatives’ were represented by the mainstream of the LDP, former British Prime Ministers Churchill and Thatcher, and former American President Reagan. On the other hand, ‘progressives’ are labeled ‘left-wing’, ‘anti-establishmentarian’ and ‘supporters of communist groups’, and represented in the former Japan Socialist Party, the Japan Communist Party, Asahi Shinbun (newspaper), ‘*Nikkyouso* (the Japan Teacher’s Union)’ and so-called ‘progressive intellectuals’ (Abe and Okazaki 2004: 33, 104, 142-143, 201, Abe 2006-b: 19, 21). They opposed the revision of the Japan-US Security Treaty in 1960, which Prime Minister Kishi forced through. Abe noted that he had become sympathetic to ‘conservatism’ due to the reaction against criticism of his grandfather who had been called an ‘evil reactionary conservative’, and Abe came to distrust those who offered such criticism of his grandfather in the name of ‘progressivism’ (Abe 2006-b: 18, 21). Put simply, the ‘progressives’ became Abe’s political opponents, and thus were treated as ‘enemies’ because they supported ‘postwar democracy’.

Abe repeatedly described postwar Japan as a society dominated by these ‘left-wing’ ‘progressives’. From his childhood, at ‘*The 1960 Anpo-toso* (the movements against the revision of the Japan-the US security Treaty in 1960)’ throughout the Cold War era, ‘conservatives’ were considered villains who strove for the return to the prewar regime and ‘progressives’ were heroes who sought to cultivate Japan’s future, implying that capitalism was a social ill and communism was virtuous (Abe 2006-a: 120, Abe 2006-b: 24). The mass media, critical circles and the academic community have been occupied by ‘left-wing’ ‘progressive’ intellectuals, with whom Abe has never felt sympathy (Abe and Okazaki 2004: 201, Abe 2006-b: 24). Despite the collapse of the

Soviet Union, ‘the remnants of communism had maintained its strength’ and it had been pervasive in all corners in postwar Japan (Abe and Okazaki 2004: 107, Abe 2006-a: 149).

In such a society, anti-American and pro-Constitution groups like the JSP and the JCP have been regarded as pacifists, while pro-American ‘conservative’ groups were likely to be considered as militarists. The Yoshida School conservatives also supported this social climate, considering that it enabled Japan to depend on US security without complete rearmament and allowing it to single-mindedly pursue its own economic development without efforts to revise the ‘foreign-written’ Constitution (Abe 2006-a: 90, Abe 2006-b: 126). Given this situation, ‘postwar-democracy’ was represented as a social belief system rather than democracy as a political system, in which ‘left-wing’ ‘progressive’ values were predominant while ‘conservatism’ was marginalized. In this context, Abe sought to transform values which were given to both groups; he provided positive meanings and roles for ‘conservative’ thought while demonstrating the negative effects of ‘postwar-democratic’ views which had been heavily influenced by ‘progressive’ thought. He critiqued ‘progressive’ thought in the light of nationalism and the relationship between a state and people, and pointed toward its negative effects on Japanese politics and society in terms of education, diplomacy and security.

The most frequent representation of ‘progressive’ thought in Abe’s books was as an ‘allergy against the state (*kokka*)’ and any nationalistic values. This allergy, which was brought about by defeat in WW II and the reaction against prewar statehood, has been considerably strong (Abe 2006-a: 40, Abe 2006-b: 124). A ‘commonly mistaken notion’ among people (*kokumin*) spread by progressives is that ‘a state (*kokka*) and individuals (*kojin*) were competing’ (Abe 2006-a: 160). Those who were influenced by such an idea, Abe said, tended to be hostile toward the state and nationalism and

supported ‘cosmopolitanism’. Abe believed that ‘cosmopolitanism’ was ‘unnatural’ and ‘ideational’ because ‘only states can in effect secure individual rights and properties’ and explained that the allergy to the concept of ‘a state’ might be so strong that it serves to combine individuals with cosmopolitanism to bypass the state (Abe 2006-b: 95). He also pointed out that progressive people demonstrated a tendency to negate and attack ‘nationalism’ itself and to avoid highlighting their national identity (Abe 2006-a: 19, Abe 2006-b: 83, 99). They seemed to abhor the national anthem ‘*Kimigayo*’ and the national flag ‘*Hinomaru*’ as symbols of militarism and hated to see young people cheering national football team (Abe 2006-b: 82-83).

In this respect, Prime Minister Abe mentioned that due to the trauma of WW II cautiousness against the term ‘patriotism’ could not be removed from minds of the Japanese people. As a result, ‘wounded nationalism because of defeat’ has not been restored. On that point, he defined nationalism as ‘sound patriotism’, ‘unifying national feeling’, and ‘to identify the state to which he or she belongs and to confirm his or her identity’ and regretted that Japan’s nationalism has only been allowed in the case of sports (Abe 2006-b: 79-80). Thus, it was argued that in ‘postwar-democracy’, Japan’s nationalism had been marginalized under the influence of progressive thought, in which the ‘state allergy’ became widely held among postwar Japanese people.

With respect to postwar Japanese education, Abe criticized not only the Basic Education Law formulated during the Occupation period but also the ‘progressive’ view towards history (Abe 2006-b: 206). He claimed that the Basic Education Law would lack Japanese uniqueness because it referred to neither ‘the importance of a state (*kokka*), locality, history, and family’ nor ‘values of public service’ (Abe 2006-a: 234). In addition, according to Abe, postwar education established by the Occupation also deprived Japanese people, especially the younger generation, of their national pride by

negating traditional Japanese values and historical achievements (Abe 2006-b: 207). Furthermore, this system ‘left behind the essential Japanese values of self-discipline, a spirit of public-mindedness, and affection for one’s community and national traditions (Abe 2006-j)’. As a result of postponing revision of the Basic Education Law, as well as amendment of the Constitution, ‘profit-and-loss arithmetic has become an important standard for value judgment while values beyond such arithmetic as family ties, affection to the land of birth, and attachment to a country have been downplayed’ (Abe 2006-b: 29). In addition, Abe attributed the distortion of society and moral degeneration to postwar education, stating that:

There is no denying that our education system has not sufficiently addressed ideas such as moral values, ethics, and self-discipline. Experts today often call attention to this issue of decline in children’s morals and desire to learn, and families and communities are said to be less and less capable of filling the educational roles they once did (Abe: 2006-i).

Abe noted that one of the most serious problems would be ‘masochistic and biased education’ peculiar to defeated countries (Abe 2005-b: 79-80, 2006-b: 206). This was partly because of the Occupation policy, which sought to remove attachment to their own history from the Japanese people (Abe 2006-a: 133). He mentioned that ‘pro-communists’ held a historical view that only illuminated the negative aspects of history and negated the positive achievements in order to hinder Japanese national pride (Abe and Okazaki 2004: 107). Furthermore, postwar education has helped to bolster the ‘allergy’ to the state and prevented people from creating a strategy from a state view (Abe 2006-b: 202). Therefore, postwar education has exerted negative effects on the

relationship between people and this country. Given the convergence of these concepts, 'postwar democracy' was constituted in a way that it was deviant and thus should be utterly revised.

5.3 Key concepts and Identity Construction

There were three key concepts at the core of national identity in the discourse of Abe and the neo-revisionists: 'peace', 'democracy', and 'independence/autonomy'. It might give the strange impression that these concepts coincide with slogans of progressive, 'pro-constitution', nationalism in the 1960s given that right-wing traditionalists tend to use 'traditional culture' or 'the Emperor' instead. However, it could be thought that neo-revisionists might try to dismantle the particular meanings of these words, which were assigned by left wing progressives, offering new meanings to them in accordance with their own thoughts. National identity could be constructed through the process in which the new meanings are given and fixed, constituting a particular reality of the world. Moreover, each concept, given a new meaning, might result in the polarization of the world, implicit or explicit articulation of 'other' in order to construct the identity of 'self'. In what follows, an argument about how the meanings of the three key concepts were transformed will be presented exploring what kind of national identity was constituted in relation to the discourse on the postwar regime, as well as how this identity was utilized to legitimize Abe's policy.

5.3.1 Peace

There can be no doubt that 'peace' has been one of the primary concepts in

postwar Japanese society. In particular, the passage of the Article 9, which renounces the right to wage war, represents the core of 'pacifism'. 'Peace' in the progressive context, thus originally went along with the pro-Constitution movement and makes reference to 'anti-war', 'unarmed neutralism' and 'anti-nuclear'. It was also used to mobilize people against the revision of the Japan-US Security Treaty in 1960 claiming that it would deepen subordination to the US. Therefore, it can be argued that 'peace' in progressive terms would imply the existence of postwar Japan's 'nationalism' behind the backlash against the Japan's 'blindly following' the US. In this context, it would seem to be inconsistent if neo-revisionists pursued national identity as a 'peaceful country' in accordance with progressive connotations, because they relentlessly claimed it was necessary for the revision of the current Constitution, and they tended to seek enhancement of the Japan-US Alliance. In addition, it seemed to be contradictory that while Abe criticized the 'peace constitution' and 'postwar pacifism', he also argued that 'Japanese people should be proud of their path as a peaceful country'.

However, Abe attempted to utilize the word 'peace' as a core concept of national identity, by transforming the meaning of 'peaceful country' and by adopting the dichotomy to reconstruct national identity and to legitimize his stance. First of all, Abe and his colleagues re-articulated the feature of progressive's 'peace' as 'idealistic' and 'hypocritical', and defined their peace movement as virtually equal to the 'anti-America, pro-Communism' movement. It was 'idealistic' because the Constitution, which the progressive's pacifism relied upon, became far removed from the reality of the world. It was 'hypocritical' because a country which offered only money without providing contribution in personnel under the name of 'pacifism' could be seen only as 'dubious (*zurui*)' (Abe 2006-b: 136). Such 'pacifism' would mean no more than 'one-country pacifism', which might serve only self-satisfaction and could not be welcomed in

international society. Therefore, there can be seen ‘othering’ of postwar Japan, more precisely, postwar Japan which had been dominated by the progressive ‘pacifism’. As postwar Japan with ‘one-country pacifism’ must not be regarded as an honorable member of international society, it should be discarded and reconstructed to be a true ‘peaceful country’. In this context, Abe’s ‘peaceful country’ should be opposite to the ‘one-country pacifism’ with resentment against the US. Therefore, it was a country, which proactively contributed to the peace and stability in the world in cooperation with the US, instead of escaping from responsibility as an alliance partner and concentrating on self-defense.

What should be noticeable here is that Abe tried to ensure compatibility between ‘peaceful’ identity and the Japan-US Alliance by defining that it was not the Constitution but the Japan-US Alliance that maintained peace surrounding Japan in the postwar era (Abe 2006-a: 134, 256). In other words, Abe tended to use Japan’s ‘peace contribution’ when he emphasized the significance of the ‘Japan-US Alliance in the global context’ and ‘Japan-US alliance for Asia and the world’ (NDRP: 2006-p), in which the two countries were cooperating to demonstrate leadership on global security issues. The Prime Minister insisted that as the ‘Japan-US alliance for Asia and the world’ was a cornerstone of Japan’s security policy, ‘it should be necessary to further strengthen the Japan-US Alliance in order to protect the lives of the Japanese people, peace, and independence, as well as freedom and democracy in our country’ (NDRP: 2007-b). He successively claimed that in order to contribute to the peace and stability of the world, Japan should make legislative preparation especially on the right to collective self-defense to deal with security issues according to the current situations. In addition, Abe (2004-e: 16-17) clearly insisted that Japan should revise the Constitution and authorize to have the right to wage war and that the SDF should be allowed to play

military role in making international contributions. Put another way, the revision of the constitution and the specification of the exercise of the right of collective self-defense would be necessary for Japan to proactively contribute to international peace. In this context, the Constitution was regarded as an obstacle to Japan's identity as a 'peaceful nation', which contributes to world peace. In short, there can be seen the transformation of the meaning of a 'peaceful country' from 'unilateral pacifism' to the proactive contribution of international security with the US.

With regard to the construction of national identity, Abe might reinforce the 'non-militaristic' aspect of a 'peaceful' country by emphasizing differences from a 'militaristic' other. It was because the representation of 'militaristic' others is necessary to rely upon the constitution of 'non-militaristic' identity of Japan. Thus, the emphasis on 'peace' and a 'peaceful country' would presuppose the boundary between a 'peaceful country' and a 'militaristic country' or a 'terrorist country', which could threaten peace and stability in the world. While the former was a member of international society, the latter was regarded as non-member or even a threat to the international community. Abe believed that postwar Japan has been a 'peaceful country' in that it has nothing to do with militarism. He argued that Japan has never demonstrated an aggressive attitude towards other countries for more than sixty years since the end of WW II (Abe 2006-b: 137, 150). From his statement, it seemed to be clear that he tried to construct Japan's 'peaceful' identity by highlighting differences from an oppositional 'other'.

Has Japan tried to equipped long-range missiles to attack other countries? Has Japan aimed to rearm with nuclear weapon? Has Japan suppressed human rights? Has Japan restricted people's freedom? Has Japan tried to destroy the democratic system? All of the answers are "No". Japan is undoubtedly a democratic country

that is immune to militarism (Abe 2006-b: 69).

In this narrative, there can be seen an implicit construction of an oppositional ‘other’ to articulate the identity of the ‘self’; it articulated Japan’s identity (A) by constituting and denying the identity of ‘other’ (non-A). There is assumed to be a country as ‘other’, which attacked other countries by long-range-missiles; and which suppressed human rights, freedom and democracy. As will be discussed in later chapters, ‘other’s will turn out to be China and North Korea. China was often described as a country with ‘hegemonic’ and ‘militaristic ambition in the region’ with the ‘lack of transparency’ (Nakanishi 2001: 103-4, Abe 2006-a: 61-62). North Korea was frequently represented as a country which is a military-driven, ‘genuinely terrorist state’ (Nakanishi 2001: 57, 143, 2003: 26). Both countries were treated as having an opposite identity from Japan.

In this way, Japan’s identity as a ‘peaceful’ country was reconstructed to legitimate Abe’s policy toward both domestic and foreign issues; the revision of the Constitution, the enhancement of the Japan-US Alliance, and approach to China and North Korea.

5.3.2 Democracy

‘Democracy’ has also been one of the core ideas of progressive nationalism often employed in the event of the mass demonstration against the revision of the Japan-US Security Treaty in 1960. In the progressive context, ‘democracy’ was used to express backlash against the policy of ‘reverse course’ to the prewar system, which was non-democratic and authoritarian policy making process exemplified in the Kishi

administration. The term ‘the drift to the right’ was often used to imply ‘the drift towards militarism and authoritarianism’ and was often described as ‘the crisis of democracy in postwar Japan’. It was clear that ‘democracy’ was the oppositional value to ‘militarism’, ‘authoritarian Emperor System’ and ‘the right-wing prewar values’ in the progressive context. ‘Postwar democracy’ would mean, in other words, a ‘departure from the prewar regime’. Therefore, it appears to be strange that Abe and his colleague emphasized ‘democracy’ as a fundamental value considering that they criticize ‘postwar democracy’.

Indeed, Abe’s usage of ‘democracy’ might be different from what the progressives employed and what ‘postwar democracy’ meant in the context of Abe’s group. It could be thought that they might redefine ‘democracy’ by giving different meanings from the progressives view and transform it in accordance with their own interests. In the argument of the right-wing traditionalists, ‘postwar democracy’ was transplanted from foreign culture and has been maintained by the ‘deviant’ progressives. Therefore, it would deny the continuity of national history and traditions; it could rob Japanese people of their national affinity and pride because it was based on a ‘masochistic’ view of history; it could hinder people’s identification with their ‘state’ by defining that ‘a state can conflict with its national people.’ In short, ‘postwar democracy’ can be defined as a ‘democracy without a state’, which is anti-Japanese in nature (Saeki 2001). Abe and his supporters basically shared this view with the traditional right-wing nationalist, and used ‘postwar democracy’ and ‘postwar regime’ interchangeably. Put simply, ‘postwar democracy’ should be discarded because it was produced and maintained by the Constitution, and it distorted Japan’s identity.

The point to be noted is that ‘postwar democracy’ was not equalized as ‘democracy’ as a universal value in Abe’s discourse. ‘Democracy’ was repeatedly

emphasized as a 'universal value' as well as freedom, human rights, rule of law and market economy. According to Abe, democracy was the fundamental system and value of postwar Japan without referring to the prewar society. It would distinguish them from the traditional right wing whose claims often focused on the restoration of traditional values and the skepticism of 'Western universal values' (Yagi 2007). 'Universal values' would not be a kind of values which traditional right-wing nationalists tended to embrace. It might be partly because Abe and his colleagues intended to avoid being identified with the traditional right wing which was often regarded as prewar militarism and to assuage concerns of people at home and abroad that prewar-type militaristic nationalism was resurgent in Japan. Abe often argued that postwar Japan was far from militarism in his book (Abe 2006-b). Instead, they would emphasize how genuine Japan has been a supporter of democracy and how Japan should contribute to the world peace with the US. Therefore, by emphasizing universal values, they might attempt to make an impression that the departure from the postwar regime will not mean the revival of militarism and thus draw the attention of Japanese people.

The narrative that Japan was a supporter of universal values inevitably assumes that there existed 'others' who did not share universal values. Among 'others', there can be distinguished two sorts, one that will take in and support universal values in the days ahead, and one that is totally opposite to such values. The former was regarded as an 'assimilable' other, a potential ally, whereas the latter was viewed as an 'inassimilable' other, an inconvertible enemy. These articulations might be important for Japan to conduct foreign policy in Asia because it identified itself as a 'vanguard of universal values in Asia'. In this context, there can be seen some situations when 'democracy' could play an important role in the discourse of Abe and his supporters; as a part of Japan's identity, as a universal value which makes further cooperation with other

‘democratic’ countries, as a fundamental differences from ‘non-democratic’ countries, and as political capital in domestic power relationships.

Abe often described Japan’s postwar ‘peaceful development’ that ‘Japan has modestly strived to reconstruct itself for international contribution by endorsing freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law (Abe 2006-b: 150). ‘Democracy’ was treated as an integral part of Japan’s ‘peaceful’ identity. Instead of regarding ‘democracy’ as merely a ‘foreign’ value transplanted to deny the Emperor System by the Occupation regime as some traditional right-wingers claim, Abe’s group often argued that democracy was never alien to Japan. Actually, Taro Aso of the LDP often argued that Japan was the oldest democracy in Asia when he was a Foreign Minister in the Koizumi and Abe administration and this claim was one of the premises of the policy of the ‘Arc of Freedom and Prosperity’, which emphasized ‘universal values’ as will be discussed in a later chapter. It can be thought that the claim that Japan was the oldest democracy in Asia could make two ideas compatible: that a primary value should not serve to the discontinuity of national history and that Japan is a genuine supporter of universal values. Therefore, Japan as a ‘democracy’ was used as an essential part of ‘peaceful’ country and thus naturalized in Abe’s discourse.

Second, as it is a ‘universal value’, ‘democracy’ was a common value with other ‘democratic’ countries such as the US, EU countries, Australia and India. As they would share fundamental values to national identity, they were regarded as an ‘assimilable’ other, or ‘friend’. Based on this identity construction, it was naturalized to strengthen ties with those countries. A policy of deepening cooperation with India under the Abe administration, as discussed in a later chapter, was conducted in line with this logic. The policy to enhance ties with other democratic countries was ardently supported by Abe’s supporters because of two reasons. These two reasons would

correspond to the third and fourth situation in which ‘democracy’ was utilized by Abe and his supporters.

As a third role, ‘democracy’ highlighted a difference between Japan and ‘non-democratic’ countries so as to illuminate ‘radical otherness’ and thus legitimate hard-line approaches to those countries. Abe argued that in ‘authoritarian’ and many communist countries, values of freedom and democracy were denied and people were suppressed and slaughtered (Abe 2006-b: 65-66). In this context, ‘non-democratic’ was regarded not merely as different, but also demonstrated a lower moral standard in the country; ‘democracy’ and ‘non-democracy’ were not only conflicting but also incompatible. Therefore, a hard-line stance without any concession to those countries was legitimized in the foreign policy discourse of Abe and his supporters. Abe often emphasized the difference of political systems between Japan and China (Abe 2006-b: 153) and depicted China as a ‘developmental dictatorship’, which does not observe democratic rules (Abe 2006-a: 60). He also argued that Japan should not be optimistic about such a country like China, which did not accept “the standard values of developed countries” in either economic or security areas (Abe 2006-a: 224). A professor of Kyoto University Terumasa Nakanishi (Sakurai, Kasai and Nakanishi 2007: 56-57) supported Abe and Aso’s emphasis on democracy as universal values in foreign policy towards China, because it would set off China’s manipulation of the ‘history card’ and give advantage to Japan since universal values were widely shared in international society. In addition, Abe’s supporters launched the Diet Member’s Group for Promoting Value-Oriented Diplomacy and stated that they would appeal for the need to keep a close watch on China, which would not share universal values (Furuya 2007). In this way, the emphasis on ‘democracy’ was utilized to highlight difference from ‘non-democratic’ countries like China and to legitimize a hard-line policy to those

countries.

Finally, ‘democracy’ as a universal value might play an important role as political capital in a domestic power relationship. In relation to the second and third role, pursuing a policy to strengthen ties with ‘democratic’ countries was manipulated as a measure to consolidate Abe’s power base in domestic politics in two aspects. To begin with, this policy served to offset frustrations among Abe’s supporters against the rapprochement with China as will be touched in Chapter 6. As the statement of Keiji Furuya, the president of the Diet Member’s Group for Promoting Value-Oriented diplomacy, demonstrated above, Abe’s ‘value-oriented diplomacy’ was closely related to policy toward China. Abe’s endorsement of ‘democracy’ was considered to be setting a demarcation between Japan and China, so as to construct the latter as an ‘inassimilable’ other. Therefore, it might contribute to the appeasement of his supporters and thereby the consolidation of Abe’s power base in the LDP. Secondly, as the remark of Furuya showed again, Abe’s group tried to achieve their ‘true conservative values’ and goals by gathering conservative powers under the name of ‘universal values’. In other words, they attempted to manipulate ‘democracy’ or other universal values to consolidate their power to realize their domestic political agenda such as the revision of the Constitution, which had nothing to do with ‘universal values’ in fact.

5.3.3 Independence/autonomy

Compared with ‘peace’ and ‘democracy’, which seemed to be more universal rather than nationalistic, ‘*jishu dokuritsu*’ or merely ‘*dokuritsu*’ (translated into ‘independence’ or ‘autonomy’,) seems to be more of a nationalistic value. Although

Japan's independence was restored in legal terms with the conclusion of the San Francisco Peace Treaty in 1952, it has long been argued by the traditional right wing as if Japan had not restored its autonomy (Abe 2006-a: 39). Both the left-wing progressives and the right-wing traditionalists have attacked the Japanese government for its lack of self-reliance. The 'lack of autonomy' has generally been identified with the 'subordination to the US', and thus 'independence/autonomy' would mean independence from the US subordination in the context in which they criticize the one-sided nature of the Japan-US Security Treaty. In short, the Security Treaty might be a symbol of 'blindly following' of Japan to the US in conventional interpretation. The Japan-US Security Treaty and pro-US conservative politicians in the LDP were regarded as obstacles to Japan's autonomy in a historical context of postwar Japan.

On the other hand, however, there can be observed some different points on what has restrained Japanese sovereignty and prevented it from achieving genuine 'independence' in the narratives of Abe and his supporters. Firstly, it was the current Constitution, which might hinder Japan from meeting the requirements as a 'normal' independent state. In their argument, as long as Japan upholds the current Constitution written and imposed by a foreign country, and it denies the right to wage war, Japan has to remain a quasi-sovereign state. Therefore, the revision of the current Constitution would be a symbol of the achievement of genuine independence for Japan (Abe 2006-b: 29). In addition, against the criticism that pro-American conservatives tend to accept, or even try to deepen, subordination to the US, they argued that it was the pro-Constitution power that was truly dependent on the 'imposed' Constitution. In their argument, the status quo might not be 'blindly following' but merely reflecting 'one-sided' relations, which could become more equal when Japan could make the security treaty more reciprocal. Abe argued that it was by increasing mutuality that might enhance Japan's

influence on the US, thereby make the bilateral relationship more equal (Abe 2006-b: 133). At this point, there seemed to be a difference between the traditional right wings and Abe's group. For instance, a famous writer Jun Eto, who represented traditionalists, argued that the US had restrained Japan's sovereignty by imposing the Constitution (1991: 329). However, Abe did not follow this idea although he often supported and cited Eto's statements. In short, it was not the Japan-US Security Treaty but the Constitution that was a symbol of the lack of autonomy and it was the people who supported the Constitution that impeded Japan's independence in neo-nationalist narratives. In this context, the revision of the Constitution and the enhancement of the cooperation with US proposed by Abe's group were legitimized to achieve Japan's autonomy.

Another factor to which neo-revisionists would attribute Japan's lack of autonomy was the concession to neighboring countries on the history issue. It was claimed by Abe's group that 'apology diplomacy' based on the history view of the Tokyo War Tribunal, which has blocked Japan from pursuing its national interest through foreign policy. As long as the Japanese government prioritizes consideration for national feelings among neighboring countries over Japan's national interests, and by accepting a situation in which the 'history card' is manipulated, China and South Korea could exploit the history issue regarded as interference in domestic affairs. As a result, Japan might have difficulty to conduct an 'autonomous' policy to secure its national interest. Therefore, in their argument, it was not the United State but China and South Korea that restrained Japan's diplomatic autonomy by manipulating the history issue. In this way, it was insisted that it should be necessary to depart from 'apology diplomacy' for Japan to attain full autonomy as an independent state. For this, taking a tough stance and making no concessions on the history issue to China were legitimized for Japan's

‘autonomy’ in the narratives of Abe’s group.

5.4 The construction of domestic ‘others’

By manipulating these key concepts, Abe and his supporters tried to achieve their political goals and legitimize their policy choices through the identity constructions of political actors. As discussed above, there can be seen two kinds of external ‘others’; ‘assimilable’ other which share ‘universal values and might not claim the history issue, and ‘inassimilable’ other which would not have common values and tend to raise the history issue. In addition to those external others, there can be found domestic others in Abe’s discourse; the progressives and his political rival within the LDP, that is, the Keisei-kai and the Yoshida School conservatives. Those groups were regarded as radical other for Abe’s group; they were described as ‘anti-Japanese’ and treated as the ‘enemy within’.

To begin with, it would be clear that the progressives were seen as the ‘deviant’, a fifth column or ‘anti-Japanese’ for Abe’s group because the ideas of left-wing progressives would be the opposite to Abe’s conservatism. It was obvious that Abe took a hostile attitude against the group by the fact that he tried to define his beautiful country by dismantling the discourse of ‘postwar pacifism’ endorsed by the progressives. Indeed, Yagi (2008: 22) argues that Abe’s ‘beautiful country’ was named against the title of Kenzaburo Oe’s Nobel lecture, ‘Japan, the ambiguous, and Myself (Oe 1994)’, because Oe could represent the progressive intellectuals who has supported postwar democracy. What would mean ‘anti-Japanese’ in the texts of neo-revisionists was a negative evaluation of prewar Japan, represented by the ‘the Tokyo War Tribunal view of history’. Yagi (2008: 265) explained that what decisively distinguished *them*,

Abe's group, from 'those who would kill Japan' was the 'understanding of history'. As argued before, the progressives viewed prewar Japan as militaristic, authoritarian, and ultra-nationalistic, all of which should be discarded to become a 'peaceful nation'. On the other hand, Abe's group thought that such a progressive view of history was 'arrogant' because it ignored the sense of continuity of national history. They claimed that Japanese people should be 'humble' on national history in a way that they respect the ancestors who maintained the long history of Japan, instead of regarding prewar Japan as evil as the progressives use the phrase 'humble on national history'. In addition, in the argument of Abe and his supporters, as postwar education was launched by the Occupation Regime and maintained by the progressives, it brainwashed the Japanese people into thinking 'a state is evil' based on the Tokyo War Tribunal view of history, people were not be able to be proud of history and traditions of their country. By doing so, the progressives deprived the Japanese people of their national pride and sense of belonging. What was more, postwar education broke the ties between the state and its people, and destroyed traditional cultures. In this sense, the progressives were described as not only 'non-Japanese' but also 'anti-Japanese' because they regard prewar Japan as negative and thus diminish the foundation of their country.

In addition, it was often said that 'anti-Japanese' people turned out to be the 'enemy within' especially in terms of diplomatic relations with Asian countries over the history issue. 'Enemies within', in this context, were those who had an 'anti-Japanese' view of history, the Tokyo War Tribunal view of history in other words, and supported neighboring countries on the history issues instead of supporting their own country. In progressive discourse, since postwar Japan had been established on feelings of remorse for the war, it should demonstrate consideration for national feelings of victim countries like China and South Korea rather than high-profile diplomacy. Abe's group often

condemned that it was not only ‘unpatriotic behavior’ but also an act of ‘treachery’. For example, some progressive activists supported ‘comfort women’ and helped them to bring a suit against their own government despite the fact that they *were* Japanese. In addition, it was often claimed that it was the *Asahi Shimbun* and other progressive mass media that made the textbook issue a diplomatic problem (Abe 2005-d: 28-32). They intentionally reported the textbook issue and the Yasukuni Shrine issue so as to draw the attention of China and South Korea, which encouraged both countries to attack Japan. Behind this backdrop, neo-realists believe, the Comintern or the Chinese Communist Party might undertake secret operation or conspiracy in order to put Japan in a pinch (Nakanishi 2007: 33). Moreover, according to Abe (Abe 2005-e: 33), the *Asahi Shimbun* collaborated with North Korea and tried to ensnare Abe and Shoichi Nakagawa in order to inhibit the enactment of sanctions. As the progressives might be manipulated to serve the conspiracy, they were regarded as a kind of fifth column. In that sense, the progressives and those who go along with them were treated as ‘enemies within’ in the discourse of Abe’s group.

Another construction of domestic ‘other’ was concerning mainstream conservatives within the LDP, the Yoshida School (the Kochi-kai) and the former Tanaka faction (the Keisei-kai). Although the division line between the progressives and the conservatives has been focused on the existing literature, what is noticeable is that Abe’s group regarded those mainstream conservatives as ‘others’ and ‘enemy within’ even though they belong to the same party because Abe’s ‘departure from the postwar regime’ partly aimed to revise the Yoshida line and to break the Keisei-kai dominance. Terumasa Nakanishi (2001: 253), a professor of Kyoto University and a conservative debater, clearly pointed out that ‘the true division line concerning the settlement of the “postwar issues” as an ideology can be drawn not between the

progressives and the conservatives, — the resistance of the progressives and mass media has not truly been the real issue —, but always between the conservative camps.’ There were three reasons why the mainstream conservatives were considered to be ‘other’; power struggle within the LDP, pandering to the progressives, and pursuing pro-China policy.

In postwar Japanese politics, the Yoshida School (the Kochi-kai) and later the Tanaka faction (the Keisei-kai) have dominated the LDP while the Seiwa-kai, to which a number of Abe’s group Diet members belong, has remained anti-mainstream in the party. It can be argued that the rivalry between the Keisei-kai and Seiwa-kai might reflect the self-other nexus in the narratives of neo-revisionists. As argued before, the mainstream of the LDP has followed the Yoshida line, which was based both on the Constitution and the Japan-US Security Treaty and thus has been attacked from both sides of the progressives and traditional right wing. The fact that they have manipulated the double standard logic on the history issue was also singled out for criticism. From the right-winger’s view to come around on the historical view would mean that the mainstream would go along with the progressive view. As for China policy, the division line coincides with one on the history issue because it was vital to acknowledge Japan’s war responsibility to establish and maintain the diplomatic relations with China. From the 1970s, the former Tanaka Faction dominated the LDP in addition to the successors of Yoshida. As Kakuei Tanaka restored diplomatic relations with mainland China and his faction has been closely linked to China, the former Tanaka Faction is known as the pro-China power in the LDP².

Taken together, elements of the domestic radical other in Abe’s discourse were

² Komachi (2006: 50) argues that “pro-China” scholars and intellectuals were regarded as “progressives” and those who maintained critical approaches were grouped together as “conservatives”. However, the Tanaka faction is reputed as pro-China while it is “conservative”.

the progressives and the mainstream conservatives, and they were constituted as ‘anti-Japanese’ and the ‘enemy within’ because they had a deviant view of history which would diminish their country and served to realize China’s interests rather than Japan’s. In this context, it can be observed that ‘anti-Japanese’ had the same meaning of ‘having an understanding of history in which Japan was assailant’ which justified a pro-China policy.

5.5 Conclusion

Abe and his supporters tried to deconstruct ‘postwar democracy’ and proposed a ‘departure from the postwar regime’. All the essential components of postwar democracy were denied and rejected as what constituting distorted the ‘genuine’ ‘innocent’ Japan. In particular, the Constitution was regarded as a symbol of the postwar regime and became a target of criticism. Looking at what kind of national identity was constructed in foreign policy of Abe’s group, there can be seen three key concepts. These were ‘peace’, ‘democracy’, and ‘independence/autonomy’, and were utilized to realize their domestic and foreign policy goals in the discourse of the neo-revisionists. While all these concepts had a historical context in which the progressives used as the ‘nationalistic values’ of the 1960s to resist the LDP government, Abe’s group transformed the meanings of those values so as to legitimize their policy goals. In the domestic arena, Abe’s group treated its political rivals as ‘domestic others’, namely the progressives, the Yoshida School and the Keisei-kai politicians. By defining them as the ‘enemy within’ and ‘anti-Japanese’, Abe and his supporters tried to abandon their old political rivals and to expand their power base in domestic politics so as to achieve their ultimate goals; the revision of the Constitution.

In the foreign policy arena, three key concepts were utilized to naturalize and consolidate ties with the US, EU, Australia and India, and to marginalize ties with China and North Korea. These were the claim that Japan's contribution to world peace and stability should be based on the close cooperation between Japan and the US: that was natural for Japan to cooperate with the US because both countries endorse universal values such as democracy: and that when Japan achieves its 'true independence' by revising the current Constitution, which might make it possible to exercise the right of collective self-defense, it could be an equal partner by increasing reciprocity with their states. In short, the three concepts were manipulated to justify natural and strong ties with the US because both countries share fundamental values and the mutuality between the two would imply Japan's 'independence'. On the other hand, they were also utilized to marginalize an alternative policy option, which identified China as a 'friend' to Japan and promote a good relationship. It was argued that China was the opposite to 'peaceful' and 'democratic' Japan, it was 'inassimilable', and that the 'history card' manipulated by China hindered Japan's autonomy: therefore, China was treated as the 'enemy' to Japan. Thus, taking a tough stance to China was legitimized in the logic of Abe's group. Although the Abe administration improved the bilateral relationship with China, it did not seek a fundamental reconciliation because of this staunch anti-Chinese logic, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 6. Case Study 3 and 4: Nationalism and Foreign Policy toward China and North Korea under the Abe administration

Prime Minister Shinzo Abe undertook a step to mend relations with Japan's disgruntled neighbors immediately after his taking office. This went against general expectations that it might be difficult for Abe to repair ties with China because he was well-known as a 'staunch nationalist' and one of the leaders among anti-Chinese politicians. The new Prime Minister visited Beijing and realized a summit with President Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao. Leaders of both countries agreed to establish a 'mutually beneficial relationship based on strategic interests', which aimed at strengthening cooperation and enhancing mutual interests in a wide range of agendas like the East China Sea. Abe shelved the history issue especially Yasukuni, using strategic ambiguity in order to realize a summit and avoid a diplomatic dispute which could lead to a diplomatic hiatus like the Koizumi administration had made. On the whole, it can be argued that the Abe administration was successful in improving soured bilateral relations between Japan and China, taking a soft-line foreign policy and avoiding major confrontations on the history issue, at least on the surface.

On the other hand, Abe maintained a tough stance against North Korea with a very high priority on the abduction issue. Unlike the previous government, the Abe administration made every effort to boost pressures against the DPRK, aggressively imposing unilateral and international sanctions on North Korea's declaration of the nuclear test and its 'insincere' attitude to the resolution of the abduction issue. Abe's uncompromising stance seemed to make a sharp contrast with his predecessor's North Korean policy and also his policy toward China. This chapter thus explores what made it possible for the Abe administration to conduct a reconciliatory policy to China on the one hand, and to take an utterly unyielding

stance against North Korea on the other hand. This question will be discussed by examining how national identity was reconstructed and what sort of logic was manipulated in order to legitimate Abe's policy. Furthermore, it will explore how Abe and his supporters tried to manipulate China policy and the North Korea issue in order to strengthen their political capital.

My argument is as follows: the Abe administration avoided diplomatic embarrassment with China, unlike the Koizumi administration, by shelving the Yasukuni Shrine issue, which would mean that his cabinet did not treat China as an 'identity threat' to Japan at least on the surface. Due to a diplomatic stagnation in the relationship with China, the improved relationship became a source of political capital for Japan's political leaders. Abe wanted to prevent his opponents from exploiting the deadlock with Beijing against him. In addition, the fact that China demonstrated understanding and appreciation of Japan's postwar development as a peaceful nation might contribute to the tentative settlement of the 'identity-crisis', which had been highlighted in the Yasukuni issue during the previous administration. The efforts of both governments did not produce social antagonism, so that Abe's soft-line policy toward China was legitimized. Instead, the Abe administration explicitly and implicitly constructed China as only a 'potential threat' or an 'inassimilable other' in foreign policy discourse.

On the other hand, there seemed to be no room for concessions to North Korea, because the abduction issue was treated as a question related to fundamental character of Japan as a 'state'. That is, it was considered to be an identity issue and was made a part of his political agenda of 'the departure from the postwar regime'. It seemed that Abe tried to reconstruct Japan's identity by using North Korea to restore a bond between nation and state, reconsidering postwar security policy, and reviewing the postwar low-profile foreign policy in East Asia. Furthermore, a hard-line approach against North Korea served as political

capital to appease the frustrations among Abe's anti-China supporters. In this way, Abe's foreign policy toward China and North Korea might be 'nationalistic' in the sense that it was closely linked with his desire to reconstruct Japan's national identity.

6.1 China Policy

6.1.1 Chronology

8 October 2006 marked the remarkable moment in which Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe visited Beijing and realized a bilateral summit with Chinese President Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao. This was described as an ice-breaking visit because China had refused the bilateral summit for nearly 18 months due to the visit to Yasukuni Shrine by the previous Prime Minister Koizumi. Now Abe and Hu agreed to establish a 'strategic mutually beneficial relationship' aimed at 'strengthening mutual trust' to contribute to peace and stability in the region and the world', 'advancing the bilateral relations for further cooperation to tackle regional and global challenges together' and 'enlarging strategic common interests (Abe: 2006-f)'. Shelving the Yasukuni Shrine issue, both leaders also agreed to facilitate cooperation in a wide variety of areas such as energy, environmental protection, and the East China Sea¹. Above all, they acknowledged common interest in addressing the North Korean nuclear problem, emphasizing 'denuclearization and peaceful settlement of concerns in the Korean Peninsula through dialogue'. From then on, the high-level meetings continued, including reciprocal visits of leaders, foreign ministers, and high-level officials, such as the Japan-China High-Level Economic Dialogue. These

¹ Other areas for cooperation were finance, information and communication technology, cultural exchanges, protection of intellectual property, the reform of the United Nations and so on.

meetings were intended to create a ‘mutually beneficial relationship based on common strategic interests’, which would be expected to expand those common interests thereby ‘the two countries take their solemn responsibility and contribute jointly to Asia and the world (Ministry of Foreign Affairs: 2008)’². In addition to various high-level meetings including the 6 foreign minister’s meetings, Wen Jiabao made an ‘ice-melting’ trip to Japan in April 2007 to consolidate and give a more concrete meaning to their ‘strategic reciprocal relationship’. After the summit between Abe and Wen, both countries released the Japan-China Joint Statement, in which they confirmed and advanced contents of the ‘mutually beneficial relationship based on common strategic interests’ (Abe: 2007-c). Wen also addressed the Japanese Diet for the first time in history. On the whole, the Japan-China relationship during the Abe administration marked an improvement and comparatively stabilized phase even though the East China Sea issue made little progress.

6.1.2 Background of Abe’s rapprochement with China

It can be thought that a growing domestic pressure to call for the new Prime Minister to mend the soured Japan-China relationship was so strong that Abe did not have a choice but to do so. Since the Koizumi period, it was regarded as an urgent diplomatic task and the opposition parties strongly criticized the government in the Diet session. They asserted that Koizumi’s visits to the Yasukuni Shrine caused the diplomatic isolation of Japan in Asia, which severely damaged national interest. In other words, the reality of ‘diplomatic crisis’ was constructed in foreign policy discourse and dominated in the Diet. The business community also came to make a request to improve the Japan-China relationship more

² For instance, Foreign Ministers of both countries, Taro Aso and Li Zhaoxing, and Abe and Hu had a meeting at the APEC in Hanoi in November. They agreed to set up a joint study group of Japan-China history, discussed on the joint development of the East China Sea, and called for North Korea to return to the Six-Party Talks.

loudly.

The Keizai Doyukai (Japan Association of Corporate Executives) called for self-restraint in terms of the visit to Yasukuni Shrine of Koizumi and published a document titled a '*Proposal to the Japanese and Chinese Government*' in 2006³. This Association, the second largest business community in Japan, articulated the prime ministerial visit to the Shrine as a 'principal impediment to immediate resumption of the top-level meeting and warned that further visits 'would not benefit Japan's national interest but also could damage what postwar Japan has achieved' (The Keizai Doyukai 2006: 3-4).

Although Prime Minister Koizumi dismissed this proposal and express his unpleasant feeling that 'business and politics are different' (Asahi Shimbun: 2006-c), it can be thought that strong demand from the business communities could not be ignored with regard to domestic politics and close economic ties with China. In addition, there was an idea that the improvement of the Japan-China relationship might be necessary to strengthen international pressure against North Korea. Thus, the Abe government recognized the necessity of rapprochement with China. The Chief Cabinet Secretary Yasuhisa Shiozaki remarked that it should be a top priority to hold summit talks with Chinese leaders as soon as possible and to improve the bilateral relationship the day Abe takes office.

6.1.3 The Rapprochement with China as Political Capital

Due to the deterioration of the relationship between Japan and China under the Koizumi administration, the rapprochement with China became an urgent task and also political capital for Japanese political leaders. Actually, in the last days of the Koizumi

³ It might be notable that this proposal suggested to upgrade a phase of the Japan-China relationship from friendship to a 'comprehensive strategic partnership' based on mutual interests, which seems to be incorporated into the 'Strategic reciprocal relationship based on common interest' in the Abe administration.

administration, a number of politicians visited Beijing and had meetings with Chinese top-level officials to break diplomatic deadlock. For instance, the Minister of Economy, Trade and Industry Toshihiro Nikai, who was a potent pro-Chinese lawmaker of the LDP, had a meeting with Premier Wen to find a breakthrough in the deadlocked relationships (Asahi Shimbun: 2006-a). Ichiro Ozawa, who is also well known as a pro-Chinese politician, visited Beijing and met with President Hu. It was reported that his intention of visiting China this time was to put forward his diplomatic position of stressing relationship with China (Asahi Shimbun: 2006-e). In addition, Ichiro Aisawa of the LDP launched 'The Study Group on Strategy toward China' aiming at the improvement of the Japan-China relationship, and more than forty lawmakers across factions in the LDP joined this group (Asahi Shimbun: 2006-b). Those activities of pro-Chinese politicians would demonstrate that the rapprochement with China was not only important diplomatic task but also regarded as an opportunity to expand their influences and power resources in political situation.

In particular, the debate among the contenders for the LDP presidency revolved around the Yasukuni Shrine issue and the improvement of the Japan-China relationship. All the candidate were requested to clarify their view on these issues; Finance Minister Sadakazu Tanigaki clearly criticized Koizumi's visit to the Shrine and insisted on the rapprochement with China; former Chief Cabinet Secretary Yasuo Fukuda called for the establishment of a separate national war memorial to honor the war dead to resolve the Yasukuni issue; and Foreign Minister Taro Aso took a cautious stance on the Yasukuni issue stating that he would prioritize 'national interest over personal feeling' (Aso 2006-d). Given these, it can be argued that the cancelation of the prime ministerial visit to the Yasukuni Shrine and the rapprochement with China rather than the frustration among anti-Chinese groups would be an important source of political capital in the successor race of Koizumi. Among them, Fukuda was considered to be the most prominent rival candidate for Abe and political

opponents of Abe started to gather together under him.

Abe seemed to be in a disadvantaged position because he supported Koizumi's worship at the shrine and took a more conservative view of history and a hard-line stance toward China, compared with other candidates. It might count against Abe if he kept his original stance on the Yasukuni Shrine and China issue. Even worse, there was a high possibility that his rivals could exploit the rapprochement with China to beat him. In order to avoid this, Abe insisted that the Yasukuni Shrine problem should not be a major issue in the presidential election and refused to say whether he would visit the shrine as Prime Minister. In this sense, foreign policy toward China seemed to be closely related to power struggle in Japanese domestic politics.

Looking back the history of the LDP, there was similar story to this case. In the successor race of Prime Minister Eisaku Sato in 1972, Kakuei Tanaka utilized the issue of normalization of the Japan-China relationship, defeated his greatest competitor Takeo Fukuda and became a Prime Minister (Ogata 1992: 81-83). Although it was not certain that Abe took account for the case of Fukuda, who was former leader of his faction and the father of his rival, at least, Abe had to avoid the Yasukuni Shrine issue and the improvement of the Japan-China relationship being utilized by opponents in the presidential election, especially Fukuda. Even after Fukuda revealed he would not run the presidential election and Abe was practically assured of victory in the presidential election, his opponents such as Koichi Kato and Taku Yamasaki established 'The Study Group on the Vision to Asian Diplomacy'. Yamasaki (2006) explained that this group promoted the improvement of the relationship between Japan, China and North Korea as a matter of the highest priority of Japan's diplomacy and aimed to break diplomatic stagnation with those neighboring countries 'across the borders of factions' (Yamasaki: 2006). It would mean that Abe's opponents might be gathered together in the name of correcting his diplomatic stance toward East Asia

across the borders of factions within the LDP. Therefore, Abe needed to prevent the improvement of the Japan-China relationship from being manipulated by his opponents after he took office to take a firm grip on power.

In addition to power struggle within the LDP, the improvement of the bilateral relations with China was also utilized as political capital to counter against criticism from the DPJ, the biggest opposition party. The leaders of the DPJ such as Katsuya Okada or Naoto Kan repeatedly criticized Koizumi's visit to the Yasukuni Shrine because it caused diplomatic deadlock. Although Abe's hard stance to China and his revisionist view of history had been an easy target for criticism, however, the DPJ lost a great opportunity to criticize the Abe administration because of Abe's shift to the rapprochement with China. One of the DPJ executives expressed a sense of frustration saying that 'if Prime Minister Abe would not go "rightward", the DPJ could not acquire support from conservative-centrist voters' (Asahi Shimbun: 2006-h). This means that the improvement of the Japan-China relationship was regarded as a source of political capital to attract right of center constituencies, who conventionally supported the DPJ.

6.1.4 Obstacles to the rapprochement

Despite the necessity to break diplomatic stagnation, there were some obstacles for Abe to tackle and overcome the 'reality' of diplomatic crisis: the integrity of his words and deeds, expected opposition from the anti-China politicians, and especially the Yasukuni Shrine issue. Abe was one of the leaders of anti-Chinese politicians who claimed that China should not intervene Japan's domestic issues related to its identity. It was unthinkable for such anti-Chinese groups to make a compromise to China on the Yasukuni Shrine issue. It was expected that those anti-Chinese politicians among the LDP might strongly oppose the

rapprochement with China. What was more, it was obvious that the issue of the prime ministerial visit of the Yasukuni Shrine should be critical point. Abe, however, had strongly supported Koizumi's visit of the Yasukuni Shrine and had insisted that the next Prime Minister should continue the visit. Furthermore, Abe himself had made no disguise of his anti-Chinese stance at least until when he had entered into the Koizumi cabinet. He had reiterated the radical 'otherness' of China with regard to the wide difference between the two countries, representing China as an 'authoritarian', 'militarist' and 'untrustworthy' enemy which sought to intervene Japan's sovereignty with manipulating the history issue. Given these, it seemed to be very difficult for Abe to undertake the rapprochement with China.

6.1.5 Identity Construction and policy legitimization

6.1.5.1 Abe's shift from a past anti-Chinese stance to a more moderate stance

Despite those hurdles, however, Abe undertook and succeeded in the improvement of Japan-China relations and legitimize his policy. It appeared that Abe had prepared to deal with the first obstacle, his personal staunch anti-Chinese reputation. Since when he had entered into the Koizumi cabinet, Abe came to refrain from radical remarks on China and the history issue. In particular, he refrained from emphasizing binary oppositions, which highlighted difference between Japan and China so as to illuminate China's radical otherness. Abe's remark on perception of history also changed; while his view had been based on the revisionist view, which challenges the legitimacy of the Tokyo War Tribunal, and rejects the successive governmental view such as the 'Kono Statement' and the 'Murayama Statement', but he still came to declare that he would follow the conventional governmental view since he entered into Koizumi's cabinet.

In particular, Abe's tough stance against China seemed to gradually tone-down since he became a potent candidate of the next LDP president, thus the next Prime Minister. With regard to the linkage between economic ties and political relationship with China, for example, Abe concluded that economic ties and political relations with China should be considered separately to stabilize the entire relationship. In his book, Abe naturalized a 'hot economics and cool politics' relationship due to the difference of political regime and criticized China's using economic ties as leverage to intervene in the Yasukuni issue. Behind this, he implied that Japan did not have to resume the top-level summit if it hinged on Japan's compromise on the Yasukuni Shrine issue. That is, 'hot economics and cool politics' might be bound to happen because China was a radical 'other' and the naturalization of a political clash might be reflected in his insistence on the principle of the separation between politics and economy.

However, when he attended the second 'Beijing-Tokyo Forum' on 3 August 2006 as a Chief Cabinet Secretary, his explanation on a desirable relationship between Japan and China changed. While his argument was not changed in terms of arguing that politics should not damage economic ties, on this occasion, he argued that 'Japan and China should create a relationship in which two wheels of 'politics' and 'economy' boldly work together, so that it would promote the advancement of the bilateral relationship.' In order to achieve that, both countries should appropriately recognize the other via *direct dialogues*' and take the ties one step further from mere friendship to partnership (Genron NPO 2006: 8). This would make contrast with his past uncompromising and confrontational wording and attitude. It seems that Abe came to demonstrate more a conciliatory attitude by referring to the importance of direct talks and the necessity to alleviate a 'hot economics and cool politics' relationship by using the metaphor 'two wheels'. Furthermore, in the Japan-China Joint Press Statement issued when Abe visited Beijing, the metaphor 'two wheels' was used here again by denying

the principle of separation between politics and economy (Abe: 2006-g). In this way, Abe gradually moderated his confrontational wording and avoided demonstrating obvious anti-Chinese attitude.

6.1.5.2 Easing the frustration among Abe's anti-Chinese supporters

In order to improve and stabilize the relationship between Japan and China, Abe had to deal with the frustrations among his anti-China supporters because a tough stance on China had been important political capital for him. Otherwise, there was a risk of losing the support of anti-China supporters and having his China policy disturbed by them. Yet, Prime Minister Abe carried out the rapprochement with China and stabilized the bilateral relations without losing supports from anti-Chinese group. There can be seen some factors which enabled Abe to do so.

In terms of opposition from anti-Chinese and revisionist groups, the fact that he was a hawkish and anti-Chinese politician might work to Abe's advantage for the rapprochement with China. Interestingly, there could be seen little criticism against Abe's rapprochement with China from anti-Chinese camps in the Diet debate. It can be said that since Abe was one of their leaders, anti-Chinese politicians in the LDP did not criticize Abe's rapprochement with China in order to stabilize and consolidate his administration. Berger (2007: 202) noted that 'it is possible that Abe's conservative credentials will provide him with political cover on the Right that he needs to pull off a sustained change in Japanese policy on the history issue, much as President Nixon's reputation as a "cold Warrior" enabled him to change the US policy on China in the 1970s'. Furthermore, Wakamiya (2006: 148-9) pointed out that this was a 'logic of the right wing', which could be observed when former Prime Minister Takeo Fukuda, who was also known as a hawkish and anti-Chinese, had agreed to reach the

Treaty of Peace and Friendship between Japan and China. In other words, if other pro-Chinese and dovish politicians such as Fukuda or Tanigaki did the same thing, it might be harshly criticized as ‘servile tribute diplomacy’ from the anti-Chinese school (Wakamiya 2006: 10). Because Abe was a leader of anti-Chinese group, he could avoid a backlash from critics at home and abroad. A research of Kenneth A. Shultz (2005) on the US foreign policy made similar point with a ‘logic of the right wing.’ His model suggested that ‘hawks enjoy a number of political and strategic advantages in trying to make peace (2005: 4)’. Taking an example of Nixon’s approach to China, Shultz (2005:5) argues that as a ‘dovish government that cooperates is considered to be extreme, while a hawkish government that cooperates is believed to be moderate, ‘initiating cooperation can be an electoral boon for a hawk but electoral suicide for a dove’. Therefore, ‘a moderate hawk is the most likely type to initiate cooperation’, because hawks need to use cooperation to guard against being seen as hard-liners.

Furthermore, Abe’s supporters attempted to consolidate the power base of the administration in order to achieve their primary goal: the revision of the Constitution. As Abe stated several times, his primary agenda was to revise the current Constitution, on which the ‘postwar regime’ has been based. To accomplish this, he had to win the coming Upper House election and to consolidate his power base for long period in office. Therefore, he tried not to lose the point by prolonging diplomatic deadlock but pull off a credible diplomatic achievement before the election. Since Abe’s ambition to revise and recreate the Constitution based on more conservative values was shared by his anti-Chinese supporters, they might refrain from working against their leader’s effort to improve the Japan-China relationship. From this point of view, Abe’s hawkish position might work in his favor to suppress intra-group criticism against the rapprochement with China and his policy was enabled through a power relationship in domestic politics.

Although the ‘right-wing power dynamics’ might serve to contain the frustrations among the anti-Chinese group in the LDP to some extent, Abe had to take other measure to divert them from their discontents on China policy. Put simply, Abe’s conciliatory approach toward China had to be offset by other foreign policy choice to appease the frustrations among his anti-Chinese colleagues in order to retain their support. In this circumstance, North Korea seemed to be a perfect target. As Abe’s anti-Chinese colleagues demonstrate a pronounced propensity to take a tough stance against North Korea, they strongly supported Abe’s hard-line approach to Pyongyang. In fact, harsh criticism against North Korea by emphasizing its radical ‘otherness’ and differences between the two countries seemed not to be contained in the Parliamentary debate in contrast with comparatively moderate wording to China. Furthermore, the nuclear test by North Korea provided excellent excuse to accelerate a hard-line stance such as imposing unilateral sanctions to the country, which was not promoted under the previous administration. In this way, it can be thought that the frustration among Abe’s right-wing supporters against his rapprochement with China could be offset to some extent by conducting a hard-line policy toward North Korea.

In addition to the ‘right-wing power dynamics’ and trade-off by a hard-line policy toward North Korea, there seemed to be another way to appease frustrations among anti-Chinese supporters through the representation of China in foreign policy discourse. While the Abe administration pursued a foreign policy to improve and stabilize relationships with China on the whole, it might not mean that Abe and other anti-Chinese policymakers changed their mind-set on China. It was true that Abe and his colleagues, who had loudly represented China as a radical ‘other’ or ‘identity threat’, tended to publicly refrain from emphasizing differences between Japan and China such as in terms of political regime. Although China was rarely depicted as ‘authoritarian’ country by using direct expressions, differences between the two countries were implicitly constructed to highlight China’s

‘otherness’ in political discourses.

First, the negative representation of China was converged on its rapid military buildup and the lack of transparency of defense budget. A lawmaker of the LDP Naoki Okada argued that a fracture experiment of space satellites by China was puzzling and violent practice and that it should clarify its enormous military capabilities in the Diet session (NDRP: 2007-h). In response, the Deputy Foreign Minister Katsuto Asano made contrast between Japan and China in terms of transparency of defense budget and argued that:

Although the National People’s Congress announced that the Chinese defense budget has caught up with Japan, but China should make an effort to be open on its transparency of military defense in order to dispel the concerns of neighborhood because it is clearly different from Japan in that while Japan’s defense budget was 100% transparent through a series of parliamentary debates the transparency of the Chinese military budget was almost 0%.

Prime Minister Abe also pointed China continued double-digit growth of its military budget for the 18th consecutive year and the lacked transparency about its contents (NDRP: 2006-m). In addition, Abe expressed opposition to deregulation of arms import from the EU to China at a summit with Prime Ministers of Denmark and France, pointing out China’s lack of transparency. Given these, policymakers implicitly constructed China as a ‘militarist’ without transparency, which might indicate that it was ‘dangerous’ and ‘untrustworthy’ coupled with the difference in political regime.

On the other hand, China was implicitly constructed an ‘other’, who can not share fundamental values with Japan by emphasizing other countries with common values. The endorsement of universal values seemed to play a major role to distinguish ‘inassimilable

others', even though who might not directly constituted as an enemy, from 'assimilable others', who could be depicted as friends or partners with common values. For instance, as discussed in a later chapter, India was highlighted as a country with increasing importance for Japan in foreign policy discourse during the Abe period. The Abe administration assiduously promoted closer ties with India, illuminating India as a 'pro-Japanese' country who could share universal values with Japan. In addition, Abe sought to strengthen cooperation with the US, Australia, New Zealand, and India, emphasizing that they are all, including Japan, democratic countries. It can be thought that these foreign policies which emphasizing universal values implicitly highlight a representation that China does not share universal values with Japan, therefore, it could not become a genuine ally or friend.

6.1.5.3 The Yasukuni Shrine issue and social antagonism

As for the Yasukuni Shrine issue, Abe used so-called the 'strategic ambiguity'. Although he thought that the intention to visit the Shrine was not to 'glorify militarism' but to pray for 'lasting peace', it was not desirable that the Yasukuni Shrine would become a 'political and diplomatic problem' and utilized as political capital of his opponents. Therefore, Abe determined that he would not comment on whether he visited it or not, or whether he will or not (NDRP: 2006-m). This ambiguity was supposed to intend mainly to downplay the Yasukuni Shrine issue, which would indicate that the Abe administration would not treat it as an identity issue unlike the previous administration.

It is true that this 'ambiguity' could also be regarded as effort to make consistency between what Abe had remarked previously and his current position, that is, Abe's attempt to save his neck. However, it can also be considered to be more than mere self-protection; it was regarded and legitimized as an important diplomatic measure for Japan to take an

initiative. Then Vice Foreign Minister Shotaro Yachi referred to change of Abe's wording in his book and made clear how he utilized Abe's 'strategic ambiguity' during the Japan-China Comprehensive Dialogues to persuade Chinese counterpart Dai Bingguo to resume the bilateral summit (2009: 40-41). Yachi explained that whereas the Yasukuni Shrine issue had played an over-proportionate role during the Koizumi administration and had made the Japan-China relationship abnormal, Abe tried to normalize and establish a strategic reciprocal relationship by downplaying the issue. He argued to Dai that Abe's ambiguity would mean the same thing as him not visiting the Yasukuni Shrine. Yachi described the 'strategic ambiguity' as kind of a tightrope act for Abe because he might be criticized from both the right-wing and the left-wing. At the same time, however, he also explained that it would mean that Abe obtained a major diplomatic card by this 'ambiguity', which was that 'if China still rejects Abe's visit to China, he would make a visit to the Yasukuni Shrine'. In addition, one of Abe's supporters, a lawmaker, mentioned that it would be a strong bargain chip to improve the relationship with China for Abe to maintain the right to visit the Yasukuni Shrine but refrain voluntarily from worship for the time being (Asahi Shimbun: 2006-d). Furthermore, Seiji Maehara, who tends to take a hard-line stance to China, also appreciated that Abe's ambiguity on the Yasukuni issue, could be a major diplomatic card in view of the international setting in which international society should be united against the nuclear test by the DPRK and deal with North Korea problem (NDRP: 2006-m). Given these, Abe's 'strategic ambiguity' on the Yasukuni Shrine issue seemed to gain tacit approval from his colleagues and was not criticized as too-large a concession to China but legitimized as a major bargaining chip.

What should be notable here in relation to the Yasukuni Shrine issue in the Japan-China relationship during the Abe administration was that there seemed not to be visible 'social antagonism' in foreign policy discourse. As discussed previous chapter, China

had been criticized because it did not acknowledge Japan's peaceful development in postwar era, demonstrated little appreciation toward Japan's contribution like enormous amount of ODA to China, and carried out anti-Japanese education. As a result, 'social antagonism' came to the forefront due to China's negation of Japan's 'peaceful nation' identity. This antagonism worked to legitimize Koizumi's unyielding stance against China. It might be interesting to note that 'social antagonism' did not come to the forefront at the time when the well-known anti-Chinese Abe became a Prime Minister and sought a way to resume the top-level summit. On the one hand, Abe's 'strategic ambiguity' might contribute to avoid the stimulation of anti-Chinese policy discourse. On the other hand, it would be of great importance that China demonstrated its understanding and appreciation towards Japan's national identity as a 'peaceful nation'. For instance, 'Japan-China Joint Press Statement' released in April 2007 articulated this point.

(2) The Chinese side expressed its positive evaluation of Japan's consistent pursuit of the path of a peaceful country and Japan's contribution to the peace and stability of the world through peaceful means over more than sixty years since World War. The two sides agreed to strengthen dialogue and communication on the issue of United Nations reform and to work toward enhancing common understanding with each other on this matter. The Chinese side attaches importance to Japan's position and role in the United Nations and desires Japan to play an even greater constructive role in the international community (Abe: 2007-c).

This passage would have significant impact on the subsequent foreign policy making discourse. Yuji Miyamoto (2007), then Japanese Ambassador to China, also made clear about this point. One of the most notable points in the Joint Press between Japan and China

launched in October 2006 and April 2007 would be the fact that the Chinese government officially acknowledged a peaceful development of postwar Japan for the first time in return for Japan's recognition of China's 'peaceful rise'. Miyamoto explained that China's historical view on Japan had made little improvement after normalization in 1972. Even at the Joint Declaration on Building a Partnership of Friendship and Cooperation for Peace and Development in 1998 indirectly referred to postwar Japan's 'peaceful nation' identity', only mentioning that 'The Chinese side hopes that the Japanese side will learn lessons from history and adhere to the path of peace and development (Obuchi: 1998-b)'.

This time, however, the difference was clear and evident; the Chinese government expressed 'its positive evaluation of Japan's consistent pursuit of the path of a peaceful country' and 'Japan's contribution to the peace and stability of the world through peaceful means over more than sixty years since World War II'. According to Miyamoto, although China's past view on Japan as a 'resurgent militarist' might only impede a true bond of friendship, but a positive evaluation of this new recognition could shape foundation of the development of Japan-China cooperative relationship. China showing appreciation of Japan's 'peaceful nation' identity had great importance in foreign policy debate in the Diet. Jyunji Higashi, a Lower House member, argued that it was the first time for China to give positive evaluation to Japan's postwar peaceful development, and its importance should be emphasized because 'Chinese side finally received Japan's message that Japan has long hoped that China would acknowledge her postwar peaceful development, that is, Japan as a 'peaceful country', and quit carrying out anti-Japanese education from the Jiang Zemin period (NDRP: 2006-m).' In response, Prime Minister Abe agreed Higashi's point saying that 'Japanese people have had some ill feeling so far against China's negation toward our postwar development' and argued that the Joint Statement was meaningful in a sense that China positively evaluated Japan as a 'peaceful and democratic' country. In other words,

Japanese policy-makers positively evaluate China's attitude that demonstrated its understanding and appreciation to Japan's postwar 'peaceful nation' identity, which serve not to produce social antagonism.

In addition to the Joint Statement, China went a step further when Premier Wen Jiabao visited Japan in April 2007 and delivered a speech in the Japanese Diet, where he was supposed to mention China's appreciation to Japan's postwar peaceful development. Although Premier Wen omitted this part for a 'technical' reason⁴, it might be clear that China would demonstrate its understanding and positive recognition toward Japan's postwar peaceful identity in order to improve the bilateral relationship. Given these, along with Abe's 'strategic ambiguity' which aimed to downplay the Yasukuni Shrine issue, changes in the Chinese stance on evaluation of postwar Japan led to positive responses among Japanese policy-makers. As a result, it can be argued that 'social antagonism', which resulted from China's negation of Japan's 'peaceful' identity, did not come to the forefront in the Abe administration, which in turn might justify a more conciliatory policy toward China. In other words, the Abe administration did not treat the Yasukuni Shrine issue as an identity issue; it did not construct China as an 'other' who threatened and negated Japan's 'peaceful' identity because of changes in China's attitude. This might not produce 'social antagonism' and might make it possible for Abe to improve the bilateral relationship with China.

6.1.6 Conclusion

⁴ The omitted passage was as follows: 'After the war, Japan embarked on the path of peaceful development, and became a leading economic power and influential member in the international community. As a friendly neighbor of Japan, the Chinese people support the Japanese people in their continued pursuit of peaceful development.' 'Speech by Premier Wen Jiabao of the State Council of the People's Republic of China at the Japanese Diet' on 13 April. Available at Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's republic of China <http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/zxxx/t311544.htm>

In this way, the Abe administration implemented rapprochement with China by downplaying the Yasukuni Shrine issue and built a 'strategic reciprocal relationship'. This was made possible by Abe's 'strategic ambiguity' on the Yasukuni Shrine issue, because it would indicate that the administration might not treat the issue as an 'identity crisis' and China as an 'identity threat'. In addition, the fact that China demonstrated understanding and appreciation to postwar Japan's peaceful development, that is Japan's 'peaceful national identity', also contributed to remove social antagonism, which was emphasized in the Koizumi administration to legitimize uncompromising policy. As a result, Abe's foreign policy to improve and stabilize the bilateral relationship with China was legitimized. Furthermore, Abe's policy shift was discussed from the viewpoint of a domestic power relationship. In addition to the right-wing power dynamics, as the improvement of the bilateral relations with China was regarded as an important source of political capital in power struggle in domestic politics, Abe had to prevent the issue from being utilized by his opponents to defeat him. This political intention also contributed to the realization of Abe's China policy. At the same time, however, Abe had to ease the frustration of his anti-Chinese supporters. Abe pursued a policy to enhance cooperation with countries with 'common values', excluding China and repeatedly pointed out China's lack of transparency on defense budget. This policy implicitly constructed China as a 'non-democratic', 'militaristic' and 'dangerous' other, which was 'inassimilable', and indicated that rivalry between Japan and China was not over. In addition, a hard-line approach to North Korea served to offset discontents among his anti-Chinese supporters against Abe's non-confrontational stance to China.

6.2. Policy toward North Korea

As a whole, the period of Abe's prime ministership saw little developments for normalization and, rather, Abe moved in a new direction; a hard-line policy against North Korea, with its almost exclusive focus on the abduction issue unlike the previous Koizumi administration. Foreign policy toward North Korea during the Abe administration could generally be depicted as 'diplomacy for pressure', which was generally characterized as being close to the pressure school, by its focus on imposing sanctions on and an uncompromising stance against the DPRK. Despite its placing high priority on the abduction issue in the bilateral relations, there was little progress concerning this problem during Abe's tenure. Rather, Japan seemed to be isolated in the Six Party Talk because of its 'obsession' with the abduction issue. In addition, even when the US came to shift toward a more 'flexible' approach to Pyongyang in the process of the Six Party Talk, for instance, over North Korea's frozen funds at a Macao bank, Abe would not change his hard-line stance unlike his China policy. This section attempts to examine how it was made possible for Abe to take an unyielding stance against North Korea, especially on the abduction issue, when the situation was fallen into the deadlock and how this issue was manipulated as political capital. It starts from outlining the bilateral relationship between Japan and North Korea during the Abe administration. After explaining background of his hard-line stance to North Korea, it will argue on the discourse of the pressure school including the Abe administration, illuminating its narrow focus on the abduction issue. In this section, discourse to be examined would include those which had been made during the Koizumi administration, because there can be seen little changes in the narratives of the pressure school and Abe.

My argument can be summarized as follows: Abe's narrow focus on the abduction issue can be explained not only by the simple fact that he gained national popularity for his

hard-line approach to Pyongyang, but also by more complicated domestic power balance. His tough stance to North Korea was utilized as political capital in domestic politics to ease the frustrations among anti-Chinese revisionists and to criticize political opponents. Furthermore, discourse among the pressure school policymakers demonstrated that Japan's response to the abduction issue would be politics of 'restoring Japan'. According to the pressure school, the issue was considered to be a good opportunity to regain a strong bond between a state and its nationals. In that discourse, not only North Korea was articulated as 'authoritarian', 'militarist' and 'isolated wrong-doer' but also the domestic opposite groups were constructed as the 'enemy within'. In addition, the North Korea problem was regarded as a part of the 'settlement of Japan's postwar', in a different way from what the dialogues school used, by restoring the bond between the state and its people, reconsidering security policy, and reviewing conventional low-profile diplomacy in Asia. In this sense, as the abduction issue was treated as an 'identity issue' which might question Japan's foundations as a state, Abe's uncompromising stance was legitimized and other policy choices like the appeasement policy was marginalized.

6.2.1 Chronology

A policy shift in direction, from conciliatory approach with its emphasis on dialogues to a hard-line stance with its focus on pressures and sanctions, actually started in the last days of Koizumi's premiership. There can be seen recurrent pattern in which the Japanese government retaliated with sanctions for North Korea's provocations. When North Korea launched missiles into the Sea of Japan in July 2006, the Japanese government immediately asked the UNSC to convene an urgent conference and proposed a draft of the Security

Council Resolution calling for sanctions against North Korea⁵. It is said that Abe and his political ally Aso, then Foreign Minister, who had strong influence in the Koizumi administration in terms of foreign policy making, played a leading role in promoting this proposal. The UNSC Resolution 1695 was adopted and the Japanese government put a series of unilateral sanctions on North Korea in line with the Resolution such as a six-month ban on port against the North Korean ship Mangyongbong-92 and strengthened screening of entry requests to impede North Korean officials from entering into Japan. Immediately after North Korea conducted an underground nuclear test on 9 October 2006, Japan imposed unilateral sanctions on the DPRK; totally banned North Korean ships from coming into Japanese ports, all imports from the country, and entrance of its people. The Japanese government once again pushed hard for a tough UNSC Resolution 1718 coordinating closely with the US. As a result, Japan-North Korea relations continued to be stalemated while there could be seen some progress in the Six Party Talks. Although there was a certain degree of progress in the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, such as the implementation of the “Initial Actions for the Implementation of the Joint Statement”, Abe would not change his unyielding insistence on making the resolution of the abduction issue a top priority for the agenda in the bilateral relations.

In February 2007 at the Six Party Talks, the “Initial Actions for the Implementation of the Joint Statement” was agreed in which North Korea will be provided limited energy aid in return for disabling its nuclear development program. Although the Japanese government welcomed the deal with the DPRK, however, it refused to give any energy assistance to North Korea because the abduction issue was not resolved. In early March, the two countries resumed normalization dialogues after a 13-month hiatus, but failed to make substantial

⁵ This proposal aimed at preventing North Korea from acquiring funds, materials or technology for the development of weapons of mass destructions.

progress leading to an additional 6-month hiatus without political initiatives to improve bilateral relationships by both countries. The Japanese government continued unilateral sanctions against North Korea and the Diet approved a so-called ‘North Korea Human Rights Law’, which stipulates responsibility of the government to make effort for the resolution of the abduction issue. Afterwards, there seemed to be little visible improvement on the Japan-North Korean relationships until when Abe stepped down September 2007.

6.2.2 Background of Abe’s hard-line policy

6.2.2.1 North Korea’s provocation

It is supposed that there were some factors, which would make it possible for Abe to take a hard-line stance against North Korea such as international environment, personnel affairs, and considerations concerning domestic politics. Firstly, North Korea’s provocative actions in this period, missile launch and nuclear test, would give credentials to hard-line policymakers like Abe. Some internal and external observers argued that missile tests by the DPRK ‘worked favorably for Japanese hard-line politicians, enabling them to better appeal to both domestic and international audiences, in particular, the missile tests and a sense of crisis caused by it might be a ‘big plus for Abe’ (Kang and Lee 2006d: 1-2)’. Actually, A poll taken on 25 July showed that 77 percent of respondents felt a threat from North Korea because of the missile launch (Asahi Shimbun: 2006-g). This public sense of threat made the Japanese people to seek a hard-line policy with strong leadership. In this circumstance, as Green and Koizumi (2006c: 4) argued, North Korea’s missile launches provided Abe with ‘an optimal opportunity to demonstrate his leadership credentials’. Thus, international environment might be one of the causes to promote Abe’s hard-line policy.

6.2.2.2 Personnel Affairs

Secondly, it can be thought that the personnel affairs might have huge impact on policymaking direction. It is said that the Japanese government took a more hard-line stance against North Korea partly because Abe and Aso came to hold important position in the cabinet; Abe became a Chief Secretary of the Cabinet in the third reshuffled Koizumi cabinet and Aso also entered into it as Foreign Minister⁶. Furthermore, there were no cabinet members or senior officials in the Abe administration who were categorized in the dialogue school. In addition, the fact that Shotaro Yachi, a diplomat with close ties with both of them, was appointed a Vice Foreign Minister in the last days of the Koizumi administration also might serve to turnaround of foreign policy toward North Korea from a conciliatory stance to a hard-line. Yachi held a firm belief that as the abduction issue is the most serious humanitarian problem, the Japanese government should not make any concession on this issue. When the Koizumi cabinet divided concerning whether five abductees should be returned to North Korea, Yachi strongly insisted that the government should not return them to Pyongyang and persuaded Koizumi to do so with Abe (Yachi 2009: 186). Masayuki Takahashi (Yachi 2009: 188-9) revealed that although Koizumi intended to appoint Hitoshi Tanaka as a Vice Foreign Minister at first, Abe, Foreign Minister Machimura and Aso persuaded him to reverse his decision. It was because they were concerned that if Tanaka became the Vice Foreign Minister, North Korea could control negotiations to its satisfaction, as Tanaka seemed to be too conciliatory to Pyongyang. As a result of persuasion, Koizumi gave up his original plan and instead nominated Yachi, whom Abe, Aso and Machimura

⁶ The third reshuffled Koizumi administration (31 Oct 2005-26 Sep 2006), but Aso had been a Minister of Public Management, Home Affairs, Posts and Telecommunications Koizumi's cabinet from 22 September 2003 to 31 Oct 2005.

recommended. Takahashi concluded that as a personality of the Vice Foreign Minister can affect diplomatic orientation, it was an important decision to promote a hard-line stance to North Korea. In other words, this personnel decision might serve to enable a shift in foreign policy toward North Korea from conciliatory to uncompromising.

6.2.2.3 High Popularity and political capital

Thirdly, Abe's tough stance against Pyongyang could not be explained without referring to domestic political consideration and maneuver. Since Abe owed much of his popularity to a hard-line policy he had conducted against North Korea, it was a vital source of political capital for Abe to take a tough stance against North Korea. For one thing, it played a decisive role for his victory in the presidential election of 2006. The provocation of North Korea by missile launch in July obviously served to prompt a sense of crisis among the public and to boost Abe's credibility. In addition, it was said that it was the missile launch that made Yasuo Fukuda, the most important rival for Abe, abandon his candidacy for the party president (Asahi Shimbun: 2006-f). Although Fukuda posed a competitive threat to Abe because Fukuda's pro-Chinese stance was expected to contribute to the improvement of the Japan-China relationship, however, North Korea's provocation put Fukuda at a disadvantage because he supported a reconciliatory approach toward Pyongyang. In contrast, it served as a tail wind for Abe's victory. From this, it might be clear that a hard-line stance to North Korea could be a source of political capital for political leaders, and this capital might become increasingly important when Japan-DPRK relations deteriorate.

On the other hand, it might be fatal for the administration to make concession or take a soft stance. For instance, Abe's popularity saw a decline in early 2007⁷. While public

⁷ According to Asahi Shimbun, from 63 percent in September 2006 to 41 percent in March (Asahi

expectations were high because of his tough stance against Pyongyang, mishandling of some domestic issues⁸ and scandals of cabinet members seemed to have disappointed the public. It can be argued that this decline of popularity urged Abe to take an unyielding stance against North Korea. Even when negotiations with North Korea remained deadlock, Abe could not choose to change his unyielding stance to bring about a breakthrough. Moreover, as taking a tough stance might play a role to calm discontent with a soft-line approach to China among Abe's anti-Chinese supporters, he had no choice to maintain a hard-line approach in order to attract and retain those supporters. In this way, the issue of North Korea was an important source of political capital for Abe.

6.2.3 Identity constructions: 3 binary oppositions

In addition to these conditions, which facilitated and legitimized taking a tough stance against North Korea, I would argue that it would be the constructions of subjects and a certain 'reality' that served to the justification of Abe's uncompromising policy and marginalization of other policy choices. There seemed to be three sets of subject constructions and their corresponding 'realities' in foreign policy debate on North Korea by Abe's group. It might be evident that North Korea was articulated as a 'radical other', in contrast with the 'self' Japan. Differences between the two countries were highlighted and led to shape the 'abnormal relationship', and then used to legitimate an unyielding stance. The second self-other nexus was constructed on the differentiation between what Japan should be and what postwar Japan tended to be, focusing on the way of diplomacy, security

Shimbun: 2007-a).

⁸ In particular, his too-late decision to bring back the members who were expelled by Koizumi due to their opposition to the postal services privatization and a suicide of Toshikatsu Matsuoka, the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, followed by dubious money scandal had huge impacts on declining support ratings.

policy and the role of the state. This might be related to and was used to support Abe's political agenda, the 'settlement of the postwar' and 'a beautiful country'. Another dichotomy was constituted between domestic opponents and Abe's camp; the former was described as the 'enemy within' while the latter was implicitly constructed as 'faithful guardian of the people'. In what follows, this section explore what kind of identity construction was utilized to legitimized Abe's foreign policy.

6.2.3.1 Japan and North Korea: construction of external radical 'other'

While emphasis on 'radical otherness' of China by Abe and his colleagues of the pressure school was moderated to some extent, the representation of North Korea saw little changes, or rather, differences from Japan was much more highlighted. Although, as well as the dialogue school, they articulated the DPRK as 'authoritarian', 'militarist', and 'isolated wrongdoer', but they tended to use more radical expression. Since there were little changes in representation of North Korea, this section examines how the country was constructed in foreign policy discourse including what had been made in the Koizumi administration.

Firstly, North Korea was often articulated as an 'authoritarian' country emphasizing its 'abnormality'. A lawmaker of the LDP, Masaharu Nakagawa noted that North Korea was not a 'normal' country because it was under 'military dictatorship' (NDRP: 2002-f). The DPJ member Yoshitake Kimata also made clear on the difference in political system from Japan that it was an 'abnormal authoritarian state' (NDRP: 2002-g). Yuriko Koike, who entered into the Abe cabinet, argued that North Korea was a 'totalitarian', 'militarist' and 'authoritarian' country which 'disregarded human rights and there could not be seen any essence of democracy (NDRP: 2002-i)'. Wataru Ito of the Komei Party argued that the country was volatile and unstable because 'North Korea was a really peculiar, that is,

installed dictatorship' (NDRP: 2006-o). In this way, there were a large number of representations of North Korea as an 'authoritarian' or 'non-democratic' state. In their narratives, North Korea tended to be articulated not just 'authoritarian' but as 'inhumane' and 'tyrannical', which totally lacked respect for basic human rights or democratic values. These focuses on the political regime would illuminate the difference from Japan, and thereby reinforce its 'radical otherness'. In short, it made stark contrast between 'democratic Japan' and 'non-democratic North Korea', and would give moral superiority to the former by highlighting the latter's 'abnormality'.

In this context, Atsushi Watabe of the LDP described the negotiations with North Korea as a 'confrontation between a democratic country and a totalitarian regime' and therefore 'Japan's diplomacy is tested' (NDRP: 2006-e). These articulations would imply that negotiation was regarded as a kind of diplomatic 'battle' and 'zero-sum game' instead of seeing it as a 'dialogue' based on the mutual interest. As Japan faced 'authoritarian' North Korea on behalf of 'democracy', negotiations were actually clashes over fundamental values between the two different political regimes. In this circumstance, it was a self-evident assumption that Japan should protect 'democratic' values because it was fundamental to Japan's identity. In this circumstance, to make concessions in negotiations was viewed as being equivalent to back down on fundamental 'democratic' values. Therefore, Japan should abandon the appeasement policy to make breakthrough in the negotiations because it might be identity-threatening. In this way, a policy option of making a concession for consensus was marginalized in the Abe administration.

Depiction of North Korea as a 'militarist' country was also a typical representation. Shozo Azuma of the LDP clearly described the DPRK as a country, which had 'single-mindedly pursued military expansion at the expense of people's lives and posed a threat to other countries' (NDRP: 2002-p). Prime Minister Abe described North Korea as

‘military-first country’ and ‘being isolated from international community’ and emphasized how serious threat it would be for such a dangerous country to gain nuclear capability and to develop missile delivery means (NDRP: 2006-m). Lawmaker Shoichi Nakagawa, Abe’s sworn ally and well-known hawkish, anti-Chinese and anti-DPRK nationalist, repeatedly articulated North Korea as a ‘terrorist state’ (NDRP: 2006-k). These articulations illuminated ‘abnormality’ of North Korea and emphasized how ‘dangerous’ ‘deviant’ it was in international society. Moreover, by depicting it as a ‘terrorist state’, North Korea was articulated as ‘enemy’ of international society. Therefore, it would mean that there was no room for the appeasement or mutual understanding. In this way, the appeasement to North Korea was marginalized as a policy option under the Abe administration.

Furthermore, North Korea was represented as ‘untrustworthy’ and ‘insincere’ other, which was isolated from international society due to its ‘misdeeds’. Abe often criticized that North Korea had not responded in sincere manner on the abduction issue (NDRP: 2006-n). Therefore, it was so dishonest that Japan should not treat it as a ‘dialogue partner’ on the assumption of mutual interest. In addition, North Korea was trustless because it easily breaks agreements reached with Japan. Abe and Seiji Maehara agreed that it was the fact that North Korea reneged on the Pyongyang Declaration, which turned out to be a dead letter (NDRP: 2006-m). Put it in another way, North Korea was depicted ‘untrustworthy’ because it did not think twice about renegeing on the promise it had made. Moreover, it has been described as a ‘wrongdoer’ or ‘criminal state’, which not only broke international agreements but also committed international crime on national scale such as the smuggling of drugs into Japan. Seiji Maehara, one of the leaders of the DPJ, argued that North Korea might be the only country whose government took the initiative on cultivating, purifying and smuggling drugs to a unified standard and high-grade⁹ (NDRP: 2002-l). Abe also labeled North Korea a

⁹ Lawmaker Takeshi Hidaka also made a remark on the same point (NDRP: 2002-o).

‘criminal state’ and stated that as it sponsored the production of drugs and exported it to Japan, the Japanese government should not place trust in such a country (NDRP: 2004-y). Thus, the Abe administration minimized a policy option of ‘dialogues’ on even footings because North Korea was not worthy to trust as a dialogue partner and it took part in crimes.

These representations of North Korea as an ‘authoritarian’, ‘militarist’, ‘wrongdoer’ or ‘inhumane’, ‘immoral’ ‘deviant’ country might explicitly or implicitly construct Japan as the opposite; ‘democratic’, ‘non-militarist’, and a ‘responsible and respectable member of international community’. For instance, Shigeru Ishiba, the Director General of the Defense Agency at that time in the Koizumi cabinet, clearly highlighted differences from Japan and stated that ‘our country is not a country of autocratic despotism. As diplomacy of our country is based on the national support and understanding, normalization would be unthinkable when leaving out the abduction issue, missile and nuclear problems, and spy ship incident and ignoring public opinion’ (NDRP: 2002-l). He also made it clear that

Decision-making in that country is supposed to be really different from that of our own country. I would have no idea why this country calls itself “Democratic People’s Republic”, while there can be seen no public opinion, democratic election, a parliamentary cabinet system, which are foundation of political decision-making, and it conducts military-first policy (NDRP: 2002-o).

On the whole, the ‘abnormality’ and ‘peculiarity’ of North Korea with an ‘inhumane’ and ‘immoral’ nature was emphasized. As the identity of North Korea was so radical and ‘inassimilable’, there seemed to be no indication that identity of North Korea was transformable or that Japan should treat it as a ‘dialogue partner’ with mutual interest. The argument of Masatatoshi Wakabayashi of the LDP, a Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and

Fisheries at the Abe administration, summarized the articulation of North Korea by the pressure school:

North Korea is a military country which is ruled by dictator Kim Jong-II, enforces nuclear development despite facing economic collapse and a starvation problem, intimidates Japan by missile launches, repeats intrusion into Japan's territorial water, violates Japan's sovereignty like kidnapping our nationals, and ignores human rights. That is, it is an extremely dangerous country (NDRP: 2004-b).

In addition, the articulations of North Korea made sharp contrast with Japan so as to construct and reinforce Japan's identity as the opposite to it; 'democratic', 'non-militarist' and 'well-conducted' state. Furthermore, Abe believed that the identity of North Korea would not change without the regime change, and that only stiff sanctions could pave the way for it (Abe 2005-a: 54-55). As a result, an uncompromising policy was legitimized because to make concessions was regarded as detracting Japan's fundamental values and identities.

The pressure group tended to describe a 'reality' as 'abnormal' and 'Japan's crisis' as did the dialogue school, but its cause and prescription were totally different. Both schools of thought assumed that Japan was facing a military threat from North Korea such as missiles and nuclear weapons in addition to the abduction issue. The dialogue school attributed this 'abnormal relationship' to the lack of diplomatic ties and insisted on the necessity of the settlement of the past including compensation for the past colonial rule. On the other hand, the pressure school blamed the identity of North Korea for the current 'abnormal relationship'. Abe, then-Chief Cabinet Secretary argued that 'we would like (the North) to think about who brought about the current relationship. The abductions, the nuclear, and the

missile issues--- North Korea caused all of them (Kang and Lee 2006d: 2)'. Put simply, it was the 'abnormal' identity of North Korea itself that caused the current 'abnormal relationship', not Japan's incomplete war settlement. Therefore, according to the pressure school, it was not Japan but North Korea who should be responsible to the current 'abnormal situations'.

With respect to the situation in which Japan was exposed to a threat by North Korea, the pressure school tended to emphasize how 'dangerous' an 'enemy' it was for Japan. Shozo Azuma, a vocal member of the pressure school, described the current 'reality' in the Diet session that:

North Korea points more than one hundred Nodong missiles at Japan at this moment and many of them are said to be carrying chemical or biological weapons. There might be nothing to stop ballistic missiles once they fire. Even at this very moment, we, whether it is nuclear plants in Niigata or the Imperial Palace or the Diet building or Kasumigaseki or ten million Tokyoites, are taken hostage by Kim Jong-Il (NDRP: 2002-f).

A lawmaker Shingo Nishimura noted that it was no doubt that 'North Korea was clearly Japan's 'enemy' because 'it puts on a bluff of making Tokyo sea of fire, breaks agreement with us, deceives us to get money, and kidnapped more than two hundred Japanese nationals' (NDRP: 2003-c). Abe clearly stated that the development of missile capability and nuclear test would imply that the threats Japan was facing doubled (NDRP: 2006-n). In their narrative, North Korea tended to be depicted not just as a 'military' threat but an 'any and all threat' to Japan. Yuriko Koike, a Lower House member, condemned North Korea as a 'terrorist state', which was 'unpredictable' with a 'high risk of exploding', arguing that;

(North Korea) kidnapped a junior high school girl, sent agents, obtained components of weapons, alleged irregularities of *Chogin* Credit Unions¹⁰ and a scandal over secretive payments, steals information. That is, North Korea has seized all of things, people, materials, money, and information from our country. As that country is too dangerous a neighbor, it is normalization of North Korea itself, that is needed before negotiations for normalization even start (NDRP: 2002-i).

In other words, because of its ‘abnormal’ and ‘hostile’ identity, Japan should not normalize its relationship with North Korea without regime change. In sum, the pressure school and the Abe administration argued that Japan was exposed to a security crisis because North Korea was a ‘dangerous’ ‘terrorist’ country in essence; it would be Japan’s ‘enemy’ by its very nature and this identity is assumed not be transformable by dialogues or diplomatic normalization. North Korea was treated as an ‘enemy’ and ‘threat’ against Japan by nature, which was too different from Japan to assimilate. There was no room for the existence of concessions or mutual interest. This construction of subjects and a ‘reality’ might serve to legitimate Abe’s hard-line stance against the DPRK and marginalize alternative policy.

In order to argue the construction of subjects and a reality concerning North Korea questions, it is inescapable to examine narratives on the abduction issue. Actually, the second and the third dichotomies emerged in discourse on this issue. Although the Koizumi administration and the dialogue school also treated the problem as important and as an urgent task to be solved before normalization, the way to handle this issue by the Abe administration and the pressure school was far more uncompromising. This was related to

¹⁰ Chogin Credit Unions mainly served the large community of ethnic Koreans in Japan who are loyal to the North and alleged to transfer billions of dollars to the DPRK.

how the abduction issue was conceptualized in foreign policy discourse.

First of all, the abduction problem was often defined as a state crime by North Korea that infringes Japan's national sovereignty. It was also regarded as a violation of human rights and serious crime as lawmaker Akira Oide of the DPJ argued that the abduction issue was 'a serious crime, which threatened the peace and security of Japanese nationals and infringed national sovereignty' (NDRP: 2002-a). Ishiba, a cabinet member, declared that the abduction issue was a security issue (NDRP: 2002-e) and Togashi of the JCP condemned the abduction as 'unacceptable international criminal act, which menaced the security and human rights of Japanese nationals' (NDRP: 2004-p). Ryuji Matsumura of the LDP argued that as the root of the abduction issue was the 'infringement of sovereignty' and was the 'matter of the national prestige', 'it should be resolved at any cost and any means, even resorting to war' (NDRP: 2004-r). Since national sovereignty is a foundation of a state, the appeasement to the 'other', who infringed upon it, should definitely be unacceptable. In this context, increasing pressure for North Korea was justified. According to Jin Matsubara, the Japanese government should pose more sanctions in order to demonstrate its stance that Japan was a country, which surely fights back against the infringement of national sovereignty, even at the slightest effect (NDRP: 2004-y). Yoshitake Kimata of the DPJ also insisted on the necessity of imposition of sanctions, arguing that it was not a matter of effectiveness but a matter of national will and prestige. In sum, by articulating the abduction issue as a matter of national sovereignty related to national pride, Japan called into question one's *raison d'être* as a 'state', and thus legitimate to strengthen pressure and made it difficult to make concessions.

In addition, the abduction issue was treated as 'humanitarian concerns', which international society should work together cohesively. The Vice Foreign Minister in the Abe administration Takeshi Iwaya emphasized that one of the points in the 'Resolution on the

Human Right Situation in North Korea', which had been collaborated by Japan and the EU, was that it stipulated the abduction issue was one of the international concerns and added statement that the abduction by the DPRK would be the violation of human rights in all other sovereign states (NDRP: 2006-q). In addition, the Diet approved 'the Revised Bills on the Abduction Issue and Other Violation of Human Rights Problems by North Korean Authorities', so-called 'a North Korea Human Rights Law', which stipulates responsibility of the government to make effort for the resolution of the abduction issue. This bill declared that the abduction issue and other problems on Human rights violation by North Korean authorities were tasks that the entire international community must tackle. These efforts indicated that the Abe administration tried to treat essentially different problems in the same way; the abduction issue, which infringed Japan's sovereignty, and problems of human rights violation in North Korea such as 'defectors from North Korea' issue, which was basically a domestic issue, and formulate a policy relying on this categorization. By doing so, it enabled the Abe administration to pursue, organize, and tighten an international coalition against North Korea. At the same time, it might give Japan moral superiority by endorsing the protection of human rights and reinforce its identity as a country with universal values. In other words, making concessions to North Korea was regarded as tacit approval of the violation of human rights and might ruin Japan's identity. Therefore, concessions to North Korea were marginalized and increasing pressure was legitimized under the Abe administration.

6.2.3.2 'Postwar regime' and ideal Japan

Secondly, the pressure school tended to link the abduction issue with the negative side of the path of postwar Japan. This problem was an identity issue concerning national

sovereignty but also an identity matter over the ‘settlement of the postwar era’. This conceptualization of the issue served to construct the second dichotomy between what Japan should be and how postwar Japan tended to behave. For instance, Katsuei Hirasawa, a LDP lawmaker of the pressure school, argued that ‘what the abduction issue posed might be a series of concerns--- the problem on the Constitution, national security, and how diplomacy and politics should function’ (NDRP: 2004-y). Seiken Sugiura, the Deputy Chief Cabinet Secretary at the time, after defining the abduction issue as a ‘criminal act’ and the ‘encroachment of sovereignty’, stated that ‘there might be a number of faults in postwar Japan that it should reflect on, including a concept of “state” and political system, which allowed such problems to happen’ (NDRP: 2004-y). More clearly, Yutaka Kobayashi of the LDP pointed out that although ‘there seemed to be no strong sense of protecting people’s lives, property, and sovereignty in postwar Japan under the Japan-US security Treaty system’, however, ‘how to defend our safety by ourselves’, ‘how to conduct foreign policy’, and ‘how to review postwar democracy’ might be highly questioned through this North Korea problem and declared that the resolution of the abduction issue might lead to the ‘settlement of the postwar era’ (NDRP: 2004-q). In other words, the abduction issue was constructed as the issue caused not only by North Korea but also by inability of the successive postwar Japanese governments. Yuriko Koike of the LDP harshly criticized conventional Japanese foreign policy toward North Korea that postwar Japan’s diplomacy seemed to be too willing to obey that country (NDRP: 2002-i). Chubei Kamata of the LDP also stated that ‘postwar Japanese government have not protected the Japanese people from kidnapping and have not made this issue a matter of the highest priority’ (NDRP: 2005-s). Atsushi Kinoshita of the DPJ critically mentioned that considering conventional Japan’s diplomacy towards China, Russia, and especially North Korea, it had been ‘preoccupied with such a low-profile attitude that it had conducted a weak-kneed diplomacy so as not to offend those countries’, which

was sometimes humiliated by being labeled as ‘kowtow diplomacy’ (NDRP: 2002-f). In this way, Abe’s supporters of the pressure school constructed the postwar Japanese governments as being too ‘weak-kneed’ and ‘submissive’ to North Korea, unwilling to protect its people at any cost, and thus harm national interest, and those ‘inabilities’ of postwar governments had allowed North Korea to kidnap innocent Japanese people. Therefore, the Abe administration and the pressure school was implicitly constructed as ‘protector of Japanese people’ and thus being suitable for the administration, because they staunchly took a tough stance against North Korea.

What the pressure school criticized was not only the fact that the successive governments had not taken appropriate actions, but also, or more precisely, the ‘postwar regime’ itself. As discussed in previous chapter, Abe and his like-minded politicians harshly criticized the ‘postwar regime’, which has downplayed the role of ‘state’, a concept of national security, and a proper course of diplomacy. Their criticism was closely connected with Abe’s slogan of ‘the departure from the postwar regime’ and ‘toward a Beautiful Country’, in which he insisted on the necessity of reviewing low-profile diplomacy, reconsidering security policy, and restoring national prestige and a bond between the state and its people. In this discourse, mainstream LDP politicians were constructed as policy-makers who had not been enthusiastic about protecting Japanese people and national interests, and thus caused current ‘abnormal’ situations. Therefore, by criticizing a handling of the abduction issue by the successive governments, Abe and his colleagues sought to condemn the ‘postwar regime’ and the mainstream LDP politicians, who had supported the ‘postwar regime’ and were political rival of them. In this sense, Abe and the pressure school seemed to utilize the abduction issue to crush their political rivals.

6.2.3.3 political Rivalry in domestic politics

There can be seen the third dichotomy; it was not only mainstream LDP politicians but also other political enemies who were criticized as a ‘betrayer’ in the discourse of the pressure school on the abduction issue. Most directly, a conciliatory approach of the dialogue school was harshly condemned as damaging national interest. Tsutomu Nishioka, who was a president of the National Association for the Rescue of Japanese Kidnapped by North Korea, asserted that diplomatic strategy of Hitoshi Tanaka, which promoted negotiations based on common interests, could be regarded as a practice of collaboration with enemies (NDRP: 2005-r). This indicated that in addition to North Korea, those who assume shared interest with the ‘enemy’ could be labeled as its ‘collaborator’ or the ‘fifth column’. In addition, so-called the ‘Left-wingers’ such as the Social Democratic Party, the Japan Communist Party, and the Asahi Newspaper became a target for criticism. For instance, Akihiro Ota, a head of the Komei Party, at that time, argued that:

I would like to refer to some opposition parties, which have maintained close relationship with North Korea, so that they served to sweep the abduction issue under the carpet. The SDP has taken a stance that it denied the fact of the abduction, treated the issue as ‘invented’, and defended North Korea. The JCP, on the other hand, has lauded the DPRK as a “Paradise on Earth” and asserted that the resolution of the abduction issue should not be seen as a precondition of normalization talks because we could only speculate about the problem. Both of the parties should regret their attitudes toward the abduction issue in front of the public (NDRP: 2002-h).

This statement showed that the Komei Party, ruling coalition partner, attacked the conventional friendly-stance to North Korea of the two opposition parties, the JSP and the

JCP, arguing that it was a clear act of betrayal to the Japanese people. Yuriko Koike of the LDP also stated that ‘the SDP and the JCP, both of which currently opposed to the legislation on emergency measures, had mindlessly followed North Korea’ (NDRP: 2002-i). Shoichi Nakagawa, who was once the chairman of the Parliamentary Members Alliance for the Swift Rescue of Japanese Kidnapped by North Korea (Kitachosen ni Rachi sareta Nihonjin o Sokyū ni Kyūshutsu suru tame ni Kōdo suru Giin Renmei), criticized responses on the abduction issue of the SDP and the JCP in his speech in Sapporo city, and described the two as ‘accomplices to the kidnapping (Asahi Shimbun: 2002-c)’. Furthermore, Abe, the Deputy Chief Cabinet Secretary at that time, criticized Naoto Kan, one of the leaders of the DPJ, and Takako Doi, then leader of the SDP, as ‘idiots’ because they had joined the call for Sin Gwang-su, who was suspected of kidnapping Japanese people, to be released (Asahi Shimbun: 2002-b). These articulations of the opposition parties would allow Abe and his colleagues to represent their opponents as the ‘fifth column’ or ‘enemy within’, and therefore to delegitimize opponents’ discourses. Behind the scene, there can be seen the fact that the Komei Party and other two parties contested at the nationwide local elections and that the SDP and the JCP had opposed to the legislation on emergency measures as Yuriko Koike mentioned. In other words, the Abe administration tried to take advantage in domestic politics over the opposition parties by depicting them as ‘enemy within’. Thus, the abduction issue was utilized as a political discourse by constructing a dichotomy between Abe’s camp and the opponents, and giving the former a high evaluation.

There can be seen another point to be argued; the abduction issue was treated as a question on the bond between a state and its people. Lawmaker Takehiko Endo argued that the abduction issue would ultimately question whether ‘Japan could take action to rescue only single Japanese person’ (NDRP: 2004-m). Shu Watanabe of the DPJ mentioned that the abduction issue was not only a problem of national sovereignty but also an issue of

‘patriotism’, arguing that:

I would suppose that patriotism should not be taught as a school course but might spontaneously be felt among people. That is, if there could be seen no expressions of national will that the state would surely rescue its people encountering a crisis, even one person, they would not want to do anything for the state (NDRP: 2004-z).

Kosaburo Nishime of the LDP also made a point that ‘when we think of the abduction issue, --- a desirable relationship between a state and its people will be enabled only when the state would make sure that it protects lives and property of the people’ (NDRP: 2005-r). Considering these narratives, it would be clear that the abduction issue was closely linked with ‘patriotism’ and the bond between a state and people in a discourse of the pressure school and Abe’s ‘beautiful country’. Therefore, the resolution of this issue could be seen as the restoration of the ‘lost ties between nation and states’. As this tie would be a fundamental national value to unify a nation-state, it was difficult to make concession to North Korea on the abduction issue.

Given these arguments above, the essence of the insistence of the pressure school seemed to be summarized in a statement by Atsushi Watabe of the LDP:

The abduction issue is clearly on infringement on national sovereignty and is state-sponsored terrorism, which violates human rights of our people. When I think of the role of the state, I would assert that the state has an obligation to protect its people. The Japanese government should strongly recognize and remember it. The abduction issue will test how we, as a democratic country, deal decisively with North Korea, which is a totalitarian state. That is, what is now tested would be what country Japan is

really like (NDRP: 2005-u).

On the abduction issue, the discourses of Abe and the pressure school constructed Japan and North Korea, highlighted the differences between them, and constituted other sets of dichotomies: conventional mainstream policymakers in the postwar era, who had conducted a cowardly attitude toward North Korea and had not protected the lives and property of Japanese people, and Abe and the pressure school, who adopt a firm attitude toward North Korea and a promise to protect the lives and property of Japanese people: political dissents as ‘betrayers’ and ‘internal enemies’ of the people and the ‘self’ as a ‘faithful guardian’ of the people. Those dichotomies were aimed at legitimizing Abe’s policy and excluding alternative policies proposed by his opponents. In this sense, the North Korea issue was used as a source of political capital in order to gain an advantage in domestic political struggles. Furthermore, the abduction issue was treated as a ‘test’ to question whether Japan could settle its ‘postwar pathology’ in addition to the problem of national sovereignty, national prestige and especially national identity how Japan should behave as a ‘state’. Coupled with the first dichotomy, it constructed and reinforced Japan as a ‘democratic’ country, this made it desirable to take an uncompromising attitude against North Korea and to marginalize other policy choices .

6.3 Conclusion

Abe’s foreign policy toward China and North Korea seems to form a clear contrast. Despite his previous confrontational attitude, Abe improved the bilateral relationship with China by using an ‘ambiguous strategy’ on the Yasukuni Shrine problem and shelving the general history issue, complying with a request from political and economic circles. It seems

that Abe's strategic ambiguity could be tacitly accepted by his anti-Chinese supporters, partly because the strategy might be useful to consolidate the administration so as to realize Abe's grand design of 'the departure from the postwar regime', and might also be regarded as a diplomatic card in order to gain initiatives in the Japan-Chinese relationship. In this sense, foreign policy toward China seemed to be closely related to power struggles in Japanese domestic politics. For instance, as the rapprochement with China was an important source of political capital, Abe sought to prevent it from being utilized by his opponents. Furthermore, a notable factor, which made the improvement of the bilateral relationship, was that 'social antagonism' was not emphasized and reproduced in the foreign policy debate. This was because the Abe administration did not treat the China issue as an 'identity issue' by shelving the Yasukuni Shrine issue on the one hand, and because the Chinese government officially came to demonstrate its understanding and appreciation of postwar Japan's 'peaceful' identity on the other. Therefore, China was not articulated, at least explicitly, as an 'identity threat' unlike in the previous administration, which would contribute to the legitimization of Abe's rapprochement with China. At the same time, however, China was implicitly constructed as an 'inassimilable other', who could not be 'trustworthy' and could not share universal values. This construction of China was compatible with Abe's original stance towards China and his vision of the 'departure from the postwar regime'.

As for policy toward North Korea, there seemed to be some factors, which enabled or encouraged Abe to take a tough stance to the country. It was partly because he obtained high popularity because of his hard-line policy. What is more, Abe had to ease the frustrations against the rapprochement with China among his anti-Chinese supporters by demonstrating an unyielding attitude. In this sense, the North Korean issue was also an important source of political capital for the Abe administration. Furthermore, there can be seen three sets of dichotomy on identity constructions in discourse on the abduction issue, all of them might

serve to legitimate Abe's utterly uncompromising stance against Pyongyang. The first dichotomy was between North Korea as 'external other' and Japan as 'internal self'. By constructing the former as 'authoritarian', 'militaristic' and 'isolated wrongdoer' and highlighting differences from Japan, Japan's identity as 'democratic', 'non-militarist' and a responsible member of international society' could be reconstructed and reinforced. In addition, these constructions of North Korea would allow the pressure school including Abe, to choose a hard-line policy, because the current 'abnormal relationship' was made possible by the 'abnormal' identity of North Korea. As Pyongyang was described as 'untrustworthy' and not 'transformable', Abe's pursuit of 'diplomacy for pressure' was legitimized and making any concessions to the country was marginalized as a policy option.

The second construction of the self-other nexus was between conventional mainstream policymakers and Abe's camp. The pressure school tended to criticize a traditional approach to the North Korea issue by saying it was 'too low-profile', ignored the importance of national sovereignty and discarded lives and property of the Japanese people. According to them, it was the pressure school, which could really protect the lives and property of nationals and restore national sovereignty and prestige. This construction might be closely related to Abe's political vision of the 'departure from the postwar regime' and thus supported Abe's unyielding attitude. Another dichotomy articulated Abe's dissidents as the 'internal enemy' or the 'fifth column' while implicitly constructing Abe's group as a 'faithful guardian of people'. This contributed to the marginalization of the policy of Abe's political opponents. Considering the second and third dichotomies, the abduction issue or more generally the North Korea issue was treated not be a diplomatic issue but also as a matter of a domestic power relationship. Abe's 'nationalistic' foreign policy discourse thus sought to gain advantages in domestic politics, to defeat his political opponents, and ultimately achieve his primary goal, the revision of the Constitution.

Chapter 7. Case Study 5: Nationalism and Abe's Foreign Policy toward India and the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity

On 22nd August in 2007, Japanese Prime Minister Abe delivered a speech entitled 'Confluence of the Two Seas', in which he proposed a concept of 'broader Asia'. It can be considered an expression of Abe's ambition to enhance close cooperation among the four democratic countries, Japan, the US, Australia and India. Indeed, Japan's Asian diplomacy saw the rapid development of partnership with India especially in Abe's administration. It seems to be a sharp contrast with the deteriorating relationship with neighboring countries such as China and South Korea as the history issues came to the forefront. In addition, Abe announced that he would launch 'value-oriented diplomacy' to promote 'proactive diplomacy' when he came into office. At the same time, Foreign Minister Taro Aso also proposed the 'Arc of Freedom and Prosperity' as a part of this 'value-oriented diplomacy'. Policy towards India was articulated as the pillar of those new diplomatic orientations under the Abe administration.

In this context, this chapter attempts to examine how the enhancement of the partnership with India was legitimized, and how Japan's identity was reconstructed in foreign policy discourse. Then, it also explores how foreign policy towards India was manipulated as a source of political capital, especially in relation to Abe's rapprochement with China and his political agenda of the 'departure from the postwar regime'. In terms of theoretical framework, it tries to highlight the role of positive representations of a similar 'other', stressing similarities between the 'self' and a similar 'other', and the implicit construction of a different 'other' in foreign policy discourse. Although an aspect in which negative differences and antagonism could deeply involve

the construction of the ‘other’, thereby the ‘self’, however, positive identification and assimilation could also involve the process of identity-making as Messari (2001) persuasively argues. Relying on this idea, this chapter will mainly highlight a positive identification of ‘what constitutes the self’ through examining Japan’s India policy in the Abe administration. In addition, it will also pay attention to the implicit construction of a ‘different’ other, which is constructed behind an explicit construction of a ‘similar’ other to uncover the relationship with other foreign policies.

My argument is as follows: the enhancement of the partnership with India in the Abe administration played a key role in Abe’s ‘proactive diplomacy’ as well as Aso’s Arc of Freedom and Prosperity. In foreign policy discourse, India was represented as a ‘friend’, a country that would share universal values, have strong sympathy with Japan, respect Japan’s contribution for peace and would not problematize the history issues. Similarity between Japan and India were emphasized to reproduce positive facets of Japan’s identity and India was articulated as an ‘assimilable’ other. On the other hand, China would be defined as a political subject, which would not share universal values, which often demonstrates an ‘anti-Japanese’ attitude, tends to negate positive aspects of Japan’s identity and exploits the history issue as a diplomatic tool. The friend-foe division between India and China could be reinforced and Japan’s identity as a ‘peaceful nation’, which upholds universal values and contributes to world peace, would be reproduced. This strategy could also play a role to counter the ‘logic of guilt’ by assimilating India’s identity. These constructions of subjects could make deepening ties with India more likely while fundamental improvement of the bilateral relationship with China less likely. In addition, policy to strengthen ties with India based on ‘value-oriented diplomacy’ was treated as a source of political capital of political leaders firstly to offset discontents among anti-Chinese group against Abe’s

rapprochement with China, secondly to highlight China's 'otherness' and to counter it on the history issue, and to consolidate support for the Abe administration in order to realize its 'conservative' political agendas, namely the 'departure from the postwar regime'. In short, foreign policy could produce and reproduce national identity not only by dealing with an 'enemy' through opposition and exclusion, but also by dealing with an 'ally' through assimilation and constitution of similarities.

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section briefly introduces why this case was selected, and then discusses the theoretical framework of Messari's argument on how positive representation of the 'other' constructs and reconstructs the identity of the 'self'. This is followed by analysis of Abe's 'proactive diplomacy' and 'vare-oriented diplomacy'. Then, it will examine how Japan's political leaders intended to reconstruct national identity in a discourse of the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity'. Applying Messari's argument to the case of Japan's approach toward India, the final section attempts to explore how subjects of foreign policy, both the self and the other, were articulated, how the relationship between them was constructed, and how a certain policy, an approach to India in this case, was made possible by the discourse of foreign policy toward India.

7.1 Case Selection

There were some reasons why Abe's policy toward India was selected as one of the case studies in this research. India was of great importance in Japan's foreign policy toward East Asia under the Abe administration in several ways. First of all, policy toward India was aimed at balancing its China policy for domestic political considerations. Although the enhancement of ties with India was often discussed

convincingly in terms of geopolitical aspect, domestic considerations seem to be more plausible in the context of Abe's China policy. As Prime Minister Abe carried out the improvement of the Japan-China relationship immediately after he came into office, he had to calm discontents of his anti-Chinese supporters. In this respect, India appeared to be a perfect candidate for him; the country was perceived as a 'Japan-friendly country' without any history disputes unlike China. Thus, it would not polarize public opinion unlike North Korea, which meant it could be a source of political capital to attract a wider range of people.

More importantly, India was the mother country of Judge Radha Binod Pal, who might be one of the most famous Indian figures in Japan due to his submission of separate opinion at the Tokyo War Tribunal in WW II. Pal was known as the only judge who found all the defendants to be innocent in his *'Dissentient Judgment'*. It was enthusiastically received in Japan, especially by 'conservative' or 'right-wing' people who espoused the view that Japan had fought WW II in order to liberate Asian nations from Western colonialism. Pal's separate opinion was translated by Masaaki Tanaka and published as *'The Proposition of Japan's Innocence: Justice of the Truth'* (1952) and later *'The Proposition of Japan's Innocence by Judge Pal'* (1963) and became a best seller. Conservative debaters have frequently referred to Pal's separate opinion so as to dispute the legitimacy of the Tokyo War Tribunal. Furthermore, they even tend to regard Pal's judgment as justifying Japan's colonialism and war acts in WW II and utilize it to authorize 'the affirmation of the Great Eastern Asian War' and 'the affirmation of Japan's innocence'.

Actually, it was the existence of Judge Pal that makes India be perceived as special for Abe and Japan's revisionists. While Australia or New Zealand could be another choice to emphasize the diplomatic and strategic significance, because they

share universal values with Japan and does not have intensive confrontations on the history issue in the bilateral relationships as well as India, however, They do not have an icon like Judge Pal. Hence, although the strengthened cooperation with Australia or New Zealand was positively accepted, it cannot be used as significant political capital to appeal to Abe's right-wing supporters. Therefore, it is important to focus on Abe's foreign policy to India in that Abe could manipulate Judge Pal and the friendly approach toward India as political capital for bolstering domestic credibility, mainly to appeal to his anti-Chinese supporters.

On the other hand, this thesis does not focus on Koizumi's policy toward India. Although Koizumi visited India in April 2005 and made an agreement with Prime Minister Singh that a strategic orientation would be added to the Japan-India relations (MOFA 2006)¹. In addition, it was true that the Koizumi administration insisted that the East Asian Summit should give membership to India as well as Australia and New Zealand. In this way, although Koizumi generally took an amicable stance to India, however, his policy toward India did not contained domestic political strategy like Abe, which aimed to offset discontents with his other foreign policy. It might be because a sense of frustration among the 'pressure school' was eased by his uncompromising China policy to some degree. Moreover, when Koizumi visited India in 2005, he laid a wreath in front of the memorial of Mahatma Gandhi, not that of Judge Pal. Gandhi is different from Pal in that he is not regarded as a 'friend of Japan's nationalists' and thus might not appeal to the right-wing groups. Thus, Koizumi's policy toward India was not political capital to appeal to the revisionists who opposed his policy for normalization of relationship with North Korea. In this way, this thesis focuses on the policy toward

¹ In order to strengthen economic ties, the 'Joint-statement on the Japan-India Partnership in a New Asian Era', and the 'Eight-fold Initiative' were launched, and the Japan-India Joint Study Group (JSG) began its work.

India under the Abe administration as one of case studies because it would have a great importance to analyze how political leaders try to offset their weakness in a foreign policy by choosing and conducting other foreign policies.

7.2 Theoretical framework

As discussed in Chapter 1, foreign policy would be an identity-making practice by dealing with an ‘other’ by which national identity is permanently reconstructed. In other words, what kind of ‘self’ could be revealed through the definition of an ‘other’ in foreign policy discourse. Therefore, it would be crucial to pay attention to how ‘other’ is articulated in foreign policy discourse to construct an identity of the self. Among them, the ‘other’ is more likely to be represented as a threat to what ‘the self is’ rather than just what ‘the self is not’. This seemed to be clear in Koizumi’s policy toward China and Abe’s policy toward North Korea, both of which regarded the two countries as a ‘threat’ or ‘enemy’. Yet, it can be assumed that not only negative differences and antagonism could construct an ‘other’. There might be an ‘other’ whose difference is not defined as a ‘threat’ to the ‘self’. According to Messari (2001), ‘other’ can be divided into two groups, allies *and* enemies, and national identity is reconstructed through the contact with both allies and enemies. In dealing with differences, there can be assumed two attitudes, assimilating difference as a friend or transforming it into otherness. Messari maintains that the construction of similar others reproduce a certain aspect of the existing identity of the self. When identity is constructed by dealing with similar other, firstly, particular elements of identity, which might be of positive and common between the self and other, are enhanced to construct ‘similarity’. This construction of similarity would lead to a specific representation of other which

Wennersten (1999) calls inside-inside articulation; some aspects of identity (similarity) are emphasized while others (difference) are not likely to be referred to. Then, ‘once representation is made, and once it is implied that “it is similar to us” and that “we ought to defend it”, by defending it, the self reproduces those very same emphasized aspects of its own identity (Messari 2001: 236).’ In sum, the positive aspect of others would be assimilated in order to reproduce specific aspects of identity of the self.

From this perspective, foreign policy would be a practice of a state to seek to reproduce and confirm a specific part of national identity by emphasizing similarities with others. Therefore, positive representation of other would aim to reproduce a certain facet of national identity by positively identifying the self with the other. Messari (2001) demonstrates how the national identity of the US was reproduced through its dealings with Bosnia’s Muslims and concludes that ‘the similarities between the United States and Bosnia’s Muslims were part of a process of confirming a representation of national identity (2001: 244).’ Thus, positive representation of Bosnia’s Islam was intended to reproduce precise aspect of the US identity. In sum, when an other is represented positively in foreign policy discourse, similarities are emphasized whereas silence is maintained on any other differences. Furthermore, links are established to legitimize the supportive commitment to the ‘assimilable’ others to defend them because they are identified with the self. Given these, it can be argued that assimilation and constructing similarities plays as important a role as antagonism and negative differences in the process of reproducing national identity in foreign policy discourse.

In addition to this, there might be an implicit construction of a different ‘other’. Messari himself admits that the positive identification of other could simultaneously exclude many others (2007: 233), and then, shows that the construction and the representation of similar other would rely on some dichotomies. Wennersten (1999:

289) also mentions that while EU foreign policies in the 1990s ‘include’ the Baltic States in the Western self by using inside-inside articulation, it simultaneously ‘exclude’ Russia by using inside-outside articulation. Applied to this analysis, when India is identified with a similar ‘other’, China might be the ‘other’ who is implicitly differentiated and excluded. Japan’s foreign policy uses inclusionary logic on India at the same time with exclusionary logic on China. By both the politics of inclusion and exclusion, a certain ‘reality’ would be constructed so as to make a particular policy possible and other policy less likely.

In the later section, the following analysis would apply this theoretical framework to Japan’s approach to India in the Abe’s administration. It intends to explore how a certain aspect of national identity of Japan is attempted to reproduce and affirm through constructing similarities with India in foreign policy discourse. At the same time, it would also pay attention to the implicit construction of China as an ‘inassimilable’ other.

7.3 Abe’s policy toward India

7.3.1 Chronology: The development of Japan-India relationship in the 2000s

The development of Japan-India relations was intensified in the later part of Koizumi administration. India became the largest recipient country of Japanese ODA from 2004 for the fifth consecutive year. In April 2005, Prime Minister Koizumi visited India to reinforce the strategic orientation of a global partnership with India which had been established in 2000 during then-Prime Minister Mori’s visit to India. Koizumi and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh issued a joint statement on the ‘Japan-India

Partnership in a New Asian Era: Strategic Orientation of the Japan-India Global Partnership’ and ‘Eightfold Initiative for Strengthening Japan-India Global Partnership’. To raise the bilateral relation to a higher level, Foreign Minister Aso in the Koizumi cabinet visited India in January 2006 and set several agendas to work with together. In December of that year, Prime Minister Singh visited Tokyo and agreed with Prime Minister Abe on the establishment of a Strategic and Global Partnership between Japan and India². Succeeding working-level meetings with the US, Australia and India in May, Abe had a meeting with Prime Minister Singh in India in August 2007 and signed the Joint Statement by Japan and India on the Enhancement of Cooperation on Environmental Protection and Energy Security. They also set forth a Roadmap for New Dimensions to the Strategic and Global Partnership reiterating political, defense and security cooperation such as the enhancement of cooperation on coast guards, comprehensive economic partnership like the promotion of the Special Economic Partnership Initiative (SEPI). Prime Minister Abe’s speech, ‘Confluence of the Two Seas’ delivered during a session of the Diet emphasized the historical ties between the two countries and proposed the concept of a ‘broader Asia’ in which the US and Australia would also be incorporated. During his visit, Abe met Pransanta Pal, the son of the Indian judge Radhabinod Pal, who declared all Japanese defendants to be innocent at the Tokyo War Tribunal in WW II .

7.3.2 Foreign Policy toward India in the wider context under the Abe administration

7.3.2.1 Abe’s ‘Proactive Diplomacy’ and ‘value-oriented diplomacy’

² This partnership involved closer political coordination on bilateral, regional and global issues, comprehensive economic engagement, stronger security and defense relations, greater technological cooperation, and people-to-people exchanges.

‘Proactive Diplomacy’ would be the key term to express Prime Minister Abe’s nationalism in the foreign policy area. In his first policy speech at the 165th Diet on 29 September 2006, he stated that it was high time to change conventional Japan’s foreign policy to ‘proactive diplomacy’. At first, Abe depicted ‘proactive diplomacy’ as Japan’s diplomatic footing from which to secure national interests from a strategic viewpoint and to demonstrate international leadership asserting what Japan should do for the region and the whole world and what international society should pursue (NDRP: 2006-p). In the next policy speech on 26 January 2007, he further elaborated his concept of ‘proactive diplomacy’ referring to three principles. First, he spoke of the enhancement of relationships with countries which shared fundamental values such as freedom, democracy, basic human rights, and the rule of law; the second principle was the construction and promotion of an ‘open’ Asia full of innovation; and finally, contributions to the peace and stability of the world.

Although the definition of ‘proactive diplomacy’ seemed to be too general and the three principles lacked coherence at first glance, his real intention looked clearer in his statement. Abe explained that ‘it is necessary for Japan to become a new model in international society in the 21st century, to vigorously redress its ‘postwar regime’ in diplomatic and security areas and to demonstrate a new image of Japan (NDRP: 2007-a). Put simply, the essence of ‘proactive diplomacy’ was its role in the ‘departure from the postwar regime’. That is, it was primarily intended to deny conventional low-profile diplomatic style in East Asia and to seek to reconstruct Japan’s national identity. Abe recognized that Japan had become a country which could win respect from other countries in the world due to its effort to realize universal values in the 60 years since the end of WW II. He therefore considered it necessary that Japan should discard its ‘apology diplomacy’ in Asia because of the ‘burden of history’, and meet its global

responsibilities commensurable with this respectable status. Identifying Japan as a ‘major power’, Abe stresses the importance for Japan to take a leadership role in order to contribute to the peace and stability of the world as a ‘peaceful nation’ (NDRP: 2007-g). In short, ‘proactive diplomacy’ was not just the proclamation of a new diplomatic orientation, but also the expression of his determination to reconstruct Japan’s identity by abandoning the traditional way of diplomacy. As this was a part of his domestic political agenda of ‘departing from the postwar regime’, these three diplomatic principles can be viewed as being highly associated with a domestic political power relationship.

The three principles of ‘proactive diplomacy’ might make a clear departure from conventional policies of Japan’s diplomacy in some respects. Firstly, the conventional ‘value-neutral’ approach seemed to be replaced by the stress and promotion of ‘universal values’. The postwar Japanese government has not generally put exclusive emphasis on particular values like democracy in foreign policy discourse as can be seen in its policy towards China immediately after the Tiananmen Square Incident, and the approach toward the military junta of Myanmar. In this context, Prime Minister Abe was not the first person to emphasize universal values in foreign policy area. For instance, the Japanese government issued the ODA Guidelines in 1992 (MOFA: 1992), in which a new principle stated that ‘it should pay attention to the promotion of democratization, efforts to introduce a market economy, and the protection of human rights’. In addition, it seemed that the Koizumi administration tended to make effort to incorporate ‘universal values’ into a series of statements on East Asian diplomacy such as ‘the Tokyo Declaration’ (Koizumi: 2003-b) issued on the occasion of the ASEAN-Japan Commemorative Summit. Furthermore, in ‘the Kuala Lumpur Declaration’ on the first East Asian Summit, Japan was successful in including a point

that declared ‘we strive to strengthen global norms and universally recognised values with ASEAN as the driving force working in partnership (Koizumi: 2005-f)’. In the Diplomatic Blue Book issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, universal values might not be highlighted so much until its volume from 2006 when Foreign Minister Taro Aso referred to Japan’s deep commitment to universal values throughout the postwar era. In the Diplomatic Blue Book 2007, the concept of ‘value oriented diplomacy’ was presented by Aso, which involves placing emphasis on the “universal values” such as democracy, freedom, human rights, the rule of law, and the market economy. In sum, universal values have come to the forefront in the 2000s especially in the Abe administration, in contrast to conventional Japanese diplomacy.

At this point, it is now a matter of argument about what kind of role universal values would play in Abe’s foreign policy. In this respect, Prime Minister Abe made notable remarks on the relationship between diplomacy and universal values in pursuing national interest. It would be a kind of ‘hypocrisy’ for him to conduct foreign policy only to defend universal values such as democracy and human rights. Although he acknowledged that the effort to realize those universal values might be important in international society, it would gain no ground if political leaders failed to persuade the public that universal values would be linked with national interests. In short, he argued that universal values would be the ‘rhetoric’ which would allow him to skillfully capture national interest (Abe 2003-a: 70). Therefore, it can be concluded that foreign policy emphasizing universal values was regarded as a source of political capital for him, using national interests and to achieve his political goals.

As for the second diplomatic principle, an expansion of the geographical concept of Asia within foreign policy discourse was discussed. Conventionally, Japanese Asian diplomacy tended to focus on relationships with East Asia, especially Northeast Asia

particularly China and South Korea. However, Abe proposed the concept of a 'broader Asia' in his speech at the Indian Diet, which would incorporate South Asia and the Pacific area into a single geographical concept of 'Asia'. Behind this conceptualization of a 'broader Asia' was the fact that the Koizumi's visits to the Yasukuni Shrine and the following deterioration of the relationships with China and South Korea had been the subject of controversy during the Koizumi administration. The dominant discourse in Parliament could be summarized as follows; 'Japan is alienated in Asia because of the Yasukuni Shrine issue. The Japanese Prime Minister should stop visiting the Shrine, considering popular sentiment of neighboring countries, which were victims of Japan's aggression, and vigorously attempt to improve relations with China.'

However, Abe strongly objected to this idea regarding it as the 'logic of guilt'. This 'logic of guilt' would be a part of the postwar regime, which he sought to abandon. Based on the history view of the Tokyo War Tribunal, which treated the Asia-Pacific War as Japan's 'aggression', resulted in the continuous request that the Japanese government to apologize to neighboring countries, absolutely negated the prewar values and militarism, and strictly supported the 'peace Constitution'. In other words, Japan was constructed as a 'past aggressor' who could not take political initiative because of its 'historical burden'. It was obvious that Abe sought to discard and reverse this construct of identity and the 'logic of guilt'. In order to do that, the Abe administration tried to expand diplomatic horizons and highlight its ties with India, Australia and New Zealand, which do not have history issue with Japan, and to insist that Japan was not isolated in Asia because of history issue. In this sense, the concept of 'broader Asia' can be seen as another part of Abe's political agenda in the 'departure of the postwar regime'.

Third, the stress on the responsibility toward world peace was thought of a clear

departure from postwar ‘one-country pacifism’, which would hesitate to commit global security issues because of its Constitution. This endorsement of ‘unilateral pacifism’ partly stemmed from a fear for the entrapment of the Japan-US Alliance, that is, Japan can be dragged into a war for America’s own sake and the resentment against Japan’s independency on the US. Hence, traditional Japan’s ‘pacifism’ tended to oppose expansion of its security role by deepening commitment to the Japan-US Alliance, such as by approving the use of the ‘right of collective self-defense’. On the other hand, Abe insisted on the necessity to strengthen cooperation with the US to expand Japan’s role in the region and the world. Abe equated this with the ‘proactive contribution to world peace’ and gained legitimacy by how Japan was facing an ‘unconventional’ threat from the international environment. As expressed in the New Defense Guidelines in 2004, external threats would be now discussed at the global level. In order for Japan to survive in a more ‘uncertain’ and ‘unpredictable’ environment than the Cold War era and to contribute to world peace, its commitment to global security issues should be justified. To accomplish Japan’s identity as a ‘peaceful’ country, Japan should no longer endorse ‘one-country pacifism’.

In a nutshell, it could be argued that Abe’s ‘proactive diplomacy’ would attempt to transform conventional Japan’s postwar diplomacy characterized by ‘value-neutral’, ‘stress on China and Korea’ and ‘one-country pacifism’, to ‘value-oriented’, ‘increasing cooperation with broader Asia’ and ‘proactive contribution to world peace’. These points were interpreted as strategies that the Abe administration would utilize ‘universal values’ to achieve its political and diplomatic goals; that it would enhance the cooperation with countries without the history issue, such as India, Australia, and New Zealand; and that it would abandon traditional ‘one-country pacifism’ and deepen the Japan-US Alliance to expand a security role. Therefore, all of these were closely

associated with his domestic political agenda, the ‘departure from the postwar regime’.

7.3.2.2 The Arc of Freedom and Prosperity

In addition to ‘proactive diplomacy’, a new axis of Japan’s foreign policy was introduced under the Abe administration. It was originally presented in Foreign Minister Aso’s speech on 30 November 2006 and was stipulated in the Diplomatic Blue Book of 2007 that to create the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity was the new diplomatic axis of Japan in addition to the existing three pillars, namely diplomacy centered on the United Nations, the Japan-US Alliance and the enhancement of the relationship with neighboring countries. The concepts of ‘value-oriented diplomacy’ and ‘the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity’ were originally elaborated by a diplomat Shotaro Yachi and then proposed by Foreign Minister Taro Aso as he clarified in his book *Totetsumonai Nihon (Astonishing Japan)*’ (Aso 2007-a: 160-161). The Arc of Freedom and Prosperity was defined as ‘a region of stability and plenty with its basis in universal values’ along the outer rim of the Eurasian continent (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2007: 2). It was created through ‘value-oriented diplomacy’, which ‘involves placing emphasis on “universal values” such as democracy, freedom, human rights, the rule of law, and the market economy as we advance our diplomatic endeavors (Aso: 2006-e).’ Geographically, it would cover from ‘Northern Europe and traverse the Baltic states, Central and South Eastern Europe, Central Asian and the Caucasus, the Middle East and the Indian subcontinent, then cross Southeast Asia finally to reach Northeast Asia (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2007: 2).’ A number of countries in this region have experienced great changes after the end of the Cold War and started democratization and economic development to obtain ‘peace and happiness through economic

prosperity' just as 'Japan has developed after the war' (Aso: 2006-e). By espousing freedom and economic prosperity as fundamental values, special emphasis was put on the promotion of democracy and market economy. Aso explains the relationship between them:

And when we consider which political or economic system might be ideal for advancing freedom and prosperity, we can say with confidence that it will ultimately boil down to the question of equity in its procedures. This leads us to the market economy with regard to economic systems and democracy for political systems, as democracy values the rule of law and basic human rights (Aso: 2007-e).

In sum, in discourse on the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity, democracy and a market economy would play an important role for the establishment of it, because they would be indispensable to achieve freedom and prosperity, which could lead to peace and happiness among people.

Aso explained that the policy of the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity emerged from a context of identity crisis of Japan, which might be reflected to the increasing concern for foreign policy among Japanese people. As there were growing concerns of a security threat from North Korea and the rapid development of China, which threatened Japan's status as the economic leader in the region, 'a number of Japanese people have become aware of a great change in history.' In particular, 'as Japan has been uncomfortable with the 'Chinese Central World Order' from more than a thousand years, 'how to deal with China is now a point of nation-wide debate'. In addition, according to him, although Japan has long been suffering from self-distrust by deep remorse of causing the

Asia-Pacific War, however, this self-distrust seemed to be overcome. Aso, then, argued that the Japanese people were longing for acquiring a new vision for 'what we are'. In this circumstance, Aso made clear about the role of diplomacy in reconstructing national identity. Foreign policy might serve to foster a well-grounded sense of self-esteem and 'it is high time to attempt to do this intentionally (Aso 2007-b: 4-9)'. In this respect, Abe also made a statement that 'forming the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity to my mind represents an attempt for Japan to define itself (Aso: 2007-d)'. Hence, it was clear that political leaders sought to reconstruct Japan's national identity through diplomacy in the argument of the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity.

In the discourse on the Arc of the Freedom and Prosperity, Aso repeatedly proposed three kinds of self-definition on the types of leadership Japan would take: a 'thought leader', a 'stabilizer in the region', and 'an equal peer of Asian countries'. Firstly, a 'thought leader' was explained as 'one who through fate is forced to face up against some sort of very difficult issue earlier than others' and one who moves 'forward not only through successes, but also through failures (Aso: 2005-c)'. He noted that Japan could represent itself as a thought leader in Asia through its consideration of three challenges: nationalism, environmental issues and aging society. In other words, Japan is and must be a thought leader that can teach others even through its failures. Secondly, Aso argued that Japan has been and would continue to be a stabilizing force in the region. Aso highlighted the importance of the Japan-US Alliance and Japan's identity 'firstly as a democratic state and secondly as a market economy' with the longest track record among Asian countries. Thus Japan is and should be a stabilizer 'whose readiness enables it to provide security, the cornerstone for Asian prosperity, in the areas of both economic and regional security (Aso: 2005-c)'. Finally, Japan was defined as a country that respect other states as peers and equals rather than viewing

them as above it or below.

Behind these three self-definitions of Japanese identity in the discourse of the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity, there can be observed the articulations of three basic national identities on which the former definitions would rely. All three identities seem to be interconnected with each other. The first one would be Japan as a country honoring universal values. This representation was repeatedly emphasized in statements such as ‘Japan is second to none in holding dear the value of freedom, democracy, and respect for human rights and the rule of law (Aso: 2006-e).’ Another identity was Japan as the oldest democracy and market economy in Asia due to its earliest modernization. Since Japan has been respecting the rule of law and other universal values from more than a thousand years ago and established democracy and market economy in the mid nineteenth century, Japan was a ‘true veteran player’ of democracy and thus a ‘forerunner’ and an ‘escort runner’ of young democracies in the region. The third one was concerning Japan’s sixty-year effort of ‘peace contribution’ throughout postwar era as a ‘peaceful nation’. Japanese political leaders including Abe and Aso insisted that Japanese people should be more proud of history of their country, because based on its solid democracy, postwar Japan neither invaded other countries nor violated universal values. Therefore, these self-perceptions could discursively allow Japan to become a democratic leader in the region and promote ‘peace and happiness through economic prosperity’.

With regard to internal relationship, Abe acknowledged that policy of the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity was one of the approaches to realize his ‘proactive diplomacy’ (NDRP: 2007-f). Firstly, both of them put emphasis on universal values and Japan’s global commitment. Secondly, they might also share the view that Japan needs to abandon conventional self-distrust and rearticulate its national identity. When

differences are to be found, it might be argued that Abe's emphasis was put on the backlash against the postwar regime while Aso's stress is put on the new self-image of Japan. Those arguments can be viewed as being associated with Abe's 'departure from the postwar regime'. Furthermore, both Abe and Aso emphasize the importance to strengthen the partnership with other democratic countries, especially India. In addition to Foreign Minister Aso's insistence on common beliefs with India to an increasingly extent (Aso: 2006-e), Prime Minister Abe clearly argued that 'the Strategic Global Partnership of Japan and India is pivotal for such pursuits to be successful' as pursuing 'the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity (Abe: 2007-e)'. In short, the approach to India would be a common and important foreign policy for both 'proactive diplomacy' and the 'Arc of Freedom and Prosperity', which would be connected with Abe's political agenda, the 'departure from the postwar regime'.

7.3.3 Policy to India as political capital

Foreign policy to enhance ties with India with emphasis on universal values can be viewed as a source of political capital for Japan's political leaders especially among the 'conservatives', and Abe tried to exploit it. Simply put, it was utilized to offset Abe's rapprochement with China by appeasing the frustrations among anti-Chinese revisionists and manipulated to enhance solidarity among anti-Chinese 'conservatives'. Firstly, as discussed earlier, Abe had to offset the discontents against the improvement of the Japan-China relationship among anti-China politicians because they were strong support base in the LDP. This thesis has already argued in Chapter 6 that the Abe cabinet tried to do so by taking a hard-line policy toward North Korea. In addition to this foreign policy, the reinforcement of cooperation with India could appeal to Abe's

anti-Chinese supporters. First of all, because India was the ‘mother country of Judge Pal’, Abe’s paying honor to Pal’s family when he visited India was regarded as a sign that Abe’s view of history had not change even though he shelved the history issue in order to improve relationship with China. As Judge Pal was a kind of historic icon to legitimize Japan’s past aggression to Asia, to strengthen ties with India could boost Abe’s credibility among the ‘conservatives’.

In terms of the relation to China policy, policy to India with emphasis on ‘universal values’ played an important role. In May 2007, 43 lawmakers of Abe’s supporters launched the ‘Diet Member’s Group for Promoting Value-Oriented Diplomacy’. Members of this group were ‘conservative’ politicians, who worked with Abe to promote the prime ministerial visit to the Yasukuni Shrine, to abandon the Murayama Statement, and to revise the Constitution. They came from different factions within the LDP and were thus labeled as a de facto ‘Abe faction’. This group officially endorsed ‘universal values’ such as freedom, democracy, and the rule of law in accordance with Abe’s ‘value-oriented diplomacy’. The president of this group, Keiji Furuya of the LDP explained the purposes of the establishment of this group: the enhancement of the ties with countries with those shared values and the realization of ‘true conservatism’ (Furuya: 2007). He clearly argued:

It was an impressive result of diplomacy that Prime Minister Abe realized the meetings with Chinese leaders last year. However, we should face what is behind China’s ‘smile diplomacy’. Although Japan could promote mutually beneficial cooperation such as the development of an economic relationship and the enhancement of cultural exchanges, but should take a tough stance on other important issues and strengthen ties with other countries which share universal

values.

Referring to the increase of opaque military budget and the infringement of human rights, Furuya (2006) concluded that the 'strategic and mutually beneficial relationship' between Japan and China was totally different from genuine 'partnership' because China would 'not share universal values such as freedom, democracy and the rule of law'. In other words, 'universal values' created and reinforced the division between India and China, giving the former superiority due to its sharing 'universal values'. In addition, promoting universal values was aimed to counter the history issue, which China tended to raise. In this sense, universal values were regarded as giving moral superiority to Japan and India. Given these, a set of policies to promote a friendlier approach to India and to endorse universal values were manipulated as a means of attacking China by anti-Chinese supporters of Abe.

Furthermore, endorsing universal values and promoting ties with India were connected to a domestic power relationship. Keiji Furuya (2006) claimed that '(value-oriented) diplomacy makes a different angle' to realize 'true conservatism', because 'universal values would have something in common with our "values"' This statement seemed to be strange because there can be seen little similarity between universal values and their 'conservative values', such as the opposition to the advancement of the status of women, the objection to a female Emperor, and the denial of the 'comfort women'. In fact, Furuya's argument might become clear when looking at his other statement that 'our mission is to firmly support the Abe administration in the Diet (Furuya 2006)'. In other words, promoting universal values and support for approach to India could contribute to the consolidation of the Abe administration, which would thus serve to realize their political agenda based on 'true conservatism'. That is

to say, the enhancement of ties with India with emphasis on universal values was regarded as a source of political capital among Japanese politicians to obtain their political goals.

In this way, Abe's policy to India based on 'value-oriented diplomacy' was treated as a source of political capital of political leaders first to offset frustrations against Abe's rapprochement with China, second to highlight China's 'Otherness' and to counter it on the history issue, and to consolidate supports to the Abe administration in order to realize their 'conservative' political agendas of the 'departure from the postwar regime'.

7.3.4 The Construction of national identities

When applied to Messari's identity-making model, policy toward India would be the case of dealing with 'friend' or 'ally'. It might be obvious that India was recognized as such by Japanese political leaders because the most frequent presupposition of the country would be 'pro-Japanese' or 'Japan-friendly' throughout postwar era. Once India was identified with a potential friend, similarities between Japan and India would be constructed and a certain aspect of Japan's national identity would be reproduced through emphasizing those similarities and positive representation of India. Furthermore, it can be thought that positive representation of India might rely on implicit construction of different 'Other'. It might be because national identity of a state was constructed only through a simultaneous delineation of Other as Campbell (1998) argued. In fact, when India was referred to in foreign policy discourse in Japan in the 2000s, it has been mentioned in a wider context of Asian diplomacy in particular in relation to China rather than bilateral relationship with Japan. Therefore, it would be necessary to pay

attention to implicit construction of China as well as explicit construction of India in order to find out what aspect of Japan's identity would be intended to reproduce. In this context, this section examines how identities of India, Japan and China were constructed in foreign policy discourse, which allowed legitimizing Abe's policy of strengthening ties with India.

In foreign policy debates, first of all, India tended to be represented as a 'democratic nation', more precisely 'the largest democracy in Asia', which embraced 'universal values' just like Japan³. India has increasingly been described as a democratic nation in the 2000s especially during the Koizumi administration and the Abe administration. In his speech at the India Diet, Abe claimed that Japan was now experiencing 'the discovery of India', by which India is redefined as 'a partner that shares the same values and interests and also as a friend that will work alongside us to enrich the seas of freedom and prosperity (Abe: 2007-e).' It might be easy to understand that the representation of India as such would be attempted to construct similarity between India and Japan in terms of the emphasis on universal values. *The Joint Statement on the Roadmap for New Dimensions to the Strategic and Global Partnership between Japan and India* in 2007 would expressed Japan's focus on universal values in the bilateral relationship; 'Japan and India share universal values of democracy, open society, human rights, rule of law and market economy and share common interest in promoting peace, stability and prosperity in Asia and the world.' In addition, this statement also argued that the relationship between Japan and India would have 'the largest potential for growth' and that 'a strong, prosperous and dynamic India is in the interest of Japan and a strong, prosperous and dynamic Japan was in the interest of India and recognized that Japan and India share a congruence of interests.' In sum,

³ Prime Minister Abe clearly stated that India shares universal values such as freedom, democracy, and the rule of law (NDRP: 2007-d).

similarities such as sharing universal values were emphasized and their relationship was described as non zero-sum; the rise of India was not depicted as a threat to Japan. By describing the relationship between the two countries as ‘natural partner’ and not a potential ‘enemy’, the enhancement of ties could be justified and taken for granted.

On the other hand, it should be noticed how different ‘other’ was implicitly constructed in relation to the emphasis on universal values. Hansen (2006) noted how universal discourse could articulate political subjects to be mobilized; ‘universal discourse holds out the difference between universal principles and those who adopted them on the one hand, and those who have failed to, on the other, thereby constituting spatial as well as temporal identities (Hansen 2006: 48)’ In other words, discourse of universal values could produce dichotomy between those who uphold and share them and those who do not comply with them. In contrast with ‘democratic’ India, China was described as a typical ‘developmental dictatorship’, which ‘does not comply with a democratic rule’ and ‘oppresses freedom of speech’ (Abe 2005-a: 54-57). From these expressions, it might be obvious that China was represented as a ‘non-democratic country’, which does not share universal values. According to a dichotomous framework, China’s rise especially its increasing military spending could be easily interpreted as a direct ‘threat’ to Japan because it was not ‘transparent’ and ‘unpredictable’ due to its character of ‘non-democratic’ and ‘authoritarian’ regime with ‘hegemonic military ambition’ (Abe 2005-a; 57, 2007-a). Thus, negative differences might be reinforced through the construction of China in contrast with the case of India. In this context, what aspect of Japan’s identity would be reproduced and reinforced was that: Japan was a solid democracy upholding universal values. It would mean that Japan was a ‘thought leader’, ‘stabilizer’ and ‘protector’ of universal values in the region. This positive identification would also articulate Japan as being ethically superior to a

country that does not comply with universal values, that is, China. On the other hand, this representation would rely on much silence. It would be silent, for instance, on India's nuclear test outside the NPT regimes. While Japan should strictly criticize India on this matter as the only country to have suffered nuclear attacks, the Japanese government just stated it will 'give careful consideration' to this issue (NDRP: 2007-c).

Second, the strategic and economic importance of India would be highlighted in foreign policy discourse. Abe alleged that no one could ignore its importance as strategic and an economic hub (NDRP: 2007-d). With regard to strategic importance, India has long sea-lanes that connect Japan and the Middle East. In addition, India was 'one of the axis of the four democratic countries' cooperation', to which Abe vigorously aspired. The aspiration for strengthening the cooperation among these four democratic countries, Japan, the US, Australia and India, would be expressed in a form of the proposition of a 'broader Asia'. Abe explained that his policy aimed to enhance regional stability by complementing existing regional institutions (Abe 2006-b: 159). However, there seemed little doubt that this construction of India as a 'broader Asia' would aim to counter the rise of China. Although real intention was sealed off, at least on the surface, a number of major Japanese newspapers reported that the concept was Abe's hobbyhorse rhetoric to contain China. This rhetoric was familiar not only domestically but also abroad. The US government expressed some concern for Abe's plan because 'it has a possibility to send unpredictable signal to China' when the Secretary of State Rice and then-Defense Minister Koike had a meeting (Asahi Shimbun: 2007-b). In Abe's idea, he would not deny the strategic and economic importance of China, but he put more emphasis on India because of the 'democratic tie'. In addition, the economic importance of India could not be emphasized without comparison to China. For instance, India was described as 'another central force of rapid economic development in Asia',

‘the largest recipient of Japan’s ODA’, and has an enormous population as much as one billion, ‘which will counter China’ (Abe 2006-a: 71). It seemed to be notable that the economic importance of China was not negated but recognized; rather Aso admitted that Japan’s relations with India certainly paled in comparison to China (Aso: 2006-e). In fact, according to MOFA, the amount of bilateral trade with India had increased by 22% between 2006 and 2007 but it only occupied 0.8% of the whole amount of Japan’s trade (MOFA: 2008-b). However, the potential development of India was more focused on to resist an argument that the Japanese government should only focus on the improvement of the political relationship with China not to damage its economic benefit. Abe argued that ‘now that a large number of Japanese companies are eager to access India’ and that it would be a narrow-sited idea without strategic perspective only focus on the economic importance of China (NDRP: 2007-e). It was also stressed that India would really appreciate Japan’s ‘high quality economic assistance’ while China was often depicted as a country which would not appreciate large amount of Japan’s ODA (Aso and Komori 2006: 134). In short, although the strategic and economic importance of both India and China would be acknowledged, however, India tended to be more emphasized because of its appreciation to Japan’s assistance. In this context, the strategic and economic importance of India was highlighted in order to counter the dominant argument that the Japanese government should emphasize the relationship with China because of its significance in terms of economy and security strategy. It could reinforce a facet of Japan’s identity as a ‘stabilizer’. Japan might no more espouse ‘unilateral pacifism’ but contribute to the peace and stability of the region. Its high quality economic assistance to India would emphasize contribution of postwar Japan as a ‘peaceful nation’ who has attempted to import its rehabilitation model of ‘peace and happiness through economic prosperity’ to other countries in the region.

The third representation of India was genuinely ‘pro-Japanese’; ‘friendly’ and ‘has strong sympathy with us’. In his book, Abe noted that according to the public opinion in India one of the most amicable countries in the world has always been Japan (Abe 2006-b: 159). In the Diet session, Abe depicted that India as a ‘definitely Japan-friendly country’ (NDRP: 2007-d). Above all, Judge Pal would be a firm proof that India was always described as a pro-Japanese country as former Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto expressed Pal as a ‘symbol of the spiritual bond between Japanese and Indian people’ (NDRP: 1998). In delivering his speech at the Indian Diet, Abe stated that ‘Justice Pal is highly respected even today by many Japanese for the noble spirit of courage he exhibiting during the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (Abe: 2007-e).’

As mentioned before, Judge Radha Binod Pal might be one of the most famous Indian figures in Japan due to his submission of a separate opinion at the Tokyo War Tribunal in WW II. Pal was known as the only judge who found all the defendants to be innocent. Hence, Judge Pal had enormous popularity with Japanese people especially among the right-wingers. Abe himself expressed his sympathy to India as ‘the mother country of Judge Pal, who insisted on Japan’s innocence at the Tokyo Tribunal’ in his book (2006). Briefly, Pal has been a symbol of ‘the affirmation of Japan’s innocence’ and regarded as representation of all Indian people who sympathize with Japanese people. In this context, India was regarded as a country, which did not have the history issue with Japan and demonstrated its understanding for Japan’s past.

What was emphasized here is that ‘India is different from China’ in terms of the history issue. Against the dominant discourse on the Yasukuni issue, Abe argued that while China claimed that all Asian nations felt resentment against Prime Minister Koizumi’s visit to the Yasukuni Shrine, however, India demonstrated understanding for

it (Abe 2005-d: 60). Thus it was only China and South Korea that complained about the Yasukuni issue. While there was a wide gap in the history problem with China and it often became a diplomatic issue, Abe asserted that ‘there exists no gulf in the history understanding with India and, moreover, history could have a positive effect on bilateral relation (Abe 2005-c: 98).’ Therefore, Japan should strengthen the partnership with such a country as India. Based on this recognition, it seemed that the Joint Statement in 2006 included the articulation that the Japan-India relationship was ‘unencumbered by historical differences’. Furthermore, the articulation that ‘India is the mother country of Judge Pal who insisted on Japan’s innocence at the Tokyo War Tribunal’ (Abe 2006-a: 71) would also play an important role in the light of the history issue from Conservative politicians.

Meanwhile, China problematized the fact that the Yasukuni Shrine honors the Class-A Criminals at WWII and criticized that Prime Minister’s visit to the shrine might connote the affirmation of militarism in Japan. There can be observed ‘the blockage of identity’ which would produce ‘social antagonism’ as Laclau and Mouffe (1985) pointed out. It would imply that China might negate Japan’s identity in two aspects. First, along with the ‘Tokyo War Tribunal view of history’, it might negate prewar Japan’s identity as a ‘liberator of Asia from Western imperialism’. Second, China might not admit the development of postwar Japan as a ‘peaceful nation’. Abe expressed his resentment against China’s ‘blockage of identity’, arguing that ‘there have existed some ill feelings among Japanese people against China for why it would not positively evaluate Japan’s postwar development as a peace-loving nation’ (NDRP: 2006-m). According to Abe, Japanese people should have more confidence in the postwar development of their country as a ‘democracy completely detached from militarism’ and ‘honoring universal values’ (Abe 2005-b: 44). Foreign Minister Aso

also noted that the sixty years' effort of postwar Japan would prove the sincerity of Japan's aspirations for peace and stability and its determination not to repeat the mistakes of the past and that China and Korea should look at this statement 'with an open mind (Aso: 2005-c)'. In this way, once the negation of Japan's identity by China was recognized, it would reinforce the division between Japan and China.

On the other hand, however, India was constructed as a country that would affirm Japan's Identity. Judge Pal's *'Dissentient Judgment'* was used to dispute legitimacy of the Tokyo War Tribunal and the perception of history it produced. By identifying Judge Pal's opinion that the Class-A Criminals were innocent with the consensus of the Indian people, India can be described as supporting prewar Japan's identity. Abe's meeting with the son of Judge Pal would demonstrate the importance of Pal for Japan's identity. In addition, Japan-India relations were considered to be 'based on deep respect for each other's contribution in promoting peace, stability, and development in Asia.' It seemed that India would appreciate postwar Japan's contribution for peace, thus would affirm Japan's identity as a 'peaceful nation'. Hence, there can be seen antagonism concerning the blockage of identity between Japan and China while there was not with India. In this way, the difference between India and China in the history issue was constructed. As a result of these articulations, the friend-foe division between India and China was reinforced and Japan's identity as a 'peaceful nation', which upholds universal values and contributes to world peace, would be reproduced. It could also play a role to counter 'logic of guilt' by assimilating India's identity.

7.3.5 The constructions of 'reality' and the legitimization of Abe's policy toward India

In this way, identity reconstruction through assimilation of India and the

emphasis on similarity with India could reinforce and reproduce Japan's positive aspect of its national identity. They are namely: Japan as an 'ardent supporter' of universal values, as a 'stabilizer' in the region, and a 'peaceful nation' contributing to the stability of the whole world. Furthermore, it would shape three arguments to constitute a particular 'reality' and legitimize a certain course of foreign policy. Firstly, its emphasis on universal values as a feature of Japan's identity might deny 'logic of guilt' in which Japan was often treated as negating universal values by showing an ambivalent attitude on the history issues. Japan would be respected by other countries in the world due to its effort to protect universal values throughout postwar era. The second argument was that 'Japan is not alienated in Asia'; Foreign Minister Aso argues that 'it is only China and South Korea that reject the summit with Japan in Asia (NDRP: 2006-b). In this reality, Asia would not exclusively mean China and South Korea, which criticize Japan on the history issue, but also other countries like India, which would not problematize the history issue. Moreover, as Japan promotes universal values and deepens its ties with like-minded countries, the history issue might cease to exist in diplomatic problems (Abe 2006-b: 150). As a result of these constructions of reality, there was the third argument that India would be an 'assimilable' other while China was not. It might be because the former has similarities with Japan, acknowledges Japan's positive identity, and is identified as a 'friend' with strategic and economic benefits. The latter, however, might not have similarities and negates Japan's positive identity while still having enormous economic importance.

These constructions of identities and 'reality' would legitimize a certain policy and marginalize other policies. They could make the enhancement of ties with India more likely while fundamental reconciliation with China might be less likely. The stress on similarity with India and the representation of it as a 'friend' led to represent India as

an ‘assimilable’ other. On the other hand, the emphasis on negative differences, antagonism caused by the ‘blockage of identity’, would reinforce ‘inassimilability’ of this radical other, China. The identity of honoring universal values would not only enable a state to reinforce ties to promote these values but also make it policy. It seems to be obvious when reading Abe’s speech: ‘Japan and NATO are partners. We have in common such fundamental values as freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law. It is only natural that we cooperate in protecting and promoting these values (Abe: 2007-a).’

Furthermore, the aforementioned dichotomy could also reproduce the boundary by naturalizing cooperation on how to deal with ‘the other’. In the same speech as above, Abe made remarks on how to deal with China, saying ‘We need to pay close attention to the future of this nation. And we should continue to have dialogue, to improve the regional security environment. Partners sharing fundamental values should enhance cooperation to this end (2007-a).’ It would be no doubt that ‘we’ meant countries, which share universal values with Japan and NATO countries. It would also imply that China was not ‘us’, and did not share universal values, and that countries which share universal values should be united in dealing with China. This assertion could also justify the reinforcement of the four democracies’ cooperation. In this way, the enhancement of the partnership with India would be made possible and legitimized while a policy of the fundamental rapprochement with China might be marginalized. Furthermore, it might also normalize cooperation among democratic countries, which could alienate China.

7.4. Conclusion

The enhancement of the strategic and global partnership with India in the Abe administration can be regarded as an axis of Abe's 'proactive diplomacy' and the 'departure from the postwar regime' as well as Aso's Arc of Freedom and Prosperity. In foreign policy discourse, India was represented as a 'friend' and defined through a positive 'process of linking': as a country, which would share universal values, have strong sympathy with Japan, respect Japan's contribution for peace and would not problematize the history issues. Similarities between Japan and India were emphasized to reproduce positive facets of Japan's identity and India was articulated as an 'assimilable' other. It can be said that in this sense, India as an 'ally' would play an important role in the identity-reconstruction process as argued in Messari's theoretical framework.

At the same time, however, a negative process of differentiation would take place in an attempt to implicitly construct 'China'. China would be defined as a political subject, who would not share universal values, often demonstrate an 'anti-Japan' attitude, tend to negate positive aspects of Japan's identity and exploit the history issue as a diplomatic tool. Differences between Japan and China were illuminated and China was represented as an 'inassimilable' other. Therefore, it can be argued that the stress on similarity with India would lead to further focus on the radical otherness of China. These constructions of subjects, positive identification of India with emphasis on similarity and implicit articulation of China with focus on negative differences, could contribute to the reinforcement of a particular facet of Japan's national identity and the production of a particular 'reality'. It would be a 'reality' in which it is natural for Japan to deepen the partnership with countries that share universal values without the history

issues. As Japan was a 'protector' and 'promoter of universal values' and other countries acknowledged its identity as a 'peaceful nation', they would understand that the Yasukuni issue would not conflict with upholding universal values. Thus, a particular 'reality' was constructed in which 'Japan is not alienated in Asia' even with the Yasukuni issue. These constructions of subjects and reality could make deepening ties with India more likely while fundamental improvement of the bilateral relationship with China less likely. In addition, policy to strengthen ties with India based on 'value-oriented diplomacy' was treated as a source of political capital of political leaders first to offset discontents among anti-China group against Abe's rapprochement with China, secondly to highlight China's 'otherness' and to counter it on the history issue, and to consolidate support for the Abe administration in order to realize their 'conservative' political agenda of the 'departure from the postwar regime'.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

What is Japanese nationalism? This thesis, 'Nationalism in Japan's contemporary foreign policy toward East Asia' started from such a simple question. Considering the historical context, the relationship between nationalism and Japan's diplomacy in Asia is a politically sensitive topic in postwar Japan. As nationalism tends to be identified with the 'prewar', 'militaristic', and 'right-wing rhetoric', the perspective on how it is related to foreign policy has largely remained one-sided. This can be seen in the way that the deterioration of the Japan-China relationship over the Yasukuni Shrine issue and growing tension in the Japan-North Korea relationship over the abduction issue during the Koizumi and Abe administration drew attention to the rise of nationalism at home and abroad. However, it has been pointed out above that Koizumi visited Pyongyang to embark on the negotiation for diplomatic normalization and Abe actually improved the relationship with China. It is hard to reconcile either of these with the conventional view that these leaders represent a resurgence of a conventional understanding of 'nationalism'. Given these cases, it seems to be an oversimplification to argue whether the foreign policy of Koizumi and Abe was 'nationalistic' or not. Therefore, this thesis has offered a new perspective on the role of nationalism in foreign policy.

In this context, this thesis has primarily explored what role nationalism has played in Japan's foreign policy in Asia under the Koizumi and Abe administrations. In accordance with this primary goal, the chapters have sought to give a detailed analysis of, firstly, how Japan's policy makers strove to employ foreign policy to construct a certain type of national identity by articulating a version of 'reality' in their foreign policy toward China, North Korea, and India. The thesis has also shown how the resulting national

discourse was exploited by such leaders in order to legitimate their policy programs and to create advantageous positions in domestic power relationships. This concluding chapter will summarize the arguments of each chapter, discuss the findings of the research and propose some implications for future research.

8.1 Summaries of the argument

Adopting an alternative framework of foreign policy and conceptualizing nationalism as a kind of discourse on national identity, the Introduction chapter clarifies the focus of this thesis. Put simply, this dissertation aims to explore how the role of nationalism can be defined in Japan's foreign policy in the region and how political leaders exploited it. The use of discourse analysis for analyzing the case studies is explained.

The second chapter provides background information on domestic politics with an emphasis on historical context and power struggles among factions within the LDP. In postwar Japan, there have been division lines between the progressives and the conservatives, and also between mainstream conservatives and anti-mainstream politicians. These compete against each other for the legitimacy of their different versions of national identity that are implied by the history issues, the security problem, and the debate over the Constitution. Despite the dominance of the conservative camp in the Diet, postwar pacifism, which was actually 'pro-Constitution' nationalism endorsed by the progressives, was widely embraced in Japanese society. In contrast, anti-mainstream conservatives with a revisionist view of history upheld the traditional right-wing nationalism, which emphasized 'traditional values', insisted on the revision of the Constitution, and claimed it was right to have a policy of full-fledged rearmament.

Although the government led by mainstream conservatives failed to integrate these competing nationalisms, it partly accommodated them by establishing the ‘Yoshida Line’ as a national strategy based on the twin pillars of the Constitution and the Japan-US Security Treaty.

On another front, the confrontation among the conservatives took the shape of a power struggle among factions within the LDP. The Yoshida School and the Keisei-kai formulated the mainstream while the Seiwa-kai became the anti-mainstream. The latter harshly opposed the pro-China stance and the ‘strategy of historic reconciliation’ initiated by the former group. The strategy was based on the recognition that Japan should restore trust from the neighboring countries by resolving the history issues in order to achieve political leadership in the region and expand its role to contribute to world peace. The anti-mainstream camp, led by a new generation of ‘neo-revisionists’, tried to counter this project, expressing resentment against China’s manipulation of the ‘history card’ and its rapid economic and military growth. In this context, both the settlement of the history issue and the anti-China stance became a source of capital for political actors. Prime ministers Koizumi and Abe emerged in these circumstances and pursued their foreign policy on China and North Korea as a way to utilizing this new source of political capital. In this way, the chapter discussed the linkage between nationalism both in foreign policy and in the domestic power struggle to demonstrate that postwar Japan’s nationalism was not monolithic and that political actors utilized various ‘nationalisms’ that appealed to the ways in which they tried to legitimize their bids for power. The focus is thus mainly on what kind of political actors formed what kind of power relationships in domestic politics when articulating versions of national identity, and what kind of issues could be utilized as a source of political capital for them as a consequence.

Chapter 3 dealt with Koizumi’s foreign policy to China: how China was

represented as a radical ‘other’ and Japan’s identity was reconstructed, how these constructions were manipulated to provide rhetorical justification for policy toward China, and then what role the Yasukuni Shrine issue played in the reconstruction of Japan’s identity and Koizumi’s identity politics. In order to resist China’s construction of Japan as an ‘unrepentant, insensitive and irresponsible’ country, Japanese political leaders tried to construct a ‘victimized and trustworthy’ Japan and to constitute China as ‘victimizing and untrustworthy’. The Yasukuni worship was used not for right-wing nationalistic mobilization, as is commonly believed, but as evidence that shows postwar Japan reflects its past and pledges not to commit war again. This was actually supposed to serve to construct and reinforce Japan’s national identity as a ‘peaceful country’. At the same time, China’s resulting criticism was regarded as the negation of Japan’s peaceful identity. This produced a kind of social antagonism, which legitimized Koizumi’s uncompromising attitude towards China. Behind this, there seemed to be Koizumi’s intention to remove ‘the spell of history’ and to manipulate the Yasukuni Shrine issue as political capital to minimize frustrations against his other policies, especially toward North Korea.

The next chapter discussed what made it possible for the Koizumi administration to conduct a policy for normalization with North Korea, and how Koizumi manipulated the North Korean issue and legitimized his policy by articulating national identity. The construction of the DPRK not as an identity threat but as a ‘negotiable other’, with whom Japan could have common interests contributed to a conciliatory approach. By constituting North Korea as the ‘last country’ with which postwar Japan had not restored its diplomatic ties and by considering the ‘abnormal relationship’ derived from Japan’s incomplete war settlement, normalization with the country was legitimized as the fulfillment of its war responsibility. Furthermore, diplomatic normalization was treated as serving the realization of Japan’s role as a ‘peaceful country’ with a more proactive

initiative in Northeast Asia and a proactive engagement with an emerging regional multinational security framework. In a nutshell, Koizumi's conciliatory approach was made possible by the logic that North Korea was not a threat to Japan's identity and that to promote normalization would contribute to the realization of Japan's 'peaceful' identity by bringing an end to the history issue.

The following chapter discussed the discourse of the 'neo-revisionists', centering on Prime Minister Abe. Analyzing his slogan the 'departure from the postwar regime', it demonstrated how Abe and his supporters manipulated values of 'peace', 'democracy', and 'autonomy' as a source of political capital in order to bolster their domestic credentials and to defeat their political opponents. In addition, these values were utilized to naturalize and consolidate Japan's ties with the US, EU countries, Australia, New Zealand, and India, at the same time as marginalizing China. While abandoning 'postwar democracy', which was supported by the 'Yoshida line' and deeply embedded in Japanese society, Abe insisted on the revision of the Constitution and the enhancement of the Japan-US Alliance in order to achieve 'true independence' and a more active contribution to world peace. In addition, Abe's group constructed domestic others as 'enemies within': these included mainly progressives like the Yoshida School of politicians and the Keisei-kai politicians. By defining them as the 'enemies within' and 'anti-Japanese', Abe and his supporters tried to marginalize their political rivals and to expand their own power base in domestic politics so as to achieve their ultimate goal: the revision of the Constitution. These arguments explain how nationalism shaped foreign policy toward China, North Korea and India under the Abe administration.

Abe's diplomacy toward China and North Korea was examined in Chapter 6, which focuses on how the rapprochement with China was legitimized and how the issue of North Korea policy was manipulated by Abe's group. Unlike Koizumi, the apparently

nationalistic Abe actually improved the bilateral relationship with China by shelving the history issue, modifying his wording, and adopting a 'strategic ambiguity'. In addition, China's showing its understanding and appreciation to Japan's 'peaceful' identity avoided the rise of the kind of social antagonisms inside Japan that had been used to justify Koizumi's uncompromising stance. On the domestic political front, this had allowed any improvement in the relationship to become a source of political capital for Japan's political leaders, which Abe wanted to use for himself and prevent his opponents from utilizing it against him. Furthermore, his strong power base in the right-wing traditionalist group within the LDP worked out in his favor because his Abe's hard-line policy toward North Korea could offset discontents against the rapprochement with China among anti-China groups. Indeed, the Abe administration explicitly and implicitly reduced China to only a 'potential threat' or an 'inassimilable other' in foreign policy discourse, which prevented the administration from achieving fundamental reconciliation with China but was far less confrontational than the stance of his predecessor. On the other hand, Abe was consistent in taking a tough stance to North Korea and rejected making any concessions over the abduction issue because it was considered to be a question related to the fundamental character of Japan as a 'state'. In a nutshell, Abe tried to use the abduction issue to reconstruct Japan's identity by restoring a bond between nation and state, reconsidering postwar security policy, and reviewing the postwar low-profile foreign policy in East Asia. In this sense, a hard-line policy toward North Korea was an integral part of his political agenda of 'the departure from the postwar regime'.

The final case study in chapter 7 scrutinized how nationalism was used in the enhancement of ties with India under the Abe administration in order to provide a more neutral comparison for understanding the role of nationalism in policy towards China and North Korea. Japan's increased access to India was officially placed in the context of

‘proactive diplomacy’ and the ‘Arc of Freedom and Prosperity’, whereas it was actually a part of policy toward China. This can be seen in the construction of India as a ‘Japan-friendly’ country, which shares universal values, has strong sympathy with Japan, respects Japan’s contribution for peace and that will not problematize the history issue. While these constructions served to reproduce positive facets of Japan’s identity, they also highlighted its differences with China: not sharing universal values, often demonstrating an ‘anti-Japanese’ attitude, negating positive aspects of Japan’s identity and exploiting the history issue as a diplomatic tool. These constructions of subjects made deepening ties with India more likely because it was an ‘assimilable other’, while any fundamental improvement of the bilateral relationship with China could be said to be less likely because it was an ‘inassimilable other’. In addition, the emphasis on ‘value-oriented diplomacy’ in policy toward India was treated as a source of political capital for political leaders to offset frustrations among the anti-Chinese group against Abe’s rapprochement with China. It could also be used to highlight China’s ‘radical otherness’ and to counter it on the history issue, and finally to consolidate support for the Abe administration in order to realize its ‘conservative’ political agenda of the ‘departure from the postwar regime’.

8.2 Findings from case studies: the role of nationalism

As described above, the past chapters set out to chart the complex relationship between nationalism and Japan’s foreign policy in East Asia. The five case studies clearly demonstrate that nationalism plays an important role in foreign policy-making and Japanese politics, which could shed new light on the existing literature. There can be seen some implications and findings that Japan’s nationalism is not monolithic, that Japan’s political leaders try to reconstruct Japan’s national identity through diplomacy in Asia,

and that they utilize nationalism as a source of political capital.

8.2.1 Japan's multiple nationalisms

First, as touched on in the introduction, nationalism tends to be identified with right-wing traditionalism and is regarded as 'marginalized' or 'suppressed' in postwar Japan. However, it would be misleading to assume that postwar Japan's 'nationalism' belongs to only one group or the other. In fact, there were divided nationalisms, both of which expressed a national desire of the restoration of Japan's 'autonomy' from the US: the progressives endorsed the 'pro-Constitution' nationalism and the right-wing conservatives advocated the right-wing traditional nationalism centered on 'traditional culture' and the 'sacred' Emperor system. In addition to these types of nationalism, not only the revisionist movements from the 1990s but also the strategy of historic reconciliation led by mainstream conservatives can also be seen as an alternative expression of nationalism, which aimed to reconstruct Japan by reinforcing the relationships with neighboring countries. Therefore, there can be seen at least three kinds of nationalism in historical context of postwar Japan and they came to be inherited by various actors.

In the case of the two Prime Ministers looked at this thesis, both broke the mold by adopting different nationalistic values from the progressives, mainstream conservatives and the revisionists. It is sometimes argued that Koizumi's China policy was based on the 'right-wing' nationalism while his policy toward North Korea was not. However, this is not plausible as the case study demonstrated. By reiterating apologies for past aggression and completing the war settlement through normalization of ties with Pyongyang, Koizumi seemed to follow the strategy of historic reconciliation and attempted to attract

support from centrists and the progressives. He thus appropriated nationalism in his own way, using a strategy that came to be endorsed by mainstream conservatives in the LDP and other centrist powers in the Diet. On the other hand, his uncompromising attitude to China garnered support from anti-Chinese revisionists. Although Koizumi mobilized ‘social antagonism’ to legitimize his stance on the Yasukuni Shrine issue, his emphasis was put on the representation of Japan as a ‘peaceful country’ to counter China’s manipulation of the history issue.

Therefore, Koizumi’s foreign policy seemed to have a multi-faceted aspect because he incorporated various nationalisms into his policy. Moreover, it might be argued that the fact that Abe improved the Japan-China relationships shelving the history issue and his original anti-Chinese stance would demonstrate that Japan’s political nationalism was likely to be marginalized in foreign policy. However, Abe’s foreign policy toward China definitely represented nationalism because it was hinged on China’s understanding and appreciation of Japan’s ‘peaceful’ identity as a matter of logic and because his approach to India was inextricably associated with policy toward China. As the case study shows, the dichotomy between India and China is a good way to emphasize the ‘anti-Japanese-ness’ and ‘inassimilability’ of China so that a fundamental reconciliation with China becomes less likely to realize. It is in this sense that nationalism played a key role in the foreign policy of the Abe administration. Both Koizumi and Abe can thus be said to have picked and chosen various issues to mobilize different faction, voters and resources by utilizing variant nationalistic rhetoric. Therefore, it can be proposed that not only a particular group of actors but all political leaders in Japan must endeavor to take advantage of nationalism of some kind. As a result, Japan’s nationalism should not be reduced to a single right wing ideology but should be understood as a multi-dimensional phenomenon.

8.2.2 The reconstruction of national identity in foreign policy

Secondly, the case studies in this thesis demonstrate that Japan's political leaders attempted to reconstruct Japan's national identity in the post-Cold War era by utilizing foreign policy toward East Asian countries. As a number of narratives on foreign policy debate in the Diet reveal, political actors sought to legitimize their stance by articulating an appropriate version of national identity based on themes such as 'democracy' or a 'peaceful' country'. The Koizumi administration thus justified its uncompromising policy toward China by contrasting differences between China as a 'militaristic', 'interfering' and 'authoritarian' state and Japan as a 'peaceful', 'respectful of rule of law', and 'democratic' nation. In other words, it reconstructed and reinforced Japan's identity by alienating China as a radical other and thus legitimized its inflexible approach on the Yasukuni Shrine issue. The policy to normalize diplomatic ties with North Korea was also endorsed by the Koizumi government by arguing that it would mean that Japan had become a more proactive contributor to regional peace and stability. Put simply, normalization of the relationship with North Korea was alleged to be necessary for Japan to realize its 'peaceful' identity because Japan could not become free from the history burden without completing the war settlement. Therefore, normalization would serve to realize Japan's role as a 'peaceful country' with a more proactive initiative in Northeast Asia without the 'spell of history' that dominated foreign policy discourse in Koizumi's camp.

On the other hand, the Abe administration did also articulated a version of Japan's national identity in its foreign policy. This can be seen in the representation of North Korea not just as an 'authoritarian' but as an 'inhumane', 'tyrannical' and 'hyper

militaristic' state, which totally lacks respect for basic human rights or democratic values. These representations worked to emphasize how 'abnormal', 'dangerous', and 'deviant' the DPRK was in the international community and illuminated the differences from Japan. By highlighting these 'abnormalities' of North Korea, the Abe administration delineated a picture of Japan's 'peaceful' identity. Furthermore, a hard-line policy toward the DPRK was a part of Abe's primary agenda, the 'departure from the postwar regime', which obviously sought to reconstruct postwar Japan's identity by restoring the bond between state and its people, reconsidering security policy, and reviewing conventional low-profile diplomacy in Asia.

With regard to policy toward China, a tentative settlement of the diplomatic crisis inherited from Koizumi was enabled partly because of the fact that China demonstrated an understanding and appreciation of Japan's postwar development as a peaceful nation. This indicates that the Abe administration legitimized the rapprochement with China by arguing that it served to reconstruct and reinforce Japan's 'peaceful' identity. At the same time, the representation of China as a 'non-democratic', 'militaristic' and 'dangerous' other, was articulated in foreign policy discourse to emphasize Japan's opposite identity. Moreover, a policy to enhance the ties with India was based on the similarities between Japan and India and the difference between India and China. By contrasting 'friendly' India and 'anti-Japanese' China, the friend-foe division between India and China was reinforced and Japan's identity as a 'peaceful nation', which upholds universal values and contributes to world peace could be reproduced. In short, a policy toward India worked to reproduce the positive facets of Japan's identity while, at the same time, reinforcing its 'peaceful' identity by abandoning China as a subject that will not share universal values, often demonstrates an 'anti-Japanese' attitude, tends to negate positive aspects of Japan's identity and exploits the history issue as a diplomatic tool. In this way, Japan's political

leaders sought to reconstruct or reinforce Japan's identity by articulating an identity of the 'other' in foreign policy discourse.

8.2.3 Nationalism as political capital

Finally, there can be observed a linkage between nationalism in foreign policy and domestic power relationships. Political leaders utilize nationalism as a kind of political capital to legitimize their policy, to secure their footing, and marginalize their rivals. They utilize the construction of the self/other nexus in foreign policy discourse in order to take advantage in domestic power struggles. In other words, to raise their domestic credentials and defeat their rivals, political leaders tend to construct not only elements of an 'external other', who are foreign countries, but also an 'internal other', made up of their political opponents. It might be no wonder that political subjects attempt to do so, because a discourse naturalizes a hierarchy between the self and the other.

In this way, Prime Minister Koizumi utilized nationalism among the traditionalists centering around their resentment against China and tried to offset their discontents to his policy to North Korea. Moreover, his unyielding approach to China was inextricably associated with his effort to marginalize the Keisei-kai faction, which were his political opponents and the most China-friendly group in the LDP. In this sense, nationalism played a role as a source of political capital in domestic power politics for him that was more than just as a vote-gathering strategy for the presidential election. On the other hand, Koizumi's policy to normalize the bilateral relationship with North Korea can also be regarded as a source of political capital for his government. Ironically, the Koizumi administration sought to remove a sense of stagnation on Japan's diplomacy, such as the diplomatic deadlock in the Japan-China relationship, which was the result of Koizumi's

attempt to balance his reconciliatory approach to Pyongyang by an uncompromising stance to China.

In the case of Shinzo Abe, the linkage between nationalism foreign policy and domestic power relationships seems to be more visible. The fact that he improved a soured relationship with China immediately after taking office demonstrated that the rapprochement with China became an urgent task and also a source of political capital for would-be Japanese political leaders. At that time, the rapprochement with China rather than the frustration among anti-Chinese groups would be an important source of political capital in the successor race of Koizumi. This was a disadvantageous situation for Abe, who is well known as a staunch anti-Chinese politician because other politicians could try to exploit this as an opportunity to expand their influences and power resources in the situation of leadership change. Therefore, Abe needed to prevent the improvement of the Japan-China relationship from being manipulated by his opponents, especially the most prominent rival Yasuo Fukuda and the largest opposition party, the DPJ, in order to take a firm grip on power.

In addition, Abe's China policy was closely associated with his approach to India in terms of domestic power politics. Put simply, India was utilized to offset Abe's rapprochement with China by appeasing the frustrations among anti-Chinese revisionists. It was also manipulated to enhance solidarity among anti-Chinese 'conservatives' to consolidate Abe's power base. Abe's paying honor to Judge Pal and emphasizing 'universal values' was used not only to legitimize their revisionist views and to marginalize China, but also to contribute to the consolidation of the Abe administration and to realize its political agenda of the 'departure from the postwar regime'. Furthermore, Abe's hard-line policy toward North Korea manifested the linkage between domestic politics and nationalism in foreign policy. As a part of the 'departure from the postwar

regime', he legitimized his tough stance towards Pyongyang by emphasizing how the conventional 'low-profile' policy had damaged Japan's national interest and exposed the Japanese people to the 'threat' of North Korea. What was attacked in his discourse was not only the progressives but also mainstream conservative politicians who had shaped the Japanese government in the postwar era. In this way, Abe and his supporters utilized an uncompromising attitude on the abduction issue as a source of political capital to crush their political rivals and boost their credentials.

Moreover, it was not limited to the two Prime Ministers to utilize nationalism as a source of political capital in domestic politics. As touched on in the case study chapters, a number of other political actors also tried to appropriate nationalism to contend for power and influence. Anti-Chinese groups attempted to seize the occasion to publically attack China and to counter dissidents in the Diet when Prime Minister Koizumi was showing an unyielding stance on the Yasukuni Shrine issue. By supporting Abe's policy toward North Korea, the Komei Party harshly criticized its rival parties, the SDP and the JCP. For the 'neo-revisionists', endorsing Japan's identity with an emphasis on 'universal values' was a new tool to marginalize China and to consolidate their power so as to realize their 'true conservatism'. In this way, various political actors tried to exploit nationalism as a source of political capital, utilizing different issues to legitimize their status or to offset their weakness. Therefore, nationalism is not just used as a vote-gathering strategy at the election but utilized in a more complex manner in factional politics.

8.3 The nationalisms of Koizumi and Abe

One of the most important aspects of this thesis, then, is the discussion of the different kinds of nationalism that can be found structuring foreign policy under the administrations of Koizumi and Abe. As mentioned earlier, Koizumi generally inherited the strategy of historic reconciliation in terms of the effort to normalize the relationship with North Korea. He sought to expand Japan's international role and to take an initiative in the region in political and security field as a 'peaceful' nation. In order to achieve this, a closure of the history issue was indispensable. Although anti-Chinese politicians supported his uncompromising policy toward China, Koizumi's basic perception toward China was not hostile and his perception of history was quite different from the revisionist view. It can be thought that his inflexible attitude on the Yasukuni issue was aimed at making China relinquish its manipulation of the history issue. In this sense, it can be argued that Koizumi contended for nationalism that pursued the reconstruction of Japan's national identity as a 'peaceful' country which was free from the 'spell of history' and played a major role in international society, including the construction of a regional security framework.

On the other hand, Abe's vision was clearly based on the 'neo-revisionist' discourse. Whilst he improved the bilateral relationship with China by shelving his original stance on the interpretation of history, his diplomatic orientation was consistent considering the approach to India. By emphasizing 'universal values', unlike the right-wing traditionalists, he insisted on the enhancement of ties with other democracies, which he explicitly promoted to deepen the commitment to the Japan-US Alliance and implicitly marginalize China. Abe also represented Japan as a 'peaceful' country, which plays a positive role to highlight the radical 'otherness' and 'inassimilability' of China and

North Korea. His hard-line policy toward North Korea was aimed at not only reviewing postwar Japan's low-profile diplomacy in Asia but also at revising the domestic 'postwar regime' itself. Given these features, Abe's policy can be regarded as representing a kind of 'neo-revisionist' nationalism. In what follows, the next section explains in more details the different features of Koizumi and Abe's versions of nationalism, namely, the representation of a 'peaceful country', the focus on a 'closure of the history issue', and the consequent vicious circle of nationalism and foreign policy toward Asia.

8.3.1 A 'peaceful country'

Despite differences in basic stance, the nationalisms of the two Prime Ministers have some commonalities. First, both of them tried to reconstruct Japan's identity as a 'peaceful' country, which would be appropriate to their own type of nationalism. As a background, there was a political intention widely shared by political leaders that in order to survive in an era of globalization and grip a political leadership commensurate with its economic power, Japan should reconstruct its national identity. As a 'peaceful' country identity has been an unshakable national value in postwar Japan, they tried to exploit it by giving it an alternative meaning so as to fit their policy programs. In general, their 'peaceful' country was different from the conventional usage that is based on Article 9 in the Constitution. In general, the two administrations tended to emphasize 'Japan's contribution to the peace and stability of the world through peaceful means over more than sixty years since World War II', which was, in their idea, widely appreciated by countries all around the world. This construction of Japan's identity seemed to rely on the contrast with the representation of China and North Korea as 'militaristic', 'untrustworthy' and 'deviant' in the international community. Furthermore, to decide whether or not a

country appreciated Japan, this identity was used as a standard to judge if it was a 'pro-Japanese' country or not. When the country did not acknowledge postwar Japan's 'peaceful' path and tried to raise the history issue, it was regarded as an 'anti-Japanese' country which negated Japan's identity. Domestic social antagonisms arising from this would then legitimize a tough stance towards that country according to this logic. In addition, they abandoned traditional 'unilateral pacifism' and desired to play a more active role in the regional security framework as a 'true partner' of the US based on the enhancement of the Japan-US Alliance. In short, Japan's 'peaceful' identity was largely reconstructed through the articulation of China and North Korea as others in foreign policy discourse in the Koizumi and Abe administrations.

Yet, there can also be seen a different emphasis on the content of 'peaceful-ness' between Koizumi and Abe. In the context of justification of his annual visit to the Yasukuni Shrine, Koizumi's focus was on postwar Japan's non-militaristic development and its deep remorse for its past misdeeds during the war. Although he mobilized 'social antagonism', which was caused by China's consequent negation and blockage of his version of Japan's alleged identity, the 'peaceful country' identity itself was not designed to marginalize the feelings of neighboring countries. This can be seen in the way that the Koizumi administration also attempted to legitimize its policy of normalization with North Korea and thereby to take an important political initiative in the regional security framework. In a nutshell, Koizumi's 'peaceful country' was constructed as a country, which would expand the regional role of Japan as a 'major power' in the political, and security areas. This might be made possible by the fact that Japan would have no more diplomatic rows over the history issue as a result of the normalization of the relationship with North Korea.

In contrast, Abe's articulation of Japan as a 'peaceful' country mainly played the

role of highlighting his country's differences from China and North Korea. In other words, a 'peaceful' identity was defined by the articulation of an opposite identity to China and North Korea. Therefore, it was represented as opposite to a 'militaristic', 'authoritarian', 'inhumane', 'untrustworthy' country which posed a threat to the international community. Furthermore, this construction of a 'peaceful' identity served to illuminate the radical 'otherness' and the 'inassimilability' of China and North Korea, which was utilized to legitimize a hard-line policy toward them. In addition, as demonstrated in chapter 5, the representation of Japan as a 'peaceful country' would mean further commitment to the US Alliance to contribute to 'world peace' and by revising the Constitution. Therefore, there can be seen no concerns in Abe's thinking for the 'burden of history' or diplomatic considerations for neighboring countries over the history issue because the revisionist view of history refuses to accept the war responsibility of Japan.

In this way, despite being seen by many as right wing nationalists, the Koizumi and Abe both tried to construct Japan's identity as a 'peaceful country' in foreign policy discourse. Judging from their way of manipulating the term, a 'peaceful' nation seems not to have a stable or fixed meaning but tends to be defined by the construction of an opposite identity from that of China and North Korea. In this sense, the meaning of a 'peaceful country' is not fixed but remains arbitrary in their discourse so that it can be used to accumulate factional and popular support and legitimize their policy programs.

8.3.2 A closure of the 'postwar era'

The second commonality between Koizumi and Abe was that they pursued a closure of the 'postwar era'. As mentioned before, Japan's political leaders sought to reconstruct Japan's national identity in order to survive in the global era and expand its

presence in international society. To achieve this, it was widely recognized that Japan should resolve its history issue because a ‘spell of history’ has prevented it from playing a proactive role in the region. In other words, there has been a widespread perception that a heavy ‘burden of history’ has restricted Japan’s autonomy in Asian diplomacy. In relation to the reconstruction of national identity, it was considered to be necessary to get rid of the ‘spell of history’ for Japan to restore trust from neighboring countries and to expand its role in the region, that is to say, to become a ‘peaceful country’ which proactively contributes to the regional security framework.

Prime Minister Koizumi generally tried to deal with the negative legacy from the ‘postwar era’ by reiterating the official apology to Asia for Japan’s past misdeeds during the war. But he also set out a different approach from the conventional diplomatic framework. For instance, his uncompromising attitude on the Yasukuni Shrine issue was the expression of his determination to discourage China to exploit the history issue as a bargaining chip in diplomatic negotiations. The emphasis on the representation of North Korea as the ‘only country, which has not restored the bilateral relationship’ in the Koizumi administration reflected a widely-shared belief that the normalization of diplomatic ties with Pyongyang was an integral part of a closure of the history issue. On the other hand, as clearly shown by his slogan ‘the departure from the postwar regime’, Abe also strove for the termination of ‘history-bound’ foreign policy. For him and the revisionists the history issue was nothing but a ball and chain which has unduly restricted Japan’s diplomacy in Asia. In this sense, both administrations tried to bring an end to Japan’s history issue so as to restore the ‘autonomy’ of Japan.

Yet, there can be seen differences in approach between Koizumi and Abe on how to achieve a closure of the history issue. As seen from the fact that Koizumi reiterated an apology for Japan’s past misdeeds in international settings, he never denied Japan’s war

responsibility nor glorified its aggression towards China and its colonial role in the Korean Peninsula. For instance, the Japan-DPRK Pyongyang Declaration clearly stated that ‘The Japanese side regards, in a spirit of humility, the facts of history that Japan caused tremendous damage and suffering to the people of Korea through its colonial rule in the past, and expressed deep remorse and heartfelt apology (Koizumi: 2002-b)’. The Koizumi administration sought to normalize the relationship with Pyongyang by accepting Japan’s responsibility to colonial rule in the Korean Peninsula. While he staunchly continued the annual visit to the Yasukuni Shrine and tried to make China relinquish the manipulation of the history issue, his rhetorical justification was not based on the revisionist view of history. Instead, he intended to bring the ‘postwar era’ to an end by removing the ‘spell of history’ and achieving reconciliation with neighboring countries. Given these, the Koizumi administration sought to obtain a diplomatic initiative in the region by settling the history issue in line with the strategy of historic reconciliation.

In contrast, efforts made by the Abe administration to bring the ‘postwar era’ to an end by pursuing the ‘departure from the postwar regime’, did rest on the revisionist’s view of history. Although he stated that he would follow the Murayama Statement when he became Prime Minister and shelve the history issue in the relationship with China, it was clear that his perception toward history remained the same as it had always been, judging from his paying honor to Judge Pal. For instance, Abe noted that the Class A Criminals should not be regarded as ‘criminals’ in Japan (NDRP: 2006-m), while Koizumi clarified that they were ‘war criminals’ (NDRP: 2005-n). In addition, unlike Koizumi, Abe was never too keen to express ‘deep reflection’ on Japan’s past aggression and offer apologies to the victims in Asia.

Therefore, Abe seemed not to seek reconciliation with China even though he improved the relationship and established a ‘strategic mutual beneficial relationship’.

Furthermore, with regard to the North Korea issue, he would not acknowledge the necessity to compensate for colonial rule or to normalize the bilateral relationship. Instead, Abe and his supporters diverted the focus of the ‘history issue’ from prewar Japanese aggression to the misdeeds of China and North Korea in the postwar era, emphasizing how these two countries infringed on Japan’s sovereignty. As mentioned in chapter 5, according to this discourse it was ‘apology diplomacy’ and exaggerated concerns over criticism of China and South Korea, which restricted Japan’s autonomy in the neo-revisionists’ discourse. In this context, Abe strove to end the history issue and restore ‘autonomy’ not by achieving reconciliation with neighboring countries but by leaving behind the issue of Japan’s war responsibility.

In relation to the desire to restore ‘autonomy’ in foreign policy discourse, it should be pointed out that both the Koizumi and Abe administrations did not pursue ‘independence’ from the US unlike the right-wing traditionalists or the progressives. Rather, they tried to obtain ‘autonomy’ by deepening ties with the US. For instance, Koizumi illuminated the centrality of the alliance in Japan’s foreign policy, and stated that ‘the stronger and closer Japan-US relations are, the more likely we are able to forge better relations with countries around the world, starting with China, the Republic of Korea, and other Asian countries’ (Glosserman 2006: 22). This statement demonstrated Koizumi’s perception that even when the relationships with neighboring countries became soured, Japan could secure its position in the region as long as it maintains close ties with the US. Therefore, Koizumi seemed not to be cautious about over-dependency on the US and domestic resentment against it. While Abe’s camp criticized the Occupation policy of the US, however, they also vowed to enhance the commitment to the Japan-US Alliance because it would increase Japan’s voice in the Alliance and thus could establish an ‘equal relationship’. Despite often citing from the right-wing traditionalist narratives, Abe never

criticize postwar Japan's over-dependency on the US and would not adopt anti-American discourse, which was typical in the argument of the previous generation. In this sense, Abe walked on a political tightrope, juggling both anti-US and pro-US stance. Given these, there can be seen little backlash against the subservience to the US in the discourse of Koizumi and Abe. Therefore, it can be argued that Koizumi's and Abe's nationalism could not defuse a sense of antipathy toward the US, which has long been an underlying essence of postwar Japan's nationalisms.

8.3.3 A negative cycle of nationalism and foreign policy

This thesis also offers some insights into the dynamics between the use of nationalism in the Koizumi and Abe administrations and the making of foreign policy. Central to this is the way in which both Prime Ministers became trapped in a negative cycle of reconstructing Japan's identity, which was originally aimed at increasing the country's autonomy in Asian diplomacy and enhancing its status in the region but resulted in some negative consequences. At first, the primary goal of the neo-revisionists to revise the 'foreign-written' Constitution shows, a sense of antipathy towards the US has not diminished but still underlies Japan's nationalism. This sense of frustration over Japan's subservience to the US was traditionally expressed in the form of criticism of the 'lack of autonomy'. In this context, political leaders would utilize nationalism to demonstrate that they pursue the 'restoration of autonomy'. Conventionally, postwar Japan's 'nationalistic' politicians, whether the left-wing progressives or the right-wing conservatives, explicitly or implicitly claimed to be accommodating 'anti-US' sentiment and 'independence from the US'. However, although both administrations aspired to bring the history issue to an end and to restore Japan's 'autonomy' in diplomacy in Asia, they were not able to reflect

this discontents over Japan's subservience to the US. Instead, they insisted that it was necessary to enhance ties with the US to obtain the 'autonomy' of Japan in Asia because all foreign relations with Asian countries relied on the Japan-US Alliance, as described above. Koizumi, therefore proactively strengthened Japan's commitment to the Alliance whilst he weakened the relationship with China over the Yasukuni Shrine issue. In addition, as touched on in chapter 5, Abe and his supporters reconstructed the meaning of a 'lack of autonomy' to imply that Japan's foreign policy was restricted not by the US but by the Constitution and the concessions to neighboring countries on the history issue. It was thus not the US but rather China that was presented as preventing Japan from achieving 'true independence'. In this context, a hard-line policy toward China or North Korea can be regarded as a 'trade-off act' to calm public discontents of subservience to the US, as can be seen in Abe's tough stance to ease frustrations over his rapprochement with China.

It can be seen, therefore, that the impact of nationalism on the foreign policies of the two administrations inevitably disrupted relationships with neighboring countries, although it was in ways more complex than much of the literature implies. Koizumi's attempt to bring an end to the history issue in the relationship with China and to normalize the relationship with North Korea could not remove the 'burden of history' in the end. Instead, Japan suffered from a sense of diplomatic stagnation and could not increase its influence in the region. Not to mention his inflexible approach to North Korea, Abe's policy toward China did not contribute to any fundamental reconciliation because he merely shelved the history issue and did not change his original stance. Because focus of both Prime Ministers put more emphasis on ties with the US and other 'democratic' countries like India, which might not raise the history issue, Japan could not restore trust from the regional countries or increase its diplomatic autonomy in East Asia during the

two administrations. In fact, the legitimization rhetoric of Koizumi's visit was not widely accepted, considering the criticism that came even from Asian countries other than China and South Korea¹. Moreover, the Koizumi administration could not obtain enough support from neighboring countries to obtain a permanent seat in the UNSC. Consequently, Japan could not break a sense of diplomatic stagnation on its own and came to seek closer ties with the US to secure its status in the region. This made Japan's diplomacy even more dependent on the US and those who were discontented over Japan's subservience to the US were not relieved. Political leaders thus tried to find an outlet for such discontentment in other foreign relations besides the US and ended up adopting a hard-line policy as a 'trade-off'.

In this way, a negative cycle of Japan's nationalism and foreign policy in the Koizumi and Abe administration was created and reproduced. As a consequence, there can be observed a strange pattern that the more Japan claimed the 'restoration of autonomy', the more it would deepen its dependency to the US. This vicious circle might not be terminated as long as Japan's political leaders utilize resentment against the subservience to the US in anti-Chinese or anti-North Korea sentiment in political circles and towards the public. Instead, it is necessary to resolve the history issue and war compensation problem with neighboring countries and to restore trust with them if Japan seeks real diplomatic 'autonomy' that is acceptable to the region.

8.4 Implications and prospects for future research

This thesis explores how nationalism was utilized by Japan's political elite to

¹ For instance, Singapore Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong stated that Koizumi's worship gave an impression to the people of Singapore that Japan did not acknowledged responsibility of its past misdeeds (Asahi Shimbun 2005-c).

articulate national identity in contemporary Japan's foreign policy discourse. It has raised some implications for the theory of nationalism and presented an empirical study of Japan's foreign policy. First, having made a case for the importance of nationalism, including nationalism, which is conventionally treated as a domestic political factor, this study suggests that a structural analysis focusing solely on the material interests and based on the clear distinction between the domestic and the foreign is insufficient to understand the role of nationalism in foreign policy-making. As political actors manipulate nationalism by articulating national identity in order to legitimize their policy programs and to seek advantage in domestic politics, they build linkages between foreign policy and domestic politics every time they utilize nationalism as a form of political capital.

Furthermore, there can be seen a continuous process of drawing a line between 'inside' and 'outside', that is, articulating the 'domestic' and the 'foreign' in foreign policy discourse. In this sense, what is 'national' is discursively reproduced: it cannot be stable or fixed but is arbitrary and fluid. Therefore, to analyze foreign policy with the assumption of a fixed national identity might not offer a plausible explanation for the role of nationalism in foreign policy. To make these observations does not mean a total rejection of the claims made by neo-realists and neo-liberalists. Instead, it aims to construct more powerful explanatory models of nationalism in foreign policy by combining domestic political factors, the self/other nexus and the legitimization strategy of foreign policy-making. Therefore, this thesis can contribute to enrich the study of nationalism in IR and foreign policy analysis.

In addition, this thesis has implications for the development of the study of nationalism in the subject of International Relations. In other words, the examination of foreign policy toward China, North Korea, and India under the Koizumi and Abe administrations demonstrates the utility of an approach that treats nationalism as a kind of

discourse on the continuous process of attaining, maintaining, and reproducing national identity. As the case studies have demonstrated, certain versions of nationalism produce various identities of subjects and the hierarchical relationship among them in foreign policy discourse. By doing so, nationalism naturalizes the hierarchy among subjects and thereby legitimizes a particular policy and marginalizes other policy options. For instance, the rapprochement with North Korea was abandoned due to the articulation of its national identity as an ‘authoritarian’, ‘hyper-militaristic’ and ‘criminal’ country, which was undoubtedly inferior to Japan, under the Abe administration. Taking another example, in the discourse of the pressure school, those who support the postwar regime and normalization of diplomatic ties with North Korea were labeled as the ‘enemy within’, who were treated as inferior to the ‘guardians of the Japanese people’, that is, Abe’s group. With regard to constructing the identity of subjects and a ‘reality’ in which a power relationship among subjects is articulated, nationalism can be regarded as a kind of discourse. In this sense, nationalism can be considered to be not only political capital or a legitimization strategy but ‘power as productive’. This perception might help to enrich understanding of the nature of nationalism, how it can be bound up with various ideologies, ideas and political thoughts, how it can be utilized in power struggles in domestic politics, and how a domestic power relationship might be projected on to foreign policy-making. Therefore, this thesis might contribute to the development of a new perspective on the relationship between nationalism and foreign policy.

Second, although it focuses on the Koizumi and Abe administrations, this thesis offers some implications for how Japan’s political leaders will try to utilize nationalism in foreign policy in the future. Unlike conventional observations, Japan’s nationalism is not limited to the right-wing traditionalist nationalism. In addition, a main division in domestic politics shifted from the confrontation between the progressives and the

conservatives under the '1955 system' to the intra-conservative rivalry within the LDP and between the LDP and the DPJ. Despite a change in government, there can be seen a great continuity in the policies of the LDP and the DPJ as Dobson (2012: 250) points out. Therefore, the foreign policy of even the ruling DPJ toward Asia is not free from the issue of closure of the 'postwar era' and has to deal with contested 'nationalisms'. Among them, for instance, the emphasis on the 'East Asian Community' in the Hatoyama administration and the reaction against it can be regarded as a recurrence of confrontation between the strategy of historic reconciliation and the neo-revisionist movements. Therefore, it can be argued that as long as there are divided nationalisms, they can still be a source of political capital among political actors.

On the other hand, the LDP recently shows an increasingly conservative tilt to make a sharp contrast with the DPJ and to consolidate support from the conservative constituency. Shinzo Abe has become increasingly active in claiming to uphold his 'true conservatism' to 'depart from the postwar regime' and in criticizing Asian diplomacy under the DPJ government. As the LDP is likely to strengthen its ability to regain control in the Diet, Abe's nationalism might gain momentum in the LDP. Given these developments, it can be said that the arguments in this thesis will continue to be useful for analyzing Japan's nationalism in foreign policy under the post-Abe administrations.

Finally, this thesis might contribute to the termination of the vicious circle of nationalism and Japan's foreign policy toward Asia. Although there can be observed so little public debate on 'nationalism in foreign policy' in Japanese society because nationalism is always connected to the 'prewar' 'militaristic' nationalism, this should not be a reason for keeping the issue of 'national identity' untouched in the national debate. Japan's nationalism is divergent and ubiquitous. Not only a small number of the radical right-wing politicians but all political actors, who contend for power and influence, try to

utilize nationalism and to construct a kind of national identity that can legitimize their footings. No matter how unrelated to 'nationalism' political leaders may appear, for example, by upholding 'universal values' instead of the sanctity of the Emperor, their foreign policy is inextricably associated with the articulation of national identity and the friend-foe division: 'who we are' and 'who we are not', and 'who is our friend?' and 'who is our enemy?'. Even the notion of a 'peaceful country', which is often taken for granted as a national value in postwar Japan, is likely to be manipulated by being given various timeserving meanings. Therefore, it might not be sufficient for Japan to restore trust from neighboring countries to merely represent itself as a 'peaceful country' by relying on binary oppositions.

In order to break the negative cycle of nationalism and Asian diplomacy, Japan needs to reconstruct its national identity in a way that is aimed not at offsetting discontents among a certain group or against another country but is based on a national consensus over how Japan can come to terms with its past. On this point, there is still room for further research into how Japan's nationalism can be compatible with the movement of regional integration in East Asia. In general, the relationship between nationalism and regional integration seems to remain a matter of debate, with the former often identified as an obstacle to the latter. As Japan is seeking to expand its role in regional integration, understanding the relationship between nationalist politics and foreign policy remains an important task ahead.

PhD Dissertation Bibliography

- Abe, K., (2001), *Samayoeru Nashonarizumu: Orientarizumu/Japan/Gurobarizeishon (Nationalism in drift: Orientarism/Japan/Globalization)*, Tokyo, Sekaishissha.
- Abe, S., (2002-a), (interviewed by Kudo, Y.), ‘Matamata “ku-ki” ni oshitsubusareta seiron (The justice which was hampered by “atomosphere” again’, *Seiron*, August 2002, pp. 84-93.
- , (2002-b), (interviewed by Shima, N.), ‘Nihon ha nattoku shiteinai (Japan has not accepted a situation)’, *Voice*, December 2002, pp. 40-49.
- , (2003-a), (interviewed by Kudo, Y.), ‘Wasururunakare Mizudorino haotoni obieta heike no kubiki (Don’t forget that the Heike took fright even at the rustle of the flying birds)’, *Shokun*, February 2003, pp. 64-72.
- , (2003-b), (interviewed by Sakurai, Y.), ‘Iraku ko-geki ha tsugi heno fuseki (Attacks on Iraq was strategic move to the next step)’, *Voice*, April 2003, pp. 52-63.
- , (2003-c), (interviewed by Endo, K.), ‘Kim Jong-Il kara Nihon wo mamorimasu (I would protect Japan from Kim Jong-Il)’, *BungeiShunju*, June 2003, pp. 168-175.
- , (2003-d), (interviewed by Hashimoto, G.), ‘Jikan ha wareware ni yuri ni hataraku (Time will favor us)’, *Chuokoron*, August 2003, pp. 60-63.
- , (2003-e), (interviewed by Ishihara, S.), ‘”Kangan kokka” tonon ketsubetsu no toki (It is a high time to say good-by to an eunuch state)’, *Bungeishunju*, August 2003, pp. 112-120.
- , (2003-f), (interviewed by Fukuda, K.), (Kishi Nobusuke no fukkatsu (the resurgence of Nobusuke Kishi)’, *Shokun*, September 2003, pp. 22-33.
- , (2003-g), (interviewed by Yoneda, K.), ‘Nihon kakusei no tameni wareware ha nani wo subekika (What we should do for the enhancement of Japan’s wakefulness)’, *Seiron*, September 2003, pp. 72-83.
- , (2003-h), (interviewed by Nakanishi, T.), ‘”Sengo no owari” ga hajimatta (“The end of the postwar era” has started), *Voice*, October 2003, pp. 72-83.
- , (2003-i), (interviewed by Yokota, S. and Sato, K.), ‘Kanjicho shitsu hatsu, rachikaiketsu heno michi (A way to resolve the abduction issue from the office of the Secretary general), *Shokun*, December 2003, pp. 24-36.
- , (2003-j), (interviewed by Arai, H.), Choshu no Abe kanjicho, Aizu no teiko-seiryoku to oini kataru (The Secretary general Abe from the Choshu district had a

dialogue with ‘resistance force’ from the Aizu district), *Seiron*, December 2003, pp. 60-74.

-----, (2004-a), ‘Kim Jong-II taisei hokai no shunkan (The moment of collapse of the Kim Jong-II regime)’, *Bungeishunju*, February 2004, pp. 280-283.

-----, (2004-b), (interviewed by Armitage, R.), ‘Nichibei Domei ga Kitachosen wo oitsumeru (The Japan-US Alliance can put North Korea into the corner)’, *Bungeishunju*, July 2004, pp. 150-157.

-----, (2004-c), (interviewed by Nakanishi, T.), ‘Kitachosen, Iraku, kono kokunan wo koete hoshu fukken wo mezase (North Korea and Iraq: Seek for the resurgence of the conservatives)’, *Seiron*, July 2004, pp. 62-73.

-----, (2004-d), (interviewed by Fukada, Y.), ‘Dankotaruisiwo Simesu Seiji (Politics that demonstrates steadfast will)’, *Voice*, August 2004.

-----, (2004-e), ‘Kaiken de kosenken mo mitomerubeki (the right to wage war should be admitted through the revision of the Constitution)’, *Asahi Shimbun Weekly AERA*, 5 August, 2004, pp. 16-17.

-----, (2004-f), ‘Hoshu saisei no tame kanjicho wo jisu (I resign as the secretary general of the LDP to reconstruct conservatives)’, *Bungeishunju*, September 2004, pp. 156-162.

-----, (2004-g), (interviewed by Sakurai, Y. and Yagi, H.), ‘Imakoso “jubaku” kenpo to rekishi “hyoryu” karano ketsubetsu wo (Now is the time to depart from the “spell” of the Constitution and “drift” of historical recognition)’, *Seiron*, November 2004, pp. 82-95.

-----, (2005-a), ‘Bush taisho ha nihon no chansu (Bush’s victory is Japan’s chance)’, *Voice*, January 2005, pp. 68-75.

-----, (2005-b), (interviewed by Furuya, K., Shimomura, H., and Yamatani, E.), ‘Saccha kaikaku ni manabe! Kyoiku saiko no nin ha kokka ni ari (Learn from the reform of Thatcher! The responsibility to reconstruct national education lies with a state)’, *Seiron*, January 2005, pp. 76-90.

-----, (2005-c), ‘Seisai made nagai yuyo ha ataenai (We should not suspend sanctions)’, *Chuokoron*, March 2005, pp. 52-55.

-----, (2005-d), (interviewed by Nakanishi, T.), ‘Ianfu mo yasukuni mo “Asahi mondai” da (The comfort women issue and the Yasukuni issue are fundamentally ‘Asahi Newspaper problem’)', *Shokun*, March 2005, pp. 22-33.

-----, (2005-e), ‘Watashi no Asahi Shimbun hihan, Chikushi Tetsuya hihan (My

criticism against Asahi Newspaper and Tetsuya Chikushi)', *Shokun*, April 2005, pp. 26-34.

-----, (2005-f), (interviewed by Yoshiyuki Kasai), 'Nicchu ha "Seikeireinetsu" de chodoyoi (We have no problem with "Cold in Politics and Hot in Economy")', *Voice*, July 2005, pp.54-64.

-----, (2005-g), (interviewed by Hisahiko Okazaki), 'Chugoku no Yokogurumawo Yurushitenarumonoka (Steadfastly refusing China's unreasonable demand)', *Shokun*, 2005 August, pp. 36-44.

-----, (2005-h), 'Chugokunimo Beikokunimo "No" wo (Say "no" to China and the US)', *Bungeishunju*, September 2005, pp. 95-102.

-----, (2005-i), "'Makegumi" mo sukueru Kozokaikaku (Structural Change which can save "losers")', *Voice*, December 2005, pp. 60-63.

-----, (2005-j), 'Nigerukika, Asahi! (Are you running away, Asahi Newspaper?)', *Shokun*, December 2005, pp. 28-38.

-----, (2006-a), *Abe Shinzo Taironshu (Dialogues with Shinzo Abe)*, Tokyo, PHP.

-----, (2006-b), *Utsukushi Kuni he (Toward a Beautiful Country)*, Tokyo, Bungeishunju.

-----, (2006-c), 'Konokuninotameni Inochiwo suteru (Gladly give my life for this country)', *Bungeishunju*, September 2006, pp.94-108.

-----, (2006-d), (Interviewed by Kodama, K.), "'Utsukushi Nihon" he ketsudan to ishi wo (Determination and Will to realize Beautiful country)', *Bungeishunju*, May 2006, pp. 216-223.

Abe, S., (2006-e), '*Policy Speech at the 165th Diet*', Tokyo, 29 September 2006, available online at <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/abespeech/2006/09/29syosin.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

Abe, S., (2006-f), '*Press Conference of Prime Minister Shinzo Abe*', 8 October 2006, Beijing, available online at <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/abespeech/2006/10/08chinapress.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

Abe, S., (2006-g), '*Japan-China Joint Press Statement*', 8 October 2006, available online at http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/kaidan/s_abe/cn_kr_06/china_kpress.html (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2006-h), '*Joint Statement Towards Japan-India Strategic and Global Partnership*', 13 December 2006, Tokyo, available online at

<http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/abespeech/2006/12/15joint.pdf#search='Joint%20Statement%20Towards%20JapanIndia%20Strategic%20and%20Global%20Partnership%20%202006> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2006-i), *'My Thoughts on the Fundamental Law of Education'*, Abe Cabinet E-mail Magazine, 16, November 2006, Vol. 6.

-----, (2006-j), *'End of the Diet Session and 50th Anniversary of Japan's Admission to the UN'*, Abe Cabinet E-Mail Magazine, 21 December 2006, Vol. 11

-----, (2007-a), *'Japan and NATO: Toward Further Collaboration'*, 12 January 2007, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/europe/pmv0701/nato.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2007-b), *'Policy Speech at the 166th Diet'*, Tokyo, 26 January 2007, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/europe/pmv0701/nato.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2007-c), *'Japan-China Joint Press Statement'*, Tokyo, 11 April 2007, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/china/pv0704/joint.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2007-d), *'Joint Statement on the Roadmap for New Dimensions to the Strategic and Global Partnership between Japan and India'*, New Delhi, 22 August 2007, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/pmv0708/joint-2.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2007-e), *'Confluence of the Two Seas'*, 22 August 2007, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/pmv0708/speech-2.html> (accessed 10 February 2013).

-----, (2007-f), *'Policy Speech at the 167th Diet'*, 10 September 2007, available online at <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/abespeech/2007/09/10syosin.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

Abe, S., and Okazaki, H., (2004) *Konokuni o Mamoru Ketsui (The Determination to defend this country)*, Tokyo, Fusosha.

Akaha, T., (1999), 'Three Faces of Japan: Nationalist, Regionalist, and Globalist Futures' in Yamamoto, Y., ed., (1999), *Globalism, Regionalism and Nationalism: Asia in Search of its Role in the Twenty-First Century*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.

-----, (2007), 'Japanese Policy toward the North Korean Problem: Balancing Bilateralism and Multilateralism', *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 3-4, pp. 297-320.

Ahn, Byung-Joon (2004), 'The rise of China and the Future of East Asian Integration', *Asia-Pacific Review*, Vol. 11 No.2, pp18-35.

Allinson, G. D., (1993), 'The Structure and Transformation of Conservative Rules', in Gordon, A., ed., (1993), *Postwar Japan as History*, Berkley, London, University of California Press.

Anderson, B., (1991), *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, the second edition*, London, Verso.

Angel, R. C., (1989), 'Prime Ministerial leadership in Japan: Recent Changes in Personal Style and Administrative Organization', *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 61, No. 4, pp.581-602.

Arai, S., (2006), *Rekishi Wakai ha Kanou ka (Possibility of Historical Reconciliation)*, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten.

Asaba, M., (2004), *Nashonarizumu: Meicho de tadoru Nihon shiso Nyumon (Nationalism, Reader for Japan's Political Thought)*, Tokyo, Chikumashobo.

Asahi Shimbun (1993), 'Sakino Senso wo "Shinryaku Senso" to Meigen Hosokawa Kishakaiken (Prime Minister Hosokawa stated at the Press Conference that the Previous War was an Aggressive War)', 11 August 1993.

-----, (1994), 'Sakurai Kankyochō Chokan Hatsugen Shusho ga GenzyūChui, Seifu Chugoku nadoni Ikan no I (Prime Minister gave a Strong Warning to the Administrator of the Environment Agency, Sakurai, the Japanese Government expressed regret over his Remark)', 13 August 1994, p3.

-----, (1995), 'Nikkan Kankei Shufuku ni Dageki, Eto Hatsugen Shuno Kaidan, 18 nichi ni Osakade (The Remark of Eto deal a severe blow to the improvement of the Japan-South Korea Relationship, on 18 at Osaka)', 9 November 1995, p.2.

-----, (2002-a), 'Seiken ato 1 nen, 4 wari Koizumi banareso genkai minuku? (Koizumi has less than 1 year left in office, Desertion of Koizumi's 40 percent of supporters, gaining insight into the limits?)', 22 April 2002.

-----, (2002-b), "'Doi, Kan Shi ha Manuke na Giin", Rachi Mondai Taio de Abe Fukuchokan (The Deputy Chief Cabinet Secretary Abe stated that "Members of the House of Representatives, Doi and Kan are Idiots" over responses over the Abduction Issue)', 20 October 2002.

-----, (2002-c), 'Kyu Shakai Kyosan ha "Yukai no Kyohan", Nakagawa Shi ga Yato Hihan (The Defunct JSP and JCP are Accomplices of the Abduction by North Korea", Mr. Nakagawa criticized opposition parties)', 22 October 2002.

-----, (2003), '*Shusen Kinenbi no Yasukuni Sanpai "Koyaku ni shinai" Sosaisen ("Koizumi did not Pledge" the visit to the Yasukuni Shrine on the Anniversary day of the Asia-Pacific War in the Presidential Election of the LDP)*', 16 August 2003.

-----, (2004-a), '*Benmei Kurushiku Hanpatsu niramami jiki saguru (A Lame Explanation, Expecting Reactions against the Visit to the Yasukuni and Looking for the Right Time)*', 3 January 2004.

-----, (2004-b), '*Kazoku Kikoku nara Jindo Shien (Considering Humanitarian Aid if the families of the abductees return)*', 9 May 2004.

-----, (2004-c), '*Shusho Saihocho Joken ni Nandai (The Difficult Task for the prime Ministerial Visit to North Korea again)*', 11 May 2004.

-----, (2005-a), '*"Rekishi Ninshiki Jukkou Unagasu" On Shusho, Nihon ni Taio Yokyu ("Demanding Serious Thought to Historical View", Premier Wen asked Japan's Response)*', 13 April 2005.

-----, (2005-b), '*Yoron wo Ishiki Kyoko Shisei (Consideration for Public Opinion, A Hard-Line Stance)*', 18 April 2005.

-----, (2005-c), '*Yasukuni Sanpai "Shuhenkoku no Shiten wo Singaporu Ri Shusho (Singaporean Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong asked "the Perspective of neighboring Countries")*', 18 May 2005.

-----, (2006-a), '*Koizumi go he nicchu shido (Resuming the Sino-Japan Relations for post-Koizumi era)*', 23 February 2006.

-----, (2006-b), '*Habatsu koe Azia Benkyokai (Lawmakers joined the Asia Study Group across factions in the LDP)*', 16 March 2006.

-----, (2006-c), '*"Shobai toha Betsu" Shusho hanpatsu ("Business and Politics are different", Prime Minister stated)*', 10 May 2006.

-----, (2006-d), '*Sosaisen Fukuzatsu siko wo kisotte (Competing ideas on the Presidential Election of the LDP)*', 30 May 2006.

-----, (2006-e), '*Ozawashi, Fusekino Hochu Jimin he Gaiko de Tairitsujiku (Mr. Ozawa visited China as a strategic move, Countering the LDP in the area of foreign policy)*', 30 June 2006.

-----, (2006-f), '*Fukudashi Fushutsuba Hi-Abe Seiryoku kyuchini (Mr. Fukuda will not run in the presidential election of the LDP, anti-Abe group being pushed into a corner)*', 23 July 2006.

-----, (2006-g), '*Yoron Chosa (Public opinion poll)*', 25 July 2006.

-----, (2006-h), '*Kanmon koe Seiken Ando (Abe administration cleared the*

first hurdle'), 9 October 2006.

3rd November 2006, *Yomiuri Shimbun*. Yoron Chosa

-----, (2007-a), '*Yoron Chosa (Public Opinion Poll)*', 11 March 2007.

-----, (2007-b), '*Nichi Bei Go In Taiwa, Rice Chokan Shincho ni Koike Boeisho to Kaidan (The US Secretary of State Rice met with the Defense Minister Koike and showed a cautious stance to the idea of talks among Japan, the US, Australia and India)*', 10 August 2007.

Aso, T., (2005-a), '*Asian Strategy As I See It: Japan as the "Thought Leader" of Asia*', 7 December, available online at

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/fm/aso/speech0512.html> (accessed 10 February 2013).

-----, (2005-b), *Press Conference*, Tokyo, available online at http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/press/kaiken/gaisho/g_0512.html#5 (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2005-c), '*Asian Strategy As I See It: Japan as the "Thought Leader" of Asia*', 7 December, available online at

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/fm/aso/speech0512.html> (accessed 10 February 2013).

-----, (2006-a), '*Japan Welcomes China's Democratic Future: Contribution by Minister for Foreign Affairs Taro Aso to the Asian Wall Street Journal*', 13 March 2006, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/fm/aso/contribute0603.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2006-b), '*Working together for a Stable and Prosperous East Asia: Lessons from the Past, a Vision for the Freedom to Dream*', 3 May 2006, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/fm/aso/address0605.html> (accessed 10 February 2013).

-----, (2006-c), '*A Networked Asia: Conceptualizing Future*', 26 May 2006, available online at http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/press/enzetsu/18/easo_0526.html (accessed 10 February 2013).

-----, (2006-d), '*Yasukuni ni Iyasakaare*', 8 August *Asahi Shimbun*, available online at <http://www.aso-taro.jp/lecture/talk/060811.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2006-e), '*Arc of Freedom and Prosperity: Japan's Expanding Diplomatic Horizons*', 30 November 2006, available online at

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/fm/aso/speech0611.html> (accessed 10 February 2013).

-----, (2007-a), *Totetsumonai Nihon (Astonishing Japan)*, Tokyo, Shinchosha.

- , (2007-b), *Jiyu to Hanei no Ko (The Arc of Freedom and Prosperity)*, Tokyo, Gentosha.
- , (2007-c), 'Policy Speech at the 166th Diet', 26 January 2007, available online at http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/press/enzetsu/19/easo_0126.html (accessed 10 February 2013)
- , (2007-d), 'Middle East Policy As I See it', 28 February 2007, available online at http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/middle_e/address0702.html (accessed 10 February 2013).
- , (2007-e), 'On the "Arc of Freedom and Prosperity"', 12 March 2007, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/pillar/address0703.html> (accessed 10 February 2013).
- Aso, T., and Komori, Y., (2006), 'Ajia ha Chukan dakejanai (Asia would not mean only China and South Korea)', *Voice*, March 2006, pp.128-138.
- Berger, T. U., (1993), 'From Sword to Chrysanthemum: Japan's Culture of Anti-militarism', *International Security*, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 119-150.
- , (1998), *Cultures of antimilitarism: national security in Germany and Japan*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- , (2003), 'The Construction of Antagonism: The History of Problem in Japan's Foreign Relations' in Ikenberry, G. J., and Inoguchi, T., (eds), (2003), *Reinventing the Alliance: US-Japan Security Partnership in an Era of Change*, New York, Palgrave.
- , (2007), 'The Politics of Memory in Japanese Foreign Relations' in Berger, T. U., Mochizuki, M. M., and Tsuchiyama, J., (2007), *Japan in International Politics: The Foreign Policies of an Adaptive State*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Billing, M., (1995), *Banal Nationalism*, London, Sage.
- Bojiang, Y., (2006), 'Redefining Sino-Japanese Relations after Koizumi', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 129-137.
- Bowen, R. W., (2003), *Japan's Dysfunctional Democracy: The Liberal Democratic Party and Structural Corruption*, New York, M. E. Sharpe.
- Brass, P., (1991), *Ethnicity and nationalism: Theory and comparison*, New Delhi, SAGE.
- Brown, D. M., (1955, 1971), *Nationalism in Japan: An Introductory Historical Analysis*, Berkley, University of California Press.
- Burr, V., (1985), *An Introduction to Social Constructivism*, New York, Routledge

- Buzan, B., (1988), 'Japan's future: old history versus new roles', *International Affairs*, Vol. 64, No. 4, pp.557-573.
- Calder, K. E., (1988), 'Japanese Foreign Economic Policy Formation: Explaining the Reactive State', *World Politics*, Vol. 40, No. 4, pp. 517-541.
- (1993), *Strategic Capitalism: Private Business and Public Purpose in Japanese Industrial Finance*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- (2004), 'Securing Security through Prosperity: The San Francisco System in Comparative Perspective', *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 135-57.
- Campbell, D., (1992), *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press.
- Catalinac, A. L., (2007), 'Identity Theory and Foreign Policy: Explaining Japan's Responses to the 1991 Gulf War and the 2003 U.S. War in Iraq', *Politics & Policy*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp.58-100.
- Cha, V. D., (2002), 'Koizumi Goes to Pyongyang', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 4, No.3, pp. 103-111.
- , (2003-a), 'The Sweet, the Sour, and the Bittersweet', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 113-120.
- , (2003-b), 'Contemplating Sanctions', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp.111-118.
- , (2003-c), "'Containment Lite'", *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp.119-126.
- , (2003-d), 'What a Difference A Year Makes....', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 129-136.
- , (2004-a), 'It's the Economy (and Culture), Stupid', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 133-140.
- , (2004-b), 'Happy Birthday, Mr. Kim', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 117-124.
- , (2004-c), 'Engagement from Strength', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 135-144.
- , (2004-c), 'Nuclear Sea of Fire', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 129-134.
- Christensen, T. J., (1999) 'China, the US-Japan Alliance, and the Security Dilemma in East Asia', *International Security*, Vol. 23, pp. 49-80.
- Christensen, R., (2000), *Ending the LDP Hegemony: Party Cooperation in Japan*,

Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press.

Chung, C. P., (2011), 'Japan's Involvement in Asia-Centered Regional Forums in the Context of Relations with China and the United States', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 51, No. 3, pp. 407-428

Citrin, J., Haas, E. B., Muste, C., and Reingold, B., (1994), 'Is American Nationalism Changing? Implications for Foreign Policy', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 38, pp. 1-31.

Commission on Japan's goal in the Asia-Pacific Region in the 21st Century (1992), '*21 seiki no Azia/Taiheiyo to Nihon (Asia-Pacific Region and Japan in the 21st Century)*', available online at

<http://www.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~worldjpn/documents/texts/APEC/19921225.O1J.html>

(accessed 10 February 2013)

Connolly, W. E. (1991), *Identity/Difference; Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

Coony, K. J., (2002), *Japan's Foreign Policy: A Quest for Normalcy*, London, Routledge.

Cottam, M., L., and Cottam, R., W., (2001), *Nationalism and Politics: the Political behaviour of Nation States*, London, Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Curtis, G., (1988), *The Japanese Way of Politics*, New York, Columbia University Press.

----- (1999), *The Logic of Japanese Politics: Leaders, Institutions and the Limits of Change*, New York, Columbia University Press.

----- (2001), 'The Koizumi Administration: Its Significance and Prospects', *Japan Review of International Affairs*, Winter 2001, pp. 291-303

Dale, P. N., (1986), *The Myth of Japanese Uniqueness*, London, Croom Helm.

Doak, K. M., (1996), 'Ethnic Nationalism and Romanticism in Early Twentieth-Century Japan', *Journal of Japanese Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp.77-103.

----- (1997), 'What Is a Nation and Who Belongs? National Narratives and the Ethnic Imagination in Twentieth-Century Japan', *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 102, No. 2, pp.283-309.

Diez, T., (2001), 'Europe as a Discursive Battleground; Discourse Analysis and European Integration Studies', *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 5-38.

Dobson, H., (2012), 'Japan's response to the changing global order', *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 229-257.

- Doty, R. L., (1993), 'Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp.297-320.
- , (1996), 'Sovereignty and the Nation: Constructing the Boundaries of National Identity', in Biersteker, T. J. and Weber, C., (1996) *State Sovereignty as Social Construct*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Downs, E. S., and Saunders, P. C., (1998), 'Legitimacy and the Limits of Nationalism: China and the Diaoyu Islands', *International Security*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 114-146.
- Dreyer, J. T., (2006), 'Sino-Japanese Rivalry and its Implications for Developing Nations', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 46, Issue, 4, pp. 538-557.
- Drifte, R., (1990), *Japan's Foreign Policy*, London, Routledge.
- , (2003), *Japan's Security Relations With China: from Balancing to Bandwagoning?*, London, Routledge-Curzon.
- , (2009), 'The Future of the Japanese-Chinese Relationship: The case for a Grand Political Bargain', *Asia Pacific Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp/55-74.
- Edkins, E., (1999), *Poststructuralism & International Relations: Bringing the Political Back In*, Boulder London, LYNNE RIENER PUBLISHERS.
- Envall H. D. P., (2011), 'Abe's Fall: Leadership and Expectations of Japanese Politics', *Asian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 149-169.
- Finlayson, A., (1998), 'Ideology, Discourse and Nationalism', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 99-118.
- Fujio, M., (1986), 'Hogen Daijin ooini hoeru (Irresponsible remarks of a minister)', *Bungeishunju*, October 1986, pp. 122-133.
- Fujiwara, K., (2001), *Senso o Kioku suru (Memorizing War)*, Tokyo, Kodansha.
- Fukuda, H., (2009), 'Why Are There So Many Hereditary Politicians in Japan?', *Asia-Pacific Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 1-14.
- Fukuda, K. and Otsuka, E., (2002), *Saigo no Taiwa: Nashonarizumu to Sengo Minshushugi (The Final Dialogue: Nationalism and Postwar Democracy)*, Tokyo, PHP Kenkyujo.
- Fukuda, Y., (2001), 'Statement of the Chief Cabinet Secretary Yasuo Fukuda: on Junior High School History Textbooks, which are used from 2002', Tokyo, 3 April 2001, Available online at http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/press/danwa/13/dfu_0403.html (accessed 10 February 2013)

- Funabashi, Y., (2001), *Ima Rekishi Mondai ni Do Torikumuka (How to tackle with History Issue now)*, Tokyo, Iwanamishoten.
- , (2007), *The Peninsula Question*, Washington, Brookings Institution Press.
- , (2011), *Peninshura kuesuchon (The Peninsula Question)*, Tokyo, Asahi bunko.
- Furtado, C. F. Jr., (1994), 'Nationalism and Foreign Policy in Ukraine', *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 109, No. 1, pp.81-104.
- Furuya, K., (2007), 'The Establishment of the Diet Member's Group for Promoting Value-Oriented Diplomacy', 18 May 2007, available online at <http://www.furuya-keiji.jp/blog/archives/98.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- Gao, H., (2008), 'The China-Japan Mutually Beneficial Relationship Based on Common Interests and East Asian Peace and Stability', *Asia-Pacific Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 36-51.
- Gaunders, A., (2007) *Political Reform in Japan: Leadership looming large*, New York, Routledge.
- Gayle, C. A., (2003), *Marxist History and Post War Japanese Nationalism*, London and New York, Routledge Curzon.
- Genron NPO, (2007), *Daisankai Peking- Tokyo Foramu (The Third Beijing-Tokyo Forum)*, Tokyo, Genron NPO.
- Glosserman, B., (2006), 'The Alliance Transformed?', in *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp.19-28.
- Gordon, A., ed., (1993), *Postwar Japan as History*, Berkeley, London, University of California Press.
- Gotoda, M., (1986), 'Statement of the Chief Cabinet Secretary Gotoda: on Official Visit to the Yasukuni Shrine of Prime Minister and Other Ministers', 14 August 1986, Tokyo, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/taisen/gotouda.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- Green M., (2003), *Japan's Reluctant Realism: Foreign Policy Challenges in an era of uncertain Power*, New York, Palgrave.
- Green, Michael, J. and Koizumi, S., (2006), 'US-Japan Relations; Enter Abe Stage Right', *Comparative Connections*, Vol.8, No. 3, pp.19-26.
- Guang, L., (2005), 'Realpolitik Nationalism: International Sources of Chinese Nationalism', *Modern China*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp.487-514.

- Guibernau, M., (2007), *The Identity of Nations*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Hagström, L., (2005), 'Quiet power: Japan's China policy in regard to the Pinnacle Islands', *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 159-188.
- , (2009), 'Normalizing Japan: Supporter, Nuisance, or Wielder of Power in the North Korean Nuclear Talks?', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 49. No. 5, pp. 831-851.
- Hall, S., (1983), *The Politics of Thatcherism*, London, Lawrence and Wishart in association with Marxism Today.
- , (1996), 'Who Needs "Identity"?'', in Hall and Gay (1996)
- Hall, S. and Gay, P. eds., (1996), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, London, SAGE.
- Hansen, L. (2006), *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*, New York, Routledge.
- Hashikawa, B., (2001), *Nashonarizumu: Sono Shinwa to Ronri (Nationalism: Its Myth and Logic)*, Tokyo, Chikuma Shobo.
- Hashimoto, G., Iida, M, and Kato, H., (2002), *Zukai Nihon Seiji no Shohyakka (Illustrated Encyclopedia of Japan's Politics)*, Tokyo, Ichigeisha.
- Hata, N., (2002), 'Koizumi Shusho Yasukuni Sanpai no Seijikatei: "Kokka to Irei" ni kansuru Joron' (The Political Process of the Visit to the Yasukuni Shrine of Prime Minister Koizumi: An Introduction on 'state and memorial service'), *Senso Sekinin Kenkyu*, 2002, Vol. 36, pp.10-18.
- Hatano, S., (2004), "'Rekishu Wakai" heno Dohyo --- Sengo Nihon Gaiko niokeru "Rekishu Mondai" (A Signpost for "Historical Reconciliation" --- "History Issue" in Postwar Japan's Diplomacy), in Soeya, Y., and Tadokoro, M., eds., (2004) *Nihon no Higasi Azia Koso (Japan's scheme on East Asia)*, Tokyo, Keio University Press.
- Hashimoto, R., (1997-a), '*An effort for the New Japan-China Diplomacy*', 28 August 1997, Tokyo, available online at <http://www.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~worldjpn/documents/texts/exdpm/19970828.S1J.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- , (1997-b), '*Press Conference of Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto*', 9 September 1997, Beijing, available online at http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/kaidan/kiroku/s_hashi/arc_97/china97/kaiken.html (accessed 10 February 2013)
- Hattori, R., *Nicchu Kokko Seijoka (The Normalization of the Japan-China Relationship)*, Tokyo, Chuokoronsha.
- Hayashi, H., (2008) 'Disputes in Japan over the Japanese Military "Comfort Women"

System and Its Perception in History', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 617, pp. 123-132.

Hayes, L. D., (2001), *Introduction to Japanese Politics, third edition*, New York, M. E. Sharpe.

He, Y., (2006), 'National mythmaking and the problem of history in Sino-Japanese relations', in Lam Peng Er (2006) *Japan's Relations with China*.

-----, (2009), *The Search for Reconciliation--- Sino-Japan and German-Polish Relations since the World War II*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

He, B. and Guo, Y., (2000), *Nationalism, National Identity and Democratization in China*, Aldershot, Ashgate.

Heginbotham, E. and Sammuels, R. J. (1998), 'Mercantile Realism and Japanese Foreign Policy', *International Security*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 171-203.

Hiwatari, N., (2005) 'Japan in 2004', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 41-53.

-----, (2006), 'Japan in 2005', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 22-36.

Hood, C., P., (1999), 'The Election of Ishihara: A Symbol of Rising Nationalism in Japan?', *Briefing Paper New Series*, No.7, The Royal Institute of International Affairs, pp.1-6.

Hook, G. D., Gilson, J. Hughes, C. W., Dobson, H., (2001), *Japan's International Relations: Politics, Economics, and Security*, London, Sheffield Centre for Japanese Studies/ Routledge Series.

Hook, G. D., ed., (2011), *Decoding Boundaries in Contemporary Japan: The Koizumi Administration and Beyond*, New York, Sheffield Centre for Japanese Studies/ Routledge Series.

Hopf, T., (2002), *Social construction of International Politics; Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 & 1999*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

Hoshiyama, T., (2008), 'New Japan-China Relations and the Corresponding Positioning of the United States --- History, Values, Realism in a Changing World', *Asia-Pacific Review*, 2008, Vol.15, No.2, pp. 68-101.

Houghton, D. P., (2007), 'Reinvigorating the Study of Foreign Policy Decision Making: Toward a Constructivist Approach', *Foreign Policy Analysis*, Vol. 3 (2007), pp. 24-45.

Howard, D., (2000), *Discourse*, Philadelphia, Open University Press.

Hrebenar, R. J., (2000), *Japan's New Party System*, Colorado, Westview Press.

Hudson, V. M. ed., (1997), *Culture and Foreign Policy*, Boulder, London, Lynne Leinner Publishers.

Hughes, C. R., (1997), 'Globalization and Nationalism: Squaring the Circle in Chinese International Relation Theory', *Millennium*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 103-124.

-----, (2002), 'Nationalism and multilateralism in Chinese foreign policy: implication for Southeast Asia', *The Pacific Review*, Vol.18 No.1, pp.119-135.

-----, (2005) 'Interpreting nationalist texts: a post-structuralist approach', *Journal of contemporary China*, Vol. 14 No. 43, pp. 247-67.

-----, (2006), *Chinese Nationalism in the Global Era*, London, Routledge

-----, (2008), 'Japan in the politics of Chinese leadership legitimacy: recent developments in historical perspective', *Japan forum*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 245-266.

-----, (2009) 'After 1989: Nationalism and the Global Elite', in Kipnis, A., Tomba, L. and Unger, J., *Contemporary Chinese society and politics*. London, UK: Routledge, 2009, pp. 361-394.

Hughes, C. W., (2002), 'Japan-North Korean Relations from the North –South Summit to the Koizumi-Kim Summit', *Asia-Pacific Review*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp.61-78.

------(2006), 'Why Japan Could Revise Its Constitution and What It Would Mean for Japanese Security Policy', *Orbis*, Vol. 50, No. 4, pp. 725-744.

------(2009-a), 'Japan's response to China's rise: regional engagement, global containment, dangers of collision', *International Affairs*, Vol. 85, No. 4, pp. 837-856.

------(2009-b), "'Super-sizing" the DPRK Threat: Japan's Evolving Military Posture and North Korea', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 291-311.

Hurrell, A., (1995), 'Regionalism in Theoretical Perspective', in Fawcett, L. and Hurrell A., (1995), *Regionalism in World Politics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Ichijo, A., (2002), 'The Scope of Nationalism: Comments on the Scottish and Japanese Experiences', *Geopolitics*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp.53-74.

Iida, Y., (2002), *Rethinking Identity in Modern Japan: nationalism as aesthetics*, London, Routledge.

Ikeda, S., (2007), "'Yoshida Dokutorin" no Shinwa – 1960 nendai ni okeru Hosyu-Honryu no Nihon Kakubusoron (The Myth of the "Yoshida Doctrine"-Argument of Nuclear Armament of the Mainstream Conservatives in the 1960s)' in Shindo and Mito (2007)

Igarashi, T., and Okamoto, Y., (2005), 'Nihon gaiko to "rekishi ninshiki" mondai (Japan's diplomacy and the issue of "historical perception")', *Kokusaimondai*, No. 549, pp. 2-20.

- Ikenberry, G. J., and Inoguchi, T., (eds), (2003), *Reinventing the Alliance: US-Japan Security Partnership in an Era of Change*, New York, Palgrave.
- Iokibe, M., (1989), *Nichibei Senso to Nihon Gaiko (Japan-US War and Japan's diplomacy)*, Osaka, Osaka Shoseki.
- , (2004), 'Han-Chu "Genrishugi" ha yugaimueki dearu (Anti-Chinese "fundamentalism" does more harm than good)', *Chuokoron*, No. 5, 2004, pp. 78-89.
- , (2006), *Shinpen Nihon Gaikoshi (New History of Japan's diplomacy)*, Tokyo, Yuhikaku.
- Ito, H., (1990), *Nichibei Kankei: Kokusaika to Nashonarizumu (Japan-US Relationship: Internationalization and Nationalism)*, Tokyo, Mineruva Shobo.
- Ito, N., (2008), *Gendai Nihon no Hoshushugi Hihan (Criticism against Contemporary Conservatism)*, Tokyo, Ochanomizushobo.
- Ito, M., (1985), *Ikeda Hayato to sono Zidai (Hayato Ikeda and his era)*, Tokyo, Asahi Shimbunsha.
- Iwami, T., (2005), 'Koizumi Yasukuni Seisaku no Kukyo to Meiso (The emptiness and confusion of Koizumi's Yasukuni policy)', *Chuokoron*, No. 8, 2005, pp. 50-57.
- Izumi, H., (2004), 'Rachi no Jubaku ha toketaga Kaku ga mada nokotteiru (Although we are released from the spell of the abduction issue but still have nuclear issue)', *Chuokoron*, July, 2004, pp. 50-55.
- Japan's Goals in the 21st Century, (1999), '*the Frontier Within: Individual Empowerment and Better Governance in the New Millennium*', 18 January 1999, Available online at <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/21century/> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- Jeanes, R.B., (2005), 'Victims or Victimizers? Museums, Textbooks and the War Debate in Contemporary Japan', *The Journal of Military History*, 69, pp.149-195.
- Johnson, C., (1995), *Japan: Who Governs? The Rise of the Developmental State*, New York, Norton.
- Johnstone, C. B., (1998), 'Japan's China Policy: Implications for U.S.-Japan Relations', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 38, No. 11, pp. 1067-1085.
- Kabashina, I., and Steel, G., (2007a), 'How Junichiro Koizumi seized the leadership of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party', *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 95-114.
- Kabashima, I. and Steel, G., (2007b), 'The Koizumi Revolution', *Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Jan., 2007), pp. 79-84.
- Kaldor, M., (2004), 'Nationalism and Globalization', *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol. 10,

Issue 1-2, pp.161-177.

Kamisaka F. and Kato, K., (2006), 'Chugoku to Yasukuni Docchi ga okashii (Which claim would be unusual, China or the Yasukuni Shrine?)', *Bungeishunju*, No. 8, 2006, pp. 130-142.

Kang, D., (2005-a), 'Improving and Maturing, but Slowly', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 135-144.

-----, (2005-b), 'History Impedes the Future', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 123-132.

Kang, D. and Lee, J., (2005-a), 'Little Progress on North Korea or History Disputes', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 133-142.

-----, (2005-b), 'No Major Change', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 129-140.

-----, (2006-a), 'The Big Chill', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 123-134.

-----, (2006-b), 'Japan-Korea Relations: Seirei Ketsuzetsu (Cold Politics, Warm Economics)', *Comparative Connections*, 2006, April, Vol. 8. No.1, pp.135-144.

-----, (2006c), 'Japan-Korea Relations: More Squabbling, Little Progress', *Comparative Connections*, 2006, July, Vol.8, No. 2, pp.127-136.

-----, (2006d), 'Japan-Korea Relations: Missiles and Prime Ministers May Mark a Turning Point', *Comparative Connections*, 2006, October, Vol.8, No. 3, pp.139-150.

-----, (2007-a), 'Japan-Korea Relations: Abe's Ascension', *Comparative Connections*, 2007, January, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 141-152.

-----, (2007-b), 'The Honeymoon's over', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 133-144.

-----, (2007-c), 'Treading Water, Little Progress', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 147-158.

-----, (2007-d), 'With a New Japanese Leader, New Opportunities?', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 125-134.

Kang, S. J., (2001), *Nashonarizumu* (Nationalism), Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten

----- (2007), *Nicho kankei no Kokufuku* (Overcoming of Japan-North Korea Relationship), Tokyo, Shueishashinsho.

Kang, S. J., and Morris, H., (2002), *Nashonarizumu no Kokufuku* (Overcoming

- Nationalism), Tokyo, Shueisha.
- Kang, S. J., and Miyadai S., (2003), *Chohatsu suru Chi (Provocation of knowledge)*, Tokyo, Sofusha.
- Kaseda, Y., (2010), 'Japan's Role in the Korean Peace Building Process', in Kwak and Joo (2010), *Peace Regime Building on the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asian Security Cooperation*, Surry, Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Kato, K., (1992), 'The Statement of the Chief cabinet Secretary Kato: so-called "comfort women" who were from the Korean Peninsula', 6 July 1992, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/taisen/kato.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- , *Tsuyoi Riberaru (Strong Liberal)*, Tokyo, Bungeishunju.
- Katzenstein, P. J., (1996), *Cultural norms and national security: police and military in postwar Japan*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Katzenstein, P. J., Keohane, and Krasner, eds., (2002), *Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics*, The MIT Press.
- Katzenstein, P. J., Keohane, and Krasner, (2002), 'International Organization and the Study of World Politics' in Katzenstein, P. J., Keohane, and Krasner, eds., (2002)
- Katzenstein, P. J. and Shiraishi, T., (eds.), (2006) *Beyond Japan: The Dynamics of East Asian Dynamics*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.
- Kawakami, K., (2004), 'Kurikaesareru "Okina Yokyū Chiisana Dakyo" (Repeated "big demand and small concession")', *Chuokoron*, No. 7, 2004, pp. 56-63.
- Kawasaki, T., (2001), 'Postclassical realism and Japanese security Policy', *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 221-240.
- Kawashima, T., (1994), 'Sengo Minshuka niokeru Chitsujo Ishiki no Keisei (postwar democratization and the formation of order), in Nihon Seiji Gakkai (1994), *Nashonarizumu no Genzai/ Sengo Nihon no Seiji (Contemporary Nationalism and postwar Japanese Politics)*', Tokyo Iwanami Shoten.
- Kawashima, Y., (2003), *Japanese Foreign Policy at the Crossroads: Challenges and Options for the Twenty-First Century*, Washington, Brookings Institution Press.
- Keehn, E. B., (1990), 'Managing Interests in the Japanese Bureaucracy: Informality and Discretion', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 30, No. 11, pp.1021-1037.
- Keizai Doyukai (2006), 'Proposal to the Japanese and Chinese Government', available online: <http://www.doyukai.or.jp/policyproposals/articles/2006/pdf/060509.pdf> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- Kellas, (1991), *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, New York, St. Martin's Press.
- Kingston, J., (2001), *Japan in Transformation 1952-2000*, Essex, Pearson Education

Limited.

Kitaoka, S., (1995), *Sengo Nihon Gaiko Ronshu (Complete works of Postwar Japan's diplomacy)*, Tokyo, Chuokoronsha.

(2000), *Futsu no Kuni he (Toward a 'normal state')*, Tokyo, Chuokoronsha

-----, (2001), 'Can Koizumi the Demagogue Become a True Leader?', *Japan Review of International Affairs*, 2001, Winter, pp. 278-298.

-----, (2005), 'Iwarenaki Nihon Hihan wo haisu (Dampening baseless accusation against Japan)', *Chuokoron*, No. 6, 2005, pp. 54-63.

Klien, S., (2002), *Rethinking Japan's Identity and International Role: An Intercultural Perspective*, London and New York, Routledge.

Kobayashi, Y., (2005), *Senso Ron (On War)*, Tokyo, Gentosha.

Koizumi, J., (2002-a), 'Asia in a New Century - Challenge and Opportunity', *Boao*, 12 April 2002, available online at

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/china/boao0204/speech.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2002-b), *Japan-DPRK Pyongyang Declaration*, available online at http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/n_korea/pmv0209/pyongyang.html (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2003-a), 'The End of a Diet Session', *Koizumi Cabinet E-mail Magazine*, 31 July 2003, Vol. 105. Available online at

<http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/m-magazine/backnumber/2003/0731.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2003-b), 'The Tokyo Declaration for the Dynamic and Enduring Japan-ASEAN Partnership in the New Millennium', Tokyo, 12, December, 2003, available online at

http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/asean/year2003/summit/tokyo_dec.pdf (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2004-a), 'Second Visit to North Korea', *Koizumi Cabinet E-mail Magazine*, May 20 2004. Available online at

<http://www.mmz.kantei.go.jp/foreign/m-magazine/backnumber/koizumi/2004/0520.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2004-b), 'Japan-North Korea Meeting', *Koizumi E-mail Magazine*, 27 May 2004, Vol. 141. Available online at

<http://www.mmz.kantei.go.jp/foreign/m-magazine/backnumber/koizumi/2004/0527.html>

1 (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2004-c), 'Address by Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi At Dinner for International Conference on "The Future of Asia" Organized by the Nihon Keizai Shimbun', Tokyo, 3 June 2004, available online at

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/future/address0406.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2005-a), 'Speech by H.E. Mr. Junichiro Koizumi, Prime Minister of Japan', 22 April 2005, available online at

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/meet0504/speech.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2005-b), 'Remarks by Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi at "The Future of Asia" Conference Dinner (May 25) Hosted by the Nihon Keizai Shimbun', Tokyo, 25 May 2005, available online at

<http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/koizumispeech/2003/10/21press.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/future/remark0505.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2005-d), 'Naikaku Souridaijin Danwa (Statement of Prime Minister)', 15 August 2005, available online at

<http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/koizumispeech/2005/08/15danwa.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2005-e), 'Press Conference after the APEC Summit, 21 October 2003, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/economy/apec/2003/press1021.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2005-f), 'The Kuala Lumpur Declaration', Kuala Lumpur, 14 December 2005, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/eas/joint0512.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2006-a), *Koizumi Junichiro desu (This is Koizumi Junichiro)*, Tokyo, Jijigahosha,

Kokubun, R., (2003) 'China and Japan in the Age of Globalization', *Japan Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 3-17

-----, (2005), 'The Shifting nature of Japan-China relations after the Cold War' in Lam (2005-a)

-----, (2007), 'Changing Japanese Strategic Thinking toward China', in Rozman,

Togo, and Ferguson (2007) *Japanese Strategic Thought toward Asia*, NY, Palgrave Macmillan.

Köllner, P., (2006), 'The Liberal Democratic Party at 50: Sources of Dominance and Changes in the Koizumi Era', *Social Science Japan Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 243-257

Kono, Y., (1993), '*The Statement of the Chief Cabinet Secretary Kono: survey result on 'Comfort Women'*', 4 August 1993, available online at

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/taisen/kono.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

Kosaka, M., (1963), 'Genjitsushugisha no Heiwaron (Pacifism by Realists)' in Kosaka (1998), pp. 10-26.

-----, (1964), 'Kaiyo Kokka Nihon no Koso (Future Plan of Japan as a Maritime State)', in Kosaka (1998), pp. 139-209.

-----, (1968), *Saisho Yoshida Shigeru (Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida)*, Tokyo, Chuokoronsha

-----, (1969-a), 'Nihon no Gaiko Rongi niokeru Risoshugi to Genjitsushugi (Idealism and Realism in the debate of Japan's diplomacy)', in Kosaka (1998), pp. 518-543.

-----, (1969-b), 'Okinawa Henkankosho to Hodokikan no Yakuwari (The Negotiation on the Return of Okinawa and the role of Mass Media)', in Kosaka (1998), pp. 546-558.

-----, (1969-c), 'Jiritsu heno Yokkyu to Koritsu no Kiken (Desire for Autonomy and Threat of Isolation)', in Kosaka (1998), pp. 560-589.

-----, (1969-d), 'Ichiokunin no Nihonjin (One Hundred Million Japanese People)', in Kosaka (2000), pp. 7-302.

-----, (1979), 'Yutakasa no Shiren (Trials of Prosperity)', in Kosaka (1999), pp. 7-158.

-----, (1998), *Kosaka Masataka Zenshu 1 (Completed Works of Kosaka Masataka)*, Tokyo, Toshi Shuppan.

-----, (1999), *Kosaka Masataka Zenshu 2 (Completed Works of Kosaka Masataka)*, Tokyo, Toshi Shuppan.

-----, (2000), *Kosaka Masataka Zenshu 8 (Completed Works of Kosaka Masataka)*, Tokyo, Toshi Shuppan.

Kowner, R., (2002), 'Deconstructing the Japanese National Discourse: Laymen's Beliefs and Ideology', in Donahue, R. T., ed., (2002), *Explaining Japaneseness: on Japanese Enactments of Culture and Consciousness*, West Port, Ablex Publishing.

- Krauss, E. S., and Muramatsu, M., (1988), 'The Japanese Political Economy Today: The Patterned Pluralist Model', in Okimoto, D. I, and Rohlen, T. P. (eds.), (1988), *Inside the Japanese System*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Krauss, E. S. and Pekkanen, R. (2004), 'Explaining Party Adaptation to Electoral Reform: The Discreet Charm of the LDP?', *Journal of Japanese Studies*, Vol. 30, pp. 1-34.
- (2011), *The Rise and Fall of Japan's LDP: Political Party Organizations as Historical Institutions*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Kristof, N. D.,(1998), 'The Problem of Memory', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, pp.38-49.
- Kristeva, J. (1980), *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Kubalkova, V. ed., (2001) *Foreign Policy in A Constructivist World*, New York, M. E. Sharpe.
- Kwak, T. H, and Joo, S.H., (2010), *Peace Regime Building on the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asian Security Cooperation*, Surrey, Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Kydd, A., (1997) 'Sheep in Sheep's Clothing: why Security Seekers Do Not Fight Each Other'. *Security Studies*, Vol. 7, pp. 114-54.
- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C., (1985), *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, London, Verso.
- Lam, P. E., (2002), 'Structural Reforms in Japan: Promises and Perils', *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp.67-82.
- ed., (2005-a), *Japan's Relations with China: Facing a rising Power*, London, Routledge.
- , (2005-b), 'Japan's Deteriorating Ties with China: The Koizumi Factor', *China: An International Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 275-291.
- Lapid, Y. and Kratochwil, F., eds., (1996), *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner.
- (1996), 'Revisiting the 'National'; towards an Identity Agenda in Neorealism?', in Lapid and Kratochwil (1996).
- Larsen (1997), *Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis: France, Britain and Europe*, New York, Routledge.
- Laurence, H., (2007), 'Japan's proactive foreign policy and the rise of the BRICs', *Asian Perspective*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp.177-203.
- Lee, S. H., (2004), 'Shifting of Japan's National Security Norm and the Issue of North

Korean Abduction of Japanese, 2002-2004', in *Creation of New Contemporary Asian Studies Working Papers 15*, Center of Excellence Contemporary Asian Studies.

Lin, C. C., (2009), 'How Koizumi Won', in Reed, S. R., McElwain, K. M., and Shimizu, K., (eds.), (2009), *Political Change in Japan: Electoral Behaviour, Party Realignment, and the Koizumi Reforms*,

Lincoln, E. J., (2002), 'Japan in 2001', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 42, No. 1., pp. 67-80.

Lind, J., M., (2004), 'Pacifism or Passing the Buck?: Testing Theories of Japanese Security Policy', *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp.92-121.

----- (2011), 'The Haunt of History in Japan's foreign Relations' in Gaunder, A., ed., (2011), *Routledge Handbook of Japanese politics*, London, Routledge, pp.309-319.

Machimura, N., (2005-a), 'Address by Foreign Minister of Japan Nobutaka Machimura on the Occasion of the Asian-African Ministerial Meeting', 20 April 2005, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/meet0504/address.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2005-b), 'Japan's Global Strategy and the Japan-US Global Partnership on the 60th Anniversary of the End of World War II', New York, 29 April 2005, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/fmv0504/speech.html>(accessed 10 February 2013)

Mainichi Shimbun, (1986), 'Taiheiyosen Shusho Shinryaku datta (Prime Minister stated that The Pacific War was an Agression)', 4 September 1986.

-----, (1994), 'Shato, Sekinin Tsuikyū he Nagano Hosho Hatsugen Shusho mo Futekisetsu (The JSP questioning over the responsibility of the Minister of Justice Nagano, Prime Minister found his Remark inappropriate)', 5 May 1994, p.1.

-----, (1995), 'Shato to Nihon Izokukai ga hatsu Kyōgi (The first meetings between the SDP and Japan War-Bereaved Association)', 12 April 1995.

Makino, S., (2002) 'Uchi and Soto as Cultural and Linguistic Metaphors' in Donahue, R. T., (2002), *Exploring Japaneseness on Japanese Enactment of Culture and Consciousness*, London, Ablex Publishing.

Maruyama, M., (1963), *Thought and behaviour in modern Japanese politics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Masumi, J., (1995), *Contemporary Politics in Japan*, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Masuzoe, Y., (2005), 'Musaku na Koizumi Seiken deha Jitai dakai ha konnan (Do-nothing Koizumi administration cannot break the deadlock)', *Chuokoron*, No. 6, 2005, pp. 70-75.

Matthews, E. A., (2003), 'Japan's New Nationalism', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 82, No. 6, pp. 74-90.

Mayall, J., (1990), *Nationalism and International Society*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

McCartney, P. T., (2004), 'American Nationalism and U.S. Foreign Policy from September 11 to the Iraq War', *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 119, No. 3, pp. 399-423.

-----, (2006), *Power and Progress: American National Identity, the War of 1989, and the Rise of American Imperialism*, Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press.

McCormack, G., (2002), 'New Tunes for an Old Song: Nationalism and Identity in Post-Cold War Japan', in Starrs, R., ed., (2002), *Nations Under Siege: Globalization and Nationalism in Asia*, New York, Palgrave.

Mcveigh, B. J., (2004), *Nationalisms of Japan: Managing and Mystifying Identity*, Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Mearsheimer, (1990), 'Back to the Future', *International Security*, 15, pp. 5-56.

Messari, N., (2001), 'Identity and Foreign Policy: The Case of Islam in U.S. Foreign Policy', in Kubálková, V., ed., (2001), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, New York, M. E. Sharpe.

Milliken, J., (1999), 'The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods', *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 225-254.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan, (1992), 'The General Framework of ODA', 30 June 1992, http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/gaiko/oda/seisaku/taikou/sei_1_1.html (accessed 10 February 2013)

-----, (2002), *Gaiko Seisho (Diplomatic Blue Book): calendar year 2001*, Tokyo, Zaimusho Shuppanyoku.

-----, (2003), *Gaiko Seisho (Diplomatic Blue Book): calendar year 2002*, Tokyo, Kokuritsu Insatsukyoku.

-----, (2004), *Gaiko Seisho (Diplomatic Blue Book): calendar year 2003*, Tokyo, Gyosei.

- , (2005), *Gaiko Seisho (Diplomatic Blue Book): calendar year 2004*, Tokyo, Taiyo Bijutsu.
- , (2006), *Gaiko Seisho (Diplomatic Blue Book): calendar year 2005*, Tokyo, Saeki Insatsu.
- , (2007), *Gaiko Seisho (Diplomatic Blue Book): calendar year 2006*, Tokyo, Saeki Insatsu.
- , (2008-a), *Gaiko Seisho (Diplomatic Blue Book): calendar year 2007*, Tokyo, Jijigahosha.
- , (2008-b), 'The Recent Development of the Japan-India Relationship', available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/india/kankei.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- Mishima, K., (2007), 'GRADING JAPANESE PRIME MINISTER KOIZUMI'S REVOLUTION: How Far Has the LDP's Policymaking Changed?', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 47, No. 5, pp. 727-748.
- Miyamoto, Y., (2007), *Keynote lecture at The 3rd Beijing-Tokyo Forum*, held by Genron NPO, the Beijing University and the China daily, 28 August 2007, available online at <http://www.genron-npo.net/world/genre/tokyobeijing/post-56.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- Miyazawa, K., (1982), 'The Chief Cabinet Secretary Miyazawa's Statement on "history textbooks"', Tokyo, 26 August 1982, available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/taisen/miyazawa.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- Mochizuki, M. M., (2007), 'Japan's Shifting Strategy toward the Rise of China', *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 4-5, pp. 730-776.
- Morris, M., (1960), *Nationalism and the Right Wing in Japan*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Murata, K., (2005), 'Domestic Sources of Japanese Policy towards China', in Lam, P. E., ed., (2005), *Japan's Relations with China: Facing a rising Power*, London, Routledge.
- Murayama, T., (1995), 'Statement on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the War's End', Tokyo, 15 August 1995, Available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/press/pm/murayama/9508.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- Nagai, Y., (1985), *Gendai to Senryaku (Modern world and Strategy)*, Tokyo, Bungeishunju.

Nakanishi, H., (2012), 'Joron Sengo Nihon Gaiko to Nashonarizumu (Forward Foreign Policy and Nationalism in Postwar Japan), *Kokusai Seiji*, Vol. 170, pp. 1-14, Nihon Kokusai Seiji Gakkai Hen.

Nakanishi, T., (2001), *Nihon no "Teki" ("Enemy" of Japan)*, Tokyo, Bungeishunju.

-----, (2003), *Nihon no 'Shi' (Japan's 'Death')*, Tokyo, Bungeishunju.

Nakano, M., (1997), *The Policy-Making Process in Contemporary Japan*, Basingstoe, Macmillan.

Nakauji, K., (2006), 'Nihon no Kitachosen Seisaku: Koizumi Shusho to Rachimondai (Japan's foreign policy toward North Korea: Prime Minister Koizumi and the Abduction Issue)', in Nishiguchi, K., and Ka, G., (2006), *Higashi Ajia Kyodotai no Kochiku (The Construction of East Asian Community)*, Tokyo, Mineruva Shobo.

National Diet, Records of Proceedings (NDRP), (1982), 6 August 1982, the 96th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Education, Vol. 19.

-----, (1985), 29 October 1985, the 103rd, the Lower House, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 2.

-----, (1986), 19 August 1986, The 106th the House of Representatives, the Cabinet Committee, Vol. 2.

-----, (1993), 23 August 1993, the 127th the House of Representatives, the Plenary Session, Vol. 4.

-----, (1994), 10 May 1994, the 129th the House of Representatives, the Plenary Session, Vol. 17.

-----, (1998), 25 March 1998, the 142nd, the House of Councilors, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 10.

-----, (2001-a), 28 May 2001, The 151st the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 18.

-----, (2001-b), 13 June 2001, the 151st the House of Representatives, the Cabinet Committee, Vol. 17.

-----, (2002-a), 26 March 2002, the 154th the House of Representatives, the Primary Session, Vol. 16.

-----, (2002-b), 5 April 2002, the 154th the House of Representatives, the Cabinet Committee, vol. 4.

-----, (2002-c), 18 April 2002, the 154th the House of Councilors, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and National Defense, Vol. 4.

-----, (2002-d), 24 April 2002, the 154th the

House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, vol. 12.
-----, (2002-e), 25 July 2002, the 154th the
House of Representatives, the Committee on National Security, Vol. 9.
-----, (2002-f), 10 October 2002, the 154th
the House of Representatives, the Committee of Foreign Affairs, Vol. 28.
-----, (2002-g), 10 October 2002, the 154th
the House of Councilors, the Committee of Defense and Foreign Affairs (closed
session), Vol. 1.
-----, (2002-h), 21 October 2002, the
155ththe House of Representatives, the Primary Session, Vol. 2.
-----, (2002-i), 22 October 2002, the
155ththe House of Representatives, the Primary Session, Vol. 3.
-----, (2002-j), 22 October 2002, the 155th
the House of Councilors, the Primary Session, Vol. 2.
-----, (2002-k), 24 October 2002, the 155th
the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 2.
-----, (2002-l), 29 October 2002, the 155th,
the House of Representatives, the Committee on national security, Vol. 1.
-----, (2002-m), 30 October 2002, the 155th
the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Vol. 1.
-----, (2002-n), 1 November 2002, the 155th
the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, vol.2.
-----, (2002-o), 5 November 2002, the
155ththe House of Representatives, the Committee on National Security, Vol. 2.
-----, (2002-p), 18 November 2002, the
155th the House of Representatives, the Special Committee on Reform of Special Public
Corporation, Vol. 8.
(-----, (2002-q), 2 December 2002, the
155ththe House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, vol. 3.
-----, (2003-a), 14 February 2003, the 156th
the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 11.
-----, (2003-b), 14 May 2003, the 156th the
House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, vol. 9.
-----, (2003-c), 20 May 2003, the 156th the

House of Representatives, the Committee on Account and Public Administration, Vol. 2.

-----, (2003-d), 25 November 2003, the 158th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 1.

-----, (2004-a), 26 January 2004, the 159th, the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 2.

-----, (2004-b), 3 February 2004, the 159th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 3.

-----, (2004-c), 10 February 2004, the 159th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 7.

-----, (2004-d), 18 February 2004, the 159th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Subcommittee on the Abduction Issue and the Development of Nuclear Weapons by North Korea, Vol. 1.

-----, (2004-e), 3 March, 2004, the 159th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, vol. 18.

-----, (2004-f), 9 March 2004, the 159th the House of Councilors, the Committee on Budget, vol. 6.

-----, (2004-g), 16 March 2004, the 159th the House of Councilors, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defense, Vol. 2.

-----, (2004-h), 23 March 2004, the 159th the House of Councilors, the Committee of Budget, Vol. 15.

-----, (2004-i), 11 May 2004, the 159th the House of Councilors, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defense, Vol. 16.

-----, (2004-j), 25 May 2004, the 159th the House of Representatives, the Plenary Session, Vol. 35.

-----, (2004-k), 27 May 2004, the 159th the House of Councilors, the Special Committee on Humanitarian Aid Activities and Response to Military Attack, Vol. 11.

-----, (2004-l), 1 June 2004, the 159th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Land, Infrastructure and Transport, vol. 25.

-----, (2004-m), 1 June 2004, the 159th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Subcommittee on

the abduction issue, the nuclear development and other problems by North Korea, Vol.4.

-----, (2004-n), 2 June 2004, the 159th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Account Administration Observation, vol. 7.

-----, (2004-o), 2 June 2004, the 159th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Vol. 20.

-----, (2004-p), 11 June 2004, the 159th the House of Councilors, the Committee on Land, Infrastructure and Transport, vol. 23.

-----, (2004-q), 15 June 2004, the 159th the House of Councilors, the Special Committee on the abduction issue and other Problem by North Korea, Vol. 2.

-----, (2004-r), 5 August 2004, the 160th the House of Councilors, the Special Committee on the Abduction Issue by North Korea, Vol. 2.

-----, (2004-s), 13 October 2004, the 161st the House of Representatives, the Plenary session, Vol. 2.

-----, (2004-t), 18 October 2004, the 161st the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 2.

-----, (2004-u), 20 October 2004, the 161st the House of Councilors, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 2.

-----, (2004-v), 1 November 2004, the 161st the House of Councilors, the Special Committee on the Abduction Issue and Other problems caused by North Korea, Vol. 3.

-----, (2004-w), 26 November 2004, The 161st the House of Councilors, the Special committee on Humanitarian and Reconstruction Assistance in Iraq and Response to Armed Attacks, Vol. 4.

-----, (2004-x), 30 November 2004, the 161st the House of Councilors, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and National Defense, Vol. 8.

-----, (2004-y), 2 December 2004, the 161st the House of Representatives, the Special Committee on the Abduction Issue by North Korea, Vol.2.

-----, (2004-z), 10 December 2004, the

161st the House of Representatives, the Special Committee on the Abduction Issue by North Korea, Vol.3.

-----, (2005-a), 24 January 2005, the 162nd the House of Representatives, the Plenary session, Vol. 2.

-----, (2005-b), 14 February 2005, the 162nd the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 11.

-----, (2005-c), 17 March 2005, the 162nd the House of Councilors, the Committee on Budget, vol. 13.

-----, (2005-d), 15 April 2005, the 162nd the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Vol. 5.

-----, (2005-e), 18 April 2005, the 162nd the House of Councilors, the Investigating Committee on International Affairs, Vol. 8.

-----, (2005-f), 20 April 2005, the 162nd Joint Meeting of the House of Councilors and the House of Representatives about the Basic Policy of the Nation, Vol. 3.

-----, (2005-g), 21 April 2005, the 162nd the House of Councilors, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defense, Vol. 7.

-----, (2005-h), 25 April 2005, the 162nd the House of Representatives, the Committee on Accounting and Administrative Supervision, section meeting, Vol. 1.

-----, (2005-i), 26 April 2005, the 162nd the House of Councilors, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defense, Vol. 10.

-----, (2005-j), 13 May 2005, the 162nd the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Vol. 7.

-----, (2005-k), 16 May 2005, the 162nd the House of Representatives, The Committee on Budget, vol. 21.

-----, (2005-l), 20 May 2005, the 162nd the House of Councilors, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 16.

-----, (2005-m), 30 May 2005, the 156th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Vol. 12.

-----, (2005-n), 2 June 2005, the 162nd the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 22.

-----, (2005-o), 8 June 2005, the 162nd the House of Representatives, the Committee on Health, Welfare and Labor, Vol. 26.

-----, (2005-p), 30 June 2005, the 162nd the House of Councilors, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defense, Vol. 16.

-----, (2005-q), 7 July 2005, the 162nd the House of Councilors, the Committee on Audit, Vol. 12.

-----, (2005-r), 28 July 2005, the 162nd the House of Representatives, the Special Committee on the Abduction Issue by North Korea, Vol. 4.

-----, (2005-s), 6 October 2005, the 163rd the House of Representatives, the Special Committee on the Abduction Issue by North Korea, Vol. 2.

-----, (2005-t), 7 October 2005, the 163rd the House of Representatives, the Special Committee on Postal Service Privatization, Vol.3.

-----, (2005-u), 17 November 2005, the 163rd the House of Representatives, the Special Committee on the Abduction Issue by North Korea, Vol. 2.

-----, (2006-a), 7 February 2006, the 164th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 6.

-----, (2006-b), 14 February 2006, the 164th, the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 11.

-----, (2006-c), 3 March 2006, the 164th the House of Councilors, the Committee on Audit, Vol.4.

-----, (2006-d), 16 March 2006, the 164th the House of Councilors, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defense, Vol. 3.

-----, (2006-e), 30 March 2006, the 164th the House of Representatives, the Special Committee on the Abduction Issue by North Korea, Vol. 3.

-----, (2006-f), 4 April 2006, the 164th the House of Councilors, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defense, Vol. 7.

-----, (2006-g), 5 April 2006, the 164th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Economy, Trade and Industry, Vol. 10.

-----, (2006-h), 7 June 2006, the 164th the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Vol. 20.

-----, (2006-i), 12 June 2006, the 164th the

House of Representatives, the Committee on Audit, Vol. 7.
-----, (2006-j), 29 September 2006, the
165th the House of Representatives, the Plenary Session, Vol. 3.
-----, (2006-k), 5 October 2006, the 165th
the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 2.
-----, (2006-l), 6 October 2006, the 165th
the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 3.
-----, (2006-m), 10 October 2006, the 165th
the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 4.
-----, (2006-n), 12 October 2006, the 165th
the House of Councilor, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 2.
-----, (2006-o), 18 October 2006, the
165ththe House of Representatives, the Committee on Land, Infrastructure and
Transport, Vol. 2.
-----, (2006-p), 23 October 2006, the 165th
the House of Councilors, the Plenary Session, Vol. 7.
-----, (2006-q), 7 December 2006, the 165th
the House of Representatives, the Special Committee on the Abduction Issue by North
Korea, Vol.3.
-----, (2007-a), 26 January 2007, the 166th,
The House of Representatives, the Plenary Session, vol.2.
-----, (2007-b), 29 January 2007, the 166th
the House of Representatives, the Plenary Session, Vol. 3.
-----, (2007-c), 30 January 2007, the 166th,
The House of Representatives, the Plenary Session, Vol. 4.
-----, (2007-d), 13 February 2007, the 166th
the House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol.7.
-----, (2007-e), 14 February 2007, the
House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol.8.
-----, (2007-f), 1 March 2007, the 166th, the
House of Representatives, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 17.
-----, (2007-g), 9 March 2007, the 166th,
The House of Councilors, the Committee on Budget, Vol. 7.
-----, (2007-h), 15 March 2007, the 166th

- the House of Councilors, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defense, Vol. 2.
- Nester, W., (1990), *The Foundation of Japanese Power: Constituencies, Changes, Challenges*, New York, M. E. Sharpe.
- Neumann, I., (1996), 'Self and Other in International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 2, No. 2., pp. 139-174.
- (1999), *Uses of Other: "The East" in European Identity Formation*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Niccho Kokko sokushin kokuminkyokai (The Association of nationwide Promotion of Japan-DPRK) ed., (2005), *Niccho Kankei to 6sha Kyogi --- Higashiajia Kyodotai wo Mezasu Nihon Gaiko toha (Japan-DPRK Relationship and the Six Part Talks --- Japan's Diplomacy toward East Asian Community)*, Tokyo, Sairyusha.
- Nishi, I., (2000), 'Nationalism in Japan', in Leifer, M., ed., (2000), *Asian nationalism*, London, Routledge.
- Nonaka, H. (2007), 'Ki-pason ga kataru shogen 90 nendai dai 20 kai (Testimonies of key persons in the 1990s, the 20th)', *Ronza*, 2007, Vol. 5.
- Norval, A. J., (1996), 'Thinking Identities: Against a Theory of Ethnicity', in Wilmsen and McAllister eds., (1996).
- Novak, R., (2004), *Koizumi Sees the Bigger Picture*, Chicago Sun Times, 24 October 2004, available online at http://realclearpolitics.com/Commentary/com-10_24_05_RN.html (accessed 10 February 2013)
- Obuchi, K., (1998-a), '*Japan-Republic of Korea Joint Declaration New Japan-Republic of Korea Partnership towards the Twenty-first Century*', Tokyo, 8 October 1998, Available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/korea/joint9810.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- , (1998-b), '*Japan-China Joint Declaration On Building a Partnership of Friendship and Cooperation for Peace and Development*', Beijing, 8 October 1998, Available online at <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/korea/joint9810.html> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- Oe, K., (1994) '*Japan, the ambiguous, and Myself*', available online at http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1994/oe-lecture.html (accessed 10 February 2013)

- Ogata, S., (1965), 'Japanese Attitude towards China', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 5, No. 8. Pp. 389-398.
- , (1992), *Sengo Nicchu/Beichu Kankei (Postwar Japan-China/US-China Relationship)*, Tokyo, Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Oguma, E., (1995), *Tannitsu Minzoku Shinwa no Kigen (The Origins of the myth of homogenous nation)*, Tokyo, Shinyosha.
- , (2002), *Minshu to Aikoku (Democracy and Patriotism)*, Tokyo, Shinyosha.
- Oguma, E. and Ueno, Y., (2003), '*Iyashi*' no Nashonarizumu: *Kusa no ne Hoshu Undo no Jissho Kenkyu (Nationalism as 'Comfort': Empirical Research on the Grass roots Conservative Movements)*, Tokyo, Keio Gijuku Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Oishi, Y. and Yamamoto, N., eds., (2006), *Medeia Nashonarizumu no Yukue: Nicchu Masatsu wo Kensho suru (Prospect for Media Nationalism: Examining the Japan-China Relationship)*, Tokyo, Asahishimbunsha
- Okawara, N. and Katzenstein, P., (2001), 'Japan and Asian-Pacific Security: regionalization, entrenched bilateralism and incipient multilateralism', *The Pacific Review* Vol.14, No. 2, pp.165-194.
- , (2004), 'Japan and Asian-Pacific Security', in J.J. Suh, Peter J. Katzenstein, and Allen Carlson, eds., *Rethinking Security in East Asia: Identity, Power and Efficiency*, pp. 97-130, Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Ota, M., (2000), *Nihon no Nashonarizumu Kaitaishinsho: Hatsugen 1996-2000 (The Deconstruction of Japan's Nationalism: Narratives 1996-2000)*, Tokyo, Gendaikikakushitsu.
- Otake, H., (1993), '*Nihon no Kyoiku wo meguru Seiji (Politics of Japanese education)*', in Yamaguchi and Ruprecht.
- , (1996), *Sengo Nihon no Ideorogi Taiketsu (Ideological Confrontation of Postwar Japan)*, Tokyo San Ichi Shobo.
- , (2005), *Saigunbi to Nashonarizumu (Rearmament and Nationalism)*, Tokyo, Kodansha.
- Otsuka, H., (1992), *Miyazawa Kiichi no Sentaku to Keisei-kai Shihai no Kouzu (The determination of Kiichi Miyazawa and the Dominance of the Keisei-kai)*, Tokyo, Tenzan Time Japan.
- Özkırmılı, U., (2005), *Contemporary Debates on Nationalism: A Critical Engagement*, New York, Palgrave.
- Park, G., and Vogel, S., (2007), 'Japan in 2006', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 47. No. 1., pp.

22-31.

Pempel, T. J., (2006), 'A Decade of Political Torpor: When Political Logic Trumps Economic Rationality', in Katzenstein, P. J. and Shiraishi, T., (eds.), (2006)

Penny, M. and Wakefield, B., (2009), 'Right Angles: Examining Accounts of Japanese Neo-nationalism', *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 4, pp. 537-555.

Peou, S., (2002), 'Realism and constructivism in Southeast Asian security studies today: a review essay', *The Pacific review*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 119-138.

Petersoo, P., (2007), 'Reconsidering otherness: constructing Estonian identity', *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 117-133.

Pharr, S. J., (1993), 'Japan's Defensive Foreign Policy and the Politics of burden sharing', in Curtis, G. L. ed., (1993), *Japan's Foreign Policy after the Cold War: Coping with Change*, New York, M. E. Sharpe.

Phillips, L., and Jorgensen, M. W., (2002), *Discourse Analysis: as Theory and Method*, London, Sage.

Pieterse, J. N., (1996), 'Varieties of Ethnic Politics and Ethnicity Discourse', in Wilmsen and McAllister eds., (1996)

Prizel, I., (1998), *National Identity and Foreign Policy: Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia, and Ukraine*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Przystup, J.J., (2001-a), 'Trouble Starts with "T"', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 93-103.

-----, (2001-b), 'Spiraling Downward', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 92-100.

-----, (2002-a), 'From Precipice to Promise', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 89-96.

-----, (2002-b), 'Smoother Sailing across Occasional Rough Seas', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 92-101

-----, (2002-c), 'The Good, the Bad, and ... Japan-China Relations', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 95-104.

-----, (2002-d), 'Toward the 30th Anniversary', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 94-102.

-----, (2003-a), 'Congratulations, Concern, Competition, and Cooperation', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 103-112.

-----, (2003-b), 'Cross Currents', *Comparative Connections*, Vo. 5, No. 1, pp. 101-110.

- , (2003-c), 'Political Breakthrough and the SARS Outbreak', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 109-118.
- , (2003-d), 'Bridges to the Future, Reflections on the Past', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 119-128.
- , (2004-a), 'Cross Currents', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 119-132.
- , (2004-b), 'Dialogue of the Almost Deaf', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 103-116.
- , (2004-c), 'Not Quite All about Sovereignty – But Close', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 123-134.
- , (2004-d), 'Not The Best Of Times', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 117-128.
- , (2005-a), 'A Volatile Mix: Natural Gas, a Submarine, a Shrine, and a Visa', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 119-134.
- , (2005-b), 'Trying to Get Beyond Yasukuni', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 109-122.
- , (2005-c), 'No End to History', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 119-132.
- , (2005-d), 'Summer Calm', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 117-128.
- , (2006-a), 'Yasukuni Stop Everything', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 109-122.
- , (2006-b), 'Looking Beyond Koizumi', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 119-134.
- , (2006-c), 'Spring Thaw', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp.117-126.
- , (2006-d), 'Searching for a Summit', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 123-138.
- , (2007), 'Ice Breaks at the Summit', *Comparative Connections*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 125-140.
- Pyle, K. B., (1996), *The Japanese Question: Power and Purpose in a New Era, second edition*, Washington, The AEI Press.
- Reed, S. R., McElwain, K. M., and Shimizu, K., (eds.), (2009), *Political Change in Japan: Electoral Behaviour, Party Realignment, and the Koizumi Reforms*, Stanford,

The Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Centre.

Rekisho Kento Inkai (the Committee on History and Screening), (1995), *'Daito-a Senso no So-katsu (Review of the Greater East Asian war)*, Tokyo, Tentensha.

Ronza Henshubu (Ronza editorial desk), (2006), *Riberaru karano Hangeki---Ajia/Yasukuni/9jo (Counterargument from the Liberal ---on Asia, the Yasukuni Shrine, and the Article 9)*, Tokyo, Asahi Sensho.

Rousseau, D. L., (2006), *Identifying Threats and Threatening Identities: The Social Construction of Realism and Liberalism, Stanford*, Stanford University Press.

Rose, C., (2000), 'Patriotism is not taboo: nationalism in China and Japan and implications for Sino-Japanese relations', *Japan Forum*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp.169-181.

------(2005), *Sino-Japanese Relations: Facing the Past, looking to the Future?*, New York, Routledge Curzon.

------(2006), 'The battle for hearts and minds: patriotic education in Japan in the 1990s and beyond', in Shimazu, N., ed., (2006), *Nationalisms in Japan*, London, Routledge.

Roy, D., (2000), 'Realism and East Asia', *The Journal of East Asian Affairs*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp.158-178.

Rozman, G., (2002), 'Japan's Quest for Great Power Identity', *Orbis*, winter "002, pp. 73-91.

Rozman, G., Togo, K., and Ferguson, J. P (2007) *Japanese Strategic Thought toward Asia*, NY, Palgrave Macmillan.

Ruggie, J., (1998), 'What Makes the World Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge', *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4.

Saeki, K., (2005), *Rinri to shiten no Nashonarizumu (Nationalism as moral)*, Tokyo, NTT Shuppan.

Saideman, S., (2002), 'Thinking Theoretically about Identity and Foreign Policy' in Telbami, S., and Barnatt, M., (2002), *Identity and Foreign Policy in the Middle East*, Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press.

Sakamoto, Y., (1959), '*Churitsu Nihon no Boei Koso (Defense Plan of Neutral Japan)*,' in Sakamoto (2004-c), pp. 98-129.

-----, (1960), 'Kakushin Nashonarizumu Shiron (An Attempt at Interpretation of Progressive Nationalism)', in Sakamoto (2004-a), pp137-158.

-----, (1961), 'Kenryoku Seiji to Heiwa Undo (Power Politics and Peace Movement)', in Sakamoto (2004-a), pp. 205-227.

- , (1962), 'Heiwaundo niokeru Shinri to Ronri (Mentality and Logic in Peace Movement)', in Sakamoto (2004a), pp.248-247.
- , (1963), 'Nihon niokeru Kokusaireisen to Kokunaireisen (International and Internal Cold War in Japan)', in Sakamoto (2004-b).
- , (1967), 'Ideorogi Taiketsu to Nashonarizumu (Ideological Confrontation and Nationalism)', in Sakamoto (2004a), pp.179-204.
- , (1987), 'Nihon Senryo no Kokusai Kankyo (International Environment of the Occupation in Japan)', in Sakamoto (2004a),
- , (2004a), *Sakamoto Yoshikazu Senshu 3 (Completed Works of Yoshikazu Sakamoto)*, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten.
- , (2004b), *Sakamoto Yoshikazu Senshu 4 (Completed Works of Yoshikazu Sakamoto)*, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten.
- , (2004-c), *Sengo Gaiko no Gneten (The Origin of Postwar Diplomacy)*, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten.
- Sakata, K., (2006), "'Koizumi Yasukuni" nimiru Rekishininshiki no kuhaku (Gap in the history recognition seeing from "Koizumi's worship at the Yasukuni Shrine")', *Chuokoron*, No. 3, 2006, pp. 266-277.
- Sakurai, Y., Kasai, Y., and Nakanishi, T., (2007), 'Dai Gunkaku: Chugoku to Taijisuru Hi (Reckless Military Expansion: A day when Japan faces China)', *Voice*, February 2007, pp. 78-89.
- Samuel, R. J., (2006), 'Japan's Goldilocks Strategy', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 111-127.
- Sankei Shimbun, (2002), '*Bei Jikanho Hocho wo Futatabi Hinan (The US Assistant Secretary of State criticized Koizumi's visit to the DPRK again)*', 22 October 2002.
- Sasada, H., (2006), 'Youth and Nationalism in Japan', *SAIS Review*, 26, No. 2, pp.109-122.
- Sasajima, M., (2002), 'Japan's Domestic Politics and China policy making' in Self, B.L., and Thompson, J. W., eds. (2002) *An Alliance for Engagement: Building Cooperation in Security Relations with China*, Henry L. Stimson Center.
- Sato, H., (2006), 'Japan and China: reaching reconciliation or stuck in the past?', *Briefing Paper, Chatham House Asia Programme October 2006*, ASP BP 06/02
- Sato, K., (2010), 'Japan's Role in the International Community', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 2-5.
- Sato, S. and Matsuzaki, T., (1986) *Jiminto Seiken (the LDP Administrations)*, Tokyo,

Chuokoronsha.

Seaton, P., (2007), *Japan's contested war memories: the 'memory rifts' in historical consciousness of World War II*, London, Routledge.

Shafer, B. C., (1972), *Faces of nationalism*, New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich)

Shapiro, M. J., (1988), *The Politics of Representation: Writing Practices in Biography, Photography, and Policy Analysis*, Madison, Wisconsin, The University of Wisconsin Press.

Shen, S., (2004), 'Nationalism or Nationalist Foreign Policy? Contemporary Chinese Nationalism and its Role in Response to the Belgrade Embassy Bombing', *Politics*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp.122-130.

Shibuichi, D., (2005), 'The Yasukuni Shrine Dispute and the Politics of Identity in Japan', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 197-215.

Shindo, E. and Mito, T., eds., (2007), *Sengo Nihon Seiji to Heiwa Gaiko (Postwar Japanese Politics and Peaceful diplomacy)*, Tokyo, Horitsubunkasha.

Shinoda, T., (2000), *Leading Japan: The Role of the Prime Minister*, London, Praeger.

----- (2003), 'Koizumi's Top-down Leadership in the Anti-Terrorist Legislation: The Impact of Political Institutional Changes', *SAIS Review*, Vol. 23, pp. 19-34.

-----, (2006), *Reisenki no Nihon Gaiko (Japan's Foreign Policy in the Cold War Era)*, Kyoto, Mineruva shobo.

-----, (2007), *Koizumi Diplomacy: Japan's KANTEI Approach to Foreign and Defense Affairs*, Seattle, University of Washington Press.

----- (2011), 'Prime ministerial leadership', in Gaunder, A., ed., (2011), *Routledge Handbook of Japanese politics*, London, Routledge, pp.48-59.

Shultz, K. A. (2005), 'The Politics of Risking Peace: Do Hawks or Doves Deliver the Olive Branch?', *International Organization*, Winter 2005, Vol. 59, No. 1, pp.1-38.

Smith, A. D., (1995), *Nations and nationalism in a Global Era*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

----- (2001), *Nationalism*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Smith, S., (2001), 'Foreign Policy Is What States Make of It: Social Construction and International Relations Theory' in Kubalkova, V. ed., (2001) *Foreign Policy in A Constructivist World*, New York, M. E. Sharpe.

Snyder, R. S., (2005), 'Bridging the Realist/Constructivist Divide: The Case of the Counterrevolution in Soviet Foreign Policy at the end of the Cold War', *Foreign Policy Analysis*, Vol. 1 (2005), pp.55-71.

- Soeya, Y., (1993), 'Japan's Policy Towards Southeast Asia; Anatomy of 'Autonomous Diplomacy' and the American Factor', in Jesarein, C., (1993), *China, India, Japan and the security of southeast Asia*, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies., pp. 93-114.
- (1998-a), 'Japan, Normative Constraints versus Structural Imperatives', in Alagappa, M., (1998), *Asian Security Practice: Material and Ideational Influences*, Stanford, Stanford University Press., pp. 198-233.
- Soeya, Y., (1998-b), 'Sengo Nihon Gaiko 52nen no Kiseki (52-year postwar Japan's Diplomacy)', *Gaiko Jiho*, February 1982.
- , (2003), 'Japanese Diplomacy and the North Korean Problem', *Japan Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 53-61.
- ,(2005), *Nihon no Midoru Pawa Gaiko (Japan's Foreign Policy as a Middle Power)*, Tokyo, Chikuma.
- Soeya, Y., and Tadokoro, M., eds., (2004), *Nihon no Ajia Koso (Japan's Strategy for Asia)*, Tokyo Keio University Press.
- Soeya, Tadokoro, and Welch, eds., (2011), *Japan as a 'Normal Country'?*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- Soeya, A., (2011), 'Normal' Middle Power: Interpreting Changes in Japanese Security Policy in the 1990s and after, in Soeya, Tadokoro and Welch (2011).
- Stockwin, J. A. A., (1982), *Japan: Politics in a Growth Economy*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Stronach, B., (1995), *Beyond the Rising Sun: Nationalism in contemporary Japan*, London, Praeger.
- Suzuki, S., (2007), 'The importance of "Othering" in China's national identity: Sino-Japanese relations as a stage of identity conflict', *The pacific Review*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 23-47.
- , (2011), 'The strange masochism of the Japanese right: Redrawing boundaries in Sino-Japanese relations', in Hook (2011), *Decoding Boundaries in Contemporary Japan*, pp.35-58.
- Szechenyi, N., (2006), 'A Turning Point for Japan's Self-Defense Forces', *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 139-150.
- Tahara, S., (2007) *Ofureko ! Kozsumi Kantei no Shinjitsu --- Ijima Isao Zen Hishokan ga kataru (Off Record! Truth of Koizumi's Official Residence --- Interview with Ex-Secretary Isao Ijima)*, Tokyo, Ascom.
- Takahashi, T., *Sengo Sekininron (War responsibility in Postwar Era)*, Tokyo,

Kodansha.

Takubo, T., (2001), *Atarashii Nichibei Domei: Shinbei Nashonarizumu heno Senryaku (A New Japan-US Alliance: The Strategy for Pro-US Nationalism)*, Tokyo, PHP Shinsho.

Tamaki, T., (2010), *Deconstructing Japan's Image of South Korea Identity in Foreign Policy*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Tamamoto, M., (2005), 'How Japan Imagines China and See Itself', *World Policy Journal*, 2005, Vol. 22, Issue 4, pp.55-62.

Tamura, E., (1988), *Nihon no Kyoiku to Nashonarizumu (Japan's education and Nationalism)*, Tokyo, Akashi Shoten.

Tanaka, A., (2007-a), 'Strange Unconformity in Prime Minister's Speech and Foreign Minister Speech', *Foresight*, pp.27-33.

-----, (2007-b), *Ajia no naka no Nihon (Japan in Asia)*, Tokyo, NTT Shuppan.

Tanaka, A. and Okamoto, Y., (2005), 'Kokinto Seiken wo Yurugasu 'Aikoku' boso to Sekai no Shisen (Runaway 'Patriotism' which rocks Hu Jintao regime and eyes from the world)', *Chuokoron*, No. 6, 2005, pp. 33-41.

Tanaka, H., (2005), 'Koizumi Hocho Shikakenin to Yobarete (Called as a key plotter of Koizumi's visit to Pyongyang)', *Bungeishunju*, No. 11, 2005, pp. 136-144.

-----, (2007-a), 'Japan's Policy for East Asia', *Asia-Pacific Review*, 2007, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 30-44.

-----, (2007-b), 'Rokusha Goi ha Kitachosen heno Saigotsucho ninaru (The Six-party agreement is the ultimatum for North Korea)', *Chuokoron*, No. 4, 2007, pp. 128-133 .

-----, (2009), *Gaiko no Chikara (The Power of Diplomacy)*, Tokyo, Nikkei Shimbun Shuppansha.

Tanaka, H., and Kokubun, R., (2006), 'Nashonarizumu no Shototsu wo Kaihi dekiruka (Can we avoid clash of nationalism?)', *Chuokoron*, Vol. 3, 2006, pp. 61-69.

Tanaka, H. and Tahara, S. (2005), *Kokka to Gaiko (State and Diplomacy)*, Tokyo, Kodansha.

-----, (2007), 'Nihon ha Kokusaitekina Shinyo Shittsui ni Setogiwa ni aru (Japan is on the verge of losing international credibility)', *Chuokoron*, No. 11, 2007, pp.33-43.

Tanaka, N., Tanaka, H., and Hata (1995), *Izoku to Sengo (Bereaved families of war dead and postwar)*, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten.

Taniguchi, T., (2005), 'A Cold Peace: The Changing Security Equation in Northeast Asia', *Orbis*, 2005, Vol. 49, No. 3. Pp. 445-457.

-----, (2010), *Beyond 'the Arc of Freedom and Prosperity': Debating Universal Values in Japanese Grand Strategy*, available online at http://www.gmfus.org/wp-content/files_mf//galleries/ct_publication_attachments/Taniguchi_AFP_Oct10_final.pdf (accessed 10 February 2013)

Task Force on Foreign Relations (2002), 'Basic Strategies for Japan's Foreign Policy in the 21st Century New Era, New Vision, New Diplomacy', 28 November 2002, available online at <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/kakugikettei/2002/1128tf.html#s-1> (accessed 10 February 2013)

Tokumoto, M., (1989), *Nashonarizumu no Dotai: Nihon to Ajia (Dynamics of Nationalism: Japan and Asia)*, Fukuoka, Kyushudaigaku Shuppankai.

Torfinn, J., (1999), *New Theories of Discourse, Laclau, Mouffe and Zizek*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Triandafyllidou, a., (1998), 'National Identity and the 'Other'', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp.593-62.

Uchiyama, Y., (2010), *Koizumi and Japanese Politics: Reform strategies and leadership style*, Routledge/University of Tokyo Series 1.

Uriu, R., (2003), 'Japan in 2002', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 43., No. 1. pp. 78-90.

----- (2004), 'Japan in 2003', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 44. No. 1, pp. 168-181.

Van Evera, S., (1994), 'Hypotheses on Nationalism and War', *International Security*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 5-39.

Varma, L., (2007), 'Japanese Nationalism: Response to Changing Regional and International Environment', *China Report*, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 57-68

Vlastos, S., ed., (1998), *Mirror of Modernity: Invented Tradition of Modern Japan*, Berkley, University of California.

Wakaizumi, K., (1994), *Tasakunakarishi wo Shinzemuto hossu (Hoping no alternative measure)*, Tokyo, Bungeishunju.

Wakamiya, Y., (1999), *The Postwar Conservative View of Asia: How the Political Right Has Delayed Japan's Coming to Terms with Its History of Aggression in Asia*, LTCB International Library Foundation.

-----, (2006), *Wakai to Nashonarizumu: Shinpan Sengo Hoshu no Ajia Kan (Reconciliation and Nationalism: The New Version, Perspectives on Asia of Postwar*

- Conservatives*), Tokyo, Asahi Shimbunsha.
- Walt, S. M., (1987), *The Origins of Alliance*, New York, Cornell University Press.
- Waltz, K., (1979), *Theory of International Politics*, New York, McGraw Hill.
- Ward, R. E. and Sakamoto Y. ed., (1987), *Democratizing Japan: The Allied Occupation*, Honolulu University of Hawaii Press,
- Watabe, S., Inada, T., and Yagi, H., (2008), *Nihon woshiisuru Hitobito (People who kill Japan)*, Tokyo, PHP.
- Watanabe, O., (2001), *Nihon no Taikokuka to Neo-Nashonarizumu no Keisei (Japan's making a Major Power and the Formulation of Neo-Nationalism)*, Tokyo, Sakurada Shoten.
- Watanabe, T., (2005), 'Genso wo Fukitobasu Han-Nichi Chiseigaku (Disillusionment by anti-Japanese geopolitics)', *Chuokoron*, No. 6, 2005, pp. 42-53.
- Wæver, O., (2001) 'Identity, Communities and Foreign Policy: Discourse Analysis as Foreign Policy Theory', in Hansen and Wæver (2001) in *European integration and national identity : the challenge of the Nordic states*, New York, Routledge.
- Weldes, J., (1996), 'Constructing National Interests', *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 2, No. 3 pp. 275-318.
- Wen, J., (2007), 'Speech by Premier Wen Jiabao of the State Council of the People's Republic of China at the Japanese Diet', on 13 April. Available at Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, <http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/zxxx/t311544.htm> (accessed 10 February 2013)
- Wennersten, P., (1999), 'The Politics of Inclusion: The Case of the Baltic States', *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 272-296.
- Whiting, A. S., (1981), *China Eyes Japan*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Williams, B. and Mobrand, E. (2010), "Explaining Divergent Responses to the North Korean Abductions Issue in Japan and South Korea", *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 69, No. 2 (May) 2010: 507–536.
- Wilmsen, E. N., and McAllister, O., eds., (1996), *Politics of Difference; Ethnic premises in a world of power*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Wodak, R., Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., and Liebhart, K., eds., (1999), *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Wolferen, K. V., (1989), *The Enigma of Japanese Politics*, New York, Macmillan.
- Yabunaka, M., (2006), 'Nichi In Senryakuteki Pa-tona-shippu wo Mezase (Seeking for the strategic Partnership between Japan and India)', *Chuokoron*, No. 5, 2006, pp.

202-211

-----, (2010), *Kokka no Meiun*, Tokyo Shinchosha.

Yachi, S., (2005), 'Nihon no ODA no Genjo to Kadai (The Reality and Task of Japan's ODA)', *Kokusaimondai*, No. 548, pp. 2-6.

-----, (2006), 'Nihon Gaiko no Shuyokadai to Kongo no Tenbo (Main task of Japan's diplomacy and future perspective)', *Ajia Jiho*, Vol. 37, No. 1-2, pp. 28-47.

-----, (2009), *Gaiko no Senryaku to Kokorozashi (Strategy and Vision of Diplomacy)*, Tokyo, Sankei Shimbun Shuppan.

Yamaguchi, J., (2004), *Sengo Seiji no Hokai --- Demokurashi ha doko he ikunoka (The Collapse of Postwar Politics --- Where is Democracy heading?)*, Tokyo, Iwanamishinsho.

Yamamoto, Y., (2005), 'Japanese Policies toward Northeast Asia after the 9.11 Event', in Kess, J. F., and Lansdowne, H., ed., (2005), *Why Japan Matters! Volume One*, Victoria, Centre for Asia-Pacific Initiatives University of Victoria.

Yamasaki, T., (2006), 'The Establishment of the study group on the vision to Asian diplomacy', in 'Yamasaki Taku Official Website', 26 August 2006, available online at http://www.taku.net/voice/show_text.php3?ID=6LAAN (accessed 10 February 2013)

Yang, D., (2002), 'Mirror for the future or the history card?: Understanding the 'history problem'', in Söderburg M., (ed.), (2002), *Chinese-Japanese Relations in the Twenty-first Century: Complementarity and conflict*, London, Routledge.

Yoda, T. and Harootunian, H., ed., (2006), *Japan after Japan: social and cultural life from the recessionary 1990s to the present*, Durham, Duke University Press.

Yokoyama, H., (1994), *Nicchu no Shoheki (Barriers between Japan and China)*, Tokyo, Saimaru Shuppankai.

Yomiuri Shimbun, (2006), 'Yoron Chosa (Public Opinion Poll)', 3 November 2006.

Yomiuri Shimbun Seijibu (Yomiuri Newspaper political department) (2006), *Koizumi Gaiko 2000 nichi no Shinjitsu --- Gaiko wo Kenka ni shita Otoko (Truth of Koizumi Diplomacy 2000days --- A Man Who Made Diplomacy a Fight)*, Tokyo, Shinchosha.

Yongming, F., (2008), 'Searching for Common Interests between China and Japan: a Chinese view', *Journal of contemporary China*, Vol. 17, No. 55, pp. 375-382.

Yoshida, Y., (1995), *Nihonjin no Sensokan (War Interpretation of Japanese People)*, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten.

-----, (1997), *Gendai Rekisigaku to Senso Sekinin (Modern History and War Responsibility)*, Tokyo, Aoki Shoten.

Yoshino, K., (1992), *Cultural Nationalism in Contemporary Japan: A Sociological Inquiry*, New York, Routledge.

-----, (1997), *Bunka Nashonarizumu no Shakaigaku: Gendai Nihon no Identeitei no Yukue (Sociology of Cultural Nationalism: Perspectives on Identity of Contemporary Japan)*, Nagoya, Nagoyadaigaku Shuppankai.

Zhao, S., ed., (2004), *Chinese Foreign Policy: Pragmatism and Strategic Behaviour*, New York and London, M. E. Sharpe.

Zhimin, C., (2005), 'Nationalism, Internationalism and Chinese Foreign Policy', *Journal of Contemporary China*, Vol. 14, No. 42, pp. 35-53.

[Online Resources]

Prime Minister's E-mail Magazine

Abe Cabinet E-mail Magazine

Available online at <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/m-magazine/backnumber/abe.html>

(accessed 26 June 2012)

Koizumi Cabinet E-mail Magazine

Available online at <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/m-magazine/backnumber/koizumi.html>

(accessed 26 June 2012)

Japanese parliamentary debates

Located from <http://kokkai.ndl.go.jp/>