Abstract
This paper investigates the Bureaucracy of Power-Dependence in Domestic Politics and Diplomacy of Linkage, Interdependence and Soft Law between U.S., U.K., EU and Japan. This paper consists of three parts. First, this paper explores the similarity of power-dependence in domestic politics and interdependence in diplomacy. I consider the power-dependence theory in central-local government relations by Rhodes and the interdependence theory in international relations by Nye and Keohane have common factors. The power-dependence is political dependence between central government, bureaucracy, interest groups and local government in common regime. Interdependence is mutual dependence relations between different regimes. Second, this paper investigates the role of bureaucracy and central government which coordinate the politicians, Diet, parties and local government. In negotiating Japan-EU Economic Partnership Agreement, EU and Japan has agreed on July 2017. Negotiations are determined by not only central government and bureaucracy, but also politicians and interest groups. Japan central government and bureaucracy have difficulty in coordinating the demand from the domestic politicians and interest groups who have influenced politicians. Third, this paper investigates linkage, interdependence and soft law between U.S., U.K., EU and Japan. The relations between U.S., U.K., EU and Japan become stronger. The partnership between U.S., U.K., EU and Japan includes Soft Law. This paper investigates the degree of linkage and interdependence between U.S., U.K., EU and Japan.
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Introduction

I investigate how bureaucracy coordinate power-dependence of domestic politics, and how bureaucracy and government strengthen U.S.-UK-EU-France-Austria-Japan relations.

I hope U.S.-UK-EU-France-Austria-Japan Interdependence, Linkage become stronger.

Power-Dependence of Intergovernmental Relations and Interdependence of International Relations

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

I describe my idea of comparison between power-dependence and interdependence.

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 a 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)

Table 1 Comparison between Power-Dependence Theory and Interdependence Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Power-Dependence Theory</th>
<th>Interdependence Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative Researchers</td>
<td>R.A.W. Rhodes</td>
<td>Joseph Nye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Area</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Relations between Centre and Local</td>
<td>International Relations among States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Concept 1</td>
<td>Linkage between Centre and Local Connection between Organizations, Policy Networks</td>
<td>Linkage between States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Concept 2</td>
<td>Asymmetry between Centre and Local</td>
<td>Asymmetry between States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Concept 3</td>
<td>Cost Unilateral decision is not cost-free.</td>
<td>Cost Short-term sensitivity Long-term vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law, Statute</td>
<td>Treaty, Soft Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanction</td>
<td>Law with sanction</td>
<td>Treaty and Soft Law without sanction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Principle of Ultra Vires</td>
<td>Collective Security and Balance of Power Alliance</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)

Linkage Diplomacy

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

I have researched Linkage, Linkage Diplomacy and how Diplomacy and Domestic Politics are related each other. I describe my idea about Linkage, Linkage theory.

James Rosenau created “linkage” theory connecting with domestic politics and foreign policy in 1960s (Rosenau 1969). Linkage theory means how domestic politics affects foreign policy. Afterwards, in 1970s, the concept of “linkage” has been reconstructed by Henry Kissinger. The concept of linkage by Kissinger is the revolutionary idea such that when state conducts diplomacy and foreign policy, the states should not carry out diplomatic negotiations at odds with one of issues, but
carry out diplomatic negotiations in the package of several issues. By using the concept of linkage, Kissinger challenged negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. When Kissinger reconstructed the concept of linkage, the linkage strategies were used as the concept to alleviate the conflict relations between the United States and the Soviet Union (Kissinger 1979, 1994). After that, in 1980s, the concept of linkage has been used as the relationships between the allies and the friendly nations, for example, the relations between the U.S. and Japan, the relations between the U.S. and the UK, the relations between the U.S. and the EU, and the relations between the U.S. and Canada. Joseph Nye Jr. have defined linkage strategies in association with trade and security between the United States and Japan (Nye 2007). So, Japan has been guaranteed security and peace by the United States through the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between Japan and the United States of America. Nye defines that Japan has to accept asymmetry, imbalance of trade instead of benefits of national security. This is the matters of sensitivity and vulnerability. This is essential for the cost of interdependence. Keohane and Nye referred these matters to “interdependence” or “complex interdependence.” The concept of interdependence by Nye and Keohane has been based on the liberalism and constructivism, in a sense, as antithesis of realism, traditional diplomatic idea. The concept of interdependence is crucial in modern domestic politics and diplomacy (Keohane and Nye 1977).

The policy-making actors in domestic politics are bureaucracy, party and parliament. This paper will discuss how bureaucracy affects foreign policy. This paper studies bureaucracy by the two reasons; first, as Rhodes pointed out, all the services in the domestic policy network are a mixture of bureaucracy, market and network, especially, bureaucracy is the most influential actor in policy-making, second, what bridges between domestic politics and foreign policy are government and bureaucracy (Rhodes 2006).

There exists a preoccupation that domestic politics and foreign policy are absolutely different matters. Kenneth Waltz regarded the cause of wars as one of three images: within individuals; within the structure of individual states; or within the structure of the interstate system. The third Image depends on the sovereign state by rational and unitary actor (Cohen 2008, p.120, Waltz 1959). The relationship between domestic politics and foreign policy is not found in Waltz’s concept in 1959. Later, however, Waltz pointed out importance of domestic determinants of state action, such as leadership and bureaucracy (Waltz 1979), (Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner 2004, p. 653). On the other hand, from the end of the 1970s, new political theory emerged that the domestic politics is deemed to relate with the foreign policy. Representative scholars of this new political theory are Katzenstein and Putnam. The connection between domestic politics and foreign policy come to be captured in the international political economy, whose issues are free trade on car, agricultural product and oil because of tariff reduction.

In 1978, Peter Katzenstein presented a theory that domestic policy influences the foreign policy. In the preface of Katzenstein’s literature, “it was to understand how “domestic structures” shape political strategies in the international political economy” (Katzenstein 1978, p. ). Katzenstein described “The action in society influencing the definition of foreign economic policy objectives consist of the major interest groups and political action groups. The former represents the relations of production
(including industry, finance, commerce, labor, and agriculture); the latter derive from the structure of political authority (primarily the state bureaucracy and political parties)” (Katzenstein 1978, p. 19). In contrast to the statist regarding states as actors, the domestic structure privileged state-society relationship in Katzenstein’s theory (Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner 2004, p.667). Robert Putnam also insisted that domestic sphere and foreign sphere are interwoven more than previously assumed (Putnam 1988). Putnam presented concept of two-level games to integrate domestic structures, systematic opportunities and constraints, and foreign economy policy. Putnam’s two level games consists of domestic level where the game is played between public authorities and social actors, and of international level where the game is played among governments (Putnam pp. 427-460), (Cohen 2008 p. 128). Putnam pointed out that the bargaining power of a state could be enhanced, if its rules can demonstrate that their domestic supporters would only accept a narrow range of outcomes (Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner 2004, p. 668). Putnam also 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). Peter Gourevitch also pointed two ways in which the world economy could influence polities; the basic institutional structures of polities including governing norms and capabilities and strategic opportunities of different interest groups (Gourevitch 1978), (Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner 2004, p.668), where the norm is one of the important elements of the regime.

(Yoshihiro Nagata, Bureaucracy in the Power-Dependence of Domestic Politics and Linkage in Foreign Policy, IICSS2017Dubai)

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.

(Yoshihiro Nagata, Bureaucracy of Power-Dependence in Domestic Politics in Japan and Interdependence of International Relations in the UK, U.S. and EU, ECSS2017Brighton)

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).

The power-dependence theory (Rhodes, 1986b) and interdependence theory (Keohane and Nye, 1977) involve the policy networks and the linkage, respectively.

I consider equilibrium of policies in the UK and Japan. Nash equilibrium of n-players game is defined as a condition in which every player takes equilibrium strategy to obtain overall performance criterion, that is, a function of n variables. In other words, if (n-1)-players take equilibrium strategies but for the remaining one player (the i-th player), the performance degrades (Nash, 1950). If the i-th player takes selfish strategy only for his interest, the performance criterion meaning ‘cost’ degrades. The equilibrium is institutively understood as a solution of trade-off among players. Although the world of real politics is far from mathematical theory, I study condition of the equilibrium between central-local governmental relations by analyzing bargaining of the rate support grant policy by which central government attempted to reduce amount of the rate imposed by the local authorities. I also explore condition of the equilibrium of the administrative and financial reforms by which central government attempted privatization of the Japan Post and national universities in the Koizumi Administration. Through this analysis I withdraw result about comparison of policy networks in the UK and Japan.

(Yoshihiro Nagata, Policy Networks of Central-Local Government Relations in the UK and Japan and Linkage of International Relations in the EU, IICSSHawaii2017)
Table 2 Comparison between Policy Networks and Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Networks</th>
<th>Linkage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representative Researchers</strong></td>
<td>Katzenstein R.A.W. Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Area</strong></td>
<td>Administration Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td>Intergovernmental Relations between Centre and Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Concept</strong></td>
<td>Linkages between governmental and other actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor</strong></td>
<td>Bureaucracy, Central Government, Parliaments, Politicians, Interest Group Local Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Table is made by the author based on Rhodes(1986a, 2006), Nye(2007), Keohane and Nye(1977) and Katzenstein(1978).

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

**Japan-U.S. relations**

Japan-US alliance was signed on September 8 1951. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles contributed to Security Treaty Between the United States and Japan.


Tairo, chief senior councilor Naosuke Ii signed Japan-U.S. Treaty of Amity and Commerce in 1858.

President Theodore Roosevelt helped Japan by coordinating Treaty of Portsmouth on September 1905.

From the era of Douglas MacArthur, Edwin Reischauer and McGeorge Bundy, Japan has been protected by U.S.

Power Elite by Mills, Pluralism by Dahl and Technocrat influenced Japan Politics. Traditionally, Japan tends to focus on economy than security.

I hope that Japan and U.S. have friendly ties, and strengthen Japan-US Alliance.

**Bureaucracy and Government**

Government and Bureaucracy coordinate politics. Japan traditional bureaucrat-led politics is represented by Ministry of Finance and Ministry of International Trade and Industry.
Bureau of personnel at Cabinet Office (Naikaku-Jinjikyoku) in 2014 changes bureaucrat-led politics to politician-led politics.

In 1920s and 2010s, Government is stronger than Bureaucracy because of Taisho Democracy, Rikken-Seiyukai, Kenseikai and Bureau of personnel at Cabinet Office. From 1960s to 1990s, Bureaucracy led Government.

Japan-EU Relations

From era of European Commission President Walter Hallstein to Jacques Delors, EEC(EC, EU)-Japan relation has not been strong and deep. Japan-EU Summit has been held from 1991.

Kyoto Protocol was signed in Kyoto, 1997. Kyoto Protocol is treaty related with UNFCC. Paris Agreement was signed in 2016. I think Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement are interdependence, linkage. My family and I live in Kyoto and once lived in Vienna (Wien), Austria.

President Herman Van Rompuy and Barroso agreed to start Japan-EU EPA (Economic Partnership Agreement) bargaining on May 2011.

Japan government and majority of Diet promoted but Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and JA, interest group of agriculture opposed Japan-EU EPA because of protection of agriculture.

Japan government, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), and Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI) have been main actors of Japan-EU EPA negotiations. Government, MOFA and METI had to coordinate various ministries and agencies and politicians.

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

Japan-U.K. Relations

Lord Lansdowne achieved the Anglo-Japanese alliance that Minister Hirobumi Ito opposed but Minister Aritomo Yamagata, Taro Katsura approved on January 30 1902.

Anglo-Japanese Alliance is Alliance and Balance of Power.

Vienna System by Prince Metternich-Winneburg and Talleyrand-Périgord in 1815 included Quintuple Alliance and Balance of Power. Balance of Power of Vienna System was artistic.

Prime Minister David Cameron and Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda agreed to joint defence deal to strengthen bilateral defense cooperation on April 10 2012. I think Japan-UK defence deal 2012 is cornerstone of Japan-UK Foreign and Defence Ministerial Meeting.
On January 21, 2015, Japan-UK Foreign and Defence Ministerial Meeting (Japan-UK 2+2) was held.

Through British Referendum on June 23, 2016, UK decided to withdraw from EU, BREXIT by Article 50 of Lisbon Treaty.

Japan-UK 2+2 on December 2017 affirmed Japan and UK are closest security partners, defence and security co-operation, commitment to maintain rules-based international system emphasizing international order based on rule of law and ACSA.

**Japan-France relations**

Japan Civil Law, Criminal Law, Criminal procedure were by France. Japan Constitution was by British Westminster System, Austria and U.S.


In 1975, G6 Summit was held. I think G6 Summit includes alliance, quasi-alliance of collective security as reincarnation of US-UK-France-Japan Treaty 1921.

Japan-France Foreign and Defense Ministers’ Meeting (Japan-France 2+2) was held on January 2014. Minister Jean-Marc Ayrault and Jean-Yves Le Drian joined Japan-France 2+2 on January 2017. Japan-France Foreign and Defense Minister’s Meeting confirmed “exceptional partners” sharing fundamental values, common responsibility to peace and stability.

President Emmanuel Macron celebrated 160th anniversary from France-Japan relations on July 2018. Japan and France signed ACSA and agreed framework for dialogue on maritime security cooperation.
Comparison of Bureaucracy in the History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Bureaucracy</th>
<th>The UK</th>
<th>The U.S.</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party Politics by politicians</td>
<td>Party Politics by politician and interest groups</td>
<td>High Bureaucracy</td>
<td>High Bureaucracy</td>
<td>High Bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of bureaucracy</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 17th century to 19th century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of bureaucracy 20th century</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Comparison of Bureaucracy in the History made by the author
(Yoshihiro Nagata, Bureaucracy of Power-Dependence in Domestic Politics in Japan and Interdependence of International Relations in the UK, U.S. and EU, ECSS2017Brighton)

NATO-Japan Relations


Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg called “NATO and Japan are natural partners”.
North Atlantic Council accepted Japan’s request to designate Embassy to Belgium as Mission to NATO.

Soft Law

Snyder defines “Soft Law, rules of conducts which, in principle, have no legally binding force but which, nevertheless, may have practical effects.”(Snyder, 1993)

Abbott and Duncan Snidal define “The realm of ‘soft law’ begins once legal arrangements and weakened along one or more of the dimensions of obligation, precision, and delegation.”(Abbott and Snidal, 2000)

The principle of subsidiarity and the Open Method of Coordination are linked with Norm and Legalization.

“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
Conclusion

I think Diplomacy and Domestic Politics are related each other.

I consider similarity and common factors between power-dependence and interdependence.

U.S.-UK-France-EU-Japan relation becomes alliance, quasi-alliance.

I think Linkage Diplomacy is applied to modern politics. U.S. started paradigm shift from economic trade to security in 2010s. Iron Curtain by Winston Spencer-Churchill and Containment by George Kennan are revived in 2010s as New Cold War. Western Bloc(U.S.-UK-EU-France-Japan) should develop partnership.

Linkage is applied to both economic trade and security. The main objective of Linkage is economic trade in 1980s and security in 2010s.

U.S.-UK-EU-Japan relations establish Soft Law.

I hope U.S.-UK-EU-France-Austria-Japan Interdependence, Linkage stronger in diplomatic, political, legal and cultural fields.
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