Multiculturalism Beyond Culture: Notes On Leaving Race Behind

William Bradley

Afrasian Research Centre, Ryukoku University
Phase 2

Mission of the Afrasian Research Centre

  Today's globalised world has witnessed astonishing political and economic growth in the regions of Asia and Africa. Such progress has been accompanied, however, with a high frequency of various types of conflicts and disputes. The Afrasian Research Centre aims to build on the achievements of its predecessor, the Afrasian Centre for Peace and Development Studies (ACPDS), by applying its great tradition of research towards Asia with the goal of building a new foundation for interdisciplinary research into multicultural societies in the fields of Immigration Studies, International Relations and Communication Theory. In addition, we seek to clarify the processes through which conflicts are resolved, reconciliation is achieved and multicultural societies are established. Building on the expertise and networks that have been accumulated in Ryukoku University in the past (listed below), we will organise research projects to tackle new and emerging issues in the age of globalisation. We aim to disseminate the results of our research internationally, through academic publications and engagement in public discourse.

  1．A Tradition of Religious and Cultural Studies
  2．Expertise in Participatory Research/ Inter-Civic Relation Studies
  3．Expertise in Asian and Africa Studies
  4．Expertise in Communication and Education Studies
  5．New Approaches to the Understanding of Other Cultures in Japan
  6．Domestic and International Networks with Major Research Institutes

Multiculturalism Beyond Culture:
Notes On Leaving Race Behind

William Bradley

2014

Multiculturalism Beyond Culture:
Notes On Leaving Race Behind

William Bradley[*]

Introduction

The vicissitudes of multiculturalism's meaning can be analyzed both historically, from its inception in the 1960s and 70s due to the rising immigration in European and other Anglo-American countries (Canada and Australia prominent among them), as well as from various political perspectives, right, left, and center. The narratives of its inception and (supposed) fall vary according to the given historical/geographical set of snapshots, as they do according to the claimants' political views and attempts to set multiculturalism with a framework of a particular globalizing society or region. Japan is no different in this respect and can be analyzed using the same frameworks that would appear to show it lacking almost anything that can be called multicultural policy. Banting and Kymlicka's Multicultural Policy Index (2013), which uses eight indicators weighting them with 0, 0.5, or 1 depending on whether there is no policy, a partial policy, or a clear policy (2013, 583, 598) gives Japan a consistent score of 0 points from 1980 to 2000 to 2010. Of the other twenty OECD countries, the only other countries with nearly similar consistently low scores are Denmark (0, 0.5, 0), Switzerland (0, 1, 1) and Austria (0, 1, 1.5). This ranking can be challenged however, as the 2006 Japanese Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (MIC) report, "Research Group concerning the Promotion of Multicultural Coexistence" would at least ostensibly entail a ranking of 0.5 for the first of Banting and Kymlicka's indicators.

Nonetheless, one can summarize that multicultural policies are relatively underdeveloped in Japan compared to the other twenty advanced economic countries in the index. More importantly for purposes of thinking about Japanese multiculturalism (also known as *tabunka kyōsei*, or multicultural coexistence) and its future are the political uses of multiculturalism in society from various perspectives. While it is beyond the scope of this paper to analyze these multiple perspectives in depth, I assume a normative perspective as a position for looking at this future. This might be termed pragmatic or liberal, in the sense that immigration is commonly agreed upon as necessary for Japan's future and questions should then be raised regarding the current state of multicultural society in Japan. Following Kymlicka (and his

---

[*] Professor, Faculty of Intercultural Communication, Ryukoku University.

collaborators) who can be described as working within the liberal multiculturalism tradition, even in Europe there is no generalized "retreat" from multiculturalism, but instead a blending with ideas of civic integration. Furthermore such findings are replicated in other indexes according to Banting and Kymlicka (2013). In other words, for the sake of the arguments that I raise in this paper, I assume that multiculturalism is a set of policies that work to promote tolerance and respect among different groups of people so that a more diverse society can be the goal, facilitating openness and democratic exchange in many spheres of life. While I am quite sympathetic to many of the critiques of this "liberal" position, I adopt it here for the sake of bringing some clarification to other motile and refluent concepts, namely race, culture and ethnicity that I raise as problems related to multiculturalism below.

Undoubtedly, it is difficult to write about multiculturalism without being critical in the current period. In short, multiculturalism's "discontents," have taken center stage in many parts of the world, for reasons that I will elaborate below. To preface the argument of this paper, which I subsume under the title of "notes" due to their incomplete summary, the reification of culture, which periodically masquerades as natural (or even biological) and therefore implicates racial formations, has led many to believe that multiculturalism is beyond remedy. At the least multiculturalism without or beyond culture is called for. But what would that be? Would it be called something else?

In the past several years, a number of arguments from the political center about the failings of multiculturalism have been made. This has followed years of critiques from both left and right (see Bradley 2013). In his volume on the problems of multiculturalism as well as a critique of the critics, second generation immigrant Kenan Malik describes the differences in generational thinking about the value of integrating and belonging among Asians in Britain. While first generation Asians in Britain (here he refers mostly to Indians and Pakistanis) were primarily concerned with assimilating, his generation was more intent on fighting racism. The third generation, he argues, has been radicalized to conceive of their struggle against the mainstream society in terms of cultural identity, partly through training in ways to get the best advantage from multiculturalism's identity fixations. Racism has come to mean "not simply the denial of equal rights but also the denial of the right to be different" (Malik 2013, 50). The argument is constructed on the assumption that while multiculturalism is built on a premise that there is more diversity than in previous generations, there is, according to Malik, in fact copious evidence of much more commonality. For example, he points out the contemporary internationalization in youth culture across supposed ethnically different groups, even among Muslims living in Europe (one of the groups assumed to be least assimilated by many critics) (*ibid.*, 35-36). Furthermore, multiculturalism assumes that such differences need to be respected and protected, which results in the most conservative representatives of an ethnic group being disproportionately enfranchised to promote their endogenous and essentialized views of culture, to the majority culture's increasing antipathy, *as well as* to the detriment of many of the minorities who are moderate in their claims of

identity and are relatively more interested to integrate. Malik suggests that multicultural policies never came primarily from demands from minorities themselves, but instead from governments that were reacting to various concerns about failures in integrating newcomer immigrants, a trend embodied in the term ghettoization or parodied in the phrase attributed to Amartya Sen, "plural monoculturalism" (*ibid*., 64).

While Malik's treatment of multiculturalism's historical development can be faulted for being overly specifically focused on the extreme examples that illustrate its contradictions (e.g., free speech vs. protection of minority rights, exemplified with the fatwa issued against Salman Rushdie in 1989 for his book, *The Satanic Verses*, and the Danish cartoon crisis of 2005),[1] his arguments provide a good example of the limitations that result from multiculturalism being defined within the parameters of cultural groups. What ended up as attempt to identify and ameliorate racism within various societies re-inscribed race within cultural categorizations, a distinction that has been made by various critics already for some years now (Balibar 1991; Lentin 2005; Lentin 2012).

The intricate questions of how race and racism are connected to discourses of multicultural tolerance and respect, primarily deemed necessary to be garnered from the majority population towards minorities in return for their civic integration, are being once again debated on a global scale. One can say that this is a recurrent debate, or possibly that it never stopped being a facet of the degree to which multiculturalism was (and could be) accepted as a set of policies, since at least, on the surface, tolerance and respect are the obverse side of disdain (for the "other") and discrimination. While many of the offensive terms by which minorities have been referred to in many societies have become restricted by a new common sense and public shaming campaigns, other researchers have pointed to a new racism or "color-blind" racism (Bonilla-Silva 2013; Carr 1997).

At the end of several years of researching about multiculturalism, finally it seems important to confront the questions of race and racism that lurk in the background of cultural categories and multiculturalism.[2] This is not an easy task in a short paper and I concur with Dirlik (2008) that there is "considerable intellectual risk" in writing about race and racism in the current era, since they are "globalized … deriv[ing] renewed energy from the mixing of populations through migration, and the vocabulary of race blurs the distinction between racial and cultural difference in the language of global politics ... Racism may not be dead, but it not the racism of old either. So how do we talk about it? … without contributing to further

---

[1] Both of which Malik shows were widely known about—and ignored—in the Muslim world for months before becoming staged crises of identity.

[2] Here I am making a personal reflection, as much about what I might hope to accomplish in the paper as about what I might have realized at an earlier stage in my research. It would also be important to point out that the idea of "leaving race behind" in the title should be viewed as a hope, one that, it also needs to be said, could just as easily be critiqued as hopelessly compromised by the positionality of a white researcher (myself) framing the suggestion.

racialization of the language of social and cultural analysis" (Dirlik 2008, 1363).

I will briefly outline historical developments in thinking and conceptualizing about race and racism that set the stage for the discussion of multiculturalism. This involves synthesizing an immense amount of literature, much of it published in recent years, exploring how race became an important concept in the European and North American contexts first and foremost, later spreading to other parts of the world, and why it continues to be like a mythical hydra, reappearing even when has been widely shown to be without biological basis and is understood as having little to no scientific validity as a category for understanding human diversity. I necessarily spend some time to recount how anthropology has been implicated first in race's proliferation in the 19th and early 20th centuries and then it its critique and partial demise from the 1950s onwards. In the section that follows, I relate a similar story regarding the rise of anthropological research and ethnicity (*minzoku*) in pre-WWII Japan. Finally, I conclude with some observations about why multiculturalism without culture is an important step forward that needs to be conceptualized to save multiculturalism from its worst excesses and enemies while relating the discussion to Japan. This paper reflects a culmination of several years of researching on multiculturalism to which the discussion of race and racism adds a critical dimension. I regret that it now seems to have been an obvious oversight for me to not have considered multiculturalism's racial connections until recently, probably a reflection that mirrors the critique by Trouillot (2002) regarding anthropologists' historical retreat from some of the hardest racial questions raised by the inflected culture agenda increasingly proposed by anthropology pioneer Franz Boas (e.g., *Race, Language and Culture*, 1940, up until his death in 1942). In any case, it is by necessity incomplete as it remains to be filled in with more empirical data on the current state of thinking about race and Japanese identity of Japanese themselves.

Discourses Of Racial Formation And Racism

Racialized thinking has existed at least as long as the modern use of the term, race, was coined by George Luis Comte de Buffon in 1749 (Morris-Suzuki 1998, 79).[3] Most researchers agree that it is a relatively modern categorical phenomena, at least as far as its systematic labeling. However some argue that racialized thinking has existed much longer, extending from antiquity long before the terms race and racism became common parlance in European languages (Bethencourt 2013). A more complete analysis of the transitions in racial thinking would involve recounting the history of Swedish naturalist Linnaeus' taxonomies of organisms in the mid-1700s which he then applied to supposed human races, Blumenbach's

---

[3] Bethencourt (2013, 6) however traces its first usages to the Iberian Peninsula in the early 1700s, where race was used for Jewish and Muslim peoples first, Africans and Native Americans later.

delineation of five races in 1795,[4] continue with the rise of eugenics in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and culminate in the intellectual contributions that led to Nazi racial hierarchies of Aryan supremacy and the resultant genocide and holocaust, the Apartheid system in South Africa, and other crimes against humanity of the 20th century. Skiba (2012) provides an updated account of much of this history, focusing on the U.S., but also including description of research by eugenicists in England and elsewhere, including Germany. While a careful reading of the decline of extreme and blatantly racist research agendas of, among others, statisticians who created intelligence tests in the early 1900s could lead to a cautiously sanguine conclusion that racism has gradually lessened over the past 100 years (or at the least is nowhere near as prevalent or systematic), nonetheless Skiba points to the recurrence of similar themes in racial difference research that continue right up to the present day. These include mental inferiority, proclivity to criminality, irremediability, and unrelatedness to social environment (but relatedness to geographical origins of different races). Such themes have emerged periodically in scientific research in recent times, as with the publication of Herrnstein and Murray's *The Bell Curve* in 1994, or the statement of Nobel Prize Winner Dr. James Watson, when interviewed in 2007, suggested that Africa's "prospect" was "gloomy" due to inherent intelligence differences (Skiba 2012, 1).

The early connections between imperialist and colonializing governmentalities and racial thinking has been analyzed by anthropologists for at least several decades (Baker 2010; Fluehr-Lobban 2005; Patterson 1997). This includes a large body of work focused on the U.S. and its founding fathers (e.g., Thomas Jefferson's seminal writing on slavery in *Notes on the State of Virginia*, in which he claimed that blacks possessed "inferior endowments both of body and mind," cited in Goodman et al. 2012, 16) but also extends to the culpability of early anthropologists who researched and formalized racial categories and were instrumental in making them "scientific." While too detailed to describe in depth here, the role of Franz Boas in fighting racism both in his academic work and as a public intellectual is also instrumental in showing a historical role for social science in anti-racist campaigns (see Baker 2010). It is no exaggeration to say that Boas' decoupling of race, language, and culture set the stage for many of the mid-20th century anthropological attacks on racial thinking (Montagu 1997/1942).

Even after the declaration on race's fallacy made by UNESCO in 1950, that race was not "a biological phenomenon [but] a social myth," it took somewhat longer for a majority of cultural anthropologists to agree with the seminal notion of populations and clines as stated by biological anthropologist Frank Livingstone in 1962. "There are no races, there are only

---

[4] Blumenbach's five races were based more on skull measurements than on geography or skin color (which had been more foundational for Linnaeus). The five were Caucasian (white), Malaysian (brown), African or Ethiopian (black), Mongolian (yellow), and Native American (red).

clines" (Livingstone 1962, cited in Brace 2005, 5).[5] While cultural anthropologists at the beginning of the 21st century overwhelmingly reject race, biological anthropologists are still evenly split (Brace 2005, 238-239). Genetic researchers also are more favorable to some descriptors of race (Gannett 2001), so it can be surmised that the scientific discussion of race and racial categories will continue for some time yet, even if some researchers would suggest that for the most part the racial paradigms have changed, and instead of trying to categorize races, much of the racial research of the contemporary era is focused on trying to understand how the uses of race aided historically in social, economic, and political power agendas of dominant groups vis-à-vis minorities (Ginsburg 2004; Skiba 2012).

Race's reemergence at periodic junctures, what Amin (2010) has referred to as the "remainders of race," precipitates a problem that has been challenged continuously for several decades. How is that after the intensive effort at debunking the race myth and scientific evidence that very little like racial delineations of humans can be described in any systematic form, racial categorizing continues, even if in a more nuanced way than at its height a hundred years ago. In short, if race is a social construction, why can't it be deconstructed and ultimately delegitimized, and finally abandoned? Having taught several classes on the history of race and racial thinking each year in an introduction to anthropology course for the past decade, the intractability of race thinking has struck me time and again in comments from students, often some of the most studious, like the following, "I understand what the professor wants to teach about the myth of race, but I still believe in race." In addition to recent discoveries in micro level genetic research (as noted above) providing renewed vigor to race discourses, the coding of race in cultural categories is necessarily a focus in the present era. This transposing of the category of culture embedded in the framework of cultural relativism, in Boas's transformative attempt to strip race of its power to encapsulate peoples, can also be seen as providing the resources for a new structuralism around difference. Whether this amounts to a "differentialist racism" around the "incompatibility of life-styles and traditions" (Taguieff, cited in Balibar 1991, 21), or adds up to a "neo" racism (Balibar 1991) or not is a moot question. Clearly, contemporary racism is channeled not so much through the direct identification and stigmatization of color of skin, for example, as much as through the increasingly essentialized cultural values and norms, what some have also called "culturalism" (Lentin 2012).[6]

While the earlier racism could be clearly demarcated by reference to racial categories (laws, codes, blatant exclusionary practices, and discourses of superiority/inferiority), racial

---

[5] Clines refer to the continuous minor changes in physical characteristics across geographical populations from one region to the next, which differ according to the particular characteristic. As an example, "the gradual blending of skin colors into one another across clines and populations is a function of geographic distance and does not lend itself to any clear separation" (Goodman et al. 2012, 109).
[6] Whereas this use is largely an argument about the continuation of racism in other forms, there are others who proudly espouse culturalism as a counter to multiculturalism and, moreover to defer claims of racism (see Press, n.d., for an example of the President of the Brooklyn New York Tea Party's defense of the term).

formations and racial projects[7] in the 21st century are much less clearly defined. It is for this reason that Bonilla-Silva (2013) and others have referred to racism "without racists" or "race ambivalence" (Leonardo 2013). In order to begin to comprehensively understand race and its connection to multiculturalism it would be crucial to distinguish between race and ethnicity, and racism and other associated terms such as discrimination, prejudice, ethnocentrism, othering, xenophobia, hate speech, stereotyping, and segregation, something that I will not attempt here. While it is an arguable claim whether racism necessarily includes action or not,[8] what seems beyond dispute is that it is much more likely to be connected to discriminatory and harmful action(s) than some of the others, for example stereotyping and ethnocentrism. However like all linguistic categories, there is an enormous range of meanings and application, even within the parameters of more or less stable group contexts, much more so across a range of different ethnic and (inter)national contexts. There are a number of recent publications that provide excellent examples and sources for much of this background and variability (Fluehr-Lobban 2005; Goodman et al. 2012; Hartigan 2010) yet the linkage between the ascriptive term, race, and the systematic processes of discrimination referred to as racism remain somewhat tenuous not least because of historical reasons of their separate developments. In part this may be because the term racism itself is much more recent than race, which is not to say that there was nothing like "racism" before it was first used. According to Balibar (2008, 1632) the term (at least in English and French) can be first located in work by Magnus Hirschfeld in 1933, in a book entitled *Rassismus* (*Racism*, translated into English in 1938), written in German and documenting Nazi uses of race categorizations and persecution.

One could be tempted, following Balibar, to suggest that the post WWII settlement of racism without race (i.e. explaining human proclivities towards racism and racist behaviors without there being racially diverse human species) has been followed by "racisms without racism" (Goldberg 2008). In his analysis of the neoliberalization of global society, of which I will say more below, the privatization of state processes entails that racism also becomes privatized. Racial significations and group boundary markers are used "often only implicitly, as a mode of securitization, control, expansion, and competition" and, while removed from direct state authorization, are freed up to become private expressions (*ibid*., 1713). Here it becomes necessary to foreground how racial conceptual categories are able to be inflated and deflated with such versatility (Miles and Brown 2003, Chapter 2-3, cited in Dirlik 2008, 1370) or in Amin's terms disrupted, rechanneled, and, in particular, how "accumulated racial debris, variegated and dormant from different eras, [is] ready to be instantiated in unknown ways"

---

[7] The term "racial formation" to describe the politicization of the social is from Omi and Winant (2008), a term that they have used for more than 20 years in their work. They define a "racial project" as "simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial dynamics, and an effort to reorganize and redistribute resources along particular racial lines" (Omi and Winant 2008, 1567).

[8] For example, Trouillot (2002, 52) cites Memmi (1982/2000) as the "first scholar to proclaim loudly that 'racism is always both a discourse and an action,' a structuring activity with political purposes."

(Amin 2010, 5). No doubt this is possible in part because of racial projects' amenability to intersectional blending, their ability to be interlaced with other projects of domination elaborated by simplified categories of class, gender, sexuality, and nation (Rattansi 2011, 119). Here, above all, the majority culture is exemplified by the representative males (whites in the case of the U.S., Britain, and so on, but "pure Japanese," *jyunsui Nihonjin*, in the case of Japan, for example) while all others have culture, reducible in the last instance to nature (and race where applicable).

The above discussion has skirted for the moment a central question, and that is the "expectation that when one uses the word 'race,' the addressee knows what the referent is" as well as how this knowing becomes possible (Silva 2011, 139). For an understanding of the complexity of racism at least, we can start with Takezawa's nominal descriptor for race that includes: (1) visible and invisible "bodily characteristics [including] temperaments, and abilities" which are passed down through heredity, (2) a hierarchy utilizing exclusion, (3) exclusion practices which result from regional and societal "differentiation and boundary making, often linked with conflicts of interest" (Takezawa 2011b, 8-9). However it would be necessary to add that race and racialization have aspects of ideological power (some have likened it to religious faith), and that it contains both social processes, as in Takezawa's definition, and "consciousness" of such processes. This is true just as much in understanding the aftermath of the abolition of slavery in the U.S., what some have described as the geographic crucible of racism, with the rise of jim crow legislation and KKK terror, and exclusion of Chinese laborers by law in California in 1882, as in other cases on an international scale in the early 20th century, for example Han nationalism in China, Turkish genocide against Armenians, and Mexican exclusion of Chinese, all in the first two decades (see Dirlik 2008, 1364-1368).

Racial categories, as noted in the above discussion, are often (perhaps always?) implicated in the system of class-structured rewards for the dominant groups in societies and in economic restructuring which can be analyzed in the contemporary era as neoliberalism. Numerous authors have both pointed out that globalized systems of power inequities related to the rich and poor are inflected and mutually constituted through racism (Ginsburg 2004; Goldberg 2008; Rhee 2013). Through the architectures of containment of risk and securitizing "capital (human and financial), goods services, and increasingly information … from the projected contamination and threat of those deemed for various reasons not to belong," racism embedded in cultural identities and projects proceeds in tandem with the neoliberalization of societies on a global scale (Goldberg 2008, 1713). In this way, multiculturalism can be explained as having been first mobilized by progressives, later by conservatives, and then finally giving way to the globalized security arrangements noted above (Silva 2011, 145) more easily than a first analysis would show. Is it little wonder then that there can be seeming agreement that racism is not the racism of yesteryear, yet those who are subject to its constraining mechanisms also know that it is alive and well?

Japanese Racial Thinking

Similar to the discussion of the development of racial categorizing (as well as resistance) by social scientists (anthropologists and others) in the U.S. in the early 20th century, Japanese researchers also developed concepts to understand the differences that they encountered when analyzing peoples in the Japanese empire during the Meiji era colonizations that started at the end of the 19th century. The concept of *minzoku* (translated variously as ethnicity, people or nationality) emerged as part of the colonial state-building projects in Manchuria from the end of this period onwards (Duara 2006; Morris-Suzuki 1998). The founders of Japanese ethnography, Tsuboi Shōgorō and Torii Ryūzō came into contact with Russian ethnographers and their nationalist and racialized conceptions in Siberia and developed their own theories in a dialectic fashion with theories that were current among European ethnographers at that time (Duara 2006, 10).

Tsuboi's research was focused mostly on the Ainu in Hokkaido and he became first a professor in 1892 and then the first chair of an anthropological institute in Japan at the Imperial University of Tokyo in 1893 after returning from a three-year study trip in London. Torii expanded his teacher's (Tsuboi) research agenda overseas and visited China, Taiwan, Manchuria, Korea, Sakhalin, and Siberia after 1895 as part of the colonial projection of Japanese power into Asia (Shimizu 1999, 124, 131-132). His ambitious proposal presented in 1913 was for an Asian ethnology ("race-studies" or, *jinshugaku*). He wrote, "In an integrated perspective with Japan at its centre, I would like to construct together with you Asian race studies" (Torii 1913, cited in Shimizu 1999, 133). The gradual replacement of race (*jinshu*) with ethnicity (*minzoku*) in the 1920s follows a trajectory in the careers of these prominent Japanese anthropologists as well as others.[9] According to Duara (2006, 11), Tsuboi was negative towards Western anthropologists' identification of whole peoples and races as a method to facilitate colonization, whereas Torii declared the separation of anthropology (*jinruigaku*) from ethnology (*jinshugaku*) and folklore studies (*minzokugaku*) partly under the influence of competing claims to archaeological discoveries in Central Asia by Europeans that he feared might lead to extension of their colonial claims there. While leaving out many of the finer details of this transition from primary focus on study of race to that of ethnicity, it's important to emphasize that the concept of ethnicity (*minzoku*) retained a biological component "expressed in the triumvirate of common culture, common history, and *common blood*" (Duara 2006, 13, citing Weiner 1997, italics in original).

The degree to which Japanese of this time considered themselves racially distinct from other colonial peoples that they came to control is a theme that has many details and dimensions. Oguma (2002) in his major contribution has pointed to two distinctly contradictory trends

---

[9] Morris-Suzuki (1998, 85-87) citing Fukuzawa Yukichi's introduction of the concept of race earlier in his *Sekai Kunizukushi* (Account of the Countries of the World), which was published in 1869, suggests that this replacement started already at the end of the 19th century.

from the Meiji period to the end of WWII, one composed of research and theories that viewed Japanese as a distinct homogenous race with origins in the imperial family and a second that viewed Japanese as racially mixed (with other Asians) and used hybridity as a source of strength, appealing to a Pan-Asian identity.[10] The concept of race in Japan was variable in Edo Japan to the extent that mixed heritage children were expelled with other foreigners in the 1630s, yet records of some mixed heritage people who lived in the Edo period after that exist. In one case a man with a Dutch father became a city official in Nagasaki, while in another the daughter of German doctor Franz Phillip von Siebold, became the first practicing doctor of Western medicine in Japan (Morris-Suzuki 1998, 82). This suggests that at the time concepts of race were not well established in Japan and much of the influence about racial thinking was the result of colonization influences, first in the spread of European ideas that entered Japan after the Meiji restoration, but increasingly then with Japan's own colonization of Korea, China, Taiwan and other parts of Asia.

The categorization of Japanese (and other East Asians) racially as yellow, resulted over a long period of time (beginning with initial disputes between racial taxonomers in Europe). Keevak (2011) shows this flexible categorization between the descriptors Mongolian and yellow (in addition to other colors), terms which were already utilized at the end of the 1700s and continued to coexist for approximately 100 more years until 1895 when the phrase "Yellow Peril," was first used in an engraving by German Kaiser Wilhelm II, and took hold of popular imagination in Europe and the U.S. as fear of the rising aspirations of Japan (and China to a lesser extent) became stronger. From this period onwards racial categorization of East Asian people as yellow became more readily fixed.

Numerous scholars have raised the question whether *burakumin*[11] in Japan should be considered a racial category or not, some referring to them as the "invisible race" (Kurokawa 2011; Takezawa 2011b).[12] Categorizing non-visual racial difference as feeling and representations in everyday life practices, such racism is spread through both generational reproduction and at the level of casual stereotypes. One category of such racism can be described as focused on non-visual cognitive senses such as sound, smell, or touch (e.g., body odor or voice), while a second is largely imaginary (e.g., differences in sexual organs or contaminated blood, see Takezawa 2011b, 11-13). Morris-Suzuki (1998, 84) classifies this type of discrimination, as well as that against Ainu and Okinawans, as "racism without race," but once again this raises questions about how the inflation and deflation of racism has

---

[10] Both Morris-Suzuki (1998) and Duara (2006) extend the typologies of theories, in addition to purity and hybridity, to a third, that of an alliance of different nationalities under a common state structure.

[11] Burakumin are literally "people of the hamlet," outcaste groups in the Edo period who suffered discrimination (which continues to the present day) due to birth, including various sub-groups, for example those considered doing unclean jobs such as butchering animals.

[12] Takezawa (2011b, 205) points out that Wagatsuma and De Vos (1966) first coined the term "invisible race" which she uses, while also acknowledging questions about the original work's methodology. Additionally she extends the notion to Koreans in Japan and other minorities in parts of East Asia (Takezawa 2011b, 1).

allowed it be resilient and avoid final extinction as a failed concept for understanding distinctions in humans.

Returning to the conceptualization of racial hybridity of Japanese that was prevalent among many researchers in the period from 1920-1945, it was quite possible to state what seems much harder to claim openly even in the contemporary period that "not only ethnographers from all countries, but also Japanese experts equally acknowledge that we Yamato people are an ethnic group with mixed blood" (Taniguchi 1942, cited in Morris-Suzuki 1998, 90). However it is also the case that since the 1990s much more work has been done to understand the use of *minzoku* in fostering nationalism (as well as how nationalism uses ethnicity as well), not just during the interwar period of Japanese colonialism, but also in the post WWII era. On the one hand, whereas the notion of a *tan'itsu minzoku* (homogenous people) has been and continues to be accepted by many as a common understanding for and among the Japanese themselves, on the other hand the broad sweep of Oguma's (2002) work shows the enormous amount of work that was done first to create an Japanese ethnicity that was mixed and then later undo many of the traces of such conceptualizations. Kada Tetsuji, who was linked with wartime nationalism, wrote prolifically on questions of race in the 1940s, publishing bestselling books such as *Jinshu, Minzoku, Senso* (Race, Ethnos, War). In this book he was quite critical of the race concept, using *minzoku* as a replacement. However his use in not facile. He clearly understood the use of nationalism to fuse identity based on "natural" differences, whether they are termed race or ethnicity. *Minzoku* identity, "feelings of 'otherness' and 'sameness' are mobilized by the state to overcome fragmenting status and regional identities … it increasingly takes on the characteristics of a religion itself" which includes many of the standard objects for nationalism's claims to hegemony, ancestor worship, family respect, glorification of heroes, and rejection of a standardized world culture (Morris-Suzuki 1998, 98-100).

As I noted above, although there were various interpretations during the late Taisho and early Showa period views regarding race and ethnicity, it is clear that *minzoku* came to be an important essentializing concept in solidifying the difference that was assigned by Japanese to themselves compared to other peoples in East Asia and beyond. Harootunian has written about this period in the 1930s that "Minzokugaku sought to show how the folk [*minzoku*] constituted a primal given natural and prior to the artificial system of society. Culture, now posing as nature, became the great protagonist of history .... As nature the folk served as a substructure of history and their forms of life, the eternal constant in the continual flux of economic social relations" (Harootunian 1988, 434).[13]

Following the defeat of WWII, many anthropologists had to review their involvement with

---

[13] It is important to point out that *minzoku* and *minzokugaku* have two separate character readings and meanings in Japanese. In order to avoid a more detailed and complicated discussion of these two meanings (ethnicity and folklore), I focus only on the first here which is closer to the development of anthropology in Japan.

the war efforts and the imperial projection of power. Not only were they (at least temporarily) discredited for this involvement, they also lost a large body of their work. Ishida Eiichirō was elected as editor of the Journal of Japanese Ethnology in 1948 and established a chair of cultural anthropology in the Institute of Oriental Culture at the University of Tokyo in 1951 and was credited with introducing many of the ideas of American anthropology to Japan, for example cultural relativism and academic distance from political power (Shimizu 1999, 154-156).

From this necessarily brief summary of some of the salient understandings of race in Japan in the past more than 100 years shows, a similar conflation of categories of race and ethnicity (or culture) which had allowed for discussions of the categories of different (Asian) peoples to be debated and analyzed in Japan, led to both emphasizing racial purity and racial hybridity. While racial thinking can be largely attributed in a general sense to the political, economic and nationalistic connections that materialized in a globalizing colonial world, this review also allows for an analysis of the contemporary debates over culture in multiculturalism, in the Japanese conception of *tabunka kyōsei*. A number of recent studies have focused on the problem of Japanese thinking about multiculturalism as reinforcing the conceptualized boundaries between Japanese and immigrant others (Graburn and Ertl 2008, 4; Kashiwazaki 2013; Nagayoshi 2011). How much this is the effect of scholarly emphasis on *minzoku* and its connection to nationalism or the result of pervasive media and schooling effects of delineating Japanese as different is a question that requires further research but one that by asking leads to further questioning about how the culturalism of Japanese ethnic thinking is a hindrance to a more dynamic future of a progressive multicultural Japanese society, that includes both Japanese, hybrid Japanese (those with dual or multiple ethnicities) and non-Japanese on equal standing.

In the final section, I return to a discussion of multiculturalism. If the racial dynamic embodied in culture (and *minzoku*) is so firmly entrenched as I have attempted to show above, a complex task faces multicultural theories and policymaking, one that may require the move to a multiculturalism beyond culture.

Racism Without Racists, Multiculturalism Beyond Culture

Is it possible to formulate a multiculturalism beyond culture? If the problem of racial thinking is so intractable that it persists with remainders surfacing with periodic virulence in unexpected forms, is it not naïve to imagine that multiculturalism could be imagined without its reduction to cultural containers which many have found so limiting and counter-productive? In other words, can a multicultural tolerance and recognition of difference be a positive force without the racialized "remainders" of culture returning at regular junctures? After all, at least linguistically this would be somewhat contrary to multiculturalism's own terminology. Would relexification solve the problem, perhaps a poly-

or multidiversity or poly- or multiversity, for example?

Okubo (2013) has argued recently for a "localized multiculturalism" to challenge one that she refers to as "contested" and a "distortion" related to the integration of minorities around a "multiethnic (and coexistence) state where Japanese race is at the center" (Okubo 2013, 1005, citing Song 2007). Her interviewees, including educators and activists in Osaka, questioned the official *tabunka kyōsei* policy as "incorporat[ing] social groups from the perspective of cultural difference (and not social injustice)" (Okubo 2013, 996). Her research reinforces the pressing task of deconstructing the dominant group mentality of being a single group by and through which they can identify themselves culturally and at last resort with reduction to racial characteristics.

A similar discussion, to the one about removing culture from multiculturalism, about deconstructing culture (and its racial roots) has been taking place in anthropological writing for the past two decades. Trouillot (2002) maintained that although Boas was certainly an anti-racist and his attempt to promote culture (explicitly in his notion of cultural relativism) was as an "anti-concept" to race, by ceding racial studies to sociology (at least in North America) the culture concept in anthropology has been unable to deal with power (including racism). "Not only did racism survive the Boasians, but it survived them quite well. Worse, it turned culture into an accessory" (Trouillot 2002, 54). In referring to Montagu (1964, cited in Trouillot 2002, 58), who urged anthropology to abandon race, since "the meaning of the word is the action it produces," Trouillot urged anthropology to abandon culture for similar reasons even as culture essentialisms (and culturalism) have proliferated in media and everyday discourse. The danger noted by some, including Trouillot, is that anthropologists would appear to be admitting defeat to the essentializing commentary in other fields. For multiculturalism to be reformed, relexified, or retheorized without or beyond culture would similarly entail giving some solace to the enemies of immigration and accommodation who, at least prominently in some parts of Europe, are gaining strength through increasing restrictions and control of culture (e.g., bans of veils, referenda and ordinances on minarets and mosques) often coded in phrases like values.

Multiculturalism's hope to provide generosity for tolerance and room for diversity may well have been an illusion from the start, as a fix for the problems of integrating immigrants required by the globalizing work forces of economically mature countries with low birth rates, such as in Europe or Japan, or those with large relatively less densely occupied spaces as Canada or Australia. However the goals of tolerance and diversity are worth reconfirming, even revitalizing. Leaving culture out of the picture is not a one-step solution as it has become so well integrated into discourses of multicultural nation-building. However the reduction of culture to biological factors, naturalized, even without recourse to natural physical aspects of the 19th century racial concepts, and the new forms of cultural racism remain as virulent strains of anti-humanization, able to precipitate (and be utilized in)

violence with the slightest provocation. To undo the "fetishization of race (and ethnicity) … requires challenging the fetishization of cultural, national, and diasporic identitites" and reinvigorating the "idea of the social" which has been attacked as much by neoliberal globalized economic hegemonic discourses as by identity obsession (Dirlik 2008, 1365). As such then I concur with Trouillot that culture needs to be exculpated from multiculturalism.

References

Amin, Ash. 2010. The Remainders of Race. *Theory Culture & Society* 27(1): 1-23.

Baker, Lee. 2010. *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Balibar, Étienne. 1991. Is There a Neo-Racism? In *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, eds. Étienne Balibar and Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein, 17-28. London: Verso.

Balibar, Étienne. 2008. Racism Revisited: Sources, Relevance, and Aporias of a Modern Concept. *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 123(5): 1630-1639.

Banting, Keith, and Will Kymlicka. 2013. Is There Really a Retreat from Multiculturalism Policies? New Evidence from the Multiculturalism Policy Index. *Comparative European Politics* 11(5): 577-598.

Bethencourt, Francisco. 2013. *Racisms: From the Crusades to the Twentieth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Boas, Franz. 1940. *Race, Language and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2013. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*, 4th edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Brace, Loring C. 2005. *"Race" Is a Four-Letter Word: The Genesis of the Concept*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bradley, William. 2013. Is There a Post-Multiculturalism? *Working Paper Series: Studies on Multicultural Societies*, 19. Shiga: Afrasian Research Centre, Ryukoku University.

Carr, Leslie G. 1997. *"Color-Blind" Racism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dirlik, Arif. 2008. Race Talk, Race, and Contemporary Racism. *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 123(5): 1363-1379.

Duara, Prasenjit. 2006. Ethnos (*Minzoku*) and Ethnology (*Minzokushugi*) in Manchuko. *Asia Research Institute Working Paper Series*, 74. Singapore: National University of Singapore.

Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn. 2005. *Race and Racism: An Introduction*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Gannett, Lisa. 2001. Racism and Human Diversity Genome Research: The Ethical Limits of "Population Thinking." *Philosophy of Science* 68(3): 1-8.

Ginsburg, Norman. 2004. Globalization and Racism. In *Global Social Problems*, eds. Vic George and Robert M. Page, 160-176. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goldberg, David T. 2008. Racisms without Racism. *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 123(5): 1712-1716.

Goodman, Alan H., Yolanda T. Moses, and Joseph L. Jones. 2012. *Race: Are We So Different?* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Graburn, Nelson, and John Ertl. 2008. Introduction: Internal Boundaries and Models of Multiculturalism in Contemporary Japan. In *Multiculturalism in the New Japan: Crossing the Boundaries Within*, eds. Nelson H. H. Graburn, John Ertl, and R. Kenji Tierney, 1-31. New York: Berghahn Books.

Harootunian, Harry D. 1988. *Things Seen and Unseen: Discourse and Ideology in Tokugawa Nativism*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Hartigan, John. 2010. *Race in the 21st Century: Ethnographic Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Herrnstein, Richard J., and Charles Murray. 1994. *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: Free Press.

Hirschfeld, Magnus. 1938. *Racism*. Tans. Eden Paul and Cedar Paul. London : Gollancz.

Jefferson, Thomas. 1853. *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Richmond, VA: J. W. Randoloph.

Kada, Tetsuji. 1938/1942. *Jinshu, Minzoku, Senso* [Race, Ethnos, War]. Tokyo: Keio-Shobo.

Kashiwazaki, Chikako. 2013. Incorporating Immigrants as Foreigners: Multicultural Politics in Japan. *Citizenship Studies* 17(1): 31-47.

Keevak, Michael. 2011. *Becoming Yellow: A Short History of Racial Thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kurokawa, Midori. 2011. Markers of the "Invisible Race": On the Film *Hashi no nai Kawa*. In *Racial Representations in Asia*, ed. Yasuko Takezawa, 32-52. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

Lentin, Alana. 2005. Replacing "Race," Historicizing "Culture" in Multiculturalism. *Patterns of Prejudice* 39(4): 379-396.

Lentin, Alana. 2012. Post-race, Post Politics: The Paradoxical Rise of Culture after Multiculturalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2012. 664278.

Leonardo, Zeus. 2013. *Race Frameworks: A Multidimensional Theory of Racism and*

Education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Livingstone, Frank B. 1962. On the Non-existence of Human Races. *Current Anthropology* 3 (3): 279-281.

Malik, Kenan. 2013. *Multiculturalism and Its Discontents*. London: Seagull Books.

Memmi, Albert. 1982/2000. *Racism*. Trans. Steve Martinot. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Miles, Robert, and Malcolm Brown. 2003. *Racism*, 2nd edition. London: Routledge.

Montagu, Ashley. 1964. The Concept of Race. In *The Concept of Race*, ed. Ashley Mongagu, 12-28. New York: Free Press.

Montagu, Ashley. 1997/1942. *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*, 6th edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Morris-Suzuki, Tessa. 1998. *Re-Inventing Japan: Time, Space, Nation*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Nagayoshi, Kikuko. 2011. Support of Multiculturalism, But For Whom? Effects of Ethno-National Identity on the Endorsement of Multiculturalism in Japan. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 37(4): 561-578.

Oguma, Eiji. 2002. *A Geneaology of "Japanese" Self-images*. Trans. David Askew. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

Okubo, Yuko. 2013. From "Contested" Multiculturalism to "Localized" Multiculturalism: Chinese and Vietnamese Youth in Osaka, Japan. *Anthropological Quarterly* 86(4): 995-1029.

Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 2008. Once More with Feeling: Reflections on Racial Formation. *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 123(5): 1565-1572.

Patterson, Thomas C. 1997. *Inventing Western Civilization*. New York: Monthly Press.

Press, John Kenneth. n.d. *Culturalism: A Word, A Value, Our Future*. http://www.culturism.us (accessed 15 February, 2014).

Rattansi, Ali. 2011. Race's Recurrence: Reflections on Amin's "The Remainders of Race." *Theory Culture & Society* 28(1): 112-128.

Rhee, Jeong-eun. 2013. The Neoliberal Racial Project: The Tiger Mother and Governmentality. *Educational Theory* 63(6): 561-580.

Rushdie, Salman. 1989. *The Satanic Verses*. New York: Viking.

Shimizu, Akitoshi. 1999. Colonialism and the Development of Modern Anthropology in Japan. In *Anthropology and Colonialism in Asia and Oceania*, eds. Jan van Bremen and Akitoshi Shimizu, 115-171. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press.

Silva, Denise Ferreira da. 2011. Notes for a Critique of the "Metaphysics of Race." *Theory, Culture & Society* 28(1): 138-148.

Skiba, Russell. 2012. "As Nature Has Formed Them": The History and Current Status of Racial Difference. *Teachers College Record* 114(5): 1-49.

Song Anjong. 2007. 'Koria-kei Nohonjin'-ka Purojekuto no Isō o Saguru [Exploring the Phase of the Korean-Japanization Project]. *Gendai Shisō* 35 (7): 225-239.

Takezawa, Yasuko, ed. 2011a. *Racial Representations in Asia*. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

Takezawa, Yasuko. 2011b. Toward a New Approach to Race and Racial Representations: Perspectives from Asia. In *Racial Representations in Asia*, ed. Yasuko Takezawa, 7-19. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

Taniguchi, Toradoshi. 1942. *Toyo Minzoku no Taishitsu* [Oriental People's Constitution]. Tokyo: Sangabo.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 2002. Adieu, Culture: A New Duty Arises. In *Anthropology Beyond Culture*, eds. Richard G. Fox and Barbara J. King, 37-60. Oxford: Berg.

Wagatsuma, George A., and Hiroshi De Vos. 1966. *Japan's Invisible Race: Caste in Culture and Personality*. Los Angles: University of California Press.

Weiner, Michael. 1997. The Invention of Identity: Race and Nation in Pre-war Japan. In *The Construction of Racial Identities in China and Japan*, ed. Frank Dikötter, 96-117. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Working Paper Series

Peace and Development Studies (Phase 1)

No.1   (2005)

James R. Simpson, *Future of the Dairy Industries in China, Japan and the United States: Conflict Resolution in the Doha Round of WTO Agricultural Trade Negotiations*

No.2   (2005)

K. Palanisami, *Sustainable Management of Tank Irrigation Systems in South India*

No.3   (2006)

Nobuko Nagasaki, *Satyagraha as a Non-violent Means of Conflict Resolution*

No.4   (2006)

Yoshio Kawamura and Zhan Jin, *WTO/FTA and the Issues of Regional Disparity*

No.5   (2006)

Shin'ichi Takeuchi, *Political Liberalization or Armed Conflicts? Political Changes in Post-Cold War Africa*

No.6   (2006)

Daniel C. Bach, *Regional Governance and State Reconstruction in Africa*

No.7   (2006)

Eghosa E. Osaghae, *Ethnicity and the State in Africa*

No.8   (2006)

Kazuo Takahashi, *The Kurdish Situation in Iraq*

No.9   (2006)

Kaoru Sugihara, *East Asia, Middle East and the World Economy: Further Notes on the Oil Triangle*

No.10   (2006)

Kosuke Shimizu, *Discourses of Leadership and Japanese Political Economy: Three Phallus-centrists*

No.11   (2006)

Nao Sato, *The Composition and Job Structure of Female-Headed Households: A Case Study of a Rural Village in Siemreap Province, Cambodia*

No.12   (2006)

Takuya Misu, *The United States and the United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONUC)*

No.13   (2006)

Om Prakash, *Asia and the Rise of the Early Modern World Economy*

No.14   (2006)

Takehiko Ochiai, *Regional Security in Africa*

No.15   (2006)

Masahisa Kawabata, *An Overview of the Debate on the African State*

No.16   (2006)

Kazuo Takahashi, *The Middle East, the Middle Kingdom and Japan*

No.17 (2006)

Tomoya Suzuki, *Macroeconomic Impacts of Terrorism: Evidence from Indonesia in the Post-Suharto Era*

No.18 (2007)

Kenichi Matsui, *International Energy Regime: Role of Knowledge and Energy and Climate Change Issues*

No.19 (2007)

Kazuo Takahashi, *Not the Most Popular Decision: Japan's Ground Self Defense Force Goes to Iraq*

No.20 (2007)

Shinya Ishizaka, *Leader-Follower Relations in the Foot Marches in Gandhian Environmental Movements in India*

No.21 (2007)

Yoshio Kawamura, *Participatory Community Development and a Role of Social Statistical Analysis: Case of the JICA-Indonesia Project—Takalar Model*

No.22 (2007)

Takashi Inoguchi, *The Place of the United States in the Triangle of Japan, China and India*

No.23 (forthcoming)

Kosuke Shimizu, *Asian Regionalism and Japan's Unforgettable Past*

No.24 (2007)

Kosuke Shimizu, *Human Security, Universality, and National Interest: A Critical Inquiry*

No.25 (2007)

François Debrix, *The Hegemony of Tabloid Geopolitics: How America and the West Cannot Think International Relations beyond Conflict, Identity, and Cultural Imposition*

No.26 (2007)

Naomi Hosoda, *The Social Process of Migration from the Eastern Visayas to Manila*

No.27 (2007)

Chizuko Sato, *Forced Removals, Land Struggles and Restoration of Land in South Africa: A Case of Roosboom*

No.28 (2007)

Michael Furmanovsky, *Reconciliation, Restitution and Healing: The Role of Vietnam Veterans in Facilitating a New Era in U.S.-Vietnam Relations, 1985-2005*

No.29 (2007)

Hiroyuki Torigoe, *Land Ownership for the Preservation of Environment and Livelihood*

No.30 (2007)

Kokki Goto (Edited, Annotated, and with an Introduction by Motoko Shimagami), *Iriai Forests Have Sustained the Livelihood and Autonomy of Villagers: Experience of Commons in Ishimushiro Hamlet in Northeastern Japan*

No.31 (2007)

Kazuo Kobayashi, *The "Invention of Tradition" in Java under the Japanese Occupation: The Tonarigumi System and Gotong Royon*

No.32　(2007)

Benedict Anderson, *Useful or Useless Relics: Today's Strange Monarchies*（加藤　剛訳『有用な遺制か無用な遺物？現代における君主制という不思議な存在』）

No.33　(2008)

Pauline Kent, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: The Use of Radical Comparisons to Enhance Mutual Understanding*

No.34　(2008)

Naomi Hosoda, *Towards a Cultural Interpretation of Migration in the Philippines: Focusing on Value-Rationality and Capitalism*

No.35　(2008)

Anan Ganjanapan, *Multiplicity of Community Forestry as Knowledge Space in the Northern Thai Highlands*

No.36　(2008)

Shinji Suzuki, *The Increasing Enclosure of Mangrove Wetlands: Towards Resource Management in Development Frontiers*

No.37　(2008)

Akiko Watanabe, *Migration and Mosques: The Evolution and Transformation of Muslim Communities in Manila, the Philippines*

No.38　(2009)

Acharawan Isarangkura Na Ayuthaya and Senjo Nakai, *The Emergence and Development of Interfaith Cooperation: A Case Study of the Theravada Buddhist Advocacy for People Living with HIV/AIDS (PWA) in Upper Northern Thailand*

No.39　(2009)

Jeremy Rappleye, *Decline of the Tokyo Technocrats in Educational Policy Formation? Exploring the Loss of Ministry Autonomy and Recent Policy Trends with Reference to 'Globalisation' and Educational Transfer*

No.40　(2009)

Robert Aspinall, *The New 'Three Rs' of Education in Japan: Rights, Risk, and Responsibility*

No.41　(2009)

Takehiko Ochiai, *Personal Rule in Nigeria*

No.42　(2009)

Toru Sagawa, *Why Do People "Renounce War"? The War Experience of the Daasanach of the Conflict-ridden Region of Northeast Africa*

No.43　(2009)

Aysun Uyar, *Political Configuration of Thailand's Free Trade Agreements within the Framework of Southeast Asian Regional Economic Cooperation*

No.44　(2009)

Kosuke Shimizu, *Nishida Kitaro and Japan's Interwar Foreign Policy: War Involvement and Culturalist Political Discourse*

No.45　(2009)

Julian Chapple, *Increasing Migration and Diversity in Japan: The Need for Dialogue and Collaboration in Education, Language and Identity Policies*

No.46 (2009)

Motoko Shimagami, *An Iriai Interchange Linking Japan and Indonesia: An Experiment in Practical Collaborative Research leading toward Community-Based Forest Management*

No.47 (2009)

Nakamura Hisashi, *Social Development and Conflict Resolution; as Seen by an Unorthodox Economist*

No.48 (2009)

Tomoko Matsui, *The Narrative Strategies and Multilayered Realities of Returnee Workers: A Case Study of Thai Returnee Workers from Japan*

No.49 (2009)

Yoshio Kawamura, *Framework on Socio-economic Mechanism of Emigration in the Pre-war Japan*

No.50 (2009)

Yoshio Kawamura, *Socioeconomic Factor Structure of Japanese Emigrant Communities: A Statistical Case Study at Inukami County, Shiga Prefecture, in the Meiji Era*

No.51 (2009)

David Blake Willis, *A Nation at Risk, A Nation in Need of Dialogue: Citizenship, Denizenship, and Beyond in Japanese Education*

No.52 (2009)

Shinya Ishizaka, *Non-violent Means of Conflict Resolution in the Chipko (Forest Protection) Movement in India*

No.53 (2009)

Shinji Suzuki, *Illegal Logging in Southeast Asia*

No.54 (2009)

Fuping Li, *The Current Issues and Development Process of Poverty in China*

No.55 (2009)

Shin'ichi Takeuchi, *Conflict and Land Tenure in Rwanda*

No.56 (2009)

Katsumi Ishizuka, *The Impact of UN Peace-building Efforts on the Justice System of Timor-Leste: Western versus Traditional Cultures*

No.57 (2009)

Kazuo Funahashi, *Changes in Income among Peasants in Northeast Thailand: Poverty Reduction Seen Through a Panel Analysis*

No.58 (2009)

Kazue Demachi, *Japanese Foreign Assistance to Africa: Aid and Trade*

No.59 (2009)

Akio Nishiura, *Determinants of South African Outward Direct Investment in Africa*

No.60 (2009)

Ryosuke Sato, *Discontinuity of International Law with the 'National Reconciliation' Process — An analysis of the transitional 'amnesty' mechanism of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa —*

No.61　(2009)

Kazuya Masuda, *The Reconstitution of* Adat *in a Dual Level Land Conflict: A case study of a village community under forest development schemes in Sumatra, Indonesia*

No.62　(2009)

Kyoko Cross, *Harmonizing Local with Global Justice: Emergence of a Hybrid Institutional Mechanism for Reconciliation in East Timor*

No.63　(2009)

Tomoaki Ueda, *Institution and Ideal in Indian Nationalist Thoughts: G. K. Gokhale in Comparison with M. K. Gandhi*

No.64　(2010)

William Bradley, *Educational Policy in 21st Century Japan: Neoliberalism and Beyond?*

No.65　(2010)

Kosuke Shimizu, *Structural Violence and Human Security*

No.66　(2010)

Misa Shojiya, *Democratization in Divided Society – Outcomes and Issues in International Assistance －*

Studies on Multicultural Societies (Phase 2)

No.1　(2012)

Katsumi Ishizuka, *Is US and NATO-led Security Policy Compatible with the Multiple Frameworks Model of Peace-building in Afghanistan?*

No.2　(2012)

Rieko Karatani, *Unravelling the Security and Insecurity of Female Overseas Domestic Workers: 'Global Householding' and 'Global De-Householding' Examined*

No.3　(2012)

Katsumi Ishizuka, *Japan's Policy towards the War on Terror in Afghanistan*

No.4　(2012)

Soo im Lee, *Japanese Learners' Underlying Beliefs Affecting Foreign Language Leaners' Motivation: New Perspectives of Affective Factors Mechanism*

No.5　(2012)

Kelvin Chi-Kin Cheung, *Historicizing Taiwan's Democracy: Recovering the Identity Politics Behind the New Civic Nation in Taiwan*

No.6　(2012)

Yoshio Kawamura, *Characteristics of Agricultural Production Structures Determined by Capital Inputs and Productivities in Contemporary China: Based on 2010 Annual Statistical Data at the Provincial Level*

No.7　(2012)

Satoko Kawamura, *The Formation of Global Economic Law: Under Aspects of the Autopoietic System*

No.8　(2012)

Soo im Lee, *Diversity of Zainichi Koreans and Their Ties to Japan and Korea*

No.9　(2012)

Joo-Kyung Park, *TESOL Training for Empowerment: The Case of Migrant Women in Korea*

No.10　(2013)

Josuke Ikeda, *When Global Ethics Fails: A Meta-Ethical Inquiry into Distant Rescue*

No.11　(2012)

Chizuko Sato, *International Migration of Nurses and Human Resources for Health Policy: The Case of South Africa*

No.12　(2013)

Akihiro Asakawa, *Why Boat People Are Not Welcome: Australia's Refugee Policy in the Context of Immigration Management*

No.13　(2013)

Hirofumi Wakita, *Quality Assurance of English Language Teachers: A Missing Paradigm in Teacher Education*

No.14　(2013)

Takeshi Mita, *The View of Okinawa and Yaeyama on China*

No.15　(2013)

Satofumi Kawamura, *Introduction to "Nishida Problem": Nishida Kitarō's Political Philosophy and Governmentality*

No.16　(2013)

Takumi Honda, *A Critical Analysis of Multiculturalism from Japanese American Studies*

No.17　(2013)

Shiro Sato, *Nuclear Ethics as Normative and Cultural Restraints in International Politics*

No.18　(2013)

Eriko Aoki, *Ancestors and Visions: Reemergence of Traditional Religion in a Catholic Village in Flores, Eastern Indonesia*

No.19　(2013)

William Bradley, *Is There a Post-Multiculturalism?*

No.20　(2013)

Viktoriya Kim, *Female Gender Construction and the Idea of Marriage Migration: Women from Former Soviet Union Countries Married to Japanese Men*