

OPEN

1

Introduction

Kosuke Shimizu and William S. Bradley

This book is the culmination of research carried out at the Afrasian Research Centre at Ryukoku University in Kyoto, the ancient capital of Japan. Ryukoku University was established in 1639 as a Buddhist educational institution by the Nishihongwanji Temple, the head temple of Shin Buddhism, later becoming a university, and is known as one of the oldest tertiary educational institutions in Japan. The Centre was established in 2005 in conjunction with the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan (MEXT) to facilitate a cooperative research body to explore theoretical and pragmatic inquiries into a wide variety of conflicts and confrontations in the Asia-Pacific region. The Centre aims to provide analysis and suggestions for possibilities of conflict resolutions. Research meetings and international symposia were held each year for the past three years to discuss and exchange information about ongoing conflicts caused by the radical changes and expeditious transformations in an increasingly globalizing world. What became ever more clear through our meetings and symposia was the speed of the changes and transitions in the world and the power of liberal discourses of globalization, which eventually resulted in the alteration to the focus of inquiry. The Centre subsequently shifted its focus more to conflict reconciliation and critical engagement with specific attention to the current policies, discourses, issues, and lived experiences of multiculturalism.

Any conflicts in the contemporary era of globalization, whether micro-level conflicts or macro-level confrontations, are intertwined with the concepts of difference viewed through the prisms of the overarching concepts of culture and civilization. These terms have been utilized in many fields in the past several decades. While we can only offer a brief overview of two of the fields with which the editors are most

knowledgeable (cultural anthropology and international relations), we can claim without too much controversy that culture and civilization, joined as they are historically, have been threading their way into discussions of difference, appearing at crucial junctures to create seemingly unbridgeable chasms between peoples. This is increasingly evident both in media and in everyday use, as well as in social science analyses, like some unfinished business of the past returning to remind one, almost in a melancholy manner, of the excesses of past misdeeds (Gilroy, 2005). Anthropological discussions that blossomed out of the problem of “*Writing Culture*” (Clifford & Marcus, 1986), and the predicament that culture presents for ethnographers and others (Clifford, 1988) exposed the dilemma of trying to pigeonhole entire peoples under a single unifying term, especially when those doing so were the prominent outsider insiders (i.e. anthropologists themselves). However, the complexity of what to do about the grand scheme of difference remains. Arguments for writing “against culture” (Abu-Lughod, 1991) and suggestions to “forget culture” (Brightman, 1995) meant that anthropologists have in the last two decades been extremely wary of an overarching culture concept unified by the “heroic” narratives derived from hard-earned research in the field. While some have suggested that culture can still be retained as a reasonable mode of analysis, especially if care is taken to avoid overgeneralizing (Brumann, 1999), the penchant for thinking against culture as a certifiable category for more than convenience is assumed by much contemporary anthropological research.

Civilization discourses, bound together with the pathology of 20th century modernity out of control (genocide and racism), have also been similarly viewed with scepticism by many social scientists, including in detailed treatments in anthropology (Patterson, 1997) and global history (Mazlish, 2004). Patterson focused on the (not coincidental) historical overlap of Social Darwinism and the discourses of civilization, industry, and progress, illustrating how these were instrumental in the “invention” of barbarian peoples and the ensuing genocidal actions of colonial powers in the Americas through the slave trade and wars with native peoples. Mazlish traced the first usages of the term “civilization” to Victor Mirabeau in 1756 and its link to European colonial ideology—“a racial interpretation of civilization in favour of Europe” (Mazlish, 2004, p. 70)—as the 18th century gave way to the 19th century. Nonetheless, despite such critiques, both culture and civilization have steadily found their way back into common parlance, even for some as synonyms of superior models of human development, particularly (but not entirely) through reactions to political events after September 2001. Any attempt

to analyze, evaluate, and summarize discussions of multiculturalism in theory and practice must first set out to deflate some of the aspects of the supposedly unifying discourse of cultural commonsense. Then it becomes plausible, taking great care to specify the intervening variables and conditions, to recognize concept(s) of cultural “difference” against the backdrop of a concept of a common human universality of recognition and tolerance based on rules and norms of international conduct, whether or not they are termed public, civil, civilized, or otherwise. It is that conundrum that we attempt to address by using conflict reconciliation in the title of this collection. When we discuss this problem in as large a region as the Asia-Pacific, there are bound to be numerous and unavoidable problems of particularism which threaten to negate any kind of generalizability. Even as earlier work on multiculturalism in Asia (Kymlicka & He, 2005) took care to avoid this kind of overgeneralization by focusing on a thick description of cases in many parts of Asia, it cannot be too surprising to find that Asia is occasionally seen to represent some kind of counter to European and North American models of culture and civilization, here and elsewhere. This may be inevitable, but we hope in this volume that we can move beyond such reductionist thinking, which has typified much of the discussion that revolves around the categories of East and West, to name perhaps the most overused and salient simplifying dichotomy. We are additionally aware that, by including the term Asia-Pacific in the title, we may be eliding a discussion of topics that are mostly focused on Japan with areas far and wide. On the other hand, we wish to draw attention to the multiple chapters that analyze phenomena related to migration, language, and politics in Japan in the Asia-Pacific as well as others that are not primarily focused on Japanese people or categories, even if they may be related to territorial aspects of Japan.

Turning our attention to political science, and international relations in particular, one can say that the overwhelming, one might say excessive, attention paid to Samuel Huntington’s “clash of civilizations” thesis has been an archetypal representation of increasing academic concern for the current state of world affairs and its connection to questions of cultural division (Huntington, 1993).

Moreover, as successive publications relating culture and international relations show (Barber, 1996; Fukuyama, 1992; Lebow, 2008; Nye, 2004; Pettman, 2004), the so-called “cultural turn” in the social sciences more generally, and in international relations in particular, has been instrumental in helping to understand conflict, reconciliation, and building understandings between and across diverse populations in localized

settings. As a result, a particular way to read multiculturalism as theory and a set of policies and programs to transcend the normative state of affairs of a world in conflict has come to the fore in the academic world.

In the existing literature of migration studies and international relations, culture has been often mistakenly treated as the one of the root causes of conflict. Jihad versus McWorld (Barber, 1996) and the West and the Rest (Scruton, 2002) are cases in point, let alone Huntington's clash of civilizations. Joseph Nye's excessively state-centered concept of "soft power" also provides a good example in which nation-states are destined to endless competition with each other by utilizing the power of culture (Nye, 2004). What permeates these discourses are stereotypically essentialized liberal interpretations of culture and identity with strict demarcating boundaries of selves *vis-à-vis* the other. As is well known, this interpretation is claimed to be the indispensable foundation of contemporary world affairs on the basis of civilizational clash (Huntington, 1993). This is apparently important not only theoretically, but also for its political implications. In fact, many of the discourses of culture and international relations can be read not as academic inquiry *per se* but also as a form of political manifestation of US global hegemony (Jones, 2002, p. 227). In this sense, the old saying is true that culture is political (Brown, 2006, p. 20), and, in the case of international relations, theory is always for someone for some purpose (Cox, 1981).

In order to avoid repeating this naïve approach and concluding that cultures inherently clash with each other through the process of civilizational confrontations, we draw on theoretical perspectives, expanding horizons spread across diverse disciplines and research areas from micro to macro, from regional studies to international relations, from humanities to social sciences, from everyday language to political terminology and theoretical conceptions, and from civil society to power politics. In order to illustrate this more clearly, we may refer here to the Arendtean (following the work of Hannah Arendt) understanding of the public. To Arendt, the differences among individuals and the existence of the public sphere are intimately intertwined and mutually indispensable. Without the public sphere, a society easily falls into the hands of totalitarianism (Arendt, 1973). What we are concerned with in this research project is similar to what Arendt tried to address. This is the way in which we become able to eschew the coercion of politically and culturally specific interpretations of truth and justice of one party onto the others, while at the same time establishing an interactive and communicative public space for reconciliation of conflicts and

confrontations in the Asia-Pacific region. This space is characterized by interactive and communicative “multiculturality” (an active and formed-in-process type of multiculturalism) in the case of the present studies. In this manner, it is one that does not stop at cautiously advocating the mere coexistence with those from different cultures, but encourages dialog and negotiation among them.

It is precisely at this moment in the second decade of the 21st century that we have a firm conviction that the public sphere is indispensable in constructing an environment for reconciliation. Yet culture narrowly defined in the essentialized way, mainly formulated in the liberal discourse of multiculturalism, does not automatically (or, in any final sense, authentically) provide a ground for dialog or reconciliation among the parties involved in conflict. Here, the concept of interactive and communicative multiculturalism comes to the fore as a form of the public sphere and appears in a way that holds some relevance for transcending the presupposed continuous collision of different cultures. However, even in the framing of multiculturalism, it is argued by some, the essentialized concept of culture still resides robustly in its mainstream discourses (Baumann, 1999; Phillips, 2007).

Accordingly, critical investigation of the widely accepted version of liberal multiculturalism with the essentialized concept of culture becomes particularly imperative. Continuous acceptance of liberal political discourse together with the concomitant interpenetrations of capitalism and globalization has appeared to us as a salient assumption for promoting the doctrine of mutual exchange among individuals with distinctive cultures. Simply put, it claims that we have to be tolerant of those who hold different cultural values and norms. However, culture in this context becomes problematic, as it is implicitly defined in distinctively rigid and inflexible terms. No unitary notion of culture in this context retains the possibility of changes and transformations through encounters and interactions with those who do not possess the same values and norms. Wendy Brown succinctly puts it:

When ... middle and high schoolers are urged to tolerate one another's race, ethnicity, culture, religion, or sexual orientation, there is no suggestion that the differences at issue, or the identities through which these differences are negotiated, have been socially and historically constituted and are themselves the effect of power and hegemonic norms, or even of certain discourses about race, ethnicity, sexuality, and culture. Rather difference itself is what students learn they must tolerate. (Brown, 2006, p. 16)

As a consequence, the multicultural environment in the present context on the basis of liberal discourses of tolerance, in Japan as in other parts of the world, only constitutes a place in which different cultures merely coexist next to each other. This environment occasionally leads to harsh and hostile confrontations in the name of identity politics, and turns out to be a space which is filled up with the stories of who gets what and how. In its barest and most balkanized version of coexistence, it becomes merely an aggregation of different and isolated identities and cultures. The alleged container of “multi-culture” promotes a display of a fixed collection of different cultures, which totally lacks political orientation to address the conflicts and confrontations between cultures by means of continuous dialog and negotiation.

In the discourse of liberal multiculturalism of tolerance, the widespread inclination of academic discourses to associate each culture with the concept of nation-states has been noted. This is particularly so in the case of studies in international relations. The main agents of interactions and diplomatic relations in contemporary world affairs are, needless to say, nation-states. It is often said that the perception of international relations as a discipline has been formulated on the basis of the assumption of the exclusivity of state sovereignty. As a result, world affairs have been described and articulated with the clear distinction between inside and outside (Walker, 1993). Under the given condition of potential anarchy in the world, where no transcendental political bodies or authorities over nation-states exist, individual states are destined to compete with each other militarily, politically, and economically. This is because all nation-states are assumed to be desperate to maintain their sovereignty. This traditional view of international relations has been severely criticized recently by researchers and scholars of such heterodox approaches to world affairs as post-structuralism, critical theories, gender studies, post-colonialism, and non-Western international relations theories (Acharya & Buzan, 2010; Baylis, Smith, & Owens, 2011, chapters 8, 10, 11, 12, 16; Shilliam, 2010).

Among those critical approaches, non-Western international relations theory is the most recent development. However, despite its initial intention to develop and provide new approaches to world affairs, many works of this emerging literature have shown little change in terms of the concepts and methodologies they employ with regard to nation-states (Chen, 2012). The majority of the non-Western international relations discourse confirms the traditional methodology of social science, in which researchers and scholars pursue the notion of universal truth in contemporary world affairs. Consequently, they focus

on the cores and centers of nation-states, and essentialize them with their allegedly distinctive cultures (Shimizu, 2011).

It is here that the concept of culture becomes problematic. While culture itself is very much transformative and unstable by definition, much of the non-Western international relations literature defines culture with pre-given distinctive patterns of thinking and behavior accepted and maintained by the nationals of a given place and which is assumed to be not observable anywhere else. The reason why much of the literature defines culture in such an essentialized manner is its methodological and epistemological modernist orientation of scientific investigation. Modernism has developed with such concepts as ever-continuing progress and civilization, and the development becomes possible only when it is supported by the accurate comprehension of the present (Hamashita, 1994, pp. 2–3). Thus, human progress and civilization have inevitably evolved hand in hand with the positivist scientific epistemology striving for the transcendent and universal truth. Obviously this epistemology assumes the subject/object division, which is inflexible in its ontological quality. The result is the static view towards the object of inquiry as a “thing,” and the acceptance of a rigid concept of culture within liberal multiculturalism can be understood according to this line of reasoning.

As this pursuit of the transcendent and universal truth is a distinctive characteristic of modern knowledge construction in general, the analysis of world affairs with a specific focus on the cores and centers of the world mapping, i.e. nation-states, is not confined to international relations. The critique of methodological nationalism with regard to social sciences has been carried forward by a number of scholars in recent years (Chernilo, 2006; Wimmer and Glick-Schiller, 2002). Area Studies, focusing on the East Asian cultural relations, is not an exception either. In the discourse of Asian Area Studies, much attention has been paid to explaining interactions among different parties in the region with such essentialized and immobile concepts as “Chinese,” “Japanese,” and “Korean” cultures. However, this pre-given analytical framework, based on the concept of nation-state is, we argue, insufficient for fully comprehending, and thus providing a feasible solution for, conflicts and disputes in the Asia Pacific region.

Hamashita (1994) contends in this context that the reason why the contemporary knowledge structures of social sciences and humanities are unable to sufficiently grasp the issues of East Asian politics is due to their ignorance of the margins. Because previous studies have analyzed the region only in terms of nation-states and concomitant

cultures, they miss the underlying layers of socio-economic and cultural interactions and negotiations that profoundly influence the perceptions and identities of locals. These margins are not the margins frequently deployed by such contemporary academic discourses as critical international relations, world systems theories, or subaltern studies. While the latter generally assume the center–periphery relations, with the specific concentric circle regularly denoting the West and the rest, Hamashita contends that there are uncountable and ubiquitous concentric circles in the world, and thus a margin has multiple centers against which it is defined. Utilizing such conceptions is an example of a way to enhance approaches to interactive and communicative multiculturalism.

Taking into consideration the difference between interactive multiculturalism as a political movement striving to establish a public space in the region (Alagappa, 2004) and traditional liberal multiculturalism as a mere collection of individualized and isolated cultures mainly associated with nation-states, we are obliged to ask the question of which multiculturalism we are referring to, and with what methodology we can formulate an interactive multiculturalism. Accordingly, subsequent questions might include: Who are “we” speaking of in reference to multiculturalism? In what capacity are “we” entitled to speak of “others’” cultures? How does the discourse of multilingualism affect the formation of interactive multicultural environments? How do language education policies make impacts on the processes of establishing the public sphere? Is culture the cause of these myriad types of conflict? What is an alternative interpretation of culture that promotes dialog, negotiations, and reconciliation among different cultures? Are these supposedly different cultures significantly different anyway?

The current volume is a collection of research and investigations on multiculturalism to answer these questions in the search for new and alternative ways of comprehending and analyzing multicultural society in Japan embedded in the Asia-Pacific. Individual parts of the book deal with specific foci on multiculturalism: theories, language, and migration and citizenship. These sections are somewhat separate at a glance, but are deeply intertwined with each other, not only at the theoretical level, but at the everyday level of ordinary individuals.

The concrete themes of individual researchers in this volume are diverse, with the many approaches representative of the multiplicity of disciplines. The methodologies are diverse as well, ranging from traditional methodologies, such as empiricist and positivist, to more contemporary constructivist, critical, and post-structuralist approaches. This diversity reflects our commitment to the idea of the public to

represent voices from the margin. In other words, the research program for the Centre itself was established in the public sphere of “interactive multiculturalism,” where intense, continuing negotiations take place between communities and individuals. The authors in this volume have a firm conviction, following extended, cooperative research across different disciplines on conflict and reconciliation, that dialog, negotiation, and reconciliation are the keys to achieving an alternative multiculturalism. This vision extends to both researchers and ordinary citizens. We thus see the present volume as an important contribution to the existing literature on multiculturalism.

1.1 Focus of the three sections

1.1.1 Theories and identities

The chapters in Part I focus on theories and identities of critical multiculturalism, paying specific attention to the contexts of Asia and Japan. While theories of multiculturalism have been increasingly scrutinized and challenged from a wide range of perspectives, they continue to be used as background and support for understanding policies and programs of diversity in societies, not least, for example, in relation to language and language policies (Part II) and migration and citizenship (Part III). The chapters in Part I focus more generally on society in the larger frame, occasionally starting from a national container perspective (while calling attention to the porous boundaries), but where possible drawing on transnational dimensions. This entails that the various chapters come to some critical understanding of processes that transcend the nation-state, as argued above.

As the chapters in Part I show, the definitions of what counts as multicultural are quite diverse—so much so that another challenge arises in deciding if multiculturalism is the primary object of analysis, a cause, an outcome, or just one of the many intervening elements. In looking at some of the dominant versions of liberal globalization, it had been noted that multiculturalism has often become nothing more than a marketing technique for multinational corporations to show sensitivity in the face of their consumer diversification, or viewed even more critically as a Disneyfication of difference (Gilroy, 2005). The intermingling relationship between nation-states and the global economy makes the issue even more complicated. Even if we try to transcend the prevailing territorial concepts, we often end up with wider geographical areas such as Europe, Asia-Pacific, or the “West.” In this case, a version of multiculturalism that is widely accepted is likely to be a multiculturalism of

the nation-state based on existing political and economic hegemonies. As a consequence, we subconsciously speak of a multiculturalism of a particular kind initially formulated for someone for a specific purpose, without noticing the embedded bias. Consequently, these chapters attempt to critically investigate the current discourse of multiculturalism and theorize difference in ways that retain sensitivity to important and self-defined differences (by individuals, communities, and wider polities *inter se*). This hopefully ensures the aim of a multiculturalism which addresses the idea of the public, in the Arendtean sense, while avoiding essentialist and retrogressive understandings of ethnic, racial, national, sexual, and class divisions. Thus, what we call for here is multiculturalism without pre-given essentialized culture (Phillips, 2007).

While these contributions in Part I cannot serve as some finalized theory for the types of empirical analyses of “actually existing” multicultural policies, programs, and dynamics in both the international arena and national societies, they attempt to push past the boundaries pre-set by the established discourses of multiculturalism. They explore how critical analysis of the multiple levels of changes of heretofore (at least nominally) nationally self-contained societies in the 21st century can be better formulated. In so doing, they specifically pay attention to phenomena in the interstices of what is termed multicultural and that mediate between the conceptualization and performance of global and local identities.

1.1.2 Language and language policies

Following the theoretical analysis of multiculturalism, the chapters in Part II deal with the role of language, language policies, and language education in constructing a space for negotiation and dialog among those with different cultural backgrounds. The chapters highlight the variety in multiculturalism, which deserves thorough attention in and through analyzing contemporary society and language. Needless to say, languages are regarded as one of the core factors which constitute cultures. But the reason why we pay specific attention to languages is not confined to this aspect. It also includes the fact that one is forced to use language for the expression of whatever arguments one retains and develops. No one can avoid using language as far as he or she tries to express the judgments and thoughts they come up with. Thus, languages are continually formulated and reformulated in power relations. Or, put more bluntly, languages are always products of certain power or power relations (Baumann, 1999). Controlling language not only rules and manipulates the means of expression, but also profoundly

influences the way in which the contents of thoughts are formulated and constituted. This is why we place a special focus on the issue of language in comprehending contemporary multiculturalism.

Conflicts focused upon in this section include those from personal-level friction between individuals in daily life through to national-level societal problems of the question of English in world politics. Many conflicts at the personal and national level can be attributed to issues of non-native status in and through language: that is, the fact that immigrants are non-native speakers and learners of the language publicly spoken in the host country. Such problems arise despite the official promotion of immigration policies in the globalized world specifically targeted to provide second language education for immigrants, with the expectation that they will be enabled to become competent and contributing members of the host society. This problem is of particular interest in the context of contemporary discourses of multiculturalism because it becomes impossible for recent immigrants to negotiate with the local community when they are deprived of the means of communication and mutual understanding, let alone the problem that the language (and thus the concepts and categories of negotiation) is by no means set by themselves. The same problem is detectable in the context of world politics, where, as is well known, English has been the main language used in understanding contemporary world affairs. An important dimension of this issue is the establishment of appropriate language policies as a primary prerequisite for the creation of a public space, not only for those who have recently immigrated, but also for those who have the responsibility to include them.

By drawing on their critical analysis questioning the current state of language, the chapters in Part II reveal, in terms of perceptions towards the contemporary world and its relation to language, how language influences our intellectual lives and how language has the potential to reformulate our views of the world. It also reveals, in terms of language education policies, how the results of language education policies in the region, particularly in Japan, are by no means matched to the expected goals. The contributors in Part II ask the following questions, among others. Who are the ideal speakers of the hegemonic language? For what purpose are the language norms formulated? How different are the recently introduced bilingual education policies in Japan from those of multilingualism? What are the consequences of the bilingual education policies? What is the ideal language norm which promotes dialog and negotiations in multicultural environments?

1.1.3 Migration and citizenship

After the theory-oriented analysis of multiculturalism in Part I and the policy-oriented analysis of language in Part II, the chapters in Part III concentrate more on empirical analyses of migration and citizenship. These chapters bring together empirical research studies with a particular focus on the dynamics of formal and informal negotiations in multicultural settings in Asia and Japan. Such negotiations become imperative in light of the intensified movement of people resulting from demographic transformations in host countries as well as increasing economic inequalities between sending and receiving countries. Furthermore, for the migrants themselves, these negotiations are a vital element of their “survival strategies” in the host country.

While Part III focuses on formal negotiations, on which there have been some prior studies, it also depicts the implicit and invisible negotiations that take place as people go through their daily activities. This is particularly important in the case of migrants who have to make social, economic, psychological, mental, and other adjustments and transactions as they struggle to survive in the host country’s culture and society. Each analysis in Part III contributes to the discussions on the links between international migration, citizenship, and multiculturalism by directing our attention to existing negotiations.

Culture undeniably plays a key role again in the negotiations between the migrants and the stakeholders in the host society (and sometimes even parties in the sending society like those left behind by the migrants), either as an influencing factor in negotiation or as its consequence. Culture often contributes to the outcome of the negotiation through its influence on the motivations and strategies of the parties involved on the basis of culturally determined notions of language, religion, gender, power, and minority identity. Culture also plays a contextual role as the place where the interactions and negotiation take place. This means that culture can be one of the outcomes. As negotiation progresses and concludes, a new “culture” may take shape, or, in some cases, may be “re”-shaped to accommodate the other’s culture, as in a “hybrid” form of culture in which the identities of both sides are subject to reformulation through dialog. In this process, the state of the public, or a type of multiculturalism as the space of the negotiation, is achieved in which both sides politically agree on a more convivial relationship through reconciliation. Seen in this way, some contributors to Part III consider the public space as a natural by-product of negotiations arising from the international movement of people.

As the number of people moving beyond geographical boundaries increases and globalization of economy via trade, investment, and

information networks, intensifies, the number of negotiations, which are either explicit or implicit, explained or unexplained, and visible or invisible, such as those addressed in this section, is expected to increase. We consider the discussions in this section to be a base for reference in the study of multiculturalism within the context of international migration and citizenship, and our case studies illustrate negotiations that provide the vital links between the phenomena of multiculturalism, migration, and citizenship in the era of globalization.

1.1.4 Issues

Following the introduction, Part I starts with William Bradley's focus on multicultural coexistence in Japan. In Chapter 2, Bradley begins with a discussion of the discourse of multiculturalism and argues that, given that multiculturalism and multicultural policies have been sharply challenged in many parts of the world in the past decade, discussions about what comes after multiculturalism have become more salient. In Japan, debates about multiculturalism (*tabunka kyōsei*) and policies for its implementation have been less vociferous and it could be argued that there is more support than in many other countries (especially Europe), where multiculturalism was at one time more strongly and publicly discussed and supported, at least on some levels. His argument starts by reviewing some examples of multicultural policy in several urban and rural localities in Japan and then moves to a more general discussion of the challenges and necessity for immigration policy and recognition of diversity in Japanese society.

In Chapter 3 Takumi Honda outlines the discourses of multiculturalism in the US regarding immigrants from Japan during the Second World War. Honda focuses on the history of Japanese Americans during that period and shows that this history constitutes part of the wider context of multiculturalism in the US. However, this is not the end of the story. There are Japanese Americans who were disregarded in the story of multiculturalism in the US because they did not fit into the story of what were thought to be good Americans. Honda strives to clarify why they have not been brought into the spotlight, and critically assesses the current discourse of multiculturalism in the US.

In Chapter 4, Lee Gunderson analyzes multiculturalism related to teaching and learning in classrooms that are filled with students who have various linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The purpose here is to develop a multicultural model that can be argued, contested, discussed, and possibly observed and tested in classrooms and schools in Asia. Most countries in Asia are experiencing an increase in school-age

immigrants enrolled in their schools. However, the immigrant enrollment varies widely from country to country, area to area, and school to school. The potential for inclusion can be estimated by comparing the cultural features that immigrants bring to a school with the cultural features of the enrolling school (and teachers). Gunderson argues that, overall, the absolute percentages of immigrant students in a classroom can be hypothesized to roughly predict inclusion/exclusion, along with other factors, so that neither a small number nor a very high number of immigrants will likely be easily included in a classroom.

Part II begins with Chapter 5, by Kosuke Shimizu, which specifically targets the relationship between the English language and international relations as an academic discipline. Shimizu starts his argument by claiming that the issue of language has received insufficient attention in contemporary academic circles, partly because of the uncritical assumption that language is a transparent device conveying the meanings in the mind of the subject. Shimizu criticizes the widely accepted claim that using English is a contradiction in the narratives of the Post-Western political theories, because they mistakenly regard English as a Western language. Against these prevailing notions of language and politics, he conducts a thorough investigation that reveals some hidden and unquestioned assumptions underlying the claims, particularly relating to subjectivity. Shimizu strives to criticize this immature acceptance of a naive equation of English with the West, and argues that English can no longer be seen as a Western-owned language, and politics and international relations must be prepared for negotiations with hitherto undreamt of grammatical transformations of English in order to become more multicultural and more literally an international discipline.

In Chapter 6, Toshinobu Nagamine takes up the MEXT's announcement of a new policy in 2009 to mandate that senior high school English teachers conduct all classes in English. He contends that there is no doubt that the new policy is adding to the pressure on both preservice and inservice teachers. The level of associated anxiety, in addition to the level of pressure, might vary among teachers, possibly due to differing language abilities, school settings, employment status, teaching beliefs, and/or the way teachers perceive realities. Nevertheless, dialog by which critical stakeholders (i.e. teachers) can engage with their questions and challenges is lacking in the current discourse regarding the development and enactment of the new policy. Therefore, a qualitative case study was designed and conducted to explore and investigate English teachers' perceptions of the new policy. The study revealed contextualization of

realities and issues uniquely recognized and perceived by the participants (preservice and inservice EFL teachers). Some implications were proposed for policy-makers, administrators, and teacher educators to develop and implement language education policy successfully in Asian EFL contexts in general and Japanese EFL contexts in particular.

In Chapter 7, Mitsunori Takakuwa contends that in compulsory education in Japanese public schools, English education is the *de facto* foreign language education. However, the majority of Japanese people can live their daily lives without using English. Rather, there are slightly greater chances for them to use other foreign languages, given that Japanese society is becoming more diversified with “internal internationalization.” This is especially the case with teachers at schools in which foreign children who do not have knowledge of the Japanese language are enrolled. In line with the diversification of Japanese society, more effective foreign language education should be implemented, in contrast to MEXT’s current policy of bilingualism, through the teaching not only of English but also other foreign languages that Japanese people may have a chance to use in Japan, and this may lead Japan to become more multicultural.

Part III begins with Chapter 8, in which Rieko Karatani focuses on female overseas workers in Britain. She argues that regional regimes such as the EU and global regimes such as the UN superficially appear to offer hope for female overseas domestic workers (FODWs), yet are favorable only to a limited group of women who are willing to accept the current dominant “power geometry.” As a result, the lives of FODWs, who often end up finding themselves at the bottom of the society of their host countries, are fixed and controlled by the two transnational regimes in addition to the nation-state. Thus, Karatani argues that the benefits of “global householding” in the developed countries are reaped at the expense of damage by “global de-householding” in the developing countries. In this sense, multicultural environments in the developed countries in fact become possible at the cost of stable lives in the developing world.

In Chapter 9, Maria Reinarruth D. Carlos takes up the issue of contemporary migration. She argues that the movement of Filipino nurses is profoundly affected by various factors in the host and intermediary countries, of which one of the most important factors is multiculturalism in the host countries as they consider and migrate to various locations in what she terms “stepwise migration.” Carlos examines the state of multiculturalism in such host countries as Singapore, the UK, Ireland, Australia, and the US, and investigates the extent to which policies based

on multiculturalism in these places influence the selection of the final destination by immigrants. She clarifies the difficulties of host countries in providing stable environments for immigrants, which is particularly important for countries facing a shortage of nurses and an aging society. She further analyzes attempts to deliver possible alternative policies for these new circumstances by paying specific attention to multiculturalism.

In Chapter 10, Shincha Park examines the issue of dual nationality in the Asia-Pacific region, with particular attention to South Korea. In an age of increasing interaction and migration, the issue of nationality is attracting more attention than ever. The issue of dual nationality has traditionally been regarded as a problem of and threat to national sovereignty, but his analysis reveals that recent policies in the region are based on rather different perceptions of dual nationality. In some cases, central governments, explicitly or implicitly, promote dual nationality. What purpose lies behind the policies? What are the consequences of the promotion of dual nationality policies? Who is benefiting from the promotion of dual nationality? By answering these questions, Park analyzes the different attitudes among countries in the region towards the issue of dual nationality, and strives to provide a way to achieve the communicative space in the international arena for migrants.

In Chapter 11, Julian Chapple introduces Japan's "*global jinzai*" (global human resources) policy enthusiastically put forward by MEXT. This is an attempt to promote changes in Japanese society to make it become more outward-looking. This is because stated goals, such as economic development and domestic growth, require Japan to interact on a greater scale internationally. However, the *global jinzai* policy is not free from the nationalistic orientation MEXT has been pursuing in the past 150 years. Sometimes more explicitly, other times less so, such an orientation currently resides in the core of this policy, and never fully commits to an opening towards cosmopolitan multiculturalism, instead favoring a clearly instrumental form. If Japanese society is to embrace multiculturalism, Chapple argues, *global jinzai* offers the potential for and possibilities of creating a required social and mental framework for cosmopolitan vision. However, in order to achieve this goal, it should be emphasized that the policy would need to foster global citizens who are empowered by a strong sense of social responsibility from an unbiased global perspective.

1.2 Concluding remarks

As noted at the beginning of this introduction, this volume covers a collection of diverse disciplines and research areas on multiculturalism

in the Asia-Pacific. The research fields range from migration to language and politics. The research methodology also varies according to the discipline with which the contributors are familiar and their focus on more empirical or theoretical discussion. However, what permeates these diverse chapters is the firm conviction that dialog and negotiation are the key to providing a reconciliation process for the conflicts and confrontations resulting from co-mingling of those with various cultural and historical backgrounds. In order to provide a space in which the dialog and negotiation take place, mere tolerance towards other peoples with diverse cultures is not enough. Critical insight directed toward the concept of culture itself, which is often mistakenly assumed to be rigid and inflexible, is additionally required. It is questioning the assumption of stable cultural bases that enables us to propose what multiculturalism in the 21st century might mean not only to those who formulate migration and language policies, but also to those who reside in the Asia-Pacific region negotiating between conflict and coexistence in the circumstances of an increasingly globalizing world.

References

- Abu-Lughod, L. (1991). Writing against culture. In R. G. Fox (Ed.), *Recapturing anthropology: Working in the present* (pp. 137–162). Santa Fé: School of American Research Press.
- Acharya, A. & Buzan, B. (Eds) (2010). *Non-Western international relations theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia*. London: Routledge.
- Alagappa, M. (Ed.) (2004). *Civil society and political change in Asia: Expanding and contracting democratic space*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Arendt, H. (1973). *The origins of the totalitarianism*. San Diego: Harcourt.
- Barber, B. R. (1996). *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Baumann, G. (1999). *The multicultural riddle: Rethinking national, ethnic, and religious identities*. New York: Routledge.
- Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owens, P. (Eds) (2011). *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations* (5th edn). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brightman, R. (1995). Forget culture: Replacement, transcendence, re-lexification. *Cultural Anthropology* 10(4), 509–546.
- Brown, W. (2006). *Regulating aversion: Tolerance in the age of identity and empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brumann, C. (1999). Writing for culture: Why a successful concept should not be discarded. *Current Anthropology*, 40, Supplement, 1–27.
- Chen, C. C. (2012). The Im/possibility of building indigenous theories in a hegemonic discipline: The case of Japanese international relations, *Asian Perspectives*, 36, 463–492.
- Chernilo, D. (2006). Social theory's methodological nationalism: Myth and reality. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 9(1), 5–22.

- Clifford, J. (1988). *The predicament of culture: Twentieth century ethnography, literature and art*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, J. & Marcus, G. E. (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cox, R. (1981). Social forces, states and world orders: Beyond international relations theory. *Millennium*, 10(2), 126–155.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. London and New York: Penguin Books.
- Gilroy, P. (2005). *Post-colonial melancholia*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hamashita, T. (1994). Shuhenkarano Ajiashi [The Asian history from periphery]. In Y. Mizoguchi, T. Hamashita, N. Hiraish, & H. Miyazaki (Eds), *Shuhenkarano Rekishi* [The History from Periphery] (pp. 1–14). Tokyo: Tokyo University Press.
- Huntington, S. (1993). Clash of civilizations. *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22–49.
- Jones, C. S. (2002). If not a clash, then what? Huntington, Nishida Kitaro and the politics of civilizations. *International Relations of Asia Pacific*, 2(2), 223–243.
- Kymlicka, W. & He, B. (Eds) (2005). *Multiculturalism in Asia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lebow, R. N. (2008). *A cultural theory of international relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mazlish, B. (2004). *Civilization and its contents*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Nye, J. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Patterson, T. C. (1997). *Inventing Western civilization*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Pettman, R. (2004). *Reason, culture, religion: Metaphysics of world politics*. London: Palgrave.
- Phillips, A. (2007). *Multiculturalism without culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Scruton, R. (2002). *The west and the rest: Globalization and terrorist threat*. Wilmington: ISI Books.
- Shilliam, R. (2010). *International relations and non-Western thought: Imperialism, colonialism and investigations of global modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Shimizu, K. (2011). Nishida Kitaro and Japan's interwar foreign policy: War involvement and culturalist political discourse. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 11(1), 157–183.
- Walker, R. B. J. (1993). *Inside/Outside: International relations as political theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wimmer, A. and Glick-Schiller, N. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation-state building, migration, and the social sciences. *Global Networks*, 2(4): 301–334.



Except where otherwise noted, this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>