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Ritu Vij

The papers assembled here share the dual conviction that (1) understanding the lineaments of Japanese modernity entails an appreciation of the specific forms of distinctions, discriminations and exclusions constitutive of it; (2) that the socio-economic-political fractures increasingly visible under conditions of late modernity reveal the precarious nature of the making of modernity in Japan. Bringing together a group of critical intellectuals, mostly based in Japan with long-standing political commitments to groups emblematic of modern Japan’s constitutive outside—minorities, migrants, foreigners, victims of the Fukushima disaster, welfare recipients among others—this collection of essays aims to draw attention to processes of ‘making and un-making’ (Sassen 2011) that constellate Japanese modernity. Unlike previous attempts, however, devoted to de-stabilizing positivist/culturalist approaches to a post-war ‘miracle’ Japan via a critical post-structural theoretical vocabulary and episteme (Yoda and Harootunian 2006), the essays gathered here aim principally to examine traces of the making of modern Japan in the fissures and displacements visible at sites of modernity’s unmaking. Deploying a range of theoretical approaches, rather than a commitment to any single framework, the essays that follow aim to locate contemporary Japan and the ravages of its modernity within a wider critical discourse of modernity.

Long-standing debates about how Japan’s passage from centralized feudalism in the mid-19th century to the ‘capital-nation-state’ (Karatani 2008) in the 20th century can best be recuperated have centered on a few dominant approaches. It is worth briefly noting a few so as to set the stage for the discussions that follow. Chief among these are: (1) Japan as an exemplar case of modernization in which the universal progressive transformation of societies via a process of rationalization produces broadly convergent societies (industrialized, literate, secular, individualized), a view widely embraced by the post-war generation of historians of Japan (Edwin Reischauer, Marius Jansen at the outset, and later, with greater attention to different pathways, Tetsuo Najita, Carol Gluck, Sheldon Garon, Andrew Gordon among others); (2) as an instance of ‘multiple modernities’ in which the persistence of cultural and civilizational forces over the long durée (Eisenstadt 1996; 2000), enable the pursuit of a cultural program of modernity that is distinctive in the institutional constellations...
that it develops, challenging the homogenizing and hegemonic assumptions of western modernity; (3) as a case of ‘alternative modernity’ (Clammer 1995, Arnason 1997; 2000; Gaonkar 2003) characterized by institutional and cultural forms that are different to the modular forms of western modernity but that nonetheless testify to the indigenization of modernity; (4) as a singular attempt to ‘overcome modernity’ (Kyoto School; Calichman 2008) and the consequent passage to a condition of post-modernity enabled by it, by-passing altogether the problem of subjectivity that Takeuchi Yoshimi, one of Japan’s foremost philosophers, described as coterminous with modernity. Maruyama Masao’s influential claim about the weakness of personal autonomy in Japan (the classical liberal self) serves also to ground claims about Japan’s unmediated passage from pre to post-modernity; (5) and finally, as an embodiment, no more no less, of uneven capitalist development, its specificity contained in the simultaneity of non-contemporaneous but coeval times contained in the everyday (Harootunian 2000).

If modernity, however, following Foucault’s reading of Kant (1984), should not be seen as an epoch but rather as an attitude, one that conjoins the spirit of critique with an understanding of the individual as an autonomous subject within a historical mode of being, the question of the specificity of Japan’s modernity entails attention to on-going processes of its making and un-making that serve therefore as the focus of the deliberations here. Rather than read modernity off a set of objective indicators, or take a binary view of modernity’s presence or absence, the claim that modernity is an ongoing political-economic project in which political struggles and practices by social agents can contest, disrupt, transform or re-inscribe its core elements must be made central to analysis.

With this brief comment on the parameters of debates about Japanese modernity in mind, the essays that follow are organized in three sections. The first examines the vicissitudes of Japanese modernity; the second interrogates the ground of citizenship, migrants and welfare in the construction of modern Japan; the third reflects on the inversions/reinscription of categories of Japan’s modernity in the aftermath of the Fukushima Daiichi disaster of March 2011.

Focussing on the naturalization of modernity and its effects in contemporary Japan, and the inter-play of knowledge and power that interpellates Japanese modernity in terms that are at once occidentalist and orientalist at different times, the first section provides a different angle on the specificity of Japanese modernity seen from the vantage point of the precarisation of life that has followed in the aftermath of three disasters that define 21st century Japan: the bursting of Japan’s economic bubble in the early 1990s and the two decades
of lost growth (*ushinawareta nijuen*) that followed, the Fukushima Daiichi disaster of 3/11, and the rise of ethno-nationalism/militarism represented by the present government of Abe Shinzo.

The opening essay by Carl Cassegard offers a novel theorization of the contemporary conjuncture in Japan—and arguably elsewhere—in reference to what he conceives of as naturalized modernity. Against classical accounts of capitalist modernity in terms of ruptures, shocks, or disasters, Cassegard develops an argument about the “taken-for-grantedness” (naturalization) of insecurity, solitude and the destruction of social relations under conditions of late modernity. Unlike Walter Benjamin’s account of the destruction of aura or disenchantment as the reason for the enervation of social ties that generates a heightened consciousness, a “protective shield” in defense against processes of atomization that “splinter” libidinal ties by virtue of the system of contractual exchange characteristic of capitalist social relations, Cassegard foregrounds privatization as the condition that generates a withdrawal from social ties. Privatization—the redirection of libidinal investments away from relations between people to the safer non-social domain (of consumer objects)—renders insecurity and solitude the new order of things in which obscurity, incomprehensibility and complexity is tolerated, if not enjoyed. Exemplified in Murakami Haruki’s fictional characters, Cassegard’s account of “the embrace of self-imposed isolation and solitude” in contemporary Japan’s social landscape offers a powerful heuristic that renders explicable a range of social phenomena including that of the *hikikomori* (shut-ins) or social withdrawal, *manga* and *anime* obsessed *otaku* sub-culture, *sekkusu shinai shokogun* (celibacy syndrome) that registers a flight from human intimacy in Japan. More generally, however, Cassegard’s account of the melancholic turn away from social relatedness consequent on the normalization of insecurity renders Japan’s naturalized modernity emblematic of a larger socio-economic-affective transformation discernible in much of the advanced industrialized western world today.

Kinhide Mushakoji’s essay departs from the straightjacket of academic writing to offer an uncharacteristically personal account of the occlusions that have shaped the making of modern Japan. Building on his long experience as one of Japan’s best known intellectuals and a vocal critic of the government’s embrace of liberal imperialism, especially in relation to its Asian neighbours, Mushakoji offers a counter-intuitive account of the ethno-politics of contemporary Japan. In distinction to both Orientalist and Occidentalist west-centric versions of Japanese modernity, the essay draws attention to the invidious return of notions of ethnic supremacy in Abe Shinzo’s contemporary state project and the occlusion of a long-standing tradition in Japan of pluralistic co-existence.
among diverse communities. In drawing attention to the occlusions shaped by the entanglements of Japanese colonialism and state-building with American hegemony, Mushakoji attempts to locate practices of exclusion within Japan (and vis-à-vis its Asian neighbors) in an account of what he contends is a civilizational project, best thought of as “Smart Occidentalism”, dominant in contemporary Japan.

In the first of three essays in the section on Citizenship, Migrants and Welfare in Modern Japan, Hironori Onuki examines the long durée of transborder migration in Japan to uncover the contradictions between Japan’s deployment of labour-importing strategies to ensure a continued supply of workers, and the myth of ethnic homogeneity that grounds practices of othering at best, and xenophobic hysteria at worst, vis-a-vis migrant workers. Uncovering state practices of making and un-making migrants as acceptable or dangerous, given the state’s ‘developmental’ agenda since the Meiji Restoration of 1868, Onuki traces the production of the ‘self-illusion’ of ethnic homogeneity (minzoku) and its deployment in the criminalization of migrants today to the tension at the core of Japan’s modernity: its historical reliance on “trans-border labour importing means to ensure the continued supply of the workforce,” and the myth of monoethnicity that grounds the claim of haigai shugi (nativism) central to the making of Japan’s nation-state imaginary. Maintaining this delicate balance between the economic need for and cultural repudiation of migrant workers, is, Onuki suggests, key to the current program of late modernity in neoliberal Japan. Strategically pursuing strategies aimed at the flexibilization of the labour force (both domestic and foreign), programs of ‘cosmetic multiculturalism’ since the mid-1990s have simultaneously expanded the acceptance of unskilled migrant workers but on a strictly temporary basis, while leaving intact the “(self)-illusion of ethnic homogeneity.” As Giorgio Shani’s paper in the third section demonstrates, by viewing migrants primarily through the prism of cultural difference (at the local level), and as Onuki clearly shows here, recognition of the contribution of migrants to the economic security of Japan is suppressed. Onuki’s contribution clearly identifies key moments in Japan’s past and present in the making and re-making of this constitutive tension of Japan’s modernity.

Next, Reiko Shindo examines the paradox of ‘Pretended Citizenship’ in the practices of legal migrants (specifically interns and trainees), to advance a claim about the re-making of ‘resistance’ and political subjects in contemporary Japan. Going against the grain of much contemporary scholarship on citizenship, including by those critical of a state-centric discourse that aligns citizenship with legality, rights, and above all sovereignty, and its related regime of mo-
bility control that draws lines of distinction between legal and illegal border crossings, Shindo directs attention to the border itself as a site of control and resistance by those who, as she puts it, ‘inhabit’ the border. Taking issue with critical citizenship studies whose focus on irregular or illegal migrants’ struggle for legal status reinscribes state control of mobility and the inside/outside logic that is constitutive of it, Shindo turns her attention to how legal migrants, authorized to enter Japan as trainees and interns, subvert the statist logic of inclusion/exclusion by becoming workers, albeit low-waged, in an economy with a chronic shortage of labour. Legitimate in terms of their legal status, trainees and interns, are recognised as being indispensable to the labour force and “are thus treated as de facto workers.” Their legal status notwithstanding, trainees and interns enter the terrain of illegality as workers, together with ‘irregular’ workers subject to the depredations of low pay, harsh working conditions and the threat of deportation by employers given any overt challenge to the terms of their employment. By inverting the meanings of legality/illegality, legal migrants, Shindo suggests, offer an alternative context-specific understanding of the making of citizenship that enables a shift away from the state’s putative control over mobility as the axiomatic focus of critical citizenship studies. In the context of Japan especially, Shindo’s argument gestures towards an alternative political praxis in which legal migrants, with the support of local groups, can catalyse changes in employment law and practices. Shindo’s paper clearly illustrates the making/un-making and re-making lines of distinction between legal and illegal migrants, central to maintaining the order of things in late modern Japan.

Echoing the theme of difference and its occlusion that appears through many of the essays here (Mushakoji, Shani, Onuki, Shindo), albeit re-conceived here in terms of the differentials of disadvantages, Reiko Gotoh’s essay draws attention to the limits of the principle of universal liberalism and consumption security that characterizes post-war Japan’s welfare state. Arguing against an income-based approach to welfare that remains singularly ill-equipped to deliver the range of goods deemed central to well-being on a variety of registers, Gotoh urges a more expansive vision of welfare, better attuned to “disadvantage differentials”. In light of qualitatively distinct disadvantages among recipients (a disabled person vs. a single mother), the normative basis of welfare as the provision of well-being is better served, Gotoh suggests, if grounded in Amartaya Sen’s capabilities approach to enable the ‘doings and beings’ of differently disadvantaged recipients. In bringing an economist’s perspective to the question of difference in the context of contemporary Japan, Gotoh’s argument militates against a merely cultural reading of difference, and urges a
re-making of Japanese welfare provision consistent with the ideal of “equality of differences”.

The third section offers a set of counter-intuitive readings of the 3/11 Fukushima Daiichi disaster and its aftermath. Inverting traditional Japanese approaches to natural phenomena, including the arrival of foreigners, as tantamount to the negligence of the ruling class, (since social order is presumably based on nature), the three articles included in this section refuse the nature/culture binary central to western modernity and claims about its isomorphism in Japanese modernity. Focussing rather on the making of the Fukushima Daiichi disaster as a nature-culture ‘hybrid monster’ (Hiroyuki Tosa), as a traumatic site for re-imagining ethnic homogeneity, a central pillar of the making of Japan’s ‘capital-nation-state’ (Giorgio Shani), and generative in the re/creation of a ‘community of destiny’ within Japan (Paul Dumouchel), the three essays considered together offer insight into Fukushima as emblematic of the making of the abyss of modernity, and the fatalities unleashed by the failure of techno-scientific attempts to master the modern order of things. Fukushima, as interpreted here, represents both the series of crises, disasters and contingencies without cataclysmic end or transcendence equated with modernity, and an occasion for re-stabilizing a social order rendered increasingly precarious under conditions of late modernity. Echoing Naomi Klein’s notion of ‘Disaster capitalism’ in *The Shock Doctrine*, (where disasters enable a strident re-making of structures of wealth distribution in favour of the 1 percent), albeit on a different register here, the shock of the Fukushima Daiichi disaster occasions a re-making of citizens into resilient subjects, the re-making/re-imagining of a multi-cultural society into an ethnically homogenized one, and the re-making of the divisions between the real victims of the disaster and those who contributed to it (the political-technocratic-bureaucratic-corporate elites), into a shared ‘community of destiny’ that is the polity itself. Fukushima as traumatic event re-makes Japan *qua* Japan here. Inasmuch as the Japanese modern is contained within the ‘borromean rings’ of its capital-nation-state (Karatani 2008), the essays in this section testify to the remaking of two of the three rings of Japanese modernity, namely the nation and the state, but do not address its third, arguably more vexed, element: capital.

Hiroyuki Tosa’s essay, ‘The Failed Nuclear Risk Governance,’ deploys Bruno Latour’s conception of modernity as a dual process of purification (the nature/culture binary) and hybridization (the mix of nature and culture) to interpret the Fukushima Daiichi disaster as a ‘hybrid monster’ produced as the conjoined effects of nature, technology, and political judgements about the trade-off between the benefits of nuclear expansion and the risk of climate change

and human safety. Detailing the politics of the development of Japan’s nuclear programme, including the lasting influence of President Eisenhower’s advocacy of nuclear energy as ‘atoms of peace,’ Tosa draws attention to the social/political construction of ‘risk,’ and the bio-political re-making of citizens as subjects of resilience in instances where the misfortune of putatively ‘black swan events’ like Fukushima (rendered an accident of nature and therefore beyond technological or regulatory control) elides the role of politics in making populations potentially vulnerable to nuclear accidents. By re-politicizing the depoliticized space of modern science and technology in Japan, Tosa locates the Fukushima Daiichi disaster in ongoing attempts to create technologies of governance that are increasingly bio-political, directed at the creation of subjects of resilience in a world of endless uncertainties. Late modernity in Japan, on Tosa’s reading, offers little hope for the reinscription of zones of comfort or sociality conventionally associated with Japanese modernity (family, kaisha (corporation), even kokka [state]) but rather pits the population of Japan alongside others elsewhere subject to similar processes of bio-political re-making.

Advancing a somewhat different claim, Giorgio Shani’s essay explores the re-inscription of ethno-nationalism and its subtle deployment in post-3/11 Japan. Drawing on bio-political divisions between racialized others—objects of Human Security discourse in the Global South—and their reproduction within Japan in zones of abjection and exclusion created by the triple disaster of 3/11 (earthquake, tsunami and nuclear accident), Shani shows how 3/11, presented as a traumatic event mobilizes a discourse of Ganbaru Nippon (Do your best Japan!)—a discursive re-making of a nationalist myth of ethnicity, even as the state effectively abandons the victims of the disaster, reduced now to the status of ‘bare life’ or internal others. Echoing Tosa’s theme of the re-making of citizens, (particularly the residents of the Tohoku region, the immediate victims of 3/11), into resilient subjects, Shani’s discussion of the re-inscription of the ethnic/national imaginary occasioned by the disaster provides a clear instance of the making of the nation as an ongoing political practice.

A second move in the paper, however, draws attention to the occlusions upon which this re-making of an ethnic imaginary depends. Critically examining a new discourse of tabunka kyōsei (multicultural co-existence) that privileges cultural difference between zainichi Koreans and Chinese and migrants from China, South and South-East Asia, and the ethnically Japanese, the discourse of multiculturalism not only re-inscribes notions of minzoku (ethnicity) in the nationalist imaginary, but also occludes a long history of ethnic pluralism within Japan. By limiting the reach of policy-shifts in recognition of tabunka kyōsei exclusively to the local level, however, practices of local coexistence (chiiki...
kyōsei) extending denizen rights to migrants at the municipality or ward level, contain the potentially subversive effects on notions of ethnic homogeneity at the national level, and forestall the un-making of a nationalist imaginary of an ethnic community. Considered together, the twin discourses of Ganbarō Nippon and tabunka kyōsei entail a set of practices that contribute to the re-making of a nationalist imaginary and the (re)production of internal others who serve as the constitutive outside of late modernity in contemporary Japan.

Finally, Paul Dumouchel’s ‘Reciprocity: Nuclear Risk and Responsibility’ offers a counter-intuitive reading of the normative/political role played by those hit by the Fukushima Daiichi disaster: those who died, those who were displaced, and those whose health has been permanently jeopardized by radiation unleashed by the nuclear meltdown are not hapless victims of natural/technical/political disaster, but rather agents whose contribution to building a ‘community of destiny’—a future in which such disasters cannot happen again—should be seen as a form of reciprocity for the help extended to them at the time of the disaster. Deploying Jean-Pierre Dupuy’s concept of time inversion (in which the present is evaluated from the standpoint of the future such that it simultaneously transforms the past), Dumouchel makes a persuasive case showing how victims of the Fukushima disaster ‘by virtue of having being the victims of this accident’ authorize an anti-nuclear discourse that gains legitimacy and generates action (citizen protests, policy-recommendations at the local and national level), that calls into being a shared sense of risk. Inverting the pedagogical function of the ‘other’ in naturalizing hierarchies in a given order, however, Dumouchel’s re-conceptualization of Fukushima Daiichi victims as reciprocal agents, serves to constellate the safety of the future of the Japanese community as one in which, paradoxically, the institutionalization of governance structures in which risks are made permanent also creates a community in which damage is permanent (i.e. never irrevocably eliminated). Fukushima’s allegorical function here is deeply political.
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Naturalized Modernity and the Resistance it Evokes: Sociological Theory Meets Murakami Haruki

Carl Cassegard

Abstract

Shock has often been viewed as emblematic of modernity. Paradigmatic in this respect are the theories of Benjamin and Simmel. However, an equally important experience in modern societies is that of naturalization. This article attempts to investigate the implications of this experience for the theory of modernity through a discussion of contemporary Japanese literature, in particular the works of Murakami Haruki. I argue that just as the focus on shock enabled Benjamin and Simmel to illuminate the interconnectedness of a particular constellation of themes—the heightened consciousness or intellectualism of modernity, the destruction of aura or disenchantment, and the resulting spleen or Bläsertheit—so the focus on naturalization will contribute to an understanding of how themes such as the sense of complexity or ‘obscurity’, the phenomenon of ‘re-enchantment’ or ‘post-secularity’, and the increasing role of ‘non-social’ spheres in late modernity are interrelated.

What is the defining formative experience of modernity? Walter Benjamin provides a famous answer in Some Motifs in Baudelaire (1939), where he claims that the price for ‘the sensation of modernity’ is ‘the disintegration of the aura in the experience of shock’ (Benjamin 1997, 154). He arrived at this formula through his interpretation of the shocks experienced in the Parisian crowd as a key experience in the poetry of Baudelaire, for whom these shocks were not simply menacing, but also a source of intoxication and inexhaustible novelty. At the time of the second empire, Benjamin writes, the Parisian flâneurs obtained ‘the unfailing remedy’ for their boredom in the crowd. ‘Anyone who is capable of being bored in a crowd is a blockhead. I repeat: a blockhead, and a contemptible one’, he quotes Constantin Guy, a painter and friend of Baudelaire (ibid. 1997, 37). Benjamin is not alone in elevating the shock-sensation to a central feature of modernity. The portrayal of modernity in virtually all classics of sociology—Simmel, Tönnies, Marx, Weber, and Durkheim—resonates with a pervasive feeling of upheaval and crisis, and with an unsettling awareness of contingency and insecurity. In a sense, shock has become emblematic of modernity.

1 The article summarizes and builds on arguments from Cassegard (2007).
2 Simmel takes the overabundance of stimuli and the intensified nerve-life of the city as the starting point of his analysis of the modern metropolis. Tönnies’ notion of Gé-
Ethno-politics in Contemporary Japan: The Mutual-Occlusion of Orientalism and Occidentalism

Kinhide Mushakoji

Abstract
This essay offers a critical reading of Japan’s attempt to craft a modern identity. Eschewing the conventions of most scholarly writings, however, the essay builds on a personal history of political and intellectual engagement with key figures in post-war Japan to outline a counter-narrative about the ethno-politics of contemporary Japan.

In distinction to both Orientalist and Occidentalist versions of Japanese modernity, the essay draws attention to the invidious return of notions of ethnic supremacy in Abe Shinzo’s contemporary state project and the occlusion of a long-standing tradition in Japan of pluralistic co-existence among diverse communities. In drawing attention to the occlusions shaped by the entanglements of Japanese colonialism and state-building with American hegemony, this essay attempts to locate practices of exclusion within Japan (and vis-à-vis its Asian neighbors) in an account of what the essay contends is a civilizational project, best thought of as “Smart Occidentalism”, dominant in in contemporary Japan.

Introductory Remarks

The present article is not a scientific report. It is a personal report by a Japanese intellectual. In the good old days tradition, when cultural anthropology was a science of the West on the Rest, there used to be a distinction between the researcher and the ‘informant’. The scholar from the west was writing his or her scientific report on the basis of information provided by the informant, a narrator of the exotic happenings in the rest of the world for the western scientist to analyze.

I am making this point not as an Occidentalist statement criticizing this Orientalist situation. It is rather because I wish to be allowed to narrate my story as freely as I can, and not be burdened by the need of “scientific” writers to be “objective”. I will tell my story based on an historically unproved interpretation of modern Japan. This will permit me to tell a story of Abe Shinzo in the context of my own personal history. I will use my personal academic contacts with Shimizu Ikutaro to develop a pseudo theory on what I call ethno-politics
A DILEMMA IN MODERN JAPAN? MIGRANT WORKERS AND THE (SELF-)ILLUSION OF HOMOGENEITY

Hironori Onuki

Abstract

Transnational labour migration has recently returned to the spotlight in Japan, due to its rapidly declining population and labour force. This paper argues that the tension between the (self-)illusion of Japan as a homogeneous nation-state and trans-border labour-importing to ensure the continued supply of the workforce has inherently characterized the process of Japan’s modernity since the Meiji Restoration of 1868. In doing so, it seeks to demonstrate how the synchrony of such ostensibly conflicting interests makes eminent economic sense to recruit migrant workers in order to ameliorate chronic labour shortages while keeping their labouring and living condition perpetually insecure and vulnerable.

A trial calculation released by Japan’s Cabinet Office on February 24, 2014, has rekindled an interest in transnational migration to offset the projected decreases of its population and workforce. This calculation (Cabinet Office 2014), prepared at an expert panel discussing Japan’s future challenges under the Council of Economic and Fiscal Policy, presented the scenario that the annual reception of 200,000 migrants from 2015 along with the rebound of its fertility rate—1.4 in 2012 (MHLW 2014) to around 2.0—would make it possible to maintain the population above 100 million over the next century. Japan currently has a population of 127 million, but the National Institute of Population and Social Security Research (2012) projects that the figure will drop to 42 million in 2110, unless something is done to change the recent demographic condition of shoshi koreika (declining birth rates and an aging population). It is forecasted that 4 in every 10 of the Japanese will be aged 65 or older and the working-age population (15–64) will fall from 80 million to 21 million. With consideration of these estimates, the Cabinet Office envisaged that the introduction of migrants, who will settle and have children in Japan, would increase 22 million and boost the 2110 figures of Japan’s population to 114 million, if the birth rates were also to rise. Whereas denying the possibility for reflecting the Cabinet Office’s calculation in the policy, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and his Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) have been stimulating the move to expand the influx of migrant workers to Japan with the aim to plug gaps in a rapidly shrinking workforce (J-Cast News 2014, The Japan Times 2014).
Pretended Citizenship: Rewriting the Meaning of Il-/Legality

Reiko Shindo

Abstract
This paper examines the on-going debate on the conceptual usefulness of citizenship as an analytic tool, arguing that the academic debate often assumes that resistance to state control of mobility is manifested only in refusal to accept the il/legal boundary. Such an assumption leads to a tendency in the debate to privilege irregular migrants' experiences. By looking at regular migrants who come to Japan with a legal status and the ways in which they negotiate the il/legal boundary, the paper highlights different practices of resisting state control: namely practices that pretend to accept state control while quietly rewriting the meaning of il-/legality.

Introduction
In the past 10 years, the citizenship scholarship has taken an exciting turn to focus on the political implications of protests organised by people without status.¹ What initiates this key turn is the idea of acts of citizenship which theorises citizenship as a site of resistance to state control.² Despite lack of citizenship status, immigrant protesters act as if they were citizens. This challenges the traditional assumption of citizenship where only people with citizenship status become legitimate political actors. Immigrant protests manifest struggles not simply to obtain legal status but, more crucially, to be recognised as “someone with an audible and corporeal presence that can be described as ‘political’”.³ By organising protests, irregular migrants make themselves visible and audible and challenge the silent position allocated to them.

In this line of thinking, immigrant protesters are what Nyers call “emerging political subjects”.⁴ They are not a priori subjects defined by the statist frame-

---

What Japan Has Left Behind in the Course of Establishing a Welfare State

Reiko Gotoh

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to examine the direction which the Japanese welfare state has pursued and what it has left behind, by contrasting the points of view of two representative approaches in economics: the traditional income approach and the capability approach which has been newly proposed by Amartya Sen. In extracting the structure of the tax-social security system, the paper refers to the framework of John Rawls, precepts of “common sense of justice” and their higher principles in his theory of justice. The main conclusion is that Japanese welfare state has followed universal liberalism based on continuity, the essential characteristic of the income approach, and has left behind the equality of the differences. This paper indicates that the capability approach which makes it possible to analyze the discontinuity within an individual’s life by focusing on her doings and beings is also suitable for understanding the differences among individuals.

Introduction

Behind social institutions there exists a balance of precepts of “common sense of justice” (Rawls, 1971), each of which is widely accepted by people, but the structure of which is not so explicit. Here let us call them simply “precepts of fairness”. The purpose of this paper is first, to explicate, in regard to the underlying balance of “precepts of fairness”, the basic structure of institutions of income taxes and social security in Japan. This has recently become transparent through the “comprehensive reform of tax and social security” which was undertaken by the previous government, led by the Democratic Party in 2009 and which has been taken over by the current government, led by the Liberal Democratic Party, and its economic program of “Abenomics”, through the imposition of a consumption tax hike from 5% to 10% (in 2017).

According to John Rawls’ theory the balance of “precepts of fairness” can change depending not only on social circumstances but also on the higher principles of justice. In fact, in the history of the Japanese welfare state, it is in discussions on the institution of public assistance that the work of higher principles can be most clearly recognized and have been explicitly debated. The
The Failed Nuclear Risk Governance: Reflections on the Boundary between Misfortune and Injustice in the case of the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Disaster

Hiroyuki Tosa

Abstract
Although technological progress has greatly created the possibilities for the expanded reach of risk management, its newly manufactured uncertainty may bring about a big scale of catastrophe. In order to control risk of the nature, the human ironically may create a hybrid monster that the human cannot control. The Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster also can be described as a hybrid monster, in which natural and technological elements combine to produce uncontrollable risks that may have disastrous consequences. This article scrutinizes the politics of the boundary between calculable risks and unpredictable uncertainty as well as the politics of the boundary between misfortune and injustice by focusing upon the lineage of a hybrid monster such as the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster. Following the check of implications of a hybrid monster, we will interrogate historical lineage. Third we will examine the way in which technocratic politics of <risk/uncertainty> would influence the boundary between misfortune and injustice. Fourth we will scrutinize problems with the probabilist way of thinking, which tends to suppress the risk of nuclear technology. Finally we shed a light on technocratic governance forcing the people to become resilient.

As recent Science and Technology Studies (STS) literature suggests that scientific and technical knowledge needs to be seen as situated in social and material spaces (Simondo 2010, 204, O’Malley 2004), political interests would shape the presentation of scientific facts and predictions in areas of high uncertainty (Heazle 2010, Jasanoff 1990, 6) and the configuration of political actors in each country may bring about the different perceptions of risk and its related different regulatory policy (Jasanoff 2005, Brickman, Jasanoff, and Ilgen 1985, Vogel 2012, Jasanoff 2012, 23–58). As scientific knowledge becomes more closely aligned with economic and political power, new expert elites try to manipulate the unknown uncertainty in accordance with its vested interests in the name of risk management. Particularly in the field of the post-normal science where system uncertainties and value-loadings (decision stakes) are high, the political would become conspicuous (Funtowicz and Ravetz 2003). In addition, since risk is driven by mental perception, there are various kinds
Reciprocity: Nuclear Risk and Responsibility

Paul Dumouchel

Abstract

Focusing on the March 2011 Fukushima nuclear accident, this article argues that there is or can be a form of reciprocity between the victims of a catastrophe and society at large to the extent that victims become the occasion and rationale for social reforms. The victims' contribution to society in this case is the simple fact of being victims. Such a form of reciprocity requires a particular relation to time which Jean-Pierre Dupuy has recently analyzed. In the case of modern risks such as nuclear risk, the contribution of the victims is not only to a better future, but also takes place in the present by rendering patent risks which, as Ulrich Beck argued, though they are known tend to remain socially invisible.

Reciprocity

According to the official report of The Fukushima Nuclear Accident Independent Commission prepared for the National Diet of Japan, Sato Yuhei, Governor of Fukushima Prefecture at the time of the accident when interviewed by the commission at one point declared that: “National support has been broadly extended to Fukushima and its people since the disaster. To reciprocate, Sato said that he wants to contribute by building a community with the promise not to let a similar disaster ever happen again.” At the personal level this is a very straightforward and clear illustration of the idea of reciprocity: you have done something for us, by helping us when we were in need, and in return we would like to do something for you. We wish to contribute to making sure that such a disaster never happens again. This comment implies in fact a rather complex and unusual form of reciprocity, which it hides, in spite of, or perhaps because of, its apparent evidence and transparency.

First, why, how, in what way does contributing to building a community where similar disasters will never happen again, constitute a form of reciprocity? Governor Sato assumes that this is evidently the case, but why is it so? The evident, but never explicitly stated answer is because similar nuclear accidents threaten all of Japan; preventing them is an important urgent task.

Civil Religion in Greece: A Study in the Theory of Multiple Modernities

Manussos Marangudakis

Abstract

The article examines the moral sources and the cultural codifications of civil religion in Greece as this has been shaped by a series of historical contingencies and social forces. It identifies a certain developmental process from a "sponsored" by state and church civil religion (1830–1974) to an autonomous civil religion (1974–today). This development was not the result of an automatic process of social differentiation, but a cultural mutation caused by historical contingencies and the presence of charismatic social elites that instigated the change. Following the premises of the theory of multiple modernities, the analysis identifies foundational cultural patterns on which both sponsored and autonomous civil religions are based upon, patterns that can be traced back to Orthodox religious ontological and cosmological principles as well as visions of the moral self. These premises became the modality of a modern and secular, yet schismogenetic civil religion that functions simultaneously as a force of social cohesion and of social rupture.

Introduction

Either as a spontaneous social product (Durkheim 1912/1961; Bellah 1967), or as a manufactured political resource (Rousseau 1762a/1973), civil religion is assumed to be as mechanism for achieving social cohesion. From Rousseau and Durkheim, to Bellah, Coleman (1970) and Cristi (2009), the concept is envisioned to reflect a moral binding force which allows the formation of the body politique as a moral force behind civic virtue. Yet, this is an analytic assumption rather than an empirical observation, based upon Durkheim’s claim that “religion” is the mechanism that necessarily creates social cohesion. This supposition led to analysis focusing on the forms civil religion might take (e.g., Coleman, 1970; Jacobsen, 2009) or its sheer existence (Flere 2009), rather than on the substantive qualities that animate and distinguish it.

Yet, the substantive qualities of a certain civil religion could be, analytically speaking, as important as its external form, since “religion” is more than a functional prerequisite for social cohesion. Rather, it formulates particular and, more or less, specific ways of linking the individual and the collectivity to the ultimate source of morality, meaning and salvation based upon the
Abstract
The aim of this paper is to show that science, understood as pure research, ought not to be affected by non-epistemic values and thus to defend the traditional ideal of value-free science. First, we will trace the distinction between science and technology, arguing that science should be identified with pure research and that any non-epistemic concern should be directed toward technology and technological research. Second, we will examine different kinds of values and the roles they can play in scientific research to argue that science understood as pure research is mostly (descriptively) and in any case ought to be (normatively) value-free. Third, we will consider and dismiss some widespread arguments that aim to defend, especially at a normative level, the inevitable value-ladenness of science. Finally, we will briefly return to the connections among science, technology, and values.

1. Introduction

The intrinsic epistemic value of science and scientific knowledge is a topic of wide and varied interest, as demonstrated not only by the great amount of philosophical, historical, sociological, and anthropological reflection on it, but also by the fact that many philosophers, historians, sociologists, and anthropologists of science who aim either to emphasise or to reframe this value are well-known to the general public (some examples include Karl Popper, Thomas Kuhn, Paul Feyerabend, Imre Lakatos, and Bruno Latour). Further, we generally consider ourselves epistemically superior to our ancestors because we possess a more advanced scientific knowledge about the world. For instance, contrary to most of our predecessors, we have knowledge of such phenomena as the speed of light, the structure of the atom, the number of planets in the solar system, the nature of electricity and magnetism, and the gas laws. In retrospect, it is difficult to argue that science makes no epistemic progress and that the growth of our society does not largely depend on it. Defending the intrinsic value of scientific knowledge, of course, we do not deny that an extrinsic value also exists, nor do we ignore the possibility of transferring scientific knowledge
The Challenge of Creativity: 
A Diagnosis of our Times

Celso Sánchez Capdequí

Abstract

This article analyzes the idea of creativity due to its relevance in our habits and lifestyles. Until recent times the creativity was only a skill of artist, but now it has became in a normal activity for the rest of society. We must be creative. This is the new creative ethos. The core of article insist on the axial origin of this idea. And it intends to remember the reasons that explain its emergence and to re-think the outcomes of the axial revolutions, specially, the ideas of creativity and transcendence without the help of myth of secularization. The Thought of second degree will occupy a central place in this article in order to explain the importance of axial cultures for the future of the human history.

The appearance of the axial cultures in the second half of the 1st century BC brought about far-reaching changes in the history of humanity, and at the same time introduced new, never-before-seen elements into the way in which the world was depicted: transcendence and creativity. Up to that time, the monism of pre-axial cultures was the principle around which collective life was organised. Myths and rites concerning the renewing mystery of nature make up the bases of a form of social organisation in which the interlocutors are Mother Nature and the social community. The imaginary reference point for social behaviour is the ritual contribution of the group to the renewal of the natural event on which its own collective subsistence depends. Such societies are dominated by a holistic view of experience in which the cosmos (objectivity), society (inter-subjectivity) and the individual (subjectivity) make up a single, consistent whole.

The axial civilisations introduced a radical change into organisational and social representation structures. The mark of transcendence and creativity implies that the world is split into two levels and that man discovers himself to be an agent capable of acting on himself and on his surroundings. From the outset of the axial period salvation beyond this world and human action, moral orientation and the awareness of freedom, often criss-crossed with and integrated into social acts themselves, expressed that transformation of the representation of the world, seen as a point of no return in the course of history. Cracks appeared in the monist unity of pre-axial societies and the first signs of
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