

Multiculturalism in Japan : A Victory over Assimilationism or Subjection to Neo-Liberalism?

TAKAYA Sachi

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the issue of multiculturalism in Japan. It is true that the proportion of the population made up of ethnic and cultural minorities in Japan is not as large as in many other countries, but it keeps increasing. The number of the registered foreign nationals in 2005¹⁾ was estimated to 2,011,555, which is equivalent to 1.6% of the total population and represents about twice as many as in 1990. There are Koreans (30%), Chinese (26%), Brazilians (15%), Filipinos (9%), and so on.

Until the middle of the 1980s, most members of ethnic minorities in Japan were Korean and Chinese, referred to as 'Zainichi', who came from the former colonies and their descendants. However, migrants from Asia and South America became noteworthy beginning in the late of 1980s and the number of the ethnic and cultural minorities has been increasing.

Though there are various definitions of multiculturalism, we will define it here as a position which positively views differences between different races, cultures, ethnic groups, religions, languages, traditions and so on, and recognizes the rights of minorities. Although some countries have adopted multiculturalism as an official policy, there has never been the case in Japan. The Japanese government has only a strict immigration control policy²⁾.

Criticizing the homogeneousness in Japanese society, some began to use the word 'Kyousei' (whose literal translation is 'symbiosis', 'living together'³⁾ or 'conviviality'⁴⁾). When around 1990 'Kyousei' began to be used by academics, its meaning was not only that of the 'conviviality' between different cultures and ethnicities but also 'conviviality' in general (Inoue, Nawada and Katsuragi [1992]). It is said that the term 'Tabunka-Kyousei' ('conviviality of multi-cultures') was not adopted until a NGO supporting foreigners proclaimed itself 'the Center of Tabunka-Kyousei' after The Great Hanshin-Awaji earthquake of 1995. 'Tabunka-Kyousei' means an ideal situation where people of various cultures, ethnicities, and identities live together in equality and harmony. After that, 'Kyousei' as well as 'Tabunka-Kyousei' became widely popular terms and today many local governments use them. Furthermore, as we shall see later on, even Ministries and the business community have come to use these terms in their policy proposals referring to migrants since

about 2000. I regard this trend as an expression of multiculturalism in Japan⁵⁾. Some of their proposals have already been put into practice, though there is not yet a comprehensive policy for migrants in Japan⁶⁾.

Of course, it is well-known that migration policies often result in unexpected consequences (Castles [2004]). Thus, even if these policy proposals were brought into practice as they have been formulated, it remains difficult to predict what their consequences would be. Therefore, my argument does not pretend to be able to foresee the consequence of the coming comprehensive policy for migrants. Rather I want to focus here on the background idea of these policy proposals and policies. In other words, I want to analyze the idea on which they are based.

I want to make clear how multiculturalism is being introduced in Japanese policies examining the policy proposals and policies of Ministries, local governments and the business community. The increasing concern about migration policy is mainly based on two problems now facing Japan. The first is the necessity to react economic globalization while the population of Japan is decreasing. Economic globalization promotes neo-liberal policies such as privatization and deregulation in order to heighten a country's 'international competitiveness'. The second it is a fact that the number of migrants now living in Japan is increasing, which is thought to cause many 'social problems' and friction with Japanese residents, as well as difficulties concerning the education of children and so on. Especially, local governments of areas where numerous migrants live insist that a migration policy is necessary because they have been urged to deal with these 'social problems'. Thus, the increasing concern with migration policy in Japan is grounded on the global as well as the local context, and both contexts are interrelated. In order to promote economic globalization, it is necessary to construct multicultural society in some areas. For example, the 'Strategy in the Globalizing Economy' formulated by Council on Economic and Fiscal Policy of the Government of Japan in 2006, says that: 'Strengthening International Competitiveness in Japan's Regions' by building multicultural societies in local areas is positioned as one of the 'issues to be addressed strategically' for 'enhancing Japan's capacity to grow and compete' in globalization. So, at the present, the need of a multicultural policy expressed in local context seems to be replaced by the needs of the global context, namely, the necessity to react to economic globalization.

Thus, we need to recognize what motivates this change of policy for migrants and consider multiculturalism and economic globalization in relation to neo-liberalism. Neo-liberalism is defined as the doctrine that aims towards a 'minimal government' and promotes policies of privatization and deregulation. It is based on 'moral authoritarianism' and 'strong economic individualism' (Giddens [1998]). That is to say, neo-liberalism tries to change the social structure, in order to accommodate it to the needs of the market. In other words, as Ulrich Beck says, neo-liberalism is 'a form of *one-dimensional* thinking and acting, a *monocausal*, economistic view of the world' (Beck [1997=2000: 118]).

The trend of neo-liberalism is adopted by policies in many countries and Japan is no exception. Some think that multicultural policies are influenced by this trend. For example, Shiohara [2005]

demonstrates the relation between the change to 'official multiculturalism' and neo-liberalism in Australia. As for the Japanese immigration policy, it has been pointed out by Morris-Suzuki [2002] that it suggests a change from assimilationism to multiculturalism, however she does not deal with the relation between multiculturalism and neo-liberalism in detail. This I propose to do in the remainder of this paper.

It is also interesting to examine the relation between multiculturalism and neo-liberalism from a theoretical perspective. This is because there are characteristics that are common to multiculturalism and neo-liberalism. That is, both tend to respect differences while neglecting the equality of social and economic conditions. One of the main issues of multiculturalism is whether multiculturalism can ensure equality while respecting their differences (Taylor [1994], Fraser [1997], Barry [2001]). Nancy Fraser doubts whether the mainstream multiculturalism has treated the problem of equality adequately and as neo-liberalism tends to weaken the basis of equality, it is now important to examine how multiculturalism relates to this trend.

Furthermore, multiculturalism is originally a form of thought attentive to minorities who are deprived of cultural recognition (Young [1990], Fraser [1997], Kymlicka [2002]). In other words, multiculturalism is a demand for the recognition of the cultural differences of minorities and for including them with fairness in mainstream society⁷⁾. Can multiculturalism as adapted to neo-liberal policy still be viewed as a thought favorable to the inclusion of minorities? In order to answer this question, we have to consider the relation between multiculturalism and exclusion.

First, I shall examine the characteristics of the Japanese immigration policy of today and offer some critical remarks. It is clear that past policy was based on the principle that foreigners are marginalized economically, excluded socially and politically, and should be forcefully assimilated culturally. As I have pointed out, multiculturalism in Japan has been viewed as a criticism of that principle.

In the second place, I shall examine how multiculturalism has been proposed and adopted by policymakers in Japan.

In the third place, I propose to point out that multiculturalism is being adapted to neo-liberalism by considering some policy proposals. I hope to discuss this last issue from the two points of view: 'individualized multiculturalism' and exclusion of undocumented migrants viewed as a risk.

Finally I want to emphasize that it is necessary to take into account the perspectives of NGOs when criticizing the various use of the idea of multiculturalism.

2. Discriminatory treatment towards foreigners in Japan

For about 40 years after the end of WW II, the most important ethnic minorities in Japan, except national minorities such as the Ainu or Okinawans, were Koreans and Chinese (Taiwanese), referred to as 'Zainichi'. Therefore it is the best to look at the policy concerning them

if we want to know what ideas lie behind the conventional treatment of migrants in Japan.

Although members of these minorities had Japanese citizenship, even if it was considered imperfect compared with that of 'Japanese' during the war and until 1952, they were suddenly deprived of their citizenship by a decision of the Japanese government in the context of the San Francisco Peace Treaties. Since then, they have been deprived of various rights. To be accurate, they have been marginalized economically, excluded socially and politically, while being forced to assimilate into 'Japanese culture'. For example, even the third or fourth generation 'Zainichi' do not have the right to vote inasmuch as they are not naturalized⁸⁾ in Japan. Besides, the government has discriminatory policies against their ethnic schools. Furthermore the fact that about 80% of Korean 'Zainichi' use 'Japanese' names bears witness I think of the consequences of what not only the Japanese Government, but also Japanese society, has done to compel them to assimilate.

Assimilationism is so deeply rooted that even foreigners who came to Japan after the 1980s suffer from its consequences. It is said that they are often encouraged or forced to use their 'Japanese' names in offices or schools. In short, assimilationism remains.

It is true that the way of treating ethnic minorities has been changing as I shall consider later, but I cannot overemphasize just how much assimilationism still exists, especially in daily life. As discussed later, the policy that praises multiculturalism also contains some aspects of assimilationism.

In short, there are now several, perhaps contradictory, ideas in the treatment of 'foreigners' in Japan.

3. The realization of multiculturalism?

As I pointed out, it is the words, 'Kyousei' and 'Tabunka-Kyousei' that are used to express multiculturalism in Japan. When the word 'Kyousei' first began to be used in academic arguments (especially political-philosophy and sociology) in the 1990s, the aim was to criticize assimilationism (Inoue, Nawada and Katsuragi [1992], Okuda and Tajima [1991][1993][1995], Onai [1999]). Even in empirical researches, there seemed to be a normative concern. On the ground of that concern, researchers tried to find 'Kyousei' style relationship in everyday social life.

It is said that 'Tabunka-Kyousei' did not start to be used until a NGO supporting foreigners named itself 'the Center of Tabunka-Kyousei' in 1995. 'Tabunka-Kyousei' refers to an ideal situation where people of various cultures, ethnicities, and identities live together in equality and harmony.

Though 'Kyousei' as well as 'Tabunka-Kyousei' were at first used against assimilationism in Japan, these terms have become widely popular and now many local governments use them. Even Ministries and business communities have come to use these terms in their policy proposals referring to migrants since around 2000.

One reason for this phenomenon is that about 10 years have passed since the revision of the immigration law which enabled ethnic Japanese from South America to enter and work in Japan.

They tend to live in particular areas where the number of registered foreign nationals is higher than elsewhere in Japan, for example, 15% in Ohizumi in Gunma prefecture, 8% in Minokamo in Gifu prefecture. Although local governments in these areas individually established policies for migrants, they consider it necessary for them to cooperate with one another. In 2001, they organized 'the Council for Cities of Non-Japanese Residents' and suggested to the Government 'the declaration of Hamamatsu' (2001) and 'the declaration of Toyota' (2004). These proposals cover three fields, labor, community, and education, and were highly valued because they were made on the basis of the actual circumstances of migrants in various local areas. To take a simple example, they demanded the end of discriminatory treatment towards migrants in the domains of employment and social security.

In 2006, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications formulated 'The Regional Multicultural Society Promotion Plans' as a guideline for the construction of multicultural societies in local areas. This report encourages multiculturalism as a situation where people with different nationalities and ethnicities live together while recognizing their mutual cultural differences and trying to build equal relationship. According to this report foreigners should not be treated as objects to be assimilated or endured, but as subjects, as equal members in the areas where they live.

Viewed in this way, multiculturalism becomes a formal ideal that we should pursue. What should we think of this situation? This is the realization of an aim that many people may think desirable.

However there also are many criticisms against 'Kyousei' : (1) as the word 'Kyousei' usually tends to be used in an optimistic way which does not always correspond with the real condition in which foreigners live; (2) it neglects the social and economic condition of migrants while respecting their cultural condition (Kajita, Tanno, and Higuchi [2005: 295-7]); (3) it is mainly concerned with individual relationship and neglects the social structure (Onai [1998]⁹⁾); (4) In the context of sociology, though many empirical researches have been done in terms of multiculturalism, few are analyzed from the theoretical point of view.

I think these defects make us overlook the influence of the change of the social structure on multiculturalism itself.

It is true that the above proposals were the products of sincere approach to the 'social problems' caused by migrants and a desire for multiculturalism in local areas, but they were inadequate.

First, those who are compelled to change their behavior and custom are not Japanese but foreigners. In other words, foreigners are not accepted as they are. They are admitted only insofar as they obey the manners of Japanese society. On the other hand, Japanese society is seldom requested to change itself.

Second, as the concern of those proposals is mostly directed towards the cultural dimension, they neglect the influence of the reorganization of the social structure which plays an important

role in the lives of migrants as well as those of the Japanese. I would like to argue about these aspects in relation to neo-liberalism in the next section.

4. Multiculturalism adapted to neo-liberalism

4.1 Individualized multiculturalism

At the late 1980s, the sudden increase of migrant workers induced numerous arguments over immigration policy. In those arguments, whether or not migrant workers were accepted was mainly addressed in terms of their influence on the national labor market. This discussion cooled down with the revision of the immigration law in 1989. However, as we have seen above, the number of migrants has been increasing even after the bursting of the bubble economy.

Since about 2000, there have often been the arguments over migration policy, but it is clear the background of these arguments has changed from that of the previous ones. This is because recent arguments focus on the need to deal with a globalized economy as well as with the fact that more than 2 million migrants now live in Japan. In short, the reason why many policy proposals came to be submitted is the clear influence of economic globalization. And I can say that most of proposals are essentially based on neo-liberalism.

I would like to analyze here the influence of neo-liberalism. In 1999, a report 'Ideal Socio-economy and Policies for Economic Rebirth' submitted by the Economic Council, which was the advisory committee of then Prime Minister Obuchi, was accepted by the cabinet. This report called on 'Secure Diversity and Vitality by Accepting Foreign Workers' and said,

In this time of ongoing globalization, we are approaching the era of diverse knowledge. For Japan to remain prosperous in the future, it must actively utilize multifaceted and diversified talents and expand economic activity based on the concept of creativity. From this perspective, mutual cooperation between foreign people and companies—who have different overseas cultural backgrounds—and Japanese people and companies is desirable, as is the creation of an environment where such people and companies can take active parts in a competitive atmosphere.

This report led to arguments over the migration policy, and some Ministries, councils and business communities started to refer to it¹⁰. Their common concern is how Japan can tackle the problems of aging and of a declining birth rate while dealing with globalization. They think it is necessary to promote deregulation and privatization while accepting cultural diversity. 'Recommendations on Accepting Non-Japanese Workers' (2004) by Japan Business Federation is a good example to see such an idea:

Global competition for top-rate human resources is becoming increasingly intense while Japan's socio-economic composition is changing with lower birthrates and a graying population. These changes

must be countered by bringing the dynamism of diversity into Japan from outside so that it could enhance the “value-adding creativity” of each man and woman among the Japanese public, thus maximizing the contribution of non-Japanese workers within this process.

Another example is the ‘Policies for Economic and Fiscal Management and Structural Reform 2005’, which was submitted by the council on Economic and Fiscal Policy seated in Cabinet Office. It contained a chapter entitled ‘To Realize a New Dynamic Era—Overcoming Aging and Globalization’. It stated that “in order to successfully deal with globalization, Japan’s international competitiveness must be reinforced through means such as innovation. For this, we must strengthen human capability”. And it proposed that “it is essential to establish a society in which each individual is able to realize his or her capabilities to the fullest extend”. Besides, as a part of strengthening human capability, it added “in order to utilize foreign human resources, the Government will facilitate the acceptance of skilled foreign laborers”.

It is easy to recognize that these proposals are made on the ground of the ‘competition of human resources’ under globalization and neo-liberalism, a situation whose characteristics are deregulation and structural reform led by the market. It is accepted here that we must now do away with assimilationism and pursue diversity, because diversity can contribute to increase our competitiveness.

However, this diversity is clearly different from what multiculturalists have been demanding. This is because diversity here is regarded as a human resource, not as the rights of groups. In other words, multi-culture or multi-ethnicity is individualized and becomes a human capability, therefore only those who are able to use their capabilities effectively can be accepted. Thus we can see here at work the ‘individualized multiculturalism’, or ‘individualization of multiculturalism’ in Japan, just as Shiohara [2005] pointed out in the context of the Australian policy¹¹⁾. This is true, even if the experience of multiculturalism between the two countries is different, in particular, in view of the fact that in Japan multiculturalism has not been embraced as a national policy. Nonetheless, from this viewpoint, one may say that, in Japan, multiculturalism is being adapted to neo-liberalism.

Allow me to stress again that ‘individualized multiculturalism’ means that diversity is now looked on not as the rights of groups but as one of the resources of an individual. To this we must add that diversity now needs to be constantly developed by the individual himself or herself. It is easy to see, in this assertion, a reflection of the fact that government today make people develop themselves flexibly, as Nicholas Rose [1999] or Saito [2005] have argued. As Saito puts it, government today utilizes active and voluntary self-government; therefore people are required to create new values and to cope with the change of environment quickly. As he also says, another characteristic of the governance today is the emphasis on self responsibility and self choice. People must be responsible for what they do while being provided with the freedom of choice. However, there is no choice which is based on complete information and options. In other words, even when

people seem to exercise their 'freedom of choice', they do so under incomplete information and options. Thus, as Saito suggests, the emphasis of self responsibility can bring the trend that social problems is transformed into individual problems. Given that, it is difficult to doubt or to criticize the choices of other actors which may affect their lives.

The importance of his suggestion cannot be emphasized too much because, in our context, it is likely that group rights, which constitute one of the central issues in multiculturalism, will be difficult to legitimize. One of the reasons for this is that difficulties which an ethnic group suffers will be regarded as caused not by the social structure but by insufficient individual efforts or resources to overcome the competition. Therefore it seems reasonable to say that the idea of multiculturalism which appeared as a criticism issuing from minority groups at first¹²⁾ has now clearly changed.

On the other hand, if we assume that multiculturalism is generally characterized by a respect of cultural differences and a disregard of social and economic inequalities (Fraser [1997]), it is possible to say that multiculturalism from its origin has a certain affinity with neo-liberalism. I think that this point remains a matter for debate. What I can only say here is that in the context of Japanese sociology the idea of multiculturalism which is going to be adapted in national policy has not been properly analyzed and criticized, especially given that these policies have no intention of changing the social structure.

4.2 Encouragement of Diversity together with the Exclusion of Undocumented Migrants

Another example which shows the influence of neo-liberalism in policy proposals is concern about law and order. Ulrich Beck qualifies today's society as a 'Risk Society'. Beck says that, in risk society where security is lost, solidarity is based on fears and weak (Beck [2002=2003: 15]). Besides, he points out that economic globalization is promoted by the risk society.

Globalism, then, draws only a small part of its strength from what is at present the case. Its potential force comes more from the staging of threats. This is the realm of the 'might', the 'should' and the 'if . . . then'. It is thus from a variant of risk society that the transnational corporations derive the power. It is not 'actual damage' from economic globalization . . . , but the threat of the same in public discourse, which stirs up fears, intimidates people The semantic of hegemony of globalism, its publicly fomented ideology, is a source from which the corporate sector draws its strategic potential (Beck [1997=2000: 122]).

This Beck's suggestion seems to indicate that the doctrine of neo-liberalism will generally be easily acceptable in a risk society. Neo-liberal policy also derives power from the risk society by 'stirring up fears and intimidating people' as well as transnational corporations do. In other words, neo-liberal policy makes use of fears present in our risk society.

However, a policy based on the fears of people also has problems. As Zygmunt Bauman insist,

Unsicherheit [fears] are reduced to much simpler concerns with law and order (that is, with bodily safety and the safety of private homes and possessions), while the problem of law and order tends to be, in its turn, blended time and again with the problematic presence of ethnic, race or religious minorities . . . (Bauman [1999: 52]).

Most people would accept that the concern with law and order is rising in Japan, too. We can think that that concern is based on fears. Bauman's argument also seems reasonable in relation to policies concerning migrants. For, an increasing concern about law and order is also found in immigration control policies and migration policy proposals. Crackdowns and deportation of undocumented migrants have already taken place and enforcement of the law is more and more strict.

In 1999, the year the report 'Ideal Socio-economy and Policies for Economic Rebirth' was submitted, the immigration law was also revised and the crime of 'illegal residence' was introduced. Four years later, the Immigration Bureau of the Ministry of Justice, the Metropolis of Tokyo as well as other agencies announced a 'Joint Declaration to Strengthen Countermeasures Aimed at Foreigners with Illegal Visa Status in the Greater Tokyo Area'. What is apparent here is that the concern of this declaration is public security in Metropolitan Tokyo. Some time later measures against 'illegal' migrants were adopted in a national policy. In 2003, the Ministerial Meeting against Crimes formulated an 'Action Plan for the Realization of a Society Resistant to Crime'. According to this action plan, the government will aim at reducing the number of 'illegal' foreign residents by half in the next five years in order to ensure public security. Now the exclusion of undocumented migrants in terms of law and order becomes official.

In Japan, the number of undocumented migrants was estimated to about 300,000 in 1993 and, since then has been declining. Furthermore there is no indication that the number of criminal activities by illegal migrants has been increasing rapidly. Despite these facts, it is around the year 2000 that the crackdown against the undocumented migrants started being reinforced on the grounds of concern with law and order. That is to say, undocumented migrants are regarded as a risk and excluded. 'Recommendations on Accepting Non-Japanese Workers' (2004) by Japan Business Federation is another illustration of the same point. It proposes to 'Coordinate Measures on Illegal Residents and Public Security with Acceptance Policy'

Exercising greater control over illegal residents is an important consideration in alleviating the anxiety among the Japanese public over this issue. At the same time, however, greater attention must be paid to striking the proper balance between public security measures and acceptance policy in order to ensure a fully developed acceptance policy so that non-Japanese workers and students are not drawn into criminal activity.

It is entirely within the means of the host country to reduce crime by creating a socio-

economic climate that encourages non-Japanese workers and students to work and study in Japan by ensuring that they are able to live stable, secure lives.

As seen in this quotation, the concerns is about the 'socioeconomic climate' that non-Japanese people will experience, but it is clear that it is also about anxiety concerning public security that is believed to be threatened by the criminal activities of non-Japanese.

It should be also noted that its concerned about the education of children of migrants which again is motivated by anxiety concerning public security. That is to say, the fact that when many children who do not enter school is regarded as the hotbed of juvenile delinquency¹³⁾.

'Strategy in the Globalizing Economy' formulated by Council on Economic and Fiscal Policy Government of Japan, as we have seen above, refers to both 'increasing acceptance of human resources from other countries and strengthening resident status control'.

In examining those proposals, it is clear that ideas of diversity and exclusion of undocumented migrants viewed as a risk are raised simultaneously. In other words, even when exclusion of migrants is being carried out, differences or diversity is not always being denied. Rather, for achieving 'diversity' in Japanese society, we must exclude disturbance, or risk. In short, 'diversity' does not conflict but is parallel to 'exclusion'.

I think that multiculturalism adapted to neo-liberal policies cannot react to the exclusion of undocumented migrants. For example, though 'The Regional Multicultural Society Promotion Plans' by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and communications, as we saw above, stated the necessity of constructing a multicultural society in local areas, it never referred to strict crackdowns against the undocumented migrants by the Immigration Bureau. In short, this report consequently confirms the exclusion by remaining silent about such practices. This is because multiculturalism deals mainly with the cultural dimension of problems. Therefore, multiculturalism results in indifference to exclusion on the basis of risk as well as indifference towards socioeconomic problems. From this point of view, we can say that multiculturalism is no longer a demand for the inclusion of minorities through their recognition, but a doctrine that participates in the process of their exclusion.

5. Conclusion

Here I have made a humble attempt to raise the problems with the use of the concept of multiculturalism in various policy proposals and policies. To begin with, there are discriminatory treatments towards ethnic minorities in Japan, which seems to be the relic of 'assimilationism'. Next, I illustrated the influence of neo-liberalism and pointed out two problems: (1) 'individualized multiculturalism', and (2) the encouragement of diversity together with exclusion of undocumented migrants.

Can we still promote 'multiculturalism' despite these problems? An answer could be found in policy proposals made by NGOs. To take a simple example, the proposals submitted by Solidarity

Network with Migrants Japan (SMJ)¹⁴ which is a network of individuals and groups supporting migrants and refugees. SMJ published a proposal for migration policy which can ensure the rights of migrants (SMJ [2006]). The proposal tries to deal with various issues that migrants are facing on a daily basis, such as law, labor, education, and medical care.

I will take the NGO's suggestion regarding education as an example to show its idea of 'multiculturalism'. Apart from concerns about the education of children by the business community or the local government, which are caused by an anxiety regarding public security, the NGO believes that difficulties in their education originate from social inequality. In order to change such a social structure, the NGO suggests that the children be granted an opportunity to learn their mother tongue and culture as well as Japanese language in public schools. This suggestion is not insistence of 'essentialism' that particular ethnic group must acquire particular language and culture. Rather, this suggestion assumes that the cultural background of the children is compelled to change under the current social environment. In such circumstances, granting the opportunity to learn one's mother tongue or culture will not only nurture respect for their cultural background to the children but also provide a clue to Japanese society in order to change. Thus we can say that the NGOs' proposal is intended to change the social structure as well as instill respect for culture of ethnic minorities according to individual situations, and therefore constitutes an alternative to current proposals.

On the other hand, it is also a fact that the influence of NGO's on policy makers is still very limited. Consequently, national policies may easily use 'multiculturalism' adapted to neo-liberalism. Although we can not know beforehand how the introduction of such multiculturalism into a policy will change the Japanese society and social relationships in the reality, we need to pay attention to what is happening now.

* This is the revised version of the paper read at International Conference 'Varieties of Multiculturalism' held in Kyoto, 22 March 2006.

Notes

- 1) In addition, there are undocumented migrants, who are estimated to more than 200,000. Furthermore there are those who have Japanese nationality while having roots of other countries. The total of these has been about 400,000 since 1952.
- 2) In Japan, the migration policy has always been about 'border control'.
- 3) Okuda and Tajima [1993].
- 4) Inoue, Nawada, and Katsuragi [1992].
- 5) On the other hand, those who don't want to adopt the word 'Kyousei' come to use the word 'Integration' instead of it. 'Integration' means 'equality of social and economic position and difference of culture' (Kajita, Tanno, and Higuchi [2005]).
- 6) It is said that the national policy for migrants is planned to be made public at a not distant date.
- 7) Certainly, some minority groups do not want to be included into mainstream society, but, as Kymlicka

says, most ethnocultural groups within Western democracies want to be full and equal participants in modern liberal societies. He argues, as the 'liberal culturalist', that 'there are compelling interests related to culture and identity which are fully consistent with liberal principles of freedom and equality, and which justify granting special rights to minorities' (Kymlicka [2002: 338-9]).

- 8) In Japan, the phrase of naturalization is more general than that of 'getting citizenship'. Because in Japan naturalization is closely connected with assimilation many people, especially in from first generation of 'Zainichi', have rejected it. However in the third or fourth generation, the number of those who are naturalized is increasing because it is convenient to daily life.
- 9) As Onai deals only with the concrete system as the social structure, his theory lacks the social fluctuation which may influence the concrete system itself, so is static.
- 10) Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, the Council on the Movement of People Across the Borders (The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan), and Japanese Business Federation etc.
- 11) On the other hand, it might be an error to assume that the nationalization of multiculturalism is another characteristic of multiculturalism influenced by neo-liberalism, as Shiohara has argued. Since multiculturalism is a theory concerning national policy from the beginning, it is thought to originally have an aspect of nationalism. In reality, the exclusion of migrants and refugees, which was looked on as the grounds of 'nationalization of multiculturalism' by Shiohara, may be supported by the theory of multiculturalism itself (Ishiyama [2004]). I think that the new dimension of this situation that needs to be understood is that they are excluded as risk, as I argue later.
- 12) Kymlicka [2002].
- 13) This way of thinking is common to suggestions by local government, too.
- 14) <http://www.jca.apc.org/migrant-net/>.

References

- Barry, Brian, 2001, *Culture and Equality*, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt, 1999, *In Search of Politics*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Castles, Stephen, 2004, 'Why migration policies fail', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27(2): 205-27.
- Beck, Ulrich, 1997, *Was ist Globalisierung?*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag. (= 2000 *What is Globalization?*, translated by Patrick Camiller, Cambridge: Polity Press.)
- , 2002, *Das Schweigen der Wörter: Über Terror und Krieg*: Suhrkamp Verlag.
(= 2003 *Sekai risuku shakai (World Risk Society)*, translated by Shimamura Kenichi, Tokyo: Heibonsha.)
- Fraser, Nancy, 1997, *Justice Interruptus*, New York: Routledge.
- Giddens, Anthony, 1998, *The Third Way*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Inoue, Tatsuo, Nawata, Yoshihiko, Katsuragi Takao, 1992, *Kyousei heno Bouken (Adventure for Conviviality)*, Tokyo: Mainichi Shimbunsha.
- Ishiyama, Fumihiko, 2004, "Tabunkashugi to riberarizumu" ("Multiculturalism and Liberalism"), *Shiso (Theory)*, 965.
- Kajita, Takamichi, Tanno Kiyoto, and Higuchi Naoto, 2005, *Kao no mienai teijuuka (Settlement with Invisible Faces)*, Nagoya: Nagoya University Press.
- Kymlicka, Will, 2002, *Contemporary Political Philosophy*, 2nd Edition, Oxford University Press.
- Morris-Suzuki, Tessa, 2002, *Hihanteki Souzouryoku no tameni (For Critical Imagination)*, Tokyo: Heibonsha.
- Okuda, Michihiro, and Tajima, Junko, 1991, *Ikebukuro no Asia-kei Gaikokujin (Asian Foreigners in Ikebukuro)*, Tokyo: Mekon.

Multiculturalism in Japan : A Victory over Assimilationism or Subjection to Neo-Liberalism? (TAKAYA)

- , 1993, *Shinjuku no Asia-kei Gaikokujin (Asian Foreigners in Shinjuku)*, Tokyo: Mekon.
- , 1995, *Shinban Ikebukuro no Asia-kei Gaikokujin (Asian Foreigners in Shinjuku, new edition)*, Tokyo: Mekon.
- Onai, Toru, 1999, 'Kyousei Gainen no Saikentou to Arata na Shiten ('Rethinking the Concept of Conviviality and the New Perspective'), *The Bulletin of Faculty of Education of Hokkaido University*: 79.
- Rose, Nicholas, 1999, *Powers of Freedom*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saito, Junichi, 2005, *Jiyu (Freedom)*, Tokyo: Iwanami Press.
- Shiohara, Yoshikazu, 2005 *Neo-Liberalism jidai no tabunkashugi (Multiculturalism in the time of Neo-Liberalism)*, Sangensha.
- SMJ, 2006, *Gaikokusekijumin tonon Kyousei ni mukete (For the Conviviality of Foreign Residents)*, Tokyo: Gendai Jinbunsha.
- Taylor, Charles, 1994, "The politics of recognition", in Amy Gutmann eds, *Multiculturalism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Young, Iris Marion, 1990, *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.