

Political Science in Three Democracies, Disaffected (Japan), Third-Wave (Korea) and Fledgling (China) *

Takashi Inoguchi (Professor, University of Tokyo)

Prepared for presentation at the RC33 Panel Session of World Congress of the International Political Science Association, Durban, South Africa, June 28-July 4, 2003

1. Is Political Science an American Social Science?

It is Stanley Hoffmann (197X) who once rhetorically asked a question, Is International Relations an American Social Science? Yes, it has been at least for the last half a century--is a standard answer to the question. The same question must be asked of political science. Has political science been dominated by Americans? Yes, it has been for the last half a century--is a standard answer to the question. In terms of amount and variety--and some say in terms of quality as well, it is undeniable that American political science has led political science in the rest of the world. Just as Midland, Texas has brought up George W. Bush and Tommy Franks and thus shaped United States war policy in Iraq, Ann Arbor, Michigan has exemplified and thus arguably shaped quintessentially American political science. It is the trinity of robust academic professionalism, solid positivism and heavy methodological armory has been a trademark of American political science (Gunnell, forthcoming; Easton et al, 1995, Oren, 2003).

In political science journals in other countries, one can easily discern the creeping influence of American paradigms and authors just by looking at the uniformly comprehensive and catholic citation practice and the plain and clear style of presentation. However, one can discern a robust non-American citation practice in many other countries. What is called the three stage citation style in one's academic career still robustly exists in most countries (Inoguchi, 1985). In the early stage, you normally aspire to become a great academic and express it in the form of citing great scholars somewhat shamelessly frequently. In the middle stage when one perceives she or he has established her/his foothold among great scholars at least with her or his areas of expertise, she or he starts unabashedly her or his own works. In the twilight stage, everything looks so self-evident that she or he stops citing others' as well as her or his own works. In other words, the cycle of others-citation, self-citation, and no citation in this order seems to be a universal truth governing every academic's citation practice. A casual glance at my own writings for the last three decades after my Ph.D. enables me to say that I have been unintentionally and thus dangerously following the three stage cycle, now seemingly heading toward the third stage (<http://www.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~inoguchi>). But Americans are different.

Americans are an exception. They have overcome this life-cyclical pattern, says Peter Katzenstein (199X). Indeed, the multiple anonymous reviewing system plus the use of the social science citation index linked to higher salaries, positions and prestige in one way or another seems to discipline many American political scientists sufficiently to surpass the seductive three-stage citation cycle of many academics of the world.

The purpose of this paper is to describe how political science has been developing in East Asia, Japan, Korea and China, for the last quarter of the last century, to show that their development has been proceeding in ways that are definitely associated with American political science often with some lags but that their development has been inexorably grounded on the nature and dynamics of their society and politics, especially the nature and dynamics of their democracies, a disaffected democracy in Japan, a third-wave democracy in Korea and a fledgling democracy in China and therefore that the dominance of American political science is not a key feature of these three political sciences. Before going into the three political sciences, I will first compare the three democracies that characterize the three regimes in East Asia (Inoguchi, 2002). Then I will describe each of the three political sciences one by one, focusing on the kinds of subjects popular during the last quarter of the last century, in relation to the nature and dynamics of each regime. Lastly, conclusion will be drawn, pointing to the further need to closely examine the rise and fall of topics in relation to the regime self-transformation.

2. Disaffected Democracy, Third-Wave Democracy and Fledgling Democracy

A disaffected democracy (Pharr/Putnam, 1999) is a democracy which is long since its birth, which has become mature and established, but in which distrust and indifference in politics have become a key feature. Robert Putnam (1997) has famously published *Bowling Alone*, in which the associational propinquity of Americans has been lost long before and instead of enjoying bowling together with friends and with the family, bowling alone has become a normal phenomenon and in which vibrant democratic spirit has been reduced. Most visibly, popular trust in political institutions has been at its nadir with political parties accommodating members and supporters without much partisan passion and interest (Dalton/Wattenberg, 2001; 2003; Wattenberg, 2002). A disaffected democracy is also called an established or mature democracy in which critical citizens (Norris, 1997, 2002, Norris/Inglehart, 2003) plays a key role of voicing dissent and demanding correction of wrongs. Whether a democracy had better be called a disaffected democracy or a critical democracy depends on one key feature of a democracy. It hinges on whether citizens demonstrate their robust commitment with democratic

norms and values. Citizens' distrust in politicians and political institutions may not automatically constitute a strong evidence of its being a disaffected democracy. Rather, as long as the basic core commitment with democratic norms and values is robust, it is positive, so argues Pippa Norris. Is Japan a disaffected democracy? Yes, it is. Two evidences. Confidence in political parties, the parliament, civil service, political leaders and the elected government are uniformly low (Pharr, 2000, Inoguchi, 2003). Furthermore, electorates overwhelmingly prefer democracy to authoritarianism, thus robust commitment with democratic norms, values and institutions (Inoguchi, 2002).

Distinguished from a disaffected or established democracy is a third-wave democracy (Huntington, 1993; Rose/Shin, 1995). Third-wave democracy is so called because it was born in the third wave of democratization in the twentieth century (first after World War I, second after World War II and third in the last quarter of the last century). Its key features are its focus on the procedural definition of democracy, on the electoral aspects of democracy, on the manipulative nature of democratic regime, and on the fragile nature of democratic commitment. Democracy is normally defined in terms of substance, not just in terms of procedure. Hence government by people, of people, and for people. But here its definition focuses on how leaders are selected in terms of free and fair election among a number of political parties, often under the monitoring of the United Nations. East Timor is a good example. Also salient are the manipulative aspects of regime designing and construction such as those found in southern Europe, East/Central Europe, Latin America and East and Southeast Asia (Huntington, 1993; Sartori, 199X). And no less important key feature is its fragility and volatility. Some regimes manifest more of these than others. In Korea, for instance, citizens' commitment with democratic norms and values is manifestly lower than established democracies, for instance, in Japan (Shin, 2001, cf. Inoguchi, 2002).

Is Korea a third-wave democracy? Democratization took place in Korea, with the military dictatorship following the tide of democratization already underway in Southern Europe, Latin America, and East and Southeast Asia. Korean democracy has been exhibiting its volatility of public opinion, as exemplified by the dramatic anti-Americanism during the December 2002 Presidential election (Kim, 2003). Furthermore, a fairly sizable number of electorates prefer authoritarianism to democracy (Shin 2001).

A fledgling democracy is in other words a semi-democracy or a democracy in the making. Although the basic nature of the regime is doubtlessly authoritarian, one can find some features that might as well transform themselves into a democratic

form. They include the increasingly inclusionary nature of nomenkratura, village level democratic elections, and the increasingly attention to transparency and accountability. In China, for instance, Jiang Zemin's "three represents" doctrine wanted to enhance the members of the communist party by allowing those who are capitalist and those advanced in science and technology as well as those committed to the communist party. Increasingly practiced village elections allow multiple candidates directly chosen by popular votes although most candidates are from the communist party. Hu Jintao, the new President, proclaims the "three wei"s, meaning power used for people, sentiments shared with people, and interests promoted for people. It is not quite government by, but somewhat of, and increasingly for, people.

The inept and non-transparent handling of SARS infection in the spring of 2003 has reinforced the low level of transparency of the political system. Although President Hu Jintao and Prime Minister Wen Jiabao replaced the health minister of the Central Government, they were not able to do anything either about the Guangdong Provincial Government or the People's Liberation Army, both of which were sometimes suspected for being responsible.

Given the above admittedly cursory review of a disaffected democracy, a third-wave democracy and a fledgling democracy, I shall describe the development of political science in Japan, Korea and China in this order with the different democratic characteristics kept in mind.

3. The Development of Political Science in Japan 1975-2000

Japan's unconditional surrender to the Allied Powers led by the United States set the stage for political science, so argued Masao Maruyama (1946), a political scientist who came to dominate the third quarter of the last century in the discipline. He asked the twin questions and shaped Japan's fledgling political science (Inoguchi, 1995; 2002). They were: (1) What went wrong to Japan in the 1930s and 1940s, which had been seemingly making progress in the scheme of "enlightenment and entrepreneurship" and "a rich country and a strong army"? (2) What is the secret of Western democracy in excelling itself in terms of keeping freedom and accumulating wealth? These questions led Japanese political science to produce historians of modern Japan and philosophers of Western countries.

For the last quarter of the last century, Japanese political science started to ask a different set of questions. Having built its confidence in its democracy and wealth accumulation in addition to the pacifist credentials of having waged no wars and no soldiers killed in combat, Japanese political scientists started to take a close look at

its own political system. Why is Japanese politics shaped so heavily by bureaucracy? Why has Japan kept a one party dominant system? Why are its citizens so weakly partisan in their voting choice? How are politics and economics intertwined in policy making and electoral behavior? Initially Japanese political scientists tended to look down upon Japan, as they tended to think that Japan was an outlier among Western democracies. Toward the end of the century and toward the end of the Cold War, Japanese political scientists began to take a look at Japan from a comparative perspective. Comparative politics was established for the first time in history in the sense that Japan is compared on an equal footing of a sort (JPSA, 200X). Then third wave democratization made steady progress during the last quarter of the last century. Japanese political scientists started to take a closer look at increasingly democratic East and Southeast Asian countries, examining commonalities and differences again on an equal footing of another sort, taking historical and cultural backgrounds into full consideration (Inoguchi, 1993-1994; Inoguchi/Ahn, forthcoming).

This trend is clear if one looks at journals and encyclopedia edited during the last half a century. *Nenpo Seijigaku* (The Annals of Political Science), the key journal of the Japanese Political Science Association since 1955 has published articles most heavily on Western philosophies and Japanese politics, historical and contemporary. But *Leviathan*, which started since 1987 by a gang of four including the author of this paper, focused mostly on Japanese politics and increasingly comparative politics and policy with some of those concepts and methods guided by American political science. The *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, which started in 1999 in English from Cambridge University Press by an editorial board based on the first generation *Leviathan*, is refreshingly ambitious (<http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk>). It has adopted a strong positivist orientation with comparative perspective albeit with an East Asian slant. Escaping from falling into the "Asia ghetto" while elucidating some striking features of Japanese and East Asian politics in comparative perspective is a key editorial principle. *Senkyo Kenkyuu* (Electoral Studies) is one of the key journals of the Japanese Electoral Studies Association, carrying most energetically strong empiricist analyses of Japanese elections and voting. *Kokusai Seiji* (International Relations), one of the key journals of the Japan Association of International Relations, has been publishing articles most heavily on three areas, Japanese diplomacy and international relations, area and international studies of the rest of the world and international relations theories. In the last of which Japanese political scientists have been assiduous in selectively absorbing American international relations for the last half a century. In another key journal of the Japan Association of International Relations is *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, which started in 2000 from Oxford University Press. This journal aims at a first rate

international relations journal, with natural focus on Asia-Pacific (<http://www.oup.co.uk/irasia>). It has recently received a very favorable review at the *Times Higher Educational Supplement* (Deans, 2003). Turning to encyclopedia, the 500 page long political science encyclopedia published in 1999 under the principal editorship of the present author of this article summarizes the achievement of Japanese political science in 1975-2000(Inoguchi, 1999). A similarly edited encyclopedia of international relations is well underway toward publication.

Japanese political science has been most *bumi putra* among the three for two major reasons. First, it has a long history of exposing to and selectively absorbing Western social sciences and thus endogenized much of it already (Inoguchi, 2001). Second, privileged elites normally do not send their children to universities abroad unless for special purposes. Thus compared to Koreans and Chinese, who are educated, teach and publish their works abroad, Japanese political scientists rarely teach and publish their works abroad because those who do graduate study there most often do not stay until a Ph.D. and return to start teaching at home. Like most returned Korean political scientists, they do not publish much in English once they get back. Do in Rome as Romans do. Nevertheless, Junko Kato (1993, 2003), Takako Kishima (1994), and Masaru Kohno (1997) published works on Japanese politics. Takashi Shiraishi (1987) and Rie Karatani(2002) published books on Indonesian and British politics respectively. Arihiro Fukuda (199X) did on political philosophy. Sueo Sudo (2002) and Hideaki Shinoda (2002) did on Japan's international relations with Southeast Asia and on state sovereignty. But it remains *Leviathan's* gang of four, Michio Muramatsu, Hideo Ohtake, Ikuo Kabashima and the author of this paper, who collectively and individually energized Japanese political science in 1975-2000.

4. The Development of Political Science in Korea, 1975-2000

South Korea has been making dramatic regime changes a number of times. In 1961 Park Chunghee's coup d'etat took place and military dictatorship continued. In 1983 the Chung Doowhan's suppression of the Kwaju rebellion took place. In 1986 the Marcos dictatorship fell by the combination of people power and the help extended to people power by the United States government. Perhaps sensing the tide of the democratizing world, in 1989 Taiwan's Jiang Jinguo announced the relaxation of the ruling Kuomintang's dictatorship by allowing other political parties to enter into politics. Similarly in 1989 Roh Taewoo, military dictator, announced that a transition will be made to democracy. Since 1989 Korea has been democratic till today.

Roh Taewoo's, Kim Young Sam's, Kim Dae Jung's and Roh Moo Hyon's democratic presidencies spanning the period between 1989 and 2003 are in good contrast to the previous military dictatorial presidencies in that academics write much more freely about governments. Prior to that academics tended to focus on political philosophy and security affairs. Why? Because political philosophy is an area in which academics can freely write their beliefs and dreams without being implicated as being anti-government. Because security affairs was mostly about foreign countries, academics can fairly freely write about them without arousing domestic political actors as long as the line pursued by academics were the correct one, so judged by the government. The internal security act which was legislated shortly after 1961 has been in force in 2003 as well without being revised in any fundamental sense. For this reason, for instance, Korea's freedom is rated one notch lower than similar democracies like the Philippines and Thailand in Freedom House's annual report. Nevertheless, the development of political science was remarkable in pre-1989 period as well. Two major factors must be mentioned. First, the tradition of civilian primacy in the Confucian tradition under military dictatorship was important in giving high prestige to academics (Palais, 1975). Second, a large number of Korean-born academics teaching and publishing in the United States influenced Korean academics at home as well. Some of them came back to Korea. Given the basically insecure country, privileged elites have tended to send and educate their children overwhelmingly in the United States. For instance, Foreign Minister Yoon Young Kwan is a SAIS Ph.D. in political science and Ambassador to the United States Han Sun Joo is a Berkeley Ph.D. in political science. Furthermore, Korean political scientists (some a couple of thousands) register 600 American Ph.D.s whereas Japanese political scientists (some a few thousands) register 60 American Ph.D.s.

Since 1989 the development of political science in Korea has been impressive. The range of subjects dealt with in their works has broadened. Nothing is an inviolable sanctuary now. At the same time, the subjects that deal with and depict third-wave democracy's malaise have naturally become most popular ones. In English language publications, one can easily cite Chung-In Moon (1999) on political economy, Sunhyuk Kim (2000) and John Kie-Chiang Oh (1999) on democratization, Doh Chull Shin (2001) on third wave democratization, Meredith Woo-Cumings (1997) on the developmental state, David Kang (200X) on corruption, Samuel Kim (2001) on globalization under this rubric. Many of them have been deeply influenced by American paradigms such as the developmental state and democratic transition and consolidation. Outside this rubric, Katherine Moon (1997) combines gender, identity, security and democracy, Jae-ho Chung (2000) on Chinese local-central government dynamics, Victor Cha (2000) focuses on security, and Jonryn Mo (1999) brings in rational choice and institutionalism into his work on Korean democracy.

Needless to say, there are a vast number of political scientists who keep writing mostly in Korean. Though there are some 600 American Ph.D.s in Korea, most of them start to write mostly in Korean only, once they get their job at home. In tandem with the departure from English publications, the style and flavor as well as content of American political science seems to be reduced considerably. In other words, most of them are endogenized fast. In other words, despite of the appearance of being most heavily Americanized of the three, Korea, China and Japan, Americanization may not be so deep. In 2002 the rule was promulgated by the Ministry of Education to the effect that the frequency of the Social Science Citation Index is one of the important evidence on which the evaluation of academic performance be made. That would further enhance the penetration of American political science. In part responding to the newly introduced rule, journals have been springing up: *Journal of East Asian Studies* with Byung Kook Kim as editor from Lynne Rienner and *Journal of Comparative Governance* with Chung-In Moon as editor. Among those who mostly write in Korean are those who write most powerfully and sharply: Choi Jangjip (198X) on the state and social movements, Park Myunglin (1996) on the Korean War and Ha Young-sun (2000) on globalization.

5. The Development of Political Science in China, 1975-2000

China has been ruled by the Communist Party since 1949. It has gone through three phases; (1) revolutionary class politics by Mao Zedong, (2) reformist politics initiated by Deng Xiaoping, and (3) all-people-state politics by Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao. It is after Deng Xiaoping's reformist politics that Chinese political science has become very interesting. During the 1980s when Secretary Generals Hu Yaopang and Zhao Ziyang executed reformist politics, the development of political science flourished. The so-called Beijing Spring came. During the period the relaxation of human rights restriction was noted (Kent, 199X). The vigorous reformist politics was waged by academics like Yan Jiaqi and Li Shenzi. They were a protégé of Zhao Ziyang who was demoted from his position after the Tiananmen massacre took place. Yan Jiaqi was forced to live abroad while Li kept intermittently protesting the Party's harsh and unjust treatment of the reformist members at the June 4 event until his untimely death in 2003. Yan Jiaqi published *Political Leaders* (1986) and *Power and Truth* (1987). There were also those who started publishing their important reformist politics in the 1980s and survived into the 1990s and beyond. One of them is Wang Hening who published *Comparative Political Analysis* (1987) and *Chinese Political Culture in Villages and at Family* in 1991.

But more vigorous development came in the 1990s and beyond. The Tiananmen massacre of 1989 might have been part of the global tide of third-wave

democratization. It failed in China. But important and interesting is that since around 1992 the economic boom generated by the reformist policy of opening to the world, foreign capital and technology --and ideas and institutions-- have kept pouring into China. As if China has been heading toward third-wave democratization, the topics covered by Chinese political scientists have something to do with democratic politics. Li Jipeng (2000) deals with *Theoretical Study of Chinese Political Development*, Yu Keping deals with *New Methodologies in Western Political Science* (1989), *Public Benefit Politics versus Rights Politics* (2000), Chu Kuangshi deals with *Contemporary Chinese Political Process* (2002). Lin Shangli (2000) deals with *Contemporary Chinese Political Modalities*, (2000), Hu Wei deals with the Governmental Process, (1998) Liu Junning deals with *Republicanism, Democracy and Dictatorship* (1998), Xu Yung *Chinese Villiage Autonomy* (1997) and Guo Dingping deals with *Pluralist Politics* (1994) and *Parties and Government* (1998). Yang Haijiao (2000) gives a very detailed and most useful survey of Chinese political science.

At a glance the penetration of American political science in China has been pervasive. Its vocabulary has been popularized through their academic writings. Its cultural thirst for democratic vocabulary has been very strong. Their thirst for communist vocabulary was very strong in the 1910s through 1930s when the Japanese translation of Western including communist philosophy and social sciences was imported by Chinese young students in Japan and transmitted into Chinese vocabulary. Communism and the communist party, for instance, were first created by Japanese as the *kanji* (Chinese-idiograph)-based Japanese words. Reinforcing this trend of Americanization are two: education and institutions. Like in Korea, privileged elites keep sending and educating their children in the United States. University institutions have been undergoing through tremendous reforms modeling after famous American institutions. Gigantic institutions modeled after the Kennedy School of Government and Woodrow Wilson Center for Public and International Affairs have been set up at a number of places like Peking and Fudan.

Nevertheless, reading through some of these books does not tell you that China should abandon the Communist Party and communist rule. Instead, either recanting philosophical criticisms of Western style democracy or advising careful and cautious thinking about Western democracy on the basis of empirical conditions China has been placed for long seems to be the way in which American political science vocabulary has been imported en masse. It is not quite "Teacher by Negative Example". It is more like "let us prepare for things that might come to us as well," whether it is solid democracy or fully fledged capitalism. Although guided heavily by American concepts, empirical analysis components tend to be weaker. Introducing

Concepts and Methods of American political science may be sometimes better to characterize their importation. Also at times it might be better to characterize their endeavor as their investigation of what's going on in foreign countries through American looking glass. There are substantial books on politics abroad.

In surveying political science in China, one cannot disregard those works published by culturally Chinese political scientists teaching abroad or near-abroad. Anita Chan (Australian National University), Baogang He (University of Tasmania), Yongnian Zheng (National University of Singapore), John Quansheng Zhao (American University), Chun Lin (London School of Economics), Jianwei Wang (University of Wisconsin) and Hongyin Wang (Syracuse University) are such examples.

6. Conclusion

What are the three political sciences in associated democracies in East Asia like when they are examined vis-à-vis political science in an auto-centric democracy, the United States? Whether it is disaffected, third-wave or fledgling, it is clear that the East Asian democracies have been treading the path of democratic development associated with American democracy. Similarly, the three political sciences have been making associated development with America's auto-centric political science in one way or another. But all this does not necessarily mean that the three East Asian political sciences have been dominated by American political science. Rather empirical realities posing key questions to political scientists, who in turn seek conceptual and methodological guidance to American political science. In Japan why is disaffection with political leaders and institutions so pervasive? In Korea why is anti-Americanism so vehement 15 years after democratic transition? In China why are cadres so distrustful of people and so untransparent and unaccountable? These are some of the key questions that guide their political sciences. Clearly the need to more closely and systematically examine the rise and fall of popular topics in relation to the evolving nature of regime characteristics does exist. Although much remains to be done in this paper, it is most important to see the nature of each political science well grounded in the evolving nature of politics and society with which each political science community is embedded. What is the place and role of American political science in the development of the three East Asian political Sciences? The primary role of American political science is conceptual. American political science gives an initial good guidance to answering the questions. In this sense American political science has been taking a leading role. American political science has been a most auto-centric political science in the sense that it evolves around its own professionally competitive drive and does not care much about what's going on elsewhere but that its conceptual influence often goes beyond its border. In this sense also, American political science has been instrumental in promoting American style

democracy abroad (Cox/Ikenberry/Inoguchi, 2000, Oren, 2003).

* A number of friends enlightened me immensely. They include: Chung-Si Ahn (Seoul National University), Dingping Guo (Fudan University), Baogang He (University of Tasmania), Daisong Hyun (University of Tokyo), and Doh Chull Shin (University of Missouri). Clearly a friend in need is a friend in deed. My heartfelt gratitude to all. The amount of their suggested readings has clearly surpassed my ability to digest in the four languages in a fairly short span of time. Hence a very preliminary draft. Hence I welcome comments. Most importantly, hence the need for me to zero-in on the embeddedness of the three political sciences with their societal evolution and on the role of American political science in the development of their political science.

Reference

Cha, Victor (200X) *Alignment despite Antagonism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chan, Anita (2001) *China's Workers Under Assault: Exploitation of Labor in a Globalizing Economy*, NY: ME Sharpe.

Choi, Jangjip (199X) *The Working Class Movement and the State in Transition to Democracy*

Chung, Jaeho (2000) *Central Control and Local Discretion in China*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dalton, Russell and Martin Wattenberg, eds. (2003) *Democracy Transformed? The Expansion of Citizen Access in Advanced Industrial Democracies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dalton, Russell and Martin Wattenberg, eds. (2001) *Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Deans, Phil (2003) "Youngster in Search of an Audience," *Times Higher Educational Supplement*. 25 April 2003, p35.

Easton, David et al. (1995) *Regime and Discipline: Democracy and the Development of Political Science*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Freedom House (2002) *Freedom in the World*, New York:

Fukuda, Arihiro (1998) *Sovereignty at the Sword: Harrington, Hobbes, and Mixed Government in the English Civil Wars*, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gunnell, John (forthcoming) *Imagining the American Polity: Political Science and the Discourse of Democracy*, Pennsylvania State University Press.

Guo, Dingping (1994) *Duoyuan zhengzhi* (Pluralist Politics), Hong Kong: Sasnian shudian xiangang yanxian gongsi.

Guo, Dingping (1998) *Zhengdang yu zhengfu* (Political Parties and Government), Shanghai: Zhejiang renmin chupanshe.

Ha, Young-sun,ed. (2000) *Kukchehwa ui segyehwa: Hanguk, Chunguk, Ilbon* (Internationalization and Globalization: Korea, China and Japan).

He, Boagang (1996) *The Democratization of China*, London: Routledge.

He, Baogang and Yinjie Guo (2000) *Nationalism, National Identity and Democratization*, London: Routledge.

He, Wei (1998) *Zhengfuguo Cheng* (Political Process), Shanghai: Zhejiang renmin chupanshe.

Hoffmann, Stanley (197X)

Huntington, Samuel (1993) *Third Wave: Democratization in the Twentieth Century*, Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

Inoguchi, Takashi (1985) "Inyou bunken ni tsuitenno Life-style Kasetu (A Life-Style Hypothesis on Citation Practice), *Toshokan no mado* (Windows of the Library), Tokyo: University ofTokyo Library, 24:9.

Inoguchi, Takashi, ed. (1993-94) *The East Asian States and Societies Library* 6 volumes, Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Inoguchi et al. (1999) *Seijigaku jiten* (Encyclopedia of Political Science), Tokyo: Kobundo.

Inoguchi, Takashi (2001) "Voice and Accountability: The Media and the Internet in Democratic Development," background paper to the United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 2001, New York: United Nations Publications.

Inoguchi, Takashi (2001) "Area and International Studies: International Relation," Neil Smelser and Paul Baltes, eds., *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Science*, Vol.2, New York: Elsevier, pp.707-711.

Inoguchi, Takashi (2002) "Broadening the Basis of Social Capital in Japan," in Robert Putnam, ed., *Democracies in Flux: The Evolution of Social Capital in Contemporary Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.359-392.

Inoguchi, Takashi (2002) "Japanese Political Science Looks Toward 2005," *Participation*.

Inoguchi, Takashi (forthcoming) "Globalization wa yoi governance o motarasuka (Does Globalization Bring About Good Governance?), *Nempo seijigaku* (The Annals of Political Science), Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

Inoguchi, Takashi (2003) <http://www.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~inoguchi>

Inoguchi, Takashi and Chung-Si Ahn, eds.(forthcoming) *Governance in Asia: Under the Shadows of the Developmental State, Asian Values and Third-Wave Democracy*.

Japanese Political Science Association (200X) *Mittsu no Minshushugi* (Three Democracies), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Kang, David (200X) *Crony Capitalism: Corruption and Development in South Korea and the Philippines*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karatani, Rieko (2002) *Defining British Citizenship: Empire, Commonwealth, and Modern Britain*, Portland, Oregon: Frank Cass.

Kato, Junko (1994) *The Problem of Bureaucratic Rationality: Tax Politics in Japan*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kato, Junko (2003) *Regressive Taxation and the Welfare State: Path Dependence and Policy Diffusion*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Katzenstein, Peter (199X) personal conversation at one of the annual conventions in the United States.

Kent, Ann (1999) *China, United Nations, and Human Rights*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kim, ByungKook (forthcoming) "Anti-Americanism in 2002," in Jorge Dominguez and Byung-Kook Kim, eds., *East Asia, Latin America and the New Pax Americana*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Kim, Samuel, ed. (2001) *Korea's Globalization*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kim, Sunhyuk (2000) *The Politics of Democratization in Korea*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Kishima, Takako (1991) *Political Life in Japan: Democracy in A Reversible World*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kohno, Masaru (1997) *Japan's Postwar Party Politics*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Koo, Hagen, ed.(1993) *State and Society in Contemporary Korea*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Li, Jipeng (2000) *Quanli zhengzhixue* (Political Science of Power), Heilongjiang: Heilongjiangjiaoyu chupanshe.

Lin, Chun (2000) *China: Modernizing Chinese Polity, the Transformation of Chinese Socialism, Defending a Changing China in Global Politics*, New York: Ashgate.

Lin, Shangli (2000) *Dandai Zhongguo zhengzhi xintai yanjiu* (Study of Contemporary Chinese Political Modalities), Tianjin: Tianjin renmin chupanshe.

Liu, Junning (1998) *Gonghe, Minzhu, Zhuangzheng* (Republicanism, Democracy, and Dictatorship), Shanghai: Sanlian shudian.

Maruyama, Masao (1946) "Kagaku to shitenno seijigaku (Political Science as a Science)," *Jinbun*, 2 (later included in his *Gendai seiji no shiso to kodo* (The Thought and Behavior of Contemporary Politics), Tokyo: Misuzu shobo, 1964, pp.341-59.

Moon, Chung-In and Jongryn Mo, eds. (1999) *Democracy and the Korean Economy*, Stanford: Hoover Institution Press.

Moon, Katherine (1997) *Sex among Allies: Military Prostitution in US-Korean Relations*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Norris, Pippa, ed. (1997) *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Governance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, Pippa (2002) *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing Political Actions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart, eds.(2003) *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Challenge around the World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oh, John Kie-chiang (1999) *Korean Politics: The Quest for Democratization and Economic Development*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Oren, Ido (2003) *Our Enemies and US: America's Rivalries and The Making of Political Science*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Park, Myunglin (1996) *Hanguk jangchong ui popal gwa pyonghwa* (The Outbreak and Origins of the Korean War), 2 vols., Seoul: Nanam Publishers.

Palais, James (1975) *Politics and Policy in Traditional Korea*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pharr, Susan (1997)

Pharr, Susan and Robert Putnam, eds. (1997) *Disaffected Democracies*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, Robert (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon and Shuster.

Rose, Richard and Doh Chull Shin (2001) "XXXX" *British Journal of Political*

Science.

Sartori, Giovanni (198X)

Shin, Doh Chull (1995)

Shin, Doh Chull (2001) *Mass Politics and Culture in Democratic Korea*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shiraishi, Takashi (1990) *An Age in Motion: Popular Radicalism in Java 1912-1926*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Wang, Henin (1987) *Bijiao zhengzhi fenxi* (Comparative Political Analysis), Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chupanshe.

Wang, Henin (1991) *Dandai Zhongguo Congluo Jiazhu Wenhua* (Village Family Culture of Contemporary China), Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chupanshe.

Wang, Hongying (2002) *Weak State, Strong Network: The Institutional Dynamics of Foreign Direct Investment in China*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wang, Jianwei (2000) *Limited Adversaries: Post-Cold War Sino-American Mutual Images*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Wattenberg, Martin (2002) *Where Have All the Voters Gone?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Woo-Cumings, Meredith, ed. (1997) *The Developmental State*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Xu, Yung (1997) *Zhongguo nongcong congmin zizhi* (Autonomy in Chinese Agricultural Villages), Shanghai: Huadong shifang daxue chupanshe.

Yan, Jiaqi (1986) *Shounaolun* (On Leaders), Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chupanshe.

Yan, Jiaqi (1987) *Quanli yu zhenli* (Power and Truth), Beijing: Guanmin ripao chupanshe.

Yang, Haijiao, ed., (2000) *Xin Zhongguo zhengzhixue hui gu yu zhangwan* (The Review and Prospect for the New Chinese Political Science), Beijing: Shijie zhishi

chupanshe.

Yu Keping (1989) *Xifang zhengzhi fenxi xin fanfa lun* (New Methodologies in Western Political Analysis), Beijing: Renmin chupanshe.

Yu Keping (1998) *Shequn zhuyi* (Corporatism), Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chupanshe.

Zhao, John Quansheng (1997) *Interpreting Chinese Foreign Policy: The Micro-Macro Linkage Approach*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

----- (1993) *Japanese Policy Making: The Politics Behind Politics*, Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.