

THE FULBRIGHTER
IN
CHUBU

No.7

February 1997

CHUBU GARIOA / Fulbright Alumni Association

目 次

巻頭言

自動車産業に於ける日米交流……………大石 秀夫……………1

ゲスト・スピーチ

George Washington's Farewell Address, Two Hundred Years Later:
Lasting Influence on U.S. Foreign and Domestic Policy
……………Jeffrey M. Jamison……………4

報 告

1. 総会記録……………16
2. 平成7年度決算および平成8年度予算……………18
3. 例会記録……………19

Fulbright Lecturer および Fulbright Fellow の紹介

……………20

事務局だより……………21

編集後記……………22

巻頭言

自動車産業に於ける日米交流

大石 秀夫

アメリカでの日本車の販売シェアが30%に迫るなど、市場では、激しい競争が伝えられていますが、自動車産業全体として見ると、様々な分野で日米の交流が計られています。端的な例が現地生産であり、日本の主要メーカーは、現地に工場を持ち、現地の人を雇ってかなりの量の生産を行っています。95年で見ると現地生産は約230万台であり、米国の全生産約1200万台の20%近くを占めています。生産をスムーズに行うために、多くの日本人技術者が渡米し、現地の人と共に汗を流しながら、車造りを行っています。

現在、米国で現地生産を行っている日本メーカーは、トヨタ、日産、ホンダ、マツダ、三菱、富士重工、いすずの各社で、カナダでは、トヨタとスズキが生産中です。

さらに、現地の市場に最も適した車とするため、部分的には、開発も現地で行われています。各社とも、先行開発は、カリフォルニアで、本格開発は、中西部で、というパターンが共通しています。販売においても、各社とも販売機構を持ち、現地の販売店の方の努力を日本人派遣者が支援しています。日本車といえば、おもちゃのように思われていた、1960年代から、多くの先人が、血の滲むような努力を重ねて、今日の姿が築かれたものです。

また、日本と米国メーカー（Big 3）の間では、現地生産有無に関わらず、広い分野での協力関係があり、共同開発とか、共同生産とか、現地生産車の販売協力など、様々な分野で、日米の技術者の協力が行われており、トヨタ・スズキ・いすずはGMと、日産およびマツダはFordと、三菱はクライスラーと交流あるいは連携を計っています。

これらの業務をスムーズに行うために、実用的な英語教育を盛んにする

ことも急務ですが、やはり、それ以上に仕事に対する熱意を持ち、他人に対する親切心、心配りの出来る人を育てることが根本的に必要と思われま
す。

また、アメリカは、産業の面では、日本に対する敬意も持っており、効
率の良い生産やスピードの早い開発などについては、アメリカが、日本に
随分勉強に来ています。元々、自動車産業は、アメリカで発達したもので、
私どもが社会人となった頃は、アメリカは、雲の上の存在でした。このよ
うに、良いところは、誰からでも学ぼうとするアメリカの姿勢も立派で、
今では、生産性も開発スピードも、かなり、日本に近いところまで来てい
ると聞きます。

日本と米国とは、勿論、文化や、仕事の進め方が異なりますが、基本は、
「人は皆同じ」ということで、うまく行けば喜び、失敗すれば、悲しみ、
また、それぞれの人に家族があり、楽しい時には笑い、悲しい時には涙す
るという点では同じで、そう思っつき合うと、肌の色、髪の色、目の色
の違いなどは問題では無くなります。

また、これら日本人駐在員の家族も米国で生活し、アメリカ人に触れ、
多くの体験をし、一部の子息は、米国に残って米国の大学に進み、つい
には米国人になるケースも見られます。

こういう草の根の交流が、いくつもいくつも積み重なって、国と国との
関係が出来る訳で、この点からも、改めて、フルブライト・プログラムを
立案・推進された故フルブライト上院議員の偉大さに感心致します。

先に、日経新聞で同議員の自叙伝が連載され、その中で、同議員が、セ
シル・ローズ奨学金を得て留学生となり、欧州で若い時を過ごし、その経
験がフルブライト・プログラムを作る根底になったと書かれていました。
若い日の外国生活の大切さは、私どもも充分認識するところです。

数年前に同議員夫妻が訪日された際に、東京の懇親会でお目にかかるこ
とが出来、その穏和で、優しいお人柄にすっかり魅了されてしまいました。
素晴らしい経験をさせて頂いたことの万分の一でも、世の中にお返しでき

ればとの感を深くしました。

中部地区にも、少数ではありますが、米国からのフルブライターが訪れ
ています。皆さん、日本の文化や産業に興味を持ち、好奇心一杯で、夢と
期待に溢れて日本に来られた方達です。

私どもが米国に行った頃に比べれば、メディアも発達し、相手国のこと
もよく知って居られるとは思いますが、それでも聞くと住むとは、大違い
ということもあろうかと思えます。

私たち中部同窓会も、これらのフルブライターを暖かく迎え、出来る限
りの支援の下に、日本をより良く理解して頂く努力が一層必要と思えます。

(1997年1月記)

(中部同窓会副会長、三菱自動車工業㈱)

Guest Speech

George Washington's Farewell Address, 200 Years Later:
Lasting Influence on American Domestic and Foreign Policy
Jeffrey M. Jamison

Good evening and thank you for your warm welcome and your kind invitation to speak before you this evening. As many of you may know, from your own experience in the United States, yesterday, the fourth Thursday of November, was Thanksgiving, so I wish you a Happy Thanksgiving as well.

One of the newer traditions associated with Thanksgiving, because it always falls on a Thursday, is taking the following Friday off in order to enjoy a four-day *renkyu*. I have done that as well, but although I did not work today, I am more than delighted to be with you this evening to speak with you.

When Professor Iwano first asked me if I would speak to your annual meeting, I did not hesitate to accept and jump at the chance. There were several reasons for my eager acceptance. The first is that I have, throughout my seven-year diplomatic career, always enjoyed the company of Fulbrighters, both Americans who were assigned to the countries in which I worked, and those from foreign countries whom I had the opportunity to interview before and after their experiences in the United States. I can think of no other group that is united by common purpose, capability in the English language, and interest in the United States, but also contains a wide range of diverse specialties and unique perspectives on the United States. So for that reason I wanted to come this evening.

Secondly, Professor Iwano indicated that I could speak in English. As much as I enjoy tackling the task of speaking about the United States in Japanese, I feel that in speaking English, I could speak more freely, without notes, as I plan to do this evening. Finally, Professor Iwano left the choice of topic up to me. I was quite intrigued by the chance to speak on anything I wanted.

In deciding on the topic I would address this evening, I went back to my reflections on what I wanted to accomplish in Nagoya during my four years here. More specifically, I tried to think of what big events, related to America, might be occurring in the next four years, something I could use to promote greater understanding of the U.S., something around which I could organize meaningful events regarding the U.S.

In the last twenty years, America has celebrated many important anniversaries, starting with the Bicentennial of the Declaration of Independence in 1976. Since then, we have had the bicentennials of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the rededication of the Statue of Liberty in 1986, the bicentennial of Washington's first inauguration, which was commemorated by retracing Washington's path from his home in Mount Vernon to New York City, the capital at the time. 1993 was the 250th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, which President Clinton commemorated by retracing Jefferson's steps through Virginia into Washington on the occasion of his own inauguration.

Looking at the next four years, through to the year 2000, there doesn't seem to be much for celebrating--100 years after the Spanish-American War doesn't seem to me to be a momentous occasion. But there are two events associated with the founding of the United States that took place 200 years ago: George Washington's 1797 departure from public office, combined with his farewell address, and Washington's death two years later, in 1799.

Washington's 1796 decision not to seek a third term as president was a landmark in history and certainly not an event that should be overlooked. The unprecedented relinquishing of political leadership ought to be celebrated and treasured, and the Farewell Address that Washington made to cement his decision should be commemorated, yet it is somehow overlooked. In fact, we ourselves have missed the anniversary of the address, which was delivered on September 17, 1976.

Why should it be so that Washington's farewell is neglected? One

possible explanation is that, as a forward-looking people, Americans prefer to celebrate beginnings rather than endings. Another more concrete reason is a diminished awareness of George Washington's importance in the founding of the nation. Of course, Washington is admired as a military leader who successfully waged the War of Independence against Britain, but in terms of lasting importance, people respect the men of ideas, since those have a more lasting impact to this day. Jefferson, Franklin, and the other writers of the Declaration of Independence, and Madison and Hamilton, the authors of the Federalist Papers defending the Constitution, are seen as more important, and are higher in the consciousness of their civic descendants.

It is my belief, however, that Washington's political ideas, which are perhaps best expressed in the Farewell Address, do have a lingering effect on American politics, both domestic and foreign, and that arguments in current political debates echo Washington's political ideas. But before I turn to an analysis of the Farewell Address, let me briefly discuss some of the particulars of the address.

As I mentioned previously, the Farewell Address was delivered, or more accurately, published in September 1796, appearing in a New Jersey newspaper and then circulated nationwide. This was in keeping with Washington's established practice of sending written State of the Union messages to Congress as part of his Constitutional duties as president. Now, of course, presidents not only go to Congress to deliver the State of the Union address orally, they also have the speech broadcast live to a nationwide television audience.

Washington had actually instructed James Madison, in 1792, to draft a farewell message for the end of his first term as president. Madison, trying to prevent Washington from leaving office, informed several of Washington's advisors and confidants of his plan, and they then prevailed upon Washington to accept election for a second term, which was virtually certain. In 1796, more determined to leave office, Washington asked Alexander Hamilton to polish a draft of a farewell address which he had already prepared. Scholars debate the role of Hamilton in the drafting of the address, but most agree that the ideas

of the address are Washington's own, with language crafted by Hamilton. Washington wished to make sure that his intention not to seek re-election was clear from the earliest stages, in order to clear the way for an orderly transition to the next president.

I should also add, before moving on to comments about the actual address, that I am not a professional historian. My purpose in talking about the address is to offer a review of the speech and its ideas as a helpful guide to interpreting Washington's legacy in American political life, and perhaps to provide some insights into current American political debates.

The first question, I guess, is whether Washington's political ideas, as expressed in the Farewell Address, have had a lasting impact on American political life. For a while I considered putting a question mark at the end of the title of my speech, because many do doubt that Washington was a man of ideas who left an influential legacy to the course of American politics since his departure from public life. I believe, however, that in looking at three major themes in the address, one can see reflections of current political debates in the United States.

The first major theme addressed by Washington was the role of religion and morality in public life. About that, Washington said the following:

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness--these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. . . . And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained with religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

To me, that is an extraordinary statement, and not one that you are likely to hear today. The separation of church and state is so far along today that religion is by and large removed from political debate in the U.S. Politicians do feel obligated to say "God bless America" in their speeches, and they move on to acknowledge a personal religious

devotion, but they move on to controversial ground if they cite religious motivations or justifications for their policy positions, or if they urge their fellow citizens to be more moral or religious themselves.

The current debate over the role of religion rages so fiercely today, that we realize that statements such as Washington's generally acceptable 200 years ago, would trigger uproar in today's political and social climate. Many of you are familiar with the rise of the Christian Coalition in American politics, and the split in the U.S. between those who ardently defend a role for traditional morality as a guide to policy making and those who fiercely resist the entry of religion into affairs of state. Even still, a figure such as President Clinton, who is largely identified with the political left which resists religious prescriptions for policy, had this to say as he accepted his re-election earlier this month, at the time of his greatest political triumph:

On a purely personal note, I must thank my pastor, Rex Horne, who prayed with me before I came out here tonight, and all the ministers and people of God who prayed for me and with me over the last four years. . . . [They] reminded me that humility is always in order in the presidency, for in this life we see through a glass darkly and we cannot know the whole truth of our circumstances. . . . I thank them all for bringing me closer to God and to the eternal wisdom without which a President cannot serve.

Some may argue that the statement was politically motivated and perhaps calculated, but the fact remains that the president of the United States felt he had to acknowledge divine providence. Even with the tension over the idea, Washington's conviction that religion and morality were indispensable in a republican form of government still has palpable influence in modern America.

The Second main feature of Washington's Farewell Address is Washington's arguments against the formation of political parties:

It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passion.

Washington saw the formation of political parties as a threat to the fragile American republic. The vitriol of the rivalry between the Federalists of Alexander Hamilton and John Adams, and the Democratic-Republicans led by Jefferson and Madison was to Washington a stark contrast to the unity of the revolutionary period. Washington argued that the divisiveness inherent in party politics would encourage factionalism and even invite foreign intervention into American politics, especially as the Federalists sided with Britain, and the Democratic-Republicans with France in the rivalry between the two European powers.

In the end, however, Washington's admonition was powerless to stop the formation of political party organizations, which were also developing in England between Whigs and Tories, and in the series of national assemblies in revolutionary France. To me, understanding the failure of Washington's argument requires a look at the ability of alternatives to political parties to recruit, train, and develop political leaders.

During Washington's time, at the end of the eighteenth century, there existed several sources of potential leaders, but a review of them shows, I believe, that none of them could become an effective means for the recruitment and formation of public leaders. Washington, and the generation of political leaders from Benjamin Franklin to James Madison, owed their emergence as leaders to the ferment of revolution and the immediate requirements of the struggle for independence. Certainly constant war and revolution, although it does indeed breed leaders, was not a desirable alternative. The economic sphere offered potential leaders, but in a way that would only pit the interests of New England traders and manufacturers against Southern farmers and landowners, not an appealing option to someone who abhorred faction and sectionalism as Washington did. Publishers were influential at that time, and Benjamin Franklin come from their ranks, but journalists were otherwise held in disrepute, as attested by the passage of the Sedition Act of 1789 aimed at curbing the excesses of newspaper publishers.

Lawyers were another option, and in fact many revolutionary

leaders and colonial assemblymen were trained in law, but other than John Adams, not many reached leadership positions without additional credentials. An intriguing possibility, urged by Washington himself, was the creation of a national university in the new capital of Washington, D.C. to educate future leaders through academic study and observation of republican government in action. This was another idea of Washington never enacted, and the nineteenth century fascination with the "self-made man," such as Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln, would be the final blow against the training of government officials and politicians in an elite institution.

The current alternative to political parties as training grounds for new leaders are parallel to those of two hundred years ago, and their limitations are remarkably similar as well. Frequently mentioned alternatives include the wealthy, commentators and journalists, military or other heroes, experts and technocrats, and moral figures. Leaders from each of these areas have been considered as potential national political leaders, but a look at each of these fields shows their limitations as avenues for the emergence of political leaders.

The flirtation with the candidacies of Ross Perot in 1992 and Steve Forbes in 1996 is a strong indication of the appeal of business and economic leaders to American voters, particularly with their reputations as shrewd managers who flourish in the competitive world of business, seen as more real than the political game played in Washington. But the ultimate failure of Perot and Forbes must be contrasted with the record of wealthy men who have succeeded in politics: members of the Rockefeller and Kennedy families, or the late Senator John Heinz, who were engaged in politics their careers and moved up the ranks as they gained experience. An oft-repeated adage says, "The presidency is not an entry level position."

The same principle holds true, I believe, for other fields as well. Journalists and commentators such as Pat Buchanan and Rush Limbaugh are exciting for the energy they bring to public discourse and for their enthusiasm for political debate, and therefore attractive as candidates for public office. The idea of commentators as politicians has also been reinforced by the "revolving door," by the reverse

movement of politicians into the news media--John Sununu and Geraldine Ferraro now appear on CNN's "Crossfire," Oliver North became a radio talk show host, and other political figures appear often on the circuit of public affairs discussion programs on U.S. television. It is interesting to note, however, that the one person from this field who has made significant headway into electoral politics, Pat Buchanan, has political experience from positions in both the Nixon and Reagan administrations.

Military leaders, because of the demands of their vocation and their obvious patriotism, also make attractive candidates for public office, but once you've reached the highest ranks of the military, it can be difficult to enter politics as anything but a candidate for the presidency. And a look at American history shows that unless you actually win a war--as Washington, Zachary Taylor, Ulysses Grant, and Eisenhower did--it is difficult to make the transition to political leadership. Of course, the jury is still out on Colin Powell, who may yet take the opportunity to run for the presidency in the future. Other national heroes, such as former astronaut John Glenn, have been able to enter politics but have found the transition to a national role difficult.

The appeal of the "technocratic" alternative or government by non-ideological experts surfaces once in a while, as seen in the Dukakis "management" campaign in 1988 or the failed effort to bring Peter Ueberroth, who successfully organized the 1984 Summer Olympic Games in Los Angeles, into the political sphere. But just as Washington's idea of a national university for the professional training of politicians did not take off, the stubborn American distrust of credentialed experts and intellectual elites prevents sustained support for anyone from this field. I am reminded of William F. Buckley's famous statement that he would rather be governed by the first one hundred names in the Boston telephone directory than by the faculty of Harvard University. Moral or religious figures such as Pat Robertson and Jesse Jackson have waged campaigns for the presidency, but none have gained support from a broad spectrum of the American electorate.

We must conclude, therefore, that parties provide the only viable channel for the recruitment and formation of political leaders, absent war or "world-significant" crises such as a revolution. But, on the other hand, we must acknowledge the lingering influence of Washington's admonition against parties in current American politics. Pleas for non-partisanship, disgust with so-called "gridlock" in Washington, the recent flirtation with "outsiders," or at least the need for politicians to pose as outsiders, all point to a general dissatisfaction with politicians in the U.S. Suspicion of politicians has resulted in the growing movement for term limits and support for part-time legislators who do not rely on politics and the taxpayers for their livelihood. So even though Washington was unable to prevent the tide towards political party divisions that was a phenomenon throughout the West at the end of his political career, his way of thinking still permeates American politics.

The final point of the Farewell Address that needs to be considered is Washington's thinking on foreign policy. Washington is well known for his call to avoid "permanent alliances," although it is frequently confused with Jefferson's warning against "entangling alliances" from his first inaugural address. Washington framed his contentions in this way:

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded, and that in place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. . . . Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury. . . . Likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. . . . Sympathy for the favorite nation betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification.

Washington's concern, as with the rise of political parties, was for the fragility of the United States in its infancy and the need for unity. Aligning American interests with those of any foreign power, Washington argued, would only pull the country into disputes and rivalries which did not involve direct American interests. A vulnerable country such as the United States would find survival difficult if pulled into war needlessly. Furthermore, Washington's own experience

taught him the fleeting nature of foreign alliances--he fought one war, the French and Indian War, on the side of England against France, and then fought the War of Independence against England, with assistance from France. Washington was also acutely aware of his responsibility as the nation's first chief executive to set proper precedents for his successors, who were inevitably going to emulate Washington in his behavior as president.

This avoidance of permanent alliances is often termed "isolationism," by analysts who set up a dichotomy between the Washingtonian isolationist tradition and the Wilsonian internationalism tendency in American foreign policy. I would argue that Washington's advice does not constitute isolationism, and does not call for inaction or disengagement. Although he does argue that the ways of Europe, especially its dynastic rivalries and intrigues, ought not to taint American foreign policy, Washington was ardent in his belief that America must vigorously and actively defend its interests, particularly the freedom of maritime commerce, even if it required diplomatic or military engagements with other countries. I would instead pinpoint the beginning of American isolationism at a later period, after the Spanish cession of Florida in 1819 and the declaration of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823. It was then that U.S. policy retreated into a continental or isolationist mode, having succeeded in removing external threats from the western hemisphere.

Furthermore, a look at Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points, which many consider the basic document of American internationalism, shows similarities to Washingtonian foreign policy. The points include freedom of the seas and international commerce, interests vigorously defended by almost every administration from George Washington to the present.

Therefore, the legacy of Washington which is perhaps the most tenacious and enduring is the averseness to ties with foreign powers. In the 1790s, the choice was virtually dictated by the need for national survival. The option of finding a protecting foreign power, an option taken by other countries throughout history, was anathema to Washington, who had just fought a war for independence and was not

about to "turn over the car keys" to France and French influence in U.S. politics. To be sure, U.S. geography made this option possible and ultimately successful. It is also interesting to note that this legacy of Washington may in fact be stronger in other countries, especially in the post-colonial regimes in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East which resisted alliance with the superpowers during the Cold War and founded the Non-Aligned Movement.

In this post-Cold War era, we have witnessed a resurgence of the traditional American suspicion of foreign entanglements. Echoes of Washington's ideas can be heard in the opposition to the North American Free Trade Agreement and the bailout of the Mexican peso, which are based on the argument that our economic fortunes should not be subject to uncontrollable foreign developments. Pat Buchanan's campaign against the World Trade Organization and opposition to U.S. armed forces fighting under United Nations command and insignia draw on the tradition of suspicion of foreign entanglements and on George Washington's guidance for protecting it.

Having said this, however, there is one clarification I would like to make. Many people throughout American history have argued an isolationist or anti-interventionist line based on the principle of America's uniqueness in the world. These arguments often cite the ideal of America as "a city shining on a hill," a concept that you are probably familiar with, one that was first pronounced at the beginning of the colonial period, some one hundred and fifty years before Washington came onto the national scene. This must be seen as distinct from Washington's argumentation on at least two grounds. The first is that belief in the U.S. as the "city on a hill" has been used to oppose intervention or involvement. Wilson's Fourteen Points, used to justify a "war to end all wars" and a mission to "save the world for democracy," can also be said to draw inspiration from this enduring idea.

Furthermore, although Washington was undoubtedly familiar with the "city on a hill" idea, and probably sympathetic to it, he did not base his foreign policy advice in such spiritual or philosophical grounds. The exhortation to avoid permanent alliances is founded on practical

grounds of the national interest and the need to preserve the very vulnerable new country over which he presided for eight years, the one whose primary figure he was for a quarter of a century.

That Washington should choose practical arguments over emotional appeals, and that his rhetoric should proceed from concrete matters should not at all surprise us. He chose to leave a legacy mostly regarding practical matters of state, as befits a military man who had to deal with all kinds of operational questions, and who as president had to steer his country through the political passions of his era in a balanced manner.

Washington's practicality in politics may also represent another legacy to the American people, who have always centered their politics in concrete matters and less in ideology. The American people, who are very practical (although motivated in most cases by principle), respond to Washington's concerns, and we can say finally that Washington's thought and ideas, as expressed in the Farewell Address, continue to have a strong hold on the American psyche.

(Excerpts from talk given on November 29, 1996)

Mr. Jeffrey M. Jamison is Director, Nagoya American Center

報 告

1. 総会記録

平成8年度の中部同窓会総会は、南山大学にて、5月26日(土)午後6時30分から、会員11名の出席を得て開催された。今回はゲストはお迎えせず、来期の役員改選に伴う同窓会ならびに事務局運営に関する問題を討議する場とした。

会長挨拶に続き、総会議長に上田慶一氏を選出して議事を進めた。主な内容は以下の通りである。

1. 平成7年度事業報告の件：ガリオア・フルブライト中部同窓会総会の開催(平成7年5月26日)、例会の開催(平成7年11月25日)、会員名簿・NEWSLETTERの発行、Fulbright Fellowsの受入
2. 平成7年度(平成7年4月ー平成8年3月)決算報告ならびに監査報告の件：別記の通り承認された。
3. 平成8年度事業計画案の件：総会・例会の開催、会員名簿・NEWSLETTER 発行の計画につき説明があり、承認された。
4. 平成8年度予算案の件：別記の原案通り、承認された。
5. 今後の中部同窓会運営の件：

現在は、南山大学に事務局を置き、大学の協力を得て、人件費(役員会・総・例会を除く)、印刷代金(冊子除く)、封筒等の備品代等を同窓会からの出費なしで賄っており、同窓会は現状の年会費で十分に運営できている。しかし、現会長が役員を退かれた後、このまま継続して南山大学に事務局を置くことは困難であり、別のところに依頼

した場合も、現行の年会費での運営は難しいという問題が残る。この点を解決すべく、参加者全員で議論した。

中部同窓会の現状として、新しい人材の不足、会員の高齢化が挙げられ、若手のフルブライターが、同窓会を通じて何らかの感謝の気持ちを表そうとはしなくなっているのではないかと思われる。ここで現在の同窓会の存在意義を再確認すると、30周年募金、又、40周年募金に貢献したことで、ある程度の目的は達成されたとし、事務局運営の問題を機に解散、または休会もやむを得ないとの意見が出された。更に事務局を運営せず、総・例会も開催せずに年会費を本部に寄附として納める方が有益である、との意見も出された。

また、事務局運営を検討して下さる会員の方もあったが、後日お断りのお返事を頂いた。

この議案に関しては、6月の役員会でも再検討され、会員数の多い名古屋大学で、次期会長、事務局をお世話頂くのがよいとの意見となった。9月には、現役員と名古屋大学学長との話し合いの場が持たれ、「大学としての対応は難しいが、学部単位であれば可能」とのことであった。平成9年度の総会での新役員の選出と同時に事務局も移行する予定である。