

Japan-India Dialogue

PUBLIC SYMPOSIUM REPORT

International House of Japan
Japan Foundation

Japan-India Dialogue: Public Symposium Report

Published by
International House of Japan and Japan Foundation
Copyright © 2012

International House of Japan
5-11-16 Roppongi, Minato-ku, Tokyo
Japan 106-0032
Telephone: 81.3.3470 3211
Fax: 81.3.3470 3170
Email: program@i-house.or.jp
URL: www.i-house.or.jp

Edited by
Editage (a division of Cactus Communications Pvt. Ltd.)
URL: www.editage.jp

Book design by
Cactus Japan K.K.
URL: www.cactus.co.jp

Contents

Programs	5
Symposium I	
Asian Renaissance: Learning from Shibusawa, Tata, Okakura, and Tagore	7
1-1 Shibusawa Eiichi and India.	9
<i>Shibusawa Masahide</i>	
1-2 Tata Group—India’s Largest Conglomerate.	11
<i>Kaji Masahiko</i>	
1-3 Okakura Tenshin: New Modes of Consciousness	13
<i>Brij Tankha</i>	
1-4 Forging Reflective Attentiveness: Japan-India Dialogue in the Next Decade	15
<i>Jyotirmaya Sharma</i>	
1-5 Panel Discussion (Moderators: Urvashi Butalia and Takenaka Chiharu)	18
Symposium II	
A New Asia Seen from Japan-India Dialogue	21
2-1 How Should We Deal with India?	23
<i>Sakakibara Eisuke</i>	
2-2 Asian Stability and the Japan-India Relationship	25
<i>Brahma Chellaney</i>	
2-3 Japan-India Dialogue from a Civilizational Viewpoint	27
<i>Ashis Nandy</i>	
2-4 Panel Discussion (Moderator: Horimoto Takenori)	29
Profiles of the Participants	33

Japan-India Dialogue Public Symposium 1

Asian Renaissance

Learning from Shibusawa, Tata, Okakura and Tagore

Monday, December 5, 2011

Iwasaki Koyata Memorial Hall, International House of Japan

Opening Remarks from the Organizers

Shimizu Junichi (Director, Japanese Studies and Intellectual Exchange Dept., The Japan Foundation)

Introduction by the Moderators

Urvashi Butalia (Director, Zubaan Books)

Takenaka Chiharu (Professor, Rikkyo University; Councilor, International House of Japan)

Presentation 1 “Shibusawa Eiichi and India”

Shibusawa Masahide (President, Shibusawa Eiichi Memorial Foundation)

Presentation 2 “Tata Group—India’s Largest Conglomerate”

Kaji Masahiko (President, Tata Consultancy Services Japan Ltd.)

Presentation 3 “Okakura Tenshin: New Modes of Consciousness”

Brij Tankha (Professor, University of Delhi; Visiting Professor, Ryukoku University)

Presentation 4 “Forging Reflective Attentiveness: Japan-India Dialogue in the Next Decade”

Jyotirmaya Sharma (Professor, University of Hyderabad)

Panel Discussion

Shibusawa Masahide, Kaji Masahiko, Brij Tankha, Jyotirmaya Sharma, Nanjo Fumio (Director, Mori Art Museum), Glen S. Fukushima (Chairman, Airbus Japan), Vishakha Desai (President & CEO, Asia Society), Horimoto Takenori (Professor, Shobi University), Ashis Nandy (Fellow, Centre for the Study of Developing Societies), and Brahma Chellaney (Professor, Center for Policy Research).

Q&A

Japan-India Dialogue Public Symposium 2

A New Asia Seen from Japan-India Dialogue

Tuesday, December 6, 2011

Iwasaki Koyata Memorial Hall, International House of Japan

Opening Remarks from the Organizers

Akashi Yasushi (Chairman, International House of Japan)

Introduction

Takenaka Chiharu (Professor, Rikkyo University; Councilor, International House of Japan)

Session 1: Keynote Speeches

“How Should We Deal with India?”

Sakakibara Eisuke (President, Institute for Indian Economic Studies; Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University)

“Asian Stability and the Japan-India Relationship”

Brahma Chellaney (Professor, Center for Policy Research)

“Japan-India Dialogue from a Civilizational Viewpoint”

Ashis Nandy (Fellow, Centre for the Study of Developing Societies)

Session 2: Panel Discussion

Moderator: Horimoto Takenori (Professor, Shobi University)

Comments from the Discussants

Vishakha Desai (President & CEO, Asia Society)

Oguma Eiji (Professor, Keio University)

Fujiwara Kiichi (Professor, University of Tokyo)

Q&A

Panel Discussion

Sakakibara Eisuke, Brahma Chellaney, Ashis Nandy, Vishakha Desai, Oguma Eiji, Fujiwara Kiichi, Urvashi Butalia (Director, Zubaan Books), Jyotirmaya Sharma (Professor, University of Hyderabad), Brij Tankha (Professor, University of Delhi), Takenaka Chiharu, Nanjo Fumio (Director, Mori Art Museum) and Glen S. Fukushima (Chairman, Airbus Japan)

Concluding Remarks

Horimoto Takenori

Public Symposium I
**“Asian Renaissance
Learning from Shibusawa, Tata, Okakura, and Tagore”**

December 5, 2011
International House of Japan

Shibusawa Eiichi and India

SHIBUSAWA MASAhide

President, Shibusawa Eiichi Memorial Foundation

Shibusawa Masahide (hereafter Shibusawa) shared with the audience different episodes of Shibusawa Eiichi's life from the end of the nineteenth century to the twentieth century in light of Japan-India economic relations.

According to Shibusawa, encounters between Shibusawa Eiichi (hereafter Eiichi), Tata, Tagore, and Okakura progressed a long way, along with the Japan-India economic relations that flourished from the end of the nineteenth century to the twentieth century. The year 1892 was significant, as this was when prominent Indian business mogul R.D. Tata set foot on Japanese shores. At this time, India was still a British colony and whatever trade relations (including maritime trade relations) India had with China, Japan, and other countries of East Asia were all in the name of the British Empire. On the other hand, around twenty years after the Meiji Restoration in 1868, Japan, maintaining its independence, had successfully attained a complete modernization of its industries and electrical and railway systems and had prospered in trade as well in the coal, textile, and spinning industries, shipbuilding, and the manufacture of artificial fertilizers. It was the only country in the non-Western world that achieved this feat during this time, Shibusawa emphasized.

Shibusawa then said that R.D. Tata, a member of the Tata family, which became known for its business, sought to import coal and other products from Japan. Tata opened a branch of his business in Kobe, and entered into a business exchange with Eiichi, who was in Tokyo. Tata wished to give Japan an equal opportunity to gain a foothold in the shipping industry, which was monopolized by the British during that time. However, owing to the difficulties of plying maritime routes with regards to the trade of goods between Japan and India, the results of R.D. Tata's visit to Japan were not concretely visible. The high expense of maritime travel also added to the difficulties experienced at this time.

Shibusawa then went on to talk about the other Tata, Indian industrialist Jamsetji Nusserwanji Tata (J.N. Tata), who arrived in Japan in May 1893, the following year. Jamsetji was a cousin of R.D. Tata and the founder of the Tata Group. Eiichi invited Japanese businessmen and traders and held a big welcoming reception for him. Two years later, in January 1895, the then 53-year old Eiichi gave an account to a research group (composed mainly of distinguished people and members of the nobility) about Jamsetji's visit to Japan in 1893 and how the earlier arrival of R.D. Tata had paved the way for the start of economic and trade relations between Japan and India. Jamsetji was a highly experienced and capable man, not to mention his seniority in terms of age (in relation to R.D. Tata), and Eiichi was said to have looked forward to working with him and urged everyone's cooperation. In short, a joint venture between Jamsetji and Eiichi paved the way for the establishment of economic and trade relations between Japan and India, as well as furthering the interaction between Japanese and Indians during this time.

According to Shibusawa, Jamsetji at that time desired to oppose the present monopoly the British (P&O Shipping Company) had in the shipping industry and sought to work with Japan regarding this. He consulted with the Japanese, Eiichi in particular, and proposed a joint venture that would challenge the existing status quo in the shipping industry with regard to maritime travel fares. To have at least a 20 percent reduction in fares would in itself address the British monopoly in the open seas. Thus, Jamsetji expressed interest in opening a new maritime route with the help of his Japanese

counterparts. With this, Eiichi, together with members of the Boseki Rengokai (Japan Cotton Spinners Association) met at the house of Morioka (Masazumi), the president of a Japanese shipping company, Nippon Yusen Kaisha (NYK Line), to discuss Jamsetji's proposition. After which, the group gave careful consideration to this plan based on costs, and on November 7 of the same year, Hiroshima Maru, the first ship to ply a Bombay route, left the port of Kobe. Shibusawa said that both Japan and India contributed their own ships in the venture. In what had been only a single ship sent out every six weeks, there were now around four ships sent out every three weeks to ply the Bombay route.

However, the business venture was not free from foreseen and unforeseen challenges, especially with regard to the reduction of maritime fares, according to Shibusawa. There were big risks involved in challenging this. Ships from Tata's shipping company were chartered by NYK to address the problems being faced by the Japanese side. Moreover, NYK was not able to keep its promise with regard to transporting all of the trade goods. According to Shibusawa, during this time, Eiichi did not directly manage the shipping and spinning industries. However, in 1882, he worked with Mitsubishi Shipping, and in 1883, he was involved in the founding of the Osaka Boseki Company. Eiichi himself was also involved in the banking and financial sectors. The depth of his experience as well as the fine reputation he had received for his work thus enabled him to set his sights on promoting exchange with the West.

On the Indian side, meanwhile, the Bombay route was violently opposed by the British, and this led to competition between the shipping industries of the two countries in 1893 and 1894. However, in response to the British threat, Eiichi said that they would not be intimidated and would not retaliate in any way. They would also not give up their routes despite British threats.

Shibusawa then talked about Japan's trade relations during the Sino-Japanese War and during and after World War I as well as post-World War II trade and economic conditions. There is no doubt that Japan's modernization since the Meiji period had remarkable results. However, the Japanese were strangely unaware of the impact their own economic activities could have on other countries—as they themselves saw Japan as a resource-poor country, while in reality the country compensated for this through technology and advances in the production process. Shibusawa argues that it was unfortunate that Japan eventually entered into a “trade war” with the United States for a long time. Whether Eiichi envisioned the serious consequences that Japan's economic advancement at that time would bring is a question to this day.

Shibusawa went on to talk about Eiichi's encounter with Tagore in 1916 in Yokohama. Tagore was said to have given a lecture upon the invitation of Eiichi in 1924, and throughout the time that Tagore was in Japan, Eiichi and Tagore engaged in various interesting discussions, such as race issues. Talking about Eiichi's encounters with other personalities, Shibusawa explained how Eiichi, on board the return ship, Kanagawa Maru, from the United States, had met notable Japanese during his journey, including Okakura Kakuzo (Tenshin) who got on the ship in Singapore.

In closing, Shibusawa told the audience of his own encounters with India that started in 1943 when he met Indian nationalist leader Chandra Bose, who was attending the Greater East Asia Summit in Tokyo. At that time, Bose stayed in the Shibusawa home for three weeks. More than ten years later, in 1956, he met one of Mahatma Gandhi's descendants when he was in London. Looking back at these encounters, Shibusawa believes that there is a need to know more about India as there are a lot of praiseworthy things to be learned from this country.

Tata Group—India’s Largest Conglomerate

KAJI MASAHIKO

President, Tata Consultancy Services Japan Ltd.

Kaji Masahiko gave a short history of the Tata Group as well as its status in today’s business world. He also talked about India’s emergence in the information technology (IT) sector and how this is becoming more significant in the economic and industrial relations between Japan and India.

The Tata Group was created at the same time as Japan was entering the Meiji period in the late 1800s. The Tata Group is one of India’s biggest representative industrial groups with around 400,000 employees at present. Expanding on his discussion about the Tata Group’s various businesses, Kaji talked about Tata Motors as an illustration. He spoke of Tata Motors’ production of Nano in December 2008—news of which was reported by the Japanese media—costing a mere 100,000 Rupees. On putting this car out in the market, several factors had to be considered, particularly with regard to its saleability. One important question that emerged in relation to this was, “What approach is needed in order to sell this kind of car at a reasonable price in emerging markets (e.g., India) without compromising quality?” Issues such as this are being evaluated at the moment, according to Kaji. Moreover, in 2008, Tata Motors bought Jaguar and Land Rover from Ford Motors.

Next, Kaji talked about Tata Steel, a subsidiary of the Tata Group. Beginning in the early 2000s, India’s economy has been growing, and the company ranked 50th in the world in the steel manufacturing industry at that time. In 2007, Tata Steel bought Corus, a European steel industry ranked 8th in the world, which has branches in the United Kingdom and other parts of continental Europe. Upon purchase of Corus, Tata Steel leaped to 5th place in world steel rankings.

The Tata Group also operates Tata Power—the biggest electrical power company in India, which was founded in 1911—and the Taj Hotel Group known for its first-class hotels. The Taj Hotel Group operates ninety-two hotels domestically and sixteen first-class hotels abroad. In November 2009, the Taj Hotel Group’s flagship hotel, the Taj Mahal Hotel, was devastated during the Mumbai terrorist attack, but was fully restored to its original condition after a year and is now back to regular operations. The Tata Group is also visible in the telecommunications industry (with the Tata Teleservices Company and, recently, the Tata DoCoMo brand), as well as in the IT business (with the Tata Consultancy Services—the first company to introduce IT services in India—founded in 1968).

Next, Kaji gave an outline of the history of the Tata Group (founded in 1868). Kaji added that during this time (and during the early years of the Meiji period), Japan was gaining success in the maritime industry and was even recognized overseas to the point of being given a review certificate (by foreign entities), which was, at that time, a rarity. Kaji then talked about the philanthropic activities of the Tata Group, which account to around two-thirds of the company’s capital, hence exemplifying its status as a premier CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) company. These philanthropic activities are attributed to the second-generation chairman of the Tata Group, Dorabji Tata. Dorabji Tata was also instrumental in setting up Tata Power and Tata Steel. A great part of the philanthropic work of the company goes to the development of India’s science and technology, and in 1909, the Tata Group founded the Indian Institute of Science, based in Bangalore.

The fourth-generation chairman of the Tata Group, J.R.D. Tata, was chairman of the company for more than fifty years. When he was thirteen to fourteen years old, J.R.D. Tata spent a year studying

at the Yokohama International School, when his father, R.D. Tata—a member of the Tata clan who was instrumental in establishing economic and trade relations between Japan and India—was based in Japan. According to Kaji, the years marking J.R.D. Tata's tenure as the company's chairman can be said to be turbulent years. During his term as company chairman were a series of significant events, including Gandhi's independence movement, of which the Tata Group was a big supporter.

During the latter years of J.R.D. Tata's term as chairman, India under the Nehru government was a command economy, and the incumbent government at that time was known to have a policy against the existence of large enterprises. Thus, banks and insurance companies, and even the airline company, Air India, became state-owned. During those years, Kaji said that the internal structure of their company inevitably collapsed, but it is the current chairman of the Tata Group, Ratan Tata, who has been at the helm of the regeneration of the company and brought back the Tata Group as we know it today over the last two decades.

Kaji further talked about the development, as well as the policies and strategies, of the Tata Group in the past 140 years, during which many things happened politically. Kaji said that in Japan, people would generally be apt to use a top-class company as a core to expand business. However, with a vision of the future, the Tata Group has conducted what is called the reorganization of the company portfolio on a large scale and particularly focused on IT and communications for the past 20 years. Currently, IT and communications make up 25 percent of the company's sales. Kaji also mentioned that the Tata Group gives importance to how business is conducted, as well as to its employees' performance; it even has a Code of Conduct that each employee, regardless of rank, has to follow. Moreover, Kaji said that a culture of business innovation is one characteristic of the Tata Group.

Okakura Tenshin: New Modes of Consciousness

BRIJ TANKHA

*Professor, University of Delhi;
Visiting Professor, Ryukoku University*

As an introduction to his presentation, Brij Tankha mentioned that the urge to explore the world was already present in Japan during the years of Tokugawa isolation. But it was only after the Meiji Restoration (1868) that the Japanese began to travel—as scholars and students, and as explorers and tourists. One might question the motivations of these explorers to venture out of Japan and explore the bigger world. Tankha argued that one aspect of these travels and explorations is that they define the modern Japanese and their relationship with the wider world. These explorations and travels, however, were forgotten and overshadowed due to the wars that Japan waged in the name of its expansionist project and the desire to create an empire. However, Tankha pointed out the danger in writing history backwards where every action is seen as inevitably leading to what happened.

Tankha then segued into a discussion of Okakura Tenshin and his contribution to Japan-India relations by quoting Okakura's famous, yet often misunderstood phrase—"Asia is One"—and asked, "What does 'Asia is One' mean?" Tankha said that Okakura's phrase was misunderstood on two levels. First, the phrase was misrepresented because it was appropriated by the Japanese government (after Okakura's death) to justify the creation of the East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere. With this, Okakura was considered to be an early exponent of later Japanese colonialism, which, Tankha believes, is a plain misunderstanding of Okakura's thought at that time. The second misunderstanding relates to a call for Asian unity within an Orientalist framework that saw Okakura to be a purveyor of Western ideas on Asia. Tankha argued that Okakura's ability in English has led him to be seen more as an interpreter of Japan to the West and not as a Japanese open to a range of influences who was trying to make sense of his world then. Thus, the relevance of Okakura's thought was largely undermined. During this time, English had become the language of colonial intellectuals—Okakura, being one of them—and it was through English that the rest of the world communicated with each other.

Japan's encounter with the world by the turn of the nineteenth century, Tankha argued, can be framed within a Western encounter where all other relationships are seen as secondary and marginal. Japan in the late eighteenth century was marked by political and social turmoil where the Japanese were busy trying to cope with understanding outside ideas and influences, as well as making them their own. Tankha mentioned that the Japanese then did not only have to deal with these ideas, but also with the wars and disorder going on in the outside world. This led to various movements by students, political activists, and government officials, as well as the creation of transnational networks that led to a criss-crossing of information and influence. Tankha argued that a simple binary of East and West is not enough in understanding these currents, since the Japanese intellectuals were engaged as much in trying to understand the West as they were in trying to make sense of the East.

Okakura's writings represent a powerful argument in the definition of modern Japan as being very much linked with Asia. Tankha said that Okakura, along with other intellectuals, challenged the dominance of European power in his writings. First, he sees the "foreign" as an integral part of Japanese history and civilization, as the "foreign" has always been important in Japan. Tankha then stated that Okakura's ideas were in opposition to the Meiji agenda that saw Tokugawa absolutism and isolationism as a period of darkness. The Meiji agenda sought to refashion Japan into the Western image,

thus becoming a more powerful country. This was embodied in the phrase, *bunmei kaika* (cultural enlightenment), wherein Japan sought to attain Western enlightenment. Okakura's idea that Japan was formed by the flow of ideas from all parts of Asia, however, was putting forward a radical agenda that seeks to dissolve the barriers between a sacred Japan and the outside. With this, Okakura can be seen as attacking the nationalism put forth in the ideas set out by *kokugaku* (School of National Learning)—Hirata Atsutane, and others—that underlay Meiji nationalism.

Okakura based his idea of cultural unity on Buddhism. Why was this so, and what did Okakura see in Buddhism, a religion that in the latter part of the Tokugawa period was attacked as being foreign and was considered as a religious system built by “unproductive” monks? The attack on Buddhism during this period also led to a crackdown on the religion, and Buddhist temples were burned and torn down and were separated from Shinto shrines. Tankha, however, said that Okakura believed that it was these foreign imports, such as Buddhism, that have made Japan the way it is. Okakura argued that Japan has maintained and developed these ideas that allowed it to show the way to other Asian countries. This fits in well with the rediscovery of Buddhism as a world religion.

Owing to Okakura's assertions, he was seen to be the defender of a Japanese aesthetic tradition based on tea and Zen. However, Okakura's focus was not necessarily on Japanese art and aesthetics from the beginning. Tankha mentioned that Okakura's graduation thesis was originally on the nature of the state, but because of an accident, it was destroyed, and he had to write a new one, however, this time, he chose to write about art—given the limited time he had left by the deadline. Influenced by Western scholars teaching in Tokyo, Okakura, as an art bureaucrat, sought to preserve art not just as museum pieces but as part of a living Japan. Okakura's works span many areas that include Japanese history and art and architecture in Japan and China. He also experimented with designing clothes for a new age by using a mix of Chinese and Japanese styles.

This was the Okakura who traveled to India and engaged with Tagore and other Indian intellectuals, as well as children in the community. It was in India where Okakura was most productive and where he wrote the manuscripts of the works he is known for. The manuscript of *The Awakening of the East*, written in 1901 but only published in 1938, was written in India. His other works include *The Ideas of the East: With Special Reference to the Arts of Japan* (published in 1903), *The Awakening of Japan* (1904), and *The Book of Tea* (1906). According to Tankha, Okakura's stay in India reflects his serious engagement with Indian intellectuals and an awareness of their writings. More importantly, Tankha emphasized, Okakura led others to India. It was also probably directly or because of his influence that Japanese artists, such as Yokoyama Taikan and Arai Kanpo, went to India, thus leading to serious intellectual and cultural exchange that enabled the creation of an artistic language between Japanese and Indian intellectuals and artists at that time.

Another person influenced by Okakura was Ito Chuta, an architect, who traveled all over China, South East Asia, India, and Europe. Ito, who wished to create a new Japanese architectural practice that built on Asian elements, found a patron who sympathized with his ideas in Otani Kozui, the head of Nishi Honganji, one of the popular Buddhist sects in Kyoto. Otani, a great admirer of Akbar and Moghul architecture, commissioned Ito to build a villa, *Nirakuso*, in Kobe, which would serve as an alternative to Honganji in Kyoto. Through these examples and Okakura's works, Tankha demonstrated how Japan-India relations were also built on art and cultural exchange.

In conclusion, Tankha said that Okakura's phrase, “Asia is One,” needs to be read along the opening lines to his other book, *The Awakening of Asia*, where Okakura calls for the end of colonial rule and exhorts other Asians to rise up against colonialism. Tankha adds that Okakura's vision of Asia is a unity of diverse traditions—Buddhist, Confucian, Hindu, and Islamic. Okakura's vision was one that saw these traditions as equally contributing to the creation of a new Asia, and this continues to speak to us today. This found an echo in the Indian government that signed an independent treaty with Japan after the war, the signing of which is being celebrated today.

Forging Reflective Attentiveness: Japan-India Dialogue in the Next Decade

JYOTIRMAYA SHARMA

Professor, University of Hyderabad

Jyotirmaya Sharma started his presentation by sharing his experience of being in Japan for the first time in 2008, where he spent two months as a fellow of the Asia Leadership Fellow Program (ALFP) of the International House of Japan and the Japan Foundation. He told the audience that he was then ignorant of Japan, but it was also during this time that he started a dialogue about Japan with the various people he met. He was grateful that he was thrown into the challenge of getting to know a civilization and a country different from his own. Upon setting foot in Tokyo in 2008, Sharma said that the words of a philosopher came into his mind: “a man who thinks he could understand a culture at will is like a foolish man who thinks he can repair the web of a spider with bare hands.” One presumes that one can understand another culture, but this is not necessarily so, Sharma says. Throughout his short stay in Japan then, Sharma spoke to a diverse group of people—intellectuals, academics, artists, painters, trade unionists, and right-wing ultranationalists. From his interactions with them, he was able to gather their opinions and thoughts, and he read fragments of these to the audience. Tagore’s essays on nationalism on Japan and India are still significant and prophetic in this day and age and Sharma read these fragments at the same time making sense of them through Tagore’s ideas. The following are the six excerpts that Sharma quoted:

There is always a temptation to return to an imaginary past. These attempts result in the search for an idea of “Japaneseness” or the quest for the “real” or “true” Japan. In Japan, we live with a strange paradox: things do change but change does not happen. Why does change not happen? The desire to change is different from the desire to be changed. There is a fear of the unfamiliar.

There is a serious identity crisis in terms of the changing relationship between individuals and society. In the attempt to find authenticity and meaning in life, people resort to the easiest of methods: hating someone. People create imaginary pasts and identify with them, and religion often flows into the political realm.

The education system offers no training in discussing issues. The young men and women have opinions but these are repressed. Everything is oriented towards “work.” They do not know the value of discussion and expression. Education is memory oriented with little emphasis on original thought and logic. All this flows into an argument for a strong and powerful country. Since there is no “core” to nationalism here and no potent system of symbols and myths, economic success and affluence becomes the core of nationalism in the 1960s to the 1980s. This changes after 1992. After this, there is the period of revisionist historical nationalism.

Shinto is taught in schools not as a religion but as representative of Japanese culture. There is hostility to Christian schools, especially those run by Westerners because there is the fear that Westerners will teach children democracy and when these children grow up, they will be anti-government. Thus, this suppression happens in the name of secularism. There is, therefore, no experience of an independence movement or a democratization struggle here. As a result, we have not experimented with political change. This has fuelled a cynicism and a belief that even if we move, nothing will change.

We need some kind of hindrance to the unbridled march of capitalism. Efficiency is a must but culture and tradition is more important. The market does produce things that are logically beautiful, but it doesn’t make

Japan-India Dialogue: Public Symposium Report

mankind happy. Financial engineering is bad application of mathematics. Despite science and technology, the Japanese have to get back to the idea of “deep emotion,” like waiting for the cherry blossom tree to flower. In all this, the influence of foreign countries is bad, as they are all pursuing only national profit. Japan must keep intact its sense of moral superiority and not be influenced by the lies that other nations speak. Patriotism, a deep feeling for roots and cherishing the little things that are part of your tradition is the key to national uniqueness.

Peace and democracy seem to be what we call the pillars of national consensus. But these have got eroded over a span of time. Peace has transformed into a worship of the status quo and democracy has been rendered into a periodic ritual of elections. From 1995 onwards, there is emphasis on study of official history and this history is now seen as the so-called “mainstream.” If there are any radical movements here, these do not any longer find any viable political expression. If we have to prevent the right-wing movements from becoming the only movements in Japan, we must learn to resist and not just oppose.

Sharma said that what was very striking to him when he was going through the quotes he just gave was that these also told the story of India. These quotes told the story of people inventing imaginary pasts, the story of the conflict and tensions between individuals and society. These thoughts were also about the intrusion of religion into the political realm, about the increasingly uncritical society that was developing in India, where questioning is seen as disruption and where one must not disturb social equilibrium. Sharma added that these also talked about xenophobia in Indian society, about questioning models of development, as well as the story of the young resenting the status quo in society. Moreover, the quotes question the need for unchecked affluence and the value of democracy. Sharma emphasized that all of these things, if seen in the Indian context, flow into the argument of having a strong state, a middle-class agenda that wants to see a growth in the GDP, a question of real and imagined enemies, as well as a World Bank-led rhetoric about good governance, etc.

Sharma then said that Tagore talks about fundamental principles that could break down some of these problems. First, Tagore talked about immensity—that is, not being confined in one’s national boundaries or having excessive pride in one’s culture, but being open in learning from others as well as respecting them. However, Sharma said that this cannot be done without dignity—dignity not just of oneself, but imparting dignity to others. In turn, this imparting of dignity cannot be done without hospitality. According to Tagore, one must be hospitable: “Let the world come in and enjoy your hospitality, not just through the window of your house, but through the door.” Sharma added that Tagore also sees friendship as important since it is the only relationship that is not instrumental, as one does not usually use people for self-aggrandizement.

However, Sharma thinks that one cannot achieve any of these—as there will always be people who would push for a strong state, a high GDP, the dilution of democracy, etc.—unless Tagore’s theory of time is considered. Sharma conceptualized this theory of time as “reflective attentiveness.” He then quotes Tagore, writing in 1914: “The cultivation of usefulness produces an enormous amount of failure, simply because in our avidity, we sow seeds too closely.” Sharma then told the audience that the modern world is about this emphasis on usefulness and the need for one to produce, as well as reach, a goal. These people who cultivate usefulness according to Tagore are conscientious men—these conscientious men are comfortable men who lie within the bound of their duties and enjoy a fixed amount of leisure. Thus, one should try not to fret or to strain; one must not force oneself to be too conscious about things. The more you try, the more you fret about things, and with this, Sharma again quoted Tagore: “The strength that wins is calm, it has an exhaustless resource in its passive depth.”

Behind the strenuousness and preoccupation with work, Tagore talks about lies or what he calls a “moral tyrant” and this tyrant, Sharma said may be a state, a corporation, an idea or an ideology. What this “moral tyrant” does is that he/she makes his/her thoughts prevail by means of subjection.

Forging Reflective Attentiveness: Japan-India Dialogue in the Next Decade

“It is absurd to imagine that you must create slaves in order to make your ideas free,” according to Tagore. “There are men who make idols of their ideas and sacrifice humanity before their altars.”

In conclusion, Sharma said that if a conversation between Japan and India (he prefers the word conversation than dialogue, since the word conversation does not have a heavily guided purpose or an end) is to happen, he believes that Tagore’s idea of reflective attentiveness and moral tyrants still rings true to this day.

Panel Discussion

MODERATORS:

Urvashi Butalia (Director, Zubaan Books)
Takenaka Chiharu (Professor, Rikkyo University)

SPEAKERS:

Shibusawa Masahide (President, Shibusawa Eiichi Memorial Foundation)
Kaji Masahiko (President, Tata Consultancy Services Japan Ltd.)
Brij Tankha (Professor, University of Delhi; Visiting Professor, Ryukoku University)
Jyotirmaya Sharma (Professor, University of Hyderabad)

PANELISTS:

Shibusawa Masahide
Kaji Masahiko
Brij Tankha
Jyotirmaya Sharma

Nanjo Fumio (Director, Mori Art Museum)
Glen S. Fukushima (Chairman, Airbus Japan)
Vishakha Desai (President & CEO, Asia Society)
Horimoto Takenori (Professor, Shobi University)
Ashis Nandy (Fellow, Centre for the Study of Developing Societies)

One of the symposium's moderators, Urvashi Butalia, started the panel discussion by saying that all the presentations were fascinating as they covered a wide range of topics and there is so much to learn about the experiences of these cultures and countries. She mentioned Sharma's presentation on how people have the luxury, time, and interest to absorb each other's thoughts, cultures, languages, and more. She particularly pointed out though that the concept of hospitality should not be a literal reference to the opening of one's home and country, but rather it should point to the creation of an environment where an exchange of ideas can actually flourish and enrich. In connection with this, Butalia shared a story of an event that took place in Japan when she was an ALFP (Asia Leadership Fellow Program) Fellow in 2000. This was an initiative taken by women's groups in Japan to set up a war crimes tribunal to look at the whole issue of sexual slavery and crimes against women during the

war—an issue that does not get discussed at an official level. Butalia said that this was a lesson on how civil society can take a dialogue, that states are reluctant to make, further. She then added that there is a great deal at many levels that we can all learn from each other.

Next, Nanjo Fumio gave his comments. He particularly found the concept of “Asia is One” interesting but complex. No one has actually given a concrete answer to the question, “What is Asia?” Nanjo said. However, he thinks that Okakura’s “Asia is One” essentially points to becoming open to one’s neighbors. From a cultural perspective, we cannot really say “Asia is One”—as Asia is made up of diverse cultures, but “Asia is One” can be seen as a source of inspiration. The strength of Asia, particularly the region’s cultural strength, ought to be seen as inspiring. He then talked about the Chalo India (Hello India) exhibit held at Mori Art Museum from November 2008 to March 2009, which can be said to be a “typical” Indian exhibit. Having visited India a number of times, the curators were able to put up what can be said to be a “typically” Indian exhibit that showcased Indian artists’ works. Nanjo also mentioned that at present, people who are involved in traditional arts are decreasing. However, merely preserving traditional art would be meaningless. Rather, people should reinvent traditional arts and create new things and produce new products. This is because the meaning of “traditional” culture will eventually disappear. Conditions change and along with these, cultures also change.

For his part, Glen S. Fukushima said that he was fascinated by the four presentations and that he was struck by the fact that India and Japan have both diversity and commonalities between them. Focusing his comments on the first two presentations, he singled out the presentation of Shibusawa and said that he was reminded of something his professor had asked him when he was a student at the University of Tokyo in the 1970s. His professor asked him when Japan was able to get rid of extraterritoriality. Fukushima said that he had only studied history from the point of view of the West and this kind of question did not occur to him. Furthermore, he thought that the four presentations from the standpoint of Asian countries gave a very important perspective and that they had a lot of richness that can be developed in the context of Japan-India relations. Looking outside at Asia, it can be said that the world has taken note of the rise of the region and the economic importance of Asia. As a U.S. citizen of Asian ancestry, Fukushima said that it is interesting to see the interactions within Asia but also between the United States and Europe and Asia (particularly with regard to the interactions between the United States and Asia), as well as the role people from Asian countries are playing. Some of them choose to keep their own nationality and passports, while some have changed their passports, nationality, and citizenship to the United States. He thinks that the relationship between citizenship and ethnicity is important with regard to political, economic, and business relationships between and among Asian countries.

Vishakha Desai said that it is unusual to have a panel whereby both economic and cultural or intellectual ideas come together, and in that sense, it is striking to say that the amount of connection between the two countries in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—that seemed to be at least at the elite level—both on the business side (e.g., Shibusawa Eiichi and Tata) and the intellectual side (e.g., Okakura Tenshin and Tagore) is remarkable. Desai, however, pointed out the gap in terms of economic side and cultural side that may have led to some of the misunderstandings and events that followed especially after the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War (e.g., how Japan’s economic activities caused trade friction with other countries). She said that if we come back to post-independent India and postwar Japan in the twenty-first century, that in itself points the way. She further emphasized that what we need to focus on is “How do we connect the dots between the economic, political, and cultural realities of where Japan is and where India is”—as she believes that connecting these dots would help prevent us from making mistakes and also strengthen relations and build communities. Communities are built when one has cultural understanding, or a sense of what Homi Bhabha calls “neighborliness.” Having communities within the sense of building a new Asian community involves the need to go back to the contributions of Tagore. What Tagore brought out was the idea of global citizenry. “Asia is One” should not only be seen in a political sense, but as a new notion of connectivity among Asians. She then said that the relevance of Okakura, Tagore, Tata, and Rockefellers (who

came to Japan in the 1920s and 30s) needs to be brought back so that a new kind of community with a sense of parity among Asians, along with Americans and Europeans, can be thought about.

Horimoto Takenori, while saying that he found the four presentations interesting, wished that the presentations had touched on the role of politics as well. It would be worth noting the political roles these four people—Shibusawa, Tata, Okakura, and Tagore—had in their own times. He also hopes to know the political context of the time as well as the political connections that each of these figures' activities had in both India and Japan. Moreover, Horimoto would like to know the relevance of the four in today's world. He said that it is apparent that they were ahead of their time by being individuals having a global vision, and thus, their significance in today's world should be further looked into.

Meanwhile, Ashis Nandy said that the words Asia and Africa were “gifts” of colonialism. He then spoke of British colonial rule in India and how it first started as a form of “pillage” reminiscent of Spanish and Portuguese expansion. However, British colonialism took on a different shape wherein the introduction of concepts and categories accompanied the introduction of the English language and British law in India. This changed the nature of global dominance, where control by concepts and categories, in the ways of looking at the world, are seen. He then proposed that this dialogue must explore the possibilities of breaking that stranglehold, and understanding and rediscovering the categories through which we have judged our society, culture, aesthetics, and our concept of distinctive futures and ideas of a good society.

The speakers then addressed some questions from the audience. To the question on CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) and the Tata Group, Kaji said that Tata's philanthropic activity is connected with sustainable development and the role that technology (such as computers) can play in this.

Tankha then addressed a question regarding the paradox of Japan as a country free from colonialism, which had engaged in its own imperialist plans by saying that the notion of Asia is different in Japan and India. In Japan, it was part of its colonial drive, while in the Indian context, Asia is more of a rhetorical device. He added that Okakura was not talking about a colonial Asia. Rather, he was talking about learning from each other and how a new Asia can be created. Tankha also talked about the notion of Asia as “resistance.”

In response to the question, “What connects a multi-religious, multiethnic, and multilingual India and Japan that has a myth of being ethnically homogeneous?” Sharma said that a connection between the two countries could be established “if we speak the full truth about ourselves.”

To the question of how the model of “renaissance” could be used in this era, Desai pointed out that one of the issues that we face today in the twenty-first century, especially in India but also everywhere else including the West, is over-specialization—which does not allow one to look at issues in a trans-disciplinary way of thinking that is more integrated. She also said that this is a good time to think about what a new model of renaissance would look like wherein we could bring the kind of connectivity (which involves connecting disciplines, ideas, mind, and body) together.

Finally, Shibusawa said that Shibusawa Eiichi sought Japan's economic growth. However, Tata, while having the same aim, also desired to oppose British colonialism. Shibusawa said that people in Japan today still do not understand this complexity in India's history and that he hopes that this Japan-India Dialogue will be a good start for people in both countries to understand each other.

In closing, Butalia remarked that the symposium was a fascinating and rich dialogue and that this is only the beginning. For her part, Takenaka said that one thing that can be said to be common among these four giants (Tata, Shibusawa Eiichi, Tagore, and Okakura Tenshin) is that they all thought of ordinary people's lives and of how they could contribute to society through their works and thoughts.

Public Symposium II
“A New Asia Seen from Japan-India Dialogue”

December 6, 2011
International House of Japan

How Should We Deal with India?

SAKAKIBARA EISUKE

*President, Institute for Indian Economic Studies;
Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University*

Sakakibara Eisuke, who has a wide-ranging experience in dealing with India that spans ten years, gave a presentation on the importance of Japan-India economic relations. After leaving his post at the Ministry of Finance, he first visited India on the invitation of an Indian bank. He then went on to work for an Indian IT company for five years.

In his presentation, Sakakibara first talked about the shared historical ties between India and Japan. The two countries have maintained very friendly relations, especially when compared to Japan-China relations where both countries are locked in competition. This goodwill between Japan and India started when Japan served as a place of refuge for Indian dissidents opposed to British colonial rule. These Indian exiles lived in Japan and established their lives by marrying locals and introducing Indian culture such as curry.

During World War II, when Japan was fighting the British, some Indians even sided with Japanese forces during battles such as the Battle of Imphal in 1944. Sakakibara said that these Indians were motivated by the possibility of independence from Britain if they helped the Japanese.

Sakakibara said that since then, relations between Japan and India have remained excellent. Yet, he doubts that Japanese today really know or understand Indians and Indian culture. The same can also be said about Indians and what they know of and understand about the Japanese and Japanese culture.

Meanwhile, Sakakibara pointed out that historically and culturally, the two countries have differences. Throughout its history, Japan has remained unconquered by other countries. Many Japanese do not appreciate this exceptional fact, but it has shaped many of the cultural traditions and personality traits of the Japanese. India, on the other hand, was repeatedly invaded and held by different powers throughout its history—from ancient times all the way to the recent past. This history has led to diversity in Indian cultural traditions and in its ethnic composition.

However, even as there are differences, there are also similarities between India and Japan, Sakakibara notes. For example, they share Buddhist belief and tradition, and people in these two countries may be connected on a deep religious and philosophical level by sharing similar mentality or ways of thinking. One example of this shared view is *mujokan*, a sense of the vanity and transiency of life. Although there are differences in how each culture understands *mujokan*, it is nonetheless similarly present in both cultures and this is a solid connection, a similarity between the two societies.

Sakakibara then went on to compare India with another country that is receiving a lot of attention lately—China. Sakakibara wrote a book in 2011 entitled *India As Number One*. Two years ago, a book entitled *China As No.1* (written by C.H. Kwan) came out and sold very well. Over the years, China has become number one or dominant in many fields such as trade, manufacturing, finance, or even as a market for cars. China has already overtaken Japan in terms of GDP output, and in a few years, China is predicted to overtake the United States as well. While India is not yet number one in many respects, Sakakibara believes that its turn is coming.

In terms of population, China is also a giant with 1.3 billion people. India also has a huge population, with one billion people. The big difference between China and India on this issue, however, is that China's population has already peaked and is now slowly declining, Sakakibara said. However, in

India's case, its population growth is still one of the highest in the world. At this rate, by 2020, India's population will start to overtake China's population and by 2050, India's population will be 1.6 billion people, Sakakibara said.

Sakakibara claims that there will be a great reversal between China and India on the economic front. At the moment, China's economy has been growing at 10 percent per annum while India is growing at 7 percent annually. But, because China's population is declining, by 2050, China's economy will grow no more than 4 percent. On the other hand, India's economy is likely to sustain a 7 or 8 percent economic growth all the way to 2050.

Aside from population size, there is also a significant difference in demographics between the two countries, according to Sakakibara. China's population is already starting to age. India, however, still retains a young population. The median age in India is twenty-five years old. This young population gives India more potential (than China) for economic growth and development.

Sakakibara then pointed out that India's economic potential is already attracting a "third wave" of Japanese investors and companies wanting to do business in India. Still, Japanese companies complain of the difficulty of doing business in the Indian market, partly because of the differences in how the market works in Japan and in India. Still, the Indian economy is open to foreign investment and many foreign companies doing business in India are able to flourish. Lately, Korean appliance makers like Samsung and LG have captured 60 to 70 percent of the Indian TV and home appliance market. Why Japanese companies like Sony or Panasonic were unable to do that is a mystery, Sakakibara said. The presence of other foreign companies like Korean appliance makers, and their level of success, proves that the Indian market is open and that more Japanese companies should seriously consider entering it.

India will also play a more strategic economic role in the near future as more countries organize themselves into regional free-trade blocs, Sakakibara said. Currently, China, South Korea, Japan, and the ten member countries of ASEAN are developing free-trade policies, creating an ASEAN+3 trading bloc. It will soon include other new countries as well, most probably India. If such a free trade bloc were to be created, India will be an even more important market for Japanese industries.

Japanese companies hoping to expand into India should be aware of the limits of their business strategies and be willing to accept change and modification of these strategies. In the past, Japanese industrial expansion into China and Southeast Asia copied centralized management strategies used in Japan. In expanding to India, this strategy is unlikely to prosper. Japanese companies must give their Indian subsidiaries more independence and flexibility if they are to succeed. Japanese company presidents are not known for their globalized view and seldom travel outside Japan. Expanding into India could be a turning point in Japanese industrial strategy towards a more globalized strategic outlook. Sakakibara emphasized that expanding an economic relationship also means it becomes more important for Japan and India to develop deeper cultural understanding and relations. In the future, perhaps even Indian companies might establish Japan subsidiaries, especially in the IT industry, he added.

To conclude, Sakakibara said that India might not be a big economic power right now but it will grow very fast in the next few years. It is important then that Japan should form a relationship with India now in anticipation of its eventual economic rise.

Asian Stability and the Japan-India Relationship

BRAHMA CHELLANEY

Professor, Center for Policy Research

Brahma Chellaney started his presentation by noting that 2011 is a year when Japan experienced terrible tragedies such as the East Japan earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear power plant accident. And yet despite these tremendous difficulties, Japan's true strengths were revealed, such as its "resilience," "social unity," and "indomitable spirit." These qualities are still outstanding in the world today and the Japanese should be proud of having these qualities, Chellaney said.

Chellaney proceeded to discuss the main topic of his presentation, which he had divided into two parts. First, he looked at the larger political landscape in Asia, taking note that it is one of the fastest-growing regions in the world. At the same time, it is also the site of enormous challenges and political and territorial conflicts among Asian countries, making it a very dangerous region. The second part of his presentation discussed how and why Japan and India should band together and take on these challenges.

Asia has a lot of potential for economic growth, according to Chellaney. Asian economies are growing fast at a rate unparalleled in world history. But, at the same time, many problems are also present in Asia, such as growing energy and water consumption, increasing military expenditures, and the most number of dangerous conflict areas in the world. And yet Asia will still greatly influence the direction of globalization.

Chellaney then identified five challenges that need to be addressed in Asia.

Challenge 1: The root of many conflicts among Asian countries goes back to the "baggage of history," harmful historical legacies among countries that are then reflected in stereotypes Asian countries hold of each other. Chellaney argues that any major interstate relationship in Asia is weighed down by the baggage of history. In order to address present-day conflicts, these historical issues need to be addressed once and for all so that they will no longer be a hindrance in creating new directions for the future.

Challenge 2: We must "cage the demons of nationalism that have been let loose in Asia," Chellaney said. He pointed out that in some cases, the decline of state ideologies has been replaced with the embrace of nationalism or even ultranationalism. Nationalism has also been used in helping stimulate a country's resurgence.

Challenge 3: There is also the need to get rid of the threat of hegemony by any single power in Asia, the same way as the threat of hegemony in Europe has been banished. It is necessary to address hegemony so that states can institutionalize political cooperation based on shared interests. As Asian countries compete with each other, more powerful Asian countries tend to take on or be seen as seeking hegemony over other weaker states. This is unlike modern Europe, in particular Germany, where it is the largest European economy and the largest European country but it does not seek to be "first among equals." Germany is content to be "one among equals." In Asia, the threat of hegemony is very large if countries are unable to form an "Asian community" with common rules. This threat of hegemony is also at the core of the growing conflict among states in Asia.

Challenge 4: Pointing out how no community in the world has ever been built without some basic common norms, Chellaney discussed the need to develop common norms and values in Asia. The problem Chellaney specifically brought up is that while it has become fashionable in Asia these days to talk about the “Asian Way,” no one seems to know exactly what the “Asian Way” represents. Given that Asia consists of divergent political systems—as opposed to Europe, which has democracy as a common norm—and that some states in Asia have embraced economic values of the West while rejecting Western political values, Chellaney noted that it would be extremely difficult to have an interstate dialogue and build common norms and values in Asia.

Challenge 5: There is a widening gap between greater economic links between Asian countries, on the one hand, and deeper political divisions between these same Asian countries. “When the economics and the politics are running in different directions, it spells trouble,” Chellaney stated. For example, nations in Asia such as Japan, Vietnam, India, and China trade with each other, and trade is booming more than ever. However, booming trade does not indicate political progress between any two countries, nor does it “guarantee moderation or restraint” in political relations. Chellaney further emphasized how economics alone will not be sufficient to create goodwill or stabilize the political relations of estranged neighboring countries. While trade between Japan and China, as well as between India and China, has grown tremendously for the past ten years, the trade growth has not necessarily eased tensions or helped improve political relationships between these countries. If the current political conditions are to stay unimproved, cold war-era territorial and maritime disputes might resurface.

In the second part of his presentation, Chellaney discussed how Japan and India can cooperate in addressing these challenges. He said that the balance of power in Asia will be determined by developments in two subregions: East Asia and the Indian Ocean region. The two major Asian democracies, India and Japan, should take the lead in building common norms and values. They should also help in creating a healthy power equilibrium in Asia. India and Japan can work together more readily and harmoniously, as the two countries have no outstanding historical or political issues between them. Generally speaking, Indians and Japanese have mutual positive images of each other. Both have similar strategic interests as well.

Asian countries are bound by the sea and much of its population lives near water. Economic prosperity is concentrated in the coastal areas. But these coastal areas are highly susceptible to disasters and to climate change. Japan and India, as major maritime democracies, should ensure safety and security of sea lanes, since both countries are highly dependent on these lanes for trade and energy sources. Taking these factors together, Chellaney believes that the two countries are “natural allies” with converging core strategic interests.

Chellaney pointed out that India and Japan are already engaging with each other through strategic partnerships. This is evidenced by a number of agreements signed between the two countries, such as a strategic global partnership agreement in 2006, a security and cooperation agreement in 2008, an action plan for the security agreement in 2009, and a free trade deal that came into force in 2011. There is also an increase of high-level official interaction between the two governments, such as minister-to-minister dialogues on issues like trade and defense. There are also joint naval exercises being planned from 2012. Such interactions are having ripple effects on people-to-people contacts and trade.

Finally, Chellaney suggested other ways in which Japan and India can further deepen their relationship. One suggestion is for Japan and India to widen their relationship beyond an economic and trade relationship to something more like a strategic partnership, similar to the Japan-US strategic partnership. Such a relationship would include close cooperation in the field of international relations and military and defense affairs, he said. Perhaps Japanese and Indian navy officers can regularly visit and serve in each others’ navies. Or, allow both Japanese and Indian navies to operate seamlessly between the Indian and Pacific Oceans, Chellaney suggested. Japan and India can even cooperate on defense systems like missile technology. Of course, Chellaney said that he can see that the Japanese constitution, specifically Article 9, could impede such a relationship. Still, he believes that it is not impossible to overcome this hindrance, and that in time, this level of cooperation between the two countries is a possibility.

Japan-India Dialogue from a Civilizational Viewpoint

ASHIS NANDY

Fellow, Centre for the Study of Developing Societies

Ashis Nandy gave a presentation on India-Japan relations from the point of view of civilizations. By training, Nandy is a clinical psychologist who has also studied political psychology and violence.

The overall theme of Nandy's presentation was "Dialogue of Civilization." He began by mentioning that he got lost while taking a walk before attending the meeting that day. He tied that small event to the topic of his speech. In doing cross-civilizational dialogue, he said, both parties are inevitably going to get lost. If they do not get lost, he continued, they have not engaged in a true dialogue.

Nandy then made the point that when one crosses borders of cultures and civilizations, he or she also crosses borders within him or herself. This applies not only to individuals but also to societies. Having a dialogue with other cultures is also about examining one's self. Nandy further argued that the best dialogues are those when, in the process of opening a dialogue, one begins to look within and open a dialogue with parts of him or herself which are not accessible to him or her and parts of his or her society which have been marginalized or cornered or peripheralized, which have become recessive in the civilizational context. In short, he said that "a dialogue of civilizations and cultures is also always an internal dialogue."

Nandy then told a story about a psychoanalyst and his patient. The patient spent days not talking at all, looking tense and upset. The psychoanalyst felt that attempts at dialogue with the patient were going nowhere. One day, the patient looked at the books in the psychoanalyst's office and suddenly said, "that book is upside down." The psychoanalyst took this opening as an opportunity to talk. Nandy read the psychoanalyst's note: "In a moment of inspiration, without knowing why I was telling her this, I said 'Why didn't you tell me that you had an abortion?'" Then the patient started to talk. This, Nandy said is an example of "listening with a third ear." Nandy proposes that in a civilizational dialogue, it is necessary to listen with a third ear.

Nandy also talked about his recent research interest, which is the history of mass violence in the last hundred years. He noted that "the most venomous, the most gory, most vulgar form of violence takes place when the two ... parties to the violence are not strangers to each other, but when they are very close to each other." He then added that he came to this insight accidentally. Based on his research on violence during the partition of India and Pakistan, at least 1 million people were killed, but according to his own calculation, actually no less than 2 million were killed. This is because so many old people and children were abandoned as different ethnic groups fled from each other. Also, many died from infectious diseases such as typhoid and dysentery.

Violence occurred in equal measure in East India and Punjab, and nowhere else in India. Comparing violent episodes during this time, Nandy observed that violence between ethnic groups in Bengal was not particularly cruel while violence in Punjab was more cruel. He notes that, strangely, in Punjab, Sikhs, Muslims, and Hindus were closest to each other. On noticing this, Nandy then examined other instances of mass violence.

Nandy discovered that an anthropologist studying the differences and similarities of Tutsis and Hutus in Rwanda could not find any significant ethnographic differences between the two groups.

However, because the anthropologist was writing for officials and needed to make a definitive definition, he ultimately said, “it is safer to identify anybody who has more than five heads of cattle as Hutu and anybody who has less than five heads [of cattle] as Tutsi,” Nandy recalled. “Closeness can be dangerous,” he added.

Another example Nandy gave was that of German Jews and Germany. “In Nazi Germany, the German Jews were closest to the Germans. In fact, you could not define Germany without taking into account the German Jews. They defined Germany. And when the violence came, it came firstly to them,” Nandy said. He, however, added that closeness can also be creative and productive.

Another example of closeness and conflict that Nandy mentioned is divorce. According to a study on divorce in the United States, one of the best predictors of divorce is when a husband and a wife become more like each other further and further along in their married life. When the couple got married, they married because they complemented each other. Once the complementarity ceases to be, “discord increases and there is an unrecognized sense of betrayal.” This should also serve as a lesson to others who are opening a dialogue of civilizations and cultures.

Adding to the above insight, he looked at another aspect of marital discord. Nandy mentioned a story about a philosopher friend who read Erik Erikson’s book on Gandhi. His friend said that Erickson presumed that Gandhi’s marriage was unhappy because Gandhi and his wife were always quarreling. Nandy’s philosopher friend reacted to this by asking Nandy if, in the United States, people believe in a concept of marriage wherein, if married people do not quarrel, then the relationship is considered happy and successful. Nandy replied by saying that a happy marriage can be seen through two different ways. One is if there is no quarrel at all between the couple. The other way is to look at how much quarreling a couple’s marriage can take. “If a marriage can take more quarrels, then it is also a successful marriage,” Nandy says.

It is these points that Nandy believes should guide the discussions on India and Japan. He said that he is particularly interested in “how far the Japan-India dialogue will enrich both parties and encourage them to look within.” He asked, “Are we going to emerge a more mature civilization or culture?”

Nandy, however, made a clarification on the term “civilization”—the term Nandy admitted that he had been using for nearly forty years. Lately, he finds himself using this word less and less because he noticed that civilization has entered “a new hierarchical frame” that implies a hierarchy among civilizations. “Some cultures are civilizations [while] other cultures are not. Nobody talks of African culture as a civilization or American-Indian culture as a civilization,” he said. They are in fact no less of a civilization compared to others, he added. Still, there are many instances where these are seen as hierarchies; for example, in the nineteenth century, African people were seen as half child and half savage. Or, other cultures like Japan or India are seen as “senile or decrepit” and must learn from the youthful European civilization.

In ending his presentation, Nandy talked about the importance of engaging in dialogue by sharing a story about a researcher who went into a region that was inhabited 5,000 years ago and attempted to learn how to navigate the ocean from one of the two navigators who was still there. In doing so, he opened a dialogue with him. From the navigator, the researcher learned how to navigate by looking at things, such as the waves of the ocean, the color of the water or the height of the waves, or the flow of the water. He also learned how to understand the winds, the flocks of birds flying above, the floating vegetation, or the schools of fish passing by. Taking all of these factors together, this is how the navigator and the navigator’s ancestors were able to cross and navigate through the Pacific. Nandy said that modern technology could replace the need for such skills, but by engaging in dialogue with the navigator, human potentialities are released—like how to read nature or read the signs around us. Losing this form of dialogue is a loss for us, he said. In engaging in dialogue, Nandy hopes that this will be the way people will look at why we engage in one.

Panel Discussion

MODERATOR:

Horimoto Takenori (Professor, Shobi University)

SPEAKERS:

Sakakibara Eisuke (President, Institute for Indian Economic Studies; Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University)

Brahma Chellaney (Professor, Center for Policy Research)

Ashis Nandy (Fellow, Centre for the Study of Developing Societies)

DISCUSSANTS:

Vishakha Desai (President & CEO, Asia Society)

Oguma Eiji (Professor, Keio University)

Fujiwara Kiichi (Professor, University of Tokyo)

On the second day of the symposium, three discussants were asked to give comments on the presentations given by Sakakibara Eisuke, Brahma Chellaney, and Ashis Nandy. Vishakha Desai first talked about how Asia is at the core of a “second wave” of globalization—the point Chellaney made in his presentation, as well as in his article she had read. Initially, globalization was seen in the late 1980s to the early 1990s as “Westernization,” “McDonaldization,” or “Americanization.” But now, the focus of globalization is centered on Asia, which Desai describes as the “*sushi*-fication” or “*curry*-fication” of the world. Economic interconnection on the part of Asian countries has promoted the spread of Korean culture, for instance, throughout Asia in the form of Korean TV dramas. She said, “the opportunity for envisioning a new Asia is much higher today than at any other time.”

On the issue of why India and Japan do not enjoy a closer relationship, which they could well have had, given that they do not have any bitter economic or political disagreements, Desai pointed out that there is a “trust deficit” and a “knowledge deficit” between the two countries. In order to overcome these deficits, Japan and India should engage in dialogue at many levels and layers of society, and this is where Nandy’s idea of dialogue comes in, she said. She emphasized that the process in which dialogue is being initiated and held is as important as the content of the dialogue. In other words, we need to place equal importance on how we go about making this pathway to dialogue and what we talk about. She then went on to talk about the Homi Bhabha’s concept of “neighborliness” (which she mentioned in the first panel discussion) through which we can have cultural underpinning to these relationships we are aiming for. She said that neighborliness is about “being side by

side ... understanding the difference without trying to completely diminish the difference; it is about negotiating differences with respect, and it is also about having empathy; it is about truly being an insider and an outsider at the same time, to be able to put yourself in the other person's shoes so that you can actually understand why the differences occur." Desai further emphasized that we need to create pathways that would enable us to connect and listen to each other.

Meanwhile, Oguma Eiji brought out four points to discuss. The first point is that Asian countries see each other as different from each other. There is no sense of a united Asia. As an example, Oguma pointed out that when he reads a newspaper in India, the foreign news section does not mention any news from Asia; instead, it only has news from America or Europe.

The second point Oguma discussed is the issue of commonalities between Japan and India. Often, Buddhism is brought out as a common point. Oguma believes that this opinion is only one-sided and is thought of mainly by Japanese. Indians on the other hand have a different view of the Japanese that the Japanese would not agree with. Taking Buddhism as an example, Oguma recounted how he once met a Hindu activist in India who thought that all Japanese are Buddhist, and therefore, they are also Hindu since he thinks that Buddhism is a branch of Hinduism. In light of the view that Buddhism may be understood differently in these two countries depending on the context, Oguma pointed out the challenge we face in understanding each other's culture. It is often the case that, when presenting either Japanese or Indian culture without a particular context, we merely stimulate other's exoticism rather than having either of the culture actually understood by the other.

Oguma's third point tackles what would be the basis of an India-Japan relationship. One way to define this relationship is through having a common rival or enemy, such as China. This, however, contradicts the spirit of cooperation among all Asian countries, including China, which is being promoted by everyone in the region. Another way for the two countries to root this relationship would be through economics. But, for Oguma, aside from economics, there are more ways through which Japan and India can forge a relationship.

For his last point, Oguma pointed out that a Japan-India relationship can also be centered on globalization and finding commonalities and differences in how each country had experienced globalization. If this is the framework for engaging in comparative study, many taken-for-granted comparisons can then be questioned. For example, on the topic of a homogenous Japan and a diverse India, on closer study, Japan is not so homogenous after all. This is a very recent idea in Japanese history and is rooted mainly in the idea that the Japanese are homogeneously middle class. Whatever claim to truth this fact may have had from the 1960s to the 1980s when Japanese homogeneity was a popular concept, this has been exploded by the apparent and widening social gaps in Japanese society today.

Fujiwara Kiichi, for his part, concentrated on the issue of how Japan and India should go forward with a relationship. He said that "Japan's relationship with India should be located within the discourse of a search for 'our Asia' [which] is an Asia that is based on mutual understanding and mutual benefit." He explained that Japan's intentions for "our Asia" first led to colonizing and brutalizing China. Now that China became a rising power and surpassed Japan's economy, China has become Japan's rival. When China turned communist, the ASEAN countries became the "favorite Asia" that Japan could relate to. Now, Japan is looking to India as a wonderful opportunity for investing and forming a mutual relationship. He believes that perhaps, as Nandy mentioned, the distance between Japan and India allows them to form a friendlier relationship—while the closeness of Japan's or India's neighbors could make it more difficult for them to form closer relationships with their neighboring countries.

While Japan and India may have many reasons to develop a relationship centered on economics and national security, Fujiwara, like Oguma, believes that the relationship can cover many other points between the two countries. Japan and India are facing similar social issues but at varying degrees; for example, industrialization is a process that has touched both countries, but is experienced similarly and differently at the same time. Another example of similarity is in politics. Both countries are thought of as "democracies," but both countries have been dominated by one party for long periods of time.

This one-party rule calls into question the meaning of democracy, a debate that both countries' intellectuals can discuss.

Among the comments received from the audience after the three discussants had spoken, there was one comment from the chairman of the Japan-India Association, Mr. Hirabayashi Hiroshi. He believes that Japan and India have a relationship with global implications. From 2000 onwards, both countries have become leaders in politics, in economics, or in culture. Their relationship affects the world, and their relationship is not only about their own interest, but should be thoughtful of the implications for the global community. He said, "we have to ask ourselves what we can do not only for ourselves but for the global community."

Another comment came from a presenter from the first day, Brij Tankha, who summarized the two days into two words: "neighborliness" and "global." He noted that discussion has been about breaking stereotypes of each other ourselves. He added that there is no one Asia, and that there are many Asias, meaning there are many categories by which people judge what Asia is. But since they are categories, they can be made and remade over and over again, he said.

Nandy added a further point on democracy in India. In India, the commitment to democracy is made in the sense that democracy preserves plurality. This is especially so because India is a multiethnic society. In having a discussion between Japan and India on the issue of democracy, a new understanding of democracy through this concept can be achieved.

Chellaney took up the running theme that India is very diverse and therefore difficult for Japan to understand. But he then asked if similarity or closeness of culture between the two parties is necessary in order to make a close relationship. India and Japan both have neighboring countries with which they share many cultural similarities, but their relationships with them are not the best. Japan and the United States have a close relationship; yet, both are culturally different, the United States being more culturally diverse than Japan. It is not a question of closeness or being culturally far apart; it is about "convergence of strategic interests."

For Desai, the "takeaway" message for her from this symposium is in the world of globalization—interdependence in Asia is emerging. It is not about any necessity of similarity of culture; it is simply a reality that Asian countries are geopolitically and geo-economically interdependent. The center of this new globalization is Asia, so countries must know more about each other and understand each other better. But she insists that it is not a lack of understanding of the strategic importance of relationships, it is that there is not enough underpinning in the relationship. "Asia has not been really together for the last 300 years," she said. She added that we need space and time to understand each other, and we need to reassess our ways of learning about each other.

At the end of the symposium, the moderator, Horimoto Takenori, said that the timing of this conference was very good. Exactly sixty years ago, Japan and India established relations. For sixty years, many people have said that the vital common good for Asian security was the Japan-US alliance. But for the future, perhaps a Japan-India alliance will become a vital ingredient in keeping the peace in Asia.

Profiles of the Participants

BUTALIA, Urvashi (Director, Zubaan Books)

Butalia is a well-known figure in gender studies not only in India but also in Europe and the United States. She co-founded Kali for Women, the first feminist publisher in India, which has published various books on gender issues in India. She has been active in the women's movement in India. She has also been active in researching the modern history of India, and her book *The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India* (Duke University Press, 2000), an oral history of the tragic separation of India and Pakistan, has been a bestseller in India. She is also an active participant in international citizen's exchange conferences, where she speaks on behalf of Indian women. Since 2003, she has been a director of Zubaan Books, the publisher that developed from Kali for Women. She received a Nikkei Asia Prize in 2003 and the Padma Shri (Indian award for cultural merit) in 2010. The International House of Japan and the Japan Foundation awarded her an Asia Leadership Fellow Program fellowship for 2000.

CHELLANEY, Brahma (Professor, Center for Policy Research)

Chellaney is a professor of strategic studies at the Center for Policy Research, an independent think tank based in New Delhi. He was formerly a member of the Policy Advisory Group headed by the Foreign Minister of India. As a specialist on international security issues, he held appointments at various universities in the United States and Australia. He has often appeared on CNN and BBC, among others, and his opinion articles are carried in many important newspapers. His books include the international bestseller *Asian Juggernaut: The Rise of China, India and Japan* (Harper Collins, New York, 2006) and *Water: Asia's New Battleground* (Georgetown University Press, 2011).

DESAI, Vishakha (President & CEO, Asia Society)

Desai holds a B.A. in Political Science from Bombay University and an M.A. and Ph.D. in Asian Art History from the University of Michigan. She worked as a curator at the Museum of Fine Arts Boston, followed by her academic career at the University of Massachusetts, Boston University, Columbia University, and Williams College. She has held several positions at Asia Society, a leading global organization committed to strengthening partnerships among the people, leaders, and institutions of Asia and the United States. Appointed President in 2004, she sets the direction for the Society's diverse set of programs ranging from major US-Asia policy initiatives and national educational partnerships for global learning to path-breaking art exhibitions and innovative Asian American performances. She has also published and edited several books, scholarly catalogues and numerous articles on traditional and contemporary art.

FUJIWARA, Kiichi (Professor, University of Tokyo)

A graduate of the University of Tokyo (B.A. and M.A.), Fujiwara studied at Yale University before he returned to Japan at the Institute of Social Science (ISS) of the University of Tokyo. He has held positions at the University of the Philippines, Johns Hopkins University, the University of Bristol,

Japan-India Dialogue: Public Symposium Report

and was selected as a fellow of the Woodrow Wilson International Center in Washington D.C. His works on international affairs include *Senso wo Kioku suru* (Remembering the War; Kodansha, 2001), *Demokurashii no Teikoku* (A Democratic Empire; Iwanami Shoten, 2002) and *Kokusai Seiji* (International Politics; The Society of the Promotion for the Open University of Japan, 2007).

FUKUSHIMA, Glen S. (Chairman, Airbus Japan)

Born in 1949 in California. Graduated from Stanford University and Harvard Business and Law Schools. Before joining Airbus, the world's leading manufacturer of commercial aircraft, in 2005, Fukushima was Co-President and Representative Director of the Japan operations of the NCR Corporation. He also held prominent positions such as President and Representative Director of the Japan operations of Arthur D. Little, Inc., Deputy Assistant United States Trade Representative for Japan and China, and Director for Japanese Affairs at the Office of the United States Trade Representative. He was also the President of the American Chamber of Commerce in Japan for two terms. His publications include *Nichi-Bei Keizai Masatsu no Seijigaku* (The Politics of U.S.-Japan Economic Friction), winner of the Masayoshi Ohira Memorial Prize in 1993. Assumed his current position in 2010.

HORIMOTO, Takenori (Professor, Contemporary South Asian Politics at Shobi University)

Received his M.A. (Pol.Sc.) from the University of Delhi. Specialist on South Asian politics and U.S. Asian policy. He has authored and edited many books including: *Indo – Gurobaruka suru Kyozaō* (India: The Big Elephant Globalizes; Iwanami Shoten, 2007) and *Gunjitaikokuka suru Indo* (India as a Rising Military Power; co-edited; Aki Shobo, 2010). He has given many India and South Asia related lectures and presentations as well as serving as political commentator on NHK TV programs.

KAJI, Masahiko (President, Tata Consultancy Services Japan Ltd.)

Born in 1947. Received bachelor's degrees in Chemistry and Economics from Sophia University. After working for Citibank Japan, the National Bank of Abu Dhabi, and the Australia & New Zealand Banking Group, in 1998 Kaji became Managing Director of ASB International Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai, which is a subsidiary of Nissei ASB Machine Co., Ltd., Japan, the leading manufacturer in PET technology and molding. He became General Manager, Tata Consultancy Services Japan Ltd., in October 2001, and assumed his current position in January 2004. Kaji also serves as a board member of the India International School in Japan and the Indian Chamber of Commerce and Industry Japan. He is also known as an alpinist who has been on mountain climbing expeditions in the Himalayas six times.

NANDY, Ashis (Fellow, Centre for the Study of Developing Societies)

Born in 1937 in Bhagalpur, Bihar, India. Nandy received his M.A. and Ph.D. from Nagpur and Gujarat Universities. He has been Director at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center in Washington, and Fellow at the Institutes of Advanced Study in Berlin, Nantes and Edinburgh. Originally trained as a sociologist and clinical psychologist, he has been close to social movements and non-state political actors grappling with issues of peace, human rights, environment, intercultural dialogue, and cultural survival. He has authored and edited many books that deal with political cultures, future studies, and dialogue of civilization.

NANJO, Fumio (Director of Mori Art Museum)

Nanjo graduated from Keio University in the faculty of Economics (1972) and Letters (Aesthetics/ Art History; 1977). He organized numerous exhibitions as an officer of the Japan Foundation (1978–86), the director of ICA Nagoya (1986–1990), the founder and the representative director of Nanjo and Associates (1990–2002), and as the deputy director of the Mori Art Museum (2002–Oct.2006). His achievements include serving as commissioner of the Japan Pavilion at the Venice Biennale (1997), artistic co-director of the Yokohama Triennale 2001 and artistic director of the Singapore Biennale

(2006 & 2008). He has also served as a consultant on several public and corporate art projects. He was awarded the Foreign Minister's Commendation for the Fiscal Year 2007 for his contributions to international cultural exchange over the years. Publications include *Asian Contemporary Art Report: China, India, Middle East and Japan* (2010).

OGUMA, Eiji (Professor, Keio University)

Born in 1962. Graduated from the Department of Agriculture at the University of Tokyo. After working for Iwanami Shoten, a Japanese publishing company, from 1987 to 1996, Oguma obtained his Ph.D. in Advanced Social and International Studies from the University of Tokyo in 1998. He specializes in Historical Sociology. His publications include *A Genealogy of 'Japanese' Self-images* (Trans Pacific Press, 2002) and "The Hidden Face of Disaster: 3.11, the Historical Structure and Future of Japan's Northeast" (*Asia-Pacific Journal*, Sept. 2011).

SAKAKIBARA, Eisuke (President, Institute for Indian Economic Studies/Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University)

Born in 1941. After graduating from the University of Tokyo, Sakakibara joined the Ministry of Finance of Japan. He received his Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Michigan in 1969. After serving as President of the Institute of Fiscal and Monetary Policy and Director-General of the International Finance Bureau, he became Vice Minister of Finance for International Affairs. He retired from office in 1999 and then worked as a professor at Keio University and Waseda University, followed by his present career at Aoyama Gakuin University and the Institute for Indian Economic Studies. He is well-versed in India's economy and society, and his books about India include *Indo Kyodaishijō wo Yomitoku* (Cracking the India Market; co-authored; Toyo Keizai, 2005) and *Indo Azu Nanbā Wan* (India As Number One; Asahi Shimbun, 2011).

SHARMA, Jyotirmaya (Professor, University of Hyderabad)

Sharma has been a fellow of the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies and the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, and has lectured at the universities of Baroda, Hull, Oxford, and the St. Stephens College, Delhi. He was visiting professor in democratic theory at the South Asia Institute at Ruprecht-Karls University in Heidelberg in 2005. He also held senior editorial positions at the *Times of India* and *The Hindu* between 1998 and 2006, and continues to write columns for *Mail Today*, *Hindustan Times* and *Outlook*. The International House of Japan and the Japan Foundation awarded him an Asia Leadership Fellow Program fellowship for 2008.

SHIBUSAWA, Masahide (President, Shibusawa Eiichi Memorial Foundation)

Shibusawa graduated from the Department of Agricultural Economy of the University of Tokyo. He assumed his current position in 1997. He is also the executive director of the MRA Foundation and executive director of the East-West Seminar. He has held eminent positions such as the Director-CEO of Tokyo Jogakkan Schools of Women, Visiting Professor at Portland State University, Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) in London. His publications include *Chichi: Shibusawa Keizo* (Memoir of a Father Shibusawa Keizo; Jitugyo-no-Nihon, 1968), *Taiheiyo ni Kakeru Hashi: Shibusawa Eiichi no Gyoseki* (Bridge Over the Pacific: A Case History of Relations among US/China/Japan during 1879–1931, Based on the Life and Work of Shibusawa Eiichi; Yomiuri Shimbunsha, 1970), *Asia in the World Community* (co-edited with Prachoom Chomchai; Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, 1973), and *Taiheiyo Ajia: Kiken to Kibo* (Pacific Asia, Perils and Promises; Simul Publications, 1991).

TAKENAKA, Chiharu (Professor, Rikkyo University)

Graduated from the University of Tokyo in 1979. After working for various universities in Japan including Waseda University and the University of Tokyo, Takenaka assumed her current position in 2008. Also has been a visiting fellow at the University of Delhi department of history, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and George Washington University Gaston Sigur Center

Japan-India Dialogue: Public Symposium Report

for Asian Studies. She specializes in international politics, comparative politics, South Asian studies, and Gender Studies. Her recent interest is civil society in the era of globalization, nationalism, ethnic and religion conflict. Her publications include *Tōuzoku no Indo-shi: Teikoku, Kokka, Auroro (The Bandit History of India: Empire, the State and Outlaws; Tokyo Yushisha, 2010)* and *Sekai wa Naze Nakayoku Dekinaino? Boryoku no Rensa wo Toku tameni (Why Is There Always Fighting in the World? To Undo the Chain of Violence (Hankyu Communications, 2004).*

TANKHA, Brij (Professor, Univeristy of Delhi; Visiting Professor, Ryukoku University)

Born in Lacknow, India, in 1947. Tankha earned his B.A. and M.A. from the University of Delhi, and Ph.D. from Jawaharlal Nehru University. His research interests are nationalism, Pan-Asianism, religion, and Japan's relations with Asia. He has been a recipient of the Japan Foundation fellowship and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science fellowship, and was a visiting professor at Kyoto University, Waseda University and Hitotsubashi University. In 1977, he assumed his current position at the University of Delhi. He is also currently a visiting professor, ICCR Chair for Indian Studies, Ryukoku University, Kyoto. His publications include *Narratives of Asia: From India, Japan and China* (co-authored; Sampark, 2005) and *A Vision of Empire: Kita Ikki and the Making of Modern Japan* (Global Oriental, 2006).

*Affiliation and titles are those at the time of participation in the symposium.