

Session 4

General Discussion

Chair: Makoto Ibusuki (Seijo University)

Makoto Ibusuki

Without a break, let's move on to the Session 4, general discussion. Professor Naka Makiko, Hokkaido university and Professor Hamada Sumio, Ritsumeikan university are the appointed speakers in this session.

We have been here since early in the morning in this session of electronic recording. This is the last stage for us. I hope you will stay with us till the end of this session. Designated speaker is Professor Sumio Hamada. Professor Hamada is known to you. He is indeed the authority as the first generation of interrogative statement procedure. Professor Hamada, you have the floor to talk to us based on the lectures today.

Sumio Hamada

Thank you very much. I am Hamada. With a very limited time given to me, allow me to make a few comments. Just like Professor Naka, I am involved in the children's psychology. While I am also involved in the criminal procedure matters, why is it that I get to be involved? It's been 35 years since I got involved. I was groping in the bush in the beginning but I moved into the fact-finding process and found the role to be played by the psychologist. That's what I have been doing in the past. No audio video recording is done so far. No place for the psychology in the past. As somebody said, in the areas where the psychology functions, numerical and the quantitative perspective, but I think I went into the quagmire of researching each case one by one in order for me to understand the situation. But I was able to see some of the issues and challenges in a way. I am very much excited and having a lot interesting experiences.

As I listened to the talk today as Professor Dixon frankly stated, why is it Japanese interrogation asking for the remorse or rehabilitation, what's going on in the Japanese interrogation – that was the point of the question

I concur with you. In 1980s, American researchers came to Japan to do the field study. Several of them pointed that Japanese interrogation has the inquisition style of remorse. I believe this is to ask for the apology from the suspects, they said. This investigation is supposed to be fact-finding, however in that stage they even ask for the remorse which is uniquely Japanese as Mr. Takagi said, or this is a cultural uniqueness of Japanese interrogation. Be it whether it is cultural feature or characteristic, asking for apology or asking them to take responsibility, fact-finding has to come first. Yes, that's logical but investigators think they are culpable and they are guilty and they ask for apology and for remorse. Why is that?

In the case of the false charges, they started out demanding the apology. In the case of Ashikaga case, he was brought on the voluntary basis and brought to the interrogation room. At that time, the police went to the home of Mr. S and showed the picture of the victim saying you have to apologize to her. Without knowing him as the accused, they demanded the suspect to give the apology to the victim. Asking for the apology equals to the conviction. Only after fact-finding is done that can be possible but they started out that the suspect is the convicted. Without proof, there is the conviction. But in psychology, the conviction has to be the strong belief that there is the culprit.

Suppose Mr. A killed Mr. B and somebody saw that scene and I am confident Mr. A is the criminal but you wouldn't say I am confident. I know he is the accused. There is the difference in understanding conviction. Without proof, you try to have the conviction and try to demand apology. I think this is culturally unique to Japan. But it looks like there are some commonalities as human beings. You think you have seen this crime scene and a strong belief starts to be moved. If there is a serious case, you try to ask for the apology and remorse. In the major fictitious charge case, that kind of thing

was the starting point, unnecessarily excessive demand for apology. But the police investigators do not have any malintention. They were too enthusiastic and we need to rehabilitate this suspect and ask for the remorse, that's what they have in their minds. This is the poster they always keep in their minds as investigators.

In that sense, in comparison with 30 years ago, in the past, I was called as the enemy of the police but nowadays I am invited as a lecturer 10 times a year by the National Police Agency. I am very much appreciative. I will tell in front of the police. Like Professor Naka who teaches the interrogation technique, conviction without proof is something I don't want to do. That's what I always tell them. You try to think he is not guilty and that is going to be the starting point. Otherwise, you cannot prevent the wrongdoing in front of the veteran police investigators. In the Ashikaga case, you got the conviction. Later if he is approved to be acquitted, you will have trouble, nightmare. In order to prevent from that happening, if you have some questions, please start that he is not guilty. That is the starting point. Fictitious conviction, people in the world tend to think that the police use the terrible methods. But there were some cases that fictitious proofs were created. But many of the policemen had a strong belief that they found the real criminal.

Through the audio and video recording in the recording room, we are able to prevent the act of the illegal interrogation. That's for one thing. Also, at the back, we are able to move into the minds of the investigators. That has to be done by the psychologists as to how we are going to tell what they have. For example, demanding the apology, that's the mindset of the Japanese police. In the investigation room, if you see what's happening there, if you feel the same way as the police officer even if they are not resorting to the wrong confession taking, you do have the sympathy to that

policeman. Therefore, as for the demand for the apology or asking for the accountability, that has to be separated out from the sentencing.

When lay jury system was introduced, fact-finding process and judgment on sentencing had to be procedurally separated out. There was such discussion. But this was not treated as the major issue but they were put together in the same court undertakings. In the written statement you always come across a statement by the suspect saying, I am sorry. If you try to note the witness' testimony, the victims said I want him to get the worst sentence. That has to be recognized and improved. Fact-finding has to come first. Only after that, we would be able to demand the suspect to take the responsibility. Although there may be cultural uniqueness, but fact has to be followed. Otherwise, even if we introduce the audio video recording, I don't know whether we would be able to reduce the number of false charge. That might increase the troubles.

There are a lot about challenges. In the past, there were many cases where the audio tapes were used as the proof or evidence in the court. I listened to the tapes of the Niho case. That was a case from 1954. In that case, as long as 30 hours, there was the audio recording. I committed this, until he confessed. There was an assertion that there was torture. Torture is not recorded in audio tape. Give up and after they confess the tapes started for 30 hours and for several days. It was put on the table of the court as a voluntary proof. That was put on the table from the public prosecutor's side. The court said that is voluntary. But if I checked the audio tape, it was totally the fictitious confession. The suspect had trouble in understanding what was asked because he did not know anything about that crime. But the judge recognized there was the voluntariness, but taking more than 17 years, he was acquitted. Even the professional judges were not able to recognize that there was coercion but probably it will be much more

difficult for the lay judge to do that. Those fictitious confessions, for many judges it is very difficult for them understand.

In the Ashikaga case as Mr. Takagi reported, there were questions by public prosecutors in audiotape. In that question, when there was denial on the case on the following day, in the crime scene I just wondered how you committed and how you described the dress of a girl. There was the demonstration and there was the police and public prosecutor. There was no leading question but the suspect said, "Yes, I discarded her dress in this place." The public prosecutor got the strong belief that he had committed. How come there was the denial in the audio tape? This public prosecutor had a very strong conviction that Mr. S was accused in the crime but he was not the convict. But in the interrogation when they were put in impasse, they act as if they were the criminal, although they know they didn't do anything wrong. But the police or the public prosecutors know all the facts but Mr. S was the only one who didn't know what was happening. But Mr. S found them psychologically that he has to admit what was asked. Even if he tries to guess and answer the fictitious questions and those questions are only given to him by the public prosecutors and police, he started to say, oh no and started to respond yes, yes to all those questions.

Now, as the audio video recording is going to be introduced, as for the level of the voluntariness, it is possible to check whether there was any illegal act, but if the policeman has the belief that he is the criminal as to how they are going to treat the suspect, what is the area that there is the risk and danger turning a point, it is very difficult to find that out. Probably there is always the same problem as we came across with the written statement period. I hope that the methodology would be changed as Professor Naka has been stating. First, fact-finding has to come instead of demanding for remorse and self-reflection. But we really have to think that

whether such deception can be detected when we see the images. We discussed tape recording and there was the decision recently on the retrial of Hakamada case. About 3 years ago, I learned the presence of audio tape and it was disclosed, but the suspect gave up and gave in and was forced to make confession so many times. One week or 10 days later his confession was audio taped. He had no way but to act like a true criminal. All the questions are open questions and no tact questions, what and what happened next, as Professor Naka mentioned. Without any break, the suspect was able to answer. If you listen to that rehearsed confession, then all of us will believe that he was the offender.

Intuitively, the investigators know that there should not be any leading question. Even the audio tape taken in 1966, the interviewer gave open-ended questions, what then and what next. But when we introduced the audio visual taking, what kind of role lawyers can take? This is something we really have to certainly think about for the benefit of all of us, including suspects.

The Sayama case, the audio tape was recently disclosed. The audio tape was recorded after the admission by the suspect. The suspect first was sobbing after he made the admission, but in this case, first he admitted as a witness. Three days later he admitted the crime as one of the offenders and thirdly he once admitted. All of the three confessions are tape recorded.

In essence, this is a very important material which would allow us to understand why such erroneous process took place that led to false confessions. At least if a complete process can be audio recorded or audiovisual recorded, I think there are ways we can take for further improvement. Thank you very much.

Makoto Ibusuki

Thank you very much. Now Professor Naka, could you give us your comments about impression of the discussion and further observations?

Makiko Naka

Thank you very much. Many speakers shared with us very interesting outcomes of their studies and research. As Professor Takagi mentioned audio visual recording is now taking place in Japan and some trial cases have been introduced. Interesting materials audio-video are now accumulating in other countries. Professor Delahunty, Professor Dixon, Professor Jo, Professor Park, and Professor Takagi and I myself have interesting materials. Gradually, we are able to accumulate those important materials for further improvement and research.

Then, what is appropriate way of interview? That's one question. The second question is how can we best use the materials we were able to gather so far? First question, what is the right way of interviewing? As has been mentioned, first starting with apology which is not at all neutral is not a right way for interviewing. Confession first comes from a follower making confessions in church to ask for forgiveness from God. Making confessions, if that's spontaneous and voluntary that's good. But when you are driven into confession making, then there are things which really have to be corrected and redressed. Confession made so far might have a confession making in church where the suspect was forced to make apology and remorse. But psychological research or intelligence tests if the person taking the exam or test does not know how to put the blocks together and then clinical psychologist may prompt a right answer. But if such a prompt is given from the examiner, the truth cannot be found. If we want to draw truth from the suspect, then from the very objective way we need to try to draw a statement from the suspect.

In any interview, leading question or suggested questions are usually given from the interviewer when the interviewee said something. If you say just, is that right, tell me the truth, come on, it may be so according to your memory. If those words are uttered by the interviewer, then the interviewee will be forced to say something else even if they are all false. So, a full and complete audiovisual taking is a must but how can we get good and meaningful and also the correct information from the interviewee, that's not easy. Just to tell me or speak to me is not enough. What are the motivations we can give to the interviewee to be honest with the interviewer?

Professor Delahunty and Professor Jo made a very important point that is the rapport building. If you build it in a poor manner, the interviewee will just try to please the interviewer, try to be friend and try to just be compliant with the interviewer. That is not right. What type of rapport makes the environment where the interviewee is able to speak honestly without being compliant? Rapport making perhaps requires to a certain degree the interviewer to speak something about him or herself but to what extent that is allowed is one of the questions we need to look into. In Western countries, especially in the UK, 48 or 72 hours at most and perhaps the same goes to Australia, such a time limitation on detention. Whereas in Japan the detention can be so long, 10 days or up to 1 month and circumstance rapport making is a part of the process we need to be very careful in trying to understand what is the right way to build rapport.

Third question, to ask open questions perhaps you are now good at it. We are now good at making rapport and we began to draw information from the interviewee gradually but sometimes you have difficulties. Professor Inaba referred to a very interesting case in the morning. Some persons are able to speak in a concrete and specific manner but on one level higher

where they have to think in abstract terms they cannot speak meaningfully with the interviewer, or only in a certain frame the interviewee is able to speak. How can we deal with such difficulties in communication on the part of the interviewee? Dr. Hamada discussed the problem of demanding remorse, demanding apology. When this problem is added to the difficulty of communication, we might just end up in drawing information which is favorable from the viewpoints of interrogation. Not just motivation to speak but at the same time how can we allow the interviewee to tell us their accounts in a precise and accurate manner honestly is a very important question.

One way is not to ask them the reasons why, rather what you did then and what happened, just giving a concrete account of what they did is something even a small child can do when they are trained to learn how to account – to tell us what happened. Often case they are good at telling us specifically what happened first and what happened next, such a concrete sequence of events and to ask them to tell us a concrete sequence of events may be one of the ways to get the accurate information from such interviewee. The right interviewing is very important and we have to learn a way to train right interview techniques.

Another question is about the use. Now audiovisual recording is going to begin. We would like to further expand this process to complete a perfect audiovisual recording. But what about the right of silence and what to do about access to defense attorney, and how should we evaluate the evidence that's gained from audiovisual recording? Rather than using this in evidence in court some may say that we should place more emphasis upon the oral statements to be made in court. Professor Jo or Professor Park or Professor Fuchino mentioned the importance so far placed upon the oral arguments in court over statements made earlier. How can we make best

use of a high quality statement or visual images?

I would like to ask one question here. Rapport making, as someone mentioned and as I mentioned earlier, Professor Takagi mentioned the case where the suspect said, forgive me, excuse me. In essence, this seems to mean that there was a rapport, although which was rather inappropriate between the suspect and the interrogator. Perhaps that is why the suspect began to say forgive me, forgive me please to the interviewer. What is the right rapport making? A relaxed atmosphere, 24-hour, 48-hour detention and rapport making when the detention is so long as 10 days or 1 month. Is there any difference in the appropriate way of building the right rapport? That's one question. About the right of silence, and this is something I asked Professor Dixon a minute ago. In the UK when someone stays silence that is taken against the suspect. But that is not the case in Japan and which I think is good in a sense. However, we want the suspect to speak in order to prove not guilty. In the judicial process, I asked Professor Dixon how this remaining silence is taken as something against the suspect is being dealt with. This is a question I would like to throw to Professor Dixon and also to Professor Delahunty or others. Some people say when they are on record, the suspect may stay silent, especially when the defense counsel is there. But basically it seems okay that the suspect stays silent.

Confession is after all a confession. They shouldn't be driven into a confession forcefully. If they do not speak, we have to just do the right job for information gathering beforehand. If the interview is done in the right manner and if the atmosphere is comfortable and if the suspect is given enough information about the rules and the rights they have - it just happens to me Professor Takagi mentioned in PEACE model there is an indication that the suspect may have done something wrong and then rapport making begins. But in PEACE model the interviewer never says

that you perhaps have committed the crime. It's not confrontational and in many occasions there is no confrontation at all between the suspect and the interviewer, so not really force suspect into speaking. But still if the suspect says still silent what is the reason for the suspect to stay silent. He might rather begin to speak in court. He might be afraid that the sessions may not be properly audio video recorded or he might want to just protect the interest of someone else and he might begin to tell in court. What are the reasons for not to speak, to stay silent if the reasons are well documented? I think that can make part of the high court evidence. Memory fades away dramatically over time. Before the suspect begins to forget, perhaps it is beneficial for the suspect to speak and tell that he was someone else on such occasion. Professor Park, Professor Fuchino, or Professor Dixon, this is another sort of question I would like to have some response from other experts.

Makoto Ibusuki

May I try to summarize the questions? There are three types. One is about the rapport formation, how do you see the rapport formed in the case of Ashikaga? I would like to get a comment from an expert in the audience. The second question is the value of right to silence. Professor Fuchino, please give us your comment. Concerning the issues in Korea and Australia, the right to silence is taken as something against the suspect. How do you evaluate the right to silence? I would like to ask Professor Dixon and Professor Park to respond. May I ask Mr. Sato to talk about Mr. S, why he said please forgive me in that interview?

Hiroshi Sato

I am Hiroshi Sato from Tokyo. I am a lawyer. I was the counsel for Mr. S for Ashikaga case. Concerning the audio tapes for the interview, I think it carried a big importance. Discovery of the tape was made after Mr. S was

released, after the acquittal. We knew that listening to the audio would not change the consequence, but the question is whether the audio tape would reveal that Mr. S was not guilty. But I thought that almost everybody would regard Mr. S to be guilty even if you listened to the tape. In the first instance, the counsel believed that Mr. S is the criminal. It's not so simple that the video recording would make sure whether the person is guilty or not. The rapport was a big issue for Mr. S. Rapport in French has a positive connotation, but in Japan, the prosecutors are saying that it's quite important to have the positive relationship between the suspect and the interviewer. That's why they start the interview by asking information about the family of the suspect or reveal the personal information of the prosecutor saying that I was a poor boy as well, for example. That's why before the session that you heard today, there was a very delicate position, the question given.

Mr. S did like being questioned by the prosecutor because the prosecutor gave so many wonderful questions. The prosecutor believed that Mr. S was the culprit for the two other cases. In only 35 minutes, he made a confession that he did kill two other people. Toward the end of the day, he said, "Prosecutor, can I ask a question?" "Yes, go ahead." "Well, you are a strict person but I realized that you are a very kind person." The prosecutor sounded very happy. If this was disclosed to the lay judge, lay judges would regard Mr. S to be guilty. Prosecutors in Japan even with the full recording visually of the sessions would overcome any difficulties by acquiring new technique. The counsel could not detect that the confession was false thanks to the DNA retesting. Only with the DNA retesting, we became sure that the confession was made as a forced confession. But I am not sure whether even the counsel can detect the falseness of the confession. In other countries, there is a clear guideline as a correct way to conduct interviews and the wrong way to do it. We need to learn it. I have to say that we have

more problems today with the start of the audiovisual recording. The miscarriage of the justice even may increase with the start of the audiovisual recording if we are not right about dealing with this issue. I hope I was not misleading.

MAKIKO NAKA

Rapport must be formed carefully to – you need to make an environment for the suspect to feel easier to speak, although it's not good to make the suspects feel that they have to accommodate themselves to the interviewers.

Hiroshi Sato

One day before the session for 2 hours Mr. S explained and continued to deny the crime for 2 hours. The prosecutor succeeded in making a wonderful rapport. Mr. S started to say, "Can I say the truth?" The prosecutor said, "If you have not done it, it's okay." Then, there are 2 hours of tape reporting, Mr. S denying committing the crime. I think this was an appropriate way of receiving information. But the next day, as you heard during the presentation, Mr. S admitted the crime. When I go to the police academy, I talked about the session by the prosecutor one day before the session in the presentation saying that this is a good example of good interview. We can learn both good and bad lessons from the Ashikaga case.

Makoto Ibusuki

Thank you. Professor Hamada?

Sumio Hamada

I believe that the rapport is quite important. The judicial interview has only limited time available. The rapport, the quality in the criminal justice in Japan has dubious quality because 20 days in a row is acceptable. Human

relationship, the trustworthy relationship may come from – may lead to the truth but the human relationship in the session may also lead to the false confession. In the case of Mr. S, Mr. S continued to admit the crime when the voluntariness should be highest in the court, still Mr. S continued to admit the crime because he had to continue the play the role of the culprit because he realized there was nobody who believed in what he really said. The procedure of investigation must be changed, otherwise you can't get the true quality and the benefit of the interview of the suspect.

Makoto Ibusuki

I agree. The whole process of the psychology on the part of the suspect must be visualized, otherwise simply the audiovisual recording is not sufficient. The rapport has a lot to do with how we practice the job of the counsel for the benefit of the suspect.

Now, moving on to the second question. Dr. Fuchino, could you respond? Professor Naka talked about the value of silence because it reveals certain kind of information. What is the significance of silence in the Japanese justice system?

Takao Fuchino

What is the significance of remaining silent? This is the defense against illegal investigation but essentially it has two meanings. Suppose that the person is a real culprit, and then the true culprit making a statement is incriminating. He may be put into a prison or he may receive capital sentence. No coercion of incriminating act is a way to respect the human rights of all people. The second one is more to do with the topic of today's symposium. Suppose the person is not guilty when he was forced to talk, then this right to silence has a big meaning.

Professor Naka started to say that we want to ask the suspect to tell clearly that he has not done it. But this is a way to demand the suspect to show the evidence of not being guilty. The lack of evidence from the suspect may lead to the decision in the court which finds the person to guilty. That's why all the burden of proof is on the part of the prosecutors. There is no burden of proof on the part of the suspect about the innocence. He or she has the right to silence because with this you can excuse the suspect from the burden to prove his innocence. Here, the criminal procedure may have some divergence vis-à-vis psychologists. Psychologists feel that it's better to have many more of good statements in order to prevent the miscarriage of justice because this can prevent miscarriage of justice. Paradoxically, the criminal procedure starts with a lack of statement. There are more unsolved cases because the assumption is that the suspect would remain silent. Even toward the end, it may be impossible to decide whether the person is guilty or not. By having the presumption of innocence when the evidence is not strong enough, that's how the criminal procedure is conducted.

Makoto Ibusuki

Thank you. Clearly, here is the difference between the psychology and criminal procedure. Still being aware of the difference between the law and psychology, we have to think about how better we can prepare the rules for the benefit of all the people concerned. The law is about the norms and the psychology is experimental human science. Here we see a difference. Even with the difference we should be able to benefit from both. We hope to realize such a new relationship.

Now, coming to the last question, right to silence. Right to silence is presumed to be something against the suspect. Australian legal condition for right to silence, please.

David Dixon

It may be more useful to talk about the right to silence more generally in Australia and England. I said before there is extensive research which has been done on this. That research can be summarized into really three points. One, that the use of silence is greatly exaggerated usually by police in claims for greater powers that in fact very few suspects remain silent in police interviews and there are many reasons. I can explain why that's the case.

Secondly, remaining silent does not lead to – is not a benefit – usually very beneficial to suspects that suspects who remain silent are more likely to escape conviction or to escape being charged. Thirdly, the kind of changes which have been introduced in England and in New South Wales to the right to silence, certainly in England do not lead to more confessions or more convictions. In other words, briefly, the right to silence is largely a political issue, not significantly a legal one. It's far too much time spent talking about it.

While I have the microphone, can I just make one more point? I don't understand the Mr. S's case which is being talked about a lot. But if I am right, I am being told that he was innocent. Why we are not talking about the person who really did the killing of the child? The real problem which a criminal justice system which wants to reform has got to look face up to is why do you spend years chasing after someone who turns out to be innocent if the result of it is – forget about the problems that it causes that individual but focus on the fact that somebody killed a little girl and has got away with it has not been convicted. That is a problem which the criminal justice system has to face up. I don't know if this is a general problem in Japan or not. I don't know almost anything about the Japanese criminal justice system. But what did happen in Australia and in England

was that finally the criminal justice system came to realize that letting people get away with bad things was a problem and something was done about it. Specifically what happened is that the judges said that the kind of slow reform which is being talked today isn't enough and the judges started to say, we will not allow police use evidence unless it is being collected properly.

Like I say, I am not telling you that there is a problem in Japan, I don't know. But you people here know and if there is a problem then the way to do something about it is to get judges to stand up, or one way is to get the judges to stand up to the police and say you cannot bring evidence to court which has been collected in ways which are by international standards unsafe.

Makoto Ibusuki

I believe the last point is the adaption of the evidence in the court. I believe that was the very critical point and that has to be received very seriously. The United Nations Human Rights Committee believes there was almost finishing of the discussion on the Japanese case. For example, the very lengthy interrogation time as well as no presence of the attorney, it is criticized by the international community. In spite of those critiques, Japanese courts do not listen to those critiques. As long as it is in the range of 23 days, even if it is a confession after detention it is admissible. This is the response using my prerogative as the chairman. The courts and judges have to act as the watcher, as the protector and guarantor of the suspects. They are not playing the role. Police, public prosecutors, attorneys, those of course are very important but the roles to be played by the court and judges are even more important in that sense.

Could you tell me the situation of Korea about right to silence of defendant.

Professor Park?

Ro Seop Park

I will try. In Korea, the right to silence is guaranteed by the constitution. But in actuality the exertion of the right is very rare. It has to be seen from two perspectives. The first one is, in the investigation the suspect has the right to silence. Secondly, the suspect has the right to silence again at the court because in court the prosecutor has the right to interview the suspect as defendant. The right to silence has to be viewed for two layers of the process. The right to silence in the court trial is more important. Even though the suspect didn't exert the right to silence during the investigation, he or she might have the right to silence again, have a chance to use the right to silence again during the trial.

Additionally, I would like to point out the meaning of the video recording system in Korea. Firstly, in Korea, more focus is on securing the credible statement of the suspect, but I would emphasize that we should move on to have more focus on controlling the investigative process to control the investigative process.

Makoto Ibusuki

Can I ask one question? In Korea, can prosecutors use silence of defendant for presumption against the defendant?

Ro Seop Park

I have some empirical study about the perception of right to silence from suspect's perspective compared to the investigator's perspective. They have different perceptions about the use of right to silence. The investigators perceive that if the suspect uses the right to silence as if the suspect is guilty. It's the kind of evidence that the suspect is guilty. Whereas the

suspects perceive the right of silence – if they use the right of silence they might be perceived as uncooperative suspect. They feel like they have to cooperate to have the kind of justice – to lead the procedure to be not unfair to them. Am I making it clear?

Makoto Ibusuki

Yes. Please, Thank you.

Ro Seop Park

If the suspect actually used the right to silence but still he or she is found to be guilty, then the suspect as a defendant would be disadvantaged in sentencing. That's why even though that's suspect's right, using the suspect's right actually is a very delicate issue.

Makoto Ibusuki

Thank you very much. I am sure there are a lot of questions or comments. But we do have the reception to come. I hope you will have more opportunities to discuss those matters together with the overseas lecturers as well as your colleagues from Japan. We do have some room for the additional people to join, so please join us in the reception. That would be held in Tawawa Restaurant on the 7th floor of this building.