

閉会挨拶

植木（川勝）千可子
（早稲田大学・教授）

どうもありがとうございました。それぞれの先生方には、たくさんの質問を簡潔にまとめてお答えいただき、本当によかったと思います。皆さまのご協力を得て、非常に示唆に富むセッションができました。

GIARI のシンポジウムとしては四回目となりますが、今回は「アジア地域統合と安全保障協力」をテーマとして、次のような観点からシンポジウムを開催しました。すなわち、アジアには実際人々の交流、あるいは経済的な統合・協力といったものがデ・ファクトのかたちで現実に行進していますが、最近のニュースを見るとそれとはまるで逆行しているような安全保障の動きがあります。これに対してアジア諸国においてはどのようにして連携がとれているのでしょうか。依然として二国間という枠組みの中で支えられている安全保障と、そのマルチなかたちで進んでいる地域の経済的な協力関係という、この二つの合わない絵がどのように合わせられていくのかが、今回のテーマにおける問題意識となりました。そこで最後に、いくつか私なりの観察というか、ここで学んだことを、皆さまと一緒に分かち合いたいと思います。

まず午前中のパネルでは、アメリカあるいは米軍のプレゼンスということが、議論の焦点の一つになりました。北朝鮮の問題、あるいは全体的な地域の安定にしても、この地域にまだまだ各国間の不信感が拭い去れない状況の中で、やはりアメリカの軍事的なプレゼンス、あるいはアメリカの軍事的抑止力というのは、まだまだ必要であろうという議論がなされました。発表者の先生方は、米軍のプレゼンスはある程度この地域の安定供給剤になっている、と述べられました。それぞれそのプレゼンスのレベルや中味については意見の不一致があるかもしれませんが、少なくともそれを、ある程度は安定材料として残し、また築いていくということが、短期的、中期的にはいえるという議論でした。いくつかの答えを出すことを目的としてこういったシンポジウムをやりますけれども、そのほとんどの場合答えは出せずに、更に疑問が深まるというのが常だと思います。しかしやはり、このシンポジウムにおける積み残しの宿題というか、疑問がいくつか残ったことと思います。

一つとしては、やはりそのそれぞれの分野で進んでいることの行方についてです。特に午後のパネルで話し合われたような、経済的な協力、そして人の移動と接触、あるいはそういったことによって起こっている、特にエリートというよりも一般の、国民のレベルで起こっている、アイデンティティの徐々なる融合といったようなこと、あるいは、非伝統的な安全保障の問題での協力といったものが、果たしてこのまま、ゆっくりとではあるが進んでいき、そして地域の国同士の、多国間の協力に繋がっていくのか、あるいはそうではなくて、紛争といった何か大きな出来事によって、それらは一気に崩れてしまうようなものなのかについては、まだ積み残しの宿題であると思います。そしてまた、何度か先生方が因果関係の矢印についてのお話をされましたように、アイデンティティの変化が接触によって起こっていることは確かですけれども、政治の高いレベルでの関係の変化、あるいはその力の変化、そういったようなものが因果関係の矢印になって、アイデンティティをより大きなかたちで動かしていくのかどうかについても、まだわかっていないのではないかと思います。

そしてあともう一つの積み残しの宿題についてです。アジア地域では、人が飛びつくような問題ではないところから協力が始まっている。具体的にいえば、非常に大事なことではありますが、自然災害時の救援や海上における救難・訓練、あるいは人間の安全保障といった分野での協力が進んでいます。ただ、何か起こると非伝統的分野から伝統的分野に進んでしまうのは一体なぜなのかを、考える必要があると思います。それは、たとえば、主権に強く関係することであるためなのか。あるいは実際の生命の安全に深く結びついていることであるためなのか。あるいは非常に感情的なレベルでナショナリズムと関わっていて、自分たちが実際の問題の大きさは必ずしも等価でないかたちで感情的に揺さぶられるからなのか。あるいはそのそれぞれの安全保障、防衛を担っている軍事組織またはその他国内の組織の利益に向けて、伝統的な安全保障の分野の方がより傾注されるか

らなのか。そうになっているのはどうしてなのかという理由を、考える必要があるかと思います。

このように、経済が進んでいて人の移動が進んでいるにも関わらず、まだまだ安全保障面の問題が残っています。これだけ日中関係が発展してきたのに、今回のレアアースの事件等の問題で、あまり経済的相互依存が進んでもよいことがないのではないかと思います。しかしやはり、そういう時は反実仮想をやってみる、すなわち、こうでなかったらどうだろうと考えてみることの大切さも、今日のシンポジウムで学んだことであると思います。これだけの経済的な相互依存が進んでいなかったとしたならば、ひょっとしたら事態はもっと悪くなっていたかもしれない。どうしてもマイナスのところに目が行きがちですけれども、これがたとえば、もっと状況が悪かったならば実際どうなっただろうか、と問うてみるのも重要であると思います。

この地域には様々な枠組みがあります。二国間同盟もちろんありますし、そしてASEANを中心とした動きや、先程言ったような海難の救護訓練は、日本あるいは韓国等で主催され、オブザーバーとして中国や他の多くの国を招いて開かれるものもあります。あるいは津波、地震といったケースでの協力関係も進んでいます。今日そういったような色々な枠組みがある中で、収斂に向かうことはないのではないかと、悲観的になることもあると思います。ただ、朗報として、お話にもありましたが、メンバーになっていると、その国というのは、その枠組みの中で協力し、その枠組みを守ろうとする傾向があるので、いくつもいくつも絵が描かれています。日韓、日豪でも協力は進んでいますし、日韓豪、日米韓でも昨年はじめて三防衛大臣の会合を開き、今日から日米が共同訓練を行っていますけれども、今回は韓国もそれにはじめて参加しています。それはもしかすると対中国、対北朝鮮のためのものかとも思われます。けれども何年か前を振り返って頂くと、韓国がそういったようなものに参加するということはある得ないような日韓関係だった時代もあるので。そういうことからすると、日中韓関係も進んでおり、様々な枠組みができて、それぞれメンバーになっているため、不満で新しいものをつくっても、メンバーに入っていれば、その枠組みを守ろうとするというのは、よいニュースかと思っております。

今回は皆さんのご協力を得て、色々考える材料をいただいた、よい機会でしたので、非常に感謝しております。来年度は五年目になりますが、同じ12月の最初の金曜日、12月2日に、またここでシンポジウムを開催致します。また近くなりましたらご案内が行くかと思います。まだテーマも明確には決まっておりますませんが、その時はまた是非ご参加いただき、また一年間皆で宿題を考えて、色々とし唆をいただきたいと思います。本日は、本当にどうもありがとうございました。

付録（１） １日目ワークショップ

Pre-symposium Meeting

Date: December 2, 2010

Venue: Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies, Waseda University

Participants (in alphabetical order): Prof. Satoshi Amako, Prof. Rumi Aoyama, Prof. Kang Choi, Dr. Miki Honda, Dr. Kenji Horiuchi, Prof. Alastair Iain Johnston, Dr. Hiro Katsumata, Dr. Shu Min, Prof. Andrew Oros, Prof. Hatsue Shinohara, Dr. Rizal Sukma, Prof. Chikako (Kawakatsu) Ueki, and GIARI RAs.

The issues discussed at the meeting can be divided into the following eight categories:

1. Key terms
2. Regional security architecture
3. Regional communities and identities (1): foundations
4. Regional communities and identities (2): Critical views
5. ASEAN
6. US presence
7. The Korean Peninsula
8. The rise of China

The issues discussed at the meeting, concerning each of these eight categories, can be summarized as follows:

1. Key terms

- If one is to explore the key determinants of Asian regional integration, the first thing he/she has to do is to define the notion of “regional integration/cooperation.” Regional integration/cooperation must be the so-called “dependent variable” in his/her analysis.
- It may be useful to make a clear distinction between the concepts of “cooperation” and “integration.” The former may be more relevant to the process in Asia, and the latter may be more appropriate to capture the process in Europe. In any case, in East Asia, even “cooperation” is difficult in the security field.
- With regard to the notion of “security cooperation,” one key issue to explore is the level of cooperation. There are many ways by which countries can cooperate. For example, European countries have developed what can be regarded as a “security-management” institution. The quality of cooperation may differ, depending on how countries choose to cooperate.

2. Regional security architecture

- East Asian countries today do not have an overall/general architecture for regional cooperation that goes beyond existing issue-specific frameworks.
- In the area of non-traditional security issues, various cooperative mechanisms in East Asia do matter. This is the case, although the US presence continues to have an important role in the area of traditional security.
- Multilateral dialogues at the top/senior-official level may be effective for the stability of the East Asian region, involving China, Japan and South Korea.
- The capacity of East Asian countries is an important issue. Each needs a regional cooperative architecture because it lacks the ability to address various security issues by itself unilaterally.
- For the exploration of a future regional security architecture in East Asia, it is essential to identify the preferences of key players, including China, the US, Japan, ASEAN, South Korea and North Korea. One useful way of examining their preferences is to draw a matrix, showing each country's preferences, concerning the following five key issues. The first is the membership of any given security framework. The question of whether the US should be included as a member can constitute a point at issue. The same thing can be said of the status of Taiwan and of North Korea. The second is the rules and/or decision making procedures. Some countries may want all decisions to be made on a consensual basis, while others may prefer decisions to be made by a majority vote. The third concerns the responsibility involved in membership. The extent to which countries should contribute their military forces to regional institutions, for example, can be a point at issue. The forth is the issue areas to be covered within multilateral

frameworks. Some countries may want to avoid liberal issues such as human rights and democracy. Countries such as China may want to avoid addressing territorial issues within multilateral frameworks.

- It can be argued that, in any case, all countries in the region probably want to be involved in regional integration in one way or another. In this respect, the notion of “relevance” may be useful in addressing what each wants: all want to be a relevant player, having a legitimate stake in regional integration.

3. Regional communities and identities (1): foundations

- Socialization and people-to-people exchanges are prerequisites for the formation of regional security communities. Such communities represent a form of regional order, which should be distinguished from other kinds of order, such as the concert of great powers and military alliances. Security communities are characterized by the prevailing expectation for peaceful change.
- Social contract theory may be useful in analyzing the formation of security communities. The key to forming security communities is in- and out-group differentiations, and thus it is important to analyze the determinants of such differentiations.
- In East Asia, there is robust evidence to show that foreign policy choices are made on the basis of the perceptions of identity differences on the part of policymakers.
- It is worth exploring whether economic development/modernization leads to identity changes and the mitigation of differences between societies in East Asia. Relevant to this point is the literature arguing that economic integration leads to the convergence of identities among business elites, and that such convergence may affect political activities.
- It should be noted that the perception of identity similarities/differences is relative, and dependant on one’s reference groups. In this regard, it can be said that collective identities can be formed more easily when relevant parties share a common perception of an out-group.
- The existence of a common security threat may be an important factor in shaping a regional identity.
- Although people-to-people exchanges may seem like a negligible phenomenon today, their importance should not be underestimated because future generations, including students and youngsters, are involved. They may form a collective identity and lead the process of regional integration in the future. Yet, at the same time, young people may be passive, and simply bandwagon with dominant phenomena.

4. Regional communities and identities (2): Critical views

- The formation of a collective identity at the societal level may not always lead to its formation at the political/elite level. Notable in this respect is the fact that, in Europe, it was an identity at the elite level which promoted regional integration. Yet it may also be argued that exchanges at the societal level facilitated inter-governmental integration in Europe.
- Activities such as traveling and economic exchanges can work in both directions: integration or disintegration. It is notable that the Japanese are not welcoming Chinese tourists, who actually account for as high as 70% of the total number of tourists to Japan, according to a survey by the Yomiuri Shimbun.
- It is worth adding that tourism is all about experiencing something different/exotic. If this is the case, mass tourism may not be an effective force for the construction of collective identities.
- Politics may matter. Political leaders may play a role in shaping public perceptions. To illustrate, only after a power-balance change between great powers did Japanese people develop an interest in the Soviet leader, Gorbachev. Another point to note in this regard is that political cooperation may be a prerequisite for economic cooperation and perhaps also for collective identity formation.
- Regional cooperation may easily be undermined by conflict. Domestic political problems may undermine efforts for regional cooperation. Thus, functional cooperation may be the most promising. The role of national leaders should be emphasized in advancing regional cooperation.

5. ASEAN

- It is worth exploring whether identity similarities have contributed to the formation of a regional community in Southeast Asia. In this regard, it is worth noting that, in Southeast Asia in the past, there had been continuous conflicts and wars. Hence, the nations there came to recognize that cooperation was essential. Their understanding that there was no other way but to cooperate led them to address various issues. One of the first tasks was the joint production of fertilizer.
- Recently ASEAN members have agreed to bring their disputes to the International Court of Justice (ICJ),

and to accept decisions made by the court.

- After the end of the Cold War, Southeast Asian countries expanded the areas of cooperation to include non-traditional security issues. There was a need to change the goals and means of ASEAN.
- Today democratization and human rights protection are indispensable for the formation of a common identity in Southeast Asia. This is because socialization would not be possible if people's interactions were restricted. It is worth adding that the development of security communities cannot be planned in a top-down manner.
- It can be said that the development of ASEAN preceded the development of theories of regional integration. Yet it can also be said that theoretical concepts have served as policy frameworks in Southeast Asia.
- The role of ASEAN in East Asia may be limited to the provision of forums in which the countries of Northeast Asia and Southeast Asia can meet. In any case, these forums may have a constraining effect on Chinese behavior – an effect created by the countries observing of each other's behaviors.
- The significance of ASEAN can be understood in terms of the association's emphasis on maintaining its members' sovereignty, rather than weakening it by creating a supranational structure.
- ASEAN's forums are not able to "resolve" the problems in the region: nevertheless, they provide political space for addressing these problems. In this respect, ASEAN's forums are more than just "talk shops."

6. US presence

- The US presence in East Asia may be a prerequisite for regional order. Yet it should be noted, in this respect, that the US should think more seriously about multilateral cooperation.
- The ways in which East Asian countries respond to various security issues may be determined by the presence of the US. However, the real effect of the US presence is difficult to determine. In any case, counterfactual analyses may be needed. One may ask, for example, in what way China would have behaved in the 1995/96 Taiwan Strait Crisis, if US forces were not present in Asia.
- An important question for researchers to examine is whether the US has the will and capacity to make a contribution to the stability of East Asia, in particular, by promoting the formulation of regional cooperation architectures.
- It seems that US policy toward China has become more assertive. This may be one of the reasons why China behaved so assertively in the South China Sea, the East China Sea and the Yellow Sea in 2010. In any case, the intention of the US may have been to reassure its allies, and also to signal to others that it is not in decline, and that it is by no means retreating from the East Asian region.
- US domestic politics should be examined. The White House was seen as weak vis-à-vis Beijing during the 2009 Obama-Hu summit. Hence, the US government may be intending to show to its domestic audience, as well as to the East Asian nations, that US policy toward China should remain strong, and that it is determined to remain engaged in East Asian affairs.

7. The Korean Peninsula

- The presence of the US may be serving as a deterrent. Yet another question is whether a decrease in the degree of US presence would lead to greater cooperation among the East Asian countries to deal with their common enemy, North Korea.
- It is important to recognize differences in the security concerns of Northeast Asian "stakeholders." The relations that Northeast Asian countries have with North Korea are all different. In any case, a stronger emphasis should be placed on the benefit of cooperation.
- One remarkable development in recent years is that the Chinese have mentioned that they could agree to the unification of the Korean Peninsula, as long as certain conditions were met. They have however not specified what exactly these conditions are.
- Importantly, North Korea depends on China. Their relations are not one of "interdependence," but one of "dependence."
- It can be argued that the bilateral alliances of the US are the only way to deal with the issue of North Korea, from a certain perspective. It is difficult to imagine effective multilateral cooperation over the issue of North Korea, given the difficulties of the existing multilateral institutions in Asia.

8. The rise of China

- China is trying to create new norms of international politics, on the basis of its own preferences.
- The recent use of rare earth exports by the Chinese as a strategic tool raises the question of whether the liberal view of regional peace is really relevant. Economics and politics can always be separated, and the spillover effect may work in a negative direction.
- At the same time, it may be counter-factually said that, if the condition of economic interdependence had been absent in the first place, the situation could have been worse. It may be that the economic measures were taken, instead of more aggressive measures, because of the significance of economic interdependence.
- Increasingly assertive Chinese behavior in the South China Sea, the East China Sea and the Yellow Sea in 2010 can be seen as the result of exogenous shocks, which were magnified by the media and certain interest groups. A counter-factual question is how China would have behaved if the exogenous shocks had occurred last year, and so on.
- The Chinese foreign ministry has become aware of the possible impact its regional policy will have on the image of its country. Some kind of learning process is developing between China and Southeast Asian nations.
- The ways in which countries perceive the status of Taiwan is diverse. In particular, the views of the US and of Southeast Asian countries are different.
- One factor that might explain China's increasingly assertive behavior is distrust between Washington and Beijing. East Asian countries apparently have not been able to reassure China in the security sphere. This issue should be explored in depth in the future.

付録（２）参加者 経歴

天児 慧 (Satoshi AMAKO)

早稲田大学大学院アジア太平洋研究科教授。専門は、現代中国論、アジア国際関係論。一橋大学社会学研究科で博士号取得。琉球大学助教授、共立女子大学国際文化学部教授、青山学院大学国際政治経済学部教授を経て、2002年4月より現職。1999年アメリカン大学客員教授。近著に『中華人民共和国史 新書』（岩波書店、1999年）、『現代中国の構造変動4 中央と地方の政治構図』（編著 東京大学出版会、2000年）『等身大の中国』（勁草書房、2003年）『中国とどうつきあうか』（NHK出版、2003年）『中国の歴史11 巨龍の胎動 毛沢東 VS 鄧小平』（講談社 2004年）『中国アジア日本』（ちくま新書、2006年）『東アジア共同体の構築（1）新たな地域形成』（共編、岩波書店、2007年）、『日本再生の戦略』（講談社、2009年）、『アジア連合への道：理論と人材育成の構想』（筑摩書房、2010年）など。

Professor, Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies (GSAPS), Waseda University. He earned his PhD in International Relations from Graduate School of Social Sciences, Hitotsubashi University. His specialties are Contemporary China and Asian International Relations. He became Professor at Waseda University in April 2002 after serving as Assistant Professor at Ryukyu University, as Professor in the Faculty of International Culture, Kyoritsu Women's Educational Institution and in the Department of International Politics and Economics, Aoyama Gakuin University. He was invited to American University as Visiting Professor in 1999. Major Publications include *The History of People's Republic of China, New Edition* (Iwanami, 1999); *Change in Contemporary Chinese Structure, vol.4, The Political Structure of Central and Regional Government* (writing and editing, The University of Tokyo Press, 2000); *Life-Size China* (Keiso Shobo, 2003); *How to Associate with China* (NHK Book, 2003); *The History of China, vol.11: Mao Zedong vs. Deng Xiaoping* (Kodansha, 2004); *Road to Asian Union: Theories and Ideas on Capacity Building* (Chikuma Shobo, 2010) and others.

青山 瑠妙 (Rumi AOYAMA)

早稲田大学教育・総合科学学術院教授。専門は、国際関係論、現代中国外交。慶応義塾大学にて博士号取得。近著に「中国の地域外交と東アジア共同体」『東アジア共同体の構築3-国際移動と社会変容』（岩波書店、2007）、『現代中国の外交』（慶応義塾大学出版会、2007）、『中国のパブリック・ディプロマシー』（国際交流基金、2009）など多数。

Professor, The Research Institute of Current Chinese Affairs, School of Education, Waseda University. She was a visiting researcher at the Stanford University from 2005-2006. She earned a Ph. D. in Law from Graduate School of Law, Keio University. Her specialty is Contemporary Chinese Diplomacy. Her Contemporary China's Foreign Policy (Gendai chuugoku no gaikou) was honored with the 24th Masayoshi Ohira Foundation Memorial Prize. Her other most recent publications include "Chinese Diplomacy in the Multimedia Age," in Kazuko Mori & Kenichiro Hirano eds., *A New East Asia: Toward a Regional Community* (Singapore: National University of Singapore, 2007); "China's Public Diplomacy," in Shin Kawashima eds., *China's Foreign Policy* (Tokyo: Yamakawa Press, 2007) (in Japanese).

チェ・カン (Kang CHOI)

韓国外交通商省外交安全保障研究院アメリカ研究事務局長・教授。オハイオ州立大学にて Ph.D 取得。1992～1998、2002～2005 年、韓国防衛分析研究所（KIDA）に勤務。KIDA では、現代防衛問題調査特別委員会最高執行官、国際軍備管理研究主任、Korean Journal of Defense Analysis (KJDA) 編集人など、様々な役職を務める。軍備管理、政軍関係を含む危機管理、韓米安全保障同盟についての 60 を超える研究プロジェクトを行う。1998 年～2002 年、韓国国家安全保障理事会事務局で政策立案・調整担当上級理事を務める。4 カ国協議における韓国代表団の 1 人であった。"An Approach toward a Common Form of Defense White Paper"、"International Arms Control and Inter-Korean Arms

Control”、“Inter-Korean Arms Control and Implications for the USFK”、“Future ROK-US Security Alliance”、“North Korea’s Intentions and Strategies on Nuclear Games”、“A Prospect for US-North Korean Relations: beyond the BDA issue”など、多くの論文を発表。韓国下院外交通商統一委員会、国家防衛省、統一省、民主平和統一諮問会議などで諮問委員会の委員を務める。

CHOI, Kang (Ph.D., the Ohio State University) is a professor and Director-General for American Studies at the Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. From 1992 to 1998, and from 2002 to 2005, Professor CHOI worked in the Korea Institute for Defense Analyses (KIDA). When at KIDA, Professor CHOI assumed various positions such as Chief Executive Officer, Task Force for Current Defense Issues, Director of International Arms Control Studies, and one of the editors of Korean Journal of Defense Analysis (KJDA). He has done more than 60 research projects on arms control, crisis/consequence management including pol-mil games, and the ROK-US security alliance. From 1998 to 2002, he served in National Security Council Secretariat as Senior Director for Policy Planning and Coordination. He was one of South Korean delegates to the Four-Party Talks. Professor CHOI has published many articles including “An Approach toward a Common Form of Defense White Paper,” “International Arms Control and Inter-Korean Arms Control,” “Inter-Korean Arms Control and Implications for the USFK,” “Future ROK-US Security Alliance,” “North Korea’s Intentions and Strategies on Nuclear Games,” and “A Prospect for US-North Korean Relations: beyond the BDA issue.” Professor CHOI holds several advisory board membership including Committee on Foreign Affairs, Trade, and Unification of National Assembly, Ministry of National Defense, Ministry of Unification, and the National Unification Advisory Council.

アラステア・イアン・ジョンストン (Alastair Iain JOHNSTON)

ハーバード大学行政学科教授（中国研究）。1993年、ミシガン大学で PhD（政治学）取得。主として東アジアの国際関係や中国の外交政策を対象に、社会化理論、アイデンティティと政治行動、戦略文化などに関する研究を発表している。主な単著として、*Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History* (Princeton 1995)、*Social States: China in International Institutions, 1980-2000* (Princeton 2008)があり、共編著として、*Engaging China: The Management of an Emerging Power* (Routledge 1999)、*New Directions in the Study of China’s Foreign Policy* (Stanford 2006)、*Crafting Cooperation: Regional Institutions in Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge 2007)、*Measuring Identity: A Guide for Social Scientists* (Cambridge 2009)などがある。

Alastair Iain Johnston is the Governor James Noe and Linda Noe Laine Professor of China in World Affairs in the Government Department at Harvard University. He received his PhD in Political Science from the University of Michigan in 1993. He has written on socialization theory, identity and political behavior, and strategic culture, generally with application to the study of East Asian international relations and Chinese foreign policy. Johnston is the author of *Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History* (Princeton 1995) and *Social States: China in International Institutions, 1980-2000* (Princeton 2008), and is co-editor of *Engaging China: The Management of an Emerging Power* (Routledge 1999), *New Directions in the Study of China’s Foreign Policy* (Stanford 2006), *Crafting Cooperation: Regional Institutions in Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge 2007), and *Measuring Identity: A Guide for Social Scientists* (Cambridge 2009).

鎌田 薫 (Kaoru KAMATA)

早稲田大学第16代総長。1970年早稲田大学法学部卒業。同大学院法学研究科修士課程、博士課程を経て、1976年法学部専任講師、78年助教授、83年教授となる。1978-80年・2001-03年パリ第2大学および第1大学で在外研究。専門分野は民法、不動産法、フランス法。法学部教務主任（学生担当）、大学院法務研究科長などを歴任し、2010年11月5日より現職。学外では、法科大学院協会副理事長、法制審議会民法（債権関係）部会部会長、国土交通省土地鑑定委員会委員長のほか、最高裁判所司法修習委員会、産業構造審議会知的財産政策部会、医道審議会医道分科会、中央教育審議会大学分科会法科大学院特別委員会、東京都収用委員会、JICA カンボジア「法制度整備プロジェクト」民法作業部会の委員、日本土地法学会・金融法学会・日仏法学会の理事などを務めている。

16th President of Waseda University. He received a B.A. in Law (1970) and an LL.M. (1972) at Waseda University. He has served Waseda University as Lecturer (1976-78), Assistant Professor (1978-83) and Professor (1983-). He has also conducted overseas research at Paris University I and II on two occasions (1978-80 and 2001-03). He specializes in Civil Law, Real Estate Law and French Law. He also served as Curriculum Coordinator (Student Affairs) at the Faculty of Law, Dean of the Law School and took office as 16th President of Waseda University on November 5th, 2010. Outside Waseda University, he serves in other positions including: Vice-chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Japan Association of Law Schools; Chairperson of the Civil Law Subcommittee (Credit Obligation Sub-Team), Legislative Council of the Ministry of Justice; Chairperson of the Land Appraisal Committee of the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism; Member of the Judicial Apprentice Committee, the Supreme Court; Member of the Intellectual Property Policy Subcommittee of the Industrial Structure Council, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry; Member of the Medical Ethics Subcommittee of the Medical Ethics Council, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare; Member of the Special Committee for Law Schools, University Subcommittee, Central Education Council, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology; Member of the Expropriation Committee, Tokyo Metropolitan Government; Member of the Civil Law Working Group, the “Legal and Judicial Development Project” for Cambodia, Japan International Cooperation Agency; Board Member of the Japanese Society of Land Law; Board Member of the Japanese Society of Financial Law; Board Member of La Société Franco-Japonaise de Sciences Juridiques (French-Japanese Society of Legal Science).

植木(川勝)千可子(Chikako KAWAKATSU UEKI)

早稲田大学大学院アジア太平洋研究科教授。専門は、国際関係論、安全保障論。マサチューセッツ工科大学で博士号取得。朝日新聞記者（政治部等）、北京大学国際関係研究所客員研究員、防衛省防衛研究所主任研究官などを経て、2009年に現職。近著に「戦力、軍事力、安全保障」『アクセス安全保障論』（日本経済評論社、2005年）、「世界構造変動と日米中関係—『リベラル抑止』政策の重要性」『国際問題』No. 586（2009年11月）など。

Professor, Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies (GSAPS), Waseda University. She earned her Ph.D. in Political Science from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Her thesis: “The Rise of ‘China Threat’ Arguments” examined U.S. and Japanese perceptions of China after the Cold War. The dissertation received Lucian Pye Award for Best Dissertation in Political Science. Her specialties are International Relations and Security Studies. Her areas of expertise include causes and prevention of war and East Asian international relations, with a special focus on U.S.-Japan-China relations. Prior to joining GSAPS, Dr. Ueki was Staff Writer and Political Correspondent for The Asahi Shimbun, Visiting Scholar at Institute of International Relations at Peking University, and Senior Research Fellow at the National Institute for Defense Studies. She has written extensively on issues concerning threat perception in a unipolar world, transformation of international relations after Cold War, and issues relation to security problems in East Asia. Her major publications include: *Nationalism as a Cause of War: The Case of the Crimean War* (1998), “China: In Search of New Thinking” in *East Asia Strategic Review* (NIDS, 2004), “Strategy, Military Power and Security—Senryaku, Gunjiryoku, Anzenhoshon” in *Access Anzenhoshoron* (2005), *Repairing the Strategic Safety-Net: Security and Interdependence in East Asia* (2006), “International Structural Change and Japan-U.S.-China Relations: The Importance of a Policy of Liberal-Deterrence,” *International Affairs* (Kokusai Mondai), Vol. 586 (November 2009) (in Japanese).

ベンジャミン・シュレイア (Benjamin SCHREER)

オーストラリア国立大学戦略防衛研究所上級研究員、同研究所学部研究主任。2008年、ドイツ・Christian-Albrechts-University KielでPhD（政治学）取得。2009年3月～2010年6月、ドイツ・アスペン研究所副所長。2008年5月～2009年2月、ドイツ・コンスタンツ大学「西洋民主主義と近代保護領」研究グループ共同グループ長。最近の主な著作として、“NATO’s New Strategic Concept and US Commitments in the Asia-Pacific”, (with Stephan Frühling) *RUSI Journal*, vol. 154, no. 5 (October 2009), pp. 98-103, *The Howard Legacy: Australian Military Strategy, 1996–2007* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2008), (with Stephan Frühling), ‘Australia’s Last Priority. Lessons for the future of NATO’s global partnerships’, (with Stephan Frühling), *IP Global Edition*, vol. 10 (November/December 2009), pp. 46-50.

Benjamin Schreer is Senior Lecturer of Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, Australian National University and Director of Undergraduate Studies at the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre. He earned PhD in Political Science from the Christian-Albrechts-University Kiel, Germany (2008). He was a Deputy Director, The Aspen Institute Germany, Berlin, March 2009-June 2010 and a Co-Leader Research Group on “Western Democracies and Modern Protectorates” at Konstanz University, Germany, May 2008-February 09. His current Publications include “NATO’s New Strategic Concept and US Commitments in the Asia-Pacific”, (with Stephan Frühling) *RUSI Journal*, vol. 154, no. 5 (October 2009), pp. 98-103. *The Howard Legacy: Australian Military Strategy, 1996–2007* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2008), (with Stephan Frühling), ‘Australia’s Last Priority. Lessons for the future of NATO’s global partnerships’, (with Stephan Frühling), *IP Global Edition*, vol. 10 (November/December 2009), pp. 46-50.

篠原 初枝 (Hatsue SHINOHARA)

早稲田大学大学院アジア太平洋研究科教授。専門は、国際関係史、国際関係論。シカゴ大学歴史学科にて博士号取得。恵泉女学園大学人文学部助教授、明治学院大学国際学部国際学科助教授、早稲田大学大学院アジア太平洋研究科助教授を経て、2004 年より現職。近著に、『戦争の法から平和の法へ—戦間期のアメリカ国際法学者』（東京大学出版会、2003 年）、「アメリカ正戦論」油井大三郎・紀平英作編『グローバリゼーションと帝国』（ミネルヴァ書房、2006 年）、「戦間期国際秩序における国際連盟」田中孝彦・青木人志編『戦争のあとに』（勁草書房、2008 年）、「アメリカ国際政治学者の戦争批判—古典的リアリズムと構造的リアリズム」『思想』（岩波書店）No. 1020(2009 年 4 月)、『国際連盟』（中公新書）No. 2055（2010 年）など。

Professor, Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies (GSAPS), Waseda University. She earned her PhD from Department of History, Chicago University. Her specialties are History of International Relations and International Relations. She became Professor at Waseda University in 2004 after serving as Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Humanities at Keisen University, Assistant Professor in the Faculty of International Relations at Meiji Gakuin University, Assistant Professor at GSAPS. Major publications include *Forgotten Crusade: The American Scholars of International Law in the Interwar Period* (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 2003) (in Japanese), "American Just War Theory," in *Globalization and Empire* (Kyoto: Minerva Shobo, 2006) (in Japanese), "The League of Nations and International Order in the Interwar Period in After the Wars (Tokyo: Keiso shobo, 2008) (in Japanese), "American IR Theorists' Critique of War: Classical Realism and Structural Realism" *Shiso* No.1020 (April 2009) (in Japanese), and *League of Nations* (Tokyo: Chuokoronshinsha, 2010) (in Japanese).

リザール・スクマ (Rizal SUKMA)

インドネシア国際戦略研究所（CSIS）所長。1997 年、ロンドン・スクール・オブ・エコノミクス（LSE）で PhD（国際関係論）取得。主な研究対象は、東南アジアの安全保障問題、ASEAN、インドネシアの外交防衛政策、インドネシアにおける軍改革、イスラームと政治、及び国内政治体制の変化など。ムハンマディーヤ中央理事会国際関係担当筆頭理事。バリ民主主義フォーラム（BDF）実施機構理事会理事。平和民主主義研究所（IPD）理事。インドネシア共和国防衛省戦略防衛検討国家委員会委員。2000～2001 年、国防法案起草国家委員会委員。2002～2003 年、国軍法案起草国家委員会委員。中曽根賞を受賞した最初のインドネシア人である（2005 年 7 月）。フォーリン・ポリシー誌（米国）の「2009 年のグローバルな思想家 100 人」（100 Global Thinkers 2009）に挙げられている。Global Change, Peace and Security 誌の地域編集委員会委員、Studies in Asian Security 誌（Stanford University Press と East West Center が発行）国際編集委員会委員も務める。主な著作として、*Security Operations in Aceh: Goals, Consequences, and Lessons* (Washington, DC: East-West Centre, 2004)、*Islam in Indonesia's Foreign Policy* (London: Routledge, 2003)、*Indonesia and China: The Politics of A Troubled Relationship* (London: Routledge, 1999)などがある。最新の論文として、"Indonesia-China Relations: The Politics of Re-engagement," *Asian Survey* (July/August 2009)がある。

Rizal Sukma is Currently Executive Director at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Jakarta. He received Ph.D. degree in International Relations from the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), London, in 1997, and has worked extensively on Southeast Asia's Security issues, ASEAN, Indonesia's Defence and Foreign Policy, Military Reform, Islam and Politics, and Domestic Political Changes in Indonesia. He is also Chairman of International Relations, Muhammadiyah Central Executive Board; and a member of Board of Governor of the implementing agency for the Bali Democracy Forum (BDF), the Institute for Peace and Democracy (IPD). He has served as a member of National Committee on Strategic Defense Review at the Ministry of Defence, the Republic of Indonesia, and a member of National Drafting Committee for National Defence Bill (2000-2001) and the Armed Forces Bill (2002-2003). He is the first Indonesian to receive the Nakasone Award in July 2005. He was named as one of 100 Global Thinkers 2009 by *Foreign Policy* magazine (US). DR. Sukma also sits as a member of regional editorial board for *Global Change, Peace and Security*; and a member of International editorial board for *Studies in Asian Security*, Stanford University Press and East West Center. His Publication includes *Security Operations in Aceh: Goals, Consequences, and Lessons* (Washington, DC: East-West Centre, 2004); *Islam in Indonesia's Foreign Policy* (London: Routledge, 2003), and *Indonesia and China: The Politics of A Troubled Relationship* (London: Routledge, 1999). His latest article, "Indonesia-China Relations: The Politics of Re-engagement," appears in *Asian Survey*, July/August 2009.

寺田 貴 (Takashi TERADA)

早稲田大学アジア研究機構教授。専門は、国際政治経済学、アジア太平洋地域主義・統合論。オーストラリア国立大学院で博士号取得。シンガポール国立大学人文社会科学部助教授、早稲田大学アジア研究機構准教授を経て、2008年4月より現職。研究対象は、アジア太平洋地域の国際関係、地域主義・地域統合の実証的・理論的研究、日本政治・外交論。近著（過去1年間日本語）に『アジア学のすすめ：政治経済編』（編者、弘文堂、2010年）、「東南アジア域内外の競争的地域主義：シンガポールとASEANの役割」ミレヤ・ソリース他編『アジア太平洋のFTA競争』（勁草書房、2010年）、「地域統合推進要因としての国家間競争：東アジア金融地域主義と日中関係」（『問題と研究』39号3巻、2010年）、「東アジア地域主義と日本：地域概念の形成と定着におけるイニシアチブ」（第8章）原喜美恵編『在外日本人研究者が見た日本外交』（藤原書店、2009年）、「APECと日本：「橋渡し」戦略の再構築に向けて」（『国際問題』No.585、2009年）、「米国とAPECの20年」浦田秀次郎編『アジア太平洋巨大市場戦略：日本はAPECをどう生かせるか』（日本経済新聞社、2009年）などがある。2005年、ジョン・クロフォード賞受賞。

Takashi Terada is Professor of International Relations at Organization for Asian Studies, Waseda University. He received his PhD from Australian National University in 1999. Before taking up the current position in April 2008, he was an assistant and associate professor at National University of Singapore (1999-2006) and associate professor at Waseda University (2006-2008). His research interests include international relations in Asia-Pacific, empirical and theoretical studies on regionalism and regional integration, and Japanese politics and foreign policy. His most recent works (written in English) include "The Origins of ASEAN+6 and Japan's Initiatives: China's Rise and the Agent-Structure Analysis," *The Pacific Review*, 23(1) 2010; "Competitive Regionalism in Southeast Asia and Beyond: Role of Singapore and ASEAN's," Mireya Solis, Barbara Stallings, and Saori N. Katada (eds.), *Competitive Regionalism: FTA Diffusion in the Pacific Rim*, (Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); "Japan and Evolution of Asian Regionalism: Responsible for Three Normative Transformations," in Dieter, Heribert (ed.) *The Evolution of Asian Regionalism: Economic and Security Issues* (Routledge 2008), and *Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation: Critical Perspectives on the World Economy*, 5 Volumes, (Routledge 2007), co-edited with Peter Drysdale. His books written in Japanese include *How to Analyze Asian Political Economy* (editor, Kobundo, 2010). He is the recipient of the 2005 J.G. Crawford Award.

王 逸舟 (WANG Yizhou)

北京大学国際関係学院教授・副学院長。前職は中国社会科学院世界経済・政治研究所（IWEP）副所長、教授。専門は国際関係理論と中国外交戦略。中国社会科学院博士号を取得（法学博士）。ハ

ンガリーアカデミー経済研究所、米国ハーバード大学国際問題研究所研究員を経て、2010 年より現職。主な著作として『中国外交新思考』（東京大学出版社 2007 年天児慧、青山瑠妙編訳）、『中国における国際政治 - 1995 年から 2006 年 - 』（2006 年）、“*Construction within Contradiction: Multiple Perspectives on the relationship between China and International Organizations*”(2003 年)など多数。

Professor and Deputy director of School of International Studies, Peking University. Former deputy director of Institute World Economic & Politics, Chinese Academy of Science (CASS) and Professor of international politics, senior fellow. Graduate School of CASS, Beijing, received MA. and Ph.D degrees, 1982-1988. He was visiting Scholar, Hungary Academy of Sciences in 1988 and Associate Professor and researcher of CASS, 1988-1993. He became visiting Scholar, at CFIA of Harvard University during 1996-97. He became Deputy Director of IWEP, CASS since 1998. His main interests recently in research are China's diplomacy, IR theories in the West and China and trends of international institutions and Laws. His publications are “New Thinking of China's Diplomacy”, 2007, Tokyo (in Japanese), “IR Studies in China (1995-2005)”2006, Beijing (in Chinese), “*Construction within Contradiction: Multiple Perspectives on the relationship between China and International Organizations*”, 2003, Beijing (in Chinese and English) and others.

(アルファベット順；敬称略)