Abstract
This paper investigates Bureaucrats and Politicians in Power-Dependence of Domestic Politics and Interdependence, Linkage of Diplomacy: From Bureaucratic Leadership to Official Residence Leadership. This paper consists of two parts. First, this paper investigates the common factors between Power-Dependence of domestic politics and Interdependence in international relations. The power-dependence means political dependence in the political networks between central government, bureaucracy, local government and interest groups in common regime state. The interdependence means comprehensive relationship, from which zero-sum game is not necessarily derived, between various states with different regimes. Second, this paper investigates Bureaucrats and Politicians focusing on the history from bureaucratic leadership to official residence leadership in Japan. The bureaucracy in Japan, especially the Ministry of International Trade and Industry has been main actor of Japan after the 55 system, the Conservative Merger in 1955. From the late 50s to the 70s, each Liberal Democratic Administrations, led by strong leadership of prime ministers, Kishi, and Ikeda, succeeded in Japan-US Security Treaty and doubling of income, respectively. Since the 70s, the foreign economic policy is forwarded between the United States and Japan in place of the security and political issues between them. Prime minister Nakasone, Hashimoto and Koizumi tried to reorganize the bureaucracy. In Japan, the bureau of personnel at Cabinet Office changed the bureaucrat-led politics to politician-led politics. This paper investigates how government and bureaucracy cooperate for the success of policy making.

Keywords: Power-Dependence, Interdependence, Linkage, Domestic Politics, Diplomacy
Introduction

Table 1 Comparison between Power-Dependence Theory and Interdependence Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Concept 1</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linkage between Centre and Local</td>
<td>Linkage between Centre and Local</td>
<td>Linkage between States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection between Organizations, Policy Networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Concept 2</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asymmetry between Centre and Local</td>
<td>Asymmetry between States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Concept 3</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilateral decision is not cost-free.</td>
<td>Short-term sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law, Statute</td>
<td>Treaty, Soft Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanction</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law with sanction</td>
<td>Treaty and Soft Law without sanction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stability</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principle of <em>Ultra Vires</em></td>
<td>Collective Security and Balance of Power Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Table is made by the author based on Rhodes (1986a, 2006), Nye (2007), and Keohane and Nye (1977).

(Yoshihiro Nagata, Power-Dependence of British Central-Local Government Relations and Interdependence of International Relations in the EU, ACPEL2016)

Table 2 Comparison between Policy Networks and Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Concept 1</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linkage between Centre and Local</td>
<td>Linkage between States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection between Organizations, Policy Networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Concept 2</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asymmetry between Centre and Local</td>
<td>Asymmetry between States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Concept 3</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilateral decision is not cost-free.</td>
<td>Short-term sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law, Statute</td>
<td>Treaty, Soft Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanction</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law with sanction</td>
<td>Treaty and Soft Law without sanction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stability</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principle of <em>Ultra Vires</em></td>
<td>Collective Security and Balance of Power Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy, Central Government, Parliaments, Politicians, Interest Group Local Government</td>
<td>States International Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Table is made by the author based on Rhodes (1986a, 2006), Nye (2007),
(Yoshihiro Nagata, Policy Networks of Central-Local Government Relations in the UK and Japan and Linkage of International Relations in the EU, IICSSHawaii2017)

**Power-dependence Theory in Intergovernmental Relations**

In 1981, Rhodes presented power-dependence theory for analysis of the intergovernmental relations in the United Kingdom (UK) (Rhodes, 1981). Rhodes’ concept of the power-dependence is based on the process of resource exchange between domestic organizations. In other words, the concept of the power-dependence is a counterexample of the traditional concept that the local government is the agency of the central government. Rhodes’ power-dependence theory is addressed as policy networks (Rhodes, 1997, pp. 29-45). However, Morgan *et al.* criticized Rhodes’ ‘governing without government’ by showing their case study that “while central government may no longer be so directly involved in the local economic development arena, it continues to exert an extremely powerful influence” (Morgan, Rees and Garmise, 1988, p. 195-6).

Rhodes considered analysis level of the power-dependence theory composed of micro-level of analysis, meso-level of analysis and macro-level of analysis. The objectives of the micro-level of analysis are resources and internal political process. The objective of the meso-level analysis is pattern of interaction which is analyzed by corporatism as a theory of classification. The objective of the macro-level of analysis is distribution of power which is analyzed by corporatist theory (Rhodes, 1986a, pp.7-9). Rhodes proposed five propositions about dependency of domestic organizations. These propositions on the power-dependence are defined as

(a) Any organization is dependent upon other organizations for resources.
(b) In order to achieve their goals, the organization have to exchange resources.
(c) Although decision-making within the organization is constrained by other organizations, the dominant coalition retains some discretion. The appreciative system of the dominant coalition influences which relationships are seen as a problem and which resources will be sought.
(d) The dominant coalition employs strategies within known rules of the game to regulate the process of exchange.
(e) Variations in the degree of discretion are a product of the goals and the relative power potential of the interacting organizations. This relative power potential is a product of the resources of each organization, of the rules of the game and of the process of exchange between organizations (Rhodes, 1981, p.98-9, Rhodes, 1986b, p. 17).

These organizations are summarized as four components; the central government, the national community of the local government, the local authority as the member of the national community of the local government and single function policy community. The relation between the association and central department is characterized by bargaining for resources. The resources in the above propositions are authority, money, political legitimacy, information and organization (Rhodes, 1986b, pp.17).

(Yoshihiro Nagata, Power-Dependence of British Central-Local Government Relations and Interdependence of International Relations in the EU, ACPEL2016)
Interdependence in the International Relations

The interdependence in the international relations is the concept against the traditional view of the realist who believes the global structure is determined by the military power between states. Although the traditional view based on the military power has been accepted till end of the Vietnam War, new norm of the interdependence emerged in the mid of the 70s motivated by the Detente between the United States and the Soviet Union. The emergence of this norm are due to two reasons; recognition for a new equilibrium of post-Vietnam War as a National Security Advisor of the USA (Kissinger, 1979, pp. 65-70), and recognition of crucial importance of soft power. Nye’s belief about power of the sovereign is the military power, economic power and soft power. Nye proposed the soft power by the warning that the use of force might jeopardize economic objectives (Nye, 1986, p.10). In this context, Keohane and Nye called the concept of the interdependence the overall structure approach which does not differentiate among issue areas in the world politics. These issue areas includes not only the political issue, for example the nuclear disarmament negotiation resulted in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks 2 (SALT II), which was signed in 1979 between USA and USSR but not ratified, but also the global environment issue represented by a report ‘Limit to Growth’ published by Club of Rome in 1972. The traditional view of the realist based on the state power never agreed theory of regime change. However, Keohane and Nye assert that as the power of states changes, the rules that comprise international regimes will change accordingly. They emphasize this dynamic, the regime change, is at the heart of their model on the overall power structure. From viewpoint of the interdependence, the border between the domestic issue and the foreign issue becomes fuzzy. The international interdependence also affects domestic matter (Nye, 2007, pp. 210-213, Keohane and Nye, 1977, pp. 42-46).

(Yoshihiro Nagata, Power-Dependence of British Central-Local Government Relations and Interdependence of International Relations in the EU, ACPEL2016)

Comparison between Power-dependence Theory and Interdependence Theory

This section considers comparison between the power-dependence theory and the interdependence theory. First, actors of the power-dependence are organizations composed of the central government and local governments within the same regime of the state but different evaluation systems, while actors of the interdependence are states some of which belong to one regime but the other of which belong to different regime. The legislative rule in the power-dependence relations is the statute and common law, while the legislative rules in the interdependence relations are the international law including treaty and soft law, especially manipulating on the balance of power and collective security. Second, common factors between the power-dependence theory and the interdependence theory are linkage, asymmetry and cost of change. Concept of the linkage is essential both in the power-dependence in the intergovernmental relations and the interdependence in the international relations. The power-dependence itself is the concept of linkage between the central government and community of the local authorities. In the framework of the power-dependence in the UK there exist four kinds of linkages. Example of the linkage between the national government environment and the national local government system is a connection between Department for Communities and Local Government and the Consultative Council on Local Government Finance (Rhodes, 1986b, p. 101). Example of the
linkage within the national community of local government is a connection among Association of County Councils (ACC), Association of District Councils (ADC), Association of Metropolitan Authorities (AMA), Greater London Council (GLC) and so on (Rhodes, 1986b, p. 255). Example of linkage between the national community of local government and the single function policy community is a connection between Police & Fire Committee of AMA and Central Fire Brigades Advisory Council (Rhodes, 1986b, p. 310). Connection between Education Committee of ACC and Advisory Committee in the Department of Education and Science is also above example (Rhodes, 1986b, p. 330). The linkage plays an important role in the international interdependence theory. Nye pointed out that much of the political conflict over interdependence involves the creation or prevention of linkage, and economic sanctions are often an example of such linkage (Nye, 2007, pp. 216-7). Asymmetry is also common factor in the power-dependence and the international interdependence. Asymmetry is a concept of unbalanced power between two organizations or states. Rhodes recognizes asymmetry in the intergovernmental relations (Rhodes, The National World of Local Government, p. 20). Nye pointed out that asymmetry is at the heart of the politics of international interdependence. He analyzed its reason that if two parties are interdependent but one is less dependent than the other, the less dependent party has a source of power as long as both value the interdependent relationship, and concluded that manipulating the asymmetries of interdependence can be a source of power in international politics (Nye, 2007, p. 215). Cost of change is also common factor in the power-dependence and the international independence. Rhodes pointed out that unilateral action is not cost-free; as the cost becomes visible, the government either intensifies the attempt to direct local authorities or employs different strategies by recognizing its dependence on local authorities (Rhodes, 1986a, p. 6). The cost of international interdependence corresponds to sensitivity and vulnerability, respectively. Due to Nye’s definition, sensitivity means amount and pace of the effects of dependence: scale and quickness which change in one part influences to another part. Vulnerability means the relative costs of changing the structure of a system of interdependence (Nye, 2007, pp. 213-4). Difference between power-dependence and interdependence exists in sanction. Within the intergovernmental relations in the UK, the discretionary power of the local authority is conferred by the Parliament. Although the local authority can implement policies using conferred discretion, the local authority must comply under the principle of *ultra vires*. Therefore, the sanction does exist even if the local authority acts beyond the statute. In the interdependence relations, the bilateral treaty or multilateral treaty and many trade agreements or environment protocols never provide sanction based on the legal force. However, if the compliance is not maintained, stronger state sometimes maneuvers political sanction or economic sanction. For maintaining peace and stability, the balance of power and collective security sometimes require the political sanction. The states seek alliance, the balance of power and the collective security. NATO (OTAN) is the typical collective security. The Britain and the United States special alliance and Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan are typical alliance. Japan-UK Foreign and Defence Ministerial Meeting is a linkage.

I also discuss degree of dependence in the power-dependence of the intergovernmental relations and interdependence of the international relations. The political agenda in the intergovernmental relations is featured by the bargaining between the state strategy and the local interest. The political agenda in the
international relations depends on the regime of states. As pointed out by Krasner, the regime is defined as a set of principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which expectations of actors converge in the given area of international relations (Krasner, 1982, pp. 185-7). The interdependence relations also exist between different regimes by considering balance of power. The financial policy seems the most uncompromising agenda between centre and local in the UK, that is, the financial policy is featured by the unilateral decision of the central government, while the local government is discretionary in the decision of the rate. However, the bargaining between centre and local exists in the form of the grant negotiation, where the grant is provided by the central government to the local authority. The financial policy motivated by the big company and National Bank is featured based on the national interest. Sometimes states within the same regime attempt coordinated intervention to avoid financial crisis issued from the critical state. The agenda of the global environment is featured by almost all states. Although the purpose of the global environment is decided as the international protocol, this decision is an objective to be complied with sanction-free. The public policy is the agenda with sanction-free in the intergovernmental relations within the state and the Member States under the EU.

(Yoshihiro Nagata, Power-Dependence of British Central-Local Government Relations and Interdependence of International Relations in the EU, ACPEL2016)

Policy networks and Linkage

The policy networks and the linkages have similarity, meanwhile the former is addressed in the domestic power dependence and the latter in the international interdependence. Policy networks are composed of bureaucracy, central government, party, parliament, politicians, interest groups and local government. Policy networks, especially central government and bureaucracy coordinate domestic and foreign issue and policy. Policy-making has been determined by policy networks. Rhodes defines policy networks as set of formal institutional and informal linkages between government and other actors structured around shared if endlessly negotiated beliefs and interests in public policy making and implementation (Rhodes, 2006, pp. 423-424). Rhodes continues that the power-dependence approach treats policy networks as set of resource-dependent organizations. Their relationships are characterized by power-dependence (Rhodes, 2006, pp. 432-433). On the other hand, in the world of international relations, Kissinger, a pioneer of the ‘linkage’, describes start of the linkage in the Nixon Administration. Kissinger pointed out that Nixon’s view of Soviet Union was not based on all-or-nothing proposition as his predecessors but rather based on comprehensive approach, that is, linkage on issues with varying degree of solubility. Nixon attempted to synthesize all the elements of the superpower relationship into an overall approach which is neither confrontation nor conciliation (Kissinger, 1994, p. 714). Keohane and Nye pointed out that military and economically strong states will dominate organizations and issues by linking their own policies to other states’ policies, however, when military force is devalued, strong states may still attempt linkages on other issues, trade, shipping or oil (Keohane and Nye, 1977, pp. 30-31). Putnam studied entanglement of domestic and international politics. Putnam takes a case of Japan in which the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MITI), the Economic Planning Agency, and some politicians within the Liberal Democratic Party attempted to promote business interest agenda, using U.S.
pressure against the resistance of the Ministry of Finance (MOF) (Putnam, 1988, pp. 427-460).

(Yoshihiro Nagata, Policy Networks of Central-Local Government Relations in the UK and Japan and Linkage of International Relations in the EU, IICSSHawaii2017)

In the real policy making process, many aspects became to be seen which domestic politics influences the foreign economic policy. The increasing influence of the domestic politics to the foreign economic policy is clear due to the following reasons. First, the political theory emerged by Katzenstein or Putnam who proposed relevancy between domestic policy and foreign economic policy. Katzenstein pointed out that domestic interest group and political party influence the foreign economic policy. Putnam presented 2 level game model. In the domestic level of the model, the game is played between government and interest group, and in the international level of the model, the game is played between states. Second, the Japanese bureaucracy dealing bilateral or multilateral relations became influenced not only by the international relations but also opinion of the domestic interest groups.

R.A.W. Rhodes presented a political theory of dependence relation between British government and local government, which is called power dependence theory (1981). Rhodes proposed five propositions of the power dependence, where the keyword is the resource which means authority, money, political legitimacy, information and organization. Rhodes’ main proposition is that all organization depends on the other organization for the resource. Furthermore, the organization exchanges the resource for achieving the goal. The policy network is unconsciously made based on the concept of the power dependence. Due to the definition by Rhodes, the policy network is a formal or informal linkage between the government and the other actors. In Japan, the policy network also plays an important role in the policy making process. However, main actors in the United Kingdom are government and local government, whereas main actors in Japan are government, bureaucrat and Liberal Democratic Party.

The linkage in the international relations, first advocated by James Rosenau in the 1960s and after that, in 1970s, strategically developed by Henry Kissinger for the cold war between the United States and Soviet Union. Kissinger described “linkage strategy” which makes diplomacy, not by focusing on one foreign issues, but by packaging several foreign issues. In the 80s, Joseph Nye and Robert Keohane redefined “linkage diplomacy” to apply between the allies and friendly nations; the US-UK special relations, the US-France relations and US-Japan relations. The linkage diplomacy by Nye and Keohane is based on the linkage Strategy by Henry Kissinger. The common factor between power-dependence and interdependence is asymmetry. Asymmetry of Domestic Politics is applied to asymmetry between central government, bureaucracy, ministries, politicians, diet, interest groups and local government. On the other hand, asymmetry of international relations is asymmetry between nations.

(Yoshihiro Nagata, Bureaucracy of Power-Dependence in Domestic Politics in Japan and Interdependence of International Relations in the UK, U.S. and EU, ECSSBrighton2017)
**From Bureaucrat-led Politics to Politician-led Politics**

In Edo period (1603-1868), Bureaucracy had supported Tokugawa Shogunate. Daimyo, Karo were Bureaucrats and Politicians in Japan. My ancestors are Daimyo, Ujikane Toda (1576-1655), Ujiyori Toda (1614-1686), First feudal Lord of Ogaki, Lord of Ogaki Castle.

In Edo period, Japan and U.S. Treaty of Peace and Amity was achieved on March 1854. Taio, chief senior councilor Naosuke Ii achieved Treaty of Amity and Commerce Between the United States and the Empire of Japan on June 1858. Ieyasu Tokugawa (1543-1616), Shogun, was a great politician.


In Japan Politics History, the politicians based on Bureaucracy and politicians based on Party and Local have cooperated and conflicted. During Meiji period (1868-1912), Lords of Home Affairs, de facto Prime Minister Toshimichi Ohkubo founded Bureaucracy and Meiji Government. Prime minister Hirobumi Ito built Rikken-Seiyukai, political party. Prime minister Aritomo Yamagata strengthened Bureaucracy based on army and police. The politicians based on bureaucracy were prime minister Yamagata, Katsura and Kiyoura. The politicians based on party and local were prime minister Ito and Kinmochi Saionji. Rikken-Seiyukai and Kenseikai were big parties in Taisho period. In Taisho period, Party Politics became active.


President Theodore Roosevelt helped Japan by Treaty of Portsmouth(1905).

President Dwight David Eisenhower, John Foster Dulles, Chester Nimitz, Douglas MacArthur and McGeorge Bundy achieved Japan-U.S. friendly relations.

John von Neumann and Alan Turing developed Computer, Von Neumann architecture, Turing machine. ARPANET in 1960s was Computer network. I think Computer, Computer network is linked with Politics.

I think that Japan-UK Foreign and Defence Ministers' Meeting(Japan-UK 2+2) is de facto Japan-UK Alliance, and Japan-France Foreign and Defense Minister’s Meeting(Japan-France 2+2) is de facto Japan-France Alliance.

Prime Minister David Cameron, Boris Johnson, Philip Hammond and Michael Fallon achieved Japan-UK friendly relations.

President Emmanuel Macron, Hollande, Ayrault and Le Drian achieved Japan-France friendly relations.

The merger of conservative parties was made in 1955. After the 55 system, Liberal
Democratic Party has politicians based on party and local, and politicians based on bureaucracy. Prime minister Shigeru Yoshida drew politicians based on bureaucracy. Prime minister Ichiro Hatoyama drew politicians based on party and local. Liberal Party, Yoshida faction was opposed to Japan Democratic Party, Hatoyama faction in 1950s. De facto Regime Change had occurred in Liberal Democratic Party.

I think Civil Law and Criminal Law have common factors.

Power Elite by C. Wright Mills, Pluralism by Robert A. Dahl and Technocracy influence Japan Politics.

From Bureaucratic Leadership to Official Residence Leadership

Katzenstein pointed out that Japanese foreign economy policy is supported by the business, especially big companies to which economic interest serves. He also insisted that Japanese foreign economy policy is facilitated by the high centralization between state and society (Katzenstein, 1978).

Since the 70s, the foreign economic policy is forwarded between the United States and Japan in place of the security and political issues between them. Its beginning is Japan US textile negotiation.

Hashimoto Administration of the Liberal Democratic Party emerged change from bureaucratic leadership to office residence leadership. This trend was inherited to Koizumi Administration and Abe Administration. The personnel of the bureaucracy became to be controlled by the bureau of personnel at Cabinet office, set by Abe Administration. At the same time, the domestic interest group became to influence the foreign economic policy, and the self-regulation at Japan side disappeared.

The influence of the domestic interest group to the foreign economic policy can be understood as the new trend against the conservatism under the US-Japan asymmetry.

In the bilateral negotiation, the Japan-US asymmetry is effective for the policy making advantageous to the United States. However, in the multilateral negotiation, like the TPP, the asymmetry between two states is not effective.

(Yoshihiro Nagata, Bureaucracy of Power-Dependence in Domestic Politics in Japan and Interdependence of International Relations in the UK, U.S. and EU, ECSSBrighton2017)

In 2014, the Bureau of personnel at Cabinet Office(Naikaku-Jinjikyoku) was set. Naikaku-Jinjikyoku was based on Cabinet Act. Article 4 of Cabinet Act in 1999 strengthened initiative of prime minister, Official Residence.

The Bureau of personnel at Cabinet Office(Naikaku-Jinjikyoku) made the paradigm shift from bureaucrat-led politics to politician-led politics in Japan.

Japan Government, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry promoted TPP and Japan EU EPA because TPP and Japan-EU EPA develops economic growth, interdependence and linkage. JA, agricultural association opposed
TPP and Japan-EU EPA. Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries did not directly oppose against TPP because the ministry is also the member of the government. But Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and Fisheries and Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism opposed Japan-EU EPA because of agriculture and train market.

The bilateral Japan-U.S. FTA and Japan-U.S Security Treaty can be addressed twin-set.

The United States and the United Kingdom have been rapidly switching from existing multilateral FTA to bilateral one.

(Yoshihiro Nagata, Bureaucracy in the Power-Dependence of Domestic Politics and Linkage in Foreign Policy, IICSSDubai2017)

About bargaining of Kyoto Protocol, Japan Government negotiated and coordinated ministries, politicians, parties and local government. Government had difficulty in achieving balance and harmonization of economic growth and protection of environment.


I became Cool Forest Ambassador of IBFRA18 (Austria). In 2018, I attended and presented at IBFRA18 as Cool Forest Ambassador.

Government, Bureaucracy and Politicians must consider National Interest.

IPCC, UNFCCC are important for Japan-EU relations. Paris Agreement was adopted in COP21 2015.

European Council President Donald Tusk, European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker and Prime Minister Abe agreed Japan-EU EPA and Japan-EU Strategic Partnership Agreement(Japan-EU SPA) on July 6 2017. At EU-Japan summit on July 2018, Japan-EU EPA and Japan-EU SPA were signed.

President Donald Trump and Prime Minister Abe agreed to start negotiation of Japan-U.S. Trade Agreement on goods(TAG) on September 26 2018. On April 2019, Japan and U.S. started bilateral negotiation, Japan-U.S. TAG. U.S. Trade Representative(USTR) Robert Lighthizer and minister Motegi negotiated Japan-U.S. TAG. Japan and U.S. may negotiate at G7 summit in France.

Central government cooperates with Network.

Olympic, Expo make Soft Power and Soft Law.

On June 23 2016, Prime Minister David Cameron held Referendum. UK decided BREXIT by Article 50 of Lisbon Treaty.

European Parliament Election was held on May 2019. European People's Party(EPP)

The principle of subsidiarity and the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) are linked with Norm and Legalization. The Maastricht Treaty, the Treaty on European Union (TEU) was signed on February 7 1992. Article 3 of the Maastricht Treaty defined the principle of subsidiarity.

(Yoshihiro Nagata, (2013), Policy-Making Process of Education and Politics in the EU focusing on the Norm and Legalization, the Master’s Degree Paper of Osaka Kyoiku University 2013, pp1-115)

**Conclusion**

I think that Diplomacy and Domestic Politics are related each other.

I have researched Power-Dependence, Interdependence, Linkage, Linkage Diplomacy, Bureaucracy and how Diplomacy and Domestic Politics are related each other.

I consider that power-dependence theory and interdependence theory have similarity and common factors.

I have researched the similarity and common factors between power-dependence of domestic politics and interdependence of foreign policy.

I think Linkage Diplomacy is applied to modern politics.

I think Balance of Power is applied to Diplomacy and Domestic Politics.

I think Containment by George Kennan, Sea Power by Alfred Thayer Mahan and Iron Curtain by Winston Spencer-Churchill are applied to 2010s.

I consider Japan-U.S. TAG compared with bilateral negotiation, Japan-EU EPA and multilateral negotiation, TPP.
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