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Perspective and Method

The task that lies before the author is to summarize research findings obtained in Thailand by Japanese sociologists and then present research trends to researchers in other disciplines in an understandable manner. In this paper, due to space limitations, the author has elected to limit the reviewing period and references as follows:

First, in order to present a complete overview of the research, I gathered documents from the databases of the Japan Sociological Society and the Japan Society for Southeast Asian History for the period of 1995 to 2006.

Second, I collected sociological research papers that had appeared during the same period in the Japanese Sociological Review, Southeast Asian Studies, Asian Economy, Asian Studies, and Southeast Asia; History and Culture. Although publications other than the Japanese Sociological Review specialized in regional research, I also referred to papers in other fields such as political science, economics, history, and anthropology in order to utilize the sociological perspectives in those papers. Incidentally, only six of the papers featured in the Japanese Sociological Review or IJJS were related to Southeast Asia. Of them, two papers of Thai studies were by Sakurai and the rest was by Kitahara (Sakurai, 1996, 1999; Kitahara, 1997, 2004). In other words, very few Thai research papers can be found in specialized sociological journals. The reality is that only papers and books written from a sociological perspective and analysis have been published as regional research works. For this reason, I will review only documents that have developed sociological studies, specifically observed in sociology, while at the same time keeping in mind regional studies of Southeast Asia in general.

Trends in Sociological Surveys in Thailand and Other Regions of Southeast Asia

Atsushi Kitahara reviewed sociological studies on Southeast Asia between the 1960s and 1996, and posed the following two sociological questions: 1) how to reconcile regional cultures and their livelihood structures with world systems, and 2) how to conduct a pilot
study that can compare regional cultures and societies (Kitahara, 1997). Although comprehensive theories such as dependency theory and world-system theory have been proposed with regard to the former, they strike me as attempts to use a single aspect of the multifaceted realities in regional communities as proof of globalization. Consequently, those theories have not been used as successfully as in monographs in which the logics of local communities can be described in minute detail. One can clearly depict the interconnection between a region and the world by analyzing only the elements that are directly influenced or transferred due to globalization such as finance, capital ties, multinational corporations, or foreign labor. Therefore, rather than directly aiming for the former, it would be more productive to indirectly focus on the issue of the former based on the findings of the latter.

For instance, I concur with Kitahara’s assertion that the sociology of business culture and labor-management relationship involving Japanese corporations and their overseas subsidiary companies can be projected through the spectrum of local cultures with Japanese-style management as the prism. The theory of comparative sociology through the eyes of workers at Japanese corporations (Imada and Sonoda, 1995) was pioneering work. Problems involving the establishment of Japanese-style labor-management relationships and career formation for local workers in foreign countries will never end so long as Japanese corporations continue to go abroad (Sakurai, 1996). This type of endeavor has been conducted as a comparison to the establishment of civil society in Asia (Iwasaki, 1998), the new middle class (Koyano, Kitagawa, Kano, 2000; Hattori, Torii, Funatsu, ed., 2002) and NGO activity (Shigetomi, 2001).

Still, it is not easy to maintain a balance between comparing collective entities (family, community, associations, etc.) that compose the objective concept as well as their indexes that are intentionally coordinated, and how to utilize local contexts.

There are all kinds of differences: differences between people of Chinese descent who perceive family in relation to exclusive kinship groups and people in island regions who associate with other people through cooperatives or intimate groups or zones; differences between communities and government-backed autonomous organizations that have been founded for the purpose of development and maintenance of security, and self-governing organizations that have been independently generated from the management of natural forests, common forests, fishing grounds, and irrigation facilities. Even though these
groups may share the same functions at present, each has a different historical background. Exploring these historical differences is crucial to understanding the region and provides a real excitement in regional studies.

Comparative regional research was proposed by Noriyuki Suzuki in 1996 while he was reviewing Thai studies in the field of sociology in Japan (Suzuki, 1996). Suzuki also proposed: 1) we move from community research to macro research by focusing on social class, migration, and the structure of nation states; 2) we move from regional research without follow-ups to action research through which researchers can resolve social issues together with those directly involved; and 3) we examine the Japan-Thai relationship from the perspective of social solidarity in addition to economic cooperation and migration of laborers. Suzuki contends that a study is not a sociological one unless we conduct a structural analysis beyond the area of regional research by interconnecting the structure of global international communities and the structure of nation states.

With regard to his first idea, studies based on Suzuki’s proposals correspond to the creation of the research category of international sociology. Yet, it is still difficult to encapsulate the entire international community in a research perspective. In actuality, many studies have been immigrant studies discussing the citizenship of immigrants and refugees or the structure of multi-cultural society. As for his second and third recommendations, most of those studies were Suzuki’s own (Suzuki, 2006a; Suzuki and Wangpokakul Peeriya, 2006; Noriyuki Suzuki, Keeratiporn Sritanyarat, 2006). In my view, there is ample room for improvement concerning the content of reports on NGOs and NPOs.

Comparative regional research has been promoted by regional researchers, rather than by sociologists. The COE Project at the Institute of Developing Economies has striven to understand Southeast Asia multilaterally by using key concepts such as “small-population society” (Tsubouchi, 1998), “composite society,” “frontier world,” and “dense society.” Yet, such terms do not appear to converge with common localities (Tsubouchi, ed., 1999, 2000). On the contrary, once the subject of comparison is extended to race, religion, and culture (Kato, 2004) or family, region, and ethnicity (Kitahara, ed., 2005), the diversity of the region is emphasized.

Compared to research of Northeast Asia and South Asia, comprehensive studies on Southeast Asian society commonly depict social aspects that are greatly regulated by
external factors such as the ecosystem or the history of colonization rather than broad ethnic histories in the memories of people or the continuity of cultures, if not the foundation of the nation or the history of its disappearance. The sociological perspective also shares this point. Under circumstances in which regions are involved in the global capitalist economic system or rapid social change that are implemented under national development-oriented policies, those studies have examined how individuals, family, regions, and social systems have adapted to the changes.

In this respect, beyond simply focusing on the inherent feature of specific regions, depicting regional differences in terms of the depth or direction of transformation is much more in the nature of sociological research; at the same time, presenting issues of the local community or society in general from the standpoint of individual dignity or social equity also falls under the purview of sociology (Ikeda, 2000). Globalization and development-oriented political and economic policy have been the driving forces behind social transformation in Southeast Asia, (Suehiro, 2000). The transfer of people, things and money has helped generate rapid social change in the region, during the course of which the following research tasks have emerged with respect to various aspects of society.

3 Sociological Research Tasks of the Present

3-1 Region (Rural – Urban Relationship)


Because businesses and factories with large employment capacity are located only in primary cities of several million people, and medium-sized cities of several hundred thousand people, rural people often participate in the informal sector in urban areas for cash earnings so that they send money to support their children or aging parents in rural villages. Many young people form households in the slums or suburbs, and a large number of them live there permanently as lower-class workers. The class structure, regulated by the resources related to land ownership and the right to use areas for agriculture, forestry and fisheries, is about to collapse. The village landscape has changed
greatly due to the high academic achievement of children, made possible by cash income (secondary school graduates do not inherit family businesses) and consumerism (materialism and debt). Now, rural villagers not only have a hard time making a living in jobs that involve dealing with nature, but are also unable to conduct extensive subsistence farming (Yamamoto, 1999). The background is this: in addition to the fact that the increasing demographic pressure does not allow unruly or unregulated use of resources (excess of slash-and-burn cultivation), ecological destruction (the conversion of forests into agricultural land; river management by dams, etc.; pollution due to factory and urban waste) were added; thus, stakeholders have conflicts over the boundaries of private property, commons, and national land. In the 30-year period of 1960-90, the forest area in Thailand dwindled to half (this happened in Northeast Thailand in 1975-90); in 1989 Thailand banned commercial logging of natural forests (Sato, 2002).

From rural community to city, from the socialist bloc to the capitalist bloc, resources continue to be drained in one direction. Industrialized countries are also working to protect the right to live in rural regions --- even in areas under adverse conditions --- by imposing government policies such as price supports and income security for farm produce, or support for environmental sustainability. Southeast Asian countries, however, do not have sufficient financial latitude to carry out improvement of regional communities even though marginal settlements are generated in the ecosystem or with labor resources. Unlike Japan, South Korea, or Taiwan, those countries cannot afford to promote dual employment or subsidiary businesses as a managerial strategy or national policy. Because infrastructure is not sufficiently developed, it is unrealistic to envision industrial sites in rural areas. Although sustainable farming and eco-tourism initiatives have been implemented by regional development NGOs, their power to generate employment remains weak. To live in a rural community in Southeast Asia, not only in Thailand, involves serious problems (The Japanese Association for Rural Studies, ed., 2004).

And what of cities? Urban studies have been conducted on the formation of the labor market and industries in global cities in Thailand and Southeast Asia and on the issue of social classes at the Graduate School of Economics, Osaka City University (Tasaka, ed., 1998). A global city means a city with two classes: in the socially upper class are executives and families of MNCs and international organizations, while in the socially
lower class are foreign workers who have legally or illegally immigrated from neighboring countries; a competitive relationship and segregated housing may be observed between native and illegal workers. Through the transfer of money by migrant workers inside and outside the country, who have established residency, and through the networking of transient workers, the global city is directly connected to the rural area or neighboring countries. Still, it is not quite true that the Southeast Asian region has become “borderless.”

The transmigration of workers and working conditions are controlled by the country in question and their civil rights are limited. In Thailand and Malaysia, “semi-legalization” measures have been adopted by which illegal workers who had migrated from neighboring countries are required to be registered to work (Tamaki, 2005). Meanwhile, migrant workers who are willing to go abroad are either lower-middle class workers or farmers from economically advanced countries. Underground organizations are involved in illegal human transport, which includes human trafficking. In other words, the national boundary of economic disparity helps bring an enormous profit to people or organizations involved in the transfer of human beings.

In those stratified and segmented global cities, a number of urgent issues have surfaced: coping with traffic congestion and waste, controlling gambling, drugs, and prostitution, taking care of slum residents and street children, maintaining the urban environment, and developing communities (Hata, 2005).

In Southeast Asia, regional social studies focusing on policy enforcement to maintain local communities are required. The actors in regional formation can vary. Dichotomous thinking, such as whether ODA or NGO/NPO, economic development or social human-resource development, external resource-importing development or spontaneous development, is now out of date. Thus, it is crucial to build up local theories that take root in the realities of the region by conducting research surveys.

3-2 Family, Education, and Labor

In Southeast Asia, the birthrate has been on the decline not only among the urban middle class but in rural communities as well. Thus, each nation has begun to discuss a solid reinforcement of the social security system in preparation for a further decline in the birthrate and the aging of populations (Tanada, ed., 2005).
In Thailand, the average birthrate in 2000 was 1.82 nationally and 1.12 for Bangkok specifically. As the economy grows, the life course of not succeeding one’s parent’s occupation, receiving secondary education (the enrollment rate was 82.5% in 2003) and becoming a salaried worker in a city has become increasingly common. Twenty years ago, the enrollment rate for higher education institutions was less than 5%; it is now over 40%. Thailand’s economic growth has spurred dramatic progress in higher education. On the other hand, students at national universities in 2003 (41 out of 78 colleges were made regional universities from educational colleges) accounted for only 18% of the total number of college students. Two “open” universities, where anyone may enroll, accounted for 41%, 61 private colleges for 26%, and 17 junior colleges and others for 15%.

According to World Bank statistics, the highest enrollment rate of institutions for higher education (including junior colleges) in 2003 was Thailand (40.1%), followed by The Philippines (29.4%), Malaysia (28.8%), Singapore (25.0%/2004), Indonesia (16.2%), Myanmar (11.3%), Vietnam (10.2%), Laos (5.1%), Cambodia (3.1%), and Brunei (1.9%). The 2003 per capita GDP of Singapore ($21,825) was approximately ten times higher than that of Thailand ($2,236), and approximately 64 times higher than Laos ($339.5). The policy on quantitative relaxation for higher education (an increase in the number of private colleges and national university students) varies depending on the country. The above figures more or less match the economic growth of each country.

However, with the exception of Singapore, no country has established a labor market compatible with the expansion of higher education. Cheap labor is still required in the labor-intensive manufacturing industry and service industry. Also, it is not that the demand for technical jobs or administrative work worthy of higher education graduates has increased dramatically. In Thailand, Malaysia, and the Philippines, the guarantee of quality in higher education is the key to making economic progress. In Indonesia and Vietnam, quantitative expansion is the key; other countries are still in the phase of training leaders.

In Southeast Asian societies, where, traditionally, women’s economic activities are not restricted, the employment rate for women is higher than that in Northeast Asian societies. Still, that does not mean that men and women equally share household chores and child rearing. In the city, the cost for the externalization of domestic chores (eating out is the norm; hiring foreigners or workers from provincial areas for cleaning, laundry, and child
rearing) used to be low. But now, when, due to urban sprawl, the commute becomes longer and the child-care costs rise, women’s work patterns show an M-shaped curve in a figure analogous to Japan (Ochiai, Yamane, and Miyasaka, ed., 2007). Domestic labor moves to countries that can afford the cost. Therefore, the Philippines exports house keepers and care workers to Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore, and other countries, and Vietnam sends brides to Taiwan, who become permanent residents through international marriages (approximately 30% of marriages in 2003 in Taiwan were international). The household and family have become global. Advanced countries can enjoy globalization. But in developing nations where nursing-care workers cannot be employed, the elderly won’t be able to receive public assistance or support from their children’s generation. How will they manage? There is no easy solution to this; it is a complex issue strongly linked to both gender and globalization.

There have been a number of papers and books describing cultural differences among family members, the gender issue in individual communities, and the empowerment of women. What the comparative study by Ochiai, Yamane, and Miyasaka suggested was that besides the expansion of feminism in East Asia and Southeast Asia, the entire Asian region had begun to experience common transformations in family-related matters. Yet, inter-hierarchical and international disparities are still clearly reflected in strategies to restore family life through education and diverse employment styles. For this reason, survey research is urgently needed to clarify the specific relations between family transformations and globalization in individual regions. After having done that, there are various issues that must be addressed regarding social security including gender-related issues (Osawa, 2004).

3-3 Race, Religion, and Culture

In the islands of Southeast Asia, during the period of Dutch and British colonial rule, when workers were brought in from China and India, different ethnic groups --- people of Chinese descent, the Tamil, and the native people --- coexisted. From the days of colonization till individual nations became independent nation states, there were resident Chinese, and various trading ethnic groups in Southeast Asia. In addition, they experienced wartime recruitment following the Japanese invasion of Southeast Asia, the migration of Chinese Nationalist Party supporters in the wake of the Chinese Civil War,
and the migration of refugees after the establishment of the socialist government (Wang, 2004; Kataoka, 2006). Despite that, people have freely crossed between the Asian continent and the island area.

In ASEAN countries, the degree of freedom in civil rights and economic activity that should be given to people of Chinese descent, who accounted for 10% to 30% of the population, was a major issue in social and economic policy. Chinese-dominated Singapore achieved independence from the Federation of Malaya; In Thailand, Chinese residents assimilated into Thai culture and occupied the center of power in political and economic circles. The Philippines, Malaysia, and Indonesia, in the name of nationalism, treated Chinese residents badly. Meanwhile in river delta areas on the continental side, the ethnic majority conducted wet-rice cultivation. In the mountain area, there were ethnic minority groups who conducted slash-and-burn cultivation or trading. Under various government policies, such as the religious policy (from animism to Theravada Buddhism), the political-stability policy, the environmental conservation policy (conversion from the poppy and slash-and-burn cultivation), those minority and fringe groups, and the social welfare policy (state- and NGOs-supported), had no choice but to assimilate into the nation ruled by the ethnic majority (Hayami, 1998). Now they are faced with the issues of poverty and HIV (Michinobu, 2005). From the perspective of religious research, there has been a detailed report on the process by which Theravada Buddhism, Catholicism, and Islam were blended with ethnic religions, and eventually into a practical religion, as well as its present condition (Hayashi, 2000; Nishii, 2001; Tanabe, 2003). Sakurai (2008) carefully analyzed varieties of regional development activities by monks in Northeast Thailand and considered the cultural and social condition under which socially engaged religion substantially contribute to social welfare.

Recent cultural studies show a strong tendency to view culture as something hybrid and dynamic. Cultures in Southeast Asia had strong blending elements consistent with the mixed housing of different ethnic groups. However, those cultures have been reorganized under various political pressures (the push for creating a nation state, authoritarian developmentalism, and identity politics by opposition forces). By focusing on culturally representative monuments, collective memories of the state and the culture those monuments may evoke, and the narratives of self and others, the constructive aspects of culture can be clarified (Kato, ed., 2004). If this viewpoint is applied, from the
expressed concern that globalization will Westernize (or Americanize) and homogenize ethnic cultures, we can detect a will to build an indigenous national culture while addressing cultural changes. What greatly contributed to the establishment of national culture was public education to edify the integration of the people.

Education not only contributes to personal development, but also has the aspect of bolstering the social system in helping to cultivate national identity. Among many ASEAN nations, new governments were launched based on certain specific groups that had opposed colonial forces; those countries were controlled by the government and the military. The goal of education was to culturally and politically integrate areas and ethnic groups surrounding the power. Papers on region and school (Onaka, 2002), national education and primary education (Nozu, 2005), and the expansion of civic education (Hirata, 2007) have been published by researchers in the field of comparative education.

3-4 Disparities in region and class and Civil Society

Among ASEAN nations, the larger the area of agricultural, mountain, and fishing villages a country has, the greater its class disparities. However, as economies have improved, one can increasingly see movements of people who seek free speech and economic opportunity, and who detest restrictions imposed by authoritarian governments.

Looking at the political awareness of the urban middle class from statements by newspapers and intellectuals, and anti-government street demonstrations, it is certainly true that beginning in the 1990s, the movement towards democratization has accelerated in Thailand, the Philippines, and Indonesia (Asami, 1999). Still, in Thailand, the soft landing of the authoritarian system is considered to have been prepared from the 1980s; the roles and the political awareness of the new middle class remain unclear (Tamada, 2003). Found among the people with lifestyles that promote an information-oriented and consumer society are many white-collar workers who work for corporations owned by ethnic and Chinese conglomerates, influential politicians, bureaucrats, or soldiers. The relationship between them and the people power of the working class, who have nothing to lose, is subtle. Needless to say, NGOs, which have been working to play a leading role in social movements to establish civil society, are still active. However, the organization of the labor movement is incomplete and the momentum for citizens’ movement and
anti-discrimination movement to spread to the general public beyond stakeholders remains weak.

In Thailand, following bloody pro-democracy conflicts, a new Constitution was introduced in 1997. The eligibility to run for parliamentary election was restricted to college graduates or higher. Whatever the realistic reasons were, some 80% of the people lost their eligibility. Thaksin Shinawatra, the head of the Thai Rak Thai Party who won the general election of 2001 in a landslide, received overwhelming support from farmers in the North and Northeast regions; he adopted the populist policy of promising farmers debt reduction, a 30-baht medical care program, and one million baht for a district (Tambon) revitalization fund. Although the rising Thai economy initially supported his CEO-like political style, his autocratic approach (conflict with Muslims in southern Thailand; 2,637 drug dealers shot to death in 2003 alone), cronyism and nepotism (promotions for family members and peers, and favoritism for his own firms), and opaque asset management (tax breaks and stock sales) came under severe criticism. Prime Minister Thaksin dissolved the National Assembly in March, 2006, and held a general election on April 2nd.

The opposition party, however, expressed protest by boycotting the election. Only candidates from the Thai Rak Thai Party and several minority parties ran. This election became a virtual vote of confidence for the ruling party. The Thai Rak Thai Party won 359 seats in 400-seat single electoral districts (with one seat going to the opposition party and 40 seats to be re-voted), and all seats in 100 proportional representation districts (votes obtained: 56.5%). But due to the two-month-long anti-Thaksin demonstration and at the behest of the King of Thailand, the prime minister was forced to release a transfer-of-power statement. One Thai English-language paper called it “a victory for democracy” (editorial in The Nation, April 5, 2006), while one Japanese newspaper reported it was “led by the middle class in the capital area” (Asahi Shimbun, April 6, 2006). Due to the reelection, the opening of the National Assembly has been delayed, and Thai politics continues to be in disarray, yet fundamental issues have yet to be discussed.

There is a difference in political awareness between regions and classes. Looking at region-by-region voting patterns, that is share of the votes by the Thai Rak Thai Party and the percentage of blank votes in the single-seat electoral districts, they were North
That the transfer of power was realized by people power and there was a successful political movement with the mobilization of citizens --- those facts are still discussed in the context of democratization. Meanwhile, the will of the constituents, so called “local farm votes” that had gone through a democratic process was regarded as an inconsequential fact. Media outlets, which are mainly led by intellectuals and turn the urban middle class into avid readers, consider those facts to be less important. This kind of divided civil society is characteristic of not just Thailand, but of Southeast Asian society in general, where interregional and inter-class disparities are conspicuous. The argument that the new middle class will promote democratization and become a primary actor in the formation of civil society has some validity, particularly in advanced countries where the middle class is the majority. However, in a society where representative democracy has been adopted despite a small middle class, the ideals of the middle class and intellectuals may not always agree with the will of the majority. Populist politics in Thailand undoubtedly amplified this schism.

“The Structural Transformation of Asian Communities and the Formation of the New Middle Class” compiled by the Asian Sociological Society (Koyano, Kitagawa, Kano, ed., 2000) featured discussions about this. Yet, understanding the new middle class partially and specifically through class categories and actors (NGOs and self-governing groups) does not necessarily demonstrate a political awareness of the middle class. Contributing author, Hirotsugu Ohata, questioned a certain cultural foundation of civil society – that of nepotism – in one case example of South Korea. In the case of Southeast Asia, it is cronyism that reaches into rural villages and political and economical communities, which can be corruption if exposed. For good or ill, cronyism is social capital in Southeast Asian society, and the range of trust and cooperation does not extend beyond such relationships. The logic of this living world, which supports political and economic
transactions and negotiations as well as daily lives, conflicts with Western civil society, whose basic rule is problem solving and profit sharing based on debates and rules. This aspect, conventionally viewed as a Southeast Asian cultural one that is difficult to change, must be analyzed sociologically as a social relationship theory in the formation of civil society, as an issue to be overcome. Kitahara (2002) also pointed out the undesirable social capital on regional election campaign in Thailand, which calls on populists to reflect on their thought that regards all of traditional social relations in rural community as social capital of villagers. He furthermore considers the corporation between advocacy on community thoughts by those populists and civil society theory by liberalists, and hopes the establishment of welfare society that close the gap between rural areas and cities, upper class and lower class, by redistribution policy.

There are also arguments that envision leaders in the formation of civil society other than the new middle class. Alternative development theories were presented by intellectuals, religious personnel, and NGO members and researchers from industrialized nations expressed their support (Nishikawa, ed., 2001; Nishikawa and Noda, ed., 2001; Komai, 2001). The social development theory was proposed by international aid organizations as well (Onda, 2001). It is certainly appealing to have a cultural composition that presents an antithesis to the capitalism and modernism of a hegemonic state while placing its developmental ideal on Theravada Buddhism and agricultural fundamentalism. Religious personnel, the key to endogenous development and the activity of practical and efficient farming are all very fascinating, yet those studies left me with the impression that the role of NGOs/NPOs in regional development and the role of religion in making a social contribution were both overrated. It is true that there are many cases one needs to learn from, but without coordination with social policies, it will be difficult to overcome class and regional disparities (Kitahara, 1996). The essence of the discussion to explore the social development theory with traditional cultures, customary practices in communities, and religious culture as social capital consists of two points: 1) social capital may or may not contribute to economic progress, thus, what is crucial is to examine the conditions for social development, 2) since social capital was historically established, it will be difficult to artificially re-create it in a short time; therefore, it is essential to discuss the social process when incorporating social capital into the development theory.
Whether it is the new middle class or a new social movement, it is not easy to describe the process of civil society formation from just one social force as a blueprint. For this reason, the tasks of linking the transformation of regional society to macro political and social changes and connecting the discussion on the formation of civil society that has been extracted from an analysis on the existing state of Southeast Asian society to the theory of Western civil society remain unresolved for many researchers (Funatsu, 2005).
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