

Descriptions of Conceivable “Quantum Urban Governance” by Analogy with Discourses on Those Who Are on the Move

Mitsuhiro TANIMURA

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Reconsideration of the Framework for Analyzing a Migratory Population
3. From Depictions Rooted in the “Newtonian View of the World”
4. Thoughts on Breaking out of the “Newtonian Paradigm”
5. Through a Perspective of the “Many - ‘Habitats’ /Identities Interpretation”

1. Introduction

So as to effectively formulate schemes and policies of what is called “Globalization/Urbanization for All,” especially in light of migratory movements, there will soon be a grave need to devise “governance,” more flexibly than ever (Tanimura 2009, 27–28). Because of awareness of the issue, I have ventured away from conventional governance theories, and explored “Descriptions of ‘Conceivable Governance’ by Analogy with Physics” (Tanimura 2009).¹

At the start of this discussion, a pivotal question was the people’s “living” states of “Parallel ‘Habitats’,” that I had looked into through relevant research projects at the Rector’s Office, United Nations University (UNU) and other academic institutions (Tanimura 2005, 66–67; 2006, 276). In particular, “Beyond UN-Habitat’s Classic Framework in Urban Development Strategies” (Tanimura 2006) focused attention on some concrete cases of “Parallel Habitats;” subsequently, an idea of governance in response to the “living” states was put forth in the tentative proposal of “Quantum Urban Governance,” which took a cue from the “Many-Worlds Interpretation” of quantum mechanics.

In addition, the above-mentioned “Descriptions of ‘Conceivable Governance’ by Analogy with Physics” (Tanimura 2009) inferred the word meaning of “Parallel ‘Habitats’,” “Quantum Urban Governance,” and other related key terms, and made some alterations on their tentative definitions (Tanimura 2009, 42). Prior to the current study, definitional descriptions of those important concepts have been summarized, as follows.

“Parallel ‘Habitats’”

“Parallel ‘Habitats’” could be defined as “a quantum-mechanical superposition of an individual’s

two or more ‘living’ states, ‘inhabiting’ territorial/non-territorial spaces, so as to ensure adequate solutions” (Tanimura 2009, 42).

“Quantum Urban Governance”

“Quantum Urban Governance” could be referred to as “a proposal of urban governance that makes a Many-‘Habitats’ Interpretation of the superposition of *plural* ‘living’ states (on the basis that overall coexistence ‘living’ states are real), implied by the concept of Parallel ‘Habitats’— by taking a cue from the Many-Worlds Interpretation in quantum mechanics, deepening the Newtonian paradigm for managing the fictional ‘sedentary’ society with approximate expressions” (Tanimura 2009, 42).

“Newtonian Urban Governance”

“Newtonian Urban Governance,” analogized from classical mechanics, would be the urban governance encompassing the following thoughts on “Governance in Solidity” and “Governance in Fluidity.” A depiction of the worldview could be a conception in which “the outer framework of fixed absolute nation-states” is set up in advance, and fundamental laws sustaining people’s “sedentary” states govern such a complex world as the “ingenious mechanical society” composed of international organizations, civil society organizations, corporate citizens, and the like. It would also be an imaginable analogy that this Newtonian paradigm is still applicable to the real world, if dealt with approximately (Tanimura 2009, 41-42).

.....

“Governance in Solidity” is grounded on such building blocks of modern nation-states as conventional communities and local/national governments that have territorially been woven by “sedentary” inhabitants. This perspective could also be shared by international organizations and global entrepreneurs attempting to reinforce/strengthen the territory-based logic. In consequence, migrants are treated within the framework of newly arriving “permanent” residents, and for the sake of each individual, there is only “optimum” solution (Tanimura 2006, 295; 2009, 28).

.....

“Governance in Fluidity” is a dynamic view of the peripatetic side as local communities are shaped from networked relationships of plural societies, including the idea of “transnationalism” woven by globally mobile people who are “commuting” from permanent residents selected as the only “optimum” solution and those migratory population groups that are seeking to attain a new “sedentary” home, considerably beyond the static view of the above-mentioned “solidity” (Tanimura 2006, 295; 2009, 28).

Based on a series of studies, this paper, as the next step in the work, proceeds further with rudimentary research for innovating a paradigm of “Quantum Urban Governance,” through a comprehensive review of literature of those who are on the move — with particular attention to respective standpoints, highlighted questions, innovative approaches, as well as their implications — and further, by analogy with those discourses. Likewise, in addition to the “‘living’ states” under discussion, I will carve out the path with another clue — identities — which have often been touched upon in the reference materials.

In the event, this paper begins by providing an overview of those articles that call for radical reconsideration of the conventional framework for analyzing a migratory population, and surmising paradigms for reflection on them. In the subsequent sections, I will look into discourses on “diasporas,” “transnationalism,” and “Globalization and Women’s Border-Crossing,” in which migratory population groups are depicted from the “Newtonian View of the World,” and then, as thoughts breaking out of this “Newtonian Paradigm,” touch upon such “peculiar” discussions as “diaspora as a ‘point of view,’” “philosophy of difference and fluidity,” and “the quantum ‘self.’” On the basis of the above deliberation, the last section considers a key issue of this paper, that is, the definition of “Quantum Urban Governance,” and, for its fundamental question, an interpretation of the “quantum-mechanical-like phenomena of individuals’ ‘living’ states and/or identities;” the latter attempts to raise the idea of the “Many- ‘Habitats’ /Identities Interpretation,” on the analogy of the Many-Worlds Interpretation, grounded in “Stochastic Interpretation of ‘Living’ States/Identities,” which could be devised by using a patchwork of classical and quantum mechanical perceptions. The very end of this paper briefly notes upcoming research steps.

2. Reconsideration of the Framework for Analyzing a Migratory Population

A critical commentary points out the fact that researchers have treated the situation of recurrent population mobility above a certain size as a phenomenon of migration, and attempted to analyze its background factors and detect its patterns, even though, at the individual level, respective movements could have harbored multiple meanings and different conditions (Iyotani 2007, 5). For instance, *The Age of Migration* (Castles and Miller 1993, 25) depicts the “migratory process” as a stage model, that is, from “temporary labour migration” to “family reunion with growing consciousness of long-term settlement,” to “permanent settlement.” Additionally, in terms of “*labor* movements” and “*population* movements,” relevant theories have put emphasis on expected wages, family members, stratified labor markets, and the like (Yan 2005, 12–23; Kohno 2006, 13–18). Migrants’ “stories” have come down to the scenarios of their “settlement,” “citizenization,” “assimilation,” and access to equal rights and services in respective destinations (Iyotani 2007, 9; Zhai et al. 2008, 210–211; Yan 2009, 166). In the meantime, instead of dealing with these matters in the same way, out-of-the-box thinking shares the idea that discussing

migration works out to fundamentally rebuilding a perceptual framework and, in terms of migration, pondering over what may be looming into view in a new and different way (Iyotani 2007, 10).

This section proceeds to provide an overview that [1] attempts to unlearn the crux of the influential discipline — migration studies — as a radical reconsideration of the framework analyzing migrants, [2] attends to the question of the “I” misunderstood by those who conceptualize the “sole I,” with regard to human migration and formation of identity, and [3] provides an alternative framework/worldview that reshapes the “permanent settlers’ world.” Moreover, in light of the aforementioned tentative perspectives of conceivable governance, I will determine what kind of paradigms the respective contentions are rooted in.

2-1. An Attempt to Unlearn Migration Studies

Amid growing concern over human migration in various academic arenas, Toshio Iyotani (2007, 3), who has paid particular attention to international re-examination process on the “methodology” of migration studies, stresses the need for radical transformation of contemporary migration studies through efforts to unlearn previous migration studies, in his article, “Migration as a Means: Perceiving Place in Motion.”

This leading expert on migration and globalization comments first about the background to the modern age that has been a period when, despite frequently advocated “freedom to move,” a moving range is designated by segmentation boundaries, including national borders, in advance; an implicit assumption is a sedentary society in which each individual’s “place to inhabit” or “place to return” is self-apparent, and pervasion of particular mindsets is just taken as “progress” and “civilization.” He throws light on the popular assumption that “permanent dwelling” has been seen as a very “ordinary state,” more specifically an “ideal situation,” of people’s life; but “migration,” in contrast, has been perceived as a “departure from the normal” — merely a “temporary and exceptional phenomenon” and a “provisional status” — and those who are under such circumstances have been labeled as the “uncivilized and backward,” to be settled down before too long (Iyotani 2007, 3, 5-6).

With this tendency in mind, Toshio Iyotani (2007, 9) has an insight into the nature of traditional migration studies that has often been dependent on the usefulness of policy science, and focused on migrants as a target group for policies. He concisely describes the essence of the standpoint, as follows (3-4).

Questions for migration studies that deal with “deviation,” are left to migration researchers’ arbitrariness. Migration policies, purposes and motives for relocation, transformation of home and host societies, and the like, have been taken up from a place regarded as having no movement. What has supported the arbitrariness, is rooted in the style of having tacitly and unconsciously viewed migrants as a target group to be managed.

Those researchers targeting migrants have assumed a certain stable territory, a fixed place, as a normal position, and observed the migrants as an exception. [Tentative translation by Tanimura]

In the section on “Questioning Spaces from Motion,” this precursor, who takes a firm stand to call for reconsideration of the very place of migration studies, asserts that there will be a need to attempt rebuilding what has been referred to as “society” or the world from the perspective of motion, by redefining place through the lens of motion, rather than by seeing motion from a fixed place, set out as a given in advance (Iyotani 2007, 10).

Furthermore, he concludes that what migration studies should particularly work on as a task ahead, is questioning the research framework confined to the national fabric, in other words, dealing with those issues that are fundamentally common to all human beings (Iyotani 2007, 19).

2-2. The “I” Misunderstood by Those Who Conceptualize the “Sole I”

In addition to regarding how to set an entirely reasonable looking agenda, such as why on earth people are leaving their native soil, and moving across borders, Toshio Iyotani (2007, 8) promotes in-depth discussion on why people have been supposed to have a special attachment to their native soil; likewise, why has only the “motion” been called into question, and why have migrants always been checked on their own identities? With respect to the point of identity, he presents the idea that it is far from static, and obviously, by the same token, it should not have to converge with a national identity.

As for human migration and formation of identity, Alberto Merler (2006), professor at the University of Sassari, Italy, develops the thought-provoking argument that the multiple, “composite and polymerized I (*io composito*)” (72) is formed, through depicting “amalgamated, combined, and polymerized Europe viewed from migration” (67), in line with the thinking of “migration as a normal state/settlement as a scene from migration” (63).

The researcher on regional and community studies reviews a situation where, when seeing those who are on the move, authorities often assume each individual migrant is an entity of the ceaselessly warring “lacerated I” or the “irreconcilable I” with the self, as if others have already been within the “I,” and tactically implemented a wide variety of assistance measures rooted in “empowerment.” Under the present set of circumstances, this expert who has also some personal experiences as a “migrant,” is concerned that there would be a potential for recurring improper operations, as official schemes merely force immigrants to make efforts that are irreversible, as long as the engagement is based on the premise that each individual settler is a “lacerated,” “deficient” being, institutionally or personally (Merler 2006, 71, 73).

On reflection, Alberto Merler (2006) ventures the idea that the “plural I (*io plurimo*)” represents the “composite and polymerized I (*io composito*),” which is composed of “uni-plurality (*una pluralità*),” like the organically combined, rather than just the pluralistically scattered

throughout extensive experiences (72). Subsequently, he describes a propensity in those who are insistent on the “sole I,” to hardly be able to conceive of the plurality-containing unipersonal, which is simply regarded as the “lacerated” being and, as an “exit” from such a framework, to only paint a picture of fury, deviance, and insanity by reason of the unipersonal (*persona*), thus producing an agonizing pain for the “composite and polymerized I” (73). In addition, he emphasizes the need to strengthen power to work out an alternative framework of thinking, and convert unorthodox, heretical responses in light of ready-made solutions into orthodox practices; under such circumstances, the question of whether converging on a “single world” or building “multicultural symbiotic societies” is meaningless from the viewpoint of this “composite and polymerized I” (75–76).

Recently, a leading expert on Middle East/Islamic studies, Yuzo Itagaki (2011), who mulls over the implication of civil revolt destabilizing the country enriched by the Nile, has offered a highly inspiring view. His standpoint is grounded in the fact that Middle Eastern people, including traveling merchants and commercial farmers, have historically lived on the organizational principle of urban networked partnerships (29) — prior to modern civil societies/nation states that commonly appreciated the European origin notions — presented as follows (25).

I have proposed the two concepts, “n areas” and “identity complex.” “N areas” could imply a situation where people live their lives by picking over different sizes of “areas” that are not in a concentric fashion, but in the amoeboid form of ceaselessly connecting exclaves. “Areas” are seen as what people could dynamically modify and retry to attain on a constant basis. The minimum of “n” is an individual’s ground, and the maximum is the Earth + α . “Identity complex” could indicate a style where people live their lives by picking over the numerous “I’s.” In other words, it is the networked “I” by means of internally piecing various “I’s” together. It is not appropriate that failing to keep a single identity is regarded as a splintered personality. Engaging with urban life is living in accord with an identity complex. [Tentative translation by Tanimura]

In addition, while speculating on the fate of the Middle East and the world, the author, who also presents the idea that people live in multiple identities, suggests that, first and foremost, nationality is merely one of a number of uneasy identities, and the fact that national flags are often carried in the midst of the revolutions currently spreading to the Middle East, should be seen as an ad hoc transitory phenomenon characterizing the trial and learning processes of new “citizens” — likewise related to the above-mentioned “I” — who transform themselves from protesters into agents of transformation (26). Interestingly, he advocates the perspective of Tawhid, the relationalistic holism of “many are identical to one” (31), as an important clue to mull over alternative conceptual meanings of the “citizens” (30).²

2–3. An Alternative Framework/Worldview Reshaping the “Permanent Settlers’ World”

For working out the idea of the European, Alberto Merler (2006, 69, 76–77) sets forth basic guidelines, including an attention to the risk of universalization and systematization by those frameworks that might deal with a multi-layered history in a simplistic way and initialize a myriad of identities, and dialogue and cooperation with the aforementioned “composite and polymerized I,” who has the compositeness and polymerizability of plural cultures. However, as the expert expresses the opinion that “plural I’s” do not mean the hardly socialized “contentious I” (*io conflittuale*), who possesses an element of danger and deviates from social norms (72), it can be inferred that he prefers to get around the puzzle of stepping in that direction.

Besides, under the circumstances where conventional social-scientific analytic points of view such as class, race, and gender, are useful for understanding aspects of people, but inadequate for capturing the entire picture, Yuzo Itagaki (2011, 30–31) explores an alternative way of people creating revolution; he sees an innovative idea in the style of “civil” movements widely practiced in Middle Eastern societies, in which diverse individuals and groups work together horizontally, multilaterally, decentralizedly, and synergetically, to build extensive networks and partnerships and liven up a holistic transformation process driven by those institutions. In addition, in light of the thinking of restorative justice, he emphasizes the need for dialogue on how to actualize a revolution that turns the negative experience of having social ills into a positive one, including measures for encouraging the wrong hands to run on a right course, rather than simply wiping them out.

On another front, there are wanderers’ and migrants’ views that are interestingly contrasted with a perspective from the “normative” world. The alternative point of view is seen in Xuetai Wang’s vagrant (*youmin*) studies which Norihiro Nakamura (2009, 299–302), an editorial supervisor of *Migrants and Pluralistic Society in China* and author of its “Overall Conclusion,” points out as one of the notable discussions, and the Japanese sociologist’s comment on the unique studies. First and foremost, Xuetai Wang who had engaged in research on the history of literature and culture at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences for a long time, describes in his book, *Youmin Culture and Chinese Society* (1999), *youmin* and *youmin* intellectuals as those people and intellectual figures who withdraw from a social order derived from Confucian philosophy. They share common characteristics such as a highly antisocial nature, a guerrilla spirit for social struggles, serious consideration on teaming up as a group, and little consciousness of social roles. Norihiro Nakamura (2009, 302) crisply summarizes Wang’s idea that, in conclusion, Chinese culture has contained some sort of non-normativity, in which *youmin* culture could be animated, and then describes the essentials as follows (302–304).

In fact, historically, the sedentary world based on the patriarchal clan system and lineage ... had been the foundation for forming a proper social order in China. At the same time, as an institution to absorb those who had no choice but to drop out of the sphere due to natural

disaster, famine, and the maelstrom of war, there had been a mutually complementary alternative world ... This was the very world of wanderers and migrants, in an extreme case, of *yumin*, ... that could be a basis to build a new sedentary order [when the public order was destabilized].

Now, it can be said that modern institutions on state power and market economy have been grounded on a settled way of life without exception, and have coerced the public into the settled lifestyle ... This is just such situations as the unification and inactivation of our own lives. [Tentative translation by Tanimura]

Furthermore, Norihiro Nakamura (2009, 311) points out that talking about the pluralism of Chinese society should take into consideration the very existence of an alternative Chinese society, which involves more than just superficial diversity, including ethnicity and locality. He also notes that the dynamism between wanderers and permanent residents could be quite common, at least in East Asia, although the above discussion is derived from China.

2-4. Revisiting the Paradigms in Which the Questions Have Been Raised

Henceforth, I will summarize the profound discussions reviewed in this section, through inferring the paradigms in which respective questions have been raised, in light of the standpoints of “Newtonian Urban Governance,” which encompasses the views of “Governance in Solidity” and “Governance in Fluidity,” and “Quantum Urban Governance” defined in the Introduction.

At the outset, concerning the conventional migration studies that should be unlearned (Iyotani 2007, 3), the mindset and terms that echo those of the “Newtonian Paradigm,” and specifically “Governance in Solidity,” are clear. On the premise of the absolute space and time of “national fabric,” “from a place regarded as having no movement” just like Newton’s stance as a spectator (Tsuduki 2002, 143–144), in a setting where “looking at a fixed stage from a fixed seat” (Takeuchi 2004, 98), migrants, who are in a state of “departure from the normal,” are especially “observed” as “a target group to be managed.” The “transformation of home and host societies” is analyzed individually. The migrants, who are approximately seen from the perspective of “labor” or a population with a view to “policy” analyses, are pressed to empower the “solo I” as a “lacerated/deficient being” and join in the “stories” of “citizenization,” “assimilation,” “multicultural symbiotic societies,” and the like, without any delay, so as to “settle down” in the new “place to inhabit” — the destination — ; this is unless the persons in question go back to the “place to return.”

Against these entirely reasonable looking ways of thinking for sedentary inhabitants, the question of why only the “motion” and migrants’ “identity” have been taken up (Iyotani 2007, 8) brings to mind the puzzle that Fumitaka Sato (1997, 61) ably shows in *Ideology in Quantum*

Mechanics: “Then, why should we feel provocation, embarrassment, ... for setting into the imaginary? These feelings would intrinsically be based on the presupposition that there is no wonder as long as we stay within the domain of the real number. However, there is a need for looking into whether that is so true.” Nevertheless, the posed issue of calling for reconsideration on the very place of migration studies (Iyotani 2007, 10) coincides with an assertion of Gottfried W. Leibniz, who presented opposing points of view for Isaac Newton: “the postulated outer frame (background) of absolute space and time is not appropriate ... because the Newtonian way brings in unnecessary qualities not inhering in things of the world” (Uchii 2007, 155), rather than reflections rooted in the paradigm of quantum mechanics.

Then, the perspectives of “migration as a normal state/settlement as a scene from migration” (Merler 2006, 63) and “n areas” (Itagaki 2011, 25) are fundamentally common to “Governance in Fluidity,” that is, to a dynamic view of the peripatetic side as local communities are woven up in “network-like” connections of plural “areas,” beyond the static framework assumed by “Governance in Solidity.” Likewise, in regard to their identities formed in the circumstances, the “composite and polymerized I” as “the plurality-containing unipersonal” is talked about as substitute for a plausible “sole I.” Ultimately, any of these is “observed” by “Newtonian” eyes. Yet, the description of “people live their lives ‘by picking over ... areas’ / ‘by picking over the numerous I’s’” in “multiple” states (Itagaki 2011, 25), could be closer to the “Stochastic Interpretation of ‘Living’ States” — at the moment of a survey, only one “living” state is left behind, and anything but the selected “living” state is artificially discarded — worked out by analogy with the Copenhagen Interpretation, which was criticized as a patchwork of quantum mechanics and classical physics (Tanimura 2009, 42–43), if those sketches are revisited in the context of “quantum superpositions.” Furthermore, the depiction open to further discussion would develop into the idea of the “Stochastic Interpretation of ‘Living’ States and/or Identities (the Self’s States).” However, in any case, the “living” states that are not found as “ground,” and/or the “I’s” that are not assessed as salient identities (the self’s states) at the time of observation, might be dealt with as unmeaningful. Alternatively, if the “observed” cases are seen as inconsequential relative to roughly anticipated “states,” they are at risk of just being read as an “ad hoc transitory phenomenon.”

Lastly, the discussion that “talking about ‘pluralism’ of ... society” should be nothing less than taking into account not only “the sedentary world” but also “the world of wanderers and migrants.” This is referred to as “a mutually complementary alternative world,” which “has contained some sort of the non-normative” by Nakamura (2009, 302–303, 311), who sees “plural” worlds. However, the depiction is not shown in the context of quantum-mechanical-like superpositions. Although the developed innovation is, as it were, an unusual stage setup incorporating broader areas that are seen as backstage from the perspective of those researchers who view the “normative” world as a stage, the worlds are in effect “observed” by “Newtonian” eyes. Moreover, identities such as “*youmin* and *youmin* intellectuals,” seemingly

typical “actors” found in “Governance in Fluidity,” are some states of the “sole I” in a practical sense, and thus purport to coincide with the mindset of “Governance in Solidity.”

3. From Depictions Rooted in the “Newtonian View of the World”

This section will first provide an overview of “diasporas,” “transnationalism,” and “globalization and women’s border-crossing” in which migrants would be described from the “Newton’s stance in the nature of a ‘spectator’” (Tsuduki 2002, 143–144), and then, especially with regard to “living” states and identities, briefly touch on the points that are shown in the leading experts’ expositions.

3-1. Diasporas

Robin Cohen, who focused attention on “diasporas” from the standpoint of comparative sociology of migrants (Komai and Enari 2009, 21), writes a little note in the introduction to “Diasporas Series” as the editor of the first pages of his book, *The Global Diasporas* (1997, ii):

The assumption that ... migrants will demonstrate an exclusive loyalty to the nation state is now questionable. Scholars ... need new conceptual maps and fresh case studies to understand the growth of complex transnational identities. The ... idea of “diaspora” may provide this framework. Though often conceived in terms of a catastrophic dispersion, widening the notion of diaspora to include trade, imperial, labour and cultural diasporas can provide a more nuanced understanding of the often positive relationships between migrants’ homelands and their places of work and settlement.

Furthermore, as for the types of “adjectival diasporas” (29), Robin Cohen explores some ethnic groups considered as typical examples, and builds his diaspora studies (ch. 8), with the advance explanation that, in reality, “[t]he typology I have proposed ... is more unambiguous than the history and development of diasporas suggest. Some groups take dual or multiple forms, others change their character over time” (x). Hiroshi Komai (2001, iv–v), scholar in international sociology responsible for the translation supervision of the Japanese-language version, praises the author by saying that the definition of diasporas presented in this book would become a starting point for further discussion, and new ways of thinking are hammered out about those characteristics of international migrants who are prone to merely be highlighted as an aspect of labor.

In any case, under the concept of “diasporas,” experts have looked into the relationships between their beloved “home countries” and “societies chosen as a place to settle down” in destination countries. However, in a rapidly changing international society, there are some case studies to give pause to simply applying the schema mechanically. For instance, Enmei Wang

(2009), having studied those “overseas Chinese in Korea” who are originally from Shandong Province, the People’s Republic of China, and live in South Korea with the Republic of China’s citizenship, begins by figuring out the social structure of overseas Chinese. In the milieu where the native land became unreachable and the “external” utterly unable to be accepted under the previous anticommunist regimes, those people saw the Republic of China as the “home country,” which guaranteed their suffrage even without any attachment to the unconnected land; the expert then traces the reversal process whereby the “home country” has turned out to be the “external,” owing to recent transformations, such as the Taiwanization of the Republic of China and a change in its overseas Chinese policy (277).

Tiensi Chen (2008), who has analyzed the changing patterns of border-crossing by overseas Chinese and those of Chinese descent, and advocated wanderers (*piaobo*) as an appropriate translation for diasporas, stresses the need to depict the living states that those people create as footholds in various parts of the world and where they acquire transboundary bases in the course of wandering back and forth between places where they experience some kind of bond — at times, in the shadow of exclusive dynamics — (298) from a “transnational view of the world.” This is different from the framework of nation states (305), without being bound by the conventional model of “returning to the native country or taking root in a destination country” (298).

Besides, Mizuka Kimura (2009), who has carried out migration studies on Chinese Muslims, deftly clarifies the point that “diasporas” are neither “imagined communities” rooted in a uniform ideology still pervasive beyond boundaries of nation states (255, 257), nor the actor’s states defined merely by hybridity shown in the substitution for oneness and homogeneity (257); subsequently, he derives an important conclusion: perceiving the communities of “diasporas” should start with recognizing the coexistence of diverse — occasionally, even contradictory — logics in context (257).

Nevertheless, those researchers who have recently focused on drawing a blueprint for “imagined communities” such as the host countries of migrants and the international society working on development issues, see diasporas maintaining relations with home countries as an important emerging non-state actor — with attention to their dual/hybrid identities — (Brinkerhoff 2008, 1, 5; Esman 2009, 7–8). Milton J. Esman (2009), Emeritus Professor of International Studies at Cornell University, alters the aforementioned Robin Cohen’s “adjectival diasporas” to three taxonomic groups — settler, labor, and entrepreneurial diasporas — in light of the functions they serve in their host country (15, 167), and discusses the prospects of diasporas, such as inversion in power relationships, integration into the mainstream, and disappearance (179–180). For the foreign aid community, Jennifer M. Brinkerhoff’s research group focuses attention on the potential of diasporas, such as transfer of knowledge and remittances to their homeland, and recommends concrete measures — including policies and programs to enhance partnerships and enabling environments — to harness the opportunities

(Brinkerhoff 2008, 15; Orozco 2008, 207, 211).³

3-2. Transnationalism

In “Local Communities from Migrants’ Perspective,” the second part of *Communities in Globalization and Postmodernization*, Yasuo Hirota (2006) who places “transnationalism” at the core of his discussion, quotes a definition from Nina G. Schiller, social anthropologist, and others, as a useful means of deepening the understanding towards cross-border migrants and their activities (Schiller, Basch and Blanc-Szanton 1992, 1-2).

We have defined transnationalism as the processes by which immigrants build social fields that link together their country of origin and their country of settlement. Immigrants who build such social fields are designated “transmigrants.” Transmigrants develop and maintain multiple relations — familial, economic, social, organizational, religious, and political that span borders. Transmigrants take actions, make decisions, and feel concerns, and develop identities within social networks that connect them to two or more societies simultaneously.

As for “social fields,” Yasuo Hirota (2006, 85) also refers to a study by anthropologist Peggy Levitt (2001), who points out that the creation of transnational public spheres enables migrants to go on being vigorous in “both worlds”; Hirota expresses his own thoughts that the theory of transnationalism is important in terms of highlighting the issue that diverse “alternative public spheres” moored at respective places overlap with the existing institutional world. He asserts concern that, in disregard of the development of those underlying social spaces, ordinary citizens cannot understand the significance of cross-border migrants currently found in everyday life.

Nonetheless, with regard to the above description of “[immigrants’] country of settlement,” Junko Tajima (2008), who looks into the transnational moves of Chinese migrants, notes that the final stage in the process of migration is not always settlement in a host society (224). For instance, she pays close attention to the living states that the Chinese migrants, who have their family members and houses in both Japan — a destination country, where they obtained nationality and other statuses — and the motherland to which they did not return but strategically “remigrated,” frequently go back and forth between the two places (230–231). On a daily basis, they have “Japan” within their lives in hometowns, and enjoy the “home country” within their lives in Japanese society, with the advent of sophisticated information and communication technologies (240). Their livelihood is a form of “shuttle migration” (Iyotani 2001, 237) that transnationally moves back and forth among plural living bases.

Moreover, Mioko Tsuboya (2008) who probes into living conditions and multiple identities of the “Chinese population staying in Japan,” stresses the point that it would be no less impossible to ignore their subjective ideas about “residing temporarily” and “returning to the homeland

in time,” even in an apparently permanent settlement stage (33), and tries to figure out their lifestyle through the concept of “permanent sojourner,” an intermediate category between “sojourner” and “permanent settler,” albeit one sympathetic to implications drawn from “transnationalism” studies (12, 29–34).

As to the phenomenon that those transmigrants simultaneously belonging to plural countries engender overlapping societies and work from within the respective nation-states, Fumiko Sawae (2009) discusses it as “transnational politics.” For ensuring better status, basic rights, and reaping more profits in host societies, transmigrants place demands on both host and home countries. She outlines the current situation that, along with diversification of identities among the people, calls for a home government that addresses a range of issues from sheer protection and assistance to matters affecting regime and ideology of their original country (44); in economically and diplomatically utilizing the emigrants abroad as “overseas assets” (43), the sending country is further required to make public relations efforts — including strategic propaganda — to emigrant communities (44).

Incidentally, in the milieu where the situations of migrants working in transboundary spaces are described by means of “transnationalism,” and pluralistic multi-layered consciousness arising from attachment to bases (“hometowns”) in more than one country is explained by the idea of “transnational identity,” Yuiko Fujita (2008), who specializes in media sociology, points out the necessity to deepen discussions on the matters with a view to Benedict Anderson’s “long-distance nationalism” — the thinking of those people who have little affinity toward a host country, and would rather imagine the homeland more closely through media thereby constantly harboring an identity as a member of the home country — as well (19–21, 190–191).

In any case, every study remains confined to “nation-state”-based reflection. Fatima El-Tayeb (2007) who looks into European cities as instances, observes the formation of “trans-local structure” that links communities together among the host countries for migrants, and goes beyond the conventional framework of sending and host countries (205) to present a view of the community not as a fixed entity but as a process (208).

3–3. Globalization and Women’s Border-Crossing

Mariko Adachi (2008), who has focused her efforts on a project exploring the frontiers of gender studies on the subject of international migration, asserts that merely casting a spotlight on duality and counter-ness of “the globalization of the production sphere,” such as the thought of neoliberalism and the protest movement against it, is inadequate to perceive the deepest part of contemporary globalization (225). Profound discussion from the viewpoint of “the globalization of the reproduction sphere [related to reproducing life, human being, and workforce]” is crucially important (235). She also stresses that, among others, household organization should be seen as the bounded being transformed according to the circumstances, and the unit being modified by people’s expectations for the future and rationally-based decisions (241). As to “the globalization

of the reproduction sphere.” Toshio Iyotani (2011) sheds light on the following new aspects: [1] the collapse of the national reproduction sphere — based on the premise of a closed framework — due to the disintegration of a welfare state; [2] the commercialization of the reproduction sphere — care and household work — intensified under neoliberalism (and practically, under indirect national control); and [3] the global discovery — allowing unlimited mobilization — of those female workers who would play a focal role in the reproduction sphere (300, 303–308, 311 n. 25).

“Where are women?” (*Gendai-shiso* Vol. 33 No. 10, Seidosha). A division, “Move,” within the feature pages asking the question contains a thought-provoking article, “Ido no nakaheno Teiju” (Mirjana Morokvasic [Translator: Hisako Motoyama] 2004, “Settled in Mobility,” *Feminist Review*, Vol. 77, pp. 7–25). Morokvasic (2004) who has observed Polish migrants, depicts these women’s transient transboundary movements in the form of back-and-forth motion — a phenomenon that the thought of “transnationalism” focusing on sustainable linkages over a long period of time, tends to overlook (9) — as follows (16–17).

Most of the Polish women who commute to work [abroad] do reproductive work — as domestic helpers or caring for the elderly. Thanks to the rotation system, which they set up with a couple of other women, they can continue to take care of their own families at home. This smoothly functioning ‘self-managed’ rotation system that Polish women have set up to optimize the opportunities and minimize the obstacles relative to their reproductive paid [while-visiting] and unpaid [at-home] work relies on solidarity, reciprocity and trust of its participating members...

Besides enabling women a transnational, double presence, combining life ‘here’ and ‘there’, the rotation system yields other opportunities for agency.

As for those who, in this way, exclude the option of overseas emigration and keep crossing the border on a short-term basis — “settle within mobility” (11) — in order to maintain and upgrade living quality at home, the author also describes the situation as “living in/between two worlds” (16).

In contrast, Masako Kudo (2008), who studies “Japanese Wives of Pakistani Muslim Migrants” living in Japan as a distinctive case of the process of being formed as a “multi-sited family” beyond national boundaries, finds out that multiple worlds are made up around women from early in marriage through childbirth and child rearing, and, in accordance with the overlap, complex self-transformation processes are facilitated (243). As a reason for not describing “multi-tiered,” she expounds on the picture that the respective tiers do not exist autonomously but overlap and influence one another, because these women not only cross boundaries routinely, but also play intermediary roles linking the layers (247). In addition, she illustrates the facts of

life that the individual living in a diversified society discovers new horizons are dealt with in the surrounding relationships, not just by forming their own plural identities to be switched simply according to the circumstances, but also by cultivating a capacity to mediate between the selves (248).

Taking Singapore and Hong Kong as examples, Wako Asato (2009), who views care and migrant workers from the conventional perspective of national and regional economic policies aiming to maintain international competitiveness, points out that the popularization of higher education and income in women and the hiring of foreign household workers have been favorable for nations as well as for women (93); he concludes that not only more policy options are desirable in a rapidly aging society where nursing-care workforce issues are a consideration but also the inclusion of migrants and foreign workers (104). In contrast, Chiho Ogaya (2009), who looks into the position of the Philippine’s national strategy as a sending country, reveals the fact that even migrant labor-related NGOs calling for protection of emigrant laborers’ rights have unintentionally had a hand in the neo-liberal policy of “upskilling” (94, 109), and then refers to the sending country’s intention to fully incorporate the people living abroad into national development schemes, including overseas ballots (110).

3–4. “Living” States and Identities Depicted from the “Newtonian View of the World”

This section has provided an overview of those articles that seem to study migrants from “Newton’s stance in the nature of a ‘spectator’” (Tsuduki 2002, 143–144). Definitely, the position attempting to observe the noteworthy “target” — the focal point “arbitrarily” picked out on the basis of some distinctive aspect — from spectatorial eyes and precisely depict it is shared in the discussions above. In addition, even though dynamic views of the peripatetic such as transnationalism in “fluidity” and Benedict Anderson’s “long-distance nationalism” that could be regarded as an attribute in “solidity” are introduced, those reflections fundamentally postulate the absolute space and time of “national fabric,” as shown in keywords like “international migration/migrants,” “home/host countries,” and “transboundary movements.”

On that basis, with regard to migrants’ “living’ states,” the very focal points are primarily intended to clarify “where they are” and what migration “patterns” are generated. The people, like “particles,” are dealt with in a way that the individuals are correlated with their places — generally countries — to stay at the time of “observation,” and described as living in “societies chosen as a place to settle down/host countries” away from their “home countries.” The same is the case, even if they are presented as living in “multiple/both worlds” in the form of “back-and-forth motion/shuttle/rotation” between “transboundary bases/plural living bases” that is “not always settlement.” For instance, when the “target” population are “observed” in Japan, their “living’ states” are portrayed only “approximately” after all, as migrants “living/staying in Japan,” in compliance with the “conventional” institutional framework.

As to “identities,” grounded on nations as “imagined communities” and ethnic groups,

those identities regarded as “complex” in “fluidity,” including “dual/hybrid identities” and “transnational identities,” or those identities in line with “solidity,” such as “a member of the home country” or “overseas so-and-sos (nationals)/such-and-such (nationals)’ descent” are discussed as if one is looking precisely into the heart of issues. Moreover, depending on the interests of those who “observe,” the “self” of those who are on the move is determined in advance, as “migrant,” “worker,” and “woman/wife,” and often stated together with the name of “home country” or “living/staying in country X” as mentioned above.

Intellectual work carried out by those researchers, who observe through “Newtonian” eyes, might be regarded as a thorough exploration of an apparently “new cog” of the changing contemporary society (Tanimura 2009, 42), just like the work of those physicists until the close of the 19th century who postulated that “[t]he entire universe was supposed to be a glorious clockwork, whose intricate workings” could be figured out “in limitless detail” (Lindley 1996, 1). “Adjectival diasporas” (Cohen 1997, 29), “permanent sojourners” as the intermediate (Tsuboya 2008) or similar, that is, another “typology” expressed “approximately” through close “observations” with a view to subdividing categories, could be knowledge entirely built up in the “Newtonian Paradigm.” Politically “favorable” cogs occasionally draw attention as emerging “actors” blazing a trail. In this context, “transnational politics” (Sawae 2009) could be interpreted in light of the aspects of the “clockwork” that old and new cogs are interlocking.

Meanwhile, there are some contentions that could tie in with the standpoint of the “Stochastic Interpretation of ‘Living’ States and/or Identities (the Self’s States),” mentioned in the last part of the previous section. It might be interesting to further infer connotations of, for instance, not “hybridity” — in substitution for “oneness and homogeneity” — but “coexistence of diverse logics” for “diasporas” (Kimura 2009, 257), “transnational, double presences” based on a case study of women’s “back-and-forth motion” (Morokvasic 2004, 17), and “multiple worlds” and the individual’s “plural identities to be switched ... according to the circumstances” with “capacity to mediate between the selves” as in the “multi-sited family” (Kudo 2008, 243, 248). An underlying similarity of these discussions is the approach that, while probably perceived “quantum-mechanical-like superpositions,” any one of the coexistent “living” states/identities is merely selected at the moment of an “observation”; everything else is discarded for the present, as if founded on the “Copenhagen Interpretation.” Further, at the time of reporting, those typical instances found in “observations” are initially picked up as each individual state, and subsequently depicted as a situation of “overlap.” The description of “switched ... according to the circumstances” also implies that the “wave packet collapse,” as it were, is assumed at the moment of an “observation.” In light of the interpretation, the expression of “mediate between ...” could inevitably be worked out.

4. Thoughts on Breaking out of the “Newtonian Paradigm”

This section provides an overview of the standpoints somehow “different from usual,” such as “Diaspora as a ‘Point of View’,” “Philosophy of Difference and Fluidity,” and the “Quantum Self,” as thoughts challenging the Newtonian Paradigm. Again, I will touch upon the key points when “living” states and identities are depicted in those discussions.

4-1. Diaspora as a “Point of View”

Toshiya Ueno (2000) who outlines “Diaspora” from the viewpoint of cultural studies as one of the “Keywords for Contemporary Philosophy” (*Gendai-shiso*, Vol. 28 No. 3, Seidosha), describes its theoretical gist not as conceptualizing by means of types, such as the aforementioned “adjectival diasporas” proposed by Robin Cohen, but as criticizing the elements of capitalist hegemony, productivism, gender/“racial” division of labor, and nationalism as a propeller in a variety of diaspora phenomena; he then explores an opportunity for resisting them, with reference to a discussion of Paul Gilroy, a leading thinker in cultural studies and postcolonial theories (47). In “Thinking Diaspora” (Ueno 1999), he indicates that diaspora is an “alternative thought and experience” inherent in modernity per se (250), and refines it as follows (33).

The point of view cultivated in those cultures resulting from involuntarily forced migrations is not necessarily the thought of diaspora. Or rather, the consideration led by those who, as a consequence of defending their own unique standpoint, turn down conventional ways of thinking/living and choose such motions/actions as withdrawal from the normal, must be the very thought of diaspora. Critical thinkers unavoidably have to move from the point [e.g., of national space and time] regardless of self-consciousness ... [Tentative translation by Tanimura]

Diasporas’ identities are delineated as a network — with the feature of “translocal”—reweaving imagined communities in different directions (Ueno and Mori 2000, 200); they are shown as “the changing same” like flames of glowing charcoal, that is, the plural and moreover not only the formed but also the renewed at every moment (Ueno 1999, 81; Ueno and Mori 2000, 201).

As to the diaspora as a point of view, Rogers Brubaker, associate professor at the University of California, Los Angeles, interestingly discusses “Entity or stance?” in “The ‘diaspora’ diaspora” (2005, 10). Under the recent circumstance where the term “diaspora” has proliferated and come to have a broader meaning, the sociologist outlines its basic elements including [1] dispersion in space, [2] orientation to a “homeland,” and [3] boundary-maintenance (5), and then describes that diasporas dealt with as “entities” just like the nation and ethnic groups are primarily regarded as “unitary actors,” and “possessing countable, quantifiable memberships”

(10). Even in the concepts of hybridity, creolization, and the like that apparently offer an alternative to “bounded entities,” he has an insight into the problem that, in any case, the dynamics of “groupism” arise from the bottom up, when they are referred to as being with respective communities and identities (11). Subsequently, he advocates the importance of diaspora as a stance (12).

To overcome these problems of groupism, I want to argue that we should think of diaspora not in substantialist terms as a bounded entity, but rather as an idiom, a stance, a claim. We should think of diaspora in the first instance as a category of practice, and only then ask whether, and how, it can fruitfully be used as a category of analysis... It is often a category with a strong normative charge. It does not so much *describe* the world as seek to *remake* it.

Rogers Brubaker calls much attention to preventing the fall into using the expression of “awakening” that is rooted in essentialist assumptions by theorists on “diaspora” (13).

Incidentally, a question raised by Takanori Hayao (2009) who explores the European modern history of social thought, including difficult issues on Jewishness and Israel, is directed not at what diasporas regarded as the “errant,” but what “authenticity” and “authentic citizens of the state” just shown as practically “colorless and transparent” are (166–167). He points out that thought of the diaspora is a criticism of the “nation-state” and, furthermore, one that is unconsciously conceived as “national authenticity” (205); in such a milieu seen as part of the sphere of Hegelian philosophy (168), an epistemological base underpinning the modern world is formulated on the prearranged “absolute space” of the nation and the progressive view of history as one postulating unilinear development (170–171).

4–2. Philosophy of Difference and Fluidity

When outlining “Challenges of Post-structuralism” that uphold anti-anthropocentrism, anti-westerncentrism, and anti-logocentrism, the literary critic Seiji Takeda (1990) describes a simple preface that contemporary concepts such as Jacques Derrida’s “deconstruction” and Gilles Deleuze’s “rhizome and multiplicity” mimic screams; this is a consequence of intuitively understanding the impasse and difficulty in working out universal “meaning” and starting from there (182). Why does the world exist? Why do we have earthly lives? Gilles Deleuze’s views are that in modern society, established on the basis of conviction that rational and universal recognition would be possible by relying not on the Divine but on the power of reason, the desire of modern wisdom (metaphysics and dialectic) to pursue the perfect answer to those questions is intimately intertwined with a sort of “weakness” for constantly trying to see the world as well-organized (192); they are expounded in the spirit of that Nietzschean time (191–192). He concludes that a basic framework of post-structuralism is not simply to present an

alternative worldview but to fundamentally rethink the system of human “wisdom” (193).

Motoaki Shinohara (2008), who is the author of “Introduction: Modernism and Postmodernism,” in Kiyokazu Washida ed., *History of Philosophy*, Vol. 12, Chuokoron-Shinsha, shows that post-structuralism — particularly Gilles Deleuze’s thought — begins with the idea of regarding difference not as dichotomy between “A” and the negative of “non-A,” but as the positive value of “intensity,” in itself a difference (26–27). In addition, Masaki Sawano (2004) introducing key components of Gilles Deleuze’s *Difference and Repetition* (1994), concisely presents the notion of “difference” as follows (217).

... difference should not be combined with negation and confrontation, and intensity should not be mixed with specific scale and degree. “Difference of intensity,” in principle, is unnoticeable, as the difference does not form difference from anything yet, as far as the whole thing stays in the virtual. In order to know what it is, the difference must be reduced. Until one thing is observed as it is, the difference must adequately be subtracted. Accordingly, intensity is the notion referring to the virtual that we can not feel a thing. [Tentative translation by Tanimura]

As to the term “virtual,” Gilles Deleuze (1994) suggests that “the virtual is opposed not to the real but to the actual. *The virtual is fully real in so far as it is virtual*” (208).

Furthermore, *Difference and Repetition* raises the idea of the nomadic as an alternative option. Motoaki Shinohara (2008) touches on the essentials that Gilles Deleuze discusses concerning nomadic distributions in contrast to sedentary distributions, where the nomadic distributions refer to the non-hierarchical, anarchistic distributions on the condition that the sedentary distributions indicate the distributions of being in accord with the idea of identity and representation (40). Likewise, Kuniichi Uno (2001), who depicts Gilles Deleuze’s “Philosophy of Fluidity,” expounds on the thought of the nomadic distributions as an attempt to reject the way distributing difference to a classification table hierarchicalized from trunk to branches like a tree according to some kind of “identity (representation)” (92), and excessively affirm and open every possible difference (94).

Moreover, with regard to the nomad, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (2004), *A Thousand Plateaus*, explain that every point where the nomad moves around “exists only as a relay,” and “[t]he life of the nomad is the intermezzo” (419), and argue further that the nomads are “nomads by dint ... of holding a smooth space that they refuse to leave” (532). The French philosophers also refer to mixes, passages, and superpositions between the opposed, such as a possibility of living smoothly even in the striated space of cities, and being a nomad in place (530–532).

Concerning the thought “to be a nomad,” some researchers voice concerns. Toshiya Ueno and Yoshitaka Mori (2000, 204–205) in the field of cultural studies, point out that to be a nomad should not be to fall into the theoretical trap often associated with romanticization of a certain

concept or stance. Moreover, Caren Kaplan (1996), who has conducted sociological studies on feminist theories, comments that the metaphorical mapping of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, such as the desert, practically “perpetuates a kind of colonial discourse” (88).

4-3. “Quantum Self”

The previous section focused on the thought of becoming a nomad. Now, in what way could the self be discussed? In a special issue, *The Philosophy of Gilles Deleuze (Gendai-shiso, Vol. 30 No. 10, Seidosha)*, Naoko Otsuka (2002), who precisely takes up the theme of what entities are in Deleuze’s philosophy, illuminates his ideas on entities in which the “fixed I” assured of identity at any one time and the “thinking I”— the Cartesian cogito — persisting without any changes, are turned down (214–215); difference is viewed in a positive light by developing a schema referred to as an actualization of the virtual (217, 220). She then describes pluralism of the self, as follows (225).

Affirming haecceitas [thisness], which is transformed by events from moment to moment, and accepting an ad hoc state of identity are breaking away from the identical and fixed self. The notion of “I” assured by divine eternity is now nothing more than an illusion. *Cogito* has already been cracked. In a context where time flows into it, the self would be the variable and the arbitrary.

How would the pleated [the virtual] be unfolded or folded in casual meetings? Humankind could be the entity because of the action of the pleated. Therefore, there is no room in which the invariant, true self steps in. [Tentative translation by Tanimura]

Interestingly, an up-and-coming physicist, Danah Zohar, who has a profound knowledge of philosophy and religion, introduces a quantum physical theory of consciousness in her book, *The Quantum Self* (1990), where she tries to describe consciousness, like physical matter, from the standpoint of “quantum reality” (23). The basis of the reality per se is an “indeterminate maze of probabilities” (28) and, in light of the particle/wave duality: (131–132)

The particle aspect of quantum matter gives rise to individuals, to things that, however briefly, can be somewhat pinned down and assigned an identity. The wave aspect gives rise to relationships between these individuals and the consequent birth of new individuals through the entanglement of their constituents’ wave functions. Because wave functions can overlap and become entangled, quantum systems can “get inside” each other and form a creative, internal relationship ...

Thus, through inferring human “awareness” on the basis of quantum mechanics, Danah

Zohar reaches a conclusion that not only “I am I (the union of all my subselves),” but “I am also I-and-you (the union with you)” (149). In this instance, “you” counts as “those who have gone before — with the dead —.” She literally asserts with emphasis that “[i]t is not that I *recall* them, but that I *am* (in part) them.” A key perspective is the “I”/“we” interwoven with history (148).

4-4. “Living” States and/or Identities in Thoughts Challenging the “Newtonian Paradigm”

At the end of the section 2, I discussed a philosophical overlap between Toshio Iyotani’s assertion calling for reconsideration of the very place of migration studies (2007, 10) and Gottfried W. Leibniz’s opposing stance to Isaac Newton (Uchii 2007, 155). The connection is also applicable to the standpoint of “Diaspora as a ‘Point of View’.” Discourses rooted in the absolute space and time of “national fabric” in general — attached to the keyword of “awakening” at times — such as “nation state,” “nationalism,” and “authentic citizens of the state,” are being critically examined. However, “diaspora as a stance” then puts stress on the importance of “practice” to, more than anything, *remake* the world (Brubaker 2005, 12).

As long as the above struggle is key, the depiction of the “translocal” (Ueno and Mori 2000, 200), which is likely to be seen as an analogous concept of “transnational” built on a foundation of “national,” might be somewhat vulnerable. The “translocal” could be taken as an unexpected notion that is connected to the “authentic” local in the process. A grave question would arise as to how to describe a “negotiating table” of those who “unavoidably have to move.” Besides, with regard to “the changing same,” the “same” is not simply the “plurality-containing unipersonal,” as Toshiya Ueno (1999, 81) shows; it is not the unchanging essential but the repeated renewal process without any materialization. Nevertheless, this also involves tricky wording and is liable to be trapped in a mechanism under the influence of the “authentic” one and only. In any case, the deliberation ought to be seen as the thought of a “resisting” exercise/“practice” while sticking to “(trans) local” and the “same.”

Alternative ways of thinking beyond the “Newtonian Paradigm” are thoughts grounded in quantum mechanics that are common to the “philosophy of difference and fluidity” and the “quantum self.” According to Gilles Deleuze’s key terms, “the virtual is ... real.” Yet owing to the principle that “[u]ntil one thing is observed as it is, the difference must adequately be subtracted” (Sawano 2004, 217), the Copenhagen Interpretation seems to be introduced as a model, that is at the moment of measurement, assumed to be the “wave packet collapse,” artificially discarding anything but the selected state. Danah Zohar (1990, 23, 28) who puts forward the quantum physical theory of consciousness, also uses peculiar terms of the interpretation, like the standpoint that a core of a quantum reality is an “indeterminate maze of probabilities.”

Hence, on this occasion, I am also interested in gathering useful hints to work out the aforementioned “Stochastic Interpretation of ‘Living’ States and/or Identities (the Self’s

States)” by analogy with the Copenhagen Interpretation. First of all, although the Copenhagen Interpretation is epistemologically positivism, those precursors “switch” to realism before starting on the discussions described above. Nonetheless, regarding which of the states is selected, and what happens at the point of “observation,” their delineations are in line with the interpretation.

In addition, it is noteworthy that the wording of “as a stance” pointed out in “Diaspora as a ‘Point of View’” can also be seen as the “sedentary” and “nomadic” underscored by Gilles Deleuze. In particular, “to be a nomad” has been examined by leading experts, and valuable critiques have been provided. Nevertheless, without a deep understanding of the phrasing that the self in a fundamentally “quantum-mechanical-like superposition” is talked about in terms of a typical state possibly “observed” on the basis of the Copenhagen Interpretation in advance — like vanishing anything but the selected state at the moment of observation — denigration, objection, and admiration could be irrelevant opinions. From Gilles Deleuze’s perspective, “the identical and fixed self” and “the invariant, true self” are turned down. Once “the virtual” referred to as “the pleated” is “observed,” “haecceitas [thisness] ... is transformed ... from moment to moment,” or in other words, “an ad hoc state of identity” is to be found according to “actualization [the wave packet collapse].”

As to the portion of “the virtual,” in accordance with Danah Zohar’s profound suggestion of quantum-mechanically overlapped and entangled states including “I-and-you,” the union with you — possibly a “living” state at one location and a “living” state at another location — would enable those “Living” and/or Self’s States that have occasionally been dismissed as nostalgia for the past and/or home to be taken as the ongoing reality. In regard to the depiction of “I am I (the union of all my subselves)” (Zohar 1990, 149), as long as quantum-mechanical superposition is put into perspective, the hierarchy-laden wording of “sub” becomes unsuitable.

5. Through a Perspective of the “Many- ‘Habitats’ /Identities Interpretation”

When exploring “Descriptions of ‘Conceivable Governance’ by Analogy with Physics” (Tanimura 2009), as touched upon at the beginning, I first developed the rough idea of “Newtonian Urban Governance” by analogy with classical mechanics, including the thoughts of “Governance in Solidity” and “Governance in Fluidity,” in which “the outer framework of fixed absolute nation-states” is set up in advance, society as a whole is seen as an “ingenious machine” composed of various “actors,” and the world is governed by fundamental laws sustaining people’s “sedentary” states (28, 41–42). In fact, as primarily discussed in section 3–4 “‘Living’ States and Identities Depicted from the ‘Newtonian View of the World’,” a weirdly “friendly” illustration in common with this inference has been devised in minute detail.

In addition, Gottfried W. Leibniz’s perspective in opposition to Isaac Newton’s stance, could tie in with the idea of calling for “reconsideration of the very place of migration studies”

and “Diaspora as a ‘Point of View’,” as described in the respective first parts of section 2–4 “Revisiting the Paradigms in Which the Questions Have Been Raised” and section 4–4 “‘Living’ States and/or Identities in the Thoughts Challenging the ‘Newtonian Paradigm’.”

Now, with a view to those points, the final section proceeds to a key task of this article, that is, touching on the definition of “Quantum Urban Governance,” and looks into a core question: interpretation of “quantum-mechanical-like states.”

Based on the foregoing discussions, at the outset, “Quantum Urban Governance” could be modified as “a proposal of urban governance that begins with making the Many- ‘Habitats’ and/or Identities Interpretation of the quantum-mechanical-like superposition and entanglement of *plural* ‘living’ states and/or identities (the self’s states) by taking a cue from the Many-Worlds Interpretation in quantum mechanics, deepening the Newtonian paradigm for grasping and managing the fictional ‘sedentary’ society with approximate expressions” for now.

Subsequently, I will wrap up an interpretative framework primarily presumed on the basis of the Copenhagen Interpretation which is pointed out as a patchwork of classical and quantum mechanical perceptions — “Stochastic Interpretation of ‘Living’ States/Identities (the Self’s States)” — and, in light of the explanation, further work out a description by analogy with the Many-Worlds Interpretation — “Many- ‘Habitats’ /Identities Interpretation” —. Needless to say, it is conceivable that depictions beyond such matters as “habitats” and “identities” are likely to be needed. Hence, these alternative perspectives are tentative ideas that must be revised untiringly.

“Stochastic Interpretation of ‘Living’ States/Identities (the Self’s States)”

I will upgrade “Stochastic Interpretation of ‘Living’ States” (Tanimura 2009, 43) to a newer version.

In the “Stochastic Interpretation of ‘Living’ States and/or Identities (the Self’s States),” almost quantum-mechanically coexistence states are seen not as “fictional” but as “real (the virtual).”

However, at the time of a survey, any one of the “living” states and/or identities (the self’s states) would be “stochastically” selected by an observer, and anything but the selected “living” states and/or identities (the self’s states) should be discarded for the nonce. This interpretation as it were, assumes the “quantum collapse of ‘living’ states and/or identities (the self’s states).” The mindset could be said to be an ad hoc modification approach where even if the quantum-mechanical-like superposition and entanglement are suggested, an observed (or observable) typical state is individually picked up, in fact, as an extension of the conventional paradigm. “Insignificant” states for the observer might be treated practically as lacking in meaning or as inconsequential transitory phenomena.

In some instances, a “prime” state could be described as a sense of stance as well as entity.

“Many- ‘Habitats’ /Identities Interpretation”

I will also upgrade the “Many- ‘Habitats’ Interpretation” (Tanimura 2009, 43) to a newer version.

In the “Many- ‘Habitats’ (‘Living’ States) and/or Identities (the Self’s States) Interpretation,” the entire quantum-mechanical-like coexistence states are seen as “real,” represented by the Many-Worlds Interpretation, or beyond realism in the classical theory.

The question of which of the “living” states and/or the self’s states would be shared with the observer at the instant of a survey depends on the degrees of coexistence of respective states. This interpretation never supposes the “quantum collapse of ‘living’ states and/or identities (the self’s states),” and sees other states as consistently existing together.

Not with an observer’s perspective that merely focuses attention on matters of concern set out in advance, but with the quest for simpler and less complicated explanation, I tentatively take up the points laid out here one by one. In the case of surveying “an individual in superposition and entanglement of location A’s ‘living’ state and location B’s ‘living’ state,” it could analogically be said that in one branch, an observer obtains a result that the individual is in location A’s “living” state. Moreover, in a nearly identical branch, a copy of the observer obtains a result that the same individual is in location B’s “living” state.

Likewise, in the case of surveying “an individual in superposition and entanglement of the self’s state X and the self’s state Y,” it could analogically be said that in one branch, an observer obtains a result that the individual is in the self’s state X. Moreover, in a nearly identical branch, a copy of the observer obtains a result that the same individual is in the self’s state Y.

In any event, each copy of the observer perceives herself or himself as being one of a kind and sees chance as cooking up one reality from a menu of the individual’s possible “living” states and/or identities (the self’s states), even though, in the full “reality,” every alternative state on the menu happens.

Even if a certain “living” state and/or self’s state should be advocated as a sense of stance as well as entity, this interpretation sees that other states are still coexistent with the observed.

Finally, the gist of this conceivable “Quantum Urban Governance” (“Many- ‘Habitats’ /Identities Interpretation”) could also be described as follows.

- From the perspective of “reality” depicted in the “Many- ‘Habitats’ /Identities Interpretation,” discussions in the “Newtonian Paradigm,” including standpoints of “Solidity” and “Fluidity,” and even those of Leibniz’s position in opposition to Newton’s position, could be seen as the thoughts of a selected specific branch through “contrived” observation. In considering a feature of “Quantum Urban Governance” that is not based on “paradigm shift” but on “paradigm deepening” as well, the proposed idea might be understood to embrace every conventional thought of governance rooted in such observation.
- One point of view that, in people’s lives, “struggles” for seeking out “adequate solutions” to their problems are maintained in the very “entire quantum-mechanical-like coexistence

states,” brings about alternative “awareness of the issue” and “policy intuitions.” What are conventionally referred to as “places and/or the self’s states” at the time when people pursue negotiations, would be, as it were, nothing short of “storytelling” in one “distinctive” branch on which observers have set their eyes in earnest. Likewise, as to “homeland,” “community,” “history,” and the like, alternative thoughts of “resisting exercises/practices” and “governance-views” could be generated by recalling the “real” in “superposition and entanglement.”

- In “Quantum Urban Governance” that does not need to consider the “quantum collapse of ‘living’ states and/or identities (the self’s states),” those who are involved in public policies, in particular, should be urged to revisit and supplement what they tried to observe, what they found out as a consequence, and what they aimed to propose, in light of the “Many- ‘Habitats’ /Identities Interpretation.”

As mentioned above, by reference to discussions focused on those who are on the move, this paper has pursued fundamental work on innovating a paradigm of “Quantum Urban Governance” that could be counted as a way of further deepening conventional governance theories. In the next phases, while untiringly bearing “Globalization/Urbanization for All” in mind, I will incrementally cultivate the thought in light of extensive studies on urban and regional development, governance, international cooperation, and other related realms.

Notes

¹ “Descriptions of ‘Conceivable Governance’ by Analogy with Physics” (Tanimura 2009) is also available in a Chinese version: Tanimura, Mitsuhiro 2011 (Translator: Yong Li), “Cong Wulixue Leitui Dechu de ‘Kexiangxiang Zhili’ Jishu,” in Ming Wang ed., *China Nonprofit Review*, Vol. 8, pp. 92–115, Beijing, Social Sciences Academic Press. In this regard, my deepest gratitude goes to Professor Ming Wang, School of Public Policy and Management, Tsinghua University, and his academic associates.

² Yuzo Itagaki (1993, 13) also mentions that, although Tawhid is a standpoint sticking resolutely to the ultimate “one,” it thoroughly postulates that recognizing the individuality and distinctness of the universe is all but inevitable.

³ In a later publication, *Digital Diasporas* (Brinkerhoff 2009, 203, 221–234), policy recommendations of a similar purport are offered to host governments, homeland governments, and international development practitioners, with a view to diasporas organized on the Internet.

This paper is an English version of Tanimura, Mitsuhiro 2012, “Ido suru Hitobito wo meguru Ronko kara no Ruisui yori Kangaerareru ‘Ryoshi Toshi Governance’ no Kijutsu,” *The Meijo Review*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 49–70, Nagoya, The Society of Economics and Business Management, Meijo University. I would like to thank Editage for English language editing. The article is also available in a Chinese version: Tanimura, Mitsuhiro 2014 (Translator: Yaqin Cheng), “Cong Yidong Renkou Yanjiu Leitui Kexiangxiang de ‘Liangzi Chengshi Zhili’ Jishu,” in Ming Wang ed., *China Nonprofit Review*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 24–53, Beijing, Social Sciences Academic Press.

Bibliography

- Adachi, Mariko 2008, "Saiseisan Ryoiki no Global-ka to Setai-hoji (householding)" [Globalization of the Reproductive Sphere and Householding], in Ruri Ito and Mariko Adachi eds., *Kokusai Ido to <Rensa-suru Gender>* [International Migration and <Gender Chains>], pp. 224-262, Tokyo, Sakuhinsha.
- Asato, Wako 2009, "Care no Kakuho wo Megutte Hikiokosareru Hito no Kokusai Ido" [International Migration Triggered by Securing the Care-related Workforce], *Gendai-shiso*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 91-105, Tokyo, Seidosha.
- Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M. 2008, "The Potential of Diasporas and Development," in Jennifer M. Brinkerhoff ed., *Diasporas and Development*, pp. 1-15, Colorado, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M. 2009, *Digital Diasporas*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers 2005, "The 'Diaspora' Diaspora," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 1-19, Taylor & Francis.
- Castles, Stephen and Mark J. Miller 1993, *The Age of Migration*, London, Macmillan Press.
- Chen, Tienshi 2008, "Hyohaku suru Kakyo-Kajin Shinsedai no Ekkyo" [Border-Crossing by Wandering New-generation Overseas Chinese and Chinese Descent], in Akio Takahara et al. eds., *Ekkyo* [Border-Crossing], pp. 297-324, Tokyo, Keio University Press.
- Cohen, Robin 1997, *Global Diasporas*, London, UCL Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles 1994, *Difference and Repetition*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari 2004, *A Thousand Plateaus*, New York, Continuum International Publishing Group.
- El-Tayeb, Fatima (Translator: Miho Muramatsu) 2007, "Urban Diaspora" [Urban Diasporas], in Toshio Iyotani ed. *Ido kara Basho wo Tou* [Motion in Place/Place in Motion], pp. 201-233, Tokyo, Yushindo.
- Esman, Milton J. 2009, *Diasporas in the Contemporary World*, Malden MA, Polity Press.
- Fujita, Yuiko 2008, *Bunka Imin* [Cultural Migrants], Tokyo, Shinyosha.
- Hayao, Takanori 2009, "Diaspora to Honraisei" [Diaspora and Normality], in Mitsuharu Akao and Takanori Hayao eds., *Diaspora kara Sekai wo Yomu* [Perceiving the World in Light of Diaspora], pp. 166-206, Tokyo, Akashi Shoten.
- Hirota, Yasuo 2006, "Transnationalism no Tenkai ga Motarasu Chiiki-shakai no Gendaiteki Kadai" [Contemporary Local Community Issues Raised by Pervasive Transnationalism], in Michinobu Niihara et al. eds., *Globalization/Postmodern to Chiiki-shakai* [Communities in Globalization and Postmodernization], pp. 81-97, Tokyo, Toshindo.
- Itagaki, Yuzo 1993, "Toshi-sei to Hikaku" [Urbanism and Comparison], in Yuzo Itagaki and Akira Goto eds., *Islam no Toshi-sei* [Islamic Urbanism], pp. 3-16, Tokyo, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.
- Itagaki, Yuzo 2011, "Chuto to Sekai no Yukue" [Prospects for the Middle East and the World], *Gendai-shiso*, Vol. 39 No. 4 (Extra Edition), pp. 24-32, Tokyo, Seidosha.
- Iyotani, Toshio 2001, *Globalization to Imin* [Migration in an Age of Globalization], Tokyo, Yushindo.
- Iyotani, Toshio 2007, "Hoho toshite no Imin" [Migration as a Means], in Toshio Iyotani ed. *Ido kara Basho wo Tou* [Motion in Place/Place in Motion], pp. 3-23, Tokyo, Yushindo.
- Iyotani, Toshio 2011, "Globalization Kenkyu to Kadai toshite no Gender" [Globalization Studies and Gender as an Issue], in Toshie Awaya and Yuko Matsumoto eds., *Hito no Ido to Bunka no Kosa* [Intersection of Migration and Culture], pp. 295-312, Tokyo, Akashi Shoten.
- Kaplan, Caren 1996, *Questions of Travel*, Durham NC, Duke University Press.
- Kimura, Mizuka 2009, "Risan to Shugo no Unnan Muslim" [Yunnan Muslims under Dispersive and Aggregative Circumstances], in Mitsuharu Akao and Takanori Hayao eds., *Diaspora kara Sekai wo Yomu* [Perceiving the

- World in Light of Diaspora], pp. 220–257, Tokyo, Akashi Shoten.
- Komai, Hiroshi 2001, “Kanyakusha Jo” [Introduction by Translation Supervisor], in Robin Cohen (Translator: Takako Kadotani), *Global Diaspora* [Global Diasporas], pp. iii–vi, Tokyo, Akashi Shoten.
- Komai, Hiroshi and Miyuki Enari 2009, “Joron” [Introduction], in Hiroshi Komai and Miyuki Enari eds., *Europe, Russia, America no Diaspora* [European, Russian, and American Diasporas], pp. 11–27, Tokyo, Akashi Shoten.
- Kohno, Shigemi 2006, “Sekai Jinko no Doko to Kokusai Jinko Ido” [Trends of the World’s Population and International Migration], in Yoshio Yoshida and Shigemi Kohno eds., *Kokusai Jinko Ido no Shin-jidai* [A New Age of International Migration], pp. 1–24, Tokyo, Hara Shobo.
- Kudo, Masako 2008, *Ekkyo no Jinruigaku* [An Anthropology of Border-Crossing in Japan], Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press.
- Levitt, Peggy 2001, *The Transnational Villagers*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- Lindley, David 1996, *Where Does the Weirdness Go?*, New York, Basic Books.
- Merler, Alberto (Translator: Michinobu Niihara) 2006, “Sekai no Ido to Teiju no Shokatei” [Processes of Global Migration and Settlement], in Michinobu Niihara et al. eds., *Globalization/Postmodern to Chiiki-shakai* [Communities in Globalization and Postmodernization], pp. 63–80, Tokyo, Toshindo.
- Morokvasic, Mirjana 2004, “Settled in Mobility,” *Feminist Review*, Vol. 77, pp. 7–25, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Morokvasic, Mirjana (Translator: Hisako Motoyama) 2005, “Ido no nakaheno Teiju” [Settled in Mobility], *Gendai-shiso*, Vol. 33 No. 10, pp. 154–171, Tokyo, Seidosha.
- Nakamura, Norihiro 2009, “Zentai Ketsuron” [Overall Conclusion], in Shoichi Nebashi and Miharuru Azuma eds., *Idosuru Hitobito to Chugoku nimiru Tagenteki Shakai* [Migrants and Pluralistic Society in China], pp. 293–319, Tokyo, Akashi Shoten.
- Ogaya, Chiho 2009, “Okuridashi-koku Philippine no Senryaku” [Strategies of the Philippines as an Emigration Country], in Japan Association for Comparative Politics ed. *Kokusai Ido no Hikaku Seijigaku* [Comparative Politics of International Migration], pp. 93–113, Kyoto, Minerva Shobo.
- Orozco, Manuel 2008, “Diasporas and Development,” in Jennifer M. Brinkerhoff ed., *Diasporas and Development*, pp. 207–230, CO, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Otsuka, Naoko 2002, “Deleuze-teki Shutai towa Nanika” [What are Entities in the Philosophy of Gilles Deleuze?], *Gendai-shiso*, Vol. 30 No. 10, pp. 214–227, Tokyo, Seidosha.
- Sato, Fumitaka 1997, *Ryoshi-rikigaku no Ideology* [Ideology in Quantum Mechanics], Tokyo, Seidosha.
- Sawae, Fumiko 2009, “Imin womeguru Transnational Seiji to Shussin-koku” [Migrants’ Transnational Politics and Home Countries], in Japan Association for Comparative Politics ed. *Kokusai Ido no Hikaku Seijigaku* [Comparative Politics of International Migration], pp. 37–68, Kyoto, Minerva Shobo.
- Sawano, Masaki 2004, “Sai to Hanpuku” [Difference and Repetition], *Gendai-shiso*, Vol. 32 No. 11 (Extra Edition), pp. 214–217, Tokyo, Seidosha.
- Schiller, Nina G., Linda Basch, and Cristina Blanc-Szanton 1992, “Transnationalism: A New Analytic Framework for Understanding Migration,” in Nina G. Schiller et al. eds., *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration*, pp. 1–24, New York, The New York Academy of Sciences.
- Shinohara, Motoaki 2008, “Sorou: Modern to Postmodern” [Introduction: Modernism and Postmodernism], in Kiyokazu Washida ed., *Tetsugaku no Rekishi* [History of Philosophy], Vol. 12, pp. 19–46, Tokyo, Chuokoron-Shinsha.
- Tajima, Junko 2008, “Kokkyo wo Koeru Shakai Kukan no Seisei to Chugoku kei Ijusha” [Creation of Transnational Social Spaces and Migration of Chinese Descent], in Akio Takahara et al. eds., *Ekkyo* [Border-

- Crossing], pp. 223–242, Tokyo, Keio University Press.
- Takeda, Seiji 1990, “Post Kozo Shugi no Chosen” [Challenges of Poststructuralism], in Shuhei Kosaka et al., *Gendai Shiso Nyumon* [Introduction to Contemporary Thought], pp. 182–193, Tokyo, Takarajimasha.
- Takeuchi, Kaoru 2004, *Sekai ga Kawaru Gendai Butsurigaku* [Contemporary Physics with an Alternative View of the World], Tokyo, Chikuma Shobo.
- Tanimura, Mitsuhiro 2005, “Development and Urban Futures,” *The Journal of Social Science*, No. 54, pp. 49–72, Tokyo, International Christian University.
- Tanimura, Mitsuhiro 2006, “Beyond UN-Habitat’s Classic Framework in Urban Development Strategies,” *The Journal of Social Science*, No. 57, pp. 275–304, Tokyo, International Christian University.
- Tanimura, Mitsuhiro 2009, “Descriptions of ‘Conceivable Governance’ by Analogy with Physics,” *The Meijo Review*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 27–46, Nagoya, The Society of Economics and Business Management, Meijo University.
- Tsuboya, Mioko 2008, *‘Eizokuteki Sojourner’ Chugokujin no Identity* [‘Permanent Sojourner’ – Identity of Chinese Migrants in Japan], Tokyo, Yushindo.
- Tsudoku, Takuji 2002, *Shinso-ban Fukakuteisei Genri* [The Uncertainty Principle (Renewed Edition)], Tokyo, Kodansha.
- Uchii, Soushichi 2007, “Ryoshi-juryoku to Tetsugaku” [Quantum Gravity and Philosophy], *Gendai-shiso*, Vol. 35 No. 16, pp. 152–165, Tokyo, Seidosha.
- Ueno, Toshiya 1999, *Diaspora no Shiko* [Thinking Diaspora], Tokyo, Chikuma Shobo.
- Ueno, Toshiya 2000, “Diaspora,” *Gendai-shiso*, Vol. 28 No. 3 (Extra Edition), pp. 44–47, Tokyo, Seidosha.
- Ueno, Toshiya and Yoshitaka Mori 2000, *Cultural Studies Nyumon* [Introduction to Cultural Studies], Tokyo, Chikuma Shobo.
- Uno, Kuniichi 2001, *Deleuze – Ryudo no Tetsugaku* [G. Deleuze–Philosophy of Fluidity], Tokyo, Kodansha.
- Wang, Enmei 2009, “Kankoku Kakyo no Sotonaru ‘Kokyo’ to Uchinaru ‘Sokoku’ ” [An External ‘Hometown’ and an Internal ‘Home Country’ of Chinese Living in South Korea], in Mitsuharu Akao and Takanori Hayao eds., *Diaspora kara Sekai wo Yomu* [Perceiving the World in Light of Diaspora], pp. 258–289, Tokyo, Akashi Shoten.
- Yan, Shanping 2005, *Chugoku no Jinko Ido to Minko* [Population Mobility and Migrant Workers in China], Tokyo, Keiso Shobo.
- Yan, Shanping 2009, *Noson kara Toshi he* [From Rural Areas to Cities], Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten.
- Zhai, Zhenwu et al. (Translator: Yuan Yuan) 2008, “Jinko Ido no Peak” [The Peak of Migration], in Tian, Xueyuan and Guoqiang Wang eds., *Chugoku no Jinteki Shigen* [Human Resources in China], pp. 165–215, Tokyo, Hosei University Press.
- Zohar, Danah 1990, *The Quantum Self*, New York, William Morrow.