TOYO UNIVERSITY

Japanese Society and Culture

Volume 4 Article 7

3-31-2022

Acceptance of Modern International Law in Japan

Motoyasu Nozawa
Faculty of Law, Graduate School of Law, Heisei International University

【**Received** 30 September 2021 / **Revised** 1 0ctober 2021 / **Accepted** 8 0ctober 2021】

Acceptance of Modern International Law in Japan※

Motoyasu Nozawa※※

Abstract

From the end of the Edo period to the beginning of the Meiji period, there was almost no knowledge of international law in the government. I have examined, under these circumstances, how Japan accepted and applied modern international law through several events and national practices. I also discussed how international jurists were born, what role they played in the development of international law, and what influence they had on the subsequent development of modern international law in Japan.

Keywords: Modern International Law, Extraterritoriality, Unequal Treaties, Consular Jurisdiction, Major International Jurists

1. Introduction

When international law is viewed as the law that governs the relationship between states, the beginnings of modern international law[1] can be found in Europe in the 16th century. Thereafter, modern international law was systematized based on the concept of modern state, the concept of sovereignty, and the freedom and equality of sovereign states from the 17th to 18th centuries, and was established as general international law from the 19th century. As is well known, in the 16th and 17th centuries, sovereign territorial states existed side by side in various regions as the territorial princes opposed the medieval authority of the Pope and the Holy Roman Emperor. The historical environment of the coexistence of sovereign territorial states in Europe is thought to have fostered modern international law. The opening

---

※ This article was originally published in *Review of Japanese Studies, No.12,2021 by Department of Japanese College of Humanities and Social Science, Chug-Hua University* and has been revised and translated into English.

※※ Professor of International Law, Faculty of Law, Graduate School of Law, Heisei International University, Saitama Japan

1 Comparing modern international law and contemporary international law, the basic structure of international society, which is the coexistence of sovereign states, has not changed.
The first is the structural change of international society. The first is the structural change of international society, and the second is the change in the normative structure of international law.
According to the former, modern international law is formed on the basis of a society composed of countries with different socioeconomic structures, cultural traditions, and stages of economic development, and thus with different demands for international law.
According to the latter, modern international law is based on societies composed of countries with different socioeconomic structures, cultural traditions, and stages of economic development, and therefore have different demands for international law.
However, the League of Nations Covenant, the Non-war Treaty, and the Charter of the United Nations stipulated that war should be illegal, and international law changed to a unitary structure.
Furthermore, modern international law is characterized by the expansion of the scope of discipline, the organization of the international community, the discipline of issues that were once considered to be matters of domestic jurisdiction (international guarantee of human rights), and the concept of the interests of the international community as a whole.
International Law Association of Japan (ed.), Dictionary of International Relations Law, Sanseido, 1995, p.214

event was the Treaty of Westphalia (1648). The significance of the Treaty of Westphalia in terms of international law is that most of the European countries concerned became parties to it, their territories were demarcated by the actual international law of peace treaties, and the establishment of modern international society was recognized. During this period, many natural law and international law scholars and thinkers, such as Vitoria, Suarez, Gentili, Grotius, and Vattel, developed their own theories. Initially, the dominant view was that international law was a universal norm for humanity based on traditional natural law thought, but it gradually shifted toward legal positivism that attempted to understand the relationship between equal legal entities in analogy with domestic private law. Needless to say, however, in an international society that lacked a unified higher authority, it was impossible to thoroughly implement this idea, and the technology of law enforcement was not yet developed. Modern international law, which was originally established as European public law, expanded its scope of application from the 18th to the 19th century, beginning with the American independence in 1776, and continuing with the Treaty of Paris in 1856 and the Treaty of Nanking in 1842, which made each country subject to modern international law. Japan also became subject to modern international law through the Treaty of Kanagawa in 1854. In this paper, I would like to examine how Japan came to accept and apply the so-called Taisei International Law after the Meiji era through several cases, and then discuss the birth of international jurists and the role they played.

2. Development of Modern International Law in the 19th Century

In the 19th century, modern international law developed dramatically against the background of European cooperation and the Industrial Revolution. The characteristics of this development can be summarized in the following four points.[2] First, as mentioned above, the scope of the validity of international law expanded worldwide. Modern international law was initially called European public law because of its cultural homogeneity among the Christian nations of Europe. In the 18th century, Russia and the United States successively became subject to modern international law, and later, in the beginning of the 19th century, Latin American countries successively became independent and were recognized as subjects of international law. This shattered the framework of European public law in a regional sense. These countries were also liberated from traditional European politics. On the other hand, the framework of cultural homogeneity among Christian states was broken by the Treaty of Paris of 1856, which allowed Turkey to "participate in the interests of European public law and cooperation" for the first time. At about the same time, states in the Far East also came to be recognized as subjects of international law, with China becoming the bearer of modern international law by concluding the Treaty of Nanking with Britain in 1842 and Japan by concluding the Treaty of Kanagawa with the United States in 1854. It should be noted, however, that the expansion of the scope of validity of modern international law in the 19th century was due to the acceptance by non-European countries of the modern international law that had been formed in Europe, not to any substantive change in its content. In fact, it is not difficult to imagine that there were various barriers to the application of modern international law by non-European countries. It took some time for these countries to attain the status of civilized nations and become the true bearers of international law. The second is that treaty law came to play an important role among the sources of international law. In the 19th century, the methodology of international law shifted from

2 Shigejiro Tabata, International Law I, Yuhikaku, 1980, pp.33-55

natural law theory to legal positivism that emphasized state practice and precedents, and international law was established as a norm of actual international law. In particular, many treaty laws, including legislative treaties among many countries, were concluded instead of customary international law, which had been the mainstream until then. International conferences, such as the Vienna Conference of 1815, led to the conclusion of a number of legislative treaties governing the conduct of a large number of states in general and in the future, which was noteworthy in the field of international legislation. Third, the content of the treaties was enriched according to the situation. Along with the increase in the number of multilateral treaties mentioned above, international organizations were established to help multiple states achieve common goals, and they played an important role in the development of laws and regulations in various fields. In addition, the international arbitration court system was enhanced to resolve disputes between nations due to the increase in international trade, paving the way for the judicial court system. In this way, modern international law achieved remarkable development, but as mentioned above, it was essentially a form of application of what had been developed in Europe and accepted by non-European countries. There were various problems inherent in this, and these problems became apparent in the process of applying it. In the following, I would like to clarify how Japan solved these problems and applied international law in the process of accepting modern international law.

3. Acceptance of International Law in Japan and the Birth of Major International Law Scholars

The Treaty of Amity between Japan and the United States (1854) and the Treaty of Amity and Commerce between Japan and the United States (1858) opened Japan to modern international law and became the basis for the application of modern international law. However, the latter was not sophisticated and unilateral in content, and various procedural problems arose. Specifically, as is well known, it imposed consular jurisdiction on Japan and limited its right of customs autonomy. Japan was then forced to conclude similar treaties with the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, France, and other countries.

These events were humiliating for Japan, but in the larger scheme of things, they were very significant in the sense that Japan abolished the system of national seclusion and opened its doors to the world. The introduction of modern international law was also very important. This was also the beginning of the introduction of modern international law.

From the end of the Tokugawa Shogunate to the beginning of the Meiji Era, international law was becoming known in Japan under the name "Public Law of All Nations." The American missionary William Martin (who lived in China at that time) translated Whetstone's book *Elements of International Law* into Chinese, and this was published as *Universal Public La*w (1818). This book was published as *Universal Public Law* in 1864 and was reprinted in Japan the following year. In addition, at the request of the Meiji government, Shusuke Nishi, Shinichiro Tsuda, and Rinsho Mitsukuri[3] studied international law in

---

3 Mitsukuri Rinsho used the term "international law" for the first time in his translation of Woolsey's "Introduction to the study of International Law" in 1873. However, his greatest achievement was to translate the entire French Six Laws and to use the term "constitution" for the first time instead of "national constitution" as it had been called before.
International Law Association (ed.), International Law Dictionary, Kajima Press, (1975), p.653.
For the achievements of Shusuke Nishi, Shinichiro Tsuda, Rinsho Mitsukuri, Genichiro Fukuchi, and others, see Masao Ichimata, "Nihon no Kokusaihō wo Kiduita Hitobito" [People Who Built Japan's International Law], Japan Institute of International Affairs. (1973), pp.1-5.

Europe and were the first to introduce modern international law to Japan. It can be said that they formed the foundation for the development of international law scholars in Japan. In particular, Nishi and Tsuda studied in the Netherlands and learned international law from Professor Vissering of Leiden University, and after returning to Japan, Nishi published his lectures in the book *Vissering International Law* (1868) and became professors of international law in the government. Later, however, they were not professors of international law, but were involved in translating foreign legal systems for treaty revision. However, during that time, a number of foreign relations cases occurred, all of which were related to international law. In order to solve these problems, there was an urgent need to train international legal scholars. However, it was not until 30 years after Nishi, Tsuda, Mitsukuri, and others returned to Japan that the so-called major international law scholars[4] represented by Nagao Aruga, Toru Terao, Sakuei Takahashi, and Shingo Nakamura were born.

In the following sections, I would like to take up some of the foreign affairs cases and events in which Japan was involved, give an overview of how Japan dealt with them, and examine how modern international law was accepted through these changes.[5]

3.1 External Neutrality in the Franco-Prussian War

Since the opening of Japan to the world, Japan has encountered various international (foreign) problems. As a representative example, Japan's neutrality during the Franco-Prussian War can be mentioned. With the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870, Japan was forced to confront the issue of neutrality under international law. According to the then Foreign Minister Watanabe, "There is no one in Japan who understands the nature of external neutrality, and the French Minister requested that we observe the obligation of external neutrality. The first time I studied the subject, I found very few reference books on the subject. In the first instance, the study of extraterritorial neutrality was conducted, but there were very few reference books. It was drafted by William Martin"[6]. In 1870, Japan declared its neutrality, but problems arose over the interpretation of its provisions. According to Article 3 of the Declaration, "If one of the two battleships sails into the harbor within twenty-four hours of the other ship's departure, the other ship may not sail."[7]

The French interpreted this provision to mean that if the first ship was not a warship, the following warships could continue on their way, and the French ship Linoit not only pursued and threatened the German merchant ships as soon as they left the port of Yokohama, but also abused this Article 3 to patrol the coastal waters using the Japanese ports as the base of operations and engage in battles such as the Guerre de Course.[8] In response, the German Minister objected that Japan's neutrality was incomplete. Japan accepted this letter of protest and notified the Franco-Prussian Minister of the addition of the following two points to the regulations on external neutrality.

---

4 In addition to Masao Ichimata, see Taro Suifu, "Nihon no Kokusai Hōgaku (International Law in Japan)," Diplomacy, Vol. 2, No. 4 (1912), pp. 104-117, and No. 5, pp. 87-100.
See Taro Suifu, "Japan's International Law," Diplomacy, Vol. 2, No. 4 (1912), pp. 104-117, and No. 5, pp. 87-100.

5 According to Sakue Takahashi, "If we look back at the development of international law research during the Meiji period and compare it with that before and after, there are some things that are quite different. Takahashi, Sakue, "The Development of International Law Research in the Meiji Era (1)," Journal of the Hōgaku-kai, Vol. 30, No. 10.
Journal of the Japan Society for the Study of Law, Vol. 30, No. 10, (1912), p. 33.

6 The above paper, p.34

7 Previous paper, p.36

8 Previous paper, p.36

1. Within twenty-four hours after the departure of one of the merchant ships, the departure of the warship of the other side will not be completed.
2. The Japanese ports or the Sea of Japan should be the basis of battle, and in order to prevent the entry and exit of ships from one of the belligerents, the right sea boundary should be blocked, and the Sea of Japan should be used as a hiding place for battle.[9]

This seemed to have solved the problem, but the French Minister responded, "Without the approval of the both ministers, no changes will be made."[10]

As if to follow up on this, the minister stationed in Japan also acknowledged the legitimacy of the amendment, but insisted that the amendment must be negotiated with the Prussian and French ministers through proper procedures beforehand. In the end, Japan decided to suspend the amendment through discussions with the Prussian minister, and the issue was resolved.

With regard to this foreign neutrality in the Franco-Prussian War, Sakue Takahashi, a leading Japanese scholar of international law, wrote the following from the perspective of international law. "The enactment of laws by one nation is a matter of course and a function of its sovereignty, and is not a matter for other nations to interfere with. Even though the French armed forces themselves understand what the obligations of external neutrality are, it is already unjustifiable for them to act in violation of international law by abusing Article 3 of Japan's Declaration of External Neutrality, but to go one step further and advocate a failure in amending this incomplete provision is not only unjustifiable in terms of logic, but also illegal interference with the legislative authority of other countries in terms of logic."[11] This makes it easy to understand how Japan was disregarded and underestimated by the other countries at that time."[12]

3.2 The Maria Luz Case

In July 1872, the Peruvian sailing ship Maria Luz, which was carrying Chinese laborers from Macao to Peru, called at Yokohama Port for repairs.

On the night of July 15, a Chinese laborer who was allegedly mistreated on board escaped from the ship and was rescued by the British warship Iron Duke at anchor. The Japanese government ordered Kanagawa Prefectural Governor Taku Oe to conduct an interrogation of the Chinese laborer, confirming the fact that the Chinese laborer had been mistreated, and prosecuted the captain, who was found guilty. In response, the Peruvian government sent the following letter to the Japanese government, claiming that the Japanese measures were illegal and demanding compensation for damages.

1. The captain's action was only an on-board warning, which is not subject to Japanese jurisdiction, even in port.
2. The fact that he sent all the workers ashore to check on the status of the contract in Macau was not allowed, as it was outside the jurisdiction of Japan.
3. The administrative body is in charge of the trial under the precept of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
4. The trial is arbitrary.

---

9 Thesis, p.38
10 Prepublication paper, p.39
11 Prepublication paper, p.42
12 Prepublication Paper p.42

In response, the Japanese government argued that (1) precedent makes it clear that coastal states have jurisdiction over disputes between masters and passengers of foreign ships in port; (2) ships engaged in the slave trade are not protected; (3) judicial proceedings by administrative agencies are acceptable as long as they do not violate domestic law; (4) the real intention of Japan was to prove the abuse in the port of Yokohama; and (5) it was clear that Japan was not obliged to hand over the passengers who landed on the ship, considering that even criminals were not obliged to be handed over.[13] After negotiations between Japan and Peru, a protocol was signed on June 19, 1873, and the case was referred to an arbitral tribunal by Tsar Alexander II of Russia. In May 1875, Alexander II fully accepted Japan's claim and ruled that the Japanese government was not responsible in any way. With this ruling, Japan's compliance with international law and its prompt application of it were praised by other countries.

However, this does not mean that the study of international law in Japan was sufficiently developed. We should not forget that the other country was a so-called "weak country without a treaty" like Peru, and that there were Anglo-American legal advisors who worked for Japan.[14] It took some time for Japan to be recognized by the West as a truly civilized country.

3.3 Treaty Revision

Since the 1854 Treaty of Amity between Japan and the United States, Japan had been forced to conclude treaties that were unequal in that they allowed extraterritoriality for Japanese nationals in the contracting states, recognized consular jurisdiction (legal rights), and did not allow for voluntary taxation by Japan (tax rights). Therefore, Japan conducted a number of negotiations to restore its legal and tax rights and to gain equal status with Western countries. It took more than forty years to finally conclude a treaty of equality, starting with the first one by Iwakura Tomomi (1878), followed by the abolition of the consular tribunal system under Mutsu Munemitsu (1894), and finally the restoration of customs autonomy under Komura Jutaro (1911). However, the reasons why Japan was forced to conclude unequal treaties can be cited as the lack of awareness of the international situation, the lack of knowledge of international law, and the fact that domestic laws had not been developed enough to insist on the abolition of extraterritoriality. The Japanese government's approach to the revision of the treaty was (1) how to revise it and (2) by what method to revise it. As for (1), the question was whether to acquire legal and tax rights collectively or to give priority to one of them (and whether to negotiate collectively or individually as a means of negotiation). As for (2), in other words, it was necessary to prepare for the revision of treaties by improving domestic laws, that is, to enact national laws in harmony with Western culture, and to enhance Japan's status by joining prominent international treaties.[15] In order to achieve these goals, the Constitution Enactment Study Group, the Code Study Group, and various study groups on treaty revision were organized. In particular, it was necessary to study the basic notions held by Western countries regarding the elimination of consular jurisdiction. In other words, "it is necessary for Japan to be a nation with a European legal system and to protect the lives and property of Europeans."[16] Furthermore, accession to prominent international treaties was also emphasized for treaty revision.

---

13 International Law Dictionary, p. 648
14 Takahashi, Sakuei (2), Vol.30, No.10, 1912, p.81
15 Takahashi, Sakuei (4), Vol.31, No.4, 1913, pp.100-101
16 Takahashi, Sakuei (4), Vol.31, No.4, 1913, pp.100-101

They wanted to show that "the Japanese people will never yield to the West in respecting humanity and international law."[17] In fact, by joining the Red Cross Convention (Convention for the Protection of Victims of War) in 1886 and the Paris Declaration (Declaration Establishing the Essentials of the Law of the Sea) in 1887, Japan was praised by Western civilized nations and recognized as a civilized country with the will and ability to understand and abide by these treaties. However, some of the Western powers thought, "However, we do not have enough faith in Japan's ability to fulfill the aforementioned treaties in a warring state."[18] In short, it can be said that modern international law was truly accepted in Japan when various treaties were actually applied in a concrete manner.

As we have seen, the compilation of domestic laws was a prerequisite for the revision of treaties, and the delay in producing major international law scholars in Japan can be considered to have been caused by the revision of treaties. According to Sakue Takahashi, although the purpose of compiling national law was to revise treaties, "the study of international law is one step ahead of the study of national law."[19] Shusuke Nishi, Shinichiro Tsuda, and Rinsho Mitsukuri, who were the first Japanese to study international law in Western Europe, were forced to engage in the compilation of national laws (or more accurately, the translation of foreign legal systems) for the revision of treaties immediately after their return to Japan, and were not given the opportunity to teach international law and train their successors. As mentioned above, 30 years after their return to Japan, the first major international law scholars were born in Japan. International law research during this period was limited to referring to and translating original sources from abroad, which was done in conjunction with the compilation of national laws and was far from research in its original sense. The situation might have been different if any one of Nishi, Tsuda, and Mitsukuri had been allowed to devote himself to research and teaching international law.[20]

3.4. The Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese Wars

In the process of revising the treaties, Japan acceded to the Red Cross Treaty and the Paris Declaration, which in a sense made Japan a member of the civilized world, but there were still doubts in the Western world as to Japan's ability to implement these treaties. As a matter of fact, it was not expected that these treaties could be implemented in a time of war when people's minds were in a frenzy. However, it was the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War that put these doubts to rest.

The Imperial Rescript of the start of the Sino-Japanese War in August 1894 stated, "We, the undersigned, hereby declare war against the Republic of China, and we, the undersigned, in accordance with our will and in conformity with the war against the Republic of China, both on land and at sea, shall endeavor to accomplish the purposes of our nation, but so long as we comply with international law, we shall use all means at our disposal to meet our respective obligations."[21]

In the February 1905 Imperial Rescript on the Start of the Russo-Japanese War, it was stated, "We, the people of Japan, hereby declare war against Russia, and we, the Army and Navy, will do our utmost to engage Russia, and let all means be aimed at within the limits of international conventions, and let there be no miscalculation."[22]

---

17 Previously mentioned paper p.112
18 Previously mentioned paper p.115
19 Pre-Bulletin p.101
20 Ichimata Masao's pre-blocket letter, pp.28-29
21 Takahashi, Sakue, article (5), Vol. 31, No. 5, 1913, p. 49
22 The above paper, p. 49

In order to ensure compliance with international law, the government sent international law experts to serve as legal advisors in both wars in order to show the other countries how Japan was complying with international wartime law. In the Sino-Japanese War, Nagao Aruga served in the Army and Sakue Takahashi served in the Navy. In order to assert Japan's legitimacy in the war, Aruga published *The Sino-Japanese War from the Perspective of International Law* in French (1896)[23] and Takahashi published *International Law Cases during the Sino-Japanese War* in English (1903).[24] In the Russo-Japanese War, in accordance with the imperial decree, the Army took all possible measures by assigning two international law experts to each army. Aruga served under General Kodama, the Chief of Staff of the Manchurian Army, while Takahashi served in the Navy with Genroku Endo and Tadao Yamakawa. When Dr. Desjardins of the French Academy witnessed this, he said "In a remote corner of the Orient, there is a country that must accomplish a great task, and this country is Japan, and its progress is so great that it has astonished Europe not only in the art of war but also in the ideal of public law in time of war. My old Europe has been destroyed by empty theory, eroded by destructive fever, and light-hearted companies keep on coming up, so all the things are shaking and lacking in reality, and the idea of right and law is declining more and more."[25]

Furthermore, in the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars, Japan supplemented the shortcomings of conventional international law and set an example for the world. According to Takahashi,

"The battlefields of the two wars (the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War) were in the Far East, and many phenomena differed from those in the West. Even in such cases, the Imperial Army, in accordance with the sacred order and in accordance with humanity and in accordance with legal principles, has been able to make up for the shortcomings of international law, and has provided examples that have contributed to the revision of the Red Cross Treaty and the London Declaration."[26]

It is important to note that Japan has made a great contribution to the development of modern international law. Until then, modern international law had been created and improved on the basis of historical examples from Europe and the United States, or in other words, on the elements of similar civilizations. However, with the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars, countries with elements of different civilizations other than Western civilization injected new ideas into the existing modern international law, and this made international law truly global.

4. Conclusion

Modern international law achieved a dramatic development in the 19th century, and as we have seen, Japan also accepted modern international law by experiencing many international cases and disputes,

---

23 Nagao Aruga translated this work into Japanese and published it under the title "Nichisei Senryaku Kokusaihōron" (The International Law of the Sino-Japanese War) in 1896. In it, he wrote, "The purpose of this book is to present the detailed facts of the Sino-Japanese War, in which the enemy disregarded the rules of war but our forces complied with the rules of civilized warfare. In this way, he argues that the Japanese theory is one step ahead of the current reality in Europe. I have argued that the Japanese theory is one step ahead of the current practice in Europe." See Ichimata, above, p. 71

24 Takahashi and Aruga served in the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War and showed the world the high level of Japanese awareness of international law. In addition, Takahashi was one of the first to turn his attention to the United Kingdom and introduce British international law scholars such as Westlake, Holland, and Oppenheim and their theories to the Japanese academic community.

25 Takahashi, Sakue, p.51

26 The above article, p.50

and in the process, many major international law scholars[27] were born and became active. It was thirty years after the return of Shusuke Nishi, Shinichiro Tsuda, and Rinsho Mitsukuri, who had first studied international law in Europe during the late Edo and Meiji periods. Thereafter, international law scholars in this department published articles and works in European languages (English and French) from abroad. Among the most notable ones are Nagao Aruga's *Protection of Qing Nationals in Japan during the Sino-Japanese War* (Kokusaihō Zasshi, 1895) and *The Sino-Japanese War from the Perspective of International Law* (1896), and Sakuei Takahashi's *International Law Cases during the Sino-Japanese War* (1899), both on the Sino-Japanese War. Nagaoka Shunichi's *The Russo-Japanese War and International Law* (Kokusaihō Kankeihō Zasshi, 1904), Aruga Nagao's *The Surrender of Lushun* (Kokusaihō Kōhō Zasshi, 1907) and *The Russo-Japanese War and International Law from a Continental Perspective* (1908), and Sakue Takahashi's *International Law Applied to the Russo-Japanese War* (1908).[28]

However, it should be noted that the so-called indiscriminate view of war was generally affirmed at that time, and self-help (revenge, use of force) for illegal acts was recognized. Due to this influence, Japan's interest in international law was focused on wartime international law, and it was not until the 1890s that Japan began to pay attention to peacetime international law. Toward the end of the Meiji era, research on basic theories of international law began to be conducted in Japan, and it was Sakutaro Tachi who systematized these theories. Until then, theories had been thought of as something that reinforced and complemented the practice of international law, but Sakutaro Tachi, from the standpoint of legal positivism, appealed for the independence and importance of theories and developed his own theories. In particular, he developed his own views on the theory of sources of law, interpretation of law, and deficiency of law that were not borrowed from Western scholars.[29]

Later, the League of Nations, established after World War I, clarified the illegality of war and the collective security system, which led to a further step forward in international law. Japanese international law was dramatically developed by Kisaburo Yokota and Ryoichi Taoka, and this laid the foundation for the current international law.

---

27 The following are the major international law scholars who were active at that time. Senga Tsurutaro (1857-1927), Terao Toru (1859-1925), Aruga Nagao (1860-1921), Sakue Takahashi (1867-1920), Saburo Yamada (1869-1965), Shingo Nakamura (1870-1939), Nobuo Junpei (1871-1962), Endo Genroku (1872-1967), Yamakawa Hatao (1873-1962), Tachi Sakutaro (1874-1943), Nagaoka Shunichi Nagaoka (1877-1949). See Ichimata, above.

28 Kinji Akashi, "Nihon no Kokusaihō Hōgaku Gaikokuho no 100 Nen [100 Years of Japan's International Law]," Kokusai Shakai no Hōto Seiji [Law and Politics in International Society], Sanseido, 2001, pp.212-214

29 Murase, Shinya, "Nihon no Kokusaihō ni okeru Hōgenron no Tassei [The Phase of the Theory of Sources of Law in Japanese International Law]," Kokusai Ritsuhō [International Legislation], Toshindo, 2001, pp.47-50

*** This paper is the result of a joint research project by the author, Professor Kazuo Asano, and Professor Haruhiko Urushibata on the theme of *"The 'Free and Open Indo-Pacific' Concept and the Current Situation and Challenges of Pacific Rim Countries and Island Nations,"* and was written with the support of a research grant from Heisei International University.