

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN JAPAN

by TADASHI KAWATA and SABURŌ NINOMIYA

I. *The Inter-War Period*

The new field of study known as 'international relations' or 'international politics' came into existence in Japan as well as in the West at the turn of the 20th century, especially as a result of World War I, and made remarkable progress following World War II. In Japan, prior to World War I, international affairs were not so important as domestic affairs as a subject of scholarly interest. Usually they were dealt with only in the field of international law or of diplomatic history.¹ As for political science, its object tended to be limited to domestic politics, partly because of the strong influence on it of German *Staatslehre*.² Consequently, questions of international politics were dealt with briefly as those of 'foreign policy,' which was regarded at best as an extension of domestic politics.

After Japan started overseas activities on an international scale with its entry into World War I and subsequent participation in the League of Nations as one of the leading members, the importance and complexity of international relations became widely recognized among informed people and grew into a subject of active discussion. In this period, a great number of

¹ In Japan, the study of international law was established as a separate research subject as early as the birth of modern academic studies. As to these circumstances, see Kisa-burō Yokota, *Kokusai-hō-gaku* (International Law), Tokyo Yūhikaku, 1955, Vol. I, pp. 139-144. However, it was only at the beginning of the 20th century that the study of diplomatic history became one of the research subjects. For example, in the Faculty of Politics of the Tokyo Semmon Gakkō (the College of Tokyo), the predecessor of the present Waseda University, the course in *Modern Diplomatic History* was founded by Prof. Nagao Ariga in 1899; and the course in politics at Keiō University, *History of Politics and Diplomacy* was also founded by Prof. Nagao Ariga in 1903; in the Tokyo Kōtō Shōgyō Gakkō (Tokyo Advanced Commercial College), the predecessor of the present Hitotsubashi University, the course in the *Modern History of Diplomacy* was founded by Prof. Mineichirō Adachi in 1903; in the Faculty of Law of the Imperial University of Tokyo, the predecessor of the present University of Tokyo, the course entitled *Diplomatic History* was founded by Prof. Sakutarō Tachi in 1906. Regarding works on diplomatic history, see Tokushirō Ōhata, "Nihon ni okeru Gaikō-shi Kenkyū no Gen-dōkō (Recent Developments in Studies of Diplomatic History in Japan)" in *Nihon Kokusai-seiji Gakkai* (Japan Association of International Relations), ed., *Nihon Gaikō-shi Kenkyū—Shōwa Jidai* (A Study of the Diplomatic History of Japan—the Shōwa Period), Tokyo, Yūhikaku, 1960.

² As to the history of the study of politics in Japan, see Masamichi Rōyama, *Nihon ni okeru Kindai Seiji-gaku no Hattatsu* (The Development of Modern Political Science in Japan), Tokyo, Jitsugyō-no-Nihon-sha, 1949.

commentaries and comments on all aspects of international affairs including fundamental questions such as peace settlement, war and peace, international morals and the essence of diplomacy, came to appear in such special journals on foreign policy as *Kokusai-hō Gaikō Zasshi* (Journal of International Law and Diplomacy),¹ *Gaikō Jihō* (Diplomatic Review)² and *Kokusai-remmei* (League of Nations)³ as well as such magazines of general nature as *Taiyō* (Sun), *Chūō Kōron* (Central Review), *Kaizō* (Reconstruction), *Nihon oyobi Nihon-jin* (Japan and the Japanese), and *Tōhō Jiron* (Eastern Review). More remarkable among the contributors to these magazines were Minoru Maida, Yōtarō Sugimura, Shigeo Suehiro, Jumpei Shinobu, Sakutarō Tachi, Hikomatsu Kamikawa, and Masamichi Rōyama.

While general interest in international affairs was growing, attempts were made in the 1920's to specify a new field of studies under the name of 'international politics,' in the complicated circumstances of international relations resulting from World War I. The first of these attempts was an approach by Jumpei Shinobu in the field of international law, the second was one by Hikomatsu Kamikawa in diplomatic history, and the third by Masamichi Rōyama in political science.

Shinobu's study of international law was completed in his *Kokusai-Seiji Ronsō* (Treatise on International Politics), 4 vols., 1925-1926.⁴ This may well be called the first of the more complete works on 'international politics.' Shinobu posed a question: "Can 'international politics' be a science? . . . Even if 'international politics' can be a science, should we study it as a science independent and distinct from political science?" In answering his own question, he stated, "If we can approve of its independence, then 'international politics' should be a discipline whose aim is to analyze international political phenomena collectively, to study common features to be observed therein, and thus to discover principles underlying these phenomena of international politics."⁵ What he meant here by 'international political phenomena' was the political phenomena centred around relations among nations, which

¹ Founded in 1902 under the name of *Kokusai-hō Zasshi* (Journal of International Law), and since the issue of Vol. XI, No. 1 (October, 1912) published under the title of *Kokusai-hō Gaikō Zasshi* (Journal of International Law and Diplomacy).

² Founded in 1898.

³ Founded in 1921. The title was changed to *Kokusai-chishiki* (International Understanding) in October, 1922 (Vol. II, No. 10), to *Kokusai-chishiki oyobi Hyōron* (International Understanding and Review) in April, 1937 (Vol. XVII, No. 4), and to *Gaikō Hyōron* (Diplomatic Review) in January, 1942 (Vol. XXII, No. 1).

⁴ Jumpei Shinobu, *Kokusai-seiji Ronsō* (Treatise on International Politics), 4 vols., Tokyo, Nihon-hyōron-sha, 1925-1926: Vol. I, *Kokusai-seiji no Shinka oyobi Gensei* (Development and Present Situation of International Politics), 1925; Vol. II, *Kokusai-seiji no Kōki oyobi Rensa* (Principles and Concatenations in International Politics), 1925; Vol. III, *Kokusai-funsō to Kokusai-remmei* (International Conflicts and the League of Nations), 1925; Vol. IV, *Gaikō-Kantoku to Gaikō-kan* (Diplomatic Administration and Diplomatic Organizations), 1926.

⁵ *ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 15.

are conceived as being different from those dealt with by 'diplomacy' or 'foreign policy.' Another characteristic of his study lies in the emphasis which he placed on the role of law and morals in international politics.¹ This apparently conformed to the idealistic tendency discernible in the studies of international relations in the West of the 1920's, and it was probably because he was originally a scholar of international law.

Next, Kamikawa published a number of treatises dealing with international affairs, the central themes of which were concerned with the idea of international peace and the League of Nations. He embodied the results of these studies in his *Kokusai-remmei Seisaku Ron* (On the Policies of the League of Nations), 1927.² Studying a variety of relations possible among nations, he found a course of historical development leading from antagonism to association and further to fusion. This brought him to think that the principal agent of international politics should be the League of Nations and led him to discuss the problems which he believed should be settled by this international organization. Since he was originally a scholar of diplomatic history, his study of international politics was no doubt based on his exhaustive knowledge of international political history as seen in his later work, *Kindai Kokusai-seiji Shi* (Modern History of International Politics), 4 vols., 1948-1950.³ In developing the field of 'international politics,' however, he was also strongly subject to the idealism of the 1920's.

Compared with the above two, Rōyama intended to establish a new field of 'international politics' with a clearer idea of what would come into question. His studies were published in *Kokusai-seiji to Kokusai-gyōsei* (International Politics and International Administration), 1928.⁴ In attempting to establish an independent discipline of 'international politics' his actual motivation was, according to himself, his realization of the need to introduce new concepts, different from the existing concepts of political science, which would serve to interpret the intricate international relations following World War I and to pass judgment of Japan's foreign policy at that time.⁵ In this work, Rōyama set up the concepts of 'international political science,' 'international society,' and 'international organization,' and thereby studied the social foundation of international politics. Particularly, he emphasized that the study of 'international organization' as a constituent of the international political system should be an important subject in 'international politics'.

While attempts were being made to develop a new discipline of 'international politics', as seen above, some important contributions were made,

¹ See especially *ibid.*, Vol. II.

² Hikomatsu Kamikawa, *Kokusai-remmei Seisaku Ron* (On the Policies of the League of Nations), Tokyo, Seiji-kyōiku-kyōkai, 1927.

³ Hikomatsu Kamikawa, *Kindai Kokusai-seiji Shi* (Modern History of International Politics), 4 vols., Tokyo, Jitsugyō-no-Nihon-sha, 1948-1950.

⁴ Masamichi Rōyama, *Kokusai-seiji to Kokusai-gyōsei* (International Politics and International Government), Tokyo, Ganshō-dō, 1928.

⁵ *ibid.*, pp. i-iv, 2-3.

not formally but substantially, to this field, by Sakuzō Yoshino, Ikuo Ōyama and Tadao Yanaihara.

An outstanding political scientist in Japan, Yoshino had since during World War I published *Ōshū Dōran Shi-ron* (Historical Account of the European War), 1915, *Nisshi Kōshō Ron* (On Sino-Japanese Relations), 1915, *Shina Kakumei Shō-shi* (A Short History of the Chinese Revolution), 1917¹, and many other works on China and Europe. Following the War, he published more magazine articles by which he actively commented, from the viewpoint of 'international democracy', on Japan's foreign policy and international affairs, thereby contributing to the progress of the democratic movement in postwar Japan.

Along with Yoshino, Ōyama, another leading promoter of the democratic movement in those years and political scientist, produced remarkable achievements in 'international politics'. As seen in his *Seiji no Shakai-teki Kiso* (The Social Basis of Politics), 1923, and *Minzoku Tōsō to Kaikyū Ishiki* (National Struggle and Class Consciousness), 1923,² his penetrating analysis of real international politics and interesting studies in relations between nations and classes were, in substance, exactly in the nature of 'international politics'. In fact, Ōyama had a plan to prepare a systematic theory of international politics under the title of *Kokusai-seiji no Shakai-teki Kiso* (The Social Basis of International Politics),³ though unfortunately he was unable to put this plan into practice.

Yanaihara, one of the famous Christians produced by modern Japan, also left behind him valuable achievements. In international affairs, too, he stands on the highest level in Japan with many works in which he studied the main factors motivating international relations such as nationalism, colonialism and imperialism. Typical of these works are *Shokumin oyobi Shokumin-seisaku* (Colonization and Colonial Policy), 1926 and *Minzoku to Kokka* (Nation and State), 1937.⁴ One remarkable feature of his achievements is that he did not limit himself to basic studies but applied them to the specific problems of India, Formosa, Korea and Manchuria, thereby conducting empirical studies. Especially, his *Teikoku-shugi-ka no Taiwan* (Formosa under Japanese Imperialism), 1929⁵ and *Nanyō Guntō no Kenkyū* (The Pacific Islands under

¹ Sakuzō Yoshino, *Ōshū Dōran Shi-ron* (Historical Account of the European War), Tokyo, Keisei-sha, 1915; *Nisshi Kōshō Ron* (On Sino-Japanese Relations), Tokyo, Keisei-sha, 1915; *Shina Kakumei Shō-shi* (A Short History of the Chinese Revolution), Tokyo, Banda-shobō, 1917.

² Ikuo Ōyama, *Seiji no Shakai-teki Kiso* (The Social Basis of Politics), Tokyo, Dōjin-sha, 1923; *Minzoku Tōsō to Kaikyū Ishiki* (The Nationalist Struggle and Class Consciousness), Tokyo, Ganshō-dō, 1923. The former is included in Vol. I, and the latter in Vol. II, of the *Ōyama Ikuo Zenshū* (Complete Works of Ikuo Ōyama), Tokyo, Chūō-kōron-sha, 1947.

³ *ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 220, note 2.

⁴ Tadao Yanaihara, *Shokumin oyobi Shokumin-seisaku* (Colonization and Colonial Policy), Tokyo, Yūhikaku, 1926; *Minzoku to Kokka* (Nation and State), Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1937. Also, *Yanaihara Tadao Zenshū* (Complete Works of Tadao Yanaihara), Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1962, now under publication.

⁵ Tadao Yanaihara, *Teikoku-shugi-ka no Taiwan* (Formosa under Japanese Imperialism),

Japanese Mandate), 1935¹ had great repercussions not only in Japan but also abroad. Some of these were published in Chinese, English, and Russian editions and were well known outside Japan.

As the studies of international relations grew more active, there was an apparent tendency to recognize 'international politics' as an independent field of study and subject in education. University catalogues tell us that "the Second Chair of Politics and History of Political Theory" (occupied by Shigeru Nambara) was set up at Law Faculty of the Imperial University of Tokyo (now the University of Tokyo) in 1924, and it was established for the purpose of teaching international politics.² In 1932 the catalogue of the Faculty of Politics and Economics of Waseda University carried a course on International Politics (by Jumpei Shinobu).³ Again, a 1927 compilation published to show the level of academic studies of political science at that time, Sakuzō Yoshino, ed., *Seiji-gaku Kenkyū* (Studies in Politics),⁴ had an independent heading of 'international politics', under which it included Nambara's "Kanto ni okeru Kokusai-seiji no Rinen (I. Kant's Idea of International Politics)" and Kamikawa's "Minzoku-shugi no Kōsatsu (A Study of Nationalism)."

More recently, however, since Japan came under the control of militarism following the Manchurian Incident (1931), scientific research in international relations suffered pressure from real politics and its development was greatly hampered and distorted. Especially after the Sino-Japanese War broke out, studies of international relations increasingly tended to serve the purposes of national policies. As a result, such national policy doctrines as the "New Order in East Asia" and the "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperty Sphere," as well as the "Theory of East Asian Community" and "Geopolitik" which were used to justify those doctrines, were actively preached, while any study of international relations opposed to them was suppressed by the authorities.⁵

Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1929; translated into Chinese (three versions, 1930, 1952, 1956), and translated into Russian (place and date of publication unknown). As for the Chinese and Russian editions, see *Yanaihara Tadao Zenshū* (Complete Works of Tadao Yanaihara), Vol. II, p. 685.

- 1 Tadao Yanaihara, *Nanyō Guntō no Kenkyū* (Pacific Islands under Japanese Mandate), Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1935; translated into English by the Institute of Pacific Affairs, London, Oxford University Press, 1939.
- 2 Imperial University of Tokyo, *Tokyo Teikoku Daigaku Gakujutsu Taikan: Hō-gakubu, Keizai-gakubu* (Outline of Academic Research at the Imperial University of Tokyo: Faculty of Law and Faculty of Economics), Tokyo, Imperial University of Tokyo, 1942, p. 25.
- 3 Waseda University, *Han-seiki no Waseda* (Half a Century of Waseda University), Tokyo, Waseda University Press, 1932, pp. 420, 422.
- 4 Sakuzō Yoshino, ed., *Seiji-gaku Kenkyū* (Studies in Politics), Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1927.
- 5 For example, Tadao Yanaihara's *Teikoku-shugi-ka no Taiwan* (Formosa under Japanese Imperialism), cited above, and also his *Manshū Mondai* (Manchurian Problems), Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1934 were suppressed in February 1938. See *Yanaihara Tadao Zenshū* (Complete Works of Tadao Yanaihara), Vol. II, p. 686.

II. The Postwar Period

World War II brought about a drastic change in Japan's position in the world. In the meantime, the Japanese people, who had received a direct and overwhelming impact from international politics in the rapidly changing circumstances of defeat, occupation and independence, were led to take great interest in international affairs. Against this general background, studies of 'international relations' or 'international politics' experienced spectacular developments both in quality and quantity in the postwar years, or more exactly, after the effectuation of the Peace Treaty (1952).

1. Research and Education at Universities

These developments found their most direct expression in the research and educational systems at the universities. Before the war, universities seldom had an independent subject or separate course in 'international relations' or 'international politics', and even those which had one of 'diplomatic history' could be counted on the fingers. With the war over, many universities set up a subject or course relating to international affairs, such as 'international relations' and 'international politics', not to speak of 'diplomatic history' and 'international political history'. At some universities, special institutions were established for advanced studies of international relations.¹

¹ The following are the results of inquiries made by the present writers in 1959 in regard to the main universities in Japan.

The universities providing the subject of *International Politics* are: Aichi University, Dōshisha University, Hiroshima University, Hokkaidō University, Hōsei University, International Christian University, Keiō University, University of Kyōto, University of Kyūshū, Meiji University, University of Nagoya, Nihon University, University of Okayama, Ōsaka Municipal University, Ritsumeikan University, Senshū University, Takushoku University, University of Tokyo, Tokyo Metropolitan University, Tōhoku University, and Waseda University. Among these, Aichi University has a Centre for International Studies.

The universities providing the subject of *International Relations* are: Aoyama Gakuin University, Hitotsubashi University, International Christian University, University of Kanazawa, University of Tokyo, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, and Tōhoku University. Among them, the University of Tokyo has an International Relations Section in its Faculty of Liberal Arts, where the subjects of *International Politics and Economics*, *International Law*, *International Political History*, *International Organization*, *Soviet Studies*, *Chinese Studies*, and *World Geography*, etc. are provided. This section, in parallel with the Sections of Area Studies (America, Britain, France, Germany), aims at comprehensive education in international relations. Furthermore, the University of Tokyo has a special course in *International Relations* in its Graduate School. Aoyama Gakuin University has an Institute of International Relations.

Other principal courses or institutions for area studies are: the Slavic Research Institute (Hokkaidō University), the Research Institute of Social Sciences (International Christian University), the Research Institute for Humanistic Science (University of Kyōto), the American Institute (Rikkyō University), the Institute of Foreign Affairs (Takushoku University), the Institute of Oriental Studies (University of Tokyo), the Institute of Social Science (University of Tokyo), the Centre for American Studies (University of Tokyo), and the Institute of Foreign Affairs (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies).

A survey of researchers in international relations and area studies at Japanese universities and colleges, sponsored by the Kokusai Bunka Kaikan (International House of Japan)¹ shows that of 881 persons surveyed, 132 specialize in international relations in the very broad sense (including international relations, international politics, international political history, diplomatic history, international law, international private law and international organization). Of the latter number, 82 are engaged in international relations in the somewhat narrower sense (international relations, international politics, international political history, and diplomatic history). Since the survey, conducted over several years from 1958, is not an exhaustive one and is limited to researchers in universities and colleges, its results are undeniably far from complete, but it will provide a clue to the number of researchers of international relations in Japan.

2. Trends in Learned Circles and Institutions.

Turning to trends in academic associations, it is noted that the two organizations, the Kokusai-hō Gakkai (Japan Association of International Law) and the Nihon Seiji Gakkai (Japanese Political Science Association), have come to place considerable emphasis on various aspects of international politics. In 1956, a new Nihon Kokusai-seiji Gakkai (Japan Association of International Relations) also came into being, with *Kokusai-seiji* (International Relations) as its journal.² In addition, there are quite a few institutions, associations, and organizations which were formed after the war to deal with international affairs. Among them, the more important are the Nihon Kokusai-mondai Kenkyūsho (Japan Institute of International Affairs),³ the Nihon Gaisei Gakkai (Japan Institute of Foreign Affairs),⁴ the Chūgoku Kenkyūsho

¹ Kokusai Bunka Kaikan, Kokusai-kankei Chiiki Kenkyū Genjō Iinkai (Investigation Committee on the Study of International Relations and Area Studies, International House of Japan), *Nihon no Daigaku ni okeru Kokusai-kankei oyobi Chiiki-kenkyū no Genjō* (A Survey of the Study of International Relations and Area Studies in Japanese Universities and Colleges), Tokyo, International House of Japan, 1962.

Incidentally, the Kokusai Bunka Kaikan (International House of Japan) is a unique non-official organization which plays a noteworthy active part in promoting international cultural exchange, regularly holding lectures or symposia by famous diplomats or experts in foreign affairs.

² As academic associations dealing with international affairs, the Ajia Seikei Gakkai (Japan Society for Asian Political and Economic Studies), though more specific, was founded in 1953, issuing *Ajia Kenkyū* (Asiatic Studies) as its bulletin; also in 1951, the Nihon Kokusai-keizai Gakkai (Japan Association of International Economics) was established, issuing *Kokusai-keizai* (International Economics).

³ The Nihon Kokusai-mondai Kenkyūsho (Japan Institute of International Affairs) issues *Kokusai-mondai* (International Affairs) monthly, *Kokusai Nempō* (Survey of International Affairs) yearly, *Kokusai Kenkyū Sōsho* (International Studies Series) semi-yearly, and *Kokusai-mondai Shirizu* (International Problems Series) irregularly. Besides, it has been publishing its English bulletin, *The Japan Annual of International Affairs* since 1961.

⁴ The Nihon Gaisei Gakkai (Japan Institute of Foreign Affairs) issued its bulletin, *Gaisei* (Foreign Affairs Quarterly) from No. 1 (January 1956) to No. 11 (April 1959). Since then, the publication has been discontinued.

(China Research Institute),¹ and the Ajia-Afurika Kenkyūsho (Asia-Africa Institute).² The Ajia-keizai Kenkyūsho (Institute of Asian Economic Affairs)³ and the Sekai-keizai Chōsakai (Institute of World Economy)⁴ while giving priority to economic affairs, also deal with social and political subjects fairly broadly. Including the periodicals of these organizations, Japan today has a large number of publications on international affairs.⁵

3. A Remarkable Increase in the Publication of Studies

Corresponding to such institutional developments, studies in international relations have been published in rapid succession in the postwar period. Books and articles on various aspects of international relations (for example, war and peace, nationalism, neutralism, and so on) are too numerous to mention,⁶ while area studies have developed remarkably, especially on Afro-Asian countries, China and the United States.⁷

¹ The Chūgoku Kenkyūsho (China Research Institute) issues monthly *Chūgoku Kenkyū Gappō* (Monthly Report of Chinese Studies) and the yearly *Shin Chūgoku Nenkan* (New China Yearbook).

² The Ajia-Afurika Kenkyūsho (Asia-Africa Institute) issues monthly *Ajia-Afurika Kenkyū* (Asia-African Studies) and the yearly *Ajia-Afurika Nenkan* (Asia-Africa Yearbook) edited jointly with the Chūgoku Kenkyūsho (China Research Institute).

³ The Ajia-keizai Kenkyūsho (Institute of Asian Economic Affairs) has issued more than 100 volumes of various reports including surveys and translations on economic, social, and political affairs in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In addition, the Institute has its monthly journal *Ajia-keizai* (Asian Economies) and quarterly English journal *The Developing Economies*.

⁴ The Sekai-keizai Chōsakai (Institute of World Economy) issues its monthly journal *Sekai-keizai* (World Economy) and has compiled several area studies on Africa, Latin America, etc.

⁵ Besides the materials referred to above, the main journals published after World War II are as follows: *Shin Kokumin Gaikō Chōsakai* (Foreign Affairs Research Institute of New Japan), *Gaikō Kikan* (Foreign Affairs Quarterly), from Vol. I, No. 1 (January, 1956) until Vol. VI, No. 4 (October, 1961), discontinued since then; *Nihon Kokuren Kyōkai* (Japan United Nations Association), *Kokuren* (The United Nations); *Jiji-tsūshinsha*, *Sekai Shūhō* (World Weekly); *Gaikō-jihō-sha*, *Gaikō Jihō* (Diplomatic Review); *Sekai-jānarū-sha*, *Sekai Jānarū* (World Journal), and so forth. Also, *Gaimushō* (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), *Gaimushō Chōsa Gappō* (Monthly Report of Ministry of Foreign Affairs) is useful for its excellent contents.

⁶ As to the comprehensive and detailed list of the materials for studies on international relations in Japan, see Tadashi Kawata, *Teikoku-shugi to Kenryoku-seiji* (Imperialism and Power Politics), Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1963, Appendix, pp. 228-242.

⁷ Studies on China have long been made in Japan. For their recent development, see the following articles: Shinkichi Etō, "Chūkyō Shi Kenkyū Nōto (A Note on Studies of Communist Chinese History)," *Tōyō-gakuhō* (Reports of the Oriental Society), Vol. XLIII, No. 2 (September, 1960); Shinkichi Etō, "Recent Trends of Asian Studies in Japan," *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. XXI, No. 1 (November, 1961); Masataka Banno, Akira Doi, Hiroharu Seki, and Tadao Miyashita, "Development of China Studies in Postwar Japan," *The Developing Economies*, Preliminary Issue No. 2 (September-December, 1962).

After our brief survey of studies in international relations which have been growing in Japan following World War II, it may now be proper to turn to the basic works produced by the Japanese academic circles in the field of 'international relations' or 'international politics' as a separate discipline. The major works are as follows: Hikomatsu Kamikawa, *Kokusai-seiji-gaku Gairon* (International Politics), 1950; Masakuma Uchiyama, *Kokusai-seiji-gaku Josetsu* (Introduction to International Politics), 1952; Koshirō Okakura, *Sekai-seiji Ron* (World Politics), 1956; Naokichi Tanaka, *Kokusai-seiji-gaku Gairon* (International Politics), 1956; Tadashi Kawata, *Kokusai-kankei Gairon* (International Relations), 1958; Kakuzō Maeshiba, *Kokusai-seiji-gaku Taiikō* (International Politics), 1959; Yoichi Itagaki, *Kokusai-kankei-ron no Kihon-mondai* (Basic Problems of International Relations), 1963.¹

Furthermore, we have to mention two representative full-length surveys which are somewhat different in category from the above-listed works, and yet have succeeded in adopting the viewpoint of international politics in international political history. These surveys are Kamikawa, *Kindai Kokusai-seiji Shi* (Modern History of International Politics), cited above, and Yoshitake Oka, *Kokusai-seiji Shi* (History of International Politics), 1955.²

Before discussing these basic works, we must refer to another noticeable tendency in Japanese studies of international relations after the war. This is the zeal with which the studies of Western scholars and Marxist works have been presented to Japanese readers. The main works and articles of E.H. Carr, F.L. Schuman, H.J. Morgenthau, A.J. Toynbee, Hans Kohn, W. Friedmann, G.F. Kennan, W.W. Rostow, H.A. Kissinger, P. Noel-Baker, G. Myrdal

For the trends in Southeast Asian studies, see Hiroaki Aono, "Sengo Nihon ni okeru Tōnan-Ajia Seiji-kenkyū no Kaiko to Tembō (Development of Studies on Southeast Asian Politics in Postwar Japan: Retrospect and Prospect)," *Ajia Kenkyū* (Asiatic Studies), Vol. IX, Nos. 3-4 (January, 1963).

Studies on the U.S.A. have been largely developed since the end of World War II. As to their recent trends, see, among others, the reports on area studies presented at the Japan-America Conference on Education and Cultural Interchange (the first held in January 1962 and the second in October 1963); and also Kenichi Nakaya and Yoshimitsu Ide, "Nihon no Daigaku ni okeru Amerika Kenkyū (American Studies in Japanese Universities and Colleges)," *Nichi-Bei Fōranu* (Japan-America Forum), Vol. VIII, No. 11 (December, 1962).

¹ Hikomatsu Kamikawa, *Kokusai-seiji-gaku Gairon* (International Politics), Tokyo, Keisō-shobō, 1950; Masakuma Uchiyama, *Kokusai-seiji-gaku Josetsu* (Introduction to International Politics), Kyōto, Sanwa-shobō, 1952; Koshirō Okakura, *Sekai-seiji Ron* (World Politics), Tokyo, Nihon-hyōron-sha, 1956; Naokichi Tanaka, *Kokusai-seiji-gaku Gairon* (International Politics), Tokyo, Kōbundō, 1956; Tadashi Kawata, *Kokusai-kankei Gairon* (International Relations), Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1958; Kakuzō Maeshiba, *Kokusai-seiji-gaku Taiikō* (International Politics), Kyōto, Hōritsu-bunka-sha, 1959; Yoichi Itagaki, *Kokusai-kankei-ron no Kihon-mondai* (Basic Problems of International Relations), Tokyo, Shinkigensha, 1963.

² Yoshitake Oka, *Kokusai-seiji Shi* (History of International Politics), Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1955.

and many other outstanding scholars of international relations of the West have been actively discussed and translated into Japanese. At the same time, the collected and selected works of Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tse-tung and Liu Shao-chi, along with many Soviet and Chinese materials relevant to Marxism, are almost constantly presented to the Japanese public.¹ It is impossible to overlook the fact that the influx of these foreign documents and materials has greatly influenced the study of international relations in Japan.

4. Some Important Currents in Methodology

A closer examination of the study of international relations in Japan after World War II, with the discussion centred around the several basic works mentioned above, may lead us to find three main approaches. The first of them is an approach from 'international political science', the second from 'international relations' in the more limited, original sense which aims at a new, comprehensive study of international affairs, and the third from 'international political history'. This does not mean that there is any clear-cut distinction of methodology among these three approaches. Rather these have many common overlapping features in the definition of the objects of study as well as in the tools of analysis. It may therefore be safe to say that they amount to hypotheses which the individual researchers supposed would provide effective analytical schemes for the elucidation of international relations in the future. For this reason, it seems, individual researchers strongly tend to choose one or another of these approaches, depending on their own academic background. This tendency is apparent in the fact that the first approach includes, more than others, those researchers who have so far been specializing in political science, the second those who have been specializing in economics, and the third those who have been specializing in history or political history.

The first approach, from 'international political science', can be further divided into two groups, one being the 'power politician group', and the other the 'Marxist group'. The power politician group tries to establish a system of 'international political science' by analyzing power relations presupposing nation-states or sovereign states. In the light of the development of

¹ Efforts have also been made to review the current trends and developments in studies of international relations in foreign countries. As to the studies made in the United States and Western European countries, see Tadashi Kawata, *Kokusai-kankei Gairon* (International Relations), pp. 1-47. Also, as to those made in America, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union, see Nihon Kokusai-seiji Gakkai (Japan Association of International Relations), ed., *Kokusai-seiji-gaku no Taikai* (System of International Politics), Tokyo, Yūhikaku, 1959, pp. 129-161. This contains the following articles: Yoshihiko Tanigawa, "Amerika ni okeru Kokusai-seiji-gaku no Genjō (The Present State of Studies in International Politics in America)"; Masakuma Uchiyama, "Igirisu ni okeru Kokusai-seiji-gaku no Genjō (The Present State of Studies in International Politics in Britain)"; Kinhide Mushakōji, "Furansu ni okeru Kokusai-seiji-gaku (The Study of International Politics in France)"; Yasuyuki Funaki, "Soren ni okeru Kokusai-seiji-gaku—Gaikō-shi, Kokusai-kankei—Gakkai no Tembō (A Sketch of the Academic Circles in the Soviet Union Connected with International Politics—History of Diplomacy and International Relations).

studies of international relations in the West, this group can be regarded as *orthodoxy*. The most typical scholar in this group is Kamikawa who was one of the pioneers in 'international politics' in Japan and who turned from "idealism" to "realism" after World War II. In his attempt at a comprehensive understanding of international politics, he analyzed, by means of such concepts as nation, nationalism, imperialism, power, and balance-of-power, "the process of conflict and struggle among nation-states through the force or power for self-preservation or for domination of other nations in international society."¹ In addition to Kamikawa, mention may be made of the three names of Rōyama, Tanaka and Uchiyama who, roughly speaking, seem to come under this group. Among the works of these scholars, Rōyama's "Kokusai-shakai ni okeru Kokka-shuken (State-sovereignty in International Society)," 1950,² is appreciated highly in the Japanese academic world as an outstanding monograph which successfully brought into relief the characteristic features of the 'Western State System' by throwing light on the nucleus problem of international politics, state-sovereignty.

This position of power politics is being brought forward especially by such young scholars as Kamiya, Kōsaka, Mushakōji, and Seki.³ It is worth noticing in this connection that there is a growing interest, in Japan, in the behaviour sciences which were developed and introduced into the study of international relations in the United States and which provided a stimulant for Japanese scholars. Nihon Seiji Gakkai (Japanese Political Science Association), ed., *Taigai-seisaku no Kettei-katei* (Decision-Making in Foreign Policy), 1959,⁴ and a series of treatises by Seki⁵ are an indication of the new tendency. Again, Sakamoto, slightly different in approach from these scholars, attracts widespread attention with his studies⁶ in which he makes a sharp

¹ Hikomatsu Kamikawa, *Kokusai-seiji-gaku Gairon* (International Politics), p. 43.

² Masamichi Rōyama, "Kokusai-shakai ni okeru Kokka-shuken (State-Sovereignty in International Society)," in Kōbundō, ed., *Kindai-kokka Ron*, Vol. I, *Kenryoku* (The Modern State, Vol. I, Power), Tokyo, Kōbundō, 1950.

³ Fuji Kamiya, "Shō-Eikoku-shugi Ron (On Little Englandism)," *Kokusai-hō Gaikō Zasshi* (Journal of International Law and Diplomacy), Vol. LIII, No. 5 (April, 1955) and Vol. LIV, No. 6 (December, 1955); Hiroharu Seki, "1917-nen Harubin Kakumei (The Harbin Revolution of 1917)," *Kokusai-hō Gaikō Zasshi* (Journal of International Law and Diplomacy), Vol. LVII, No. 3 (August, 1958) and Vol. LVII, No. 4 (September, 1958); Masaaki Kōsaka, "Igirisu to Uin Taisei (Britain and the Vienna System)," *Kokusai-hō Gaikō Zasshi* (Journal of International Law and Diplomacy), Vol. LIX, No. 3 (September, 1960); Kinhide Mushakōji, *Gendai Furansu no Seiji-ishiki* (Political Consciousness in Modern France), Tokyo, Kōbundō, 1960.

⁴ Nihon Seiji Gakkai (Japanese Political Association), ed., *Taigai-seisaku no Kettei-katei* (Decision-Making in Foreign Policy), Tokyo, Iwanami-shoten, 1959.

⁵ See Footnote 3, above.

⁶ Yoshikazu Sakamoto, "Kokusai-seiji ni okeru Han-kakumei Shisō (Anti-Revolutionary Thought in International Politics)," *Kokka-gakkai Zasshi* (Journal of the Association of Political and Social Sciences), Vol. LXVIII, Nos. 11-12 (May, 1955), Vol. LXIX, Nos. 3-4 (September, 1955), Vol. LXXII, No. 6 (June, 1958), unfinished; "Uin Taisei no Seishin-

analysis of modern international relations with the frame of reference of mental structure.

Distinct from the 'power politician group', the 'Marxist group', arguing from the premises of their view of the economic, social, and political development of the world based on the Marxist theory of classes, tries to attain an understanding of international political phenomena in the context of historical development and social structure. In their analysis, importance is attached to social classes, which are, along with State and nation, elements or motives in international political phenomena. They also consider it important to interpret these phenomena with the aid of a distinction between social systems: between the capitalist system and the socialist system (or the liberalist system and the communist system). While the 'power politician group' insists on the difference between domestic and international politics and hence on the independence of the study of international politics as a science from that of domestic politics, the Marxist group is characterized by their belief that political phenomena originate from conflicts between social classes and hence by their attempt to relate domestic and international politics in continuity and unity. One of the leading scholars in this group, Maeshiba, states: "Basically, 'the conflict of the two worlds' in domestic politics, or the fundamental conflict among classes, and the consequent 'conflict of world outlooks' give rise to and condition 'the conflict of the two worlds' in international politics. This latter conflict, as it develops, is reflected in the former conflict and conditions its development."¹ Okakura's position may be considered almost identical with Maeshiba's.²

We may now turn to the second group, which adopts the approach from 'international relations'. This group tries to analyze the dynamics of international relations as a whole, including not only political relations but also legal, economic, and social relations among nation-states. As the first of the positive reasons for such a synthetic approach, it may be pointed out that it is difficult to understand the diversified and complicated phenomena of international relations within the existing bounds of the minutely specialized branches of the social sciences. In fact, in order to bring the intricate international relations of today into light, we should not confine ourselves to the existing type of studies in international law and economics, but must be more deeply concerned in the role of expanding international organizations and regional alliances, facts about the rapidly changing politics and economics of the communist and developing countries, and remarkable developments of science and technology. Also, at a time when political co-operation and

kōzō (The Ideological Basis of the Vienna System)," in Kanichi Fukuda, ed., *Seiji-shisō ni okeru Seiō to Nihon* (The West and Japan in Political Thought), Vol. I, Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1961. The latter was briefly summarized in English in *The Japan Annual of Law and Politics, No. 11—Politics and Political Science*, Tokyo, Second Division, Science Council of Japan, 1963, p. 11.

¹ Kakuzō Maeshiba, *Kokusai-seiji-gaku Taikō* (International Politics), p. 31.

² Koshirō Okakura, *Sekai-seiji Ron* (World Politics), p. 82.

economic unification have been making progress in Europe, a comprehensive view which would include plural states of, say, 'Western Europe' in one economic or cultural unit will have something to add to the existing view of the nation-state and the national economy. The approach from 'international relations', which Itagaki and Kawata adopt, originates from the reflection that a many-sided and yet synthetic knowledge is needed to appreciate the complicated events of the contemporary world. In his attempt at criticism, Itagaki writes, "'international relations' is neither 'international politics' nor 'international economics'. These two have the commonly defect in that they both confine their study of the intricate and dynamic phenomena of international relations to a certain aspect of them." He goes on to state, "In order to throw scientific light on the very reality of live international society or international relations as a whole, it is necessary to establish a new discipline of 'international relations' which deals with international relations as a unified politico-economic phenomenon."¹ Itagaki applied this unique method in the study of international relations in his analysis of contemporary relations among the nations of Asia. He had the results of his studies published under the title of *Ajia no Minzoku-shugi to Keizai-hatten* (Nationalism and Economic Development in Asia), 1962.² This work of Itagaki was rated high in the Japanese academic world.

Kawata defined the study of 'international relations' to be "the analysis of facts about international society designed to clarify all factors affecting international relations and to discover rules governing them."³ The method he adopted was typical of a synthetic approach, as is shown by his statement, "International relations should be studied in a comprehensive manner, in the fields of law, politics, economics, geography, and social psychology."⁴ Kawata, too, analyzed the realities of the contemporary world by such an approach, and he recently published his studies in two volumes, *Sekai-keizai Nyūmon* (Introduction to World Economies), 1963 and *Teikoku-shugi to Kenryoku-seiji* (Imperialism and Power Politics), 1963.⁵

Finally, we may turn to the third group which adopts the approach from international political history. This group is characterized by their attempt at attaining an understanding of international political phenomena in the context of historical changes in the structure of international politics as well as in the political, economic, and social foundations of the various states. The approach is, in this connection, different from that of the existing studies

1 Yoichi Itagaki, *Kokusai-kankei-ron no Kihon-mondai* (Basic Problems of International Relations), p. i.

2 Yoichi Itagaki, *Ajia no Minzoku-shugi to Keizai-hatten* (Nationalism and Economic Development in Asia), Tokyo, Tōyō-keizai-shimpō-sha, 1962.

3 Tadashi Kawata, *Kokusai-kankei Gairon* (International Relations), p. 5.

4 *ibid.*, p. 7.

5 Tadashi Kawata, *Sekai-keizai Nyūmon* (Introduction to World Economies), Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1963; *Teikoku-shugi to Kenryoku-seiji* (Imperialism and Power Politics), Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1963.

of diplomatic history which concentrate on tracing the events of international politics fact-by-fact, with emphasis laid on the process of governmental negotiations and intercourse among states. Its position is represented by Oka. In his work, *Kokusai-seiji Shi* (History of International Politics), Oka points out that the traditional history of international politics, in most cases, has been based on the assumption: "the state, or diplomacy, always and *a priori* pursues national interests, and the national interests of states are the basic motivating power of international politics." He brings his criticism forward and says, "The concept of national interests is originally very general and far from clear. It is therefore very unsound to trace the historical process of international politics simply by presupposing the idea that the state or diplomacy pursues national interests." From the position of this criticism, he went on to depict "the basic course of changes in international relations, basing his discussion on historical changes in the structure of international politics."¹

Although they were both scholars of diplomatic history, Kamikawa and Oka have a common feature in that they try to attain a structural view of modern international relations, beyond the bounds of traditional diplomatic history. A similar attempt was made by a historian, Eguchi. Along with two co-authors, Eguchi prepared *Kokusai-kankei no Shiteki Bunseki* (A Historical Analysis of of International Relations) in 1949,² and subsequently published a number of articles, which he put together in two books.³ In these books he pointed out major defects of the traditional methods of study in international politics in the West and wrote, "It strongly tends to relate the mere phenomena of ideological conflicts and relative strength of abstracted forces rather than to throw sufficient light on the rational development of the economies underlying international relations and on the substance of state power as a mediator between the masses of the people and international politics."⁴ While himself approving of the Marxist theory of history, Eguchi introduced a flexible view of historical facts which has enabled him to provide unique interpretations of the problems of modern imperialism and nationalism.

The field of history of international politics has recently produced further developments. These range from Takashi Saitō, "Myunhen-kyōtei Seiritsu no Ichi-kōsatsu (A Study of the Conclusion of the Munich Pact)," 1953⁵ to a more recent work by Makoto Yokoyama, *Kindai Furansu Gaikō-shi Josetsu* (Introduction to the History of Modern French Diplomacy), 1963.⁶ A series of

¹ Yoshitake Oka, *Kokusai-seiji Shi* (History of International Politics), pp. iii-iv.

² Bokurō Eguchi, Kōhachirō Takahashi, and Kentarō Hayashi, *Kokusai-kankei no Shiteki Bunseki* (A Historical Analysis of International Relations), Tokyo, Ochanomizu-shobō, 1949.

³ Bokurō Eguchi, *Teikoku-shugi to Minzoku* (Imperialism and Nationality), Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1954; *Rekishi no Gen-dankai* (Present State of History), Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1958.

⁴ Bokurō Eguchi, *Teikoku-shugi to Minzoku* (Imperialism and Nationality), pp. 241-242.

⁵ Tadashi Saitō, "Myunhen-kyōtei Seiritsu no Ichi-kōsatsu (A Study of the Conclusion of Munich Pact)," *Rekishi-gaku Kenkyū* (Journal of Historical Studies), No. 163 (May, 1953).

⁶ Makoto Yokoyama, *Kindai Furansu Gaikō-shi Josetsu* (Introduction to the History of Modern French Diplomacy), Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1963.

particularly positive studies by young scholars has been produced.¹

As seen in the foregoing, it may be safely said that, on the whole, the study of international relations in Japan following World War II has made spectacular progress. Furthermore, at a time when the significance of international relations to human society has grown overwhelmingly weighty, the importance of the new discipline of 'international relations' or 'international politics' has been receiving wider recognition, and increasing expectations have been set on this newly-developed field by scholars in many other fields of social science. At the same time, this discipline, with not many years behind it, may still be groping for answers to the questions of from what angle it should approach, and by what method it should analyze, the quickly changing, intricate and yet gigantic whole of modern international relations. Thus it will have a thorny way to go. In addition, unlike the advanced countries of the West, Japan, a defeated nation in World War II, is a neighbor, in the West, to the two great powers with a different social system, the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, and in the East, directly across the Pacific, to the leading power of the Free World, the United States of America, and in the southeast, to the extensive area of Asian countries which won political independence after the war and are still experiencing many economic and social difficulties. In the light of this particular position in which Japan finds herself amidst the international relations of today, it will be imperative for the study of international relations in this country to incorporate many unique viewpoints. These viewpoints, in the nature of the case, will be different from those adopted in the studies of international relations in Europe and America, and also in the Soviet Union and China. The study of international relations in Japan, which has come of age only recently, has therefore a number of problems to solve, and yet we may well expect that it will produce achievements by solving them as it proceeds.

¹ On this point, see Bokurō Eguchi, "Kokusai-kankei-shi (History of International Relations)," in *Kokusai Rekishi-gaku Kaigi, Nihon Kokunai Inkai (Japan Committee, International Congress of History, ed., Nihon ni okeru Rekishi-gaku no Hattatsu to Genjō (The Development and Present State of Historical Studies in Japan), Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press, 1959; Tokushirō Ōhata, "Nihon ni okeru Gaikō-shi Kenkyū no Gen-dōkō (Recent Developments in Studies of Diplomatic History in Japan)," cited in Footnote 1, p. 190*