

Japanese Journal of Political Science

<http://journals.cambridge.org/JJP>

Additional services for ***Japanese Journal of Political Science***:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Political Science in Japan: Looking Back and Forward

TAKASHI INOBUCHI

Japanese Journal of Political Science / Volume 11 / Special Issue 03 / December 2010, pp 291 - 305
DOI: 10.1017/S1468109910000125, Published online: 29 October 2010

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1468109910000125

How to cite this article:

TAKASHI INOBUCHI (2010). Political Science in Japan: Looking Back and Forward. Japanese Journal of Political Science, 11, pp 291-305 doi:10.1017/S1468109910000125

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Political Science in Japan: Looking Back and Forward

TAKASHI INOBUCHI

University of Niigata Prefecture
inoguchi@ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract

The aim of the article is to review Japanese Political Studies in Japan (JPSJ) circa 2000 for the purpose of identifying the trends of JPSJ and gauging its scope, subject areas, and methods. I then identify the key questions asked in JPSJ, i.e. for the third quarter of the last century: (1) What went wrong for Japan in the 1930s and 1940s, which had been seemingly making progress in the scheme of ‘enlightenment and entrepreneurship’ and was ‘a rich country’ with a ‘strong army’? (2) What is the secret of Western democracy in excelling itself in terms of keeping freedom and accumulating wealth? For the last quarter of the last century: (1) Why is Japanese politics shaped so heavily by bureaucracy? (2) Why are its citizens so weakly partisan in their voting choice? (3) How are politics and economics intertwined in policy making and electoral behavior? Following these trends in JPSJ in the latter half of the last century, I identify the three trends that have emerged in the first quarter of this century: (1) historicizing the normative and institutional origins of Japanese politics, (2) putting Japanese politics in comparative perspective, (3) the new self-conscious impetus for data collection and theory construction. Despite the steady tide of globalization and the strong influence of American political science, market size, long tradition, and language facility, lead political scientists in Japan to think and write more autonomously.

1. Is political science an American social science?

The aim of this article is to review Japanese Political Studies in Japan (JPSJ) circa 2000 for the purpose of identifying the trends of JPSJ and gauging its scope, subjects, and methods. JPSJ has a dilemma. The subject, Japanese politics, is politics at home; thus presumably most familiar to most Japanese political scientists. Therefore, when the Japanese Political Science Association (JPSA) asks its members to register their three specialist areas of study from such a list as political theory, political processes, comparative politics, public policy, and international relations and their sub-areas of study, it so happens that many Japanese political scientists do not indicate Japanese politics as one of the three specialist areas of their expertise. Therefore, for example,

those who mark modern Japanese politics amount to 121 when the JPSA membership is approximately 2,000. To take my own example, I mark political theory, comparative politics (East Asia), and international relations. Many members resolve their dilemma in favor of not specifying any area of Japanese politics. Japanese politics is so familiar that whatever is written about using Japanese political materials and data must belong to those areas of political science. The adjective, Japanese, is redundant, it seems. The reason I start with this dilemma is that the review of JPSJ may not be able to rely primarily on the official figures of self-reported areas of special expertise. It would be very misleading. For this reason, I adopt the conventional method of identifying the trends and gauging the scope, subjects, and methods by illustrating recent publications that fall into the new emerging trends in JPSJ. This may be criticized as being impressionistic. I have taken note of this criticism by taking into account indicators such as Google Scholar and its Japanese counterparts, JSTOR and CiNii. The time span that this article covers is a quarter of a century to circa 2000. It is a very short period of time, but this choice is justified in my view for two major reasons. First, political science in Japan is blossoming. It is indeed like One Hundred Flowers Bloom, One Hundred Schools Contend! Even limiting the temporal span to a quarter of a century makes the coverage of noted works plentiful. Second, the subject of historicizing Japanese politics has become a vogue, by digging up Japanese political norms, practices, and institutions as far back as possible. Therefore, those historical works of JPSJ are bound to be covered in one way or another in the course of dealing with the subject of historicizing Japanese politics.

It is Stanley Hoffmann (1987 [1977]) who once rhetorically asked a question: is international relations an American social science? Yes, it has been at least for the last half a century – is a standard answer to the question. The same question must be asked of political science. Has political science been dominated by Americans? Yes, it has been for the last half a century – is a standard answer to this question. In terms of amount and variety – and some say in terms of quality as well – it is undeniable that America has led political science in the rest of the world. Just as Midland, Texas nurtured George W. Bush and Tommy Franks and thus shaped United States war policy in Iraq, Ann Arbor, Michigan has exemplified and thus arguably shaped quintessentially American political science. It is the trinity of robust academic professionalism, solid positivism, and heavy methodological armory that has been a trademark of American political science (Gunnell, 2004; Easton *et al.*, 1995; Oren, 2003).

In political science journals in other countries, one can easily discern the creeping influence of American paradigms and authors just by looking at the uniformly comprehensive and catholic citation practice and the plain and clear style of presentation. Benedict Anderson, a political scientist at Cornell University, has gone so far as to say that American academic writing is targeted at a narrowly defined professional audience and its style is ‘boring’ to other potential readers (Anderson, 2009: 242). Also, in many other countries, one can discern a robust non-American citation practice. What is called the three stage citation style in one’s academic career

still robustly exists in most countries (Inoguchi, 1985). In the early stage, it is normal to aspire to become a great academician and express this in the form of citing great scholars somewhat shamelessly frequently. In the middle stage, when one perceives that a foothold has been established among great scholars, at least within one's own areas of expertise, it is normal to unabashedly cite own works. In the twilight stage, everything looks so self-evident that it is common to stop citing other's as well as own works. In other words, the cycle of others-citation, self-citation, and no citation, in this order, seems to be a universal truth governing every academic's citation practice. A casual glance at my own writings for the last three decades, after my Ph.D., enables me to say that I have been unwittingly and thus dangerously following the three-stage cycle – now seemingly heading toward the third stage (<http://www.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~inoguchi>). But Americans are different. Americans are an exception. They have overcome this life-cyclical pattern, says Peter Katzenstein (2006). Indeed, the multiple anonymous reviewing system plus the use of the social science citation index linked to higher salaries, positions, and prestige in one way or another seems to discipline many American political scientists sufficiently to surpass the seductive three-stage citation cycle of many academics of the world.

Indeed, as Google dominates the world frighteningly steadily, the academic world is flattened to accommodate the American style of writing in many other countries. In tandem with it, the subject and substance of political science writings are being slowly reshaped in other countries as well. In what follows in this article, I will trace the development of political science in Japan over the last quarter of the last century, focusing on key questions that have driven political scientists to search for answers. In so doing, I will examine how they approach their subjects and how they register the bases of analysis and discussion in their references to works on the subject concerned.

2. The development of political science in Japan 1975–2000

Japan's unconditional surrender to the Allied Powers led by the United States set the stage for political science, so argued Masao Maruyama (1946), a political scientist who came to dominate the third quarter of the last century in the discipline. He asked the twin questions and shaped Japan's fledging political science in a most effective way (Inoguchi, 1995; 2002). They were: (1) What went wrong for Japan in the 1930s and 1940s, which had been seemingly making progress in the scheme of 'enlightenment and entrepreneurship' and was 'a rich country' with a 'strong army'? (2) What is the secret of Western democracy in excelling itself in terms of keeping freedom and accumulating wealth? It was quite natural in Japan to address these two questions and many fellow political scientists flocked to examine modern Japanese history on the one hand and Western philosophies on the other. Maruyama believed that something was entirely wrong with how Japanese leaders designed and molded their political institutions and conducted their political actions, and urged fellow citizens to unravel what went wrong and to search for a better political system. The style of and audience for their writings were almost exclusively domestic. Their message often had direct political implications.

For the last quarter of the last century, Japanese political scientists started to ask a different set of questions. Having built up confidence through democracy and wealth accumulation, in addition to the pacifist credentials of having waged no wars and having no soldiers killed in combat, Japanese political scientists started to take a close look at their own political system. Why is Japanese politics shaped so heavily by bureaucracy? Why has Japan kept a one party dominant system? Why are its citizens so weakly partisan in their voting choice? How are politics and economics intertwined in policy making and electoral behavior? Initially Japanese political scientists tended to look down upon Japan, as they tended to think that Japan was an outlier among Western democracies. Toward the end of the century and toward the end of the Cold War, Japanese political scientists began to take a look at Japan from a comparative perspective. Two initiatives are noteworthy in this respect. The Leviathan group led by the gang of four, Michio Muramatsu, Hideo Otake, Ikuo Kabashima, and myself, began in 1987 to publish a journal called *Leviathan* in Japanese, underlining a methodologically strong positivist outlook and a substantively Japan-focused analysis. After about a decade of their editorship, new generations of political scientists took over. After another decade, a further new generation is about to take over the editorship. Naturally, as times change, the original tones and the analytical modes have changed.

About the same time, in 1984, the Contemporary Political Science Library was launched by the University of Tokyo Press under the general editorship of myself. Within the decade since publication started in 1988, 18 volumes have been published. Two volumes are now under way toward completion of the original 20 volume publication schedule. The tones and subjects are positivist with strong substantive thrusts. The titles of the Library are: *The State and Society, Governance, Political System, Revolution, Voting Behavior, Political Participation, Social Stratification and Politics, Ideology, Public Choice, Public Policy, Policy Process, Legislative Process, Political Party, Interest Groups, Local Autonomy, Enterprises and the State, War and Peace, International Interdependence, World System, and Foreign Policy*. The Library was well received. Even now, the Library has been a standard reference for Japanese political scientists. Also noteworthy is the fact that 18 volumes were translated into Chinese and published by China Economic Daily Publisher. Even now the Library remains on sale. I have encountered a number of Chinese academics mentioning that they read the Library. The Chinese editions started publication late in 1989, shortly after the Tiananmen Square massacre took place. Comparative politics was established for the first time in history, in the sense that Japan is compared on an equal footing (JPSA, 200X).

The third wave of democratization made steady progress during the last quarter of the last century. Japanese political scientists started to take a closer look at increasingly democratic East and Southeast Asian countries, examining commonalities and differences again on an equal footing of another sort, taking historical and cultural backgrounds into full consideration (Inoguchi, 1993–1994; Inoguchi and Carlson, 2006). The style and audience of their writings were increasingly mixed. Their style started to become more American: clear, plain, logical, and yet ‘boring’, with neither anecdotes nor jokes attached. As Japan’s credentials of wealth accumulation along with peace

preservation became an undisputable reality, Japanese political scientists increasingly targeted their writings at an overseas audience, even if most of their writings were in Japanese. In terms of language facility, political scientists in Japan enjoyed (and suffered from) high-level autonomy. A sufficiently large domestic market for their writings ensured that they had a tangible size of audience in Japan. In this respect, political scientists in Japan are placed in qualitatively different environments from those living in, say, Korea, Denmark, or the Netherlands. However, in tandem with the growth of interest in things Japanese as symbolized by *Japan as Number One* (Vogel, 2001), political scientists published works on Japanese politics. Those that are noteworthy include Junko Kato, Yutaka Tsujinaka, Masaru Kohno, Michio Muramatsu, and Takako Kishima.

This trend is clear if one looks at journals and encyclopedia edited during the last half a century. *Nenpo Seijigaku* (The Annals of Political Science), the key journal of the Japanese Political Science Association since 1955, has published articles most heavily on Western philosophies and Japanese history. But *Leviathan* has focused mostly on Japanese politics and increasingly comparative politics and policy, with some of those concepts and methods marginally guided by American political science.

This journal, that is the *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, which was started in 1999 in English by Cambridge University Press, has an editorial board based on the first generation *Leviathan*, and is refreshingly ambitious. It has adopted a strong positivist orientation with a comparative perspective, albeit with an East Asian slant. Escaping from falling into what was sometimes referred to as the provincial club, called the 'Asia ghetto', a key editorial principle is to elucidate some striking features of Japanese and East Asian politics in comparative perspective. The journal has been recently accorded ISI-approval, and is now widely regarded as a worthy publication site for an author's promotion, especially in the United States. Its impact factor for 2009 is registered 0.441, a respectable figure for a journal editorially head quartered in a non-English speaking society.

Senkyo Kenkyuu (Electoral Studies) is one of the key journals of the Japanese Electoral Studies Association, carrying most energetically strong empiricist analyses of Japanese elections and voting. *Kokusai Seiji* (International Relations), one of the key journals of the Japan Association of International Relations, has been publishing articles primarily in three areas: Japanese diplomacy and international relations; area and international studies of the rest of the world; and international relations theories. In the last area, Japanese political scientists for the last half a century have been assiduous in selectively absorbing American international relations. Another key journal of the Japan Association of International Relations is *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, which began publication in 2000 by Oxford University Press. This journal aims to be a first-rate international relations journal, with a natural focus on Asia-Pacific (<http://www/oup.co.uk/irasia>). Its impact factor for 2009 is registered 0.824, a no less respectable figure for a similarly situated journal.

Turning to encyclopedia, the 500 page long political science encyclopedia published in 1999 under the principal editorship of the present author of this article summarizes the achievements of Japanese political science for the period 1975–2000 (Inoguchi

et al. (eds.), 1999). A similarly edited encyclopedia of international relations was also well received (Inoguchi, *et al.* (eds.), 2005). Both encyclopedias preceded two big encyclopedias, i.e. the *Oxford Handbook of Political Science* under the general editorship of Robert Goodin and the *International Encyclopedia of Political Science* (Sage) under the coeditorship of Bertrand Badie, Dirk Berg-Schlosser, and Leonardo Morlino. The former represents a first-rate, most comprehensive encyclopedia of political science in terms of subjects and authors. It is strikingly fair to all strands of political science, ancient, modern, and postmodern; normative and empirical; descriptive and formalistic, etc. – although one cannot help noting that most contributing authors teach and write in English-speaking societies. The Sage volume is still in production, but judging from the coeditors, and those working under their leadership, it represents a global and inclusive encyclopedia, or one that is a little more culturally sensitive, historically attentive, and philosophically pluralist. Compared to these two encyclopedias, the two Japanese encyclopedias are characterized as encyclopedic in the original sense. In other words, the number of concepts examined is very large, but the number of words allotted to each item to describe and explain them is much less. The Japanese encyclopedias each appear as one big volume, whereas the two global encyclopedias consist of multi-volume handbooks.

Japanese political science has been most *bumi putra* (sons of the earth) when compared to that in South Korea and China, for two major reasons. First, it has a long history of being exposed to and selectively absorbing Western social sciences and thus has endogenized much of it already (Inoguchi, 2001). Second, privileged elites normally do not send their children to universities abroad unless for special purposes. Thus compared to Koreans and Chinese, who are educated and teach and publish their works abroad, Japanese political scientists rarely teach and publish their works abroad. Those who do graduate abroad do not undertake post-graduate research there, but return to Japan to continue their studies, and to teach and publish their works. Like most returned Korean political scientists, they do not publish much in English once they get back – do in Rome as Romans do. Nevertheless, Junko Kato (1993, 2003), Takako Kishima (1991), and Masaru Kohno (1997) have published works on Japanese politics in English.

An increasing number of works have been published in areas other than Japanese politics, and noteworthy ones include: Takashi Shiraiishi (1990) and Rieko Karatani (2002) on Indonesian and British politics respectively, Arihiro Fukuda (1998) on political philosophy, Sueo Sudo (2002) on Japan's international relations with Southeast Asia, and Hideaki Shinoda (2002) on state sovereignty. But it remains *Leviathan's* gang of four who collectively and individually energized Japanese political science in 1975–2000.

3. The development of political science in Japan 2000–2025

Entering into the new millennium, we can identify new trends in Japanese political science. They are: (1) historicizing the normative and institutional origins of Japanese

politics, (2) putting Japanese politics in comparative perspective, and (3) the new self-conscious impetus for data collection and theory construction.

3.1 *Historicizing Japanese politics*

As already noted, Masao Maruyama, a giant of political science in Japan in its formative stage in the 1940s and 1950s, declared in 1946 that there is no tradition of political science in Japan to speak well of (Maruyama, 1946). I take mild issue with this declaration and non-review of the pre-1945 political studies in Japan, because of the dismissal of many works done prior to 1945, which are ahistorical in a most serious sense.

Masamichi Royama, a political science professor at the Imperial University of Tokyo in the 1930s and 1940s, who was purged of public office by the occupation authorities, challenged Maruyama's declaration by publishing a book entitled *The Development of Political Science in Modern Japan* (Royama, 1949). Maruyama's argument directly links regime type and the development of the discipline. With his own direct and bitter experience of freedom suppression in the 1940s (Karube, 2007), Maruyama declares categorically, 'Where there is no freedom of speech, there is no political science.' Royama argues that there was wide-ranging and lively political science works even prior to 1945, citing a number of key works by Onozuka Kiheiji (1903) and others. What Royama perhaps unwittingly overlooked was a series of serious works on political philosophy by those mostly teaching at non-imperial universities, such as Waseda and Chuo universities (Uchida, 2002 and Mitani, 2005). Whereas Tokyo University professors tended to focus on the constitutional role and institutional functioning of the state in broad congruence with the *Staatslehre* tradition, private university professors tended to tread the paths of normative political theories and empirical studies of political actors and institutions in harmony with the traditions of non-governmental freedom fighters in the 1880s and 1890s and legislators and orators who fought what was called above-partisan cabinets in the Taisho democracy such as Tsuyoshi Inukai (Banno, 1995, 1996). Most simplistically, imperial universities supplied a large proportion of the imperial government servants (bureaucrats), whereas non-imperial private universities were a hotbed of anti-government opposition parties in the Imperial Diet. The latter was most of the time overlooked in writings by imperial university professors, including both by Masao Maruyama and Masamichi Royama.

Still overlooked are those normative works produced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries during the Tokugawan rule in the domain of philosopher-rulers (Maruyama, 1983; Watanabe, 1985; Hiraishi, 1997). The political system was called the *bakuhau* system whereby the Tokugawa cabinet prevailed over 300 or so domains, each of which, however, ruled itself more or less autonomously. The Tokugawa cabinet was a kind of federal government, whereas domain governments were more or less autonomous state governments. The former was monopolistically in charge of defense, diplomacy, external commerce, and federal security. The latter was in charge of domestic policies and some federal duties imposed on them by the Tokugawa government,

such as supplying corbé labor for infrastructure constructions and serving the federal government as an executive officer or director. The bureaucracy both in Tokugawa and domain governments were all warriors, who became disarmed bureaucrats and who constituted 3–7% of the total population (Ravina, 1999, Screech, 2000, Inoguchi, 2010). One of the key features was that the Tokugawa reign was characterized by no external wars and very few internal wars. Also the Tokugawa government forbade any foreigners except Chinese and Dutch merchants from entering Japan and any Japanese from taking a trip or leaving Japan (Toby, 1984). In this general setting, domain policy was characterized by two key features: autonomy in finance and inclusivity in governance. Accordingly, there developed political philosophies that emphasized the inescapable ties between the governing (warriors) and the governed (the rest). This might be called a fledgling form of elementary democracy in domain politics which was constrained structurally by the authoritarian nature of status politics where warriors had an absolute say (Inoguchi, 2005, 2010).

Thus looked at, it may be the case that Maruyama exaggerated the undemocratic past of early modern and modern Japanese politics prior to 1945. Rather, political philosophers abounded, examining various strands of authoritarianism and combining status-authoritarian and fledgling democratic ideas during the Tokugawa reign.

3.2 Putting Japan in comparative perspective

Whereas the last quarter of the last century witnessed noticeable Japanese focus on political science writings, the first decade of the new millennium finds an increasing number of comparative writings. This represents a great departure. It is the opposite to the departure from Western political philosophies, which significantly crowded out other areas of political science in the third quarter of the last century. Now comparatives have, in a sense, come back. The majority of these comparativists however are not philosophers or normative theorists, they are dominantly empirical theorists or behavioralists or institutionalists. Rationalists or rational choice theories are only just visible. Furthermore, the terms of comparison vary a great deal. Rather key questions drive their pursuit, which are couched with key concepts. Such concepts include citizens, globalization, democracy, peace, the state, bureaucracy, non-governmental organizations, political parties, parliament. In the third quarter of the last century, comparisons took the form of individual non-comparisons and collective comparisons. In other words, different authors tackled different philosophers and then collectively readers attempted their voluntary comparisons. In the new millennium, the terms of comparison are less Japan-centered and more systematic. In other words, instead of the set of individual non-comparisons and collective comparisons, comparisons by one author or one set of coauthors have been on the rise. In tandem with this trend, the methodologically historical comparisons have been largely replaced by analytical comparisons. One of the good contrasting examples is Junosuke Masumi's (1990) comparative politics, which masterfully compares and contrasts governments in Asia, America, and Europe through the historical evolutions of each country. In a good

contrast, Jean Blondel and Takashi Inoguchi's (2006, 2008) comparative political culture examines nine Asian and nine European countries with ideal-typical characterizations, using a cross-national comparative survey and carefully delineating political cultures.

In terms of the style and audience of their writings, comparative works were very different from those observed in the last century. In short, they have been more American: clear, plain, systematic and empirical and professionally solid. Yet one can easily discern that many comparative works done by political scientists in Japan contain those qualities which give some flavors different from the American. Less tightly affected by political science jargons and related concepts of American origins, political scientists in Japan display definitely needed new insights, and often overlooked cues in the search for a true reality.

Those comparative categories they are interested in include electoral systems and outcomes, path-dependent policy outcomes, comparative interest groups, comparative lifestyles. Representative of this spirit are such works as Kato Junko's comparative public policy (Kato, 1994, 2003), Yutaka Tsujinaka's comparative interest groups (Tsujinaka, 2002), Yoshiaki Kobayashi's comparative civic cultures (Kobayashi, 2000), Ikuo Kabashima's comparative mass media-intermediated political behavior (Kabashima, 2007, Kabashima and Steel, 2010), Takashi Inoguchi's comparative analysis of citizens' attitudes toward the state (Blondel and Inoguchi, 2006; Inoguchi and Blondel, 2008; Inoguchi and Marsh, 2009), Takashi Inoguchi's AsiaBarometer surveys on values, norms, and lifestyles (Inoguchi *et al.*, 2005, 2006, 2008, 2009). One of the salient features of comparativism is the commitment to create, and dig into, comparative empirical databases and to engage fellow political scientists abroad as well.

In terms of new conceptual angles and methodological framing that have some Japanese flavors, one of the key points made in the 18-country democracy survey is solid evidence against the 'Asian values' argument or the 'good European citizens' argument (Blondel and Inoguchi, 2006; Inoguchi and Blondel, 2008): that is, inter-regional differences (i.e., Asia versus Europe) are not as salient as intra-regional differences (i.e., those differences within each of the two regions). Similarly, one of the key points made in their quality of life in East Asia survey (Inoguchi and Shin, 2009) – that is, the finding that six Confucian sciences do not necessarily exhibit strict distinctive Confucian flavors in comparison to the Western self-reporting of quality of life – is further solid evidence against a common, often Confucian tinged, East Asian community.

3.3 Building the initial momentum for large scale data collection and research infrastructure

In tandem with the global trends of informationization and globalization (Toffler and Toffler, 2006), a knowledge-based society has been steadily shaped, and evidence-based social decisions and debates have become a norm. This transformation inevitably creates the impetus to dig for new empirical data and to share them in academic analysis and policy decisions. Political science in Japan is no exception to this trend.

When their focus was on classical normative theories, data generation and associated infrastructure would not ever enter into their concerns. When their focus was on Japanese politics, data generation and associated infrastructure did not pose much of a problem because data generation was more often carried out by government agencies and mass media such as major newspapers and TV networks. When their focus is on comparative data, one immediately notices that you need to make best use of accessible data and furthermore that you need to generate data on your own, depending on your concepts and frameworks – and on the intensity of curiosity. Yet research infrastructure building is very slow to come about. First, research infrastructure at universities is focused on science, medicine, and engineering, but not necessarily on humanities and social sciences (Inoguchi, 2002). After all, all the scientists and most humanists and social scientists are against the idea of funding big projects in humanities and social sciences. They retain the increasingly anachronistic idea, in my view, that in humanities and social sciences having papers and pencils are enough. Second, among humanists and social scientists, collaborative endeavors have been so fragmented and so non-enduring. Fragmented because academic divisions on campus are not conducive to institutionalizing such infrastructure building across academic disciplines. Non-enduring, firstly because budgeting and implementation within the fiscal year each year is a strict norm; secondly because research project funding is normally for very limited duration, say from one to three years, in the national scientific grant competition scheme conducted by the Ministry of Education and Science and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Sciences. Into the 2000s, a slightly less rigid and more enduring practice of getting projects funded and implemented is steadily accepted, it seems, however.

Of large-scale data generation endeavors, the following are especially noteworthy: citizens and the state in Asia and Europe (Inoguchi and Blondel, 2008), values, norms and lifestyles in 29 Asian societies (Inoguchi *et al.*, 2005-present), interest groups in industrial democracies (Tsujinaka, 2002-present), and civic culture in the world (Kobayashi, 2000-present). To make those data accessible to other non-members of projects, infrastructure building attempts have been accomplished such as: the Social Science Data Archives (University of Tokyo's Institute of Social Sciences), the AsiaBarometer Survey archives (University of Tokyo's Institute of Oriental Culture and University of Niigata Prefecture), Comparative Interest Associations Archive (Tsukuba University), Comparative Civic Culture Archive (Keio University). However, it must be stressed that in comparison to the United States and the European Union, Japan's progress in data generation and infrastructure building is much slower and on a small fragmented and non-enduring basis, despite all the fascinating data generation and book and article publications.

4. Conclusion

Although much remains to be done, in this article it is most important to see the nature of Japanese political science well grounded in the evolving nature of politics

and society within which the Japanese political science community is embedded. What is the place and role of American political science in the development of the Japanese political sciences? The primary role of American political science is conceptual. American political science gives initial good guidance to answering the questions. In this sense, American political science has been taking a leading role. American political science has been a most auto-centric political science in the sense that it evolves around its own. It has significantly expanded the number of sessions non-American political scientists organize in annual conventions. Its most notable consequence is perhaps that non-Americans are induced to think and write, using the American conceptual frameworks and methods and professionally competitive drive. It needs to be said that American political science does care about what's going on elsewhere. That its conceptual influence often goes beyond its border. In this sense also, American political science has been instrumental in promoting American style democracy abroad (Cox, Ikenberry, and Inoguchi, 2000; Oren, 2003).

When one takes a close look at the style and audience of their writings, clearly the tide of American flavored globalization – as exhibited by the style of writings especially the reference style, the comprehensiveness of referee items, and the surfing over the hegemonic cycle of reference – is increasingly visible. Yet the extent of American dominance in Japanese political science has been more moderate than one might like to think. Market size, long tradition, and language facility vigorously lead political scientists in Japan to think and write more autonomously. The large market size of the political science writings ensures they write predominantly in Japanese; the relatively long tradition of political science leads them to be deeply self-conscious and inward-looking and, not ironically, mildly auto-centric; the limited ability to express oneself in academic works in English moderates their exposure to non-Japanese language writings and thinking.

About the author

Takashi Inoguchi is Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo and President of the University of Niigata Prefecture. He specializes in Japanese politics, comparative political behavior, and international relations. He has published numerous books and articles, amongst which are *Japanese Politics Today* (Palgrave, 1997), *Japanese Foreign Policy* (Palgrave, 2000), *Japanese Politics: An Introduction* (Trans Pacific Press, 2005), *Political Cultures in Asia and Europe* (Routledge, 2006), *Citizens and the State* (Routledge, 2008), *Globalisation, Public Opinion and the State* (Routledge, 2008), *American Democracy Promotion* (Oxford University Press, 2000), *Reinventing the Alliance* (Palgrave, 2003), *The Uses of Institutions* (Palgrave, 2007), *The Quality of Life in the Six Confucian Societies* (Springer, 2009). He is Executive Editor of the *Japanese Journal of Political Science* (Cambridge University Press) and Director of the AsiaBarometer project.

References

- Anderson, Benedict (2009), *Yashigara wan no sotoe (Out of Coconut Palm Rice Bowl)*, Tokyo: NTT Shuppan.
- Banno, Junji (1995), *The Establishment of the Japanese Constitutional System*, London: Routledge.
- Banno, Junji (1996), *Kindai Nihon no kokka koso, 1871–1936 (The Structure of the State in Modern Japan, 1871–1936)*, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Blondel, Jean and Takashi Inoguchi (2006), *Political Culture in Asia and Europe*, London: Routledge.
- Cox, Michael, G. John Ikenberry, and Takashi Inoguchi (2000), *American Democracy Promotion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Easton, David *et al.* (1995), *Regime and Discipline: Democracy and the Development of Political Science*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Fukuda, Arihiro (1998), *Sovereignty at the Sword: Harrington, Hobbes, and Mixed Government in the English Civil Wars*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gunnell, John (2004), *Imagining the American Polity: Political Science and the Discourse of Democracy*, Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Hiraishi, Naoaki (1997), *Nihonseijishisoshi: Kinse o chushin ni (A History of Japanese Political Thought: With a Focus on the Early Modern Period)*, Tokyo: Hosodaigaku Shinkokai.
- Hoffmann, Stanley (1987 [1977]), 'An American Social Science: International Relations', reprinted in Stanley Hoffman (ed.), *Janus and Minerva: Essays in the Theory and Practice of International Politics*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 3–24.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (1985), 'Inyou bunken ni tsuiteno life-style Kasetu (A Life-Cycle Hypothesis on Citation Practice)', *Toshokan no mado (Windows of the Library)*, Tokyo: University of Tokyo Library, 24: 9.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (1995), 'Democracy and the Development of Political Science in Japan', in David Easton *et al.* (eds.), *Regime and Discipline*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, pp. 269–93.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (2001), 'Area and International Studies: International Relation', Neil Smelser and Paul Baltes (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Science*, Vol. 2, New York: Elsevier, pp. 707–11.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (2002), 'Infrastructure: Japan and Korea', in Neil Smelser and Paul Baltes (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, New York: Elsevier, pp. 707–11.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (2003), <http://www.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~inoguchi>
- Inoguchi, Takashi (2005), *Japanese Politics: An Introduction*, Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (2009), 'Federal Traditions and Quasi-Federalism in Japan', in Baogang He, Brian Galligan, and Takashi Inoguchi (eds.), *Federalism in Asia*, London: Edward Elgar, pp. 266–89.
- Inoguchi, Takashi (2010), *Nihon seiji no nazo: Tokugawa model o sutekirenai Nihonjin (The Enigma of Japanese Politics: The Japanese Who Cannot Throw Away the Tokugawa Model)*, Tokyo: Nishimura Shoten.
- Inoguchi Takashi (ed.) (1993–94), *The East Asian States and Societies Library*, 6 volumes, Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Inoguchi, Takashi and Jean Blondel (2008), *Citizens and the State*, London: Routledge.
- Inoguchi Takashi and Matthew Carlson (eds.) (2006), *Governance and Democracy in Asia*, Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.
- Inoguchi, Takashi *et al.* (2005, 2006, 2008, 2009), *Human Beliefs and Lifestyles in Asia*, Mexico City: Siglo and Tokyo: Akashi shoten.
- Inoguchi *et al.* (eds.) (1999), *Seijigaku jiten (Encyclopedia of Political Science)*, Tokyo: Kobundo.
- Inoguchi Takashi *et al.* (eds.) (2005), *Kokusai kankei jiten (Encyclopedia of International Relations)*, Tokyo: Kobundo.
- Inoguchi Takashi and Ian Marsh (eds.) (2008), *Globalisation, Public Opinion and the State: Western Europe and East and Southeast Asia*, London: Routledge.
- Inoguchi Takashi and Doh Chull Shin (eds.) (2009), *Quality of Life in Six Confucian Societies*, Amsterdam: Springer.
- Japanese Political Science Association (JPSA) (2002), *Mitsu no Minshushugi (Three Democracies)*, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

- Kabashima, Ikuo (2007), 'Changing Media, Changing Politics', *special issue of the Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 8(1).
- Kabashima, Ikuo and Gill Steel (2010), *Changing Politics in Japan*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Karatani, Rieko (2002), *Defining British Citizenship: Empire, Commonwealth, and Modern Britain*, Portland, OR: Frank Cass.
- Karube, Tadashi (2007), *Maruyama Masao*, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Kato, Junko (1993), *The Problem of Bureaucratic Rationality: Tax Politics in Japan*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kato, Junko (2003), *Regressive Taxation and the Welfare State: Path Dependence and Policy Diffusion*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Katzenstein, Peter (2006), Personal conversation at the Association of Asian Studies annual meeting, San Diego, 22–25 March 2006.
- Kishima, Takako (1991), *Political Life in Japan: Democracy in a Reversible World*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kobayashi, Yoshiaki (2000), *Citizen, Responsive Government*, New York: JAI.
- Kohno, Masaru (1997), *Japan's Postwar Party Politics*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Maruyama, Masao (1946), 'Kagaku to shitenno seijigaku (Political Science as a Science)', *Jinbun*, 2 (later included in his *Gendai seiji no shiso to kodo (The Thought and Behavior of Contemporary Politics)*, Tokyo: Misuzu shobo, pp. 341–59.
- Maruyama, Masao (1983), *Tokugawa seiji shisoshi (A History of Tokugawa Political Thought)*, Tokyo: Miraisaha.
- Masumi, Junnosuke (1990), *Hikaku Seiji (Comparative Politics)*, 2 Vols., Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Mitani, Taichiro (2005), 'Chuo School of Political Thought in the Pre-War Period', Political Science Lecture, Faculty of Law, Chuo University, March 12.
- Onozuka, Kiheiji (1903), *Seijigaku taiko (Modern Political Science Outlined)*, Tokyo: Hakubunkan
- Oren, Ido (2003), *Our Enemies and US: America's Rivalries and the Making of Political Science*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Ravina, Mark (1999), *Land Lordship in Early Modern Japan*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Royama, Masamichi (1949), *Nihon ni okeru Kindai Seijigaku no hattatsu (The Development of Political Science in Modern Japan)*, Tokyo: Jitsugyonyonihonsha.
- Screech, Timon (2000), *The Shogun's Painted Culture: Fear and Creativity in the Japanese States, 1760–1829*, London: Reaktion Books.
- Shinoda, Hideaki (2002), *Kokusai Shakai no Chitsujō (The Order in International Society)*, Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Shiraishi, Takashi (1990), *An Age in Motion: Popular Radicalism in Java 1912–1926*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Sudo, Suetō (2002), *Kokka no Taigai Kodo (External Behavior of the State)*, Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Toby, Ronald (1984), *State and Diplomacy in Early Modern Japan*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Toffler, Alvin and Heidi Toffler (2006), *Revolutionary Wealth*, New York: Knopf.
- Tsujinaka, Yutaka (2002), *Gendai Nihon no Shiminshakai: Rieki dantai (Contemporary Japanese Civil Society: Interest Group)*, Tokyo: Bokutakusha.
- Uchida, Mitsuru (2002), *Waseda Seijigaku Shi Kenkyū: Mouhitotsu no Nihon Seijigaku Shi (Research of Politics History in Waseda University: Another Japanese Politics History)* Tokyo: Toshindo.
- Vogel, Ezra (2001), *Japan as Number One*, New York: Replica Books.
- Watanabe, Hiroshi (1985), *Kinsei Nihon-shakai to Sogaku (The Modern Japanese Society and the Sung Study)*, Tokyo: Tokyo University Press.

Appendix

Here assembled are the titles of those sessions that illustrate the three features of Japanese political science in the program of the Annual Convention of the Japanese Political Science Association, 2009, Nihon University, 10–12 October 2009.

- A4 Party Politics in Transition
 Chair **Iokibe Makoto**
 Papers **Fukumoto Kentaro and Murai Ryota**
 A Survival Analysis of Pre-1945 Cabinets: with a focus on the Parliament and the Military
Yun Subgoung
 Logic of Survival of a New Party: the Democratic Party of Japan since the 1990s
Sugatani Yukihiro
 Political Cleavages of the Taisei Yokusankai with Focus on the Second Konowe Cabinet and the Imperial House
- Discussion **Shinada Hiroshi**
Ino Yukio
- C4 Analyses of Japanese Politics during the Wartime and Prewar Times
 Chair **Masuda Tomoko**
 Papers **Komori Yuta**
 A New Institutional Analysis of Civilian-Military Relationship
Sasada Hironori
 The Developmental Process of the Regulatory Associations-Sectorial Associations: Path Dependence and Ideas
2. Comparison
- D1 Multi-country Comparison of Political Parties and Redistribution
 chair Mori Hiroki
 papers Yamamura Takeo
 Diversity of Redistribution Policy: Features and Origins of Redistribution Regime Japanese Style
 Omura Hanako
 Reliability of Political Party's Commitment: Political Parties in OECD countries
 discussion Kohno Masaru
- E3 Multiple Methods Endorsed: The Present and Future of Political Science Methodology
 Chair **Yamada Mahiro**
 Papers **Imai Kosuke**
 Statistical Analysis of Causal Mechanisms: Identification, Estimation and Sensitivity Analysis of Causal Intermediary Effects
Aida Masahiro
 Opinion Polling: Review and Prospect
Taniguchi Naoko
 Experimentation: Review and Prospect
Nakamura Etsudai
 Multi-agent Simulation: Review and Prospect
- Discussion **Maeda Yukio**
Iida Ken
- E4 Politics of Redistribution: Between Political History and Intellectual History
 Chair **Iokibe Kaoru**
 Papers **Kono Yuri**
 Between Jinsei (Benevolent Politics) and Society
Oki Yasumitsu
-

The Notion of Redistribution in the Taisho and Early Showa Era: with focus on the
Interchangeability of Idealism and Socialism

Nakakita Koji

Politics of Redistribution in Early Showa Japan

Discussion

Karube Tadashi
