Multiple Modernities and Japan
Nagai Kafū and H.G. Wells

Yui Kiyomitsu
(Kobe University)

Abstract
This article aims to explore the analytical framework and its basic premises to consider the situation of current societies as multiple second modernities under glocalization and deals with Japan as its case study. This paper analyses different patterns of relationships among the individual, the intermediate group and the state in each region/local area, and tracks the transformation of those patterns in the contemporary society. Sometimes the structural tension inherent in modern society between traditional and more ‘contractual’ elements after modern, is expressed in the institutional patterns of the relations among the individual, the intermediate group and the state in each area. In current society, which is the age of multiple second modernities, the relational pattern is expressed in the configuration of individuality (not individual), intermediate networks (not intermediate group) and transforming state (not just state). To observe the distinctness of each locality in plurality, we need to consider not only the institutional structure of these three factors but also the more fundamental logic for collectivity/individual formation in each society in question. Considering the example of Nagai Kafū’s and H.G. Wells’ works, the article investigates this issue. In considering these issues, the article focuses on contemporary Japan as one of the cases of the multiple second modernities under glocalization based on the observation of Japan’s historical and cultural distinctness.
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1 Introduction

Theories of modernisation have developed throughout the stages, from the stage of convergence through that of comparison, to ‘multiple modernities’ (S. N. Eisenstadt). While the idea of modernity transformed itself facing the arguments of the post-modern, there have been significant (counter)arguments of ‘high modernity’, ‘reflexive modernity’ and ‘second modernity’ (U. Beck). In this article, I will explore the subject that I call ‘Eisenstadt-Beck nexus issue’ as regards multiple second modernities under ‘glocalization’.

When examining the distinctiveness of non-Western countries’ mod-
ernisation process, especially that of East Asia and Japan, we should take into account the significance of the issue of received modernity before the issue of compressed modernity. In the case of the West (which is an ‘ideal typical’ expression), the same driving force that led to break the tradition from inside also constructed the modern after the breakthrough (see the Weberian arguments of protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism). By contrast, as for East Asia, the driving force of breaking through the tradition is a combination of a fatal impact (threat of colonisation) from the outside by the Western powers and the vulnerable structure of the tradition from within. On this condition of ‘received modernity’, the construction process of the modern started.

This is the fundamental difference between the initial condition of East Asia in its modernisation process and that of the West. It is this difference of initial condition that made the entire process of modernisation different. The nature of compressed modernity is only a part of what started after the issue and the condition of the reception.

The process of non-Western modernisation can be oriented by two elements: 1) condition of reception; 2) constructive force for modernisation after the breakthrough of the tradition. Then, the condition of reception can be furthermore broken down into two elements: 1) vulnerability of tradition resisting during the process of breakthrough; 2) existence of the elements of structural similarities with the West.

Owing to the last two elements, the modernisation process proceeds rapidly. I argue that the issue of compressed modernity concerns this rapid process, yet this should not be just the matter of the speed of compressed time, but the distinctive (sometimes twisted) pattern of the process of modernisation that appeared in a short period of time. As a ‘compressed’ modernity, in the case of Japan, the distinctive pattern of modernity appeared in terms of two interactive factors: 1) the pattern of the relationship among three elements, i.e. the individual, the intermediate group and the state; 2) the aspect of traditional Japan’s structural similarities (that is to say ‘functional rationality’) with the West.

The condition of reception mainly concerns the first modernity and its pattern was already different from that of the West in terms of the relational pattern among the individual, the intermediate group and the state. Also as a compressed modernity, the features of the second modernity could appeared to be precocious in the first modernity.

The significant factor of the second modernity is its glocal nature, since it is inevitable and strongly involved in the global arena and appeared vis-à-vis the arena with all its distinctiveness. In this context, we can term the second modernity more accurately as ‘multiple second modernities’ or ‘multiple glocalities’.

This article aims to consider the analytical framework and basic premises while exploring the situation of multiple second modernities under
glocalization, and deals with Japan as a case study. In doing so, this article sets as its subject the different patterns of relationships between the individual, intermediate groups and the state in each region/local area and tracks the transformation of these patterns in contemporary society. As an implication, it concomitantly explores the relationship between globalisation and sociological theory.

The structural tensions inherent in modern society between traditional and more ‘contractual’ elements are periodically expressed in the institutional patterns of the relationships between the individual, intermediate groups and the state in each area. As a part of its basic analytical frame, this article considers the similarities and the differences between the theory of glocalization and that of multiple modernities in order to articulate the two approaches; then, the article tries to form a typology of the West, the USA and Japan in terms of their relational patterns with respect to the three factors mentioned above. In the age of multiple second modernities, relational patterns are expressed as configurations of individuality (and not the individual), intermediate networks (not intermediate groups) and transforming states (and not just states in their traditional shape but transforming itself in responding to global impact and intervention). To observe the distinctness of each locality in all its plurality, we need to consider not only the institutional structure of the three factors but also the more fundamental logic behind all collective/individual formations in each society in question.

In considering these issues, the article focuses on the case of Japan in order to analyse contemporary Japan as one of the states that exhibit multiple second modernities under the glocalization process. Our findings are based on observations of Japan’s historical and cultural distinctness.

‘Multiple second modernities’ indicate first that the pattern or course of modernisation differs according to the distinct cultural and historical course of development in each area, and then that they are transforming in contemporary society as the second modernity. It should be mentioned that this sort of attempt itself presupposes the condition or the problems that the localities emerge only in the contacts/negotiations with the global arena. In the following sections, the article will describe the distinctiveness of each area, i.e. the areas of ‘Japan,’ ‘USA’ and the ‘West’, which are the ‘names’ by which certain locations are just indicated and not presupposed as fixed entities.

The subject of multiple modernities, then, immediately provokes the issue of why it should still be called ‘modernity’ (Eisenstadt 2002, 3). Eisenstadt argues that its common core lies within the intense reflexivity and inner dynamics by which it re-creates itself in persisting manner. According to him, though the reflexivity was first crystallised in the axial age, it characterises the age of modern, when reflexivity is renewed in its intensity far stronger than ever (Eisenstadt 2002, 4). The driving force
of this reflexivity lies within the tension inherent in modernity itself. The tension comes from the contradiction between traditional and modern sectors and the inherent tension between (formal) rationality, which has been the leitmotif of modernity, and the authentic cultural tradition of each society (Eisenstadt 2002, 12). It is not impossible to describe the internal tension by means of the common indications of modernity in terms of its more concrete social process or institutional structures, even though these could still remain very basic descriptions. For example, they are growing structural differentiation, urbanization, industrialization, growing communications [...], the development of new institutional formations, of the modern nation-state, of modern, especially national, collectivities, of new and above all capitalist-political economies; and, last but not least, a distinct cultural program. (Eisenstadt 2003, 520-1)

Anyhow we can here presuppose the common indications of modernity. The tension between the two elements was already salient in the first modernity in the West, but it becomes more and more intensified in the course of the expansion of its shock wave beyond the West, through America, Asia, and then South America and Africa. When the shock wave reached, for example, Asian countries by its encounter with or, rather, crash of ‘authentic’ cultural traditions in each area, their concrete figuration became more and more diversified. In this regard, the process of modernisation in the world is the process of amplification of the extent of diversification/multiplicity of modernity itself.

One of the aims of the article is to explore the phase in which the tension is expressed in terms of institutional/structural figuration as the different shape of relational pattern of the three elements of individual, intermediate group and the state in each area. It is observed that the fundamental tension of modernity is institutionalised in the triad relational pattern of the three elements. The article also tracks the assumption according to which multiple modernities are included in the transformational process of the transition from the first to the second modernity.

In his paper of 2000, Beck describes the characteristics of contemporary society in fifteen items (Beck 2003; Beck, Gernsheim 2002). For instance, identity becomes ‘radical non-identity’ or ‘contested transitional identity’, and the sense of place is transformed from ‘monogamy’ in the first modernity to ‘polygamy’ in the second modernity. Also the belief in the progress has disappeared; the value of “bigger, more and better” has declined, and the fundamental categories in the first modernity as an industrial society has turned out to be ‘zombie categories’ now (Beck 2003).

But, on the one hand, the difference of his arguments from the post-modern one lies within his pointing the importance of the double sided operation of the re-constructing process of the detachment of the indi-
individual from the institutions of first modernity and, on the other, the re-institutionalisation movement for the individual, even though the process can be very unstable too. Individuals are now forced to combine and use those institutions for their own way of life and, at the same time, these processes of combination and utilization of institutions are in a global uncertainty and the global risks. According to Beck, the notion of ‘institutionalized individualism’ is tied to a fundamental paradox in the society of second modernity.

With regard to the issue of the theoretical relationship between globalization and modernisation, in identifying the difference between these two theories, we can argue that it concerns the emphasis given on which side of the theory, i.e. either on diffusion (the globalization theory) or functional interdependence (the modernisation theory) of the elements within one area. From the standpoint of the historical development of the theories, functionalism appeared as a critic against diffusionism as ‘a patchwork theory’ of culture. Since the theory of globalization came after the theory of modernisation that is based on the functionalist premise, it cannot be a simple return back to diffusionism and we cannot ignore functionalist ideas, even though, interestingly enough, it is still not irrelevant to diffusionism. The focal point in the arguments of glocalization lies within their tracking the process of articulation of the local and the universal in one area. In this sense of glocality, the combination of the ‘world city’ and the state where the world city is embedded, appeared as one of the examples of the performance of this glocality. Thus, the state has to transform itself in the process of coping/negotiating with globalization (Sassen [1999] 2003).

In the arguments of modernisation, scholars such as Eisenstadt and Bellah saw the critical significance of the elements of ‘the transcendental’ in terms of value-orientation in the case of the West, namely the transcendental nature of ultimate value (conscious = Geistes authority) beyond secular world including the state. For Weber, this is the point of departure/criterion for the comparison of world religions; for Eisenstadt, the base for his study of the historical development from the axial age, and for Bellah the base for his study on Japanese religion. Then, according to Maruyama (1998), Mizubayashi (2002) and others, in Japan there have been some transcendental thoughts and religions but these have not been dominant/decisive factors in Japanese history. These transcendental thoughts and ‘religions’ are different from Weber’s West.

Anyhow, when we seriously – and paying attention to local distinctiveness – consider the construction of the theory of glocalisation, we tend to enter into the scope of the articulation of the globalisation theory with the arguments of multiple modernities. Namely the theory of glocalisation should absorb the sense of deepness of locality by means of a historical/diachronic approach to the arguments of multiple modernities on the one
hand, and the arguments of multiple modernities should learn the notion of a trans-border flow of people, things and images in one world from the horizontal/synchronic approach of glocalization theory, on the other.

2 Individual, Intermediate Groups and the State

Another key word is the intermediate group. The idea to consider the middle-size group as bearing an intermediate function between the individual and the state is an idea as old as the emergence of sociology itself. This indicates that sociology emerged as a counter-argument against the Enlightenment in its atomistic individualism in the eighteenth century.

Social thought in the Enlightenment tends to presuppose the direct connection between atomistic and abstracted individual on the one hand and abstracted as well as universal reason on the other, and tries to eliminate particular intermediate structures/organisations between the two, regarding them as obstacles. The universal corresponding to the reason on the ultimate pole in this configuration should ideally be the whole world but actually it is the domain overlapped to the emerging nation-state. In the issue of the breakaway from the ancient regime, the configuration of the intermediate group that can be antagonistic to the state – while confronting or relating to it – is characteristic of the modernisation of the West, even though the critical point is that the individuals who were deprived of the old shell of the intermediate group are simultaneously connected to each other in the solidarity of a new community of ideals; in this regard, they are the people who constructed new social groups. In any case, there are indefinite different focal points to describe the West, and this is just an angle in this particular context of the article. The same consideration should be applied to Japan, the USA, and so forth.

As for the West, in its very initial shape during the first modernity, it tried to crush the shell of the intermediate group to construct the nation-state and it needed to form the configuration of the bare individual directly confronting with the state. Contrary to the type of configuration in the eighteenth century, the nineteenth century as the age of organisation (or more exactly, of re-organisation) headed towards the rediscovery of the significance of the intermediate group vis-à-vis the turmoil that the eighteenth century suffered because of that atomistic configuration. De Tocqueville, Comte and Durkheim are among the advocates of this new trend of the age of re-organisation. Sociology per se emerged as the sociological ideology (see Parsons 1974-5) of the age of organisation.

In the case of the USA, as Tocqueville so vividly described, in the setting of nothing (or almost nothing) similar to the ancient regime as a pre-existing condition, no absolute state emerged; intermediate groups were only reliable social entities through their lively act and exchange with each other; and the nation was imagined community. In this regard, it was a configuration of a simultaneous emergence of individual, intermediate group and state. Tocqueville took this configuration from the standpoint of the age of re-organisation in the West. Bellah in his *Habits of the Heart* tackled this sort of American tradition in his own context of the late twentieth-century America as the post-mass society situation.

Almost on the contrary, in the case of Japan, there has been an old and new question concerning the residential organisation (old/traditional intermediate group) represented by the traditional ‘association of community’ (previously called *burakukai*, now known as *jichikai*), i.e. whether it is just the end unit of the state and the subcontract machine of administrative bureaucracy or not. Also there is a question regarding how we should understand the relationship between NPO activities and the *jichikai*. Here I want to contrast the above configurations: basically here we have the problematic and historical setting that the intermediate group was incorporated into the state, in an ideal typological sense again. Eisenstadt pointed out that the characteristic of Japanese modernity lies within its conflation of civil sector with the state and this trait makes the case of Japan exceptional compared to other modernities in the world (Eisenstadt 2002, 15). Also Sakuta Kei’ichi, setting the subject relating to this article, pointed that, in Japan’s case, the autonomy of the intermediate group, which is “situated in-between society and individual”, has been very weak (Sakuta 1967, 13).

As for the relational pattern of the three elements, individual, intermediate groups and the state, Maruyama once pointed in his “Various Patterns of Individuation” in the following way. The pattern of individuation in Japan tends to appear in the combination of atomisation and privatisation (at least as its tendency), in contrast to the principle in the West, in which autonomous individuals and their solidarity with associations appear simultaneously. Thus, Maruyama defined the situation in Japan as follows: “in short, all events seemed to point to the full-fledged growth of ‘mass society’ in a tiny, though central, part of the country” and to the “premature appearance of aspects of mass society”, which appeared in geographically limited areas but were conspicuous due to the metamorphosis of the megacity of Tokyo (Maruyama 1965, 518, 530). Also with other writings, Maruyama argued that the characteristics of Japan’s modernisation lies within its phenomenon of ultra-nationalism as the conflation of secular power with the spiritual authority of Emperor regime in contrast to the case of the West in which individuals emerged by the transcendental conscious authority over the secular state. Maruyama obviously is a thinker
who radically digested the problematics put by Weber in the sense mentioned above.

Sakuta also suggested that, such as the disorganisation of traditional folk society’s proceeding, is a “common transformational process in the world” and such as the mass society development, this brings about the matter of the blurring of the intermediate groups’ borders, along with the cross-cutting nature of the groups that leads to the discrepancy/misunderstanding of the definition of the situation. In this new situation, he also suggested that not necessarily the “consciousness of guilty” by the internalisation process of value, but the “consciousness of shame” could prevail in larger and larger areas in the world (Sakuta 1967, 13-20). This is the general shift from the criterion of value to that of sentiments in the formation of consciousness, and this sort of recognition can hold basic validity as the analysis on the present situation of the world and may not be confined to Asia (see Alexander, Thompson 2008). In the case of Japan, this fragility of the intermediate group existed before the mass society; thus, here we have “old and new characteristics of the culture of shame in Japan” (Sakuta 1967, 20). Here we have the arguments related to compressed modernity and the multilayered arrangements of the first and the second modernities in Japan.

Accordingly, in this article the following three prototypical configurations in the first modernity are supposed to be: 1) the intermediate group that can confront the state (the West); 2) the simultaneous emergence of individual, intermediate group and the state (the USA); 3) the problematic of the intermediate group incorporated into the state (Japan). To avoid any misunderstandings, this concerns only the situation of first modernity in the very initial shape of its ideal-typical, prototypical and basic configuration. With regard to the settings of the West, the article should also mention that the intermediate group in the West was not fragile but rather had strong roots in the society. Otherwise, we cannot understand why Beck maintains, in the arguments of the second modernity, that individuals are now finally ‘unstuck’ from the modern institutions (see the intermediate groups in this article) and that those who do not have any traditional reliable entity in contrast to the first modernity anymore become desolate.


The Two-Faceted Structure of Intermediate Group in Japan

Sato once argued the issue of “two-faceted structure of intermediate groups in Japanese society” (2003). He pointed that “communal public sphere” such as neighbourhood organisation and cooperation units among neighbourhood residents in Japan’s tradition have been situated as the end unit of a power structure so as to incorporate them into the power
framework of government. To set against the tradition he claimed the possibility of ‘civic public sphere’ as associations working through networks among the citizens who have common interests and a common sense of problematics (Sato 2003, 6-10).

An issue related to the ‘weakness’ of the intermediate groups in Japanese tradition – claimed by Sato, Eisenstadt and Sakuta – is that of the ‘Ie’ household arguments that have long lists of references. These arguments concern the ‘Ie’ (家, a Japanese type of household) that has been an end unit of the political governance of the feudal domain/the state; the ensuing structure, therefore, has been a series of domination apparatus through the Ie-village/domain/central-government concatenation. Thus, the problematic here is: how could we transform the Ie into something that (can) escape from the controlling structure and construct the civic public sphere? Actually this article believes that there has been a considerable transformation in this tradition in the second modernity in contemporary Japan, even though it concomitantly deals with numerous additional problems.

Before proceeding with the issue of the second modernity in Japan, we have to look at the subject of basic logic in the deeper layer of collectivity/individual formation in Japanese society that defines the concrete shape of the relational pattern of the three elements mentioned here.

3 Deeper Layer of Collectivity/Individual Formation. Two Stories of Runaways: Bokuto Kitan (by Nagai Kafū) and The Door in the Wall (by H.G. Wells)

However, in this further investigation, the dimension of the layer of the deeper cultural disposition – which is seemingly invisible – appears to be the most difficult to understand in articulating different modernities. On that layer, however, every visible combination of the three elements aforementioned are standing. To delineate the layer the article draws upon two novels from two modernities of UK and Japan.

Bokuto Kitan is one of the masterpieces written by Nagai Kafū (1879-1959), a famous Japanese novelist in the late Meiji to Shōwa period, and a son of one of the founding fathers and economic giants of the Meiji regime. The novel consists of many different sorts of dual structure. First, it has a layer in which the ‘I’ as a narrator/writer is wondering around the area called Bokuto to obtain some materials for his novel entitled Runaway. Therefore, the novel can be termed as a meta-novel since this structure is a novel in a novel. Also, as a different kind of layer, the ‘I’ confesses that he has a tendency of having a double personality and discloses only one face of them. Yet another layer is a spatial double structure. ‘I’, as a successful writer who lives in a Western style mansion in uptown Tokyo, visits the labyrinth of narrow paths in the prostitution area in downtown
Every day and spends a double life hiding in there. ‘I’ spends a life of ‘habitat segregation’ shuttling between the two spaces, and feels pleasure and nostalgia in hiding himself (running away) in this downtown labyrinth, which is a sort of enchanted garden. Kafū as a Japanese modern man, thus, experienced his double-faceted daily life in his habitat segregation.

Meanwhile the leading character of Wells’ (1866-1946) *The Door in the Wall* is a parliament man of the British National Assembly who was brought up in a distinguished and rigorous family. One day he ran away on the way to the Parliament to vote on an important decision. In this context, this is also a story of a runaway. Yet the next day his body was found in a deep hole on the construction site of a street. What happened?

In his infancy, as a precocious and honour student raised in a rigorous family, he once lost his way in a London street. Then, when he escaped from his house, he found the tempting door on the white wall for the first time in his life. Behind the door there was the ‘enchanted garden’ (Wells [1911] 1974, 148), filled with happiness by every nostalgic/beautiful things, and he noticed that his father got furious once he entered in it. After the first encounter, he had several chances to have a glance at the door. A second chance came to him when he was fascinated by the play called “Discovering the North West Passage” with his friends. Who can be the first to discover the shortest route to reach the school? Like Kafū’s ‘I’ tried to be deeply versed in every back lanes and secret passes in the downtown Tokyo, Wells’ leading character tried to come back to the secret enchanted garden by exploring every byway in London. In the middle of the play, he found the door on the street where “some rather low-class” (Wells [1911] 1974, 153) lives. If he enters there, he will be late for school. He was an honour student. He thought that he could come back later and went straight ahead to school.

Even after he grew up and become a successful politician, he never forgot about the door on the wall. One day, on his way to the Parliament to vote on another important decision, he saw the door again. But if he had stayed, he would have been late for the vote. He chose the reality and the duty to vote, even though he felt as if he had left his heart behind. In the Parliament he told to the ministerial whip that he “made a great sacrifice” to which the whip replied that “they all have” (Wells [1911] 1974, 158). Then, he became a Cabinet minister and one evening on his way from Parliament to home he ran away. Perhaps he once again saw the door, and finally this time he got to enter into it. This is a story of a runaway in a Western modern Great Britain. He could not spend a dual life of habitat segregation such as Kafū’s ‘I’ could manage and enjoy, and he had to disappear from “this grey world” (Wells [1911] 1974, 151) to choose the pleasure in another world. The story seems to me a perfect description of what happens in the process of disenchantment of the world (*Entzauberung der Welt*, in Weber’s words) in Western modern and what asceticism could mean in the process.
By constructing the contrast between Kafū and Wells, what I am trying to suggest here is that, according to Weber, the process of modernisation – namely the emancipation of the world from the magic (the process of dis-enchantment) by Protestantism – and the process of rationalisation should be the ones that are a methodological as well as a systematic reformulation/rationalisation of the mundane world as a whole according to a transcendental criterion. This point is the focus of the debate between Bellah and Maruyama Masao. Bellah argued that Japan had achieved some rationalisation already in the pre-modern era, which resulted in Japan’s rapid modernisation. Against this assertion, Maruyama put forward some counter-arguments and then asked why the fomentation and explosion of irrational sentiments of Emperor regime emerged in the process of Japan’s modernisation. Instead, is it not the case that Japanese modernisation was not the systematic reformation of the entire mundane world including the state, by the transcendental criterion of ultimate value, but was the conflation of spiritual and magical authority of the Emperor and the mundane power of the state, thus of ultra-nationalism? The rational bureaucracy already existed in pre-modern Japan, but on the other side, though, some hedonistic another-world always simultaneously existed. This was related to the logic and the psychology of the habitat segregation in the instrumental rationality and the irrational world of ‘free and easy going’ (‘let joy be unconfined’, according to a Japanese saying) that co-existed side by side. While the Western notion of history can be described as the drama of ‘all or nothing’, the drastic alteration through the struggle to death between orthodoxy and heterodoxy (therefore the historical ‘development’), the case of Japan can be considered as the world of habitat segregation – for example, almost every different kind of religion may coexist in ‘peace’.

Weber’s inner worldly asceticism cannot stop in front of the iron wall of the segregated domain in Japan. The logic of domain segregation reveals the tendency of side-by-side co-existence of the separated domains of rigorism and arbitrariness within one personality, which can be mobilised and used by one situation (field) and another. Once permitted and tolerated, this exceptionally hedonistic domain cannot stop invading and differentiating (in a mathematical sense) into every aspect of social behaviour. It is obvious that this type of principle tolerance (admission) of exceptional domain in the value system directly contradicts the idea of systemic application of the Weberian “ ethic of asceticism” (Maruyama [1958] 1996, 287-8). Kafū enjoyed the opportunity of hiding and living in another world within this world, while the leading character of Wells’ could not help disappearing from this world in order to enjoy that enchanted garden. Here we have the contrast between ‘habitat segregation’ and ‘systematic rationalisation’ in the deeper layer logic of collectivity/individual formation.

To combine this issue of deeper layer of logic of the social with relational pattern of the three elements (individual, intermediate group and
the state), we see not only the difference of patterns as such on that level, but also the mechanism according to which the pattern can be realised and emerge only within the more fundamental layer of logic. In the case of Japan, the ideal type of the relational pattern is exercised differently within each domain of functionality (public) and non-functional/non-rational (private) domains. We know that also in the Western configuration the difference between public and private is significant, but in the case of the West, there are an orientation towards one transcendental value (the Weberian ideal type of the modern) and diversifications stemmed from this fundamental orientation, while in the case of Japan this basic layer of value orientation per se can be different in each domain. Thus, according to these different value orientations, different relational patterns of the three elements can be formed in each domain in Japan. Even within the Japanese arrangement of the social, the relational pattern of the three elements can be different according to different domains. In the more functional domains, such as samurai’s official work place and time, the intermediate group incorporated into the state is dominant and even almost perfectly prevailing, while, within more non-functional/non-rational domains, this pattern of arrangements is sometimes totally irrelevant.

This combination with a deeper layered logic of habitat segregation, as the presupposition for collectivity/individual formation, can be the initial condition to consider Japanese modernisation. The next focal issue is, however, how this initial condition has been transformed or not transformed in the second modernity of contemporary Japan.

4 Second Modernity in Japan under Glocalization

The year 1995, when the Great Hanshin Awaji earthquake hit the city of Kobe, was called the first year when the real volunteer activities started in Japan. The same year, the case of the ‘subway sarin gas’ by the new radical religious cult called ‘Aum Shinrikyō’ occurred. As Hannigan said (1995), some decisive events that attracted public attention can make the turning point in the social construction process of social problems including that of environmental and risk issues. With these two events in 1995, this year was marked as the turning point in people’s acknowledgement of risk society in Japan.

One of the crucial problems at the time of the earthquake was the issue of the interrelation between residential organisation in the local area (old and traditional intermediate group) and the volunteers (new intermediate groups). In the process of recovery, many of those volunteers left, yet some people remained; the NPOs established in the course of the recovery continued to find their bearers among the local residents. In the process, it may be said that there are some residential organisations
that have been transformed by the impact of NPOs from outside the local area. Many Town Recovery/Formation Committees emerged there and were mainly constituted of local residents who sometimes pushed back the Recovery Plan made by the local government to transform it into a more residents-led type of plan, or actively participated in the process of making the recovery plan, while there are some other local areas that could not really participate. Either way, local/state government has to confront with this residential organisations as their partners of negotiation, or to put it differently, the governments were ‘lucky’ enough to find out their negotiation partners.

Yet one can ask what caused a different reaction on the part of these localities? Is that a difference in the quality of community solidarity that was already there, or is it due to the different level of interrelationship between new and old intermediate groups? Perhaps this is not due to the fact that on the one hand there was the old intermediate group that was old in every aspects and, on the other, there were new groups that were new in every aspects, and to the fact that these two groups could not be interrelated; as a matter of fact, they could not enter a network type of relationship, but only when they were transformed in order to be articulated with each other, did the opportunity of an interrelation of the two emerge.

In the wave of the second modernity, while it is said that it could be difficult to sustain the type of relationship of traditional intermediate groups, the new intermediate groups that have the logic of connection as a networking, fit with the condition of the second modernity.

The reason why the networking theory can be apt to the analysis on contemporary society is this: although there are some different types of networking theories, they all have one thing in common in their basic premise, i.e. these theories do not necessarily presuppose the solidarity by means of an internalisation of a common value system. It means that the premise of a networking theory can disengage the basic presupposition of Weberian modernity with regard to the principle of solidarity by systematic reformation of the world as a whole and by the solidarity through shared ideals, namely by transcendental value. The networking premise only presupposes that the connection is involved in the interchange and mobilisation process of social capital.

Of course, it can be argued that Coleman considers the norm as one of the social capitals (Coleman 1998). But, firstly, this sort of idea is only a part of the networking theories but, rather, the ideas of a weak tie or structural holes are preponderant; secondly, even the norm in this regard can be considered to be outsourced as one of the facilitating resources of connection. This does not concern the situation that is presented by the networking theory, namely the situation in which the solidarity of a certain group is sustained by a norm that is articulated as a role-status structure with certain group borders. According to the development of the network
theory, this part of dense relations and connections is conceptualised as a ‘cluster’ and, using the term, interrelation between new and old (traditional) intermediate groups can be rephrased as the relation between network and cluster that is a sort of more structured island in the sea of the networking.

The network theory is a breakthrough in the level of principle and its impact is rather significant and its range is longer than imagined. If the basic logic of modern sociological theory has been the one that presupposes the existence of universal or transcendental ideals that are beyond each concrete situation, and if the individuals are supposed to internalise those ideals, then only as its corollary can the modern theory explain the solidarity in each situation. Now, since the condition in that universal/transcendental ideals has broken down, one should ask why the connection/solidarity could still exist in each situation and how we could explain it.

The theories that are described as ‘situational’, such as Goffman’s ethnomethodology, and the interaction theory are coping with the following issue. Among these theories, the network theory seems to be able to provide a logic of linkage between each situational field and a larger structure beyond that. Then, the questions are: why can these networks be connected and how are they caused? Then, by what kind of stuff is interchanged? Coleman conceptualised it as a mobilisation of social resources and a merit of a certain state of social structure.

The fact that NPO activities are supported by the mind-set of “think globally, act locally”, namely sustained by glocalisation of culture that is beyond locality and blood ties as their mind-set, also signifies the fact that their consciousness is simultaneously fragmented. Appadurai says:

They [the electronic media] are resources for experiments with self-making in all sorts of societies, for all sorts of persons […]. Because of the sheer multiplicity of the forms in which they appear (cinema, television, computers, and telephones) and because of the rapid way in which they move to through daily life routines, electronic media provide resources for self-imaging as an everyday social project. (Appadurai 1996, 3-4)

The link between the imagination and social life, I would suggest, is increasingly a global and deterritorialized one. (55)

The network theory suggests a logic that can connect even the people living in the world described by Appadurai. Along the line of the triad relationship among the individual, the intermediate group and the state, nowadays the triad among individuality (not individual), the intermediate network (not intermediate group) and a transforming state (the state that is transforming itself in coping with globalisation) has to be presupposed. In other words, in the multiple second modernities under glocalisation, the
focal points concerned the following questions: what kind of relationship individuals could have with the state that is transforming itself in dealing with the ‘embedded’ globality (Sassen); the individuals connecting with each other through the network by interchanging social resources (Coleman); the individuals who have been ‘unstuck’ (Beck) from traditional institutions of old intermediate groups, who have ‘polygamic’ (Beck) sense and relationship with places and who could have only a transitional identity, in short, the individualised individuals.

5 Runaway Volunteers and the Network in Habitat Segregation

On the day that the Great Hanshin Awaji earthquake occurred, residents experienced the collapse of the sacred canopy (Berger), the canopy of the norm sustained by the legitimated cosmos set against the chaos, and suddenly the people who lived there were invaded by chaos. It was the moment of the awakening in which our society and its institutions are vulnerable canopies only set by ourselves and at any moments of time we can experience its collapse. It is our fundamental condition as the people living in this contemporary world that at any moment we can be unstuck from the institutions of society. The earthquake was the drastic and dramatic symbol of this condition.

Just after the earthquake, unexpectedly plentiful people – especially the young generation – came to the place as if they need to see that symbolic collapse, and they started their activities against the chaos. People who came to rescue the sufferers are not only from all over Japan but also from all over the world. The disaster-stricken area was suddenly exposed to the universal protocol to be rescued, which was a totally unfamiliar situation for Japan by then.

Another argument to which sociologists committed just after the earthquake was that of ‘collective effervescence’ (Durkheim). However, it can also be said that it was related to the arguments of euphoria that paradoxically emerged just after the sacred canopy collapsed (Berger). What the earthquake revealed was our (the contemporary people’s, in general) daily condition of chronic euphoria that could be related to the arguments of re-enchantment in contemporary (consumer) society. The situation that can bring us chronic euphoria and re-enchantment, at least in a short span or during the collapse of the sacred canopy in its yoke of banal and conventional norms, is unstuck from traditional institutions, or more exactly freed from the conventional institution.

By now, we know much darker and more serious aspects about it. Here I mention only two of those instances, namely homeless people who are dwelling on the street and the net-café refugees who have to stay overnight at the cheapest accommodation that is the internet café. When the
Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare of Japan conducted the research for the period from January to February of 2003, 25,296 homeless people were living on the street; in January 2007 they dropped to 18,564. From the end of 2008 to 2009, there was an event caught the public attention in Japan, namely “The village for pull through the year-end” in Tokyo, where more than five hundred people who were divested of their part-time (dispatched) job, got together to survive the cold year-end supported by NPOs. In my view these phenomena are not just plainly a matter of poverty, however closely related to it, but they emerged by the process of being unstuck from the traditional institution called ‘family’. In this regard, living in emergency shelters such as the situation just after the earthquake is the basic symptom of our age. We all are in a sense a homeless mind.

As a part of the effervescence theory, one might say that those volunteer people came to the earthquake sight to run away from their daily lives. But actually while there are some who ran away and never came back, there were others who temporarily stayed in the sight and then came back, or kept the pattern of shuttling between their home and the sight. This might be explained by the mechanism of the habitat segregation. Kafū enjoyed the habitat segregation and shuttled between the enchanted garden in downtown Tokyo and his western style mansion in uptown as his public and official house, and this could be the strategy that nowadays volunteer activists use as a form of re-enchantment. The logic of habitat segregation could imply that the domain of freedom, which is sector open to pleasure, can be kept in reserve in another place. The activities of volunteers and/or new intermediate groups may consist in forming networks in each space of the disaster-stricken area and living their own daily lives shuttling between the two spaces in the logic of habitat segregation. Naturally sometimes these two networks may cross each other and, in the process, one of them can form the cluster by making intimate linkage with the traditional and old type of intermediate groups that accumulated in the local area.

Kafū, as a Japanese modern man, lived in two separated spaces and temporarily ran away to downtown to hide himself. This type of separation and fragmentation of time and space has drastically accelerated in these days and volunteers (then, the young generations) are now running away in the contemporary configuration of time and space in this world. Differentiating the habitat segregation of time and space per se into minute details means having a transitional identity as a self (subject) and forming polygamic networks with different places. Though there has been the problematic of intermediate group incorporated into the state, this has been mainly confined to the phase of formal and technological rationality, and on the reverse side of it there has always been the space for enchantment. The state that has been trying to incorporate the intermediate group and individuals is now transforming and fragmenting itself into pieces.

The word ‘runaway’ is perhaps the key term. One of Beck’s articles is
entitled “Living your own life in a runaway world” (2003). He very vividly describes our contemporary daily life. Despite the super-fragmented daily life in nowadays Japan, which is the condition of living your own life in a runaway world, we still have opportunities to let the networking of ‘sub-politics’ via ‘transnational social spaces’ (Beck 2008, 25) emerge in our contemporary society. The sociological theory building under glocalisation has to be transformed into the set of terms that can open the perspectives for the articulation of individuals with institutions even through the process of individualisation (Beck).
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