The SAGE Handbook of
Asian Foreign Policy

2 Volume

Edited by

Takashi Inoguchi

An Evidence-Based Typology of Asian Societies: What Do Asian Societies Look Like from the Bottom Up instead of Top Down?

Takashi Inoguchi[1]

INTRODUCTION

What is the dominant approach to the study of comparative Asian politics? Academics often employ historical–cultural factors in their analysis. Drawing on a combination of historical narratives and cultural threads which are broad enough to include political culture, this school of investigation focuses on culturally shaped societal norms, rules, and institutions as the key determinants in shaping power and politics. Western bias often influences the design and analysis of research, ultimately impacting the outcome of such research.

The Western classical works of Hegel (2004) (one man's freedom), Marx (1875) (Asiatic mode of production), Weber (2002) (Protestant work ethic), and Karl Wittfogel (1981) (oriental despotism) form the foundation and provide the underlying tenets into scholarship on political culture. One such tenet found in these works and other similar works is Asia's supposed absence of modernity. It is a theme that underlies research and builds on such classics. As modernization theory swept the academic landscape in the third quarter of the 20th century, this school used the above noted classics in Western political thought to create the next generation of research, centered on political culture.

In 1963, Gabriel Almond and Sydney Verba published their research on comparative political culture, titled *Civic Culture: Attitudes and Beliefs of Five*

Nations (Almond and Verba, 1963). Notable as the first study of its kind based on a social survey, the analyses and conclusions reflect the mindset of the time. Almond and Verba's research on citizens' attitudes and beliefs in the United States, UK, Mexico, Germany, and Italy confirmed and strengthened the then dominant world view of Western Europe and North America, that is, democracy as a political system is only truly achievable for northwestern European Protestants. Two decades later, in 1985, Lucian W. Pye published his work on Asian political culture, titled *Asian Power and Politics* (Pye, 1985). Pye's study is not dependent on a social survey and his view of Asian politics reflects a more nuanced understanding of Asian political culture and Asian diversity, which he absorbed from Asian academics with immense knowledge of, and insights into, the diverse and complex history and culture of Asia. Just as Almond and Verba represented the fixed views of their generation toward Asian politics, Pye, perhaps due to the passage of time, represents a new wave of understanding that distinguishes itself from works cited in the past, including the classics. Yet both the 1963 and the 1985 publications belong to the school of modernization theory. They both endorse the thesis that to achieve democratic politics, pre-modern societies must develop and grow a middle class as they pass through the stages of industrialization, urbanization, and democratization.

More recently, Bruce Gilley's book, *The Nature of Asian Politics*, is fresh and well-informed about Asian politics, and employs basic political science concepts that include state and society, development, democracy, governance, and public policy (2015). Gilley's study of comparative Asian politics is exceptional because it steps outside the confines that have dominated his field of scholarship, that is, Western-biased modernization theory and rigid political culture narratives of area specialists who adhere to a description of society and politics that reflects their area of specialization.

My overall assessment of Gilley's book is that it represents a more open and insightful academic endeavor of comparative Asian politics that can be used as a genuine reference for building further research. Yet I struggle with the author's use of a grand theory to explain the nature of Asian politics, a notion that can be traced back to the classical works of Hegel, Marx, Weber, and Wittfogel, arguing that the nature of Asian politics is essentially power-centered. My question is: is politics power-centered as the economy is market-centered? Politics cannot be defined without significant, if latent, elements of power, irrespective of whether it is Asian or non-Asian.

Gilley may respond that the book is the product of a careful and diligent scholarly investigation that followed rigorous empirical and comparative analysis. In turn, I would ask him to add to his state-centric conceptualization, a society-centered conceptualization that would provide a way forward to a new Asian comparative politics that is much less reliant and burdened by the still strong Western bias that permeates other writings. As an example of such research, I refer to the social surveys conducted throughout Asia in the 2000s on

quality of life, culminating in a jointly authored volume by Inoguchi and Fujii (2013). From the 29 societies surveyed in East, Southeast, South, and Central Asia, Inoguchi and Fujii construct a citizen-centered society typology. Factor analyses of the survey results yield six society types. The ordering of three key dimensions determines society types. Ordered according to survival, social relations, and public sector dominance, six society types emerge: (1) survival followed by social relations and public sector dominance; (2) survival followed by state dominance and social relations; (3) social relations followed by survival and public sector dominance; (4) social relations followed by public sector dominance and survival; and (5) state dominance followed by survival and social relations; (6) public sector dominance followed by social relations and survival. The impetus of this citizen-centered exercise is to demonstrate that Asian politics viewed from below looks very different from Asian politics viewed from above. In pursuing this approach to Asian comparative politics, the yoke of Western bias may loosen, and in doing so reveal a more genuine understanding of Asian comparative politics.

Before turning to the conceptual work of proposing a typology of Asian societies as people see it from experiences of daily life, I need to briefly describe how I have come to think that way as my views on the varieties of Asian societies have deepened and sharpened.

Since 2003, I have executed a large-scale Asia-wide survey on quality of life called the AsiaBarometer. Here quality of life is defined as the contents and conditions of life as seen by each individual and more broadly by society as a whole (Inoguchi and Fujii, 2013). The aim is to register how people live their lives in Asian societies in the early 21st century, focusing on their daily activities in a systematic and comparative manner. Geographically, I have defined Asia as covering 29 societies in East, Southeast, South and Central Asia. In addition, Russia, Australia, and the United States are included in the AsiaBarometer Survey for comparative purposes (Inoguchi and Fujii, 2013).[2]

In analyzing (1) quality of life, (2) trust, and (3) exit, voice, and loyalty, my consistent line of inquiry has been threefold: (1) how people perceive their daily lives and beyond; (2) how people relate to other people and to social institutions with trust or distrust; and (3) how people act when organizations or societies they belong to deteriorate in quality. The questionnaire has been designed to cover some other subjects so that the three subjects can be understood more broadly and comprehensively in the analysis and synthesis.

This chapter is along the same line of inquiry: how people perceive their society's characteristics on the basis of their daily life experiences, and, more significantly, on the basis of their daily life satisfaction. The angle is from the bottom up, in other words, how people portray their own society by registering the degree of satisfaction with life circumstances and aspects (Inoguchi, 2015a). Hence, the title, What Do Asian Societies Look Like From the Bottom Up Instead of Top Down?

METAPHORS FOR FIVE TYPES OF ASIAN SOCIETIES

Literature Review of Asian Societies

Types of societies are often deductively derived from semi-frozen concepts of earlier thinkers in the field. Thus, types of societies have been discussed by reference to political regimes. Aristotle uses monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy as the characteristics by which societies are more or less determined. Hegel uses freedom to say that freedom for one person is called despotism. Marx uses modes of production to characterize Asiatic feudalism.

Even when types of societies are discussed by reference to some sociological concepts such as family and trust, they do so often in isolation from other components of society. Types of family units have been discussed by reference to such concepts as the matrilineal system, kinship, marriage, residence, and inheritance (Nakane, 1967a, 1967b; Todd, 2011). Types of business sectors have been discussed by reference to how trust can be extended to extra-kinship relationships (Fukuyama, 1995).

Types of society have also been discussed by reference to climatic, geological, and environmental conditions, such as Karl Wittfogel (1981) on the supply and need for large-scale infrastructure building; James Scott (2009) on hill tribes' community formation to avoid tax, war, and administration; Takeshi Matsui (2000) on Pushtuni and Baluchistani aggressively defensive isolated community formation; Shan (2004) on Chinese and Hindus in terms of cultural traditions; and Takashi Kato (2012) on the nature and modes of religions binding and bonding in community formation.

To augment the power of such typologies, I propose new types of Asian societies. I propose types of Asian societies by inductively generalizing Asian societies in terms of daily life satisfaction. In other words, types of societies are drawn from the bottom up or from the angle of people. At the same time, instead of what may be called barefoot empiricism, I use the above ideal-types and metaphors to help imagine types of societies by aggregating individual respondents' satisfaction about daily life activities in various life domains. This approach I call the evidence-based inductive generalization approach.

Use of Metaphors in Conceptualizing Types of Asian Societies

Apart from the above types of Asian societies, with some strong generalizing impulses, there are many revealing and enlightening works examining non-Asian and/or particular Asian societies. The metaphors I employ in conceptualizing types of Asian societies are selected to highlight the nature and modes of inclusiveness and legitimization. By inclusiveness I mean accommodating differences of various kinds, and by legitimization, I mean bestowing self-respect and

providing semi-auto-immunity to minorities of various sorts. The following types of societies are highlighted for the purpose of hinting at some loose ideal-types in the Weberian sense.

a. Masao Maruyama is a political scientist who invented the concepts of an octopus-cave society (*takotsubo gata*) and a bamboo-made mixing tool society (*sasara gata*) in his endeavor to best characterize Japanese society. The former is inward-looking, narrow in focus, and intensive in digging. The latter is outward-looking, broad-gauging, and extensive in diffusing. An octopus-cave society assembles together without much conversation with each other but in a competitive manner in the search for caves that can accommodate their growing body. This imagery captures Japanese society (Maruyama, 1961).

b. Arundhati Roy is a novelist from southern India who wrote *The God of Small Things* (1997). Indian society is full of differences and cleavages in terms of religious castes, class distinctions, ethnic differences, linguistic diversities, eating habits, marriage styles, and child-rearing methods and so on. The beauty of Indian society, if it is so called, is that because it exists to protect and respect the tradition of a certain position in caste, class, ethnicity, language, and family practices, one can be the god of small things. Take one example, in national, state, city, and village elections, each caste is often well represented in local party organizations of dominant or emergently dominant parties, locally or nationally. More directly, low caste Jats in Haryana Pradesh, who control the water supply to New Delhi, struck and stopped the water supply before the Governor of Haryana Pradesh agreed to increase their wages (*The Economist*, 2016a).

c. Guillermo O'Donnell is a political sociologist in Argentina who invented the concept of bureaucratic authoritarianism (O'Donnell, 1973). By that he meant that in running societies a certain set of coalitions of sectors bundle together to colonize and control regimes in their entirety. Sometimes during the economic developmental take-offs involving technocracy, the military and business literally control those regimes.

d. Franz Fanon is a psychiatrist, philosopher, and revolutionary, who writes about Africa. In his work, *The Wretched of the Earth*, he describes the fragmented, feeble, and helpless society of Africa, which lacks an ingenious solution to coping and competing with the ever-penetrating external market and other forces from abroad (Fanon, 2005). At the same time, he describes the inherent strength of Africa with equilibrating dynamics of societies and intense pride in Africa's independence and nationalism.

e. John Keane is a political philosopher in Australia. *The Life and Death of Democracy* is a tour de force of the theory and practice of democracy 2,000 years before Christ and after Christ (Keane, 2009). When ancient Greek direct democracy ceased to work and when classical English representative democracy revealed the malfunctions, it created a void of both direct and representative democracy (Mair, 2013; Levin, 2016). What has emerged is monitory democracy in tandem with the rise of globalization and digitalization.

Corroborative Narratives of Five Metaphors

As the above loose ideal-types are highlighted to reveal certain natures and modes of accommodation of differences and of legitimizing semi-auto-immunity of minorities of various kinds, I need to provide more contextual narratives that corroborate ideal-types.

Japan: Robert Putnam (1997), in discussing the visible difference between American and Japanese subjects' behavior in the prisoner's dilemma game, notes that the Japanese tend to express their trust more highly than Americans in

face-to-face situations than when they face an anonymous other person. Whether it is in experiments or surveys as well as in normal human interactions, Putnam's observation points to a Japanese particularistic trait of expressing trust. Maruyama's octopus-cave society points to the Japanese bias in treating far more intimately or far more politely those who share the same school, same village, same company than those who do not have a shared common association. Once you are out of your octopus-cave, patterns of expression and behavior change. The relations among those caves are not particularly close or actively interactive.

India: Genron-NPO (2016), a think-tank in Japan, carried out a survey in 2016 on democracy in the three largest democracies in Asia: India, Indonesia, and Japan. Of the survey questions, three are of particular interest: (1) How do you see your country's future prospects? (2) Do you think that your country's democracy is well functioning? (3) Thinking about political parties in your democracy, do you expect political parties to play a positive role? The response of the Indian respondents is very positive to all three questions. In particular, on the third question, Indian respondents registered 85.9% positive responses (accessed on August 20, 2016). This cannot be well understood until one considers that in Indian society, there are gods in small things. This mindset not only accommodates societal differences and cleavages, but also creates respect and protection with honor, thereby making Indian society more positive than other societies.

Thailand: Extreme inequality exists in the five regions of Thailand – Bangkok, Central, Northeast, North, and Southern Thailand. When comparing them in terms of population size, GDP, and general public expenditure, Bangkok almost monopolizes general public expenditure, capturing 75% of it, although it produces only 26% of GDP and sustains 17% of the population. The Bangkok trinity of royalty, military, and bureaucracy colonizes the other four regions from within (*The Economist*, 2016b). An entrepreneurial politician, Thaksin Shinawatra, became prime minister by mobilizing the poor in the Northeast and North regions for a good part of the 2000s. He was overthrown and forbidden from visiting Thailand after a 2006 military *coup d'état*. Although his sister later became prime minister, another military *coup d'état* in 2014 wiped Yingluck Shinawatra and her peasant troops from Bangkok. Furthermore, the southern region is made up of ethnic Malays who are extremely poor but strongly Islamic and have often been defiant and violent. The military held a national referendum in 2016 that secured a state of military emergency for many years to come (Phongpaichit and Baker, 2015).

Pakistan: Similar to Algeria and Africa (see Franz Fanon, 2005), Pakistan keeps its resilience despite seeming fragility, fragmentation, and vulnerability. Keeping Islam as the only unifying flag, Pakistan connects an enormous array of diversities into strength: the army, nuclear weapons, a population of 200 million, agriculture, a sense of honor and pride, excellent scientists, and oratorical capacity (Lieven, 2012).

Singapore: A tiny island with a small population emerged from the mud in the last quarter of the 20th century to become an advanced country over less than three decades (Lee, 2000). What's the secret? Outstanding among many factors is building infrastructure of a knowledge society on an island with astuteness, adroitness, and aggressiveness. Not to be underestimated is the ability of micro-management of governance in a small and yet already densely populated country. Micro-monitoring of the population is said to be far more advanced in Singapore than in a hugely populated big space such as China.

SIX TYPES OF ASIAN SOCIETIES ON THE BASIS OF DAILY LIFE SATISFACTION

Most of these revealing and enlightening works on types of societies have been undertaken in the form of qualitative comparisons or case studies or intense narratives of particular societies. Types of societies should also be examined systematically, comparatively, and quantitatively. Hence, the questionnaire included the following: 'Please tell me how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the following aspects of your life.' Respondents answered on a five-point verbal scale of 'very satisfied', 'somewhat satisfied', 'neither satisfied nor dissatisfied', 'somewhat dissatisfied', and 'very satisfied', with a 'don't know' category. The 16 specific life aspects included the following:

> housing
> friendship
> marriage
> standard of living
> household income
> health
> education
> job
> neighbors
> public safety
> conditions of the environment
> social welfare system
> democratic system
> family life
> spiritual life
> leisure

Each respondent's level of satisfaction was measured through a corresponding ordinal scale, that is, 5, 4, 3, 2, or 1. Factor analysis was carried out with varimax rotation for the matrix of the 16 daily lifestyle aspects of all the respondents, country by country. The number of societies examined was 29. Some may suspect that ecological fallacy might exist in factor analysis of individual responses. Since the scale used for responses is of ordinary scale, factor analyzing

individual responses yields correlation coefficients which are considered as 'normal figures'. Hence, no concerns are necessary on ecological fallacy. Also such labels as materialism, post-materialism, and public sector dominance are applicable both to societal and individual characterization, and the six societal types may as well be called the six types of individual's attitudinal and behavioral inclinations in Asian societies.

Further analysis results are reported in Inoguchi and Fujii (2013) and Inoguchi (2015a). They are robustly similar to those of Ronald Inglehart (1977) and many other works, including the World Values Survey, in terms of the key dimensions: materialism, post-materialism, and public sector dominance. The appearance of public sector dominance is because people's perception of society contains public institutions and activities by the state. Its weight differs from society to society. Thus, the order of the three dimensions differs from society to society. These statistical differences form the basis of the six societal types I propose for Asia. This is what I may humbly call one of the ingenious aspects of my typology of Asian societies. As you can see from the labels attached to the key dimensions of factor analysis, this typology is universally applicable to non-Asian societies as well.

Eigenvalues show how much variance each dimension explains. In this chapter, only the three key dimensions are presented here to make the typology of Asian societies simple and meaningful. Empirically, six types of Asian societies have emerged (see Table 22.1).

To explain what Table 22.1 means, in the Abc type of society, the first dimension of materialism, that is, satisfaction with survival-related daily life aspects, weighs most. The second dimension of post-materialism, that is, satisfaction with social relations-related daily life aspects, weighs second. The third dimension of public sector dominance, satisfaction with state-related daily life aspects, weighs third. In the Acb type of society, the first dimension of materialism weighs most. The second dimension of public sector dominance weighs second. The third dimension of post-materialism weighs third.

In the Bac type of society, the first dimension of post-materialism, that is, satisfaction with social relations-related daily life aspects, weighs most. The second dimension of materialism, that is, satisfaction with survival-related daily life aspects,

Table 22.1   Six types of Asian societies

	First dimension	*Second dimension*	*Third dimension*
Abc	materialism	post-materialism	public sector dominance
Acb	materialism	public sector dominance	post-materialism
Bac	post-materialism	materialism	public sector dominance
Bca	post-materialism	public sector dominance	materialism
Cab	public sector dominance	materialism	post-materialism
Cba	public sector dominance	post-materialism	materialism

Table 22.2   Distinguishing life sphere of domain assessments – Japan

	Factors			
	Materialist	*Post-materialist*	*Public*	*Uniqueness*
Housing	0.41			0.70
Standard of living	0.77			0.31
Household income	0.77			0.34
Education	0.44			0.64
Job	0.49			0.60
Friendships		0.47		0.69
Marriage		0.59		0.55
Health		0.36		0.69
Family life		0.67		0.47
Leisure		0.53		0.58
Spiritual life		0.63		0.44
Neighbors			0.38	0.66
Public safety			0.64	0.52
Condition of the environment			0.60	0.51
Social welfare system			0.71	0.44
Democratic system			0.70	0.46

Note: The reported loadings were from a principal factors solution with orthogonal varimax rotation

Japan	
Factor	*Eigenvalue*
Factor 1	5.640
Factor 2	1.097
Factor 3	0.645
n	1,352

Source: Inoguchi and Fujii (2013)

weighs second and the third dimension of public sector dominance, that is, state-related aspects of daily life, weighs third. One may ask how social relations-related satisfaction with daily life aspects has more weight than survival-related satisfaction with daily life aspects. In Bac or Bca societies, how to handle social relations at high and community levels often makes crucial differences to survival and future well-being. In the Bca type of society, the first dimension of post-materialism weighs most, the second dimension of public sector dominance weighs second, and the third dimension of materialism weighs third. In the Bca type of society, both social relations-related and state-related daily life aspects weigh more than survival-related satisfaction with daily life aspects. The third dimension of materialism, that is, satisfaction with survival-related daily life aspects, weighs third.

In the Cab type of society, the first dimension of public sector dominance weighs most. The second dimension of materialism weighs second, while the third

dimension of post-materialism weighs third. In other words, social relations-related satisfaction with daily life aspects weighs least of the three dimensions. In the Cba type of societies, the first dimension of public sector dominance weighs first. The second dimension of post-materialism weighs second, and the third dimension of materialism, weighs third.

The six patterns of two-dimensional orders are shown with six representative societies: Abc is represented by Japan; Acb is represented by India; Bac is represented by Thailand; Bca is not found among the 29 Asian societies; Cab is represented by Pakistan; Cba is represented by Singapore. All the factor analysis results are shown in the Appendix of Inoguchi and Fujii (2013). Tables 22.2 to 22.6 show the factor analysis results of the five representative societies.

Table 22.3   Distinguishing life sphere of domain assessments – India

	Factors			
	Materialist	Public	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Housing	0.62			0.56
Friendships	0.53			0.63
Marriage	0.52			0.62
Standard of living	0.66			0.51
Household income	0.62			0.57
Health	0.55			0.61
Education	0.58			0.62
Job	0.56			0.62
Neighbors	0.43			0.64
Public safety		0.62		0.57
Condition of the environment		0.65		0.58
Social welfare system		0.66		0.54
Democratic system		0.63		0.57
Family life			0.57	0.52
Leisure			0.51	0.62
Spiritual life			0.57	0.56

Note: The reported loadings were from a principal factors solution with orthogonal varimax rotation

India	
Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	4.804
Factor 2	1.430
Factor 3	0.422
n	1,202

Source: Inoguchi and Fujii (2013)

Table 22.4   Distinguishing life sphere of domain assessments – Thailand

	Factors			
	Post-materialist	Materialist	Public	Uniqueness
Housing	0.41			0.70
Friendships	0.42			0.75
Marriage	0.55			0.63
Neighbors	0.56			0.59
Family life	0.65			0.49
Leisure	0.57			0.57
Spiritual life	0.60			0.51
Standard of living		0.53		0.51
Household income		0.65		0.54
Health		0.38		0.72
Education		0.55		0.65
Job		0.65		0.52
Public safety			0.61	0.53
Condition of the environment			0.60	0.53
Social welfare system			0.66	0.51
Democratic system			0.59	0.62

Note: The reported loadings were from a principal factors solution with orthogonal varimax rotation

Thailand	
Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.001
Factor 2	0.974
Factor 3	0.659
n	701

Source: Inoguchi and Fujii (2013)

The six patterns of three-dimensional orders are taken as types of Asian societies:

Type Abc includes Japan, Indonesia, Taiwan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan.
Type Acb includes China, South Korea, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, and Mongolia.
Type Bac includes Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, and Kyrgyzstan.
Type Bca is not found among the 29 Asian societies.
Type Cab includes Pakistan, Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, Pakistan, and Kazakhstan.
Type Cba includes Singapore and Sri Lanka.

Labels attached to each of the five types of Asian societies are as follows:

Abc - octopus-cave society, described by Masao Maruyama (1961)

Table 22.5   Distinguishing life sphere of domain assessments – Pakistan

	Factors			
	Public	Materialist	Post-materialist	Uniqueness
Public safety	0.67			0.47
Condition of the environment	0.73			0.43
Social welfare system	0.77			0.39
Democratic system	0.71			0.48
Housing		0.50		0.66
Friendship		0.43		0.66
Standard of living		0.55		0.50
Household income		0.74		0.41
Health		0.59		0.58
Education		0.51		0.66
Job		0.60		0.49
Marriage			0.50	0.62
Neighbors			0.40	0.75
Family life			0.56	0.60
Leisure			0.45	0.60
Spiritual life			0.58	0.64

Note: The reported loadings were from a principal factors solution with orthogonal varimax rotation

Pakistan	
Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	4.745
Factor 2	1.563
Factor 3	0.754
n	579

Source: Inoguchi and Fujii (2013)

An octopus-cave society is composed of a myriad of octopus-occupying caves, each keeping a distance from one another, within each of which different rules and norms prevail.

   Acb - god-of-small-things society, named by Arundhati Roy (1997)

In a despotic society, freedom exists only for one person, so says Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. In a god-of-small-things society, everyone is king and has freedom in their respective sphere. A god-of-small-things society co-exists side by side with a domineering state.

   Bac - society colonized from within, named by Guillermo O'Donnell (1973)

Table 22.6   Distinguishing life sphere of domain assessments – Singapore

	Factors			
	Public	Post-materialist	Materialist	Uniqueness
Public safety	0.70			0.46
Condition of the environment	0.71			0.45
Social welfare system	0.73			0.42
Democratic system	0.71			0.45
Housing		0.44		0.71
Friendship		0.56		0.61
Marriage		0.58		0.51
Neighbors		0.34		0.72
Family life		0.65		0.45
Leisure		0.62		0.48
Spiritual life		0.56		0.56
Standard of living			0.44	0.64
Household income			0.67	0.48
Health			0.54	0.54
Education			0.62	0.55
Job			0.57	0.57

Note: The reported loadings were from a principal factors solution with orthogonal varimax rotation

Singapore	
Factor	Eigenvalue
Factor 1	5.420
Factor 2	1.308
Factor 3	0.673
n	578

Source: Inoguchi and Fujii (2013)

In a society colonized from within, a leading sector and its coalition colonize the regime. There is no level playing field, with the rest of society not in a position for participation and recruitment.

  Bca - fragmented and fractured society, named by Franz Fanon (2005)

A society composed of those who are disconnected and dispossessed is a fragmented and fractured society. Unlike a society colonized from within, a fragmented and fractured society does not enjoy a high level of compliance. Because of affluence and poverty, coercion and defiance, and oppressive environments, the equilibrium of fragmentation and fluctuation is maintained robustly.

Table 22.7 Top five lifestyle priorities for each of the 27 Asian countries

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Afghanistan	Diet	Health	Home	Being devout	Job
Bangladesh	Health	Medical care	No crime	Being devout	Home
Bhutan	Health	Home	Diet	Job	Work
Brunei	Health	Home	Diet	Family	Job
Cambodia	Diet	Health	Home	Job	Income
China	Health	Home	Job	Medical care	No crime
India	Health	Home	Diet	Job	Family
Indonesia	Health	Diet	Home	Being devout	Job
Japan	Health	Family	Job	Home	Others
Kazakhstan	Health	Job	Home	Medical care	Income
Kyrgyzstan	Health	Diet	Job	Home	Income
Laos	Health	Diet	Home	Job	Family
Malaysia	Health	Home	Diet	Family	Job
Maldives	Diet	Medical care	No crime	Health	Job
Mongolia	Health	Home	Diet	Job	Medical care
Myanmar	Health	Diet	Being devout	Home	Job
Nepal	Health	Diet	Job	Work	No crime
Pakistan	Health	Diet	Home	Being devout	Income
Philippines	Diet	Health	Home	Job	Family
Singapore	Health	Home	Job	Family	Diet
South Korea	Health	Home	Family	Job	Income
Sri Lanka	Health	Diet	Home	Family	Job
Tajikistan	Health	Diet	Home	Job	Income
Thailand	Health	Diet	Home	Job	Family
Turkmenistan	Diet	Health	Income	No crime	Home
Uzbekistan	Health	Home	Income	Job	Diet
Vietnam	Health	Job	Diet	Home	Work
Asia	*Health*	*Home*	*Diet*	*Job*	*Family*

Bca – this society is not found among the 29 Asian societies.

Cab – seeming fractured and fragmented divisions of a society are covered by the sheer force of public sector dominance, whether it is materialized and consolidated by Islam, Buddhism, monarchy, estate elite coalition, mining – foreign capital coalition, or ethnic competition.

Cba - micro-monitory society, named by John Keane (2009)

A society small enough with sufficiently capable regime apparatus keeps the rest of the residents focused on pursuing comfort and compliance.

SIX TYPES OF ASIAN SOCIETIES AND LIFESTYLE PRIORITIES

Some may say that the results of the factor analysis of daily life satisfaction require at least one more piece of corroborative or reinforcing empirical evidence. To meet this request, here are the top five lifestyle priorities, country by country (Inoguchi and Fujii, 2013: 96). The question asked was, 'Of the following lifestyle aspects or life circumstances, please select five that are important to you'.

Type Abc materialism (lifestyle priorities are italicized), followed by post-materialism and public sector dominance.

Afghanistan: diet, *health*, home, being devout, and *job*
Indonesia: *health*, diet, home, being devout, and *job*
Japan: *health*, family, *job*, and home
Taiwan: *standard of living*, *income*, *health*, *job*, leisure, and *housing*
Tajikistan: *health*, diet, home, *job*, and *income*
Uzbekistan: *health*, home, *income*, *job*, and diet

Those societies with type Abc naturally register many materialist-oriented (or survival or quality-of-life sustaining) lifestyle priorities, followed by many post-materialist oriented (or social relations or quality-of-life enriching) lifestyle priorities, further followed by public sector-related lifstyle priorities.

Type Acb materialism (lifestyle priorities are italicized) followed by public sector dominance.

China: *health*, home, *job*, medical care, and low crime rates
South Korea: *health*, home, family life, *job*, and *income*
Cambodia: diet, *health*, home, *job*, and *income*
Laos: *health*, diet, home, *job*, and family
Myanmar: *health*, diet, being devout, home, and *job*
Bangladesh: *health*, medical care, low crime rates, being devout, and home
India: *health*, home, diet, *job*, and family life
Nepal: *health*, diet, *job*, and low crime rates
Mongolia: *health*, home, diet, *job*, and medical care

Again both materialist (survival or quality-of-life sustaining) and public sector dominance (or quality-of-life enabling) lifestyle priorities are most frequently registered.

Type Bac Post-materialism (lifestyle priorities are italicized) followed by materialism, and further followed by public sector dominance.

Hong Kong: *friendships*, *marriage*, health, education, *family life*, *leisure*, and *spiritual life*
Malaysia: *health*, *home*, diet, *family life*, and job
Thailand: *health*, *diet*, home, job, and *family life*
Vietnam: health, job, *diet*, home, and success at work
Kyrgyzstan: *friendships*, home, living standard, and *spiritual life*

These post-materialist lifestyle priorities are often registered as well as material-ist lifestyle priorities.

Type Bca cannot be found among the 29 Asian societies.

Type Cab public sector dominance (lifestyle priorities are italicized) followed by survival and further followed by social relations.

Brunei: health, home, diet, family, and job
Philippines: diet, health, home, job, and family
Bhutan: housing, education, spiritual life, and prayer
Pakistan: health, diet, home, being devout, and income
Sri Lanka: health, diet, home, family, and job
Kazakhstan: health, job, home, medical care, and income

Under public sector dominance, lifestyle priorities are often registered with materialism and post-materialism dominance.

Type Cba public sector dominance followed by materialism and further followed by post-materialism.

Singapore: health, home, job, family, and diet
Sri Lanka: health, diet, home, family, and job

Public sector dominance, lifestyle priorities are often registered together with materialist lifestyle priorities and post-materialist dominance.

Looked at from lifestyle priorities as well, the six types of Asian society, on the basis of everyday life satisfaction registered by people, are validated empirically.

CONCLUSION

Having been heavily influenced by classical authors on Asia such as Hegel, Marx, Weber, and Wittfogel, studies of Asian societies have tended to be viewed from the top down, not the bottom up. However, more recently, the remarkable growth in solid empirical data collected about various aspects of Asian societies has enabled analysis of Asian societies and individuals, broadly bereft of such classical Western biases (Inoguchi, 2015b; Inoguchi and Estes, 2016). The method of looking at societies from the bottom up is applicable to both Asian and non-Asian societies as well as to both societies and individuals. This chapter has attempted to look at Asian societies from the common person's perspective. Having made use of the AsiaBarometer quality-of-life focused Asia-wide survey carried out in the 2000s, I have factor-analyzed people's daily life satisfaction based on 16 aspects, society by society, for 29 Asian societies. The results are strongly similar to the key findings of the World Values Survey, led by Ronald Inglehart (1977, 1990, 1997), Inglehart and Welzel (2005), and many others. Materialism, post-materialism, and, since the state is part of people's everyday

life, public sector dominance, have emerged as three key factors. The order of eigenvalues of these three dimensions differs society by society. In other words, Asian societies consist broadly of six types: Abc, Acb, Bac, Bca, Cab, and Cba, depending on the order of the first three key dimensions.

Judging from the method, data, and results, the unique aspect of this analysis is that it generates the types of Asian society from the bottom up systematically and scientifically.

Having been liberated from classical Western bias in characterizing Asian comparative politics, this research conveys an important message. There is neither Western political science nor non-Western political science (Inoguchi, 2016). When the hitherto dominant Abrahamic orientation in social sciences is loosened in terms of conceptualization and theorization and when the Dharmic orientation in social science enriches knowledge of and insights into Asian comparative politics, the prospect for Asian comparative politics to flourish is bright. Abrahamic refers to the standardizing and unifying orientation in concept and theory formation, whereas Dharmic orientation refers to orientation with respect to diversity and digging into further complexity.

Notes

1   This represents a revised version of my article, 'An Evidence-Based Typology of Asian Societies: What Do Asian Societies Look Like from the Bottom Up instead of Top Down?', published online on 14 February 2017, in the *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 18 (1), pp. 216–34. The revision has focused on the extension of the two-dimensional typology of society to the three-dimensional typology of society. I gratefully acknowledge permission by Cambridge University Press. Also I gratefully acknowledge permission by Springer to republish Tables 22.2–22.6.
2   Publications focus on quality of life, trust, and Hirschman's (1971) concepts on exit, voice, and loyalty. Inoguchi and Fujii authored *The Quality of Life in Asia* (2013). Inoguchi and Yasuharu Tokuda co-edited *Trust with Asian Characteristics* (2017). In 2017, Inoguchi published his latest work *Exit, Voice and Loyalty in Asia* (2017).

REFERENCES

Almond, G. and S. Verba (1963), *Civic Culture: Attitudes and Beliefs of Five Nations*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
The Economist (2016a), 'Backward ho!: Caste in India' Feb 27, 2016.
The Economist (2016b), 'Twilight of the King: Politics in Thailand' July 23, 2016, pp. 17–19.
Fukuyama, F. (1995), *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*, New York: Free Press.
Fanon, F. (2005), *The Wretched of the Earth*, New York: Grove Press.
Genron-NPO (2016), 'Sekai no demokurasi wa kotai shitanoka? Ajia no minshushugiha kono shiren ni dou tachimukaunoka?' (Has democracy receded in the world? How do Asian democracies cope with this challenge?)', www.genron-npo.net/future/archives/6333.html [accessed August 20, 2016].
Gilley, B. (2015), *The Nature of Asian Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hegel, G. W. F (2004), *The Philosophy of History*, London: Dover Philosophical Classics.

Hirschman, A. O. (1971), *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1977), *The Silent Revolution*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1990), *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1997), *Modernization and Postmodernization*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. and C. Welzel (2005), *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Inoguchi, T. (2011), 'Political Theory', in Bertland Badie, Dirk Berg-Schlosser, and Leonardo Morlino (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Political Science*, London: Sage publications, vol. 6, pp. 2050–2063.

Inoguchi, T. (2015a), 'Multiple Modes of Well-Being in Asia', in W. Glatzer et al. (eds.), *Global Handbook of Quality of Life: Exploration of Well-Being of Nations and Continents,* Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 597–607.

Inoguchi, T. (2015b), 'Quality of Life Research in Asia', in F. Maggino (ed.), *A Life Devoted to Quality of Life: Festschrift in Honor of Alex Michalos*, Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 237–69.

Inoguchi, T. (2016), 'The Emergence of Comparative Politics in Japan', *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 1(1): 77–87.

Inoguchi, T. (2017), *Exit, Voice and Loyalty in Asia: Individual Choice under 32 Asian Societal Umbrellas*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Inoguchi, T. and R. Estes (2016), 'The History of Well-Being in East Asia: From Global Conflict to Global Leadership', in R. Estes and J. Sirgy (eds.), *The Pursuit of Well-Being: The Untold Global History*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Inoguchi, T. and S. Fujii (2013), *The Quality of Life in Asia: A Comparison of Quality of Life in Asia*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Inoguchi, T. and L. T. Q. Le (2016), 'Toward Modelling a Global Social Contract: Jean-Jacques Rousseau and John Locke', *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 17(3): 489–522.

Inoguchi, T. and Y. Tokuda (eds.) (2017), *Trust with Asian Characteristics: Interpersonal and Institutional*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Kato, T. (2012), *Buki to shiteno shakai ruikei ron* (Typology of Societies as a Weapon), Tokyo: Kodansha.

Keane, J. (2009), *The Life and Death of Democracy*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

Lee, K. Y. (2000), *From Third World to First: Memoirs of Lee Kuan Yew*, Vol. 2, New York: Harper.

Lieven, A. (2012), *Pakistan: A Hard Country*, London: Penguin.

Levin, Y. (2016), *The Fractured Republic: Renewing America's Social Contract in the Age of Individualism*, New York: Basic Books.

Mair, P. (2013), *Ruling the Void: The Hollowing of Western Democracy*, London: Verson.

Maruyama, M. (1961), *Nihon no shiso* (The Idea of Japan), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Marx, K. (1875), 'Critique of the Gotha Programme', *Marx and Engels Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow: Progress Publishers, pp. 13–30.

Matsui, T. (2000), *Seinan Ajia no Sabaku Bunka (Desert Culture in Southwest Asia)*, Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Nakane, C. (1967a), *Garo and Khasi: A Comparative Study in Matrilineal Systems*, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nakane, C. (1967b), *Kinship and Economic Organization in Rural Japan*, London: Bloomsbury Academics.

O'Donnell, G. (1973), *Modernization and Bureaucratic Authoritarianism: Studies in South American Politics*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Phongpaichit, P. and C. Baker (2015), *Unequal Thailand: Aspects of Income, Wealth and Power*, Singapore: National University of Singapore Press.

Putnam, R. (1997), 'Democracy in America at Century's End', in A. Hadenius (ed.), *Democracy's Victory and Crisis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 27–70.

Pye, L. W. (1985), *Asian Power and Politics*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Roy, A. (1997), *The God of Small Things*, London: Flamingo.

Scott, J. (2009), *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Shan, H. (2004), *Zhongguoren yu Induren: Wenhua zhuangtong de bijiao yanjiu* (Chinese and Hindu: A Comparative Study of Cultural Traditions), Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chupanshe.

Todd, E. (2011), *The Origin of the Family System*, Paris: Gallimard.

Weber, M. (2002), *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism: And Other Writings*, London: Penguin Classics.

Wittfogel, K. (1981), *Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power*, New York: Vintage.