

I grew up in a bicultural environment (two cultures). I moved to the U.S. when I was five years old due to my father's work, and stayed there for five years before returning to Japan at age 10. I then spent the next 14-15 years of my life in England. After returning to Japan, I experienced some reverse culture shock, but perhaps because I was still young, I adapted to Japanese society just as I had adapted to American society. I was fortunate enough to gain two perspectives from this experience. At the same time, I also carried a bit of alienation in not being able to share my feelings. From there, I came to find my identity in standing among people and cultures.

I've been working in the art field as a Japanese-to-English translator and interpreter for probably six years now. I am currently co-director of the Art Translators Collective, an arts-focused translation and interpreting organization, as well as communication design director of the APAF, a human resources development program for the Tokyo Art Festival, where I work to improve the intercultural communication environment. I'm working on it. I arrived at this job by accident, and I guess I still continue to do it because I can openly move between the two language worlds.

But the more I do this work, the stranger it gets. It is the heterogeneity of the way we interact through translation (a term I use here to encompass both translation and interpretation). For example, in interpreting, there is a speaker on the other end of the line, but you don't talk directly to him or her. Instead, you have to communicate with another person (the interpreter) next to him (often not even close to the other speaker) in a game of message. Although I do it as a job, I find it very strange when I think about it in a calm way. Then again, seeing how it is accepted as if it were natural adds to the mystery for me.

The act of translation is a kind of fiction. There is another entity (an interpreter or translator) intervening between people, but it must never be realized that he or she is manipulating the communication to some extent. As with the stage, the fourth wall must not be broken. The rule often imposed on interpreters is to "disappear like a black person". There is no "I" as an interpreter there at all. "I honestly don't really agree with you, but this person seems to be saying, OO. Maybe it's No interpreter would ever speak in such a way. If you talk like this, you will probably get either an offense or a laugh. The fact that such a reaction occurs is proof that the above rule does exist.

There are so many different dynamics at work behind the scenes of translation that shouldn't exist. Interpretation and translation work is often seen as a complete duplication of work, and of course the translator is committed to translating the information as accurately as possible. Ultimately, however, as the translator takes on the speech of others, with his own body as a receptacle and filtration device, his own specificity - experience, knowledge, perspective, etc. - is in no small part Can we assure you that it will never seep out of it even slightly? In the case of an interpreter, his or her behavior, facial expressions, vocal tone, and even gestures are accepted as part of the translation. In such a case, is there any such thing as "perfect replication"? For example, if the implicit rules of translation were applied to the play, the performances of the numerous actors who have played Ophelia would all have to be the same. In reality, however, the Ophelia portrayed on stage would be different for every person. Probably each one of them is trying to cut out some aspect of Ophelia through his or her own body and make it manifest. That's not considered a failed act. There is simply going to be a presentation of the reality associated with multiple Ophelia. Why can't the same be said for translations?

Various power relations are also naturally revealed between the speaker and the interpreter. The interpreter is also in a significant position, in the sense that he or she

operates in two languages and derives two perspectives from them. (When communication involves an interpreter like me who speaks with American pronunciation, there is no doubt the influence of Eurocentrism at play. The speaker basically has no way of knowing the quality of the translation other than to glean from the other person's reaction. At that point, the speaker is anxious. They may even be distrustful at first. So how do you get them to open up and share their perspectives and contexts from there? (The translator is not a machine. They can only do a good job if they know the context behind the words. Words can have different meanings depending on the situation and context).). Interpreters can also see where misunderstandings and frictions are occurring because they have a good view of their surroundings. Should interpreters intervene in such situations? This comes down to an ethical issue as well. Should offensive words be interpreted as they are? Should we just sit back and watch someone being verbally harmed? If we are going to intervene, to what extent do we intervene? How can we be neutral instead of taking on the shoulders of someone in particular and escalating the conflict? In the moment, the interpreter is confronted with issues like these that go beyond language.

While the translator's agency is undeniably present, the translator can only exist as a parasite on the speaker, a contradiction in terms. What does this twisted "individual" mean? What will be revealed when the fiction of "translation" is dismantled in front of the audience and the mechanism of this backstage mechanism is revealed? (I'm also very attracted to the self-recursive approach of presenting it as a performance on stage).

My motivation for this project may come from the conflict between the "I" of the interpreter who is pretending to be something that is not there, and the "I" of the interpreter who is definitely there, but who cannot exist without the others. It is a mirror image of Nicolas's "I" conflict, which has been playing himself for years. The "I" that refuses to be reproduced and the "I" that tries to exist through reproduction. How will the boundaries of each be negotiated?

Translated with www.DeepL.com/Translator (free version)