『社会科学ジャーナル』55〔2005〕
The Journal of Social Science 55 [2005]
pp.*69-94*

THE BOUNDARY-SPANNING DIALOGUE APPROACH (BDA) PROJECT: Background & Previous Outcomes

Jacqueline Wasilewski*

I. An Overview of the Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach (BDA) Project

In early February 2005, the Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach (BDA) Project will bring together 16-20 participants (mostly students) and 5-10 observers (civil society members and academics) from Japan, Korea, China and Russia for a three day meeting at International Christian University (ICU). The participants will discuss the question, "What is the nature of the 'good' society in Northeast Asia in the 21st century in the context of the issues facing the region at the present time?" The participants in the meeting will include indigenous people from the region, such as Ainu, Evenks and Buryats.

At the moment there is no established forum where people from this region can regularly gather to discuss the issues that affect the region as a whole. Thus, issues such as the Japanese children left behind in China at the end of WWII (one of whom recently surfaced in Russia), the abductions of Japanese by North Koreans a generation ago, the nuclear activities of North Korea currently, the future of the Korean Penninsula in general, the Japanese apology issue, the unification of China (or not), the relatively silent struggle going on over in which direction pipelines carrying Siberian energy resources should go (towards the Sea of Japan or towards Daqing) and, of course, the fate of the Northern Territories receive no regular attention by **all** the stakeholders involved.

*Professor, Division of International Studies

This BDA Project meeting will provide an opportunity for some of the future leaders in the region to have an opportunity to discuss, compare and contrast and bring into productive relationship the basic values of the various peoples of the region in the context of the issues currently facing the region.

II. The Background of the BDA Project

The Project derives its name from the Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach (BDA) to meeting design and meeting process. This is one of 35-40 structured dialogue processes being used around the world to deal with complex issues. This approach has been developed through a two decade long collaboration between Americans for Indian Opportunity (AIO), a national indigenous peoples' advocacy organization in the United States, and Dr. Alexander Christakis and his colleagues in the International Society for the Systems Sciences (ISSS). Out of this collaboration has emerged a new concept called *Indigeneity* and a new international indigenous peoples' organization, AGI (Advancement of Global *Indigeneity*). This COE Boundary-spanning Dialogue Project, drawing on the concept of *Indigeneity* and using the BDA, will be the first meeting in Asia to be facilitated by Native American and Maori members of AGI. It is seen as an opportunity to introduce both the concept of *Indigeneity* and the BDA process to both indigenous and non-indigenous people in the region.

This Project originated in two realms, in the work of two of my graduate students and in the work I have been doing over the past two decades, as mentioned above, with Americans for Indian Opportunity (AIO).

1. Positive Intercultural Interaction & Identity Continuity

The two graduate students in question, Zheng Wei and Elena Kozoulina, are both doctoral students here at ICU. Mr. Zheng is from Shanghai and is doing his doctoral work on the history of Chinese/Japanese human relationships with

the goal of identifying factors that contribute to and nurture positive interactions between the people of the two societies. Ms. Kozoulina is from the Buryat Republic in Eastern Siberia in the Russian Federation and is exploring identity continuity in the Buryat Republic. Identity politics were a major factor in the dissolution of the old Soviet Union, and identity politics will probably continue to play a role in the region, particularly in the struggle for control of Siberia's energy and other natural resources.

Mr. Zheng's master's work (2002) was on employer/employee relationships in 15 Japanese companies doing business in Shanghai. Particularly in the manufacturing sector, he encountered some interaction dynamics that were mutually beneficial to all the participants in the interaction, regardless of either status or whether the person was Chinese or Japanese. This piqued his interest in what factors enable Chinese and Japanese to engage in productive relationships. Mr. Zheng (in press) is also writing a very interesting paper on contrastive Chinese and Japanese concepts of harmony. The Chinese-Japanese relationship is often plagued by false assumptions of similarity, particularly around values that stem from Confucian roots.

Ms Kozoulina came to her doctoral work as a mixed heritage person with a background in linguistics. She is of Polish-Jewish, Tungu (also known as Evenk), and Ukrainian heritage. She has relatives in the Buryat community as well. This journal published her paper (Kozoulina, 2004) on Russian and English language discourse about identity. The two discourses do not have many overlapping identity terms even though on a surface level some of the vocabulary items seem to be the same. This linguistic exploration of academic discourse on identity further piqued her interest in identity dynamics. She will explore the identity maintenance strategies of the three communities of people considered by the government of the Russian Federation to be "native" to the Buryat Republic: the Russians, the Buryats and the Evenks.

What these two areas of work have in common is their concern with articulating and elaborating intercultural relationship dynamics in areas that up until now have not formed the data base for our understandings of intercultural communication and relations or of our ideas regarding self and identity. The work with AIO, the national Native American advocacy organization mentioned above, has entailed similar explorations of non-Euro-American territory.

2. The Greek, Indigenous and Systems Sciences Roots of the Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach (BDA) (see also La Donna Harris & Wasilewski, 2004)

The BDA has three roots, a Greek root, an Indigenous root and a Systems Sciences root.

(1) The Greek Root

As all of us in the U.S. learned in school, it was the 500 men of Athens who created the first democratic meeting process in the Western World. *Democracy* is the Greek word for the people's power. *Demosophia* is another Greek word. It means the people's wisdom, and the *agora* was the open space where Greek citizens discussed issues and competing interests. The BDA approach enables *demosophia* to appear in the *agora* so that *democracy* can be enacted.

The question now, however, is how to have effective dialogue in open conceptual (as distinct from open physical) spaces about complex issues with more people of ever more varied backgrounds participating in the conversation.

Slater and Bennis' definition of democracy in a prophetic 1990 article, *Democracy is Inevitable*, is as follows:

- Full and free communication, regardless of rank and power;
- A reliance on consensus rather than coercion or compromise to manage conflict;

- The idea that influence is based on technical competence and knowledge rather than on the vagaries of personal whims or prerogatives of power;
- An atmosphere that permits and even encourages emotional expression as well as task-oriented behavior;
- A basically human bias, one that accepts the inevitability of conflict between the organization and the individual, but is willing to cope with and mediate this conflict on rational grounds.

But what is rational? Rational by whose standards?

Dialogue among civilizations was defined by Herman Lopez-Garay, in *Dialogue Among Civilizations: What For?*(2001):

> …intercultural dialogue should aim at disclosing the foundation of the way of being of the participating cultures – their particular cultivation of their collective way of life – so that in the context of such a display of ways of being human, 'we' the human race can discover our humanity as a whole and hence disclose a new way of transcendence, a new way of being together at a global scale. (p. 18)

This definition echoes a passage by Parker Palmer in To Know As We Are Known: Education As A Spiritual Journey (1993) which was quoted by Scott Hammond and Yeo Kee Meng (1999) in their description of "dialogic problem-solving":

> where each person speaks in fidelity to inner truth, … [as] … a process for checking and criticizing and clarifying our communal relationships. … As the dialogue goes on, larger truth is revealed, a truth that is not only within us but 'between' us. (p. 55-70)

When thinking of what a new global *agora* could look like, we have to ask ourselves, will it consist of a ne**w** "Center", or will "it" more resemble the idea Yoneji Masuda raised in the TheInformation Society as Post-Industrial Society in 1981 (!), that the new *agora* will be a "multi-centered participatory democracy." That is, do we need a World Government or simply the conditions for a Self-Organizing World System with no enforcer?

Successful self-organizing systems also have self-organized criticality. In such a system "the Knower" is included in the system (see C.S. Peirce's Collected Works, 1935). This relates back to Palmer's statement above of the fact that there can be no private truth. Escher's graphic of two hands drawing each other captures, visually, this same idea.

(2) The Indigenous Root

AIO's Background: Thirty-three years ago, a Comanche woman named La Donna Harris founded an organization in Washington, D.C., called Americans for Indian Opportunity (AIO), that she envisioned as a national advocate for the advancement of opportunities for Native Americans in the United States. This organization was based on a previous state level organization, Oklahomans for Indian Opportunity (OIO), that she helped found in Oklahoma in the 1960s. OIO was the first organization in Oklahoma to bring all of the more than 60 Oklahoma Tribes together into a state-wide organization. OIO also worked with the African American community to integrate the state of Oklahoma. Over the years both AIO and OIO have served as catalysts for initiatives that have enriched the cultural, political, social and economic self-determination of Indigenous peoples in the United States. They have particularly focused on participation in governance and leadership development.

AIO's Research on Common Tribal Values: What AIO's activities and research have shown over the last two decades is that there are common core cultural values shared by most Indigenous peoples (Harris & Wasilewski, 1992;

Poupart & Martinez, 2003). In fact, beginning in the 1980s the Indigenous peoples of the entire Western Hemisphere seemed simultaneously to begin to look at and to try to articulate their values to each other and to non-Indigenous people (Cayuqueo, 1984).

At this time AIO initiated a series of meetings to discuss common Tribal values in North America. Twelve different North American Tribes representing the seven major Indigenous culture areas in the United States participated in these initial meetings. Some of these meetings were part of another line of our research, research on family systems as applied to Tribal communities (Rauseo, 1988, 1989; Rauseo and Wasilewski, 1989).

(3) The Systems Sciences Root

The AIO/Christakis Relationship: Most of these meetings after 1985, however, were conducted according to the computer-assisted, consensus-based, complex problem-solving process that was then being developed by Dr. Christakis and his colleagues in the Systems Sciences at the Center for Interactive Management at George Mason University in Virginia. It was in 1985 at the World Affairs Conference in Boulder, Colorado, that AIO staff encountered Dr. Christakis.

When we heard Dr. Christakis' list of the features of his process, we marveled that this high tech process exhibited some of the essential features of pre-contact decision-making processes in North American Tribal communities. These features included an order of speaking, everyone having a chance to speak, no evaluative comments, the speaking going on until no one had anything else to say, etc. What was most attractive, however, was that this structured dialogue process, through computer assistance, purported to make consensus-building efficient. U.S. officials had always told Tribes that decision-making by consensus was just too time consuming. This meeting in Boulder was, thus, the beginning of the long collaborative relationship between AIO and Dr. Christakis

and his colleagues. (Please consult the extensive literature on the evolution of this dialogue process, e.g., Warfield, 1994; Warfield and Cardenas, 1994; Christakis, 1996; Christakis & Brahms, 2003, etc.)

More than 70 meetings using various forms of the structured dialogue process have been held since 1985. Meetings have been held in various venues (from Tribal offices to the chambers of the U.S. Senate) and have included intra-Tribal, inter-Tribal, and inter-governmental participants. Inter-governmental meetings have included participants from Tribal, national, state and/or local governments and their agencies. Some of these meetings have been with the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Western Governors Conference, etc., as well as most recently, meetings between Urban Indians and among Emergency Response Teams in the United States and meetings between Maoris and Native Americans internationally.

In 2001 a colleague of Dr. Christakis, Ken Bausch, published a book called The Emerging Consensus in Social Systems Theory. In this book he identifies five emerging areas of consensus regarding systems theory and shows how they impact on the practice and ethics of social systems design, for which the BDA is a tool. From a systems perspective this book provides the fundamental logic behind the whole BDA process. Wasilewski (2002) summarized this material for the Japanese Institute of Negotiation.

The members of the International Society for the Systems Sciences (ISSS) have, thus, made a huge contribution to "re-cognizing" the alternative mode of discourse represented by the approximately 35 different varieties of structured dialogue processes that were shared at the Society's annual conference in Crete in 2003. That this very ancient dialogic "social technology" has so many contemporary manifestations is reason for hope.

III. Outcomes of the Use of the BDA Structured Dialogue Process by Native Americans: Identifying Core Indigenous Values

A result of the initial meetings in "Indian Country" in the 80s and early 90s was the identification and articulation of four core values which cross generation, geography and Tribe. These four core values, the Four R's, are Relationship, Responsibility, Reciprocity & Redistribution. Each of these values manifests itself in a core obligation in Indigenous societies.

1. The Four R's & Their Ensuing Obligations

Relationship is the kinship obligation. This is the profound sense that we human beings are related, not only to each other, but to all things, animals, plants, rocks … in fact, to the very stuff the stars are made of. This relationship is a kinship relationship. Everyone/ everything is related to us *as if* they were our blood relatives. We, thus, live in a family that includes all creation, and everyone/everything in this extended family is valued and has a valued contribution to make. So, our societal task is to make sure that everyone feels included and feels that they can make their contribution to our common good. This is one reason why Indigenous people value making decisions by consensus, because it allows everyone to make a contribution.

Responsibility is the community obligation. This obligation rests on the understanding that we have a responsibility to care for all of our relatives. Our relatives include everything in our ecological niche, animals and plants, as well as humans, even the stones, since everything that exists is alive. Indigenous leadership arises from the assumption of responsibilities arising out of our relationships and the roles in society these relationships engender, not from an ability to exercise force over others. Responsible Indigenous leadership is based on an ethos of care, not of coercion. The most important responsibility of a leader is to create the social space in which productive relationships can be established and take place.

Reciprocity is the cyclical obligation. It underscores the fact that in Nature things are circular, for example, the cycle of the seasons and the cycle of life, as well as the dynamics between any two entities in relationship with each other. Once we have encountered another, we are in relationship with them. The relationship La Donna Harris, founder of AIO, has with the woman with whom she founded OIO, Iola Hayden, began when her great grandfather captured La Donna's great grandfather in the 19th century down in Mexico soon after La Donna's great grandfather's family had emigrated from Spain. They became social "brothers." Therefore, the families have been "in relationship" since then, engaging in an ongoing set of uneven reciprocal exchange obligations. At any given moment the exchanges going on in a relationship may be uneven. The Indigenous idea of reciprocity is based on very long relational dynamics in which we are all seen as "kin" to each other.

Redistribution is the sharing obligation. Its primary purpose is to balance and re-balance relationships. Comanche society, for example, was an almost totally flat society, socially, politically and economically. It had many, many ways of redistributing material and social goods. In principle one should not own anything one is not willing to give away. Possessions do not own you. The point is not to acquire things. The point is to give them away. Generosity is the most highly valued human quality. The basic principle is to keep everything moving, to keep everything in circulation.

Each of these values, as you can see, is integrally related to all the others and builds on the others. Indigenous peoples understand that relationships define our roles and shape our responsibilities. They realize that these relationships, roles and responsibilities are reciprocal in nature and lead to the redistribution of both society's tangible and intangible assets.

2. The Encounter & Collaboration with the Maori & the Emergence of the Concept of Indigeneity

In 2002 another fateful meeting took place in the history of AIO. That was the meeting with Maori leaders in New Zealand as part of AIO's leadership development program endowed by the Kellogg Foundation that is called the Ambassadors' Program. As part of that program young Native American leaders have the opportunity to meet with Indigenous leaders elsewhere in the world. In this encounter it was as if the "medicine" of the young Native Americans and the *mana* of the Maoris ignited in a nearly instantaneous synergistic bond. The result has been the creation of a Maori counterpart organization, AMO (Advancement of Maori Opportunity), a Maori Ambassadors' Program and the initial plans for the development of a new international organization, AGI, Advancement of Global Indigeneity. The purpose of this new organization is to advance Indigenous perspectives in the world. The Wisdom of the People Forum AIO and AMO conducted at the annual conference of the International Society for the Systems Sciences (ISSS) in Heraklion, Crete, in July of 2003 (Laura Harris & Wasilewski, 2004; Christakis, 2004) addressed the next steps in bringing this new organization into being.

Four structured dialogue sessions have now been held with Native American and Maori participants, and together they have begun to articulate a comprehensive construct, *Indigeneity*, which will capture the cluster of concepts that Indigenous people have to offer global *agoras* in the 21st century.

IV. Indigeneity: A Global Contribution

Indigeneity is rooted in core values based on communal life handed down from the many grandfathers and many grandmothers of Indigenous people. Indigenous peoples see everything through the filter of community. This common Indigenous world view and its associated "deep logic" has an asset base arising out of the intangibles of cultural identity, communal wisdom, values, philosophies and their resulting alternative world views.

Indigeneity assumes a spiritual interconnectedness between all aspects of creation and affirms that everything created, not only has the right to exist, but also has the right to be able to make a positive contribution to the larger whole. Therefore, all peoples have a right to exist, and it is imperative to our coexistence, to our ability to live together, that each group find their own self-determined ways to share and contribute their communal wisdom to global society. Complementary coexistence relies on the ability of all peoples' voices to be heard, and to be heard equally. The pursuit of this type of coexistence entails continuously recreating a harmonic balance. This pursuit stands in opposition to the pursuit of dominance, exclusion and exploitation.

Indigeneity is, thus, a very ancient global paradigm of sustainability, spiritual interconnectedness and coexistence … of *convivencia* … of living together. This is a world view that throughout the modern era has been undervalued.

Indigeneity involves the practice of relational politics, that is, of creating relationships between diverse elements, not eliminating them. Even though the *Indigeneity* concept is culturally … which means communally … grounded, it is neither culturally neutral, nor is it culturally exclusive. Rather, it is culturally inclusive and relational. The practice of *Indigeneity* creates dynamically inclusive dialogic space.

1. Indigeneity's Dialogic Space

Actually, nothing exists except *us* in this moment in time, engaging in this interaction, in this dialogue. "Us" includes you, me, all of our relationships, taking place in our various personal, social, political, cultural, physical and spiritual contexts. This is a vast, interacting, overlapping … constantly changing … network. (By now you can perhaps see how much the systems approach is central to the concept of *Indigeneity*.) All our identities are honored when we are in positive relationships with each other.

If, when we interact with each other, we are in a state of valuing all of our relationships, these relationships will take care of us, and we will have things to share, to give back. One gives because it is right. It will come back to you.

If we value each other in a way that we simultaneously, for instance, value the Earth, it will take care of us. Our set of overlapping relationships will always take care of us. This was why there were no orphans in Comanche society. Children were the responsibility, not just of the mother, but of the mother's entire family and, ultimately, of the Tribe as a whole. This is another example of responsibility emerging out of a set of relationships. It was well understood that unless the children were cared for, there would be no future.

This sense of caring interconnectedness assumes the need for all things to coexist. Thus, this dynamic valuing of the other is inseparable from true dialogue. Such dialogue involves, as poet Joy Harjo (1996) says, "adventuring out through listening and learning." Through caring enough for each other to engage in true dialogue we enable ourselves to be ourselves together.

In fact, we can *only* be ourselves together. We can only be a "self" in community. We are simultaneously *both* autonomous and connected. There are no private truths. We have to let the realities of others into our conceptual and emotional spaces and vice versa.

In social space constructed according to the principles of *Indigeneity*, strong individuals contribute on the basis of their uniqueness to strong groups which, in turn, contribute to strong nations and to a strong international community. Uniqueness and strength are inherent in this dynamic from the beginning. All the uniqueness and strength, all the "truths" in the system have to be brought into complementarity, into some kind of accord.

2. Indigeneity: A Dynamic Spiral

Bringing our disparate realities into complementarity, however, involves inevitable differences that somehow have to be transformed.

The shape of this transformation is an upward spiral, like the flight path of the sea bird the Maori call *kuaka*. In this spiral dynamic there is no domination. Rather there is a reiterative moving forward into the future together which involves, again in the words of Joy Harjo (1996), the ability "to understand the shape and condition of another with compassion," to value them.

This spiral movement potentially includes all communities. It is moving, spinning upward through time and space. Through the energy created by the interaction among the Four R's and their resulting Obligations as described above, our collaborative work spins out in ever larger and further reaching spirals to include others in constantly evolving, productive relationships.

Thus, the ability to transform is the ability to balance, to bring disparate elements into complementarity. Not "balance," a static noun, but "to balance," a dynamic verb. This is the Indigenous form of respect. We care enough about others to include them in our world.

This is a dynamic, emergent, creative, collective process which demands everyone's participation. Through this process, somewhat like the improvisational jamming of a jazz ensemble, as Dr. Christakis once said, "We keep track of ourselves through constant communication."

3. The Maori Canoe Metaphor

Finding this kind of balanced coexistence, or what Edward Said (2003) termed "deep coexistence" in his last lecture before his death, is tough to achieve. It takes a great deal of energy and strength to create the necessary coordination. A Maori canoe provides a metaphor that captures the central

features of the dynamics this article is trying to describe, that is, how each of us can contribute our individual energy to collective forward movement, to the upward spiral.

Indigeneity features outcome-oriented thinking which creates a kind of solution-oriented, value-driven solidarity (see also Dimas' [2000] goal-oriented, ideologically driven solidarity in post-conflict El Salvador). In this environment each person can contribute effectively to the whole from their place of belonging so that we can all move forward into the future together. To reiterate, this dynamic is solution oriented.

V. Dynamic Inclusivity

Indigenous people think dynamic inclusivity is greatly needed in the world today. Valuing cultural diversity is crucial to both the building and sustaining of any civil society. Actually, merely respecting diversity is not enough. A truly civil society must accept, encourage, and ultimately insist upon the participation of all the diverse peoples of that society.

1. All World Views Must Be Valued, Including Those of the "Enemy."

To return to the Comanche culture of AIO's founder, the Comanche word for respect, *mabitsiaruh*, combines the feelings of respect, honor and to care for into a single construct. It literally means to honor the Other as a good person. For respect to exist between us we have to value each other.

One should behave in a way that values both self and other simultaneously in order to be respectful. It is one of those paradoxical aspects of human existence that if we do not value ourselves, we find it very difficult to value others.

In fact, this kind of respect-as-value circles around and in turn designates one of the primary responsibilities of Indigenous people, and that is to honor

their Tribal identities. In order to honor what the ancestors went through and died for, Indigenous people have a responsibility to want to continue as members of their Tribes and to carry on (Roslyn Ing in Alfred, 1999, p. 36).

You can even value your enemies. Utes and Comanches were traditional rivals. They warred against each other. But they never wanted to exterminate each other. How could they be "brave" if they had no worthy opponents?

2. An Inclusive Rationality, A Common Human Standard

Taiaike Alfred (1999) notes in his book, Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto, "a deep reading of tradition points to a moral universe in which all of humanity is accountable to the same standard" (p.21). This standard, this potentially inclusive rationality, is based on a natural flow, on a logic of human behavior situated in caring relationships.

In the last years of the 20th century and during the first years of the 21st century, international society has put much effort into trying to identify "universal human rights", a standard of justice which is universally accepted. Indigenous people perhaps have special insight into this effort, particularly since they have often been denied basic rights.

Also, "Indigenous societies are the repository of vast experience and deep insight on achieving balance and harmony" (Alfred, 1999, p. 21), and not only regarding the environment. Justice, for instance, is "the achievement of balance in all … relationships, and the demonstration in both thought and action of respect for the dignity of each element in the circle of interdependency that forms our universe."

This statement echoes Lakota Medicine Person, Black Elk's, famous vision of the Sacred Hoop:

> … for I was seeing in a sacred manner the shape of all shapes as they must live together like one being. And I saw that the sacred hoop of my people was one of many hoops that made one circle, wide as daylight and starlight … (1931, p. 43)

Finding patterns of effective interaction where we can discover, share and coordinate our mutual value is, thus, our primary task. Relationships, responsibilities, reciprocity and redistribution form dynamic spirals out of which responsibility, reciprocity and redistribution are manifestations of caring relationships. The hoop of each community begins to spin as it incorporates the energy emerging from new relationships.

The image of the spiral captures the dynamic nature of this kind of inclusivity. This dynamic of ever expanding spirals of care is the I.D., the main feature of the Indigenous Democracy AGI is interested in sharing with the rest of the world. This dynamic of care creates the dialogic space where relational politics can be practiced.

VI. Power & Governance

Indigenous philosophies of governance even provide examples of Foucault's (1980) "non-disciplinary forms of power" (in Alfred, 1999, p. 45). In Indigenous governance personal autonomy has precedence over collective sovereignty. There is no coercion, only "the compelling force of conscience" (Alfred, 1999, p. 45) based on the Four R's described above.

Leadership in an Indigenous system is non-coercive. Leadership does not consist of "power wielding" (Burns, 1978, in Alfred, 1999, p. 45), of individual triumph, competitiveness, debate, majority rule, winners and losers or of power and control over others. Rather, leadership involves taking responsibility, not control. The leader's major task is to be able to knit together and orchestrate the energy that enables each person to contribute effectively to the whole. Thus, a

key responsibility of a leader is to create social spaces in which we can come to value each other.

In the 21st century this requires the continuous construction of ever more inclusive social spaces. This is a kind of community building. It can also be likened to orchestrating or networking human energy towards a holistic vision or goal … towards a preferred outcome that is good for everyone. Since strong individuals make strong groups, whether local or global, leadership is shared responsibility and is exercised by enabling "individuals to pool their self-power in the interest of the collective good" (Alfred, 1999, p. 25).

In Native American society, this "good" is usually evaluated on how today's decision will affect the future, the Seventh Generation, the children's children's children and, thus, the ability of the community to continue. Another evaluation point when evaluating any kind of behavior is the answer to the following question: "What if everyone behaved that way, would the world still work?"

However, the collective, whether family, community or state, does not have precedence. "Individuals alone determine their interests and destinies." (p. 54) Some relationship can be seen here to Western concepts of "personal and popular sovereignty" (p. 54).

VII. A Change Management Alternative to the Model of Revolutionary Change

Alfred also notes that these ideas around power and coercion provide an alternative model to the revolutionary one as to how change can occur in society.

> [The] focus is not on opposing external power, but instead on actualizing [one's] own power and preserving [one's] intellectual independence" … "this conception of power is not predicated on force. It does not involve coercing

> or inducing other beings to fulfill imperatives external to their own nature; thus, it is not inherently conflictual (p. 48)
>
> … it focuses on whether or not power is used in a way that contributes to the creation and maintenance of balance and peaceful coexistence in a web of relationships" … "power is the force needed by all to achieve peace and harmony (p. 49)
>
> Thus, these governance and power concepts are similar to
>
> … the original principle of federalism … achieving a relationship between peoples founded on the principles of autonomy and interdependence … the notion of respectful cooperation on equal terms … of cultivating relationships that allow for ongoing dialogue (p. 53)

However, we must also remember that the very concept of federalism was borrowed by 18th century Western European observers from the 1000 year old Iroquois Confederacy (Johansen, 1982; Weatherford, 1990).

Indigenous ideas about governance are, thus, based on a set of power relationships in which we all acknowledge that we are all permanent features of our social and political landscapes. Because we exist, we have a right to exist, and we are, thus, due honor, respect … and care.

VIII. Self-Determination vs. Imposition/Conversion

We are all looking for our place in the sun. Cultural and ethnic strife exist on this planet because those in power deny the desire of others for political and cultural autonomy. But what if values collide? What about the present apparent collision between the values of various fundamentalisms , Jewish, Christian and Islamic,that we are presently experiencing in the world?

Again, La Donna Harris' Comanche background comes to our aid in trying to understand these dynamics. Comanches know that what is good for me is not necessarily good for you and vice versa. Power resides in the ability of each of us to choose. But good choice and, therefore, the ability to coexist and to be truly self-determining, relies on two things. First, each person/group has to be allowed to speak for him/her/themselves. In fact, it is a human responsibility. Second, each voice has to actually be heard. It is not enough simply to give voice, although that is one step. One has to actually be listened to and heard.

If you do not value a voice, you cannot hear it. And conversely, you have to give voice in a non-threatening way, so that your voice can be heard.

The Maori say that "dialogue is the food of chiefs." We might even consider words as a kind of "social grooming mechanism" used in establishing relationships. (A "debate," on the other hand, is characterized by the Maori as "a war of words.)

What one's words articulate, however, one's views, are based on experience. In the Indigenous perspective it is assumed that we have each had different experiences, so, of course, there are multiple realities. We have to be able to hear the experience on which a point of view is based. If we can mutually do that, then we are able to construct a shared set of experiences (not to be confused with identical ones) on which to base our next set of actions.

This is how our strength is increased by sharing. We can affirm our view, expand our view, or sometimes alter or even give up our current view when we encounter a new one. We can also allow others to have contrastive views as long as they do not impose their views on us and vice versa.

IX. *Agoras & Indigeneity*: Discursive Democracies for Crafting Co-Existence Based on Valuing Self Determination

Both Indigenous and contemporary practice, thus, constitute a treasure box of resources for the cultivation of dialogic relationships through which "discursive democracy" (Alfred, 1999, p. 45) can be enacted.

We may yet create Habermas' (1984) "ideal speech situation" in global practice. Such a "speech situation" is

> a discussion in which participants express themselves freely, forthrightly, and truthfully; therefore, they put aside external power relationships and address each other on an equal footing. In such an ideal discussion, every viewpoint and argument is heard, and decisions are made by the force of the better argument (Bausch, 2001, p. 64).

The synergy created between these ancient and contemporary structured dialogue practices has huge potential. It can enable us actually to create new social spaces, global *agoras*, where we can act with the care and patience necessary to mutually discover the value each of us and our communities of belonging have to contribute to our collective well being. We can create new problem-solving and decision-making spaces where, in the words of a Cook Island Maori woman speaking to an environmental conference in Vanuatu on the eve of the First Gulf War, "the voices of hummingbirds are listened to with as much respect as the voices of eagles" (Forestel, 1991). These dialogue practices, ancient and contemporary, have the potential of enabling us 21st century human beings to share our collective wisdom with each other effectively in a global context.

X. Conclusion: The Next Step Forward

Thus, the COE funding for the Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach Project on the nature of the "good" society in Northeast Asia in the 21st century

provides us with the support necessary to take the next step in the development of social spaces where optimal mutual learning can take place. This funding provides us with a further opportunity to increase our understanding of how to go about creating 21st century global *agoras* where, simultaneously, we can fulfill our obligations to our multiple relationships, we can all have authentic voice, and we can all be ourselves together.

* This research has been conducted by the fund of ICU COE Project.

References

Print:

Alfred, Taiaiake (1999). *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Toronto: Oxford University Press Canada.

Bausch, Kenneth C. (2001). *The Emerging Consensus in Social Systems Theory*. New York: Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers.

Black Elk, Nicholas (1931). In John C. Neihardt (1932). *Black Elk Speaks*. Reprint 1972. New York: Pocket.

Burns, J. G. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Cayuqueo, Nilo (Coordinator) (1984). Working Commission Reports: Second Conference of Indian Nationals and Organizations of South America, March 6-13, 1983, Tiwanaku, Bolivia. Berkeley, California: South American Indian Information Center.

Christakis, Alexander (1996). "A People Science: The CogniScope System Approach." *Systems: Journal of Transdisciplinary Systems Sciences*. 1:1, 16-19.

Christakis, Alexander, and Sabrina Brahms (2003). Boundary-spanning Dialogue for the 21st Century Agoras. Paper presented at the 47th Annual Conference of the International Society for the Systems Sciences, Hersonissos, Crete, Greece, July 6-11.

Christakis, Alexander (2003). Wisdom of the People. Keynote presented at the 47th Annual conference of the Internaitonal Society for the Systems Sciences, Hersonissos, Crete, Greece July 6-11.

Dimas-Hernandez, Carlos Eduardo (2000). Civil Conflict and Social Capital Formation: Starting at the Grassroots - Case Studies of Three Rural

Salvadoran Communities. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Graduate School of Public Administration, International Christian University, Tokyo, Japan.

Foerestel, Lenora, Ed. (1991). *Women's Voices On the Pacific: The International Policy Congress*. Washington, D.C.: Maisonneuve Press.

Foucault, M (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. C. Gordon, ed. and trans. New York: Pantheon Books.

Habermas, Jurgen (1984). *The Theory of Commuicative Action, Volume I: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. (T. McCarthy, trans.) Boston; Beacon Press. (Original work published in 1981.)

Harjo, Joy (1996). *The Spiral of Memory*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Harris, Laura and Jacqueline Wasilewski (2004). "Indigenous Wisdom of the People Forum: Strategies for Expanding a Web of Transnational Indigenous Interactions." *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*. 21, 10 pages. (Published on line in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com)

Harris, La Donna & Jacqueline Wasilewski (1992). *These Are the Values We Want to Share*. Bernalillo, New Mexico: Americans for Indian Opportunity (AIO).

_____ (2004). "Indigeneity, an Alternative Worldview: Four R's (Relationship, Responsibility, Reciprocity, Redistribution) vs. Two P's (Power & Profit) - Sharing the Journey Towards Conscious Evolution." *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*. 21, 15 pages. (Published on line in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com)

Ing, Roslyn (personal communication). In Taiaiake Alfred (1999). *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Toronto: Oxford University Press Canada.

Johansen, Bruce E. (1982). *Forgotten Founders: Benjamin Franklin, the iroquois and the Rationale for the American Revolution*. Ipswich, Massachusetts: Gambit Publishers.

Kozoulina, Elena. (2004). "Russian Matryoshka: The hierarchy of Ethnicities and a matrix of Semantic Shifts." *The Journal of Social Science*. 53, 77-97.

Lopez-Garay, Herman (2001). "Dialogue Among Civilizations: For What?" *The International Journal of World Peace*, 18, 15-33.

Masuda, Yoneji (1981). *The Information Society As Post-Industrial Society*. Washington, D.C.: The World Future Society.

Palmer, Parker (1993). *To Know As We Are Known: Education As A Spiritual Journey*. In Scott Hammond and Yeo Kee Meng (1999), "Dialogic Problem Solving in Culturally Complex Groups," *The SIETAR International Journal*, 1:1, 55-70.

Peirce, C.S. (1935). *Collected Works of Charles S. Peirce*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Poupart, John and Cecilia Martinez (2003). *Nee-gon-nee-shid (in the Anishinabe Language, one who leads): Preserving American Indian Traditions Through Culture and Leadership*. St. Paul: American Indian Policy Center.

Rauseo, Louise (1988). *Consultant's Report to AIO on the Winnebago Family Systems Project*. Bernalillo, New Mexico: Americans for Indian Opportunity (AIO).

_____ (1989). *Consultant's Report to AIO on the Poarch Creek Family Systems Project*. Bernalillo, New Mexico: Americans for Indian Opportunity (AIO).

Rauseo, Louise and Jacqueline Wasilewski (1989). *Report to the Van Ameringen Foundation on the AIO Family Systems Project, December 23*. Bernalillo, New Mexico: Americans for Indian Opportunity (AIO).

Slater, P. and W. B. Bennis (1990). "Democracy Is Inevitable." Harvard Business Review. 8:5, 167-177.

Warfield, John (1994). *A Science of Generic Design*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

Warfield, John and A. R. Cardenas (1994). *A Handbook of Interactive Management*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

Wasilewski, Jacqueline (2002). "Global Multicultural Dialogue: The Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach (BDA), a Practice that Enables Participatory Democracy." Presentation to the Japanese Institute of Negotiation, November 11.

Weatherford, Jack McIver (1990). *Indian Givers: How the Indians of the Americas Transformed the World*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Zheng, Wei (2002). Unpublished Master's Thesis, Intercultural Interaction Between Japanese Managers and Their Chinese Subordinates: A Qualitative Approach to Japanese Companies Doing Business in Shanghai. Graduate School of Public Administration, International Christian University, Tokyo, Japan.

_____. (In press). "Contrasting Conceptions of Harmony in China and Japan."

_____. (In press). Annotated Bibliography of all Reports on all AIO/OIO/AMO Meetings held using the IM/*Cogniscope*™/TIMS/ILIS™ process since 1985. Bernalillo: Americans for Indian Opportunity (AIO), in press.

Radio:

Said, Edward (2003). Last Lecture – Arab-American Anti-DiscriminationLeague, June 15, 2003, *Democracy Now*. KUNM/NPR, October 20.

Internet:

Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach (BDA) (www.CWALTD.com).

Indigenous Leadership Interaction System (ILIS) (www.aio.org).

The International Society for the Systems Sciences (ISSS) (www.ISSS.org).

The Certificate Program in the Technology of Social Systems Design, Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center in San Francisco (www.saybrook.edu/).

境界を越えた対話のアプローチ（BDA）プロジェクト：背景と現状

＜ 要 約 ＞

ジャクリーヌ・ワシレウスキー

2005 年 2 月初めに ICU は COE 研究活動の一環として、構造化された対話プロセスを主催する。この対話プロセスは日本、中国、韓国、ロシアから 20 ～ 25 人の学生と市民社会の参加者を招いて、何が地域で「良い」社会を形作るかという文脈において北東アジアの人々が直面する課題について討議する。本稿ではこのプロジェクトの発展を解説する。

このプロジェクトは中国とロシアからの二人の ICU の博士課程の学生（曽纓氏とエレナ・コツリナ氏）の博士論文テーマと、アメリカ合衆国における先住者の人々の NPO「先住者の機会のためのアメリカ人団体（American for Indian Opportunity: AIO）」の研究に基づいて開始された。曽氏とコツリナ氏はそれぞれ、日本と中国の文化間交流の歴史と、東シベリアにおけるアイデンティティの継続性について研究している。過去 20 年以上に渡って、AIO は BDA（the Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach）と呼ばれる構造化された対話プロセスの発展に関わってきた。このプロセスは多様な背景を持つ参加者を戦略的な計画と集団的で複雑な問題解決に関与させるために開発されたものである。BDA は三つのルーツを持っている。ギリシャのルーツ（公的な対話の場であるアゴラ *agora* のアイデア）、先住者のルーツ（我々はみな親族であるとのアイデア）、そしてシステム科学のルーツ（人間の対話を支援する情報技術の使用）である。

過去におけるこの対話プロセスの活用は世界中で先住者の指導者の間と、先住者の指導者及び政府の代表者間の建設的な対話を可能にした。それは新しい国際的な先住者の組織である「グローバルな先住性の進展（Advancement of Global Indigeneity: AGI）」の登場と、この新しい（同時にとても古い）概念である先住性（*Indigeneity*）の問題提起を可能にした。この概念は世界中の先住者の人々に共有された根本的な価値に基づ

くものである。

先住性の概念は、文化的に普遍的というよりも、包括的な共通の人間の基準を作り出すことを可能にするダイナミックで、包括的な合理性のための哲学的な枠組みを提供する。それは「分散された民主主義」が自己決定の価値に基づいて共生を形作ることができるようになることを通じて、変化を管理するモデルの基礎を提供する。可能性としては、これは権力関係と政府に対してより深い効果を持つものである。

2 月初めにマオリ族とコマンチ族の人々が ICU の COE BDA プロジェクトの推進に訪れる際、それはアジアに 21 世紀のアゴラを作り出すために BDA と先住性の概念的な基礎を使用する最初のステップとなるだろう。