

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
SCHOLARSHIP AROUND THE WORLD

Edited by Arlene B. Tickner and Ole Wæver



WORLDING BEYOND THE WEST

5 Japan, Korea, and Taiwan

Are one hundred flowers about to blossom?

Takashi Inoguchi

Introduction

International relations studies in East Asia were long regarded as something only slightly more than the disparate combination of national security analysis, area studies, and diplomatic history. The state, and its think-tanks and agencies that produced official documents, controlled developments in all three, while academia's role ranged from extremely marginal (in the case of national security), to supplying detailed country-specific information to policy makers (in area studies), to compiling and consuming historical documents (in the case of diplomatic history).

Although this is an over-simplified picture of the state of international studies in countries such as Japan, Korea, and Taiwan between the 1960s and the early 1990s, it captures quite appropriately the marginal role played by academia until fairly recently. Three factors changed this picture quite dramatically around 1989: economic development, democratization, and the end of the Cold War. East Asian economic development pushed up interest in the world economy, particularly given its export-oriented economic structure (World Bank 1994). Democratization enhanced civil society and one of its key components, the academic community (Inoguchi 2002a; Schwartz and Pharr 2003). In addition, the end of the Cold War enlarged the horizon of diplomacy and international relations available to the region (Inoguchi 2001a).

Admittedly, many differences exist between the countries of East Asia, and these forces have had varying degrees of influence upon academic fields such as International Relations. Economic development took place first in Japan, later in Korea and Taiwan, and most recently in China. Their degree of democratization varies tremendously from a long-established democracy in Japan over third-wave democracies in Korea and Taiwan (Inoguchi and Carlson 2006) to the East Asian case with its own chapter in this book: fledgling in mainland China. Although the Cold War ended in Europe, in Asia two strong, confrontational postures have remained more or less intact. Yet, this threefold development has been driving the growth of international relations studies quite steadily in each of the East Asian sites mentioned over the course of nearly 20 years.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and examine the recent development of international relations studies in East Asia, in the light of its increased significance, in a comparative framework. Rather than developing an extended argument about the field's qualitative leap forward, my main interest is to analyze the role of the factors and historical contexts mentioned. Given my personal expertise and professional location, I look primarily at the development of Japanese studies of international relations since 1945, and only secondarily at the cases of Korea and Taiwan. However, the major *raison d'être* of the

chapter lies in tracing the region-wide movement of international relations research in East Asia since the early 1990s.

The chapter proceeds as follows: in the first section, I develop a comparative framework for examining international relations studies in East Asia by posing three questions about academic autonomy, research agendas, and salient approaches to the field, and attempting to answer them one by one. I then examine the field's historical development in Japan with reference to four distinctive academic traditions: *Staatslehre*, Marxist, historicist, and American empiricist. In the chapter's third section, I explore the key framing questions underwriting Japan's international practice since 1945, and discuss some academic works that were influenced by such questions. Subsequently, the qualitative leap in international relations studies is examined in the cases of Japan, Korea, and Taiwan in terms of contexts, set menus, and new orientations. I conclude the chapter with some remarks about the future prospects for the field in East Asia.

Comparative framework

In comparing international relations studies in distinct sites within East Asia, three questions seem particularly relevant: (1) How autonomous or appendaged, isolated or fused is the professional academic community in relation to the policy community?; (2) What are the key framing questions that shape academic research agendas?; and (3) What are the salient approaches to international relations?

The first question addresses the issue of how distinctive the International Relations academic community is in relation to the policy community that deals with what is called high politics, including security, diplomacy, defense, and intelligence matters, and this is bound to be dominated by the government. Its main purpose is to gauge how much space the International Relations academic community occupies within society, and how separate and mature the civil society is vis-à-vis the state. How does the space occupied by the academic community provide a general indication of the separateness existing between civil society and the state? Without doubt, academic communities thrive where freedom of expression and of speech is abundant in civil society. Civil society prospers where the state does not suppress freedom. Given mostly recent developments in civil society in the countries discussed in this chapter, the question will therefore shed light upon the emergence of relatively vibrant academic communities in East Asia.

The second question addresses the primary concerns and interests of international relations scholars, mainly the types of subjects they are interested in tackling. It will enable us to see how similar or dissimilar the academic interests of the East Asian community are in comparison to North American, West European, or Latin American international studies, about which systematic comparative pictures have already been drawn (Wæver 1998; Tickner 2003). Similarly, the third question is important in identifying the methodological inclinations of International Relations scholarship in the region in comparison to these same counterparts.

These questions will be used to create profiles for each International Relations community in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, following which I will evaluate the prospects for the field region wide in East Asia. However, before comparing the three cases, it would be helpful to provide, in the way of a historical background, a summary of the field's development in Japan, given that it emerged earlier here than in the other two countries.

International Relations in Japan in historical perspective

As in other societies, the field of International Relations in Japan has been strongly influenced by the major currents of the social sciences that have been prevalent in the country (Inoguchi 1989, 2001a; Nakano 2007). The first is the *Staatslehre* (teachings about the state) tradition, which greatly influenced military and colonial studies in the prewar period and remained strong in a metamorphosed form even after 1945. The main feature of this tradition is its emphasis upon rich, descriptive details that elucidate complexities of all sorts. Top priority was given to supplying ample historical-institutional backgrounds and to describing events and personalities in diverse contexts, as well as their consequences, all in minute detail. This approach was valued for analyzing trends and changes within the international system that could have affected Japan's foreign relations. Even after 1945, however, the bulk of area studies have continued in the *Staatslehre* tradition, especially when conducted by government-related think-tanks. In such cases of officially sponsored research, its main purpose is naturally to aid the government to design and implement good public policy.

In sharp contrast to the salience of this tradition in government-related research, most area studies as practiced in academia are markedly humanistic, rather than relevant to the social sciences or useful to government policy. What do I mean by humanistic versus relevant or useful? In part, this reflects the reaction of scholars to the domination of the *Staatslehre* tradition in the prewar period. Why would academic area studies develop as a reaction to this tradition? Traditionally, area studies were subordinated to the state whether the mission was to modernize Japan or to colonize adjacent space. A corollary of the centrality of the *Staatslehre* tradition within the country is its emphasis on law and economics as opposed to political science and sociology. Whereas schools of law and economy are common in Japan, there are no autonomous departments of political science or sociology. For over a century, those disciplines were most likely to be found as appendages to the faculties of law or of letters. Even at the dawn of the twenty-first century, Japan is one of the few countries in Asia which does not have an autonomous department of political science in terms of professorial appointments or budgetary allocations. Thus, when oppositional currents react against the *Staatslehre* type of area studies, the available form is not another kind of social science but the humanities.

The second current of thought that influenced the early stages of social science thinking in Japan is Marxism, which was very prominent between the 1920s and the 1960s. This tradition is associated with the conception of social science as *Oppositionswissenschaft*, or opposition science. As if to counter the *Staatslehre* tradition, a vigorous Marxist school was clearly discernible throughout this approximately 40-year period. In what ways did Marxism counter the *Staatslehre* tradition? It did so by arguing that academic research should not necessarily interiorize and revolve around the distinct missions of the state, but rather that its potential role was to unveil the subordinate nature of the *Staatslehre* and thus liberate academics from this tradition's stronghold. Marxist categories of political analysis imparted a critical coloring to the observation of political events and the recognition of the ideological biases of the observer. In the 1920s, when the term *shakai kagaku* (social science) first came to be used in Japan, it often denoted Marxism, rendering the social sciences virtually synonymous with this school. Japanese social sciences had been literally *marxisé* by the 1930s. After 1945, in the absence of prewar internal security laws, Marxist influence became even more widespread, and from the immediate postwar period through the 1960s, the social sciences, including economics, political science, and sociology, were often led by Marxists or Marxist-leaning scholars.

International Relations were no exception. Marxism was so influential and pervasive that many other social science theories, especially non-Marxist ones, were literally crowded out. Instead, within the Marxist framework, theories of international relations, such as “the second image unreversed” and “hegemonic destabilization,” were put forward. Given the prevalence of the *Staatslehre* tradition and the nearly continuous one-party dominance that existed for nearly half a century beginning in the mid-1950s, it was considered natural or desirable for academics and journalists alike to form a sort of countervailing force that was critical of government conduct. After the end of the Cold War, while most Marxists have become post-Marxist, many have retained their critical view of government policy. Some have transformed themselves into postmodernists, radical feminists, and non-communist radicals in the post-Cold War and post-September 11 periods. In other words, when Marxism was discredited by the turn of historical and intellectual events it was widely believed that although it would be best to liberate scholarship from Marxist dogma, maintaining its critical stance towards social and political malaise was crucial.

The third tradition, one that has been extremely influential, is the historicist tradition. As a result, the bulk of scholarship in International Relations consists of historical research, and is therefore more akin to the humanities than to the social sciences. International relations research is historical in the sense that it is interested primarily in digging up primary historical sources but not in conceptualization. In contrast to the *Staatslehre* tradition, historicists are much less concerned with the policy relevance of their work and are normally interested in topics that involve events and personalities prior to 1945. The spirit that tends to guide much international relations research is often similar to the Rankean concept of history, *Wie es eigentlich gewesen ist*, or broadly “Let the facts speak for themselves.”

Finally, post-war international relations studies have been informed by the recent introduction of perspectives and methodologies derived from American political science. In the prewar period the absorption of European social scientific thought – in the form of the works of Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, Leon Walras, and Alfred Marshall – constituted the antidote to strong Marxist influence in the social sciences. After 1945, the American social sciences played a similar role. Two components of American-style social sciences were particularly influential within the Japanese context: proclivity for the formulation of theories and for vigorous empirical testing. This intellectual tradition became stronger beginning in the 1970s and its impact has extended through the 2000s.

It is important to note that, even today, these four diverse currents are all observable in Japan’s international relations studies and that they coexist fairly amicably without many efforts made towards integration. Indeed, diversity without disciplinary integration – if not without organizational integration – is one of the main features of the academic community in Japan, due in part to the strong legacy of four very different social science traditions originating from the one-and-a-half-century experience of nation building, economic development, war, and then peace.

The persistence of the four traditions, all of which are strongly embedded in the Japanese International Relations community, makes it difficult at times for the more home-grown and trained Japanese scholars to discuss matters of mutual interest with more heavily U.S.-influenced (or arguably neo-colonial) East Asian neighbors such as Korea, Taiwan and even China. However, various efforts have been underway to free Japanese academics from their slightly insulated academic community, based on a long-term accumulation of academic achievements. The most vigorous of these efforts is the launching of a new English-language journal, *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* (published three times a year by Oxford University Press). Referees are globally distributed, depending upon the expertise of a subject

matter dealt with in a manuscript. Approximately 50 percent of the journal's referees are from North America and about 30 percent from Asia, including Japan and Australia. Article submissions exhibit a roughly similar pattern of geographical distribution.

Unsurprisingly, the journal has been slowly but crucially transforming the Japanese International Relations community into an entity that is far more intensely interested in the generation and transmission of ideas and insights on a global scale than before. Publications of their works in the English language by Japanese academics have been on the steady increase. About one hundred scholars out of the community's approximate size of 2,000 have published their books in English and more than three hundred have published articles in English. Given that the number of American Ph.Ds in Japan is very small – some 6 percent of all the members of the Japanese Association of International Relations, compared to around 60 percent of the total membership of the Korean Association of International Studies – these efforts to make inroads into the global academic community are quite remarkable. Moreover, the perception of the Japanese International Relations community held by global scholars seems to be changing too.

Key framing questions in Japanese IR since 1945

In order to observe the substance of international relations research in Japan more closely, I now turn to the past half century in the development of International Relations in Japan in terms of the key framing questions that have driven intellectual agendas in the field. It is important to note at the outset that in this country the four “great debates” as conducted and narrated in the United States – realism versus idealism, behavioralism versus traditionalism, neoliberalism versus neorealism, and rationalism versus reflectivism – were not rehearsed in Japan, simply because proponents and opponents of such theoretical approaches were not very prominent among Japanese scholars in International Relations. Contrary to their East Asian neighbors, Japanese international relations studies have been much more deeply rooted in the country's own historical soils. Therefore, U.S.-derived theories needed to be historicized and contextualized first in order to generate insights and propositions that are more sensitive to Japan's historical and cultural complexities.

Although other social science disciplines such as economics and sociology were pursued in Japan since well before World War II, International Relations, as in many other places in the world, was only introduced afterwards. The historical moment, along with state needs after 1945, were determining factors that affected the development of international relations studies and its three key questions. These were: (1) What went wrong with Japan's international relations?; (2) What kinds of international arrangements best secure peace?; and (3) Why is it that so much remains to be desired in our diplomacy?

While all three questions are interrelated, it is important to note that as time passed, concern with the first question started shifting towards the other two. Concerns about Japan's international relations go back to the days when the country's external policy led to war, and then to defeat and foreign occupation, and they continue to be one of the key framing questions in the study of international relations today. This question has drawn International Relations students to study history (both diplomatic history and other aspects of modern Japanese history) in the related areas of economics, sociology, and political science.

The landmark *Road to the Pacific War* volumes are an interesting example of the above. In this work, most of the analyses developed seem to originate directly from this key question. For example, the economics perspective focuses on the productive capacity and production relationships of the Japanese economy, whose alleged distortions drove the country into a

mistaken and lengthy war. The sociology perspective is grounded in the study of feudalistic social relations and state-led social mobilization that were eventually manipulated and mobilized by the state to support and sustain that war. Political science devoted its energies to the study of the pitifully insufficient democratic arrangements and institutions, among them the Imperial Diet, political parties, the bureaucracy, elections and the armed forces, and their role in the war. It is safe to say that most of the premier postwar scholarship revolved around this first key question too. In addition to the work cited, Masao Maruyama (1963) is the foremost scholar addressing the question in his *Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics*. If one had to choose only one key framing question in the Japanese social sciences during the latter half of the twentieth century, “What went wrong?” would be everyone’s choice. In this sense, Japan’s social science community has been living under the long shadow of World War II (belying the basis for the oft-heard chorus of “Do not forget the past”). Takeyoshi Kawashima (1978) in Japanese civil law, Hisao Otsuka (1965) in the economic history of feudalism, and Tadashi Fukutake (1954) in agricultural village sociology are just a few examples.

In the study of international relations, the key framing question that attracted students was Japan’s diplomatic interactions with foreign powers. The then newly founded Japanese Association of International Relations compiled and edited the multi-volume work on Japan’s “Road to the Pacific War” (*Taiheiyo senso e no michi*), mobilizing virtually all available scholars and diplomatic historians, of which some were Marxists, active in the field in the 1950s and the 1960s. The approach it employed was predominantly descriptive rather than analytical or theoretical, in sharp contrast to the other disciplines that adopted interesting mixtures of Marxism and culturalism in attempting to address similar issues.

This landmark Pacific War study asks the big what-went-wrong question and devotes chapter after chapter to tracing and examining absorbing details of the diplomatic and political dynamics of Japan’s external relations. As the work is based primarily on studies of the recently released public documents of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the volumes are full of newly revealed details that led to the disaster. Most actors are portrayed as having done the right thing in executing their duties in those places to which they were assigned. The problem was that collectively their dutifulness and diligence did nothing to avert war with the rest of the world. Rather, the sum of each individual’s actions led to collective disaster of gigantic proportions. The past presidents of the Japanese Association of International Relations (JAIR) include many who were involved in this massive study and remained leaders in the field long after the work was completed and published. In that sense as well, the key framing question had a very strong impact on the entire discipline. Diplomatic history has had a strong presence in JAIR throughout the last half century. An illustration of this is found in Table 5.1, where – in 1998 – the self-identification of Japanese International Relationists pointed to the history of Japanese diplomacy as number one. And generally, history takes several spots near the top.

In tandem with the JAIR Pacific War project, newspapers and magazines played an important role in framing the academic agenda of international relations studies. For the press, the key framing question was the second: What are the best arrangements to secure peace? Therefore, debate unfolded on the subject of peace with the allied powers. Should the San Francisco Peace Treaty have been signed? In the context of the Cold War, what was the right choice, a partial peace with the Western powers or a total peace including all the Allied powers? Nambara Shigeru, a political philosopher and President of the University of Tokyo, took the latter position in the collectively signed appeal to total peace (Tsuchiyama 2005). The former position was called realism because it placed greater emphasis on the feasibility

*Table 5.1 Areas of specialization among Japanese IR scholars**Specialized areas of IR as self-identified by Association members (1998)**

History	Japanese diplomacy	211
Theory	Theory and philosophy	200
Theory	Security studies	180
History	Diplomatic history/int'l political history	174
Theory	Int'l political economy	147
History	History, Europe	118
Area studies	Western Europe	109
History	East Asia	108
History	The Americas	107
Theory	Ethnicity	85
Area studies	North America	85
Theory	Foreign policy making	83
Theory	Peace research	79
Area studies	Southeast Asia	78
Area studies	East Asia	77
Area studies	China	69
Theory	North–South issues	68
Area studies	Japan	66
Area studies	Russia	66
History	Southeast Asia	59
Theory	International integration	53
Theory	International exchanges	47
Theory	Global environment	41
Theory	Human rights	39
Theory	World system	38
Area studies	Middle East	37
Theory	Cultural conflicts	35
Area studies	Area studies	34
Area studies	Eastern Europe	33
History	China	33
Area studies	Latin America	32
History	Russia	31
History	Middle East	30
Area studies	Africa	28
Theory	NGOs	26
Area studies	Oceania	21
Theory	International mobility	19
Theory	Regionalism	18
Area studies	Central Europe	18
History	Oceania	18
Theory	Interdependence	17
History	Africa	12
Theory	Quantitative analysis	10
Area studies	South Asia	8

Note

* Out of 2,163 members as of December 1998, 1,172 responded to the Association-led survey of members. They were asked to choose up to three specialized areas of research. On average they marked 2.5 per person. See Inoguchi and Harada (2002).

of the choice accepted by the international environment, the latter idealism because it gave priority to pursuing a higher ideal. The debate on realism versus idealism unfolded in Japan during the 1960s and the 1970s. At first glance it resembles the first great debate between idealism and realism in the United States. However, in Japan, unlike in the U.S., realism's victory over idealism was somewhat incomplete; and marked a bigger difference: the parties to the debate were not really the same, and the debate was therefore not "the first great debate."¹

The salience of the debate on peace in the most widely read newspapers and popular magazines was such that the main arena of intellectual and political debate was journalism instead of academia. Therefore, those individuals who were involved in journalistic debates became the best-known names in the field of International Relations – also inside the IR community. Many of them received no formal training in IR or the social sciences, while some were journalists or former public officials acting as journalists. There is nothing wrong with the debate itself. Intellectuals who speak out in the media have played immensely important roles throughout the past sixty years in the Japanese context. The problem was that professionals in the academic community of International Relations ended up becoming less rigorous in their scholarship than their colleagues in other fields of the social sciences. The second framing question was basically a policy question, but given the way in which Japanese society is organized, there was little likelihood that members of academia could develop careers as experts on policy or become well versed in policy affairs and well connected to policy-making circuits. Inter-sectoral labor mobility is so limited that even scholars active in the journalistic debates over policy could not realistically aspire to active involvement in policy making as part of their careers. What seemed like policy debates, therefore, were in fact largely illusory. Ultimately, "journalist scholars" simply came to constitute a unique species within academia. This situation contrasts strongly with the case of the United States, where professionalization has made great advances over the past half century and academics have established themselves by an autonomous/autocentric dynamism.

The third framing question about the desirability of Japanese diplomacy is more recent. Although in a sense it is similar to the second question, it has led to empirical rather than theoretical investigations of what should be done. In this sense, it encouraged scholars to carry out empirical studies of an extremely detailed nature. This trend became dominant in the 1980s and the 1990s. For instance, Kusano Atsushi published meticulously researched books on Japan–United States policy discussions on the market and trade liberalization of agriculture and large retailing shops (Kusano 1983). Kusano has been quite active in commenting on policy and politics in TV programs since then. In addition, Tadokoro Masayuki published a well-conceptualized work on the international political economy of U.S. dollars and Japanese yen (Tadokoro 2001). Tadokoro too has been active as the co-editor of a monthly magazine in which he regularly contributes a policy column. Unlike empirical studies conducted in the United States, those done in Japan do not necessarily feel driven to place their research in grandiose and occasionally almost Procrustean theoretical schemes.²

A natural question to ask here is how the four traditions of thought highlighted previously correlate with the three key questions underlying international relations research. Over the long years since 1945, the first two traditions, *Staatslehre* and Marxist, seem to be waning in their influence. This waning correlates with the shift from the dominance of the first question and later away from the second one. Instead, the latter two, historically oriented studies and American social science-influenced studies, have been in the ascendent. This ascendent correlates with the salience of the third type of framing question. However, the basic resilience of all four of these traditions over many years has much to do with the lack

of political science and International Relations departments on university campuses, and their failure to become autonomous in terms of operating as academic disciplines. Where then do political science and International Relations take place? The absence of institutionalized political science departments has much to do with the nineteenth-century tradition of priming future bureaucratic elite candidates in legal training and with the fear of producing a bundle of unemployed young elites trained in “political science” which might be subversive to the “system.” Therefore, political science is normally appendaged at the undergraduate level to programs in law, whereas International Relations is taught under various umbrellas such as departments of international cooperation and of international languages and cultures.

Paradigmatic events in East Asia in 1989

In the rest of East Asia, international relations studies developed much later than in Japan. The year 1989 constitutes a turning point for the region, given that a number of events took place that helped the field make a qualitative leap in countries such as Korea and Taiwan. This genesis resulted from the combination of three factors: East Asian developmental momentum reaching a plateau; a middle-class-led civil society born in fledgling form; and the end of the Cold War in Europe bringing about a thaw of one sort or another to other forms of confrontation in the rest of the world. It would be fair to say that their convergence constituted a watershed in the development of international studies in East Asia.

The bubble economy was created in Japan around this time, due in part to the country’s commitment to make massive capital flows available to New York following the Plaza agreement of 1985, whereby Japan’s trade surplus was to be reduced by massively purchasing United States Treasury bonds. In 1989 a large scandal erupted within the Japanese governing Liberal Democratic Party, while in that same year President Chiang Ching Kuo of the Republic of China (Taiwan) announced that the Kuomintang’s authoritarian politics would be replaced by gradual democratization. Similarly, President Roh Tae Woo of the Republic of Korea announced that military dictatorship would be replaced by democracy. By 1993, East Asian politics and economics had experienced substantial change. In Japan, the governing Liberal Democratic Party lost power for the first time since 1955 when the party was founded. In Korea the people democratically elected Roh Tae Woo as President. In Taiwan they democratically elected Lee Denghui as President. In other words, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the stage seemed to be set for the forthcoming blossoming of international relations studies in the 1990s and beyond.

Before 1993, international relations studies in East Asia had set menus. Furthermore they were narrowly focused on the highest priority subjects. In other words, similar to the case of Japan, there were key framing questions that set the scope and tone of international relations studies in each place. While in Japan, predominant international concerns at the time revolved around the country’s alliance with the United States, in Korea North–South relations and reunification issues were fundamental. In Taiwan mainland or cross-strait issues captured the attention of international relations scholars. In each national context the framework imposed by the Cold War, in combination with domestic settings under military or party authoritarianism and state developmentalism, acted to confine the menu of international relations studies into a narrowly focused and fixed set of menus that were all policy relevant. Although there was hardly any space for academics to say much about the issues, to choose their topics of research or to influence the policy process, such space was the largest in Japan, followed by Korea and Taiwan, and smallest in China. In each case, however, the field began nearly anew around 1993.

Japan

Although the focus was placed on the alliance with the United States, the combination of the end of high levels of economic growth, one-party dominance, and the Cold War helped Japan's international relations studies enlarge their scope and subjects of interest quite significantly (Inoguchi and Bacon 2001). The country's foreign policy line between 1975 and 1990 centered upon playing the role of supporter of the United States-led international economic system. Conversely, between 1990 and 2005, Japan's foreign policy line shifted towards the role of a global civilian power. This transformation reflected the emergence of an enlarged space for those non-militarist powers like Germany and Japan (Katada *et al.* 2004). Along with it came the increase in interest in such topics as human security, multilateralism, regional organizations, human rights, democratization, official development assistance, free trade regimes, and historical memory. Also noteworthy was the fact that the predominant focus on Japan was replaced by increasing interest in global politics. Undoubtedly, the country's strength in area studies facilitated this transition. Although, in the past, area studies kept their distance from international relations studies, in recent years they have been more or less fused in the sense that they are now defined as part of local developments of global politics, in tandem with the tide of globalization. In turn, this transition has facilitated the integration of area studies and International Relations in departments such as international and area studies, international cultures and languages, and international cooperation.

Korea

Inter- or intra-Korean relations or reunification issues constituted the set menu for Korea.³ Although the predominance of these topics did not change much, the scope of international relations studies in Korea was enlarged substantially following the end of military dictatorship and the bipolar conflict, as well as the resurrection of talks with North Korea. Korea's foreign policy line between 1990 and 2005 was characterized by its adroit regionalism and globalism, such as those found in the country's stance towards World Trade Organization globalism, mini-regionalism with China and Japan, Asian regionalism with the ASEAN plus Three and the APEC, free trade agreements, and regional monetary funds. A large number of American Ph.Ds teaching in Korea has enhanced this trend.

Taiwan

Cross-strait relations dominated Taiwan's international relations studies. Competition with Beijing in terms of diplomatic recognition has encouraged Taiwan to grow as an active global power with its deft use of official developmental assistance. It is a little like Israel's foreign policy vis-à-vis Africa, Latin America, and the South Pacific in that obtaining recognition is a very high priority. (Statistically, this shows (Table 5.2) in a predominance of "foreign policy" over IPE or IR theory, although it should be noticed that the score for theory is relatively high compared to most other countries outside the Western core.) Taiwan's foreign policy between 1990 and 2005 has been confronted by two dilemmas. First, that of forming a coalition of powers vis-à-vis China or joining the bandwagon on China. Second, the dilemma of enhancing economic integration through direct investment or restraining too heavy involvements in China. Facing all these dilemmas, Taiwan's international relations studies have significantly deviated from the aforementioned set menu. The large number of American Ph.Ds teaching in Taiwan has helped this change to accelerate.

Table 5.2 Fields of research in Taiwan

<i>Subfield</i>	<i>State of IR research in Taiwan (1988–1993)</i>				
	<i>Faculty speciality self-ID</i>	<i>Articles</i>	<i>Thesis dissertations</i>	<i>Research projects</i>	<i>Courses</i>
IR methodology	5.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.07
IR theory	23.33	6.01	7.58	21.88	23.53
International political economy	27.11	20.04	12.63	9.38	10.07
International organization/law	13.11	10.62	11.01	9.37	19.78
Foreign policy/relations	31.33	63.33	68.69	59.37	44.92
<i>N</i>	46	499	198	32	187

Source: Bau *et al.* (1994). Each column reports percentage distribution between the five subfields.

The set menus were associated with a certain set of orientations in international relations studies. Most noteworthy was a predominantly descriptive orientation. This descriptive orientation was strong in all places in all subfields of international relations studies, whether in area studies, diplomatic history, or narrowly defined International Relations. Two plausible reasons might be noted. First, the descriptive orientation went in harmony with the policy orientation of a bulk of international relations studies. Policy-oriented work needs clarity in assessing the congruence with the policy line of the government more than the descriptive work. Second, academics in these four places are less positivistically analytical in their orientation in international relations studies. They more strongly bring contextual elements into their work than American more theoretically oriented scholars in International Relations. As the menus enlarge, other methodological orientations have been increasingly adopted.

It would have been unthinkable until around 1993 to see the following kinds of theoretically informed debates conducted in East Asia. In Japan, how strongly Westphalian (stressing state sovereignty, use of force, patriotism), Philadelphian (underlining popular sovereignty, freedom, human rights, and democracy), and anti-utopian (emphasizing loss of sovereignty, failed or bankrupt, or rogue states) national actors are, is a case in point. Some argue that their distinction is more or less geographically delineated like Robert Cooper's premodern, modern, and postmodern distinctions (Cooper 2003; Tanaka 2003). Others argue that these paradigms are globally constituted and thus the geographical matching between the paradigms and a certain group of states misses the whole point (Inoguchi 1999).

In Korea, whether the seemingly vehement anti-Americanism of Koreans, as was revealed in December 2003 during the Presidential election campaign, was attributed to generational factors as younger generations did not know the tragedy of the Korean War (Kim 2005) or as a still insufficient development of a mature civil society in Korea (Moon 2003) has been debated in various forms. In Taiwan, how China's neighbors behave in response to the rise of China has been debated between those who argue that there are bound to be counterbalancing coalition formations (Taiwanese friends of John Mearsheimer and Avery Goldstein) and those who argue that most would bandwagon China (Taiwanese friends of Robert Ross and Ian Johnston).

Penetration of American international relations studies

The size of American Ph.Ds in the three sites examined can be very broadly compared. Korea and Taiwan have a very large number of American Ph.Ds among professors and some

politicians. A good contrast is between Korea and Japan. Korea has 600 American Ph.Ds whereas Japan has about 60. Taiwan is comparable to Korea in this regard. In proportion to the size of American Ph.Ds in political science, translated American IR books are salient in Korea and Taiwan. In Japan translation is no less vigorous. But Japanese professors prefer to selectively digest and partially incorporate them into their own textbooks rather than translated textbooks.

This pattern points to the importance of the interaction between global and domestic structure. The Japanese structure of the discipline is generally very different from the American hierarchical one organized around top theorists and top journals structuring a large domestic market with high mobility (Wæver 1998). In Japan, the IR academy has been more “uncompetitive and decentralized, with a hierarchical reward structure based on longevity of service and fidelity to one’s academic peers and mentor” (Inoguchi and Bacon 2001: 16; also Inoguchi 2002b). This again was reinforced by the institutional weakness of political science and IR, leaving scholars affiliated to a diverse mix of schools and departments, which in turn tends to weaken the institutional structures of IR, although the organization JAIR has been of growing importance. In Taiwan and Korea, in contrast, the discipline is more a product of a 1960s state-initiated effort self-consciously modeled on the U.S. and therefore leading to both a structuring of the disciplinary landscape more similar to the U.S., and internal dynamics that operate with a more permanent side view to the U.S. (Ho and Kao 2002; Moon and Kim 2002; Huang 2007).

A brief look at the outlets for products of international relations studies reveals the degree of American penetration. (1) A few get their pieces in those first-rate American journals like *World Politics*, *International Organization*, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, and *International Security*; (2) Many get their pieces printed in their most respected local language journals; (3) Even more print their work in those journals published by departments or universities; and (4) More still get their pieces in magazines addressed to a wider audience.

The Korean and Taiwanese governments encourage academics to publish works in those journals which are taken into account in the *Social Science Citation Index*. The Taiwanese government also saw to it that what is called the *Taiwanese Social Science Citation Index* be created. The Japanese government has not taken any formal action in this regard. (On the different status of international publication scores in the three countries, see further Huang (2007).)

The publication of English-language journals of international relations studies has been motivated by the desire to get East Asian scholarship known to others abroad, the desire to create an academic forum in which debates can be conducted productively, and the desire to elevate the level of academic competitiveness through the publication of a journal. Let us take a glance at some of them, especially those published in the English language.

Japan

International Relations of the Asia-Pacific (<http://irap.oxfordjournals.org>) is a publication of the Japan Association of International Relations. It is published three times a year from Oxford University Press. Its founding editor is the author of this chapter. It is meant to provide an academic forum for those interested in International Relations in the Asia-Pacific. In other words, it is not primarily meant to provide a vehicle for Association members to have their research products published. The distribution of authors in terms of their residence indicates that 35 percent are from North America, 35 percent from Asia including Japan and Oceania, 25 percent from Western Europe including the UK, and 10 percent from the rest. Japanese

authors amount to 10 percent for the period from 2001 to 2006. The subjects taken up by articles range widely: regionalism, alliance, energy and security, gender and military bases, state sovereignty, human rights, bilateralism, environmental agreements, and more country-specific foreign policy issues. The latest special issue is about international relations studies in Asia edited by Barry Buzan and Amitav Acharya. Available on line, it is globally subscribed. It has been favorably assessed in the *Times Higher Educational Supplement* (Deans 2003).

International Journal of Asian Studies (http://www.journals.cambridge.org/jid_ASI) is a humanistically oriented journal published twice a year from the Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo. It deals with historical materials such as nineteenth-century international trading networks in East and Southeast Asia and twentieth-century crop production and rainfalls in India, and its editor is Takeshi Hamashita. Furthermore, it has been taken into account in the Social Science Citation Index since 2008.

Japan Review of International Affairs (<http://www2.jiia.or.jp/shuppan/jr/index.html>) is a journal published by a think-tank of Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It covers key issues of international security such as the Six Party Talks on North Korea, Japan's official development policy, China's rise as a global power, and the United States Middle East policy.

Asia-Pacific Review (<http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/13439006.asp>) is a journal published by the International Policy Research Institute, a private think-tank in Tokyo. It covers key regional issues such as the East Asian Summit, the World Trade Organization and bilateral free trade agreements, and the Japan–United States alliance.

Japanese Journal of Political Science (http://journals.cambridge.org/jid_JJP) is a very academic journal published three times a year from Cambridge University Press. Its focus is on comparative politics, especially Japan, East Asia, and beyond. It sometimes covers international relations as well. Its editor is the author of this chapter. The latest special issue is the comparative political culture of East Asian societies examining quality of life, social capital, governance, and democracy. It has been acclaimed in a piece appearing in the *Times Higher Education Supplement* (Connors 2003). It has also been taken into account in the Social Science Citation Index since 2008.

Korea

Journal of East Asian Studies (<http://www.rienner.com/viewbook.cfm?BOOKID=1354>) is a publication of the East Asia Institute, Seoul. It is published three times a year by Lynne Rienner. Its founding editor is Kim Byung-kook. Its current editor is Stephen Haggard. It is a highly acclaimed academic journal. It is a combination of comparative politics and International Relations. It deals with democratization, environmental protection in Northeast Asia, inter-Korean issues, and international relations studies in East Asia.

Journal of International and Area Studies (http://iia.snu.ac.kr/iia_publication/iia_publication_jias.htm) is a publication of the Seoul National University's Institution of International Affairs, published by Seoul National University Press. Its editor is Chong-sup Kim. It is a very academic journal with many articles authored by professors of Seoul National University. It covers key issues of international relations theories and practices in general and those surrounding the Korean Peninsulas in particular.

Korean Journal of Defense Analysis (<http://www.kida.re.kr/english2005/publications/kjda.htm>) is published by the Korea Institute of Defense Analysis. It focuses on Korea. It publishes key security issues as perceived by Korean policy makers and think-tank academics and, more broadly, security experts around the world. It enjoys a high reputation.

Global Asia (<http://globalasia.org/main.php>) is a brand new journal featuring key regional players and policy issues, and is published by the East Asia Foundation. Its editor is Chung-In Moon, ambassador-cum-academic from Yonsei University. It is highly acclaimed.

Taiwan

Issues and Studies (<http://iir.nccu.edu.tw/english/IandS.htm>) is a journal published by the Institute of International Relations, National Chengchi University. It is a policy-oriented journal published four times a year. It focuses on cross-strait relations but of late it has been developing its global reach and its theoretical wings as well.

Others

International Studies (<http://www.ciis.org.cn/en/publications1.asp>) is a journal published by the China Institute of International Studies, a think-tank of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It presents the range of thinking flowing around China's foreign policy community.

The *Chinese Journal of International Politics* (<http://cjid.oxfordjournals.org/>) is a journal from Tsinghua University with Yan Xuetong as editor and is published by Oxford University Press. It is a very academic and yet at the same time policy oriented journal. It is very interesting because it publishes those articles originally published in Chinese for a Chinese audience. It receives high acclaim in terms of academic quality and level of translation.

World Economics and Politics (<http://iwep.org.cn>) is a journal published by the Institute of World Economy and Politics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. It is a high-quality academic journal. It covers the whole range of international relations, universal security, and international political economy. It is also noteworthy that the journal publishes articles by foreign authors even on such potentially sensitive topics as Chinese nationalism.

Contemporary International Relations (<http://www.cicir.ac.cn/en/publication/cir.php>) is a journal published by the Contemporary China Institute of International Relations, the Chinese Communist Party's think-tank. It covers the whole range of key international issues as perceived by China's governing elites. It is highly acclaimed as an authoritative journal on China and enables readers to take a close look at Chinese foreign policy thinking.

China: An International Journal (<http://www.nus.edu.sg/sup/cij/>) is a journal of the East Asia Institute, National University of Singapore. It is an academic journal published four times a year from Times Atlas. Its editor is Wang Gungwu. It is a high-quality journal on a par with *The China Quarterly*, *The China Journal* and *Modern China*. It covers international relations as well.

Asian Journal of Political Science (<http://www.fas.nus.edu.sg/pol/kcommu/ajps.htm>) is published by the Department of Political Science, National University of Singapore. It is an academic journal published twice a year from Routledge. Its editor is Terry Nardin. It covers Southeast Asian politics and international relations.

Contemporary Southeast Asia (<http://www.iseas.edu.sg/csea.html>) is published by the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore. It focuses on each country of Southeast Asia but it often covers international relations beyond Southeast Asia. It is a highly acclaimed academic journal from many disciplines.

International Studies (<http://isq.sagepub.com/>) is a journal published by Jawaharlal Nehru University from Sage Publications. Its focus is on South Asia. However, more recently it has often gone beyond South Asia, reflecting the global outlook of Indian elites.

This rather detailed survey of journals in the region shows in static terms a diverse picture of journals of all kinds – from general to specialized, internationally oriented to local,

anchored in the region or outside it, basic theory to policy orientated – and it shows quite a number of well-established, recognized, and well-edited journals. However, to the extent that trends and attempts can be read from especially the more recent initiatives and changes, a major change of the total picture is an increased balance of more strictly academic journals now coexisting with the already numerous, more policy-oriented journals. In addition, a trend may be discerned towards moving out of national frames and into mostly subregional or regional ones.

Conclusion

Are one hundred flowers about to blossom in the East Asian International Relations academic community? Yes, to a certain extent, given the still robust developmental momentum, the steady empowerment of civil society, and gradual and steady thaws in regionalized cold wars. To this list of structural factors I might as well add the American factor. I have briefly touched on the American penetration of International Relations concepts and methods in East Asia through translated books and articles, and via American Ph.Ds. This is one form of American democracy promotion and diffusion. Korea is definitely the most penetrated by American IR if looked at on the surface. Taiwan is the second. Japan is curiously the third. Certainly, Japan has translated more American IR books than any of the two others here, but the extent to which academics refer to American IR concepts and methods, let alone follow them, is much lower in Japan. Japan's endogenous system of training students, recruiting professors, and evaluating academic products is the most dissonant of the three with the American system. It is not quite that the Japanese skepticism of American IR knows no bounds, but has a lot to do with the proficiency of the English language among elite academics in each of the three places. Japan has been slow in making English an important language to master. Setting aside these structural factors, which this chapter has not dealt with very much, most noteworthy is the fact that American IR itself is drawn into the process of diffusion, confusion, and fusion in East Asia, and more contextualized, more culturally sensitive, and more historically grounded IRs seem to be in the offing. The idea of reappropriation in a different regional setting is one of the things that should be paid more attention to in East Asia.

Notes

- 1 The second great debate between traditionalism and the scientific school did not take place in Japan either, meaning that the behavioral revolution never took hold in international relations studies. Neither the third nor the fourth debates, between neorealism and neoliberalism, and rationalism and reflectivism, respectively, took place either. However, many Japanese scholars feel that they have been practicing reflectivism long before it was preached by Americans, although they were less articulate and sophisticated about methodology.
- 2 However, competition among international relations scholars has increased somewhat in tandem with growth in the membership of JAIR – as of January 2008, the number is slightly more than 2,200 – with which Japanese scholars may feel tempted to employ U.S.-style academic strategies.
- 3 For statistics on the themes of articles in the main journals and of Ph.D. dissertations, see Park and Ha (1995). However, the categories used here are not very helpful for measuring the dominance of the set menu, because such studies can fall into a number of categories (area studies, inter-Korean relations, military and security studies [East Asia], South Korean foreign policy, North Korea, etc).

References

- Bacon, Paul and Edward Newman (2002) "IR Studies East and West: Some Sociological Observations," *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 2(1): 21–44.

- Bau, Tzeng-ho *et al.* (1994) *Survey of Manpower Distribution in the Discipline of Political Science*, Project Serial Number NSC 83-0131-H-002-014, Taipei, Taiwan: National Science Council.
- Connors, Lesley (2003) "Eastern Horizons of the Art and Science of Governing," *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, October 24, p. 32.
- Cooper, Robert (2003) *The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-first Century*, London: Atlantic Books.
- Deans, Phil (2003) "Youngster in Search of an Audience," *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, April 25, p. 35.
- Fukutake, Tadashi (1954) *Nihon noson shakai no kozo bunseki* (Sociological Characteristics of Japanese Peasants), Tokyo: Yuhikaku.
- Ho, Szu-yin and Lang Kao (2002) "The Study of International Relations in Taiwan," *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 2(1): 89–110.
- Huang, Xiaomin (2007) "The Invisible Hand: Modern Studies of International Relations in Japan, China, and Korea," *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 10: 168–203.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (1989) "The Study of International Relations in Japan," in Hugh Dyer and Leon Mangasarian (eds), *The Study of International Relations: The State of the Art*, London: Macmillan, pp. 257–264.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (1999) "Peering into the Future by Looking Back: The Westphalian, Philadelphian, and Anti-utopian Paradigms," *International Studies Review*, 1(2) (Summer): 173–191.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (2001a) *Global Change*, London: Palgrave.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (2001b) "Area Studies in Relation to International Relations," in Neil Smelser and Paul Baltes (eds), *International Encyclopedia of Behavioral and Social Sciences*, Vol. 2, New York: Elsevier, pp.707–711.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (2002a) "Broadening the Basis of Social Capital in Japan," in Robert Putnam (ed.), *Democracies in Flux*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp.358–392.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (2002b) "The Sociology of a Not-So-Integrated Discipline: The Development of International Relations in Japan," *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 2(1): 111–126.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (2007) "Are There any Theories of International Relations in Japan?," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 7(3): 369–390.
- Inoguchi, Takashi and Paul Bacon (2001) "The Study of International Relations in Japan: Towards a More International Discipline," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 1(1): 1–20.
- Inoguchi, Takashi and Paul Bacon (2006) "Japan's Emerging Role as a 'Global' Ordinary Power," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 6 (1): 1–21.
- Inoguchi, Takashi and Matthew Carlson (eds) (2006) *Governance and Democracy in Asia*, Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.
- Inoguchi, Takashi and Shiro Harada (2002) "Kokusai seiji kenkyuusha no sentou senryaku" (Strategies of Specialization by IR Scholars), in Yanai Haruo (ed.) *Tahenryo Kaiseiki Jisurei Handbook* (Handbook of Multivariate Analyses), Tokyo: Asakura shoten; http://www.t-inoguchi.com/comp/publish_j/bin/bin15091614339210.pdf.
- Katada, Saori, Hanns Maull and Takashi Inoguchi (eds) (2004) *Global Governance: Germany and Japan in the International System*, London: Ashgate.
- Kawashima, Takeyoshi (1978) *Nihon-jin no Ho-ishiki* (Legal Consciousness of Japanese), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Kim, Byung-Kook (2005) "To Have a Cake and Eat It Too: The Crisis of the Pax Americana in Korea," in Jorge Dominguez and Byung-Kook Kim (eds), *Conflict and Compliance: East Asia, Latin America and the New Pax Americana*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, pp.219–250.
- Kusano, Atsushi (1983) *Nichibei Orange Kosho* (Japan–U.S. Negotiations over Orange), Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Shinbunsha.
- Maruyama, Masao (1956–1957) *Gendai Seiji no Shiso to Kodo* (Thought and Behavior of Contemporary Japanese Policies), Tokyo: Miraisha.
- Maruyama, Masao (1963) *Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics*, London: Oxford University Press.

- Moon, Chang-in and Taehwan Kim (2002) "International Relations Studies in South Korea," *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 2(1): 45–68.
- Moon, Katherine (2003) Presentation at the Conference on Korea, East Asia, and the United States, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, November.
- Nakano, Ryoko (2007) "'Pre-history' of International Relations in Japan: Yanaihara Tadao's Dual Perspective of Empire," *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, 35(2): 301–319.
- Otsuka, Hisao (1965) *Kokumin Keizai – Sono Rekishiteki Kosatsu* (The National Economy: Historical Investigation), Tokyo: Kobundo.
- Park, Sang-sup and Ha, Young-Sum (1995) "Trends in International Relations in the United States and Present Status of International Studies in South Korea," *Korean Journal of International Studies*, 35(1): 313.
- Schwartz, Adam and Susan Pharr (eds) (2003) *Civil Society in Japan*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tadokoro, Masahiko (2001) *America o koeta dollar* (The Dollar Beyond the United States), Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Shimbunsha.
- Tanaka, Akihiko (2003) *New Middle Ages: The World System in the 21st Century*, Tokyo: LTCB Library.
- Tickner, Arlene (2003) "Hearing Latin American Voices in International Relations Studies," *International Studies Perspectives*, 4(4): 325–350.
- Tsuchiyama, Jitsuo (2005) "Japanese Relations Theories: Kosaka Masataka, Nagai Yonosuke and Wakaizumi Kei," paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association (ISA), San Diego, California, March.
- Wæver, Ole (1998) "The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations," *International Organization*, 52(4): 687–727.
- World Bank (1994) *The East Asian Miracle*, Washington, DC: World Bank.