TEORÍA Y DEBATE

Performativity and National Identity:
Japan's Domestic Policies

ELISA MONTIEL*

ABSTRACT: This article explores the insights that can be gained by applying Judith Butler's concept of "performativity" to national identity construction. It then shows how this can provide a useful perspective for explaining the evolution of Japanese national identity. In contrast to mainstream approaches that see national identity as an unconscious process built up through years of tradition and lacking significant planning or coordination by any one group or institution, the findings of this study suggest that the state plays a strong role in "silently", actively and artificially planning the construction of national identity.

RESUMEN: Este artículo explora las percepciones que se pueden adquirir al aplicar el concepto de Judith Butler de la "performatividad" a la construcción de la identidad nacional. Después muestra cómo puede ofrecer esto una perspectiva útil para explicar la evolución de la identidad nacional japonesa. A diferencia de los enfoques convencionales que ven la identidad como un proceso inconsciente construido durante años de tradición y sin un grado significativo de planeación o coordinación por un grupo o institución, los hallazgos de este estudio sugieren que el Estado juega un papel clave al planear la construcción de la identidad nacional de una manera silenciosa, activa y artificial.

Key words: feminist theory, Japan, national identity, performativity.
Palabras clave: Teoría feminista, Japón, identidad nacional, "performatividad".

* Elisa Montiel is a fellow at the Peace Research Institute of Oslo (PRIO), where she has been focusing on peace and identity-related research. She is a doctorate candidate and Monbukagakusho (Japanese Ministry of Education) scholar at Nagoya University's Graduate School of International Development.

Introduction

It has long been recognized that national identity is a constructed, rather than a "natural" phenomenon. Seminal works devoted to defending such a hypothesis are numerous —e.g. Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (1983, 1991), Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (1983), Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (1986), and Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (1990). Nevertheless, all these central works, and most of the more recent works based on them, understand the construction of national identity as an unconscious process built up through many years of tradition and lacking significant planning or coordination by any central group, institution or body.

In 1998, two works seriously contested this view within the discipline of international relations. David Campbell's *Writing Security* and Cynthia Weber's, *Performative States* argued that the political identity of the state is artificially constructed through foreign policy discourse. Both Weber and Campbell used elements of the poststructuralist feminist theory of Judith Butler —most notably, the idea of "performativity"— to ground their theoretical approach. Butler herself had earlier rejected the possibility of applying her "performative theory"[1] (which she originally intended to apply only to gendered identity construction) to ethnic or national forms of identity. While innovative and interdisciplinary, the centre of attention for Campbell and Weber is placed exclusively upon the *political* identity of states. In concentrating on these political elements, Campbell and Weber fail

---

[1] In 1990, Butler herself absolutely rejected the possibility of applying her theory to ethnic forms of identity (1990: 12). However, after a few stu-dies effectively applied a version of her theory to political institutions, in 1999 Butler conceded that her theory had, perhaps, a wider application than she originally thought (1990: 9). Indeed, several factors suggest that her theory may be eminently applicable to ethnic forms of identity (which, like gender, also rest partially on the way we perceive the body).

to translate Butler's theory into the social sphere and therefore fail to consider the nation-state as an entity constituted not only by its institutions (state) but also by the populations inside it (nation). It seems more plausible to understand both the political and the social dimensions of the nation-state as inseparable. If this is correct, then the identity of a nation-state rests as much on how the internal populations of a state perceive themselves as belonging to a national group as it does on how foreign policy discourses affect that perception. The proposed research will show that while foreign policy might have some role to play in national identity construction, a state's domestic policy is the main protagonist —and it is a highly conscious player. This article will apply the theory to a single case study to demonstrate in more depth and detail how the knowledge of "performativity" can assist our understanding of the artificial construction of Japanese national identity.

JUDITH BUTLER'S THEORY AND ITS RELATION TO NATIONAL IDENTITY

Judith Butler developed the theory of performative construction of identity, which was originally designed to map female individual identity construction. Such theory of the "performative construction of identity" contests the notion of gender-fixed identity and explains how identity is located not in the body but beyond it, within the acts that individuals perform and repeat in their social context. Butler explained that "[i]dentity is performatively constituted by the very 'expressions' that are said to be its results."[2] The idea of performative creation of identity refers to

[2] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York and London: Routledge, 1990), 12.

the concept as something *executed* as opposed to something merely "possessed". However, this "performativity is… not a singular 'act', for it is always the reiteration of a norm or set of norms, and to the extent that it acquires an act-like status… it conceals or dissimulates the conventions of which it is a repetition."[3]

It is hoped that the application of the performative construction of identity theory in this study will affirm that the norms of the performativity can be and are established not only in the case of gender, but also to the case of other identities such as the national identity by the institutions of the state, as well as by the institutions of society. The transference of Butler's theory into national identity formation is plausible and highly useful because it goes further than other theories. Judith Butler's theory seems more compelling primarily because it is based not on subjectivity, as other postmodern theories, but in performativity. One reason for favoring performativity is that it is based in more concrete circumstances than the often highly abstracted discussions found in theories based on discussions of subjectivity found in, for example, Derrida. Moreover, performativity proves to be more fruitful when used to explain the collective development of identity.

Butler's theory goes as far as challenging aspects never touched by others, considering the subject as disembodied, sexless, and gender-blind in character.[4] This is very significant for this study, since transcending the physical body is one of the challenges of states with multi ethnic groups. Butler states repea-

---

[3] Butler, *Gender Trouble,* 12.

[4] Jenny Edkins, "Politics, Subjectivity and Depoliticisation," in Jenny Edkins, *Poststructuralism and International Relations: Bringing the Political Back In* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1999), 31. The most central theories associated with this approach can be found in the work of Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, Ferdinand de Saussure, Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan, Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe and in some feminist thought.

tedly that the body is not a central element for identity. Despite visual differences, individuals in fact develop their identity based on other elements of categorization. When individuals act in a certain way, they overcome the physical aspects making them less important than behavior. What emerges from this insight is a particular element that provides a tool for understanding how a multi ethnic society can build cohesion of kind. The differences in physical aspect can be overcome, minimized and ignored, by placing the categorization on the way they act. The initial conclusion relevant to my study is that things that are thought to be rooted in corporeal or physical differences may not be as rooted there as we think. And if they are not so rooted, then they might not be as unchangeable either. Butler's theory provides the theoretical framework in general terms that I aim to illustrate by the particular case of Japan: a multi ethnic, nationally identified society.

Due to the complexity of Butler's theory, and the challenge to transfer it to the realms of national identity, it is important to isolate the main elements of the theory of performativity to be used in this study. Such elements, which will be explained ahead with some historical illustrations from the Japanese case, are the following: collectiveness,[5] representation, normative subjectivity, repetition/rituals, and finally performativity.

UNDERSTANDING THE JAPANESE CASE USING BUTLER'S THEORY

It is widely accepted that the origin of "Japanese" identity, of "being Japanese", is fundamentally linked to a "*natural*" ethnicity

---

[5] The definition of the element of collectiveness is taken from Benedict Anderson's idea of nationess and expanded with notions of Butler about the creation of collective identities.

that coincides with the territorial borders of the Japanese state.[6] Several authors make claims focusing on the hermetic nature of Japan's historical and geographical context.[7] There is much evidence to suggest that such positions are based on a mistaken account of Japanese reality. This widely-made mistake is rooted in several factors. First, the initial perception of Japan by other countries played a significant role. Second, there is a widespread misperception of the so-called hermetic geographical conditions of Japan. Third, and largely a result of the first two, in the nineteenth century the Japanese state created and disseminated myths of "Japanese" origin for the explicit purpose of artificially establishing a homogenous Japanese identity. The myths were presented to the population as "recoveries" of exceedingly ancient events rather than politically expedient and recent inventions. This artificial establishment of something that is really socially constructed as being "natural" is a foundational argument in Butler's theory. The parallels with Benedict Anderson's idea of an imagined community based on constructed imagery are also very clear.

When Japan was first recognized as an autonomous political and geographical community, it was generally perceived by western imperial powers such as Portugal to be a highly exotic land with exotic inhabitants.[8] While a large variety of ethnicities have in reality always been present within the Japanese territory, to western eyes, all these ethnicities looked so physically different

---

[6] See Peter N. Dale, *The Myth of Japanese Uniqueness* (New York: St. Martin Press, 1986). See also E. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Random House, 1978), 283, and Nosomu Kawamura, "The Historical Background of Arguments Emphasising the Uniqueness of Japanese Society," in *Social Analysis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970).

[7] Delmer M. Brown, *Nationalism in Japan: An Introductory Historical Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955*)* and Louis D. Hayes, *Introduction to Japanese Politics* (New York: Paragon House, 1992).

[8] See Said, *Orientalism* for more on this idea.

from western appearances that they were effectively generalized into one perceived homogeneous group. This is clearly inconsistent with the history of the region. It is also counterfactual to view the Japanese people as part of the same ethnic group. Indeed the existence of such cultural homogeneity can be proved wrong just by traveling within Japan, a region formed by several islands, and looking at the physical characteristics of the inhabitants.

Nevertheless, the western perception of Japan as "one" had already influenced the policies of the Japanese state itself toward standardizing Japanese culture within the territory —largely through the creation and dissemination of myths of origin of the "Japanese" identity. Even from this limited and brief analysis, it is possible to see the beginnings of the relevance of the performative theory of identity construction in our understanding of the Japanese case. Indeed, one can say that the process of performativity had started and had created a homogenous Japanese subject for the state to represent. This basic point falls largely under at least two of the themes I isolated as central to Butler's theory. First it can be explained by the idea of *representation* which is the effect of institutions producing subjects that they will represent or govern. Second, it set up the basis for the idea of *nationness*, which is the aspect of identity determined by a behavior dependant on our imagination. However, the connections with the theory go much deeper.

The historical geographical reality of Japan has also been taken to be a *naturally* unifying force. Evidence exists to the contrary here. Japan's official state frontiers were drawn in the middle of the nineteenth century, but were never really closed to external interaction. The kind of hermetic seal implied by Brown's depiction of a "naturally isolated region" is not altogether the most accurate characterization of Japan's geogra-

phical context. Modern frontiers cut across "stepping stones",[9] small islands which have acted as zones of exchange and also enclosed within the Japanese state a number of groups whose language and history had very little in common.

Homogeneity of Japan is therefore not a natural phenomenon, though many respected academics have taken it as such. On the contrary, the homogeneity that now exists in Japan has to a very large extent been consciously and artificially constructed. Perhaps the wide acceptance of Japanese homogeneity can itself be understood as a sign that this construction has been particularly successful in the case of Japan. What I wish to point out now is that the theory of performative construction of identity can be extremely useful in helping us to understand just how the government carried out the process of identity construction.

The stages in the process are complicated and highly inter-connected, interactively influencing each other at every stage in the ongoing project. For this reason, it is very difficult to study the different "stages" in strict isolation from each other. The theory of performativity nevertheless makes it possible to focus on certain ongoing themes (as opposed to "stages" of the creation of the nation). In the case of Japan the explanation of the construction of national identity can be divided into what I consider to be the major themes of the process: nationness, representation, normative subjectivity, repetition/ritual and finally, performativity as a whole.

---

[9] Tessa Morris-Suzuki, *Reinventing Japan* (Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1998), 10.

Nationness

Nationness is based on an expectation of belonging to a determined nation. It is something determined by a behavior dependant on our imagination, in which individuals consider themselves as fellow-members of a nation. The sense of belonging to a nation, and the nation itself, then depends on individual perceptions and the development of a sense of belonging constructed by the conventions and institutions of a society.

As Tokutomi Soho mentioned, it is very evident that in the case of Japan, "the concept 'foreign nations' brought forth the concept 'Japanese nation'."[10] Japan started its transformation into a nation when it heard about nations and, as in other cases of identity, with the comparison to "the foreign" (which may be understood as Butler's "the other") , following the XIX century trend of creation of national states, Japan began to identify and build upon its own characteristics.[11]

For conventions and the limits of the belonging to come into being, the simple comparison with the outside world was not enough. The limits of the territory and the individuals, the official borders were declared and officially announced. This became the first step towards the establishment of Japan as a "natural state", an idea which was later reinforced by official history and myths of origin. This image of a natural region needs to be understood as something essential in the construction of the nation state. That is to say, the importance lay in constructing

---

[10] Ramon Myers and Mark Peattie, *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895 to 1945* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 16, cited by Morris-Suzuki, *Reinventing Japan*, 13.

[11] This idea is very well explained by the Japanese term *kokutai*. Its explanation could be translated as "the creation of the unique character of one nation as against other nations". In other words, the birth of the uniqueness depends in many respects upon comparison to other similar ones.

a unity based on the particularity of its national identity, as a prior entity which grew to become a national body with institutions. Put in Butlerian terms, just like her example of homosexuals, the individuals in the Japanese territory needed to perceive their own form and existence inside the limits of certain existing norms, so later they could be represented by the institutions as part of a kind. This idea was the reason to delimit the borders of the Japanese state.

The idea of a "natural state" is also a key factor for the construction of a nation. If the state is considered natural, then any type of coercive measure to ensure its limits is considered justifiable. In other words, to set the standards of the identity in the nation, and develop it further than in terms of simple administration, it was necessary to declare the borders of Japan, and construct from them a number of ideas to influence the individual and group psychology of the Japanese.

Before the first complete encounter and relation with the western powers, the word *Wajin* existed. The territories of Japan were controlled by several landlords of families, and those under the central power jurisdiction called its inhabitants *Wajin*. The same word later became *Nihonjin* or "Japanese", and acquired a different sense in the understanding of the people.

Until the middle of the eighteen century, most ordinary people in Japan would have had very little cause to reflect on their identity as Japanese.[12] Once the foreign nations arrived to the Japanese land, their ideas became important to follow a desired path of progress. They came in ships with flags from a defined nation, with an identity and more in common than just a monarch. The outsiders were identified groups, with customs and traditions that according to them were built on the bases of

---

[12] Morris-Suzuki, *Reinventing Japan*, 13.

a common origin or blood. Japan became aware of these ideas, and as many of the other formulas borrowed from a superior power, they adopted this new view of themselves, and a new view of the world. For this to happen, a new sense of nationness and the redefinition of Japanese which included those tribes outside the *Wajin* system, like the Ainu and Okinawans, changed along with the new relation with China and the encounter between the European powers and Japan.[13]

The ideas relative to the world were taken to Japan from the Chinese culture. It was then a concentric representation of the world, *ka-i*, in which barbarism increased the further one moves away from the civilized center. China was the center, and Japan was still considered civilized. After the consolidation of the Tokugawa Shogunate,[14] the elite of power decided to redefine the *ka-i* view of the world making Japan its new center, taking the most important position from China to be substituted by them.

A new idea called Meiji *bunmei* replaced *ka-i*. This new conception was a more dynamic term related to the idea of progress brought by the Europeans, in which the differentiation was not in relation to the center-periphery, but in relation to the degree of assimilation of the Japaneseness. In short, ideas of belonging were totally relevant to the progress. Those who could be part of the new Japan had to be incorporated and had to assimilate the commonality. For the Japanese, the key of foreign success in the West lay in the cohesion of its members.

Via policies related to these above mentioned examples, a new sense of nationness was built and consolidated over time. The Japanese assimilated the culture and new limits and definitions of their existence, and could develop in their imagination

---

[13] Morris-Suzuki, *Reinventing Japan*, 17.
[14] Edo Period, 1603.

the communion needed to create their nation within the existing state.

Representation

Another theme of the process of performative construction of identity isolated for this study from Butler's theory of performativity was that of representation. Representation is the effect of institutions producing subjects that they will represent or govern. It is a process of inclusion by the means of politics.

The world order changed at the Meiji and as Morris-Suzuki states, it produced the idea of Japan as a natural region, the contemporary Japanese idea of *shimagumi* or island country.[15] But the borders brought a new problem that would eventually bring solution to the dissimilarity. The Japanese State found it indispensable to go through the process that Morris-Suzuki called "cultural colouring in", in which the State worked to bring together the societies of the periphery into the official image of a unified nation in order to accomplish the desired social uniformity.[16] Defining this, the subjects of the emperor were also subjects of representation and politics. The new way of belonging went further than the previous way of being part of a certain administration; it became also a production of individuals who were inside the limits of a certain standard: a way and a kind. We can say that the territorial differentiation with the outside, brought as a consequence internal social ordering, and later, originated commonality.

The process of representation is also in many cases a process of exclusion. According to the theory, it sets the limits

---

[15] Morris-Suzuki, *Reinventing Japan*, 25.
[16] Morris-Suzuki, *Reinventing Japan*, 24.

of the "normal", and gives a determined shape to the subjects to be represented by the institutions. The difference within the country contrasted and stressed the differentiation of the Ainu and Okinawa in relation to the urban elite. These regions were not as assimilating of the common culture, and thus considered retrograde. Okinawans and Ainu underwent a process of standardization with the rest of Japan. But it started late and brought about many economic disparities in the region.

In the Japanese case, I would say that discourse also generated the origin of the identity of the national subject. In which case, the encouragement of the government to develop the studies of Japanese genealogy can explain the efforts of the institutions to create and sustain the idea of Japanese as an ethnic group defined by spatial principles.[17]

As stated by Butler, representation has the task of asserting the limits of the individual to exist and be able to be represented by institutions. Once those limits were established in Japan, the Japanese could belong and be represented by their Emperor, inside the norms and limits already established. Butler thus gives us with her theory benefits in understanding the Japanese process, and the importance of the policies enforced by the creation of the Japaneseness.

Representation goes further than just a type of political right to the people; it also sets the *image* of those to be represented. In Japan, the only way to be considered part of the progress and part of the nation was redefining the individuals to be so. For this aim, a process of defining normative subjectivity had to take place in the life of the Japanese.

---

[17] By spatial principles I wish to express that being Japanese was not determined by the phenotypical or biological elements by first instance, but by their existence in a limited and well defined territory, a space in which Japanese are supposed to appear and exist.

Normative subjectivity

Normative subjectivity which in Butler's theory is in charge of delimiting the behavior and the further forms of performativity, also took place since the Meiji era in Japan, giving a meaning to the ways Japanese had to act. In other words, for individuals to define their acts and identity, rules and standards of social conventions are necessary. In Japan, this process took place through the creation of a number of state policies defined as "policies for assimilation".[18] These had as a main task both the transformation of the texture of the daily life of the people in the established territory and the promotion of a certain shape for an idealized image of the Japanese.

As a part of the logics of assimilation identified by Butler as crucial to identity construction,[19] we can mention the following aspects: the process of creating the idea of Japanese essence, diminished local autonomy, education, conscription, common ideology, changing concepts of time and space and the processes in which diversity was targeted for elimination by the imposition of language.[20] In the theory, all those aspects represent a step toward normalization and standardization of the subjects, constructing through their performance the national identity of the Japanese.[21]

---

[18] Steve Rabson, "Assimilation Policy in Okinawa: Promotion, Resistance, and 'Reconstruction'," in *Okinawa Cold War Island*, ed. Chalmers Johnson (San Diego Japan Policy Research Institute, 1999), 138-143. See also Morris-Suzuki, *Reinventing Japan*, 25.

[19] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 34.

[20] Morris-Suzuki, *Reinventing Japan*, 25.

[21] Even until recent times, there has been a number of expressions by government officials and policies indicating Japan's "uniqueness" in a form of a fully homogenous nation. Probably, the most vivid comment was made in 2005 by the then Internal Affairs and Communications Minister Taro Aso, who is the current Prime Minister. He described Japan during a speech in Fukuoka as having "one nation,

Benedict Anderson, in his renowned book *Imagined Communities*, argues that one of the major components of the environment in which nations emerged was language. The decline of the usage of the old universal languages and the standardization of certain versions of each vernacular language led to the emergence of larger groups with shared identity on the basis of common language. For Japan, language plays a central role as one of the *sui generis* characteristics of the nation. Language is perhaps more emotionally involved in a people's self-perception of their ethnicity than any other cultural artifact. Therefore an official language was established, imposing a change from the regional diversity to a unified Japanese culture. The language, which was taken from a high-class group from Tokyo, became a central element of the assimilation of a common Japanese ideology and a powerful instrument of nation-building.[22] The dialects were the target of the most severe critics, and those who talked in the streets in their dialect were considered badly educated.[23]

Education was also standardized. The highly centralized system brought compulsory education that included people from all over the corners inside the borders of the state. In the schools, the new ways of living were also decided and shown to the Japanese,[24] a defining image of themselves and their life in the new order of the nation.

one civilization, one language, one culture and one race". He added that "there is no other nation (with such characteristics)." Along with this, the emphasis on the collective memory surrounding the commemoration of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, puts special attention in the idea of Japan as a "peace-loving nation", a term often used Japanese government officials to highlight the foreign policy intentions of Japan and show the nations unity by its pacifist spirit and Constitution.

[22] Morris-Suzuki, *Reinventing Japan*, 28.

[23] Rabson, "Assimilation Policy in Okinawa," 139.

[24] Rabson, "Assimilation Policy in Okinawa," 138-140.

The way to convince the population of a change in their daily life texture was also by means of artificially establishing and continually reinforcing progress as an ideal. For this aim, changing concepts of time and space become very important for analyzing the examples in which the ethnic or cultural differences are related to retrograde or against progress, initiating the cultural application of the discrimination policies. In other words, the retrograde groups or individuals changed from being discriminated by the state to a social form of discrimination. In the terms of the performative construction of identity we can say that this discrimination was part of the process of deciding what the limits of the normal were.

Repetition/ritual

Normative subjectivity went then from the state policies of assimilation into social practices and rituals. Repetition is a part of performativity in which behavior already internalized is performed over and over to assert identity. In the case of Japan, this process took place in part through the recreation of the established dates of memorization of national culture. Dates and ideas of the national culture were positioned in certain places building an environment through spaces, statuary and other mnemonic sites to recall official memory.

Rituals of Shinto became of very deep importance for Japanese identity creation. In the Meiji era, the governors of Japan decided to reestablish an ancient religion of Japan and made it the state religion. Japanese then were forced to pray and practice in Shinto shrines and so took part in the rebirth of a common ideology via a set of divine ideas. Shinto became very important since it was transformed by the Meiji to be a religion that asserted the link between the Japanese and their territory. Probably

one of the most important characteristics of Shinto is a ritual or repetition of prayers, in which people pray for their Japanese ancestors. Most importantly, this makes it impossible for any foreigner to become a shintoist, and gives a special divine link to the Japanese with the others before them that were inhabitants of the same (even if newly delimited) land.

Performativity

As it was mentioned before, it is very difficult to categorize each element of history into the themes of performativity. The elements created a spiral of interaction, they went from the institutionalized standardization to something that shaped the everyday life of the people and that was repeated and performed constantly. The performativity was an instrument that "artificially naturalized" and shaped through the myths and performance of actions a certain identity, in this case the Japanese.

CONCLUSION

The theoretical themes and historical examples I have used are clearly of some help in understanding the process by which Japanese identity was formed. We can see that the Meiji Reconstruction was more a construction of the "nation state" itself. The institutions established official policies that impacted deeply on the minds of individuals and on group psychology. The examples in this document illustrate how the construction of the nation state was a process in which the identity bonded the dissimilarities and achieved unity. These conjectures enhance our understanding of the Japanese identity, but perhaps as importantly, they function as an empirical validation of the theory of perfor-

mative construction of national identity or even of the nation itself. We can say that the analysis of the Japanese nation state can be seen as a step towards developing a theoretical and methodological framework of a larger study about the nation states in the contemporary world, and as an instrument to understand other realities that had been naturalized and shaped by the myths and performance of actions with that intention.

A broad recognition of some of the points contained in Butler's theory has been around for some time. The well-know Japanese scholar Takashi Fujitani, for example, has mentioned several ideas in the context of nationalism that are not only paralleled within Butler's theory, but that are developed systematically and deeply in that theory even though it was not originally intended to be applied to questions of national identity formation. These kinds of ideas can be taken to a deeper and more systematic theoretical level by importing a version of Butler's theory into the field of international relations.

The five themes of the theory of performative construction of identity are advanced and complex concepts. But despite their difficulty, the five main themes can help us explain the practice more-fully than other theories have done, since they appear to be more complete and realistic about the complexity of such a process.

The importance of showing this case as a validation of the performative construction of identity relies on the strength of the arguments that show us how this identity was constructed. Japan is still cited as the most evident example of homogeneity by many scholars due to its success. Nevertheless, some further questions regarding the use of this theory remain. Since the historical examples are useful to show the development of the process, in my perception an analysis of the current situation of Japan, as a country with low incidence of conflict, could

also illustrate to us a side of the consequences of such practices for nation identity construction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANDERSON, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalisms*. New York: Verso, 1991.

_____."Western Nationalism and Eastern Nationalism: Is there a difference that matters?" *New Left Review 9* (May-June 2001 [cited 29 July 2004]): available from: <*http://www.newleftreview.net/NLR24302.shtml*>

BROWN, Delmer M. *Nationalism in Japan: An Introductory Historical Analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955.

BUTLER, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge, 1990.

_____. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory". In *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*, edited by Sue-Ellen Case. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990.

_____. *Bodies that Matter. On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York and London: Routledge, 1993.

CAMPBELL, David. *Writing Security. United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

DALE, Peter N. *The Myth of Japanese Uniqueness*. New York: St. Martin Press, 1986.

EDKINS, Jenny. "Politics, Subjectivity, and Depoliticisation." In Jenny Edkins *Poststructuralism and International Relations: Bringing the Political Back In*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1999.

FARROKHZAD, Kourosh. "The IMF: the International Manipulation Fund?," *Peace Magazine* (Jan/Feb 1994 [cited 26 July 2004]) from <*http://www.peacemagazine.org/archive/v10n1p06.htm*>.

FELLUGA, Dino. "Modules on Butler: On Gender and Sex." Paper presented at the North American Conference on British Studies. Vancouver, Canada (October 1994).

FUJITANI, Takashi. "Inventing, Forgetting, Remembering: Toward a Historical Ethnography of the Nation-State." In *Cultural Nationalism in the East Asia: Representation and Identity*, edited by Harumi Befu. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies University of California, 1993.

FUKUTAKE, Tadashi. *The Japanese Social Structure*. Translated by Ronald P. Dore. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1982.

GELLNER, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.

HALL, R.K. *Kokutai no Hongi: Cardinal Principles of the National Entity of Japan*. Translated by J.O. Gauntlett. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Havard University Press, 1949.

HAYES, Louis D. *Introduction to Japanese Politics*. New York: Paragon House, 1992.

HESTER, Jeffry. *Shifts in Conceptions of Affiliation and Difference with Institutional Development of the Nation-State in Japan*. Osaka: Kansai Gaidai University, 2003.

HORSMAN, Mathew and Andrew Marshall. *After The Nation-State: Citizens, Tribalism and the New World Disorder*. London: Harper-Collins, 1994.

HOSU, Alina. "Identity Politics and Narrativity." Paper presented at the conference Narrative, Ideology, and Myth', Special Session: Narrating subjectivity and security in de-territorialized world. Narrative theorizing in peace research/IR today. Tampere: Tampere Peace Research Institute and Department of Political Science and International Relations University of Tampere (26-28 June 2003).

KAMISHIMA, Jiro. *Kindainihon no seishin kozo. The Mental Structure of Modern Japan*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1961.

KAWAMURA, Nosomu. "The Historical Background of Arguments Emphasising the Uniqueness of Japanese Society." In *Social Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

KIDDER, J.E. *Ancient Peoples and Places: Japan.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1959.

MORRIS-SUZUKI, Tessa. *Re-inventing Japan.* Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1998.

MUROGA, Nobuo. "Atarashii sekai no ninshiki: Nanban sekaisu byobu." In *Esunishiti to tabunkashugi*, edited by Ryuhei Hatsuse. Tokyo: Shogakukan, 1978.

MYERS, Ramon and Mark Peattie. *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895 to 1945.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

NORMAN, Emma R. *Ser político.* México: Ediciones Coyoacán, forthcoming 2005.

RABSON, Steve. "Assimilarion Policy in Okinawa: Promotion, Resistance, and 'Reconstruction'." In *Okinawa Cold War Island*, edited by Chalmers Johnson. San Diego Japan Policy Research Institute, 1999.

REISCHAUER, Edwin O. *Japan Past and Present.* New York: Knopf, 1964.

REISCHAUER, Robert Karl. *Early Japanese History.* London: Oxford University Press, 1937.

SAID, E. *Orientalism.* New York: Random House, 1978.

SETON-WATSON, Hugh. *Nations and States.* London: Methuen, 1977.

SMITH, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.

_____. "Nationalism" in *Dictionary of Ethics, Theology and Society*, edited by Paul Barry Clarke and Andrew Linzey. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

STAVRAKAKIS, Yannis. "Identity, Political." In *Encyclopedia of Democratic Thought*, edited by Paul Barry Clarke and Joe Foweaker. London: Routledge, 2001.

TAKAKUWA, Yoko. *Performing Marginality: The Place of the Player and of Woman in Early Modern Japanese Culture.* Tokyo: New Literary History, 1998.

TSURUMI, Kazuko. *Social Change and the Individual: Japan Before and After Defeat in World War II.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

_____. "Aspects of endogenous development in modern Japan, Part II: Religious Beliefs: State shintoism vs. folk belief." *Research Paper Series A-37.* Institute of International Relations, Sophia, 1983.

WEBER, Cynthia. "Performative States." *Millenium: Journal of International Studies* 27, no. 1 (1998).

YOSHINO, Kosaky. *Cultural Nationalism in Contemporary Japan: A sociological enquiry.* London and New York: Routledge, 1992.