

CONCLUSION

TADASHI ARUGA

I would like to quickly make some concluding remarks.

In her keynote address Professor Strange criticized the argument of realist school of international relations and struck down their fallacies very convincingly. Professor Strange argued that war became practically impossible among major powers and that regional conflicts would be contained without much disturbing general framework of international order. She also argued against the realist view that trade wars were taking the place of the old Cold War and took the view that protectionism would be restrained in the world of interdependence. She called the attention to the important tasks which major nations should deal with in cooperation, that is, fiscal policy to maintain economic growth and international coordination to protect global environment. Professor Strange observed that states, even the powerful state such as the United States, were losing power and power is now dispersing much more than ever, and the loss of American power was by no means a net gain for Japan. I am very much encouraged to hear Professor Strange that the zero-sum view of international relations was out-moded, because I was always critical of the overly pessimistic realist view and was afraid of its vicious influence upon international relations, particularly relations between Japan and the United States.

Recognizing the similar structural change in international relations, Professor Otani emphasized the importance of realizing common interests not only the common interests among the states, but also common interests for humanity. He argued for the necessity of drastic reform of the United Nations as an international organization more suitable to meet the task of realizing common interests. And I think his position seems to be supported by Professor Verhoeven who emphasized the change from collectivity to community.

In the Session One, Two and Three, we have discussed political problems in the Asian-Pacific region and legal problems relating to the European integration. As for the Asian-Pacific region, I was encouraged during this symposium because both Professor Kusuma and Professor Simon were relatively optimistic, although both of them mentioned several uncertain elements in this regions in international relations. Professor Oshiba questioned the validity of the concept of regionalism. I think there are variety of regionalism; limited regionalism and expansive regionalism, hegemonic regionalism and cooperative regionalism, and more closed regionalism and more open one. There is no doubt some kinds of regionalism, regional arrangements, are necessary for the Asian-Pacific region. And I understand Professor Tanaka suggested in his paper that Japan should seek cooperative, and open regionalism. He seems to be less optimistic because he was critical of Japan and he considered that Japan needed some domestic reform, drastic domestic reform to pursue

such a purpose. It is unfortunate that the Asian-Pacific region cannot have a very solid international unit like the European Community because of cultural and other diversities.

As Professor Otani suggested the collapse of the Soviet Union and growth of European Integration were two most important phenomena in the last quarter of the twentieth century. Today in Sessions Two and Three, Professor Mayer, Doctor Vignes, Professor Manin, and Professor Verhoeven, all of them discussed the impact of European integration upon the sovereignty of its member states. And the development of the EC law also has some impact upon Japanese law as Professor Yokoyama discussed. Comments by Professor Ida was also very stimulating. I listened to these presentations and discussions with great interest.

Having heard the presentations and discussions this morning and afternoon, I feel as a political historian that international law specialists are more progressive in following new phenomena in international relations and in contributing to developing new legal realities than many international political scientists who are still viewing the world much in terms of zero-sum power politics. Therefore I renew my respect for international law specialists, and I would like to take seriously Professor Susan Strange's admonition for the students of international relations to develop a framework more suitable to new realities.

Coming to the end of this symposium, I feel both much satisfaction and some dissatisfaction. Much satisfaction, because many aspects of structural change in the world order have been discussed. For this success I would like to express my hearty gratitude to the guest participants, particularly those who came from abroad, who came a very long way to participate in this symposium. At the same time I have to fear that time was too short to develop our discussion, but it may be inevitable more or less for such a symposium. I hope this symposium has succeeded in strengthening an international network of Hitotsubashi University, and I wish we could carry on this scholarly dialogue on the more long-term basis.

Thank you very much.

HITOTSUBASHI UNIVERSITY