

The ICU-COE Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach (BDA) Northeast Asian Forum

Jacqueline Wasilewski *

I. Introduction

The background for the ICU-COE Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach (BDA) Project is examined in detail in *The Journal of Social Science* No. 55 (Wasilewski, 2005). But briefly, this project is meant to introduce a computer-assisted, consensus-constructing dialogue process for addressing complex issues to the citizens and future leadership of Northeast Asia.

This dialogue process is the result of two decades of collaboration between Americans for Indian Opportunity (AIO), an indigenous peoples' advocacy organization in the United States, and the International Society for the Systems Sciences (ISSS). This collaboration was the result of the need to create effective forums for the discussion of indigenous peoples' issues which cross many governance boundaries (local, regional, national, and inter-state) and require cooperation across all these boundaries in order to be addressed effectively.

A point of intersection was found between the systems sciences and indigenous ideas about the nature of dialogue. In the words of an AIO handout (2005):

[d]ialogue is not just informally getting together, talking and coming up with a plan. A dialogue helps people in groups have genuine and meaningful conversation, and then channels that energy and wisdom towards something that has never been created before. Our ancestors used traditional systems and protocols to ensure productive dialogue. Americans for Indian Opportunity, after working with tribal people and tribal governments for the past 35 years, has found that true dialogue always follows a set of principles.

* Professor at the Division of International Studies

There are six principles, and these can be arranged into an Influence or Root Cause Map with the root cause listed at the bottom of the chart below.

Influence/Root Cause Map

Participants will understand the relative importance of their ideas only when they compare them with others in the group.

^

Participants become wiser about the meaning of their ideas when they begin to understand how different people's ideas relate.

^

A diversity of points of view is essential when engaging stakeholders in a dialogue for defining and resolving a complex issue.

^

The whole group learns and evolves as each participant sees how their ideas relate to those of others.

^

Every person matters, so it is necessary to protect the autonomy and authenticity of every person's observations.

^

Dialogue must be structured so that participants are not overloaded with too much information.

Other results of this collaboration have been the development of the concept of *Indigeneity* (which is explained at length in Wasilewski, 2005) and the development of a new international indigenous peoples' organization called Advancement of Global Indigeneity (AGI). This first BDA forum in Northeast Asia was, thus, facilitated by two experienced indigenous BDA facilitators, Laura Harris, a Comanche Indian from the United States, and Kate Cherrington, a Maori from New Zealand, both of whom are founding members of AGI. This background also meant that particular attention was paid to the inclusion of indigenous and minority voices in the design of this first Northeast Asian BDA forum.

This article will tell the next part of the BDA Project story:

- 1) the results of the first BDA Forum at ICU in February 2005,
- 2) the results of the follow-up Feedback and Planning Meeting for BDA II in June 2005, and
- 3) the plans for BDA II to be held sometime during Winter Term 2005-2006.

II. Overview of BDA I: February 4-6, 2005

This initial three day meeting at International Christian University (ICU) in Tokyo had **two main objectives**:

- 1) the need to address the issue of how to increase intercultural/boundary-spanning dialogue in Northeast Asia so that members of civil society and their governments can design a regional system that will consistently nurture the most vulnerable members of their communities (children, women, elders, and the small cultures of the region), paying special attention to how this can be done in ways that honor the diverse life styles and histories of the peoples of this region, and
- 2) to introduce the BDA process to the region as a tool for addressing such complex issues.

Twenty **participants** (mostly students) and about 30 **observers** (mostly academics, but including business persons, consultants and other students) gathered to address this issue. The active participants functioning as stakeholders in the dialogue process were from Japan, South Korea, the PRC, Taiwan and Hong Kong, Russia, Uzbekistan and Mongolia. These participants included indigenous people from the region, Ainu from Japan and Evenki from the Buryat Republic in the Russian Federation, as well as participants from various parts of China, including Western China, which has a large number of minority peoples.

The observers were from the above countries, as well as from the United States, Germany, Belgium, South Africa, Myanmar, Canada, and the Netherlands. There were also 16 young professionals, graduate and undergraduate students from New Zealand, Japan, the U.S., Germany, and the Philippines who were familiarizing themselves with and being trained in the BDA process and who functioned as **assistant facilitators** and as **interpreters**.

The four **advisers** to the process were from the United States and Russia, two of whom were indigenous people, La Donna Harris, chairperson of the Board of AIO, a Comanche Indian from the United States, and Darya Petrovna,

head of the Evenki Cultural Center in the Buryat Republic of the Russian Federation (she also functioned as a participant). As noted above, the two **chief facilitators** were indigenous people, one Comanche and one Maori, from the United States and New Zealand, and they were founding members of the indigenous people’s organization, Advancement of Global Indigeneity (AGI).

1. Agenda for BDA I

The agenda for the three day BDA meeting was as follows.

OVERALL PLAN

- Friday** **6:00 Social Session (Pizza Party)**
- Saturday** **9-5:30 Session I (ERB-II #301)**
 6-8:00 Reception, Alumni House
- Sunday** **9-5:30 Session II (ERB-II #301)**
 6:00 Social Session (Optional Dinner at a Local Restaurant)

Friday

- 6:00 p.m. Pizza Party at Professor David Rackham’s House
- Six Principles of Dialogue Exercise (1/2 hour)
- Overview of the Indigenous Leaders Interactive System (1/2 hour)
- Wisdom of our Ancestors (LaDonna Harris)/Complex Issues (Laura Harris)

Saturday

- 9:00 am Opening
- Purpose of the Northeast Asia Forum
- 1. To appreciate the Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach (BDA) for the management of complex issues (through use of the Indigenous Leaders’ Interactive System [ILIS] and the Root Cause Mapping [RCM] software)
- 2. To engage in an interactive experience by designing an action plan for the resolution of a complex issue relevant to the participants
- 3. To experience the process and the products of the BDA
- The issue to be addressed by the Northeast Asia Forum
- How can we increase intercultural/boundary-spanning dialogue in Northeast Asia so that we members of civil society and our governments can design a regional system that will consistently nurture the most vulnerable members of our communities (children, women, elders, the small cultures). How can we do this in ways that honor the diverse life styles and histories of the peoples of our region?*
- 9:30 am Group Self-Introductions
- What do you value most about being a member of your community or culture?*
- 10:30 am Break
- 10:45 am Relaxation Exercise – Focusing mind and energies (Kate Cherrington)
- 11:00 am Definition of the Issues - Identification of the Barriers/Obstacles
- What are the obstacles to intercultural/boundary-spanning dialogue in Northeast Asia?*
- 12:30 pm Lunch
- 2:00 pm Clarification of the Obstacles

3:30 pm	Ranking of Obstacles of Highest Priority
3:45 pm	Break – <i>Maori Dance</i>
4:00 pm	Generation of the Pattern of Influence/Relationship <i>If we (the stakeholders) were able to make progress in addressing “obstacle A” would that significantly improve our ability to address “obstacle B?”</i>
5:30 pm	Adjourn
6:00 pm	Reception in Alumni House – Okinawan Music & Dance

Sunday

9:00 am	Relaxation Exercise
9:15 am	<u>Design for Addressing Issues</u> - Review the Pattern of Influence
9:30 am	Generation of Action Items <i>What actions, if undertaken by the stakeholders, would overcome the system of obstacles in order to create open dialogue among cultures and countries in Northeast Asia?</i>
10:30 am	Break
10:45 am	Clarification of Action Items
11:45 am	Classification of Action Items
12:00 pm	Lunch
1:00 pm	Small Group Discussion – Action Scenarios <i>Which 5-8 Action Items should be acted on first and in what order?</i>
2:00 pm	Small Group Oral Presentations to Whole Group
3:00 pm	Wrap Up Comments <i>Questions, Comments and Reflections</i> <i>Ainu Dance</i>
5:30 pm	Adjourn
6:00 pm	Dinner at a Local Okinawan Restaurant

As can be seen from the above agenda social time is an intrinsic part of the BDA process and is an essential element in the effectiveness of the process in enabling diverse participants to construct consensus around complex issues. There is also attention paid to the energy level of the participants, so that relaxation exercises and other activities (in this case, indigenous peoples' dance practices) are integrated into the sessions to maintain an optimum energy level. In short, much is done to insure that participants encounter each other as full human beings.

2. The BDA Process

Briefly, the BDA process involves a group of participants mutually considering a commonly agreed upon “triggering question” which captures the essence of their central mutual concern. The BDA process ends in the articulation of an Action Plan for addressing the participants' issue of mutual

concern. The process for doing this has nine steps.

(1) Step 1: Gathering Responses

The participants articulate as many responses to the triggering question as they can. These responses are “gathered” simply by going around the room and one by one having participants articulate their responses one at a time with no interruption or discussion until all the responses have been gathered. This goes on until no one has anything else to contribute. As each person speaks their response is entered into the computer and simultaneously displayed for all to see. Each participant can edit his or her own statement after s/he sees it in print.

(2) Step 2: Clarifying the Responses

At this point any of the participants can ask any of the other participants to clarify what they have said. This does not involve debate and argumentation about whether the statement is “right” or “wrong.” Rather this is about understanding exactly what the participant meant when they said what they said. Each of these clarifications are also entered into the computer. This clarification process goes on until all feel they understand what each participant has contributed.

(3) Step 3: Ranking the Responses

In this third step all the responses and their clarifications are printed out so that each participant has a copy. Then, each participant chooses what they believe are the five best ideas generated so far, and they rank these ideas from highest to lowest. These weighted votes are entered into the computer.

(4) Step 4: Generating Patterns of Influence

At this time all ideas that received at least one vote are carried forward into the next stage of the process. In this step all the ideas that received at least one vote are compared with all the other ideas that received at least one vote. This comparison is done in a semantic context, in this case, “If we were

able to make significant progress in addressing idea A would that significantly improve our ability to address idea B?” These comparisons of paired statements are each done twice, A compared to B and B compared to A. This is the most “unnatural” part of the BDA process. It really challenges one’s sense of cognitive consistency. This simple reversal of order of comparison changes the part of the statement on which one focuses, the subject? the predicate? the verb? Because the items have been generated in natural language, different parts of each statement become salient depending on the particular statements to which they are compared and the order of comparison. These small decisions are made by a simple show of hands. On close votes there is a little discussion as to why to vote yes or no. It is in this step that the computer speeds up the consensus-construction process. It can more effectively and efficiently track the multiple lines of inference collectively being generated by the participants as they make these small decisions than can be done by unassisted human minds. The result of this step is an Influence or Root Cause Map (like the one on p.421).

(5) Step 5: Displaying the Influence or Root Cause Map

When the participants are able to see the Root Cause Map, they are able to see the structure of their complex issue, how all its parts fit together. At this point there is often a subtle shift in the dynamics of the room. The group often develops a “team spirit” as they address this collectively generated mutual vision of the issue they are collectively addressing. Participants can also regard this map with normal human vision and suggest changes, additions and corrections (often from ideas that were left behind in Step 4). With a simple majority vote these changes can be made.

(6) Step 6: Generating Action Options

Looking at the Root Cause Map the participants now generate ideas for dealing with this now patterned issue at hand. The same round robin technique used in Step 1 is used in this step to gather ideas for how to deal with the issue.

(7) Step 7: Clarifying the Action Options

The same clarification technique used in Step 2 is used in this step.

(8) Step 8: Creating Action Scenarios

The participants divide into small groups (usually based on function) and create Action Scenarios of 5 to 8 items selected from the Action Options generated in Step 6 and clarified in Step 7. These Scenarios are then shared with the group as a whole.

(9) Step 9: Taking Responsibility for Implementation

The final step consists of integrating the Action Scenarios and determining what the next steps for the participants will be and who will be responsible for what.

Since this first BDA Dialogue had the two purposes of addressing the intercultural dialogue issue in Northeast Asia and of introducing the BDA process to the region, we felt it important to get through all the steps in the process so that participants, observers and facilitators-in-training could experience all the steps. Therefore, we had to cut two steps short, steps number 2 and 4. And we had to address Step 9 in the Feedback and Planning Meeting for Dialogue II later in June (see below).

3. The Triggering Question

In the BDA process the “triggering question” functions as the point around which the dialogue can be constructed. It requires that one or several “brokers” vet the question with all the participants or stakeholders in the dialogue. It was in articulating this “triggering question” that we encountered our first challenge in working across five languages (Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Russian and English) with no one language functioning as an effective language of wider communication. The original wording of the triggering question in English was, “What are the barriers to intercultural/boundary-spanning dialogue in

Northeast Asia?” However, both our Russian and Chinese participants said that when the word, “barrier,” was translated into Russian and Chinese it connoted something that was not amenable to human intervention. After some discussion we substituted the word, “obstacle,” for the word, “barrier.” Obstacle connoted something that was amenable to human intervention, that one could go over, around, under or through it and/or remove it altogether. So, the triggering question became,

What are the obstacles to intercultural/boundary-spanning dialogue in Northeast Asia?

(1) Step 1: Gathering Responses

In response to the Triggering Question the participants generated 78 obstacles as listed in Table 1.

Table 1: List of Obstacles

1. Controversy about economic development of different countries
2. There are no public forums that value diversity
3. There is a controversy about land distribution between the Evenki and the government
4. Lack of information and isolation
5. Controversy about the geographical position of the Russian Far East and the people’s self-identification
6. The nation’s leaders put the highest priority on national interest
7. The imbalance in economic growth among the countries of Northeast Asia
8. Territorial disputes
9. Different historical perspectives
10. Different social systems
11. Because of the lack of national government initiatives, there is a lack of private level exchanges, and rumors may create misperceptions
12. Conflict over historical issues
13. Lack of mutual trust
14. Loss of motivation in making dialogue
15. Lack of positive self-identification
16. Lack of multicultural language
17. Unsettled war in the Korean Peninsula
18. Prejudice and discrimination based on ethnicity
19. Inequity in access to information
20. Being unable to have a long term perspective because of sticking to past memories
21. Religious differences
22. Lack of accountability in governments

23. Difficulties in preserving the cultural heritage of minority populations
24. Inability to accept foreign values
25. Lack of interest about neighboring countries
26. Too much emphasis in education on self-esteem creates a feeling of superiority towards others
27. Different levels of people's civility in Northeast Asia
28. Differences in communication styles
29. Fear of knowing another culture
30. Too many people put the highest priority on individualism
31. Possibility of being brain-washed by government which may or may not be true and correct
32. Lack of common values
33. Occidentalism
34. Dilemma of language abilities and differences
35. Lack of social and political awareness
36. Lack of opportunities for Northeast Asian peoples to meet each other
37. Each government's security policies rely too much on military power
38. Lack of resolution of wartime and colonial oppression
39. Failure to recognize one's role in relationships with others
40. Exclusion of either part of a divided nation from the regional dialogue
41. Suppressed motivation to expose own culture
42. Dependency of minority populations on the federal government and federal policies
43. Poverty of minority populations
44. Wrong interpretation of intercultural values
45. Reliance on inter-governmental relations rather than people to peoples
46. Too much emphasis on nationalism rather than people-ism
47. Different levels of being westernized
48. Ideology of pitting people against each other
49. The fact that different people have grown up with different cultural views and political views
50. Too much ethnocentrism
51. Lack of interdependence
52. Egoism
53. Failure to show the diversity within a country
54. Monocultural viewpoint
55. Lack of competing political force against the conservative force
56. Lack of application of international law
57. Overbearing US influence in the region
58. Inability to have your own opinion without being driven by the majority around you
59. Separatist trends within a country
60. Destruction of ecological niche where indigenous people live
61. Absence of a common enemy
62. Lack of understanding and knowledge of one's own ethnicity and resulting in an feeling of inferiority
63. Difficulty in achieving understanding through language
64. Lack of effort to understand people of other countries
65. Lack of sense of responsibility
66. Double standards
67. Confusion with other arguments' framework
68. Lack of Northeast Asian boom
69. Lack of textbooks and fiction in minority languages
70. Inability to make mutual concessions
71. Much too strict immigration policies, especially in Japan

72. State supported mainstream culture imposition
73. Identity crisis
74. Lack of transportation within the region
75. No apology
76. Busy everyday business prevents thinking about international peace
77. Inability to question authority
78. Lack of exchange of ethnic music of other countries

(2) Step 2: Clarifying the Responses

The next step in the BDA process is to clarify each of the responses. Because of time restrictions only 52 of the 78 responses were clarified. Participants were given the option of clarifying any of the remaining 26 responses that they deemed necessary, but all consented to continue working with the 52 responses that had been clarified.

One example of a clarified response is Number 9, the obstacle, *Different historical perspectives*, which during the clarification was combined with Number 12, the obstacle, *Conflict over historical issues*. The clarification of these items was as follows:

There are different educational systems in different countries. Governments have the responsibility to educate people about their cultures. There is a need to teach people about histories but because of different views and the influence of WWII, every country has a different interpretation about those histories or particular events. There are lots of troubles between nations and if we do not share the same perspectives it creates lots of barriers between each other. The educational system and government policy can help one nation to understand another.

Another clarified response is Number 10, the obstacle, *Different social systems*:

There are two separate major social systems – capitalism and socialism. While encountering problems it will take different solutions because of the different systems. The capitalists may not agree with the socialists. At the same time, the socialists may not think it is appropriate to correct the capitalists. There is a contradiction between socialism and capitalism. I think it is very important to accept both of the systems and not just keep criticizing them.

(3) Step 3: Ranking the Responses

After the clarifications of the 52 obstacles identified in the responses the participants voted on which obstacles had highest priority by selecting five

obstacles and ranking them from highest to lowest priority. Every obstacle that received at least one vote was brought forward into the next step of the process.

The following 11 obstacles were the ones collectively deemed most important (some of the obstacles have been combined):

1. Discrepancies in the economic development of different countries & imbalance in economic growth among the countries of Northeast Asia
2. There are no public spaces that value diversity & the lack of opportunities for Northeast Asians to meet each other
3. Territorial disputes
4. Different historical perspectives & conflict over historical issues
5. Prejudice and discrimination based on ethnicity
6. Being unable to have a long term perspective because of sticking to past memories
7. Religious differences
8. Lack of accountability in governments
9. Differences in communication styles
10. Lack of resolution of wartime and colonial oppression
11. Reliance on inter-governmental relations rather than people to people ties

(4) Step 4: Generating Patterns of Influence and

Step 5: Displaying the Influence/Root Cause Map

These 11 obstacles were collectively organized by the participants through pair-wise comparisons into the following **Influence/Root Cause Map** with Level IV being the root cause:

Influence/Root Cause Map of Obstacles to Intercultural Communication in

Northeast Asia

Level I

Discrepancy in economic development & imbalance in economic growth in Northeast Asia	Unable to have long term perspective because of sticking to past memories	Prejudice & discrimination based on ethnicity	Religious differences
	^	^	^
	^	^	^

Level II

Lack of resolution of war time and colonial oppression	^	^	^
	^	^	^

Level III

^	^	^
^	^	^
Different historical perspectives & conflict over historical issues	^	^

Level IV

^	^
---	---

There are no public spaces/places that value diversity & lack of opportunities for Northeast Asians to meet each other

(5) Step 6: Generating Action Options

In response to the total list of obstacles and to the **Influence/Root Cause Map**, the participants then generated the following 32 actions (see Table 2) which, if taken, could overcome the obstacles to creating dialogue in the Northeast Asian region.

Table 2: List of Actions

1. For each country, governments should have discussions to have an agreement on historical perspectives
2. Enrich empowerment programs for minority people and the oppressed
3. Increase and support student exchanges
4. Increase joint governmental projects for the common interest
5. Establish a media network for the generation between the ages of 20-35 in the region, especially in the cities of Northeast Asia
6. Create a belief in pursuing the benefit of not only one's own nation but also for the benefit of all the people of Northeast Asia
7. Create non-governmental organizations for dialogue in Northeast Asia
8. Provide incentives for people to take part in exchanges
9. Think independently
10. Create an international day of reconciliation
11. Allow people to move freely between countries

12. Encourage cultural exchange
13. Encourage people and governments to take positive attitudes about improving their relationships with others
14. Create a contest for mass media in Northeast Asian countries
15. The need of governmental support
16. Increase the number of exchange students to promote intercultural understanding
17. Nurture Asian leaders and famous people in the world
18. Build many, many more international dormitories
19. Decrease actions that cause political tension that prevent providing investment in public spaces
20. Peoples' efforts to have objective understandings of history
21. Create a fund to support projects which contribute to dialogue in Northeast Asia
22. Have forums founded in international law and mediated by internationally recognized objective parties
23. Learn to accept and appreciate differences
24. Continue to provide lunches for free
25. Continue to have Boundary-spanning Dialogues at ICU
26. Conduct large scale research on the cultures of the people in Northeast Asia
27. Develop more trade and economic cooperation between countries
28. Invite the political leaders of each country to join this project
29. Establish an institution to do more research on the farmers in each country to learn about their cultures
30. Establish a cultural institution to promote the exchange of culture
31. Diversify your interests
32. Know how you are related to other countries' economies

(6) Step 7: Clarifying the Action Options

and

Step 8: Creating Action Scenarios

Finally, after the above actions were clarified using the same process as in Step 2, the participants divided into five national and sub-national groups and developed the following **Action Scenarios**, choosing from 5 to 8 of the above 32 actions to construct their scenarios:

Russian Group

25. Continue to have Boundary-spanning Dialogues at ICU.
3. Increase and support student exchange.
12. Encourage cultural exchange, including the creation of an organization to support such exchanges, ... to create mutual trust.
10. Create an international day of reconciliation.
11. Allow people to move freely between countries ... to not be afraid of "foreigners" – open borders, ban passports – embrace our neighbors.

Japanese Group

9. Think independently ... don't negate being able to be friends with the "enemy."
31. Diversify your interests ... be interested in others.
11. Allow people to move freely between countries.
12. Encourage cultural student exchange ... it can act as an ice breaker. If students have no fear about talking, then they can talk about history.
20. Peoples' efforts to have an objective historical understanding.

Japanese-Ainu Group

25. Continue to have Boundary-spanning Dialogues at ICU.
5. Establish a media network for the 25-35 year old generation in the region, especially in the cities of Northeast Asia, to broaden the dialogue process.
18. Build many, many more international dorms ... to deepen the dialogue.
2. Enrich empowerment programs for minority people and the oppressed.
26. Conduct large scale research on the cultures of the people of Northeast Asia ... bring their data to create an historical consensus.

Chinese Group

3. Increase and support student exchange ... enable people to meet while young ... none of the participants would have been able to participate in this dialogue if they had not been on exchange.
7. Create non-governmental organizations for dialogue in northeast Asia.
28. Invite political leaders to join the project ... although some of our group disagreed with this point as being unrealistic.
1. Each country's government should have discussions to have an agreement on historical perspectives.
11. Allow people to move freely between countries.

Korean-Chinese-Japanese-American Group

4. Increase joint government projects for the common interest ... need government support to allow people to participate.
8. Provide incentives for people to participate ... government approval to

- overcome financial constraints ... to make sure that people join.
2. Enrich empowerment programs for minority people and the oppressed ... e.g., human rights might constitute a common interest project.
 1. Then ... each country's government should have discussions to have an agreement on historical perspectives.
 10. Create an international day of reconciliation.

These Action Scenarios were shared by each of the sub-groups with the group as a whole just before the final social event, the dinner at the Okinawan restaurant. Each participant promised to send in critical feedback about this first dialogue as a whole and expressed interest in continuing with the process into the future.

II. Planning Session for BDA II: June 12, 2005

Thirty of the participants, observers and facilitators of BDA I were able to gather for an afternoon in June to integrate the Action Scenarios using a modified KJ Method and to discuss some of the feedback on BDA I. (The KJ Method is a non-computer assisted, Japanese structured dialogue method for integrating information [Kawakita, 2000.]

1. Integrated Action Scenario for the Future of the BDA Project

The integrated Action Scenario that resulted from the discussions has short term, support, personal and long term goals.

Short Term Goal

I. Continue to Have Dialogues

- Continue having Boundary-spanning Dialogues at ICU (and elsewhere)
- Invite political leaders to join the Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach Project (although some of our participants still disagreed with this point as being unrealistic).

Support Goals

II. Government Support for Dialogues in General

- Each country's government should have discussions in order to have an agreement on historical perspectives.
- Increase the number of joint government projects for the common interest ... need government support to allow people to participate.
- Provide incentives for people to participate to make sure that people join ... need government approval and help to overcome financial constraints.

III. Support for the Inclusion of Minorities in Dialogue and Minorities as a Topic of Discussion

- Fund empowerment programs for minority people and the oppressed ... e.g., human rights might constitute a common interest project in the region.

IV. Support for Cultural Exchange

- Encourage cultural exchange, including the creation of organizations to support such exchanges, ... to create mutual trust.
- Encourage cultural student exchange in particular ... it can act as an ice breaker. If young people have no fear about talking with each other, then they can talk about history.
- Increase and support student exchange ... enable people to meet while young ... none of the participants would have been able to participate in this dialogue if they had not been on exchange.

V. Support for Places of Dialogue

- Build many, many more international dorms ... to deepen dialogue.

VI. Non-governmental and Media Support for Dialogue

- Create non-governmental organizations that support dialogue in Northeast Asia.
- Establish a media network for the 25-35 year old generation in the region ... especially in the cities of Northeast Asia ... to broaden the dialogue process.

Personal/Individual Goals

VII. Qualities, Attitudes and Knowledge to be Enhanced

- Diversify your interests ... be interested in others.
- Think independently ... don't negate being able to be friends with the "enemy".
- Conduct large scale research (at the grassroots level, as well as in the academy) on the cultures of the peoples of Northeast Asia (not just national level culture, but include the multiple cultures of each of the nation states) ... bring the data together and, through dialogue, create a widespread historical consensus.
- People should make an effort to have an objective historical understanding of the region.

Long Term Goals

VIII. The IDR

- Create an International Day of Reconciliation (IDR).

IX. A Borderless East Asia

- Allow people to move freely between countries ... to not be afraid of "foreigners" ... to open borders, ban passports ... to embrace our neighbors.

2. Feedback on BDA I

Written feedback was received from one fifth of the participants and observers and from both of the chief facilitators. Verbal comments were received from all of the participants and about half the observers. These written and verbal comments were used as the basis for formal and informal discussions at the Feedback and Planning Meeting.

For most of the participants it was the first time that they had ever sat down with people from Russia, China, Japan, Korea, Uzbekistan and Mongolia around the same table at the same time to talk about anything. So, this in itself was an interesting experience. Most of the participants found that not having to debate issues was freeing. It gave them more time to think about how to articulate their

own thoughts more clearly, although doing this so that they could be understood across five languages took a lot of time and patience. In fact, most participants were astonished at about how much time it took to truly understand others.

(1) Social Aspects

The participants very much appreciated the social aspects of the BDA process and even made suggestions about how to make these aspects even more effective. One participant, Yuta Suzuki (2005), head of the Japanese team, even wrote his senior thesis on a comparison of the open and structured dialogue processes he had experienced and suggested how to combine the positive aspects of both in order to create an ethos of sharing and cooperation.

Elena Kozoulina, one of the Russian participants, expressed a number of additional needs in the social sphere: 1) broaden understanding of the process before the dialogue starts, 2) overtly address the anxiety in the teams before the process starts, 3) enable the teams to “jam” and get the feel of the other teams more throughout the process, 4) be more conscious about bonding the facilitators and the participants both before and during the process, 5) have short briefings between the facilitators and the teams to address problems the teams might be facing, and 6) figure out ways to maintain connections with the facilitators after the dialogue is over.

(2) Linguistic Issues

Initially we thought that either English or Japanese would function as a language of wider communication since most of the participants were currently residing in Japan in Japanese and/or Japanese/English settings. Even though the first dialogue at ICU benefited from the presence of simultaneous interpreters for Japanese and English, this was not enough. Although this bilingual simultaneous translation did extend the discussions among more participants than would otherwise have been possible, for the discussion of complex issues neither language functioned sufficiently as a language of wider communication.

Sometimes the ideas also had to be conveyed informally through a series of languages, as in translations from Evenki to Russian to English to Chinese. The multilingual participants themselves then had to function as interpreters, but this was too much of a heavy burden to carry out in addition to their own participation in the dialogue.

In BDA II, even though we will not be able to afford to have simultaneous interpretation in five languages, we will have at least informal, community interpreters to carry out this intermediation work, and this will be their sole responsibility. Also, all written materials will be generated in as many of the languages in use as possible, even if informally. This will be quite a challenge.

(3) Participants

Almost all the participants in BDA I requested a greater variety and more knowledgeable participants for subsequent dialogues. Even though we tried to recruit Japanese-Koreans whose families came from both North and South Korea, we were unsuccessful, so there were no Korean-Japanese or North Koreans participating in BDA I. Some participants also recommended including more Japanese minorities besides Ainu, for example, Okinawans. In fact, increased diversity was requested in all demographic categories. So, the next dialogue will recruit more participants beyond the student community.

One new factor for the facilitators was the fact that the students, as students, were not true stakeholders in view of the fact that they had no official responsibilities for implementing any of the ideas they came up with. This was the first time the facilitators had worked with such a group. All their other work had been with true stakeholders in the political sphere. Thus, in working with students, we must be careful to choose those who have the potential of being future leaders in the region, whose intellects, energy and passion will enable them to be truly engaged and to see participation in this dialogic process as a first step in a perhaps lifelong journey.

The participants in BDA I themselves also thought they should have been better prepared on the issues. They suggested it might help to disseminate

more information on the main topic of the dialogue so that the participants could prepare more. One observer suggested the use of some audio visuals to stimulate discussion, e.g., documentary films on Northeast Asian conflicts (WWII, the Korean War, various negotiations, etc.)

On the other hand, in some of the more diverse teams in terms of ethnicity and social role, there were also some age and status differences that needed to be addressed so that the teams could operate smoothly.

Finally, even though there was a process through which observers could participate, there was a request to integrate observers even more rigorously into the process.

(4) Future Dialogues

The next dialogue will not be for “root cause mapping”, but rather for “mapping the historical territory” of the region. In addition to having no functional language of wider communication in the region, many of the participants had no idea about other historical conflicts in the region. They were only familiar with their own dyadic conflicts. At a popular level there seems to be no mutual perception of regional history. So the long term goal is to hold these dialogues in various venues so that *eventually* there might be able to be an International Day of Reconciliation in the region.

One of the observers, Chad Stewart, of a consulting firm called Interconnections, suggested that we look into the Spiral Dynamics concept of “triple loop learning”. He felt the present BDA process engaged in “double loop learning”, but that it would benefit from being able to integrate “triple loop learning” into its process, that is, to combine what we are looking at [content], what we are looking through [context], and what we are looking with [ego-structure and culture-structure].

(5) Diversity of Dialogue Spaces

The final group of feedback statements had to do with having dialogues in different venues, not just at ICU which is so self-consciously “international” and

“peace” oriented. More places of interaction would attract different participants ... artists, activists, politicians, ordinary working people, etc. Although the next dialogue will be at ICU, the next dialogue will also include a virtual aspect on the Internet. Video conferencing was also suggested as a means to maintain the involvement of BDA I participants.

In BDA II it might be possible, however, to have a main Dialogue and then sub-Dialogues to address specific issues in the region, that is, the textbook issue, the abductees, economic relations, freedom of movement, etc. It might be necessary to integrate at least three levels of “recursion” into the next stage of this project in order to get to the core of certain issues.

In any case, in BDA II, it will be very interesting to try to go deeper and deeper, i.e., try to get down to the core issues, while extending the dialogue wider and wider, i.e., including more kinds of people.

3. Video of BDA I

And one last accomplishment of BDA I is that one of ICU’s Rotary Peace Scholar Program participants, Carl Shephard, has made a half hour video of this first dialogue. We will use this video to introduce new participants to the BDA process and, hopefully, this will lessen some of their anxiety as they engage in the process for the first time.

III. Dialogue II at ICU and on the Internet

1. Overall Design

The next dialogue will take place both at ICU and on the Internet. We expect this activity to begin during Winter Term 2005-2006. This will be, as the participants in BDA I suggested, an open space, unstructured dialogue centered around a sharing of historical perspectives in order to create a 360 degree view of the history of the Northeast Asian region. In essence it will be a Multiple Community Regional History Project. It will use a wiki technique (wiki.org) in which the participants will comment on and edit each other’s materials. By

creating both a place of face to face interaction (at ICU) and a place of virtual interaction (on the Internet), we hope to include as many of the first dialogue participants as possible even as the circle of interaction expands to include new participants.

2. Preparation of Participants

Participants in this second round must be willing to do some pre-participation assignments. These will include 1) reflecting on the history they learned in school, 2) reflecting on the history passed down in their families (interview relatives), 3) reflecting on the discussions being carried out currently in the mass media on history, 4) reading at least one of the joint history texts being produced in the region, e.g., the Chinese, Japanese, Korean joint history book produced by Koubunken (www.koubunken.co.jp), and 5) visiting contrastive historical presentation sites, for example, in Japan, the Hiroshima Peace Park and Museum, Yasukuni Shrine, etc. These activities are intended to enable them to share a more rigorous personal perception of history and, therefore, to be more engaged in the process.

3. Support by Information Science Students

To support this expanded dialogue, information science students in the Department of Applied Informatics in the School of Policy Studies at Kwasei Gakuin University, some of whom were observers of BDA I, under the direction of Professor Paul R. Hays, one of the advisers to BDA I, are in the process of constructing a multilingual website which will present the results of the first dialogue and provide a virtual meeting space for further dialogue. Key to this next stage of the project is the recording and posting on-line of the personally generated histories outlined above. By sharing in an open and non-judgmental way the experiences of members of all of the communities, the clash of official histories can be avoided, and communication can begin.

4. Presentation of BDA I Results at the 49th ISSS Conference in Mexico

In addition, the Japanese team leader, Yuta Suzuki, and one of the assistant facilitators, Rotary Peace Scholar, Daniel Sturgeon, went to the 49th annual meeting of the International Society for the Systems Sciences (ISSS) in Cancun, Mexico, from July 1-5, 2005, to present the results of BDA I on a panel with other presenters associated with dialogue projects from all over the world and to interact with the Student Special Interest Group on the Systems Sciences. It is expected that their participation in this meeting will expose them to ideas we can incorporate into the next phase of our own work.

5. Addressing the Linguistic Issues Affecting Internet Implementation

As discussed above a critical issue for our dialogue process is the linguistic diversity of the participants. One of the key points in the BDA is that every participant should understand every idea put forth. At the virtual level of dialogue a truly multilingual site is necessary, although not every bit of information can be provided in every language. Some languages may not even have a writing system. Merely recording a personal history, however, is not enough. It is the sharing of these histories that leads to understanding. Posting these on a web site where they can be accessed with multilingual summaries is one option. Having participants record their histories in at least two languages, Russian and Japanese or English and Korean, for example, may be another possible solution. In any case, various approaches are being discussed and will be tried in order to allow participants to feel comfortable both in the face to face space and in the virtual space.

The goal is to see that the BDA Multiple Community History Project provides a valuable resource for a broad range of real world discussions so that the Project can eventually culminate in an International Day of Reconciliation in the Northeast Asian Region.

References

- Kawakita, J. (2000). *The KJ Method: A Scientific Approach to Problem-solving*. Tokyo: The Kawakita Research Institute.
- Suzuki, Yuta. (2005). *Demosophia – Dialogue and New Democracy in the 21st Century*. Unpublished senior thesis, International Studies, International Christian University, Tokyo, Japan.
- Wasilewski J. (2005). The Boundary-spanning Dialogue Approach (BDA) Project: background and previous outcomes. *International Christian University Social Science Research Institute Journal of Social Science*, 55: 69-94.
- _____. (2005). *Principles of Dialogue Handout*. Bernalillo, New Mexico: Americans for Indian Opportunity.

ICU-COE 境界を越えた対話のアプローチ (BDA) 北東アジア・フォーラム

< 要 約 >

ジャクリーヌ・ワシレウスキー

本稿は「境界を越えた対話」の初めての実践として、2005年2月4日から6日まで、東京の国際基督教大学 (ICU) で行われた会合の経験と成果をまとめたものである。この三日間の会合の目的は、以下の二つである。

- 1) 北東アジアにおける境界を越えた対話をいかに拡大することができるかという問題に取り組むことである。そのことによって、市民社会のメンバーとその政府が地域システムを進展させ、コミュニティにおける最も弱い人びと(子供、女性、老人、また地域の文化的マイノリティなど)が特別に配慮され、地域における多様な暮らしと歴史を尊ぶことが可能となるためである。
- 2) 地域における複雑な問題に対応する手段として、境界を越えた対話のアプローチ (BDA) の展開を紹介するためである。

この対話、BDA においては、17カ国から、20人の参加者と、30人の参観者、4人のアドバイザー、2人の進行まとめ役、16人の訓練中の進行まとめ役が集められた。活発な参加者はこの対話プロセスの中心的な機能として位置づけられ、それらの人びとの出身国は日本、韓国、中華人民共和国、台湾、香港、ロシア、ウズベキスタン、モンゴルであった。これらの参加者の人びとには、日本のアイヌ、ロシア連邦ブリヤート共和国のエヴェンキ族などの先住民がおり、また多くのマイノリティをもつ中国の様々な地域、特に西部の出身者も含まれていた。

2005年6月12日に同じく ICU で、この BDA パート1の評価と次回 BDA パート2の計画審議会が設けられた。BDA パート2は、2005-2006年冬学期に行う予定である。これらの会合は、社会科学ジャーナル 55号に掲載されたワシレウスキーの論説の境

界を越えた対話のアプローチ (BDA) のプロジェクトの実行段階として構成される。

これまでの BDA のプロセスにおいて明らかにされたことは、北東アジアの市民社会のメンバーによって、地域コミュニティの歴史プロジェクトが推進されていくということである。将来、このプロジェクトが地域の和解の日の幕開けとして実を結ぶことを希望するものである。

