

Q&A, Discussion

Inaba: We had explanations of all five projects. Thank you very much. After this, we'd like to take some questions from the floor. Anybody, if you have any questions, please raise your hand. Or if you have any comments, please raise your hand as well.

Matsuda: I have a question for the panelists. As to the methodology, you talked about going beyond borders. If you have international projects, please introduce them briefly.

Tani: On the escorted support team, we provide support for family members of children who have disabilities. We have developed programs for three years and we have acquired some evidence. That program was applied in Taiwan last year. We made a preliminary research result presentation last year, and that was very highly received. They actually asked us to apply our program in Taiwan. We have just started the program in Taiwan.

Matsuda: Our team is very much interested in transboundary transfer of evidences. If other teams have any international collaborative research projects, please explain for future investigation.

Inaba: What about international research on the proactive support team?

Tsuchida: We have a program to deal with depression. This program was originally from Canada. We've made presentations at international conferences. We are going to make comments from the Japanese side so that we can further improve the program in Canada.

Nakamura: As to the restorative program, I have a wide range of programs such as ranging from macro to micro. Together with Nanjing University we were

studying the trauma of war. I have an annual workshop with Nanjing University in China. That's the program that I've been doing. That's a workshop style program dealing with macro problems. This kind of theme, trauma by war, has not been well studied in Japan yet. In the area of restorative studies, I started a program around aborigines and Maori people. When I was in Sydney we researched those people, aborigines or indigenous people. I would like to continue our exchange with them in Australia. As to domestic violence, Japan is lagging far behind in this area. Therefore, I am learning a lot from other countries. In research and also in practice I'd like to have further exchange with foreign countries.

Matsuda: Thank you very much. Your comments are very informative. I hope we could collaborate on those research projects for methodological consideration.

Inaba: Are there any other questions from the floor? Any questions or comments?

Question: I am from School of Law of Ritsumeikan University. I belong to the research group to support victims. At the beginning, the concept of inclusive society was explained by Prof. Inaba. I think I understood it, but according to the paper, there are the words, "coexistence with society." I think with these words we can imagine a society where various kinds of people live together, but when I use the words "inclusive society," as was mentioned by Prof. Nakamura, sometimes I think too much or excessive inclusiveness should be pursued, so I feel that there is a kind of risk that we try to have a kind of framework for inclusiveness. So, why do you use the word "inclusiveness" instead of the "society of coexistence"? I think we should be careful with the kind of negative aspect of using the words of "inclusive society."

Inaba: From whom do you want to hear the answer or comment?

Question: Anybody can answer. So, first I'd like to ask Prof. Inaba to explain the

difference of the meaning of the words.

Inaba: I think each one of us has a different understanding or different feeling about the words, but I myself feel that “coexistent society” is an ideal one. My impression is that each group, or in a narrow sense, or cultural group, or group of people with a specific cultural background can exist in society through an equal existence. To realize that kind of ideal and fair society is the meaning of the coexistent society. Of course, we have to pursue the ideal of this coexistent society, but it is hard to realize in a short period of time. Especially, there are the people who need social support, so just by telling them to coexist together, coexistence can’t be realized. As a first step, I think we have to provide the service or support to these people in need. The leaders of the projects and the researchers in these projects sometimes provide direct support to these people in need. Of course, there are people who have been providing services and support for these people, and we can communicate with these people. So, providing support to these people is the step to reach the ideal state of coexistence. That’s why we use this word of “inclusive society.” This is a kind of way to try to reach this idea of coexistence. This is my understanding about these two words. If any other researchers have any other ideas or definitions of these words, please share them with us.

Matsuda: I think as a kind of discipline or definition, “inclusive society” is easier to understand because it’s antonym, “social exclusiveness,” shows a situation that we have to avoid or something we have to work on. I think it’s harder to find a word that opposes “coexistent society”. Confrontation is not something we think of as an opposing word. So, I think “inclusiveness” is an easier word to understand when I think about the situation of society.

Inaba: How about Prof. Nakamura?

Nakamura: I think this is a very important discussion point. Maybe we cannot have a consensus here. From the minority study, “coexistence” or “symbiosis”

are words we don't want to use. Excessive inclusiveness, should also be looked at or paid attention to because if we excessively consider inclusion, it may relate to that exclusion. We would like to continue our research. To that direction, at the end of the fiscal year we may continue our discussion. This would be a good discussion point for the future.

Inaba: It would be a future challenge. Thank you very much for your comments.