

Open Forum 2019

“Beyond Diversity:
Impact of Inclusive Society to Unlock Creative Potential”

<Date>

Friday, March 1, 2019, 16:00–18:30

<Venue>

Belle Salle Tokyo Nihonbashi

Index

- Organizer's Greeting . . . P.4
- Part1 : Keynote Speech . . . P.6
- Part2 : Discussion . . . P.14

●Introduction



MC: We would like to start the Open Forum 2019, “Beyond Diversity: Impact of Inclusive Society to Unlock Creative Potential.”

The Tokyo Metropolitan Government has set its vision to become an international city of arts and culture taking Tokyo 2020 as an opportunity. One of the elements for the city to attract people, especially from the creative community, is diversity and

inclusion. This is also the most relevant theme that is being discussed in various cities around the world today.

Diversity is becoming a familiar word; however, inclusion has not yet gained such recognition in Japan. Oftentimes we hear the two words “diversity and inclusion”, combined and used together; however, the words present a slightly different meaning.

In today’s forum we would like to define the word “diversity” as a community consisting of people, visible or not with different features or characteristics. On the other hand, inclusion is not only recognizing the diversity of people but also accepting people of difference and unlocking their latent creativity.

Why is it that a society that has diversity and inclusion gives life to creative power? We are here to ask such a question to understand the essence of creativity and lead Tokyo to become an international city full of creative power in 2020 and beyond. That is the purpose of this Open Forum.

Today we have two parts. In the first part we will have Mr. Iwao Nakatani, who is a board member of the Arts Council Tokyo and also Chairman of Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting makes a key note speech. In part 2, we’ll focus on discussions. We’ll have Mr. Peter Anders, Director of Goethe-Institut Tokyo, Mr. Shinji Kajitani, Director of the University of Tokyo, Center of Philosophy, and Director Ms. Ritsu Yoshino from the Asian Cultural Council Japan Office, and as a moderator, we will have Mr. Takashi Serizawa, Executive Director of P3 art and environment, and discussion will explore new possibilities for Tokyo to become an international city full of creativity leading up to 2020 and beyond.

First, on behalf of the organizer, Mr. Katsunori Miyoshi Director General of Arts Council Tokyo, would like to give an opening remark.

●Organizer's Greeting

Katsunori Miyoshi: Thank you all very much for your the participation. My name is Katsunori Miyoshi and I am serving as Director General of Arts Council Tokyo. There may be some people in the audience who have heard of Arts Council Tokyo for the first time. I'd like to take this opportunity to briefly explain our organization.



Arts Council Tokyo was established in 2012; therefore, we are in the seventh year. It has been modeled after Arts Council England, which was inaugurated 70 years ago, in 1946. Around that time, towards the end of World War II, the way forward was the biggest issue. Keynes, the economist, had two thoughts. First, in order to stabilize the world economy and prevent further disastrous wars, he recommended the establishment of international monetary and currency systems. Although it turned out to be slightly different from the concept of Keynes, the IMF was established.

The other idea was to establish an arts council in order to enrich the lives of British people through arts and culture. Keynes who proposed the establishment of the organization became the first president. We could say that it was his last work done, as he passed away right after the establishment.

Over time, in 2000s, the fact that social change is not solely driven by economy but also creation of values gained increasing recognition. In 2012, when Arts Council Tokyo was inaugurated, the former chairman of Shiseido, Yoshiharu Fukuhara said “ Now is the time to leverage the power of culture backed by the wisdom and history of people” with such expectation.

Now as Arts Council Tokyo, we believe in two aspects for the aim of arts and culture. Firstly , that arts and culture help people live a human life. Secondly, we consider making the city comfortable, not only by pursuing the convenience of people but by developing a community where people can communicate face to face. Thus we believe that these are the two missions for Arts Council Tokyo, people-building and community-building.

I would now like to speak about this forum. The title is “Beyond Diversity: Impact of Inclusive Society to Unlock Creative Potential.” I would like to briefly introduce the speakers we have invited today to discuss this very difficult topic.



First, Mr. Iwao Nakatani who is a specialist in economics and serves as a board member of Arts Council Tokyo, will give us the keynote address. As our board member he has been giving us various valuable inputs and has shown us the directions forward.

In the panel discussion, Mr. Peter Anders Director of Goethe-Institut Tokyo has joined us today. He has experience working at various Goethe-Instituts all around the world therefore, I think he will give us his input based on a global view. Our second panelist Prof. Shinji Kajitani is serving as the Director of University of Tokyo Center for Philosophy that aims to realize “inclusion” which is exactly today’s topic. The third person is Ms. Ritsu Yoshino the Director of Asian Cultural Council Japan Office, which is supporting international cultural exchange among Asian countries, and between Asia and the United States.

Our moderator will be Mr. Takashi Serizawa. He is leading P3 art and environment, which is conducting activities related to reciprocal formation processes between people, society, humanity and the environment. He willingly took this role as moderator, and I’d like to appreciate all the speakers, who have accepted our offer.

Lastly, I’m convinced that this forum will provide you the opportunity to think about humans, community and organizations. I hope you will enjoy the program. Thank you very much.

Part 1: Keynote Speech

●Speaker



Iwao Nakatani

Board member of Arts Council Tokyo /
Chairman, Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting Co., Ltd.

Born in Osaka in 1942. Graduated from the Department of Economics at Hitotsubashi University in 1965. Holds a Ph.D in Economics from Harvard University. Currently serves as a Chairman of Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting Co., Ltd, Chairman of Fushiki-an and Chief Director of the Fushiki-juku, an executive development program exclusively designed for global business leaders in Japan.

His publications include “AI Shihonshugi ha jinrui wo sukueruka-unmeishi kara yomitoku- [Could AI capitalism save mankind? A look into history of civilization]” (NHK Publishing, Inc.,2018), “Shihonshugi wa naze jikai shita no ka [Why did capitalism self-destruct]” (Shueisha International Inc., 2008); and “Nyumon Macro Keizaigaku [Introduction to macroeconomics]” (Nippon Hyoron sha co.,Ltd, 2007).

●Keynote Speech

Coordinator: Thank you very much. For Session 1, we'd like to start the keynote address. We invite Mr. Iwao Nakatani who is the board member of Arts Council Tokyo and Chairman of Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting Company.

Iwao Nakatani: Good afternoon. Thank you for having me today. As introduced earlier, my area of specialty is economics; therefore, today's topic is very inclusive and difficult for me to tackle, but as Mr. Miyoshi gave me this opportunity, I will try my best to deliver a presentation so that you can bring back something out of it.



I will be discussing about three main points today.

Firstly, about inclusive society. The opposite term of inclusion is exclusion. The shift from exclusion to inclusion has been occurring in societies since the beginning of modern age. This historic trend of shifting from exclusion to inclusion is one point I'd like to mention today.

Secondly, suppose that as a result of this historical trend, an inclusive society is established. With the arrival, will the whole world or society be able to unlock the creative potential? My view is that if we continue viewing the world based on efficiency or rationality, we cannot expect creativity to be promoted. I would like to explain this from a philosophical point of view. As we have Professor Kajitani who is a specialist in philosophy here today as a panelist thus I feel a bit nervous but anyway I will talk about that as the second point.

Thirdly, then what kind of policy stance and position should Tokyo take in order to create an inclusive society? What kind of a stance in policymaking will be appropriate? I would like to give you my personal view.

With that, today I will address as first point: history; second point: philosophy; and the third point: policies to promote arts and culture.



Firstly I would like to give you my view on the historical trend of shifting from exclusion to inclusion. There are discussions around the start of the Modern age but let's define it here as the arrival of Columbus at the American continent. The prominent view of the 500 years of history after the start of the modern era, I believe, is the control of the non-West by the West. The attitude of the West towards non-West society embodies exclusion. With the help of religion, the West

tried to control the non-West under the call of civilization, backed by the notion of European values being universal to assimilate the non-West into the West. In my opinion that was exactly the logic of exclusion.

As a result, the world shifted towards capitalist society . What is the essence of the logic of capitalism? To maximize one's own interests through the exploitation of others and that this is thought to be the social justice. We can say that this logic of exclusion formed our modern society. Of course there have been many positive things brought about as a result thus I am not saying whether this was good or bad, but it is important to have such perspective when looking into the history of the world.

Having said that, modern era proceeded promoting the logic of exclusion but gradually some difficulties started occurring showing the impasse of this direction. This represents what is happening in today's society. We can discuss this from different viewpoints as various issues of modern era have been originating from this very logic of exclusion.

One of the most typical example is the destruction of the global environment. Based on the logic of capitalism, economic entities or business firms allowed themselves to use nature without paying the cost since nature cannot be valued in monetary terms. Principle of the market mechanism is that one must pay the cost to transfer the ownership of the goods which are valued, but with nature this doesn't function. With nature, for example the air you inhale or water etc. things that are considered as public goods, one will not able to own them with cost thus the ownership cannot be transferred . This is why you cannot price nature, however without a price, one may think it can be used free of charge. As a consequence, the resources from nature have been abused which lead to such serious deterioration of the global environment.

Recently there has been a very intensive discussion that by the end of this year or the end of next year, a new geologic age may be approved by the geologic society. The newly proposed epoch is called "Anthropocene" and dates from the commencement of significant human impact on the Earth's geology and ecosystems.

The thing is, after the Industrial Revolution, many substances which the Earth's ecosystem cannot restore where newly-generated. The most fearful one is radiation. Radiation cannot be absorbed by nature as well as plastic. Once produced, most of the plastic materials cannot be resolved by this planet. For example, you may have heard on the news that off the coast of Thailand some whales were found dead and when cut open, we found many plastic bags in their abdomens which disabled them to absorb nutrition.

Although it is invisible to us, deep under the sea, deposited plastic materials have piled up and the marine creatures are victimized. As I mentioned earlier, when geologists research into the geological layers hundreds of years later, they will find the deposited non-absorbable materials, such as plastic and radiation, accumulated on the seabed. This is the new geologic age. In the logic of capitalism, nature is available free of charge but it is clear that this is no longer sustainable. This issue is not only about the natural environment. Earlier I talked about how the West has exerted control over the non-West. Various undeveloped lands have been modernized, urbanized and consequently the nature diminished. As geographical frontiers reduced significantly, developed capitalist countries were no longer able to leverage undeveloped frontiers for their growth which lead to their economic slowdown.



Another surprising fact is the inequalities in the world. The combined assets of top 8 wealthy people, Bill Gates and others, are equivalent to the assets of the bottom 3.6 billion of the world's population. Just eight people and their asset value equals the assets of 3.6 billion people combined. This level of inequality cannot be justified.

I would also like to touch upon the combination of AI, the genetic engineering, gene analysis etc. those new technologies utilized to modify human bodies. Recently we heard about the result of the genetic engineering in China. Apparently, the research team succeeded in creating a baby that will never contract AIDS. It is horrifying how technologies can re-create human. This means that till today we were discussing economic inequalities, but in the future, we may have to deal with biological inequalities. Wealthy people will take advantage of genetic engineering technology while the majority of people will be unable to access such technological innovations thus biological inequality will occur.

The modern society made significant growth due to the logic of exclusion which enabled us to live in this civilized world rich in culture. However apparently, we can no longer continue going forward with this logic. Therefore, inclusion, which is the opposite concept of exclusion must be revisited and introduced in rebuilding the world. This is how society has shifted over the years.



Recently there have been many media news regarding “inclusion” examples. I am sure you are familiar with the case of Ms. Ardern, Prime Minister of New Zealand. She has given birth to a baby through her common-law marriage, took six-months’ maternity leave as a prime minister. Accusing her for serving an important role, unofficially married, taking six months’ leave, are no longer acceptable. In New Zealand, people seemed to be even celebrating her

decision. The values, such as saying No to women raising a child and serving as a prime minister at the same time, is outdated.

I’ll give you another example. Ochanomizu University, a women’s university, decided to accept transgender students from next year. In this case, transgender means that person is officially registered as male but feel and recognize oneself as female and university decided to accept them. This is simply one sign of the Japanese society becoming more inclusive.

The Science Council of Japan announced that social inclusion must be at the core of any cultural policies and this is in line with the global trend. Global trend doesn’t mean that we have already achieved an inclusive society, however, it shows the overall direction that the world is shifting towards. If we discard the idea that it isn’t a problem to exploit nature, and rather appreciate, respect and revive nature, this may unlock their potential creativity. We may be able to enjoy their benefits again. Similarly, marginalized people who have been discriminated or been oppressed before, once invited to the center, their creative powers may put to light .

I have explained about the society moving from the logic of exclusion to the idea of inclusion. Now, coming back to the theme of today’s forum, does inclusive society unlock creative potential? To be honest, I don’t know. It is true that if we achieve an inclusive society, marginalized people will have the opportunity to bring out their creativity, but is this enough to say that the society has become more creative?

This leads to my second point. We tend to believe that one and only Truth exist, and we can slowly reveal this by a scientific approach. In other words, an idea that every phenomenon can be scientifically elucidated exist.

Perhaps I can call this idea a naturalistic view of the world. For example, physicist acknowledge the existence of the expansive universe and that Earth occupies a fraction of

that space, which leaves us humans living on this Earth a miniscule existence. Such view of the world makes us nihilistic as it implies that living beings have no meaning nor significance.

This may also be called scientism. Earlier I talked about the idea of universalism in Europe. Belief that everything can be explained by science is a contemporary form of universalism. In ancient Greece, Aristotle believed that the universe consists of Goodness, Truth and Beauty. However, in the current world one believes that only Truth can be validated and Goodness and Beauty cannot. We cannot refer to a certain data to prove Goodness or Beauty thus putting these aside and believing in only what can be proved, is called the naturalistic view of the world. In that case, where do we find a place for Art ? I feel that in the 20th century, art and culture were to an extent, confined in this scientific view of the world and in my opinion this should be corrected.



Over the past 20 years, I have run a private academy called Fushiki-juku, where people study liberal arts, and one of the books we studied is *“Why the World Does Not Exist”* by Markus Gabriel. It is world’s best seller and there he argues that it is wrong to believe that there is one and only True universe which we live in. Rather, each and every one of us should continue questioning ourselves these issues that cannot be validated such as Why do we live? What is beauty ? He suggests that we must interact with others and become creative. Unless we embraced this new view of the world, no matter how inclusive a society becomes, we cannot achieve a creative world. That is the second point that I wanted to highlight.



Before going into the third point I would like to speak about one painting which Some of you may have seen. It is called *“Sessan Doji”* by Shohaku Soga. The *Sessan Doji* on the tree branch is the former life of the Buddha and he/she was roaming the mountains seeking enlightenment when the blue demon read the first half of the poem “The colors of the flowers are so beautiful and fragrant—like a person’s beauty or the interesting things in this world. My life is like that. Who can say it won’t long last forever without change? No, nobody can. It ends at last.” *Sessan Doji* thought the poem is amazing and that if he can hear the latter half, he would be enlightened at last. Thus asked the blue demon to let him hear.

“Sessan Doji (Sessan Doji Offering his Life to an Ogre)”(c. 1764), Soga Shohaku, Keisho-ji Temple, Mie.

The demon said, I’m too hungry. The former Buddha said, “Okay, if you let me hear the latter half, I will be enlightened and after this I will not regret even if I pass away.”

Then the demon said “Then I will teach you.” and read out the second half. “I pass over the deep mountain called Ui (Kyoto) today. No more shallow dreams; no more wanton drunkenness.” The former life of the Buddha became naked and he/she is about to jump onto the demon to be eaten by him. This painting fires my imagination and is one of my favorites. I cannot bear the thought that this can be analyzed based on naturalistic world view or a scientific world view. Do you all like this as well?



In fact, the previous drawing is modeled after another painting called “*Shashin Shiko Zu*” which is contained as a National Treasure at Horyu-ji Temple in Japan. Very hungry tigers are drawn and the mother tiger is about to eat the child tiger. Buddha thought it’s too pitiful for the child tiger to be eaten, so he is offering himself. This painting that came from India portrays mercy, love, of Buddha which is the same theme with the previous painting. There is a gap of around 1,000 years between these paintings which means in 1,000 years, the “*Shashin Shiko*”, the Indian painting with very vivid colors transformed into that kind of Japanized image as “*Sessan Doji*” .

“Shashin Shiko Zu” from Tamamushi Tabernacle (c. Asuka Period: mid 6th - beginning of 8th), Horyu-ji Temple, Nara.



Final point is, what is Japanese culture? Professor Funabiki from Tokyo University is here today which also makes me feel nervous but I will continue. In Japan, the Jomon culture of thousands of years ago remains deeply rooted at present. In other words, this Jomon era culture formed the foundation of Japanese culture. There, exotic culture from overseas have been imported, and over many years have been absorbed and digested,

leaving only the good things to be localized into the Japanese culture. I think that there you can see a so-called dual structure in Japanese culture. As you can see in “*Shashin Shiko*” to “*Sessan Doji*” for example, such strong Indian painting transformed into a very typical Japanese image taking over 1,000 years. Masao Maruyama, who is one of the intellectual leaders of Japan after the war, frequently mentioned that the Japanese ideological history is the process of accepting the universal view from around the world and modifying it. This means that the based on the foundation of Japanese culture which is very persistent,

whatever come from overseas, how exotic they may look, are localized and transformed into a good thing. This concept being a characteristic of Japanese culture is a well-known argument.

Taking all the points I have mentioned into consideration, I would like to give a simple recommendation on the approach that Tokyo should take in promoting arts and culture. Tokyo should become the mirror that reflect the world, accepting and including everything. Later, over a long time, those cultures will be filtered and transformed into values. I believe this is the role Tokyo can play. In fact, the city of Tokyo already has many things from all around the world, for example, various kinds of restaurants from far countries, their culinary culture had been transformed into delicious cuisine in Japan. We are used to this process and it is applicable to culture as well. The strong cultural foundation gives Tokyo the capacity to accept and absorb difference from all over the world and transform them into values. I think this is the approach Tokyo should take in order to promote arts and culture in this city. With this conclusion, I would like to finish my presentation. Thank you very much for your kind attention.

Part 2: Discussion

●Speaker



Peter Anders, Director of the Goethe-Institut Tokyo

Peter Anders, who majored in Theater, Film and Media studies has been working at the Goethe-Institut since the 1990s. Initially he worked as head of the department of fine arts at the headquarter in Munich. Subsequently he became the director of the Goethe-Institutes in Cameroon, Brazil (Salvador da Bahia) and Bulgaria. Between 2007 and 2011 he was the program leader of the Goethe-Institut for Africa (South of the Sahara) with an office in Johannesburg (South Africa). From May 2011 until January 2016 he served as director of the Goethe-Institut Beijing and country director for China. Since February 2016 he is the director of the Goethe-Institut in Tokyo.

Shinji Kajitani

Director of the University of Tokyo Center for Philosophy

Born in 1966. Completed his Ph.D. at Human- and Environmental Studies of Kyoto University. His main research field is phenomenology, cultural studies and medical history. His main works are: *Basic Problems of the Phenomenology of Hermann Schmitz* (Kyoto University Press, 2002), and *What Does It Mean to Think? – an Introduction to Philosophy for People ages 0 to 100 years* (Gentosha, 2018). He is recently conducting the project of philosophy dialogue.



Ritsu Yoshino, Director of the Asian Cultural Council Japan office

Ritsu Yoshino involved in the opening of the 21st Century Museum of Contemporary Art, Kanazawa (Japan) from 1999 and worked as curatorial assistant until 2005. From 2005 to 2009, she was an exhibition coordinator at 21_21 DESIGN SIGHT (Tokyo, Japan) for The Miyake Issey Foundation. From September 2009, she started working at the Asian Cultural Council (ACC), where she is currently director of the ACC Japan office.

●Moderator

Takashi Serizawa Executive Director of P3 art and environment

Born in 1951 in Tokyo. After graduating from the Mathematics Course in the Faculty of Science at Kobe University and from the Architecture and Building Science Course in the College of Engineering at Yokohama National University, Serizawa was involved in research related to ecological land-usage planning as a member of Regional Planning Team Assoc., Inc. In 1989, he founded "P3 art and environment." He successively served as general director of the Tokachi International Contemporary Art Exhibition "DEMETER" (2002), secretary general of the Asahi Art Festival (2003 to 2016), curator for Yokohama Triennale 2005, general director of the Beppu Contemporary Art Festival "Mixed Bathing World" (2009, 2012 and 2015), and director of the Saitama Triennale 2016 (2016)



●Discussion



Coordinator: For Part 2, we are going to have a discussion. I would like to introduce the speakers.

Mr. Shinji Kajitani, Director of University of Tokyo Center for Philosophy; Mr. Peter Anders, Director of the Goethe-Institut Tokyo; Ritsu Yoshino, Director of Asian Cultural Council Japan Office; and as the moderator we will have the Executive Director of P3 art and environment, Mr. Takashi Serizawa.

Moderator, Takashi Serizawa: Good afternoon and very nice to meet you all. I will serve as moderator for today's session. Mr. Kajitani, Ms. Yoshino, Mr. Anders, thank you for being here.

First, I would like to revisit the purpose of the forum. We all heard the objective explained at the beginning and I believe Mr. Nakatani's exciting and insightful presentation gave us a good idea of what this forum is trying to achieve, what we are here to think about. So, if I may, I would like to recapture Mr. Nakatani's presentation. Our traditional ways of doing, so called capitalistic way, have tended to draw a line between what's inside and outside and turned away from what's outside as it didn't concern us. We tended to focused on enriching what was inside by coldly exploiting from the outside.

However today, we are seeing limitations to this current approach. Mother earth, our planet and human society are fatigued and this brings us to this idea of inclusion rather than exclusion becoming very important. I believe that's what Mr. Nakatani pointed out in his presentation. I am involved in modern art, and I started to hear about this importance of social inclusion in the arts world these ten years. However as the terminology is difficult, I was always hoping that there would be an easier, softer word to explain the idea.

The important thing is, rather than excluding others, not only accepting diversity but making the most of those differences and living together. Of course, this is nothing new, but we are living in an era that requires us to revisit and recognize this idea.

In Mr. Nakatani's presentation he talked about how the naturalistic view of the world needs to be modified and overcome. Personally, I thought that was a very important message. Perhaps later in the discussion we will be able to talk more about that.

The word "inclusion" perhaps made today's audience feel that we will cover a very difficult topic, but I hope today's forum will help you to think of it as your problem and internalize the discussion. Everywhere around the world we are seeing states placing priority on their own interests and I believe going too far on this will lead to exclusion. As we heard earlier, inequalities are growing wider and wider, to a point it's unbelievable.

Again, even in our daily lives, we see advancements in science and technology. For example our daily use of devices such as smartphones allows us to quickly search whenever we come across something we don't know without giving much thought.

Going back to earlier topic, last month in China twin girls were born as a result of clone technology as well as genome engineering. Perhaps many of you haven't had the chance to see the sci-fi film "*Gattaca*" but similar phenomena is happening in today's world, science and technology creating even more inequality, discrimination, and exclusion as a result.

I think we need the time to stop, think and discuss about these topics rather than simply pursuing the mission of Tokyo becoming an international city of creativity. That is the underlying idea for the title of this forum.

We have three speakers from different sector such as arts and culture and philosophy and each of them is engaged in very fascinating jobs. Therefore, as an introduction I would like to now ask each of the three speakers to talk about their ideas of inclusion, what it means to be inclusive. I believe we are starting with you, Ms. Yoshino please start.

Ritsu Yoshino: Hello. First of all, thank you very much for inviting me to be here. When I hear the word inclusion, I must admit I wonder what I am supposed to say as it is a very difficult topic. However as I've been given this opportunity to speak in front of you today, I would like to introduce the activities of Asian Cultural Council, and also talk about our mission, why we are engaged in such activities.



We are called the Asian Cultural Council and were formed in 1961 in the US by John D. Rockefeller III. He used his own private funds to establish this council, and we now have offices around the globe in order to accomplish his original aims. The headquarter is in New York, and we have offices in Tokyo, Hong Kong, Taipei and Manila, and in each locations we run the foundation.

Before going into Mr. John D. Rockefeller III's vision for the establishment of the organization in 1961, I would to talk about what we do. We provide individual fellowship to people in the arts sector or artists which gives them opportunities to come in contact and interact with different cultures.

1963 was the year the organization kicked off and I would like to introduce his quote when explaining the initial aim of the foundation. "The supreme worth of the individual" This implies that each and one of us is different and we need to recognize the value in that differences.

He believed that knowledge and respect for other cultures will lead to knowing, understanding and respecting the individuals. In other words, “Through knowledge and respect for other cultures we are able to appreciate the peoples themselves.”

That’s where we started and this is the mission of the Asian Cultural Council. We are here to “advance international dialogue, understanding, and respect through cultural exchanges that nurture the talents of individual artists and scholars in Asia and the US.”

As I mentioned before, we provide fellowship opportunities, for example scholarships for conducting research. In the US and countries in Asia, in order to gain opportunities to be trained or to conduct research in countries other than their own, we provide long-term fellowship to artists and scholars in the areas of arts and humanities. We do have other programs, such as grants for organizations, travel grants and others, but as a matter of principle these fellowships are given to individuals so that they can immerse themselves in other cultures, absorb and think about the differences.

We cover the US as well as 25 countries and regions in Asia. ACC Japan here in Tokyo sends people to the US and other countries in Asia. We cover very extensive areas in arts and humanities such as: archaeology, architecture, art history, arts administration, crafts, arts critic, and many more. This also represents diversity. Rather than being confined in one profession or area, we want our grantees to be connected with wider people from different areas, thus we extend support to people from diverse fields.



Providing financial support is the basic activity of the council, but we are aware that the process of “knowing” cannot be supported solely by financial assistance and we need to extend the scope of our assistance. We have offices in different countries, so those staff will provide support for traveling, including visa assistance, finding residence, giving advices etc. For instance, our staff will support scholars or experts sent to their countries and save their

time to find residences or meet people. We place importance on these processes. We believe it is important that the we extend not only one-off support for a certain period such as three months or six months but to continue communicating, building friendship and ties with those people . We call the people who receive assistance grantees and continue to build the network. People who received grants back in 1963 when it started, are still part of the network, and our past grantees support to our new grantees by giving advices or introducing people.

Since our establishment, over the years we have had over 4,000 grantees in the world, including US and various other countries and they are all connected. This connection was

not only when they first received the grant, but the grantees continued to be engaged and expanded their network. Not just artists, scholars and experts who are our grantees but the ACC headquarters have directors who are the supporters. Regardless of the differences of the position, directors and grantees are all connected in this one network which is another characteristic of the council.

This connects with today's topic. Earlier I talked about the initial idea of John D. Rockefeller III in founding the organization. Reading through books on our program, I found another quote.

Traditionally Americans have viewed international relations primarily in political and economic terms, with comparatively little attention given to the cultural dimension. This has been true whether one considers academia, press coverage of world events, or formal governmental relationships. The result is that our world outlook has tended to be bound by our own culture instead of being broadened by a sensitivity to other cultures. This remains largely so today.

Earlier, Mr. Nakatani said that we tend to rely on science, data, and numbers that govern our world. Rather than following such an approach, we must place importance on something that's different from just science and data and numbers, so I think that's expressed through this quote.

I would like to introduce one more quote. Here he talks about interdependence. The sentence was actually written in 1975, and at that time, perhaps the word was used rather in the international relations context but he said "Interdependence as a word and a concept has entered our awareness in recent years, but can there ever be effective interdependence without the tolerance, the respect, and the admiration that comes from a sensitive understanding and appreciation of other cultures?"

So now, this is the last part of my presentation, I would like to briefly introduce the activities of ACC through this short video, which we created last year. You will see pictures of our 4,000 grantees in the background. That concludes my presentation, thank you very much.



Moderator Serizawa: We've learned today that ACC has been connecting Asia and America through exchanges over many years. I felt the openness of USA but on the other hand, now they have a dispute over building a wall on the border.

Apparently the social division is progressing in USA today and given that background ACC's mission is ever more important. Next, Prof. Kajitani, could you please take the floor?



Shinji Kajitani: My name is Kajitani. Thank you very much for the invitation. I don't think I have been given many opportunities to talk about this exact topic.

Philosophy is the area of my research but setting that aside, I would like to talk about the “philosophy dialogue” which has been my main area of interest. We do this typically in schools or local communities or in repopulating rural villages. “Philosophy dialogue” is one of the methodologies for communication, and I would like to explain how philosophy plays a role.

Philosophy is about “asking” “thinking”, and dialogue is about “conversing” “listening”. The “philosophy dialogue” consist of ask, think, converse, and listen. Usually when you “think” on your own you are having a dialogue with yourself asking questions and answering to it and in a “dialogue” you are thinking together with others. Basically the difference is whether you are doing it by yourself or with others but what is common is that “having a dialogue” is about “thinking”. The important thing is to “question”. To have questions in your mind, to think, to talk about them which means to verbalize your thought and listen to other people’s ideas.

I have been doing this for about past five years, and wherever I go to attend a school session, have similar experiences. You may think that Japanese people are too shy to talk but actually, Japanese people like talking and are not really bad at it. So, why do we think that we can't talk well or hesitate to participate in conversations and often only talkative people lead the session? Before going into these questions I would like to touch upon the rules of the philosophy dialogue.

As the rule 1, you can say whatever you like. That is very important, but in daily conversation, there are actually many things that you are not supposed to say, or if you say something you will be laughed at or be scorned. People fear such possibilities and say nothing. It may seem like reading the atmosphere but in fact the fear for a negative attitude towards what you say make one remain quiet. This is why rule 2, to never say negative things towards one's idea become very important.

The rule 3 is, its Ok to simply listen. Sometimes when we are forced to say our opinions we just give an off-the-cuff opinion. I think it's better to say nothing if that is the case. There is a way to participate in the dialogue just through listening.

The rule 4 is to ask, which is quite difficult. As I mentioned, “questioning” is the first definition of philosophy, but questioning each other urge thinking. This is not about negating other people's opinions but to show that you have different opinions, you can ask questions. If you think it sound different from your opinion, you can ask “ why do you think so? “. However, we are not good at it because when you do so in daily life, most of the time that person get

offended. This fear that if you question you may upset others enable you to do so. Also, when you are persistent in asking questions, one may feel uncomfortable. Therefore, we can say that our daily conversations consist of half-listening and no questioning.

The rule 5 is that you must talk based on your own experience rather than knowledge. People tend to pretend to be very versed in the topic which makes the knowledgeable persons always leading the conversation and others not participating in the dialogue.

The rule 6 is that you don't need to draw a conclusion. There tend to be a person who wants to act as the coordinator in the conversation and wants to always keep the discussion focused.

The rule 7 is that you can change your opinion. People tend to get upset when one changes opinion but as dialogue is the process of thinking, it is natural that your opinion changes.

The last rule 8, is that you don't necessarily have to understand. You are allowed not to understand. Realizing the fact that you don't understand means that you are having questions and this is food for thought.

The rules I just mentioned seems like a common sense, but if you look in to the rules of our daily conversations its actually the opposite. I feel this particularly when I go to schools. All the rules I just mentioned is prohibited in schools and if you say what you want the teacher will be angry. I believe there are only three things accepted to say in School : correct things, good things and things that are in line with teachers' expectation and anything outside of this is negated by the teacher by being scolded or ignored. This is not an exaggeration.



I would like to go back to the topic of inclusion. Where can we find "others" including people from different cultures or backgrounds? Taking schools as example, hierarchy is developed by evaluating students and I believe that is already the system of exclusion . If you are not a good student, you are excluded and if you are further down the hierarchy, you may be asked to leave the school.

As such, in my eyes school is the system of exclusion and seems to me like an epitome of society. What is being done in the entire society is principally done at schools. People evaluate and classify people such as good or no-good and excluded when judged no-good. It's not only about excluding LGBT or people from different cultures or people with disability but also before that, at school exclusion is already starting by judging whether you have a good or bad school records, characters etc. Thus I have a question about focusing only on

LGBT, foreigners and disability as the marginalized ignoring this baseline. To change this, I think the school education has to transform fundamentally, but I know it's very difficult.

Moderator Serizawa: Thank you very much. I am relieved to hear you mention that we don't have to wrap up the dialogue as it means that this rule is applicable to this discussion as well today. Next, could we ask Mr. Anders. Are you ready?

Peter Anders: Thank you very much for the invitation. I have learned that I might be one of the marginalized foreigners here thus allow me to give you my brief insight into the topic by relating it to the current situation in Germany. Rather than talking about Goethe-Institute, which you probably know, it may be more of your interest if I speak about migration and questions of exclusion which are very virulent in Germany and in Europe as a whole at the moment.



I thought my role here is quite different from others in participating in this forum, and in my case, as an expat in a foreign country, it is nevertheless a very privileged one. I was sent by my company to fulfill certain duties. I am well-paid. I have caring colleagues. I have a fascinating job, which is facilitating cultural and artistic relations, and I have a wonderful partner. Japan is the sixth country where I am doing this, so I believe that there might be someone here even in the room who is more German than I am myself, who has spent in Germany almost not even half of his life.

So where is my home? The German sociologist Armin Nassehi, helps me to answer this question, and I quote, "home is where you do not need to explain that you are there." Although we in Europe are facing a rise of nationalism and racism based on the pretension that one's own habits and own way of life, what normally makes us feel home, is in danger. It's easy to blame the others, the foreign workers, the migrants, that they exploit the social system, that they are bringing diseases, that they are a threat on our values, such as women's equality or same-sex marriages.

Interestingly enough, our pride for pluralism ends there with the color of the people. We expect the migrant to acculturate and to search and find home, but we neglect that we have to give home. The comfort zone seems to be restricted.

The discourse of home is booming in times of uncertainties with fear of the consequences of globalization and digitalization. As such time of high complexity where Western concepts are challenged, we are at the same time confronted with a reduced and homogeneous mode of thinking, or fake news and others. Having listened to Prof. Nakatani, I am wondering if the power of binary codes, of algorithms and molecular biology are rather risking to establish universally-readable systems, as a consequence, explosive pace of technological development may be placing an unparalleled power into the hands of the few global corporations. These questions are also raised within a new research and art program of the house, of the culture, of the world in Berlin which is called “The New Alphabet”.

I quote from its concept: “Faced with this destabilization of the existing systems of order and categorization, and with the dynamization of the living world, the requirements of knowledge production are shifting dramatically and might ask for social action. The crisis of Western societies urged the representation of an inclusive society, which is aware of the demand of new forms of social dialogue, which the post-colonial discourse can help bring about. New forms of resistance and alternative modes of thinking and living are required, and in this situation, artistic appropriation, recoding counteract the functionalization of language and codes with poetic and sensual variations.”

Cultural policy must lay the ground for structures which are used as common platforms, such as – and I stay within our context and lead to Berlin –the Exil Ensemble at the Maxim Gorki Theater for professional artists who have been forced to live in exile. These young performers continue to pursue their professions by developing their own projects and evenings of performances in a special studio. They appear in the normal Gorki productions, performances, and they engage with master classes. Shermin Langhoff, the director of Gorki Theater in Berlin, has emphasized the inclusive approach, and I quote, “We commit ourselves to be lobbyists of history, lobbyists of those who were kept silent, and lobbyists of the desperate.”

To build up sustainable structures is the key for success of an inclusive creative leeway following the action plan for diversification of the cultural sector in Berlin, which was presented in 2016 and to which I refer here in my following remarks. Action is based on the following arguments.

First, diversity is a nucleus of the successful brand of Berlin’s cultural landscape and keeps high economic potential. Studies have shown that 74 percent of the visitors to Berlin have argued to choose Berlin as the destination because of its cultural and artist scenes.

Second, exclusion as an instrument of discrimination is often multilayered and complex. The Somali-German student wearing a scarf will face other forms of discrimination than a white mechanic from Belgium. Attributions of cultural superiority and inferiority, as well as racism, have a long history, at least in Germany. And I think this is an important to think of the difference of diversity than internationalization. It's not just to be international, as we have for example in dance or in choreography. We have very international ensembles who are working together, but this is not what we are talking about when we are thinking of diversity and inclusion.



And third, special attention is needed to artistic production in the so-called subcultural sector as their cohesive effect, especially for young people, may not be underestimated.

I already gave you two examples of current projects in Germany "The New Alphabet" exhibition and "The Exile Ensemble" which are triggered by the huge change of technological, political, and social conditions, and I'll give you a final example.

The German Federal Cultural Foundation has recently rolled out a nationwide program called 360 Degrees – Fund for New City Cultures, with which the foundation, I quote, wants:

"...to encourage institutions in the areas of fine and performing arts, music, literature, architecture, New Media and related forms, as well as cross-genre institutions, cultural- and art-historical museums, which address contemporary issues in their related field, to take a perspective that encompasses all of society.... "

Funding is awarded to promote diversity in cultural organizations in the area of programming, audience reach, and staff appointments. The Foundation will finance a position, so-called "agent", and provide additional project resources for supportive activities and formats. The agents will, over a four-year period and in cooperation with institutions, develop recommendations and measures which can be implemented by the institutions to change and diversify their activities themselves and which contribute to shaping a self-confident, immigrant-friendly society, by which all of urban society can benefit. The agents should possess diversity-related competence, experience in initiating interaction between cultural organizations and participants of immigrant background, and relevant language skills. Their task is to develop and guide the diversity-oriented process of change at their respective cultural institution.

Well-renowned institutions such as the Hamburg Thalia Theater, the City Library in Munich, Rautenstrauch Museum in Köln and others and Dresden, all of them now have their 360 Diversity Agent working together on the common ground to an inclusive society, which, and I come to my conclusion, is part of the strategy of giving home to those who want to work for a better quality of life.



Home means not just participating but also representing, and this is one reason why the foreign cultural policy in Germany is a no-passport-driven one, but open to those who want to share their artistically, politically or socially validated experiences and contributions to the contemporary German cultural landscape, with artists and cultural stakeholders from and within the whole world, with our local project “Goethe Damascus in Exile in Tokyo”. We invited four artists from Syria living in exile in Germany. In all cases, they were amazed by the opportunities given to exchange with Japanese artists, sharing knowledge, and not being stigmatized just as refugees or migrants, but being taken seriously as artists contributing to the diversification of the world. Thank you.

Moderator Serizawa: Thank you very much. As he mentioned, Goethe-Institut Tokyo invited four artists from Damascus to Tokyo and this project was very exciting and stimulating. Taking Germany into consideration, the country seems to be shaken with the new immigrant policies, however against this backdrop, the cultural and art sectors, including the Goethe-Institut are playing a role through their activities placing importance on diversity and inclusion. That was very interesting. Thank you very much for sharing.



Now, I would like to move on to discussion but we have very limited time. We heard three speakers talk about their activities and their ideas, so we all seem to place importance in inclusion rather than exclusion and have different approaches in the respective activities. We'd like to take a step forward to engage in discussions.

First I would like to talk about inclusion in the arts . I have an impression that we assume that arts and culture embrace inclusivity. We also share the feeling that inclusion enhances creativity. However, I would like to question this by giving you an example. When we look into

the history of artistic movements, there has been many cases when artists exclude different ideas of the others and fought over ones correctness. Therefore, I think even in the art world we cannot assume inclusion.

However thinking one step forward about our own potential creativity, indeed we feel that inclusion is what gives power to it. Creativity is a topic much talked about however I personally feel a bit strange about the use of the word. Especially those from my generation tend to share an image of “creators” engaging in creative activities with the ability to build the world according to the perfect blueprints that they have drawn. However, taking the history of life on earth which I am personally interested in as an example, 3.8 billion years ago when primal living organisms started to emerge, did they actually evolve to what we are today 3.8 billion years later as per the blueprints? No, I think not. I think we have created this world full of diversity spontaneously rather than by design, with trial and error and ingenuity. I would say generative creativity, something emerging or something being purified. That’s what makes sense for me when I talk about creativity.

Recognizing inclusion, in an inclusive society, perhaps the kind of creativity that we think may also expand on its own. I have no intention whatsoever of placing this idea in the context of West versus East, but I think the idea of monotheism embraced in the West and polytheism being the mainstream in the East, this difference in how we view the world may give differences also in how we think about creativity.

I understand this is a very difficult topic, and I don’t expect us to come to any conclusion, but when we think of creativity and inclusion, how do you view these two ideas and how do think these are related? That’s what I would like to ask the speakers.



Shinji Kajitani: Well, I would like to speak about the inclusivity of the philosophy dialogue. When the dialogue is conducted based on those rules that I shared earlier, you can have a very flat and frank dialogue irrespective of one’s age, grades or profession. Suppose there are five-year-old child, high school student, working person, as well as grandparents generation participating in a dialogue, with this rule, they still can have a natural conversation.

It is difficult to correlate diversity and creativity, but I can explain how to make the dialogue philosophical. Philosophy enable one to think differently from before which means it is one way to become creative. However, a dialogue becoming philosophical has nothing to do with the nature or character of the individuals participating. It also has nothing to do with how considerate the person is but rather for example, people from different ages tend to have different views so maybe a child may say unimaginable things from the adults’ perspective, people from different occupation may share different view on things, as well as the students who have different deviation values in school scores tended to have very different views.

Therefore, the dialogue become more interesting with diversity. On the contrary, dialogue among only good performers at school tend to be uninteresting. Their individual abilities may be high, but their values are similar therefore, the dialogue tends to be uninteresting. Thus including the older generation in this, the dialogue become much more fun and interesting.

When we do these activities at schools, I see frequently children with developmental disabilities or learning disabilities treated as difficult children and usually told to take care of them with attention as they are problematic. However, actually when the dialogue is concerned, having them is almost never a problem. In fact, in most cases their participation deepens the dialogue. This makes me realize an issue about schools as I don't think those children are problematic and when the dialogue is concerned there are no difficulties in dealing with them. Intellectually, there are no differences with the other children.

Then why are those children treated problematic at school? Children with high learning ability and children with low learning capacity could have a very good dialogue, which makes me wonder why do schools system discriminate and exclude the bad performers from the good performers and separate them so that they stay away from each other? Through the dialogue process, people with different track records and professions can have a dialogue which expand ones view very naturally.

It doesn't necessary have to be in a form of dialogue, but in creating a group or a place with diversity I think this kind of methodology will be useful. I don't think that with mere diversity, meaning various people existing in one place will lead to creativity just as is. It is about how we can actually bring together those various people. Those rules that I shared will make it easier to create such space. The rules themselves are very simple but without knowing them, creating such space would be very difficult and at times maybe very unpleasant.

Therefore, I have the feeling maybe art is adequate for creating such space. The beauty of art is that you don't have to be always correct. You don't have to understand. You never know whether what you said is good or bad, and you may have to care a little bit about other people's thinking, but don't necessarily have to draw conclusions. Hence those rules I mentioned earlier are easier to be applied in art field which makes it easier to be inclusive.

This is what I feel about inclusion and creativity looking at schools. It's about creating a space to bring people with various backgrounds together. This includes not only people from different culture but also people with differences such as students with various learning skills, for example.

Ritsu Yoshino: In the field, I have the opportunity to see artists bringing themselves to different environments. I would like to share with you a story of one artist in residence program which I thought was interesting. This is about one of those artist-in-residence programs being implemented in many different locations, which are expanding. This program, taking place in a town called Shin-Nagata in Kobe, called Dance Box has been running for the past ten years. Since it's a not a big community, when they first started, the local people were bit puzzled, as they saw these dance artists which were group of adults dressed in a different way, and the wondered how those people made a living. As the program continued running , the artists become part of their daily locals as they met them at locals bathhouse, shopping arcade etc. The locals started to understand that these people happens to be called artist and they started to accept those strange people in their community,.



Once the people start recognizing that these are people who share different values who are a bit strange but are doing something interesting, they started to communicate with each other. The locals would buy some food for the artists when seeing them in the shopping arcade etc. and like that, the dancers become more and more part of the community. As a consequence, the residents seem to have started to feel freer. The drycleaner said “ Since I like dancing, I want to dance” or “ I have an open space, so please use it for your performance” Like that, these local residents started to unlock their creative sides. There was one child who refused to go to school, through interacting with those artists, that child established a school of their own.

As such, having these artists in the local community, the local residents thought that it is okay to be different and who they are. This was one of the examples that I was able to learn from the program organizer. This episode made me think that artists maybe similar to a virus, just floating in the air and one day you may simply be infected without realizing it and changed, so to speak. Again, I realized that one's creativity has a huge influence on the society to generate new values, creating new things .

Moderator Serizawa: I see, so artists being incorporated into the community leads to the dialogue.

Ritsu Yoshino: Right. I think art is about dialogue, expressing one's self, extending one's hand, trying and wanting to communicate and connect with others. Something invisible like spores but with great influence.

Moderator Serizawa: Mr. Anders, please share more about the art project you mentioned earlier, working together with the migrants for creation. I understood that what is critical in those project is dialogic interaction and that the migrants are not specially treated just because they are migrants. Could you please touch upon your view on how being different and creativity is correlated?



Peter Anders: One of the most intriguing experiences I had was a project in Johannesburg in Hillbrow, which is an area you cannot walk into because of riots and huge social disaster.

I would rather tick the topic of the ideology of the word dialogue. We are always talking about the dialogue, and it's a very common ground that we have to have a dialogue, but we shouldn't forget that also historically the dialogue always include communicators with power in the hierarchy. We must envision this in different approaches and nowadays recaptured by the so-called post-colonial discourse. This also recovers the real views of the dichotomy between the West and other worlds, North and South etc.

Coming back to South Africa, I would like to speak about the special project we did there. We rented an old small warehouse which was not in use anymore and called for projects of the community and the citizens. We asked for their project proposal and a jury from different artistic areas chose which project to offer funding. All the other things they had to do on their own from looking for materials to building the project. They had six months and were given the means and the opportunities to do whatever they want. We did evaluate but we did not guide them through a certain process. Indeed there were projects which failed very early. After four weeks, they spent their money with drinking and smoking, and it was over.

However, there were other projects which were integrated into the communities, and that was a very successful. It was very reliable because when we are dealing with the issue of the others we can only achieve it taking people really seriously and working together for the others. I think we need to let them explore themselves and find their way into the integration.



Moderator Serizawa: Thank you. We started with the idea of inclusion and creativity. Having a dialogue can be the fundamental step to cast away the fear that we are different. If you actually interact with that person, as Prof. Kajitani mentioned before, it's easy to recognize and accept those differences. We must start from there and I am sure the rules that Mr. Kajitani presented earlier can be based on. Otherwise, we will not be able to stop developing

an image of others being different based on our stereotype. That's how I feel after listening to the three speakers.

Going back to Ms. Yoshino's example, it reminded me of the program that took place in Beppu in Oita. There I was involved in the direction of the arts festival several times, and I believe it was when the first time the festival took place, there was this dance piece which a group of dancers created. In this project, the dancers were hidden in the city and the audience were to walk around the city to find them. Interestingly, we happened to realize that in Beppu, it was very difficult to distinguish whether this person in front of me was a dance performer or just another elderly man from the local community. Perhaps it had to do with the fact that it took place in the city of Beppu where public baths are here and there, has a very open community and drunk middle-aged men or various people doing unique things blend in in the city. Those audiences who went into the city to look for professional dancers on the street were a bit befuddled. Even if the person you come across on the street to all appearances look like a dance performer, actually he/she is just another local person.

This project really challenged our stereotype, our view on a certain group of people which is similar or different. What I felt after listening to our three speakers that these fixed ideas and preconceptions inhibit us from having the very basic dialogue that was supposed to take place. I think that's very much a bottleneck in building an inclusive society.



Shinji Kajitani: I think people can tolerate others that are “very” different from themselves. For instance, foreigner etc. I don't have to stay with him or her all the way, and just have fun together for the moment.

However at school, when there are good and bad performers in the same classroom, actually they are not together. In fact, when the student with low learning capacity is in the classroom not understanding what's been taught, it's almost meaningless to stay in the same class and they may be better off being in a different place as they could learn something else.

If one did not understand English or Mathematics in junior high, it's natural that one won't be able to understand what's been taught at senior high school, however just because they sit in the same classroom they are seen as one group while actually they are not together. The division is happening within one school while already school itself is segregated based upon the learning ability of the students creating hierarchy groups. That said, I think even among students with high learning performance or students with low learning capability themselves are finally not together. However because this segregation is within the school system it is considered only about evaluation and not as a huge differences. But gradually people get used to the system and no longer can students with high learning ability put up with students without.

On the contrary when the others are very different making it incomparable to ourselves, we could accept them. In my opinion those people who themselves are measured by one yardstick who simply apply the same to measure others, do not take into account coexistence or inclusion. These people tend to think that when good and bad performers exist in the same classroom, it's natural that bad performers are unable to follow the class. But I think it is possible to create classes where everyone can understand.

When it comes to Art as a subject I have the feeling this is possible. I don't think teachers will scold a student with bad drawing skills. But in math, if you don't perform well you will be scolded by the teacher and become sort of excluded from the class. I feel this is strange because it is so natural that there are various types of students within schools. I don't think superiority or inferiority do not need to determine at school and it's hard for me to understand why it's put such a high priority. For example, that you are better at studying than others or, that you are superior as you passed an exam of a good university etc. Students with such mentality confined in the same classroom are actually not together.

I believe that once people are able to get together with the others in that level, we will not have difficulty co-existing with foreigners or people with disabilities etc. I see frequent use of word "inclusion" mainly meaning paying special consideration in order to be together with foreigners or people with disabilities, but I think if we really want to establish an inclusive society, we should think about whether or not we are succeeding to include the others close to you such as your classmates.

Peter Anders: I just wanted to add our experience in Germany. There, inclusive schools and classes went very well between the students but the problems were the parents. Parents were saying that to have an inclusive class, it's too time consuming or the advancement is too slow and they do not want their child to be relented.

Also about the dialogue, as you are aware, some artists may not be good speakers. This is why it is absolutely necessary to form a place or opportunity like residencies where one can work together, experience together and create together. This is why the Goethe-Institut is focusing a lot on co-production. Rather than presenting and showcasing German culture, we invest much more in residencies and coproducing to bring the people together, to let them work together. I think at this time when we are so challenged by these global affairs this approach is critical.



Moderator Serizawa: Indeed coproduction is important. Now, it seems we are running out of time as we want to secure some time to receive questions and comments from the

audience. Lastly, I would like to wrap up. As today's forum is hosted by Arts Council Tokyo I would like to connect today's discussion to Tokyo. We all seem to be on the same page about the importance of inclusion but more specifically, how can Tokyo change itself so that it can become a more vibrant and creative city. If you have any ideas or suggestions, please share them with us.

Peter Anders: I think it's very important to give power to the minorities, such as migrants, LGBT etc. Bring them into positions to do and develop their own projects and their own contact because what they need is a platform for representation. We can provide the structural support which is necessary.

Moderator Serizawa: Thank you very much.

Ritsu Yoshino: I completely agree with what was said. We have people with diverse values and the first step is for everyone to recognize the fact that there are people with different values. From there we can move on to realizing inclusion. Probably school should be a place to teach us this but as I just learned from Mr. Kajitani, it seems it is difficult in school. Schools tend to force only one set of values on children but on the contrary different values are intertwined in society. When it comes to Art, different values crossover and are always changing and shifting. Therefore, a society must acknowledge that different values coexist and those values are also shifting.

Shinji Kajitani: In Tokyo, as there are a lot of things available, I feel that the city as a whole is creative. However as it's huge and too many people are living here you can avoid interactions with different others and spend time only among your friends with similar values. Therefore on an individual basis, it's rather difficult to be inclusive.

For example, in rural areas, you can't get away with interacting with different others. Even if the neighbors seem different from you, you have to pay an effort to get along well with them. However, in Tokyo, you don't have to do this. This is a big difference. Having a big population and having the freedom to do what you want is at the same time benefit of living in Tokyo, but because of this I don't think inclusion can happen spontaneously. Therefore, as I've been saying such place to get together is necessary and hoping that education can achieve this, but in reality school tend to be very monothetic. I'm hoping that the transformation can start from schools.

Ritsu Yoshino: As Mr. Anders mentioned earlier, not only public institutions such as Goethe-Institut and others, but also community centers or private sector organizations like our foundations and similar, these various actors could play roles in making structural support.



Moderator Serizawa: Thank you. I see, so creating many of those places in schools is important. That reminded me of one episode. A friend of mine has been teaching at a private arts' graduate university and he told me that the recently majority of the art students are non-Japanese and most of them are from China. It was interesting to know that which subject motivated the students from China to study at this arts university was interested in things like Anime or manga but

at the same time so called underground artists such as Shuji Terayama or Tatsumi Hijikata were particular areas of their interest to study in Japan.

When I thought about the reason, in China they had the Cultural Revolution and that one particular time in history, different ideas, the underground art movements were completely eradicated. This kind of dictatorship naturally creates an era in which certain sets of ideas are completely excluded from the mainstream and in Asia including the Southeast Asia, many countries that have experienced such dictatorship.

Perhaps Japan followed a different course. It's not that underground art movement was encouraged, but at the same time, it was not excluded. It's interesting that we have such a history and environment. So excessive inclusion, when we think of that, I think for Tokyo and for Japan to be viable, to survive in this world, I think that may be one approach.

So as a strategy for the city, I think it's very important that we try to practice and execute this idea of inclusiveness and inclusion to the very extreme. That's my opinion.

So, I think since we have many people in the audience, it's a good opportunity to open the floor to the audience. I must apologize that we will only be able to take one or two questions. So, if you have a question or comment you would like to share, please raise your hand.

Question: It was a very interesting session. Thank you very much. I am working in a company, and various values and diversities are understood including myself. I also agree that conceptually it will generate good chemistry and encourage innovation. We understand that, but for example, we have bad chemistry with some people and I wonder how would you describe the inclusiveness *Aufheben*, when it comes to liking or disliking people and inclusion?



Moderator Serizawa: Are there any people who want to respond to that comment? I think it's difficult.

Shinji Kajitani: I think it may apply to art as well, but when you do a dialogue, of course in a group we don't always have only people with good personality but strangely you stop thinking about the person in front of you having a bad character. Whatever opinions you hear, you wouldn't have a negative feeling. Also, I'm getting old too but I tended to talk very softly and politely when talking to elderly people however, through a dialogue we acknowledge one another as equals which enable me to really enjoy conversation with them. As such, maybe the situation around you, the company as a setting is what is making you feel about the person that way.

Moderator Serizawa: According to Mr. Kajitani's experienced it seems you would not encounter such situation where you dislike specific person if you have a dialog based on the roles, so there, you may be able to find hints.

Shinji Kajitani: For example, try your conversation within your company based on these rules. Maybe the performance will drop, but you may feel more comfortable at your workplace.

Question: Thank you very much. Okay. I will try to do dialogue rather than discussion. Thank you for your input.



Question: Thank you very much for the exciting discussion. Mr. Nakatani recommended Tokyo to become the looking glass of the world. It's a difficult proposal but I like it as I agree that to bring change we need to take extreme measures. The discussion by the four speakers was interesting but perhaps it may have been better if they've touched upon a very basic question: why is inclusion so difficult? It is because inclusion brings fear in people as

the idea of having something different from you threatens your life and your safety. That's at the baseline of this discussion. This is why we see Japanese people tsking when seeing many Chinese tourists in Ginza.

I understand completely that dialogue is important in addressing these situations. But why is it important? That's because we need to overcome the fear against people who we are supposed to include. Without this fear, there wouldn't need to be discussing the issue of migrants. Because the fear exist, dialogue comes in place as a way to overcome it. If we do not acknowledge the existence of this fear, the discussion would not mean much. I believe Mr. Kajitani wanted to point out that if we stop there we will not go anywhere so we need to

apply the a specific approach having these dialogues, and we were able to hear other good examples.

There is this fear of inclusion at the starting point, and as a result of this fear, people tend to exclude those who are different to keep their life and safety. However it is apparent that if we continue that, the society will not be creative thus to overcome this fear we should have dialogue. I think that's what this discussion was all about.

That's why I thought it is important to emphasize that baseline otherwise the participants will simply agree that inclusion is important and we must try to embrace it and bring back a nice story.

Peter Anders: Thank you very much for this comment. I totally agree that it starts from the fear for the others. The problem is that stereotyping the others will not mend your fear. Indeed the fear comes from ones' own insecurities. Due to changes happening around us such as digitalization and climate change, we are always confronted with new experiences and crises. Blaming the others, blaming those who are different for this is a very easy way to exclude. Therefore, I think it's really important to look at ourselves, to look at what am I afraid of and why am I afraid and what makes me so insecure? Is it about my own pension? Is it about my own future? Is it about my own family? All these social questions must be overcome to fear-less.



Moderator Serizawa: I think we've already gone over the time. We are not under pressure to reach any conclusion or to try to summarize the conversations we had. Today we started with a keynote speech by Mr. Nakatani, and then we had the three speakers on stage to have a discussion. I think we are reaching towards the point where we need to do something. Since we've entered this new era, we have always had this sense of urgency. Somewhere in the

corner of our minds we were always feeling the necessity to see substantial change. Hopefully, today's symposium gave the opportunity for each one of you to think about this topic. Thank you very much.

MC: Thank you also to all the speakers. Please give them a big round of applause. Thank you very much.