

September 19, 2018

Suggestions on How NGOs Can Contribute to Order Formation for the Global Community

Kiyoyuki SEGUCHI

The Canon Institute for Global Studies

1. Impasse in the Traditional Process of Shaping World Order

(1) Changes in the US-led Process of Shaping World Order

(i) The Trump Administration's Abandonment of Global Leadership

Since World War II, the US government has long maintained its role of exercising leadership in shaping world order as the hegemonic state. After the Trump administration was launched, however, Washington apparently began to relinquish this role. This can be illustrated by the following three moves from Washington.

The first move is the promotion of protectionistic policies that deny the free trade regime. Immediately after its inauguration, the Trump administration withdrew from Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations. After the turn of this year, the administration set out a series of protectionistic measures. These include raising tariffs against China under Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 as well as increasing duties on steel, aluminum, and automobiles against many developed countries including Japan, Canada, and European countries under Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

In the wake of WWII, when the world economy was at rock bottom, the United States identified the problems that had triggered the devastating war. Determined never to let such a tragedy happen again, the US implemented two basic policies. One was to prevent economic bloc formation. The other was to support the development of the world economy. To achieve the objectives of these two policies, the US promoted the establishment of a free trade regime both by investing its own treasury funds to support infrastructure construction in many countries and by calling on major countries to lower tariffs at the expense of reducing its own tariffs. The US also established many international frameworks

based on US-led multilateral negotiations while discouraging bilateral talks, which are more likely to result in inequalities due to differences in national strength. The result was a global regime whereby even smaller countries could enjoy the benefits of free trade and economic development without receiving discriminatory treatment.

Such long-lasting commitment by the US allowed the world economy to maintain the free trade regime and continue to reap the benefits of economic development. The Trump administration, however, has been setting out a series of measures that go against these past efforts made by the US.

The second move is the withdrawal from important international agreements on such issues as the environment and human rights. These issues can be described as part of the social infrastructure common worldwide. With regard to the environment, Trump appointed Edward Scott Pruitt, a skeptic of global warming, as administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. This was followed by the pullout from the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, a framework for global efforts to improve the environment. On the domestic front, the Trump administration took a series of measures that contravene the Paris Agreement, including substantially relaxing restrictions on emissions from thermal power plants, a measure designed to protect the environment. As for human rights, the administration expressed its intention to pull out of the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) as an expression of discontent with the UNHRC's series of resolutions against Israel for attacking Palestine.

The third move is the retreat from its commitment to the peace process in the Middle East. Both the transfer of the US embassy in Israel to Jerusalem and the withdrawal from the Iran nuclear deal were the decisions that highlighted the US's pro-Israel stance and signified a retreat from the Middle East peace efforts which the US had made.

As these three moves clearly indicate, the Trump administration has been destroying the US's historical contribution to the process of shaping world order.

(ii) Transformation of the US Stance As a Historical Inevitability

In short, the Trump administration has been destroying the achievements, one after another, which the US accomplished with its long-time dedication and leadership in shaping world order. Viewed from a wider perspective, however, the move to back down from its leadership began with the Bush (Junior) administration although it is more conspicuous under the Trump administration. The Bush administration followed some policies that would undermine the Middle East peace process and invite the rise of IS. The Obama administration seemed rather reluctant to stem the tide.

Such a change in the US stance after the turn of the century is thought to be caused by two major factors. The first is the relative decline of the economic strength of the US. The second factor is the aggravation of the problems facing American society. The following paragraphs analyze these factors.

The first factor, i.e. the relative decline of US economic strength, is an inevitable consequence of the international contribution that the US has consistently made since the end of WWII. After the war, the US supported major powers with economic reconstruction and subsequent sustainable development through a range of international frameworks. Among them were the GARIOA and EROA funds, which financed the supply of daily necessities for the defeated countries; the Marshall Plan, which supported the reconstruction of Western European countries; and the GATT/WTO, which guaranteed the free trade regime. Consequently, European countries, Canada, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, China, India, and ASEAN nations among other countries have so far enjoyed economic development. As a result, however, the US share in the global economy shrunk from more than 50 percent to less than 25 percent.

The second factor, i.e. the aggravation of social problems within the US, boils down to social polarization stemming largely from the widening gap between the rich and poor. Adherence to the principle of free competition based on the free trade regime and the market mechanism has resulted in widening economic disparities in the US. Until the 1970s, tariff barriers and immigration controls protected US domestic industries, securing employment for the white middle class. The subsequent liberalization of trade and influx of immigrants, however, curbed wage increases as the former resulted in the influx of cheap imports and the latter led to the increase of cheap labor. Even under these circumstances, the

social polarization could have essentially been avoided if enhancements to social security had corrected the economic disparities. The US Establishment, however, only pursued free competition and the market mechanism, failed to bolster social security, and refrained from changing the economic structure where wealth was unevenly distributed for more than three decades. This inaction eventually prompted the rise of a huge political force that shares antagonism against the Establishment, thereby shifting more support behind anti-establishment candidates in the presidential election such as Mr. Trump and Senator Bernie Sanders. The polarized state of American society will remain uncorrected unless a popular political leader who can fundamentally rectify the situation appears on the political scene. It is unlikely, however, that such a leader will appear in the near future.

(2) Absence of a State That Will Replace the US to Lead Order Formation

In view of the US's domestic affairs and relative decline of its economic strength as described above, it is rational to conclude that any post-Trump administration will likely fail to exercise strong leadership in world order formation as the US did in the 20th century.

Given such circumstances, it would be best for major powers that have increased economic strength relative to the US, such as the EU, China, and Japan, to take over some of the roles the US has played. It seems, however, that no state is willing enough to play the full role in filling the void left by the declining leadership of the US.

The EU, which has in fact served to partially complement the US leadership, is now plagued by internal distress over BREXIT, its negative impact on the economy, and the declining leadership of Germany and France.

China is yet to afford to replace the US in playing the constructive role in the global community as the country is struggling to address the serious structural domestic problems it faces over the long term, even though it has maintained economic stability in the near term. In addition, China lacks both the will to contribute to the global community as a key stakeholder and the experience in doing so; it was only ten years or so ago that the country began to demonstrate its presence on the global scene. Moreover, a political setup different from other major democracies makes it difficult for China to win international trust as the

US did in the past. Given these factors, it is extremely difficult for China to complement the roles of the US for the time being.

In the meantime, Japan could have partially filled the void left by the US in light of its economic prowess and close relationships with Western countries. Yet Japan has not been so interested in contributing to the world on its own initiative. The Japan-led TPP 11 is an important test case of the capacity and shape of Japan's leadership in building multilateral frameworks. It would be desirable for Japan to use the TPP 11 as a springboard to exercising leadership in shaping world order in relation to such issues as the environment, human rights, economic stability, and immigration. It is unlikely, however, that Japan will hasten to assume such a pivotal role at least for the time being.

Russia is not a possible candidate in the first place. The country's GDP is only one-third that of Japan and declining economic strength is apparently weighing down the country's national strength.

In summary, no player exists among the major powers that will fill the void left by the US, the country that led the shaping of the postwar world order but is now withdrawing from that role. As Asian economies further develop, the relative economic scale of the US may shrink further and continue to be plagued by serious social problems. If that is the case, the US leadership will decline further.

That would mean that the process of shaping world order will be hindered for a long time to come, putting the global community at a higher risk of confusion.

2. Transformation of the Major Issues Facing the Global Community

(1) Major Global Issues Defying the Framework of a Nation State

A look at major issues facing the global community in recent years shows that many of them transcend the framework of a nation state. These issues include environmental pollution and climate change, cyberattacks, terrorism, immigration, tax systems, financial risks, how to design free trade and investment rules, and food safety. All of these issues go beyond national borders and are intertwined with many countries.

Any attempt to establish international common measures based on a

compromise which factors in the circumstances peculiar to each country should result in any solution being merely perfunctory. If that is the case, any measure will not solve the problems satisfactorily. Conversely, if each country sets its own standards based on parliamentary deliberations, a common framework for addressing the issues will not be shared.

Either of these two options will have a negative impact on addressing global challenges.

It is thus difficult to solve global challenges that defy the framework of a nation state with common measures that are built on agreements among national governments. Such measures are proving to be ineffective. This is a common dilemma facing the global community in recent years. In fact, this challenge has already manifested itself in such issues as the environment, trade, and immigration, posing a serious problem for the global community.

(2) Formation of International Standards Led by the Non-government Sector: A Case Study on International Food Safety Standards

While the global community was facing this particular challenge, the Global Food Safety Initiative (GFSI), a non-governmental organization (NGO), was launched in 2000. Eight food distributors in Europe and North America are among the influential members of the GFSI. They are Carrefour (France), Tesco (UK), Metro (Germany), Migros (Switzerland), Ahold (the Netherlands), Wal-Mart (US), Delhaize (Belgium), and ICA (Sweden).

The Japan Food Industry Association (JAFIC)¹ explains the activities of GFSI as follows:

GFSI conducts the following activities with the participation of retailers, manufacturers and food service providers, accreditation/certification bodies, and international organizations on food safety.

- 1) Delivering equivalence and convergence between existing food safety management schemes to reduce food safety risks

¹ An organization set up in 1970 to support sound development of the food industry through closer cooperation across the industry as a whole. Serving a pivotal role in achieving this purpose in the industry, JAFIC involves a comprehensive range of members, including some 120 groups in the food and related industries, about 150 major food businesses, and around 30 local food industry councils. JAFIC was once under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.

- 2) Enhancing the cost efficiency of the global food system as a whole by eliminating redundancy and improving operational efficiency
- 3) Developing the capacity to deliver food safety in order to create consistent food systems
- 4) Providing an international stakeholder platform for collaboration, knowledge sharing, and networking

The GFSI food safety standards are respected by national governments as de facto global standards on food safety.

A case in point is the 2020 Summer Olympics in Tokyo. The International Olympic Committee (IOC) allows only food providers that meet the GFSI food safety standards to provide food to the Olympic village.

Originally, Japan was poorly motivated to go out of its way to achieve international certification on food safety as the country is one of the top countries worldwide in terms of food safety. People from all walks of life are well aware of the importance of food safety on the back of the tradition of Japan's unique food culture as well as high living standards. However, because IOC rules allow only food providers that meet GFSI standards, the Japanese government encouraged many food-related businesses to achieve the international accreditation recommended by GFSI. In response, many businesses moved to achieve that accreditation.

As these developments show, the standards of GFSI, a non-governmental entity, are now part of the de facto international standards that national governments and international organizations must respect.

Mechanisms like this should be instrumental in achieving unified food safety standards for all countries worldwide. Such mechanisms, if applied to environmental pollution control, cyberattack prevention, counter-terrorism, and many other sectors, would lead to international standards that are more efficient, effective, and practical than the international frameworks that have been established on the initiative of national governments. They have the potential to contribute to shaping world order in each sector.

3. Impact of Growing Globalization on World Order Formation

(1) Use of Force Increasingly Difficult in the World Order Formation Process Associated with Globalization

As described above, the decline of the US leadership in shaping world order highlights growing signs that the traditional process of world order formation is at a standstill. Moreover, as major challenges facing the global community are being transformed and challenges that defy the framework of a nation state are increasing in number, common measures agreed upon among national governments to address global challenges are proving increasingly ineffective.

Considering a new model of world order formation in light of these circumstances may require factoring in gradual changes in how armed forces—which played a key role in the traditional state-led process of world order formation—fit in a wider context.

A look back at the period when Western powers led world order formation shows that this period can be divided into three major eras: Pax Romana, Pax Britannica, and Pax Americana. These three eras had one thing in common: The then hegemonic state possessed armed forces far powerful than those of any other competing state or region at the time and gained ascendancy over the counterforces accordingly, thereby securing the stability of its sphere of influence. A similar pattern of dominion applies to other periods when a non-Western power held hegemony and shaped world order.

The practice of shaping order with armed forces, an essential prerequisite in these phases of human history, seems to be undergoing fundamental change amid progress in the US-led process of globalization since the 1990s.

More specifically, the use of force is an increasingly impractical solution to international disputes between major powers.

With the end of the Cold War, the possibility of a full-fledged armed conflict seems to have almost disappeared between Japan, the US, China, Europe, and Russia, let alone between Western countries. Behind this lie two factors. The first factor is a substantial improvement in living standards that could not have been possible without progress in the integration of national economies into the global economy based on the free trade regime. The second factor is the political power

base at the national level is increasingly fragile amid the democratization process that goes beyond national governments.

Even if a conflict between two developed countries intensifies, it is unlikely that the electorate in either country will support the policy of gaining ascendancy over the other country by using force.

Such a strong orientation toward peace is an outcome of the successful economic development of a world that defies economic bloc formation over decades in the postwar period thanks to the substantial contribution by the US.

The benefits of such contribution are now felt in almost all countries and territories in Asia. Over a period of more than 70 years after WWII, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore achieved remarkable economic development, followed by Malaysia, China, and Thailand. In the process, their neighboring economies also started to develop. Now, almost all the economies in the region are on a sustainable growth track. As a result, the possibility of use of force has substantially diminished in Asia, allowing the whole region to enjoy peace and economic development.

Even in countries without a democratic political system, such as China, Vietnam, and Cambodia, the growth of the middle class is resulting in democratic ideas being increasingly shared by the public. Now it is extremely difficult even for the leaders of autocratic political parties to continue with policy management in ways that disregard the opinions of the masses. For example, it should be this sociopolitical background against which the Chinese government puts environmental pollution control and poverty eradication at the top of its political agenda.

Such a structural change in social thought means the risk of full-fledged armed conflict has significantly diminished in Asia as a whole.

(2) Advent of an Era That Is New to Human History

(i) Rise of a Global Community

The transformation of the global community into one built on peace and economic development, which has been prompted by the US-led globalization process since the 1990s, is changing the traditional practice of the international

community whereby nation states play the leading role in setting multilateral rules.

The drivers of globalization include IT, finance, and multinational corporations. Their growth and development, in turn, is supported by the free trade regime with the WTO at the core.

Through the process of globalization, economies worldwide began to cooperate closely. As a result, global economic activities outside the direct control of nation states are increasing their influence. For example, the lack of parts supplies in the aftermath of the Great East Japan Earthquake in March 2011 forced some factories of local-based enterprises in China as well as Japanese businesses to suspend operations for one or two months after the earthquake. This turn of events stemmed from the fact that the parts supply networks are integrated into the horizontal specialization structure involving Asian countries. The routes for acquiring parts for the local Chinese enterprises were diverse and complex. Some parts were imported from Japan or ASEAN countries. Others came from other enterprises in China. Because of the diversity and complexity of the acquisition routes, it was quite difficult to know beforehand which parts were from businesses in the Tohoku Region of Japan, which was hit by the March 2011 earthquake. This difficulty represents one of the characteristics of globalized production systems.

It was China and the US that benefitted most from the free trade regime under the WTO. As a result, many US businesses invested in Chinese enterprises and imported quality products at low cost from them, thereby increasing economic welfare for themselves and US consumers at large. Such intertwined relationships have significantly changed the structure of trade between the US and China. Some 60 percent of Chinese exports to the US are handled by non-Chinese enterprises, mostly US businesses. The remaining 40 percent of the exports from Chinese enterprises include parts from many foreign companies, including those of Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. Under these circumstances, any attempt by the US government to impose economic sanctions on China should end up hurting many US businesses and other non-Chinese firms as well as Chinese enterprises.

In short, instigating trade frictions or even a trade war in these close economic ties and taking retaliatory actions against each other will result in mutual

downfall. It is possible to argue that the economic version of mutual assured destruction—a concept relevant to the relationships between the nuclear superpowers—does exist between the US and China.

Mutual escalation of trade sanctions by the two countries despite such a bilateral relationship constitutes an act of economic suicide. It should not be an option if the Chinese and US governments make economically reasonable decisions.

It is thus possible to conclude that trade war deterrence as well as nuclear deterrence is at work between these two major powers in the global community.

Some hold that the close trade relations which existed before World War I between the UK and Germany, and between Germany and France failed to serve as a deterrent to the devastating war. However, I would argue that the current economic relations which are increasingly intertwined due to shared production networks are quite different from the trade relations back then. This can be substantiated by the chain of production suspensions in Japan and China in 2011. Given the economic relations before WWI, it would be almost unthinkable that a powerful earthquake in a region in Germany could have forced factories in the UK and France to suspend operations.

(ii) The End of the Era When World Order Is Shaped with Resort to Force

As discussed above, on the back of the great contribution by the US, since the 1990s the global community has been experiencing the transformation from a loose federation of states into a community that involves the close cooperation and even integration of economies.

As a result, a world where force cannot be used to settle international disputes is looming, for the first time in human history, over the developed regions and Asia.

In the past, the hegemonic state reined in competing powers with its overwhelming force to achieve socioeconomic stability. Now, it is difficult even for the hegemonic state, i.e., the US, to solve problems or to shape order by resorting to force against developed countries and in Asia.

(iii) Toward a World Order That Draws on Eastern Ideals and Embraces Diversity

The transformation from the order formation process which involves the use of force into an order formation process that defies the use of force is paralleled by the increasing irrelevance of an order formation process based on a dichotomous worldview built on monotheism.

In a society that assumes Christianity and Islam as preconditions, mutual killings of human beings were historically condoned on the back of religious antagonism (Islam versus Christianity, Shia Islam versus Sunni Islam).

In the East, however, different religions such as Confucianism, Buddhism, Taoism, Zen, and Shinto, have coexisted. The ideal common to these Eastern religions is respect for the lives of all living things. For this reason, there has been no religious war that condones taking the lives of different faith believers.

Closer relations among countries worldwide amid growing globalization are resulting in the emergence of a world where diverse spiritual foundations have no choice but to coexist or already do coexist peacefully without denying one another. In short, a world order based on the Eastern concept that tolerates different philosophies, seems to be taking shape.

4. A New Guiding Principle for Shaping a Global Community Order

(1) Need for a New Standard Concept That Fits the New Era

As discussed above, the traditional process of shaping order with the hegemonic state at the core was aimed at building a homogenous global community which excludes states and organizations with different religions, ideals, or social philosophies based on maintaining order through the use of force.

The process of globalization since the 1990s, however, has made it practically impossible to resolve international disputes through the use of force against the developed countries and in Asia, and resulted in closer relations between nations through economic, social, and cultural exchanges. Like it or not, we are entering a new era that calls for a new model of world order formation which is built on mutual tolerance of diverse ways of thinking as well as different states of affairs in, and development stages of, nations.

Under such circumstances where approaches to, and ideals for, world order formation are undergoing fundamental change, new ideas are put forward as to the framework for international organizations and conventions that is necessary for order formation. The following paragraphs discuss some of these ideas.

(i) The Continuation of Voluntary Efforts Should Be Subject to Evaluation.

In the traditional model of world order formation, the criteria for membership of organizations and conventions are often predetermined and strict; potential members needed to meet certain conditions to fulfill such criteria.

In the new model, organizations and frameworks for shaping a new order which tolerates diversity should, by contract, be more open to varied actors as long as they share the ideals and behavioral principles in the sector concerned.

The new standard concept of evaluation should not require participating states and organizations to meet certain standards or conditions in order to be qualified for membership; rather, it should essentially make an after-the-fact evaluation of their voluntary efforts to achieve their self-set objectives and the outcomes of such efforts.

In other words, the point is not to make the fulfillment of certain conditions a common goal for countries. The focal point of evaluation is whether each potential member continues to make voluntary efforts to achieve goals based on common ideals, be it environmental improvement, anti-terrorism, or cyberattack prevention.

(ii) Experts at NGOs Should Be the Agent That Shapes Common Ideals.

It should be left to experts in each sector to identify appropriate goals and behavioral principles to be shared among the participating states and organizations. Such experts should be independent and free from the constraints associated with policy management by each state. Government officials who are bound by the decisions made by national governments should be excluded. Experts thus selected should design frameworks that are desirable for the global community, without being constrained by national policies and the domestic political situation in the countries they come from.

The selection of expert members tasked with identifying such standards should be left to independent decisions made by specialists in each sector on condition that diversity is tolerated, and transparency and integrity are ensured. However, a Global Order Council to be based in Tokyo (discussed later) should make evaluations and provides input as necessary.

(iii) Specific Voluntary Efforts Should Be Left to the Free Will of Each Member.

Each participating state or organization should have the freedom to decide what voluntary efforts it will make with the aim of achieving the common goals and how. This arrangement is designed for the global community as a whole to encourage participating states and organizations to continue with their voluntary efforts.

There should be no punishment of participating states and organizations that have failed to make voluntary efforts. No punishment mechanism means that no coercive power will be at work. For this reason, conspicuous achievements that would be expected from traditional strict standards will be unlikely for the near term.

However, any failure to make sufficient efforts will be disclosed to the whole world, inevitably lowering the reputation of any national government concerned. That would be the de facto spiritual punishment. Nevertheless, it will not rule out the possibility of neglect on the part of participating members, leaving room for moral hazard risks.

Still, the new standard concept of evaluation has a major advantage in that long-term, sustained improvement is expected from the efforts by the global community as a whole to build a mutual cooperation architecture. Under the traditional framework of uniform standards, continued voluntary efforts are to be encouraged.

Each participating state or organization should make its own decisions both on the specific efforts that suit the situation it finds itself in, and on practical and effective approaches that suit it for achieving the goals. Then each participant should continue with these efforts. It must flexibly modify or even replace the approaches thus identified, depending on the changing situation.

The problem with traditional international organizations and conventions based on state-led, multilateral agreements—including the World Trade Organization (WTO), Europe Union (EU), and free trade agreements (FTAs) of various kinds—is that it would be a Herculean task to flexibly revise the already-agreed criteria even though the objective circumstances surrounding a specific issue have changed. By contrast, the framework of shaping a new order which is based on flexible revisions of the goals and behavioral principles by experts can overcome the rigid structural problem intrinsic to these traditional multilateral agreements.

(2) Spiritual Foundations Rooted in Oriental Philosophy on Which the New Standard Concept Is Based

(i) Sharing the Spiritual Foundations Aimed at Contributing to the Global Community

In order to ensure that efforts made by participating states and organizations will continue over the long term as discussed above, it is important that all participating members from the global community share a sense of pride in contributing to the entire global community as well as a sense of shame in neglecting to make voluntary efforts. As it were, these senses are similar to a sense of fair play in sports. In short, participating states and organizations must have a strong sense of being responsible members of the global community that are mutually intertwined. In other words, they must share the common consciousness that they are stakeholders in the global community.

Unless this consciousness is shared, it is likely that members will fail to make self-help efforts and deliver nothing.

Oriental philosophy refers to this sense or spirit as “Yi” (義) and describes the act of disciplining oneself to achieve it as “Nei Sheng” (内省, looking inwardly to examine one’s true thoughts or feelings of his own) or “Shen-du” (慎独, being watchful over oneself even when no one else is around).

In addition to Yi, Oriental philosophy has many concepts that describe the way people should be, such as Ren, Li, Zhi, and Xin (仁礼智信); it attaches importance to these goals, which are explained in major China classical texts such as the *Da-xue* (大学), the *Lun-yu* (論語), the *Tao Te Ching* (老子), and the *Shujing* (書經). These goals have no limits. Once a high level is achieved

along the way toward them, a higher end comes into view. Thus, people should continue to strive for these goals as long as they are alive. In this way, the end to be pursued is to heighten the commitment to continuing with such constant voluntary efforts to the further higher level. The aim is to make this standard concept rooted in Oriental philosophy serve as the basis for world order formation to overcome the limitations that the traditional Western standard concept could not.

This is not intended to deny the Western standard concept. Rather, it aims to sophisticate the process of shaping order for the global community by fusing Western and Eastern concepts.

(ii) The Concept of “Fusing Yin (陰) and Yang (陽) to Create All Things” or the “Agree to Disagree” Concept at the Core of the New Standard Concept

The new standard concept that supports the NGO-led process of shaping world order is characterized by its ability to allow diverse states and organizations to take part in global organizations and conventions as long as they share common goals and behavioral principles even though such members greatly differ in their level of attaining these goals.

The traditional standard concept was based on a dichotomous worldview; therefore, it excluded those states and organizations that failed to meet the uniform standards which were based on many assumptions.

By contrast, the new standard concept will allow states and organizations to participate as members as long as they share the common goals and behavioral principles even if they are at different developmental levels or have different ideas.

This new concept is based on the Eastern idea of “fusing yin (陰) and yang (陽) to create all things.” In other words, it stems from the “agree to disagree” concept.

In this context, a China classical text titled “*Tao Te Ching* (老子)” includes the following passage:

“The Tao begot One; One begot Two; Two begot Three; Three begot all things.

All things bear yin and embrace yang, harmonized by the immaterial qi.”
(Chapter 42)

This passage can be interpreted as follows:

(Excerpts from Yoshifumi Taguchi’s book titled “Rida no Shishin ‘Toyo Shiso’”
[Eastern thought as a guide for leaders])

“The source of the universe (Tao (道)) generated One, that is, the original energy. Then the original energy generated Two, that is, yin (陰) and yang (陽). Yin and yang, in turn, generated Three, that is, the immaterial qi, which harmonized yin and yang to generate all things. Thus, all things are the sum of yin and yang in harmony.”

The term “immaterial” here means “empty.” The term “immaterial qi” means “empty mind.” The state of empty mind means a state of “absorption,” “self-oblivion,” or “selflessness.” Attaining this state of mind is the only way to embrace and transcend yin and yang, which are seemingly contradictory to each other.

(3) How to Evaluate Voluntary Efforts by Participating Members Based on the New Standard Concept

With regard to the organizations and frameworks for the traditional state-led process for shaping world order formation, only government officials in the participating countries had access to information on other countries and conducted mutual examinations and evaluations of the behaviors of these countries. That was the basis for ensuring governance by participating members.

In the new model, experts will make effective use of state-of-the-art technology such as latest IT, AI, and big data to analyze data on the outcomes of the voluntary efforts made by participating states and organizations. Their findings and evaluations will be regularly made available to the public in ways that are easy for them to understand. This arrangement will allow everyone to know the specific efforts made by participating states and organizations.

It should be noted, however, that the criteria to be applied should be varied rather than being uniform. Quantitative evaluation may be difficult in the near

term.

For this arrangement to work, it is vital that participating members report on the results of their voluntary efforts in good faith and with transparency. Unless this condition is met, mutual monitoring will never be done, which in turn will render the whole framework ineffective.

Once the final results and expert evaluations of them are released, it should be up to the participating members to set their next goals based on these findings. The actions to be taken by them should not be imposed or constrained by other members.

Thus, specific efforts by participating members are not to be dedicated by external standards but by internal, self-driven motivation. This is the fundamental difference between the traditional Western concept and the new standard concept that is rooted in Oriental philosophy.

(4) Advantages of Introducing New Standards

The new standard concept embraces such uniform standards that allow a measure of leeway and flexibility, and let each participating state or organization decide how to achieve their goals. The following are some of the advantages of making this arrangement a precondition for shaping world order.

(i) Flexible Adjustments to Global Standards According to Changing Circumstances

This arrangement will make it easy for varied countries to participate and, after participation, continue with their long-term efforts to achieve the goals and make adjustments in response to changing circumstances.

The WTO, NAFTA, TPP, and the EU have many problems associated with their rigid membership qualifications and common rules. Such problems will not occur under the framework based on this new standard concept.

Moreover, if this new standard concept can be introduced to existing organizations and conventions, the following benefits may result:

- 1) China's participation in the TPP
- 2) Immediate agreement on RCEP
- 3) More flexible setting of environmental improvement goals by each state
- 4) Maintaining morality of EU member countries after acceding to the regional body

(ii) Increased Governance

Governance will be strengthened because significantly improved transparency and understandability of performance evaluations will put participating states and organizations under wider scrutiny.

(iii) More Sophisticated Goal-setting

More sophisticated and desirable standards may be shared as they are not designed to strictly constrain participating members.

5. Specific Measures to Shape a New Order for the Global Community

It is significant to create a model for identifying an NGO-led framework for world order formation based on the new guiding principle described above. Such a model envisions the following components.

(1) Establishing a Track II Conference of Experts from Eight Countries

A Track II conference will be established which involves the participation of one or two experts from each of the eight major state players in the global community, namely, Japan, the US, China, the UK, France, Germany, India, and Russia. The meeting will discuss major challenges in shaping world order and possible solutions to them. The gist of these discussions will be published. However, remarks made at the meeting will not be sourced.

(2) Establishing a Steering Committee Made up of Experts from Some of the Eight Countries

As it is difficult to launch a full-fledged meeting from the start, this project will start off by establishing a steering committee involving some of the eight countries—possibly Japan, the US, China, the UK, France, and Germany—to decide on the conditions and rules for managing a full-fledged Track II

conference. Such a steering meeting may be established by 2019 at the earliest.

(3) Where the Eight-Country Track II Conference Will Be Based

As a rule, any meeting of the Eight-Country Track II conference will be held in Tokyo. This arrangement has the following advantages:

- Japan shares cultural foundations rooted in Oriental philosophy with China, India, and other Asian nations while respecting Western philosophy as well as the political, economic and administrative systems and ideals of the West since the Meiji Restoration in 1868.
- Japan poses no military threat as the Constitution renounces the use of force against other countries.
- Japan offers high levels of hospitality.
- Japan hosts no international organization aimed at contributing to the world for world order formation on its own initiative. My hope is that establishing this conference and demonstrating its practical activities will inspire more young people in Japan to get out of their inward orientation and work for the contribution to the global community.