PANEL II

FRAMING RESPONSIBILITY: GLOBAL JUSTICE, AND DEMOCRATIC CHALLENGES

MODERATORS

YASUSHI WATANABE

PROFESSOR AT KEIO UNIVERSITY
/ SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW AT NIRA

PANELISTS

MAIKO ICHIHARA

PROFESSOR, HITOTSUBASHI UNIVERSITY

HIROHIDE TAKIKAWA

PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO

ISABELLE GIRAUDOU

PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO

Framing Responsibility: Global Justice, and Democratic Challenges

Yasushi WATANABE

Introduction

In Panel 1, each speaker addressed the legal, economic, and social challenges arising as the world grapples with increasingly severe environmental problems, driven in large part by climate change. They reflected on the measures taken so far and explored potential avenues for responsible action. Panel 2, titled "Challenges for Global Justice and Democracy," approached the conference's overarching theme of "responsibility" from the perspectives of democracy and justice.

Democracy today faces significant challenges. The decline of the middle class, widening inequality, and the rise of exclusionary nationalism have contributed to deep divisions in many democratic societies. These divisions extend beyond conventional political disagreement; they reflect fundamentally incompatible worldviews, in which opposing sides view each other as existential threats. This can lead people to justify authoritarian measures to protect 'our' democracy from 'them', ironically undermining the very values they claim to protect. Alarmingly, there is growing concern that democratic processes themselves, particularly elections, may be exploited to entrench authoritarianism, fostering a climate of polarization reminiscent of Weimar Germany in the 1930s.

On the global stage, authoritarian regimes are gaining influence, while the narrative championed by democratic nations appears to be losing its appeal. Former colonial powers, in particular, are increasingly questioned about what moral authority they possess to advocate for democracy. Their perceived hypocrisy—espousing democratic principles while failing to consistently uphold them—undermines trust and credibility. Meanwhile, even within democratic countries, contradictions abound, with reality often falling far short of the values they claim to uphold. Consequently, their promotion of democratic ideals can ring hollow and even provoke resistance, no matter how eloquently articulated. Such sentiment is especially common across the countries of the Global South, where people often recognize the importance of democratic values in the abstract, yet struggle to fully embrace the Western-centric framing of those ideals.

It is against this backdrop that we find the idea of a free and open world, built on democracy and the rule of law, at a critical crossroads. With a shared sense of the current moment's urgency, each of Panel 2's speakers drew on their respective areas of expertise, to examine the vulnerabilities of democracy in contemporary society, the contradictions inherent in democratic principles themselves, and the pursuit of global justice through environmental litigation.

1. Maiko ICHIHARA: Three Distinct Dimensions of Democracy: Values, Institutions, and Ideology

Professor Ichihara addressed the challenges facing democracy from both domestic and international political perspectives, based on the panel's subtitle "Challenges of Global Justice and Democracy."

Democracy can be understood through three distinct dimensions: institutions, values, and ideology. The first two—institutions and values—are primarily domestic in nature. Institutions form the structural foundation of democracy, while values serve to protect and sustain those institutions. The third dimension, ideology, emerges in the realm of international politics.

For all the talk of democracy, there is no universally accepted definition, remaining instead a subject of ongoing debate. For the purposes of this discussion, however, democracy should be understood to encompass several widely accepted conditions: regular free and fair elections, broad electoral eligibility, and the protection of civil liberties necessary for such elections to take place. These civil liberties include the freedoms of speech, assembly, and association—rights that enable citizens to act freely. To safeguard these liberties, democratic countries establish systems such as the separation of powers, the rule of law, and legal protections for individual rights.

However, these institutions can be surprisingly fragile, in much the same way as the ice atop a frozen pond can be unpredictably thin. Even if the legal framework remains unchanged, sustained attacks on the values that uphold these institutions can gradually erode their effectiveness. For example, in the United States, recent developments include the use of temporary budgets that diminish Congress's authority over fiscal matters, disregard for Supreme Court rulings, restrictions on media access to the White House, and attacks on the rights of transgender individuals. While these actions may not directly alter the formal legal structure, they undermine the commitment to democratic values.

Therefore, protecting democracy requires not only defending its institutions but also actively upholding the values that support them. Actions taken to preserve these values function as "soft guardrails" for democracy (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). For democracy to thrive, institutional design alone is insufficient— a deep commitment to democratic values is essential.

Turning to international politics, Ichihara examines democracy's role as an ideological construct, highlighting the complex interplay among three key entities: the state, war, and democracy.

The analysis begins with the argument that modern nation-states emerged through war as various territorial entities in Europe competed militarily. Those most capable of sustaining large armies and financing that warfare eventually evolved

into sovereign states (Tilly, 1975). These sovereign states would go on to form the Westphalian system which became the foundation of the modern international order.

Then, as these sovereign states adopted democratic governance, a social contract emerged between the states and their citizens. Citizens began to identify as members of the nation, and the state, in turn, provided public goods—such as democratic institutions and values—to maintain domestic order (Jackson, 1990).

This has come play an important role in times of war, with democratic states frequently mobilizing their populations by invoking moral principles, including democracy itself (Way, 2022). When cooperating with other countries, they frame their actions as an expression of solidarity among fellow democracies. In these international narratives, democracy is rarely addressed in terms of institutions or values (see Quadrant I in Figure 1). Instead, the concept of democracy functions ideologically—as a rhetorical tool to delineate adversarial relationships. This pattern was evident during World War II and the Cold War, and continues to shape political discourse in the 21st century.

It is important to recognize that what is often described as a "fight to protect democracy" may not, in practice, constitute a defense of democratic institutions or values. Rather, it may reflect an effort to defend states that possess democratic institutions. In such instances, the concept of democracy is invoked in a manner detached from its institutional and value-based meanings.

Figure 2: Threats to Democratic Systems and Ideals

	Democracies	Autocracies
International	"Us" and "Them" as Mobilization Discourse: • World War II Era: Fascism vs. Democracy • Cold War Era: Communism vs. Democracy • 21st century: Authoritarianism vs. Democracy These are not battles to defend democracy itself; rather, they are battles to defend nations that possess democratic institutions.	Influence Operations: • Disseminate disinformation and malinformation to accelerate the fragmentation and destabilization of democratic societies. • Spread disinformation and malinformation to worsen relations between democratic nations.
Domestic	Attacks on customs, values, and norms undermine and	Cynical use of concepts such as elections, human rights, the

	delegitimize institutions.	rule of law, and democracy—distorting their meaning to legitimize authoritarian rule while stripping these principles of their association with liberty.

Sources: Prof. Ichihara's handout.

Today, democracy is under attack both domestically and internationally. Within democratic societies, sustained assaults on core democratic values are gradually eroding institutional integrity. Simultaneously, the very concept of democracy is increasingly perceived as hypocritical in both domestic and international discourse.

This is compounded by influence operations undertaken by authoritarian regimes to undermine the belief in, and commitment to, democratic values within free societies. These include disinformation campaigns and the deliberate spread of malicious content aimed at accelerating social fragmentation and destabilizing democratic societies. Similar tactics are also employed to damage relationships between democratic nations.

Manipulation also occurs within authoritarian regimes themselves. Foundational liberal concepts such as elections, human rights, the rule of law, and democracy are distorted and repurposed to legitimize authoritarian rule. Because these concepts carry international credibility, authoritarian governments selectively reinterpret them to reinforce their claims to legitimacy. For example, even blatantly fraudulent elections are presented as genuine expressions of popular will, with claims that the government was "elected" by the people. Regarding human rights, authoritarian regimes may emphasize social and developmental rights while deliberately sidelining civil liberties.

In this way, democracy finds itself under assault from all sides— undermined from within by domestic actors in democratic societies, and pressured from without by, authoritarian states internationally.

2. Hirohide TAKIKAWA: Responsibility to Whom? The Limits and Hopes of Democracy

"To whom are we responsible?" This was the question Professor Takikawa posed to the audience as a guiding thread with which to explore both the limitations and the potential of democracy.

The first port of call is the boundary problem in democratic theory. At its core, this issue concerns the question of who constitutes the demos—that is, the body of

individuals entitled to participate in democratic decision-making. A nation state is by definition, an entity that must define and enforce boundaries. A fundamental challenge then for democratic states is where and how to draw those lines, and thus who will, and will not, be included in the demos.

Logically speaking however, that challenge is actually a contradiction that cannot be resolved democratically. This is because, attempting to determine who should be included in a democratic process leads to a paradox: such a decision presupposes an already defined demos with the authority to make it. Any effort to resolve this democratically results in an infinite regress of prior decisions about who may decide what.

In practice, most democratic states adopt a pragmatic solution: they limit the demos to adult citizens. This vests decision-making authority in those with the requisite citizenship above a certain age, while excluding all others. Although this approach offers administrative clarity, it introduces its own problems—particularly when considering the two key limitations discussed below.

The first of these limitations on democracy is spatial. Because the demos is defined by national citizenship, democratic participation is limited to citizens, and excludes non-citizens—in effect the vast majority of those residing beyond the relevant national borders. Yet in today's interconnected world, decisions made within one country often have far-reaching consequences that impact those in other countries. However, no matter how great the transnational impact, those affected outside the demos have no formal means of influencing such decisions. This disconnect contributes to global injustice, with poverty and inequality serving as prime examples. As long as the demos remains confined to citizens, these challenges cannot be adequately addressed.

The second major limitation on democracy is temporal. Democracy empowers current voters to shape present-day policies, even though those decisions inevitably affect future generations. Take, for example, Japan's pension system: amid declining birthrates and a rapidly aging population, its long-term sustainability is in question. Yet the individuals who will bear the consequences—children and future citizens—are excluded from the decision-making process. Environmental issues present a similar dilemma. Democracy, as currently practiced, lacks the mechanisms to fully account for the interests of those who cannot yet participate.

These limitations expose a structural "responsibility deficit" inherent in democracy—namely, its lack of accountability to those positioned outside its boundaries. By design, democracy distinguishes between insiders and outsiders, systemically disregarding the interests of those outside it. Spatially, this refers to individuals in other countries who are affected by the decisions of that democracy but denied participation in it. Temporally, it refers to future generations whose lives will be shaped by choices they had no voice in.

To address this deficit, Takikawa outlines three possible responses. The first is to maintain the status quo, in deference to the perceived difficulty of reform. The second is to expand the demos, thereby reducing the number of those excluded and

enhancing democratic accountability to external stakeholders. The third is to abandon the expectation that democracy alone can resolve these issues, and instead pursue alternative institutional frameworks better suited to addressing the relevant challenges. In the following discussion, he focuses on the second and third approaches.

Beginning with the second option, Takikawa explores the possibility of expanding the demos through the all-affected principle—a prominent concept in philosophy of law. According to this principle, the boundaries of democratic inclusion should be determined by the extent to which individuals are affected by political decisions; all those impacted are entitled to participate in the decision-making process. This notion closely parallels the well-known American slogan, "No taxation without representation."

Applying the all-affected principle to the demos would lead to a multitude of far-reaching changes. The right to vote likely would no longer be limited to citizens and would be conferred upon foreign nationals. This extension of voting rights would not be limited merely to those within a nation's borders, but would instead extend to those living outside the country who are materially affected by its policies. Under such a framework, for example, non-citizens would likely be eligible to vote in U.S. presidential elections due to the global nature of that country's influence.

Another likely consequence of applying the all-affected principle would be the potential inclusion of children in the electorate. Although no country currently grants voting rights to those under the age of majority, children are undeniably impacted by political decisions. On this basis, they too could be considered rightful participants in democratic processes. Some theorists go even further, arguing that future generations—those not yet born—should also be represented. However, from a practical standpoint, it is difficult to imagine how future generations could be legitimately included in the voting process. Those who do not yet exist by definition cannot express their preferences, and it remains unclear who could legitimately speak on their behalf. The question of how anyone can authentically claim to honestly represent the interests of future individuals is undoubtedly a difficult one.

Thus, while the all-affected principle offers a compelling framework for addressing the spatial exclusions of democracy, it falls short when attempting to resolve its temporal limitations.

As the preceding discussion illustrates, democracy possesses inherent limitations. By its very nature, it delineates boundaries—creating an "outside" and excluding those deemed outsiders. While democracy remains a vital framework for collective decision-making, it must be employed with a clear awareness of its constraints.

In light of these limitations, it is essential to explore institutional arrangements that extend beyond the democratic paradigm. One such approach involves constitutional recognition of children's rights. This would empower courts to adjudicate cases concerning those rights, thereby introducing a form of accountability that operates outside traditional democratic mechanisms. Although

judicial review is not a strictly democratic process, it can nonetheless serve as an alternative means of fulfilling societal responsibilities.

Democracy is not a bad or fundamentally flawed system, but it is also, as discussed, not all-encompassing. To ensure that we do not abandon responsibility in those areas where democracy falls short, we must consider complementary institutional designs capable of addressing its blind spots.

3. Isabelle GIRAUDOU: The Reconceptualization of Responsibility as Response-ability in Times Called the Anthropocene: An Ultimate Thought Experiment for Lawyers?

Professor Giraudou examines the complex challenges faced by lawyers engaged in international climate change litigation in the Anthropocene era, exploring how the notion of responsibility might be reconceptualized as "response-ability." The Anthropocene, a geological concept, denotes an epoch in which human activity became the dominant force shaping the Earth's environment and ecosystems.

By emphasizing the global scale of humanity's collective impact—which threatens both ecological integrity and human survival—the Anthropocene concept offers an alternative framing to the traditional narrative of "ecological destruction" which posited the environment as something external to human society. Instead, the Anthropocene positions humans as embedded within and inseparable from ecological systems.

That said, applying the Anthropocene concept to human induced environmental change is not always a perfect fit. For example, the Anthropocene does not distinguish between humans, human activity, and the "more-than-human world," and is unable to differentiate between actors with varying degrees of responsibility for climate change. As a result, it risks obscuring critical questions of accountability. Nonetheless, the concept has opened space for a reimagining of models of responsibility that move beyond conventional moral and legal frameworks.

Traditionally, environmental law has conceptualized nature primarily as a resource—an asset to be managed and regulated. Within this framework, humans are simultaneously positioned as both steward and sovereign of the natural world. This anthropocentric perspective continues to dominate much of international environmental legal thought, with many scholars having yet to meaningfully integrate the concept of the Anthropocene into their theoretical or normative frameworks.

Nonetheless, some scholars have begun to challenge the conventional, anthropocentric framework. The emergence of Anthropocene theory has thus

introduced significant shifts in international environmental law discourse. By interrogating what constitutes responsible action in the Anthropocene, the central premise of the theory becomes clear: the inextricable entanglement of humans and the more-than-human world. This recognition opens the door to a critical reassessment of conventional legal concepts such as state responsibility and environmental protection.

To illustrate these shifts, Giraudou focuses on international climate change litigation. Transnational climate change litigation has increasingly emerged as a strategic instrument for compelling both state and non-state actors to take meaningful action. Fundamentally, litigation functions as an opportunity to tell stories—stories about justice and harm. It also serves as a reflective mechanism that can expose contradictions within the law.

Climate change litigation, in particular, has illuminated deep-seated conflicts in legal reasoning. The following section explores the evolving strategies that have arisen through such litigation, assesses their effectiveness in responding to ecological vulnerability, and considers how their limitations might be addressed through legal innovation and institutional reform.

The traditional liberal approach focuses on actual harms—whether past or ongoing—experienced by human victims within a state's territorial jurisdiction. States are held accountable for wrongful acts, if those acts or omissions fall within their territorial jurisdiction. However, because environmental damage can easily spread beyond the borders of a single state, it can quickly become difficult both to assign fault and hold those responsible accountable when the harm is transnational.

To address this, multilateral legal frameworks have emerged to facilitate preventive and managerial cooperation among states. Yet, the harm caused by fossil-fuel-based economies in the Anthropocene differs fundamentally from conventional pollution. Climate harms, unlike traditional cross-border pollution, involve causes and effects that are deeply entangled and spread across multiple spaces, time periods, and actors. Defendants often exploit this complexity to avoid responsibility, arguing that climate change is a global phenomenon beyond any single actor's control.

Despite improvements in international regulations addressing the above issues, challenges remain. Existing human rights systems require a causal link between specific harm and rights violations, which makes litigation difficult—creating a procedural barrier. Claimants have pushed for looser links between individual perpetrators and victims of climate harm.

This has led to the rise of what can be called a progressive critical approach that expands the scope of responsibility—from actual harm to potential harm, from human rights to non-human rights, from territorial to extra-territorial obligations, and from present generations to future ones. This approach is increasingly entering mainstream legal discourse and practice.

However, this approach is not sufficient, for it still falls short of recognizing the entanglement of climate harms across space, time, and species. Scholars

advocating for a reparative approach take seriously the entangled nature of climate change's causes. This approach reconfigures traditional rights-based frameworks around questions of subjectivity, spatiality, and temporality (Petersmann, 2024). This includes shifting the scope of attention and accountability from potential harm to entangled harm, from non-human rights to a more-than-human ethic of care, from extra-territorial boundaries to terrestrial space, and from future generations to enduring temporalities. This approach allows claimants to seek repair across multiple spatiotemporal dimensions, offering a qualitative shift toward justice grounded in more-than-human care.

In conclusion, the transboundary and enduring nature of climate harms challenges existing environmental and human rights law. It calls for flexible, imaginative governance that attends to more-than-human concerns. The central question—what critical legal scholars call "response-ability" in the Anthropocene—should prompt us to look beyond conventional legal frameworks. We must explore legal mechanisms that account for entangled harms, more-than-human care, and the deep temporal and spatial dimensions of climate change. The Anthropocene narrative challenges not just the justiciability of climate harms, but also how we imagine and respond to ambiguous harms and disproportionate vulnerabilities in our time.

4. Discussion, Question & Answer Session

Following the three presentations, a wide-ranging discussion unfolded with topics including the decline of democracy, its sustainability, and the implications for the global order.

Democratic Backsliding

One of the primary concerns was the impact of democracy's retreat. Once regarded as the sole legitimate form of governance, democracy now faces internal threats—even from leaders within democratic nations. For example, U.S. President Donald Trump actively undermined democratic values, raising fears that democracy may soon be viewed as merely one political system among many, rather than an ideal type.

Ichihara responded by observing that President Trump demonstrated a lack of respect for democratic principles and predicted that such values would continue to be subject to relativization. She further warned that China has increasingly claimed to embody democratic principles, posing a risk of redefining and appropriating the concept of liberal democracy. As a countermeasure, she emphasized the importance of constantly articulating narratives centered on liberal values.

The discussion also explored the potential unraveling of the liberal international order as a consequence of democratic backsliding—most notably in the United States,

which, as the sole global superpower, has long supplied essential public goods to uphold that order. Should the U.S. disengage from its role as a steward of international norms, the current system could give way to a resurgence of 19th-century-style power politics. To prevent this, the international order must be rebuilt in a way that avoids the perception of imposing Western values—particularly among the nations of the Global South.

Ichihara proposed moving away from dependence on U.S. hegemony in favor of a multilateral approach to global governance. She called for shared leadership from both established powers—such as Japan, Europe, and Canada—and emerging actors, including South Korea, Taiwan, and India. Moreover, she emphasized the importance of engaging a broad spectrum of stakeholders, NGOs, media organizations, and academic researchers, in partnership with democratic governments through "Track 1.5 Diplomacy."

War and Democracy

While the concept of a "just war" has been extensively examined within both moral and legal frameworks, a more complex inquiry that deserves attention is: is it possible for war to embody democratic principles?

Ichihara cited Ukraine as a case in point. In the face of Russian aggression, Ukraine has been compelled to affirm its democratic credentials to secure support from fellow democracies. This has prompted the Ukrainian government to combat corruption. However, certain wartime measures—such as the banning of opposition parties alleged to have pro-Russian sympathies and the centralization of media under state control—complicate Ukrainian assertions of democratic governance.

Therefore, Ukraine's wartime measures cannot be unequivocally characterized as democratic. Nonetheless, democratic allies may be willing to tolerate certain illiberal actions, given that Russia initiated a unilateral invasion and operates under an authoritarian regime.

The Future of Democracy

Although modern democracy appears to be in decline, it has served as an effective system of governance for 80 years since the end of World War II. Yet if democracy is to avoid becoming a historical artifact, we must consider what institutional reforms can be undertaken to ensure its continued survival and relevance for future generations.

One point of view is that there has always been a certain degree of skepticism surrounding democracy itself—specifically, whether citizens have ever truly been able to exercise their sovereign will in a meaningful way. Engaging with such criticisms in a thoughtful and substantive manner may require the contemplation of political frameworks that transcend conventional democratic models.

In response to the above, Takikawa cautioned against abandoning democracy or pursuing radical alternatives. Instead, he advocated for comparative analysis, emphasizing that even in its weakened state, democracy continues to outperform

authoritarianism in both procedural integrity and policy outcomes. Citizens in democratic societies retain a greater capacity to express their will than those living under authoritarian rule. For this reason, democracy should remain the system of choice.

Takikawa highlighted how incremental reform is generally more effective than the pursuit of new and novel approaches. He underscored the diversity of democratic systems and stressed the importance of diagnosing and categorizing their specific challenges in order to address them effectively. To support gradual improvement, he called for the use of complementary mechanisms—such as the rule of law and the democratic values and norms highlighted by Ichihara—as pillars that reinforce democracy.

Defining the Demos

Even if democracy is preferable to authoritarianism, it still faces unresolved challenges—chief among them, the question of how to define the demos. As Takikawa noted, democracy cannot determine its own boundaries democratically. Yet boundaries must inevitably be drawn, for which defined criteria are necessary.

Future generations exemplify those systematically excluded from present-day democratic processes. Embracing the concept of generational sovereignty—where each generation is recognized as possessing sovereignty—implies that the current generation is infringing upon the sovereignty of future generations. This underscores the need for mechanisms to mitigate the negative effects of boundary-drawing.

Even if the drawing of boundaries is unavoidable, one may question their ethical legitimacy. As Takikawa noted, while the act of boundary-drawing may be inevitable, the rationales behind them must be subject to ongoing scrutiny. If these justifications are reassessed and found wanting, it follows that the boundaries themselves may need to be redrawn.

However, Takikawa noted that when defining the scope of the demos, non-human entities are inevitably excluded—particularly when the framework is based on the binary relationship between humans and non-humans. He argued that this approach contrasts with Giraudou's perspective, which emphasizes ethical responsibility toward non-human beings. In response, Giraudou proposed reimagining the very notion of the boundary between inside and outside. Rather than focusing on the dichotomy itself, she suggested shifting attention to the dynamics within the internal sphere, what she called "intra-relations." This conceptual transformation, she argued, could offer a vital foundation for rethinking the meaning and scope of responsibility.

The Significance of the Anthropocene

The discussion also explored the origins and implications of the Anthropocene concept. According to Giraudou, the term is not new—it was discussed in 19th-century France and popularized in 2000 by atmospheric chemist Paul Crutzen.

Giraudou explained that environmental activists and legal scholars have embraced this concept as a valuable opportunity to develop their thinking from a critical perspective. The idea has since been further developed within the fields of environmental law and litigation. Lawyers involved in climate change litigation are increasingly attentive to theoretical advancements that can inform and strengthen their legal strategies. These strategies often draw upon academic discourse, which in turn incorporates practical legal considerations. As a result, the theory of the Anthropocene and legal practice have come to shape one another in a mutually reinforcing manner. Giraudou emphasized that the concept of the Anthropocene already exerts tangible influence—both intellectually and operationally—within the domain of international climate change litigation.

Panel 2 of the conference "How to Act Responsibly Today? Politics of Law in Europe and Japan" (held on April 26, 2025), titled "Frameworks of Responsibility: Challenges for Global Justice and Democracy," addressed the overarching theme of "responsibility" by examining how we should respond to the various challenges confronting contemporary democracy. Although the three presentations were distinct in content, they shared interrelated perspectives.

Ichihara underscored the urgency of defending liberal democracy against ongoing assaults. Yet she did not advocate for protecting all aspects of democracy equally. Instead, her emphasis lay in preserving the values, norms, and customs that function as democracy's "soft guardrails"—essential elements especially susceptible to erosion. This distinction illuminates both the foundational essence of democracy and its inherent vulnerability. Safeguarding formal institutions alone is insufficient; it demands a sustained sense of civic responsibility, expressed through everyday efforts to uphold the normative framework that gives those institutions meaning.

In doing so, we must acknowledge that democracy, by its nature, draws boundaries, excluding those outside its framework. Yet these excluded individuals may still be affected by decisions made within democratic systems, and their exclusion can foster resentment. The most difficult case, as Takikawa pointed out, involves future generations. Because their preferences cannot be adequately represented by the current generation, any decision we make risks encroaching upon their sovereignty. Neglecting their interests perpetuates a cycle in which burdens are passed down from one generation to the next, ultimately jeopardizing the sustainability of our society—and eventually democracy itself.

Takikawa and Giraudou offered contrasting approaches to addressing democracy's boundary problem. Takikawa acknowledged democracy's inherent boundaries but argued that, compared to other political systems, democracy remains superior. He advocated for responsible action within the existing democratic framework, suggesting that we either revise the boundaries or mitigate their negative effects through mechanisms other than democracy. In this view, democracy should be steadily improved rather than radically transformed.

In contrast, Giraudou highlighted emerging approaches in climate change litigation inspired by the Anthropocene concept—approaches that fundamentally

reject fixed boundaries. For her, responsible action or "response-ability" entails continuous search for novel, previously unimagined approaches. Rather than working within existing systems, she called for innovation that transcends traditional frameworks.

Ultimately, responsible action can take many forms. We may choose from existing models or create new ones. What matters is that we remain committed to acting responsibly in the face of complex and evolving global challenges.

References

Robert Jackson (1990) *Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Third World*, Cambridge University Press.

Marie Petersmann (2024) "Entangled Harms: A Reparative Approach to Climate Justice," *LSE, Legal Studies Working Paper No. 19*, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5054925

Charles Tilly ed. (1975) *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*, Princeton University Press.

Lucan Way (2022) "The Rebirth of the Liberal World Order?," *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 33, Issue 2, pp. 5-17, https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/the-rebirth-of-the-liberal-world-order/

Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt (2018) *How Democracies Die*, Crown.

Conference Report: How To Act Responsibly Today? Politics Of Law in Europe and Japan

Published by Nippon Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA)
150-6034, Yebisu Garden Place Tower, 34th Floor
4-20-3 Ebisu, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo, Japan
Phone: +81 3-5448-1710
https://english.nira.or.jp/