



The Canon Institute for Global Studies

CIGS Working Paper Series No. 23-003E

**Proposals for the G7 Hiroshima Summit based on
Future Design
~International Governance for Global Public Goods~**

Yoshinori Nakagawa (Research Institute for Humanity and Nature /
Kochi University of Technology)

Keiichiro Kobayashi (The Canon Institute for Global Studies / Keio University /
Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry)

Ken Jimbo (The Canon Institute for Global Studies / Keio University)

Kazuhito Yamashita (The Canon Institute for Global Studies /
Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry)

Akiko Yoshioka (The Canon Institute for Global Studies)

Tatsuyoshi Saijo (Research Institute for Humanity and Nature /
Kochi University of Technology)

2023.3

※Opinions expressed or implied in the CIGS Working Paper Series are solely those of the author, and do not necessarily represent the views of the CIGS or its sponsor.
※CIGS Working Paper Series is circulated in order to stimulate lively discussion and comments.
※Copyright belongs to the author(s) of each paper unless stated otherwise.

General Incorporated Foundation

The Canon Institute for Global Studies

一般財団法人 キヤノングローバル戦略研究所

Phone: +81-3-6213-0550 <https://cigs.canon/>

Proposals for the G7 Hiroshima Summit based on Future Design International Governance for Global Public Goods

Yoshinori Nakagawa^{1 2} Keiichiro Kobayashi^{3 4 5} Ken Jimbo^{3 4}
Kazuhito Yamashita^{3 5} Akiko Yoshioka³ Tatsuyoshi Saijo^{1 2}

¹ Research Institute for Humanity and Nature

² Kochi University of Technology

³ The Canon Institute for Global Studies

⁴ Keio University

⁵ Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry

Executive Summary

Humanity is facing various challenges today, such as the Russian invasion of Ukraine, the resulting energy and food security crises, the collapse of the global biogeochemical cycle systems including carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus, and the biodiversity collapse. Faced with such urgent challenges to survival, it is only natural that we would attempt to solve them with immediate and effective responses.

However, future generations who will live decades from now may not necessarily regard these solutions as the best choices. Such concerns become real when discussions about the future are stifled by short-term interests of individual nations, preventing consensus-building and the development of creative visions for the long-term future.

Therefore, various methods have been developed to design a long-term future to ensure the protection of the interests of future generations, who do not have a voice to negotiate with the current generation. One of these methods, Future Design (FD)—which systematizes the way policy makers imagine policies from the perspective of the future—has been gaining attention in recent years.

We (authors 2–5) conducted discussions to simulate the adoption of the FD approach during the G7 Hiroshima Summit in 2023 when the participating leaders will respond to the impact of the Russian invasion of Ukraine. To this end, we developed a concrete image of what the international community will look like in 2053, and then envisioned a path for the international community to realize cooperation among various seemingly unrelated issues that will become linked within a span of 30 years. Based on this experience, we have the following proposals for the Heads of State and Government participating in the 2023 G7 Hiroshima Summit. In particular, we would like to emphasize that Heads of State or Government should strive to establish an international governance system to provide global public goods.

Proposals

(1) At the G7 Hiroshima Summit, the leaders of the seven major economies should imagine themselves as the future president/prime minister in a cooperative international community from 2053, when the Russian invasion of Ukraine will have ended.

(2) From that perspective, they should consider what consistent solutions the G7 leaders should have come up with regarding the following five potentially interrelated policy issues, and advise the G7 leaders of 2023.

- I. The importance of unity as the G7 in the various sanctions against Russia being implemented as a countermeasure to the military invasion of Ukraine and its exit strategy.
- II. The efforts of G7 to encourage China to participate in the U.S.-Russia nuclear arms control regime in a transparent manner and to encourage China to cooperate with Western countries, including the U.S., in the development of a free world economy.
- III. The role of the G7 in the upcoming discussions on institutional design regarding the fund to be established as decided at the 27th United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference (COP27) to provide “loss and damage” funding to vulnerable countries hit hard by climate disasters.
- IV. The efforts of G7 to ensure wealth distribution to the Global South, particularly Africa, which did not benefit from the Green Revolution of the 20th century.
- V. The efforts of the G7 to achieve global stabilization, in terms of nuclear disarmament, the expansion of free trade, prevention of global warming, and distributional justice, in an integrated manner through the establishment of an international governance system for the provision of global public goods in the world after the end of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine.

Regarding I, the G7 must unite and stand firm behind the idea that the Russian invasion of Ukraine is an outrage that fundamentally undermines the international order established after World War II, and cannot be tolerated. By agreeing in advance on sanctions against Russia, including an exit strategy, the G7 nations will be aligned and the sanctions will continue to be enforced until the end. This can have a deterrent effect and might prevent such a tragedy from happening again in the world after the end of military aggression. Issue II relates to China, which will hold the key to global stability in the world after the end of military aggression. Issue III also involves the establishment of a stable world that is not reliant on Russian fossil fuels. Issue IV concerns the reconciliation of the international community, including countries that opposed or abstained from the UN resolution of 2022 condemning Russia, in a post-invasion world. Issue V regards integrating the efforts related to II through IV.

Introduction

As of January 2023 (hereinafter simply referred to as “today”), a summit of the leaders of the major economies (hereafter referred to as “the G7 Hiroshima Summit”) is scheduled to be held in Hiroshima on May 19–21, 2023. The Prime Minister’s official website indicates that the Japanese government is considering what position should be taken at the G7 Summit in light of the Russian invasion of Ukraine on February 24, 2022.

It is only natural that the more we face pressing challenges, like Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, the more we will be forced to take measures that will be effective in the short term. However, when these measures are evaluated in the long term, there is no guarantee that they will be optimal for future generations decades ahead. Therefore, this report sets two objectives.

- First, we will conduct simulations to determine the effectiveness of G7 leaders adopting the Future Design approach and discussing issues from the perspectives of imaginary future presidents/prime ministers in the year 2053.
- Second, if this is found to be effective, we will extract hints as to the issues that should be discussed by these imaginary future presidents/prime ministers.

Four of the authors of this report (Kobayashi, Jimbo, Yamashita, and Yoshioka) actually employed the Future Design discussion method to simulate the international community in 2053 as persons imagined to be of the future, and devised a message to the G7 leaders in 2023. However, it is important to note that the message itself is not our proposal to the G7 leaders. Our proposal is that the G7 leaders imagine themselves as leaders of the future, hold discussions, and send a message to themselves in the year 2023. The simulation will reveal hints that deserve attention of the G7 leaders adopting Future Design, and the final goal of the simulation is to identify them. The remaining two authors of this report (Nakagawa and Saijo) supported the discussions among the four in their capacity as experts in Future Design.

The discussions among the four authors were held in two sessions, on September 28, 2022 (Day 1) and November 24, 2022 (Day 2). Day 1 consisted mainly of (i) an icebreaker, (ii) implementing past design as a practice, and (iii) Future Design discussion. On Day 2, (iii) Future Design was conducted again to expand the discussion from the first day.

What is Future Design?

The prototype of the social system behind “future failures” in which the current generation places a heavy burden on future generations, including climate change, biodiversity collapse, disruption of the

nitrogen and phosphorus cycle, and massive government debt, can possibly be attributed to the originators of liberalism such as Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau (Deneen, 2019). It involves the social contract to envision freedom and equality for all people, put an end to the state of “war against all,” and break the yoke of social institutions and indecisive norms that tolerate inequality. The existence of the state supports this, and through the state, the foundations of the current social system of free markets and representative democracy can be laid. Bacon, who preceded them, proposed the idea of the dominion of mankind over nature.

Democracy is a mechanism to realize the interests of the people who are alive today, but is not a mechanism to involve future generations. Similarly, the market is an excellent mechanism to realizing people’s immediate desires, but is not a mechanism to allocate resources with future generations in mind. Unfortunately, it is not possible for the voices of future generations to be heard in today’s market. In other words, the two basic social mechanisms of today do not guarantee sustainability, and thus survivability.

Future Design (FD) takes the opposite position from traditional (social) science (Kamijo et al., 2017; Saijo, 2020). Conventional social science assumed that people’s ways of thinking do not change easily. Human’s thinking (or its nature), however, is transformed by social institutions and their feedback. In other words, the very mechanisms of society—markets and democracy—shape the way we think. Therefore, it is necessary to design a social system that transforms our way of thinking. This is the starting point of FD.

Many people might agree with the idea that parents feel happier when they reduce their own food intake and give that amount to their children when food is scarce. Beyond kinship, then, we define “futurability” as the property that this decision and action, and even thinking in this way itself, will make people happier even if it reduces current gains, insofar as it enriches future generations. The essence of Future Design lies in designing a social mechanism that activates futurability.

Several approaches have been devised to protect the interests of future generations that do not have a voice in negotiations with the current generation. Of these, Future Design has recently begun to attract particular attention as a means of systematizing how policymakers conceive of policies from the perspective of future generations (e.g., MacAskill, 2022).

What is Past Design?

However, such a framework of thinking is not one that is used daily and therefore not one that can be easily adopted. Therefore, in this experiment, as a preliminary step, the participants reflected on what they were doing 30 years ago, and after presenting what they were doing 30 years ago to the other participants as an “ice breaker,” they made a virtual proposal from the present to the past 30 years ago. This frame of mind is what we refer to as past design. Past design is good training for future

design because the two frameworks of thought are similar, both involving starting from a certain point in time and sending recommendations to the past that goes back the same number of years.

Coincidentally, about 30 years ago, from July 7 to 9, 1993, the 17th G7 summit was held in Tokyo, under the chairmanship of Japan. It was chaired by then-Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa. Moreover, one of the items on the agenda for that summit was “transitions of Russia and other former Soviet countries.” The G7 summits of 1993 and 2023 both have Japan as their chairing country and Russia as one of the major issues on the agenda. Therefore, the discussion topic for this past design was to make recommendations from 2023 to the major industrialized countries of 1993. We expected this to facilitate the discussion for the future design exercise.

Discussion Results (Ice Breaker)

During the icebreaker, the following topics were presented to the participants to start the discussion.

- 1) One at a time, please take turns and reflect on what you were doing around 1993 and in what social context. (Within 3 minutes each)
- 2) Based on 1), please freely discuss what society was like in 1993 compared to 2022.

During the icebreaker, each of the four participants introduced themselves in turn, while relating their lives to national and international events that had taken place some 30 years earlier. The main events mentioned were as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Major Domestic and International Events Around 1993¹

1989	The Fall of the Berlin Wall: Democratization of Eastern Europe
1990	Outbreak of the Gulf War and the defeat of Iraq
1991	Dissolution of the Soviet Union
1992	U.S. and EC agree to the Uruguay Round of Agricultural Negotiations of GATT
	Collapse of Yugoslavia, intensification of civil war
	Burst of the bubble economy, recession worsens
	Act on Cooperation for United Nations Peace-keeping Operations passed; Self-Defense Force dispatched to Cambodia
1993	Uruguay Round Concluded After Seven Years
	Maastricht Treaty enters into force, European Union (EU) established

¹The following website was used to excerpt and prepare the major events.
<https://www.jijiphoto.jp/ext/news/heisei/>

1994	Civil war in Rwanda, the mass exodus of refugees Role of GATT concluded, World Trade Organization (WTO) established to cover a wider range of sectors
------	--

During the discussion, Mr. Yamashita, who was already a mid-level bureaucrat, first reflected on his own life at that time. In 1993, as a negotiations coordinator in the International Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries, he traveled frequently to Geneva, Switzerland, and spent two months there during the final phase of the Uruguay Round of GATT negotiations. The most important issue for Japan was the issue of rice, and Mr. Yamashita was negotiating to introduce special tariff measures for rice. Next, Mr. Kobayashi mentioned that in 1993, he was in his third year at the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) (now the Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry (METI)) and had just been transferred to the General Affairs Division of the Secretariat. The bubble economy had burst, and prices of land and stocks were falling even though fiscal policies were implemented to counter the economic downturn. He was in a position to see the whole picture of MITI's efforts to deal with that situation.

Both Mr. Yamashita and Mr. Kobayashi were already working at the time, and they spoke of their experiences as ministry employees. On the other hand, Ms. Yoshioka and Mr. Jimbo were still students around 1993, so they looked back on how they perceived the social situation at that time from their perspective.

First, Ms. Yoshioka recalled, in response to Mr. Kobayashi's account, that when she was a university student, she sensed that the job-hunting situation, which had been a seller's market, had begun to change. She also mentioned that she was interested in international affairs—the Berlin Wall collapsed in 1989 and the Cold War ended when she was in high school—and that she later studied abroad in Russia as a university student, majoring in Russian studies. Next, Mr. Jimbo said that his interest in security was triggered by the Gulf War that took place in 1990, the same year as the collapse of the Soviet Union. He then entered university, where he read books such as Francis Fukuyama's "The End of History and the Last Man" and Samuel Huntington's "The Clash of Civilizations," and wondered what the world would be like in the future. He also felt that there was a disconnect between the parallel occurrence of two opposing movements: the conflict in Yugoslavia was intensifying, while in Europe, the Maastricht Treaty was being established and the integration of countries was deepening.

What distinguished Ms. Yoshioka and Mr. Jimbo's narrative was their attempt to express their generational identity by stating that their interest in international relations and security was not uniquely their own, but was common to many of their generation.

After the four participants had thus reflected on their lives at the time, a free discussion was held. There, rather than every participant further developing what they had said, they sought to clarify the

kind of society that existed in 1993 by exploring the relationships between what they had said to each other. Specifically, Mr. Kobayashi attempted to present a general framework to organize the domestic and international situations that were mixed up in the narratives of the four. He contrasted the two situations, describing how in 1993, Japan was in the midst of its economic bubble burst and the atmosphere was becoming grimmer, while outside, the world was experiencing a brighter period of development toward globalization.

This was followed by a discussion in which the four participants sought a shared understanding of what exactly the bright international society ahead of globalization was like. It could also be described as a process of finding a connection between the various facts they had mentioned separately in the previous section. An important part of this process was Francis Fukuyama's concept of "the end of history," which Mr. Jimbo had first encountered as a student. Mr. Kobayashi referred to this concept introduced by Mr. Jimbo, and summarized the state of the international community in 1993 with the phrase "the world's elation at the time when globalization was beginning." The word "elation" was first used by Mr. Yamashita several times earlier in the discussion, when explaining how the Uruguay Round negotiations, in which he was involved as the negotiating coordinator of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, were concluded, leading to the establishment of the WTO in 1995, which included the EU, which had newly been established in 1993. Ms. Yoshioka echoed Mr. Jimbo's summary, adding that after the collapse of the Soviet Union, in the 1990s, the people of Russia shared the hope and dream of becoming affluent like the West.

Thus, the four participants were able to reach a mutual understanding of what society was like around 1993. The remainder of the "ice breaker" was devoted to identifying major historical trends, starting with the society of 1993, which was underpinned with such optimism, and ending with the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022. In other words, the West, through the International Monetary Fund (IMF), proceeded to privatize state-owned enterprises and shift to a market economy, but this did not turn the Russian economy around. Russia entered an era of chaos, with hyperinflation, declared debt default, and a decline in its international standing. This deepened Russia's grievances and feelings of inferiority toward the West, which led to a resurgence of great power consciousness under President Vladimir Putin. In addition, the expansion of the EU and NATO proceeded in parallel with the progress of globalization, and after the color revolutions that took place in the former Soviet countries from 2003 to 2005 and the Baltic states joining NATO in 2004, Russia began to openly criticize the US and NATO in the late 2000s. These factors, combined with President Putin's imperialist ideology, perverse sense of victimhood, and excessive defensiveness, led to the invasion of Ukraine in 2022.

Results of the Discussion (Past Design)

As part of the Past Design, the following topic statements were presented to the participants to start the discussion.

Approximately 30 years ago, on July 7-9, 1993, the 17th Summit of the Group of Seven (G7) industrialized countries was held in Tokyo.

- 1) Please send a message to the leaders of G7 at that time.
- 2) Discuss how society would be different today if that message had been delivered.

Past Design began with the four participants reading the gist of the political declaration at the 1993 G7 Tokyo Summit (Asahi Shimbun, September 8 Evening Edition) and the gist of the economic declaration (Asahi Shimbun, September 9 Morning Edition). The political declaration read as follows.

We reiterate the objectives of universal adherence to the NPT as well as the Treaty's indefinite extension in 1995 and nuclear arms reduction.

The Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), which entered into force in 1970, is a treaty aimed at preventing the proliferation of nuclear-weapon states. Noting this passage, Mr. Yamashita started the discussion. He asked Mr. Jimbo, a security expert, for an explanation of the political and historical background of the inclusion of this phrase in the declaration. Mr. Jimbo responded by explaining the NPT and how nuclear weapons in the Soviet countries were transferred to Russia after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

As a result, although the exchange itself did not lead directly to the conclusion of the past design, it significantly directed the discussion that followed this exchange. Specifically, this response led to a discussion of how, in the 1990s, the UN was expected to take the lead in global security after the end of the Cold War, which was subsequently betrayed. Reflecting on the Yugoslavian conflict (1991-2001), the Somali civil war (1980s-), and the Rwandan civil war (1990-1994), the four participants confirmed that UN-led conflict resolution through international cooperation had not been realized. Thus, the participants decided to send a message from today in 2022, "At this time in 1993, let's all (i.e., each country) gather a little more political will" (Mr. Kobayashi); the message will hereafter be referred to as "(a)".

At this point, the topic took a turn. It was pointed out that in the 1990s, China was not as economically developed as it is today, and the Soviet Union had just collapsed, which meant that Western countries, including Japan, recognized that Russia and China should be extended a helping hand. In that context, the failure of the IMF to support Russia, which was discussed in the icebreaker, was also revisited. Mr. Yamashita argued that even if Western countries imposed their own ways, it was impossible for human beings to change immediately, so there would always be discord.

Perhaps associated with the dysfunction of the IMF, Mr. Yamashita noted that the WTO, which was established in 1994 after the conclusion of the Uruguay Round negotiations, has become dysfunctional today. Since its inception, the WTO has been able to produce only minor agreements such as trade facilitation agreements because it employs a consensus system, which means that no agreement can be made unless all countries agree to it. The Uruguay Round negotiations should have seen similar difficulties, and the WTO should have learned from this and modified its decision-making procedures by adopting a majority voting system. This was the second message (“(b)” below) from the present to the early 1990s.

Thus, two messages emerged. (a) was for security and (b) for trade, so no explicit links were observed at first glance. Nevertheless, while abstracting the two, Mr. Jimbo proposed the third message: “I think we all agree that the governance mechanisms of the major countries should have been created with a bit more of the future in mind” (Hereafter, “(c)”). This allowed him to recognize the unison of the previous two messages.

Through this, he derived the fourth message, hereafter “(d),” in the opposite way. Similar to how Mr. Yamashita expressed regret over the WTO’s decision-making system, he wished that a decision-making mechanism had been established to achieve international cooperation without consensus in the area of security. If this had been possible, the UN could have taken some enforcement measures, such as dispatching troops without waiting for a Security Council resolution, at the stages from early warning to the escalation in international conflicts, and potentially halting several conflicts since the 1990s.

Thus, we arrived at four messages with a hierarchical structure. Apart from the flow of discussion, there was also a discussion led by Ms. Yoshioka and Mr. Yamashita, which focused specifically on Japan-Russia relations. Then, a fifth message “(e)” was presented, which was that when Japan was supporting the privatization of Russian state-owned enterprises and the transition to a market economy, the Japanese government could have used this as leverage to ensure the proper progress of the Northern Territories negotiations. This is a message that is in part separate from the previously mentioned (a) through (d). Nevertheless, Ms. Yoshioka used this as a starting point to conceive the sixth message (hereinafter “(f)”), which was for the international community to reach a consensus on “how to deal with Russia” and “what kind of country to make Russia.” In reality, the international community had only vague expectations that Russia would move in the right direction. Ms. Yoshioka’s idea could bridge the gap between the contents of messages (a) to (d) and the issues to be discussed in Future Design, which will be discussed in the next section.

In summary, the results of the Past Design discussions can be summarized in the following messages.

(a) We would have liked to see the establishment of a system that would mobilize the political will

of each country so that international issues could be resolved through international cooperation, with the UN at the center.

(b) We would have liked for the WTO to fully fulfill its original function by adopting a majority decision-making system rather than a consensus system.

(c) (As a summary of (a)&(b)) We would have liked for the major industrialized countries to design an effective governance mechanism to deal with various international issues.

(d) (Considering (b)) We would have liked for the UN and the WTO to adopt more flexible decision-making methods that allow early intervention in international conflicts, such as dispatching troops without waiting for a Security Council resolution.

(e) In the 1990s, when Japan was supporting the privatization of Russian state-owned enterprises and the transition to a market economy, we would have liked for the Japanese government to use this as leverage to ensure the proper progress of the Northern Territories negotiations.

(f) We would have liked for the international community to reach a consensus on “how to deal with Russia after the collapse of the Soviet Union” and “what kind of country to make Russia.”

Results of the Discussion (Future Design)

In Future Design, the following topic statement was presented to the participants to start the discussion.

You have been transported back in time to the year 2053 in a time machine, at the same age as you were, and you now live there.

- 1) What is your daily life like in 2053 as you seek happiness?
- 2) Please describe in as much detail as possible the society of Japan and the international community in which you live.
- 3) Please send a message to the G7 leaders scheduled to participate in the Hiroshima G7. Also, please discuss how the Hiroshima G7, which responded to that message, has changed society in 2053.

In the Future Design discussion, the participants were asked to imagine they were people from the future in the year 2053. When referring to the year 2023, they were asked to use the past tense rather than the present tense.

The discussion initially developed between four themes related to Russia and the international community around it. These themes were

- (1) The decline of Russia’s national power

(2) Russia's possession of nuclear weapons

(3) The democratization of Russia

(4) The position of the Northern Territories

Let us look at the details in order, starting with (1) The decline of Russia's national power. In 2022, Russia invaded Ukraine and was under economic sanctions. It was clear that this reduced the country's power. Moreover, in 2022, Russia's domestic economy was supported by oil and natural gas exports, but since the invasion of Ukraine, Russia's economic power declined further, partly because the international community, including Europe, accelerated its move away from dependence on fossil fuels.

This also affected (2) Russia's possession of nuclear weapons. In a difficult economic situation, Russia used nuclear weapons as a tool to extract economic benefits from the U.S. and other countries in international negotiations. The economic sanctions imposed after 2022 also worked to strengthen Russia's desire not to give up its nuclear weapons.

Therefore, Russia continues to maintain its nuclear weapons in 2053, but it is in part because of this that Russia is able to stay in power. This is similar to North Korea in 2022. Russia has become an authoritarian state, so to speak, and continues its hegemonic behavior. Of course, if (3) "The democratization of Russia" had progressed after 2022, Russia would not have needed to maintain power by retaining nuclear weapons, but history did not unfold that way. This is because Russia continues to have very bitter memories of the turmoil of inflation and deteriorating security in the 1990s during the progress of democratization and free marketization.

The above arguments (1) through (3) are closely related to (4) "The position of the Northern Territories" for Russia. As long as Russia continues to possess nuclear weapons, it needs to claim the Northern Territories and deploy nuclear submarines in the Sea of Okhotsk to establish mutually assured destruction between Russia and the United States. The worse the relations between the U.S. and Russia become, the more important the Northern Territories become to Russia. As of 2053, Japan continues to be an ally of the U.S. and hostile to Russia, but it is difficult to determine the nature of the relationship between Russia and the U.S. In any case, however, this should still impact the negotiations between Japan and Russia for the return of the Northern Territories.

This concludes the discussion of Russia and the international situation surrounding it in 2053. From this point, the participants began to consider what message to send to the leaders of the G7 industrialized nations in 2023. The task, however, proved to be a difficult one. They realized there were few actions that the G7 nations could take against Russia. Nuclear disarmament of Russia (and the rest of the world) is almost impossible. Similarly, it is almost impossible to cause a change in Russians' way of thinking and bring about democratization, and it is difficult to move them away from an authoritarian regime. Under these two constraints, it was difficult to compose a message for 2022 about actions that would prevent problems in global security caused by Russia.

Thus, on Day 2 (November 24), the participants were asked to concentrate on an ideal state of the world for 2053 without adhering to matters related to the international situation that were common knowledge among experts in 2023. According to Masaaki Takahashi, assistant manager of the Planning and Finance Division, who is actively engaged in administrative management that incorporates Future Design methods in Yahaba, Iwate Prefecture, when inviting residents of Yahaba to participate in discussions imagining themselves as future residents, he asks the participants to “think outside the box” (Takahashi, personal communication). The participants of this exercise were also told this and were encouraged to think freely without being bound to the perspective of 2023. Of course, this was not a request for each of the four to put aside their professional insights and literally “think outside the box.” It was a request for them to creatively search for an ideal state of the world in 2053 that, even if unusual in 2023, was still possible in the eyes of experts.

The participants responded to this request in their own ways. First, Mr. Kobayashi proposed to assume that the world in 2053 is steadily moving toward the abolition of nuclear weapons, reversing the Day 1 discussion on theme (2). He also proposed to assume that the world has achieved carbon neutrality to prevent global warming.

Mr. Yamashita expressed his agreement with these two proposals and further developed them. As confirmed in theme (1) on the first day, Russia would have weakened due to economic sanctions imposed by the international community, but China would have increased its presence in the international community to replace it. Therefore, Mr. Yamashita suggested that the issue of Russia’s nuclear possession be considered together with the issue of China’s nuclear possession. He also suggested that they should consider not only the military aspect of China but its trade aspect as well, and envision the year 2053 when China is cooperating with the international community.

Mr. Jimbo, on the other hand, shifted the topic and presented his own view of the world in 2053. He assumed a world that regretted the rise of authoritarianism of the 2020s, where international governance was practiced and wealth distribution to the Global South, including Africa, had been carried out. Although this seemed at first glance to be a sudden statement of opinion, other participants were willing to accept it, understanding it as a natural extension of the earlier discussion. In fact, Mr. Yamashita pointed out that in 2022, Africa was strengthening its ties with authoritarian Russia and China, and Ms. Yoshioka pointed out that there were countries in the Global South that opposed the UN resolution against Russian aggression in 2022, and that there may have been a backlash against the West, which was behind it, noting that as the only Asian country in the G7, Japan had a role to play in building the international order. Thus, the other members attempted to position Mr. Jimbo’s expression of opinion as a natural extension of the previous discussion.

Thus, the participants developed an image of an ideal international society for the year 2053, relating the themes of (A) effective sanctions against Russia, (B) distribution of wealth to the Global South,

(C) global nuclear disarmament, and (D) international reconciliation in terms of China's military and trade.

The theme of (E) global warming prevention presented by Mr. Kobayashi is directly related to (A) in the sense that advancing this theme will lead to breaking away from dependence on Russian fossil fuels, but the following remarks of Mr. Yamashita further strengthened the connection with themes (A) and (B).

(I think) it is best to send a message that a confrontation between two major countries (China and the U.S.) involving other countries is not beneficial to any of them. This is true for nuclear issues, global warming, and everything else. Conflicts are not good for anything. And that, of course, is why we want to create global public goods. There are political public goods, and there are military public goods.

In general, global public goods are “goods having non-excludable, nonrival benefits that cut across borders, generations and populations” (Kaul et al., 2003). In other words, goods that have the property that one person's consumption of it does not prevent others from using it (non-competitiveness), and it is difficult to exclude those who wish to benefit from the goods (non-exclusionary). Mr. Yamashita's idea is to use this concept to integrate the five themes discussed so far. All the themes of (A)–(E) were integrated into the idea that the realization of international cooperation, both military and commercial, as well as the realization of the prevention of global warming, is ultimately a means to the ultimate end of ensuring the equitable utility of all citizens of the planet, including the Global South. Thus, the vision of the world in 2053 as envisioned by the four and their message to the G7 leaders in 2023 based on this vision were summarized as follows.

Following Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2022, the West imposed economic sanctions on Russia. Therefore, the importance of making these sanctions effective was reaffirmed at the G7 Summit in 2023, and Russia was restrained from destabilizing the international order to the maximum extent possible. Specifically, anticipating the end of the war sooner or later, the G7 discussed in advance a set of exit strategies for economic sanctions and a policy of claiming reparations from Russia, thereby preventing a disruption in G7 alignment. It is also important to prevent Russian oil and gas from flowing into the Global South. In this context, the world accelerated its global warming response and adopted a system less reliant on Russian oil and gas. As these suggest, the response of the G7 and the international community to Russia's invasion of Ukraine was, from at least three perspectives, the beginning of the realization of peace and stability in the world today in 2053.

The first perspective concerns nuclear disarmament. The economic sanctions imposed due to

the invasion of Ukraine and the world's shift from dependence on fossil fuels weakened Russia's economy, which was replaced by China, which became an important factor in the international order. China, which had hostile relations with the U.S. in 2022, now has a harmonious relationship with the U.S. and other Western countries and contributes to the maintenance of the international order. The G7's persistent efforts to communicate to China that a confrontation between the U.S. and China that would divide supply chains and marginalize free trade would only be a disadvantage to everyone have borne fruit.

China adopted a more harmonious attitude toward the international community, not only in economic terms but also in nuclear disarmament. Coincidentally, the G7 summit in 2023 was held at the site of the atomic bomb, Hiroshima, which is also the birthplace of Prime Minister Kishida. In retrospect from 2053, this was a turning point in history. Specifically, every year since that summit, the Political Declaration included language urging China to join the international nuclear arms control regime as a responsible superpower. Nuclear disarmament by the U.S., China, and Russia could only proceed with the establishment of a transparent nuclear arms control regime. China was convinced that transparency in the number it possesses would allow it to establish a mutually assured destructive relationship with the nuclear powers and protect its own security, and the G7 made efforts to this end. As a result, the world today, in 2053, is in a steady movement toward the abolition of nuclear weapons.

The second perspective relates to the response to global warming. Therefore, the international community used the sanctions against Russia as an opportunity to accelerate the trend away from fossil fuels. The international community phasing out fossil fuels and actions against global warming had an aspect of economic sanctions against Russia. Specifically, at the G7 Hiroshima Summit in 2023, the G7 leaders stated that they would actively cooperate with the "Loss and Damage" Support Fund. In doing so, the G7 countries clarified their stance to take a responsible position toward the Global South for the sake of global stability by addressing global warming and increasing momentum to achieve zero emissions of greenhouse gases.

The third perspective concerns the distribution of wealth between the Global North and South. Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2022 triggered the world's attention to the Global South, including Africa. Indeed, the fact that there were countries in the Global South that abstained from voting on the resolution condemning Russia at the UN General Assembly in 2022 was interpreted as a reflection of the influence of Russia and other authoritarian states. In addition, as already noted, there was concern that Russian oil and gas under economic sanctions would flow to the countries of the Global South, making it impossible to maintain the effectiveness of the sanctions. Therefore, the G7 set out to build international governance that would ensure the distribution of wealth to the Global South. The fight against hunger through increased food production for Africa, which did not benefit from the Green Revolution of the 20th century,

became symbolic of such efforts. Such efforts contributed in the short term to the effectiveness of sanctions against Russia, and in the long term to global stability through the narrowing of the North-South gap.

From the above discussion, we can say the following. Ironically, the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022 provided an opportunity for the G7 and the international community to act in a united manner. In other words, it was an opportunity to organize world movements in the seemingly independent areas of nuclear disarmament, wealth distribution to the Global South, free trade, and global warming prevention to achieve a peaceful and stable world in 2053. With this in mind, the message we would like to send to the G7 leaders in 2023 will ultimately converge on one point: “In order to maintain global stability, we would like all nations to begin building an international governance system to create and protect the global public goods that they need.” This may seem difficult to achieve, but what we would like to refer to then is the ASEAN+3 Emergency Rice Reserve (APTERR) system established in 2012 under Japan’s leadership. We hope that the Hiroshima Summit in 2023 will be the first step toward taking a long-term step forward, using this example as a model.

Reflection on the Series of Discussions

This paper has described the process by which the international community in 2053 and the recommendations for 2023 were derived in three stages: (i) Ice Breaking, (ii) Past Design, and (iii) Future Design. Taken together, we can confirm that they are organically linked, and that (i) and (ii) indeed functioned as preparatory work for (iii). This is confirmed below.

In (i), the participants’ own memories of 1993 were used as a starting point to develop a common understanding of the characteristics of the international community’s period in 1993 (and beyond). It can be described as “the enthusiasm of the international community (including the former Eastern countries) for globalization and the subsequent setback.” The term “setbacks” is used because it reflects the history of Russia after the collapse of the Soviet Union where, while receiving the support of the IMF, it could not realize the path of becoming rich like the Western countries or emphasize with them.

In (ii), the participants devised a message to the international community in 1993, asking them to “establish a governance mechanism for the major countries” (effective in solving international problems). This message was born out of a reflection on the failure of the three international organizations, the UN, the IMF, and the WTO, to contribute adequately to solving problems after the 1990s; the common thread of the IMF’s dysfunctionality links (i) and (ii).

In (iii), the participants prepared a message for 2023, “We hope that the nations of the world start to build an international governance system to create and protect the global public goods that they need to maintain global stability.” This is considered a more concrete and clear statement of the

purpose of the “governance mechanism of major countries,” the necessity of which was recognized in (ii), and the discussion in (ii) may have contributed to the discussion in (iii).

Proposals for the G7 Hiroshima Summit

Based on the above, we would like to present some recommendations for the G7 Hiroshima Summit. The critical situation of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine is currently ongoing in 2023, and it is highly significant to envision the future from the perspective of a hypothetical person from 2053, decades after the invasion has ended. The significance is as follows.

For the G7 leaders in 2023 (and for many people in the Western world), making sanctions against Russia effective is an urgent task. The perspective of a person imagined from 2053 means taking an objective look at ourselves in 2023 from a bird’s-eye viewpoint as we face this urgent issue. This makes it possible to envision the ideal world of 2053 from a broader solution space, without being caught in the perspective of the year 2023. In addition, it will be possible to examine from various angles from a different perspective than usual what paths the solutions to the most pressing issues in 2023 could take to realize the ideal. The fact that the participants of this discussion reached the conclusion that the ultimate goal of building global public goods can be achieved through pathways in which sanctions against Russia encourage the international community to work toward international cooperation and carbon neutrality in both military and trade is a testimony to this conclusion. The discovery of these pathways came as a surprise to the discussion participants. We, therefore, propose the following recommendations to the leaders who will participate in the G7 Hiroshima Summit in 2023.

- At the G7 Hiroshima Summit, time should be set aside for discussions imagining the leaders being from the year 2053.
- In the discussion, they should envision a future world in which sufficient time has passed since the end of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, and from there, make proposals to themselves as leaders in 2023.

The subjects discussed in this debate should ideally be determined naturally during the discussion, but due to time constraints, we have extracted the following five possible issues from our Future Design experiments.

- I. The importance of unity among the G7 in the various sanctions against Russia being implemented as a countermeasure to the military invasion of Ukraine and its exit strategy.
- II. The efforts of the G7 to encourage China to participate in the U.S.-Russia nuclear arms control

regime in a transparent manner and to encourage China to cooperate with Western countries, including the U.S., in the development of a free world economy.

- III. The role of the G7 in the upcoming discussions on institutional design regarding the fund to be established as decided at the 27th United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference (COP27) to provide “loss and damage” funding to vulnerable countries hit hard by climate disasters.
- IV. The efforts of the G7 to ensure wealth distribution to the Global South, particularly Africa, which did not benefit from the Green Revolution of the 20th century.
- V. The efforts of the G7 to achieve global stabilization including nuclear disarmament, the expansion of free trade, prevention of global warming, and distributional justice in an integrated manner through the establishment of an international governance system for the provision of global public goods in the world after the end of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine.

The following two points should serve as hints for the success of this discussion. First, instead of focusing solely on what the Western sanctions against Russia in 2023 should have been, we should consider from multiple perspectives what positive meaning the people of the world in 2053 might attach to the historical fact that such sanctions were imposed. The four participants gave significance to the possibility that the sanctions against Russia will be, inadvertently, a turning point in a desirable direction for the international community.

Second, prior to such a Future Design discussion, it is useful to imagine what kind of message we would like to send to the G7 leaders 30 years ago. This will allow the leaders to objectively look at the international community of 1993, of which they were a part, from a bird’s eye view, and recognize the issues that prevailed in the international community from 1993 to 2023. This may provide hints for considering an ideal 2053 to realize. The discussions among the four participants show the correspondence between the conclusions of the past design and those of the Future Design, as already mentioned.

References

- MacAskill, W. (2022). The Beginning of History. *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2022.
- Saijo, T. (2020). Future design: Bequeathing sustainable natural environments and sustainable societies to future generations. *Sustainability*, 12(16), 6467.
- Kamijo, Y., Komiya, A., Mifune, N., & Saijo, T. (2017). Negotiating with the future: Incorporating imaginary future generations into negotiations. *Sustainability science*, 12(3), 409-420.

Kaul, I., Conceição, P., Le Goulven, K. and Mendoza, R. U. (Eds) (2003). Providing Global Public Goods. Oxford: Oxford University Press.