



THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS STUDIES IN JAPAN

Suyunova Barno

PhD, Senior Lecturer University of journalism and mass
Communications of Uzbekistan

barno.suyunova.95@mail.ru

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20956760>

Annotation: In this article was studied the reasons why the Asian approach to the theory of international relations is more visible have been studied by political scientists. This work was analyzed by using methods that are systematical, historical, content-analysis and objectivity. In result, it was obtained that Japan had its own approaches to international relations and Japanese scientists created their own theoretical constructions on the basis of concepts brought from abroad. At the initial stage of studying international relations in Japan, it is possible to highlight the importance of social and cultural aspects of international relations, the multi-layered nature of the world order and its role.

Keywords: staatslehre, Marxism, historicism, positivism, idealists, Kelsenists, cosmopolitans, supporters of Great Asia

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada xalqaro munosabatlar nazariyasiga osiyocha yondashuv ko'proq namoyon bo'lishining sabablari siyosatshunoslar tomonidan o'rganilgan. Ushbu ish tizimli, tarixiy, kontent-analiz va obyektivlik usullaridan foydalangan holda tahlil qilindi. Natijada Yaponiyaning xalqaro munosabatlarga o'ziga xos yondashuvlari borligi va yapon olimlari xorijdan keltirilgan tushunchalar asosida o'zlarining nazariyalarini yaratganligi ma'lum bo'ldi. Yaponiyada xalqaro munosabatlarni o'rganishning dastlabki bosqichida xalqaro munosabatlarning ijtimoiy va madaniy jihatlarining ahamiyatini, dunyo tartibining ko'p qatlamliligini va uning rolini ajratib ko'rsatish mumkin.

Kalit so'zlar: statslehre, marksizm, istorizm, pozitivizm, idealistlar, kelsenchilar, kosmopolitlar, Buyuk Osiyo tarafdorlari

Аннотация: В данной статье исследованы причины, по которым азиатский подход к теории международных отношений более нагляден, исследованы политологами. Эта работа была проанализирована с использованием таких методов, как систематический, исторический, контент-анализ и объективизм. В результате было получено, что у Японии были свои подходы к международным отношениям и японские ученые создавали свои теоретические построения на основе привезенных из-за рубежа концепций. На начальном этапе изучения международных отношений в Японии можно выделить важность социокультурных аспектов международных отношений, многослойность мироустройства и его роль.

Ключевые слова: staatslehre, марксизм, историзм, позитивизм, идеалисты, кельсенисты, космополиты, сторонники Великой Азии

Introduction

In recent years, it has become a trend to describe international relations theories from the views of Asian scholars. The reasons why the Asian approach to the theory of international relations is more visible have been deeply analyzed by political scientists. The possibility of

emergence and development of new theories are explained by Japanese and other foreign scientists. In Asia Japan had its own approaches to international relations on the basis of concepts brought from West.

Methodology

The methodological basis is the principles of historicism and objectivity, as well as a systematic approach, which consists in the study of theories, opinions and facts not in isolation from each other, but in aggregate and logical relationship. One of the essential components of the theoretical basis of the study were the works of Japanese and foreign researchers devoted to the theory of international relations.

Results and discussion

Political scientist M. Lebedeva explains the possibility of emergence and development of new theories in the context of the evolutionary development of the existing political organization without connecting the emergence and development of alternative theories with the current crisis of the world political organization built on the basis of the Western model. First of all, he cites the rapid economic development of Asia, especially its eastern part, as the reason for the increasing appeal to non-Western theories.

Secondly, it is evident that along with economic development, this region has begun to develop in the field of science, especially social sciences. Such as, Chinese and Indian universities are making great progress in the field of international relations.

Thirdly, the crisis of the western model of world political organization encourages us to look for solutions in other civilization structures [1, c. 251].

Such views are reflected in the appearance of many publications on this issue. In particular, in 2010, a collective monograph was published under the editorship of A. Acharya and B. Buzan, studying the characteristics of approaches to international relations in the East. In Russian academic circles, the issues related to non-Western theories of international relations are covered in the works of T. Alekseyeva, P. Sigankov. Japanese approaches to the theory of international relations are analyzed in the works of S. Chugrov, who notes that the main aspiration in the Japanese academic tradition is to harmonize political realism and relations, giving preference to soft power.

Even at the beginning of the 21st century, Japan was one of the few countries in Asia that did not have a political science department. Although theoretical approaches to international relations in Japan were formed mainly on the basis of Western philosophy, political science and law schools, national characteristics are noticeable in them. In general, specific concepts have appeared in Japan under the influence of Western thinking and on the basis of national traditions. Japanese approaches to international relations developed simultaneously with a conceptual revision of the surrounding world and Japan's place in it, as well as national relations.

A distinctive feature of the Japanese approach to international relations is that it emphasizes economic and cultural aspects and promotes concepts that ensure Japan's global leadership as a non-military state. This aspect reflects the specific characteristics of the Japanese mentality and the specific characteristics of the Japanese political culture.

The theoretical issues of international relations are considered in the works of many Japanese scholars of the modern and pre-war period. Professor T. Inoguchi, a political scientist who classified Japan's international theories, wrote a number of works on this topic.



The post-war evolution of Japan's approach to international relations is deeply analyzed in the works of K. Yamamoto. As can be seen from the works of these authors, Japanese approaches to the theory of international relations in Japan were formed under the influence of Western political thought: Europe before the Second World War, and the USA after 1945.

One of the Japanese scientists, K. Shimizu, singles out the cultural component in Japanese theoretical approaches to international relations.

The origin of the science of international relations in Japan dates back to the end of the 19th century. The Meiji Restoration gave a strong impetus to intellectual research, familiarization with the works of European scientists and the desire to create a powerful state no less than the European powers aroused interest in social sciences from the West. In Japan, the science of international relations was formed as a symbiosis of various disciplines, such as diplomatic history, international law, international economics, regional studies, and political theories.

T. Inoguchi defines four main directions developed within the science of international relations: staatslehre, Marxism, historicism and positivism. By Staatslehre, Inoguchi means learning how to run a state from a centralized perspective. His influence can be seen in the first political science textbook in Japan prepared by Kiheiji Onozuka at Tokyo Imperial University. By historicity, the scientist explains the methodology by which everything should be studied on the basis of historically verifiable documents and materials. The most studied book in this direction is Tokutomi Soho's work on world history. In the direction of Marxism, a political doctrine is understood that looks at and examines the dialectics of forces and relations that produce events and their political manifestations. One of the most famous works in this tradition is Toyama Shigeki's work on the Meiji Restoration. Positivism refers to the ideological principle that everything should be empirically verified and tested [2, p. 61].

Staatslehre is the study of government affairs. It appeared under the influence of the spread of German science in Japan, because Germany was in many ways a model for creating a sovereign state on the Western model. His traditions greatly influenced the study of military affairs and colonialism. State teaching is characterized by an emphasis on descriptive methods, as well as reliance on documentary sources. Scientists in the field of political theory and international law played an important role in the development of science. The topics of international relations were first discussed in Japan in the pages of the almanac "Journal of International Law and Diplomacy". Marxism, as described by T. Inoguchi, is an intellectual direction that studies phenomena from the perspective of the dialectic of productive forces and production relations and their manifestation in politics. Marxism became widespread after the First World War, especially in the context of the study of socio-economic problems during the emergence of the labor movement [2, p. 53].

When the term shakai kagaku (social science) was first used in Japan in the 1920s, it often referred to Marxism and made social science almost synonymous with Marxism. Marxist influence became more widespread after 1945, and until the 1960s the social sciences—economics, political science, and sociology—were often led by Marxists or Marxist-leaning scholars. International relations were no exception. In the Marxist framework, theories such as the "irreversible second image" and "hegemonic instability" of international relations were put forward. Given the strong state tradition and almost continuous one-party rule since the mid-1950s, it was considered natural or desirable for academics and journalists to form a kind of

counter-force critical of government behavior. Some have transformed themselves into postmodernists, radical feminists, and noncommunist radicals in the post-Cold War and post-9/11 era. Nevertheless, Japanese academics could be said to be de facto de-Marxized by the 1970s.

The third tradition, historiography has been very strong, and as a result, the bulk of academic research in international relations has become more like historical studies and therefore has come to be considered a branch of the humanities rather than the social sciences. Unlike the *Staatslehre*, historians pay little attention to the relevance of politics [2, p. 51].

In the years after the war, the main attention of scientists was focused on the study of the reasons that led Japan to war. This led to the fact that history remained one of the main directions even after the war. In December 1956, the Japan Association for International Relations was founded, mainly engaged in the study of historical issues, which contributed to the gradual disclosure of war documents [3, p. 263].

Positivism is based on the principle that everything should be tested empirically, and it is mainly associated with American political science. At the same time, according to Japanese professor T. Inoguchi, it would be wrong to say that the emergence of positivism in Japan is only the result of the influence of the United States, because works written in the spirit of positivism in Japan itself at the end of the 19th century appeared. An example of this is the book "Appeal to Knowledge" by the Japanese scientist F. Yukichi.

All directions listed by T. Inoguchi developed in parallel, there were no serious disagreements between them, but at the same time they did not strive for convergence and integration. T. Sakai, Professor of the University of Tokyo was engaged in the study of international relations and colonial policy within the framework of pre-war international relations research in Japan, and according to his observations, scholars observed trends based on two ideologies in Japan at the beginning of the 20th century. One of them is the ideology of internationalism, which emphasizes that Japan's attitude to international relations is close to the international system based on the Western understanding of the world as a society of equal members. The second is the ideology of imperialism, according to which Japan, as the leader of Asia, should lead the region towards civilization. As the Japanese scientist Shimizu pointed out, the reconciliation of these two ideologies – internationalism and imperialism – could only be helped by colonial policy based on respect for socio-cultural and historical diversity [4, p. 73].

Another type of research on Japan's theoretical approaches to international relations was proposed by Ritsumeikan University Associate Professor J. Ikeda. According to his views on the concept of "international society", J. Ikeda distinguishes four groups of international scientists: idealists, Kelsenists, cosmopolitans and supporters of Greater Asia.

Tokyo Imperial Institute Professor M. Royama's view of international society was presented through the image of "international politics" in his work "Seijigaku no Ninmu to Taishou" ("The Purpose and Theme of Politics"). If the term "international policy" refers to the political activities aimed at achieving the common goals of the states, then the concept of "foreign policy" is the policy carried out by the state in order to ensure its interests. Royama's view of international politics is rationalist in a sense, rejecting both realist and cosmopolitan thinking. Royama described the International Society as a single "Zentai Shakai" consisting of two types of "Bubun Shakai (Separate Society)": "Kiso Shakai (Primary Society)" and "Hasei Shakai (Derivative Society)". States belong to "Kiso Shakai" and non-state actors to "Hasei

Shakai" [6, p. 12]. Thus, during the reign of the state-based Staatslehre, this scholar recognized the role of non-state actors in international relations.

Kelsenists who study international relations came from the environment of international law, and they built their views on international society through the prism of legal terminology. A. Osawa, Professor of Kyushu Imperial University represented international society as a legal order. Emphasizing that the international order is higher than the national order, he estimated the existence of an international legal constitution that substantiates the legitimacy of this international order. Another Japanese scientist, K. Yokota, denied the idea of state sovereignty and spoke about "world sovereignty" as a single world society. He was one of the staunch supporters of the UN idea and considered the UN Charter to be an international constitution. The most obvious difference from the idealist point of view is that the Kelsenians tried to define international society only in terms of legal language. They used the term "order" instead of the concepts of the League of Nations, ethics and "society", and they tried to construct theories of international society as theories of international order. This tendency was also explored by the Great Asians, but the Kelsenians developed the idea of order more systematically. For the Kelsenians, the problem of order was not limited to the international order, but to the entire legal system. Although the second is theoretical, the first is more practical. In other words, the problem of international society was a good example of applying Kelsen's theory of law.

The third group of scientists – cosmopolitans appeared in the period between the two world wars and expressed their views about the world. Political scientist Kamikawa singles out human society as the subject of international politics. According to him, international politics consists of "Kokusai Kyoudou Kanri" - international relations. For Kamikawa, the scope of international politics as an international society was insufficient; rather, what he thought was a kind of human society, and this was based on his argument about World Unity. For him, world unity had four rules.

First, it was an idea that recognized the "moral ties" between all ethnic groups and states.

Second, he respected Kant's moral philosophy and treated other actors as ends rather than means to further their selfish interests.

Thirdly, he considered the interest of one state to be the interest of the international community.

Finally, he even saw individual morality evolving into world morality or "humanity".

In fact, he used the term "cosmopolitanism". It can be seen that his approach was strongly influenced by Kant.

Tanaka, another cosmopolitical scientist, justified the existence of world society. His argument about the world community is significant in two ways.

First, he emphasized that the world community can be created as a kind of human community. It was based on the German scholar Tyonnie's idea of Gemeinschaft, and Tanaka cited the state as a typical example. He said that as the number of associations (such as churches, unions, companies, etc.) increases, and more associations operate beyond national borders, they create a certain "atmosphere", which in turn is a wider society than states. He argues that "the creation of more international associations can contribute to human solidarity and community." As a professor of economic law, the expansion of the economy was key to world society.

The second is that their understanding of international society already implied a broader sense of society than "international".

Kamikawa used the terms "society" and "human society" interchangeably, while Tanaka used the terms "international society" and "world society" almost equally [6, p. 14-16].

Kelsenists study international relations in the environment of international lawyers, and they built their views on international society through the prism of legal terminology. Professor A. Osawa represented international society as a legal order. Emphasizing that the international order is higher than the national order, he estimated the existence of an international legal constitution that substantiates the legitimacy of this international order. Another Japanese scientist, K. Yokota, denied the idea of state sovereignty and spoke about "world sovereignty" as a single world society. He was one of the staunch supporters of the UN idea and considered the UN Charter to be an international constitution. The most obvious difference from the idealist point of view is that the Kelsenians tried to define international society only in terms of legal language. They used the term "order" instead of the concepts of the League of Nations, ethics and "society", and they tried to construct theories of international society as theories of international order. This tendency was also explored by the Great Asians, but the Kelsenians developed the idea of order more systematically. For the Kelsenians, the problem of order was not limited to the international order, but to the entire legal system. Although the second is theoretical, the first is more practical. In other words, the problem of international society was a good example of applying Kelsen's theory of law.

Proponents of Greater Asia connected their theoretical constructions with the policy of creating a cooperative prosperity sphere of Greater Asia. Professor K. Yasui examined the international society from the point of view of the legal order, but he did not talk about the universal order, but about the specific order in Europe and Asia. K. Yasui considered that it is possible to talk about the existence of Greater Asian international law, which is a legal system that regulates relations both inside and outside the field. Speaking about the international order, S. Tabata denied its single essence and presented it as a pluralistic structure [6, p. 14-16]. First of all, the joining of the Eastern countries to the international order did not mean the universalization of this order and its extension to non-Western countries. Secondly, he spoke about the emergence of regional blocs. Later, he abandoned a pluralistic approach to the world order in favor of a solidarity-based approach that focused more on human rights.

Conclusion

Thus, even before getting acquainted with American political science, Japan had its own approaches to international relations. Often, their appearance was stimulated by studying the works of European, first of all, German or English authors, but Japanese scientists created their own theoretical constructions on the basis of concepts brought from abroad.

First of all, most of these studies focused on the perception of Japan's identity, its position between the West and the East, and its regional role. At the initial stage of studying international relations in Japan, it is possible to highlight the importance of social and cultural aspects of international relations, the multi-layered nature of the world order and its role.

Secondly, Japan's theoretical approaches to international relations are diverse, including political science, diplomatic history, cultural studies, and political economy. They are based on different methodological traditions that coexist and do not strive for mutual integration, but at the same time are rarely in conflict.



In short, Japan's foreign policy thought developed under the influence of Western theories, but was not completely influenced by them, on the contrary, it was able to revise them and create its own directions based on them. Japan's approaches to international relations developed simultaneously with a conceptual revision of the world around and Japan's place in it, as well as national identity.

References:

- 1.Л Лебедева Марина Михайловна (2017). Незападные теории международных отношений: миф или реальность? //Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Международные отношения, 17 (2), 246-256.
- 2.Inoguchi T. Why are there no non-Western theories of international relations? The case of Japan //Non-western international relations theory. – Routledge, 2009. – С. 61-78.
- 3.Yamamoto K. International Relations studies and theories in Japan: a trajectory shaped by war, pacifism, and globalization //International Relations of the Asia-Pacific. – 2011. – Т. 11. – №. 2. – С. 259-278.
- 4.Shimizu K. Is there a Japanese IR //Seeking an Academic Bridge through Japanese History of International Relations. Research Series. – 2008. – Т. 5. – 90 p.
- 5.Добринская О.А. Теоретические подходы к международным отношениям в Японии //Японские исследования. – 2021. – №. 2. – С. 92-109.
- 6.Ikeda J. Japanese vision of international society: a historical exploration //Is there a Japanese IR. – 2008. – С. 5-28.