Innovation for Inclusion and Reflection

Riccardo Pozzo

University of Verona, Italy

1. Introduction

"Social and Cultural Innovation" is a syntagma that has been receiving increased usage since 2016, when it was chosen by the European Strategy Forum Research Infrastructures for the name of the working group that deals with research infrastructures primarily connected with the Social Sciences and the Humanities.[1] Innovation refers to the creation of new products and services by bringing a new idea to the market. Economic growth turns on infrastructures, which provide access to services and knowledge, e.g. by overcoming the digital divide. Globalization has made it clear that a most urgent objective is to work out policies of social and cultural innovation to the advantage of citizens—policies that aim at achieving changes in the regulatory environment that make societies both inclusive and reflective.[2] The *Faro Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society* of UNESCO encourages reflection on the role of citizens in the process of defining, creating, and managing a cultural environment in which communities evolve.[3] The notions of inclusion and reflection are inspired by philosophical ideas referring to the role of deliberative communication of citizens in a modern public sphere aiming at mutual understanding. Jürgen Habermas has applied to society[4] what G. W. F. Hegel had elaborated as the passage from the surface of being to the ground of essence, a passage that takes place, literally, by "reflecting into the thing"[5] – like reflected light that illuminates something previously invisible, or creates a pattern not previously existing. It is now time to examine the implications of innovation for redefining the

---

1. European Strategy Forum Research Infrastructures, *Strategy Report Research Infrastructures: Roadmap 2016*, Brussels, Science and Technology Facilities Council, 2016.

2. D. Archibugi and A. Filippetti (eds.), *The Handbook of Global Science, Technology and Innovation*, London, Wiley, 2015.

3. Unesco, *Faro Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*, Paris, Unesco, 2007.

4. J. Habermas, *Wahrheitstheorien*, in: *Wirklichkeit und Reflexion: Walter Schulz zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by H. Fahrenbach, Pfüllingen, Neske, 1973, pp. 211-265.

5. See http://www.zeno.org/Philosophie/M/Hegel,+Georg+Wilhelm+Friedrich/Wissenschaft+der+Logik> accessed 15 July 2018. G. W. F. Hegel, *Wissenschaft der Logik*, vol. 2: *Die Logik des Wesens*, section I: *Erster Abschnitt: Das Wesen als Reflexion in ihm selbst*, chapter 2: *Die Wesenheiten oder die Reflexionsbestimmungen*.

ways in which the culture has been envisioned, particularly to visualize the various ways in which users engage with cultural processes in the past, present, and future.

2. Inclusion

"Reduced inequality" has been declared the tenth goal of the Substainable Development Agenda of the United Nations.[6] Inequalities and exclusion are major concerns in Europe and are being extensively researched in Horizon 2020:

> Reducing inequalities and social exclusion in Europe are crucial challenges for the future of Europe. At the same time, there is great potential for Europe through opportunities provided, for example, by new forms of innovation and by the engagement of citizens. Supporting inclusive, innovative and reflective societies is a prerequisite for a sustainable European integration.[7]

Theories, events, doctrines, facts and real life are an essential part of today's world: if their knowledge were not to be explored with new educational instruments and transferred in a participated and constructive way, national narratives and identitarian ideologies would attract the minorities and affect the majorities as well, which is a drift the world should be aware of, bearing in mind, e.g., the dreadful experience of the Holocaust. Innovative education and training policies can enhance labor productivity, social equality and eventually democratic participatory process.

"Social innovation" aims to directly address unmet social needs in new ways by developing or enhancing new products and services through the direct engagement of the people who need and use them, typically through a bottom-up process. It takes place when a new product or service answers positively to the following three questions: (1) Does it solve the problem? (2) Does it have a fair cost? (3) Is it universally accepted? An example of social innovation is the regional healthcare card of the Lombardy Region in Italy.[8] It was introduced in 1999 as a pioneer endeavor. It solved the problem of providing access to data; not only did it cost right, but it enabled substantial savings; and it was accepted without any opposition.

Basic research is often funded by public investment. However, due to a lack of successful communication strategies to the general public, its importance is rarely fully understood by citizens who do not grasp its actual usefulness. Co-creation as part of knowledge and technology transfer assumes a social relevance, in that it makes basic science widely accepted by the society and

---

6. See <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/development-agendaSee https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/development-agenda/> accessed 3 September 2018.

7. See <https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/ europe-changing-world-inclusive-innovative-and-reflective-societies> accessed 3 September 2018.

8. See <http://www.regione.lombardia.it/wps/portal/istituzionale/HP/DettaglioServizio/servizi-e-informazioni/cittadini/diritti-e-tutele/carta-regionale-e-nazionale-servizi> accessed 15 July 2018.

among taxpayers by giving space to societal actors that follow the whole research and innovation process.[9] For these reasons, measuring the impact is fundamental to improve societal acceptance of public investment in basic research because it provides a basis for aligning research and innovation with the values, needs and expectations of society.[10] The methodology relies on composite indicators that have reliable characteristics when complex and multidimensional phenomena need to be measured. It looks for integrations and complementarities. It takes account of the effects of engaging stakeholders and the civil society in the dynamics of science-based innovation. Finally, the methodology considers the measure of benefits for the private sector as it invests in curiosity-driven research.

Innovation is the main concern of research councils, agencies that began to be established about a century ago, at the time of World War I. They differ significantly from universities and academies. University faculties are mostly free to investigate topics of their interest, they are largely devoted to teaching; freedom of research and teaching is a constitutive right of their profession. European academies were funded by monarchs so that they could obtain answers to their inquiries from live-in scholars. Research councils, on the contrary, are funded by governments in order to achieve results of strategic relevance for the country. Directly related are research infrastructures, which foster economic growth by providing access to services and knowledge. In this view, it is up to national governments to help build competencies that generate complexity.[11]

European research infrastructures today are of different kinds. They range from large-scale facilities with advanced instrumentation (e.g., the CERN Laboratories in Geneva, the European Synchrotron Laboratory, etc.) to resources for knowledge storage, such as archives and databanks. The latter are no longer mono-locational; they are instead the result of an integration of resources and laboratories that are distributed all over Europe. Their governance and legal status are structured as a European Research Infrastructure Consortium (ERIC).

Research infrastructures are "common goods."[12] They are planned, built and managed for serving vast research communities, which operate in diversified sectors on the principles of open access and competition. The 2018 ESFRI roadmap considers six groups of research infrastructures: DAT-Data, Computing and Digital Research Infrastructures, ENE-Energy, ENV-Environment,

9. C. K. Prahalad and V. Ramaswamy, Co-opting Customer Competence, *Harvard Business Review*, 78/1 (2000), pp. 79-87.

10. European Science Foundation, *Research Infrastructures in Digital Humanities: Science Policy Briefing 42*, Strasbourg, ESF, 2011; M. Kaase, *Research Infrastructures in the Social Sciences: The Long and Winding Road*, in: *Understanding Research Infrastructures in the Social Sciences*, edited by B. Kleiner, I. Renschler, B. Wernli, P. Farago and D. Joye, Berlin, Seismo, 2013, pp. 19-30; Q. Lauer, *Die Vermessung der Kultur: Geisteswissenschaften als Digital Humanities*, in: [SEP]*Big Data: Das neue Versprechen der Allwissenheit*, edited by H. Geiselberger and T. Moorstedt, Berlin, Seismo, 2013, pp. 99-116; M. Žic-Fuchs, *Research Infrastructures in the Humanities: The Challenges of 'Visibility' and 'Impact'*, in: *Facing the Future: European Research Infrastructures for the Humanities and Social Sciences*, edited by A. Dușa, D. Nelle, G. Stock and G. Wagner, Berlin, Scivero, 2014, pp. 121-133.

11. C. Hidalgo and R. Hausmann, "The Building Blocks of Economic Complexity, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106/26 (2009), pp. 10570-10575.

12. R. Pozzo and V. Virgili, Governing Cultural Diversity: Common Goods, Shared Experiences, Spaces for Exchange, *Economia della cultura*, 26/1 (2016), pp. 41-47, doi.org/10.1446/84035.

H&F-Health and Food, PSE-Physics and Engineering, and eventually SCI-Social and Cultural Innovation, whose strategy working group:

> proposes possible solutions (related to RIs) that are able to help tackle the Grand Challenges facing society, such as health or demographic change, or the SC6-«inclusive, innovative and reflective societies» challenge from the third pillar of Horizon 2020 called «Tackling societal challenges». It establishes possible methods through which social sciences and humanities could be used as an evaluation criterion for the activity of other RIs in the ESFRI roadmap (e.g. social impact, etc.). It also explores how RIs can contribute to social innovation or better knowledge transfer towards society.[13]

3. Reflection

"Cultural innovation," no doubt, might sounds like an oxymoron. It is something real, however, that tops up social and technological innovation.[14] Cultural innovation requires spaces of exchange in which citizens engage in the process of sharing their experiences while appropriating common goods content. We are talking of public spaces such as libraries, museums, science centers, but also of any place in which co-creation activities may occur. At this level, social innovation becomes reflective and generates cultural innovation. Insisting on reflexivity helps to raise awareness for the importance of framing issues around engaging with science and society, identifying problems and defining solutions.

The Horizon 2020 topic "Europe in a Changing World: Innovative, Inclusive and Reflective Societies" introduces another syntagma that covers a vast array of the social sciences and humanities dealing with the past and the present, from history to geopolitics through cultural heritage studies and up to practically all fields of the humanities. A closer scrutiny reveals that this syntagma is strongly inspired by philosophical ideas referring to the crucial role of deliberative communication of citizens in a modern public sphere aiming at mutual understanding.[15] The current migrant crisis has made it clear with extraordinary force that a most urgent objective is to work towards Euro-Mediterranean societies that are inclusive, reflective, and attentive to the impact that migration is having on social and cultural innovation, security and health, environment and biodiversity.

It is now time to examine the role of reflection for rethinking the ways in which culture has been envisioned, particularly to visualize the various ways in which users engage with cultural processes in the past, present, and future. Let me propose a case study. Imagine a second-generation

13. See <http://www.esfri.eu/working-groups/social-and-cultural-innovation> accessed 15 July 2018.
14. R. Pozzo and V. Virgili, Social and Cultural Innovation: Research Infrastructures tackling Migration, *Diogenes: International Journal of Human Sciences*, 64/4 (2017), doi.org/10.1177/0392192117739822.
15. J. Habermas, *Op. cit*.

diaspora child (*huaqiao* 华桥) who attends a human sciences high school in Italy. At a certain point, s/he might be asked to read a text by Plato, possibly the *Apology of Socrates* (*Apologia Sokratous* Ἀπολογία Σωκράτους), first in Italian, then perhaps in the Greek original or in the classic Latin rendering of Marsilius Ficinus. Students today delve easily into multilayered, multilingual hypertexts, and they do so on the basis of the reciprocal guidance made possible by social reading tools. Our student ought to read the same text in modern unified Chinese as well, so that s/he might be able to start a discussion on Socrates in its Chinese-speaking family. Inversely, schoolmates might appropriate, say, the *Analects* (*Lunyu* 伦语) of Confucius through the conceptual references indicated by our student. Together they may start thinking on movement (*dong* 动), rest (*jing* 静), human being (*renji* 人际), humaneness (*ren* 仁), and eventually come to grasp key tenets of Neo-Confucianism,[16] such as the dictum that represents the unity of heaven and human or supernal heaven and humanity (*tianrenheyi* 天人合一), which amounts to "restoring the Heavenly Principle and diminishing human desires".[17]

Globalization is not a new experience. It is a long-term historical process that enhances regional, national, and local identities[18]. In addressing Europe's need to adapt to historical change, one needs to challenge the anachronistic notion of a European intellectual identity. Europe has evolved beyond its Greco-Roman intellectual roots, and has become much more diverse: "When talking of ancient luminaries such as Aristotle, who profoundly shaped European thought, we can correctly describe them as forming part of Europe's intellectual *basis*. European intellectual *identity*, on the other hand, is now much broader in scope, enriched through historical change, particularly immigration."[19] Cultural identity is a "polysemic, slippery and illusory" syntagma.[20] In fact, "culture cannot be but plural, changing, adaptable, constructed…. A culture that does not change and exchange with other cultures is a dead culture."[21] Cultural identity is therefore "what we construct whenever we are in contact with other human beings—regardless of the fact that they are from the same environment or not."[22]

4. Conclusion

Rémi Brague has noted that the Arabic term for dictionary, سوماق (qāmūs), is a translation of the name of the Titan of Greek mythology Ὠκεανός (Okeanós), in the original literal sense of a liquid

---

16. Ni Peimin, *Understanding the Analects of Confucius: A new Translation of Lunyu with Annotations*, Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press, 2017.

17. R. R. Wang, "Zhou Dunyi's Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate Explained ('Taijitu shuo'): A construction of the Confucian metaphysics," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 66 (2005), pp. 307-323, here p. 320.

18. Tu Weiming, *The Global Significance of Concrete Humanity: Essays on the Confucian Discourse in Cultural China*, New Delhi, Centre for Studies in Civilizations, 2010, p. 331.

19. DG-R&I, *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

20. F. Dervin, Cultural Identity, Representation, and Other, in: *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*, edited by J. Jackson, London, Routledge, 2012, pp. 181-194, here p. 181.

21. Id., *Op. cit.*, p. 183.

22. *Ibid.*

extension that embraces all emerged lands, permitting navigation and hence communication.[23] Leibniz has used the ocean metaphor for an encyclopedia, which is the very same idea concerning languages that this paper tries to defend. As Karl Jaspers pointed out, Confucius and Laozi lived and taught in China, the Upanishads were produced in India, where the Buddha lived, alike Zarathustra in Persia, the prophets in Palestine, Homer, Parmenides, Heraclitus, and Plato in Greece. "Everything implied by these names developed almost simultaneously in China, India, and the West."[24] Today, we see the rebirth of the cultural melting pot that Plato spoke about in the *Timaeus* (23c), thus prefiguring "the translation of Greek words, culture and thoughts into the Latin words of Cicero and Boethius, or the dynamics of the great Mediterranean cultural circle made of translation and tradition of philosophical, religious, and medical texts from Greek and Hebrew into Arabic, Latin, and all vernacular languages."[25]

The new "missions" of the next Framework Program for Research Innovation of the multiannual financial period 2021-2027 will foster research on the systemic change in the new generations. First and foremost, a change in the mindset, e.g. urban development, urban regeneration; institutional change; i-like culture as way of obtaining ratings. We are talking about common goods.[26] Given that migrants use cell-phones to obtain information – hacktivism, hackathons, we can think of measuring impact which generates trust between capital entrepreneurship, like venture capital, and social innovation, we see improvements. We expect cultural innovation to trigger a change in the mindset as regards locating culture (anthropology of space and place) for inclusion and reflection in education, life-long learning, healthcare, urban development and regeneration. Culture cannot be but plural, changing, adaptable, constructed. Inclusion and reflection are constructed whenever we are in contact with other human beings, regardless where they come from. This we have to learn.

23. R. Brague, "Langues et traditions constitutives de la philosophie en Europe, in: *Vocabulaire européen des philosophies: Dictionnaire des intraduisibles*, edited by B. Cassin, Paris, Seuil, 2004, pp. 694-699.

24. K. Jaspers, *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte*, Zürich, Artemis, 1949, p. 2.

25. T. Gregory, Translatio Studiorum, in: *Translatio Studiorum: Ancient, Medieval and Modern Bearers of Intellectual History*, edited by M. Sgarbi, Leiden, Brill's, 2012, pp. 1-21, here p. 12.

26. X. Graeffe, Cultural Heritage as a Common Good, *Cartaditalia*, 1 (2017), pp. 207-20.