

June_18_407_004

OK, with that, let's get started. So as you can see, this is a session entitled Empowering Communities, Unlocking, again, Aging Potential, Building Resilience, and Transcending Climate Changes.

I'm Yasu Sawada. I'm a moderator of this session. So let me move on. So first, I'd like to give you some brief background. And then I'd like to introduce our distinguished panelists, then followed by each panelist's short presentation and discussion.

OK, so as a background, I'd like to point out there is an ongoing public crisis. Disaster and crisis, here, left hand, I simplified four different type of crisis or disasters. Disaster triggered by natural hazard, left technical disasters.

And indeed, Fukushima, a power plant incident, is a combined, compounded disaster of these two types. And then economic crisis and violence -related disasters. So Ukraine war, violence -related disasters, making a weak price hike and turn into the economic crisis in some African countries.

And COVID -19 is really a combination of these different type of disasters. So public crisis, that's a big, ongoing disaster. And also, we need to point out that ripple effect. So a single disaster can generate a negative, really serious and negative effect across time and across space.

So this is a big background. Then, against these huge, unexpected events or negative shock, market mechanism, unfortunately, market mechanism are far from complete. So this is a little bit outdated data, but global data.

How economic losses caused by disasters and natural hazard driven disasters, economic losses, what's the proportion covered by formal market -based insurance? Far from complete, especially for low- and middle -income countries.

What about the government? So obvious market failure, government support meant at least partly, but left chart showing the humanitarian aid to developing Asia. As we can see, amount of support provided by high -income economies to low -income economies overall, orange part is really big share, orange part showing emergency response.

That means after the disaster, there is an exposed response. Amount is quite substantial, but unfortunately, ex ante, insurance mechanisms, public mechanisms, is far from complete perfect. Then, theoretically speaking, right then, we have a layered approach, international support needed for rare but mega disasters.

And the more frequent disasters, we can have our own country, our own government, or private sector can at least partly support. But these theoretical mechanisms, again, far from perfect. But I'd like to also mention, there are some innovative insurance mechanisms, such as index -based risk transfer products.

These are getting available, but very, very small in terms of quantity and quality. So, lack of a market completeness and government failures are also quite substantial. So, in this respect, right chart, in order to support the people's livelihood or normal firms' operation, daily operation, I think community can potentially play a very important role to amend or complement market mechanism and government mechanism.

So, this is a big framework I direct to postulate and a distinguished panelist will talk about some focused mechanism and channels in this large framework. So, what we're gonna discuss? First of all, I would like to discuss overall how to enhance a complementarity among the market, state, and community mechanism.

And secondly, especially, although I pointed, you know, natural hazard -driven disasters and technological disasters, economic crisis and conflict -driven disasters, but emerging big disaster is aging, super aging, especially in Asia and developed economies, and also climate -related shocks.

So, how to handle these upcoming or already materializing shocks. And then, sadly, we would like to also, towards the end, discuss some concrete insights from the field and from the community. So, this is our plan for this short panel discussion.

So, I'd like to introduce our distinguished panelist, Professor Daniel Aldrich, Professor Department of Political Science and Director Security and Resilience Studies Program, Northeastern University.

Daniel, welcome, welcome. Thanks, thanks for participating. And Dr. Emi Kyota, Associate Professor at Yonge Law Ling School of Medicine and College of Design and Engineering, and Deputy Executive Director, Center for Population Health at National University of Singapore.

Welcome, thanks for participating, Emi. And Dr. Leonard Lee, who is the Director and Roy's Register Foundation Professor or Roy's Register Foundation Institute for the Public Understanding of Risk, IPUR, Professor of Marketing at NUS Business School, National University of Singapore.

Welcome, welcome, Leonard. With that, I'd like to first invite Daniel for several minutes' presentation. For our zigas.

Thank you, Professor Sawada. Great, I've put up my email address and my Twitter handle in case you want to have a conversation outside this room or maybe later on. So Professor Sawada mentioned the idea that we have really three mechanisms that work in the world to help us increase resilience and reduce risk.

That's the community, the government, and markets. And I think there really is one type of space or place in our societies that already exist that are really under-recognized and underutilized. I want to call these social infrastructure.

Social infrastructure can be divided really into four main categories. The upper right - handed image is of a park. They're called linear reserves in Australia. They might be a dog walking park or a playground.

Maybe you play cricket someplace with your kids or some other kind of outdoor space. So we have one category of parks. We also have community spaces, community centers. And my colleagues will be talking about some of those both in Singapore and in Japan.

These are open to everybody. You can walk in and walk out. There's no fee to use them. The bottom left -handed quarter are religious worship places. Mosques, temples, churches, shrines, gudwaras. And finally, social businesses.

So maybe you got a coffee today at the Starbucks outside or 7 -Elevens nearby. Maybe you go bowling. So these four types of spaces exist in every kind of society, developing to developed. And we often think about them only in the last moment.

I've got to go place and place, I need a library. But I'm gonna argue that they're incredibly powerful tools in the space of disasters and resilience. And our lab has been working for several years now to measure what impact do these kind of spaces and places have in our society.

The most interesting aspect that we've found is a library, a park, a pub. These aren't just spaces to meet with friends. They're spaces that enhance our bridging social capital. They're different types of ways to connect to people.

We call them bonding, bridging, and linking ties. Quickly, bonding ties are those between friends and family. Bridging ties are people different than us. So maybe at this meeting right now you're meeting new friends.

And linking ties are vertical ties. What we found was these kind of spaces, all four categories. So community spaces, worship spaces, parks, and businesses. They're all positively associated with bridging ties.

Heterogeneous ties, ties to people that are different than us. They don't necessarily build ties to family. They don't build ties to governance structures. What they do is they enhance the ability to meet people outside a normal realm.

So think about these as Granovetter's weak ties in our societies. You can get jobs through them, get resources, new information. Now, these four types of spaces, they also have a measurable impact after a disaster.

So we've measured now in different countries what happens if your community, after a disaster, decides it wants to spend money at Sketting in different types of programs. Some of them are bottom up, some of them are top down.

Some of them enhance our gray infrastructure, the kind of roads we see nearby, the Shinkansen tracks right nearby, gray infrastructure. Some of them enhance the green or social infrastructure nearby.

And we've categorized the impact of these types of top down or bottom up and gray social infrastructure in terms of two big outcomes. What happens to population, people coming back to a disaster hit area, and what happens to income, what happens to making money?

And we can see here is the following. If the money that your community spends after a major disaster is on top down large scale projects, that's the Blue Mountains and the Yellow Mountains in this chart, the Blue and the Yellow Mountains.

What you see is overall income is lower. So spending money, for example, only on large scale bridges, on dams, on airports after a disaster, in fact reduces per capita income, and it reduces migration levels.

People aren't coming back to those communities. But if the kind of money you're spending is a bottom up project, a library, a park, an NGO facility, in fact, overall income is higher, and we see population growth is higher.

By the way, a colleague here in Japan, Nagamatsu Shingo called this the Fukko Mujun, the reconstruction paradox. If the money you spend is all top down large scale, the average citizens don't care as much.

But if you're building back parks and parts of daily lives, people feel that's what they want to see. One last idea I'm going to argue for is that these social infrastructure sites are not evenly distributed in our society.

This is the place where I live, Boston, Massachusetts. And we've mapped all 25 communities that we have, all neighborhoods, based on these four types of facilities. What you notice is that some of them have a lot of all four of them, and some of them have a few of all four types of them.

By the way, I live in the bottom third, if you're wondering about my personal life. My children and I had literally one fourth the number of libraries and parks and pubs growing up that my neighbors did up in those top areas.

What does that mean? It means if a progressive city in a blue state like Massachusetts can have this level of inequity, probably whether it's here in Japan or in developing nations or even other developed countries, probably most cities around the world have not given every community the same access to these kind of projects.

What does that mean? It doesn't just mean that people have less time to go play or fewer playgrounds. It also means, as Rav Chetty has shown in his work, that we're building fewer connections to people who can enhance our lives.

We're building less resilience with fewer ties. Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you very much, Daniel. In order to enhance community mechanism, appropriate social inference design and space design, that's very critical. So now let me invite Leonhard to talk about aging disaster.

Thank you.

Good afternoon. Thank you so much for coming to this session and thank you, Professor Sawada, for inviting me to join the panel. Okay, so from NUS, from IPUR Institute for the Public Understanding of Risk, for those of you who are curious about the Institute, you know, please do visit our website to find out more about our programs and initiatives.

Okay, so today we're going to talk about aging. And so aging, well, okay, so I'm going to shamelessly tell you that yesterday was my birthday. And so aging, well, I mean, so aging is a thing that is very close to my heart, right?

So yesterday was my birthday. And I'm also the main caregiver for my elderly parents, who are 78 and 79, respectively. But I'm going to impress upon you that aging is not just my problem or my parents' problems.

It's actually all of our problems. And to some extent, we have a responsibility towards a society to collectively address this issue of aging, right? And so many of us are more than familiar with the increasing lifespan that everyone in the world is experiencing.

So we can see that from 1950 to 2020, we've actually lived longer for about 20 years, right? So that's quite impressive. But at the same time, some of you may not be aware that there's also been a decline in the fertility rate, right?

So from an average of five children per woman, right? So that has actually reduced dramatically to only two children per woman, right? So together, what these results when juxtaposed together is showing that there is an increasing size and proportion of older people in our populations.

And clearly, these are problems that are very well acknowledged. So for example, in a recent report released by the United Nations, some of the notable quotes include, older populations are rapidly growing everywhere.

Number of people aged 65 years and above will more than double to 1.6 billion between 2021 and 2050. And also, aging touches all parts of economies and societies as highlighted by Professor Sawada, right?

So while this issue of aging is actually exacerbated, where we consider the gap between lifespans and health spans, right? So by health span, what I mean is the number of years in which we are actually healthy.

As you can see, this gap is actually quite substantial. So that means that in Singapore, for example, in the last 11 years of your life, you're actually living in sickness, right? So the question is, what do we do about this?

What do we do about this? So I'm going to share an initiative that we in Singapore have actually embarked on to address this issue of aging head on, right? So this is the Queenstown Health District at Queenstown Project.

So essentially, think of the Queenstown area as a living lab that we have actually started, right? Where we're going to test different interventions, different policies in order to promote a healthy and meaningful longevity, right?

So essentially, a Queenstown has a population of slightly less than 100,000. So 22.3% of the population are aged like 65 and above, and 78.8% of individuals within these housing estates live in public housing, right?

So this is kind of like a community that Singapore projects its population to be in the coming years, right? So in these initiatives, we have four main objectives. So we like to increase healthy longevity, we want to enable purposeful and meaningful longevity.

Importantly, one of the key pillars of this project is that beyond physical health and psychological or mental health, there is a strong emphasis on social health, right? So you know, speaking to what Daniel said about social infrastructure and capital, right?

So how do we create spaces and how do we create activities to increase intergenerational bonding? And finally, how do we create a place where people can grow all in, right? So where you do not have to spend the last years of your lives in like nursing homes and hospitals and so on, right?

So with that, I have two more slides. I'm going to tell you a little bit about this study that we have embarked in within this initiative. So this is the baseline study. And the purpose of the baseline study is to come up with a set of baseline outcome indicators.

So a measurement tool where we can actually measure the overall intervention impact of the initiative. And basically, we want to take a pulse of the community, right? So we want to know how people are thinking about aging, their needs, their wants, their aspirations, and so on, right?

And so we use a multi -method approach, right? So we have longitudinal surveys, we have interviews, and importantly, we also have focus group discussions to really gain more insight into the underlying psychology and the motivations that people might have for their answers, right?

So without further ado, I'd like to share some, you know, very, very recently uncovered preliminary results that we have collected from the first wave of our survey. And the sample size is 5 ,224. So that's the number of people from whom we collected data in the last one year, right?

So I'm going to talk about three main findings. So the first finding is about age, right? So of course, I think some of these results are not going to be very surprising, right? So as people grow older, they actually report less physical health, right?

So lower physical health. But actually, what is really interesting is that we found that older adults reported higher psychological well -being, so they're happier, right? And they're more satisfied with their jobs, if they're working, you know, they're less lonely, not more than younger adults, right?

So this suggests that contrary to what we think, oh, you know, you're old, you're lonely, right? So it's actually quite the opposite, right? So we found that in fact, the younger people tend to be more lonely and less happy compared to the older people, right?

And so for those of you who are familiar with the social emotional selectivity theory by Laurel Carstenson at Stanford, so you know that. So her theory says that, you know, as people grow old, they're actually much more selective in the kind of activities that they choose, right?

So they will grow for things that are emotionally rewarding and meaningful in their lives, right? So I think this is kind of consistent with that. Second result, okay, so we found that men self-reported, right, to actually be physically healthier, but women reported greater happiness, right?

They have a greater psychological well-being, so I also want to highlight that these results are actually relatively small compared to the age effects, right? So I think this is also very interesting, because we know that women live longer than men, so could there be more complex basis for this longevity, right?

Could it be that, you know, women are psychologically more resilient, they're happier, and that sort of like promotes physical health as well, right? And finally, education, and this is something that perhaps like many of us can identify with.

So our research found that people with higher educational levels, they report like greater physical, social, and financial well-being, but they're also less cheerful, they are less relaxed, they are more anxious, and they are more tired.

So the thing is that, you know, despite our relative success in life, perhaps this comes at a price, you know, like lower well-being, right? Okay, so with that, I just want to highlight that the statement that preparing for longer lifespans, right?

So it's not just about saving money, right? So it's also about social interactions, and it's also about evidence-based research that really informs us like how we can actually prepare for aging society.

Thank you. Thank you very much, Leonhard, for sharing very intriguing findings from Queenstown. And according to your finding, Leonhard, you became a one-year additional happy year. And so happy birthday, happy birthday.

So now let me invite Emi. And Emi will talk about not only aging, but also kind of compounded issues with climate change. So Emi, Flora is yours.

Well, thank you so much for the invitation. And I'm just so grateful to be able to talk about social issues with two other friends, because when I started this nonprofit organization 15 years ago, I was very lonely because not much conversation was happening about social infrastructure at the time.

So I'm so grateful to be able to talk about this. So today I'd like to be able to talk about aging, either global, no, that's one demographic shift and climate change. And I would like to actually make sure to add equity matters.

You know, we talked about like healthy longevity and life span. The graph didn't show was women actually stay longer being frail. So they live longer, but they stay longer frail. Those are the equity issues that we really have to think about.

So I would like to take you to this presentation from individual perspective, um, a little bit. So they are, uh, climate change and the global, um, global demographic shift. People talk about, you know, physical infrastructure change, like housing and, you know, all the other infrastructure, but we really need to think about social infrastructure and a lot of discussion about resilient hub, you know,

how to create the hub that is going to provide people to evacuate. And, um, it just, um, to learn about climate change issues. But what's very important is that we really have to integrate the hub into everyday life, because the last thing people will, will do when they

fit, uh, they faced a disaster is to look for maps or, you know, just look for the information about the disaster.

But if it's part of the everyday life, if you can just bring that resilient hub as a part of your everyday routine, it could be a part of supermarket. It could be a job creation. It could be a community, uh, community places that actually is much more effective.

So one of that, um, um, initiative that I started 10 years ago, you know, 11 natural disaster happens in, uh, in Japan and, uh, in Iwate area. We went and just try to help other people. What we've learned was that all the people wanted to be, be helpful to others.

What that's what they wanted to do. So they, we decided to create the hub, which is called Ibasho House. That is actually, uh, it was designed by older person for the program and the built environment, and it's actually run self -sufficiently, self -sustainable way for last 11 years.

Uh, people didn't think that it was going to last that long, but we, we had the dream that if it's a grant space, uh, approach, when the grants run out, it is everything fall apart and all the people didn't want that.

So it lasted for 10, 11 years. So how we do, um, how we actually change our view was that all the people at the various assets to our community, rather than social right liabilities, like we are just sometimes treating them and the life experience and wisdom benefit younger generation and strengthen the resilience of their community.

Uh, previous two speakers talk about this enough, so I'm not going to go deep. Um, so basically what we tried to do was to create the place where older people don't mind going there to start with. Yes, I wanted to create the place where people would like to go there, but it's very difficult to create the community have that older people want to go.

So we started with the place where they don't mind going there. Uh, so to try to do that, we are creating the eighth principle. What we've learned for as a lesson is that older

people and community organization, community members, if you give them blank sheet of paper and have too much freedom, they cannot decide what they want.

So we have to create strong enough, loose enough structure. And that's what we came up with eight principle. This is a place where all the people are valued as a, um, asset of the community. It has to be normal.

No one wants to go to nursing home or senior center. They wanted to go to place that it's Starbucks or regular coffee shop. The third one is the marginalization. Everybody wants to be in the action, the place where the action is not in the middle of nowhere in the outside of the city.

And the principle number four, it is community ownership. People wanted to own the place and the program. Everything has to be multi -generational. Other people don't want to be only with other older people.

I don't know. Maybe one year older, you, um, good. And we also wanted to create the culturally appropriate places. Uh, and the principle seven, it was not actually in the first place. First, uh, we were working on this episode.

We learned that all the people wanted to be, uh, to leave a healthier planet for the younger generations. So we started to integrate that. The last one is embracing imperfection. Bunch of Japanese people who are rather perfectionist, but we wanted to create imperfection means that, you know, if it's good enough, let's start and just change, you know, just, it's almost like a version 1 .2.

Just why don't we just try to do something because the perfect moment will never come if you wait too long. And what makes it by show it is try to apply eight principles by giving other people a leadership.

And the process has to be all run by the older person and activities run by older person to the community members, not the other way around. And the place has to be, again, the place where people normally go, there's a high food traffic.

So we are not going to demaginalize older people. So in terms of, um, um, disaster, uh, the climate change and, uh, um, demographic shift, um, there is a map making. This is, uh, it's, uh, it's called Nigejizu that we were helped by, uh, Nige and Seike and Meiji University.

So that's, you know, that people came and start, uh, to develop the evacuation map that is appropriate for older populations because the current maps are rather strenuous for older populations. Uh, so they wanted to create, uh, um, the, the map that is good for the older populations and it's not coming from the city.

It is really encouraging the community members to make one that was very important. And we did a similar thing in Nepal and Nepal's case was a little bit more difficult because they didn't have a map.

So we created a map to beginners and it created a disaster map. So people always ask me like, what does that, anything to do is older people empowered to global aging. You know, the older people has to be empowered to feel that they can do something to the community, make decision and take ownership.

So that is going to help for the social capital that will help community resilience. And I love this photo because we created this exercise bar for high school children, like students and the benches for older people.

What happened is that older people are exercising and high school children are playing video game and the bench. But this is actually an important photos because our policymaking hasn't changed. We still have this age's point of view when we do the policies.

So I just wanted to end with one of the interview studies that my colleagues and I have done. So basically just going back to the resilient hub, what we need is many, many facets for people to be able to come into this place.

Normally what happened is that senior center, they always focus on activities. Ibasho lasted and its community member owned it because they have more function than activities. That is a place where people bring food and they actually visit their friends and Ibasho because it's comfortable.

And that's where the people share and sell things and they come and use the toilet or printers. And you know, just important thing is they are part of the operations. So again, learning after 11 years of self -operation, I think one of the key is that just give people opportunity, like easy opportunity to be engaged so that they can actually engage in other ways, any part.

So these are the photos that come from Ibasho. But I would like to share my learning at the last. So what I've learned was that we always talk about creating community. It's creating, we cannot create community for the community members.

We really have to create enough room for people to negotiate, to create their own space and what, you know, what is the extent of our role is something that we have to think about. Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you very much, Emi -san, for sharing insights from Iba Sho. And I think we are doing extremely good in terms of time management. So why don't we come forward and having each panelist really insight for discussion, direct panelist, what do you learn?

Maybe one most important learning from each participant, and particularly focusing on, you know, we talked about a lot of somewhat abstract, you know, discussion, but how these theories into transforming into practice, what kind of insight did you learn from each panelist?

So starting from Daniel.

So it's a fantastic panel. These are fantastic projects. So for me, both the Queenstown Health Project and Eboshow embody the idea of social infrastructure. These are places that are created by the community, for the community.

I would add, which we didn't use yet, like stewardship and co -production. These are very fancy ways of saying what we said already, which is that their community members are designing these programs for things that they need, rather than being told from the outside.

And I think also both of them are working well, because these are multiple benefits, right? Isn't that one thing is going on at Eboshow, or one thing is going on at Queenstown. We have exercise programs, we have yoga, we have the cafe, right, for the people nearby.

So the number of ways these embody social infrastructure is myriad, so I would say for me, really the most important thing is it's possible to build these. And I guess the other thing you see is, these are projects that are happening right now.

So in whatever community we live in right now, it is possible to enhance our social infrastructure.

Okay, so I actually have so many reflections after hearing all these wonderful research and so on. So I'm going to share one of them first and then so perhaps like later during the Q &A we can talk about some of the other thoughts that I have.

So I think that we often think about the question is what is identity, right? And so we often think of identity from a very individualized perspective, right? So who is the person that we want to be?

You know, what is our ideal self? You know, what is our current self and so on? So I think what hearing, you know, from Daniel and Amy's experience is that, you know, perhaps this notion of social identity, right, might have to take like increasing importance, right?

So in a sense, in a community or in the society, where do we see ourselves, right? So how do we fit in, right? So I think perhaps, you know, this could add new ingredients into promoting not just our social health, but also our physical and not our psychological health and perhaps even our physical health.

Yes, the biggest reflection is that Ibasho house lasted for 11 years. That is a big accomplishment and a big reflection because I think we had a sense of ageism. And ageism is a very interesting ism because gender or just ethnicities, you don't belong to yourself.

You're not subjected to yourself, but ageism, if we have it, we are all grown into it. So it's not like you're discriminating toward other people, but you are discriminating toward your future, your own future.

But at the same time, when we started this Ibasho idea, people really thought that, oh, it's good for the older person. They're cute, they're trying this, but they kept it for 11 years. To me, it is a very strong message to me that we really have to rethink about what other people's roles are.

Because I think still, when we have a conversation, we still have this sense that we have to find solution for them. So we have to figure all this out for them rather than try to figure out with them.

So that's the big reflection.

Thank you, thank you very much. Again, we are doing extremely well in terms of time management, and we have 20 or so minutes. But one quick question I have to Emi. Ibachio, it's a very, how to say, a little bit narrow, concrete question.

You know, Ibachio House has air conditioner, right? And, you know, now there's a lot of discussion, you know, heat waves and global temperature rise, how to set up a cooling center in the community, or for example, rural ability Bangladesh.

So these issues are really, you know, burning issue. So I was wondering, Ibachio, because they have a nice, you know, cafe and also, you know, space and also, as Daniel said, you know, growing together kind of a space as well as air conditioner.

So that, you know, regardless of age, people can get together and naturally get together and interact. So I was wondering, is there any response to that? Rather specific question or comment.

Sure. So the one in Japan, I don't think they have air conditioning, because in Tohoku, it's relatively cool. We just started the second experiment. I mean, the newest experiment is in Singapore. We just opened that up two months ago.

So we don't have much to share with all this detail. But yes, we do have air conditioning, because it's a health hazard in Singapore not to have air conditioning. But at the same time, we made sure that we have natural ventilation, because some older people do not like air conditioning.

Yeah, and then they like to come in the morning to just enjoy it. So I think the problem with air conditioning for us is that we have to close the door, like a windows, so people cannot interact at the people inside.

So I think the balance is important.

Okay, so we have, it's a 6 .10. I think officially we have 10 minutes, but probably we have 10, 15 minutes. So now I'd like to open the floor for the questions or comments or anything you want to ask the panelists.

Yeah, please. Yeah, can you kindly share your name and yeah.

Oh, okay. My name is Afida Eshin. Okay, my name is Yumi Matsuda. I'm a faculty member of Coba City University Foreign Studies. Thank you very much for the excellent presentation. Today, I have a couple of questions for Professor Daniel Ailey.

I don't know if I'm pronouncing your name correctly. Okay, so the first question is, I think you are showing the data, the number of libraries according to the areas of your hometown or something. Actually, I have seen the library, very nice library in yoga prefecture, but nobody's using because of the proximity.

I think the location is very important because sometime people have to pay a transport to reach the library. So even if the number is sufficient, maybe in the proximity, you know, they're from people to access it.

I wonder if you have any reaction to this point of view. And that is first question. The second question is, you were saying that like park and mosque, that kind of facilities are good to harnessing the horizontal trust from social capital point of view.

But I'm just wondering if you have a chance to look into like vertical relationship, trust between the citizens and the authority or institutions from social cohesion perspective through using this kind of volume.

Just wondering, thank you.

Thank you very much. This is a great question. So the neighborhoods we're looking at here are about three to four kilometers square, and we're measuring it normed by population. So in theory, in a neighborhood this small, even one library wouldn't be more than a one and a half kilometer walk, which most experts analyze as the distance will walk.

And so some of these communities, as we saw, have four of those facilities per thousand people in the community, which is, again, less than four kilometers square. Some of them, like mine, only have one.

So it's a great question about proximity, and this is a different question, which is sort of quality and access. To what degree are communities building parks, libraries that everyone can get to? It's a good question that we can't answer with this data right now, but I think it's a good point.

The vertical relationship data, we haven't found information that shows us that these kind of facilities build trust and ties to government officials, perhaps because many of them are sort of not really government agencies visibly there.

So for example, if you go to a park, you don't necessarily see someone from the local, whatever, government agencies, you go to a library as well, even though often libraries are funded by local funds, you don't necessarily see evidence of that kind of government intervention.

So actually, the data that we have in our study shows no measurable impact on vertical ties and trust.

Thank you, three wonderful and inspiring presentations. So I'm Olivia Jensen, I declare an interest, I'm from the Institute of the Public Understanding of Risk with Leonard, and at the National University of Singapore with Emmy, and I've heard and had a chance to hear Daniel's work, about Daniel's work before.

I have one question for each of you. Leonard, I'll start with you. In a way, this idea that people get happier as they get older is a cause for optimism, for all of us. But is it possible that it's more of a cohort effect?

Is it possible that it's people who were born in the 1960s who are just happier than people who were born in the 2000s? And I know it may be difficult to say anything from the data at this stage, but I'd just be very interested in your reflection.

Emmy, I wonder, you mentioned briefly that you've also done some work in Nepal, and of course, now you're setting up the center in Singapore. I don't know if you've had a chance to explore these issues in Europe, and I just wonder to what extent it would be the same or different.

While I would generally resist kind of big cultural generalizations, I have an impression that older people are more independent, and maybe that impulse to help the community that you're finding and you're working with, Ildebasho, might not be as strong in Europe or elsewhere.

I'd be very interested in your reflections on that. And then we've talked, the other panelists have talked also about the bottom up, things that are generated by the community. And so I'm wondering when you look across Boston or elsewhere, the inequity and the availability of these social spaces, social infrastructure, to what extent do you feel that it's subject to public intervention?

Is it possible that you just, you build a park and then that contributes to social capital there, or is it something that has to come from the ground up?

So, why don't we start from Emi?

Yeah, thank you so much for great questions. I think that cultural adaptation argument is a tricky one actually, because I do walk on the ground and sometimes cultural adaptation sort of opinions can be used to not try new things.

So that I have to be very careful about that. But I think in my point of view, I think what subject it means subjectively, it's pretty universal. People don't want to be socially isolated. They want to be useful to others.

Those are the things that it is very universal. In fact, the Basho when I started, I was in Washington DC thinking that US needs one. And so I feel like that social isolation piece is very universal.

How to adapt it? That's why we chose the eight principles, like how the cultural significance are different. I think Europe will be probably the lifestyle and the food to eat, those things are different.

But I really feel like that interestingly, if we could do this in Singapore and Japan, it is that can be done in Europe because Singapore good or bad government works, just function really well. So it's quite top down in a way.

So as Japan, I think we provide a lot of service compared to the US way I was living in. So people had the sense of dependency somewhat to the government to help them. But Europe, because it's independency, just advocacy is strong.

So in a way, it might actually work better because of the community advocacy background. We actually are trying to do one in Switzerland this year. So stay tuned.

Olivia, thank you so much for the question. So I think it's a really important question, right? So just to remind everyone, so Olivia's question is, you know, to what extent are the results that we found the H effects, right?

H effect or is it a cohort effect, right? So in other words, so given that, you know, I'm supposedly happier because I've crossed the 50 euro mark now. And so, and when, well, perhaps if it is a cohort effect, so that means that turning back the clock when I was 30, I was probably happier than the 20 euros now, right?

So that is what the cohort effect is all about. So I have three responses to that important question. So the first is in her social emotional selectivity theory. So Laura does have studies that actually attempted to tease apart H effects from cohort effects, right?

So she established that H actually does have an effect. Secondly, I think this is nonetheless a really important problem. And so in fact, just last Friday, you know, where we had a meeting on the health district, there were discussions about, you know, whether it's time for us to set up a cohort study, right?

So that we can actually follow a panel of respondents over time to see whether, you know, the happiness or the psychological wellbeing might change over time, right? My third reaction is that, you know, I mean, my personal reflection is that it's probably both, right?

I think it's probably both. So I'm thinking that there are some psychological theories that will support the fact that, you know, these two things could be happening at the same time, right? So on the one hand, there is research that established that older adults, you know, tend to focus more on the present, whereas like younger adults tend to focus on the future, right?

So that's also one of the reasons why the way that people define happiness is actually quite different, right? So if you were to ask a 20 or 30 -year -old, what is happiness to you? They would say that it's excitement, right?

But when you ask people like me or older, no adults, they would tell you that it's contentment, right? So again, this reflects the different time perspective. You know, but at the same time, if you look at the world around you, and I think that's one of the reasons why we're all here at this conference, right?

So there are lots of environmental contextual factors that influence how happy we are, right? So think about the younger generation now, right? We talk about social media, right? How people are starting to compare themselves with other people.

We talk about social media addiction, and we talk about climate change, and it seems that it's all doom and gloom, right? So perhaps this future orientation plus what's happening around them could actually contribute to this decreased happiness, which means that it is both an H effect and a cohort effect.

This is a great question about public interventions. The weird thing about some of these spaces is they've been there for 200 years. Some of the parks and libraries in Boston literally have formed in the 18th century, and they've stood in that same spot now.

They haven't moved even once. Boston Common, for example, was there when the British soldiers were there, and we began fighting with them over the revolution. But other places can be popped up. There are cultural spaces that literally pop up.

It's Assata Day two food trucks that had come down. Those are mobile ways of building spaces, and we even have a cultural pop up culture house that goes to areas that we have fewer of these kind of spaces and builds them.

So there is the possibility, at least, that a bottom -up way of building these kind of places. Obviously, the benefit in Ibar show is you have literally could be a permanent house, a permanent old farm house there in the middle of Masakicho now, which could be there forever.

I know in my community in Boston, Chinatown has never had a library. They've been there since the 1790s or so, the 1800s. They still don't have a library. So we see inequities lasting in some ways over a long time.

OK, other comments? Yes, please.

Thank you. Hello. My name is Alexandra Kalin. I'm a diagram specialist at the bank. I'm coming from Romania, so although it's part of Europe, I have to say Europe is very different in terms of culture.

So not everything applies to each country. But one thing specifically which I struggle with is the mistrust. So it's not just mistrust in institutions, but it's mistrust between people. And especially for people that are elderly, who have been through communism, and that destroyed a lot about when we talk about communities and trusting each other.

So I think even creating the space, sometimes it's hard to leave people, even if they have their own interests, to build themselves the communities. They need a bit more than the space. So public libraries, you will see people staying each one in their own piece.

Even in public spaces, they will stay with their friends. It's so hard to meet a new person on the street. Nobody will come talk to you in Romania. And I think this mistrust, unfortunately, is being passed through generations.

So unless there are people that were educated outside, they have the same teachers, so it's a big issue. And I think it's the hardest challenge to create communities. So I wonder from your experience and from your projects, if you have seen something that helps build distrust through social investments, and if there are other type of interventions that are needed to create distrust.

I'll just quickly give two examples. I think your point is really well taken that you see trauma pass down through generations that people grew up being told don't trust the government, don't trust your neighbors.

I actually read a study about East Germany that after the Stasi was there reporting on people nearby, many children grew up estranged from their parents and had fewer friendships as well. So I completely get that.

I would just mention there's two interventions I've seen in different countries. One is that we know communities like the idea of getting together, even if it's for a shallow idea, like a party. So some communities actually have funds for neighborhood parties, a neighborhood block party called Neighborfest in San Francisco, exactly.

So my friend Dan Homsey created this program about 10 years ago. And the idea was that especially in communities that have not had good relationships with each other or the government, there's no agenda behind this.

So if I want to bring the guacamole and you want to bring tofu, that's great. There's nothing else going on. But it also makes us organize. Who's bringing the tofu? Who's bringing the guacamole? Who isn't there?

And a lot of interesting things showed that even having that organization of a non - government related party and non -pointed party built those kinds of ties, that's one thing. The other thing I've seen that worked pretty well has been deliberate community currency programs.

These are attempts to incentivize volunteerism and civic engagement. So for example, if I don't normally volunteer, I'm offered five himeji dollars, or maybe go yakuen, girai, whatever, to go volunteer for an hour here in himeji.

And that money only circulates at local stores. So maybe I didn't necessarily go to every store nearby. So I'm creating a positive virtuous cycle there, volunteering more often, and then that money is circulating in the community.

But I think you're right. I think you need scaffolding for some communities more than others. And these are the kind of interventions I've seen.

Maybe.

I don't really have a whole lot of experience from this but compared to rural areas, urban areas seem to have more distrust in the same culture even. So for the example of like Singapore, there are few people actually they came to the It's not scientific but what's working out for us because we just try to figure it out with elders in a community is we need to have consistency that the person who is someone same you know same group of people are there consistently so that you can start to trust you know build up the trust from the neighbors.

Neighbors normally come and peek in one day and they will probably just try to open the door and just give you something and then start to come in every time like a closer and closer but if that people start to change that trust kind of destroy easily so we are just try

to figure out how to give consistency to be a good neighbor that's what we are just trying to do.

So I don't have the answer to that question as well, because I think it's such an important question. And I do have to admit that from that perspective, perhaps, you know, so Amy and I, you know, we are currently living in a country where there is actually relatively high trust, right?

And I think it's, I mean, it's also important to the extent of, you know, whether certain behavioral interventions, you know, that are introduced by policymakers will work, right? So because you want to know, people want to know that the policymakers have the best interest at heart.

So I think that's where trust is really important. So just thinking aloud, yeah. So I think, you know, unfortunately, trust is something that, you know, once eroded, it's really, really hard to rebuild.

So I wonder whether we could start small, right? So one thought that I have is to increase the realization that we are all interdependent, right? You see, now I'm actually attacking my own idea because I'm thinking that, you know, if you don't trust someone, then increasing this like interdependence might actually erode trust even further, right?

You know, but at the same time, I think, I believe that, you know, inspired by the Ernest Hemingway quote that Olivia was sharing in her session on trust this morning, I actually think that, you know, perhaps we can think of the idea of trust leadership, right?

So I give an example. So many, many years ago, so one of the government agencies in Singapore actually ran a study to encourage people to recycle, right? And so they found that when you tell people, please recycle is good for the environment, very few people would do it, you know?

But the things that you say, you know, set an example, right? So be an ambassador and get your neighbors to recycle, right? So in fact, the recycling rate actually went out, right,

significantly. So I think in this case, so I wonder whether that could be like diets or even small communities where people are encouraged to trust other people and in return, perhaps that trust between people can be rebuilt over time.

Yeah.

Yeah, I think that's such an important question. And I'm a hard -walled economist. And economists, behavioral economists, and experimental economists, to conduct experimental games, a trust game, a public goods game, to elicit the objective level of mutual trust.

And there are many studies. And one study I just reminded was experimenting Bosnia after the civil conflict ended. Most of high school was intentionally designed so that Muslims and Catholic learned together within the same classroom.

Then comparing Muslim -only school and Catholic -only school, there is a substantial higher level of trust, not just by this physical setting. So I think this is a very simple example. But I think carefully designed physical space and social infrastructure can naturally build up social capital and the mutual trust.

I think having said this, this is a really important issue. And we need more study and evidence. Are there running out of time? Maybe last question. Please.

Thank you very much, my name is Keiko Sakoda, I'm a senior disaster management specialist from the World Bank, together with Sandra. So thank you so much, again, very interesting. I mean, because most of the session that I attended talked about how the government invests in public goods and social goods, but I think all of your presentation were talking about individual community level or driven approach.

So, but you know, because we come from the World Bank, my question is, what would you, I mean, maybe you don't really, you know, expect anything from the government or public sector, but what would you, I mean, expect from the public sector to enable or

create a neighboring environment for the community or individual to strengthen their kind of social capital?

Thank you.

No, no, you go first. No, no, no.

No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. Public sector. You know, so when I think about the public sector, I think about civil societies, I think about nonprofits. And so I think just a very quick comment before I pass to my other panelists.

So I think perhaps nonprofits and public sector are the best organizations to really set a good example of the trust leadership that we are talking about. Yeah, so I think, well, because it's all about altruism, it's all about doing things for the greater good.

So perhaps if they were to start from that perspective, that could really proliferate and help to rebuild that trust in society.

this is really based on my experience so it could be skewed toward one way but I think the local government level if the local government level of officials and you know just the whole thing has to be done systematically by the way everybody has to change their mindset at the end of the day that I think we have to change the way we view all the person in aging and the government can take leadership of that but the problem is government will just let's say try to create a partial I will love to be able to have support from the government sector to kick off this initiative together and give a little bit of lift for people to start you know if it's a space issues of you know architecture people can actually come and design that kind of help is needed in a way but they shouldn't run this thing so it's hard I needed to tell some city mayor's he said so how can I help you I said I think staying away from this after opening and just try to make maybe grant available now you know the community members can't walk on it to make it you know just to apply for grants so that they they just need they will get the money but it is not automatically because if we have funding to run organization like a bus show I think the spirit's going to disappear because their spirit will probably turn into we have to spend this money every year we do this all the time at the end of the year we have to burn all this budget

but you know because I think the government can actually be a resource available when it's needed I think that's very important

So I guess three broad areas. One would be do no harm. I can give a lot of examples. I escaped from Hurricane Katrina in 2005, and the government thought they were helping by putting people on buses.

That meant they separated people from their families and their children and their pets and their doctors, just like in Japan in 1995, the Cobra earthquake and the Kodokushi, the lonely deaths. So the first is do no harm.

Are you having programs that you think are helping people, but in fact, you're doing the opposite, like individual relocation rather than group relocation, that's the first thing. The second would be to rebalance spending.

Right now, 94% of money in the disaster space is physical infrastructure. And no offense to any of the sponsors if you're in the room. But if you look downstairs at the kind of people that were downstairs, these are satellite systems, and JAP buses, and they're shiny new systems, and this is, I didn't see anything about community there.

I didn't see anyone from the community here in Japan at all. Everything was about large-scale corporations and government stuff, so that's very nice. But again, 95% of the money we're spending right now is on gray infrastructure, and 5% at most, it's not social infrastructure.

And that's true in Japan, Australia, and America. And finally, we'd be taking co-design and co-creation seriously. To what degree does the World Bank, or the IMF, or the ADB, or these other organizations that spend a lot of money in this field, to what degree are citizens and residents actually on these committees and decision makings?

It's usually after the fact, we've decided to do something for you, now come to our meeting, I'll tell you about it. That's not really co-design anymore. Co-design would be you ask a citizen to sit on the design committee with you as you're building a new post -

disaster Masaki -cho, and the citizen says, we need a Masaki -cho, what can we do about it?

Not to be told about it. So I think taking those three principles, doing no harm, rebalancing, and co -design, that might give us some use for those government systems.

Okay, thank you, thank you very much. We had such a library discussion. And in closing, I think I learned a lot. And I have two take -home message. Number one is proper designing, inclusive designing of social infrastructure from a bottom -up approach.

And also mutual kind of insurance across the age, across the space, that's very important. And World Bank Funding Agency for Infrastructure, I think that community center feature can be nicely incorporated.

Number two, I think field -based research, rigorous research is very, very important. We can learn a lot. Queenstown and Uwasho and Boston, we learn a lot from the existing ongoing best practices. So these are two my take -home message.