

Comment

Inaba: We would like to ask Prof. Soydan to comment on this panel discussion, or our presentations. Please prepare your receivers if you want to listen in Japanese.

Soydan: Thanks for giving me this opportunity. To me, it's a great privilege that I'm asked specifically to say a few words about the presentations. I hope I won't disappoint you. First of all, I think the entire enterprise that you presented on the behalf of the Institute of Human Sciences is very impressive. It is multifaceted. It has impressive empirical attempts, and it also has theoretical ambitions, so it's very promising. I have worked twice in my career in such a large enterprise, and it takes about 10 years, at least in my experience, to start, develop, and establish such an enterprise, so you have a number of years to go. One of the outcomes of this experience is that at the end of the period, you have a large amount of knowledge and wisdom about the things you have been doing. The challenge really comes at that point. It's about sustaining that kind of experience. Individuals come and go. Institutions have longer lives, so I think one thing to think about is how to really transfer this information to coming generations and how to include them in the work you're doing so that they will be the carriers of this collective wisdom. So, I challenge you to think about this aspect.

It was very interesting to see how you actually operationalized the research program, or the enterprise, as I call it, in terms of proactive, escortive, and restorative support—variations of guiding self-help. Prof. Inaba mentioned an Internet search in terms of the concept of inclusiveness. You briefly mentioned that what you found among these 100-plus titles really referred to the concept of immigration and ethnic diversity, things like that. However, you choose to translate it in a different way. I think that it's very wise. It's really contextual. It should be contextual because the program should respond to the needs of the larger populations as they are at this point in history and in this place, and not

really imported from somewhere else, because those problems will be foreign to what you are doing, so I really support that kind of operationalization of the larger project.

In Europe, truly, the concept of inclusiveness, as the question came from the professor in the audience, and as it was addressed by Prof. Matsuda, is the pair of concepts, inclusiveness and exclusiveness. It's an invention of the European Union. The question of newcomers has become a public issue so much more than it was during the 1980s, perhaps early 1990s in Europe. So, it's very much a European context. But in the end, the question also came up in terms of why not use the term "coexisting society." Well, in one sense, concepts come and go, and they change because over time they get this negative connotation. When they were launched they were positive in the minds and perceptions of people, but in time they get loaded with negative feelings, and we tend to change them. It's that kind of issue. For me personally, in terms of "coexistence of society" in the literature, it very much refers to anthropological studies of cultural adaptation, simulation, and integration. Coexistence of society, I think, denotes European integration policies, very much, which is about the functional adaptation of newcomers in terms of daily living, but really the cultural coexistence of different ethnic groups. That's just a brief comment on that.

In terms of what Prof. Matsuda mentioned here, and what I also did read in the paper that was handed out earlier, is the internationalization aspect. For some reason, Japan and other Asian countries have been selected as points of reference, points of comparison. The question came to my mind, what is the rationale of this specific strategy? What are the similarities, and the similarities between the countries that are involved here? Isn't it fair also to look beyond Asian countries? Perhaps at times similarities, if it is what you're looking for, will be even more pronounced, as compared to Asian countries. It's just a question. Really, I try to understand the rationale of it. The only thing that came to my mind is geographical proximity. But I'm not very sure. I travel extensively in China several times a year, as well as to Korea. Many times I'm struck by the

differences, so that's a question that came to my mind.

Let me see if I had something else. Well, I think I can stop there. Thank you very much for the opportunity this afternoon.

Inaba: Thank you very much, Dr. Soydan. Now we'd like to conclude the panel discussion. Thank you very much for the panelists, and thank you very much for your contributions from the floor. Thank you very much for Dr. Soydan.