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CHINESE POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Editor's Note

The Chinese Scholars of Political Science and International Studies (CSPSIS) was established in 1985, with funding from the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Rockefeller Brothers' Fund. Its purpose is to undertake an active program of academic exchange among the Chinese scholars visiting and studying in the United States. In the past, the CSPSIS held two annual conferences and published two issues of the NEWSLETTER.

Beginning in this issue, the new title of the CSPSIS' publication is CHINESE POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW. This change is a result of combining the valuable ideas of many people.

This volume includes three articles, a research proposal, and a research note. Quansheng Zhao's article is a case study of the Japanese foreign policy making based on an extensive field research in Japan. He develops an "informal pluralism" model in the Japanese decision-making process. Shaoguang Wang's article casts new light on the study of the Cultural Revolution. He argues that the joint role played by the masses as well as the leaders has to be considered in order to understand such a large-scale mass movement. Xueguang Zhou explains Chinese political process with the evolution theory. He distinguishes between organizational and institutional dimensions, and the historical and behavioral aspects of decision making and implementation. As Shaoguang Wang, Zhou suggests that the role of the populace is equally important as that of the state. Tienjian Sh presents a meaningful and ambitious survey research proposal. He searches for the unique pattern of political participation in China, and puts it in a comparative perspective. In her research note, Yangli Tong provides a systematic comparison of the similarities and differences in their economic and political reforms in Hungary and China. The authors of this volume show a serious attempt at conducting theoretically and methodologically informed case studies. Their works suggest that China study by Chinese scholars is no longer sine-centrie.

I would like to thank the authors for their contribution to our journal. I also wish to thank the other Board members, particularly Ping Hu and Zheya Gai. Without Ping Hu's persistent phone calls of urging me to hurry up, and without Zheya Gai's financial and other logistic backup, this volume would never have been published.

Finally, we invite scholars in China-related fields to present their research papers in this journal, but the CSPSIS is not responsible for errors in fact which are unknowingly published herein.

Editor.

Ven Fang Tang

---

Japanese Pluralism and Its Implication:
A Case Study on the Formation of
Japanese Foreign Economic Policy

Quansheng Zhao

The study of political structures inevitably addresses the question of the relationships among political parties, government bureaucracy, and various interest groups. In his classic work Community Power and Political Theory, Nelson Polsby states, "It is possible to distinguish three kinds of data with respect to decision-making which often serve as indices of the power of actions." His three categories are (1) who participates in decision-making, (2) who gains and who loses from alternative possible outcomes; and (3) who prevails in decision-making. Polsby suggests that identifying the last group would be "the best way to determine which individuals and groups have 'more' power in social life." These remarks help shed light in a review of decision-making processes.

By conducting a case study of the formation of Japanese economic policy, in the four Japan-China economic agreements, this study discusses how the bureaucratic monopoly in Japan's policymaking process has been replaced by a more pluralistic structure. Therefore it explores the nature of Japanese politics.

An "Informal Pluralism" Model

In this study, I will argue that Japan has indeed entered a democratic and pluralist stage. Yet this pluralist status is somewhat different from its American counterpart. I will define Japanese politics as a model of "informal pluralism." By using the term "pluralism" I mean (1) there is no single source of authority; therefore there is no concentration of power in the sense of the absolutist state; (2) there is a legitimate right for non-political groups to exist and to influence the state; and (3) there are, of these groups must be, as Philippe Schmitter points out, "organized into an unspecified number of multiple, voluntary, competitive, non-hierarchically ordered and self-determined categories.

What is meant by "informal?" If we look at the Oxford English dictionary, the definition of "informal" is "not formal; irregular; without ceremony or formality." "Informal Pluralism," I believe, is the norm of Japanese politica in many ways, especially when compared to American pluralism.

Various Schools on the Nature of Japanese Politics

A popular view among scholars (including the Japanese) is that Japan's ruling circle is like a tripod consisting of the bureaucracy, the ruling party—Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), and big business. This is a part of the result of a research project of mine on Japanese politics. I accumulated a great debt to my former Berkeley professors and friends who helped me in completing the project. I would like to thank Robert Scalapino and Aaron Wildavsky for their frequent guidance and advice, Chalmers Johnson, Kenneth Waltz, Richard Holton, and Gerard Lowe for their helpful comments on the original version, and Peter Yuen and Martha Yamamoto for their careful proof-reading of the manuscript.


The Second Annual Conference of the Chinese Scholars of Political Science and International Studies

A three-day conference of the Chinese Scholars of Political Science and International Studies, Inc. (CSPSIS) was held at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in Tufts University, Boston, from June 5 to June 7, 1987. It was the second annual conference of the organization since its establishment last summer in Houston. Over one hundred and thirty Chinese scholars and students in the United States attended this year’s conference, an increase of about fifty people over last year’s attendance. While scholars and students of political science made up most of the participants, interested scholars from other social sciences and even from hard sciences also attended the conference.

The CSPSIS was founded primarily to provide a forum for academic exchange among Chinese scholars and students visiting or studying in the United States. The entire organization meets once a year for academic discussion and report of research. Its first annual conference in Houston last year was devoted mainly to issues of Chinese foreign policy. The topic for this year’s meeting was “China and the world”, focusing on both China’s domestic and foreign affairs. The conference was sponsored by the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. A representative from the Ford Foundation attended the conference. Mr. Guangcai Hua, President of CSPSIS, was the principal organizer of this year’s meeting.

The conference was inaugurated on the morning of June 5 with an invited talk by Professor Samuel P. Huntington, Director of Center For International Affairs, Harvard University and President of American Political Science Association. He spoke on the question of political development and political reform. Professor Huntington addressed both the theoretical issues of political development and the specific experiences of political reform in socialist countries. The topic drew great interest from the audience and aroused a lively exchange of questions and answers.

The conference was carried on in the form of panel discussions, with three to four speakers in a panel and each panel devoted to a particular topic. During the two days and one evening of discussion, fourteen panels were held and over forty-five scholars and students presented their papers. In general, their topics concentrated on three areas: China’s political reform, international relations, and China’s foreign policy. On the issue of political reform, many speakers explored the aspects of the theory and practice of political reform in socialist countries in general and in China in particular, covering such issues as the concept of socialist democracy, contemporary Chinese politics, problems and prospects of political reform, China’s constitutional, legal and administrative reforms, and Soviet political and economic reforms. Others discussed political reform in relation to Chinese political culture, specific institutions, economic reforms and the mass media. On international relations, topics discussed include China’s relations with the superpowers—Sino-Soviet and Sino-American relations, the US-USSR-PRC triangular relations, China and the Asian-Pacific region, China and Southeast Asia, etc. Papers on China’s foreign policy ranged from more general topics such as the theory and practice of Chinese foreign policy to more specific ones such as China’s foreign economic policy, and China’s policy toward specific countries and regions. On each of the topics, one would always find some fresh perspectives and insightful analyses. In particular, reports based on dissertation research usually stood out as impressive, systematic and in-depth studies.

In general, the fully-scheduled three-day conference was stimulating and fruitful. The participants found it helpful to meet each other in a forum like this to exchange their ideas and thoughts, to broaden their perspectives, and to make joint efforts in developing social sciences in China. Some participants expressed the wish to further improve the academic quality of presentations. Some others considered it important to let everything be aired. Yet more participants still felt that the value and survival of the forum would depend ultimately on its quality, which would not contradict the principle of freedom of speech.

At the conference, the Board of Directors of CSPSIS presented its working and fiscal report for the past year. All members were satisfied with the entire board and its work. The election of the Board of Directors was then held. On the basis of voluntary nomination and open contestation, the following individuals were elected as the members of the Board of Directors for the next working year:

- Zheyu Gai, Department of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh
- Ping Hu, Department of Government, Harvard University
- Xiaopo Lu, Department of Political Science, University of California at Berkeley
- Wenfang Tang, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago
- Yan Sun, Department of Political Science, The Johns Hopkins University

The new Board elected Ping Hu of Harvard University as the new President for the organization in its first board meeting. Other issues discussed at the meeting included the selection of a new title for the Newsletter (the organization’s quarterly publication), the publication of new issues of the Newsletter, the improvement of the quality of articles and papers for the quarterly publication and the annual conference, and the arrangement for the next annual conference.
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