Japanese Journal of Political Science 3 (2) 289–302 Printed in the United Kingdom © Cambridge University Press 2002

Book Reviews

Matthew Shugart and Martin Wattenberg (eds.), *Mixed-Member Electoral Systems: The Best of Both Worlds?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

With more and more countries around the world adopting some form of mixed electoral rules for their national legislatures, the field of electoral studies finds itself confronting a completely new set of questions. Why are mixed-member systems the predominant choice for new and established democracies considering electoral reform? What are the political consequences of their adoption? And do mixed-member systems really offer the best of both worlds by combining plurality rule with proportional representation?

Scholars have sought to tackle these questions by conducting detailed case studies as well as the quantitative analysis of one or more mixed-member electoral systems. Many, however, remain wary to study an electoral system that has only been tested two or three times. Moreover, the adoption of a mixed-member system may occur simultaneously with other changes in the political arena, such as party realignment or the adoption of new campaign regulations, which can make it difficult to specify the intended consequences of the new electoral system.

Against this background, Shugart and Wattenberg's edited volume makes an important and timely contribution. With a broader theoretical chapter, case study chapters on Germany, New Zealand, Israel, Italy, Japan, Venezuela, Bolivia, Mexico, Hungary and Russia, and many tables and figures, the book proposes to answer why countries of diverse electoral histories have turned to mixed-member electoral systems and looks at the political consequences. Although this is an excellent reference book that provides unique and extensive coverage of a diverse range of cases, it is only partially successful in answering its own questions.

After an introduction to the world of mixed-electoral systems, the causes leading to the adoption of mixed-member systems in ten cases are analyzed by country experts in Part II. Many of the authors make reference to Shugart's arguments presented in Chapter 1, in which he suggests that a detailed understanding of both inherent and contingent factors in each country is necessary to understand how mixed-member systems come into practice. In the case of Japan, for example, Steve Reed and Michael Thies usefully focus our attention on the tradeoffs between the short-term and long-term interests of Japanese politicians during the passage of the electoral reform bills. One of the major themes across these chapters is that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mixed-member systems often emerge as the creation of political compromise among competing political actors.

The political consequences of the new mixed system are presented for the same countries in Part III. These chapters highlight some of the complex challenges involved in evaluating the consequences of mixed electoral systems, especially when many of the expected changes have not yet materialized or are fraught with many unexpected consequences. In the case of Italy, for example, Richard Katz discusses how electoral dynamics have changed considerably, but some of the changes that accompanied the new system, such as an increase in party fragmentation, were precisely the opposite of what was desired. In addition to the ten case studies, readers interested in the prospects of electoral reform in other countries will find a useful discussion of the debates underway in the United Kingdom and Canada in Part IV.

Although the editors have assembled incredibly rich material for these diverse cases, they did not give themselves sufficient space to explore it. Some readers are likely to be disappointed by the relatively sparse theoretical treatment of these cases beyond Shugart's discussion of the interparty and intraparty dimensions of mixed-member electoral systems. In particular, the editors might have substituted a case study chapter for a more critical discussion of the strengths and limitations of existing political science theories to explain the causes and consequences of mixed electoral systems, particularly given many of the unexpected changes and the challenges in predicting the effects of reform discussed in the case study chapters. The editors might have also included more discussion of such concepts as change and time, or have introduced additional conceptual frameworks to better assess the consequences of mixed-member electoral systems.

Political science theories, for example, might have difficulty in explaining discrete political events, such as the passage of electoral reform covered in the first half of the book, but might hold more promise for understanding some of the political consequences of the systems which have emerged or are likely to emerge in the future. What are the strengths and limitations of existing approaches? Which theories of political science are likely to be useful for examining mixed-member electoral systems? With more critical discussion of existing approaches and theoretical material, Shugart and Wattenberg might have also extended their analysis of mixed-electoral systems by identifying testable hypotheses about the effects of reform across some of the cases.

In the introductory chapters, readers learn about the important variations across mixed-systems such as the variable of linkage between tiers, the percentage of seats set aside in the list tier, as well as the magnitude of the list tier, but there are only brief suggestions offered for how such variations might lead to different effects on legislative behavior or on the party system. Which institutional features in the cases examined led to specific changes in the countries examined given our assumptions about how different electoral laws work? Even though mixed-electoral systems may be a diverse lot, Shugart and Wattenberg should have attempted more generalizations across the case study chapters. Their ideas could then have been examined in the case study chapters, which would have undoubtedly made a bigger contribution to the literature.

Likewise, Shugart and Wattenberg could have made a more concerted effort to unpack the challenging concepts of time and change in their analyses, particularly as Richard Katz and other case study authors note the importance of these concepts in their evaluation of different mixed-member systems. How should scholars distinguish the transitory and short-term effects

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of mixed-electoral systems from their more long-term properties? How are these systems likely to further change as political parties and politicians adapt to the new incentives and electoral dynamics? As Angelo Panebianco (1988) argues, the biggest empirical problem is how to distinguish between fundamental changes in the organizational order from the many small changes continually present that do not affect the organizational order. This problem seems particularly acute when the long-term effects of a new electoral system are not likely to appear until after several election cycles have passed.

In addition to more critical attention to the variables of time and change, the volume might have offered more discussions on the effects of electoral systems at the district and national level, which might have better accounted for changes in political party systems at different levels of analysis. Gary Cox (1997), for example, demonstrates the importance of examining the effects of electoral systems at both the district and national level, arguing that the linkage of these levels depends on such factors as the skills of parties to unite elite actors into single nationwide party organizations. Although some of authors fruitfully make use of this distinction in their country study, the utility of this distinction should have been noted at the outset.

Ideally, the suggestions noted above would have been made in the introduction, applied to the country chapters, and integrated into the charts and tables to evaluate the experiences of these countries not on a case-by-case basis but in order to establish common patterns and to evaluate existing approaches and tools. With a stronger theoretical core and more comparisons offered across the range of cases, the editors might have been more successful in answering the questions that they proposed in their introduction: why do mixed-systems emerge; what are their political consequences; and, finally, do mixed-member electoral systems represent the best of both worlds?

In terms of their last question, Shugart and Wattenberg perhaps overstate their argument. As the experiences of many of the case studies suggest, this question is not easily answerable. Not only are there empirical assertions about the likely consequences of mixed voting rules, but also value judgments on the desirability of these consequences. Mixed electoral systems do not really represent the best of both worlds; they merely combine a part of each world. A major challenge for scholars will thus be to understand to what extent different combinations across these systems affect such areas as the political party system or legislative behavior. Despite its limitations, this book provides useful clues and discussion for how to proceed.

Matthew Carlson
University of California, Davis and the University of Tokyo

References

Cox, Gary (1997), *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral System*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Panebianco, Angelo (1998). *Political Parties: Organisation and Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Paul Pierson (ed.), *The New Politics of the Welfare State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Understanding the sustainability of welfare states has been one of the primary concerns in the studies of comparative politics. Welfare states are under stress due to various sources of structural changes such as intensified competition in international markets, slow productivity growth caused by de-industrialization, changing production strategies, increasing women's labor market participation, aging populations, and increased capital mobility, to name just a few. Those pressures have brought about efforts to introduce significant changes in welfare states, which in turn have provoked 'sharp conflicts and triggered widespread social unrest' (p. 1) in many advanced industrial democracies. The welfare state is now at the center of political discussion and the consequences of its reform will have an enormous impact on the competitiveness of a country as well as citizens' well-being. Thus, political scientists have investigated diverse adjustment processes and consequences of welfare reforms over the course of the last decade.

Among the large number of publications on contemporary welfare states, there is no doubt that *The New Politics of the Welfare State*, edited by Paul Pierson, is on the top of the reading list for students of comparative politics and welfare states. The authors clearly demonstrate the impacts of post-industrialization, aging populations, and globalization on welfare reforms under various political settings and different policy legacies. They also successfully define pressing research agendas for further investigations.

Among the numerous contributions that this book makes, I highlight three major points that are relevant to scholars of Japanese studies. My focus is highly selective, yet this choice can be justified as Japan is often on the margin of the current academic debate. It is quite important to elucidate insights from which scholars of Japanese politics can learn so that the Japanese case can be placed in a comparative perspective.

Political Economy and Welfare States

The literature on political economy and welfare states have been merging recently and *The New Politics* is a good exemplar of this academic trend. Recent scholars increasingly reveal that welfare states are not merely involved in the distributional or redistributional matters of economic activities, but are integral parts of modern economies. For instance, welfare states have shaped corporate strategies of human capital formation, labor restructuring, and wage negotiations. Many scholars have investigated the linkages between particular aspects of social policy arrangements and distinct national varieties of capitalism, exploring precisely in what ways welfare states are beneficial to firms (see, for example, Ebbinghaus and Manow (eds), 2001). In *The New Politics*, Evelyne Huber and John D. Stephens commit to such an intellectual endeavor and demonstrate that particular types of welfare states are strongly associated with distinct production regimes.

The exploration of institutional complementarities between welfare states and corporate activities has led scholars to focus on the roles and preferences of employers, rather than unions and social democratic parties, in shaping and restructuring welfare states. As employers have long adjusted to the development of welfare states, their attitudes toward welfare state reforms are not always oppositional but often halfhearted or even supportive. At the same time, certain elements of social policy arrangements have come to be incongruent with their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

new corporate strategies under ever-changing business environments. Identifying the source of employers' discontent with regard to exiting social policy arrangements allows scholars to understand what kinds of policy reforms social actors are likely to favor. This perspective is well taken by Philip Manow, Martin Rhodes, Susan Giaimo, and Stewart Wood in their respective chapters.

The shift from the union-centered view to the employer-centered view is relevant to students of Japanese politics in at least two ways. First, Japan can be a test case for the reinterpretation of the political economy of the welfare state undertaken by *The New Politics*. It has been impossible for Japanese specialists to ignore the role of employers in constructing and reforming social policy due to the weakness of unions and social democratic parties. Yet, as most historical accounts stand on the premise that the interests of employers are not compatible with those of workers, the positive function of the welfare state with regard to production activities has not been fully investigated. Specifying such linkages in Japan allows one to hypothesize about the mechanisms of welfare capitalism and make a theoretical contribution to the literature of comparative politics (see, for instance, Hall and Soskice (eds), 2001).

Second, the employer-centered view enables the Japanese case to be more comparable with other case studies in affluent democracies than in past studies. Japanese employers are aggressively seeking welfare state reform in order to alleviate their financial burdens, just as employers do elsewhere. This means that different reform outcomes between Japan and other selected countries can be partly attributed to political institutional factors such as interest intermediation, veto points, and party systems. In *The New Politics*, chapters written by Duane Swank, Giuliano Bonoli, and Herbert Kitschelt investigate the institutional or partisan logic of policy change. The incremental and consensus-oriented nature of Japanese policy-making is quite similar to that found in countries where political authority is fragmented. Further comparative analyses enable us to specify exactly which institutions deter policy change under what conditions.

Constructing Dependent Variables

Comparative public policy is a messy field in the sense that dependent variables themselves are usually controversial. Generally speaking, scholars tend to focus on three types of dependent variables: spending patterns, speed and degree of policy change, and patterns of change. Spending patterns are usually straightforward, yet once tax expenditures and long-term effects of a policy change are taken into consideration, it becomes much more difficult to figure out who pays and who gains. The speed and degree of policy changes might be easy to grasp, although simply comparing radical reforms with incremental changes does not deepen our knowledge on the actual terms of compromise. Even on such a seemingly straightforward outcome, there is little consensus in the literature of welfare states. Gauging the speed and degree of change entails conceptualization of the nature and scope of policy change, but characterizing the patterns of change has not been undertaken systematically, which is one of the major causes of the current lack of consensus. In response to the dependent variable problem inherent in the study of comparative public policy, in the concluding chapter Paul Pierson proposes three dimensions of welfare reforms: re-commodification, cost containment, and recalibration. The articulation of such concepts is one of the most important contributions that *The New Politics* makes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Since welfare reforms are commonplace over the last decade, numerous comparative studies have revealed different policy outcomes across countries and policy areas, yet systematical measuring of policy outcome, which Pierson successfully demonstrates, has hardly begun. Just as Esping-Andersen's influential conceptualization of 'de-commodification' spurred regime analyses of the welfare state a decade ago (Esping-Anderson, 1990), Pierson's three formulations of welfare reforms will certainly inspire followers. In the context of Japanese studies, examining how recent welfare restructuring has proceeded along these three dimensions is a pressing research agenda. Once the dependent variable has been correctly identified, fascinating puzzles will surely be generated for comparing Japan and other countries. For instance, it is crucial to reveal whether or not Japanese reforms contain re-commodification as a reform agenda. According to Pierson, only liberal welfare states place a priority on re-commodification. Since it is still controversial if Japan should be categorized as a liberal or conservative welfare state, the presence of re-commodification, or the lack thereof, will be a strong indicator of Japan's position in the regime analyses.

Still the Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism?

Somewhat related to the last point, Japan's reform paths pose an intellectual challenge to the dominant regime analyses on welfare capitalism. Esping-Andersen's three-world typology of welfare states – liberal, social democratic, and conservative or Christian democratic – has been used in a variety of research questions. In *The New Politics*, chapters by Huber and Stephens, Swank, and Pierson show the usefulness of this typology. Not only do the three worlds capture fundamental differences in the development stage of welfare states, but recent studies demonstrate that distinct reform patterns can also be discerned in each regime.

For Japanologists however, pervasive praise for the three-world typology cannot be accepted at face value, and, to the quite contrary, it presents a puzzle. First of all, Japan's position is still unsolved, as mentioned above. Japan is not the only country that does not squarely fit to the typology, yet the uneasiness of Japan's positioning causes the next, more intriguing problem. Liberal traits of the Japanese welfare state happen to exist in the surrounding of a coordinated market economy. As it is usually considered that 'there is no overlap between the world of liberal welfare states and the world of "organized market economies"' (p. 432), there are two ways to reconcile this contradiction: Japan should be categorized as a variant of the conservative welfare regimes; or Japan constitutes a distinct class. Either way, more systematic comparative work is required between Japan and other conservative welfare states to solve this problem.

Furthermore, scholars also increasingly point out that three distinctive welfare regimes have experienced different solutions to problems caused by the shift of employment from the manufacturing sector to the service sector. *The New Politics* particularly stresses the profound impact of the changes in the employment structure and takes issue with simple claims that emphasize globalization. Once employment shrinkage takes place in the manufacturing sector, job creation can be done either by the expansion of the public service sector, as was seen in social democratic welfare states, or by the increase in low-wage sectors found in the liberal welfare states. Alternatively, the welfare states are able to compensate for the loss of jobs, keeping employment rates quite low, as was the case in the conservative welfare regimes. These three distinct solutions contain different sources of stress: fiscal overload, wage inequality, and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rising unemployment respectively. So far, this 'trilemma of the service economy' (Iversen and Wren, 1998) has now hit Japan only indirectly, but Japan will not be able to avoid the impact of the post-industrialization for long. Japan's response again will be a crucial point of investigation because the validity of the three worlds of welfare capitalism model can be clearly tested and enriched by including Japanese experiences. Since intense pressures for austerity continue to exist, as underscored by Pierson, the new politics of welfare state in Japan will take shape against a backdrop of both fiscal constraint and political need for supplying jobs. The extent to which politically and socially wage inequalities can be allowed is a focal point which would affect Japan's path.

It is hard to exaggerate the theoretical contributions that *The New Politics of the Welfare State* makes. Numerous insights for future research agendas can be discerned in the volume. Since the literature of the welfare states in advanced industrialized countries has already identified new trends of research, new comers like graduate students will easily find hot topics about Japan. It is indeed a bit puzzling for me to see such a thin layer of researchers in this field. Thus, an inspiring comparative book like that of *The New Politics* is all the more welcome.

References

Ebbinghaus, Bernhard and Philip Manow (eds) (2001), *Comparing Welfare Capitalism: Social Policy and Political Economy in Europe, Japan and the USA* (London: Routledge).

Esping-Andersen, Gøsta (1990), *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press).

Hall, Peter and David Soskice (eds) (2001), *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Iversen, Torben and Ann Wren (1998), 'Equality, Employment and Budgetary Restraint: The Trilemma of the Service Economy', *World Politics*, 50: 507–546.

Mari Miura
Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy, University of California, Berkeley

Junji Banno, *Democracy in Pre-War Japan: Concepts of Government, 1871–1937, Collected Essays*, translated by Andrew Fraser, London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

During the last few years, two prominent books on the history of Japan, John Dowers' *Embracing Defeat* (1999) and Herbert Bix's *Hirohito and the Making of Modern Japan* (2000), have each been awarded with the Pulitzer Prize. Certainly the interest abroad in Japanese history is growing, but an intellectual dialogue between Japanese and foreign academic communities has not advanced very much due to the limited availability of English publications written by Japanese historians. In this sense, the book under review written by a renowned native expert on modern Japanese political history is a much-awaited contribution. Although this book is largely based on the author's award-winning study published earlier, *Kindai Nihon no Kokka Koso, 1871–1936* (1996), it is updated, including a new chapter drawn from his more recent article (Banno, 1998).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Admittedly, because it is a collection of articles originally written over the span of fifteen years, from 1985 to 1998, this book suffers from an unbalanced structure and each important topic is not necessarily pursued with equal care and detail. Nevertheless, it is clear that the underlying theme of the book lies in the evolution of 'moderate (Chudo)' forces within the Japanese political landscape. Banno pursues this theme mostly chronologically in his five chapters. They consists of: Chapters 1 and 2 that describe the coexistence of various concepts of national governments prior to the establishment of the Meiji constitution; Chapter 3 that illustrates the range of competing interpretations of the constitution; and Chapters 4 and 5 that analyze the process and consequences of 'prewar Japanese democracy' during the 1920s and 1930s.

More specifically, the first two chapters of the book detail the development of competing ideas of national government during the first few decades after the Meiji Restoration. The author shows that, until 1881, the conceptual focus of the debate within the Meiji government centered on ideal profiles of modern states, including 'government by public deliberation (Kogi Yoron)', 'wealthy nation (Fukoku)', and 'strong military (Kyohei)'. The author labels proponents of each of these ideas as 'the democracy-from-above group', 'the industrialization-from-above group', and 'the new exclusionist group', respectively, and he describes this early period as a 'nation-building process' characterized by political interactions and confrontations among these groups. In particular, the author highly regards Inoue Kaoru who led the first group, whose pioneering role was later followed by Okuma Shigenobu and Ito Hirobumi. The author emphasizes that, while Okuma and Ito were still preoccupied with the matter of industrialization, say, as late as 1878, Inoue's thinking was more advanced at that point, already beginning to stress the need for democratization. Of course, these three ideas were not mutually exclusive and could have co-existed. Nevertheless, none of them survived in the changing political and economic environments because, according to Banno, the ideational focus of the debate gradually digressed to the aim of the revolution itself away from the question of post-revolutionary regime choice.

The 'October 1881 Political Crisis', by ousting Okuma and other proponents of the British-style parliamentarism from government, ended this earlier stage of political and ideological battles. However, this incident also set the stage for a series of new debates, which in retrospect led to the adoption of the constitution and parliamentary system. In this new round, the controversy at first took place between the conservative group within the government who adhered to the 'transcendence principle (Chozen shugi)' and the people's rights advocates associated with 'natural rights arguments (Tenbu Jinken ron)'. This juxtaposition is referred to in Japanese as 'Kanmin Atsureki'. However, because the debate was too abstract and detached from the real political context, this initial conflict was soon taken over by the compromising position called 'Accord between Government and the People (Kanmin Chowa Taisei)'. Aside from the two extreme positions that were thus converging, Banno stresses that there was an political alternative in the middle, which was based on the vision of two-party parliamentary democracy like the British model, originally advocated by Inoue and later developed by Fukuzawa Yukichi and Tokutomi Soho. Precisely because this vision of parliament was 'moderate', it was attacked by both ends of the ideological spectrum, but it certainly provided the basis for a realistic and more liberal political option.

From a broader perspective, it must also be emphasized that the ending of the debate about the aim of the revolution coincided with two other sets of developments, namely the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

establishment of fiscal conservatism and the consolidation of Japan's position in East Asia based on the alliance with Great Britain. It was in this underlying context, Banno argues, that Kanmin Atsureki turned into Kanmin Chowa, the latter of which indeed laid the foundation for the government's policy up until the 1920s. In this way, the author describes the evolution of various ideas of national government in the ceaselessly changing environments in and outside of Japan. His narrative often provides valuable insights, including his point that, while the terms 'British model' and/or 'Prussian model' were often used in the constitutional debates, these concepts were used self-consciously in order to legitimize the already existing visions of ideal polities rather than for the purpose of copying or learning from foreign experiences.

In Chapter 3, the author moves on to discuss three influential interpretations of the Meiji constitution: Hozumi Yatuka's emperor centric view ('Taiken Seiji'); Minobe Tatsukichi's cabinet centric view ('Naikaku Seiji'); and, the idea, advanced by Kita Ikki and Yoshino Sakuzo, which placed the emperor and the parliament on an equal footing as sovereigns ('Min-Pon Seiji'). Banno emphasizes that it is wrong to think that there was one specific, legitimate constitutional interpretation in prewar Japan. His view is that these three ideas co-existed, all struggling to balance between the constitution's provisions and the changing political and societal realities, and that the tension among these ideas formed the basis of Japan's constitutional polity. Thus, the author rejects the deterministic view that the emperor's power and other formally institutionalized structures shaped much of Japan's political development in the prewar period. In the same vein, Banno also rejects the account which, by pointing to the gap between institutional formality and political reality, distinguishes emperor's *de jure* power and people's *de facto* freedom under it. The author rather believes that the prewar Japanese constitutional discourse was colored by a mixture of various legitimate and competing ideas.

In Chapters 4 and 5, the author analyzes Japanese politics of the 1920s and 1930s as the culmination of 'prewar Japanese democracy'. In the conventional understanding of Japanese history, the period from 1924 to 1932 is regarded as a distinctive era because during this period the parliament functioned and political parties took turns forming national government. Banno, however, offers a more nuanced account of this period. By expanding his focus to Proletarian parties ('goho musanseito') and by highlighting the difference between the two major parties, Minseito and Seiyukai, the author tries to redefine the political landscape of this period as a confrontation between conservative Seiyukai on the one hand and neo-liberal forces represented by Minseito and Proletarian parties on the other. Viewed from this perspective, the collapse of Inukai government (1931.12–1932.5) is not a landmark event, and the following Saito Makoto (1932.5–1934.7) and Okada Keisuke (1934.7–1936.3) cabinets can be seen as a continuation of the earlier Minseito governments. This viewpoint is maintained also in Chapter 5. The author pays a particular attention to the results of the 1936 February and the 1937 April elections in which the Socialist party ('Shakai Taishuto'), the leading proletarian party, gained significant momentum. Relying on comments published by Kawai Eijiro, a renowned critic at that time, Bannno defends the view that the increase of Socialist parliamentary force reflected the people's growing support for social democratic policies and ideals. It may be true, as argued traditionally, that Minseito and the proletarian parties were divided on their stance whether to criticize or acquiesce the rising military power. Banno, however, emphasizes that the second political cleavage with regard to the acceptance/rejection

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of capitalism was even more salient. According to the author, the political development of the 1930s was taken with a sense of achievement particularly by those familiar with the earlier writing of Yoshino (Sakuzo) who had advocated the advancement of social democratic forces in parliament. Hence, Banno regards the whole period up to the outbreak of Sino-Japanese War in 1937 as the process of Japan's democratization, and argues that the revival of parliamentary democracy was possible throughout this period, despite the successive assassinations of civilian leaders.

As noted, Chapter 5 is the part of the book newly added to this English version. This is a significant addition, because it shows explicitly that the author is more concerned with the substance of Japan's prewar democracy, especially the social democratic forces under it, rather than the institutional features of the two-party political system. The author has elsewhere argued that this shift of emphasis is crucial: 'It is tempting to view that, now that the manhood suffrage Diet was achieved, the agenda left for democratization then was a realization of female suffrage. But, in the first half of the twentieth century, democracy could not have existed without the element of social democratic ideals' (*Nihon Seiji 'Shippai' no Kenkyu*. Koubou-sha, 2001, p. 146). It is this perspective that leads, for example, to his unwillingness to deny outright the political and ideological connection between the established parties on the one hand and progressive parties on the other. Banno maintains that Japan's prewar 'democracy', like any other democracy in the world, must be understood for its substantive content as well as its procedural attributes.

Overall, this book makes an important contribution by attempting to revise some of the conventional interpretations of Japan's modern political history. Banno is innovative when he highlights Inoue Kaoru's pioneering role in advocating constitutionalism, the political continuity between the 1920s and 1930s, and the existence and salience of the second political cleavage according to which Minseito and the Socialists were (said to be) located closely. Undoubtedly, most stimulating and controversial is his claim that Japan's democratization continued all the way up until the outbreak of Sino-Japanese War.

Furthermore, this book should be highly commended for its sustained effort of embedding the ideational discourse into the evolving real political context. The author is successful in analyzing relatively long-term political goals and ideas held by various groups and thinkers, as well as how the competition among them was reflected in more short-term compromises struck in day-to-day political interactions. His re-reading of influential writings, such as those by Fukuzawa, Minobe, Yoshino and Kawai, is fascinating, revealing the importance of many questions only contemporary critics could raise without the benefit of hindsight.

The underlying theme of this book is the author's (re-)evaluation of moderate political forces in Japan. In this sense, Banno offers an important corrective to the conventional literature. Although Banno spends much time analyzing the patterns of political interactions between conservatives, moderates and reformers, his analysis does not treat these three groups equally but rather focuses heavily on the middle group which thus far has largely been ignored in previous studies. What he means by the term 'moderates', of course, changes its form of existence over time. In the beginning, Banno highlights the political force that supported British style parliamentary democracy, while in the latter half of the book he uses the term to mean social democracy. For Banno, however, this is a consistent political lineage representing non-Seiyukai tradition in the prewar Japan, associated with such political parties as Kaishinto, Kenseikai, and Minseito. Many previous studies have limited their analytical focus on the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Liberal Party and Seiyukai, and the relationship between this conservative partisan tradition and Hanbatsu establishment is often described as the key to understanding Japan's prewar political development. Although some recent studies have tried to locate the non-Seiyukai tradition, no one else but the author of this book has ever tried to recapture this alternative political legacy from such a broad and long-term perspective.

Having laid out the essence and positive contributions of this book, let me now raise some questions. First, while the author treats Inoue's constitutionalism, Kaishinto's rule under parliamentarism, and the rise of social democracy led by liberal and socialist parties as distinctive events in the evolution of Japanese 'democracy', is it not more accurate to understand them as multi-layered and/or mutually complementary elements of the same problem? It would be difficult to call a polity democratic even with the realization of social democratic policies if the institutional frameworks for political participation had not been firmly established under that polity. Clearly, the meaning of elections changes from when parliament had power to when parliament became simply a lobbying entity. Unlike Great Britain where the foundations of partisan politics were secure, in Japan, in this early period, the choice of policies was not independent of that of political institutions. Banno deemphasizes the significance of the fall of Inukai government, but in this context it might be worth to recall that an influential journalist, Baba Tsunego, originally critical of conservative Inukai cabinet, later became an adamant advocate of the revival of partisan cabinets. The problems of political institutions and those of political substances cannot be separately analyzed, nor understood.

Second, the author's style of narrative which brings together the ideational and real political worlds is original and innovative, but he often falls short of providing insight as to how exactly competing ideas were translated into the actual pattern of political interactions. Banno, for example, could have traced in further detail how the three interpretive paradigms of the Meiji constitution were actually played out in determining the development of prewar constitutional polity, norms, and institutions. Similarly, Banno could also have shed new light on the rise of partisan politics in the 1920s. Parliamentarism, as he himself describes in Chapters 1 and 2, was once an aborted idea. Nevertheless, this idea was picked up in the 1920s, which made it possible for Minseito to pursue some of its progressive policies during that decade. How did a minority thinking in the past turn into an influential idea of dominant majority? Precisely because his narrative style has analytical potential, it is unfortunate that the author does not seem to take advantage of it more fully and elucidate these points.

None of these criticisms is meant to take away the value of this book, which is bound to revitalize the debate about the origins and the nature of Japan's democracy. Some observers, including John Dower mentioned earlier, adhere to the view that the Japanese democracy developed after World War II was a product of 'hybrid' between the Japanese experience and American ideals. In contrast, the view and interpretation offered in this book may lead Banno to conclude that the postwar democracy has been an extension of the prewar 'Showa' democracy (prior to Sino-Japanese War) and that there was not an 'imposition' of an American model (cf: *Nihon Seiji 'Shippai' no Kenkyu*, Koubousha, 2001, esp. 134). Thinking of the past, of course, provides us with an important roadmap for thinking about the present and future. Reexamination of Japan's prewar democracy, in this sense, is an important ingredient for rethinking about Japan's contemporary democracy in relative and perhaps more objective terms. This book published in English by a Japanese scholar certainly contributes to further

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

discussion about Japan's democracy and democracy more generally beyond national boundaries.

References

Banno, Junji (1996), *Kindai Nihon no Kokka Koso*, 1871–1936 (Tokyo: Iwanami, 1996).
Banno, Junji (1998), 'The Last Stage of Democratization in Prewar Japan, 1936–1937', *The Journal of Social Science*, 49(3).
Bix, Herbert (2000), *Hirohito and the Making of Modern Japan* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers).
Dowers, John (1999), *Embracing Defeat* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company).

Ryota Murai
Research Fellow, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science
(Translated by Masaru Kohno)

Steven K. Vogel (ed.), *US–Japan Relations in a Changing World*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2002.

Steven K. Vogel and his collaborators have produced a unique and highly original set of analyses of postwar US–Japan relations. Despite some weaknesses that will be mentioned later, this book offers an insightful overview of US–Japan relations with a forward-looking perspective. It will be widely read and cited in the near future.

The editor's introductory chapter spells out the objective of this study very clearly: 'This volume reviews the past fifty years of the US–Japan relationship and speculates about how it will evolve in the years to come' (p. 1). Actually, the twin objectives of the book – description and prediction – are much more tightly connected than suggested by this sentence; prediction is based on the long-term forecast of 'independent' variables, such as power and institutions, which will help the authors and readers predict the future of the dependent variable: cooperation and discord in US–Japan relations. Thus, 'each chapter assesses how one specific factor affects relationship as a whole. . .develop(s) clear causal arguments. . .' (p. 2) and finally 'provides a first step toward understanding where that (US–Japan) relationship is headed in the years to come. . .' (p. 8). And as a result of the analyses, he makes a dire warning: 'This situation (where the United States exerts global leadership while Japan plays a much smaller role) is not likely to continue' (p. 2).

As mentioned, each substantive chapter concentrates on the effects of one single explanatory factor: chapter 2 on the balance of power, chapter 3 on macroeconomic performance, chapter 4 on policy paradigms, chapter 5 on domestic politics, chapter 6 on the media, chapter 7 on international organization, chapter 8 on financial systems in the two countries and chapter 9 on technological competition.

Michael Green, a self-styled realist, argues in chapter 2 that 'shifts in the balance of power have been the critical drivers of change in the structure and management of the US–Japan alliance' (p. 11). While adjustments to the original strategic bargain formed in the 1950s took

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

place in stages, Green concludes that '[t]hese adjustments have always been modest enough. . . so as not to undermine the original strategic bargain' (p. 31). Thus, episodes of adjustments 'usually ended with an alliance that was further integrated. . .' (p. 29).

Finding that 'US–Japan relations work most smoothly when Japanese growth does not exceed US growth', William Grimes in chapter 3 makes a very clear prediction that 'foreseeable future trends in economic growth in the two countries are likely to contribute to less tense relations' (p. 35). As proof, he shows the periods of most rapid Japanese relative growth are nearly the same as the troughs in relationships (1987, 1992–1995). Aside from the recent signs of rejuvenation of the US economy, his prediction about the future growth patterns is based on the accelerated ageing of Japanese society, which is likely to be a 'long-term drag on the Japanese economy' (p. 55).

Keith Nitta's chapter 4 focuses on the impact of ideas – or what he calls 'paradigms' – on the bilateral relations. He asserts that the paradigms of containment and the Yoshida doctrine: 'harmonized expectations on both sides of the Pacific and laid the foundation of a highly predictable, even stylized, bilateral relationship' (p. 64). However, he notes that the two countries have entered a period of 'paradigm drift' (p. 64), which will destabilize the bilateral relationship. He predicts two alternative successors to the old paradigm in each country: for the United States, out-and-out egotism and internationalism; for Japan, deference to the United States and nationalism (pp. 88–90).

In chapter 5, Leonard Schoppa, after reviewing the impact of domestic politics on US–Japan relations, contends that 'domestic divisions within the two countries have not impeded bilateral cooperation, but greatly facilitated it' (p. 95). He illustrates this contention by examining in detail the domestic debate in Japan around the time of the San Francisco Peace Treaty and the 1951 Security Treaty. He argues that Yoshida managed to strike a balanced agreement precisely because he situated himself between the extreme poles in the domestic debate.

Laurie Freeman examines media coverage of each other in the two countries in chapter 6. While deploring the relative lack of coverage of Japan in the US media, she shows that it has been driven by events as well as perceived power shifts (pp. 135–136). She also makes an intriguing argument that the effect of 'revisionism' in the American media in the 1980s was not entirely negative (p. 139). She notes that Japanese media coverage tends to be one-sided and less than objective due to exclusionary practices of press clubs, but makes a somewhat rosy prediction that the rise of the new media, especially the Internet, may be able to offset these biases.

In chapter 7, Amy Searight looks at Japan's multilateral diplomacy in international organizations (IOs) and finds that 'IOs have served as an outlet for Japan's growing international activism' and that 'Japan has increasingly turned to IOs to bind the United States. . .' (pp. 160–161). She thinks that this tendency is most visible in the GATT–WTO regime, although similar patterns are found in other multilateral organizations. Based on these observations, she predicts that 'taking disputes up in the WTO is likely to lessen trade tensions . . . in the long run' (p. 190).

After a wide-ranging discussion of American and Japanese financial systems and relations, Adam Posen argues in chapter 8 that the two financial systems are converging to the 'arm's length, market-based, US approach' and 'if this trend continues, it will reduce tensions. . . and forge common interests between domestic interest groups across the Pacific. . .' (pp. 198–199).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

But given the still vast difference in financing structure between the two countries (as witnessed in figures 8–1 and 8–2), this convergence seems to be limited to a conceptual level.

Reviewing the recent reversal of fortune in technological competition between the United States and Japan in chapter 9, Vogel and John Zysman find that the 'Japanese (governance) system was successful mainly at the technological catch-up stage' and that 'American institutions fostered the Wintelist (Windows-Intel) paradigm that now favors American firms' (p. 241). This new American resurgence has the impact of making US–Japan technological disputes less tense as evidenced by the difference between the semiconductor and FS–X disputes of the 1980s and the NTT interconnection charge dispute of the late 1990s.

Finally, finding common threads in these wide-ranging findings and analyses, Vogel makes a number of intriguing predictions in his concluding chapter, including the provocative assertion that the security relationship will be more tense and the economic relationship less tense in the future.

Aside from being original, comprehensive, and up-to-date, this volume has a number of virtues. First, the process in which this volume was produced has some merits. The project team solicited inputs from both practitioners and academics from both countries at its preliminary stage through a series of workshops. Also, after first drafts were written, they were read by Japanese specialists in respective areas of expertise. This kind of effort to broaden the 'genetic pool' is especially useful in a narrow field like US–Japan relations, which tend to suffer from too much inbreeding. Furthermore, the organization of the volume – each chapter focusing on one specific variable at a time to shed light on the whole relationship – is not only unique but has the virtue of making theoretical assumptions and causal arguments very explicit.

Nevertheless, I have a few complaints about some aspects of this volume. First, it is not clear how these 'independent' variables were selected in the first place and how they interact with variables that are not discussed in each chapter. As in statistics, if the independent variable(s) is correlated with an omitted variable which significantly affects the dependent variable, the omission is bound to lead to mis-estimation and thus misinterpretation. The volume, as it stands, has not excluded this possibility effectively. Second, although Vogel makes a very original distinction between outcome (conflict–cooperation) and process (tension–harmony) in his introductory chapter, the remaining chapters do not follow up on this distinction (at least explicitly), aside from a short reference in the conclusions. Third, while the authors subscribe to different schools of thought such as realism, liberal institutionalism, and constructivism, their differences are not treated systematically. Vogel insists that their conclusions are complementary, not contradictory. Perhaps, a little more effort to tease out the implications of emphasizing different causal logics might have made the volume even more intellectually stimulating.

Keisuke Iida
Aoyama Gakuin University

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109902222112 Published online by Cambridge University Press