

Presented to the Annual Conference of the German Association of Social Science Research on Japan (VSJF) "Social Science Matters", 10-12 November, 2006, Hamburg, Germany

# "Japanese Social Sciences in Transition: a new institutional and methodological constellation after the collapse of the cold war system" (Draft Only)

Prof. Dr. Tetsuro KATO (Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo)

e-mail to: [katote@ff.ijj4u.or.jp](mailto:katote@ff.ijj4u.or.jp)

Netizen College: <http://www.ff.ijj4u.or.jp/~katote/exchange.html>

## [Contents]

- 1 Outline
- 2 National University Corporation : Background, Practice and Reaction
- 3 "Market Competition" Drives Out "Institutional Evaluation"
- 4 Global Competition Forced the Change of Social Sciences
- 5 New Ideological and Methodological Figures
- 6 Taking Japanese "Society" More Seriously
- 7 Historical Meaning of the "Big Bang" for Japanese Social Sciences

## 1 Outline

Social sciences in Japan face now two big historical changes. The one is institutional and organizational changes of national universities after the 2003 National University Corporation Law. It is a dramatic reform of university system since the Meiji era, and former national universities, which long led all academic fields in modern Japan, have to develop their education and research on the basis of their own management and budget.

The law said, (1) incorporation respectively of each national universities, (2) introduce management techniques based on 'private-sector concept', (3) people from outside the university participating management of universities, (4) improvement of process of selection of the president, (5) select non-civil servant type as the status of personal, and (6) thorough disclosure of information and evaluation. As a result, Japanese academic world became a competitive market to provide services for students and to get partnership with industry corporation.

By the introduction of third partner evaluation system and the 21<sup>st</sup> Century COE (Centers of Excellence) program, major universities are forced to get "top thirty universities" status in Japan and to show "the highest levels of international excellence" in global rankings. The evaluation methods of natural sciences are introduced into social sciences, such as the peer review points of performance, citation index, etc. Japanese universities are now polarized into few (top-thirty) global research universities and many other local educational institutions.

It accelerated the other big change, namely new ideological and methodological constellation of social sciences, which already started from the collapse of Soviet Union and the end of Cold War. Japanese social sciences after 1945 were strongly influenced by the cold war. Russian Marxism (historical materialism, base-superstructure theory, class analysis, socialist and communist orientation etc.) and American logical positivism (neo-classical economics, modernization theory, social system theory, behavioral science etc.) were two big influential streams in academic circles. After the 1990s, the situation changed drastically. Although so-called post-modern approaches (social constructivism, cultural studies, gender studies etc.) have partly compensated the blank for Marxist tradition, major fields are dominated by American style positivism.

One additional factor to accelerate these two big changes is technological development and spread of computer and internet. New research methods and theoretical models are easily found as digital files from all over the world. English-written 'hot papers' of on-line journals get special prestige in national and global academic rankings. The meaning of 'knowledge' is also in transition.

## **2 National University Corporation : Background, Practice and Reaction**

The background of such transformation are multiple. The first reason is the same as in Germany, the globalization of educational and research market. Second is the global spread of information system, especially of internet, and the rapid development of networks of digital journals and library system (repository).

But some special conditions of Japan also concerned.

The third reason might be the change of Japanese society to declining birthrate and aging society. It has a big impact. As Prof. Goodman might talk today, the demographic decline of young population forced universities to reform student services and social and industrial contribution. One governmental report says, we must challenge an unknown future, the "Role of Science and Technology in an Aging Society with Fewer Children."

Fourth, although Japanese government and MEXT (Ministry of Education, Cultures, Sports, Science of Technology: former ME) proclaimed the R&D as the key condition to establish the superpower of Science and Technology(ST), they are not sure to be able to keep the Asian top position in this field.

Japanese economy is recovering slowly after the "lost decade" in the 1990s, and keeps the status of the second biggest economy in the world. But the recovery is not felt realistic for Japanese

ordinary people.

In international context, Japanese economy cannot revive healthy because of its huge burden of bad debts. A decade after the collapse of the asset-inflated economy, Standard & Poor's credit rating of Japan's long-term bond is now the lowest among government bonds issued by industrial countries. In Asia, China and India, the two biggest population country in the world, have now entered in the rapid economic growth. Japan's exceptional power in Asian market is lost, and the "feeling of decline" spread even in academic world. In the 1980s and the 1990s, Asian excellent students came to Japan for learning the secret of Japanese success. But now, the best students in China would like to study abroad not in Japan but in US or European countries, partly because they do not like to learn difficult Japanese language for their degrees.

In domestic context, the expression '*Kakusa Shakai*' (unequal society, differential society) is now very popular. What this refers to are such features as the high unemployment rate (about four to five percent), big income gap between regular workers and irregular unstable workers, increase of young job-hopping part-time workers (in Japanese, "freeter" or freelance workers) and "NEET" workers ("Not in Education, Employment or Training"). Domestic political complaint on social welfare and public pension system or hereditary Diet members and business leaders, strengthen such mood and feeling as "gap society" between rich and poor or between winners and losers.

The Annual Report on the Promotion of Science and Technology (FY 2004) on "Japan's Scientific and Technological Capabilities: Japan Ten Years after the Enactment of the Science and Technology Basic Law and Its Future" pointed out as follows (in Chapter 2 Japan's Scientific and Technological Capabilities and , Section 4 Level of Science and Technology in Japan) :

Japan's attitude toward science and technology had placed emphasis for a long time on practical use---efficiently importing science and technology from other countries and applying them in the economy---in order to catch up with western developed countries. In this process, a characteristic can still be seen today in that there are a relatively large number of bachelors of engineering and patent applications in Japan. Furthermore, the national character and social characteristics that are expressed as Japan's strong points with such keywords as people's strong sense of belonging to an organization, good teamwork, a high level of discipline, field-oriented ideas, and meticulousness, seemed to have had advantageous effects mainly at the manufacturing sites of private companies. Then again, emphasis on practical use is not always suitable for creating science, which aims at exploring the absolute truth. It makes people attach more importance to uniformity and being safe and sure than to creativity, prefer loyalty to the organization over active human resource mobility, increasingly feel a sense of sectionalism, and more inclined to look inward and disregarded the international dissemination ability. Because of this, Japan's characteristics, which had been regarded as strengths, have come to be indicated as weakness through the dramatic changes in the times.

Thus, Japanese science and technology has to be more creative and universal.

MEXT recently set the four conditions and four strategic areas. The Committee on International Affairs, Council for Science and Technology (Headed by Dr. Setsuho Ikehata, President of the

Tokyo University of Foreign Studies) engaged in discussions that considered the intensifying international competition for knowledge in the form of personnel and technology. The interim report summary given below provides an overview of the strategic promotion of international activity of science and technology, which represents a step beyond "internationalization" and should be the direction for creating the next Science and Technology Basic Plan (27 Jan, 2005).

#### **Changes in the International Situation**

(1) **The Era of Intense International Competition for Knowledge**

Under globalization, countries are competing to create new technologies and industries. Also *concerning about brain drain*, they are competing to secure researchers.

(2) **Increasing Number of Issues Common Throughout the World**

While international competition intensifies, the rapid rise in the world population is giving rise to an increasing number of *global problems* that mankind must cooperate in addressing.

(3) **Demands for International Activity Based on Progress in Science and Technology**

On the other hand, *international activity is essentially indispensable for the advances of science and technology*. The growing scale of basic research and expanding cost of research and development make an international division science and technology ever more essential.

(4) **Development of Regional Cooperation and the Rise of Asia**

Simultaneous with globalization, the *EU is expanding*, economic partnerships are being formed, and other types of regional alliances are being formed. *Asia*, in particular, has experienced the fast economic growth and an enormous market is expected to emerge. In November 2004, ASEAN3 agreed going to establish East Asian Community.

#### **Issues Facing Japan**

(1) **Development of S&T, Society and Economy**

This refers to the sustainable development of Japan's cutting-edge science and technology through ties *with the leading countries of Europe and with the US* and through international activity, and to the development of Japan's society and economy based on the results of S&T.

(2) **Addressing Issues Common Throughout the World**

Japan should exercise initiative in addressing the issues of common interests for the world, such as *global scale problems*, the building of a safe, secure society.

(3) **Strengthening Ties Within Asia**

Japan should strengthen its partnerships with other Asian countries, not in the view of a leading country but in the view of an Asian country, and realize several initiatives in S&T originated from Asia.

(4) **Realizing an Attractive Research Environment**

Japan should build *a vibrant research environment that attracts researchers, technology, and other intellectual resources from throughout the world*. Incorporated universities and research institutions are expected to conduct strategic international activities by applying their unique strengths.

#### **Policies for the Strategic Promotion of the International Activity of Science and Technology**

(1) **Intensive promotion of international activity with strategy**

Taking a strategic approach is important for international activity in S&T. The following activities are necessary.

- strengthening the system to look into and analyze international trends in S&T
- improving and strengthening the funding system to support international activities in S&T with a strategic objective

#### (2) Building Partnerships in Asia

Considering the rapid development of East Asia and the idea of an "East Asian Community", it is important to build a S&T community in Asia. Thus, it is necessary to promote the following activities with considering the diversity of each country.

- promote the exchange of research personnel and developing personnel in Asia for the future
- challenge for regional common problems such as environmental issue, natural disaster, and emerging/reemerging infectious disease
- promote to create the platform for sharing S&T information and the multilayered frame work to support an activity of community in Asia

#### (3) Developing and Securing, and Building a Network of, International Research Personnel

Following activities are necessary to enhance research personnel through international activities.

- to hold more international for, and to build networks of research personnel
- to invite outstanding foreign and Japanese researchers to work abroad
- efforts to send young Japanese researchers abroad

#### (4) Strengthening the Foundations of International Activity

To support the above initiatives, it is important to strengthen the foundation of international activity and following activities are necessary

- supporting universities' international activities with an organizational strategy
- promotion of activities facilitated by oversea branch of public institutes
- strengthen the international transmission of information on research achievements

As the result, MEXT has selected twenty universities as model cases for the international Head-quarters (HQ) in 2006. These universities are happy, because they can get a big additional fund for international exchange and cooperation. But they have to use the fund only for the applied project, to show every year some progressive performance of the plan. Some scholars must concentrate in this institutional project, even if they have their personal research subjects.

#### **"Strategic Fund for Establishing the International HQs of Universities" has been launched.**

In order to deal with global mega-competition for knowledge and to realize a competitive research environment in Japanese universities that will attract outstanding scholars from both Japan and abroad, MEXT has launched a new funding program from FY2005. The program, "*Strategic Fund for Establishing the International HQs of Universities,*" has been designed as a competitive fund to which any university (including the *Inter-University Research Institute Corporation*, too) in Japan can apply. A total of 68 universities applied to the MEXT this time. We are herein disclosing the results of the screening by a deliberation council, composed of people outside the MEXT, which chose 20 universities as model cases for the international HQs.

#### 1. Outline of the "*Strategic Fund*'

(Summary)

MEXT wants to prioritize strengthening the international activities at each university by advancing university-wide and organized international activities organically coordinated with each organization on campus. It will do this by arranging an institutional system, in line with the distinct character of each university, to be known as international headquarters, which will cover entire university and create international strategies thereby for the university.

(Target)

All universities (including the Inter-University Research Institute Corporation) in Japan can apply to this fund.

(Period)

For 5 years (in principle). Mid-term evaluations will be implemented in the third year.

## **2. Outline of the screening**

(Application) 68 universities applied.

(Responsible body for the selection) Evaluation Working Group under the Committee on International Affairs, the Council of Science and Technology

(Screening procedure)

- (1) MEXT invites the applications from universities.
- (2) Screenings carried out by the WG to select the universities.
- (3) MEXT concludes individual agreements with the selected universities.

## **3. Selection results in the “*Strategic Fund for Establishing the International HQs of Universities*”**

Of the 68 universities, which applied to MEXT, the following 20 universities were selected.

Hokkaido University

Tohoku University

The University of Aizu

Keio University

Hitotsubashi University

National Institute of Natural Sciences (*Inter-University Research Institute Corporation*)

The University of Tokyo

Tokai University (representative university), Hokkaido Tokai University and Kyushu Tokai University

Tokyo Institute of Technology

Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

Waseda University

Niigata University

Nagoya University

Kyoto University

Osaka University

Kobe University

Tottori University

Hiroshima University

Kyushu University

Nagasaki University

The National University Corporation Law was as such introduced in practice. Universities, especially the managers forced to make development plan, check their own performance, and give the report each year to MEXT.

There were some objections from universities and scholars. For example, The Coalition of Organizations and Individuals Against the Bill of National University Corporations in June 2003 said as follows(<http://www003.upp.so-net.ne.jp/znet/UniversityIssues/english/JANU-irony.html>) ,

**Reasons Why We Think the BNUC (The Bill of National University Corporations) is Harmful for Japanese National Universities**

**(1) It makes the national universities into organizations that are centrally controlled by the Ministry of Education.**

The Minister of Education, according to the bill, establishes intermediary objectives ("*chuuki mokuhyou*") for each national university corporation (Article 30), and the president of national university must prepare an intermediary plan for realizing these objectives and the plan must be approved by the Minister of Education (Article 31). This system, which is apparently wrongheaded for universities, was originally introduced in the Law on General Principles Concerning Independent Administrative Institutions. This law was established for the administration of such institutions as National Aerospace Laboratory of Japan or National Institute of Sea Training, which have specific and limited social functions. Therefore, what the BNUC is going to do is like applying the same administrative system to NASA and UC Berkley.

**(2) It could induce compromise at the administration of each national university.**

According to the proposed system, the Ministry of Education gives each national university corporation the subsidies for its administration according to the evaluation by the evaluation committee in the Ministry of Education. On the other hand, the bill creates more than 500 new positions of high administrative officials under the name of "trustee" ("*riji*") and "supervisor" ("*kanji*") at national universities over the country (Article 10). What is expected to happen in such a system is that the president of national university hire retired officials of the Ministry of Education as its trustees and supervisors expecting more subsidies as a reward for offering lucrative jobs to their seniors. Thus the largest concern for the administration of national universities will be not the better education and research but how to please officials of the Ministry of Education. Such a phenomenon already happened in many national universities, but the BNUC will make it more universal and systematic.

**(3) It gives the president of national university unjustifiably huge powers so that his/her management of the university cannot be checked except by the Ministry of Education.**

Usually the board of trustees and the administration of a university are headed by different persons, and the president of the university as the head of the latter is elected and evaluated by the former. The BNUC calls the boards of trustees "board of officials" ("*yakuinkai*" in Japanese, Article 11). One of most unintelligible aspects of the BNUC is that it stipulates that the board of officials and the administration of university be headed by the same person, namely, the president of university. Moreover, according to the bill, the president is elected by the university president screening council, but the president can appoint up to the two thirds of council's members (Article 12).

This means that the total management of university is entrusted not the university corporation itself as an independent organization, but to the president as an individual who is controlled by the Ministry of Education. We might call it a puppet dictatorship of university president. The BNUC gives neither independence nor autonomy to the national universities.

**(4) Under the proposed system, the national universities are induced to give priority to the researches that fit short interests and demands of the government and big businesses.**

According to the BNUC, the administrative subsidies are given to each university from the government in accordance with the system established by the Law on General Principles Concerning Independent Administrative Corporations (Article 35, which refers to relevant articles of the Law on General Principles Concerning Independent Administrative Corporations). According to this system, the amount of administrative subsidies of each university is substantially influenced by the evaluation of evaluation committee in the Ministry of Education. As a result of such a system, each national university will be induced to give priority to the researches that fit short term interests and demands of the government and big businesses that financially sponsor it. Thus the BNUC makes it impossible for national universities to carry out their proper social function of serving the long term interests of the whole society in terms of education and scientific research.

**(5) Under the proposed system, many national universities are expected to be forced to raise their tuitions.**

Since the BNUC makes the financial basis of national universities unstable, it is expected that many national universities, especially local national universities, are forced to raise their tuitions. This will rob the people of Japan their equal right to higher education, which is at least partially protected by the current system of national universities, though their tuitions are more expensive than the average tuitions of the State Universities of U.S.A.

But the opposition was weak. Public opinion poll showed the strong complaint on former national universities of “Ivory Tower” type. The Law was introduced effective in 2004.

### **3 “Market Competition” Drives Out “Institutional Evaluation”**

After the “Big Bann” of university system, what happened in reality in Japanese academic world? Many scholars feel very busy for educational service and management and tired from making plans. Almost all researchers at universities are now involved in management and mobilized in planning. Each year the proceeding of six year plans (Medium-term Goals and Medium-term Plans) must be checked and self-evaluated. Even in research field, universities and institutions must fulfill the annual plan, show better “performance” and make some “development.”

Competition and Ranking dominate everywhere. Competition to keep the good status and to get the allocation of resources based on results of third-party evaluation becomes very hard. The 20<sup>th</sup> Century COE and the International HQ program are examples to get competitive research funds. From 1995 onwards, the *Asahi Shinbun* Newspaper Company has published the annual “University Rankings” for high school students, teachers and parents to choose “good universities” and to prepare the entrance examination. In the 1990s, it contained about 50 indexes for 561 universities.



Now, the 2007 version shows 72 sorts of rankings of 723 universities, in popularity by high school students, difficulty of entrance examination, scholarships, service of library, web accesses from outside, IT conditions, study abroad program, strength in job market, number of PhD, student fashion, taste of campus restaurant, evaluation of "brand" by students, high school teachers and business managers, etc.

The indexes are mainly about education, job hunting opportunity and domestic reputation, but *Asahi Shinbun* also show the ranking of Japanese universities within the world rankings.

Two big rankings of the world top universities are carried in the *Asahi Shinbun* ranking.

The one is the "Academic Ranking of World Universities" by the Institute of Higher Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University (<http://ed.sjtu.edu.cn/en/index.htm>, which ranks the 500 top universities throughout the world. The site also make the rating lists for the top 100 universities in America, Europe, and Asia. The rankings are based on academic or research performance, using five criteria: the number of Nobel prize and other academic laurels, highly cited researchers, articles published in 'Nature' and 'Science', articles in Science Citation Index-expanded and Social Science Citation Index, and academic performance per faculty at each university.

In the 2006 Shanghaig ranking, Japanese universities showed relatively good performance. Although the Top 100 universities were mainly in USA and UK (Harvard, Cambridge, Stanford, UC Berkeley, MIT, CIT, Columbia, Princeton, Chicago, Oxford, Yale, Cornell, etc.), the University of Tokyo got the 19th rank, Kyoto Univ was 22th, Osaka Univ. 61th, Tohoku Univ. 76th, Tokyo Institute of Technology (TIT) 89th, Nagoya Univ. 98th. Within world top 100 universities, Japan has 6 names. It was better than Germany, which has only four, Univ. Munich 51th, Univ. Heidelberg 66th, Univ. Goettingen 85th, Univ. Freiburg 93.

As my university, Hitotsubashi University is the only one national university which specialized in social sciences, it is out of lists. Shanghaig ranking is strongly inclined to heavy weight of natural sciences. Thus, the President of my university worries about the decrease of Chinese students at Hitotsubashi, because this Shanghaig Ranking has strong influence to excellent Chinese students who choose foreign institution when they have opportunity to study abroad.

The other ranking which *Asahi Shinbun* adopt is British one, *The Times* Higher World University Rankings (<http://www.thes.co.uk/worldrankings/>) in THES (The Times Higher Education Supplement).

This ranking offers an explanation of its methodology at the opening page. This site contains the results of Research Assessment Exercise, conducted jointly by the four higher education funding bodies in the UK: The Higher Education Funding Council for England, the Scottish Higher Education Funding Council, the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales, and the Department for Employment and Learning - Northern Ireland. The ranking is based on research quality and it seems more academic than the Shanghaig 500 ranking, because it consists of total 1800 points, by

Peer Review 1000, International Faculty 100, International Students 100, Faculty/Student 400, Citations/Faculty 400.

When the 2004 THES Ranking started, the University of Tokyo could be proud of its 12th rank in the top page of website, because it meant the Asian best university. But in 2005, the publicity of the University of Tokyo was more moderate, because the rank was slightly down to the 16th rank, and lost the Asian number one position by the Beijing University's 15th.

In the 2005 Top 200 University General Ranking, Kyoto University took 31th, TIT 99th, Osaka 105th, Nagoya 129th, Tohoku 136th, Hiroshima 147th, Hokkaido 157th, Kobe 172th, Shouwa 198th, total 10 universities from Japan.

In Europe's Top 50, although Cambridge is 1<sup>st</sup> and Global 3 and Oxford 2<sup>nd</sup> /4<sup>th</sup>, German universities get Heidelberg 12/45, Munich 15/55, TU Munich 40/105, Humboldt 44/112, Goettingen 46/114. In Japan the top two universities, Tokyo and Kyoto, are prominent, but in Germany, top universities are dispersed and relatively higher than Japanese. Unlike the Shanghaig Ranking, British THES shows each disciplinary area rankings even in social sciences and art and humanities, mainly measured by world scale peer reviews in each discipline and Citation Index by Thomson Corporation. Although Japanese top universities have not better ranks in 2005 THES than in Shanghaig Ranking, Hitotsubashi University could fortunately get the world 96<sup>th</sup> in social sciences and 56<sup>th</sup> in arts and humanities. We could use it our publicity as "one of the world top 100 universities in social sciences".

*Asahi Shinbun* also announces the annual domestic ranking of Japanese Economic Studies in international major journals of economics. The measure is mainly the academic impact by citation in quality journals which *Asahi Shinbun* counts by its own criteria. Hitotsubashi University got the top in Econometrics, second after the University of Tokyo in total.

This year in 2006, the American Weekly "*Newsweek*" began to make its own world university ranking by adding some special weight points to the Shanghaig Ranking and the London Times Ranking. Some Japanese journals also carry their university rankings.

More sensational and probably important in future is the "Webometrics Ranking of World 3000 Universities" in internet (<http://www.webometrics.info/>), which also started in 2006.

This is a pure digital ranking by quantity and quality of university websites. The measures are the size (total pages of university websites), visibility (accesses and citations from outsides), Web IF (Impact Factors, mutual links and networks) and the number of so-called 'rich files' (academic digital works in the figure of doc, pdf files). The top page of the 2006 version says as follows.

The Webometrics Ranking of World Universities (<http://www.webometrics.info/>) is the basis for the comparison, although the data were segregated into components for the different purposes. Taking into account the data came from the November 2005 round (not the current already updated data published in the main pages of the Ranking), the ranks for size (number of pages) and rich files (documents in pdf, doc, ps or ppt formats) were used for the

productivity tables, while the number of external inlinks appears in the Visibility section and the global Webometrics Rank is used for the impact tables.

**Essential Science Indicators** (<http://scientific.thomson.com/products/esi/>; <http://www.in-cites.com/>; <http://www.esi-topics.com/>) is a powerful database elaborated by The Thomson Corporation that provides number of papers and citations received by those papers for a large number of institutions worldwide. Extracting the universities, merging results from variant names of the same institution and deleting some mistakes, data from August 2005 (covering a period of more than ten years), the ranking of papers was used for productivity while the citations ranking appear in the visibility and impact table.

**Google Scholar** (<http://scholar.google.com>) still in a beta phase is providing access to a large (and increasing) number of databases interlinked of bibliographic and webliographic records of scientific papers. During November of 2005 all the records appearing under the institutional domains of the universities were counted and the obtained rank was used as a measure of productivity.

The data for popularity (number of visits) was extracted from the **Alexa** database (<http://www.alexa.com>). This system intercepts a large number of visits through its toolbar and spyware distributed almost evenly worldwide. The rank indicates the position of the institution in the global database, although the positions were reorganised by institution (universities) and regionalised (due to geographical bias detected in the Far East area) and finally appear in the visibility tables.

The **Academic Ranking of World Universities**, updated in 2005 (<http://ed.sjtu.edu.cn/ranking.htm>) elaborated by the Institute of Higher Education of the Shanghai Jiao Tong University. The combined indicator was recalculated using their own data for providing a unique position to every one of the 500 universities in the list. This position was used as an impact measurement.

**The Times Higher World University Rankings 2005** (<http://www.thes.co.uk/worldrankings/>) consists of only 200 institutions. The rank was also considered as an impact measurement

### **Explanation of the Tables**

Three groups of tables were prepared, including rankings of indicators of different sources. A world list of the Top 50 universities in each category is provided with smaller regional tables with the 20 most relevant institutions of Europe, North America, Latin America, Asia and Oceania (Africa was excluded by practical reasons).

**Productivity.** The universities are classified by a mathematical combination of the rankings according to their website, number of rich files, number of papers published in the last ten years and records in the Scholar.

**Visibility.** The criteria combined include link visibility, number of citations to papers in the ISI database and number of visits (popularity) to the web domain.

**Impact.** The list is presented according to their position in the Shanghai ranking, and the Webometrics, Times and ESI citation rankings are also provided for comparative purposes.

In the 2006 results, the world top 100 are almost all from USA, and they are similar high rankings to the Shanghai 500 or the THES 200. The top ten are,

- 1 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY

- 2 HARVARD UNIVERSITY
- 3 MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
- 4 STANFORD UNIVERSITY
- 5 UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA CHAMPAIGN
- 6 UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
- 7 CORNELL UNIVERSITY
- 8 UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN MADISON
- 9 UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AUSTIN
- 10 CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

**In the Best 100 ranking in Europe, German universities are relatively strong. In the top 100 in Europe, Germany occupied 35, over one third, although the top of FU Berlin is tenth rank of the European 100. The German 35 universities are almost within the world top 250.**

<b>European Rank</b>	<b>Name of Institution</b>	<b>World Rank</b>
1	UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE	19
2	UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	22
3	SWISS FEDERAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ZURICH	37
4	UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH	44
5	UNIVERSITY OF OSLO	51
6	LINKOPING UNIVERSITY	59
7	UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI	63
8	ROYAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	65
9	UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON	67
10	FREE UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN	69
13	UNIVERSITY OF HAMBURG	82
16	HUMBOLDT UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN	88
20	BERLIN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY	97
23	UNIVERSITY OF KARLSRUHE	107
26	UNIVERSITY OF BONN	117
29	UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH	120
32	TRIER UNIVERSITY	126
33	UNIVERSITY OF COLOGNE	127
34	UNIVERSITY OF ERLANGEN NUREMBERG	128
36	AACHEN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY	135
38	UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG	138
39	UNIVERSITY OF STUTTGART	142
41	MUNICH UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY	144
43	UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG	148

50	DRESDEN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY	166
52	UNIVERSITY OF TUBINGEN	170
53	TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY CHEMNITZ	171
55	UNIVERSITY OF MUNSTER	177
56	UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG	179
61	DARMSTADT UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY	187
62	UNIVERSITY OF PHILIPSS MARBURG	188
63	UNIVERSITY OF FRANKFURT IN MAIN	191
64	UNIVERSITY OF BREMEN	195
65	UNIVERSITY OF MANNHEIM	197
69	UNIVERSITY OF HANNOVER	202
70	UNIVERSITY OF MAINZ	211
71	UNIVERSITY OF KIEL	217
72	UNIVERSITY OF DORTMUND	221
73	RUHR UNIVERSITY BOCHUM	223
76	UNIVERSITY OF BIELEFELD	229
79	UNIVERSITY OF ULM	236
83	UNIVERSITY OF KAISERSLAUTERN	247
87	UNIVERSITY OF DUSSELDORF	256

In the Asian 100 ranking, Japan is relatively strong, but in the world digital ranking, Asian and Japanese performance is miserable. The best Asian and Japanese is the University of Tokyo, but it is 66<sup>th</sup> in the world. In world 250, only five Asian (three Japanese, Tokyo, Keio, Kyoto) universities are ranked up. Hitotsubashi University marks Japanese 31<sup>st</sup>, Asian 89<sup>th</sup> and world 983<sup>th</sup>. After I introduced this serious result to the President, Hitotsubashi website was quickly renewed and innovated.

Asian Rank	Name of Institution	World Rank
1	TOKYO UNIVERSITY	66
2	KEIO UNIVERSITY	122
3	NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE	146
4	NATIONAL TAIWAN UNIVERSITY	159
5	KYOTO UNIVERSITY	175
6	BEIJING UNIVERSITY	206
7	UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG	232
8	CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG	238
9	NAGOYA UNIVERSITY	268
10	NATIONAL CHIAO TUNG UNIVERSITY	305
11	SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY	311

12	OSAKA UNIVERSITY	315	
14	TOHOKU UNIVERSITY	354	
15	TOKYO INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY		361
17	UNIVERSITY OF TSUKUBA	372	
19	KYUSHU UNIVERSITY	383	
24	KOBE UNIVERSITY	503	
28	HIROSHIMA UNIVERSITY	530	
29	RITSUMEIKAN UNIVERSITY	540	
33	UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY	583	
49	TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE	725	
50	JAPAN ADVANCED INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY		727
57	NIHON UNIVERSITY	800	
59	UNIVERSITY OF ELECTRO-COMMUNICATIONS	808	
61	OKAYAMA UNIVERSITY	843	
63	EHIME UNIVERSITY	857	
64	RYUKOKU UNIVERSITY	858	
67	HOSEI UNIVERSITY	888	
68	YAMAGATA UNIVERSITY	889	
69	CHIBA UNIVERSITY	891	
72	TOKAI UNIVERSITY	913	
73	DOSHISHA UNIVERSITY	916	
76	WASEDA UNIVERSITY	943	
79	SHINSHU UNIVERSITY	953	
82	NAGAOKA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY	960	
86	NIIGATA UNIVERSITY	968	
88	MIE UNIVERSITY	980	
89	HITOTSUBASHI UNIVERSITY	983	
90	TOKUSHIMA UNIVERSITY	987	
91	TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE AND TECHNOLOGY	1,000	
93	HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY	1,010	
95	GUNMA UNIVERSITY	1,019	
96	GIFU UNIVERSITY	1,040	
97	SOPHIA UNIVERSITY	1,044	
98	OSAKA CITY UNIVERSITY	1,048	

These data shows that Japanese and Asian universities are very poor level of digital information dispatch and even domestic top universities have to make hard efforts to publish more influential papers in English, to design more attractive website, and to appeal to global academic world. Some top class universities try to open the institutional repogitory (digital library).

Of course, such sensational rankings based on mathematical method are not official and negligible. We call this “**market evaluation,**” originated from American rating system of “Gourman Report 1967” or “America's Best Colleges” ranking by the journal “*U.S. News & World Report*”.

Official method adopted by MEXT or NIAD-UE (National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation) in Japan is “**institutional evaluation,**” based mainly on British experiment by HEQC (Higher Education Quality Council 1992-1997), HEFC (Higher Education Funding Council 1992-1997) and now QAA (Quality Assurance Agency, 1997 onward), which check institutional performance to the objective goal by quality control, quality audit, quality assessment, validation and accreditation.

But once the evaluation system of academic performance is introduced, the market evaluation can get some legitimacy to society, and the institutional evaluation accelerate the market one. For mass media and ordinary people, world rankings become a reliable third party evaluation. Mass media may take up the market evaluation first, because it is easy understandable by simple indexes. Academic research competition take on a character of popularity, like the Olympic Games or the World Cup Football Games. It spreads from natural sciences to social sciences and arts and humanities. Nobel prize, Fields prize or domestic Akutagawa prize are for a long time annual news events. Academic awards and international fellowship are good assets of universities.

Social sciences enter in the battle field of “knowledge”. For example, *Asahi Shinbun* published the ranking of ISI–Thomson Scientific Indexes of highly cited papers by each Japanese university, for the first time in the 2007 version, not only in natural sciences but also in social sciences. Rankings from the database of Web of Science by Thomson Corporation gets now a reliability, more than complex and difficult institutional evaluation.

#### **4 Global Competition Forced the Change of Social Sciences**

Essential character of such rankings in academics is competition, i.e. competition among universities and institutions and/or competition among individual scholars. Sometimes it expands to the competition among disciplinary research fields and methodologies, because the trustee of university have to get higher rank than before, to gain better reputation from outside, to take more financial funds from business world, to invite best scholars as “world-class” Professor and to call “world excellent” students from Asian countries.

Market evaluation is also used as a good proof of achievement for institutional evaluation. Some universities concentrates their resources and funds in some “excellent” scholars to get “good” institutional performance. These “exceptional” scholars are free from educational or management works and devote themselves only on special project research to publish “global standard” paper for “high quality” academic journals as early as possible. If some Professor could get world-wide

reputation in academic market, the institutional evaluation could gain a special prestige.

In institutional competition, many universities are forced to reform educational curriculum. As contemporary Japanese students preferred to learn English, especially speaking English, rather than minor language courses which were formerly required second language, Russian, French, German language courses were cut or reduced. Chinese and Korean are still popular. The strong pressure of “good job training” for students and “social contribution” has effects to do more practical research for economic development, business world and governmental policies.

Basic studies of knowledge, like philosophy, history or aesthetics are unpopular, sometimes reduced or avoided in new curriculum. Financing, management or public administration may be welcomed.

As there is now strong competition to get research fund from outside even in social sciences, close connection with industry, business companies and the government is encouraged. Top universities compete in sending Professors to governmental councils and adviser committees.

Japanese government estimate that some thirty universities could become “World Class” research institution, but most of other universities might remain as domestic educational organization.

The competition to get this “Top Thirty” positions is especially serious for local (non prewar imperial) national universities and private universities. The 21<sup>st</sup> Century COE program was a typical case of this competition. Each university built a special committee to make “original and break-through” research projects and many scholars were mobilized to complete the COE plans. After the game to get the status of “COE university,” some scholars honestly confessed their feeling of “exhaustion by planning of international conferences”.

International corporative study is of course welcomed, but domestic routine research areas such as local history or rural sociology are declined.

Policy-oriented studies, like welfare reform or ecological assessment, are still lively. But studies of trade unions or social movements are unpopular. Short-term project to get visual results or concrete conclusions is welcomed, but long-term abstract theoretical studies or philosophical thinking become difficult to get enough study funds.

As the total number of undergraduate students decreases by fewer children, many Japanese universities established graduate courses. The annual number of PhD and Master degrees is an important index of “distinguished university”. But there is a big mismatch between the growth of graduate degrees and the narrow job market for graduate students of social sciences in Japan. Universities must keep the fixed number of graduate students and educate them to get MA and PhD degrees, but we can not guarantee their academic posts or research jobs. So-called post-doctoral scholars without stable workplace increase in social sciences. Some might say that the intellectual standard of PhD thesis become lower than before.

Foreign graduate students from Asian developing countries are possible candidates to compensate



this academic mismatch, because they still have good opportunity to get academic jobs in their home countries. But there is big obstacle for foreign students to get master and/or doctor degree in Japan. Many universities receive their dissertation only in Japanese written style. They have to learn Japanese language at first, not only in reading and hearing, but also in speaking and writing. Majority of foreign students in Japanese graduate schools are for a long time Chinese. But by the economic growth of mainland China and the development of international exchange between China and developed countries, “excellent” students in China learn English and go directly to American and European “world top” universities. Now the geographical structure of graduate students in Japan from China has changed. Majority are not from the east-coast famous universities or from Beijing, but from north China where the Japanese puppet state “Manchuria” was built in the 1930s.

All of such new tendencies at universities make sense for new constellation of Social Sciences in Japan.

A symbolic change of new trends is the name of new established departments and faculties.

As you may know well, Japanese university system at Meiji era began from the introduction of German system. The name of departments were simply expressed by “one or two” Chinese Character (*Kanji*) such as Law (*Hougaku* in Japanese), Economics (*Keizai*), Management(*Keiei*), Commerce (*Shougaku*), Literature (*Bungaku*), Education (*Kyouiku*) and Liberal Arts (*Kyouyoubu*) in Social Sciences and Arts and Humanities.

After the defeat of the second world war, many new universities (mainly national universities in local prefectures) were established, but the name of departments were similar to the prewar German style. It was strictly controlled by the Ministry of Education (MEXT, now).

But after industrial development and social changes by the rapid economic growth, the number of universities increased, and new names of department which challenge new scientific areas were recognized. From the 1960s through the 1980s, it was said that “four letters” in Chinese character showed new departments such as International Relatin (*Kokusai kankei*), Comparative Culture (*Hikaku bunnka*) , Industrial Society (*Sangyou shakai*), Social Welfare (*Shakai fukushi*) etc. (so-called “4 Moji Gakubu”).

After the end of cold war, former department of Liberal Arts (*Kyouyoubu*) for junior undergraduate students were disorganized and rearranged to more practical and smart (Americanized?) departments. The new established departments in the 1990s reflected new trends in social sciences such as Management Science (*Keiei kagaku*), Internatinal Economics (*Kokusai keizai*), Information Social Science (*Jouhou shakai kagaku*), Policy Science (*Seisaku kagaku*), International Exchange (*Kokusai kouryuu*) Human Culture(*Ningen kagaku*), Environmental Science(*Kankyuu kagaku*) etc. with four Chinese letters.

But some new departments took more long *Katakana* names, originated from English. Typical examples are the department of “Service” Management(*Keiei*), “Communication”, “International (*Kokusai*) Communication”, “Media”, “Community Welfare(*Fukushi*)”, “Community Policy (*Seisaku*)”, “System Design”, etc. Although there is still no department of “Global Society,”

“Internet Investment,” “Industrial Licence,” “Women Studies” or “Tourist Business” etc. ( some are already the name of section or division within department).

These “development” of department names suggests the changes of research subjects and new image of social sciences in the 21 century Japan. Typical keywords of new trend are: International, Information, Service, Management, Policy, Environment, Communication etc.

All former classic division of Japanese social science is differentiated and specialized. Disciplinary titles move and spread to more global, practical, business-centered and policy-oriented studies.

For example, in the Department of Law, principle studies of Law philosophy or Legal history are reduced, many scholars belong now to Law School for practical legal training of graduate students.

As Japanese Political Science is traditionally classified to one smaller section within Law faculty by German tradition of “Staats- und Rechtslehre”, it must also adapt to rearrangement of Law department. In new established graduate school of “Public Policy” (*Koukyou Seisaku Daigakuin*, mainly for public officials) at major (former imperial) universities, political scientists cover public administration, public policy, national security, governance etc. Practical policy studies get academic legitimacy, but study of theoretical principle, history of political thoughts, critical analysis of national government or politicians are carefully screened out in the long run. The question is displaced from “What is politics” or “Why” to rational choice, efficiency and “How to do.”

In Economics, drastic change is the decline of Marxist economics. Before the collapse of USSR, many Japanese universities have two parallel lectures for freshman at Department of Economics. One was “modern” economics, the other was Marxist. But together with the curriculum reform in the 1990s, almost all course names of Marxist economics disappeared from universities.

Of course, there remained many former Marxist scholars who were not easily dismissed from faculty autonomy (it might be a bit different from the cases of former East German universities). They changed contents of their lectures or seminars to teach at least both theoretical traditions at the same time. Old style theoretical reading and interpretation of Karl Marx’s “*Das Kapital*” have disappeared. Their research subjects often changed to more contemporary topics like industrial relation, technological development, welfare state, ecological studies, or even computerized robot production. The name of academic association of former Soviet and East-European studies has changed from “Japanese Association of Socialist Economics” to “Japan Association for Comparative Economic Studies (*Hikaku Keizai Taisei Gakkai*).

But this change did not mean the complete victory of modern economics or neo-classical theory. As no one could foresee the rapid collapse of socialist economy, and as Japanese economy entered in so-called “a lost decade” in the 1990s, all pure economic theories lost their authority and legitimacy, especially for young students. Instead, more practical areas such as management, commerce, financing, accounting, insurance, marketing, corporate governance etc. became popular for economic research.

In sociology and social studies, there remain very few scholars who still concentrate in working

class movements, socialist or communist thoughts and movements, although a huge amount of new secret documents of the Soviet communism appeared after its collapse. In historical studies of social movements in Japan, the centrality of communism destroyed before 1989. Young scholars shifted to studies of so-called new social movements, ecology and gender movements, minority studies, like Japanese Korean movement, Okinawan studies etc.

But the interest in social movement itself declined. In the second oldest academic Association in Japan, the Society for the Study of Social Policy (*Shakai Seisaku Gakkai*), the session of workers movement was central at postwar era, but now disappeared for a long time. The focus of study on social policy changed to welfare, health, environment etc. Even in labor market research, traditional style of class analysis or class structure study of poor people is almost disappeared. The new gap within Japanese society between new rich and new poor is called “Differential (*Kakusa*) Society” or “Unequal (*Fubyoudou*) Society.” The Marxist wording “Social Class (*Kaikyuu*)” is carefully filtered.

In the study of Japanese history, which was a typical field in which Marxists had very strong academic leadership, the shift seems from structural history to social history (“Sozial Geschichte” in German), from political history to the history of ordinary people’s life experiences, from the singular history only by written documents to plural histories expressed by oral history, media history, visual documents such as movies, pictures and comics, from dominant male history to forgotten female stories etc. The meaning of “history” itself is in deconstruction. Images, memories and feelings by living people at the historical time revived as “historical present”.

American style cultural anthropology and social psychology still keep good positions. But the new style of information studies or media studies gain influential impacts to all traditional areas in social sciences.

## 5 New Ideological and Methodological Figures

Critical and radical thinking and total analysis of existing society become weaker, and value-free or ideologically neutral study and research in fragmentary areas is now popular, although so-called value-free study is also constrained by the existence of scholars, as Max Weber or Karl Mannheim penetrated.

So-called neutral research supports sometimes “status quo” and tend to be nationalistic.

Methodologically speaking, as Marxist and critical studies declined, American style logical positivism and empiricism become dominant. In economics, as Marxist historical materialism, base-superstructure theory and class analysis disappeared, abstract hypothesis-verification of neo-classical macroeconomics has now no counterpart.

Neo-liberal economics become the theoretical basis of de-regulation, privatization of public sector, reducing the number of public officials (National University Corporation was a part of such “structural reform”) but for the crisis of financial market in the 1990s, government saved big

private banks by public expenditure, which results in “the small but strong state”.

Postwar American modernization theory revived in a new style. Economic growth with balanced budget becomes not only the national goal but also the goal for local governments, i.e. prefectures, cities, towns and villages. At each level of the power, there is more hard competition for more efficient and small-sized governance.

In political science, especially in international relation or in policy science, the concept of “national interest” and “efficient” management are the most important judge values. “Rational choice” and “game theory” are necessary topics for the education of political science.

Nationalism, the imagined community by Japanese nationality holders, played an important role especially at the age of Koizumi cabinet. The Yasukuni Shrine problem, originated from Japanese prewar Imperial invasion, was explained as a power game by realist scholars, as the hegemonic conflict of national interests between two Asian superpowers, Japan and China.

In historical studies, conservative right-wing scholars published many books on the Tokyo war crimes trials. They insist the difference between Nazis-Germany and prewar Japan, or between Hitler and Showa Emperor, and that Japan was forced to receive the judgment of war by “winners” but did not admit the conviction of so-called “war criminals”, because there is no official document in which Japanese government recognized the guilt of General Toujou.

In such a way, logical positivism or empiricist atmosphere spreads in almost all areas. As the absolute objective truth (the God of Marxism) died, truth is treated always subjective, relative and historical. The meaning of “truth” and “history” is also open to any plural approaches.

For example, The meaning of “postwar (*Sengo*) Japan” has changed at least three times in these 60 years. The first “postwar” was “poor and confused” image at the time of American Occupation. This image remains now only for the people who experienced the years from 1945 to 1955. The second image of “postwar” is “developing rich Japan” at the rapid economic growth 1955-1973. It has dynamic image, when the national goal was clear, “catch up to western countries, and overtake them.” This image was made in the 1960s and the 1970s, and is still strong for the so-called baby boom generation (*Dankai no Sedai*).

But after the end of cold war, together with the economic development of the other Asian countries, Japanese term “*Sengo* (postwar)” has another meaning, or no special meaning for younger generation. “Postwar” simply means “after the war” which they can not imagine without movies or anime comics (*Manga*). It has no positive or negative meaning at all, just a passing time. “*Sengo* (postwar)” becomes value-free word to learn it in a text book for the entrance examination. It means actually “no war time”. It will continue to the time when “next war” comes in future. The memory of “Hiroshima and Nagasaki” is also fading away. A part of young Japanese begin to speak openly that Japan should have nuclear weapon against the barbarous socialist dictatorship, North Korea.

Too strong sciencism and positivism in social sciences naturally produce the humanistic reaction. In all areas of social sciences, strong relativism and skepticism appear at the same time, except in few areas where clear mathematical answer and simple empirical resolution could be possible.

Such concepts as philosophical methodological pluralism, deconstruction, over determination, articulation, difference, etc. are mobilized against Marxist and any type of Holism.

Although post-modernism in Japan has no organizational or institutional center, postmodern atmosphere can be seen in various ways.

From Friedrich Nietzsche, Martin Heidegger to Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Antonio Negri, there are many Japanese translations mainly from French thoughts. Capitalism is explained by Jean Baudrillard's semiotics and consumerism. Conflicts and resistance by minority or from periphery are understood by Gilles Deleuze=Félix Guattari's "desire", "rhizome" or Derrida's "difference". Foucault's image of "panopticon", "power" of discipline or "bio-politics" influenced some scholars in sociology, political science and pedagogy. Radical global thought of "Empire" versus "Multitude" by Antonio Negri= Michael Hardt has surely compensate the decline of Marxism. Cultural studies, post colonial studies or gender studies revived partly the tradition of critical thinking of Japanese intellectuals. Edward Said's criticism against orientalism suggests Japanese scholars the importance to check their own looking eyes to oriental periphery, i.e. East Asian people, women, Korean Japanese, Okinawans etc.

So-called social constructionism (*Shakai Kouchiku shugi*) or social constructivism (*Shakai Kousei shugi*) inspire new critical thoughts in Japan. In historical studies and sociology, it made possible to focus on the role of mass media, information network, communication with gender gap, popular culture including anime and TV games, and memories of ordinary people in life world.

It also awakes a methodological interest in linguistics and semantics. Text/context, signifiant(signifier)/signifie(signified), core/periphery, le politique/la politique etc. are introduced into Japanese social studies.

At the same time, as Japanese language has more complex and multiple nuances than Latin-European languages, many imported Western concepts in Japanese social sciences are now re-examined.

For example, English word "development" has double meanings in Japanese: "*HATTEN*" of objective progress/growth and "*KAIHATU*" of subjective exploitation.

"*SEIJI* (politics)" is now the translation of western word "politics." But in Japanese classic literatures, the word was described as "*Matsurigoto*", a kind of religious worship ritual, or devotion to the God at festival. Thus, Prime Minister Abe's politics of "beautiful country (*Utukushii Kuni*)" or the symbolic *Tennou* (Emperor) system should be seen by different cultural aspects from the British Constitutional Monarchy.

"*KOKKA* (the state)" in Japanese letter has an literal image of "house (*Ie*) of nation (*Kuni*)" from early seventh century when this term came from Chinese dynasty. Japanese words "*KOKKA*(the state)", "*TENNOU* (Emperor)," and even "*NIPPON* (Japan)" were established about the same time, when Japan imported the *Ritsuryo* code from China.

English word "Public" is translated into Japanese "*Kou*". But Japanese meaning "*Kou*" has some additional nuance of "official" or "bureaucratic"(*Kan*), and it has little meaning of English nuance of "open" or German "Oeffentlich."

Probably you may know well, the German word “buergerliche Gesellschaft” translated into Japanese in two different ways, and was very controversial. In Marxist term, “buergerliche Gesellschaft” is simply “bourgeois society”, the society dominated by bourgeoisie against proletariat. But others, so-called modernist scholars translated it into “*Shimin Shakai* (English “civil society” or French “*societe civile*,” a free and equal society by civilized individuals.

## 6. Taking Japanese “Society” More Seriously

Even the most central key concept for social science, the word “Society (*SHAKAI*)” is for Japanese people very new and controversial. I here show a geo-political and geo-semantic introduction of Japanese “Society”,

The Japanese word “*SHAKAI*” first appeared in 1875, in an article by Genichiro (Ohchi) Fukuchi in “*Tokyo Nichinichi Shinbun*” Newspaper, as the Japanese translation of English word “Society”. Before the Meiji Restoration and Westernization, there was a similar Japanese word “*SEKEN* (among people’s community),” but the word “*SEKEN*” has a bid traditional and closed image in rural village community (*Mura*), probably similar to the German word “Gemeinschaft.”

But Meiji Japan has no Ferdinand Tönnies. Japanese had no similar word to German “Gesellschaft”. Thus, Japanese intellectuals at the era of “Civilization and Enlightenment (*Bunmei kaika*)” had struggled with many troublesome terminology of European social sciences.

“Society” in James Mill’s “*Liberty of the Press*” was at first translated in Japanese to various Japanese terms: “*Seifu*(government), *Nakama* (companion, friends) *Kai* (meeting), *Sha* (community under the same village god), *Koukai* (public meeting), *Kaisha* (meeting of community), *Jinmin no Kaisha* (community meeting of people), etc. by Masanao Nakamura (“*Jiyuu no Ri*, Principle of Liberty”), 1972). Yukichi Fukuzawa once translate “Society” to “*Ningen Kousai*” (“human association,” or “peoples communication and exchange among autonomous individuals”) or “*Kousai* (association, exchange)” in “*Seiyo Jijou*(Conditions in the West, 1868)”.

Fukuzawa also suggested that the Japanese “*SEKEN*” meant pre-modern and inferior community and Western word “Society” meant more civilized and superior collective of individual persons.

Thus, What Ferdinand Tönnies described “From Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft” was for Yukichi Fukuzawa, “From Japanese traditional ‘*SEKEN*’ to Western civilized ‘Society (*SHAKAI*)’”.

But the story continued. At the same time about 1870, there was no suitable Japanese word for English “Company”, “Corporation” or “Enterprise”. All these words were translated into Japanese “*KAI*”, “*SHA*” or “*KAISHA*”. Even troublesome, “Community”, “Association”, “Public” were also translated to “*KAI*”, “*SHA*”, “*SHAKAI*” and “*KAISHA*”. Thus, the struggle was continued until the late 1870s, when “Company”, “Corporation” had established their Japanese translation as “*KAI-SHA*”. “Society”, together with “Association” and “Public”, had the Japanese fixed partner “*SHA-KAI*”.

As this story tells us, early-modern Japanese have no reality of "Society". Almost all people were living in closed and stagnate community "*SEKEN*", and only some elite intellectuals who experienced Western world could be longing for "Society", "Civilized Society" and "Civil Society". This suggests, firstly, that Japanese "social sciences" started from radical negation or rejection of exiting situation of society, or exactly speaking, traditional "*SEKEN*". And if there is some remnants of "*SEKEN*" in the 21<sup>st</sup> century Japan, Fukuzawa's effort to translate "Society" into "*Ningen Kousai* (human association)," has still some sense. And probably, you, the German social scientists had some experiences to find a sense of "*SEKEN*" in contemporary Japan, for example when you were called "*GAIJIN* (foreigners)", or when you went to city hall and show your passport as a "*Alien*".

One more important lesson of this story for social sciences is the close relationship between "*KAISHA* (business company)" and "*SHAKAI* (society)" in Japan. Although the English word "Society" was once translated into "*KAI-SHA*," but "Society" became "*SHA-KAI*," because "*KAI-SHA*" at first got the fixed meaning of private company, corporation and enterprise. For Meiji Japanese, both types of human organization seemed new, civilized and modern. They combined the Chinese letters "*SHA* (religious community, or same believers)" and "*KAI* (community meeting)". They tried to pour a new spirit and critical challenge in an old traditional container. Thus, the two engines of Japanese modernization originated from the same spirits. Rapid industrialization by private companies ("*KAISHA*") and Realization of more free and equal society ("*SHAKAI*") against "*SEKEN* (closed community)". But the "*SEKEN*" was closely connected with one stronger organization, the State (*KOKKA*), and persisted still now. And the state (*KOKKA*) was born with *NIPPON*(Japan) and *TENNOU* (Emperor) over thousand year before.

"*SHAKAI* (society)" and "*KAISHA* (company)" have originally same meaning and are compatible with each other. Thus, we found in the 1970s and 1980s what Japanese scholars called "*KIGYOU-SHAKAI* (company-centered society)", where private company constrained strongly the behavior of workers and sometimes brought their "death from overwork (*KAROSHI*)". The legacy of so-called Japanese diligence or workaholism has deep roots, although German "Gesellschaft" could make productive but free-time holder society after modernization and "Freissiches Deutsch" myth.

The final lesson from the story is that the strong combination of *SEKEN* and the state(*KOKKA*), which comes from ancient Japan (*NIPPON*). Western analytical framework of (Hegelian) "State and Civil Society" is sometimes displaced to Japanese "*KOKKA*(state) and *SEKEN*." Two frames are of course overlapped, but never exactly the same. And if social scientists in Japan lose the critical spirits against existing system and structure, we cannot assure that Japanese government always acts as a developed superpower in global world community. Because if social sciences in Japan forget the tradition of modern radical ideal to create "civil society", the apparition of "*SEKEN*" with the small but strong state could again haunt by more sophisticated style than the 1930s. "*SEKEN*" do not rejects competition. Struggle by the closed community against outside

world is often fanatical and irrational. The order within the closed community is not always autonomous or peaceful, but very authoritarian and hierarchical, based on the strong inside competition to show their loyalty for the leader, as German people might also once experience.

In 1985, at the year of 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary after the end of World War II, German President Richard von Weizsäcker gave us a very impressive message for social sciences. he made the following moving statement that received wide attention around the world.

"Those who close their eyes to the past are also blind to the present."

At the same year, Japanese Prime Minister at the time, Yasuhiro Nakasone, confessed his honest feeling on his homeland as follows.

"The state, in case of Japan, is not a contract state, but a *natural nation*, originated from natural community, formed through history and tradition."

I would not like to criticize here our former prime minister, Mr. Nakasone, but I have to call attention to the reality that many Japanese might still share the similar feelings with Mr. Nakasone on the state based on traditional natural community, that is, *SEKEN*.

Thus, I believe that Japanese social sciences have double tasks.

On the one hand, we have to make effort to use and share universal common concepts and research tools with Western and foreign scholars. On the other hand, we have to be careful to think and express our ideas by pure scientific terminology which were translated from West and sometimes connected with Euro-centrism, orientalism and Japanese inferiority complex.

We can surely share social sciences, but social sciences in each country should be also scientifically observed and reviewed.

## 7 Historical Meaning of the "Big Bang" for Japanese Social Sciences

Finally, I will give a short retrospect on trajectory of social sciences in postwar Japan and reconsider the meaning of the contemporary "Big Bang".

In 1991, I gave my first English presentation in Germany at the 6th Triennial International Conference of the European Association for Japanese Studies (EAJS), 16-19 September, 1991, in Berlin. My attendance was organized by Dr. Wolfgang Seifert and Dr. Ian Neary, and my paper "Japanese Perception of the 1989 Eastern European Revolution" was prepared with and brushed up to English by Dr. Andrew Gordon who studied at the time at Hitotsubashi University.



After 16 years, I still remain at Hitotsubashi, but Prof. Seifert at the time in Berlin moved to Heidelberg, Prof. Neary at the time in Essex moved now to Oxford, and Prof. Gordon at Duke University in 1991 works now as the Dean of the department of history at Harvard University.

The institutional mobility or flexibility of Japanese universities is in such a way very weak and conservative. International exchange and global dispatch from Japan is still underdeveloped and some academic associations are sometimes closed to young graduate students and part-time female lecturers. It might be reasonable from such aspects that the social science in Japan should change and transform.

But if we take such issues on, similar points of criticism from outside were already in the 1940s, in the 1970s and sometimes thereafter.

In 1949, when so-called new universities were established, one of the key reforms was the introduction of American liberal arts as the fortress of academic freedom and campus autonomy. Both Marxism and American positivism in social sciences started in lectures at this time, instead of prewar German style “Staats und Rechts Lehre” and militarily controlled economics.

In 1975, OECD sent to Japan a mission to observe Japanese higher education to check especially the situation of Japanese Social Science after university conflicts in the end of the 1960s.

The 1976 OECD Reports “Social Sciences Policy Japan” received big critical reactions, not only from academic scholars but also from the Ministry of Education in Japan, because the OECD mission strongly criticized the closed system and fragmentation of Japanese social sciences, especially its imbalance between the import of western academic performance and the export of original ideas from Japan. The report found a clear division between Marxist economics and modern economics. The mission report recommended more open and integrated system of universities with government, industries and journalism, more social contribution, international dispatch, more PhD education, more empirical and behavioral approaches in research, and more practical and applied sciences for new departments, which adapted to the big social changes by Japanese economic growth.

These long proposal by the 1975 OECD mission is very similar to the Japanese governmental (ME) Reports in the 1990s. But the Ministry of Education in the 1970s insisted that the OECD criticism mainly came from the misunderstanding and ignorance of Japanese culture, and that Japanese social sciences had a tradition of long-term, stable and normative studies of Japanese society and not fit in the short term practical research or policy making. This suggests, that the origin of contemporary “Big-Bang” came from the change of the MEXT policies for universities after the end of cold war, not from the inside of Japanese tradition of social sciences.

In self-recognition of Japanese scientists reflects historical trajectory and path-dependency clearer.

In 1967, one book “Postwar Academic Studies (*Nihon no Gakumon*): Social Sciences and Arts and Humanities” was published (Tosho Shinbun-sha). In this book, each three top scholars in each 12 disciplinary areas discussed the academic performance of postwar Japan. For example, in

Economics, Yoshihiko Uchida, Kazuji Nagasu and Saiichi Miyazaki argued the basic issues and new tendencies within economic scholars. Their observation was wide enough to see both in Marxist and modern economics. But the central issue was the evaluation of so-called prewar “debates on Japanese capitalism” between *Kouza*-school and *Rounou*-School, and on the postwar works by Hisao Ohtsuka. They picked Eiichi Sugimoto at Hitotsubashi university as the most prominent scholar who tried to integrate Marxist and modern traditions into one theoretical system and stressed the combination between theoretical frameworks and empirical analyses of national economy, although he died young in 1952. His trial was probably inherited to Michio Morishima and Nobuo Okishio.

In the discussion on political science, the main topic was the overwhelming influence of Masao Maruyama and his methodological distance from former German tradition and Marxism.

Even in sociology or management studies, which were relatively new areas in Japanese social sciences, basic divergence was between German School and American School and the essential competitive point was set between Marxists and modernists (Masao Maruyama, Hisao Ohtuka, etc.).

In 1975, just when the OECD mission visited Japan, a young sociologist, Koukichi Shouji, later Professor at the university of Tokyo, came out to the academics by his first book “Contemporary History of Japanese Social Sciences: An Introduction” (*Gendai Nihon Shakai Kagakushi Joesetu*, Housei UP).

The clear cut line within social sciences in Japan which he sketched was also between Marxist and modernist schools, but he traced it within world scale intellectual competition between Karl Marx versus Max Weber in methodology, and controversy between two linear development theories, Soviet style historical view of materialism (from primitive community, via capitalism to socialism, communism) versus American modernization theory (from traditional society, via take-off and industrial society to high consumer society by W.W.Rostow).

But in 1993, just after the end of cold war and the collapse of real existed socialist system, Iwanami Shoten, an authoritative publishing house in Japanese academics, edited a big eight volumes series of “Methods of Social Sciences (*Shakai Kagaku no Houhou*)”.

The title of the first volume was very symbolic, which was named “Social Sciences in Shaking (*Yuragi no nakano shakai kagaku*). Other volumes also have the titles of “Transformation of Political Space(*Seijikuukan no Henyo*)”, “Diverging Economics(*Bunkisuru Keizaigaku*)” etc.

New trends of adaptation of paradigm changes, theory of complex system, chaos theory, fuzzy set theory were discussed.

But in such atmosphere as disturbance, Takeshi Ishida, Professor Emeritus of Institute of Social Science, the University of Tokyo, wrote a new book “Rethinking Social Science (*Shakai Kagaku Saikou*, University of Tokyo Press 1995)”, in which he defended Japanese postwar tradition of

Marx-Weber debates and Masao Maruyama. He also insisted methodologically the importance of problem settings by Immanuel Wallerstein on world system and “unthinking social science”, by Juergen Habermas on communicative action, and by Robert Bellah on culture and public philosophy. He stressed the serious succession of these radical and critical ideas to new areas such as gender studies, ecology, colonialism, and “knowledge” and “epistemology”.

From my standpoint, the new MEXT university reform seems that they ignored the legacy of Japanese critical thinkings within social sciences. For example, although the MEXT report on “Promotion of Social Science and Arts and Humanities: Immediate Promotion Policies in response to the Expected Role in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” (June 2002) pointed out the the mission of social science in 21<sup>st</sup> Century (1) critical role of social science, (2) succession and development of culture, (3) contribution to solve contemporary problems, (4) rearrangement of knowledge, its concrete policies were a little bit poor and the same as the indications of 1975 OECD report, (1) integration among natural, social sciences and arts and humanities by actual project studies, (2) training of young scholars, (3) international exchange and dispatch, (4) maintenance of research infrastructure. There is no serious historical analysis of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

([http://www.mext.go.jp/b\\_menu/shingi/gijyutu/gijyutu4/toushin/020601.htm](http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/gijyutu/gijyutu4/toushin/020601.htm)).

For good performance in world rankings, Japanese scholars are now recommended to abandon tragic tradition of Marxist influence. Radical thoughts should adapt to the global American positivism and to more empirical analyses in English papers.

But historical evaluations by excellent social scientists in postwar Japan (a kind of domestic peer reviews) suggest the opposite policy. We have rich assets inherited from Marxist and radical modernist tradition in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. There is a big gap between historical fruits and required tasks and policies.

I will finally suggest a bridge of the gap.

There is a new book on Japanese social sciences from USA. Prof. Andrew E. Barshay of UC Berkley wrote the first English written systematic summary, “The Social Sciences in Modern Japan” (UCP, 2004). This book with 331 pages had its sub-title “The Marxian and Modernist Traditions”, focused mainly on the (Kouzou) Uno school in Marxist economics on “structure”, and Masao Maruyama in the history of Japanese political thoughts on “subject”. His framework of “discourse”, “rationalization” and “developmental alienation” in the process of Japanese modernization seems adaptable also to German history, if we take the difference of “Gesellschaft” and “*SHAKAI*” more seriously.

This is a strong support of my evaluation of Japanese social sciences, because Japanese policy makers are weak against American top scholar’s evaluation under the academic umbrella of US-Japan partnership.

One more bridge is the domestic evaluation of Masao Maruyama, ten years after his death in 1996. As the works of Masao Maruyama are translated into English and German, I do not say here his excellent performance in Japanese intellectual history. Although I myself was not his student or inheritor of his school, I respect his works and always recommend for political science students to read his books first.

Although there are some critical issues and debates on his works, his influence has not disappeared even ten years after his death. There are more than 100 books and articles on his life and works in Japanese academic market in these ten years. We can easily get now not only his written books, academic articles and essays, but also his records of university lectures, private letters, oral presentations and discussions with other intellectuals, even some visual TV documents and photos. After his death, we can easily find some special websites on Masao Maruyama.

(<http://www2s.biglobe.ne.jp/~MARUYAMA/>)

(<http://www.ne.jp/asahi/coffee/house/MARUYAMA/index.html>)

Masao Maruyama is still alive. The studies on Maruyama are even in developing, and his works have strong influence in Japanese social sciences.

Is Japanese social sciences in crisis? Yes, there are some symptom of decline of originality and radical thinkings. But I believe, this crisis can be surpassed, as far as Masao Maruyama is read in Japanese social science. And the crisis will realize, when we forget the spirit of Maruyama, and when social sciences can not develop new methods to understand the secret of Japanese "Society" more deeply. Thank you.