

- Kim, Kyung-dong (1990), "Introduction", *Critical Studies on Korean Society*, Nanam.
- _____ (1983), "Sociology of 'Korean Sociology'", in *Issues of Contemporary Sociology*, Bubmoonsa.
- Korean Sociological Association (1995), "Liberation 50 Years, Korean Society and Sociology", Proceedings of the Special Symposium under the same title.
- Lee, Man-Gap (1970), "Sociology", *Korean Studies Today*, Institute of Asian Studies, Seoul National University.
- Lee, Sang Baek (1950), "Order and Progress", *HakPung*, Vol.13.
- Manicas, Peter (1987), *A History and Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, Balckwell, Oxford.
- Park, Jae-Mook (1986), "Development in Korean Sociology and Approaches of Third World Sociology" (in Korean), Kim, Jin-Kyun, et al. eds., *The Third World and Korean Sociology*, pp.13-35. Seoul: Dolbegae.
- Park, Myoung Kyu (1985), "The Study of Social History in Sociology", *KJS*, Vol. 19, Summer.
- Park, Myoung Kyu and Chang Kyung Sup (1996), "Between Western Theory and Korean Reality: Accomodation, Tension and Search for Alternatives" presented at the 1996 Annual Meetings of the Amercian Sociological Association.
- Park, Young Sin (1992), "Sociological History of Korean Sociology", in *Sociological Theory and Its Recognition of Social Reality*, Min Yungsa.
- Shin, Peter T., Yong-ha (1985), "The object and realities of Korean Social History", in Shin Yong-ha (ed.), *Sociology and Social History*, (in Korean) Changjakkwabiptongsa.
- _____ (1994), "Proposals for the Development of Creative Korean Sociology", *KJS*, Vol.28, 1994 Spring.
- Wallerstein I. et al. (1996), *Open the Social Sciences*, translated by Lee Su Hoon, Tangdae.
- Whitley, Richard (1974), "Cognitive and Social Institutionalization of Scientific Specialties and Research Areas", in R.Whitley ed., *Social Process of Scientific Development*, R.K.P. London.

CHAPTER 2 INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF SOCIOLOGY IN JAPAN (1)

Shoji Kokichi
University of Tokyo

Sociology in Prewar Japan (2)

Introduction of Sociology as Theory of Social Organism

Sociology was introduced in Japan in the early Meiji period by Ernest Francisco Fenollosa (1853-1908) who gave sociological lectures as a basis of his political science at the Tokyo Imperial University in 1878. Three years later sociology was adopted as one of the regular courses and was taught by the same person.

From that year on TOYAMA Masakazu (1848-1900), then the dean of the faculty of the letters, also began to teach sociology as a basis of his historical studies. Insisting that sociology is indispensable for historical studies Toyama taught some parts of Herbert Spencer's sociological system and became the first professor in charge of sociology when it was established as one of the official chairs in 1893. He actually commenced positivistic sociological studies through historical studies of Japanese traditional ideas, morals and myths.

On the other hand ARIGA Nagao (1860-1920), one of the disciples of Fenollosa, initiated some theoretical sociology insisting that society is a kind of intellectual organism. He published in 1883-84 three books "On Social Evolution", "On Religious Evolution" and "On Kinship Evolution" as volumes I, II and III of his sociological system in six volumes following Spencer's "Principles of Sociology." In these books he not only took quite a lot from Spencer as well as some from Louis Henry Morgan (1818-1881) and John Furguson McLennan (1827-1881) but also developed some of his own ideas referring to examples in Japanese, Chinese and Korean history.

Sociology thus initiated by Toyama and Ariga was quite practical in that they contended it should be a guide for the government which had been trying to establish a way of modernizing Japan. But we must not miss its basically conservative character since it was trying to orient the government officials to build a state as a kind of social organism against the early Liberal Democratic Movements. KATO Hiroyuki (1836-1916) was typical in this sense because he changed to Social Darwinism following the later face of Spencer although he had been one of the eager supporters of the basic human rights in his earlier stage following rather the early face of Spencer.

Japanese Type of Sociological System in the Age of Imperialism

In the latter half of the Meiji period, from the 1890s on, there emerged some new liberal trends influenced by George Simmel (1858-1918), Franklin Henry Giddings (1855-1931) and others. However these were interrupted by the reactionary nationalism stirred by the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05) and so-called the High Treason Case of early socialists including a famous anarcho-syndicalist Kotoku Shusui. Through these events sociology became easy to be confused with socialism so that only the conservative trend of theories of social organism could survive.

TAKEBE Tongo (1871-1945) who took over the chair of sociology in the Tokyo Imperial University in 1898 consolidated this trend by building a sociological system which was an amalgamation of Auguste Comte, instead of Spencer, and some Confucian views of society. In his "General Theoretical Sociology" (1905-18) he insisted that society was an organic cosmos where human beings should be integrated as the humanity under the Confucian control as the result of the whole cosmic evolution. He founded the first office of sociology in the Tokyo Imperial University in 1903, issued 6 volumes of "Sociological Treatises" in 1906-12, and published 10 volumes of "The Annual of Japan Sociological Institute" in 1913-22 as bulletins of the Institute which was established and run by himself. Despite having strengthened the sociological position to some extent in the Japanese imperial bureaucracy, his conservative theory and practice blocked substantially free and fruitful development of sociological studies in this country in the first quarter of the 20th century.

Formal Sociology and Marxist Critique of Sociology

TODA Teizo (1887-1955) who succeeded Takebe's chair in the Tokyo Imperial University also took a position of formal sociology and psychic interactionism and he was followed by HAYASHI Ekai (1895-1980), his successor in the same chair, and some other sociologists like MATSUMOTO Junichiro (1893-1947). Thus the Japanese sociology sloughed off the earlier synthetic and speculative stage and got into some closer relationships with German formal and cultural sociology after the World War I. Along with the emergence of these new sociologists the Japan Institute of Sociology was replaced in 1924 by the Japan Sociological Society and since then the latter has been the major academic association of Japanese sociologists for more than seventy years.

In the late 1920s, with the beginning of the Showa period, some new trends emerged in Japanese sociology hand in hand with increasingly critical situation of capitalist society. Cultural sociology was preferred by younger sociologists who became more and more critical of formal sociology which was considered by them "enjoying some stillness of the old age" and some of them moved to the

newly emerging Marxist position from which they began to do some radical criticism of sociology itself as a 'typical bourgeois ideology.' Critiques by SHIMIZU Ikutaro (1907-88) and HAYASE Toshiro (1903-1975) were good examples in the early 1930s and the Japan Sociological Society also issued in 1933 a special number on problems of 'theory and practice' as the first volume of "Annual Sociology" which was its third official journal following "Sociological Journal" and "Sociological Quarterly".

Sociology in Postwar Japan (3)

Postwar Reforms and New Institutional Setting for Sociology

The defeat in the World War II changed the situation entirely. The Japanese Empire collapsed with roaring sounds and the contracted society in the mainland, having lost not only all the colonies and dominions but even a part of the traditional domain such as Okinawa, was forced to reform itself drastically by the General Headquarters of the Allied Forces that had occupied the whole territory. Not only the Imperial Army was totally disarmed, but the big financial combines (*the Zaibatsu*) were dissolved; the class of big landowners were confiscated in order to distribute farmlands to millions of tenants; and the whole law system, including the Civil Code that had underpinned the old patriarchal family (*ie*) system, was democratized by the enactment of the New Japanese Constitution.

As the whole educational system was reformed against this background, the higher educational bodies increased so drastically that the number of national universities into which the old imperial universities were incorporated *became several times more*, while private universities were made much easier to found so as to increase in sheer number. Sociology began to be taught in most of these four year undergraduate universities since it had been recognized as a major subject of the social sciences which should be learned in the general education courses for freshmen and sophomores -- namely in the first two years.

Although it was quite difficult to make an independent faculty (*gakubu*) of sociology especially in national universities, large or small departments (*gakka*) of sociology were made in lots of national and private universities. Moreover, in some large private universities most of which were later called 'mammoth' ones or '*masupuro* (mass production)' ones, somewhat integrated faculties of sociology some of which were named those of 'industrial sociology' or something like that were gradually established as the number of university students increased more and more rapidly, hand in hand with the increase of the average family income caused by the rapid economic growth in the 1950s and 1960s.

Naturally the number of sociologists -- therefore the number of members of the Japan Sociological Society -- increased gradually to the extent that it went beyond one thousand members in the 1950s. And it was important enough that its organization and the way of management was radically democratized by new young members in terms of the general election of the executive committee members and the absolutely free chance to all the members to join and read papers in the annual meetings as well as to contribute papers to its official journal "Japanese Sociological Review". All the developments of postwar Japanese sociology were made against this background.

Postwar Social Needs and Rural Sociology

Having started as something like the 'positive philosophy', sociology cut deep into the social reality of Japan after adopting positivistic methods of research and surveys even during the wartime. The focus was family and villages since the Japanese sociology was a branch of Japanese social sciences which had converged on agrarian problems as the focus of Japan's military and semi-feudal capitalism. After the war the works of Suzuki, Ariga and others were developed by FUKUTAKE Tadashi (1917-89) who had great influence on the postwar Japanese sociology.

Fukutake's largest merit was that he threw into relief the limits of modernization of Japanese villages even in the perspective of spreading 'kogumi' connections -- rather equal ones than 'dozoku' ones which were typically patriarchal with the origin in the fatefully ultrasmall farming system in Japan's agriculture. This reflected and cut deep into the reality that postwar villages had become more the concentration points of structural contradictions of Japanese society than the prewar times because of the flow-back and longer stay of the population there and of the increasing necessity of food production in the critical situations just after the war. Fukutake's rural sociology pointed to the crucial character of Japanese society in this sense and its greater influence was reinforced by the fact that he was sharing the strong practical orientation to 'democratization of postwar Japan' with other able social scientists of this period.

Several years after the Farmland Reform, however, Japan's capitalist economy found new ways to recover in the new international conditions and began to absorb the rural population rapidly into big cities by its 'high-speed growth (*kodo seicho*)' while urbanizing villages with the strong flow of varieties of new consumer goods. Villages were no longer concentration points -- at least primarily -- of the structural contradictions of Japanese society while they began to suffer from more complicated stresses which came back as transformed and even aggravated by larger and more malignant mechanisms of the whole system of Japanese capitalism. Younger sociologists who grew up under

Fukutake's influences had to take new steps in various directions following the developmental line from villages through wider regional and urban societies to the whole structures of Japan's capitalist society.

Take-off to Rapid Economic Growth and Industrial Sociology

ODAKA Kunio (1908-92) was also a positivist and, having a stronger methodological awareness formed by his study of Max Weber (1864-1920), opened a new research frontier in the sphere of industry and labor which became as important as -- and gradually more important than -- agricultural villages as the capitalist economy recovered and took a route for rapid growth. Odaka started his study from almost the same point as other Weberians in other social science disciplines in that he selected so-called 'understanding (*verstehende*)' attitudes to inquire into the 'occupation (*Beruf*)' as his own major research subject. He went, however, in a little different direction from other Weberians like OTSUKA Hisao (1907-96) and MARUYAMA Masao (1914-96) who, under the strong influence of Marxism, severely criticized the Japanese way of modernization by stressing the lack of subjective autonomy of individuals in its process.

Odaka's sociology of *Beruf*, under Japan's defeat and the postwar influx of American sociology, was transformed into his sociology of industry with social psychological methodology. In his "Industrial Sociology" (1958) he insisted an 'human retroactive approach' as his own sociological method and put 'human relations in industry' at the center of its perspective. As the recovered capitalist economy remolded class structures in the late 1950s and the 1960s, this industrial sociology set the problems of 'middle classes' at the forefront in terms of the decisiveness of 'class identification' and drew up the Japanese type of class structures where the majority of industrial workers would identify themselves with both the company and the labor union. From this theory of 'double identification' developed not only various types of survey on the life and consciousness of Japanese workers but also serious disputes about Japan's middle classes and its move to a 'new middle mass society' in the 1970s and after.

Odaka's industrial sociology can be positively evaluated to some extent in this sense because there had been very few inquiries into the actual situation -- especially the subjective aspect -- of the Japanese working class in the Marxist camp after the war. This was an example that sociological positivism used in empirical research could work so as to elucidate some aspects of the complex reality in a rapidly changing society like Japan under the high-speed economic growth. But on the other hand it is also clear that this kind of empirical theorizing was not enough at all in grasping the dynamic processes of structural changes

that Japan had been taking in the much more drastically changing world in the 1960-70s.

Compilation of Postwar Sociology and Sociological Functionalism

The "Series of Sociological Essays" (1957-58) contained the largest variety of sociological standpoints in somewhat ambivalent forms. The first one of the eight volumes, "The Individual and Society", dealt with action and personality in a dominant mode of early sociological functionalism while the last one, "Social System and Social Change", kept still overwhelmingly Marxist styles of analysis. After this series major two types of sociological system were put forward in that sociological functionalism went up to the society-as-a-whole level while Marxist sociology went down to various types of empirical survey about workplaces, regional development cases and so on.

An example of the former is TOMINAGA Ken'ichi (1931-) who, having written some essays on social action in a sociological functionalist way in the *Koza*, went up to wrestle with problems of social system and its change in the book "Theory of Social Change" (1965). He reached this work in several years following Talcott Parsons (1902-1979) who spent twenty to thirty years to build up his sociological system of 'structural-functional analysis' learning from major European social scientists such as Alfred Marshall, Vilfredo Pareto, Emile Durkheim and Max Weber. A short-cut of this type at which Japanese scholars are generally pretty good has its own limits. Sociological Functionalist theories were sometimes not usable to analyze the dynamically changing social reality under Japan's rapid economic growth since they were not abstracted from their own social reality. Tominaga actually moved to sociology of social stratification in order to cope with the Japanese social reality in terms of drastically changed stratification or class structures by the rapid economic growth.

Theoretical sociology, however, should not be rejected generally of course. Another sociological functionalist, YOSHIDA Tamito (1931-), has made a framework for understanding the whole process of evolution at least from the genesis of organism to highly developed social and cultural systems in terms of the emergence and the development of information processing mechanisms. His perspective is so wide and flexible that he could include some heuristic parts of Marxist dialectical and historical materialism to his own theoretical framework on the one hand and formalized and reorganized such functionalist theories as those of Parsons, Tominaga and others into a much more flexible and tolerant one on the other, to the extent that theoretically we can deal with all the cases of social change including revolutionary changes.

Marxist and Critical Sociology toward the Post-Growth Age

On the other hand Japan's Marxist sociology itself began to produce not a few works of both theoretical and empirical sociology in the 1950s-60s. As regards Marxist social theory, one of the significant original works was done by SHIBATA Shingo (1930-) in his "Theory of Human Nature and Personality" (1961). He developed there a fundamental theory of human behavior based on major Marxist classical works such as "The Capital" in order to build an alternative coherent theory to American social psychological theories and especially to the Parsonian type of theory based on the 'action frame of reference'. His way of theorizing that builds all the major concepts of social phenomena on the key concept of human work along the basic line of human social development had fresh and strong impacts upon and considerably encouraged younger sociologists who were looking for new guidelines for their theoretical and empirical research.

Moreover Marxist sociologists who had exerted substantial influence on the *Koza* mentioned above went independently in organizing younger sociologists to publish the "Contemporary Sociology Series" (*Gendai Shakaigaku Koza*, 6 vols., 1964) and another "Series of Contemporary Sociology" (*Koza Gendai Shakaigaku*, 3 vols., 1965). In these publications appeared some brilliant essays such as 'Systemic Change and its Bearers' of HOSOYA Takashi (1934-), 'Analysis of Cases of Anguish Resulted in Suicide in Postwar Japan' of ORIHARA Hiroshi (1935-) and 'Types of Unhappiness in Contemporary Japan' of MITA Munesuke (1937-).

Hosoya developed more theoretical aspects of Marxist sociology on the basis of an excellent reading of classical works while continuing empirical surveys of Japanese villagers mainly in the *Tohoku* (North Eastern) district, which had been changed quite drastically by the rapid economic growth, so as to create a new perspective instead of the mostly invalidated one of Fukutake and his group. Orihara contended, in the upheaval of campus revolts of the late 1960s, that social scientists should be honest to the ideas they had stated in their scientific works and went on to inquire deeply into Max Weber's whole works in order to second his contention to the extent that he has almost entirely reorganized the original text of "Economy and Society (*Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*)". And Mita, continuing theoretical and empirical study of 'social consciousness' -- 'social attitudes' in the American sociological terminology -- changing variously in the processes of modernization from the Meiji period and of drastic social change under the postwar economic growth, stepped up with a pen-name MAKI Yusuke to develop his own theory for human emancipation in contemporary society. His "Existing Structures of Modern Society" (1975) and other works have been exerting strong influences on younger sociologists since the 1970s.

Structuralist Revolution and Phenomenological Impacts

As regards the contents of developing sociology, through the whole process of campus revolts or university struggles of the late 60s-70s the entire history of sociological development to the 60s was criticized and thrown into examination by more or less radical criticism. Even the fruits of the 'Marx Renaissance' and of the related reexamination of Max Weber and Durkheim were not exempted. Radical critics influenced by the student and labor movements in not only Japan but major advanced industrial countries questioned the very modern character of all modern thoughts including those such as Marxism which had been considered to be trying to overcome the modernist limits of the other modern social thoughts.

They raised questions like this; "Isn't even Marxism confined within the limits of modern Western humanism as far as it is premised on the concept of the worker who works for the surplus value generally no matter which nation or ethnicity he belongs to?", or further "Doesn't even Marxism have crucial limitations insofar as it is based on the very modern Western humanism from which more or less arbitrary voluntarism can be deduced?" The structuralism of Claude Levi-Strauss (1908-) was an answer to the questions of this kind as it was considered to have entirely relativised the modern Western way of thinking on social formations in terms of contending that even a seemingly savage society like Amazonian ones has its own principles -- the structure of systemic codes -- to organize itself. The 'scientific' Marxism of Louis Arthusser (1918-90) could be a kind of bridge connecting this structuralism and a much more objectified theoretical framework of Marxist social analysis where voluntaristic elements were almost completely excluded by the laws of '*surde termination*' and '*determination* at the last instance'. Thus many talented younger sociologists turned from Marxism to structuralism or structuralist social theory.

On the other hand, younger sociologists who were not satisfied with too objective trends from Europe alternately accepted rather subjective methodologies and theories such as phenomenological sociology, symbolic interactionism and ethnomethodology -- I would lump all of these under phenomenological trends -- from the United States. It was quite strange and therefore interesting that too objective theories were welcome on the one hand while seemingly over-subjective methodologies were being eagerly appreciated on the other in the same country. It is understandable, however, if we remember that there had been two major sociological or social scientific approaches, Marxist and functionalist ones, in postwar Japan and that neither of them had been successful in building a coherent way of social or societal analysis which combines the macro structural or system analysis and the rather micro agent (*shutai*) analysis in any harmonious way. The split of structuralist and

phenomenological trends appeared as a result of one of the unsolved problems of sociology and social sciences in postwar Japan.

Revival of Japanese Culture and Japanese Type of Social Theory

From the late 1960s to the 1970s various types of revision of Japanese culture or of anything which was thought to be uniquely Japanese became a boom against the background of regained self-confidence among Japanese people who had experienced the substantial rise of their living standard due to the rapid economic growth. This boom of cultural nationalism also influenced social sciences and some efforts to crystallize it into social theories were made by some social scientists including some sociologists.

The theory of 'kanjin-shugi (inter-personalism or relationism)' of HAMAGUCHI Eshun (1931-), a sociologist, was an attempt to seek a uniquely Japanese character in social relations where people would recognize the importance in their relations themselves (in between) rather than in individuals or persons bearing them at any of their ends or nodes and which was considered to be traditional, proper and fundamental to Japanese society. MURAKAMI Yasusuke (1931-93), an economist, KUMON Shumpei (1935-), an economist, and SATO Seizaburo (1932-), a political scientist, were bold enough to present an adventurous theory of social development which stressed its multi-linearity and especially the existence of a collectivist or relationist way to adapt to the technological transformation of nature as a basis for another way of industrialist modernization than the Western way.

While older people, especially those who kept well the memory of Japan's road to the ultra-nationalist militarism, took more or less prudent attitudes to these attempts, they attracted for a while some younger people who had been looking for any new ideas as a basis of inquiry or theorizing. But they were not attractive enough to keep their attention and interest so that many variations or developmental forms would appear to make an age of Japanese theory of social relations and social development. The reason is not so clear. To my understanding there were two major reasons. One is that younger people after the rapid economic growth were not so nationalist as expected by these cultural nationalists. Instead, they were more cosmopolitan as the grown-ups in the affluent society.

Another is that these theories were not direct fruits of endeavors on the other hand to accept and overcome the structuralist revolution and phenomenological impacts. Japanese types of social theory may have had something in common with these post-modernist ideas because one of their major references was WATSUJI Tetsuro (1889-1960) who had been a philosopher trying to introduce hermeneutical phenomenology in order to deconstruct the Japanese traditionality as well as the western modernity.

Where Is Japan's Sociology? An Old and New Question

Thus in contemporary Japan there are varieties of sociology from which you can take any is one you like. However, if you try to look for a sociology which is typically Japanese or at least uniquely Japanese in any sense, you will find it quite difficult to specify one. As I have stated before, we could say that in postwar Japan there were some Japanese brands of sociology such as Fukutake's rural sociology, Odaka's industrial sociology, Shimizu's theory of mass society and so forth. Although we can question if they were truly original except the rural sociology as a series from those of the postwar times, we can say that postwar versions of sociology in major fields were by and large more uniquely Japanese than those of contemporary Japan in terms of reflecting Japan's social reality.

Of course we may be able to say that it is quite natural that there is no sociology which is uniquely Japanese in any sense because Japan has been internationalized to the extent that it cannot have any particularly national problems and that, on the contrary, it is quite healthy that Japan has all kinds of sociology in the world without any national mediation. But this does not seem to me to be true because most of the sociological brands in contemporary Japan do not look deep or profound in terms of their significance in both theoretical and practical connotations. They seem to be quite sophisticated in some cases but do not make us feel that they are cutting deep into the reality, if not of Japanese society, even of contemporary societies in general.

And there is another serious problem of a language barrier. If varieties of sociology in contemporary Japan were really international and therefore more or less internationally influential, there would be no problem. But as a matter of fact, most of them do not go abroad because they are written only in Japanese and there are no adequate interpreters and because most Japanese sociologists will not take pains to write or publish the fruits of their researches in spite of knowing that there are not many Japanese-reading scholars especially in Western countries.

Then there is an old and new problem. Even the best fruits of postwar Japanese sociology have not sufficiently been introduced to the world yet due to the language barrier. Besides, we cannot help but have a question whether we have sociological products which have significant contents worth being introduced to the world. For most younger sociologists, belonging to grown-ups in a might-be exceptionally affluent society, find hard to get any sharp sense of reality.

Notes

(1) I have omitted the references because they are too many, most of which are only in Japanese, and because I have mentioned the titles and publication dates of major works referred to.

(2) This section is mainly based on Fukutake, T., 1957, 'Japanese Sociology' in Atoji, Y. & Naito, K., ed., *An Overview of the History of Sociology*, Keiso Shobo, Tokyo.

(3) This section is a revised edition of Shoji, K., 1975, 'The position of sociology in the history of social sciences in contemporary Japan', in Shoji, K., *A Preliminary Analysis of the History of Social Sciences in Contemporary Japan*, Hosei University Press, Tokyo.