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ABSTRACT

The paper illuminates the issue about how did Japanese IR scholars create the theory of East Asian Community (EAC) to support the Japan’s expansion over Asia and how did they attack the Western universal order and the principles: nationalism, imperialism and liberal universalism. In the 1920s, Japanese leading IR theorists such as Shinobu, Kamikawa and Rōyama accepted and developed the theory of international relations like idealist theorists in the West. In 1931, however, the Manchuria Incident led to their ideological convention to realism because Japanese government became intolerant towards the Versailles system and the Washington system. Japanese government advanced her imperial strategy towards the Greater East Co-Prosperity Sphere, and Rōyama and other IR scholars created the theory of EAC to support the government and criticised the Western universal order and the principles. The Japanese IR history in theory and practice suggests that political theory might make a function to justify or reject the policy of government and other political groups. This implies that even Western IR theories --- mainstream and critical --- might be rather affected by the current Western political practices and these theories might not be universal but be particular in place and in time.

INTRODUCTION

The aim of the paper is to argue about how Japanese IR scholars supported the ideas of East Asian
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community before 1945 and how did they challenge the Western universal order and the principles.

Nowadays, Asian countries are often said to pull global economy especially just after the financial crisis in 2009. Asian countries such as South Korea, Taiwan and Japan, are a front-runner in the field of high mechanical engineering and technologies. Other Asian countries such as China, India and Indonesia, have a large amount of population --- 40% of the whole global population and a booming domestic market. After the financial crisis, the U.S. and Western European counties are declining in economical and political power. Chinese and Japanese institutional investors have bought the majority of the U.S. government bonds, and American public expenditures depend on Chinese and Japanese money. Moreover US dollar and Euro are fairly decreasing in value for Yuan and Yen after the financial shock. It is not too much to say that the 21st century will be the era of Asia.

The 20th century was rightly the era of universal international order, but the international order was merely modern Western order emerging in the particular place and time. Hedley Bull, in his book *Anarchical Society* (1977), described the expansion of the international order and the international society as that of Western states system. It is true that Western European state system has enlarged all over the world in the process of colonisation and modernisation. I wonder, however, Western universal system has not been challenged by other political communities and will be changed into other political system. He suggested that the modern international system might happen to be changed into another world system in the future. He raised one case of the world system: the new medieval society through regional integration and fragmentation.

In fact, the Western universal order, the Great Britain and France had been constructing, was attacked by the U.S., Germany and Japan just before the World War II. The United States adhered to the idea of the Monroe Doctrine to combine Americans countries and to prevent intervention from old European countries. Germany under the rule of the Nazis demanded the Lebensraum (Life Space) over East European lands. Moreover, Japan made a plan to establish the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere over the mainland of China and Mongolia. The universal order in the 1930s and the 1940s was intensely challenged because of the emergence of these regional orders.

This paper will argue about how did Japanese IR scholars support the regional order before 1945. In order to discuss on the issue, I will consider the following three questions. Firstly, how did Japanese IR scholars accept the Western IR theories before the WWII? Japanese academics had already studied international law and international relations before the WWII and some of the Japanese scholars supported the idealist international relations theory in the 1920s like the Western ones. Secondly, how did Japanese IR scholars reject the Western universal order after the Manchuria Incident (the 9-18 Incident in Chinese) in 1931? Some of the liberal Japanese IR theorists, especially
Masamichi Rōyama, turned their academic position into realism because they endeavoured Japanese imperial foreign policies. Finally, how did Japanese IR scholars support the idea of East Asian Community before 1945? The paper makes a detailed explanation of Rōyama’s theory because he was an influential researcher in the Imperial University of Tokyo (the University of Tokyo) and was elected as a member of the House of Representatives under the totalitarian regime in 1941.

The argumentation on these questions will clarify how did Japanese IR theorists build the theory of East Asian Community to support the Japanese imperial policy and how did they criticise the universal order and principles: nationalism, imperialism and liberal universalism.

1. ACCEPTING 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.

1.1. 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). Daigaku 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 *Kokusaihō Zasshi* (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 Kosusai Hō* (*Public International Law in Peace*) in 1902 and *Senji Kosusai 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.

1.2. 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 was seriously confronted with Russia over interests on Manchuria and Korea. 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 forwards 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 and Kōtō Shō 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. Kokusaihō Zasshi (the Journal of International Law) was renamed to Kokusaihō Gaikō Zasshi (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).

2. ACCEPTING AND DEVELOPING IR IN JAPAN

2.1. 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 towards 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.

2.2. Introducing the Study 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). Moreover, 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 recommended that new settlers bring the land
under cultivation. Hokkaido Imperial University (Hokkaido University)\(^2\) was the centre 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 researchers\(^3\) from the 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 lecturer in Waseda University, studying international law and diplomatic history. He supported classical diplomacy before the Versailles system and seemed 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 organisations 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 civilisation, based on the principles of international pacifism and solidarism” (Kamikawa 1927: 247). He recognised the League of Nations as a world confederation to pursue the purposes of international politics (Kamikawa 1927: 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 Relations.

---

\(^{2}\) 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 studied since the age of the *Sapporo Nō Gakkō*. See Sakai (2006).

\(^{3}\) Tadashi Kawata, an emeritus professor for the University of Tokyo and Sophia University, mentioned three leading Japanese IR theorists (Kawata 1963).
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 Taisyō (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 towards realism in order to endorse the Japan’s imperialist war and regime, and entered into real politics as a politician in 1942. After WWII, he became executive board member of the Japanese Political Science Association and the first president of the Japanese Society for Public Administration.

3. TRANSFORMATION TOWARDS THE NEW REGIONAL ORDER

3.1. Background
A rail on the South Manchuria Railway, which was managed by a company founded by the Empire of Japan, was blown out on 18 September 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 1 March 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
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4 Japanese political parties were dissolved in 1940, and were incorporated into Yokusen Kai (Imperial Rule Assistance Associate) in 1940 and Yokusen 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 Yokusen Seiji Kai. After the dissolution of the Yokusen Seiji Kai, Rōyama entered the Yokusō Gin Dōshi Kai.
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 actualise these special relations (Rōyama 1933: 192-193). This means that Shinobu still supported the contemporary international order but Rōyama took one step towards an enquiry 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-Chitsujo (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 defence policy, creating a new culture and realising 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 the new 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 recognised that they could no longer publicly criticise the government. Other IR researchers created a theory supporting the government’s foreign policies: the theory of East Asian community supporting the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, for example. However, these researchers were deeply entangled in politics, and police and army as well as right wing activists kept watch on their language and behaviour. For Japanese IR scholars before the end of the WWII, keeping a certain distance from real politics was very crucial in order to survive.

3.2. 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

---

5 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 Chitsujo 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 (Yabe 1945).
Doctrine in the U.S., the theories of *Lebensraum* (Living Space) in Germany, and the 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 Sōsyō* (*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 Japanese 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 neighbour since 1933 and regional treaties securing independence of American countries from other states, and peaceful settlements and joint defence 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 bearers of European culture.

Kamikawa moved his academic position from liberalism towards 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 *Dai Tōa Sengen* (*the Joint Declaration of the Greater East Asia*) of 1942 (Kamikawa 1944).

### 3.3. Masamichi Rōyama’s Theory of East Asian Community

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

In the first article “Tōa Kyōdōtai no Riron (The Theory of East Asian Community),” Rōyama insisted that Asian people should recognise Asian identity and we should not consider Western culture and value as universal. He was critical of the liberal universalism of the League of Nations because it established the principle of sovereignty of states and their self-determination. The self-determination principle was implanted in the mind of Asian people and urged various different Asian nations to build their own nation-state rather than a single Asian regional community. The Western powers colonised Asian lands and nations in accordance with the idea of the imperial nationalism. The double nationalism --- ethnic nationalism and imperial nationalism --- negatively affected China, because many Chinese people followed their national identity to maintain their political independence and received the support of the Western imperial powers such as the U.S., and challenged the Japan’s expansion. Therefore, he stressed that Japan should overcome both the Chinese nationalism and the Western imperialism.

Rōyama contradicted the critics that the Japan’s Asian policy was imperialism like Western colonialism. The Western imperial powers such as the Great Britain and France crossed the sea and colonised many lands and people who could not feel the same destiny. On the contrary, Japanese development over Asian region was different from the Western imperialism because Japan and other Asian people could hold the destiny in common in order to defend Asian region from the Western powers and develop Asian economy to improve the lives of the Asian people.

Rōyama considered that the destiny of Asia could not come from geographical and cultural point of view. He instead insisted that a motive to build Asian regional community should come from the Raumsschicksal that was the sense of survival, revival and progress to realise peace and development in the region. Japanese political and military power pushed forwards the sense of Asian destiny because there was not any kind of the same culture throughout the Asia.

His theory of EAC, therefore, denied the Western universal principles: nationalism and imperialism and liberal universalism, and it supported the contraction of the Asian regional destiny and community to which the Japanese imperial government should lead Asian people and nations.

In the second article “Kokumin Kyōdōtai no Keisei (The Foundations of the National Community),” Rōyama accounted for the domestic side of EAC (Rōyama 1939a). He endorsed the
theory of political functionalism but criticised the theory of political institutionalism. He thought that politics should perform a function to adjust various interests between the individuals and the whole. The study on political institutions could not appropriately enquire into politics, because these institutions did not necessarily hold all political functions to coordinate interests among political actors. On the contrary, he set a different political notion — national community contrast with political institution. The idea of national community meant a political order to serve the political function for adjustment and consisted of people, society and economy. It would not be only governmental institutions and organs, but it would be composed of even moral slogans such as national unity (Kyokoku I’chi), national general mobilisation (Kokumin Sōdōin), a planned economy, or a controlled administration.

Rōyama recognised the principle of national community as a Japanese national polity (Kokutai). The principle was a Japanese original principle to integrate the national community for a long time, at least since Taika no Kaishin (the Reform in the Era of Taika) since 645 — the revolutionary reform for the centralisation of the government power — the reform of land, family registration, tax, and local administration. According to his article, the principle of the national polity lied in two ideas: Sonnō (reverence for the emperor) and Jyōi (exclusionism). He understood that these principles were taken root in Japanese tradition and history, and European principles were too universal and abstract to introduce into the Japanese society.

Rōyama laid emphasis on the reformation of the Japanese economy turning an individual and liberal economy into a controlled and planned economy in order to survive in the world. However, many theorists and politicians seriously accused his economic theory to be too socialistic. Moreover, he stressed the necessity to reconstitute the national community changing an individual and liberal community into a unified national community. The transformation of the political community needed not the unification of existing political parties. It rather required the national common inspiration and shared loyalty towards the Japanese national polity (Kokutai) and reasonable methods appropriate to a political purpose, especially an excellent means in efficiency and technology. His idea of national community seemed to be a kind of totalitarianism, but he opposed it because the national community needed not be founded upon the Western totalitarian theories but it should be established on the Japanese traditional spirit and customary loyalty to Kokutai.

Therefore, he explained the national community would be based on the moral foundation as

---

6 Taika no Kaishin was a starting point of Japanese politics, but in fact the political reformation aimed at a kind of Sinicisation to introduce a Chinese administration system and Confucianism.
7 These principles certainly had promoted Meiji Ishin (the Meiji Restoration) since 1856 and unified Japanese people and society, but these notions were not originally Japanese ideas but ancient Chinese ideas in the Spring and Autumn Age.
the historical and traditional idea of *Kokutai* and the political foundation as the non-liberal unified national community.

In the last article “Sekai Shin-Chitsujo no Tembō (The Prospect of the New World Order),” Rōyama enquired into the relationship between EAC and the world (Rōyama 1939b). He observed it from the two perspectives: *structural* and *practical*. From the *structural* perspective, he regarded the relationship between East Asia and the world as the relationship between the *special* and the *universal*. Japan had developed under the *universal* Western structure until the World War I, but after that she recognised a position of leadership in East Asia, and claimed on solving regional conflicts in Manchuria and China without any interference from Western powers and demanded the *special* interests over the mainland of China.

From the *practical* perspective, he considered the relationship between East Asia and the world as the relationship between the *ideal* and the *reality*. Japan should not deal with international disputes only from the *structural* perspective, because Chinese people could not accept her demands if Japan pushed her special interests on China. Japan should rather accept the *ideal* of the whole of East Asian people beyond the Japanese demands. The relationship between East Asian community and the world could be constructed when Japanese people would believe that a philosophical structure of East Asian order could overcome the *special-universal* and the *realistic-ideal* gaps.

The *practical* issues towards the new world order would face the *reality* from the demands from imperial Western powers and colonised nations. Western powers colonised many lands and people in the world, while many nations desired their political independence from the Western imperial domination. In order to control the *reality* in the world, the new regional order should regulate these demands from imperialism and nationalism, and promote regional developments. Japan should sublate (*aufheben*) the Japanese imperialism and the Chinese nationalism into the new regional order in East Asia in order to accomplish the regional *ideals*.

His theory about the perspective of the new world order insisted that the idea of the Japanese *special* interests on China against the *universal* world order should be turned into the idea of the regional common interests of the whole Asia. The notion of the regional common *ideals* could overcome the *reality* of the demands from the Western imperialism and the Chinese nationalism.

Rōyama considered critically nationalism and imperialism supporting the Western universal order, and he created the theory of East Asian Community supporting the new regional order. Japanese army invaded China and other East Asian countries and endeavoured to build the Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere, but Japan lost the Second Sino-Japanese War and the Pacific War. As a result, his theory on East Asian Community had no validity to explain reality.
CONCLUSION

The paper illuminates the issue about how did Japanese IR scholars create the theory of EAC to support the Japan’s expansion over Asia and how did they attack the Western universal order and the principles: nationalism, imperialism and liberal universalism. In the 1920s, Japanese leading IR theorists such as Shinobu, Kamikawa and Rōyama accepted and developed the theory of international law, international organisations and international administration like idealist theorists in the West. In 1931, however, the Manchuria Incident led to their ideological convention to realism because Japanese government became intolerance towards the Versailles system and the Washington system. Japanese government advanced the imperial strategy towards the Greater East Co-Prosperity Sphere, and Rōyama and other IR scholars created the theory of EAC to support the government and criticised the universal order and the principles. He recognised the Chinese nationalism and the Western imperialism as an enemy for EAC because the community should consist of various nations including Chinese nation and resist Western military powers. Moreover, he rejected the value of the liberal universalism, especially the League of Nations, because the system authorised the principle of sovereignty and self-determination: moral and legal foundations to promote nationalism. In fact, Japanese government and army were defeated in the Sino-Japanese War and the Pacific War, and his theory on East Asian Community had no validity to explain reality.

I suppose from the history of politics and academics in the pre-war Japan that many of the Japanese political theorists tended to insist that their theory explain the reality of domestic and international politics objectively. However, they seem to create a theory to subjectively support Japanese government or other particular political groups and to reject the Western universalism and principles. The Japanese history in practice and academics suggests that political theory might make a function to justify the policy of government and other political groups, at least the theory of EAC justified the government’s imperial policy in the pre-war Japan. This also implies that even Western IR theories --- mainstream and critical --- might be rather affected by the current Western political practices and these theories might not be universal but be particular in place and in time.

The 21st century will be the age of Asia, and then new theories from Asia will be produced to explain a new international or regional order after the decline of current Western universal order. However, we could hardly escape from the nexus of power and knowledge that Michel Foucault explained. How should we consider researchers who maintain a close relationship with governments in order to actualise their own theory in real politics? Or how should we consider researchers who keep their distance from governments and confine their theory within the library? Social scientists should
make a conscious effort to deal with the crisis in the relationship between theory and practice.
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