JAPANESE POLITICAL CULTURE

CHANGE AND CONTINUITY

Takeshi Ishida

JAPANESE POLITICAL CULTURE

CHANGE AND CONTINUITY

TAKESHI ISHIDA

Acknowledgments

Foreword

In recent years there has been considerable growth in the number of works on Japan by Western scholars. However, works by Japanese authors rarely appear in English, or indeed in any other European language. My *Japanese Society* (1971) was an attempt to partially fill this gap in the literature. That book sought to describe and analyze the essential features of Japanese society as perceived by a Japanese social scientist, but due to limitations of space, it could be only a brief introduction to a highly complex subject.

With the development of Japanese studies in the West, Western scholars have become more acquainted with works by Japanese scholars, written in Japanese. However, despite the fact that Japanese language materials are now fully utilized by Western scholars on Japan, the predominant trend is one of interpretation through Western eyes, rather than the actual views of Japanese scholars on their own society. In addition, until very recently even the excellent Japanese language-based research by Western scholars has been read by only a limited number of Westerners, academic or otherwise. In particular, Western scholars in the social science field who cannot read Japanese, seldom come across the works of their counterparts in Japan. Although there are some Japanese social scientists with international reputations, cultural "exchange" is still mainly in one direction, from the West to Japan. Thus in striking contrast with her economic relations, in cultural relations Japan has been importing far more than she has exported. It is the responsibility of Japanese social scientists, not only to provide sufficient information concerning Japan, but also to contribute to social sciences in general by offering an approach based upon analyses of their own society in comparative perspective. By doing so it may also contribute to improving the level of social science analysis regarding other non-Western societies.

In 1979 Professor Irving Louis Horowitz of Rutgers University came to see me, and while we were talking I showed him my list of publications. Then, at his request, I sent him copies of all my articles in English. He responded by proposing that I publish a collection of my essays. His offer was most generous and I was given complete freedom concerning the selection of essays. Moreover, there was no limit on the

ix

number of pages. By chance, Mr. Ian Gow, a Ph.D. candidate at Sheffield University, came to Japan as a research fellow at our Institute of Social Science, University of Tokyo. He kindly offered his assistance in preparing the book, not only by correcting my English, but also by advising on the selection of articles. After examining all the articles, we reached our conclusions based on the following principles of selection. First, those articles easily available in English, such as those published in major academic journals or books in the United States or the United Kingdom would not be included. Secondly, articles written in Japanese, specifically for a Japanese readership and later translated, should not be included. Thirdly, articles of interest only to the Japan specialist—for example, biographical essays on important modern Japanese figures such as Yukichi Fukuzawa and Kanzō Uchimura— ought to be excluded. In a more positive sense it was then decided that the articles be structured in such a way that social scientists not specializing in Japan, or with only a minimum background knowledge on Japan, would find them both interesting and informative. Finally, continuity and change in modern Japan was to be the main theme and the value system and the organizational structure were to be the principal focal points.

Regarding continuity and change, it is necessary to identify both the traditional and the new elements. Those two often seemed synonymous with the Eastern and the Western elements. Of course, "East" is not a homogeneous entity, being composed of such diverse cultures as those of India, China, and so on. More precisely, one ought to use terms such as "non-Western" in order to clarify the focal points selected for emphasis. Chapter one was specially written as a general introduction for the book, and chapter four "Westernism and Western 'Isms' " was also written specifically for this volume. Out of more than twenty articles so far written (a list of these is included in the bibliography), six were chosen to form a major part of the book. Mr. Gow kindly went through each chapter carefully for readability. Considerable effort was made to avoid overlapping but sometimes this proved impossible because certain events were mentioned in different contexts. The result of this process is the present volume.

The general introduction (chapter one) identifies continuity and change in modern Japan, chapter two deals with the particular combination of conformity and competition, with an emphasis on continuity. In part II there are case studies which, one hopes, will shed light on various aspects of modern Japan in comparative perspective: Chapter three deals with methodological problems by utilizing Japanese scholars' interpretations of Max Weber as a case study. The problem of

East and West is treated in the next chapter against the general background of the Japanese intellectual climate. Chapter five is a detailed case study of "the era of fascism" in Japan again with emphasis on the comparative perspective, in this case with Germany.

Part III is also related to the principal focal points of this book, but since the three articles included here were all in the field of peace research, they formed a separate section. The first article is a comparative study of the concepts of peace in different cultures in order to characterize Japan's traditional concept of peace. The next chapter is a case study of the Japanese image of Gandhi, which also offers certain cross-cultural comparisons. The final chapter deals with a specific subject, nonviolent direct action, which is closely related to the author's personal value commitment. In order to give the reader a better understanding of this point and the overall value premise which underlies the entire volume, I should like to add something of my personal experience.

Let me briefly explain the motivation and historical development of my research. First it is necessary to touch on my experience during the war, although that period actually precedes my research career. When General Tōjō became prime minister in 1941, he declared that the years of study for high school would be shortened to two and one-half instead of three years. Thus we had to finish our high school days half a year earlier than expected. Moreover, he also declared in 1943 that university students in the humanities and social sciences were no longer exempt from military service; I was conscripted into the army that year and served until Japan's defeat in 1945. When I returned to my studies at the University of Tokyo, what interested me most was why we had been so deeply indoctrinated by ultranationalism that we had never questioned the cause of the war. This interest was the result of serious reflection on my wartime experience, rather than mere academic curiosity. In order to establish my own identity in the completely changed value orientation of the period immediately after the defeat, it was imperative to find the answer as to why I had succumbed so easily to Japan's ultranationalist ideology.

My determined search for a new identity resulted in a decision to become a social scientist in order to discover what had been the fundamental cause of the widespread ultranationalist ideas during the last war. First, I focused attention on the system of moral education based upon the Imperial Rescript on Education of 1890, because, judging from my personal experience, it was one of the most important means of ultranationalist indoctrination. While I was tracing the historical development of moral education, I came across the important

epoch in the late Meiji period, around 1911, when the "family-state" idea was formed.

In my analysis, the family-state idea historically contained two elements. The first was a traditional familism buttressed by Confucian ethics. The familism, which included the extended family system, was expanded to cover the whole nation in such a way that the imperial family was considered to be the main family for all Japanese families. Another element was the organic theory of the state introduced from the West, particularly from Germany. The organic theory of the state, partly corresponding to the newly established bureaucratic system, was important in displacing the ideas of popular sovereignty and natural law advocated by the activists in "people's rights" movements in the late 1870s and the early 1880s. In my first book, in Japanese, *Studies in the History of Meiji Political Thought* (1954), which I finished at the end of my period as an assistant at the Faculty of Law, University of Tokyo, under the supervision of Professor Masao Maruyama, I wanted to explain the process of the formation of the family-state idea together with its ideological structure and its actual functioning in Japanese society. The familistic element in the family-state idea had proved useful in mobilizing the personal sentiment found in the family relationship and applying it to loyalty to the state. At the same time, the organic theory of the state was important in justifying the existing law and social order.

After this first book, my interest was expanded in two directions: first, it became broader, covering not only the history of political thought but also political history; second, the period under consideration was extended to cover not only the Meiji period, but also the entire modern period (1868 to the present). Thus in my second book in Japanese, *Studies in the Political Structure of Modern Japan* (1956), I dealt with the constitution, local government, bureaucracy, and party politics in modern Japan.

When I started work at the Institute of Social Science, University of Tokyo, I began field surveys of both rural and urban Japan, including one of election campaigning and local politics. Maintaining my original motivation, my interest focused on Japanese politics in its historical context as well as in comparative perspective.

I paid particular attention to the organizational structure as well as to the symbols used for the integration of organizations. While analyzing agricultural cooperatives in rural areas and labor unions in urban areas, I found one important characteristic common to both. It was a dual structure composed of a highly bureaucratized body in the upper strata and a basic unit at the bottom where a naturally developed sense of

conformity existed among those who were living or working together. (In the case of a Japanese labor union, it is based upon the enterprise; the custom of lifetime employment allows the same workers to work together until their retirement. This structure is related to the particular characteristic of symbols used for the integration of the organization. There is a tendency toward "replacement of goal,"—i.e., "forgetting" the specific goal for which the organization was established; mere identification with the organization becomes the goal. In this sort of organization, integration can easily be obtained by strengthening the existing sense of conformity in the basic units, which is then mobilized for the members' identification with the whole organization. At the same time, however, because of the lack of a clear understanding of the specific goal for which the organization was established, there tends to be an indifferent attitude toward this goal; this indifference becomes a serious bottleneck hindering the spontaneous and active participation of the members.

In my book in Japanese, *Contemporary Organization* (1961) I dealt with this problem and offered a general theory based upon a concrete analysis of contemporary organizations in Japan. Japanese organization can be considered unique in one respect, but if we consider the problem of informal small groups in huge organizations and the problem of personal influence of subleaders in many other societies, the Japanese case may well be only an extreme example of an aspect of all contemporary organizations in mass society. That was precisely why I attempted to establish a general theory of contemporary organizations based upon my analysis of Japanese organizations.

While *Contemporary Organization* was a product of my study in the field of sociological theory and the analysis of contemporary society, my interest in political history continued and, moreover, I extended the latter to include more recent history. *An Analysis of the Political Process in Japan from 1941 to 1952* was the result. This study was an effort to combine political science analysis and a historical approach to the period from the beginning of the Pacific War to the end of the Occupation. The Japanese title *Catastrophe and Peace* indicated that my motivation at the beginning of my career still continued. Although this book was published in 1968 due to delays on the part of other authors in the same series, I actually finished writing it before I went to the United States in 1961, my first experience abroad.

While I was in high school we studied German twelve hours a week and English for only one hour. This was of course partly due to it being the period of the Axis alliance. I spent my university days and the early part of my career under the Allied Occupation. Since I felt very

uncomfortable watching many Japanese flattering (or so I perceived it) American GIs by speaking English, I purposely did not speak any English during the period of the Occupation. Of course, for academic reasons I read books written in English, but my deep interest in Max Weber, G.W.F. Hegel, Karl Marx and Georg Lukács made me feel more comfortable in German. At the time of the political crisis in 1960 brought about by the revision of the security treaty between the United States and Japan, however, I felt it necessary to communicate with my American colleagues in order to improve their understanding of the Japanese situation. My opinions were published (the first time in English) in "The Diet Majority and Public Opinion," *Far Eastern Survey* 29:10 (October 1960) but this was translated from the Japanese. At any rate, my wish to communicate with American colleagues was realized when I was awarded a Rockefeller Foundation grant to study in the United States.

I stayed at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, the University of California, Berkeley, and Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, for a period of two years. At the beginning I found it extremely difficult to communicate in English, but the fact that I was exposed to a different culture gave me a tremendous academic stimulus. The difficulty in communication made me even more aware of the difference in culture. With the kind arrangement of my American colleagues, such as Robert E. Ward, I was invited to participate in various academic conferences, such as on "Political Development and Bureaucracy," "Modernization in Turkey and Japan," "Political Development in Modern Japan," all sponsored by the Social Science Research Council. At that time the theory of political modernization dominated comparative politics in the United States. I found it to be an interesting attempt to find more objective indices for comparison, eliminating the fixed ideological dichotomy beween the free democratic world and the totalitarian communist world. At the same time I was not entirely satisfied with modernization theory because of its assumption of a unilinear type of development computed by per capita income, percentage of actual voters, etc. To me, what was more important was the *pattern* (rather than the degree) of development related to the problem of culture. I touched on this briefly in my article "The Development of Interest Groups and the Pattern of Political Modernization in Japan," in R. E. Ward (ed.), *Political Development in Modern Japan,* (1968).

My study in the United States and my contact with such scholars as R. Bellah, T. Parsons, D. Riesman and S. N. Eisenstadt (then a visiting professor at Harvard University) broadened my interest and made me more oriented towards comparative studies. Although I had previously

focused on Japan, I now started to examine Japanese culture in a broader context.

My first concrete attempt to develop this idea was realized when I published *Politics for Peace* (1968); an English summary of the first part of that book appeared in an article, "Beyond the Traditional Concepts of Peace in Different Cultures" (1969, chapter six of this volume). As the reader can see from that article, I tried to characterize the traditional concept of peace in Japan compared with similar concepts in different cultures.

Politics for Peace indicates two further developments in my research interests: peace research and studies of important concepts in particular political cultures. In the field of peace research, "Japan's Changing Image of Gandhi" (chapter seven), and "The Significance of Non-Violent Direct Action—As Viewed by a Japanese Political Scientist" (chapter eight) are examples of the former. My *Logic of Peace and Social Change* (in Japanese, 1973) was an attempt to show how the conservatism of peace *maintenance* should be supplemented by peace *building* so as to overcome the "structural violence" in society.

My interest in the variety of political concepts among cultures can be seen in my essay on the introduction of various Western concepts, such as those of "freedom" and "right," into Japan ("The Assimilation of Western Political Ideas and the Modernization of Japan," 1980). Because the traditional concepts in Japan did not correspond exactly to the Western concepts, new terms had to be found to translate these words. Thus the contact between different political cultures provides us with an interesting problem reflecting on both cultures. It is not simply the problem of acculturation or cultural assimilation on the part of the receiving (or 'peripheral') culture. As Max Weber pointed out, it may also be an opportunity to question the meaning of the donor (or "central") culture. Center-periphery theory among peace researchers, such as Johan Galtung, may be directly related to this problem.

After the United States started the bombing of North Vietnam, I ceased visiting the U.S. in protest. Instead, I accepted an invitation to teach at El Colegio de Mexico in 1971 and 1972. As a reflection of my experience in Mexico, I published *Mexico and the Japanese* (in Japanese, in 1972) with the subtitle *Observations from the Third World*. When the war in Vietnam was over, I accepted an invitation to teach at the University of Arizona in 1976 and 1977. It was my first experience of living in the southwest of the United States, and by making contact with Mexican Americans and Native Americans I found another view of the United States, rather different from that of the intellectuals on the east coast. It was in a sense the view from the periphery. Thereaf-

ter I visited Tanzania to teach for a semester in 1978; I also visited China and other third world countries, because I wanted to know more about the view of the world held by those in the Third World.

To return to the methodological problem, my discontent with certain aspects of the American political scientists' theories of comparative politics in general and the theory of political modernization in particular resulted in my increased interest in political culture. I wanted to make the best use of my career as a historian on the one hand, and a social scientist on the other, and to analyze political culture in Japan in both historical and comparative perspectives. *Japanese Society* (1971) was a result of that effort, although it was merely a brief introduction, a sort of bird's-eye view. Writing something introductory in a foreign language, within a limited space, was very frustrating and I wanted to write more freely in Japanese on the same subject. *Japanese Political Culture: Conformity and Competition* (in Japanese, 1970) was a product of this effort. An English summary of this book appeared in English as a booklet, *Combination of Conformity and Competition: A Key to Understanding Japanese Society* (1980); this was modified and incorporated into the present book as chapter two.

My experience of teaching at the University of Arizona with the excellent historian Gail Bernstein; in Oxford, England at seminar with Richard Storry, one of the most respected European scholars on Japan, and with others, has made me more oriented towards history in an effort to cancel out the schematic approach which permeates political science. The two key disciplines in my research, political science and history, continuously engage in conflict in my mind. This conflict is not necessarily disadvantageous. I have been hoping that it can and should be utilized as a driving force to produce a creative result. *Law and Politics in the History of Modern Japanese Thought,* (in Japanese, 1976), a collection of articles written over the past twenty years, represents my efforts in the field of history. My most recent publication in Japanese, *Organizations and Symbols in Contemporary Politics: A Political Scientist's View of Postwar Japan,* (1978), is an effort to combine my approaches as political scientist and historian.

As the Japanese economy grows rapidly and as Japan has become an economic superpower, national self-confidence is also growing. Japan's economic development is now rated highly by American experts on modernization. I have, however, maintained a critical view of Japanese society. This is because the problem still remains as to why Japan possessed no internal forces capable of changing the political system from within until Japan was defeated by the Allied forces and forced to introduce the reforms ordered by the Occupation authorities.

Among my American colleagues, voices critical of liberal Japanese intellectuals have been heard saying that Japanese intellectuals are too critical of their own society. I would admit that this may be true, but in my view there are sufficient and good reasons for our being so critical. Despite the rapid changes taking place in Japanese society, there are certain prewar elements, such as the strong attitudes of conformity and competition still found in the post-war period. History may not repeat itself, but we cannot ignore historical continuity.

Some may criticize me for being a dreamer because of my commitment to pacifism. No one, however, except for opportunists, can be competely free from any value commitment. What is important is to be aware of one's value commitment in order to avoid possible biases due to the wishful thinking based on that commitment. A dreamer is a person seeking an impossible goal without due consideration of the actual situation, whereas an idealist in the strict sense, is a person who is seeking an ideal goal based on a realistic analysis of the actual situation. My hope is that by maintaining a critical view of my own society I can contribute to improving it by a careful scientific investigation of it. Of course, my wish to be an idealist with a realistic approach may itself be a dream, a piece of wishful thinking. How far I have achieved this must be judged by what I have written so far.

When I consider my academic career up to the publication of this volume, I cannot but reflect on my great fortune in receiving academic stimuli from various distinguished scholars both in Japan and abroad. Professor Masao Maruyama, whose seminar I attended from its very beginnings in 1946, is the person to whom I owe my greatest debt. Professor Kiyoaki Tsuji and other political scientists in the Law Faculty of the University of Tokyo have greatly influenced and stimulated me through various seminars. Colleagues in the Institute of Social Science, University of Tokyo have proved of great help during our work on various common projects. In the West, the names of scholars mentioned above are merely a few examples from among many. I would like to express my heart-felt gratitude for their kind help and valuable suggestions.

Related to the publication of this volume, the first person whom I would like to thank is Professor Irving Louis Horowitz. Without his kind offer and continued encouragement, I might not have dared to attempt to publish another book in English. *Japanese Society* required so much effort that I felt that one was quite enough. Mr. Ian Gow, who spent a great deal of his time on this volume, deserves particular acknowledgement. Without his advice and help, this volume would have been a mere collection of old essays lacking any structure. In

terms of style too, he helped considerably in rewriting various essays which had originally been written, and often translated, with the help of different persons. The various translators of my Japanese manuscripts deserve special thanks, especially my colleague, Mr. Fumiaki Moriya, an assistant of our institute. I am thankful also to those who helped me with the original essays. I appreciate Professor Patricia G. Steinhoff's assistance in the process of proofreading.

I am also grateful to Mr. Kinji Kawamura, the president of the Foreign Press Center, the editors of *The Journal of Peace Research, Developing Economies, Peace Research in Japan* and *Annals of the Institute of Social Science of the University of Tokyo* for their generosity in granting me permission to use my essays previously published in their journals.

T.I.
Tokyo, Japan

Contents

Part I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION