

Intersubjectivity and Transnational Phenomenological Sociology: An Essay on Social Empathy in East Asia from the Viewpoint of Okinawan Issues

KAZUHISA NISHIHARA | SEIJO UNIVERSITY

Regarding the concept of social empathy which has several layers of meaning, this paper aims to discuss 1) the most fundamental/corporeal layer of the concept of social empathy, and 2) the most practical/regional level of the concept of social empathy, and 3) the relationship between both layers. According to my own sociological theory, our contemporary social world is mainly composed of the following six levels: corporeal level, personal level, local level, national level, regional level, and global level. In the discussion of the most fundamental level, the concept of social empathy is closely related to the theory of intercorporeal intersubjectivity which is elucidated by phenomenological thoughts. Particularly, I paid special attention to the theoretical viewpoint of “mutual tuning-in relationship” developed by Alfred Schutz. On the other hand, the regional vision of East Asian Community is discussed as the most practical/regional layer of the concept of social empathy. As an example, this paper argues the past and present situations of this vision and shows its significances and limitations. The result of my investigation is that the vision of the East Asian Community should be argued all over the Asian area, but it should not be confined in Asia, and finally it will be open to Transpacific area and to the world. The concept of social empathy tends to be regarded as a simple slogan for social solidarity. This problematic will be partly overcome by these discussions of the theoretical foundation and the practical development.

Keywords: social empathy, transnational phenomenological sociology, intersubjectivity, Okinawa, East Asian Community

Introduction

The concept of “social empathy” tends to be regarded as a simple slogan for social solidarity, although it is very important not only for social sciences but also for contemporary world. Therefore, this concept needs to be based on a theoretical as well as on concrete context. This paper tries to give the following two foundations to this concept: one is intersubjective/corporeal/theoretical foundation, the other is transnational/regional/practical foundation.

However, this paper is not just a theoretical study. This paper also aims at considering on the necessity and possibility of social empathy or social solidarity in East Asia from the viewpoint of Okinawan Issues. This viewpoint is derived from my new book titled *Introducing Transnationalism* which discussed topics of migrants, Okinawa, and the nation-state (Nishihara 2018). In this book, I attempted to reveal a new social horizon beyond the contemporary nation-state. However, no specific plan for our future society in East Asia has been fully proposed there. So, I would like to clarify this point briefly in this paper. Of course, as I suggested above, the main focuses of my discussion are phenomenological investigation of this concept of social empathy and its concrete relationship to the practice of social solidarity in East Asia.

In order to develop my discussion, I first argue the following three standpoints as my theoretical bases: 1) phenomenological sociology, 2) sociological theory of intersubjectivity, and 3) transnational sociology. Then, at the latter half of this paper, I examine the issues of Okinawa and the East Asian Community for the realization of peace and transnational intersubjective relationship in this area. At the same time, some problematics are also discussed at the end of this paper.

Phenomenological Sociology and Sociological Theory of Intersubjectivity

First, I discuss Edmund Husserl’s phenomenological philosophy. There are various ways to interpret phenomenology itself in different contexts. I divided Husserl’s phenomenology into three main contexts. The first is the concept of “Experience of Consciousness” in his earlier writings (Husserl 1913) and the second is the concept of “Recognition of Crisis” in late Husserl (Husserl 1954). The third is the concept of “Genesis of Meaning” (Nishihara

2010, 2013, 2015).

In the first context, Husserl investigated in a subjective way the structure and mechanism of consciousness through his concept of intentionality. In the second context, Husserl recognized that the crisis of European sciences was pressing under the Nazism regime in the 1930s. He thought such a crisis had arrived originally because the meanings of our life-world got lost in the European scientific thinking. The life-world is the foundation of all our lives including scientific research activities. There was a demand in Husserl for a restoration of natural attitudes, not naturalistic attitude, in daily life.

After Husserl, it can be said that the first context was inherited by Jean-Paul Sartre in philosophical history. As an existentialistic philosopher, Sartre discussed the problems of human subjectivity including the theory of emotion (Sartre 1936, 1946). In the meantime, Martin Heidegger took over the second context. Heidegger, using terms such as death, anxiety, and decision, discussed the fundamental ontology or the problematics of contemporary people (Heidegger 1927). However, in Husserl's phenomenology, there was the third context that I give special attention to here.

The third context had been buried in many unpublished manuscripts written by Husserl (Husserl 1973). There were many discussions on various issues around the concept of intersubjectivity in these writings. However, Husserl clearly wrote there that he was paying attention to "mother-child relationship." This relationship is based on intersubjectivity that makes children acquire their subjective consciousnesses. In short, he proposed here the theory of genetic phenomenology of human consciousness. The concept of intersubjectivity must be considered first in this genetic context, and it is in the context of "Genesis of Meaning." This context had been developed later by Maurice Merleau-Ponty (Merleau-Ponty 1953, 1964, 1988). For example, Merleau-Ponty discussed that the interpersonal relationship of "infants" and acquirement of language in them were mainly argued from the viewpoint of his 'body theory,' more precisely, with his theory of "intercorporeality."

Furthermore, Alfred Schutz, a founder of phenomenological sociology, also argued that intersubjectivity was originally given in human life-world. Schutz wrote that intersubjectivity was the fundamental ontological category of human existence in the world (Schutz 1966, p. 82). Furthermore, he wrote, "Communication always and already presupposes a social interrelationship upon which it is founded, i. e. the relationship of being tuned in one upon the other" (Schutz 1966, p. 38). Schutz also claimed, "All communication presupposes a mutual tuning-in relationship between the communicator and the addressee of communication (Schutz 1966, p. 177). For Schutz, intersub-

jectivity means primarily this “mutual tuning-in relationship.” In other words, for Schutz, who was also a researcher of the theory of music, sharing rhythm was a decisive matter for his phenomenological sociology. A theoretically important point for Schutz was intercorporeally “‘sharing rhythm’ in a synchronized way” in our communication. This phrase, “‘sharing rhythm’ in a synchronized way,” can be found in his short manuscript for the planning of his last book (Schutz and Luckmann 1989, p. 299). Therefore, I think, this time when he was planning his last book was the highest point Schutz achieved in his lifetime (Nishihara 2013, p. 26).

However, there is criticism that Schutz’s phenomenological sociology is subjective micro sociology and it cannot deal with the macro social phenomena. I do not discuss this criticism here in detail, but I think that Schutz’s theories of symbol and typification¹ can deal with macro social phenomena (Schutz 1962, 1964). Through symbolization and typification, we usually recognize the macro phenomena that we cannot directly see and hear. Such recognition, however, is a kind of reification. Schutz’s sociology departs from vividly ongoing intersubjective interaction as a starting point and grasps the macro social world symbolically in the typified way or in the reified manner. Although reification in our recognition is inevitable in a sense, we also need to go beyond it (cf., Hiromatsu 1983). In what circumstances is there such a need for ‘going beyond’? One of the core points of my investigation is exactly in this point. I would like to discuss this point in the next section. Anyway, the “mutual tuning-in relationship” is a precondition and, at the same time, requirement of all human communication as Schutz showed in the intercorporeal intersubjective relationship.

The Overlap of Phenomenological Sociology and Transnational Sociology

As the world has become more globalized, sociology including phenomenological sociology must also change. A German sociologist, Ulrich Beck

¹ Schutz wrote, “It should be emphasized that the interpretation of the world in terms of types... is not the outcome of a process of ratiocination. The world, physical as well as the sociocultural one, is experienced from the outset in terms of types” (Schutz 1964, p. 233). This way of grasping world is called “typification” in Schutz (Nishihara 2013, pp. 27-29). Schutz added in the same page above, “[T]ypification on the commonsense level – in contradistinction to typifications made by the scientist – emerge in the everyday experience of the world as taken for granted without any formulation of judgments or neat propositions with logical subjects and predicates.

already suggested this point in the 1980s as follows: “Along with the de-traditionalization and the institutionalization of worldwide media-network, each individual biography is set free from his/her immediate life-sphere, beyond the national boarder” (Beck 1986, p. 219; English translation by Nishihara: Citations below from Beck also are my translations). Moreover, Beck also states as follows: “While the national government acts within the frame of the nation-state, each individual biography is nowadays open to the world society.....[T]he world society is a part of his/her biography” (ibid.). In addition, Beck stated that sociological knowledge based on positivistic method does only reproduce the past events “loyally.” To the contrary, “my statement follows another request,” which is to “attempt to take a newly emerging future into view” (Beck 1986, p. 12).

In these discourses, the following two points are important. First, so far, traditional sociologists tended to investigate domestic society only. Second, although these sociologists have thought that empirical or positivistic method are central in sociology, Beck’s sociology is the future-oriented one. According to my own terminology, these points are decisively important for contemporary sociology to go beyond the concept of “society within the nation-state” and to open the prospects for the future². Thus, I advocated the position of “transnational sociology” and “genetic theory of future vision” in these contexts.

In addition, I would like to state another important point, that is, it is necessary to distinguish the following six levels when investigating the contemporary social world of the global age: corporeal level,³ personal level, local level, national level, regional level, and global level. The most important viewpoint I emphasize here is the leaps from the local level, beyond the national level, to the regional level. Transnational sociologists focus on these leaps or movements. Taking time perspective into consideration, they think about the desirable society of the future at the regional/global level. I will mention this point shortly later. Furthermore, here, I should explain transnationalism because it has not yet discussed fully in sociology.

In terms of the word, transnationalism, I am considering the following three types: 1) empirical transnationalism (cf., Vertovec 2009), 2) methodol-

² There isn’t any space to be discussed in detail, but I can add that, in these points, my standpoint is closely related to “Sociology Beyond Societies” (Urry 2000) and “Real Utopias” (Wright 2010). Bryan Turner’s book dealing with “vulnerability” as fundamental human rights was also close to my positioning (Turner 2006).

³ This level can be also termed “animal level,” which was suggested as “animalité” by Merleau-Ponty (1964). The focal point here is on the intercorporeal intersubjectivity.

ological transnationalism (cf., Beck 2002), and 3) idealistic transnationalism (Nishihara 2016). Empirical transnationalism is closely related to positivistic study of phenomena that people are *de facto* move beyond the nation-state. Methodological transnationalism is a methodological attitude in which sociologists focus on social phenomena of contemporary mobile people across borders. This transnationalism corresponds in part to Beck's sociological statements. Beck criticized "methodological nationalism," and instead, he advocated "methodological cosmopolitanism" (Beck 2012). But as an Asian sociologist, I advocate 'methodological transnationalism' instead of methodological cosmopolitanism (Nishihara 2018). I believe, for the time being, regionalism is needed in East Asia. The last one, idealistic transnationalism, is to think of various desirable and idealistic transnational activities and to conceive a possible future society as an ideal one. In short, in order to research 1) empirical transnationalism positively, 2) methodological transnationalism should be actively adopted in East Asia, and then 3) idealistic transnationalism should be pursued for the future world.

Here I would like to take up the theory of intersubjectivity again. I have already suggested that there are three main important points to be noted in the theory of intersubjectivity. First, this theory argues the prerequisites for communication. Intersubjective relationship including the intercorporeal relationship without language is required for proper communication. Second, this ongoing interaction or relation creates something material. For example, it can be reflectively grasped on the third person basis as a relationship such as a friendship, a hostile relationship, or it creates the rules which constrain the actors' future actions. In short, intersubjective interaction is inevitably made into an object. This is a kind of reification. Third, this point is what Schutz argued in his theory of symbolization and typification, or what Emile Durkheim (1894) discussed in his theory of institution which binds people's acts externally. A nation-state is also grasped as a reified object. Benedict Anderson (1983) called it "imagined communities." Wide regions, as well as the world, are also apprehended only in a reified way because people cannot access them directly.

However, it is the intersubjective interaction that can overcome the reified situation like that. Successful Migrants beyond the nation-state surely make new relationships in new local places. In order to overcome the reified situations, there is nothing other than communication based on intersubjective interaction. The wall of a nation-state can be in fact overcome by the moving people like immigrants. Immigrants can make intersubjective relationships beyond cultural differences. Appropriate communication cannot be possible

among relations just only based on each individual culture. There is a demand for universal cultural commonality including fundamental intercorporeal intersubjectivity. It can also be said that a new common culture that exceeds cultural differences will be required. What should be sought in this point, therefore, is not 'multi'-culturalism or 'inter'-culturalism, but 'trans'-culturalism. I criticized multiculturalism and even interculturalism because they reified the culture itself (cf., Cantle 2012). So, I advocated "transculturalism" in my latest book (Nishihara 2018).

Now, I would like to discuss the second topic, that is, the issues of idealistic transnationalism and regional solidarity in East Asia. I begin with talking about various issues in Okinawa in the next section.

Okinawa and the US Military Bases

Okinawa was once an independent country called the Ryukyu Kingdom. It is said that the formation of the Kingdom was in 1429. However, this Kingdom was annexed to Japan in the 1870s. After that, in 1945, there were miserable battles between Japan and the US forces in Okinawa. This battle that sacrificed more than 200,000 dead people ended in about three months. Then, the US occupied and controlled Okinawa for twenty-seven years. Finally, in 1972, Okinawa returned to the Japanese administration, however, it was not the 'final' solution. Some people opposed this reversion itself. They thought Okinawa's return to Japan was not a way to achieve peace. Then, some of them made new constitutional drafts for a future Okinawa "society," not a nation-state of Okinawa, while keeping Japan's "peace constitution" in mind. Or, other people thought about independence of Okinawa from Japan. However, such voices of people were overwhelmed by the voice of people who demanded reversion to Japan. But after Okinawa was returned to Japan, the US military bases in Okinawa did not decrease. Rather, it has been increasing more and more.⁴ What did Okinawa's reversion to Japan mean for the people who wished for peace? Behind Okinawa reversion movement to Japan, in fact, the top political leaders of Japan and the US made the secret agreements to 'introduce' nuclear weapons into Okinawa (McCormack and Norimatsu 2012, pp. 53-67). These facts were recently revealed.

⁴ Although Okinawa takes only 0.6% of the Japanese country's land, nowadays, 70.6% of the US Military bases in Japan are concentrated in Okinawa. We must not forget the role of these military bases. In fact, during the Vietnam war, many fighter aircrafts flew from these bases in Okinawa to Vietnam.

In 1995, a girl rape incident by US Marine Corps occurred in Okinawa. This incident gave a great shock to the people of Okinawa that led to extensive social movements against the US military bases. During these movements, one constitutional draft called “Constitution of the Ryukyu Republic Societies” written in 1981 gained attention again. It was drafted by Shin-ichi Kawamitsu, a representative intellectual in Okinawa. Kawamitsu advocated even the abolition of the nation-state itself in Article 1 of his constitution (Kawamitsu 2010, p. 106). This constitution draft received a great deal of attention also in the 2010s and several books including this constitutional draft were published at that time (Kawamitsu 2010, Kawamitsu and Nakazato 2014). It was the time that the Japanese government and the US forces were planning and finally trying to build a new US base in Henoko, Okinawa. Then, Yasukatsu Matsushima and others came to think that Okinawa should be an independent country⁵. Furthermore, they established a new academic association for the study on independence of Ryukyu/Okinawa in 2013⁶. Constitutional draft and independence issue have different vectors, but there are many common orientations. They have intense peace-oriented ideas, unarmed orientations, anti-war and anti-base thoughts. Another important point is that the problems in Okinawa are not only local or national issues but also regional or global issues.

Recently the governors who claim to reduce or eliminate the US military bases have been elected in Okinawa. However, both Japanese and US governments ignore the intention of the governors and people of Okinawa. Some Japanese people seems to support, positively or passively, such governmental policy. One of the biggest reasons for such support seems to be

⁵ Matsushima and Ishigaki posted an independent declaration of Okinawa in a journal in 2010. It is “The Federation of Autonomous Republics of Ryukyuanesia: The Declaration of Independence” (Matsushima and Ishigaki 2010, pp. 6-7). At the end of this declaration, they wrote, “In order not to allow any more land of Ryukyu to be used for U.S. military basing, we declare independence from Japan. And on attaining independence, we will at once return the existing U.S. military bases to Japan that is so fond of them” (Translated by Koji Taira, cited from the following website. URL: <http://ryukyujichi.blog123.fc2.com/blog-category-19.html> (visit: October, 15, 2017).

⁶ This academic association is named “The Association of Comprehensive Studies for Independence of the Lew Chewans” (Lew Chewans= Okinawans). In its Foundation Charter, the following sentences can be seen (<http://www.acsils.org/english>, visit: October, 16, 2017).

“By gaining independence from Japan and removing all military bases from our islands we Lew Chewan wish to achieve our long sought-after goal of becoming a sovereign island of peace and hope that exists in friendship with other countries, regions and nations of the world.”

“Based on these collaborations of scholarship we will also participate in forums and commissions of the United Nations, international conferences, in order to carry out a movement aimed at Lew Chewan independence.”

because the threat of China and North Korea would exist. Indeed, there are many confrontational relationships in North East Asia and its surrounding waters. It is needless to say that there is a division line between the following two countries/areas: Russia/Japan, North Korea/South Korea, North Korea/Japan, North Korea/The US, South Korea/Japan, Okinawa/Japan, China/South Korea, China/Taiwan, China/Japan, China/The Philippines, China/Vietnam, and China/The US.⁷ In order to solve the US base issues of Okinawa, it is necessary to resolve the conflict relationships related to these dividing lines in this area. They come from the remnants of the old Cold War regime and/or from the newly emerging Cold War system accompanied by the economical-political rise of China. The US military base issues in Okinawa is not only in local level or national level, but also regional level or global level. Therefore, in order to reduce the base burden of Okinawa, a security system construction for peace is now required in this area. The economic dependence rate is very high in East Asia,⁸ but political relationship is very immature. The realization of sustainable peace in this region is an important way to solve the base issues in Okinawa. To that end, a lot of dialogues beyond the nation-states will be required at least now among governments.

Nowadays, in fact, cross-border interactions become more active even outside the economic area. They are realized by the mobilities of people and their exchanges of cultures beyond the nation-state. Thus, national border is *de facto* overcome by a lot of people moving in this area. They are foreign workers, immigrants due to marriage, international students, foreign tourists, and so on. These people may create intersubjective relationships beyond cultural differences. As I mentioned earlier, mutual communication cannot be a relationship based only on each original cultural background. It is based on more fundamental, common/universal, corporeal human culture just like “mutual tuning-in relationship” which Schutz pointed out. This is also a kind of transcultural situation. At the same time, it can give birth to a new socio-cultural relationship which is beyond the individual original culture. Of course, there are various pressures to assimilation in each local/national level,

⁷ It is obvious that there is intense nationalism of each country behind each dividing line. Such nationalism is outstanding in mainland China, Korean Peninsula, mainland Japan, and even in the US in Trump’s “America First.” The question of how to overcome such extreme nationalism is also a big problem. I would like to discuss this point on another occasion in relation to the concept of transnationalism.

⁸ According to Japanese governmental agencies, the economic interdependence rate in the middle of the 2010s is close to 60% in East Asia excluding ASEAN countries. Cf., <http://www.meti.go.jp/report/tshuhaku2014/2014honbun/i2310000.html> (visit: September, 23, 2018).

but the possibility of the creation of a new hybrid, the third culture itself is also of decisive importance. Therefore, I tried to emphasize that transculturalism is important rather than multiculturalism or interculturalism (Nishihara 2018). Transculturalism goes beyond the conception of reified, fixed, typified culture which multiculturalism or interculturalism presupposes.

Again, I want to mention here the viewpoint of phenomenological sociology. Schutz's Phenomenological sociology argued that intercorporeal intersubjectivity is the basis of communication. However, as time passes, intersubjective interaction will be reified in epistemological phase and in practical phase. This point is closely related to Schutz's theory of typification or Durkheim's theory of institution. Events in national level (as imagined communities), regional level, and more global level are grasped by symbolic typifications. In other words, they are reified. There is no way other than continuous intersubjective interaction to overcome such reification. Indeed, people who live convivially in their new place of residence are practicing such transnational, intersubjective interaction. In addition, I would like to mention that I am now considering the concept of "conviviality" as an ideal type of living together vividly.⁹

Here, a viewpoint of transnational sociology and a viewpoint of phenomenological sociology join together in terms of transnational intersubjective interaction. The keywords are criticism of reification, transnational solidarity, and convivial living together or conviviality. These keywords were already shown in Kawamitsu's thought including in his books¹⁰ and even in his 'constitution draft' mentioned above. The discourses of intellectuals in Okinawa are still very stimulating and challenging. In the next section, I suggest and discuss the East Asian Community.

⁹ Although the term "conviviality" is originally used by Illich (Illich 1973), I use it as a term to express the ideal state of living together (cf., Nishihara and Shiba 2014). It is possible to mention some examples in which this word is used in France and the UK. See, Gilroy (2002) and the following website: <http://www.lesconvivialistes.org/>. (visit: December, 25, 2018). Particularly, we can find 'Manifeste Convivialiste' in the latter website. Especially, visit, <http://www.lesconvivialistes.org/pdf/Manifeste-Convivialiste.pdf>.

¹⁰ For instance, Kawamitsu's early book (Kawamitsu 1978) titled "Okinawa: Ne Karano Toi" (=Okinawa from the Fundamental Question) has a subtitle of "Kyosei heno Katubo" (=Craving for Conviviality). Of course, "Conviviality" is a translated word by me, but I think that his idea is very close to my own idea of conviviality. Regarding the word "transnationalism," I have also found a commonality with him (cf., Nishihara 2017).

Post-Cold War and the East Asian Community

The constitution draft by Kawamitsu had an ideal transnational orientation, namely 'de-national' orientation. For example, Kawamitsu stated in Article 11 of his draft that not only people who live in Okinawa, but also everyone who agrees with the purpose of this constitution and wishes to become a member of the Ryukyu Republic Society, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender or nationality, can be qualified as the members of this Society (Kawamitsu 2010, p. 109). Kawamitsu thought that the national border was not so much meaningful, but a network society spreading to the world wide was more important. Would not the concept of "society" Kawamitsu imagined be close to the social world in near future when the possession of multiple nationalities become possible in many countries?

I mentioned in some places that the nation-state is virtually overcome by the mobile people. There are a lot of empirical transnational situations also in East Asia. Furthermore, as I pointed out in section 3, the economic interdependence rate is also very high. Therefore, is it now that the East Asian Community for peace and conviviality is needed? Now, I briefly review history of the discussion over the East Asian Community (Abbreviation: EAC).

In the field of thought of modern Japan, while intertwining with problematic "Asianism," some orientations to the world were also seen, which occurred at the end of the Tokugawa period and in the age of the free civil right movement in Meiji era, and even as the theory of colonial management in the era of Taisho democracy. However, during the fifteen-year war (the Asia-Pacific War), very strong imperialistic idea of "East Asia Cooperative Community (東亞協同体)" with Japan as a leader came to the front. This idea should be critically considered as a negative legacy. After this war, through the time of 'lack' of exchanges in North East Asia in the period of East-West Cold War, 'exchange but conflict' during the post-Cold War period since around 1990 started. Thus, the problems of East Asia, especially of North East Asia, still exists for Japanese nationals as difficult ones to see under the Japan-U.S. core regime.

Therefore, the new discussions of Contemporary "East Asian Community" (東アジア共同体) have arisen from places other than Japan. The starting point was the advocacy of East Asia Economic Group (EAEG) by Prime Minister Mohamad Mahathir of Malaysia in 1990 (This EAEG was soon changed into the name of East Asia Economic Caucus in 1992). After

that, the first ministerial conference of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) was held. Then, in 1997, the first “ASEAN+3” Summit was also held. In this period, the establishment of EU in Europe and NAFTA in North America, and there was the development of Asian NEIS and the outbreak of Asian currency crisis.

In Japan, the government-based East Asian Community plan (Japan took a main part of the initiative) started to move from the beginning of the 2000s. “The Council on East Asian Community (CEAC)” (President: Ex-prime Minister, Yasuhiro Nakasone) was founded in Tokyo in 2004 (Council of East Asia Community 2010). However, these were (political) economic-based movements. On the other hand, there were some significant movements occurring among Japanese intellectuals since this time.

When entering the twenty first century, Michio Morishima, Sang-jung Kang, and other Japanese liberal intellectuals began to speak seriously and positively about EAC. It was very impressive that Morishima, a Professor at the University of London at that time, advocated the establishment of EAC with the capital of Naha, Okinawa in his lecture in China (Morishima 2001). The idea of Kang Sang-jung’s “collaborative/cooperative house in North East Asia” was also interesting (Kang 2001). Furthermore, other Japanese intellectuals also published their introductory books on EAC.

So, what we should ask now is the movement in other North East Asian countries (mainly China, Korea, and Taiwan). Bai Young-Seo, South Korean historian, reflected on the possibility of EAC, and at the same time he asked whether Chinese intellectuals had the viewpoint focusing on East Asia (See, note 11) of this paper).

To be sure, in contemporary political history, recovery of diplomatic relations between South Korea and China in 1992 was very important. Moreover, China’s participation in ARF in 1994 was a big turning point in East Asian political relationship. Under these circumstances, it was very interesting that the previous South Korean President, Roh Moo-hyun/No Mu-hyeon tried to develop diplomacy with an eye to East Asian Community. Here, in addition of Bai Young-Seo whom I mentioned above, I can pay attention to the following scholars: Sun Ge in China who often mentioned the dilemma of talking about East Asia and the negative legacy of the Japanese Empire, and Chen Kuan-Hsing in Taiwan who developed the theory of de-imperialization from Asia as method.¹¹

¹¹ Some of their writings are translated into Japanese. So, I dare to list the titles of their representative translations below in Japanese (including English translation by Nishihara). 孫歌『ア

Here, I refer to contemporary situations regarding the movements of EAC in Japan. Recently, two big private research organizations were established. One is “East Asian Community Institute” established in 2013 in Tokyo and the other is “The Academic Society of the East Asian Community and Okinawa (the Ryukyus)” established in 2016 (its secretariat in an office of Ryukyu University in Okinawa). The former was founded by former Japanese Prime Minister, Yukio Hatoyama of Democratic Party of Japan and his comrades (they also established “the Ryukyu/Okinawa Center” of this institute in 2014). The latter was formed by various researchers and former officials of Okinawa including a previous governor and some advocates for Okinawan autonomy and independence. These two groups have already published many books and journals on EAC (Hatoyama et al. 2014; Shindo and Kimura 2016).

However, these activities have just begun. It is still unknown quantity how these activities will spread. The most important thing is whether these movements will spread throughout East Asia. At this point, it is encouraging that some researchers mentioned above in China, South Korea and Taiwan aim for the same direction. Although it cannot be said that they have the same thoughts, it is common for them in criticizing the problems of former (prewar period) imperialistic East Asian Corporative Community by Japanese Empire and in trying to build a new community in East Asia as they severely criticize the current imperialistic movements. However, there has been no place where many researchers including the aforementioned liberal intellectuals from different countries discuss the issues of EAC together. The creation of this place is also a major challenge for the future in East Asia.

Conclusion: Towards transnational, glocal and vernacular cosmopolitanism

Okinawa studies including East Asia Community studies are the future tasks also in Japanese sociology. It is necessary for transnational sociology to tackle these issues related to Okinawa studies. In addition, phenomenological

ジアを語ることのジレンマ——知の共同空間を求めて』岩波書店、2002年 (Sun Ge, 2002, *Dilemma of Talking about Asia: Looking for the common space of the wisdom*)、白永瑞『共生への道と核心現場——実践課題としての東アジア』法政大学出版局、2016年 (Bai Young-Seo, 2016, *The Way to Conviviality and the Core Scenes: East Asia as a practical task*)、陳光興『脱帝国——方法としてのアジア』以文社、2011年 (Chen Kuan-Hsing, 2011, *Towards De-Imperialization: Asia as method*).

sociology departing from social vivid interactions of individuals is important also for the change of society. My transnational phenomenological sociology tries to innovate society with genetic theory of future vision, or social environment design theory (Nishihara 2016). In this paper, I tried to develop a series of technical terms to indicate my orientations. This orientation is composed of the following two aims: 1) planning concrete actions for establishing the East Asian Community, and 2) living transnational, transcultural conviviality (living together convivially) in everyday life.

In the latter aim, cosmopolitanism is not a distant ideal far from our lives. It can exist in our everyday life. I found such a vernacular cosmopolitanism in the activities of survivors of the Great East Japan Earthquake in 2011 (Nishihara and Shiba 2016). In disaster areas, people practiced mutual aid through transcultural mediators crossing over national borders. I was especially impressed by a comment an elderly person made in a devastating area: "Whether I'm a Korean, Chinese or Japanese, it is irrelevant here in the afflicted area. We are, so to speak, Earthling people".¹² Don't these words represent transnational, glocal and vernacular cosmopolitanism? Another issue to be addressed here is how we can penetrate these cosmopolitanisms into our daily life.

Theoretically stating, firstly, social empathy is based on fundamental intersubjectivity. Secondly, social empathy should be actual in practicing transnational vernacular cosmopolitanism in the glocal area. Thirdly, at the same time, social empathy should aim to create a concrete common place called the East Asian Community. In East Asia, for the time being, the concept of social empathy must be considered in these three points mentioned here. This is a provisional conclusion and at the same time a kind of proposal for the future.

(Submitted: February 11, 2019; Revised: March 15, 2019; Accepted: March 17, 2019)

¹² These words are based on the interview survey result of Professor Kwak Kihwan at Tohoku Gakuin University and his research group members. We can find these words in Japanese book titled "Ikkyo Hisai" (Published by Araebisu in 2015) whose translation is as follows: Victims in Foreign Country: 3.11 for Koreans living in Northeast area in Japan, edited by Interview Survey Project on Disaster Experiences of Koreans in Japan in the Great East Japan Earthquake, 2015, Miyagi: Araebisu.

References

- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso.
- Beck, Ulrich. 1986. *Risikogesellschaft: Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- _____. 2002. *Macht und Gegenmacht in globalen Aetalter: Neue weltpolitische Ökonomie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- _____. 2012. "Kiss the Frog: The cosmopolitan turn in sociology." *Global Dialogue* 1(2): 1-2.
- Cantle, Ted. 2012. *Interculturalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave and Macmillan.
- Council of East Asia Community. 2010. *Higashi Ajia Kyodotai Hakusho (White Paper of East Asian Community)*. Tokyo: Tachibana-shuppan.
- Gilroy, Paul. 2002. *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Durkheim, Émile. 1894. *Les règles de la méthode sociologique*. Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France
- Hatoyama, Yukio et.al. 2014. *Higashi Ajia Kyodotai to Okinawa no Mirai (East Asian Community and the Future of Okinawa)*. Tokyo: Kaden-sha.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1927. *Sein und Zeit* [Max Niemeyer, 1967]
- Hiromatsu, Wataru. 1983. *Busshoka-ron no Kozu (Fundamentals of the Theory of Reification)*. Tokyo: Iwanami-shoten.
- Husserl, Edmund. 1913. *Ideen zur einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie*, Erstes Buch, in *Husserliana*, Bd. III. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- _____. 1954. *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie*, in *Husserliana*, Bd.VI. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- _____. 1973. *Zur Phänomenologie der Intersubjectivität. Dritter Teil*, in *Husserliana*, Bd. XV. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Illich, Ivan. 1973. *Tools for Conviviality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kang, Sang-jung. 2001. *Tohoku Ajia Kyodo no Ie wo Mezashite (Towards collaborative/cooperative house in North East Asia)*. Tokyo: Heibon-sha.
- Kawamitsu, Shin-ichi. 1978. *Okinawa: Ne Karano Toi: Kyosei heno Katubo (Okinawa from the Fundamental Question: Craving for Conviviality)*, Tokyo: Tairyu-sha.
- _____. 2010. *Okinawa Hatu: Fukki Undo Kara 40 Nen (From Okinawa: 40 years from the reversion movement of Okinawa)*. Tokyo: Sekai-shoin
- Kawamitsu, Shin-ichu. and Isao Nakazato, eds. 2014. *Ryukyu Kyowa Shakai Kenpo no Sensei- ryoku: Gunto, Ajia, Ekkyo no Shiso (The Potentiality of Constitution of Ryukyu Public Society: Islands, Asia, and Thought of Transboundary)*. Tokyo: Mirai-sha.
- Matsushima, Yasukatsu. 2014. *Ryukyu Dokuritsu-ron (The Theory of Ryukyu*

- Independence*), Tokyo: Basilico.
- Matsushima, Yasukatsu and Kinsei Ishigaki. 2010. "Ryukyu Jichi Kyowakoku Renpo' Dokuritsu Sengen." (The Federation of Autonomous Republics of Ryukyuanesia: The Declaration of Independence). *Kan: History, Environment, Civilization* 42:
- McCormack, Gavan and Satoko O. Norimatsu. 2012. *Resistant Islands: Okinawa Confronts Japan and the United States* (Second Edition). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1953. *Les Relations avec autrui chez l'enfant*, in *L'œil et l'esprit*. Paris: Gallimard.
- _____. 1964. *Le visible et L'invisible*. Paris: Gallimard.
- _____. 1988. *Merleau-Ponty a la Sorbonne: resume de cours 1949-1952*. Paris: Cynara.
- Morishima, Michio. 2001. *Nihonni Dekirukotoha Nanika (What Can Japan Do?: Proposing East Asian Community)*. Tokyo: Iwanami-shoten.
- Nishihara, Kazuhisa. 2010. *Kanshukansei no Shakaigaku-riron: Kokka wo Koeru Shakai no Kanosei [1] (Sociological Theory of Intersubjectivity: The Possibility of Society beyond the NationState, I)*. Tokyo: Shinsen-sha.
- _____. 2013. "Phenomenological Sociology in Japan and its Significance for Contemporary Social Research," Pp. 20-35, in *Contemporary Japanese Social Theory: From Individualization to Globalization in Japan Today*, edited by A. Elliott et al. London and New York: Routledge.
- _____. 2015. "Après le tremblement de terre au Japon: la mission transnationale de la sociologie." *Socio: revue des editions de la maison des sciences de l'homme* 5(Octobre): 65-79.
- _____. 2016. *Toransu-nashonarizumu to Shakaino Inobeishon: Ekkyosuru Kokusai-shakaigaku to Kosumoporitanteki Shiko (Transnationalism and Social Innovation: Cross-border international sociology and cosmopolitan orientation)*. Tokyo: Toshin-do.
- _____. 2017. "The Challenge of Okinawan Social Thoughts: Okinawan Glocal Network and Independence Movements after the Ryukyu Kingdom." Pp. 41-52, in *The Glocal Perspectives on the Contemporary Socio-Cultural Movements*, edited by K. Nishihara. Tokyo: Center for Glocal Studies.
- _____. 2018. *Toransu-nashonarizumu Josetsu: Imin, Okinawa, Kokka (Introducing Transnationalism: Migrants, Okinawa, and the Nation-State)*. Tokyo: Shinsen-sha.
- Nishihara, Kazuhisa and Mari Shiba. 2014. "Migration and Migration Policy in Japan: Toward the 21st century Multicultural Society." Pp. 329-354, in *A Quest for East Asian Sociologies*, edited by Seung Kuk Kim, Le Pelin, and Shujiro Yazawa. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- _____. 2016. "New Emotion, Action and Recognition of Migrants and Mediators after the Great East Japan Earthquake: Toward a new sociological theoretical approach to multicultural situations in Japan." Pp. 116-128, in *The Consequences of Global Disasters*, edited by Anthony Elliott and Eric L. Hsu. London and New York: Routledge.

- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1936. *Esquisse d'une théorie des émotions*. Paris: Hermann.
- _____. 1946. *L'Existentialisme est un humanisme*. Paris: Nagel.
- Schutz, Alfred. 1962. *Collected Papers, I: The Problem of Social Reality*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- _____. 1964. *Collected Papers, II: Studies in Social Theory*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- _____. 1966. *Collected Papers, III: Studies in Phenomenological Philosophy*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Schutz, Alfred and Thomas Luckmann. 1989. *The Structure of the Life-World*, trans. by Richard Zaner and D. J. Parent, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press; originally published as *Strukturen der Lebenswelt*, Bd. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp (1984).
- Shindo, Eiichi and Akira Kimura. 2016. *Okinawa Jiritsu to Higashi Ajia Kyodotai (Autonomy of Okinawa and the East Asian Community)*. Tokyo: Kaden-sha.
- Turner, Bryan. S. 2006. *Vulnerability and Human Rights*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Urry, John. 2000. *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Vertovec, Steven. 2009. *Transnationalism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wright, Erick O. 2010. *Envisioning Real Utopias*. London and New York: Verso.

KAZUHISA NISHIHARA is a Professor at the Department of Social Innovation, Seijo University, and a Professor Emeritus at Nagoya University. His research interests include phenomenological social theory, transnational sociology, and sociology of migration. Address: Faculty of Social Innovation, Seijo University, 6-1-20, Seijo, Setagaya, Tokyo, Japan 157-8511. [E-mail: vzs00645@nifty.com]

