

INTERNATIONAL LAWYER

A Dialogue with Judicial Wisdom



Professor Dr. Miyoshi Masahiro

INTRODUCTION

The Journal of East Asia and International Law honorably invited and interviewed Dr. Masahiro Miyoshi, professor emeritus at Aichi University in Japan for <International Lawyer: A Dialogue with Judicial Wisdom>.

Dr. Miyoshi was born in a small town in Shikoku, Japan. Lining a silhouette of future highly-renowned international maritime lawyer, he spent his boyhood by the sea with his father, assiduous sailor. He obtained B.A. from Tokyo University of Foreign Studies in 1960 and M.A. in Law from Keio-Gijuku University, Tokyo, in 1963. One of his papers written during his doctoral program at Keio-Gijuku University, "The Meaning of Enforcement Action in United Nations Practice" (in Japanese), was honored in 1969 by the Adatci Memorial Prize, awarded to the best international law paper of the year in commemoration of the late Adatci Mineitcuro, who was once the President of the Permanent Court of International Justice. Dr. Miyoshi performed his postgraduate course in international law at King's College, University of London, for 1973-75 under the supervision of Professor Sir Francis A. Vallat and finally got a Ph.D. in 1989.

In 1970, Dr. Miyoshi joined the Faculty of Law at Aichi University, Nagoya, Japan as an Assistant Professor of International Law. He was a visiting fellow at the Environment and Policy Institute, East-West Center, Hawaii, in 1983 and at the Max-Planck-Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law, Heidelberg in 1988. He also served as a Technical Adviser to the Coordinating Committee for Coastal and Offshore Geoscience Program in East and Southeast Asia ("CCOP"), Bangkok for some years.

Professor Miyoshi has been writing many articles and books especially regarding the law of the sea. He is the author of the books with great readership from all over the world such as *CONSIDERATIONS OF EQUITY IN THE SETTLEMENT OF TERRITORIAL AND BOUNDARY DISPUTES* (Martinus Nijhoff, 1993) and *THE JOINT DEVELOPMENT OF OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS IN RELATION TO MARITIME BOUNDARY DELIMITATION: MARITIME BRIEFING* (International Boundaries Research Unit, 1999). He has also contributed a lot on the highly prestigious *ASIAN YEARBOOK OF INTERNATIONAL LAW* as General Editor.

As a respectable senior scholar of high character and distinguishable double breasted suit gentleman who has leading sense of fashion, Professor Miyoshi is widely admired by his colleagues and has many friends in the world and in his country.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

1. Hello, sir! Thank you so much for coming. You are the second Japanese international lawyer coming to International Lawyer segment of our Journal. In 2009, we interviewed Ambassador Yamada Chusei. Unfortunately, he passed away this year. It was a really sorrowful loss to international law community of entire Asia. What kind of person Ambassador Yamada Chusei was?

I had no close personal relationship with Ambassador Yamada. All I knew about him was that he was Ambassador to India when he was elected to the International Law Commission (“ILC”) of the United Nations. However I had a feeling that, as the Special Rapporteur of the ILC on the topic of “Shared Natural Resources (Law of Transboundary Aquifers),” he would have read my publication on joint development of offshore oil and gas* for reference, because about that time when the ILC started discussing this topic he came to greet me cordially at one of the meetings of the International Law Study Group of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Since then he and I exchanged season’s greetings, and had occasional chats at the biannual gatherings of the Japanese Society of International Law. I keep a fond memory of his elegant diplomat’s manners.

2. At the very outset, I’d like to ask you some personal questions. People used to believe that you were from a noble family. Would you please share us your early years, about your parents and their education?

I am not from a noble family. My father was a common sailor of a cargo boat based in Shikoku, a South-western island of the country, being mostly away from home but bringing home news of various interesting places and peoples. This may possibly has a link, if weak, with my motive to study law of the sea issues as an international lawyer in my later years. I recall rowing a small jolly boat by myself and fishing offshore for a couple of hours after school in my junior high school days. Like father, like son, I like sea food very much indeed, and sometimes joked to my students at Aichi University, saying: “I don’t mind eating fish at three meals for 365 days a year.” Thus one of my former students, now a professor of international law at Hokkaido

* The Joint Development of Offshore Oil and Gas in Relation to Maritime Boundary Delimitation (Maritime Briefing, Vol. 2, No. 5, Durham, UK: International Boundaries Research Unit, 1999).

University, once asked me if I was doing research in law of the sea matters because I like fish.

My mother was an 'education-conscious' lady; and encouraged me to go to Tokyo, instead of staying on at the high school in my rural home town. Fortunately one of my uncles on my mother's side lived in Yokohama, and allowed me to live with him for five years until I was in the third year of university. By that time, however, my parents had died, and not having the old parents to take care of any more, I decided to proceed to a post-graduate school in international law. But the need to work to live on prevented me from finishing the Master's and Doctor's courses within the prescribed five-year period of residence: I stayed at Keio-Gijuku University Graduate School of Law over a total period of eight years. During the Doctor's course of study I managed to write a paper, "The Meaning of Enforcement Action in United Nations Practice" (in Japanese), for which I was fortunately awarded the Adatci Memorial Prize in 1969, the prize awarded each year on the best international law paper of the year in commemoration of the late Adatci Mineitciro who was once the President of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

3. After studying law at Keio University, you went to England to study international law extensively at King's College, London and got Ph.D. there, which I think was not so popular in your generation of Japan to study international law in a foreign country. What brought you to London? How did you study there?

The Adatci Memorial Prize opened a wide horizon to me in the years that followed. In 1970, I was enabled by a fund of the Hague Academy of International Law to participate in the 6-week seminar at its Centre for Research in International Law and International Relations, doing research and joining discussion sessions on "The Interpretation of Treaties", following the adoption of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties in the previous year. Three years later I got a British Council Scholarship to do my M.Phil/Ph.D. studies in international law at King's College London in 1973-75 under the supervision of the late Professor Sir Francis A. Vallat, who was the Director of Studies at the mentioned Centre for Research of the Hague Academy in 1970. In those days very few, if any, Japanese international law scholars of my age went abroad to study, and I was very lucky indeed to obtain a British Council Scholarship.

My supervisor at King's College used to be a Principal Legal Adviser to Her Majesty's Foreign and Commonwealth Office; his profound practical experience and knowledge helped me, in a word, to have a realistic view of the working of international

law. To my surprise, however, I realized at the end of my studies at King's College that I only saw Sir Francis once in every two months or so on the average, because he was then a member of the United Nations International Law Commission and away from London for ten weeks or so every year. I had to write to him in Geneva for various instructions in the meantime. I was working on "Considerations of Equity in International Arbitrations: With Special Reference to Territorial and Boundary Disputes." While he was in London, I was all ears at his tutorials. Thus just a faint hint that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office Library keeps files of the proceedings of the British-Guiana/Venezuela Boundary Arbitration of 1899 in Paris drove me to visit the FCO Library near the Houses of Parliament to read the entire records of the proceedings over a period of a month or so. When I finished the research there, the Librarian told me that so far as he knew I was the only person to read the whole proceedings of the arbitration.

But writing the Ph.D. thesis took me many more years after returning home from London. It was delayed by two factors: one was the teaching and administrative obligations at my university and the other was that a number of maritime boundary delimitations cases arose one after another in the late 1970s to 1980s, which kept me busy covering those cases and reading the related articles that came out in great numbers. Thus it was only in 1989 that I obtained a Ph.D. from the University of London.

4. Thank you so much, sir! Let us turn our topic to international law studies in Japan. Japan has the longest tradition of studying modern international law in Asia. Today also, there are many academic societies of international law in Japan who are leading in research and practice in various fields of international law. Would you say about the academic societies?

The Japanese Society of International Law, originally named the "Association of International Law," was created out of practical necessity in 1897. It was motivated first by the need to examine and research the many legal issues arising in connection with the revision of the old unequal treaties and the impending enforcement of new treaties concluded by the new Meiji Government, and secondly by the difficult problems which arose in connection with the enforcement of the Treaty of Peace with China (the Treaty of Shimonoseki). Their solution required monthly meetings of specialized scholars to discuss the various aspects of the problems. The Association gradually developed into a learned society, and in 1902 started the publication of its own periodical, *Kokusaiho Zasshi* (Journal of International Law), later changing its title

to *Kokusaiho Gaiko Zasshi* (Journal of International Law and Diplomacy) in 1912. This Journal has since helped to disseminate knowledge of international law in Japan and to contribute to its development in co-operation with the academic circles in Europe and America. In May, 1925 the Association set up a Special Committee to assist the League of Nations in its work of codifying international law. It drew up nine successive draft codes in English for submission to the League of Nations, which at its Assembly's session on September 15, 1928 adopted a resolution expressing warm appreciation for the work of the Japanese Association and for the valuable assistance given by the American Society of International Law. Today the Japanese Society has a membership of some 1,000, including graduate students. Somehow few people in Japan know that it has the longest history among the world's academic societies of international law, a matter of pride.

The Japan Branch of the International Law Association was established in December, 1920, and began the publication of the *JAPANESE ANNUAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW* in 1958, six years after Japan regained independence in 1952 and two years after its admission to the United Nations in 1956. A unique yearbook of international law in English, presenting Japanese perspectives in the fields of public and private international law and comparative law to international lawyers of the world over a period of fifty years, the Japanese Annual changed its name to *The Japanese Yearbook of International Law* in 2008. While maintaining its original focus, the new Yearbook now promotes the further advancement of international law studies around the world by seeking authors from other countries and publishing articles that offer a greater variety of perspectives. Thus, its aim is to develop a forum where people with a diverse range of backgrounds can exchange views on issues that the present international community is facing. The new Japanese Yearbook now consists of the following sections: peer-reviewed articles and notes on both general and Japan-related issues, digests pertaining to current Japanese practices in international law, digests relating to major judicial decisions by Japanese courts in the fields of public and private international law, and book reviews, as well as related documents including recent treaties and legislations. The ILA Japan Branch, with a membership of some 300, meets once a year to discuss various international law issues, especially those issues being discussed at its main body's biennial conferences.

In addition to these two main academic societies of international law, there is a third learned society in the same field: the Japanese Association of World Law established in 1965 in the modest form of a study group to pursue studies of perspectives of possible world law and world federation. It has developed into an academic society focusing on basic structural and theoretical issues of international

law. With some 370 members, it meets once a year.

There are further learned societies on a smaller scale in the field of international law: the European Union Studies Association-Japan (EUSA-Japan) established in 1980, the International Human Rights Law Association established in 1988, the Japan Association of International Economic Law established in 1991, the Japan Association for United Nations Studies, established in 1998, etc. Finally there is a very small study group on the law of the sea: the Japanese Institute for the Law of the Sea ("JAILOS") with a membership of some 30 international lawyers, meeting twice a year to discuss law of the sea issues since May, 2001 and having published the proceedings of the meetings in three volumes (available in Japanese), with a fourth volume in preparation.

5. This is simply incredible! Simultaneously, however, some people used to criticize that young Japanese lawyers are not so widely open to global standards. Some of them are rather reluctant to share their ideas with foreign scholars mainly through the academic publication in English? Do you agree with this criticism? What do you think of today's young Japanese international lawyers especially in their global activities?

Rumor has it that younger generations of international lawyers of Japan do not seem to be open to sharing ideas with foreign scholars in English. Frankly, I am not very sure how true this is. In terms of English proficiency, however, my impression is that younger generations, if some of them only, are far better equipped with spoken English than the colleagues in my or older generations. Despite their oral proficiency, however, I am not satisfied with the frequency with which they write articles in English, or French or German for that matter.

Their scholarly standards are high if compared with their counterparts in the other countries, Asian or Euro-American. I can tell this truthfully from my editorial experience as one of the General Editors of the Asian Yearbook of International Law from 2002 to 2011 and from my participations in a good number of international conferences/workshops/ seminars on law of the sea issues over the past thirty years. Despite my repeated solicitations for submissions to the Asian Yearbook, however, young Japanese international lawyers hesitated to write in English for unknown reasons. More young scholars are in fact writing in English because there are far more journals of international law today than 30 to 40 years ago. Nevertheless I cannot wipe out the impression that if they truly wanted to go, they could go abroad more frequently to deepen their studies or exchange opinions with foreign scholars of their

generations. One possible reason for their reluctance to look outward may be their 'perfectionism,' which is in a sense a national trait shared by older scholars as well. Such is a human nature that the brighter a scholar is, the more careful he/she is not to make mistakes. On the other hand, they can obtain almost any data on the Internet nowadays, and this would be another reason why they do not seem to be much interested to go overseas for the information they want to have.

6. At this stage of our discussion, let me ask you somewhat sensitive diplomatic questions. Many people in Asia are worried that the current Abe administration's foreign policy would not be so fruitful to the peace and security of East Asia. How would you evaluate the foreign policies of the Abe administration such as the so-called comfort women during World War II or the right to collective self-defense of Japan? Is Abe going well?

I am very much concerned about the current peace and security situation in this part of the world. I know well that the Korean and Chinese peoples have critical views on the current Japanese Government's foreign policy stance. But I personally suspect that such criticism is based on their misunderstanding or may even have been intentionally created. When the criticism is voiced, nothing is mentioned about, for example, China's growing military expansionist trend, or about Korea's extraordinarily persistent opposition to Japanese politicians paying visits to Yasukuni Shrine, to say nothing of the Senkaku Islands, the Takeshima Island, the so-called 'comfort women' problems, etc. The criticism of the recent Japanese political trends would have its good reason in view of the history of the late 19th to early 20th century. I submit, however, that the criticism is going just a little too far while seemingly concealing what I would call 'deliberate intentions' of unduly or unnecessarily inducing the Japanese people to kneel down before the Korean and Chinese peoples.

Have a look at this hard fact! It was not until 1985 when Prime Minister Nakasone Yasuhiro paid an official visit to Yasukuni Shrine on August 15, the date of Japan's defeat in 1945, that China began to criticize such official visits by politicians to this particular Shrine. Mr. Nakasone had assumed Premiership in 1982 and visited the Shrine every year. His predecessors, Tanaka Kakuei, Ohira Masayoshi (Christian) and Suzuki Zenko, all visited the Shrine in their official capacity as Prime Minister of Japan. Most importantly, Miki Takeo, who was considered as keeping distance from rightists, was the first Prime Minister to visit Yasukuni Shrine on August 15, 1975, and Fukuda Takeo also paid an official visit to the Shrine on August 15, 1978. China did not raise a voice against those visits. Nor did it criticize the visits by Tanaka, Ohira,

and Suzuki. China all of a sudden started criticizing Nakasone's visit in 1985. Korea started its criticism a little later than China. What does this hard fact mean? If a visit to Yasukuni Shrine by Japanese politicians, Prime Ministers among them, is anything worthy of criticism at all, why did China not criticize before Nakasone's visit in 1985, and why did Korea not begin to criticize much earlier? This simple question raises a suspicion that there may have been something behind or extraneous to genuine national rancor against Japan based on their bitter historical experience. I wonder how the Chinese and Korean peoples justify the timing of criticizing Japan as from 1985 and thereafter, and their failure to do so much earlier. Unless a satisfactory answer is given to this question, the Japanese people would not be willing to rectify what the Chinese and Korean peoples call the 'wrong perception of history'. In a word, the Chinese and Korean criticism of the Japanese perception of history looks to the Japanese people simply one-sided and unfair, totally neglecting the repeated apologies by the Japanese Government. If the Chinese and Korean peoples say the Japanese apologies are not enough - it is an easy way of humiliating the opponent - how else and how much more do they say the Japanese must express apologies?

Besides, the issue of reparation or compensation was fully settled in the Japanese-Korean Treaty of 1965 on the Settlement of Claims and Economic Co-operation and in the Japanese-Chinese Joint Declaration of 1972, respectively. Those instruments are formal inter-State agreements carefully drafted and duly signed by the parties. If these are alleged to be void in their relations, what is the use of concluding international agreements? As an international lawyer I seriously doubt the Korean and Chinese views of the validity of those agreements.

At the same time I would ask China and Korea if they have ever made formal apologies, for example, when they made any trouble for their neighbors in the past. History shows that nations cannot avoid mutually causing trouble, big or small, in some way or another. When trouble is caused to a neighbor, you normally apologize as indeed Japan has apologized repeatedly. That is the norm of human society. If China and Korea have not apologized in the past, it is simply unfair that they are now demanding more apologies from Japan. My impression is that a sense of fairness may be lacking in the Chinese and Koreans.

Just a word about the right of collective self-defense for the moment. I would say that there is some confusion about the concepts of collective security and collective self-defense in the ongoing debate in this country on whether to revise the interpretation of Article 9 of the Constitution so as to allow the exercise of the right of collective self-defense. Collective security, as provided for in Chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter, is the basis of the Organization. Japan, being a member of the

Organization, is obliged to participate in its collective security activities in accordance with her Constitution. Collective, as well as individual, self-defense as laid down in Article 51 of the Charter as the 'inherent right' is an exception to the UN collective security system, irrespective of whether the right is to be exercised at all.

7. Recently, Japan has been competing with neighboring countries for maritime territorial questions. What is the fundamental reason for these disputes as a whole? What would be the best way to resolve them peacefully?

Unfortunately Japan has three territorial problems with its neighbors: first, the Northern Territories, secondly, the Takeshima problem and thirdly, the Senkaku Islands problem. Putting aside the treaty-related Northern Territories dispute with Russia for the moment, let me take up the Senkaku and Takeshima problems now. It is true that they have hindered normal relations between Japan on the one hand and China and Korea, respectively, on the other.

I personally have done some research in these problems, and recently made presentations on the Senkaku and Takeshima problems based on theoretical legal analysis at a couple of international workshops/seminars in Taiwan and China. I am convinced that international law is on the Japanese side in both problems. Without going into details, however, I cannot discuss these problems with any substance. If I may say so, the Chinese and Korean authorities both seem to be lacking in the knowledge of the international law of territorial acquisition. Or are they putting international law aside because they know its application would lead on to unfavorable consequences to them?

Another complaint, if I may say so, about Chinese and Korean scholars in discussing the Senkaku and Takeshima problems with Japan is that their papers seem to have comparatively few analyses of legal issues involved therein. Being international lawyers, they are strongly advised to make legal discussions as independent legal scholars, instead of just repeating their governments' official statements or keeping mum on the Japanese arguments. Peaceful resolution of these territorial problems should be based on the correct understanding of the relevant history and law, and these are where scholars can play an important role with their expert knowledge.

8. Japan is not well intermingled with other neighboring countries such as China and Korea? Almost every Wednesday, there is a demonstration before the Japanese embassy in Seoul. What would be the most reasonable setting of foreign relations of

Japan with these countries in the 21st century? In order to build this ground, what should Japan do?

It is a matter of great concern to me that there are reported demonstrations, some violent, by Korean and Chinese peoples in the streets of their countries and before the Japanese Embassies in Seoul and Beijing. I know such popular anti-Japanese activities are based on their understanding that Japan is to blame for the current state of affairs. It does seem to me, however, that such activities are a result of misunderstanding of the relevant facts or of some calculated instructions to bring Japan to its knees.

There are reports of official or private statements made by some Japanese political leaders that may look rightist - or militarist - oriented not only to the Korean and Chinese peoples at large but also to self-styled liberals in Japan. But these people must candidly be aware that in Japan there has never been any military parade whatsoever, such as has been observed in the communist or socialist countries, since the end of the Second World War. To the eyes of the Japanese people a military parade looks a genuine symbol of militarism. No such symbolic military acts have been seen in Japan over the past decades. Yet, as those anti-Japanese demonstrators would like to say, there is a trend of rightist remarks among the politicians of Japan. I suspect personally that it is a spontaneous reaction to repeated disgusting accusations of the alleged wrong-doings of the Japanese people to the Koreans and Chinese. Whether such reaction is well-grounded or not, or whether such accusations are truly based on historical facts, is a matter for careful scrutiny. On the face of it, the campaign against the Japanese "wrong perception of history" looks successful, as indeed the anti-Japan advertisements in some newspapers in the United States have attracted the attention of the local residents. But these activities are reportedly funded in great amounts by the Korean or Chinese communities overseas, and consequently smack of exaggerated advocacy, if not entire fabrication, of anti-Japan sentiments.

That is the way Japan's relations with Korea and China have developed over these years, and consequently if you say "What should Japan do?" about this situation, you seem to be one-sided and fail to see things in perspective. As a matter of fact, your perception is shared with some leading Japanese newspapers which always say "What should Japan do?" in its relations with Korea and China. But they are either ignorant of the hard facts or consciously or unconsciously twist them to criticize the Japanese Government as their editorial stance commands. In Japanese society, being critical of the government, or the establishment in general for that matter, has been regarded as 'cool'. Conversely, a conservative comment, let alone a rightist, is 'uncool' among the *intelligentsia* of Japan. My point is: to ask "What should Japan do?" is

simply unfair, one-sided, intentionally or unintentionally shifting the responsibility on to Japan only, while not seeing the other side of the coin. It is suspected that those who only say, "What should Japan do?", and forget to say, "What should Korea do?" or "What should China do?" at the same time may lack intellectual integrity.

I would admit that seeing things in perspective is more easily said than done. But an international lawyer should be open-minded to see things both ways in discussing bilateral inter-State relations. If not, what is his/her role to play in the general circumstances in which governments push forward policy considerations which, as the past history shows, are not necessarily based on legal considerations or even intentionally ignore legal considerations? If the rule of law is to be the norm of international relations, as I believe it is, an international lawyer has a very important role to play as an independent observer there.

9. Japan-US relations have been changing very fast mainly due to the strategic partnership between China and US. Who is the US to Japan now? What do you expect the Japan-US relationship in the 21st century?

Now that China's economy is second only to that of the United States and it is increasingly assertive in its foreign relations, especially under the new leadership of Xi Jinping, its strategic relations with the United States have come strongly to influence its relations with its neighbors, including Japan. The United States seems to accept this development as a *donné*, as does Japan. However this may be, Japan's relations with the United States have remained unshaken based on the Security Treaty relationship established in 1951, revised in 1960 and maintained thereafter.

For one thing the weakening United States economy seems to be contributing to gradually reducing its deployments of troops overseas in the recent years, and some peace and security analysts in Japan are concerned that the United State presence in this region may be thereby affected. While sharing their apprehension to some extent, I would say the lasting good relations between Japan and the United States over the last 60 years have helped to engrave not only common peace and security concerns, but also common socio-economic and cultural concerns, like democratic institutions, in the minds of both peoples. It is hard, therefore, to think of any major shift taking place between the two nations' relationship.

Had it made any major policy shift to reduce its armed capabilities in Okinawa, for example, the United States would not have deployed a good number of MV-22 Osprey tilt-rotor transport aircraft in its base there, which could be interpreted to improve the capabilities promptly to transport troops where they are needed. Despite

the reported noisy movements against their deployment in Okinawa, quiet observers might concede that North Korea and China are not excluded from the target.

10. Today's international lawyers are getting more interested in East Asia than before. What should young international lawyers keep in their mind while studying and practicing international law under the global environment?

As an international lawyer, I would advise young international lawyers in East Asia to pursue studies in theoretical issues, as well as actual political issues, from the point of view of bringing the rule of law to this region. Politicians tend to make light of the rule of law in favor of political expediency. It is the role of an international lawyer to advise them with the knowledge of legal issues involved in the political problems with which they are faced. To make the maximum practical use of their knowledge of international law, international lawyers must learn diplomatic history and international politics as well. This is no easy matter. But it is worth doing, and what's worth doing at all is worth doing well, as the saying goes.

If I may add one thing in this context, I would advise younger international lawyers in East Asia to try to write more articles in English to let the international lawyers in the other regions of the world know the East Asian perspectives on international law. I say this because such perspectives were not well reflected in the development of international law in the past.

Interview by Eric Yong Joong Lee at Aichi University, Nagoya, Japan

A SELECTED LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Books

1. CONSIDERATIONS OF EQUITY IN THE SETTLEMENT OF TERRITORIAL AND BOUNDARY DISPUTES (Dordrecht/Boston/London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1993).
2. THE JOINT DEVELOPMENT OF OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS IN RELATION TO MARITIME BOUNDARY DELIMITATION (*Maritime Briefing*, Vol. 2, No. 5: Durham, UK: International Boundaries Research Unit, 1999).

Articles

1. 「国連の強制行動—実行におけるその意味—」、『(慶応大学) 法学研究』、第42巻第1号 (1969年)。
The Meaning of Enforcement Action in United Nations Practice, JOURNAL OF LAW, POLITICS AND SOCIOLOGY (Keio University), Vol. 42, No. 1 (1969).
<This article won the Adatci Mineitciro Memorial Prize for 1969>
2. 「国際連合による侵略の定義」、『ジュリスト』、第584号 (1975)。
The United Nations Definition of Aggression, THE JURIST, No. 584 (1975).
3. *The Basic Concept of Joint Development of Hydrocarbon Resources on the Continental Shelf: With special reference to the discussions at the East-West Centre workshops on the South-East Asian seas*, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ESTUARINE AND COASTAL LAW, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1988).
4. 「大陸棚境界画定準則に関する一考察」、『高林秀雄先生還暦記念・海洋法の新秩序』(東京: 東信堂、1993年)。
A Consideration of the Principles of Continental Shelf Boundary Delimitation, LIBER AMICORUM PROFESSOR TAKABAYASHI HIDEO IN COMMEMORATION OF HIS SIXTIETH BIRTHDAY: THE NEW ORDER OF THE LAW OF THE SEA (Tokyo: Toshindo, 1993).
5. *International Law in the Modern History of Japan: A Brief Description*, JOURNAL OF LAW AND POLITICAL SCIENCE (Aichi University), No. 136 (1994)
6. *The State's Propensity for Control over the Settlement of Disputes*, in Kathleen I. Matics & Ted L. McDorman (eds.), SUMMARY AND SELECTED PAPERS OF THE SEAPOL TRI-REGIONAL CONFERENCE (Bangkok: SEAPOL, 1995).

7. *Recent Trends in the Jurisprudence of the International Court of Justice and International Arbitral Tribunals: With Special Reference to Territorial and Boundary Cases*, ASIAN YEARBOOK OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, Vol. 6 (1996).
8. *Curricula for Teaching of International Law in Asia: Any Asian Perspective?*, SINGAPORE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW, Vo. 5, No. 2 (2001).
9. *Considerations of Equity in Maritime Boundary Cases before the International Court of Justice*, Ando Nisuke et al. (eds.), LIBER AMICORUM JUDGE SHIGERU ODA, Vol. 1 (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2002).
10. *Equity in a Multicultural World, Mélanges Offerts à Silvio Marcus Helmons: Avancées et Confins actuels des Droits de l'Homme aux Niveaux international, européen et national* (Bruxelles: Bruylant, 2003)
11. *Cross Border Security and Law Enforcement: The Japanese Experience*, THE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (Aichi University Institute of International Affairs), No. 124 (2004).
12. *The Submerged Passage of a Submarine through the Territorial Sea: The Incident of a Chinese Atomic-powered Submarine*, THE SINGAPORE YEARBOOK OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, Vol. 10 (2006).
13. *Ocean Transport of Radioactive Fuel and Waste*, in David D. Caron & Harry N. Scheiber (eds.), THE OCEANS IN THE NUCLEAR AGE: LEGACIES AND RISKS (Leiden/Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2010).
14. *The North Sea Continental Shelf Cases Revisited*, ASIAN YEARBOOK OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, Vol. 15 (2012).
15. *China's 'U-Shaped Line' Claim in the South China Sea: Any Validity under International Law?*, OCEAN DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL LAW, Vol. 43, No. 1 (2012).
16. *Japan's Claim to Extended Limits of the Continental Shelf*, in Jon M. Van Dyke, et al. (eds.), GOVERNING OCEAN RESOURCES: NEW CHALLENGES AND EMERGING REGIMES: A TRIBUTE TO JUDGE CHOON-HO PARK (Leiden/Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2013).

