

## &lt; 国際関係学部研究会報告 &gt;

第1回 (2005年5月10日)

## Periods

Nicholas ONUF

Any assessment of the world and its contents depends on ontological assumptions that we moderns rarely make explicit and may not share with each other. As a result of discontinuities in ways of thinking over many centuries, these assumptions pull us in different directions. In developing this proposition, I use an Aristotelian ontology of parts and wholes to show that the modern world has gone through a number of *periods*. Any such claim is itself rooted in a specific period in modern history.

Modern history begins around 1600 with its periodization of history: Ancient times, fall of Rome and the Dark ages, Middle ages, Modern Age. Of the many periodizations of modernity, Michel Foucault's succession of '*epistemes*' emphasizes the great changes in the way we think: Renaissance (1500-1650), Classical age (1650-1800), Modern age: the age of 'man' (1800-1968), The age after 'man' (1968- ). A fuller version of this scheme would historicize the positivist preoccupation with levels, the historicist preoccupation with periods and the functionalist preoccupation with issue areas.

*Temporal whole (period, age):* **The Age of Miracles** (Medieval period, Middle Ages)

*Date:* to 1500

*Ontology:* appearance and disappearance of unrelated macro-wholes

*Epistemic keys:* transubstantiation, casuistry

**The Age of Mirrors** (Renaissance, Humanist Era), 1450-1650

Wholes are related, as wholes, by appearance; reflection, analogy, metaphor

**The Age of Tables** (Early Modern period, Classical Age), 1600-1800

(Causal) relations of wholes, properties of parts; representation, revolution

**The Age of Levels** (Modern period, dominant phase), 1770-2000

Properties of wholes, relations of parts (positivism); analysis, prediction

**The Age of Ages** (Modern period, recessive phase), 1770-2000

Relations of wholes within wholes (historicism); dialectics, evolution, forecasting

**The Intestinal Age** (Modernist period), 1880- (Functional) relations of parts; diagnosis, therapy

**The Age of the Lattice** (Late Modern period), 1970- Relations of wholes are inclusive and constitutive; intersubjectivity, identity, recognition

**The Brownian Age** (Post-Modern period), 1970- Random dispersion of micro-wholes; relativism, rupture, aphorism, paranoia

**The Apocalyptic Age** (Neo-Feudalism, Neo-Medievalism), 1970-

The destruction of illusory wholes; eschatological prophecy

*Transitions:* 1450-1500, 1600-1650, 1770-1800, 1880-1910, 1970-2000

This scheme historicizes the way we moderns talk about the way we think. Yet this is only half the story. The rest of the story must account for the way we talk about doing useful things for ourselves and each other—about functional relations and instrumental activities. This kind of talk exhibits a striking continuity. It changes organically and it matches more or less the rise of the modern world as a material phenomenon, to which the metaphor of growth is almost inevitably applied. Continuous development is inflected by periodic changes in the way we talk about thinking, and this is reflected in talk about the stages of growth.

Both halves of the story—roughly, modernity as a story about changing ways of thinking *and* doing—go back to Aristotle and his interest in the faculties, or powers, that all animals possess, and the higher and lower powers that human beings uniquely possess.

## 第2回 (2005年7月5日)

### The Use of Puppet Governments in World Politics: Imposing Hierarchy

Thomas Primeau HOPKINS

This study examined the current scholarly debate surrounding “state sovereignty,” and whether this concept is a relative or an absolute. It argued that this debate is a rather spurious intellectual enterprise within the field of international relations given the substantial number of puppet governments (PGs) which have both historically and contemporaneously populated the inter-state system. It argued that the prolific presence of PGs, glaringly

defies the absolutist view of state “sovereignty.” The historic example of the Japanese puppet “Republic of Manchukuo,” and the contemporary example of the Turkish puppet of the “Republic of Northern Cyprus,” among many others, were offered to refute this fallacy.

Puppet governments were defined as supposedly “independent governments” which are externally imposed upon a weaker state or society by a more powerful outside country.

The presentation examined a number of scholarly tools which may be employed to objectively identify PGs in the international system (such as the presence of foreign military bases on the PGs territory, the PGs voting behavior in the UN General Assembly, and foreign government funding for the national budget of the PG).

It also examined the different reasons powerful states have used PGs to control the domestic realms of different countries. Historically PGs have been used to: (1) dispossess or marginalize indigenous peoples of the territorial control of their historic homelands (South Africa’s “Bantustans”); (2) justify the temporary military invasion and occupation of neighboring countries (USSR’s Afghanistan); (3) disguise the permanent acquisition of territory through military force (Turkey’s “Northern Cyprus”); (4) mask genocides, politicides, or large-scale human rights abuses (US’s “South Vietnam”); (5) and finally, and with increasing frequency in terms of international politics, as a form of neo-imperial economic domination (US’s post-Arbenz Guatemala).

The EU's 5th Enlargement - Patterns of  
Democratization and Development through  
"Europeanization" - Towards a universal  
*Modus Operandi?* -

Silviu JORA

This presentation centers on the idea that EU Enlargement towards the East represents a unique prototype model for the structural transformation of a country or a group of countries from a specific region. It is generally argued that the European Union has been very effective, in comparison with other international bodies, in using "conditionality" as a key policy instrument for detailing and "imposing" its criteria over the targeted countries.

After a short investigation of the general patterns of the Europeanization induced through "conditionality", the specificity of Romania as an individual case study of a Southeast European country where the transformation mechanism was slower but not less effective will be examined.

Another aspect examined is the impact of the accession negotiations on the political criteria through the case studies of several *acquis* chapters.

In the conclusion, some reflections on the relevance and limitations of the Romanian experience for other Balkan countries are offered as well as the options the EU should consider for the Southeastern European region: "Europeanization" or "Balkanization" ?

第3回 (2005年10月27日)

The European Union as 'Inter-State'  
Consociation: A Step Towards  
a Comparative Analysis of Regional  
Integrations

Olivier COSTA

Since the early eighties, researchers have frequently referred to the consociative theory to analyse the European political system. However, this approach has not effectively contributed to the setting up of a coherent and clear interpretation grid of the European Union. The aim of this contribution is to incorporate those partial and limited interpretations into a more general process of conceptualizations.

Once the specific version of the consociative theory and the concepts used have been precisely defined, it seems possible to propose a comprehensive interpretation of the European Union as a new form of consociation (which we call "inter-state consociation"), distinct both from classic federal and unitarian consociations. To consider the EU as consociation has two main advantages: it highlights the economical dimension of this integration process; it also facilitates its comparison with other forms of regional integration.

However, it is important to underline that EU is not only a matter of institutional design: the institutional architecture of EU results from a specific context determined both by the endogenous conditions of its development and by the influence of the external environment. The export of this model thus requires very specific conditions.

ADVANCING PEACE IN DIVIDED  
SOCIETIES: POWER-SHARING AND  
ETHNIC CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

Carlos de CUETO

Since the 1960s the explosion of ethno-political conflicts is a manifestation of the enduring tension between states that want to consolidate and expand their power and ethnic groups that want to defend and promote their collective identity, rights and interests. Ethno-political conflicts have become the major source of organised political violence, human casualties and political instability in World politics since the end of the Cold War. So, advancing peace in ethnically divided societies has been at the centre of the disciplines of both Politics and International Relations as one of the growing areas of political study and analysis. An important aspect of this emergent interest to achieve democracy, legitimacy and durability in the long run in ethnically segmented societies is the necessity of transforming ethnic constitutional orders—that is regimes privileging one ethnic group over all others by law, policies or practices and via the actions of the state sustained for a long time through coercive means—into fully functioning democracies and pluralist regimes based on the formal recognition of the existence of distinct ethnicities as major, legitimate components in deeply divided societies. This process requires accommodationist models where special attention should be given to inclusive participation of all individuals and groups in society. Iraq, Afghanistan, Cyprus, Sudan, Northern Ireland, Rwanda, Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia, Malaysia, Lebanon, etc., join a growing number of states that have proposed or have agreed to employ

power-sharing measures as part of negotiated resolution to civil conflicts in their efforts to stabilize the transition to enduring peace in ethno-national conflicts. Power-sharing, a very popular concept for conflict regulation in ethnic conflicts, guarantees all groups a share of state power by dividing and balancing power among rival and competing groups, so it minimizes the danger of any one party becoming dominant and threatening the security of others. To achieve that goal these consociational measures include a grand coalition, mutual veto, proportional electoral system and proportionality in the distribution of administrative appointments and either territorial or corporate autonomy.

第4回 (2005年11月29日)

REFORM OF THE UN-TREATY BODIES:  
CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Hanna Beate SCHOEPP-SCHILLING

One of the mandates of the United Nations is to promote respect for and protection and fulfilment of human rights. Over the past sixty years, the United Nations—in a number of diverse entities—formulated, adopted and monitored a great number of human rights norms. As of today, there are seven UN human rights instruments (ICCP, ICERSC, ICERD, CAT, CEDAW, CRC, MWC), to which human rights treaty bodies of independent experts are attached, whose function it is to scrutinize and evaluate the national implementation of these human rights norms by the states parties to these instruments.

Within the framework of current reform

efforts geared towards the UN system as a whole and towards the UN human rights regime in particular, the monitoring system of the UN human rights treaty bodies has also been identified as an area which needs to be made more efficient and effective. While each member state of the UN is a state party to at least one human rights treaty, 75% of them are states parties to four or more. The system is currently characterized both by a lack of reporting by states parties and by an unacceptable backlog of reports waiting for consideration by the treaty bodies.

At this point in time reform efforts are taking place due to three initiatives:

- 1) many reform have been implemented by the treaty bodies themselves, who for the past 15 years have been harmonizing their working methods;
- 2) in September 2002, the Secretary General called for a more extensive harmonization of working methods and proposed that states parties combine all their separate reporting efforts under

the seven human rights instruments into one single report;

- 3) in May 2005, the High Commissioner for Human Rights proposed to unify all seven treaty bodies into a single one.

From the perspective of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, these reform proposals may open an opportunity to mainstream gender aspects into the work of the other six human rights treaty bodies in a more in-depth way than has been achieved so far. At the same time and due experiences in the past and in the on-going reform discussions, the Committee fears that consolidated reporting as well as a unified treaty body will contribute to a new invisibility of the specific nature of women's human rights in general and of the existing world-wide abuse of women's human rights in particular. Innovative conceptual, institutional and organizational strategies will have to be formulated and implemented in order to safeguard the progress women have been making in the exercise and enjoyment of their human rights over the past 25 years.

