

# Universal Public through the Politics of Translation: Toward a True Majority Reign

Rika Kanayama \*

---

## I. Introduction

As the world becomes more and more global, people need to have more sense of being a member of the global community. The word “public” is related to “people” and has the connotation of “openness”. Some important aspects of being public include: being open to outsiders and being common to the people in the space. This paper proposes the concept of a universal public in which people of different cultures, ethnicities, and nationalities can coexist and reign as a way to true popular sovereignty. The proposition is to shift from the “democracy” of limited majority rule based on the identity of a particular dominant group to a cosmopolitan democracy founded upon “universal-individual identity” derived from the Cross-cultural Cosmopolitan Concept, discussed in *The Journal of Social Science* (JSS) No. 57 • COE Special Edition.

## 1. Translation as Cross-cultural Cosmopolitan Concept

The Cross-cultural Cosmopolitan Concept aims to attain a universal-individual identity, which enables people with different cultural, ethnic and national backgrounds to coexist in a symbiotic, multicultural way. Since language and culture are often inseparable, language reinforces one’s cultural identity as discussed in the JSS No.57 COE Special Edition. Thus, the language of translation can prescribe and embody transnational cultural identity. By applying Benjamin’s translation theory (1999), the formation of a universal-individual identity through the Cross-cultural Cosmopolitan Concept can be

---

\* Graduate of GSPA

articulated.

According to Benjamin, there is a universal nature of translation regardless of specific languages and cultures. For him, translation is a means to aspire to “pure language.” In the “task of translator”, Benjamin regards “pure language” as the original and universal language that existed before Babel, and all the languages are derived from and have the “intention” to reveal this universal “pure language.” Thus, “languages are not strangers to one another, but are, *a priori* and apart from all historical relationships, interrelated in what they want to express ‘pure language’”(1999: 73). This premise enables Benjamin to establish a link between pure language and all other languages and also postulate the existence of pure language, which is universal in between the crevice of languages. Through translation, we are able to grasp a hint of this universal language. Based on this idea of regarding the origin of translation, the uniformity of the human race in the translation behaviors can be considered as a univernally human.

Being able to translate one language and culture into others shows that there are universally common elements in every culture and group. This also implies that an all encompassing, universal nature needs to be born with a translator in order to connect and unite different cultures at a higher dimension. The translating individual would know his/her own culture by meta-phrasing another culture into his/her own culture. Within oneself, the translator has to have cultural hospitality, multi-lingual/cultural consciousness in his/her thought pattern, in which the otherness is not completely absorbed or forgotten as the host satisfies his/her desire for translation experiencing the pleasure of receiving the guest in his/her own culture. The translator, who is in the position to recognize the strength of a certain culture, is expressed more clearly in another culture. At the same time, the translator attempts to deconstruct cultural identity built upon cultural essentialism as well as exclusive ownership of cultures through the idea of translation as “between cultures.” Mostly hidden behind the predominant author, the translator has the power to shift the dimension of culture to the level of the sublime without changing the form of the culture itself.

Moreover, this very act of translation brings recognition of one's original "self" which can transcend cultures and languages, not to be dominated by them completely. By doing so, the person gains a transcendental identity – an individual identity that keeps a proper distance from ethnocentrism and embraces culturally relativistic views, free from the rigid group identities represented by nations and ethnic groups. A similar notion is pointed out by Seeley and Wasilewski in their book *Between Cultures: Developing Self-Identity in a World of Diversity* (1996); self-identity cannot be confined into a fixed cultural frame. Instead, going beyond various boundaries, such self-identity is a unique individual who expresses through one's creative metaphor.

Therefore, the translation as Cross-cultural Cosmopolitan Concept is to enhance one's identity of individuality as well as universality. It releases an independent self who is not a drifter in a culture but who transcends cultural boundaries. Through the act of translation, the individual becomes a part of a universal public by realizing a cosmopolitan, universal identity based on the uniqueness of each individual life in terms of an historically one-and-only existence in the universe that transcends group identities, such as ethnicity, nationality, gender, class, and so on.

## **2. Universal Public based on Individual Sovereignty**

This universal public, however, is different from the ruling power of an homogeneous public, a bloodless abstraction of "insubstantial individuals." These abstract individuals are often represented as a male category and European middle class cultural norm (Simon 1996:166). When such a homogeneous public opinion holds sway, truth, and value, no longer established authoritatively, lose their moorings and drift with the ever-changing currents of the day. Important issues are decided through the objectivity of majority rule, in which the quantitative dialectic of numerical accumulation replaces the qualitative dialectic of unique individual resolution through cross-cultural translation. Anonymity is the mark of a homogeneous public with great potential of becoming a totalitarian government. The homogeneous public seeks to repress all idiosyncrasies through

conformity to established cultural norm and identification with an objectivity validated social role. As Kierkegaard asserts, such a homogeneous public person “acquires some little understanding of life, he learns to imitate other men, noting how they manage to live, and so too he lives after fashion” (Kierkegaard 1970:186). Kierkegaard maintains the lack of individual self as “spiritless” because for him spirit is the self not to be like others. The single full conscious individual is a spiritual definition of being a human being; the homogeneous public, the numerical or statistical is an unconscious animal definition of being a human being (Kierkegaard 1968).

For Jung, the term individuation refers to the spiritual search for meaning. The realization of the self is the goal of individuation (Brooke 1991:21). The resurrection of spirit from spiritlessness in the public sphere can be brought about by the Cross-cultural Cosmopolitan Concept. Its individuation process through the cross-cultural translation is what is needed for releasing authentic selfhood and individual sovereignty. Individuation means becoming single and embracing our innermost, and last, and incomparable uniqueness. Genuine individual difference is, therefore, in itself, an identity characterizing spirit as at once an individual and a universal being.

In order to capture individual sovereignty, the politics of translation based on the Cross-cultural Cosmopolitan Concept ought to be adopted, particularly in the areas of such issues as: the development of gender understanding and mediation, establishing the resident foreigners’ political participation through establishing a cosmopolitan citizenship in each nation-state, and education to nurture cosmopolitan identity for future generation.

## **II. Gender Translation**

Regardless of cultural, ethnic, or national differences, gender can be looked upon as the universal otherness. This section presents masculinity/femininity in gender as the most familiar of cultural differences, and by practicing the cross-cultural translation, releases the human spirituality. Maslow understands gender relation as indispensable for the existence of each other belonging as a

whole. By detaching gender in two parts, the parts become deformed, plagued, contaminated, and with limited or lost viability (Maslow 1994). Similarly, Jung explains gender as a goal for personality formation, the concept of integrating masculinity and femininity arises in educating an original “self” through liberating one’s contra-sexual archetypes in universal unconsciousness: “*anima*” refers to the latent femininity in man; “*animus*” refers to the latent masculinity in woman (Yuasa 2004). The gender relation is meant not only to promote cooperation as fellow beings, but also to translate the each others’ differences in order to activate one’s spirituality as an individual person.

However, modern patriarchy placed one above the other by the order of sex differences, positioning the female as an inferior, marginal group. Paul Tournier describes a tendency of general disdain toward the female as having its roots in the “Renaissance” rebirth of the subjective human. The equation for human was male at that time. The rebirth of humans meant the establishment of a male identity. Through the denial of females, the male subjective self-identity was affirmed. Since then, and for the past four centuries, females have been regarded an object because of their femininity and have become the tool to support males who carry out great jobs, consolation for males when resting, and a tool to satisfy male sexual instinct (Tournier 1997: 223-224).

Females have been portrayed as a victim of the overwhelming force of the structure of culture. The prolonged exclusion of women, as Arendt expresses this loss of public sphere and living a private life as “deprived”, functions only as “non-existent.” That is, such life is deprived of “the experience of being watched or heard by others” (Arendt 1958). This also means, however, that in the public area, the female, or fundamental otherness, is absent, hampering the achievement of a liberal and equal society for all humans. In the universal public, the critical spirit of gender is indispensable in the vitalization of human spirituality as well as raising a free “independent self.”

## **1. Difference between Male and Female**

Tournier states, “If males are mesmerized by power and authority,

females are interested in people, showing strong interest in basic respect, and consideration to others.” Males work for principles, doctrines, rationality, and tend to analyze and create opposing relations. Females, who tend to work for personal relations, are subjective, possess acute sensitivity, and integrate affairs intuitively (Tournier 1997).

Developmental Psychologist, Carol Gilligan (1982), also presents the concept of ethics, drawing on a contrast between male abstraction and female speciality. Gilligan took particular notice of the different process of ethical development, depending on gender. As the final phase of ethical development, males are typically guided by the “ethics of justice” resting on abstract principles and rules, whereas females are guided by the “ethics of care” entering into each person’s need and consideration of relationships. Such care for others has been viewed as the lack of development in autonomic decision-making skills. However, Gilligan argues that this is the typical ethical thought for females. Ethical theorists, leaning heavily on principle, measured ethical development by a gender-discriminatory development theory, using males as the “yardstick.” Gilligan’s assertion was welcomed by feminists as exposing the androcentric classical theories of ethics. The achievement of establishing multicultural ethics can be noted, but there were also criticisms toward the ethics of care by the liberal feminists concerning that sex-based stereotypes such as “typical female” or “typical male” could possibly encourage discrimination (Kuzuru & Kawami 2004; 180-184).

Having noted the difference between the sexes, this can be called a cultural determinist view. Yet, both males and females should not remain confined to given values or typical gender relations. Both males and females have the possibility and freedom of being a companion to guide each other to true humanity and spirituality. How should then this kind cultural determinism to be overcome?

## **2. Gender Free through Cross-cultural Translation**

In “Individual/Transcending the Individual”, Hanazaki (1996) suggests

specific actions that imply cross-cultural translation in gender transcending sexual specialization. Positioning the two different ethical values as viewpoints, he argues that the “ethics of care” should not be assigned to females only, but should be practiced everyday by both males and females. The males are denying human maturation and “life” by staying in the cocoon of ideology and belief in power and being estranged from those in need of aid such as child nursing, and taking care of the sick and the elderly. Hanazaki’s attitude toward “ethics of care” is cultivating “love” by voluntarily engaging with the others in need that fosters human spirituality.

Theoretically, Kristeva’s differential ideology in gender has an innovative meaning of integrating the factors of both sexes. She described the “male-like” and “female-like” as codes that are translatable (Kristeva 2004). This is a totally different approach from fixed notions of “masculinity” and “femininity.” Without having gender specialization, Kristeva’s ideology of gender difference can be integrated into an ideology of equality. In the Beauvoir’s frame, only the ideology of equality could be claimed in terms of “female to become or adapt male,” whereas, Kristeva marked the notion of equality with difference with the idea of “female-like” as a code which can be experienced and interpreted by the male as well. She showed both ways to translate the male and female codes, so that female values can be no longer be suppressed in our societies. In an age of gender equality, the borders of male/female should be translated in both directions. This is similar to the gender deconstruction that Derrida affirms, rather than “feminism” that opposes the masculine hegemony, permutation is taking its place (Caputo 2004: 157-158). Permutation is the translation of gender culture creating a universal public sphere where the male embraces femininity in close relation to the female, and the female embraces masculine aspects with respect to male relations. Through the translation of otherness in gender, individuals achieve “transcendence of self,” and humans are able to improve the world through individual “self-realization.”

People that represent these orientations of gender translation most likely would be Gandhi and Tagore of India (Friedman 2000: 346, 412). Known as

the father of nonviolence, and capturing the hearts of the Indian population in a social movement, it is said that Gandhi “was proud to be both “male-like” and “female-like,” and “was more motherly than females.” Also, Gandhi’s companion and amiable poet, Tagore, is similarly said to have attempted to integrate the mother’s “mysterious internal sanctuary” and the father’s “large external world.” He restored the “sense of integration” and assigned a universal purpose to the people as individual “people.” Both Gandhi and Tagore were gender free in terms of drawing authority from both male like and female like factors.

Being gender free points to the level of identity which is at once universal and individual, rather than females advancing and assimilating in an andocentric society, or females becoming androgenic, or vice versa. This puts the border of male and female in an adaptable and heterogeneous relationship, as opposed to a binary opposition of male and female, allowing further pursuit of a new “female culture” or “male culture.” Thus, gender free does not mean the demise of difference, but through cross-cultural translation between the genders, a transcendental self-identity, namely individual sovereignty is established in the sphere of the Universal Public.

### **III. Establishment of Alien Cosmopolitan Citizenship in Nation-States**

Another way to advance the Universal Public based on individual sovereignty can be sought after constituting a foreigner’s cosmopolitan citizenship in each nation state. In embodying cosmopolitanism through cross-cultural translation, it is necessary for residing foreigners to attain citizenship in each nation as “cosmopolitan citizens.” The political participation of foreigners, the minority of the minorities, creates a space unbound to homogeneous national culture and brings a new insight to universal human rights in each nation. In the words of Hannah Arendt, “From the beginning the paradox involved in the declaration of inalienable human rights was that it reckoned with an ‘abstract’ human being who seemed to exist nowhere .....The whole question of human

rights, therefore, was quickly and inextricably blended with the question of national emancipation, only the emancipated sovereignty of the people, of one's own people, seemed to be able to insure them"(Arendt [1951]1979: 291).

Today, the progress of globalization has brought to a head conflict between human rights and collective sovereignty claims. Because sovereignty means "the right of a collectivity to define itself by asserting power over a bounded territory," declarations of sovereignty create distinction between "us" and "them," those citizens and those foreigners. This distinction became a central issue of democracy. As foreigners, immigrant laborers begin to reside for longer periods, the problems of citizenship and human rights continue to be magnified.

Recently, the resident foreigners are refused to be naturalized and continue to demand political participation without acquiring citizenships of their host countries. Although the citizenship and naturalization claims of foreigners within the border of a polity are pivotal for normative human rights and sovereignty to be observed, they have chosen membership in the long-term non-citizen immigrants category (NIRA 2001: 62-64). This is called the "phenomenon of resident foreigner" (Kanayama 2003). The analysis of this phenomenon would guide us to the deployment of foreigner's cosmopolitan citizenship as a universal public.

## **1. Phenomenon of Resident Foreigners**

The number of foreign residents is rising in many countries, but many of them choose not to change their citizenship to be naturalized. If national citizenship were merely a political status in the accounts of rights and duties carried out by all people living in the nation, there would not be any issue of a resident foreigners' phenomenon. Rather, the issue is deeply connected to one's identity and citizenship. The phenomenon can be interpreted as their denial of allegiance to the identity of the host country. Contrary to the passive notion of national identity which is pre-fixed and bound by an essentialism based on blood and territory, the aspect of diaspora identity, on the other hand, is formed by one's proactive choice from the cross-cultural translation between the home and

the host cultures, and thereby continuously changing self-creation (Kajita 2001: 108-110, 115).

In this sense, the nature of debate for conferring citizenship to foreigners is that such instances deny one's freedom of "spiritual self identity." Thus, the unique subjective nature of resident foreigners' identity cannot be reduced to the particular national cultural identity. Rather, it challenges the idea of national culture which binds all the members of a national community within the same coherence of meaning as a closed totality. Resident foreigners are emancipated from such collective nationalistic ideologies and demand for recognition of such a "new political citizenship" as their unique self identity based on individual sovereignty and universal human rights.

## **2. Significance of Translating Cosmopolitan Citizenship in Nation-State**

For the German philosopher Emmanuel Kant, the essence of a human being is being a citizen. That means a person is a citizen of the world, regardless of the particular nation he or she belongs to. An immigrant's identity may not be either his home country or resident country, but more likely the world or cosmos. In Japan, there is a controversy whether to give foreign residents voting rights for deciding municipal matters.

Although there is an increasing recognition of a universal human rights standard to guarantee social rights and civil rights of foreigners, political rights, however, especially participating in elections, is the last and highest privilege to be considered as a member of a body politic. The lines that divide members from strangers, citizens from foreigners, the "we" from the "they" are drawn most sharply around this privilege. To the extent that all the participants are admitted, they should have direct access to the public sphere where the state must appear as nation and the nation as ethno-culturally homogeneous and historically continuous (Kajita 2001: 101-103). However, the political participation by immigrants and foreigners represents the citizens of a diverse human community. In seeking to engage in the public dialogues and negotiation, citizens who

express themselves through different languages, cultures, and national identities claim to experience arbitrary constraints of a homogeneous national cultural identity that blocks their free participation, and thereby disables them from becoming free citizens.

Because the prevailing norms of public recognition define the identity of citizens, the presence of foreigners in the public sphere reminds us of our individual sovereignty and that we are all individuals (foreigner lives within us), and not amenable to given homogeneous collectivities. The significance of foreigners participating in politics a way of carrying out Kristeva's notion of *Nations without Nationalism* (1993:16):

Beyond the *origins* that have assigned to us biological identity papers and a linguistic, religious, social, political, and historical place, the freedom of contemporary individuals may be gauged according to their ability to *choose* their membership, while the democratic capability of a nation or social group is revealed by the right it affords individuals to exercise that choice.

Nations without nationalism can be implemented by establishment of a multidimensional citizenship. The multidimensional citizenship can be structured as a cosmopolitan citizenship of foreigners positioned as an addendum to an existing nation-state national citizenship. When addressing multidimensional citizenship, in the case of the European Union (EU), it only creates a "European Fortress" as another method of exclusion to non-Europeans. Whether it is a system of federation or not, the nation state model of citizenship links territory to the identity of citizenship. David Jacobson states that the identity of immigrants and foreigners is unconstrained by territory (deterritorialized identity) (Jacobson 1996: 126). Only such foreign individuals can achieve the cosmopolitan citizenship described by Renan: "Citizens are not made by race or territory. Territory provides a foundation, a place to fight and work, and humans offer the spirit.... The citizenship is based on a spiritual principle" (Renan 1997: 47).

The basis for cosmopolitan citizenship would be "the personhood" (Soysal

1994) rather than “nationality.” The establishment of cosmopolitan citizenship in each nation state does not require the political unification of the world government, which attempts to link “humans” with an ambiguous “otherness.” Nor, does it aim to overcome the international political community, but aims for the multidimensionality of the political community within a nation-state. For foreigners, a political measure to resist public discrimination is necessary in everyday life, because legal discrimination against nationality cannot be solved at a national level. In this sense, universal human rights transcend the rights of nationals and extend to all individual persons considered as moral and unique spiritual beings. Kant’s idea of “eternal peace” and horizon of world citizenship can be offered through the translation of multidimensional citizenships between national and cosmopolitan in awaking universality of free unique individuals.

#### **IV. Translation as Cosmopolitan Citizenship Education**

One of the important purposes of education is to teach children to live beyond their cultural boundaries, and have a fraternal love for all the people of the world. Education in modern nations tended to enhance patriotism. However, to avoid the hostility that could trigger wars in this global era, we must train children who can identify with and have empathy with neighbors of the world. Cultures interact and change dynamically, and it is becoming more and more important to nurture cross-cultural cosmopolitan men and women. The goal is not only to understand other cultures, but also to understand one’s self. For that purpose, cross-cultural cosmopolitan citizenship education is essential and involves the task of translation.

##### **1. Problems of National Education and Global Education**

National education, originating in the establishment of the modern nation state, focused on its national citizens. To ensure national identity promoted by the nation, the diffusion of a “national language” has great influence. However, since this means the unification of the nation and a certain language/ethnic group, acting as the source of the “national language,” this has the risk of

creating a sub-ethnic nationalistic group that antagonizes the nationalism of the central language/ethnic group (Goto 2004: 27). Hobsbaum states that “the process of modernization of the nation makes the realization of this hazardous nature unavoidable” (Hobsbaum 2001: 120). Therefore, we live in a global world, but our emotions and ideologies are contained within the nation. Modern people are tied to the pseudo-racial nation and not to the self as an individual, or to humanity.

Since 2002, Japanese elementary and middle schools started “international understanding education.” The first and foremost goal of this education is for students to have a firm awareness of their Japanese nationality, and then to recognize themselves as a part of a larger international sphere. To implement this idea of nationalist internationalism, the Japanese ministry of education has obliged students to respect the emperor and salute the Japanese flag, and schools to teach and acknowledge the richness and diversity of cultures in the world based on the distinctions of national boundaries between an “inside” as our cultural heritage and an “outside” as others. Some have criticized these hierarchically organized cultural programs as nurturing only superficial international understanding.

Antithetical to the particularism of nationalist education, there is global education based on the principle of universalism. On the basis of advice from UNESCO in 1974 and 1995, the content of learning in global education has been researched and developed, focusing on teaching of the global issues of peace, human rights, and democracy. However, the main activities in the educational practice have been requesting lectures by foreigners on those issues and interaction with exchange students, leading to criticism of global education due to its lack of reality and direct relevance to everyday life (Sato 2003: 121-126). To seek guidance for global education from UNESCO is a necessity in the era of globalization. However, education to bring a sense of global citizenship at once is a difficult task to achieve because of those ethnocentric values, dispositions, and differences engraved by the nationalist education. We need a post-national education which fosters cosmopolitan individuals who can translate those

abstract universal principles such as peace, human rights and democracy into local multicultural particularities of daily life.

## **2. Development of Cross-Cultural Cosmopolitan Education in Japan**

In order to escape destruction as a result of the hostility of nationalism and to construct a peaceful and democratic society which respects the rights of individuals, an educational policy that focuses on the development of cosmopolitan citizens within a nation state system is indispensable. This paper proposes a “Cross-cultural Cosmopolitan Citizenship Education” which provides a multicultural and multilingual framework to break away from a monocultural national education. This would encourage the development of a new individual transcending the nationally restricted mind-set and creating a cosmopolitan, universal identity that enables a person to live as a human anywhere in the world.

As the acceleration of globalization is taking place, the number of foreign students is increasing in Japan. The “Code of International Rights” and the “Convention of the Rights of Children,” guarantee that every child has the right to receive education, and to maintain his/her own culture and language. Schools should teach and respect minority languages and cultures. However, focusing on the reality of the Japanese education system, Japanese schools cannot be considered the best learning environment for children of foreign nationals. Not only are the students of foreign nationals discouraged from learning and maintaining their language and cultural heritages, but they are even excluded from the general Japanese compulsory education. Japanese education laws exclude foreigners in Japan from being integrated into the compulsory education system. Following the teaching guidelines set by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Japanese schools tend to force one-way education which demands assimilation to the students of foreign nationals.

In the age of globalization, more than ever, the Cross-cultural Cosmopolitan Citizenship Education needs to be adopted at an everyday level. International children, born to bicultural couples, should be nurtured to learn both languages

and cultures. And ethnic educations for minorities in Japan should be guaranteed. Especially, the role of ethnic schools that already exist in Japan should be evaluated and appreciated more positively as well. Not only western International schools, but also the schools for North Koreans, Chinese, and South Koreans, offer an excellent foundation for multicultural education and bilingualism or trilingualism. “Ethnic education” can be considered as a part of cross-cultural cosmopolitan citizenship education.

Ethnic education allows minority children to preserve their ethnic identities, and has been valued for restoration of one’s pride in own culture. However, in the 21st century, an education that allows all students to coexist with people of different cultural backgrounds is indispensable. Ethnic education, which puts a certain ethnic people and culture at its core, now needs to develop an education of cross-cultural translation for second or third cultures and languages. In this sense, the ethnic schools need to be transformed as places of education that are cross-culturally shared and actively opened to Japanese students and other ethnic students. The curriculums of ethnic education must be fairly acknowledged and offered in the Japanese public and private schools. By doing so, the students in ethnic schools and foreign schools will be freed from discrimination in accessing higher education and finding employment, thus attaining the basic condition for a symbiotic relationship with Japanese people in Japanese society (Kobayashi 1994:42-43).

Through ethnic education and familiarity with ethnic/national others, the Japanese people will be given not only the chance to learn about different ethnicities and cultures, but also to realize the meaning of being as a cosmopolitan individual person. The new value of Cross-cultural Cosmopolitan Citizenship Education appropriates the acceptance of diversity and its abundance, starting from learning and acquiring the ability to translate from different cultures, that eventually will become the education for the people who construct peace.

## V. Conclusion

Based on the cross-cultural cosmopolitan concept, this paper proposed the concept of a universal public in which different peoples co-exist in mutual respect by sharing their cosmopolitan identity under individual sovereignty. To achieve a universal public, cultural diversity in its public space and “politics of translation” are the conditions for protecting individuals from a homogeneous cultural mindset and allowing people to aspire to individuation. Thus, self-realization and activation of one’s spirituality are fostered in a universal public.

Three specific tasks were discussed as politics of translation in order to establish individual sovereignty in the universal public: 1) gender cross-cultural translation, 2) establishment of cosmopolitan citizenship in each nation, and 3) education to nurture a cosmopolitan identity.

First is the universal nature of gender relations as a precedent to reconciliation between different cultures, applying a cross-cultural translation-orientation to sexual differences. Using sexual differences to justify dehumanizing a certain group of people leads to the selective lowering of all humanity. The injustice existing between the sexes can be seen as the base structure in all human conflict. The cross-cultural translation of gender restores universal humanity and achieves intercultural peace. Second, by “establishment of cosmopolitan citizenship for foreigners” in each nation-state, national and cosmopolitan citizenships will be differentiated as multi-dimensional citizenship. The formulation of a cosmopolitan citizenship, different from national citizenship, will allow political participation for foreigners and embody a universal democracy based on respect of individual sovereignty. Third, shedding light on the problems of national and global education, the cross-cultural cosmopolitan citizenship education is proposed to nurture a cosmopolitan individual, independent from nations who can translate different cultures.

Thus, cosmopolitan identity in the global era is expected to activate the individual’s life and enrich that life through multiculturalism and politics of translation. It is the public ideal for the spiritual symbiosis of people beyond national boundaries. By respecting individual sovereignty, we can recognize

cosmopolitan identity as a universal public and have a basis for solving various ethnic conflicts going on in the world today.

## References

- Arendt, Hannah [1951](1979). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Benjamin, Walter (1999). *Illumination*. London: Random House.
- Brooke, Roger (1991). *Jung and Phenomenology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Caputo, John D. (2004). *Derrida tono Taiwa*. Dialogue with Derrida, translated from French by T. Takahashi. Tokyo: Housei University.
- Friedman, Lawrence J. (2000). *Identity's architect : a biography of Erik H. Erikson*. Cambridge : Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, Carol (1982) *In a Different Voice : psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University Press.
- Goto, Michio (2004) Souron: Kokumin Kokka • Nationalism • Sensou. (Generalities: Nation-state, Nationalism, and War.) Ed. M. Goto and S. Yamashina. *Nationalizm and War*. Tokyo: Ootsuki Shyoten.
- Hanasaki, Kohei (1996). *Kojin/Kojin o Sasaerumono*. (Individual /Things Sustaining Individuality.) Tokyo: Iwanami Shyoten.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. (1992) *Nations and nationalism since 1780 : programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge [England] ; New York : Cambridge University Pres
- Jacobson, David (1996). *Rights across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kanjita, Takamichi (2001). *Kokusaika to Idnetity*. (Internationalization and Identity.) Kyoto: Minerva Shyobou.
- Kuzuu, Eijirou and Kawami, Makoto (2004) *Inochi no Hou to Rinri*. Kyoto: Houritsu Bunkasha.
- Kanayama, Rika (2003). Teijyu Gaikokujin no Shiminken o Motomete : Zainichi no Identity no Shiten kara.(In Search of Citizenship for Resident Aliens: Perspective) Tokyo: Ochanomizu.
- Kierkegaard, Søren (1970). *The Sickness unto Death*. Translated by W. Lowrie. Princeton: Princeton University.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968). *Attack upon "Christendom*. Translated by W. Lowrie. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Kristeva, Julia (2004). *Onna no Jikan*. Translated from French by N. Tanazawa and C. Amano. Tokyo:Keisou Shyobou.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1993). *Nations without Nationalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Kobayashi, Tetsuya (1994) *Ibunkakan Kyoiku 8. (Intercultural Education.)* Ed. Ibunkakan Kyoiku Gakkai. Kyoto: Academia Shuppankai, 42~43
- Maslow, Abraham H. (1994) *Religions, values, and peak-experiences.* New York : Arkana.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1978). *The farther reaches of human nature.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex : Penguin books.
- Minoura, Yasuko (1998). *Ibunkakan Kyoiku 12.* Ed. Ibunkkan Kyoikugaku Kiyo Henshu- iinkai. Koganei: Ibunkakan KyoikGakkai, 6.
- NIRA・Citizenship Kenkyukai, ed. (2001). *Tabunkashakai no Sentaku——Citizenship no Shitenkara.* Tokyo: Nihonkeizai Hyoronsha.
- Renan, Ernest & Others (1997). *Kokumin towa Nanika.* (Translated by T. Ugai & Others.) Tokyo: Inscript.
- Sato, Gunei (2003). *Kokusai to Kyoiku.* (Internationalization and Education.) Tokyo:
- Seelye, H. Ned & Jacqueline Howell Wasilewski. (1996). *Between Cultures: Developing Self-Identity in a World of Diversity.* Lincolnwood: NTC Pub. Group.
- Simon, Sherry (1996). *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Translation.* London and New York: Routledge.
- Soysal, Yasemin N. (1994). *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tournier, Paul (1997). *Jyosei de Arukoto ——Personal na Sekai no Yutakasa.* Translated from *La mission de La femme*, by M. Yamaguchi. Tokyo: Jordan sha.
- Yuasa, Yasuo (2004). *Born of Philosophy: Psychology of Gender.* Kyoto: Jinbunshyoin.

## 翻訳の政治における普遍的公共性：真の多数派統治に向けて

### < 要 約 >

金山 梨花

本稿は、「他者」に対して開かれた世界、それを公共のこととして位置づけ、異なる文化、民族、国籍をもつ人びとが平和的に共生することができる「普遍的公共性」を探求するものである。これは、社会科学ジャーナル・COE 特別号 (No.57) に掲載された「アイデンティティの深層」において展開されたクロス・カルチャー翻訳志向におけるコスモポリタニズムの理論的枠組みを土台として、これまでのごく一部の集団的アイデンティティからなる多数派支配とその「民主主義」の問題点に光をあて、真の多数派統治へと移行するために、個人の人間性を基礎とした「普遍的アイデンティティ」による「人民主義」を構築することを提唱するものである。本稿は、この普遍的公共性の回路として、三つの具体的な翻訳の政治の実践課題を提案する。すなわち、「ジェンダー翻訳志向」、「外国人の世界市民権」、「クロス・カルチャー世界市民教育」である。

#### 1) ジェンダー翻訳志向

あらゆる文化集団に通低するジェンダー関係の普遍性に着目し、異なる文化間の和解の運動の先駆けとして、その性差におけるクロス・カルチャー翻訳志向を適用する。もし男女差が、一方の人間性を低めるための正当な理由として使われるのであれば、一つの理想像を規定し、その理想像からの違いによって、すべての人間性を選択的に低める道を開くことになる。男女間における正義の欠如は、人間どうしのすべての争いの根底を流れる基礎的な断層線を構成している。ジェンダーにおけるクロス・カルチャー翻訳志向は、普遍的人間性を復興させ、異文化間の平和を達成するものである。

## 2) 外国人の世界市民権

国籍市民権とは異なる新たな世界市民権を各国家に制定することによって、外国人の政治参加を導入し、各国内の公共性において国民的枠限を超えた普遍的な民主主義と個人の人権尊重の具現化を図るものである。外国人の政治参加は、国籍文化の同質性に閉鎖された政治にグローバルな視点を翻訳し、真の人間性を考慮した多様で創造的な社会を雄図するものである。

## 3) クロス・カルチャー世界市民教育

国民教育の文化的無意識の問題点に光をあて、その単独的なナショナリズムに走りやすい自文化中心主義の傾向から、国家からも自立した思考をもつ、多様な文化の翻訳を可能とするコスモポリタンな個人を育成する。