Chapter 9
Typology of Global Quasi-Legislative Behavior and Typology of Societies Focusing on Sinic East

Abstract In this chapter we attempt relating the typology of global quasi-legislative behavior (in this volume) to the typology of societies (Inoguchi 2019) focusing on Sinic East. The latter, the typology of societies, is based on daily life satisfaction surveyed by the AsiaBarometer quality of life research carried out in 29 Asian societies with face-to-face interviewing and with the sample size of 800 to 2,000 in each of 29 Asian societies (Inoguchi and Fujii 2013; see also Appendix E). The typology of societies is based on factor analyzing people’s daily life satisfaction with 16 life items (domains, aspects and styles). It is a profile of societies from the bottom up rather than top down. Since both the typology of global quasi-legislative behavior has proved to be reasonably strongly related to the internal preferences of each society obtained by the World Value Survey through the world data used in Welzel 2013 and statistically examined positively in Inoguchi and Le, 2019, another data set of domestic daily life satisfaction collected in Sinic East societies in 2019 has been examined and proved to be reasonably related each other. One strong finding here is that those domestic preferences gauged on the experts’ assessment of regimes’ nature like democratic vs. authoritarian does not seem to work well in comparison to the daily life satisfaction in 16 items of domains, aspects and styles and the values and norms in concrete life situations.

Typology of societies has been constructed from the angle of bottom up to characterize 29 societies by the degree of human daily life satisfaction in the AsiaBarometer Survey (Inoguchi 2019 and forthcoming). The idea that prompted me to construct the typology of Asian societies from the bottom up rather than top down is that Asian societies have been so often seen and typologized from the top-down perspective (Hegel, Marx, Wittfogel, Weber). The task was carried out by collecting empirical data derived from face-to-face interviews on people’s daily life satisfaction in 29 societies in East Asia, Southeast Asia, South Asia, and Central Asia with each of national sample sizes ranging between 800 (for example, Brunei, Bhutan, the Maldives) and 2,000 (for example, India, China, Japan) during the 2003–2008 period (Inoguchi and Fujii 2013). The sixteen items of daily life domains, aspects, and styles are: housing, friendship, marriage, standard of living, household income,
health, education, job, neighbors, public safety, conditions of the environment, social welfare system, democratic system, family life, spiritual life, and leisure. What are the key dimensions of daily life satisfaction? How are Asian societies as seen from the bottom up different? With these two questions in mind, my operation of typologizing Asian societies is: First, factor analyzing each of 29 national data with 16 daily life satisfaction items has yielded three key dimensions—survival, social relations, and public-policy dominance. What comes a small surprise in the findings is that each of 29 Asian societies differs tremendously from one to another in the order of the size of each of three key dimensions. For instance, the Inglehartian dimensions are two, materialism and post-materialism or survival and social relations. With 16 items we have got the three key dimensions of survival, social relations, and public-policy dominance. What is most important and interesting from our perspective is that the three dimensions’ order among themselves in terms of their explanatory power (i.e., dimensional eigenvalues) is of eight varieties. In other words, if survival is called a, if social relations is called b, and if public-policy dominance is called c, and if the largest explanatory power-exhibiting dimension is capitalized like A, B, or C, then there are six such types of Asian societies: Abc, Acb, Bac, Bca, Cab, Cba. In other words, a society characterized Abc is a society in which people get daily satisfaction most on the dimension of survival, next on the dimension of social relations, and last on public-policy dominance. This is a standard Inglehartian type bar the last dimension (public-policy dominance). Japan (Gordon 2018) and Indonesia (Kim 2019) were societies experienced feudalism which means the centripetal nature of the state is weak. Taiwan was a settler society. Uzbekistan and Tajikistan are sparsely populated and geographically dispersed. Common to them is that power centralization is minimized in getting daily life satisfaction from our bottom up perspective. Acb is represented by China (Zhang 2008; Economy 2018; Ci 2019), India (Roy 1997), South Korea, Mongolia. The public-policy dominance dimension comes the second. People get daily life satisfaction more in the Acb society from that dimension than the Abc society. Authoritarian-tinged leadership is required. In the Bac society comes atop the social relations dimension. In other words, it is a networked society among new diverse settlers. Hong Kong, Malaysia (Tajuddin 2012), Thailand (Glassman 2019), Vietnam (Nguyen 2012), and Kyrgyzstan fall into this type. The Bca society does not exist in the 29 Asian societies. My wild but reasonably educated guess is that North Korea might be close to this type although there is no systematic evidence or empirical survey data to back up that guess (Baek 2016). The Cab society is the society in which public-policy dominance comes to the fore. A fractured society though it is, it is the way in which order is restored. Pakistan (Lieven 2012), Brunei (Cheung 2017), the Philippines, Bhutan, Kazakhstan fall into this type. The Cba society includes Singapore (Chua 2017) and Sri Lanka. It is illustrated by Singapore. Public-policy dominance comes to the fore like the Cab society. One difference from the Cab society is that not only at the higher level of society but also at the lower level of society, social relations and survival dimensions tend to be routinely affected by public-policy dimension.

Although this book is about global quasi-legislative behavior, a sovereign state’s decision about participation in multilateral treaties depends not only what the rest of
the world thinks about values and norms multilateral treaties represent and exemplify, but also how its people feel about daily life satisfaction, the sum of which can be aggregated into societal types. Therefore, taking a glance at the relationship between global quasi-legislative behavior types and societal types may add more credence to the hypothesis that national citizens’ preference and global citizens’ preference converge at reasonably high level, which have been affirmed positively in Inoguchi and Le (2019).

Looking at Table 9.1, two things should be noted. First, among Sinic East’s societal types, diversity is most striking. The parenthesized DPR Korea’s societal type is my guess. With this included for regional observation, Sinic East enlarged to nine members with Singapore (see Fig. 4.3 and Fig. 4.4) and Mongolia (see Fig. 4.7 and Fig. 4.8) also included, Sinic East has every variety of eight types: Abc, Acb, Bac, Cab, Acb, Abc, Bac, Cba, and Acb when we use the bottom-up perspective. This is an important point when the more common perspective of looking at political systems, democratic vs. authoritarian, an approach used by the Economist Intelligence Unit (2020) in reporting that Sinic East or enlarged East Asia has no full democracy, with both Japan and South Korea sliding down from full democracy down to partial democracy in 2019. Although the general trend in East Asia in the dawn of the third Millennium is authoritarian backsliding (cf. Mikami and Inoguchi 2010; Croissant and Hellmann 2020) the perspective from the bottom up gives an astonishing variety as shown in the societal types. This point is doubly important because in gauging multilateral treaty participation chosen by a sovereign state, the indicator of societal preference must be based on randomly sampled, face-to-face interviews of citizens in each Sinic East society and thus not including a sovereign state’s preference or proclivity must be assured. Coming back to the main point, the Inglehartian paradigm may not easily apply to Sinic East when Sinic East’s societal characteristics are to be revealed and illuminated.

Second, on quasi-legislative behavior types, most striking is the prevalence of mutual binding strategy of Japan, Vietnam, DPR Korea, Singapore, and Mongolia. This preponderance of mutual binding strategy among Sinic East is striking when
compared to the dominance of aspirational bonding strategy both among the developed and stalled North and the developing and stagnant South. China and R Korea are the only two states in Sinic East exhibiting the strategy of aspirational bonding. (Taiwan and Hong Kong are not members of the United Nations. Therefore, we do not have empirical data for them. The parenthesized types of Taiwan and Hong Kong are merely my guess.) China and R Korea show their strategy of aspirational bonding. Milanovic (2019) argues that China has difficulties in keeping many friends and allies because it has been aloof and alone even during the non-align movement’s heady time in the 1950s. R Korea has been torn into two groups, conservative vs. progressive, which befriend two different sets of neighbors: conservatives with the US and Japan whereas progressives prefer DPR Korea, Russia, and China. Both are inclined to bond with the developing South rather than the developed North because R Korea’s maneuverability is much larger with the developing South status when coping with the developed North’s demand for burden sharing. Next most striking is the prevalence of the global commons angle in Sinic East countries, notably Japan, China, R Korea, and Singapore. They need to be exposed to the rest of the world with market access to energy, technology, and agricultural and mineral products. Those not characterized by the angle of global commons are Vietnam, DPR Korea, and Mongolia, all are run by political capitalism (Milanovic 2019).

Japan is of the Inglehartian ideal type of materialism and post-materialism exhibited in this order. First, satisfaction with survival-related daily life dominates. Second, satisfaction with social relations-related daily life aspects follows survival-related daily life satisfaction. Third, satisfaction with public-policy dominance comes last. In the Inglehartian scheme the public-policy dominance dimension never appears. But the survival and social relations aspects do appear consistently for the last four decades (Inglehart 2018; Inglehart and Welzel 2016; Welzel 2013). This is largely because the World Values Survey focuses on values and norms. Inoguchi (2019) argues that people’s perception of society contains public institutions and activities by the state. Especially seen from the bottom up, that is, from ordinary people’s daily life perspective, so this angle cannot be disregarded. Bringing in their perception of public-policy-related aspects of daily life allows to reveal the varieties of societal types. Whether the role of public policy is large or small or in which order the dimension on which public-policy-related categories are loaded strongly interests us. Not surprisingly the weight of public-policy dominance varies from one society to another. That is fascinating in itself and in relation to a sovereign state’s global legislative behavior. In Japan’s case, the order of the three dimensions is materialism, post-materialism, and public-policy dominance. How does Japan’s societal type relates to global legislative behavior? Japan’s type of global legislative behavior is abc, meaning that its speed is agile as contrasted to slow, that its angle is global commons as contrasted to individual interests, and that its strategy is mutual binding as contrasted to aspirational bonding. Then is the hypothesis accepted or rejected? It seems that the initial hypothesis is more or less moderately accepted. Japan’s semi-sovereign status or what some people call a semi-vassal status is sync with the fairly small defense expenditure per GNP. It also is harmonious with the large percentage of government budget allocated to those expenditure items related to social welfare,
public infrastructure, and government debt repayment. Calling for global leadership on the global assault of Covid-19, former prime ministers of the UK and Australia, Robert Brown and Kevin Rudd, named Shinzo Abe to lead. Japan’s strategy of mutual binding is a good strategy for this opportune time to ride on this call (Brown and Rudd 2020).

China’s societal type is Acb. That is, the weight of satisfaction with survival-related daily life aspects matters most. The second dimension is public-policy dominance. That is interesting in the sense that the state’s role carries the secondary importance in the eyes of ordinary people. In other words, Chinese society has a certain strength of resistance and resilience vis-à-vis the Chinese state’s exercising its muscle. The third is the satisfaction with daily life aspects related to social relations primarily among themselves. China’s global legislative behavioral type is abC. That is, its speed is agile. It is befitting a global power’s status, handling thousands of issues. Its angle is global commons. China’s slogan is that of advancing globalization and international cooperation on the basis of what Milanovic calls political capitalism (2019). Its strategy is aspirational bonding. Deng Xiaoping called the approach “hiding your strength and biding your time.” For the last decade or so, its strategy has got more self-assertive within the slogan of aspirational bonding with friends from near and afar. In running Chinese society from above, what counts most is whether its two-digit economic growth rates slow down visibly for three decades if from 2020 (Economy 2018).

Vietnam’s societal type is Bac. What is most important in ordinary people’s eyes is social relations. With constant war and strife, people need to rely on family, community, and workplace for assurance and assistance for safety and survival. Next important is satisfaction with daily life aspects for material survival. Family, relatives, friends, and neighbors go a long way. What comes next? Vietnam developed from incessant battlefield to prosperous market. By 2019 it boasted of registering one of the world highest annual economic growth rates. Once peace with China came at long last in 1984, Vietnamese reform policy, or Doi Moi, commenced in 1986. This is the Vietnamese version of Milanovic’s political capitalism. China has always been presence at Vietnam’s northern border, naturally leading to a combination of vigilance and trade. The southern territory is now inside the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Southeast Asian continental competitive animal spirit has been burning there (Woodside 1971). The third dimension is public-policy dominance. Vietnam’s societal type is the same as Thailand, Malaysia, and the Philippines with good, wide, and deep social relations mattering most whether it is family, colleagues, or friends. What about Vietnam’s legislative behavior? It is ABc. Its speed is slow and cautious. Its angle is individual interests. Its strategy is mutual binding. When contestation and competition are ubiquitous in one’s neighborhood, one cannot afford sloganeering on aspirational bonding. The fact that China has been an immediate neighbor in the north while in the south and on the hills Mons, Chams, Khmers, many ethnic Chinese, and other ethnic minorities have been settlers, old and new, with Vietnamese themselves being ancient settlers, leads the Vietnamese to adopt mutual binding.

North Korea’s societal type is unknown. Surveys cannot be carried out within and from without. One survey results of refugees were published (Haggard and
Noland 2011). My educated comparative estimate is that of Bca. The first dimension is that of post-materialism or social relations-dominant. The reason is that the Kim dynastic hereditary system has been kept unbroken for more than seven decades over three generations and that the Kim dynasty has been kept with the very tightly knit family-centered elites with autocratic control from one person. The second dimension is public-policy predominance. That means that neighborhood, workplace, government, and armed forces are all centrally managed. Politics takes command. Janmadan (small black market) capitalism has become ubiquitous and been slowly changing society by loosening the implementation of central order. The third dimension is materialism, survival-related daily life satisfaction. This carries the least weight. That is why with no other alternative to Janmadan market, has Janmadan capitalism spread out. The combination of tight government regulations and ubiquitous needs to use bribes and other services to get commodities for survival generates Janmadan market. How does the societal type relate to the global legislative type? North Korea’s type is ABc. Its speed of decision is cautious and slow. Given the country’s complex relations with major powers (China, the US, Russia, South Korea, and Japan) North Korea is perennially vulnerable in energy, food, the environment, poverty, nutrition, hygiene, advanced technology, and security. The ways out of extreme difficulty has been tried three times:

1. Under Kim Il Son and Kim Jong Il, North Korea was about to be successful in getting light-water nuclear power stations half-constructed in the six power talks, but ended in failure. But North Korea got good knowledge and practice on nuclear power generation.
2. Kim Jong II was able to further shift its resources to armed buildup (sungun politics) along with economic development loosening to use a modicum of market forces.
3. Kim Jong Un was able to use the fanfare of denuclearization of the Korean peninsula along with President Donald Trump, he bought the time to advance production of nuclear weapons in order to dissuade the US and South Korea from attacking North Korea.

What is North Korea’s angle of global legislative type? It is individual interests, that is, nuclear weapons to dissuade from around Japan and its vicinity. Its strategy is mutual binding. North Korea is minimalist in participating in multilateral treaties. It has joined multilateral treaties as many as the perhaps most minimalist US. The US has been the leading power since 1945 but in terms of keeping the Washingtonian principle of disentanglement from external affairs has been well kept thereafter as well, registering 133 such treaties whereas North Korea registering 77. However, the number of joining multilateral treaties per annual are about twice as many as that of the US.

South Korea’s societal type is Acb. The first dimension is that of materialism, which is followed by c, meaning public-policy dominance. The division between the conservatives and the progressives or the right and the left, has been kept sharp despite its admirable democratization after the long authoritarian and military dictatorship. Public-policy dominance is located at the second dimension, meaning that
Table 9.2  Eight typologies of global quasi-legislative behavior

| Types | Speed | Angle                  | Strategy             |
|-------|-------|------------------------|----------------------|
| abc   | Agile | Global commons         | Mutual binding       |
| aBC   | Agile | Individual interests   | Aspirational bonding |
| aBc   | Agile | Individual interests   | Mutual binding       |
| abC   | Agile | Global commons         | Aspirational bonding |
| Abc   | Cautious | Global commons     | Mutual binding       |
| AbC   | Cautious | Global commons     | Aspirational bonding |
| ABc   | Cautious | Individual interests | Mutual binding       |
| ABC   | Cautious | Individual interests | Aspirational bonding |

Table 9.3  Types of societies

| Societal types | 1st dimension | 2nd dimension | 3rd dimension                |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| Abc            | 1. Materialism| 2. Post-materialism | 3. Public sector dominance |
| Acb            | 1. Materialism| 2. Public sector dominance | 3. Post-materialism |
| Bac            | 1. Post-materialism | 2. Materialism | 3. Public sector dominance |
| Bca            | 1. Post-materialism | 2. Public sector dominance | 3. Materialism |
| Cab            | 1. Public sector dominance | 2. Materialism | 3. Post-materialism |
| Cba            | 1. Public sector dominance | 2. Post-materialism | 3. Materialism |

Authoritative inclinations, whether it is president or parliament or judiciary, tend to carry strong flavors. After 1998, when democratically elected presidents of non-military origin occupied the post, each outgoing president either smelled of bribery, committed suicide, or was sent to prison. The third dimension is post-materialism. Social relations-related life satisfaction tend to be given shadows of public-policy dominance. What is South Korea’s global legislative behavioral type? It is that of Abs. Its speed is cautious and slow given the complexity of surrounding within and without. Its angle is that of global commons. As the world 11th greatest economic power, its angle is definitely that of global commons, without being globally oriented, South Korea cannot survive in prosperity. Its strategy is that of aspirational bonding. South Korean nationalism is very strong, whether it is left-leaning or right-leaning. Without campaigning for or at least seriously mentioning national reunification possibilities, no political leader aspirant can build a career (Tables 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, and 9.5).

Table 9.6 Subregional Asian Member States: East Asia, Southeast Asia, South Asia, Central Asia plus what is called the Orthodox East is defined to consist of the following states (or areas).
Table 9.4  Some representative Asian states based on typologies of global quasi-legislative behavior

| Types | Some representative Asian states |
|-------|----------------------------------|
| 1. abc | Japan, Indonesia, Iran, Singapore |
| 2. aBC | Laos, Syria, Jordan, Mexico, Ecuador |
| 3. aBc | Algeria, Argentina, DR Congo, Nepal, Nigeria |
| 4. abC | US, UK, France, Germany, Sweden, Netherlands, Thailand, Philippines, China, Israel, India |
| 5. Abc | Albania, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkey |
| 6. AbC | R Korea, Portugal, Lithuania, Estonia, Czech R., Croatia |
| 7. ABC | Bahrain, DPR Korea, Qatar, Sandi Arabia, Oman, South Africa |
| 8. ABC | Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives, Panama |

Table 9.5  Some representative Asian states based on daily life satisfaction

| Societal types | Asian societies |
|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. Abc | Japan, Indonesia, Taiwan, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan |
| 2. Acb | China, South Korea, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Mongolia |
| 3. Bac | Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, Kyrgyzstan |
| 4. Bca | not found in 29 Asian societies |
| 5. Cab | Pakistan, Brunei, the Philippines, Bhutan, Kazakhstan |
| 6. Cba | Singapore, Sri Lanka |

Table 9.6  Subregional Asian Member States

| Region       | Countries                                      |
|--------------|------------------------------------------------|
| East Asia    | Japan, China, R Korea, DPR Korea, Vietnam, Singapore, Mongolia, Hong Kong, Taiwan |
| Southeast Asia | Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar, Singapore, Indonesia, Timor Leste, Malaysia, Brunei |
| South Asia   | India, Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Maldives, Bhutan, Maldives |
| Central Asia | Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Mongolia, Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia |
| Orthodox East | Russia, Ukraine, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Israel, Greece, Serbia, Croatia |
### Table 9.7 Daily life satisfaction and multilateral treaty participation across Asia

|                 | Society types Daily life satisfaction | Global quasi-legislative behavior types multilateral treaty participation |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **East Asia**   |                                      |                                                                             |
| 1. Japan        | Abc                                  | abc                                                                         |
| 2. China        | Acb                                  | abC                                                                         |
| 3. Vietnam      | Bac                                  | ABC                                                                         |
| 4. DPR Korea    |                                      | ABc                                                                         |
| 5. R Korea      | Acb                                  | AbC                                                                         |
| 6. Taiwan       | Abc                                  |                                                                             |
| 7. Hong Kong    | Bac                                  |                                                                             |
| **Southeast Asia** |                                      |                                                                             |
| 1. Philippines  | Cab                                  | abC                                                                         |
| 2. Thailand     | Bac                                  | abC                                                                         |
| 3. Vietnam      | Bac                                  | ABC                                                                         |
| 4. Laos         | Acb                                  | aBC                                                                         |
| 5. Cambodia     | Acb                                  | abC                                                                         |
| 6. Myanmar      | Acb                                  | ABC                                                                         |
| 7. Singapore    | Cba                                  | abc                                                                         |
| 8. Indonesia    | Abc                                  | abc                                                                         |
| 9. Timor Leste  |                                      | ABC                                                                         |
| 10. Malaysia    | Bac                                  | AbC                                                                         |
| 11. Brunei      | Cab                                  | ABC                                                                         |

(continued)
Table 9.7 (continued)

| Society types Daily life satisfaction | Global quasi-legislative behavior types multilateral treaty participation |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **South Asia**                       |                                                                          |
| 1. India                             | Acb                                                                      | abC |
| 2. Pakistan                          | Cab                                                                      | abC |
| 3. Nepal                             | Acb                                                                      | aBc |
| 4. Bangladesh                        | Acb                                                                      | ABC |
| 5. Sri Lanka                         | Cab                                                                      | AbC |
| 6. Maldives                          |                                                                          | ABC |
| 7. Bhutan                            | Cab                                                                      | ABC |
| 8. Afghanistan                       | Abc                                                                      | ABo |
| **Central Asia plus Orthodox East**  |                                                                          |
| 1. Kazakhstan                        | Cab                                                                      | Abc |
| 2. Kyrgyzstan                        | Bac                                                                      | Abc |
| 3. Tajikistan                        | Abc                                                                      | Abc |
| 4. Uzbekistan                        | Abc                                                                      | Abc |
| 5. Turkmenistan                      |                                                                          | ABo |
| 6. Mongolia                          | Acb                                                                      | ABo |
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