

Race, Cultural Identity, Citizenship, Tax, FATCA, and FBAR : An Essay on the Plight of an Expatriated U. S. Citizen in Japan

Lee Flake*

Abstract

The author takes a critical look at cultural identity and raises the question of race as a valid concept for biological or social classification and expands this point to inquire how Japanese and society determines who belongs as societal members. Marginality and ambiguity create separate criteria for determining who is Japanese. The author explains taxation laws imposed by the U.S. government on its expatriated citizens including citizenship tax, FATCA and FBAR. The burden of having to file taxes based on citizenship and not on employment or country of residence raises a question of the fairness of the tax system of the United States.

Keywords : race ; society ; cultural identity ; citizenship ; tax ; FATCA, FBAR

1. About the Author

The author having lived extensively in Japan for over two decades as an expatriated American often questions his cultural identity as the attachment to his homeland has dissolved over the years. While striving

*leeflake@nagasaki-u.ac.jp

for cultural acceptance in Japan the author has found that acceptance is exclusive to ethnic orientation and appearance over cultural knowledge or language skill. Caucasian colleagues of Western lineage who have taken on Japanese citizenship have also shared experiences on the lack of cultural acceptance and overall disbelief of citizenship based entirely on physical appearance. Western expatriates must carefully consider the political and social ramifications of naturalizing as a Japanese. Taking on citizenship is a serious matter especially since Japan does not recognize dual or multiple citizenship unless one is a minor. Renunciation of all former citizenship means that one must re-evaluate their personal identity and connection to their homeland. Likewise, one's "new" identity as a Japanese is potentially a challenge for social acceptance since nationality in the social definition is determined predominantly by race. Although politically accepted as a citizen, a naturalized Westerner may never become fully accepted by society and be condemned to reside as a perpetual foreigner.

The author studied East Asian Cultural Anthropology at universities in Korea and Japan and majored in Asian Studies and Japanese at his alma mater in the United States. The author has also worked facilitating courses at universities and public schools in Japan and Korea further providing cultural perspective based on research, experience and observation.

2. Questioning Race as a Valid Concept for Biological Classification

Human beings, in all societies, try to impose order and classify the universe around them. In all languages, objects of the natural world are named. Everything, from the smallest plants and animals to every river and mountain all have names. However, the imposed order and classification of the natural universe is more than merely assigning names. Human beings also find it necessary to determine what things belong together based upon observed similarities of qualities between plants and animals. Having an object named and categorized in a certain group serves to establish the identity of that object. However, even those who are doing the classifying are part of the natural world being classified. Therefore, humans are also subject to classification (Klass, 1971). Humans use race as a classification method to establish identity. There are many variables to consider in the classification of humans and whether it is a valid concept. With the consideration of all the complexities and contradictions within classification systems such as cultural implications and historical and modern problems, one comes to the conclusion that human classification based upon race is, in fact, not a valid biological classification concept.

Races are defined by sociologists as being “groups of people characterized by shared inherited physical traits that distinguish them from other groups.” (Rose, 1986). *Race*, in many ways is synonymous with the term *ethnicity*. Both terms are used to describe the awareness of differences among people. Ethnic groups are those within a larger society that retain distinctive cultural and social traits. Although every person

is physically unique, gross similarities of skin color, hair texture and other traits often lead us to categorize people according to certain shared physical characteristics (Horton, 1976).

Modern classification of human beings is most often credited to the work of Carolus Linnaeus, who divided humans according to skin color, and reported that there were four divisions, or races: African, European, Asian, and American-Indian (Klass, 1971). However, Linnaeus classification for races was challenged by Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, who in 1775 proposed that humans should be divided into five races: Caucasian, Mongolian, Ethiopian, Malayan, and American. Nevertheless, even Blumenbach's theory for classification has proven unsatisfactory due to certain groups that don't "fit" into his divisions. To compensate for these problems, terms such as "Mongolian-like" are used to describe East Asian, Siberian, American-Indian or Polynesian people who are not classifiable according to Blumenbach's theory (Klass, 1971). In addition to these problems of racial classification, people who are of a "mixed race" also encounter social as well as scientific difficulties identifying themselves unambiguously. Therefore, race is an invalid biological concept because of the many *sub-race* variations.

In modern scientific studies, Blumenbach's theory of five race groups has been replaced by the theories of Lewontin. According to Lewontin, the actual levels of genetic variations between and within seven designated "races" are greater *within* these races than *between* them. His studies indicate that race explains only about ten percent of human genetic diversity. This low number indicates that race is not an accurate description of human variation. Therefore, race is a product of human minds and not of nature, and "...race fails to describe variation accu-

rately [because] much variation is continuous, whereas race is a discrete unit" (Relethford, 1996).

Other reasons that race is not valid as a biological classification concept is that race has cultural and social implications. Therefore, its classification presents many problems for interpretation. Human classification of race throughout history has often had undertones of nationalistic adventures. Race is often used for biological as well as social distinctions. Aristotle, a Greek philosopher, indicated with his essentialist concept that all beings, including humans, must have their "perfect type" and he placed favoritism toward the Greeks as being the "perfect type." Linnaeus in the 1700's also classified human behavioral attributes with a heavy bias against groups other than Europeans. During the 1900's, Morton used the study of cranial size variations for the basis of his classification theory. However, he was selective about having larger skull sizes to support Europeans in his experiments, which dramatically and artificially altered the results of his studies. His studies as well as Broca's studies of cranial shape used to determine race have been proven to be inconclusive. With undertones of racism, Boas conducted "intelligence tests" on immigrants in an attempt to prove his ideas that round-headed people are superior in intellect (Lambert, 1988).

Modern classification techniques, although more detailed and varied in nature, are still inconclusive as established criteria for determining race identity. Modern classification techniques include comparative studies of blood type, hair type, DNA, and Rh factor (Marks, 1995). Mendel's law of segregation published in 1865 is still a source for chromosome study and modern classification ever since its rediscovery in the 1900s (Relethford, 2012). There have also been various linguistic studies

used in the attempt to classify of race (Cavalli-Sforza, 1991). Other studies consist of a more scientific approach to traditional race classification based upon skin color. Differences in skin color reflect differences in the rates of melanin synthesis (Richards, 1998). By theory, the skin pigmentation and its reaction to ultraviolet radiation from the sun has an influence on the distribution of race populations. Melanin pigment of the skin protects against ultraviolet radiation and is more evident in populations that are in geographic locations which heavily expose such populations to radiation from the sun (Maged, 1997).

Historical and social studies of human classification have often continued to breed segregation. It is easier to identify an individual on the basis of "race" as a title or a name without consideration to the individual. Therefore, a racial name may also be used to strip away identity and reduce a person to an object or to an inanimate entity – completely disposable and convenient to discriminate (Franti, 1994). Much like a camera cannot take a picture of itself, perhaps it is impossible for an individual to know who they are until they have an understanding of who they are not (Freilich, 1972). We find out about ourselves through others. Race is not a valid biological concept because of cultural implications as well as historical and modern problems associated with the classification of race.

Race as a classification method promotes discrimination and "othering" of marginal society members. This is also very much evident in modern societies across the globe. As Donna Nakazawa wrote in the July 6, 2003 edition of *Parade Magazine*, many governments do not readily acknowledge cultural diversity as those of mixed-race are not given the liberty to identify themselves as belonging to more than one race.

The “you can’t be both” mentality is manifested when filling out forms requesting information on race or nationality. Boxes might be labeled “black” “white” “Asian” when one of mixed-race is forced to mark only one choice and “other” or multiple selections are not an option, one’s identity becomes institutionally challenged (Nakazawa, 2003).

Scientists have acknowledged that there is more variation within race than between race further suggesting that racial classification is not valid. In social terms as well, variations in what is considered “dark-skinned” or “black” is a source for bullying and discrimination even among dark-skinned social groups. Sharon G. Flake (1998) in her novel “The Skin I’m In” writes about how African-American youth interpret different hues of dark skin color as labels and criteria for discrimination suggesting that there are different degrees of “blackness” in reference to both skin color and character.

Lee Thomas (2007) in his book “Turning White” challenges skin color as racial identification when considering skin color being altered through skin pigmentation disorders such as vitiligo. Vitiligo is a condition where melanocytes, the cells that promote skin pigmentation, shut down leaving sections of skin void of color. Universal vitiligo encompasses most of the body and such depigmentation renders an individual completely white due to the absence of skin color. Albinos are also void of skin pigmentation due to a lack of melanocytes and the enzyme tyrosinase from birth. Albinos and individuals with vitiligo have suffered social ostracization and discrimination throughout history. In the 18th century, social scientists such as Abbe Demanet, Comte de Buffon, and Claude-Nicolas Le Cat attempted to categorize albinos as a separate race further complicating the validity of race as a quantifier of humans

(Blakemore & Jennett, 2001).

3. Thoughts on Cultural Identity: Who is *Japanese* in Today's Japan?

In order to determine who is Japanese and who is not Japanese from the native resident viewpoint, it is best to have an understanding of the Japanese culture. It is difficult for Westerners to see Japanese entirely as the Japanese see themselves. It's difficult for any individual to see themselves and acknowledge their beliefs and culture until in a situation where they are in a culture or environment that is other than what they are accustomed to. In other words, "you don't know who you are until you know who you aren't." This concept can be viewed to breed separation, but it is by labeling that a society and an individual are created. Labeling is a necessary initial step in understanding anything at all. When questioning what X is, it is necessary to formulate an answer by first giving a name to X (Lebra, 1996).

Labeling by relations and patterns of social interaction provide references for belongingness. Cultural anthropologist Takie Lebra Sugiyama explains in detail about how the individual is who he/she is by formal and informal references to blood ties, geographical ties, and occupational ties. These references are distinct and necessary for creating identity for the individual and are relative to how the Japanese perceive who they are. Society determines and prescribes the value to the categories. Free society is self-governing and determines the mind-set, law—with its informal and formal restraining devices, customs, and behavior of the individual society members. How the individual fits into the category,

which is described by Dr. Lebra as being the “frame,” determines if he/she is Japanese. Moeran and Valentine (1992) also describe those who do not fit the description of what a society has prescribed as being Japanese are described as being *marginals* or *outsiders*. There are different degrees of marginality and outsiders. For example, an individual who is of mixed Japanese and foreign parentage is marginal rather than being an outsider, or a “pure” foreigner. This analysis leaves an impression that the Japanese determine who is Japanese entirely by appearance; however, distrust of ambiguity in belonging is manifested by the Japanese opinion of other Asians.

Who exactly is marginal is determined by society. Dr. Lebra stated that Japanese who don't act like Japanese are not readily accepted as being Japanese. Examples, as given in the anthropological studies are the cases of *Nikkei* “returnees.” After living abroad, those Japanese found that their perception and behavior slightly altered and differed from other Japanese upon returning to Japan. Dr. Lebra explained this concept by the description of how foreigners are expected to act like foreigners. “Japanese expect foreigners in Japan to retain their foreign identity... *Japanized* foreigners, who may be liked by their Japanese friends, to be sure, nevertheless often disturb the sense of belongingness held by most Japanese” (Lebra, 1996). This can also be argued about returnees in Japan. The author associated with Japanese returnee students at Kansai Gaidai University and was told of their experiences of being bullied by classmates due to their Japanese-ness being challenged by native residents. Most of the Japanese returnees were from Brazil; however, Japanese returnees were also composed of long-term residents of Polynesia, Australia, Canada, and the United States.

International marriages and other foreign contact label the individual separated as a marginal, marrying a foreigner from a low-status country may render one as an outsider than a marginal. How the children of international marriages are received by society also is manifested by the titles that such children have been given by society. In Korea 혼혈 *hon hyeol* or *hon hyara* meaning, “mixed blood” is common but can also be interpreted to mean “half blood” as one can see in the Korean title of J. K. Rowling’s Harry Potter series: Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince 해리포터와혼혈왕자. However 혼혈 has in recent years been replaced by the title of 반 or 절반 meaning “half”. The author assumes that there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the 혼혈 expression when compared to the expression *tuigi* 튀기 which is inherently derogatory and refers directly to children of mixed blood. *Half* and 혼혈 *hon hyeol* are debatably descriptive; however, both expressions represent the fact the Koreans create a reference only to the “half” that is Korean without acknowledgment that the child is representative of two cultures.

Likewise, in Japan, children of international marriage were once given the label of 合の子 *ai no ko*. Derogatory expressions such as 何処の馬の骨か分からない *doko no uma no hone ka wakaranai* are found in Japanese literature. In modern times 合の子 has been updated to 混血 *kon ketsu* meaning “mixed blood” which has been further updated to ハーフ or “half.” Neither Japanese nor Koreans tend to be aware of the negative nuance associated with this term. *Half* which is derived from *half-breed* or *half-blood* carries the nuance of being unfinished, incomplete or not entire—perhaps the equivalent of 中途半端 or 何か足りない in Japanese. Although no ill intention may be given by Japanese as they use this term liberally as a label, Japanese are subconsciously only ac-

knowledging the Japanese “half” of the individual. The politically correct term for a child of an international marriage is “double” or “multi-national” since these terms acknowledge the entirety of the individual. Nevertheless, having no label at all would represent true cultural acceptance and end discrimination as the individual would not be seen as nor judged by the color of his or her skin or ethnic orientation.

The concept of “half” also represents how international marriage causes a cultural pollution resulting in marginality (Kondo, 1990). The author, having interviewed individuals of mixed parentage in Japan has found that there is divided opinion as to the offensiveness of the expression “half” as a title. Most do not find the term offensive; nevertheless, those that do find the term offensive are very much vocal about correcting the use of the title and are engaged in a never-ending battle against society as the term has become so widely accepted.

By experience, ethnic origin and skin color are determining factors for treatment as a true resident of Japan. The terms *gaijin* 外国人 refers exclusively to foreigners who are Caucasian further suggesting a covert sense of belongingness based on ethnic ties. In the late 80s, Caucasian foreigners who were able to converse fluently in Japanese were labeled *henna gaijin* 変な外人. Once a popular term, this remained in use until the mid 90s which is now replaced by the perennial *Nihongo wa o-jozu desu* 日本語はお上手です which appears on the surface to be a compliment is nevertheless potentially highly offensive to one who has taken on Japanese citizenship or has been born, raised and educated in Japan and otherwise maintains a self-identity of being Japanese. As Yoshikazu Matsui (1992) writes, further offense can be taken if this compliment is given to those who have endeavored through years of study to master

the Japanese language and are told *Nihongo wa o-jozu desu* 日本語はお上手です in response for both delivering a speech in Japanese as well as for uttering a simple greeting. Based on ethnic appearance, one is treated as perpetual foreigner regardless of language ability (Matsui, 1992).

Acceptance of an individual as being Japanese is often based primarily upon appearance and superficially upon language skills. Somewhat debatable perhaps, but this provides an interesting background for another group who are of mixed Japanese and foreign parentage. Appearance already creates a level of marginality in most cases which can only be solidified by language skill. Those who are not of mixed lineage and rely entirely on language have to continually “prove” their identity (Keene, 1999). According to naturalized Japanese citizen Debito Arudo, having Japanese language ability may serve as a *qualifier to entitlement* for “Japaneseness.” Language ability and “Japaneseness” are not a racially-based social construct, as more non-native speakers and multiethnic natives continue to appear (Arudo, 2007). Demographic changes in Japan are occurring. An increasing number of foreigners are naturalizing and becoming Japanese citizens as reported in the article *The New Faces of Japan* in the September 2006 edition Newsweek Magazine. Society accepting the citizenship of naturalized Japanese citizens is the true challenge for achieving global awareness (Newsweek, 2006).

Besides language and appearance another form of establishing identity which is culturally important in any society is the individual's name. If the individual's name is a Japanese name, it creates a notable level of acceptance within the marginality. Historically, the Japanese government required foreigner nationals of countries occupied by the

Japanese military to renounce their former citizenship as well as renounce their name for a Japanese name. Later, with the end of World War II, names written in Chinese ideograph characters or *kanji* following the pronunciation of a foreigner's original name were acceptable. In the wake of World War II, taking on Japanese citizenship was more of a choice than a matter of being forcibly assimilated; however, the practice of using such 当て字 *ateji* characters has recently gone retro by requiring all those whom take on Japanese citizenship to use only standard Japanese names. In the past only foreigners that were forcefully assimilated as Japanese had their names changed according to this standard. During the Japanese military occupation of Korea and Taiwan, the Japanese government forced Koreans and Taiwanese to have Japanese names in an attempt to eclipse their nationality and remove ambiguity and forcing a merge in culture. Japanese history and treatment of the Ainu and Ryukyu people also reflects the politically supported campaign to remove ambiguity and force assimilation.

There are various levels of marginality which are controlled by society and by the disposition of the individual Japanese society member. The later is evident in examples of Caucasian Westerners who were raised in Japan, growing up as Japanese and are Japanese by all description accept for appearance. Being of Caucasian ancestry instead of Asian descent has set the level of marginality to its own category which is closer to an outsider than even a "pure" marginal. Apparently, as also in the case of other Asians in Japan, neither language nor cultural understanding is a strong enough category to allow foreigners in Japan to be accepted as being Japanese.

4. Thoughts on Citizenship

If one is adored by society, has Japanese blood through established lineage or is deemed by the government to be an asset to society, such an individual is readily absorbed into society and accepted both socially and politically as a Japanese citizen. Examples of foreign athletes or award winners being quickly granted citizenship or permanent residency over foreign residents that have spent their whole lives petitioning for acceptance makes one realize the capriciousness of both the Japanese government's standard for granting citizenship as well as public's biased criteria for social acceptance. The author's own experience of petitioning for permanent residency and the struggles associated with the government's selection process has convinced him that the true criteria for citizenship is less than transparent. The lawyer that helped the author gain permanent residency reconfirmed this viewpoint as the author was informed that one's 有益 or *profit* that one provides for the country is debatably the true and only judging criteria for obtaining permanent residency.

Statelessness is also a social issue that concerns social and political acceptance of the citizenship of society members. Although statelessness or *mukokuseki* 無国籍 exists in Japan, it is rarely covered by the media nor readily acknowledged by the government. Stateless society members are potential candidates for discrimination beyond measure as they are not given protection from any government (Chen, 2012). Although considered an uncommon social issue, statelessness has been researched by social anthropologists. The Japanese government has not offered a permanent solution to statelessness nor is willing to grant citizenship based

on mere residence as blood ties also stain political criteria for who belongs in society. Likewise, the government of Japan does not accept multiple citizenship. This is perhaps the root of the problem determining belongingness and marginality in Japan. The author believes firmly that a governmental acceptance of multiple citizenship would end the problem of statelessness in Japan as well as create an avenue for social acceptance of marginalized citizens. Moreover, as the population in Japan declines through the low birth rate or 少子化 *shoshika*, the acceptance of dual citizenship would potentially end the population crisis as many reentry Japanese who have family abroad and permanent residents who do not desire to relinquish their homeland citizenship in order to naturalize or are politically unable to renounce their former citizenship would be able to join Japan's official population as citizens. Foreign citizens were not included in the national demographics until July of 2012. Until this date, tax-paying foreign residents were not officially recognized as residents. A more comprehensive study of statelessness and dual citizenship and its legal implications would provide perspective and further add to criteria on proving and establishing personal identity. Statelessness and non-acceptance of dual citizenship is perhaps another manifestation of how multiracial residents of Japan are marginalized.

5. U.S. Citizenship Tax, FATCA, and FBAR

U.S. Citizens residing abroad are required to file tax reports to the U. S. government regardless of source of income or country of residence. The burden of filing taxes and the fear of being penalized for not filing

properly is stressful when knowing the consequences. In the wake of the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA) enacted in 2010 requires United States citizens to report all bank accounts, savings and assets to the U.S. government. Moreover, failure to report the annual Foreign Bank Account Reports called FBARs carry big civil and criminal penalties. Even civil penalties can quickly consume the entire balance of an account (Wood, 2017).

To become Japanese, one is required by law to relinquish all former citizenship. Relinquishing citizenship for United States citizens has become increasingly expensive. As Robert W. Wood (2015) wrote for Forbes, the United States has the world's highest fee to renounce citizenship. The U.S. State Department raised the fee 422% from \$450 to \$2,350. This rate is more than twenty times the average level in other high-income countries (Wood, 2015). According to researcher Harriet Cann (2016), this is extremely high when considering that there is no fee for taking on citizenship nor renouncing citizenship in Japan and that it only costs a minimal amount (usually less than \$30) to renounce citizenship in most countries (Cann, 2016). In addition to the fee for renouncing citizenship, there is now a heavy "exit tax" imposed on U.S. Citizens renouncing citizenship.

Even with the costs of renouncing U.S. citizenship, the number as of the first quarter in 2017 was 1,313 (Wood, 2017). The total for 2016 was 5,411, up 26 percent from 2015, when the total number published was 4,279. The 2015 total was 58 percent more than 2014 (Wood, 2017). United States citizens living and working abroad, although report and pay tax where they live, must continue to file taxes in the U.S., where reporting is based on their worldwide income. Many U.S. citizens claim a foreign

tax credit, but it generally does not eliminate double taxation. U.S. government requires filing FATCA form 8938 reporting all foreign assets.

The United States is the only country in the world besides Eritrea that levies taxes based on citizenship rather than on residence or the source of revenue. The U.S. government has hypocritically criticized Eritrea in the media for such taxation while at the same time continues to levy the same oppressive tax system on its own citizens. The author, as an American citizen by birth, having spent most of his life abroad – which amounts to almost 25 years abroad as an expatriate in Asia, pays taxes to the country that he resides in, but still has to go through the complex process of filing IRS returns. The author doesn't make enough money to owe tax in the U.S. – in fact, he continually pays more to CPA tax preparers than he owes in tax. Long-term expatriated American colleagues have given up their citizenship only to avoid the stress of filing such paperwork on taxes. This is not tax evasion, since it is not about the tax expatriates owe, but rather the burden of filing and fear of penalties that often make United States expatriates question the merit of maintaining U.S. citizenship. FATCA is currently reaching across the ocean and digging into U.S. citizen's pockets to pay taxes on savings that such citizens have already paid taxes on. Taxed to relinquish citizenship and taxation based on citizenship instead of income or residence is a concept that Japanese cannot relate to, but is an essential factor when considering the requirements for relinquishing citizenship to legally naturalize in Japan. The author takes an avid interest in bringing the U.S. citizenship tax system to the attention of the Economics Faculty of Nagasaki University. A more comprehensive, empirical study on FATCA and FBAR has merit.

6. Conclusion : To Be or Not to Be

After considering the financial and political ramifications of becoming a Japanese citizen, one must still consider whether or not society will endorse or socially accept one's citizenship. Having Japanese language ability is the qualifier to "entitlement" of social acceptability ; however, it is physical appearance that is immediately endorsed. Language ability alone is not enough to convince all of society into social acceptance. Moreover, having to prove one's language competency with every society member one encounters is a never-ended task.

Citizenship is not merely a matter of legal status nor is it something earnable as Japanese citizens of non-Asian lineage are condemned to unchangeable conditions such as blood or birth. Western lineage Japanese citizens are condemned to live out their lives in Japan as perpetual foreigners. Ascribing something as important as personal identity, nationality and citizenship only to lineage and blood ties can only serve to hurt Japanese society to ostracize and alienate Japanese citizens of international lineage.

Although socially an invisible minority, multiracial Japanese are increasing in society. Viewed as a social curiosity, the few known "visible" multicultural Japanese dot the modern social landscape as TV "talents" and athletes. Although not commonly mentioned, the media shows occasional interest in the social and political acceptance of multiracial citizens.

An individual's race or ethnic orientation tends to be the sole concept that is a determining factor for social acceptance and societal acknowledgment of citizenship. This is also true for Western nations as well.

The author's casual observation of social media forums on the subject of racism and race-based hate crimes suggest that racism and "othering" of minority groups exists everywhere there are human beings. Groups and individuals struggling for social acceptance and citizenship exist in every society. Racism exists as a result of labeling and stereotyping. Race and racism, are both socially constructed concepts – neither are scientific nor biologically valid. It is morally wrong for an individual to be defined or limited by the ignorance and prejudices of other people (Flake, 1999).

Ethnocentricity, in other words, the "it's easier to deal with my own kind" way of thinking is a value held in some degree by all societies. However, Japanese appear to have a great ethnocentric sense because the society value is placed on conformism and collectivism which foster a taste of togetherness (Lebra, 1996) Moreover, the hypothesis of the influences of living in a relative homogenous society has extremely strong social implications.

The author feels that Japanese are the ones who decide who are Japanese while cultural anthropologists, sociologists, researchers, and educators are left to hypothesize and ponder about the reasons and criteria for judgment. The author is in agreement with the mindset of many modern social anthropologists that Asians in general enforce belonging on a societal level and that unambiguous belonging is a key factor of determining who is Japanese and who is not. Paradigm shifts are common throughout history and perhaps as the Japanese become more tolerant and educated concerning the multi-cultural demographic changes within their nation, a newfound acceptance for marginal societal members and citizenship based on criteria other than ethnicity will take root. Diver-

sity within the concept of race and culture is a strength. If we were all the same, it would be a boring world to live in. Being different and diverse provides uniqueness and dimension to all humans. Likewise, the differences are what afford all members of this global society an opportunity to learn from each other. When considering racial classification, perhaps it is best to be *colourblind* and classify humans on a basis of who we are as individuals and not by the vague concepts of race.

References :

- 1) Arudo, D.(2007) *What is "A Japanese"? Perspectives of a Naturalized Japanese.* Presentation for International Christian University, Wednesday, April 25, 2007.
- 2) Blakemore C. & Jennett S.(2001) *Albino: The Oxford Companion to the Body.* n. pg. Online. Internet. 14 September 2013. Available : <http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/albino.aspx>
- 3) Cavalli-Sforza L. L.(1991) Genes, Peoples and Languages. In : *Biological Anthropology*, pp.163-170. Mountain View : Mayfield Publishing Company.
- 4) Chen, T.(2012). Statelessness in Japan : Management and Challenges. In : *Journal of Population and Social Studies*, Volume 21 Number 1, July 2012 ; 79-81.
- 5) Flake, F.(1999). *The Way of the Bootstrapper: Nine Action Steps for Achieving Your Dreams.* pp. 10. New York : Harper Collins Publishers Inc.
- 6) Flake, S. G.(1998). *The Skin I'm In.* London : Corgi Books Press.
- 7) Franti, M.(1994) Socio-Genetic Experiment. In : *Disposable Heroes : Hippocracy is the Greatest Luxury.* n pg. CD : Available : #162-440-541-2. New York : 4th and Broadway Records.
- 8) Freilich M.(1972)*The Meaning of Culture: A Reader in Cultural Anthropology*, pp.100-103. Lexington : Xerox Publishing Company.
- 9) Horton, P. B.(1976) Race and Ethnic Relations. In : *An Introduction to Sociology* (Fourth Edition), pp. 333-336. New York : McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- 10) Keene, D.(1999) *Living in Two Countries*, pp. 156-161. Tokyo : Kodansha International Ltd.
- 11) Klass M.(1971) *The Kinds of Mankind : An Introduction to Race and Racism*, pp.

- 12-21. New York : J.B. Lippincott Company.
- 12) Kondo D. L.(1990) *Crafting Selves : Power, Gender, and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
 - 13) Lambert, P.(1998) Utah State University. In : *Biological Anthropology 1020*. n. pg. Classroom Lecture. Not Available : 13 November 1998.
 - 14) Lebra, T. S.(1996) *Japanese Patterns of Behavior*. Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press.
 - 15) Maged N. K. Dermatology Society. *Anatomy of the Skin*.(17 February 1997) : n. pg. Online. Internet. 15 November 2005. Available : [Http://telemedicine.org/anatomy.htm#Keratin](http://telemedicine.org/anatomy.htm#Keratin).
 - 16) Marks, J.(1995) Black, White, Other. In : *Biological Anthropology*, pp. 159-162. Mountain View : Mayfield Publishing Company.
 - 17) Matsui, Y.(1992) 外国人から見た日本語—正しい日本語が分かりやすい. Nihon Kyobunsha Shuppan.
 - 18) Moeran, B.(2007) *Ethnography at Work*. Oxford : Berg Publishers.
 - 19) Moeran, B. & Valentine, J.(1992) *Unwrapping Japan : Society and Culture in Anthropological Perspective*. Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press.
 - 20) Cann, H.(2016). *MAP: Dual Citizenship Around the World*.(9 November 2016) webpage for Movehub accessed January 1, 2017 from <http://www.movehub.com/blog/dual-citizenship-around-the-world-map>.
 - 21) Nakazawa, D. J.(2003) *The Changing Faces of America : What Young People of Mixed-Race Can Tell Us about the Future of Our Children*. Sunday, July 6 2003 edition of Parade Magazine. New York : Parade Publications.
 - 22) Newsweek (2006) *The New Face of Japan : Foreigners Are Not Only Coming – They're Staying*. Special Report on Immigration, Newsweek Magazine, September 11, 2006.
 - 23) Relethford, J. H.(1996) The Biology and Behavior of the Living Primates. In : *The Human Species An Introduction to Biological Anthropology*, pp. 353-407. Mountain View : Mayfield Publishing Company.
 - 24) Relethford, J. H.(2012) *Human Population Genetics*. pp. 2-6. A John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Publication.
 - 25) Richards J. University of California.(22 April 1998) : n. pag. Online. Internet. 15 November 1998. Available : [Http://medicine.ucsd.edu/pathology/~som213/skin.2](http://medicine.ucsd.edu/pathology/~som213/skin.2)

html.

- 26) Rose, P. I. (1986) Race and Ethnicity. In : *Sociology : Inquiring into Society*, pp. 228-239. San Francisco : Canfield Press.
- 27) Thomas, L. (2007). *Turning White : A Memoir of Change*. New York : Momentum Books.
- 28) Wood, R. W. (2015). *U.S. Has World's Highest Fee to Renounce Citizenship*. Forbes (23 October 2015) retrieved January 1, 2017 from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/robertwood/2015/10/23/u-s-has-worlds-highest-fee-to-renounce-citizenship/#65584ae26568>.
- 29) Wood, R. W. (2017). *More Americans Renounce Citizenship, New List Released*. Forbes (12 June 2017) retrieved June 15 2017 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/robertwood/2017/06/12/more-americans-renounce-citizenship-new-list-released/#8a431b56fe95>