REVIEW COMMENT:

RECENT TREND OF THEORIES OF SOCIAL CLASS AND ETHNICITY

MARIKO TAKAGI

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently there have been many ethnic conflicts happening all over the world, and more and more attention has been focused on ethnic phenomena. They are more like ethno-nationalistic movements than class struggles because the hostile groups distinguish themselves from each other based on cultural, religious, racial, and linguistic factors, or a combination of these elements.

For instance, the separatist movement of the Quebecois in Canada is a typical ethnic struggle. The people who live in Quebec favor speaking French rather than English. They share common historical experiences as French-Canadians, and put much value on their French origin. They are proud of speaking French and claiming the secession from the country of Canada. The United States is known as a multi-ethnic society and there is a lot of ethnic friction among the different ethnic/cultural groups. The overt and covert discrimination against Afro-Americans is an apparent expression of the ethnic conflict. Afro-Americans are the group of people who share their common African ancestory arriving as slaves, and their complexion is quite darker than European people. In the same country, Native Americans (or more commonly called American Indians) are recognized as oppressed and disadvantaged people. They had lived on the American Continent long before the Conquistadores and the Pilgrim Fathers, but they were degraded to the status of one of the minority groups. Some of them identify themselves as Native Americans, whereas others want to claim their identity with a certain tribe, or subgroup of Native Americans.

Tribalism could also cause a serious conflict as we saw in the war in Biafra in Africa. The tragic war made the world realize that there are many ethnic groups called tribes in Africa and members of one group share strong ethnic identity and somtimes hostility against other tribes caused by ethnic differences. (See Wallerstein 1972, 1985)

Even in Japan, a comparatively homogenious society, ethnic conflicts started to come into our vision. A surge of Asian refugees are on the flow, in addition to the immigrant workers from the Philippines, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and China. Partly because Japanese are not used to having so many Asian workers around in their neighborhood, partly because the "alien" workers are not willing to assimilate Japanese culture and style of living, partly because language problems always cause more misunderstanding, antagonism against heterogeneous factors is growing among the native Japanese.

Moreover, ethnic movements are not confined to capitalist industial countries. In the Soviet Union, the republics of Lithuania and Ukraine are trying to win independence of the Union. In Yugoslavia, Slovenians are proposing to secede from the country.

Considering these ethnic conflicts in industrial countries as well as in developing countries, in communist coutries as well as in capitalist coutries, it seems that ethnicity, rather than social class identity, is a stronger cause for group formation. People appear to recognize ethnic group membership, or ethnic consciousness, more strongly than class consciousness. If not, the coalition of the Hispanic laborers and black laborers in the Labor Union Movement could have been realized a long time ago.

Thus, most of the conflicts in the world have some ethnic elements in their roots. It seems true that a social class cannot control the behavior of its laborers, and that class confrontation can no longer lead to the polarization of the society (See Darendorf, 1959). However, do class conflicts no longer exist? Even if they look like ethnic conflicts ostensibly, there are some conflicts actually caused from economic inequality between the confronting two groups, surely. The point is that these economic conflicts are not leading to the class struggle nor causing social changes. What is the relationship, then, between ethnic elements and class elements in the conflict? How do the ethno-nationalism and class conflicts interact with each other? Or are the ethno-nationalistic movements and class conflicts totally different things? How do ethnic factors influence the social stratification of society? These are the questions we must treat when we want to study the prevailing ethnic phenomena.

Many studies have been done with regards to these questions, but it appears they differ from one another to the extent that theories regarding ethnicity and class are in confusion.The definition of the term, "ethnicity," is still, in a sense, ambiguous. The purpose of this study is not to develop any new theory to analyze ethnic movements. The purposes are; (1) to see the present position of the study of ethnicity and social class and find the features: (2) to introduce the most influential current perspective, a world-system model, and see how the ethnic elements are treated in this model: (3) to introduce a comparative new approach of class struggle analysis to the ethnic phenomena, and see its future prospectos.

2. CURRENT ANALYSES ON ETHNICITY

Let us start with defining the term, an ethnic group, only for the use of this paper. (In fact the definition of the term deserves an elaborate study. See Glazer and Moynihan, 1975, Kashioka, 1986b). An ethnic group is a group of people who share some cultural elements, such as language, religion, and customs, have common historical experiences, or belong to the same racial group. The members of the group subjectively belong to this group, and the members share the "we-ness" with other members.

As we have seen at first, more and more ethnic groups are becoming active and participating in the movements. How then are these ethnic mobilizations studied by the recent social scientists? Nagel (1984; 419) argues that the increasing number of studies on ethnicity is caused by the "failure of earlier assimilationist, primordial models of ethnicity." These primordial models were influenced by the scholars of functionalism. According to Kashioka (1984; 214), the functionalist scholars shared some common understandings regarding social development. He summarized these understandings with regard to social development and ethno-nationalism. "First, in the process of industrialization, people are to respect universalism and achievement as core values, and gradually, primordial ties are to lose the significance except as a matter of style. Second, thanks to the development of a communication

network and transportation, the knowledge of the people increases. Moreover, people all over the world become more dependent upon each other, and they start to share commoner cultures. Third, people come to recognize equality and autonomy as ultimate ideological aims. In its process ethno-nationalism tends to have a certain temporary meaning, but after all the higher social development will unionize the world." Thus, the cultural, religious and linguistic (=ethnic) division will have a temporary significance at one time of social development, but it will ultimately decline because countries and states in the world become more unified in the process of development.

Since this functionalistic approach failed to forsee recent ethnic movements, some new approaches to this phenomenon were to appear. These include: theories of labor migration and immigration, dependency theory, dual labor markets, split labor markets, internal colonialism, theories of middleman minorities, labor aristocracy theories, world systems theory, cultural division of labor, and so on (See Bonacich 1980, Geschwender 1987, Nagel 1984). They vary in the focus of study and each has its strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, they are sometimes criticized for sharing a common feature: class reductionism approaches inherited from Marx's class determinism. The moving force of social change should be found in economic relations, so the Marxist theorists tend to look for economic reasons as determinants. Among these, however, Wallerstein's world-system theory is worthwhile paying attention to, though it also has some defects. The world system perspective is believed to solve "the great questions of classical sociology, such as the interplay between history and political economy, the relationship between capitalism and the worldwide division of labor, and the role of social class and state in the development of the world-system" (So, 1986; 1)

Wallerstein discusses the relations between social classes and ethnic groups from a world-system perspective and he understands these two categories in a unique way. His well-developed world-system theory helps us to better understand the prevailing ethnic phenomena within the world as a unit. In the next chapter, let us look closely at Wallerstein's world-system perspective in relation to "ethno-nations," and ethnic phenomena.

3. WALLERSTEIN AND WORLD-SYSTEM THEORY

a. Basics of World-System Theory

Wallerstein (1974; 390) defines a "world system" as a "unit with a single division of labor and multiple cultural systems."

> We take the defining characteristics of a social system to be the existence within it of a division of labor, such that the various sector or areas within are dependent upon economic exchange with others for the smooth and continuous provisioning of the needs of the area. Such economic exchange can clearly exist without a common political structure and even more obviously without sharing the same culture.

In his view, a world system naturally has cultural diversity, and each area in the world economy system is supposed to play an assigned role in terms of division of labor.

There are three basic elements to capitalist world-economy. First, is the international division of labor established for production for sale in a single market, whose purpose is to realize maximum profit. Second, is "the existence of a series of state-structures of varying degrees of strength (both within their boundaries, and vis-a-vis other entities in the world-system)" (1975; 368). Third, is that "there are not two, but three, tiers to the exploitative process" (1975; 368). Wallerstein puts the

middle tier between the tiers of two confronting groups, the exploited and the exploiter. "The existence of the third category means precisely that the upper stratum is not faced with the unified opposition of all others because the middle stratum is both exploited and exploiter" (1975; 405)

Therefore, Wallerstein introduced us the three elemental areas consisting of the "world economy", a core area, a semi-peripheral area and a peripheral area. These three areas play their own assigned parts in terms of the division of labor. In this process, the peripheral area is forced to specialize in the production of food and resources for the core area, which inevitably leads to a peripheral condition of "under-development." By introducing the three-tiered model, however, Wallerstein could "avoid the deterministic statement that a periphery is bound to have underdevelopment because the core always exploits the periphery" (So, 1986; 3). In short, the semi-periphral area is to play a role as a cushion between the core and the periphery.

b. Wallerstein and Marx

To appreciate Wallerstein's contribution to the current social studies, let us look at the differences between Wallerstein and Marx in terms of social classes and ethnic groups.

The discovory of the third tier between the two classes is the first difference between Wallerstein and Marx. Marx argued that "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" (Marx and Engels; 1975 ; 131). Marx (1978c ; 220) tried to prove ; "1) that the existence of classes is only bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production (N. B. economic-oriented) 2) that class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat (N. B. class struggle), 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition of the aboilition of all classes and to a classless society (N. B. abolition of classes) ." These notions were based on Marx's belief that groups of people in a society are gradually polarized into two confronting groups. Marx says, "Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into the great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other — bourgeoisie and proletariat" (Marx and Engels; 1975; 132). Thus, we see Marx's model was essentially made up of only two hostile social classes. Wallerstein, however, considered the middle tier between Marx's two confronting classes. In the case of Marx's two-tiered format, the class polarization should be inevitable As Wallerstein (1975; 368) says, it is "essentially disintegrating." On the other hand, the three-tiered format of Wallerstein's is more stabilizing, because of the existence of the third tier: a semi-periphery. Wallerstein (1975 ; 368) however confirms;

> We are not saying that three tiers exist at all moments. We are saying that those on top always seek to ensure the existence of three tiers in order the better to preserve their privilege, whereas those on the bottom conversely seek to reduce the three to two, the better to destroy this same privilege.This fight over the existence of a middle tier goes on continually, both in political terms and in terms of basic ideological constructs (those that are pluralist versus those that are manicheist.)

Another difference between Marx and Wallerstein regards the understanding of the ethno-nations. For Marx, only the class struggles could move the society, and change it. And class is based on the control over the means of production. Those who possess and those who do not would come into confrontation because of the existence of economic inequality. Thus, class polarization is to be caused by the "economic" elements. In other words, changes occurring in the "substructure" could stimulate the "superstructure" of the society, and inevitably lead to a total change of society. The superstructure of society includes culture, education, family relationships, religion and so forth, whereas the

substructure is purely an economic part of the structure. Marx thought that the ethnic movements which started from very cultural elements would not lead to social change, because only the economic class struggle could realize social change. Marx would not pay attention to any struggle as long as hostile groups were subjectively fighting over ethnic problems. That is to say, if black Americans were rebelling against white Americans because of the latter's maltreatment based on the racial discrimination and cultural differences, it is insiginificant in Marx's view. As long as the members identify themselves with an ethnic/cultural group, their group is still in the stage of what Marx called class-in-itself (*classe an sich*) . When they become conscious of the economic inbalance and form a group on the basis of economic interest, then their group becomes a class-for-itself (*classe fur sich*). Thus, Marx would like to call the present ethnic groups (no matter if they are fighting against each other, or at peace) groups led by "false" consciousness.

Wallerstein (1972 ; 174) answers Marx, "to answer that it is false consciousness is simply to push the question one step logically back." Wallerstein (1972; 173) asks, "Why is it that classes are not always *fur sich?* Indeed, why is it they are so seldom *fur sich?*" He applies Weber's "status group" [1] into this question, and developes his arguement. Wallerstein (1972; 173-4) asks the same question using "status groups,": "How do we explain that status group consciousness is so pervasive and powerful a political force, in Africa and throughout the world, today and throughout history?" Wallerstein (1975 ; 370) argues that;

> The traditional distinction between objective class status and subjective class membership (common to the majority of both Marxists and functionalists) seems to me totally artificial. An objective class status is only a reality insofar as it becomes a subjective reality for some group or groups, and if it "objectively" exists, it inevitably will be felt "subjectively." The question is not there, but in the degree to which the "objective" reality takes the "subjective" form of class-consciousness rather than the form of ethno-national consciousness.

For Wallerstein (1975 ; 369) , "class" and "ethno-nation" are two sets of clothing for the same basic reality. " [I]t is important to realize that there are in fact two sets of clothing, so that we may appreciate how, when, and why one set is worn rather than the other." Wallerstein believes that just like classes do not have permanent reality, neither do ethno-nations. For him, classes are formed, and consolidate themselves, then, they disintegrate, and they are re-formed. So do ethno-nations. Wallerstein (1975 ;369) says "Ethno-nations, just like social classes, are formed, consolidate themselves, disintegrate or disaggregate, and are constantly re-formed." In short, just as So and Hikam (1989 ; 7) spell out, "The history of construction of classes, nations, and ethnic groups is a history of the constant rise and fall of the intensity of these political claims in cultural clothing."

Wallerstein (1975 ; 369) points out that each concrete analysis of ethnic / class struggles should find "whether a given stratum is an emerging, established, or a declining social class." He interestingly applies the classic Marxian terminology to the three aspects of the evolution of classes; emerging classes are to be classes *an sich*, and established classes are classes *fur sich*, and then false consciousness is to be explained as the defense of the interests of a declining social class.

Thus far, we have seen some differences between Marx and Wallerstein and reviewed some of the contributions Wallerstein made to the current social studies. Now we should also look at how Wallerstein challenged another master of sociology, Max Weber. It should make us understand more about the relations between the classes and status groups.

c. Wallerstein and Weber

First we should briefly look at Weber's ideal type of status group. Weber disagreed with Marx's economic determinism in class formation, and he introduced a new idea, a status group. Weber (1968; 306) explains; "a status group means plurality of persons who, within a larger group, successfully claim (a) a special social esteem, and possibly also (b) status monopolies. Status groups may come into being: (a) in the first instance, by virtue of their own style of life, particularly the type of vocation: 'self-styled' or occupational status group, (b) in the second instance, through hereditary charisma, by virtue of successful claims to high-ranking descent : hereditary status groups, or (c) through monopolistic appropriation of political or hierocratic powers; political or hierocratic status groups."

Weber did not ignore the importance of the ethnic groups, rather he wrote one chapter on ethnic groups in his "Economy and Society," and even defined what ethnic groups were. [2] For him, an ethnic groups is a kind of status group, and he explained how the idea of "status group" is related to that of "class." Weber (1968; 932) remarks, " [H]onor may be connected with any quality shared by a plurality, and, of course, it can be knit to a class situation: class distinctions are linked in the most varied ways with status distinctions. Property as such is not always recognized as a status qualification, but in the long run, it is, and with extraordinary regularity." Although Weber (1968; 932) said "it (=status honor) normally stands in sharp opposition to the pretensions of sheer property," in general "economic interest and the quest for prestige tend to reinforce each other" (Bendix; 1974; 154). In short, people wish to improve their opportunities in life by combining property and prestige, which may exist separately.

In regard to group formation, Weber introduced the notion of "monopolization," or "closure," in explaining people clustering around a common interest. Weber spells out that once people form a group which has a common interest, they want to protect it, so they tend to be monopolistic as well as exclusive. [3] Such monopolization, or closure plays an important role also when people form an ethnic group. The members of a certain ethnic group tend to preserve common cultural traits such as customs, style of life, language, or religion and exclude the outsiders in order to survive.

How does Wallerstein react to Weber's views? Wallerstein generally agrees with Weber's ideas of status group. However, he challenges Weber with regard to the relations between status groups and social classes. Weber (1968; 938) states;

> As to the general economic conditions making for the predominance of stratification by status, only the following can be said. When the bases of the acquisition and distribution of goods are relatively stable, stratification by status is favored. Even technological repercussion and economic transformation threatens stratification by status and pushes the class situation into the foreground. Epochs and countries in which the naked class situation is of predominant significance are regularly the periods of technical and economic transformations.

Wallerstein (1972; 174) conceives that Weber's explanation "makes class consciousness the correlate of progress and social change, stratification by status the expression of retrograde forces," and ironically calls this statement of Weber's "a sort of vulgar Marxism."

There are three main points in Wallerstein's criticism against Weber. First, Weber regards status-groups and social classes as two different and cross-cutting groups. However, Wallerstein states that these two groups are two different existential forms of the same essential reality. Second, Weber said technological change and economic transformation would push the class situation into the

fore, and he was eventually criticized for his "vulgar Marxism." Wallerstein disagrees with Weber because Wallerstein puts more emphasis on the strength of status honor. Wallerstein (1972; 177) spells out; "Status honor is not only a mechanism for the achievers of yore to maintain their advantages in the contemporary market, the retrograde force described by Weber; it is also the mechanism whereby the upward strivers obtain their ends within the system (hence the correlation of high ethnic consciousness and education. . .) " Third, Wallerstein did not think that technological repercussion and economic transformation pushes the class situation into the fore-ground, contrary to Weber. After showing that history gives this the lie, Wallerstein (1972; 177) explains, "Class consciousness only comes to the fore in a far rarer circumstance, in a 'revolutionary' situation, of which class consciousness is both the ideological expression and the ideological pillar."

d. Criticisms of the World-System Theory

Thus far, we saw the contributions of world-system theory compared with the theories of the classic masters of sociology, Marx and Weber. However, the world-system theory could not avoid being a target of numerous criticisms. In this section, we should look at some of the important ones.

One of the criticisms is that Wallerstein neglects the important role of social classes on historical development. So (1986, 4) explains:

> The critics focus on a question which Wallerstein raises but does not answer: "When, then, does class analysis fit in the world-system theory?". . . Because of lack of class analysis, critics argue that the world-system analysis is highly abstract. . . [W]orld-system reseachers fail to study concrete class structure and fail to bring out the unique historical development of each social formation. . .

Another criticism is the issue of passive periphery. According to So (1986 ; 5) the critics argue that Wallerstein and his followers have exaggerated "the power of the capitalist world-system to such an extent that world-system dynamics can determine the pattern of local development irrespective of domestic class relations," and that "such a model sees the dynamic of the system as flowing completely from the center," so that "the periphery. . . becomes a passive victim of capitalism from without." The critics want to emphasize the significance of internal class relations in shaping domestic development, which was neglected in the world-system theory.

In addition, we need to pay attention to the issue of when the groups wear "status group" clothing and when they put on "class" clothing. Wallerstein said that class and ethno-nation are two sets of clothing for the same reality. However, he (Wallerstein: 1975 ; 375) added that:

> The capitalist world-economy as a totality — its sturcture, its historical evolution, its contradictions — is the arena of social action. The fundamental political reality of that world-economy is a class struggle which however takes constantly changing forms: overt class consciousness versus ethno-national consciousness, classes within nations versus classes across nations. If we think of these forms as kaleidoscopic reflections of a fundamental reality which has a structure seldom visible to the naked eye of the observer (like the world of the atom for the Physicist) , but one that can in fact be perceived as an evolving pattern, then we may come closer to understanding the social reality of the capitalist world-system of which we are a part, the better and the faster to transform it.

He points out the importance of seeing if the fighting groups wearing "status" (ethno-national) clothing will change their clothing to that of social class. But just as he did not pay enough attention to

internal class relations in the domestic arena, he did not give a clear and concrete view of when, and how a group will gain either class-consciousness or status group-consicousness.

Another criticism against Wallerstein is that even Wallerstein could not avoid being a class-reductionist.

> If the society were to become ethnically 'integrated,' class antagonisms would not abate, the opposite in fact is true. One of the functions of the network of status group affiliations is to conceal the realities of class differentials. To the extent, however, that particular class antagonisms (if not differentials, but even differentials) also abate and disappear (Wallerstein; 1972 ; 179) .

It means he did not consider the case that status groups would continue fighting over status-group issues and would not become class-conscious at all.

Most of the grand theories show that there are some difficulties when we want to apply them to the empirical local studies of rather small units. The world-system perspective actually neglects the local development process of the peripheral area in particular. [4] Thus, there are some shortcomings in world-system theory. But we should not give up studying ethnic movements, and making use of this grand theory. Since the world-system theory contributed to the understanding of the relations between ethno-nations and classes, this theory should contribute to the studies on ethnic phenomena. For instance, Hechter became interested in the lower economic status of the certain immigrant groups in industrial countries, and developed his theory of cultural division of labor, using world-system perspective. [5] There are also some other studies on ethnic mobilizations from world-system perspective. [6] For the purpose of this paper to understand the present position of studies on ethnic / class struggles, it is worth looking at a very new approach and examine it.

In the next chapter, we will focus on the new and unique approach to the ethnic/class struggles. This approach has been influenced by Wallerstein and Thompson, [7] and it attempts to put a new light on the classic historical class analysis.

4. CLASS STRUGGLE ANALYSIS — A NEW PERSPECTIVE ?

This approach of class struggle analysis tries to make use of Wallerstein's contributions to the new understanding of social classes and status groups, and tries to go beyond its weaknesses. Moreover, it also refers to Thompson's class analysis, and tries to go over the historical class analysis.

According to So (1986;12) , "Wallerstein's class analysis can be further developed. If we focus on class struggle instead of on class structure, then Wallerstein's approach may not look that unorthodox. It may therefore become easier to explain why a class usually struggles in the form of status group conflict instead of in the form of economic conflict."

One of the contributions of Wallerstein was that he brought status groups back into the class analysis. As we discussed in the previous chapters, he takes classes and status groups as two reflections of the same basic reality. It means that sometimes the confronting groups put on status-group clothing whereas on other occasions they might put on class clothing. The boundary between status-group struggle and class struggle is blurred and fluid. At one time the fighting groups might fight over disagreements on "status group" issues, such as religion, language, culture, style of life, and so forth. But they might find later that the cause of the struggle is more economic. Then they might become class-conscious and start a class struggle.

Presently in the United States, Mexican laborers are fighting against the prejudice and racism of the white Americans. The Mexican-American conflict has a historical background, but it is still in a phase of status-group struggle. It is said that the Mexican-Americans are not ready to participate in the big labor unions with the exploited black and white laborers and other ethnic laborers. But there is a possiblity that the Mexicans would notice that their lower disadvanteged position is not only due to their ethnicity but exploitation of the capitalists in the world-system. Then they might unite with other laborers regardless of their ethnicity. In this case, the status-group struggle can be transformed into the social class struggle. Actually, "when class struggle first begins, it seldom takes the form of pure class struggle but is always intertwined with gender, ethnic, generation, regional, national, and religious issues" (So and Hikam; 1989 ; 21) . The problem is whether it becomes a class struggle or it stays as status-group struggle, and what makes this difference.

One weakness of Wallerstein's world-system was its class-reductionism. "He seems to deny that status-group struggle can have its own dynamics" (So and Hikam; 1989; 22) .However, as we see in the current ethnic phenomena, it is more likely that the people form status-groups and keep struggling against each other. Thus, we must pay attention to this kind of status-group struggle. Moreover, we might have status-group struggles within a class. This kind of struggle hinder one class from fighting against another confronting class, and even promote the segmentation within the class. Although Wallerstein would not pay enough attention to this type of struggle, we should not ignore it because it also has importance. The class struggle analysis does not want to inherit Wallerstein's class reductionism, so this new approach should focus on the status-group struggle per se independently, and it also should examine the status-group struggle in relation to the class struggle.

Wallerstein was criticized for failing to explain when the existing groups decide to wear a class clothing or a status-group clothing. According to this new approach of class struggle analysis, "whether the participants present their issues in status group terms or in class terms is also a product of struggle" (So and Hikam: 1989 ; 22) . Using the example of the Japanese immigrant laborers who struck in the 1920s in Hawaii, So and Hikam explain that the Japanese workers at that time wanted to label themselves "labor class," but the capitalist class did not let them and treated the workers as the Japanese group, not as laborers' group. This example tells us that the group cannot identify themselves with whatever labels they want. They have to struggle with other classes before they can attach the label either of a class or of a status group.

An item on the research agenda for class struggle analysis, then, should be "to specify when, how, to what extent, and under what conditions status group relations become the multiple expressions / forms of class relations." (So; 1986; 14) . Here, we must emphasize that specifying the conditions under which the status-group struggle becomes a form of class struggle is not enough. Actually, we must know the conditions under which status-group struggle stay as they are, not becoming expressions of class struggle. In the empirical study of local struggles, we must understand why they label their conflict in status group terms at one time and why they use a class label at another.

The class struggle analysis wants to make use of Wallerstein's excellent idea of multi-arena struggle. It means that class struggles are not only found in the arena of production, but are also found in other arenas, such as the local community, the domestic market, the state, the interstate system and even in the world-system as a whole. The class struggle analysis tries to add a new insight on this idea of Wallerstein's. According to the new analysis, "it must be emphasized that the arena where the struggle takes place is also a historical product of class struggle" (So and Hikam; 1989; 24).The

workers want to spread the struggle in a production arena to the bigger arenas, but the dominant group wants to confine it to a smaller domain. Thus, "an agenda for class analysis is to examine under what conditions class struggles intensify and spread from one arena to another, and under what conditions are they nullified and confined to a small domain" (So and Hikam; 1989; 24) .

In addition, the class struggle analysis goes beyond Thompson's historical class analysis that has hitherto had a stable position in the historical sociology. Itemizing some criticism against historical class analysis, So and Hikam explain the strength of class struggle analysis.

The first defect is that the historical class analysis is a-structural. A-structural analysis means that this analysis does not examine structural positions of workers within the economy as a whole. Thompson paid a lot of attention to culture, but almost ignored the social structural elements. Actually, class struggle is not only influenced by cultural factors.

> [C]lass struggle emerges in a structural setting and its contour is shaped by structural components. The existing economic structure such as the rate of exploitation and accumulation crisis, the political structure such as legal regulations and state repression, the cultural sphere such as the presence of religion, and the historical heritage of class struggle all serve to shape the rise, the development, and the prospect for class struggle (So and Hikam; 1989 ; 25) .

Thus, as another item for research agenda of class struggle analysis, we must consider how class struggle is promoted by structural contradictions and how it is undermined by structural constraints. It is true that class struggle can promote class organizations. It can make "a new structure which, in turn, may create both new opportunities and constraints for the participants in struggle" (So and Hikam; 1989 ; 26). Another item on the research agenda, should be, to specify the intricate connection between a human agency and structural necessities.

The second defect of Thompson's historical class analysis is its subjectivism. So and Hikam (1989 ; 26-27) spell out, "From a class struggle viewpoint, subjectivism is highly unlikely because participants in a struggle seldom have the free will to choose the class/status labels they like. Instead, the participants need to struggle with other classes, and need to get rid of the inappropriate labels assigned to them before they are finally free to identify the label that matches their own interest."

The third defect of historical class analysis was shared by both Thompson and Wallerstein: the charge of unclear class boundaries. So and Hikam admit that class struggle analysis cannot avoid this unclear class boundaries because the boundary issue itself is a historical product of the struggle. So and Hikam spell out that "the struggle process is so dynamic that it moves from one form to another (class versus various status groups) and from one arena to another (production sphere versus other spheres) ." As such, a struggle changes its form and arena, and consequently the boundaries and class labels will also change. Thus, the problem of unclear boundaries is always our concern. We should put another item on our research agenda. We should examine the changing composition of participants in different phases of the class struggle process.

Let us summarize the items on the agenda for class struggle research. (1) To spell out the intricate connection between status group struggle and class struggle, and under what conditions they transform into one another and under what conditions they have their own dynamics. (2) To examine under what conditions class struggles are intensified and spreading from one arena to another, and under what conditions they are nullified and confined to a small domain. (3) To specify the intricate connection between a human agency and structural conditions, how structure at the same time promotes and limits class struggle, as well as how class struggle creates new structures and modefies old ones. (4) To

investigate the changing composition of participants in different phases of the class struggle process. (See So and Hikam 1989.)

How, then, could we validify this new approach in the study on ethnic struggles?

As a theory, this approach takes status group (ethnic/cultural group) struggle well. The main contribution of this approach can be its consideration of prevailing status-group struggle that do not seem to be transformed into class struggle. By including the type of status-group struggle that has its own dynamics, this analysis tries to study all kinds of ethnic trouble. Another contribution is its consideration of dynamics of class struggle from one arena to another. Sometimes, the struggle is confined to a very small domain. But sometimes, it can grow to be a very big struggle in a community, in a state, or even can be a world-wide problem. This means that the ethnic struggle is also confined to a small domain at one time, but that sometimes it can be found as a state-wide problem. Throughout modern history we have seen the strong ethnic struggle. With this new approach of class struggle analysis, we would be able to analyze the historical development of a certain ethnic struggle and find the dynamics. Lastly, we should remember that this class struggle analysis enables us to study class /ethnic struggle in a local area by using the world-system as a unit of analysis. If we pay too much attention to the world-system theory in studying local class/ethnic struggles in a small domain, we will be too confused by world-system dynamics to confine that area in a periphral positon. But we should remember that in that area they must have their own struggle, dynamics, and local development. Class struggle analysis is one tool to study the local class/ethnic struggle.

Thus, class struggle analysis is a theory that should be treated as a well-modified model of world-system. It surely did go beyond the world-system theory in terms of status/ethnic-group studies. Some criticism against this approach will emerge. However, well-organized empirical studies based on this analysis would prove that class struggle analysis should be highly evaluated.

5. CONCLUSION

Thanks to the development of current models, it seems that ethnic studies are making some progress in escaping the confusion. We could at first say that Wallerstein contributed very much to the understanding of ethno-nations, introducing a new way to look at status groups and social classes. His notion that class struggle takes constantly changing forms was a breakthrough for ethnic-group sociology. A status (ethno-national) group gained a new position in his theory, and was defined by the observation that status group and social class reflect the same basic reality. It is certain that more and more ethnic studies will make use of Wallerstein's model. In addition, a new approach called a class struggle analysis, influenced by a world-system theory, has potential to bring forth many good empirical studies. This new approach gave us some additional inspiration regarding class/status struggles. The items on class struggle research agenda help us with researching struggle in industrial areas as well as in developing areas.

For instance, class struggle analysis can be applied to recent strained immigrant labor-relations in Japan. A group of immigrant laborers are flowing onto Japanese shores and forming their own niches in a certian part of Japanese cities. A world-system theory will explain the dynamics of world-wide immigration flow, from periphery to semi-periphery areas and core countries, and also from semi-periphery to core areas. A theory of cultural divjsion of labor will tell us more about a certain group's confinement to a certain kind of job and geographical areas (niches). Moreover, we need to know the

local factors influencing the studied group's mobilization. If the studied group seems to have its own dynamics as a status group, international causes as well as local elements should be considered to find why it keeps the status-group dynamics. Here we should bring in a class struggle analysis. Currently, Asian immigrant laborers in Japan form several status groups (ethnic groups) and they have some ethnic conflicts not only against a host of ethnic groups, the native Japanese, but also among the immigrant ethnic groups, such as Vietnamese versus Chinese. To conduct an elaborate empirical research into immigrant Asians in Japan, a class struggle analysis will be very helpful. Through finding local factors influencing the relations among different ethnic groups, we will understand Japanese cultural and historical particularity. Moreover, this analysis approach will enable us to conduct a comparative study of Asian laborers in Japan with Asians in other parts of the world, by giving us a world-wide framework. As such, this class struggle analysis has a lot of potential.

This study aimed to review recent studies into social class and ethnicity. Since we are having some ethnic problems in Japan which need to be studied we hope this review comment would contribute to those who start new research on ethnic problems.

ENDNOTES

(1) Weber defines "status" as "an effective claim to social esteem in terms of positive or negative privileges." (See Weber; 1968 ; 306) Max Weber's notion of a status group is explained more in the next section, "Wallerstein and Weber."

(2) Weber tried to define three categories, "race," "ethnic groups," and "nation," and stated that all three terms would not be defined in a strict sociological way. Weber paid much attention to the causal factors of the ethnic actions, and concluded that there were too many factors to be investigate dseparately, carefully and in detail.

(3) Weber (1968 ; 341-342) exlains of "monopolization" as follows:

> When the number of competitors increases in relation to the profit span, the participants become interested in curbing competition. Usually one group of competitors takes some externally identifiable characteristic of another group of (acctual or potential) competitiors — race, language, religion, local or social origin, descent, residence, etc. — as a pretext for attempting their exclusion. . . In spite of their continued competition against one another, the jointly acting competitors now form an "interest group" toward outsiders; there is a growing tendency to set up some kind of association with rational regulations; if the monopolistic interests persists, the time comes when the competitors establish a legal order that limits competition through formal monopolies; from then on, certain persons are available as "organs"

> to protect the monopolistic practices, if need be, with force. In such a case, the interest group has developed into a "legally privileged group" and the participants have become "privileged members." Such closure, as we want to call it, is an ever-recuring process; it is the source of property in land as well as of all guild and other group monopolies."

(4) Alvin So tried to develop Wallerstein's insights into a class struggle analysis in order to study how world-system dynamics interact with local forces in shaping local development in his empirical study on silk district in southern China. (See So; 1986)

(5) Hechter (1976 ; 216) argues that " the establishment of a cultural division of labor is inherent to states in the modern world-system, and especialy so since the advent of industrialization. The basic reason for this is that certain types of industrial enterprises need to recruit unskilled labor at minimal cost." Hechter's contribution is that he explained why immigrant laborers are coming in and engage themselves in certain types of job, and live in culturally distinct niches, from world-system perspective.

(6) However, most of them share a defect of economic determinism.

(7) E.P.Thompson is a British historian. He is one of the most well-known class theorists, and he emphasized the historical and dynamic aspect of class relations. Like Wallerstein, Thompson sees class as more than an economic relationship. He sees it as a social and cultural formation. (For more details, see Thompson, 1963.)

REFERENCES

Andrew, Edward. 1983. "Class in Itself and Class against Capital: Karl Marx and His Classifiers." *Canadian Journal of Political Seience*, 16 (3) : 577-584.

Arrighi, Giovanni., Terence K. Hopkins, and Immanuel Wallerstein. 1983. "Rethinking the concepts of class and Status-Group in a World-System Perspective." Review **VI**. 3 Winter:283-304.

Bendix, Reinhard. 1974. "Inequality and Social Structure: A Comparison of Marx and Weber." *American Sociological Review* 39(April) : 149-161.

Bendix, Reinhard and Seymour Martin Lipset. 1966. "Karl Marx's Theory of Social Classes." in *Class, Status and Power*, edited by Bendix and Lipset. (The Free Press)

Conner, Walker. 1978. "A nation is a nation, is a state, is an ethnic group is a . . . "*Ethnic and Racial Studies* 1 (4) : 377-400.

Darendorf, Ralph. 1959. *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society.* (Stanford University Press.)

Duke, James T. 1976. *Conflict and Power in Social Life.* (Bingham Young University Press.)

Frank, Andre Gunder. 1967. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America. Histoical Studies of*

Chile and Brazil. (Monthly Review Press.)

Geschwender, James A. 1987. "Race, Ethnicity, and Class." In *Recapturing Marxism.* Edited by Rhonda F. Levine and Jerry Lembcke. (New York Prage.)

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan. 1975. *Ethnicity. Theory and Experience.* (Harvard University Press.)

Hechter, M. 1974. "The Political Economy of Ethnic Change." *American Jounral of Sociology* 79 (5) : 1151-1178.

————. 1976a. "Ethnicity and Industrialization: On Proliferation of the Cultural Division of Labor." *Ethnicity* 3: 214-224.

————. 1976b. "Response to Cohen: Max Weber on Ethnicity and Ethnic Change." *American Journal of Sociology* 81 (5) : 1162-1168.

————. 1978. "Group Formation and the Cultural Division of Labor." *American Journal of Sociology* 84 (2) : 293-318.

Hechter, M. and M. Levi. 1979. "The Comparative Analysis of Ethno-regional Movements." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2 (3) : 260-294.

Kashioka, Tomihide. 1984a. "*Shakai Hatten ni okeru Minzoku no Ichi: Gainen no kento.* (The Status of Ethno-nations in Social Development) " *Kenkyu Ronshu* (Kansai Gaikokugo Daigaku) 39 : 209-225.

———— . 1984b. "*Kokka to Minzoku no Fuicchi: Minzoku Undo no Dotaiteki Taiporojii shiron.* (Disparity of State and Ethno-nation) " *Kenkyu Ronshu* (Kansai Gaikokugo Daigaku) 40: 437-450.

Marx, Karl. 1978a. "The German Ideology."

————. 1978b. "The Class Struggle in France, 1848-1850."

———— . 1978c. "A Letter of March 5, 1852 to his friend, Weydeymer." In *Marx-Engels Reader,* second ed. Edited by Robert C. Tucker. (Norton) .

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 1975. "Manifesto of the Communist Party." In *The Communisto Manifesto of Marx and Engels.* Edited by Harold L. Laski. (The Seabury Press.)

Nagel, Joan. 1984. "The Ethnic Revolution: The Emergence of Ethnic Nationalism in Modern States." *Sociology and Social Research* 68 July (4) : 417-434.

So, Alvin Y. 1986. *The South China Silk District: Local Historical Transformation and World-System Theory.* (State University of New York Press.)

So, Alvin Y., and Muhammed Hikam. 1989. "Class in the Writings of Wallerstein and Thompson : Toward a Class Struggle Analysis." *Sociological Perspectives,* (Forthcoming.)

Stone, John. 1979. "Introduction: Internal Colonialism in Comparative Perspective." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2 (3) : 255-259.

Thompson, E. P. 1963. "Class Consciousness." The Preface (pp. 9-13) and a section on class consciousness (pp. 807-32) from E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (Victor Gollancz, London, 1963.) ; pp. 114-143 in R. S. Neale (ed.) *History and Class.* (Basil Blackwell Published Limited. Reprinted, 1984.)

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1972. "Social Conflict in Post-Independence Black Africa: The Concepts of Race and Status Group Reconsidered." In I. Wallerstein, *The Capitalist World Economy,* (Cambridge University Press, 1979). 165-183.

————. 1974. "The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Capitalist

Analysis." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16: 387–415.

————— . 1974 (1981) . *The Modern World-system : Capitalist Agrigulture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century.* (Academic Press.) Translation by Kawakita, Minoru, *Kindai Sekai Sisutemu I, II.* (Iawanami Shoten.)

————— . 1975. "Class-Formation in the Capitalist World-Economy." *Politics and Society* 5 (3) : 367–375.

—————. 1977. "How Do We Know Class Struggle When We See It?" *The Insurgent Sociologist* 7: 104–106.

—————. 1985. "The Construction of Peoplehood: Racism, Nationalism, ethnicity." A keynote address for the Conference on "Ethnic Labels, Signs of Class: The Construction and Implication of Collective Identity," Oct. 11–12, 1985, sponsored by Center for Study of Industrial Societies, Univ. of Chicago.

Weber, Max. 1968. *Economy and Society : An Outline of Interpretive Sociology.* vols. 1, 2, 3. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. (Bedminster Press.)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS