Summary

There were IR theories in Japan even before the end of World War II, because Japanese scholars eagerly imported the “most advanced” research on international politics from European countries and the U.S. There were also Japanese IR theories before 1945, because Japanese IR scholars criticized Western theories supporting the universal order: the Versailles system and the Washington system, and created their own theories supporting the new regional order in East Asia. Masamichi Rōyama as an advisor of prime minister Fumimaro Konoe created the theory of East Asian community and his theory justified the government’s foreign policy: the Greater East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere. The crisis for Japanese IR scholars was whether they supported the government’s foreign policy for the new regional order or not, and thus the crisis was in the relationship between theory and practice than that between reality and ideals identified in E.H. Carr’s book, The Twenty Years’ Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations.

* Draft: Please do not cite without permission from the author.
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Introduction

This paper aims at confirming there were Japanese international relations theories even before the end of the WWII. This research question has been posed among Japanese IR scholars (Sakai, 2007; Inoguchi, 2007a, 2007b). Hikomatsu Kamikawa, the first president of the Japanese Association of International Relations, raised the question “are we monkeys?” in his article of 1966 (Kamikawa, 1966). The question came from the influential book, Adolf Hitler’s Mein Kampf. Hitler argued in the chapter on race and culture that humankind was divided into three races: the creators of the culture, the supporters of the culture and the destroyers of the culture. The Japanese race was a typical race of the supporters of European and American culture. Japan made progress to introduce European culture and technology but Japanese people were not the creators of the culture. If European and American civilization collapsed, Japan would make further progress for a while but it would also decline for the last time (Hitler, 1925, chap. 9). Kamikawa posed the question, “are Japanese IR scholars only monkeys to import European and American IR theories?” (Kamikawa, 1966). The paper focuses on the pre-war Japanese IR academics and discusses the issue of whether there were Japanese original IR theories before the end of the WWII.

According to E.H. Carr’s the Twenty Years’ Crisis, 1919-1939, a blind belief in idealism caused a crisis in the Versailles system (Carr, 1939). The Versailles system was
based on belief in three idealist theories: international organization, international law and military disarmament. One of the most important functions of international organization was the League of Nations system solving international conflicts by different types of peaceful means as well as economic and military sanctions. The functions of international law were also significantly important to preserve the Versailles system, especially the Covenant of the League of Nations establishing the process of conflict resolutions and the Kellogg-Briand Pact banning war for the pursuit of states’ own political interests. Military disarmaments aimed at diminishing the risk of another world war. WWI broke out after arms races between Britain and the German Empire. Idealists supported these functions of the Versailles system but did not understand real politics between great powers in the world.

A crisis for Japanese IR academics and foreign policy makers, however, was a conflict between a contemporary universal order and an emerging new regional order. The Japanese Imperial Government supported the universal order in the 1920s: that being the Versailles system. However, after the Manchuria Incident in 1931 and Japan’s withdrawal from the League of Nations in 1933, the Japanese government and army would build a new regional order, Dai Tōa Kyōei Ken (the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere). As the government moved toward a political position set against the Versailles system, some Japanese IR scholars also changed their academic positions, and criticized Western IR theories supporting the contemporary universal order and created many different theories to
endorse East Asian regional order.

The crisis for Japanese IR scholars was in turn that of the conflict between theory and practice. The Japanese government enacted the Chian Iji Hō in 1925 (the Peace Preservation Law of 1925) for the purpose of restricting Communist and Socialist anti-government activities. The Japanese judicial authorities increased the range of crimes punishable by this law, and arrested even liberals and democratic activists. The law also restricted academic activities in universities. Some IR researchers who had doubts regarding the government’s policies found they could no longer publicly criticize the government. Other IR researchers created a theory supporting the government's foreign policies: the theory of East Asian community to support the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, for example. However, these researchers were deeply entangled in politics, and the police and army as well as right wing activists kept watch on their language and behavior. For Japanese IR scholars before the end of the WWII, keeping a certain distance from real politics was very crucial in order to survive.

On what conditions we can clarify that there were Japanese IR theories before 1945? One, at least, is to confirm that there were Japanese IR scholars before 1945. It is well known among Japanese IR academics that many researchers studied international politics even before the end of the WWII, but this fact might be unfamiliar to European and American IR academics. The paper confirms that Japanese scholars imported the studies of international law, diplomatic history and international politics from the European countries
and the U.S. They desired the “most-advanced” knowledge from European and American literature and from overseas education in the West. However, if they merely transplanted the European and American IR studies into Japanese academies, then perhaps they were just supporters of culture, as Hitler suggested.

So how might we confirm that Japanese IR scholars were creators of culture? One method is to clarify characteristics and tendencies of the Japanese IR. For example, it is often said that Asian studies in the Japanese IR are more active and advanced than in the European and American IR. That may be one of the characteristics and tendencies of Japanese IR, but it is unclear whether the advance in Asian studies within Japanese IR is a proof of its creativity. Even if Japanese IR scholars import the western IR theories and investigate politics, economy and society in Asian countries, it is not creative but rather merely supportive of the western theories. Even the use of oriental theories extracted from Asian cultures and religions by Japanese IR scholars might not qualify their work as “creative”.

Creativity comes in the first instance from critical considerations of conventional knowledge. Any theories that are critical of other theories and show new knowledge other theories do not show are creative. If we find Japanese IR theories criticizing the mainstream IR theories and providing any new knowledge on international relations, we may assume that we have confirmed the existence of Japanese IR theories. In the context of the pre-war Japanese IR academics, the theory of East Asian community provides at least one instance
of a Japanese IR theory.

The paper confirms that there were IR theories even in pre-war Japan and that there were Japanese IR theories criticizing the western IR theories and endorsing the new East Asia order.

I. Acceptance of International Law and Diplomacy in Japan

This section aims at confirming that Japanese academics accepted theories and studies on international law and diplomatic history from European countries and the U.S. even in the pre-WWI era.

(A) International Law

U.S. Commodore Matthew Perry appeared in the port of Uraga with his black ships in 1852 and demanded that the Tokugawa Shogunate open the country to the world. Japan and the U.S. signed up the Convention of Kanagawa opening the ports of Shimoda and Hakodate in 1854. Townsend Harris, the first Consul General to the Japan, negotiated with Naosuke Ii, and signed the Treaty of Amity and Commerce, securing consular jurisdiction and a conventional tariff for the U.S. Japan concluded the same kind of unequal treaties with the U.K., France, Netherlands and Russia; thus the Japanese government
required knowledge and studies of international law in order to revise these unequal treaties.

Henry Wheaton’s *Elements of International Law* was translated into Japanese and published in 1865 (Wheaton, 1836, 1865). Digaku Nankō (the University of Tokyo) started a course on international law as early as in 1870. Foreign scholars taught international law at first, and Japanese scholars have taught since 1883. The Japanese Society of International Law was established in 1897 and started to publish *the Journal of International Law* in 1902.

Sakuye Takahashi and Nagao Ariga were famous scholars in the field of international law before WWI in Japan. Takahashi taught international law in the University of Tokyo and wrote the two textbooks: *Heiji Kokusai Hō (Public International Law in Peace)* in 1902 and *Senji Kokusai Hō (The Public International Law in War)* in 1903 (Takahashi, 1902, 1903). Takahashi served as a legal advisor for the Japanese navy, and published two books in the U.S.: *Cases on International Law during Chino-Japanese War* in 1899 and *International Law Applied to the Russo-Japanese War* in 1908 (Takahashi, 1899, 1908). Ariga went to study in Germany and Austria, and taught international law in Tōkyō Senmon Gakkō (Waseda University). He worked as a legal advisor for the Japanese army, and he published two books in France: *La guerre sino-japonaise* in 1896 and *La guerre russo-japonaise* in 1908 (Ariga, 1896, 1908). These international books focused on the wartime functions of law during the first Sino-Japanese War and Russo-Japanese War.
(B) Diplomatic History

Japan won the first Sino-Japanese War and these states signed the Treaty of Shimonoseki in 1895. The treaty confirmed the cessation of Liaodong Peninsula, Taiwan and the Pescadores from China to Japan. However, Russia voiced concerns about Japan’s military and political influence on China. Russia, France and Germany intervened in the treaty, and the Japanese government reluctantly accepted the withdrawal of their military forces from Liaodong Peninsula. Japan began the Russo-Japanese War in 1904. Victory was confirmed by diplomatic negotiations with Russia in Portsmouth in 1905, in which Japan was able to assert sufficient influence in relation to the positions put forward by U.S. president Theodore Roosevelt. Japan occupied the Kwantung Leased Territory in China and the South Manchuria Railway. As the Japanese government got involved in international conflicts, especially in East Asia, diplomatic theory and history became a more important area of study in Japan.

Tōkyō Senmon Gakkō (Waseda University) and Kōtō Syō Gakkō (Hitotsubashi University) started to teach modern diplomatic history in 1889. The Imperial University of Tokyo (the University of Tokyo) also started diplomatic history in 1906. *The Journal of International Law* was renamed to *the Journal of International Law and Diplomacy* in 1912, because research on diplomacy became more important for Japanese academics and foreign policy makers.
Nagao Ariga taught modern diplomatic history in Tōkyō Senmon Gakkō, and he published *Kinji Gaikōshi* (*Contemporary Diplomatic History*) in 1898 and *Saikin Sanjūnen Gaikōshi* (*Diplomatic History in the Past 30 Years*) in 1910 (Ariga, 1898, 1910). Kiroku Hayashi went to study European diplomatic history in France, and taught diplomatic history in Keio University and published *Ōshu Kinsei Gaikōshi* (*Modern Diplomatic History in Europe*) in 1908 (Hayashi, 1908).

### II. Acceptance and Development of IR in Japan

(A) Background

European great powers launched the First World War in 1914 and Japan declared war against the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires because Japan had entered a military alliance with Britain in 1910. After WWI, Britain and France and other countries signed the Versailles Treaty in 1919 and established the League of Nations in 1920. The Versailles system secured Britain and France’s dominance over Europe.

However, the U.S. did not enter the League of Nations, and pursued an agreement on peace in the Pacific. The U.S., the U.K., Japan and other countries signed the Nine Power Treaty in the Washington Naval Conference in 1922, giving approval to the U.S. Open-Door Policy toward China. The Nine Power Treaty denied Japan’s special interests in
China although the U.S. had accepted the Lansing-Ishii Agreement in 1917 confirming Japan’s special interests over China. The U.S., the U.K., France and Japan signed the Four Power Treaty, and the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was terminated. These states also signed up to the Washington Naval Treaty to limit ship tonnage and firing power, especially in relation to Japan’s hegemony over the Pacific. The Washington System denied Japan’s special interests on China and restricted Japan’s expansion over East Asia and the Pacific.

The Great Powers sealed the Kellogg-Briand Pact in 1928, banning war for the purpose of their national policy and interests. The 1920s was the golden age for idealists in Europe and America as well as in Japan.

(B) An Introduction of International Relations in Japan

According to Hikomatsu Kamikawa, three academic groups started to study international politics before 1945 in Japan: politics, international law and diplomatic history (Kamikawa, 1967). The study of international politics, at least in Japan, derived from these academic disciplines. The Imperial University of Tokyo (the University of Tokyo) seemed to be the first university in Japan to teach international politics. International politics was, however, taught under the umbrella of politics rather than as a separate field. Nambara Shigeru was the first scholar to teach international politics. He went to Germany to study the political philosophy of Kant and Fichte, and came back to the Imperial University of Tokyo (the University of Tokyo) and taught Kant’s ideas on
international politics in the first lecture of IR in Japan in 1925 (Nambara, 1927). Waseda University established the class of international politics in 1932.

Japanese scholars of colonial studies also had an influence on Japanese IR. Japan had at that time the issue of the northern frontier, or the first colony ‘Hokkaido (Ainu mosir)’. The Ainu are the native inhabitants in Hokkaido but the Japanese occupied the island. The Japanese government established Kaitakushi (the Hokkaido Development Office) that encouraged settlers and recommended that they bring the land under cultivation. Hokkaido Imperial University (Hokkaido University)¹ was the center of agricultural and colonial development studies. After Japan’s acquisition of Taiwan in 1895 and Korea in 1910, the Japanese government required colonial studies and accordingly set up the colonial studies course at the Imperial University of Tokyo. Paul Reinsch’s *World Politics* was seen as the first basic text for Japanese colonial researchers (Reinsch, 1901; Sakai, 2006).

This paper introduces three leading IR researchers² from 1920s Japan to clarify the point that there were IR theories even in pre-war Japan.

The first scholar is Jumpei Shinobu. After he resigned as a diplomat, he became a

---

¹ Hokkaido University was founded as Kaitakushi Karigakkō in 1872. The school of Kaitakushi was renamed to the Sapporo Nō Gakkō (Sapporo Agriculture School) in 1876, and it was incorporated to the Tohoku Imperial University (Tohoku University) in 1907. Hokkaido Imperial University (Hokkaido University) incorporated the agricultural college of Tohoku Imperial University in 1918. The colonial studies and agricultural development studies had been studies since the age of the Sapporo Nō Gakkō (See Sakai, 2006).

² Tadashi Kawata, an emeritus professor for the University of Tokyo and Sophia University, mentioned three leading Japanese IR theorists (Kawata, 1963).
ljector in Waseda University, studying international law and diplomatic history. He supported classical diplomacy before the Versailles system and seems to be a classical realist (Sakai, 2007). His prominent research was the Series of International Politics in 1926 with four books and over 2,600 pages. The volume one, *Kokusai Seiji no Shinka oyobi Rensa*, focused on concepts and history of international politics, internationalism and the balance of power (Shinobu, 1925a). The second volume, *Kokusai Seiji no Kōki oyobi Rensa*, covered international law and morality, and international organizations and movements (Shinobu, 1925b). The third volume, *Kokusai Funsō to Kokusai Renmei*, dealt with international conflicts, peace movements and peaceful settlements, and the League of Nations (Shinobu, 1925c). The last volume, *Gaikō Kantoku to Gaikō Kikan*, focused on democratic diplomacy and diplomatic institutions (Shinobu, 1926). The Series of International Politics was the first and most comprehensive research on international relations in pre-war Japan.

The second scholar is Hikomatsu Kamikawa. He became a professor of the Imperial University of Tokyo (the University of Tokyo) in 1923 and studied international history and international politics. His first book, *Kokusai Renmei Seisaku Ron (The League of Nations and its Policies)*, was published in 1927 (Kamikawa, 1927). His definition of international politics reflected his idealist position. “International politics is a common control over any social values and relations by people all over the world, for the purpose of confirming permanent world peace and improving human civilization, based on the
principles of international pacifism and solidarism” (Kamikawa, 1927, p. 247). He recognized the League of Nations as a world confederation to pursue the purposes of international politics (p. 250). However, he moved his academic position from idealism to realism from the 1930s. After WWII, he became the first president of the Japanese Association of International Politics.

Masamichi Rōyama went to Britain for study, and became a professor in the Imperial University of Tokyo (the University of Tokyo) in 1928. He studied domestic and international politics and taught public administration. He originally endorsed the political theories of functionalism and pluralism (Sakai, 2007). He published Seijigaku no Ninmu to Taisyo (Politics: the missions and targets) in 1925 (Rōyama, 1925), and mentioned international politics in the last part of this book. He also brought out a book on international relations in 1928, Kokusai Seiji to Kokusai Gyōsei (International Politics and International Administration) (Rōyama, 1928). He saw international politics as a part of political studies, and explored the meaning of international politics in terms of political concepts and functions. He also moved his academic position toward realism in order to endorse Japanese the imperialist war and regime, and entered into real politics as a politician in 1942\(^3\). After WWII, he became executive board member of the Japanese

\(^3\) Japanese political parties were dissolved in 1940, and were incorporated into Yokusan Kai (Imperial Rule Assistance Associate) in 1940 and Yokusan Seiji Kai (Imperial Rule Assistance Political Party) in 1942. The Japanese Imperial government unified political parties and constructed one party system for the first time under the constitutional regime. Rōyama won the election in 1942 and entered the Yokusan Seiji Kai. After the dissolution of the Yokusan Seiji Kai, Rōyama entered the Yokusō Giin Dōshi Kai.
Political Science Association and the first president of the Japanese Society for Public Administration.

III. Transformation toward the New Regional Order

(A) Background

A rail on the South Manchuria Railway was blown out on September 18, 1931. The Japanese government argued that the incident was caused by Chinese dissidents and thus justified military operations in Manchuria. The Chinese government insisted that the incident was a Japanese conspiracy against China perpetrated as a means for the Japanese army to attempt to justify the invasion of China proper. The Japanese army occupied Manchuria and set up the puppet state of Manchuria on March 1, 1932. China appealed to the League of Nations, and the ensuing Lytton report accepted that the event had been a Japanese conspiracy and denied the Japanese-supported state of Manchuria on the grounds that China held sovereignty over Manchuria.

Some Japanese IR researchers undertook studies of the Manchuria Incident to support their government’s insistences. Shinobu asserted that Japan’s special interests could be protected under the contemporary international law (Shinobu, 1932). However, Rōyama made reference Japan’s special relations to Manchuria rather than Japan’s special interests.
(Rōyama, 1933). According to Rōyama, China and the Great Powers denied Japan’s special interests over Manchuria in the contemporary international order. He argued that the Japanese government and army, however, acted on Japan’s special relations to Manchuria. Rōyama pointed out the possibility of the use of force to actualize these special relations (Rōyama, 1933, 192-3). This means that Shinobu still supported the contemporary international order but Rōyama took one step toward an inquiry into an alternative international order.

Japan withdrew from the League of Nations in March 1933, and started the second Sino-Japanese War in July 1937 to pursue her special interests in China. Fumimaro Konoe, a prime minister of the Empire of Japan, declared Tōa Shin-Chitsujiyo (A New East Asian Order) in November 1937. The declaration suggested that Japan, Manchuria and China should build a cooperative relationship on politics, economics and culture and the new order should aim at establishing international justice, attaining a joint defense policy, creating a new culture and realizing economic unification. The declaration seemed to be affected by Rōyama’s theory of East Asia Community because Rōyama was one of the brains behind Konoe. He was a member of the Showa Kenkyū Kai, a group of researchers supporting Konoe’s policies with theory (Sakai, 1979). I will give later Rōyama’s theory of

_____________________

4 Sadaji Yabe became a professor in the Imperial University of Tokyo (the University of Tokyo) after Rōyama resigned the post. Rōyama and Yabe entered the Shōwa Kenkyūkai supporting the prime minister Fumimaro Konoe. Yabe published the book Shin Chitsujiyo no Kenkyū (Study on the New Order). The book was one of the most important and broad studies on the concept of a new East Asian order (Sadaji, 1945).
the new regional order.

(B) Japanese IR Theories to Support the New East Asian Order

Some Japanese IR theorists focused on three different theories for the regional order: the Monroe Doctrine in the U.S., the theories of “Lebensraum (Living Space)” in Germany, and theories of the new East Asian order in Japan. Each of these theories emerged as a counter-theory against the universal order.

The Japan Association of International Law started a joint research for a variety of problems in the process of founding the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere and published Dai Tōa Kokusai Hō Sōyo (the Series of the Greater East Asia International Law). The first book in the series was Kaoru Yasui’s Ōsyū Kōiki Kokusai Hō no Kiso Rinen (Basic Concepts on the European Regional International Law) (Yasui, 1942). He was an associate professor in the University of Tokyo, and examined in his book Carl Schmitt’s theory on European regional international law in with a view to transplanting the theory from Europe to East Asia. The second book was Masatoshi Matsushita’s Beisyū Kōiki Kokusai Hō no Kiso Rinen (Basic Concepts on the American Regional International Law) (Matsushita, 1942). Some scholars of international law examined the Monroe Doctrine because the Covenant of the League of Nations referred to the Doctrine. Matsushita, however, took under consideration Franklin Roosevelt’s foreign policies of the good neighbor since 1933 and regional treaties securing independence of American countries
from other states, and peaceful settlements and joint defense within the American continent.

The study of the Monroe Doctrine and American regionalism aimed at importing a regional system for the purpose of founding the new regional order in East Asia. However, these studies on American and European regional orders were little more than imports from America and Europe, and as Hitler suggested, the work of supporters of European culture.

Kamikawa moved his academic position from liberalism toward realism since the 1930s. Kamikawa studied the history of the Monroe Doctrine (Kamikawa, 1934, 1939a, 1939b), but he insisted on the foundation of the League of the Far East as a new regional order as opposed to an Asian Monroe Doctrine (Kamikawa, 1940b). He disallowed the old world orders: nationalism, imperialism, and the system of the League of Nations; though he supported the League in 1920s, and endorsed the emergence of new regional orders in America, Europe and East Asia. He provided the new concept of Tairiku Rengōtai (the continental confederation) composed of the representatives from such new regional political associations (Kamikawa, 1942a, 1942b). He seemed to keep pace with Japanese imperial policies during the Pacific War. Eventually, he showed his admiration and respect for the Joint Declaration of the Greater East Asia of 1942 (Kamikawa, 1944).

(C) Masamichi Rōyama’s Theory of East Asian Community

The paper focuses mainly on Rōyama’s theories of the new regional order, because he pursued his own theories on East Asian Community based in the context of the
history and culture of East Asia, and because of his influence on Konoe’s foreign policies. Rōyama organized many articles on East Asian community into the book *Tōa to Sekai: Shin-Chitsujyo e no Ronsaku* (*East Asia and the World: the policy toward the New Order*) in 1941 (Rōyama, 1941). The three leading articles were the most important for his theory of the community.

In the article *Tōa Kyōdōtai no Riron* (*The Theory of East Asian Community*), Rōyama explained the theory of regional common destiny in East Asia (Rōyama, 1938b). Rōyama outlined the theory of regional common destiny: “the theory is a guiding principle for the awakening of East Asian people as East Asian, that they may realize their world historical vocation and actualize the unification of East Asia. Further, the theory is a philosophical weapon to overcome East Asian tragedy fomented by misguided nationalism” (Rōyama, 1938b, 23-24). The theory of East Asian community aims at overcoming Chinese nationalism and anti-Japanese movements in China and other Asian countries, and building a new regional community and political institution under the leadership of imperial Japan.

Rōyama explained the means of overcoming Chinese nationalism and unifying East Asia. “Regional ethos and fate leads to a regional common destiny in East Asia. It comes from our consciousness of Raumsschicksal (the regional destiny)” (Rōyama, 1938b, 28). The regional ethos and fate stems from consciousness that East Asians’ survival and development and improvement depends on peace and firm foundations in East Asia. However, he described how Europe had common regional ethos and fate because of
Greco-Latin traditions and Christianity, and explained the lack of regional ethos and fate in East Asia. He considered the means of creating consciousness of regional ethos and fate: “the regional common destiny in East Asia should be created by political movements” (Rōyama, 1938b, 28).

And Rōyama put forward five characteristics of the theory of the East Asian community (Rōyama, 1938b, 29-32).

- EAC should bring a specific political region within a single political institution.
- EAC should respect Asian cultural diversity but should unify Asian culture in the future.
- EAC should make rational plans for people’s survival and the improvement of their lives.
- The economic regime in the EAC should not be imperial but cooperative.
- The theory of EAC should be a principle for a new world order.

In the next article “Kokumin Kyōdōtai no Keisei (The Foundations of the National Community)”, Rōyama explained the domestic side of the EAC (Rōyama, 1939a). Rōyama denied the idea that politics is political institutions and insisted that politics is a function forming an order for people’s life (Rōyama, 1939a, 41, 46). Therefore, it is not enough to know political institutions and existent political order if we want to understand the cause of the formation of a new order. We should, rather, understand political functions within people’s lives because politics forms the new order (Rōyama, 1939a, 46).

Rōyama also insisted that politics has the function of forming a system to which might adjust the purpose of an individual’s life and the purpose of society. Political
Institutions provide the political functions necessary to adjust the relationship between the individual and society. However, it is not enough to understand political institutions if we want to understand the principles of adjustment. We should also understand moral and ethical ideas and practices (Royma, 1939a, 44, 46). Royma contrasted states as political institutions and national communities as political orderings of people’s lives including economy and society (Royma, 1939a, 47). Royma quoted the Taika no Kaishin (Taika Reform) in 645 and Meiji Ishin (Meiji Restoration) in 1868 as the principles of adjustment at work in the Japanese national community (Royma, 1939a, 52-55), and argued that European principles of adjustment were too universal and abstract whilst Japanese principles were traditional and historical (Royma, 1939a, 50).

In the last article “Sekai Shin-Chitsujyo no Tenbo (The Prospect of the New World Order), Royma explained the relationship between the EAC and the world (Royma, 1939b). He asserted that the relationship should be considered as structural. The relationship between East Asia and the world was a relationship between the special and the universal. The European world expanded across the globe, and founded the universal order. The Japanese government demanded special interests on China, and received the agreement of the U.S. in the Lansing-Ishii Agreement in 1917. However, Japan’s special interests in China were denied after WWI because the Great Powers concluded the Nine Power Treaty in 1922 (Royma, 1939b, 77-80).

Royma also asserted that the relationship between the EAC and the world
should be considered in practical terms, bringing together the reality and the ideal. The main question was how Japanese status should be recognized in relation to that of other nations in East Asia, and the cognate issue of the status of Japan in the world order. After the Second Sino-Japanese War, it was time to consider together issues of the Japanese ideal and the East Asian reality (Rōyama, 1939b, 81-82).

Japanese status in East Asia had been considered in the context of the universal order in terms of holding special interests, but it came to be reconsidered in terms setting Japanese ideal over East Asian reality. If the Japanese government pursued special interests in China, these actions would provoke Chinese nationalism and anti-imperialist movements. Therefore, it was argued that the Japanese government should work toward the new East Asian Order taking full account of the interests of Asian people --- this was the Japanese ideal status in East Asia (Rōyama, 1939b, 82-83). He also thought that the object of realizing the Japanese ideal required the revision of the Nine Power Treaty because the treaty restricted Japan’s special interests in China as well as China’s own development interests (Rōyama, 1939b, 102-103). He denied the idea that the East Asian community aimed at actualizing imperialism because the purpose of the community was to realize a cooperative economy and development in East Asia (Rōyama, 1939d).

Rōyama considered critically nationalism and imperialism supporting the universal order, and thus he created the theory of the East Asian Community supporting the new regional order in East Asia. Rōyama’s theory shows that there were at least some
Japanese IR theories before 1945. However, ideal is ideal. The Japanese army invaded China and other East Asian countries and built the Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere, but Japan lost the Second Sino-Japanese War and the Pacific War. Rōyama’s theories on East Asian Community had no validity as a means of explaining real politics.

**Conclusion**

The research topic is whether there were IR theories before 1945. I believe that there were IR theories even in pre-war Japan. The Japanese government oriented itself toward the world order, and Japanese IR scholars eagerly imported studies of international law, diplomatic history and international politics from Europe and America. I believe that there were Japanese own IR theories even before 1945. The Japanese government needed to justify its diplomatic position against the world order after the Manchuria Incident, and some Japanese IR scholars, especially Rōyama, created different IR theories to support the concept of an East Asian community. However, the hope of achieving an East Asian community was too optimistic to be actualized in international politics. The theories of an East Asian community in Japan had no effects on the dominant IR theories because these theories were not valid to explain international politics.

However, Japanese IR scholars’ experiences in the pre-war and war period provide a lesson on the relationship between theory and practice rather than reality and
ideals. The theory of East Asian Community at least served to justify Japan’s invasion and domination of China and other countries. I believe that the theory of EAC was one of the creative Japanese IR theories but was one of the morally questionable theories. How should we judge a researcher’s morality and responsibility if his/her theory does harm to a real society? And how should we consider researchers who maintain a close relationship with governments in order to actualize their own theory in real politics? Or how should we consider researchers who keep their distance from governments in and as a result consign their theory to the world within the library walls? Social scientists should make a conscious effort to deal with the crisis in the relationship between theory and practice.
References


Kamikawa, Hikomatsu, 1940b, “Tōa Renmei Gaiiron (General Study on the League of East Asia),” *Gaikō Jihō*, 24
The 49th Annual ISA Convention in San Francisco in March 2008

Is There A Japanese IR? Seeking an Academic Bridge through the Country’s Disciplinary History (TC46)

The Twenty Years’ Crisis 1919-1939: An Introduction of the Study of International Relations in Japan

Tomoya Kamino


Matsushita, Masatoshi, 1942, Beisyū Kōiki Kokusai Hō no Kiso Rinen (Basic Concepts on the American Regional International Law), Tokyo: Yūhikaku.


Rōyama, Masamichi, 1925, *Seijigaku no Ninmu to Taisyo (Politics: the missions and targets)*, Tokyo: Gansyōdō Shoten.


