Depth of Identity
−In Search of a Universal Identity
in the Age of Globalization−

Rika Kanayama *

I. Introduction

As the world becomes more and more globalized, people need to have more of a sense of being a member of the global community, beyond their allegiance to a traditional nation state. The purpose of this paper is to explore how people with different cultural, ethnic and national backgrounds can exist in symbiosis in a multicultural way and integrate with each other with a universal identity as a global citizen.

There are not many studies regarding universal identity, and in fact, there is an ongoing argument whether such a thing as universal identity really exists. The author maintains that universal identity is possible not as a replacement for national identities, but as a cosmopolitan identity over and above one's local identities. However, it does not mean that universal or cosmopolitan identity is a uniform culture imposed by the West, or that it exists as an extension of one's group identities, but rather that one's individual identity deepens after a paradigm shift, resulting in a cosmopolitan sense of identity. With these perspectives, this paper examines how one's identity transforms from a more localized conceptualization to a more cosmopolitan or universal conceptualization and how such different dimensions of identity relate to each other.

Cosmopolitanism originated in Greece as the concept of a universal man who goes beyond national boundaries. In the modern era, the entire human race was believed to connect with others as world citizens by the individual's power of rationality. Parallel to cosmopolitanism, the concept of internationalism

* Graduate of GSPA

has been considered to be a form of multilateralism as a way by which world leadership is sustained by national governments (Wikipedia: Internationalism). The differences between cosmopolitanism and internationalism are characterized in terms of individual and national identity. Cosmopolitanism, proposed as a prototype for individual men and women who live in the wider world community in this global era, unites people beyond political and legal differences, whereas internationalism encourages cooperation between countries in the sense of regimes relying on collective identities in an "imagined community." The concept of internationalism based on the idea of a national collective identity has been challenged by the current resurgence of nationalism in the post cold war international system, and the potential for conflict in international relations as a result of past and present national movements. As the world becomes a smaller place through globalization, many scholars are setting their sights on cosmopolitanism as a way of transcending the malignant effects of nationalism.

In her book, *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, Nussbaum (1996) states that it is not patriotism but a cosmopolitan ideal in which one has loyalty to the global community that drives people toward an ethical idealism of justice and equality. In a cosmopolitan mode, Held (1995) also argues in *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance* that globalization requires the extension of liberal democracy at the transnational level. He suggests that international organizations (NGOs and private institutions), as opposed to sovereign states, should lead the way to a more global form of participatory democracy in order to solve social problems related to racial, religious and ethnic differences. Likewise, Hardt–Negri explains in *Empire* (2000) that this is the new sovereignty rising to replace that of nation-states as they decline. Marxism preached transnational unity as a result of opposition between the social classes, and this Marxist idea is inherent in Hardt–Negri's book, in which a rising multitude of people need to struggle against the global, common enemy of capitalism.

While a wide variety of views extol cosmopolitanism as an ideal identity in the global era, few researchers have examined the process of how a person,

often confined by his or her given culture, comes to acquire such a universal identity. Nussbaum (1996), for instance, argues that cosmopolitan identity is acquired as a moral choice by a rational person. She implies that the effects of a person's culture provide little hindrance to the attainment of a cosmopolitan identity as the cosmopolitan elements are simply added on top of one's local cultural identities. As for Held (1995), the self-determination of each person is an unquestionable premise necessary for the development of his theory. Since the foundation of an autonomy principle is a necessary notion for the growth of cosmopolitan democracy, Held's approach, therefore, presupposes that people can become autonomous over time, becoming free of "improper constraint — political, social, or economic" (p.32) — of culture if they can have arrangements and mutual recognition of political rule "underpinning autonomy for all in the political community" (p.41). Likewise, in the view of Hardt-Negri (2000), cultural issues are not even discussed as they postulate the identity of a Multitude against the Empire. Hardt-Negri consistently postulated the development of such an entity without facing the issues of cultural differences all over the world.

This paper attempts to describe how the emergence of a cosmopolitan identity is possible, but it also asserts that our cultural boundaries, reinforced by nationality, are not as simple as those scholars optimistically stated. In fact, these scholars consistently underestimated or ignored the factor of these boundaries. In particular, this paper examines how much the culture of collective identity is deeply entangled and confused with individual identity. There is a rising trend of nationalism and ethnocentrism in today's society as a reaction to globalization. A person is more likely to face clashes with other cultures in spite of the development of what is generally believed to be a person's autonomous will which elevates each person's moral choice to the level of universal justice. This paper discusses how one acquires a cosmopolitan identity by facing and overcoming the conflicts of nationalism and sub-nationalism.

II. Cultural Identity and the Impact of Globalization

R. F. Benedict (1949) and other social anthropologists developed a School of Culture and Personality that maintains that one's identity is greatly affected by his or her group's culture. A culture differentiates one group from another, and in that sense, a culture provides a foundation for its members' identities. That is, each individual is born into a society with a notion of its collective identity. Each individual is given a certain collective mind-set based on culture and language; this is not a product of one's free will or choice as we generally think. Language and culture are often inseparable since language affects one's way of thinking as it is closely related to cultural values such as worldview, and religious views as well as being a means of communication. People are able to identify and control their own behavior in accord with learned cultural norms and languages.

Stuart Hall (1990) states that there are two kinds of cultural identity, national and diaspora. In regard to a national or ethnic identity, all members share the same history, ancestors, land, and culture. Nations and national identities are best regarded as a special sub-variety and development of ethnicities and ethnic identities. Nations share their cultural features, such as historical memories, ancestors, myths, and common cultural traits. Governments augment this identity thorough 1) a definite historic territory or homeland, 2) the protocols of citizenship in common legal rights and duties, 3) a shared public, mass education-based culture and media, and 4) a common economy, with territorial mobility throughout (Smith 1991). In these ways, national identity is established by drawing absolute boundaries against outsiders to exclude them. This identity is often flip side of xenophobia.

The other cultural identity is what Hall calls a diaspora identity, a concept derived from the experience of the Jewish people who were scattered around the world after losing possession of their own state. The diaspora identity does not posit a clear boundary between insiders and outsiders in contrast to rigid group identities often represented by nations and ethnic groups. It is an open, fluid system in which various parts are interacting, and sometimes contradicting

each other, and yet possess a progressive mutuality. When two or more cultures encounter each other, something different emerges from each of them to forge an alternative sense of identity. In this way, the diaspora identity fosters one's individual identity.

Globalization spells significant changes in the cultural landscapes of belonging. The strengthening of today's global cultural flows transforms the world into a singular place where processes of cultural integration and disintegration take place. Globalization is spreading Western culture on the one hand, but on the other, there is a reaction against it as people try to preserve their national and subnational collective identities and to assert their unique qualities and characteristics. It may appear paradoxical, but the global culture and the emergence of transnational political and economic institutions enhance the need for local identities and accountability. Since globalization creates a loss of a sense of belonging that leads to feelings of powerlessness, one feels a need to reclaim traditional forms of personal and cultural power. These two opposing tendencies are promoting nationalistic and sub-nationalistic tendencies leading to vigorous efforts by majority and minority groups to assert their own sense of belonging. Most of the conflicts in the post Cold War era are closely related with the fact that nationalistic and other ethnic group identities are intensified by the processes of globalization (Juergensmeyer, 2002).

On the other hand, there is the rising force of the diaspora identity as a result of globalization. Hannerz (1990) argues that today's highly mobile people have a similar experience to that of the Jewish people who were scattered around the world, living in unfamiliar lands and encountering different codes of conducts and languages. New types of global business people have emerged, such as international lawyers, accountants, tax officers, financial advisors, management consultants, etc. Even in areas such as architecture, advertising, film, music, fashion, the image industries and the consumer industries, this borderless tendency is advancing. There are positive implications aspects of living in foreign lands and incorporating different cultures. It is becoming widely acknowledged that hybrid identities, several homes, and multiple attachments

are a fact of life in most nation-states. In the hybrid culture of the third space as defined by Bhabha (1990), which takes into account of the unstable identities of a diaspora existence, cultural creation is a foundational activity. It is not confined to its traditional ancillary role as a medium of communication between nations, but elevated to a form of primary creative activity.

III. Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity and Beyond

The impact of globalization with its interlinking macro elements, such as trade, finance and the structure of multinational corporations, is somewhat easier to analyze than is the area of personal micro aspects of cultural identity. In order to bring better understanding of the changes in cultural identities in the context of globalization, it is useful to apply Milton Bennett's (1986) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivities (DMIS).

In his model, Bennett describes the reactions of people to cultural differences. The ultimate goal of the DMIS is to "transcend traditional ethnocentrism and explore new relationship across cultural boundaries" (p.21). Bennett outlines six stages on a continuum ranging from *ethnocentrism* (meaning that one's own culture is experienced as the only one central to reality) to *ethnorelativism* (meaning that one's own culture is realized in the context of other cultures). The midpoint of the continuum is a paradigm division which represents "a major conceptual shift from reliance on absolute principles of some sort to an acknowledgement of nonabsolute relativity" (p.191). The first three DMIS stages are characterized as ethnocentrism, namely *Denial, Defense, Minimizing*. After overcoming the paradigm divide, one goes through the second three DMIS stages of ethnorelativism which consist of *Acceptance, Adaptation,* and *Integration*.

Denial   Ultimate ethnocentrism is represented at this stage. At this stage, cultural differences are avoided and regarded negatively as sometimes even indicating "sub-human status."

Defense   Cultural differences are recognized, yet a distinction is maintained

between "us" and "them" based on the ethnocentric notion of "we are superior and they are inferior."

Minimization   Cultural differences are acknowledged, but trivialized. Like the pax-Americana, people at this stage expect universalism based on their culturally biased ethnocentric values.

≪≪ *Paradigm Divide* ≫≫

Acceptance   A major shift from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism takes place at this stage. Cultural differences are respected as necessary dynamic aspects of human affairs.

Adaptation   At this stage, people are able to empathize and appropriate the perceptions and behaviors necessary to function within another cultural framework.

Integration   This stage implies the application of ethnorelativism to one's own identity. Being apart from any absolute cultural identification, a person is always in and out of different cultural views and has an ability to evaluate any given cultural context. The integration of differences can lead to "constructive marginality" which can be a valuable tool in cultural mediation hospitable to "the great diversity of humanity."

Bennett states that ethnocentrism hinders people of different backgrounds from understanding one another. To overcome ethnocentrism and to nurture sensitivity toward different cultures, one must move beyond the "paradigm divide" to ethnorelativism. The DMIS indicates that national identity is still a monocultural characteristic of ethnocentrism, whereas diaspora identity leaps out at the ethnorelativism stage and recognizes multicultural values. The recent nationalist and sub-nationalist reactions against the threat of western globalization can be understood in terms of the shallow cross-cultural experience characteristic of the ethnocentric stage. As the mobility of people increases and information exchange becomes more frequent and rapid, a more uniform superficial culture spreads to wider areas of the world, and there is a resulting

tendency to try to fight against Westernization and preserve traditional group identities. In this process, people often cling to their nationalistic identity which tends to enhance ethnocentrism as it associated with the nation-state which requires precise cultural boundaries, thus magnifying the distinction between "us" and "them." This strong group tendency runs the risk of encouraging a hostile attitude toward outsiders, which could then lead to ethnic conflicts and/or racism.

On the other hand, the diaspora identity opens the possibility for one to develop deep, meaningful cross-cultural experience and to establish one's cosmopolitan identity as a constructive marginal person. When a person passes a critical point in the experience of different cultures, he or she experiences a paradigm shift or serious transformation of the self and its thought patterns. Such individuals then become aware of their own state of prejudice and of the ethnocentrisms cultivated by the culture of their home country, and they are able to embrace new values suitable to living in a new culture. By doing so, they gain a new individual identity as a person who has a certain distance from any particularity of one cultural grouping, and they start having culturally relativistic views. An expatriate family moving to a new location, for instance, experiences this process. These people could then become "constructive marginal persons" who live in two or more cultures. Members of a minority group are often characterized as misfits or as not having solid roots, but these marginal people often have flexibility and the ability to accept people who have different backgrounds. Many of these people, not only have communication skills, but they are also capable of flexible thinking that embraces different values.

Moreover, this paper argues that when this kind of diaspora identity moves into the stage of "integration," a person then comes to the point where he or she might be ready to advance beyond the stages of ethnorelativism to *Universalism*. When a person transfers to the stage of *Universalism*, cosmopolitan identity is actualized. As Habermas (1987) depicts universalism as "higher level of intersubjectivity" in applying Hegel's "theory of spirit," the essential feature of this identity resides in both the individual and universal nature of human

spirituality, living as a free, self-designated proactive individual born out of cross-cultural socialization.

In fully explaining the preceding ethnocentric and ethnorelative stages, and then the subsequent universalism, it is necessary to first examine how the paradigm shift occurs between the ethnocentric and ethnorelative stages, and then how the ethnorelative stages evolve and further develop into the universal stages. In so doing, awareness of one's "cultural unconsciousness" and discovery of original "self" are the keys to moving through the paradigm shift and to becoming open to different cultures.

IV. Cultural Unconsciousness

As Bennett discussed in the DMIS, there is a paradigmatic divide between the stages of ethnocentrism and ethnorelativism. How does this paradigmatic differentiation happen? In Bennett's paper, there is no apparent reason expressed for this process. This section attempts to deal with this issue using the concept of "cultural unconsciousness."

There are conscious and unconscious aspects of culture. Most people are not conscious about their own culture because, once acquired, culture functions as the most important paradigm ruling its people's everyday life in the subconscious domain. There are various definitions of culture, but one important aspect is that it is not innate but something one learns from one's environment.

Culture has a definitive influence over one's thinking, even when the person does not realize it. What a person considers to be his unique identity is often a product of his own culture. Since this hidden controlling system is so common and accustomed, a person treats the culture of patterned behavior, habitual response, and interaction as if they were an inherited nature and unique trait to themselves. Without realizing it, one has been programmed to accept an ethnocentric, mono-cultural way of thinking and looking at things and values. In structuralism, this phenomenon is called "cultural unconsciousness." Most of our lives are lived through unconscious guidance in the forms of cultural conformity

and conventionality. Cultural anthropologist Edward Hall emphasizes that cultural unconsciousness has a blindfolding function, and thus human proactive freedom in one's own cogitation is being suppressed and can rarely surpass the limits set by the culture. With this perspective, he states that to be aware of one's cultural unconsciousness is to recapture intrinsic human nature (E. Hall 1979: 57-58, 244).

However, what seems to be the most obvious is often the most difficult for us to understand and learn. As if looking at one's own face, it is not an easy premise to recognize the archetype of our own well accustomed culture and make it relative by ourselves. It is very hard to overcome one's deeply embedded cultural unconsciousness which has tenacious aspects of ethnocentrism and self-alienation. But just as seeing our self-image in a mirror, encountering another culture enables us to become conscious of our own culture. According to E. Hall (1979), encountering a different culture can be the trigger to realizing that the self is bound to ones' own culture. He points out that placing one's self in a situation like living abroad for long periods of time or changing one's environment so that one cannot rely on one's own culture, the attitude and frame of the mind are challenged and the reality of ones' own cultural programming is revealed. In other words, since the human natural tendency is not set up in accordance with the principle of negative/unusual feedback, everything normally operates automatically and smoothly, and unless the input signals depart from a constant standard, our culture's controlling system stays unrealized. However, when matters start to deviate from the hidden cultural program and a person begins to reflect on his/her own reactions, values and beliefs, the individual realizes the existence of cultural programming. This is similar to finding that the standards of the mental map of ones' own culture lacks utility in new cultural terrain, realizing that an unanticipated deviation from the planned route has occurred, and receiving instructions to switch from automatic operation to manual operation. In this situation, human life is transformed from the "automated puppet life" to a self-active or a life "living with vitality."

But since humans have an instinct to cling to a familiar comfortable

position, the stability of one's psyche is disturbed and agitated when one experiences a culture different from the one in which he/she grew up. The impact and frequency of this shock are, in most cases, unimaginable in one's own culture. At such moments, although the degree differs from person to person in response to a threat to one's identity, the individual takes self-defensive measures to adapt and adjust to the surrounding environment. Such psychological reactions in encountering a foreign culture are called "culture shock" (Kondo 1989: 68; Watanabe 1998: 79).

V. Culture Shock and the Paradigm Shift

Generally, culture shock has been associated with psychological maladaptiveness, such as loneliness, internal conflict, and discomfort and was treated as pathological in many cases. This is due to the fact that the standard for adaptation was a monoculturally oriented one and was understood to be synonymous with assimilation, only accepting the shift from ones' own culture to a foreign culture, or the opposite (Kuroki 2000: 78-79).

Peter Adler, however, discovered more positive aspects of culture shock. His focus has been shifting to a perspective that treats culture shock from a broader perspective, as education in a different culture and as individual growth as a human (Adler 1975: 12-23). This learning experience not only brings about an understanding of foreign culture, but also a deeper understanding of self, and provides the basis for transformation. Through this experience, one learns of a way of life lived by others different from one's own way of life, and one shifts to a new paradigm that ones' culture is not the only absolute way.

Of course, experiences of encountering foreign cultures can happen within a country through foreign cultures introduced via the media or by encountering a person or a social group with values and beliefs different from one's own. However, these are only surface phenomena and dissimilar to the shock diasporic people go through. People emigrate to a foreign country with a society or culture that is different from the one they grew up in. They are

not able readily to employ the communicatory measures (linguistic or non-linguistic) necessary to communicate with the people of the host society. At the same time, they experience the necessity to adjust their own previous axiomatic thoughts, emotions, values, and patterns of behavior. Having the legitimacy of their conventional thinking intensely shaken, they constantly explore the cultural pattern of the host group (Schutz, 1967). In a state of culture shock, they experience identity crises and desperately search for their new identities. Then, and only then, do previous cultural behaviors and mind-sets become the object of examination, and the paradigm shift of ethnorelativism takes place. By relativizing one's own culture, an individual is liberated from the "blindfold" of his/her own culture. When a foreign culture and one's own culture become perceived as one out of many possibilities, monocultural ethnocentrism shifts to multicultural relativism, as stated in Bennett's DMIS. This process also explains why national identity, not only still remains unconsciously ethnocentric, but it even intensifies as a collective phenomenon with the acceleration of globalization, whereas diaspora identity develops more culturally ethnorelativistic way and nurtures the uniqueness of each individual.

Similar to Milton Bennett's DMIS, Adler (1975) classifies the process of culture shock into five phases: 1) after coming into "*Contact*" with a new culture, 2) the "*Disruption*" of the old self, 3) the "*Reintegration*" of the self, 4) the "*Autonomy*" phase, and 5) the phase of "*Independence*" (pp. 12-23, 76). The last phase - *Independence* - is parallel to the stage of *Integration* in Bennett's DMIS. It is a mature stage when one becomes more creative and experiences self-realization by being able to evaluate fairly the differences and the common elements of two or more given cultures and to find significance in the ways of life in diverse cultures. Through this *Independence* phase, one is ready to develop a cosmopolitan identity, reflecting one's paradigm shift from a mono-cultural mind-set. Culture shock makes a person aware of his/her own cultural unconsciousness. The attainment of this consciousness also brings with it an ability to appropriate, appreciate, and reflect on one's own culture. This

conscious act of responsibly accepting one's own experience promotes self awakening and subjectivity as single individual.

This transition from unconsciousness to consciousness has broader implications, because now one can tap further into the so-called "universal (collective) unconsciousness" which is the basis for the cosmopolitan identity addressed in this paper, an unbroken human archetypal psyche that transcends time, space, ethnicity, and culture, tracing back to the beginning of human civilization (Misawa, 1993: 1447).

VI. Universal Unconsciousness and Individuation

In the depths of human unconsciousness deeper than the cultural unconsciousness, the analytical psychologist Carl Jung discovered the "universal unconsciousness" which is comprised of certain symbolic themes existing across all cultures, all epochs, and every individual (Wikipedia: Carl Jung). According to Jung, the human "race" shares a "universal unconsciousness" based upon an "innate and universal history, ideology, and knowledge of humanity." Jung chose to use the word "universal" to point out that those perceptions and behavior are not based upon and brought about by experience. As a useful analogy, the universal unconsciousness can be understood as the DNA of the human psyche. Just as all humans share a common physical heritage prescribed in our DNA (like having one head, two hands, etc.), so do all humans have a common psychological predisposition indicated by the archetype of the universal unconsciousness. The universal unconsciousness is connected to ancient memories common to all humans, pointing at the "collective heart of humanity." Jung proposed this concept based on the analysis of over 80,000 dreams and fantasies (Robertson, 1987: 77).

Jung regards the whole structure of the human psyche to be composed of both consciousness and unconsciousness. However, he argues that the ego, which is the center of consciousness, has been developed much more than the unconscious, hence it brings only one-sided strength to the human psyche.

When the universal unconsciousness sends messages to the ego consciousness, the human psyche is in balance and is able to reach a higher integration of personhood called the "self." Jung used the word "self" to reflect an individual image of wholeness, encompassing the conscious, the unconscious, and the ego. Most people often confuse the ego with the self. As the ego is the only function that allows us to distinguish ourselves from others in terms of temporal identity in socio-cultural collective structures, the development of the self is one's goal in life and what we are in essence, because the self is the central archetype of the universal unconsciousness and the most complete expression of the highest unity that we call individuality.

Thus, becoming aware of one's universal unconsciousness is the process Jung called "individuation." Individuation means the realization and integration of all the immanent possibilities of the individual. Jung defines individuation as, "becoming a single, homogeneous being, and, in so far as 'individuality' embraces our innermost, last, and incomparable uniqueness, it also implies becoming one's own self. We could therefore translate individuation as coming to selfhood or 'Self-realization'" (1966: 173). Individuation is carried out by what Jung called one's "transcendental function." Jung regards this transcendental function as a part of human spirituality which restores wholeness to the organism and reaches a higher level of personal integration. In this sense, individuation is the movement of the spirit actuating both one's individuality and one's universality in terms of an "in-dividual," no longer dividable, single, universal being. Similar to Hegel's (1977) framework, seeing individuality and universality as thoroughly co-relative, not only is concrete universality in itself individual, but concrete individuality is in itself universal. It is a manifestation of "Spirit," that is Identity-Within-Difference, "I" that is "We" and "We" that is "I" (Taylor, 1980).

Individuation offers the possibility that everyone can have his or her own direction or special purpose, and it can attach a sense of value to the lives of those who suffer from the feeling that they are unable to fit in particular

cultural norms and collective identities. To those who are not recognized by the collective, who are rejected and even despised, this process offers the potentiality of restoring cosmopolitan identity and assures them of their belonging in the world (Singer, 1994).

VII. The Cross-culture Cosmopolitan Concept

In order to discover one's place in the world, however, the process of individuation begins with breaking away from cultural norms and ideals. Since individuation means separation and differentiation from the general and a building up of creative uniqueness, this individuation is always to some extent opposed or differently oriented towards collective norms. As Jung argues "creative self-destruction," which causes the disruption of ego consciousness in order to invoke the transcendent function, cross-cultural illumination and its culture shock can be regarded as a way to breakthrough the state of cultural unconsciousness formed by the collective norm. By experiencing culture shock and identity crisis, the transcendental function is activated in order to find appropriate equilibrium of the human psyche. The transcendental function starts connecting one's ego consciousness with the cultural unconsciousness, and it starts reaching towards the universal unconsciousness, as a process of widening one's cognition and moving towards one's realization of self.

In this paper, it is hypothesized that this universal unconsciousness is invoked when the cultural unconsciousness is awakened through cross-cultural interaction, and this is culture shock. Although Jung himself did not give formal recognition to such a concept of cultural unconsciousness, the Jungian Joseph Henderson (1990) discusses the reciprocal relationship between cultural unconsciousness and universal unconsciousness. According to Henderson, even though cultural unconsciousness is acquired later in one's life as a result of experience in the world, there are universal elements in each culture that derive from the universal unconsciousness. Thus, universal unconsciousness is interconnected with cultural unconsciousness and is partially realized in each culture.

Such a linkage between cultural unconsciousness and universal unconsciousness explains why a cross-cultural encounter not only makes an individual aware of his or her cultural unconsciousness, but at the same time cultural unconsciousness allows the universal unconsciousness to realize each individual's spiritual identity. In other words, to be individual is to be universal. In this sense, we can conclude that this is the concept of cross-cultural cosmopolitan.

VIII. Conclusion

This paper focused on the creation of new identities as people move around the world and encounter other cultures. The expectation is that when a person encounters a new culture, he or she experiences a paradigm shift through cultural shock and then becomes able to translate different cultures. By this paradigm shift, the cross-cultural person's spiritual aspect activates, and he or she obtains a true identity that goes beyond his or her national or local identity. The author considers that this identity operates on two levels, the individual and the collective. The two levels are often confused in discussions of ethnic and national identity. The augment is that, while collective identities are composed of individual members, they are not reducible to a group of individuals sharing a particular cultural trait. Individuals are more than their membership in a group and their participation in particular collective cultures. An individual comes to possess a cosmopolitan, universal identity from within through relating to his or her irreplaceable unique life and the world. Underlying this process is the spiritual element and respect for the meaning of life. With this way, one's local identity and universal identity are not dichotomous but exist in different dimensions. The base of universal identity is the universal value of respecting the individual identity. In other words, the transcendental nature and the spiritual element of universal identity are obtained through cross-cultural illumination. The symbiosis of multiple cultures as described in this paper is the process of discovering the individual "self."

Thus, the cocnept of cross-culture cosmopolitanism outlined in this paper identifies a positive individual who is not a cultural drifter but one who transcends the boundaries of cultural unconsciousness to exist together with others in symbiosis. Universal identity, in the sense of this cross-cultural concept, is a public ideal for the spiritual symbiosis of people across and beyond national and cultural boundaries.

References

Adler, Peter (1975). The Transitional Experience: An Alternative View of Culture Shock. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 15(4), 12-23.

Benedict, Ruth (1949). *Patterns of Culture*. New York: New American.

Benjamin, Walter (1999). *Illumminations*. London: Random House

Bennett, Milton J. (1986). Towards Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. *Education for the International Experience*, 2nd ed. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 21-71.

Bhabha, Homi K. (1990). The Third Space. *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference.* Jonathan Rutherford. ed. London: Lawrence&Wishhart, 207-221.

Habermas, Jürgen. (1987). *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity:Twelve Lectures.* Trans. Frederich Lawrence. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Hall, Edward (1976). *Beyond Culture*. New York: Doubleday.

Hall, Stuart (1990). Cultural Identity and Diaspora. *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. Jonathan Rutherford. ed. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 222-237.

Hannerz, Ulf (1990). Cosmoplitan and Locals in World Culture. *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. Mike Featherstone. ed. London: Sage, 237-251.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hegel, Grerg W.F. (1977). *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Tras. A.V. Miller. NewYork: Oxford Univesity.

Held, David (1995). *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan* Governance. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Henderson, Joseph. (1990) *Shadow and Self: Selected Papers in Analytical Psychology.* Wilmette, Ill.: Chiron.

Juergensmeyer, Mark (2002). The Paradox of Nationalism in a Global World. *The Postnational Self*. Ulf Hedetof and Mette Hjort. ed. 3-17.

Jung, Carl G. (1991). *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

————— (1966). *Collected Works Vol.7: Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*. Princeton: Bollingen Series, Princeton University.

Kondo, Hiroshi (1989). *Karucha Shyokku no Shinrigaku* (Psychology of Culture Shock). Osaka: Sougensha.

Kuroki, Masako (2000). *Ibunkaron eno Shyotai*. Osaka: Shuro Shyobou.

Misawa, Kenichi (1993). Jung. in. K. Morioka, T. Shiohara and Y. Honma, eds., *New Sociology Dictionary*. Tokyo: Yuhikaku, 1447.

Niyekawa-Howard, A.M. (1968). *A Study of Second Language Learning: The Influence of First Language on Perception, Cognition, and Second Language Learning: A Test of the Whorfian Hypothesis*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research.

Nussbaum, Martha C. with respondents (1996). *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research. Joshua

Cohen ed. Boston: Beacon Press,

Persons, Stow (1987). *Ethnic Studies at Chicago, 1905-45*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Rapport, Nigel and Andrew Dawson (1998). *Migrants of Identity: Perceptions of Home in a World in Movement*. Oxford; New York: Berg Pub Ltd.

Robertson, Robin (1987). *C.G. Jung and the Archetypes of the Collective Uncouscious*. New York: Peter Lang.

Schutz, Alfred (1967). *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Trans. G. Walsh. London: Heinemann Educational.

Seelye, H. Ned and Jacqueline Howell Wasilewski. (1996). *Between Cultures: Developing Self-Identity in a World of Diversity*. Lincolnwood: NTC Pub. Group.

Smith, Anthony (1995). The Formation of National Identity. *Identity*. Henri Harris. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 129-153.

——————— (1991). *National Identity*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Singer, June (1994). *Boundaries of the Soul: The Practice of Jung's Psychology*. New Jersey: Jason Aronson.

Stonequist, Everett V. (1937). *The Marginal Man: A Study in Personality and Culture Conflict*. New York: Russell&Russell.

Taylor, Mark (1980). *Journeys to Selfhood: Hegel & Kierkegaard*. Berkeley, Los Angelas: University of California.

Useem, John, Ruth Hill Useem, and John Donoghue (1963). Men in the Middle of the Third Culture: The Roles of American and Non-Western People in Cross-Cultural Administration. *Human Organization*, 22(3), 169-179.

Watanabe, Fumio (1998). *Ibunka Sesshyoku no Shinrigaku: Sono Genjyo to Riron* (Psychology of Cross-cultural Contact: Its Reality and Theory). Tokyo: Kawashima Shyoten.

Willis, David, Walter Enloe and Yasuko Minoura (1994). Transculturals, Transnational: The New Diaspora. *International School Journal*, 14 (1), 29-42.

アイデンティティの深層
―グローバル化時代の普遍的アイデンティティの探究―

＜　要　約　＞

金山　梨花

　グローバリゼーションを背景にして、世界中でナショナリズムが復興するなかで、いかに多様化する文化を抑圧せず、なおそれらの差異を超えてより普遍的な統合を図るかという人びとのアイデンティティにおける「共存と結合」の試みが今日重要な課題となっている。本稿は、異なる文化、民族、国籍をもつ人びとが共生することができる「普遍的アイデンティティ」を探求するものである。

　本稿が論じる「普遍的アイデンティティ」は、コスモポリタンなアイデンティティとローカルなアイデンティティの並存の可能性を論ずるものである。現代のコスモポリタニズムは、政治的な国家の枠や偏見にとらわれず、国家、民族を超えて開かれた個々人のレベルでの結合、交流にその現実的な基礎をもち、グローバル化時代におけるこれからの世界平和主義を支える古くて新しい心性の一つの原型として注目されている。しかし、多くの論者がコスモポリタニズムを達成する上で、曖昧な点あるいは自明としている視点は、「文化」である。本稿は、グローバリゼーションにおけるナショナリズムとサブ・ナショナリズムの闘争と相克という「文化の壁」の認識に立ちながら、いかに個々の文化の違いを脱し、具体的な個人の自己認識としてコスモポリタンな普遍的アイデンティティを内在化することが可能であるかという点を探求するものである。

　本稿は、人間のトランスナショナルな移動が創り出す新しい文化の生成とそのアイデンティティ形成を理論的な起点として、異文化交差（クロス・カルチャー）における必然的な境界性の相互作用が、国籍、民族、人種、文化、性別、階級などといった集団レベルの枠を超えて、人のアイデンティティに個人としてのコスモポリタンな気質を形成させるという着想にいたった。それは、ローカルな文化的アイデンティティの異文化交差（クロス・カルチャー）によって、個人のアイデンティティにパラダイ

ム・シフトが起こり、それらのローカルな次元を「超越」するスピリチュアルな次元にコスモポリタンな普遍性を確認するものである。そして、ローカルな特殊性とコスモポリタンな普遍性が二項対立の関係にあるのではなく、異なる次元に存在し互いが連関しあう多次元的なアポリアなのである。