



## **CIPSH 2023 TOKYO INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE**

### **Humanities in the Global and Digital Age**

#### **The role of Humanities research traditions and interactions in contemporary society**

Location: Hongo Campus, The University of Tokyo (Aug. 23)

Mita Campus, Keio University (Aug. 24)

The 36th General Assembly of the International Council for Philosophy and Human Sciences (CIPSH) takes place on August 21st and 22nd, 2023 at the Mita Campus, Keio University. Associated to the GA, the international conference takes place following the tradition of the CIPSH-GA.

Humanities have been studied since ancient times and have made significant contributions to human life and society. It is worth recognizing their continuous value for human life and sustainable society in contemporary contexts. The CIPSH 2023 Tokyo International Conference provides a forum to discuss issues in contemporary contexts, focusing on three main themes:

1. Global/world humanities,
2. Humanities and digital science & technology,
3. The role of the scholarly research tradition of humanities in contemporary society.

The Special “BRIDGES” Session takes place as the First Session of the first day. Nine keynotes are devoted to the three main themes. Six roundtable sessions cover topics “New Techno-Humanities,” “Planetary Health Humanities,” “Reinventing Education,” “Art and Creativity,” “Reflectivity and Contemporary Humanities,” and “Exchanges of Goods, People, and Ideas.” The Panel session on Humanity Studies on Disagreement, Communication, and Mutual Understanding. Also takes place.

#### **Table of Contents**

1. Program
2. Organizations and Supporters
3. Session Speaker-Lists and Abstracts Information

# Program

	<b>Wednesday</b> <b>August 23, 2023</b>  <b>Large Room 3 on the 1st floor of</b> <b>International Academic Research</b> <b>Building, Hongo Campus, The</b> <b>University of Tokyo</b>		<b>Thursday</b> <b>August 24, 2023</b>  <b>G-Lab on the 6th floor of the East</b> <b>Building, Mita Campus, Keio</b> <b>University</b>
9:50 am -10:20 am	Welcome Speeches Opening Remarks  Chair: Mitsuhiro Okada (Keio University) Noburu Notomi (Dean of the Faculty of Letters and the Graduate School of Letters, University of Tokyo) Teruo Fujii (President of the University of Tokyo) (Video-message) Yukari Takamura (Vice-President in charge of International Activities, Science Council of Japan) (Video message) Luiz Oosterbeek (President of CIPSH) Ping-chen Hsiung (Secretary General of CIPSH) Satoko Fujiwara (Co-coordinator of the First Day, University of Tokyo)	9:00am -10:00am	<b>Roundtable C</b> Reinventing Education: Learning in the 21 Century  Coordinator: Lincoln Zhenyu Gao Co-chair: William McBride Dongshu Ou  See below for the invited speakers list.
		10:00 am -10:10 am	Coffee Break
10:20 am -11:20 am	<b>Special Panel Session 1: BRIDGES</b> Chair: Luiz Oosterbeek (President of CIPSH) Gabriela Ramos (UNESCO ADG) Steven Hartman (Executive Director of BRIDGES) Yukio Himiyama (IGU) Kazuhiko Takeuchi (President, Institute for Global Environmental Strategies) Fumiko Kasuga (Director of the Future Earth-Japan Global Hub / Professor, Nagasaki Univ.)	10:10 am -11:30 am	<b>Thematic Keynotes</b> The Role of Humanities Research Tradition in Contemporary Society  <b>Keynote 6</b> Yasuo Deguchi (Kyoto University) Title: WE-turn: an Engaging Humanities for the Contemporary Society  <b>Keynote 7</b> Tyrus Miller (Dean of Humanities, University of California, Irvine) Title: One or more worlds? Global humanities, multiple modernities, and dissenting imaginaries
11:20 am -11:30 am	Coffee Break	11:30 am -11:40 am	Coffee Break
11:30 am -12:50 pm	<b>Thematic Keynotes</b> Global/World Humanities  Session chair: Noburu Notomi (Univ. of Tokyo)  <b>Keynote 1</b>  Takahiro Nakajima (Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies in Asia, Univ. of Tokyo)	11:40 am -12:40 pm	<b>Panel Session 2: Humanity Studies on Disagreement, Communication, and Mutual Understanding</b>  Co-chairs: Mitsuhiro Okada (Keio University) Koji Mineshima (Keio University)  See below for the special speaker and the invited panelists.

	<p>Title: Nested Structure of World Philosophy and Local Philosophies</p>		
	<p>Session chair: Satoko Fujiwara (Univ. of Tokyo)</p> <p><b>Keynote 2:</b> Tim Jensen (University of Southern Denmark) Title: Why a scientific study of religions religion education (RE) ought be a must all over the world, irrespective of various state-religion relations</p>		
12:50 pm -14:20 pm	Lunch Break	12:40 pm -14:00 pm	Lunch Break
14:20 pm -15:40 pm	<p><b>Thematic Keynotes</b> Relationship between Humanities and New Digital Science Technology</p> <p>Session chair: Mitsuhiro Okada (Keio University)</p> <p><b>Keynote 3</b> Shin Kawashima (University of Tokyo) Title: Toward human sciences and Asian studies in the newly digitalized period</p> <p><b>Keynote 4</b> (The Keynote in conjunction with the Keynote 3) Masahiro Shimoda (Musashino University) Title: Humanities in the Digital and AI Age: An Asian Lens</p>	14:00 pm - 15:00 pm	<p><b>Roundtable D</b> Art and Creativity: Humanities in the Global and Digital Age</p> <p>Coordinator: Desmond Hui Co-chair: Luisa Migliorati Desmond Hui</p> <p>See below for the invited speaker list.</p>
		15:00 pm -15:10 pm	Coffee Break
15:40 pm -16:20 pm	<p>Session Chair: Deanna Shemek (University of California Irvine)</p> <p><b>Keynote 5</b> David Theo Goldberg (University of California, Irvine) Title: Is AI Changing Us, or Replacing us?</p>	15:10 pm -16:30 pm	<p><b>Thematic Keynotes</b> Global/World Humanities</p> <p><b>Keynote 8</b> Ritsuko Kikusawa (National Museum of Ethology of Japan) Title: Establishing Science for Universal Communication: A Step toward the Society Where No-one is Left Behind</p> <p><b>Keynote 9</b> Chungmin Lee (Seoul National University) Title: Semantic Universals of Fact, Say, or Fiction: Crosslinguistic Factivity Alternation along with Epistemic/Doxastic and</p>

			Preferential/Imaginative Attitudes
16:20pm -16:30pm	Coffee Break	16:30 pm -16:40 pm	Coffee break
16:30 pm -17:30 pm	<b>Roundtable A:</b> New Techno-Humanities: Sustainable Development for Human Community  Coordinator: Peng Qinglong  Chair: Peng Qinglong (Shanghai Jiao Tong University)  Co-Chairs David Theo Goldberg (University of California, Irvine) Zoltan Somhegyi (Karoli Gaspar University of the Reformed Church)  See below for the invited speakers.	16:40 pm -17:40 pm	<b>Roundtable E</b> Reflectivity and Contemporary Humanities  Coordinator: Saulius Geniusas (Chinese University of Hong Kong)  Co-chairs: Saulius Geniusas Philip Buckley  See below for the Invited speakers list.
17:30 pm -18:30 pm	<b>Roundtable B:</b> Planetary Health Humanities  Coordinator: Tony Hsiu-Hsi Chen (National Taiwan University, NTU) Co-chairs: Philip Buckley (Philosophy, McGill University) Tony Hsiu-Hsi Chen  See below for the invited speakers.	17:40 pm -17:50 pm	Coffee break
18:40 pm -19:00 pm	Break time to move to the Reception Place	17:50 pm -18:50 pm	<b>Roundtable F</b> Exchanges of Goods, People, and Ideas: A Global History Perspective  Coordinator: Shui Haigang (Xiamen University) Co-chair: Shui Haigang Torbjörn Lodén  See the invited speakers list below.
19:00 pm	Conference Reception	18:50 pm	Closing

## **Organizations and Supporters**

### **CIPSH 2023 GA & Conference Organizing Committee:**

- **Luiz Oosterbeek** (CIPSH President)
- **Ping-chen Hsiung** (CIPSH Secretary General)
- **Mitsuhiro Okada** (Representative from Keio University Host)
- **Koji Mineshima** (Co-representative from Keio University Host)
- **Masatoshi Nara** (Dean of the Graduate School of Letters, Keio University)

### **CIPSH 2023 GA & Conference Host Institute:**

#### **The Graduate School of Letters, Keio University**

Supported by **General Incorporated Association CIPSH 2023 International Conference Support**

### **Keio University Local Organizing Committee:**

- **Chair: Masatoshi Nara**, Dean of the Graduate School of Letters
- **Members:**  
**Yasuhiro Arahata, Yoshinori Ueeda, Tatsuya Kashiwabata, and Yasushi Hirai**, Professors in the Department of Philosophy  
**Senji Tanaka and Koji Mineshima**, Associate Professors in the Department of Philosophy  
**Mitsuhiro Okada**, Professor Emeritus and Executive Supervisor of the Committee

The Local Executive Sub-Committee under the Keio University Local Organizing Committee: Takayuki Amamoto, Koji Mineshima, Mitsuhiro Okada, Kentaro Ozeki

### **Coordinators of the Hongo Campus Day, University of Tokyo:**

- **Noburu Notomi**, Dean of the Faculty of Letters and the Graduate School of Letters, University of Tokyo
- **Satoko Fujiwara**, Professor in the Department of Religious Studies, University of Tokyo

---

**The GA and Conference is organized in cooperation with/partially supported by the fundings from the following:**

- **CIPSH Chair Program at McGill University**
- **The Society of Philosophy, University of Tokyo**
- **East Asian Academy for New Liberal Arts, University of Tokyo (EAA)**
- **Japan Federation of Societies for the Study of Religions (JFSSR)**
- **JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Transformative Research Areas 23H04852**
- **Mita Philosophy Society, Keio University**
- **JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research - Promotion of Joint International Research 19KK0006**

1. ABSTRACTS OF KEYNOTE SPEAKERS .....	7
Keynote 1 .....	7
Keynote 2 .....	9
Keynote 3 .....	10
Keynote 4 .....	11
Keynote 5 .....	12
Keynote 6 .....	13
Keynote 7 .....	14
Keynote 8 .....	15
Keynote 9 .....	17
2. ABSTRACTS OF PANELS.....	19
Panel 1 on “BRIDGES” .....	19
Panel 2 on “Disagreement” .....	20
3. ABSTRACTS OF ROUNDTABLES .....	26
Roundtable A: New Techno-Humanities : Sustainable Development for Human Community .....	26
Roundtable B: Planetary Health Humanities .....	28
Roundtable C: Reinventing Education: Learning in the 21 Century.....	31
Roundtable D: Arts and Creativity: Humanities in the Global and Digital Age — the role of Humanities research traditions and interactions in contemporary society.....	35
Roundtable E: Reflectivity and Contemporary Humanities .....	36
Roundtable F: Exchanges of Goods, People, and Ideas: A Global History Perspective.....	39

## 1. Abstracts of Keynote Speakers

### Keynote 1

CIPSH: Global/World Humanities

#### Nested Structure of World Philosophy and Local Philosophies

Takahiro Nakajima (University of Tokyo)

Abstract:

There have been many challenging attempts at world literature and global history in the humanities. Why on earth are similar attempts not being made in philosophy? This question was the background of the philosophical movement we started about five years ago called “World Philosophy.” For example, in cultural anthropology, the one-sided and Western-centered view of the observer has already been severely criticized by the indigenous peoples who were regarded as the “object” of observation in the latter half of the 20th century. We should not forget that cultural studies and feminism brought a new vocabulary to the humanities, criticizing the political and social power to marginalize some particular people and women. It is also important to note that, although not easy to translate into English, psychiatric discourse has developed mainly in Japan as “self-directed studies,” in which people with mental disorders describe themselves. In a word, the restoration of the “right of discourse” has made great progress in the humanities and related sciences.

Philosophy, however, has lagged far behind such developments. Although it was already clear that its discourse was Western-centric, it has consciously or unconsciously deprived non-Western indigenous thoughts of their “right of discourse” by claiming that what it is trying to express is universal.

Therefore, we have opened the horizon of “world philosophy” and have come to hope that non-Western indigenous thoughts will be reworked as something that contributes to a new universal and circulated on a global, or rather, a planetary scale. “World philosophy” is not, as it once claimed, a collection of local philosophies in the world. Rather, it focuses on the global circulation of concepts and how they have been transformed and forged, and to hope that such possibilities will open up in the near future. In this context, my specialty, “Chinese philosophy,” has also been subjected to the challenge of reading in such a way as to open it up to new universals. For example, in China today, there is much debate over the old concept of “all under heaven [*tian*],” but if this is merely an attempt to glorify the *Chinese* universal, it will only repeat the same mistake that Japan made in the prewar period when it sought to “overcome modernity.” If, on the contrary, the discussion on “all under heaven” reaches the refinement of the concept of universality itself, it will present anew the significance of universality for philosophy.

In recent years, I myself have been advocating the concept of human co-becoming in place of the concept of human being. This is not an onto-theological framework of being in the West, but a new framework of becoming human together with others. However, it is also a modern reinterpretation of the old concept of “benevolence [*ren*],” an attempt to re-activate the old concept.

It is important to note the fact that world philosophy and Chinese philosophy are intertwined in a nested

structure. From this starting point, we hope to weave together a new planetary thinking.



## Keynote 2

Why a scientific study of religions religion education (RE) ought be a must all over the world, irrespective of various state-religion relations

Tim Jensen (University of Southern Denmark)

This paper formulates in a programmatic and normative, yet qualified form, key cultural and historical reasons why a scientific, study-of-religions, based knowledge of religion/s past and present ought be a must in any public, state driven, school curriculum, - no matter if the state in question can be characterized as secular or not.

The key arguments are: if scientifically founded knowledge in general is considered a cultural and positive value, and if scientifically founded knowledge of and approaches to humankind, culture, society, and history (and evolution) is considered equally valuable, then scientifically founded knowledge of and approaches to religion(s) must also be considered valuable. This is not least because what is called religion and religions arguably are important human, cultural, social, and historical phenomena. This 'something' called religion(s), however, is not self-explanatory, not something that has fallen from the sky or been created by some divine being. No, 'it' is, apart from also being an analytical/theoretical term and tool, a human, social and historical phenomenon that can be researched, analyzed, interpreted, and explained, and the scholarly research can without any problems be 'translated' into teaching in school. Teaching about religion from a study-of-religion(s) perspective. The study of religion can and must be pursued by scholars at public university departments, preferably at study-of-religion/s departments, but it must also be shared with the public at large and not kept as a 'professional secret' among scholars within the academia. For a state to make sure that knowledge about religion and religions, past and present, is disseminated to the citizens, the state ought to use its public schools and institute and support a study-of-religion(s) based RE as a compulsory and totally normal school subject, next to all the others offered to pupils in the public school. In this way the state provides the possibility for having a second-order analytical-critical discourse on religion next to religious (or anti-religious) discourses, something of importance for the well-being of an open, pluralist democratic society. Moreover, the RE thus offered can help provide citizens at large as well as professional and civil servants with a general education ('Allgemeinbildung') as well as knowledge useful for a qualified execution of their particular professions.

### **Keynote 3**

#### Relationship between Humanities and New Digital Science Technology

Toward human sciences and Asian studies in the newly digitalized period

Shin Kawashima

(The University of Tokyo)

This presentation introduces the proposal of the branch of Asian Studies and relationship with Asia, Science Council of Japan (SCJ) that was launched in 2017. The Science Council of Japan (The SCJ) is the representative organization of Japanese scientist community ranging over all fields of sciences subsuming humanities, social sciences, life sciences, natural sciences, and engineering. One of the main role of this organization is to make policy recommendation on academic advancement to the government. The department Asian studies and Relations with Asia, belong to the committees, linguistics, literature, philosophy, history, and area studies committee of SCJ, discusses the relationship between Asian studies and the formation of digitalized academic infrastructure. In 2017, this department launches the proposal titled “toward human sciences and Asian studies in the newly digitalized period”. I join the process of making draft of this proposal. The CIPSH 2023 is held in Asia and proposes “the Relationship between Humanities and new digitalized Technology” as one of the main topic. This proposal insists that we are faced with new challenge under “newly digitalized period”. Recently we changed the style of research because we can use the convenient academic digital public goods including meta-data, database, e-journal and so on, has been built and so on. However, such digitalization causes a series of problems, tasks, and challenges. This presentation shows the problems caused by digitalization and way of solution and introduces specific problems in Japan. So, I think it’s good opportunity to share the contents of this proposal to make discussion with your excellent participants on it. Our department and myself welcome your comments and advices.

Keywords: equality and inequality of accessibility the data base, English and local language, arbitrariness and objectiveness, academic freedom, politics and humanities, and Asianization of Asian studies

## **Keynote 4**

### Relationship between Humanities and New Digital Science Technology

#### Humanities in the Digital and AI Age: An Asian Lens

Masahiro Shimoda (Musashino University)

The advent of the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) revolution, which burgeoned in the 1990s, has profoundly reshaped numerous scientific domains. It has transitioned the entire research continuum into a digitally-focused academic milieu, encompassing everything from data acquisition and categorization to the dissemination of research outcomes. Contrastingly, the humanities, particularly in the context of Japan, have exhibited a more measured assimilation into this digital paradigm. The overarching consensus on the trajectory of digital integration within the humanities remains somewhat nebulous in the region. A predominant impediment to this transformative journey is the perception among humanities scholars. They often delegate the construction of a digital academic infrastructure to domains like informatics and information engineering, thus sidelining the intrinsic humanities challenges that lie within this spectrum. The present imperative is to re-evaluate the foundational prerequisites of humanities in light of media evolution, with the contention that only humanities professionals can aptly address these emerging challenges.

This presentation aims to elucidate latent challenges within the humanities, historically tethered to paper-based mediums, and delineate the criteria for anchoring the humanities in a digitally-augmented academic landscape, inclusive of artificial intelligence. To this end, we present a comprehensive case study spanning three decades in the realm of Buddhist studies. This area has been at the forefront of digital material conversion pivotal to its specialization. By investigating humanities research from an Eastern perspective, we not only underscore the distinctiveness of humanities scholarship (as juxtaposed against natural sciences and certain social sciences modeled after them) but also illuminate the prospective avenues for the humanities catalyzed by the confluence of Western and Eastern intellectual traditions.

## **Keynote 5**

Is AI Changing Us, or Replacing us?

David Theo Goldberg

A discussion of the developments in algorithmic capacity and AI, and the technologies they drive, from the early 1990s to the present. The discussion will conclude with consideration of the challenges- ontological, ethical, social, political-that these developments pose and how effectively to respond to them.

The lecture will discuss the emergence of AI and its social impacts in the context of the arc of digital developments and transformations from the early 1990s to our current moment. We will address whether AI is changing human practices in and relation to the world-whether it is changing us? Or whether AI-driven technology is actually replacing human beings in key ways?

## Keynote 6

WE-turn: an Engaging Humanities for the Contemporary Society

Yasuo DEGUCHI (Kyoto University)

This talk outlines We-turn, a new philosophy from East Asia that does not merely interpret the world but engages with it. The We-turn is a shift of agent, subject, or unit of action, self, life, responsibility, rights, justice, goodness, freedom, and so on. It is based on two observations of the human individual or 'I': the first and second incapability theses. The first thesis is about the incapability of single action, which claims that no 'I' can do any somatic action alone. The second one is of the incapability of full control of other agents, which asserts that no 'I' can fully control any other agents. These two theses are contemporary philosophical reactivations of East Asian traditional thoughts on 'true self' and 'holy fools'. Questions to be raised include how to avoid a bad 'We', say a totalitarian 'We', and how to build a good 'We' that comprises both human and artificial persons such as advanced sorts of robots and AI. This talk also envisions We-society which is based on the We-turn as an alternative to the modern Western one. But it doesn't purport to replace the latter with the former but aims for a multi-layered society where they can coexist as viable options.

## Keynote 7

CIPSH: Global/World Humanities

"One or more worlds? Global humanities, multiple modernities, and dissenting imaginaries" (Tyrus Miller)

My panel contribution will focus on the notion of the global in global humanities, by highlighting three critical points of theoretical and practical debate. First, I will consider the concept of modernity (or modernities) thought to underlie the conception of the global at stake in the discussion, ranging from Fredric Jameson's positing of a "single modernity" (as the title of one of his books has it) to theories of multiple and alternative modernities articulated by others. Second, I will consider the relation of the idea of the global to the conception of "world" (or "worlds") as it has figured in humanities disciplines such as world literature, world history, world art history, and philosophy (phenomenological and existential "worlds" and "worlding," "life-worlds," "possible worlds," "worldmaking," etc.). Lastly, and relevant to the symbolic productions that make up the characteristic objects of humanities studies, I will consider cultural productions as "ways of worldmaking," suggesting that global humanities should be conceived as a space encompassing plural, symbolically constructed, and often dissensual worlds.

BIO: Tyrus Miller is Dean of the School of Humanities and Professor of Art History and English at the University of California, Irvine. He is author of *Late Modernism: Politics, Fiction, and the Arts Between the World Wars* (U of California P, 1999); *Singular Examples: Artistic Politics and the Neo-Avant-Garde* (Northwestern UP, 2009); *Time Images: Alternative Temporalities in 20th-Century Theory, History, and Art* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009); *Modernism and the Frankfurt School* (Edinburgh UP, 2014); and *Georg Lukacs and Critical Theory: Aesthetics; History, Utopia* (Edinburgh UP, 2022). He is the editor of *Given World and Time: Temporalities in Context* (Central European UP, 2008) and *A Cambridge Companion to Wyndham Lewis* (Cambridge UP, 2016). He is the translator/editor of György Lukacs, *The Culture of People's Democracy: Hungarian Essays on Literature, Art, and Democratic Transition* (Brill, 2012) and series co-editor of Brill's Lukacs Library series.

## **Keynote 8**

Global/World Humanities

### **Establishing Science for Universal Communication: A Step toward the Society Where “No One is Left Behind”**

**KIKUSAWA Ritsuko**

(National Museum of Ethnology, Japan  
and The Graduate University for Advanced Studies, Japan)

#### **Abstract**

In this presentation, I will propose the idea of “universal communication,” and what I consider are inevitable for establishing the future society where everyone is integrated.

The foundation of communication in human society is language. Language is an efficient tool for information-sharing over space and time. With the development of technology, it may appear that even communicating across different languages is now becoming so easy for everyone.

However, there are those who are left out, the fact which becomes obvious only when, for example, a natural disaster hits and people need to be evacuated. It is commonly recognized among Deaf people that those who are hearing-impaired are in far more danger than the others, since the alarm, notifying emergency and how to evacuate firsthand, is commonly by sound only. It is important to be aware that this situation is in fact the everyday affair for the so-called mentally and physically disabled.

In many societies, efforts are being undertaken to make community “barrier-free.” In such efforts, a “disability,” or, the difference from the majority of the population is identified, and supports are provided to make up the “inconvenience.” This is a good starting point, however, I consider is not our final goal. I propose that “universal communication” is what we need to aim at.

The notion “universal communication” is different from “information barrier-free” in the following points. First, it assumes bidirectional communication. Everyone needs to both receive and send out information equally, and the society needs to be equipped with channels for that. Second, it presumes conflicts of interest. With the channels equipped for people with different needs, it is foreseen that conflicts among the needs will occur. Having knowledge as to how to solve such conflicts will be the sign of being a matured society. In my presentation, examples of specific cases of potential conflicts and possible solutions will be described, based on my experience with those who are “communication impaired” in the present society.

Universal society is not where the minorities are included, but where everyone has the same value and information mobility. Engineering technology plays an important role, however, I believe that what will form the foundation of it is peoples’ awareness and willingness to accept diversity and the shared

knowledge as to how to resolve conflicts to work together. Such society will be prepared to accept everyone when his/her needs change as a result of aging, accidents and physical problems. I hope my presentation will provide a step toward a better future of the human being.



## Keynote 9

Keynote on Global/World Humanities

Semantic Universals of Fact, Say, or Fiction: Crosslinguistic Factivity Alternation along with Epistemic/Doxastic and Preferential/Imaginative Attitudes

Chungmin Lee (Seoul National University, National Academy of Sciences-ROK)

Abstract:

The use of epistemic attitude predicates like ‘know’ or ‘remember’ typically entails the factivity of their proper complement clause, where the complement is headed by a covert/overt FACT (Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1972). However, if the complement clause ends in a SAY/REPORT C(complementizer) as in Altaic or a nominal SAY heads the complement (as proposed for SAY/doxastic verbs in English by Kratzer 2013), then factive presupposition can be cancelled. Thus, factivity alternation for epistemic predicates is yielded. The non-factive reading is like ‘believe with some evidence that.’ This talk presents different types of cross-linguistic factivity alternation, mainly the Altaic type, the English (Indo-European) type, and the Chinese type.

The Altaic type factivity alternation depends on complement (case) endings, where syntactic factors like the choice of FACT nominalizers vs. SAY complementizers are crucial for factivity alternation. In the English type, propositional operators such as negation, interrogative, conditional, modal, and *before*, and contextual denial with *but* and *not* are instead utilized. For example, *Bush doesn’t know that Putin is honest*, in its non-factive reading, Putin may not be honest. In languages like Chinese, where factivity alternation in epistemic predicates such as *zhidao* ‘know’ is highly restricted, the focus position is still a crucial factor leading to factivity alternation in the use of *jide* ‘remember.’

I report three findings relevant: First, Korean and Japanese have two distinct kinds of fact: external ‘fact’ with *-ta-nun kes* (K) and *-iu-koto* (J) both involving SAY under the ProFactNounn *kes/koto* (The Earth turns round – external) and internal ‘fact’ with *-nun kes* in K and *koto* in J with no SAY but personal perception involved, as grammatically distinguished (Wittgenstein earlier said a child’s ‘I know that the Earth turns round’ actually means ‘I **learned** that the Earth turns round’ in English). Second, the head nominal and its complement are consistent in factivity: (1) *Mia knows the rumor that Ken kissed Ava*. Because *the rumor* is non-factive, *that Ken kissed Ava* is non-factive. All head nouns except *the fact* are non-factive. Therefore, Vendler’s paradox about why *that* clause as the object of *know* is not presupposed is easily resolved. The third finding of mine is that the preferential *whether* is equivalent to expletive negation. The polar interrogative complementizer *whether* is initially for rogative verbs such as *know* but not *believe*. Its complement P (or not P) is presupposed truth-wise. However, preferential [or positively biased] attitude predicates such as *think*, *believe*, *hope*, and *fear* also occur with *whether* (White 2021). My finding is that this unusual, psychological use of *whether* in English is equivalent to the expletive negation phenomenon in Korean and Japanese. (1K) *Mia-nun [caki thim-i iki-ci **anh**-ul-kka] sayngkakha-n-ta/kitaiha-n-ta*. (2J) *Mia-wa [jibun no chimu ga kata-nai*

*ka to*] *omou/kitai-suru* ‘Mia thinks/expects whether her team will win.’ (If the complement verb is disadvantageous as ‘lose,’ then the higher embedding predicate must be ‘fear,’ not ‘expect/hope.’). The content of complement is determining.

The counter-factive attitude predicate *imagine* rarely takes any real-world factive complements. It typically takes the *that* complement clause, which I take to be an unusual SAY-head reportative complement. It reports the imaginer’s creative thinking. *Imagine* can take *whether* but with future/modal but not past, cross-linguistically. The predicate *dream* is similar in not dealing with any real-world facts. *Na-nun Brigitte Barudot-wa kissu-ha-nun kkwum-ul kkwu-ess-ta* ‘I dreamt a dream in which I kissed Brigitte Bardot.’ A cognate object is used and the tense is a constant kind used with stage/scene/image, originated from the present. Thus, *imagine* must be based on the ‘parasitic’ (Grice, Liefke) or rather creative use of language like a metaphor, which associates two unrelated things or propositions.

We can establish semantic universals with FACT-headed complements (equivalently ProFactNoun *kes/koto* in K/J) as presupposed, as opposed to SAY-C complements as non-factive to explain facticity alternation for epistemic attitude predicates (and the same SAY-C for doxastic predicates) (at times *imagine* as well to report ‘parasitic’/creative complements). A non-typical use of *whether* complementizer is for a psychologically biased use (departing from its original logical use), equivalent to expletive negation in Korean, Japanese, and French.

## 2. Abstracts of Panels

### Panel 1 on “BRIDGES”

SPECIAL SESSION CIPSH/UNESCO: LAUNCHING THE PROGRAMME BRIDGES (Luiz)

(proposal)

Rationale

Between 2015 and 2017 UNESCO, with the support of the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, undertook a project on "Broadening the concept of sustainability science"<sup>7</sup>. This project engaged, since 2016, several members of CIPSH and it finally led to an outcome document, approved by the General Assembly of Unesco in 2017, with UNESCO Guidelines on Sustainability Science in Research and Education.

Following this and the World Humanities Conference, conveyed by CIPSH and UNESCO in 2017, CIPSH took the initiative to promote a reflection, in 2019, on what should be possible steps for UNESCO to take to resume the centrality of Humanities in the public sphere and academia. The recommendation was to establish a Humanities driven programme of UNESCO and that such programme focused sustainability as perceived from such perspective (as the above mentioned Guidelines already acknowledged). This led to propose the programme BRIDGES, that was approved by the Intergovernmental Council of the programme MOST (Management of Social Transformations) of UNESCO, in March 2021.

The programme enters in 2023 in the stage of operationalization, and it makes all the sense to have a major momentum during the CIPSH General Assembly and Conference, at Keio University.

BRIDGES

The objective of BRIDGES is to foster sustainability science as a renewed, integrated approach that builds from the Humanities, encompassing the Social and Natural sciences, the Arts and other knowledge domains, through a process of co-design and co-construction that values the relevance of critical reasoning. BRIDGES is a coalition led by UNESCO, in which CIPSH as a permanent seat in the governing body, that defined itself as follows:

- 1) We are humanities-centered but not limited to the humanities. We value contextualized approaches, diversity, contradiction and robust understandings of sustainability challenges.
- 2) We understand the Earth not solely as a planetary system, nor as a reservoir of resources, but as a web of meanings and interactions that is inherently multilayered and pluralistic.
- 3) We are committed to a critical understanding of sustainability that emphasizes the diversity of its subjects,

objects and timelines.

4) We will work to establish a world of new relationships, based on dialogue and co-design, among the co-inhabitants of the Earth.

5) We are committed to an ethical approach to resource mobilization and use.

This programme offers a novel opportunity for all the Humanities to stand at the core of a crucial debate in contemporary societies, bringing a mid and long term scale of reasoning into what is too often presented as a series of short term needs alone.

#### The session

This will be a 90 minute session, including 45 minutes of initial addresses and 45 minutes of discussion. The purpose is not to exhaust the discussion (time being too short) but to raise awareness, also possible doubts and cautions to consider, and to contribute for a road map of implementation in which all member organizations of CIPSH can play a central part.

#### Participants (preliminary)

Confirmed initial speakers (5 to 7 minutes each):

- Gabriela Ramos - ADG Unesco and chair of the programme
- Luiz Oosterbeek
- Steven Hartmann, Executive Director of BRIDGES
- Yukio Himiyama, Past-President of the International Geographic Union and delegate to CIPSH GA
- Fumiko Kasuga, Director of the Future Earth-Japan Global Hub / Professor, Nagasaki University

#### To be invited

- Kazuhiko Takeuchi (chair of the Unesco project between 2015 and 2017)

## **Panel 2 on “Disagreement”**

### **On Humanity Studies on “Disagreement, Communication, and Mutual Understanding”**

Coordinator and Co-chair: Mitsuhiro Okada (Keio University)

Co-chair: Koji Mineshima (Keio University)

Prof. Lim Jie-Hyun (Sogang University) Special speaker

Prof. Emmanuel Picavet (Université Paris 1 Sorbonne-Phanthéon)

Prof. Yasuo Deguchi (Kyoto University)

Prof. Ritsuko Kikusawa (National Museum of Ethnology of Japan)

Prof. Tim Jensen (University of Southern Denmark)

Humanity studies have contributed to enhancing communication and fostering understanding among individuals and societies. As we navigate the new era of global communication and digital networking, it is crucial for humanity studies to play a role in promoting mutual understanding and preventing misunderstandings. With the advancement of globalization and the growing presence of multicultural and multilingual communities, embracing diversity has become indispensable in various aspects. However, the emergence of the new era of global communication has also brought forth numerous challenges that impede mutual understanding. For instance, the proliferation of AI-generated fake news images through the global communication network can significantly impact people's perspectives and decisions. Additionally, it is crucial to consider the impact of the internet and the new AI environment within these discussions, including the issue of providing fair information.

Through these studies, it is important to engage in discussions regarding communication for mutual understanding. This involves examining the challenges of understanding disagreements, compromising, and incorporating philosophical, linguistic, and historical research, including specific case studies. Furthermore, it is necessary to discuss challenges related to communication in a global, multilingual society, including sign language, and to identify various issues concerning disagreement, communication, and mutual understanding, ultimately contributing to the goal of embracing diversity of in line with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

To address these issues, we propose focusing on the study of "disagreement" as a foundation for understanding communication and promoting mutual understanding. Although disagreements have been explored in various humanities fields, the explicit use of the term as a subject of study is relatively recent, as seen in its inclusion in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy in 2018.

By examining the topic of "disagreement," this panel aims to provide new insights into communication for mutual understanding. Disagreement inherently requires some underlying agreements in order for individuals to engage in disagreement. These underlying agreements can be linguistic, related to reasoning and logical inference, or based on one's fundamental beliefs. It is essential to discuss disagreements at such fundamental levels of communication. Additionally, we will address crucial questions such as how to find agreement within disagreement and how to facilitate compromise in the process.

We intend to engage in interdisciplinary discussions on the topic of "disagreement" in relation to achieving "mutual understanding." Our aim is to explore this subject at various levels, ranging from foundational research in philosophy and logic to real-life examples and applications. By taking an interdisciplinary approach, we hope to gain comprehensive insights into the nature of disagreement and its role in fostering mutual understanding.

.

#### References:

M. Tersman (2022), Folke, "Moral Disagreement", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2022 Edition), Edward N. Zalta & Uri Nodelman (eds.)

URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2022/entries/disagreement-moral/>

Frances, Bryan and Jonathan Matheson (2019), "Disagreement", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.)

URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/disagreement/>

R. John Pittard (2019) Religious disagreement, *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*

URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/disagreement/>.

MacFarlane, John (2020) *Philosophical Logic*, Routledge.

Lim Jie-Hyun (2022) *Victim Consciousness Nationalism: The 'War of Memories' Crossing Borders* (Tokyo: Toyo Keizai Shinpo) (In Japanese)

### **Abstract: Self-presentation and conflict**

Emmanuel Picavet (Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne)

Some of the most important issues in war and peace, as well as in negotiation and compromise, raise questions of collective intelligence. They lead to an interest in forms of reasoning, expertise and judgment, but also in self-presentation and the interplay of perceptions in a dialogue characterized by disagreement.

In a way, our understanding of attitudes to conflict remains faithful to the balancing that began in the 17th century, between the pragmatism of war preparation and ideas about organized peace, between the theses of the Duke of Rohan and those of the Abbot of Saint-Pierre.

On one side, war was deemed inevitable to settle quarrels, and treaties should always be handled with caution; peace could only come from a balance of power and alliances.

On the other side, despite the weakness of treaties' promises, we should be interested in treaties of a sufficiently solid kind to institute an impartial mechanism capable of replacing war by arbitration, ensuring the maintenance of peace. The decisive alliance between nations can only be that which will make it possible to achieve *this* conquest of civilization.

Ideas of the second type may have seemed to prevail, with the ascendancy taken in practice by the ideas of Immanuel Kant, then by those of his distant intellectual heir, Hans Kelsen, and by the United Nations Charter and the institution of the peacekeeping mechanism associated with the UN Security Council. The use of force may have seemed to be brought close to a collective response mechanism to aggression, in a global peacekeeping instrument.

Shouldn't we be moving closer, at least formally, to the Kantian logic of *freedom and security* guaranteed by the deployment of a binding obstacle to those who would obstruct the exercise of others' freedom?

Such a trend has been of great intellectual and practical importance. However, in our current situation in Europe, for example, "obstructing the obstruction" through an organized mechanism seems close to impossible: the international reaction to aggression consists of helping a Nation to defend itself.

The "overhanging" force of a state no longer appears as a guarantee of the effectiveness of an international mechanism, but as a concrete threat.

For the sake of peace, and to avoid escalation, it is important to highlight the unity of a group of

mobilized countries. This raises the question of what kind of solution should be sought to achieve a situation of peaceful coexistence between nations, and to recreate confidence in the future, despite mistrust of leaders.

The ethic of seeking freedom and independence is in itself a brake on the hopes that the perpetrators of terror may place in terror. In the case of the Ukrainian war, however, it should be noted that it is above all (it seems) a question of repressing the tendency of the population and its leaders to align themselves with the culture, values and interests of states belonging to a "neighboring bloc", namely the NATO-backed European Union.

The prospects for self-presentation and a work on values, meanings and culture should be explored beyond the "influence strategy" that amounts to counteracting other influences, as in the traditional vision of "soft power", first theorized in the USA.

On a deeper level, we need to look at the conditions under which projections into the future can coexist, and thus at the cross-perceptions of the attitudes of the different parties. In circumstances such as those of the war in Ukraine, unity may seem precious, but isn't it useful to block the caricature of a "bloc" whose values are antagonistic to those of another "bloc"? Combating the caricature of "Western unity" also means changing the interpretation that can be given to the tendency to want to "join the West". If it's not a question of joining a "bloc", if it can be viewed as an interest in a very marked and irreducible plurality, it is normally not easily misrepresented as the constitution of an hostile super-power.

A hint (explored in my article for *Filosofia* (Italy), submitted 2023): a peaceful international order is partly shaped by meanings. The rules, values and principles that condition the attribution of meaning to acts are essential to procedures for resolving or overcoming conflicts. Two principles are highlighted in my recent work on this:

Intricacy:

There is an entanglement between the interpretation of norms and the description of the choices that matter with regard to compliance or non-compliance with norms.

Reflexivity:

The contextual observation of our choices by others suggests certain descriptions of these choices, which influence the interpretation of the underlying norms. The agent must take this into account in his/ her own deliberations and this also applies to nations.





### 3. Abstracts of Roundtables

#### **Roundtable A: New Techno-Humanities : Sustainable Development for Human Community**

Coordinator: Prof. Peng Qinglong

Chair:

Prof. Peng Qinglong, Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Co-Chairs

Prof. David Theo Goldberg, University of California

Prof. Zoltan Somhegyi, Karoli Gaspar University of the Reformed Church

Members:

Prof. Harold Sjursen, New York University

Prof. Kim Youngmin, Dongguk University

Prof. Wu Yun, Tongji University

Prof. Sun Xiaocun, School of Humanities, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

Dr. Yang Liu, School of Humanities, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

Technology and humanities are the two sides of the same body in the development of human civilization. Since the 21st century, the Fourth Industrial Revolution led by innovative technologies such as artificial intelligence, Internet of Things, blockchain, life sciences, quantum physics, new energy, new materials, and virtual reality has brought unprecedented changes to human society, and also huge impacts and social contradictions. From climate change to gene editing and public health, many of today's problems must rely on the joint efforts of scholars in the field of humanities, social sciences and natural sciences, and join hands with other social forces to form a global cross-border and interdisciplinary collaborative network.

Science and technology are part of the productive forces - this is *a* basic tenet of Marxism. Yet without the ultimate concern for human existence, technology will often go the opposite way to human survival and interests. As the leader of the technology, Human should lead science and technology to develop in a people-oriented direction, and avoid being swallowed by the torrent of technological development.

The main theme proposed for this roundtable is "New Technology and New Humanities: Sustainable Development for Human Community"<sup>H</sup>. Discussion or debate could focus around the following themes, within the broad frame of the Humanities:

- 1 World Literature, Transmedia Art, Convergence and Intermediality
- 2 The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence
- 3 New Media, Interactive Audiences, and the Virtual. Next Generation Narratives
- 4 Digital Humanities and its Application to Global (Economic) History
- 5 Technology, Science Fiction, Internet Literature and Comparative Literature
- 6 The Humanities and AI

#### Star Lore Across Cultures: Twenty-Eight Mansions of the Yi People of China

SUN Xiaochun and YANG Liu

(School of Humanities, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences)

#### Abstract

The Yi people, an ethnic minority group in China, have a traditional constellation system known as the "Twenty-Eight Mansions" which is used to mark the position of sun, moon, planets and stars. In recent years, scholars have found similarities between the Yi people's "Twenty-Eight Mansions" and the Indian Nakshatra system on the one hand, and the Han Chinese Xiu system on the other. Considering the unique geographical location of the Yi region on the "southern silk road" between China and India, the Yi Twenty-Eight Mansion system might be seen as an intermediate system between the Chinese and the Indian ones. Our investigation of the Yi Twenty-Eight mansions, which includes the identification of the stars and interpretation of the Yi star names, suggests that the Yi Twenty-Eight mansion system contains star lore from remote ancient times, and there may have been exchanges of astronomical knowledge between China and India in ancient times.

## **Roundtable B: Planetary Health Humanities**

Coordinator: Professors Tony Hsiu-Hsi Chen

Chairs:

Professor Philip Buckley

Philosophy, McGill University

Co-chair Professors Tony Hsiu-Hsi Chen

Professor of College of Public Health, National Taiwan University (NTU)/President of International Asian  
Conference on Cancer Screening (IACCS) Network

Members

**Professor Adams Bodomo** ([adams.bodomo@univie.ac.at](mailto:adams.bodomo@univie.ac.at))

University of Ghana

**Professor Junko Kitanaka** ([junko.kitanaka@keio.jp](mailto:junko.kitanaka@keio.jp))

Dept. of Human Sciences, Faculty of Letters/Graduate School of Human Relations, Keio University,  
Mita, Tokyo

**Professor Yonghui Ma** ([yhma@xmu.edu.cn](mailto:yhma@xmu.edu.cn))

School of Medicine, Xiamen University

**Professor Rachel A. Ankeny** ([rachel.ankeney@adelaide.edu.au](mailto:rachel.ankeney@adelaide.edu.au))

University of Adelaide, Australia

Before COVID-19 pandemic, health humanities had been proposed as a new avenue for integrating creative arts and humanities (including literature, visual, and performing arts, films, drama, philosophy and history) into evidence-based studies, medical education and practices for health professionals since 2000. Learning from COVID-19 pandemic that led to calamity including the loss of health and the disruption of social life, health humanities plays an even important role in the viral times of lockdown, quarantine, isolation, viral testing, and unequal delivery of vaccine and anti-viral delivery. By dint of anthropogenic changes on human health and digital

technology it is urgent for health humanities in post-COVID-19 pandemic to synthesize more inter-disciplinary researches to improve the health of human living on the earth under the principle of sustainable development goal (SDG) set up by WHO since 2017 in order to create the new movement of planetary health. The main theme proposed for this roundtable is "planetary health humanities" that links three concepts together including interdisciplinary connections between health humanities, the planetary health movement, and environment humanities. The goal of this theme is to re-story health humanities towards promotion of planetary health and community well-being in post-COVID-19 pandemic era. Following planetary health humanities, several detailed themes, but not limited to these ones, on the comparison before and after COVID-19 pandemic under the umbrella of planetary health humanities are proposed as follows.

1. Global unequal health care delivery issues
2. Global life style (dietary patterns and physical activity) and microbiota changes
3. Anthropocene and viral subjectivities
4. Bioethics integrated with social determinants of health
5. Recovery of international tourism industry
6. community well-being for post-COVID pandemic era

Note that this roundtable of planetary health humanities has followed the 2022 COSPH Denmark conference and three fruitful on-line conference held during COVID-19 pandemic era in 2020 covering the comprehensive fields associated with the global challenge caused by COVID-19. All these contexts have been uploaded on the established website of Health Humanities on "Planetary Health" that has already disseminated the core-value and activities of health humanities across the globe.

Future Avenues for Bioethics: The Need for Interdisciplinarity to Generate Actionable Research

Prof Rachel A. Ankeny, University of Adelaide, Australia

Contemporary approaches to bioethics include more empirical approaches and critical engagement particularly

involving interdisciplinary methods. This talk uses an example of a current Australian project on responsible innovation practices and public engagement in stem cell research and therapeutics (see <https://www.eoar.com.au/>) to explore the potential for new forms of scholarship as well as meaningful interventions using approaches from health humanities. Our project arises from the insight that there is increasing urgency for crafting replicable, open, and trustworthy science and fostering responsible innovation practices in the stem cell domain. This will require researchers and clinicians to be aware of the need to be accountable and actively engage with interested parties including patients. However, many issues in the field are hotly contested, with considerable conflict amongst researchers and practitioners, leaving regulators, funders, publics, and others frustrated and unclear about how to find accurate and reliable information, and how to contribute to shaping the future of this field for the benefit of all Australians. We have an opportunity to provide robust guidance based on interested parties' identification of the main factors that must be addressed to build trust in and to support potential acceptance and uptake of stem cell research and therapies. A key project focus is how to establish equitable distribution methods for publicly funded stem cell lines and processes for setting priorities particularly given recognised health disparities and inequities in Australia due to geography and history. We discuss our ongoing project that uses interdisciplinary methods including conceptual and empirical research to explore the shared values, goals, and priorities of diverse interested parties (including researchers and other experts, industry, patients, regulators, and publics), and how they might be best supported, as a way to assess how health humanities might expand to meet the increasing need for creative and impactful research.

## **Roundtable C: Reinventing Education: Learning in the 21 Century**

Coordinator:

Lincoln Zhenyu Gao

Co-chair:

William McBride

Dongshu Ou

Participants:

Leonard J. Waks

Margaret M. Tillman

Conggen Yan

Zhenyu Gao

Dongshu Ou

Leefong Wong (guest)

Tetsuya KONO (Rikkyo University, Tokyo)

### **Background**

In 2023, with the passing of the COVID-19 pandemic, our world is still at a turning point. Everyone knows that knowledge and learning are the basis for renewal and transformation, and education - the way we organize teaching and learning throughout life - plays a foundational role in the changes of human fate and societies. But global disparities - and a pressing requirement to rethink why, how, what, where, and when we learn — mean that today's education has not yet fulfilled its promise to help us shape peaceful, just, and sustainable futures. Currently, the Russian-Uzbekistan conflict has triggered a new global crisis, which may cause millions of people to starve, push up food prices, and trigger unrest both near and far from the conflict area. More and more people are engaged in public life, but the fabric of civil society and democracy is fraying in many places around the world. Advances in digital communication, artificial intelligence (such as ChatGPT), and biotechnology have great potential to reshape numerous aspects of our lives and education itself, but also raise serious ethical and governance concerns. Many worry that the teaching profession will be replaced by AI in the near future. Therefore, as we face grave risks to the future of humanity and the living planet itself, we must urgently reinvent education

to help us address above common challenges. This act of reinvention means primarily working together to generate new models of learning for the twenty-first century that require the development of key competencies and skills to tackle the complex global challenges ahead and lay solid foundation to the possible success of individuals.

Educators, education ministries and governments, foundations, employers and researchers refer to these abilities as twenty-first century skills, key competencies, higher-order thinking skills, deeper learning outcomes, and complex thinking and communication skills. While debate regarding the competencies and skills learners need to cope with the unforeseen challenges has given rise to a significant body of literature, there is a clear consensus that new approaches to learning must accommodate the characteristics of today's students, become more inclusive, cooperative, participatory and address twenty-first century interdisciplinary or even transdisciplinary themes (Carneiro, 2007). Furthermore, the development of twenty-first century skills should not be delayed or reserved solely for higher-performance students or students with high social-economic background. Instead, it is essential for our educators to support every student to cultivate meta-cognitive competencies and skills from the stages of formal education as early as possible. This is why Matthew Lipman, Gareth Matthews and many other followers constantly advocate the philosophy program aiming to develop children's skills of reasoning, creativity, collaboration and caring, must be incorporated into school curriculum system from an early stage (Lipman, 1980, 1988, 1991, 2003; Matthews, 1982, 1994; Gregory and Laverty, 2018).

### Objectives

This roundtable asks what role learning can play in shaping our education and shared world as we look to future. The presentation from all participants arise out of a persistent global engagement and cooperation process which showed that vast numbers of people - children, youth and adults - are keenly aware that we are connected on this planet and that it is imperative that we work together. People around the world have been already engaged in bringing about prospective changes themselves. This roundtable is integrated with their contributions on specific issues from how to reconstruct learning spaces to the development of Philosophy for Children program across the country and the importance of social and emotional learning in early childhood education, and taps into the real and growing fears about climate change, crises like COVID-19 and regional conflicts, fake news and the digital divide.

In particular, the roundtable proposed here attempts to explore key skills in depth for the reinvention of education in future and highlights several key elements for learning in the twenty-first century including personalization, collaboration, communication, informal learning, productivity and content creation. It also underlines the importance to the twenty-first century workplace of personal skills such as initiative, resilience, responsibility, risk-taking and creativity; social skills such as teamwork, networking, empathy and compassion; and learning skills such as managing, organizing, meta-cognitive skills and 'failing forward'. Through the historical review and reflection, display and discussion of some representative innovative learning models, the roundtable proposes answers to three essential questions on the reinvention of education in twenty-first century: What should we continue doing? What should we decidedly abandon? and What needs to be creatively reimaged? But the proposal here is merely a start, it is more an invitation to think and imagine than a report. These questions about learning need to be taken up and answered in communities, in countries, in schools and kindergartens, in



educational programmes and systems of all sorts - all over the world.

## Conclusions

Reinventing twenty-first century education is about making sure that all learners are prepared to thrive and succeed in a competitive world. Education should prepare learners to tackle collaborative problemsolving scenarios that are persistent and lack clear solutions. Real-world challenges are highly complex, often ill-defined and interdisciplinary in nature, spanning multiple domains (social, economic, political, environmental, legal and ethical). Learners must have opportunities to reflect on their own ideas, hone their analytical skills, strengthen their critical, creative, caring and collaborative thinking capacities, and demonstrate initiative. In particular, the ability to evaluate new inputs and perspectives, build new capacities and strengthen autonomy will be crucial. At the same time, the increased tempo at which new developments are emerging will also demand that learners of all ages recognize the importance of lifelong learning. Re-skilling and updating competencies will enable learners to adapt to new expectations in the twenty-first century workplace and life.

To equip learners to tackle twenty-first century challenges and pressures, schools must adopt curricula that are comprehensive yet flexible, centre on learners and the birth of their wonderful ideas, rather than on the specific contents that constitute academic subjects. There is a growing need for curricula that are open to learner input, interdisciplinary in focus, and blend informal and formal learning in an effective manner. And curricula must embrace an ecological understanding of humanity that rebalances the way we relate to Earth as a living planet and our singular home. Pedagogical approaches such as participation, group collaboration, personalized learning, teaching for transfer, project- or problem-based learning within real-world life contexts, community of inquiry demonstrated in the Philosophy for Children program, will also be the key to stimulating the growth of key competencies and skills. Through applying these learner-centered pedagogies, individuals will gain insights, understanding, increased capacity and confidence by grappling with meaningful questions and problems.

To realize the dream of the transformation of education, it is essential that everyone be able to participate in the process -children, youth, parents, teachers, researchers, activists, employers, cultural and religious leaders. We have deep, rich, and diverse cultural traditions to build upon. All countries and all people will face consequences if today's learners are not adequately prepared to collaborate and resolve the world's economic, environmental, health, social and political challenges. Every nation and individual can contribute to a global pool of expertise on how best to implement twenty-first century learning. We need to form alliances and build networks both at national and international level in order to overcome hidden and explicit obstacles to reinvent today's education.

## References

- Carneiro, R. 2007. The big picture: Understanding learning and meta-learning challenges. *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 151-172
- Gregory, M.R. & Lavery, MJ. (2018). In community of inquiry with Ann Margaret Sharp: Childhood,

philosophy and education. London and New York: Routledge.

Matthews, G. (1994). *The philosophy of childhood*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Matthews, G. (1982). *The philosophy and the young child*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lipman, M. (1980). *Philosophy in the classroom* (2nd edition). Temple University Press.

Lipman, M. (1988). *Philosophy goes to school*. Temple University Press.

Lipman, M. (1991). *Thinking in education*. Cambridge University Press.

Lipman, M. (2003). *Thinking in education* (2nd edition). Cambridge University Press.

### **Philosophy with Children on Environmental Issues with Local Knowledge**

KONO, Tetsuya (Rikkyo University, Tokyo)

I have long studied philosophy of mind and phenomenological body/mind theory, but my interest in philosophy for/with children over the past decade has led me to practice it in a number of different schools, from kindergarten through high school. In particular, I have been conducting educational activities in connection with environmental education and community development activities, in which children experience the natural environment, culture, and lifestyle of the local community, and then engage in philosophical dialogue. Based on these experiences, I would like to submit three important arguments. One is that dialogue is not only verbal but also corporeal communication, and that the place, the bodily experience of that place, and face-bodily interaction have a great influence on the content of the dialogue itself. Second, while philosophy is often considered to be universal knowledge, deep reflection and discussion of local knowledge have the potential to engender a new philosophy, one that considers the sustainable relationship between the place and one's own existence. Third, children have the right to talk about the future more than any other generation. The future of the earth must be discussed among children, with adults merely serving as potential resources for them to draw on. I believe that local, sustainable living, which fosters bio-cultural diversity through mutual, non-authoritarian dialogue among people, offers a corrective for contemporary society, which has been homogenized by "universal standards" and thereby generated global disparities and conflicts.

## **Roundtable D: Arts and Creativity: Humanities in the Global and Digital Age — the role of Humanities research traditions and interactions in contemporary society**

The Panel on Arts and Creativity will discuss the global and digital impact on arts and creative humanities research and the interactions in contemporary society, in particular the challenges and resulting changes brought by the COVID pandemic. Scholars engaging in the fields of art and design, media communication, art history, language; culture, translation, and philosophy from the Hang Seng University of Hong Kong, the Chinese University, National Taiwan University, University of California at San Diego and Irvine, among others, will participate in the panel as contributors and discussants. Topics include: online performance and exhibitions as new forms of artistic creation and appreciation; digital studio and critique, the social media, Arts Tech, the Meta verse and Meta sense, etc.

Coordinator: Desmond Hui

Co-chair:

Luisa Migliorati

Desmond Hui

Members:

Gilbert Fong, Hang Seng University of Hong Kong

Desmond Hui, Hang Seng University of Hong Kong

Christine Choy, Hang Seng University of Hong Kong

Shen Kuiyi, University of California San Diego

Deanna Shemek, University of California Irvine

## **Roundtable E: Reflectivity and Contemporary Humanities**

Humanities studies are in essence reflections on the human conditions. Contemporary humanities have evolved from narrowly defined-single disciplinary study of one aspect of humanity to a broader concern about how to be more inclusive in considering the interconnectedness of the various human conditions. The old idea of a "Renaissance Man," therefore, may be given a new meaning when scholars of different disciplines get together to reflect upon the human conditions past and present, thus forging a path for a collective consensus to keep the spirit of the Renaissance Man in the effort to plan for the future.

Coordinator:

Saulius Geniusas (Chinese University of Hong Kong)

Phil Buckley

Co-chair:

Saulius Geniusas

Phil Buckley

Panel Member:

Shi, Fuyuan (Taiwan University) \*\*\*

Sam Li-Sheng Chen (Taipei Medical University)

Bacillus Chen-Yang Hsu (College of Public Health, National Taiwan University (NTU)/Director of Taiwan Medical Association of Screening)

Abstracts:

Li, Tiangang: "A Reflection on Admiration to China, From Jesuits to Present"

Since Jesuits landed in China 16th century, a discourse of admiring China were in some degree of domination especially in the West. It was strengthened by 18th century great thinkers of Enlightenment. It was may only Montesquieu took the opposition to be critical to Chinese autocracy. Admiration to China's cultural humanism, political mercy, and Confucianism kindness continued to 20th century when cultural diversity and ulticulturalism more and more popular. Reflection to this kind of admiration in 21st century will be interesting and significant in the time of reflection to last wave of globalization.

Wang, Jie:

The Humanistic Value of Aesthetics in Contemporary China and Its Research Methods (Abstract)

Aesthetics is one of the humanities developed in the period of European Enlightenment. In the process of modernization in Europe and the world, aesthetics is one of the important driving forces to the modernization process. Therefore, in the development of European modern philosophy, aesthetics has always been the basic theme in European modern philosophy.

During the process of modernization of Chinese society, aesthetics has been very important in humanities. In fact, in the process of modernization of Chinese society, aesthetics plays a very complex role. There are some differences between Chinese aesthetics and European aesthetics in terms of development mechanism, dynamic structure and value orientation in the process of modernization of European society. There are both cultural and philosophical reasons for these differences. Therefore, the study on the value and expression mechanism of aesthetics in the Chinese society, focusing on a comparative aesthetic problem instead of an empirical description, which is involving the foundation of anthropology. This is the theoretical framework or theoretical dimension of this paper and the discussion.

### 1、 Anthropological Interpretation of Contemporary Chinese Films

Contemporary Chinese film has provided a theoretically feasible way to study and understand the emotional structure and cultural structure of contemporary China. In recent years, our team has continued to study contemporary Chinese films with the research method of emotional ethnography. We believe that we can analyze the emotional structure of contemporary Chinese society and the cultural structure of contemporary China, we take the analysis of three films *The Gathering of South Railway Station* in 2019 (Diao Yinan), *Changjin Lake* in 2020 (Chen Kaige) and *Full River Red* in 2023 (Zhang Yimou) as examples to analyze and explain the emotional structure and cultural structure of contemporary Chinese society from the perspective of aesthetic anthropology.

### 2、 The Humanistic Value of Aesthetics in Contemporary China

Aesthetics plays a very important role in the development of contemporary Chinese society, from Yan'an during the Anti-Japanese War to the aesthetic discussions in the 1950s and 1960s. Until the "aesthetic fever" in the 1980s, aesthetics has been a very important cultural force in the process of China's social modernization. This article pays special attention to the value and significance of Chinese aesthetics in social life in the past 30 years since the 1990s. Generally, it can be divided into two stages: (1) 1990- 2012. (2) 2012 - present. The two stages have similarities and differences.

### 3、 Reflections on the Methodology of Contemporary Chinese Aesthetics Research

Since the turn of theoretical research titled "Ideologies retreat but scholarship highlights" in 1990, Chinese aesthetics has successively witnessed "controversy and theoretical development of post- practical aesthetics", "controversy and theoretical development of aesthetic ideology", "controversy and theoretical development of aestheticization of daily life", and theoretical development of art anthropology and aesthetic anthropology. It is undoubtedly a very valuable and meaningful theoretical work to make a reflective analysis of these important

contemporary Chinese aesthetic phenomena and analyze the complex relationships between contemporary Chinese aesthetic research and the process of social modernization.

Lim Jie-Hyun: "How to Agree to Disagree in the East Asian Mnemoscape?"

Memory war has disrupted the East Asian mnemoscape. The globalization of memories in the third millennium sharpened the emotional disputes over the issues of comfort women, forced labor, Nanjing massacres, war famine, and other atrocities, etc., in coming to terms with the Japanese imperial past in East Asia. The historical controversy becomes more intensive because it touches on the "ontological security" in the international relations of the East Asian region. Ontological security implies "security as being" more than "security as survival."<sup>7</sup> That explains why emotion-laden words such as glory, fear, suffering, pride, shame, apology, forgiveness, etc., contour the East Asian mnemoscape. What matters is not the historical facts or truth but remembering the past. Historical facts to which all parties can agree cannot solve the conflicts automatically, as many believe. Memory is not a zero-sum game. What a conflict-ridden mnemoscape in East Asia demands is not a unanimous agreement on the memory of the past but a symbiosis of different memories. For a symbiosis of multidirectional memories, we should agree to disagree and leave the mnemospace open to others.

## **Roundtable F: Exchanges of Goods, People, and Ideas: A Global History Perspective**

Coordinator: Shui Haigang (Xiamen University)

Co-chair:

Shui Haigang

Torbjörn Lodén

Members:

Professor Dai Yifeng (Xiamen University) (presented by colleague)

Professor Zhang Kan (Xiamen University) (presented by colleague)

Professor SHUI Haigang (Xiamen University)

Professor CHIU Pengsheng (Shanghai Jiaotong University)

Professor WU Jing (Shanghai University)

Professor Wang, Qingjia Edward (Rowan University)

Professsor Pan Tsung Yi

Commentators:

Professor Takeshi Hamashita (SUN YAT-SEN University)

Professor Ei Murakami (Kyoto University)

### **1. Topic: Exchanges of Goods, People, and Ideas: A Global History Perspective**

This session is aimed at bringing together *a* group of experts to discuss the exchange of goods, people, and ideas across different cultures and civilizations throughout history and their impact on shaping the world as we know it today.

The exchange of goods, people, and ideas has been a key driver of human progress throughout history. In the ancient world, trade routes such as the Silk Road linked cultures and civilizations, allowing for the exchange of goods, people, and ideas. This exchange had a profound impact on the development of civilizations, leading to the spread of goods like spices, textiles, and precious metals, as well as the exchange of ideas and cultural

traditions. In recent years, the rise of digital technologies has led to a new era of globalization, with the exchange of goods, people, and ideas taking place on a scale never seen before. The internet and other digital technologies have enabled people to connect and exchange information and ideas on a global level, leading to a more connected and interdependent world.

This session is designed to be an interactive and thought-provoking forum, where attendees can share their perspectives and insights on the subject matter. Participants will have the opportunity to engage in open and honest discussions about the key factors that have facilitated or hindered the exchange of goods, people, and ideas throughout history and their impact on societies and civilizations.

The agenda for the session will include a brief introduction by the moderator, followed by presentations by invited experts on various aspects of exchanges from a global history perspective. This will be followed by an open Q&A session, where attendees can ask questions and engage in further discussions with the experts.

We believe that this session will provide valuable insights into the history of exchanges of goods, people, and ideas and will help inform future strategies and initiatives aimed at promoting greater exchange and understanding between various cultures and civilizations.

## 2.About the Initiator of session

Professor Dai Yifeng from Xiamen University is the Initiator of this roundtable session.

Xiamen is a coastal city located in the southeastern province of Fujian in China. It has a rich history and a vibrant culture. The city is located on the coast of the Taiwan Strait, making it a gateway to the booming economic region of Southeast Asia. It is also a major transportation hub, with a well-developed transportation network, including a modern airport and seaport, that connects Xiamen to other major cities in China and around the world.

Over the years, scholars from the History Department of Xiamen University have carried out fruitful research in the field of the history of global material and cultural exchanges, such as maritime migration, trade exchanges, Chinese maritime customs, merchant transnational organizations and transnational networks in the perspective of global history.

We hope to carry out more in-depth research and exchange of views with experts on various exchanges in the perspective of global history around the historical exchanges in Xiamen and Ocean Asia even the Pacific Rim.

“Guild” in China: A Global Exchange of Economic and Social Terminology in a Long Debate

Pengsheng Chiu

(Shanghai Jiao Tong University, pschiu2007@gmail.com )



## Abstract

As early as the 1880s, some Western missionaries or doctors living on the Chinese coast began to use the concept of "guild" as they had seen it in the Middle Ages in Europe as an analogy to the industrial and commercial groups in China at that time, and to suggest that the economic and social conditions in China at that time were still in the Middle Ages of Europe. In the 1950s, as Marxism and Leninism became tightly integrated into Chinese academia, intensive discussions of the so-called "the sprouts of capitalism" in China began to emerge in historiography. Many scholars broadened and deepened the established view of Chinese industrial and commercial groups as like the "guilds" of medieval Europe and criticized the persistence of guilds as an obstacle to free economic competition and, therefore, as an institutional factor impeding the development of capitalism in China. In the late 1980s, the understanding of the traditional Chinese industrial and commercial associations evolved in at least two ways: First, scholars in mainland China began to question the fact that China's political system of imperial power was so different from that of Europe's medieval free cities that the formation of European medieval guilds was impossible, and their nature and functions were completely different. Second, some American scholars have begun to emphasize the active participation of Chinese industrial and commercial organizations in urban economic and social public affairs, both as an important symbol of the birth of the Chinese "public sphere" in the 18th and 19th centuries and as a hint that China was in fact not in the social stage of medieval Europe but in the early modern period. Today, the scholarly understanding of Chinese industrial and commercial groups in the Ming and Qing dynasties has become increasingly complex and diverse, and fewer and fewer Chinese historical researchers use the foreign term "guild". This change in the use of academic terminology seems to reflect the fact that comparisons in global history seem to become increasingly difficult in some respects as the understanding of the object of study deepens. In the process of historical comparison, how to effectively use reciprocal comparison, as Bin Wong and Kenneth Pomeranz have done, to pursue both "similarities" and "differences" between the comparison pairs remains a great challenge for scholars to test their academic analytical skills.

## Global Exchange and Cross-cultural Institutional Transplantation: A Case Study of Modern Chinese Customs

Dai Yifeng

As we all know, global history research has emerged in the last two decades or so. This mode of research focuses on the transnational and cross-domain flows of goods, capital, people and information, especially on cultural exchanges, interactions, diffusion and their effects, thus emphasizing the construction of transnational and cross-domain physical space and exchange networks. The exchange, interaction and dissemination of heterogeneous cultures inevitably produce various cultural frictions, conflicts, reconciliation and integration. Cross-cultural institutional transplantation is one of the notable forms. The change of China's modern customs system, which is the case study of this paper, is a rather typical case.

As an institutionalized public authority (the state or other political community) that supervises and manages the movement of people and goods across borders, customs has a natural connection to global exchange. In ancient China, during the Xizhou Dynasty, customs took its embryonic form. Subsequently, as Chinese history progressed, the customs system underwent many institutional changes and took various historical forms, and by the middle of the 19th century, the customs system of the Qing Dynasty, represented by the Guangdong Customs, Fujian Customs, Zhejiang Customs, and Jiangsu Customs, was formed.

In the middle of the 19th century, with the second wave of globalization, the modern Chinese customs system was first established in Shanghai under the influence of internal and external factors, and then expanded to all Chinese Treaty Ports, forming a customs system with the foreign commissioners' system as the core. The modern Chinese customs system introduced and emulated various Western, especially British, management systems. Its efficient operation brought increasing tariff revenues to the Qing government and expanded its powers. Through this, customs intervened extensively in the political, economic, diplomatic, and military spheres of the Qing government, leaving marks of varying shades. The success of the cross-cultural transplantation of the customs system in the late Qing Dynasty made it an inspiration and a model for a series of institutional changes in late Qing China.

Through the cross-cultural transplantation of China's modern customs system, we can not only see the global flow of goods and people brought about by the wave of globalization since the mid-19th century, the collision and intermingling of different and even heterogeneous cultures, the historical relics it produced and the significance it manifested, but also how this global exchange landed, survived and expanded in different places, embedded in local societies, and in the friction, encounter and repeated interaction with local social politics, economy and culture, changed the original local history and bore new fruits.

Therefore, this paper intends to discuss several fundamental questions of cross-cultural institutional transplantation in the congregation, taking a case study of the change of China's modern customs system as an example. First, how cross-cultural institutional transplants are possible, what are their main influences and constraints, and what are their dynamics. Second, what are the main interactions and processes between foreign heterogeneous cultures and local cultures in cross-cultural institutional transplantation? Third, what are the results of cross-cultural institutional transplantation and how do they affect the local society.