

Carnival of Dialogue:

Open Dialogue, Dialogic Classroom, Dialogic Organizational Development in Companies

Sachiko IGARASHI

Since Socrates, “dialogue” has been one of the central issues in philosophy. In dialogue, people have discovered themselves and others, and have grown dialectically. In today’s society, however, dialogue is increasingly used as an innovative prescription for solving previously insurmountable problems in transnational and diverse fields of practice.

For example, in medicine, dialogue is attracting attention around the world as a special remedy to “cure” severe mental illnesses, usually treated only by medication or considered difficult to recover from even with medication. In the field of education, it has also been demonstrated that the educational effects of interactive classes outperform preponderantly those of traditional knowledge transfer classes. Furthermore, in corporate management, a shift from traditional management, in which superiors manage and guide subordinates, to interactive management is occurring on a global scale.

What is the power of dialogue? Why is dialogue able to solve difficult problems?

This paper elucidates the latent power of such dialogue as a “carnivalizing force.” The structure of the paper is as follows. First, I will summarize how dialogue is used in the field of medicine, which is one of these practice areas, and what is expected of dialogue. Then, the structure of dialogue at work there will be clarified using Mikhail Bakhtin’s concept of dialogue, and finally, the power of dialogue will be clarified by analyzing dialogue practices in other fields.

Let us take a look at dialogue in medicine.

I. Dialogue in Open Dialogue.

In medicine, there used to be a self-evident relationship in which the doctor *made* the diagnosis and *gave* the treatment to the patient. It is no secret

that this relationship has been criticized as paternalism. The structure of paternalism, in which the all-knowing omnipotent father guides the ignorant or inferior, or in which those in a strong position interfere, intervene, and support those in a weak position regardless of their intentions, does not necessarily lead to good healing results, because it prevents the person being treated from taking ownership. Based on this, medicine has transformed from paternalism to informed consent, based on equal dialogue between doctor and patient.

This shift to dialogue was furthered by the use of Open Dialogue.

Open Dialogue is a treatment and care technique for mental illnesses, including the most severe ones, which has been practiced since the 1980s, mainly at Keropud as Hospital in West Lapland, Finland. This treatment basically consists *only* of a visit by a team of professionals to the home of a client in crisis followed by daily meetings until the crisis is resolved. The dialogue is nothing special, but a “less structured whole” that looks like “small talk.”⁽¹⁾ However, this simple technique of just talking is “a treatment and care technique that is attracting attention around the world today”⁽²⁾ as “a form of crisis intervention in the care of the most severe psychiatric problems.” (ODAAP 82) It has a remarkably high cure rate that overwhelms conventional treatment methods, and it’s said that “if this idea spreads, it will force a major change in the way psychiatric care is provided in Japan.”⁽³⁾ Just talking will cure the disease.

At the heart of this technique, Open Dialogue, is an ideological pillar called “poetics.”⁽⁴⁾⁽⁵⁾ Poetics includes three parts: 1) tolerance of uncertainty, 2) dialogism, and 3) polyphony in social networks.

First, what is unique about Open Dialogue is that the dialogue as a therapeutic method does not take place between the doctor and the patient as in ordinary medical treatment, but as a dialogue between all parties concerned including people close to the patient. According to Seikkula:

Dedicated to giving immediate help in a crisis, the basic format of the Open Dialogue is the treatment meeting, which occurs within twenty-four hours of the initial contact. It is organized by a mobile crisis team composed of outpatient and inpatient staff and takes place, if possible, at the family home. It brings together the person in acute distress with the team and all other important persons (i.e., relatives, friends, and other professionals) connected to the situation. The meeting takes place physically in

an open forum as well, with *everyone* sitting in the same room, in a *circle*. (ODAAP 88-89, Italics mine, samely hereinafter.)

The first thing that should be noted are the concepts of *everyone* and *sitting in a circle*. Moreover, this treatment is not done in a hospital room, but in the patient's home whenever possible. In other words, this dialogue as therapy happens in the place where the patient has been until the onset of the disease, with *the therapist added to* the existing relationships between the people surrounding the patient, who are called network members. In addition, these people are not placed in a hierarchical arrangement of therapist / non therapist or party / collaborator, but are all assumed to be equal participants. The norm of equality is manifested in the shape of a circle with no top and bottom. Sitting in a circle with no ups and downs means that there is no dominant relationship. It also means that there are no dependencies. In the space of Open Dialogue, there is no strong father, as in paternalism. According to Tamaki Saito, "As a general rule, we do not make a clear distinction between staff and clients during discussions. [...] It is important to note that while 'expertise' is necessary in Open Dialogue, there is no hierarchical relationship in which 'the expert gives orders, and the patient follows.' Open Dialogue is a dialogue between expert and patient in a state of complete mutuality." (Saito 224)

All decisions about ongoing therapy, medication, and hospitalization are discussed and made while *everyone* is present. There are no separate staff meetings for treatment planning. (ODAAP 90) All interactions are transparent. These include decisions to admit the patient to the hospital, whether to use medication, and whether to include individual psychotherapy. (ODGP 125) No conversations or decisions about the case are conducted outside the presence of the network. (ODGP 150) ⁽⁶⁾

Seikkula also says:

The question that a crisis poses, "what shall we do?" is kept open until the collective dialogue itself produces a response or dissolves the need for action. Immediate advice, rapid conclusions, and traditional interventions make it less likely that safety and trust will be established, or that a genuine resolution to a psychotic crisis will occur. Hypotheses are particularly

avoided, because they can be silencing, and interfere with the possibility of finding a natural way to defuse the crisis. The therapists therefore enter without a preliminary definition of the problem in the hope that the dialogue itself will bring forward new ideas and stories. (ODAAP 94)

In Open Dialogue, the doctor does not make a diagnosis. The answers come from the dialogue. Doctors do not heal, dialogue is what heals. This is what Seikkula calls *dialogism*. The unidirectionality in which the doctor makes a diagnosis, proposes a treatment method, and the actual treatment, is carried out according to the flow of the diagnosis, and the diagnosis or treatment which is made in a doctor→patient relationship, is rejected here. However, this dialogism means that patients and their families are left in a state of limbo, unable to depend on their doctors to cure them and unable to receive a definitive diagnosis or treatment. It is also incumbent on the treatment team to simply continue to participate in the dialogue as an equal members of the team, not as a doctors, and to trust the dialogue and wait patiently for it to make a difference. We do not know what will come of it, nor can we control the dialogue. The only thing the therapist can do is to participate in the dialogue, believe in the power of the dialogue, and endure in the hope that the dialogue will do something. The process of continuing the dialogue in the midst of uncertainty must be tough for both patients and their families as well as for the therapists. However, without this tolerance for uncertainty, Open Dialogue would not be possible. The power to endure the uncertainty of Open Dialogue also comes from dialogue.

In practice, tolerance of uncertainty is constituted by frequent meetings and by the quality of the dialogue. It is important that meetings are held often enough, daily if necessary, that the family does not feel alone in the crisis. [...] includes the possibility of meeting daily for 10-12 days following the onset of a serious crisis. [...] Every severe crisis requires that *the therapists and the family*, for a period of time, manage the inherent ambiguities of the crisis situation, to which the dialogue, hopefully, provides Ariadne's thread. (ODAAP 93-94)

If the dialogue is to continue in the midst of uncertainty, where no one can predict the future, it is obvious that this dialogue is not a question-and-answer

interview between doctor and patient, as is usually assumed. The dialogue is not directed by the doctor. According to Seikkula:

The important work of the treatment team in the meeting [...] This kind of dialogue is not unlike that old question-and-answer session, the “interview” that *elicits information from the patient to plan an intervention. The form of the dialogue itself becomes the intervention.* What the treatment team needs to do in the dialogue is to create as much space as possible for connections to emerge through dialogue. The target of the intervention is the dialogue itself, not the patient or the people involved. (ODGP 142)

In other words, *creating* dialogue is *therapy*. If this is the case, then there was no dialogue in the previous environment, that is, the environment in which the patient has developed the disease. This shows why Open Dialogue treats not only the patient but the entire network surrounding the patient. It is within that network that the disease was born. In other words, the patient is sick in the relationships that surround him, the patient lives in the sick relationships, and by intervening and adjusting the relationships, the illness of the person living there can be healed.⁽⁷⁾ This web inhabited by both the patients and the relatives is nothing but a non-interactive space, a space of monologue. The therapist intervenes in this monologue.

A monologic dialogue is a one-sided utterance of one’s own thoughts and ideas without regard to the other person. This utterance rejects *another utterance*. (Saito 132)

Even when there are multiple people, or even multiple people talking, the field is often a monologic space. Only one person has the power to speak, and they speak unilaterally, forcing others to go on their rails, on their assumptions, towards their “right answer.” There are allowed and disallowed utterances, and alternative rails and voices are rejected, because the way of speaking, and the content of the speech, and the speaker is already determined. It is a ubiquitous scene. In the space of this monologue, people are made passive, or become passive. There is a center that dominates, and there is a periphery that submits to the center. Even if there is no direct control or command, if there are people who tacitly submit themselves, who have embodied themselves as passive

beings, then this is a controlled space—a space of monologue. The speech of another is rejected there. The rightness of otherness and the otherness of the other are denied. In this field, people reject their own *other* voices and make themselves others.⁽⁸⁾

If this is the space of the monologue, then the space of the dialogue is the space where all voices arise, all rightnesses are made, and all people are masters. And Open Dialogue is precisely what gives space to this other voice, the rejected others, and opens up the closed monologue of power into a variety of dialogues. To this end, the strategy of Open Dialogue is very simple “to ‘answer’ what the patient or others have said.” (ODAAP 96)

“Every spoken statement, or utterance, requires a reply. There is an aesthetic (a fitting together of utterance and reply) to the dialogue, that makes it ‘dialogical,’ rather than ‘monological,’ which would be a speaker without a contributing listener.” (ODAAP 96) No matter how strange the story, how off the subject, how out of place anyone’s speech is, in Open Dialogue it is first heard, responded to, and accepted. In fact, the treatment team even dares to open up the space to such voices. This is what Seikkula calls “the multivoiced discourse.” (HETC 169) But this is *not* just “acceptance and listening.” According to Saito, the treatment team “does not remain neutral in accepting and listening, but [...] actively broadens and diverts the topic.” (ODGP 129) It is to fracture the one / correct / central / reasonable discourse and to actively give rights to the peripheral / myriad / contradictory / arising discourses. Seikkula says, “As we understand postmodern theory, it does not forbid the use of any form of discourse. Rather, it forbids any form of discourse from making exclusive claims to the truth. We recognize that our efforts to explain may invoke theories that do not, ultimately, agree with each other.” (HETC 168-169) In a successful Open Dialogue, “the therapist was decentering at multiple levels of the conversation. The conclusion of the analysis is that <postmodern> therapy differs from other therapeutic models in that it ‘actively seeks to decenter’ rather than ‘daring to take a non-interventionist position.’” (ODGP 129) Saito said, “The development from monologue to dialogue can be clearly seen as an analogy of castration. By castrating the all-powerful monologue, the spoken word is opened up and restored into a sharable dialogue.” (Saito 58)

The act of responding to any voice is itself an act of the strong will of decentering. It goes against our own normal desire to read flow or plot in a conversation. However, the act of daring to place oneself in that unstable space

and open oneself up to *impossible* responses at each moment, itself conveys a strong message to *all present*. It is not just patients; whether family members or colleagues, they are all people who have been looking for a center and who identify themselves with an appropriate way of being, while at the same time alienating themselves. The field of dialogue speaks to these people. Every voice must arise, be accepted, and responded to as the voice of here. The voice of the other, the voice that has been stripped of its rights and drowned out, must be reclaimed. Everyone can exist here as myself, not as a rejected other or the other who has rejected me. All those who live in the web of monologue and have lost their *other voices* are accepted as they are in the field of dialogue. Every word that is uttered is heard and responded to by all. The words of response are heard and will give rise to the next words. The dialogue must continue between the myriad “multiple subjects, forming a polyphony,” (ODAAP 97) not one proper voice.

Thus, in Open Dialogue, all the treatment team has to do is to first generate, and then follow, the dialogue that arises. The therapist is no longer a therapist. They are no longer there as a therapist. The therapist is not “a neutral observer not sitting in the same room,” (HETC 161) but is there “as fully embodied persons.” (HETC 162) This principle of dialogism, of making the field *nothing but* a dialogue, requires the treatment team to let go of the therapist / observer role. The language and manner of the therapist are also determined by this principle. “At the beginning, team members are careful to incorporate the familiar language of the network members into their own utterances” (HETC 151) abandoning the language of the therapist / observer and speaking in *normal language*. Moreover, as fully embodied persons, they accept the *natural behavior*, not usually considered acceptable for medical professional’s norm, in which their own emotions resonate with those expressed by other participants in the moment. They accept the joy, anger, sadness, and sorrow that comes from sharing a field, whether it is their own, or that of the participants, as natural feelings. “The team member’s response resonates with the degree of distress and difficulty uttered. Indeed, sometimes team members offer enhanced opportunity for network members to express feelings of hopelessness. This contrasts with a solution-oriented approach in which the therapist tries to find more positive words to construct experience.” (HETC 164-165) “Indeed, it appears that the shift out of rigid and constricted monological discourse into dialogue occurs as if by itself when painful emotions are not

treated as dangerous, but instead allowed to flow freely in the room.” (HETC 166-167)

The fact that we live in this world means that we are in the context of each moment, in the relationship of each moment. We cannot be in a vacuum where there is no relationship, no context. And we have always been called upon to take on the *appropriate* personality in that context / relationship. To live in the world is to adapt oneself to the appropriate way of being demanded by each situation. In other words, it is a process of sealing oneself off from *being* oneself. A particular situation is not the only place for a monologue. All of us are always in the command of the field, in the control of the monologue. Against these basic constraints, Open Dialogue wages a full-scale struggle. A discourse that overthrows the discourses that dominate us, a polyphonic discourse that destroys one rightness, one center, is what Open Dialogue brings about—not outside the field, but within it. This is how Seikkula puts it: “The ‘strategy’ of Open Dialogue is to construct a dialogic discourse. It is in dialogue that new understandings emerge as shareable phenomena among people.” (ODGP 123)

“New,” Seikkula said. Neutralizing the norms of the field, endlessly shifting the predetermined proper landing place, disrupting the expected and obeyed story line, and simply giving rights to, and surrendering the field to, the plotless polyphony that arises there, inevitably transforms the space of dialogue into something that no one can control, something that only dialogue can control. Instead of the cul-de-sac of monologue that forces us to return repeatedly to a single center, in the polyphonic, fully permissive emergence of countless voices, there are constantly “new understandings” (ODGP 123) beyond conventional understandings, “new words” (ODGP 125) beyond the correct wording, “a new point of view” (HETC 162) beyond the proper way of seeing, “new narratives,” (ODGP 126) “new meanings,” (HETC 163) and “new possibilities,” (HETC 163) are born. It is something that can only be called “new,” something that has never existed before. It is something beyond the monologically planned and reconstructed, something that *is born* beyond all our expectations.

What is at stake here, is the joint stake of whether to maintain an impersonal order in which all of us are marginalized, or to reclaim the space in which we are ourselves. But it is only in this gamble that we stand before the possibility of living ourselves.

Seikkula said.

The crisis becomes the opportunity to make and remake the fabric of stories, identities, and relationships that construct the self and a social world. (ODAAP 95)

In the new network that emerges in the dialogue, in the experience of everyone having composed the dialogue together, and having shared all their voices and feelings with each other in the dialogue, a solidarity is born. It means that every *I* listen to, and liberates the self that has been closed up within itself.⁽⁹⁾ And, in this solidarity, “the disease” will be healed.

II. Dialogue in Bakhtin

It is well known that Mikhail Bakhtin⁽¹⁰⁾ provided the ideological background of this Open Dialogue.⁽¹¹⁾ The three pillars of Open Dialogue are “tolerance of uncertainty,” “dialogism,” and “polyphony.” Seikkula calls these three pillars “the poetics” of Open Dialogue, and it is these poetics that support the Open Dialogue that led Bakhtin. Now, in clarifying Bakhtin’s thought, his theory of Dostoevsky has an important meaning. He discusses the Russian writer Dostoevsky⁽¹²⁾ and develops his own ideas in the form of a superimposition on Dostoevsky’s work.

According to Bakhtin, Dostoevsky’s horizon is completely different from that of Tolstoy⁽¹³⁾ and other traditional novelists. Dostoevsky is a novelist, but not a novelist. If Tolstoy and his contemporaries were novelists who wrote their novels within the framework of the novel, Dostoevsky was a man who broke that framework. And the field that Dostoevsky entered is poetics. So, what is poetics? Bakhtin says that in poetics, Dostoevsky rejected “time” and chose “space.” In other words, poetics is the rejection of time and the tyranny of space instead of time.

In a normal novel, the main character is placed in a certain situation and experiences various things in their relationship with the people around them, and a certain amount of time in which they change is depicted. The story is about the lives of various characters created by the author, who live in some situation decided by the author. This is the *story*, and the *history* as a story that

they weave. In other words, a novel is a story of growth (*Bildungsroman*) in which the characters live, and the reader lives through the characters' time together in the story.

But this concept of time is what Dostoevsky avoids. He rejects the very story of growth (*Bildungsroman*). There will be a variety of people in the novel. Some are bad, some are good, some are foolish. Each of these people will live their lives by drawing a parabola that is appropriate to them as a result of their own personalities. Whether it is a tragedy or a comedy, the reader is convinced that this is what happened because these people did such in such a situation, as they put themselves into the story. For example, "He succeeded because he tried his best." or, "He tried his best, but it didn't work out. After all, there is always misfortune in life." A novel is a reconfirmation of the normative context of the world of life shared by the novelist and the reader by applying it to the characters, and a novel is a reproduction of our world of life. We confirm our lives in novels.

In fact, that is how we live our lives. We think about what kind of person we are, what kind of position and role we play, and what kind of life we are going to lead, and then we *apply that to ourselves* and live our lives. And we alienate ourselves into that trajectory by thinking that we should be like that, that we have to be like that. Of course, we do not think of it as alienation. We believe that this is our true self. Even though I am not yet, even though I have not yet, I think that I should be, that I must be, and I blame my past self for not being so, and I feel sad for my present self for not being so yet, and I impose on myself a future that is my duty. I must be, I must not be what I am not. I *cannot* be me.

Thus, the time of life is a path to me that I cannot escape, as I live it. To escape from me, I am given two paths: death or mental illness. By these two paths, I can finally get out of *my own way*.

It is time that binds me to this path of *mine*.

When I am not who I am supposed to be, I cannot say I *am not it*. I just have not become it *yet*. In saying that, I am on probation.

The dialectic of time is the dialectic of integration. The heterogeneous is not allowed to be heterogeneous; it is replaced by the immature or incomplete by the application of the dialectic of time, and then integrated into the proper, into identity. It is this kind of novel that Dostoevsky rejects. The dialectic of time, which places things that are alien to our world of life, that does not fit into

the frame, on the time axis as immature and incomplete, and then commandeers these things for “growth,” has the same power in the novel as it does in real life.

In contrast, Dostoevsky attempts to abolish the integration of time and give primacy to space, that is, to create a space that would frustrate the dialectic of time. (Creation 62-66) In the space where time is abolished, all things exist without any integration. The heterogeneous exists not as immature but as heterogeneous, as heterogeneous that cannot be eliminated by the integration of growth. And Dostoevsky sets up this space as a space of dialogue in which the dominance of one voice is overturned by the turbulence of multiple voices—a space of dialogue as polyphony.

This is where Bakhtin sees the essential novelty of Dostoevsky’s poetics. Whereas the “novel” before Dostoevsky was only the “author’s creation,” monologue-like or power-oriented work in which the author had transcendental point of view, set up the characters, and set the plot in motion, In Dostoevsky’s work, the story is not dominated by the author’s overarching plot, but by the various voices of the characters who live in the story, and it is moved “on its own” by the web of these multiple voices. Therefore, the web of voices that emerges as a dialogue does not have a dialectical predetermined result of converging into one after a certain amount of confrontation and dialogue in time, but rather, “One response gives rise to another, another to another, and so on, in an endless dialogue that lacks any *forward* movement,” (Creation 238) “a unique *perpetuum mobile*” that persists as a spatial arrangement of multiple voices. (Creation 238) Because the space of this movement is his work, for Dostoevsky, the work is not a single epic poem that has an introduction, development, turn, and conclusion, but an unfinished flow that leaves the author’s own hands and repeats the Brownian motion without cohesion. The characters are not modern subjects with identities, but rather *events* that continue to be born anew each time as *voices* that collide. No longer does “personality lose the rough substance that appeared on its outer surface and material clarity, and is replaced by an event from existence.” (Creation 331)

Thus, in Dostoevsky, the dialogue is eternally incomplete, and because the dialogue is incomplete, the personality is also eternally incomplete. We *are* the indefinable voice that arises, driven in each moment, in each dialogue. And, because this unintegrated voice is the only present tense in which we live at any given moment, “to be is to traffic dialogically,” (Creation 293) and

“in dialogue, man not only reveals himself to the outside world, but becomes for the first time what he is.” (Creation 293) What dialogue makes possible is simply *the movement of becoming what one is, the liberation* of drifting away from the tether to the subject. This is why “dialogue cannot and should not actually end.” (Creation 293) And if this incompleteness is what Bakhtin calls Dostoevsky’s method, his poetics, then Dostoevsky’s poetics is precisely that which overthrows the dominance of the monologue which materializes us, the myriad of intangible voices flowing in dialogue, into a single subject and fixes us in identity.

Bakhtin calls this a “carnival” field. Carnival is a field that overthrows my routine life and gives birth to *me*. Bakhtin said, “Carnival is not something to be watched, or, strictly speaking, even performed, but something to be lived. While the laws of carnival are in force, people live according to them, that is, they live carnival life.” (Poetics 248)

The carnival life is a life that deviates from the normal trajectory, a life that is in some way “turned inside out” or “a world of contradictions” (*monde à l’envers*). [...] The laws, prohibitions, and restrictions that govern the structure and order of normal life outside of carnival, are abolished during the carnival, and the first and foremost parts removed are the hierarchical structures of society and their associated forms of fear, reverence, veneration, manners, etc. In other words, all inequalities based on social hierarchy and other factors (including age) will be removed. All distance between people is also removed, and the unique category of carnival—free and unreserved human contact—gains power. This is a very important element of the carnival sense of the world. In the carnival square, people who, in real life, are separated by the solid barriers of hierarchy enter into free and unreserved contact. (Poetics 248-249)

In this carnival that rises up to cut open the everyday life that holds us in place, kings become slaves and slaves become kings. Distances are abolished and people collide. Identities are lost. Right becomes wrong and wrong becomes right, orders become farce, the center becomes the periphery, and the periphery becomes the center. This “carnival celebrates the alternation itself, the process of alternation, not what is being alternated.” (Poetics 252) This is because it is in this “alternation,” in other words, in the overthrow of the fixed

identity, the old system, that the monologic subject which has been objectified and connected to the identity, dies. "In each person, the protagonist dies (i.e., is denied) and then comes back to life (i.e., is purified and transcends himself)." (Poetics 257) The subject must die each time. If it does not die, the voice that I have been stifling, that is *I*, will not be able to regain its breath.

Moreover, Bakhtin superimposes the carnival square, the field of this voice's rebirth, on the dialogue of Socrates. It goes without saying that Socrates was a "midwife" who, out of an *unreserved* desire for truth, thoroughly attacked monologic truth, cornered "the subject" who spoke a given monologic truth, clashed with any opponent, and gave birth to truth from that dialogue. After pointing out that Socratic dialogue, born in the Greek agora, the square of Athens, is a square open to all, just like a carnival, he goes on to say, "Socrates' discovery of the dialogical nature of thought and truth itself presupposes a carnival-like unreserved relation among the participants in the dialogue and the elimination of all distance between them, and moreover, presupposes an unreserved relation to the object of thought itself or to truth itself, no matter how lofty and important it may be." (Poetics 265) In order to seek the real truth, and to make it clear that none of the "truths" that exist today are truths, this midwife challenges with dialogue those who clung to the "truth." One method is "synkrisis" ("the contrasting of various views of an object." (Poetics 227)) that is, the technique of relativizing the other person's statement and denying its absoluteness. The other is "anakrisis" ("a method of coaxing the interlocutor into saying something, forcing him to express his opinion and letting him finish." (Poetics 228)) in other words, a technique of provoking the interlocutor's words. "synkrisis and anakrisis make thought dialogical, lure it outside to become a verbal exchange, and make thought participate in the dialogical exchange between people." (Poetics 228) Socratic method is to split the solid subject, to lure what is inside to the outside, to provoke what is inside, to force it to say. He does not give the truth, he lures what was inside to the outside. He incises the completed monologue, which has one strong center, and drags the voices that have been squeezed inside out. And then he exposes that the truth they have been believing and following is not the truth, and frees them from that "truth" and from being the subject narrates that truth. The carnival celebrates the death of "truth" and the overthrow of the subject. Because there begins the rebirth of the other voice that has been rejected under identity, or the birth of the "one as who is," who has reclaimed that it is not another

voice, but precisely their own voice, own one that can be listened to by others.

III. Dialogue in Schools and Companies

Two characteristics of modern society that emerged after the 19th were the sovereign state system and capitalism. However, these two are not separate because there is inevitably a struggle for supremacy among the exclusive group of sovereign nations that cover almost every corner of the globe, and it will be won by the country with power, that is, the country with a strong military and plenty of money to support it. Thus, the modern nation needed strong human resources—good soldiers and good factory workers—to make up a strong nation. What these two ways of being had in common was the need for the skill (literacy) to understand the instructions given to them and to realize them with high labor productivity, and the obedient body to follow orders from above. Modernity has privileged these useful bodies and eliminated those that are not, as sick and immature. The modern school was established as an institution to train these people.

The basic system of these modern school was as follows. A single teacher stood before a large number of students, gave them all the same instructions, and taught them all to the same standard. The teacher gave the “right” answer, and the students had to take the “right” answer as the correct answer and memorize it through repeated practice. Students were graded according to the degree to which they followed the teacher’s instructions and acquired the right answers provided by the teacher. The teacher set the educational plan and curriculum, and gave priority to the uniform implementation of the plan, rather than the rate of growth of the students themselves. These were the landscapes of education that took place in the public schools of all modern sovereign nations across borders. In short, the educational goal of the modern school was to make students human resource to support a powerful nation, and all students were forced into the mold, educational plans were made by calculating backwards from the mold, and evaluation was conducted based on the degree to which the student fitted the template for their own body. And those who could not achieve were eliminated as “inferior.” Here, the subject of education is the teacher, and the state that owns the teacher as an instrument. For students, education is not their right but their duty. There was never any

doubt about this in the modern school. Moreover, it is important to note that the people were required to be active subjects who could fit themselves into useful bodies, i.e., human resources that are required by others. A “good student” is a subject who proactively makes himself into an object. In the modern school, students had to be subjects who actively alienated, standardized, and identified ourselves. And people followed this scenario themselves because they could be evaluated and move up the social hierarchy by showing themselves able to fit the mold rather than by being themselves.

However, these schools are now being forced to change their ways. The main reason is that the industrial structure of society has changed. With the transition to so-called post-industrial capitalism, the type of human resources needed has changed. The human resources that are needed now are not the heteronomous and cast-iron humans who have been cultivated by the schools in the past, but those who are self-generated and have a different form.

First, in capitalism, profit is created by differentiation from others. It is well known that in the era of industrial capitalism, companies generated profits by providing cheaper and more precise products through mass production and mass sales using mechanical factories and accurate quality control. However, now goods have become widespread through mass production, there is a demand for “higher value” and “new and unique” products. This shift from mass production and mass sales to technological innovation and product differentiation is the essence of post-industrial capitalism. This era is also an information society. In this age, the differences that have been created will be instantly duplicated and leveled out, losing their value as differences. Nowadays, companies cannot survive without constantly deconstructing themselves and creating differences from themselves. In such a situation, it is obvious that the type of heteronomous, cast-iron, and identifiable human resource that was once required will lose its value. A body that has been educated and controlled to follow a given “right answer” is not capable of destroying the given right answer and creating a new difference. It is the people who think for themselves and try to go beyond the existing values and structures that can make a difference. Such people cannot be trained in modern schools. These schools cannot create people who are anti-management, anti-cast, and who try to be subjects in the true sense of the word.

It is interesting to note that the move to active learning is occurring at the very point where the industrial structure is changing. The teaching of passive

human beings that has been done in the classroom must be replaced by the active learning of people. Thus, modern schools are in a tight spot. The industrial world is urging schools to develop human resources for the new era.⁽¹⁴⁾ However, the methods used by schools are still based on those of modern schools. “School” is still a place where one teacher teaches many students the right answer in a classroom. However, it is also true that this call for the transformation of schools is strongly supported not only by industry, but also by the teachers and citizens who seek to restore the central position of students who have been marginalized in the current school system. The school will not retain its current form, slowly but surely, it will change. This is not only due to the post-industrial capitalist situation, which is actually the saturation of industrial socialism. The main reason is the state of the world over the past two decades, when we have all experienced the many cataclysmic events that have struck our world since 9/11, from catastrophic disasters occurring in various places and terrorism to the COVID-19 pandemic. We have been made aware that we are living in an age of uncertainty with no clear answers in terms of economics, politics, and the global environment. No one can teach the passive subject a new “right” answer; therefore, the system of teaching the passive subject the right answer is no longer possible. No one can see the future. The modern waterfall model of organizational management, in which those at the top give correct instructions and those below follow them, has failed in schools, businesses, and politics. So how is the world going to overcome this crisis?

It will be through dialogue.

Cognitive Edge, Inc. and Yoichi Tamura, introduced the Cynefin Framework to Japan, the latest in organizational management theory, say, “When faced with a new problem, most organizations try to control the situation in ways they have tried before. That’s the typical response. It’s to try to deal with complex problems in an orderly fashion, which leads from the obvious to the complicated. When orderly interventions are made and do not work, the typical organization will still try to strengthen the measures of the orderly system and go higher in the complicated. At some point, however, they reach the limit, and the measures they have devised become completely ineffective, and they collapse. Then they slide down the slope so fast that they tip over and fall through the wall of carelessness into chaos.”⁽¹⁵⁾

The Cynefin Framework divides problems into two main categories.

These are problems that can be dealt with in an orderly manner and problems that are non-orderly and cannot be dealt with in the conventional order. An orderly problem (“orderly system”) consists of two domains: an obvious problem (“obvious domain”), such as “the gas meter has gone down, so I’ll refuel,” and a complicated problem (“complicated domain”), such as, “my car stalled, and I can’t deal with it with the obvious domain, so I’ll ask a specialist to fix it,” which is a complicated problem that I can’t deal with, but can deal with by asking a specialist. In contrast, problem areas that cannot be solved by such orderly measures are called “non-orderly” problems. For example, let’s consider truancy. It is clear that truancy is not an obvious problem that can be solved immediately by any one person. However, it is also not something that can be solved by leaving it to the experts. When truancy occurs, those involved must first gather a variety of data. The first step is to talk to the student, family, teachers, and friends involved, and, through persistent work, to understand the family’s and the student’s situation from various angles, so that the full extent of the problem can finally be seen. Only then will it be possible to shift to the orderly system, in which the truancy case can be dealt with partly in the obvious domain and partly in the complex domain. This is the domain called “complex domain.” Furthermore, there is a sub-domain of the non-ordered system called the “chaotic domain.” It covers things such as conflicts and terrorism for which it is impossible, at least for the time being, to elucidate causal relationships. We have learned that the old solution of sending in troops to subdue the enemy with “force for force” will rather prolong the problem and cause confusion. We have to endure the panic of the chaotic domain and take the problem to the complex domain first. What needs to be done is to transcend individual interests and listen to and understand the voices of those involved, and attempt to share the background. The heterogeneous and cast-iron human resources cultivated by modern schools may be effective in the problem domain of orderly systems. In this domain, problem solving is possible through the unidirectional application of correct solutions (downloading). However, it is obvious that the real world is filled with problems of non-ordered systems. And in non-ordered problem domains where it is impossible to “apply” the correct solution in one direction, we must grope our way together with the people involved to find a bi-directional or multi-directional solution, rather than a one-way solution.

This is exactly the direction in which the organizational management of modern companies is moving. First and foremost, it is trial and error, not application. Being aware that the one-way application of the “right answer” (downloading) is no longer realistic, they don’t adopt the waterfall management style, in which the entire organization takes time to decide on the best measures and then moves from there. Instead, people who are aware of the problem, form small groups, without distinctions of hierarchy, and work independently and autonomously to find a better solution through repeated hypothesis testing and trial and error. To be better instead of best means that progress always allows for mistake. Thus, within an organization, a series of short trials occur simultaneously. The results of the trials of these small groups—including their failures—are shared and returned *to the entire organization*. Each time, the entire organization learns from these trial-and-error processes, and the verified harvests (knowledge gained) are accumulated. All this becomes the experience and learning outcomes of the entire organization. This is called agile organizational development.⁽¹⁶⁾ In this process, all parties involved, regardless of position or hierarchy, share the journey of clarifying and solving problems in an interactive and multidirectional manner, going back to the background and essence of the problem together, and continuing to grow together. The organization is changing into a “learning organization.”

In an age of uncertainty, the best form of adaptation is to learn by trial and error, responding agilely to each situation as it arises. Naturally, what is required here is not the other-regulating and uniformed body that modernity demanded, but a subject that moves of its own accord and has differences, in other words, a subject that is autonomous and different from other entities. However, this subject is not a closed one. It is an open, interactive subject that builds teams, engages in trial and error, and openly shares the results—even if they are failures—with everyone as harvest. In order for these actors to work to the fullest and share the results of their learning with the entire organization, trial and error should not be seen as a negative but rather as important data, that is, as an opportunity for organizational growth. A trusting relationship that positively recognizes and openly accepts failures is a prerequisite. Takama says, “If we want to have an open discussion, we need to listen to each other’s experiences and what’s really going on without judging. If we can just listen without judging the other person, we can accept the other person. Then generative interaction will occur, one person will no longer be alone, and a col-

lective fusion as a team will occur, allowing for more exploration.” (Takama 42)

Of course, this is not a traditional meeting or discussion.

“This discussion requires facilitation skills to create a space where the diversity of the organization’s members accept each other and everyone can express their opinions openly and not be judged for what they say. And they allow each other to talk about their experiences and feelings. When we are able to listen to and accept each other’s experiences, an atmosphere of respect is created within each other. From this, a sense of humility is created in each of us, and we become aware that we are not the only ones who know the right answer, and that we may be wrong. As a result, people become more interested in the existence and ideas of others, and are motivated to make use of *opinions that are not based on data or other evidence.*” (Takama 148)⁽¹⁷⁾

This is what Takama calls “empathetic dialogue” which is not an evaluation or judgment from above or outside of the group on the opinions submitted or the results achieved, but an equal dialogue among members who empathize with, and support the trial process of their colleagues who are trying to construct their own questions and verify their hypotheses, and who are trying to grow together.

Furthermore, when empathic dialogue can be achieved, the discussion enters into “generative dialogue.” “This is where participants create new knowledge by engaging in collective thinking. This is different from a traditional discussion. Discussion is *a process of convergence* in which *people with knowledge, information, and experience* are valued, and participants present options and choose one of them. By contrast, generative dialogue is *a process of mutual exploration* of shared meanings and experiences. When this dialogue flows well, for example, a group of people with a standard deviation scores of about 30 can become 65. This generative discussion seems to produce better results when there is a diversity of people with different frameworks and perspectives. This is because it creates a variety of awareness among the participants. And *beyond the diversity* of each other, a sense is born like that the group is sharing a single brain.” (Takama 149)

“Beyond diversity,” Takama says. It is not just “empathy for diversity” as was done in the empathic dialogues. In generative dialogue, a process is

formed in which “the group shares a single brain beyond diversity.” It is *only through* understanding and accepting, that plurality and difference are born out of the inevitable background of each person’s experience that a joint exploration of such opinions becomes possible. Here, different frameworks and perspectives naturally meet and collide without judgment. It is not an evaluation of each other’s existence or abilities, and therefore not ego against ego, but opinion against opinion, framework against framework, creating awareness and jointly talking about how to do better. This is a conflict that does not feel like a conflict. This is a conflict felt only as joint inquiry, that is the joint process of thinking together.

Senge, who created the concept of a “learning organization,” says, “Great teams are not characterized by an absence of conflict. On the contrary, in my experience, one of the most reliable indicators of a team that is continually learning is the visible conflict of ideas. In great teams conflict becomes productive. [...] The free flow of conflicting ideas is critical for creative thinking, for discovering new solutions no one individual would have come to on his own. Conflict becomes, in effect, part of the ongoing dialogue.” (Senge 232) “On the other hand, in a mediocre team, one of two conditions usually surrounds conflict. Either, there is an appearance of no conflict on the surface, or there is a rigid polarization.” (Senge 232) In other words, “The difference between great teams and mediocre teams lies in how they face conflict and deal with the defensiveness that invariably surrounds conflict. [...] The source of defensive routines, [...] is not belief in our views or desire to preserve social relations, as we might tell ourselves, but fear of exposing the thinking that lies behind our views.” (Senge 233) Supported by empathic dialogues that unpack fear and self-protection, the “good team” will continue these confrontations, or generative dialogues.

The dialogue takes place as follows:

First, regarding the theme: “When conducting dialogues, do not set a fixed theme or agenda in advance.” (Takama 225) “If possible, it would be better if the participating members could decide the theme on their own. This is called transparency of the agenda.” (Takama 225). Next, let’s look at the space for dialogue. “In order to conduct a dialogue, the setting is important. It would be difficult to start a dialogue in a conference room in a company, in a suit and tie. Of course, once you get used to it, you can do it anywhere. The best place

is off-site, away from the office, where there is a rich natural environment.” (Takama 226). “The attire should be business casual and the atmosphere should be open. It is better not to have desks, but only chairs arranged in a circle to facilitate dialogue.” (Takama 226) This relationship also spills over into the way people address each other. “In order to change the culture of the organization, many companies have implemented measures such as ‘banning the use of roles’ and ‘campaign of calling name with ‘SAN.’ By stopping the use of names that fix hierarchical relationships, an open atmosphere can be created, and the Upgrading and downgrading of employees can be carried out smoothly.” (Takama 221)

Another important point is that the dialogue can start with a check-in. A check-in is “a one-minute session in which you tell us your name, your current honest feelings, and what is bothering you.” (Takama 229) Of course, “I don’t set the order, but let the person who wants to speak start, and when everyone has finished speaking, we can get into the content of the training. At this time, do not ask questions or butt in on what people are saying. This check-in is very effective. Because we take the action of silently listening to each other’s situations and backgrounds, we can reduce the feeling of judging. Understanding each other’s situation makes it easier to accept the other person as he is, which increases interaction. In addition, we can orient ourselves to speak when we want to, even if we are not designated to do so.” (Takama 230)

All statements, no matter what they are, are accepted. All statements make up the dialogue of the moment. “When listening, try to get the important meanings behind what the other person is saying. There is no meaningless statement, and thinking every statement has something which we should penetrate into, we strain ears.” (Takama 231)

This is how dialogue is born.

In these uncertain and unpredictable times, the only thing we know is that the way we’ve always done it won’t work—that no one has the right answer that can be downloaded, that the method of downloading itself cannot be used, and that everyone must go beyond their own known obviousness. Senge says “Part of the vision of dialogue is the assumption of a ‘larger pool of meaning’ accessible only to group. [...] Each person’s view is a unique perspective on a larger reality. If I can ‘look out’ through your view and you through mine, we will each see *something we might not have seen alone.*” (Senge 231)

Only through dialogue can *I* have the eyes of *we*. *He* can also have *our* eyes. It is not just a collective knowledge that adds up the perspectives of each. Through collective knowledge, the eyes of *I* are opened and transformed into the eyes of *we*. Scharmer, who along with Senge has been leading modern organization theory, says: “We believe that the real limits are not ‘outside’ us, but in our assumptions inside our heads about what is possible.” (LFEF 293)

IV. Carnival of dialogue

The essence of leadership in any age has always been to sense the future and make it a reality. It is about crossing the threshold and stepping into the future, a new realm different from the past. The Indo-European root of the English word leadership, “leith” means “to move forward,” “to cross a threshold,” or “to die.” (LFEF 153)

Dialogue can overcome serious illnesses that are difficult to treat with conventional medicine and opaque barriers that are difficult to overcome with conventional corporate practices. It is not a designed discussion with a theme and a set agenda, nor is it a session conducted by a coach. The dialogue used in these situations is all just talk, left to chance. No, rather, it is a chat designed to be just a chat, that is, a chat designed to exclude someone else’s control or someone else’s design. People sit in a circle without hierarchy or pecking order, each other by their individual names rather than by their roles, and talk about their experiences and feelings. In this way, raw emotions and casually dressed, private narratives told in your own words are brought into a public space such as a medical field or a corporate conference room. And there, anyone and any story can be heard and responded to. This is something that has never been allowed before. The threshold will be crossed. This is what it means “to move forward,” and “to die.”

Let us go back to Bakhtin for a moment.

Bakhtin writes about carnival: “In the Middle Ages man led a double life. One was a public life, serious and plausible from one to the other, bound by a strict class order, strangled by fear, dogmatism, awe and piety. The other was a life as free as a carnival square, full of ambivalent laughter, impudence,

blasphemy against all that was sacred, downgrading, and vulgar and open contact with all things. Both lives were legitimate, but separated by a strict time frame.” (Poetics 261) Usually, people live in order. It is a public life that is “serious and plausible, and bound by a strict class order.” But when carnival comes, that order is turned upside down. During the carnival, in the carnival square, the hierarchies, the sacred and the profane, the status of kings and beggars is overturned, the strict distinctions between them are abolished, and everything that has been distinguished until then, enters into “vulgar and open contact.” And after this carnival time, people returned to their daily order again. Later, “Until the first half of the seventeenth century, people were directly involved in carnival theater and carnival sense of the world. They were still living in the carnival, that is, the carnival was a form of life itself. Thus, the carnivalizing effect was also of a direct nature (certain genres were written directly for the carnival). In other words, the carnival itself was the source of the carnivalizing effect.” (Poetics 263-264)

However, in the modern era, public life covers the whole of life. There is no room in the modern state for the overthrow of social norms that is carnivalization. We were cast as serious, obedient, useful bodies that obeyed the norms in modern schools, and we had to be good students in school, good citizens in politics, and productive workers in our professions. A body that cannot obey had no value. It is not just about what you say and do outwardly. Even how we feel and what we want inside ourselves has been governed by the morality of how we *should* feel and what we *should* want. The image of the “patriotic soldier who willingly leaves his family to go to war for his country” is a typical example. This heteronomy has been now internalized in us. We have been thoroughly conscripted. So, when are we allowed to be ourselves in the modern world? It is in death.

Bakhtin discusses Dostoevsky’s work *Bobok*, which depicts the dead in a graveyard. In the story, the buried dead are not actually dead yet, but spend two or three months underground before their true eternal rest. Dostoevsky has one of the dead, Baron Klinevich says the following.

But I don’t want to lie for now. That’s all I want. Because that’s what’s important. It is impossible not to lie when you live on earth. Life and Lie are synonymous. But here, let’s not tell lies just for the fun of it. Damn it, even a graveyard has some meaning! Let’s all tell each other our personal

stories out loud and not be shy about anything. Let me be the first to tell you about myself. [...] I was born a carnivore, you know, and all my true feelings were held together by rotten strings in the upper world. To hell with the strings, let's live in the shameful truth for the next two months! Let's get naked, let's get naked! ⁽¹⁸⁾

"It is impossible not to lie when you live on earth." But since "Life and Lie are synonyms," we are not aware that we are lying. We just live our lives as such. Whether we are generals, barons, or peasants, in our earthly lives we have all lived this compartmentalized existence as our own, separated ourselves from others as we have been compartmentalized, and separated from ourselves as well. And we are tired of fitting ourselves into the lie, and, at the same time, we are saddened by our inability to fit into the lie. However, life under the ground, the one in which one is given consciousness for only a few months after death, "creates a situation that defies common sense in which the final life of consciousness (the life of a few months before complete eternal sleep), a life beyond life, so to speak, is freed from all the conditions, status, obligations, and laws of everyday life. How will the 'dead of our time' enjoy such a life?" (Poetics 280) Here, generals, kings, and beggars are all "naked." For the first time in their own tombs, they all meet each other and themselves, in a state of being only "dead" with all earthly compartments lost, in a state of being the dead who have been freed from their bound and alienated earthly lives, but who have only a few months left to "live."

Open Dialogue is nothing but the creation of this graveyard time, or carnival time. If in the graveyard, or in the carnival square, one meets—for the first time—only as a human being, without generals, kings, or beggars, in the Open Dialogue one transcends all earthly roles and positions, and for the first time, as one who has suffered with earthly life on his shoulders meets other suffering human beings naked, and regains his own voice and his own life. What Open Dialogue opens up is nothing other than the myriad of social barriers that we have maintained. "Open and naked" dialogue overturns the walls that have maintained social order, separated us from others, and separated us from ourselves.

This overturning dialogue is also needed by the system "on the ground," i.e., the corporation. In an age of post-industrial capitalism, where companies can only survive by adapting and changing while sensing invisible changes

in society, they need to be highly sensitive organisms rather than machines designed for expansion and reproduction. An organization composed of pre-determined objectives and rules to achieve them can be reproduced but never deconstructed as long as the system is maintained. In order for it to be transformed into something new, something future, something that does not yet exist, something better, order must continually pass outside itself, through disorder, through chaos. It is obvious that this disorder cannot be created by uniformed parts that follow order. The members of an organization are not exact parts, but must be free living and changing human beings. The organization must be transformed themselves into “other things” by ever-changing human beings—living human beings that is “Others”, incorporating the outside. “The only certain and lasting source of progress is freedom. Because only through freedom can there be as many independent centers of progress as there are individuals in this world.”⁽¹⁹⁾

Thus, the orderly, mechanistic world is transformed. Simply put, the world is a collection of people living in it. Progress does not mean increased profits. The growth of profit is only justified as far as it serves happiness. Progress means that the people living in the world become happier than they are now.

We are alive. To live is to change, to be constantly reborn as another me, an unknown me, as this me dies. And the world, which is made up of us living, also lives and changes with us.

Dying is a good things. In dialogue, we and the world leave this us and the world behind and drift constantly to a yet unknown us, to an unknown world. We begin this drift. In this carnival square, in this modern world that is becoming a *full* carnival for the first time, in this living world that is crossing every threshold, we are constantly releasing our own voices, communing with others in the myriad of voices that rise up, opening up the process of our own becoming the unknown, the not-yet-me. In this carnival of dialogue that occupies the world, we live our world fully with all the friends we have before us.

Reference

The abbreviations after the quotations in the text indicate the pages quoted from the following materials.

Saito: Tamaki Saito, *What is Open Dialogue?*, Tokyo: Igaku-Shoin, 2015.

ODAAP: Jaakko Seikkula; Mary E. Olson, “The Open Dialogue Approach to Acute Psychosis: Its Poetics and Micropolitics.” Tamaki Saito, ed., *What is Open Dialogue?*, Tokyo: Igaku-Shoin, 2015.

- ODGP: Jaakko Seikkula, "Open Dialogues with Good and Poor Outcomes for Psychotic Crises: Examples from Families with Violence." Tamaki Saito ed., *What is Open Dialogue?*, Tokyo: Igaku-Shoin, 2015.
- HETC: Jarkko Seikkula; David Trimble, "Healing Elements of Therapeutic Conversation: Dialogue as an Embodiment of Love." Tamaki Saito ed., *What is Open Dialogue?*, Tokyo: Igaku-Shoin, 2015.
- Creation: Mikhail Bakhtin, tr. Takashi Kuwano, *The Problem of Dostoevsky's Creation*, Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2013.
- Poetics: Mikhail Bakhtin, tr. Tetsuo Mochizuki, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1995.
- Takama: Kunio Takama, *Learning Organization*, Tokyo: Kobunsha, 2005.
- Senge: Peter M. Senge, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art & Practice of The Learning Organization*, NSW: Currency, 2006.
- LfEF: Otto Scharmer; Katrin Kaeufer; tr. Mikako Yusa; Ryo Nakadoi, *Leading from the Emerging Future: From Ego-System to Eco-System Economies*, Tokyo: Eiji-Shuppan, 2015.

Notes

- (1) Koji Ishihara, "The reflections began without notice." *Seishin kango*, 19(1), Tokyo: Igaku-Shoin, 2016, 14.
- (2) Tamaki Saito, "What will open dialogue bring to psychiatry?" *Seishin Kango*, 18(5), Tokyo: Igaku-Shoin, 2015, 474.
- (3) Ibid.
- (4) The "poetics" referred to here is probably based on the purifying effect of catharsis on the mind that Aristotle mentioned in his "Poetics" on tragedy. Through tragedy, the lees that had accumulated in people's minds are discharged and purified. In psychiatry, catharsis is also discussed by Freud. As with Aristotle's concept, Freud argues in the framework of psychotherapy that catharsis helps patients to become aware of and eliminate their mental oppressions, thereby improving their symptoms.
- (5) In contrast, the institutional support for Open Dialogue is "micropolitics." According to Jaakko Seikkula, a proponent of Open Dialogue, "micropolitics is the institutional aspect that underpins this approach, which is part of the Finnish government's needs-based approach." Open Dialogue has been integrated into the Finnish government's public health services, which guarantees free treatment and consistent, high-quality staff training to provide institutional guarantees for Open Dialogue. For specific details of the training in psychotherapy with an emphasis on Open Dialogue that has been provided in the mental health sector in the Western Lapland District since 1989, see Yutaka Kataoka, "Staff Education & Training Program," *Seishin Kango*, 19(1), 2016.
- (6) A "meeting" or "consultation" between the treatment team also takes place on the spot. This is called "reflecting," and it is a transparent meeting that takes place in front of the network members and only between the treatment team. By watching that, the network members are able to look back on their own situation, as told by the words of others, "with other eyes."
- (7) Tamaki Saito explains this from the perspective of Systems Theory. "Luhmann said that the human mental system and the social system are 'structurally coupled.' They interact

- with each other as environments, never merging, but nevertheless disappearing when one is absent. [...] The members (of the treatment team or network) are the ‘environment’ of the Open Dialogue system. In this environment, the Open Dialogue system reproduces the dialogue. [...] And healing is produced as a ‘waste product’ of the Open Dialogue system.” (Saito 56)
- (8) Of course, the “ruler” himself is subject to the rules of the field. The ruler is not a subject, but a passive one, following the rules of the “ruler.”
 - (9) This is exactly the structure of Heidegger’s “Dasein,” who are filled with constant fear and anxiety about whether or not it will be accepted by the world, and who forms myself to fit the world = inhibits myself. In Heidegger, too, this “Dasein” has an “authentic existence” as a possibility, and it must be opened to that “authentic existence.” In Heidegger, what opens the “authentic existence” is “listening.”
 - (10) Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin (1895-1975).
 - (11) As Seikkula puts it “This dependence on response for meaning contributes to what Bakhtin calls the “unfinalizability” of dialogue. Meaning is constantly generated and transformed by the intrinsically unpredictable process of response, response to response, followed by further response, in a process that may be interrupted but can never be concluded. The more voices incorporated into a ‘polyphonic’ dialogue, the richer the possibilities for emergent understanding.” (HETC 158-159)
 - (12) Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky (1821-1881). His major works include *Crime and Punishment*, *The Idiot*, *Demons*, and *The Brothers Karamazov*.
 - (13) Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy (1828-1910). One of Russia’s greatest writers, along with Dostoevsky and Turgenev. His major works include *Anna Karenina*, *War and Peace*, and *Resurrection*.
 - (14) The shift from the literacy model to the competency model of hypermeritocracy is a prime example of this.
 - (15) Cognitive Edge; Inc., Yoichi Tamura, Living Reliably in an Uncertain World: An Invitation to the Cynefin Framework, Ibaraki: *Evolving*, 2018, 46.
 - (16) Much of my knowledge of the latest organizational management, including the concept of waterfall and agile, was given to me by the people at Human Value, Inc. I would like to especially thank them. Human Value, Inc. was one of the first companies to introduce the latest organizational and management theories in the modern world to Japan and has contributed to organizational reform in various companies. The following material, “The Learning Organization,” is written by Kunio Takama of Human Value, Inc. (Human Value, Inc. : <https://www.humanvalue.co.jp/>)
 - (17) In this regard, Takama says the following. “Every organization will have opportunities to propose new ideas that do not exist in the world, either from within the organization or from customers. The growth or decline of a company may be determined by whether or not it can take that opportunity and realize it. The reason why such new movements are crushed is because they require evidence or data that the idea will succeed. In this case, traditional decision-making and analysis methods will hinder the new movement, and it will be postponed because the evidence is too weak.” (Takama 146)
 - (18) F. M. Dostoevsky, “Bobok”, *The Writer’s Diary*, Chapter 6, 1873, quoted by Bakhtin. (Poetics 282)
 - (19) J. S. Mill, tr. Komei Shiojiri; Takeyasu Kimura, *On Liberty*, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1971, 142.

(Associate Professor, Institute of Philosophy, University of Tsukuba)