

2008年4月10日

FAISD 国際開発研究センター

小野真依

土岐啓道

FASID・アジアファンデーション共同セミナー報告

1. 会合：FASID・アジアファンデーション共同セミナー「紛争と国家の脆弱性」
2. 日時：平成20年2月29日（金）14:00～17:00
3. 場所：FASID4階セミナールーム
4. 報告者：
Rood氏（アジアファンデーション フィリピン事務所代表）
Parks氏（アジアファンデーション 紛争・ガバナンス担当リージョナルディレクター）
秋山孝允（日本大学教授、FASID 参与）
小野真依（FASID ジュニア・プログラムオフィサー）
5. ファシリテーター：湊直信（FASID 国際開発研究センター所長代行）
6. 出席者：18名

7. 議論：

アジアファンデーションフィリピン事務所代表 Rood 氏・紛争・ガバナンス担当リージョナルディレクター Parks 氏が来日した機会に、FASID や様々な援助関係者との意見交換の場を提供するため、「紛争と国家；脆弱性」をテーマに、FASID とアジアファンデーションが共同セミナーを開催した。FASID からは日本の「脆弱国家」支援へのあり方と展望について、アジアファンデーションからは Parks 氏より center-periphery conflict 概念を用いた「脆弱性」の分析を、Rood 氏よりフィリピンでの紛争調停の事例紹介を行った。

講演者の発表の後は質疑応答が行われ、その中で、様々な地域の夫々の脆弱国家が持つ特性を理解し、社会的構造、さらには政治的要因も考慮にいたした対策を行っていく事の必要性、そしてそういった対策を進めていく上での、夫々の地域のアクター（NGO、企業、地方政府等）とのパートナーシップを促進する事の重要性等について話し合われた。以下は本講演の要旨である。

What Japan (and other donor governments) can do to assist Fragile States

Takamasa Akiyama, Professor, Nihon University / Senior Advisor, FASID

Mai Ono, Junior Program Officer, FASID

This presentation is based on the paper by FASID which focuses on the strategies, approaches and project implementation of Japan might apply in dealing with so-called "Fragile States (FS)". The

outbreak of 911 terrorist attacks has drawn the international attention to FS especially in terms of the global security problem: FS can be a potential hotbed for terrorist organizations and international crimes (such as drug trafficking). The costs of assisting FS can also become high unless measures are taken early, as is shown in the case of US intervention to Iraq and Afghanistan. FS also present humanitarian and poverty challenges, as the majorities of FS are experiencing difficulty in achieving MDGs. Further, there are China problem especially in FS that are rich in natural resources.

The widely-accepted definition on the FS is provided by OECD-DAC, which defines state fragility in terms of capacity and/or willingness of state structures in delivering key services needed for poverty reduction, development, security and the protection of human rights of their people. Many international donors have been undertaking organizational rearrangements to adopt more integrated policy responses among which is 3Ds (Defense, Diplomacy, Development) employed for instance by US and UK. Japan does not have explicit policies for FS but has provided assistance to war-torn FSs through its peace-building efforts.

Engaging with FS requires a development assistance paradigm shift. Political and social institution building and strengthening are key agenda, which calls for both improved ways of political intervention and also a long-term donor commitment. Because an FS is a heterogeneous group of countries, intensive interdisciplinary approach (ex. more Economic and Sector Work (ESW)) and the identification of comparative strength of each donor and organization is strongly needed. More research conducted in collaboration with researchers in FSs themselves would also be useful.

It is thus critical that donors adopt innovative approaches in assisting FSs. For example, World Bank, in its effort to enhance the Bank internal support for and its field presence in states with fragile institutions and conflict-affected countries, has made working experience in FSs as one of the promotion criteria for its staff. Also because economic growth is indispensable in the long-term development, there is a need for economic growth model for FSs and this requires donors to closely collaborate with the private sector including local NGOs in donor countries to assist the private sector of FSs to develop.

Defining the Most Critical Problem: State Fragility vs. Center-Periphery Conflict

Tom Parks, Regional Director, Conflict and Governance, The Asia Foundation

The Fragile States Agenda in Asia

Tackling the problem of fragile states is important for overseas development

assistance and has taken on a greater priority in foreign policy in the past 6 years. However, there are many competing definitions of state fragility, and there is little consensus on the fragile states agenda between major donor nations. Nevertheless, there are some common characteristics in the definitions of fragile state, including weak governance institutions, risk of further weakening or collapse, inability to provide physical security, and risk of conflict and instability. Not all fragile states have conflict, however, most of them have fragility in state institution and that will bring risk of conflict in the future.

Although this agenda seems to help identify fragile state that might fall in conflict in the future, there are some critiques in fragile state agenda. First of all, fragile state agenda focuses on national state level and does not address the sub-national level. In Asia, what drives conflict exists within peripheral area in the country and center can be relatively secure so that there is necessity to look at sub-national level. Next is that assistance to fragile state tends to address immediate problems and mostly strengthens the center without considering the problems of the center. Moreover, fragile state agenda is state governance level intervention and it does not consider local population so that grievances of populations in the conflict-affected regions are rarely addressed.

Defining the Problem in Asia; Center-Periphery Conflicts

In Asia, the state's inability to maintain authority over conflict-affected peripheral regions is a greater concern than the fragility of national institutions and most cases of violent conflict in Asia is center-periphery conflict. Center-periphery conflicts raise an important set of issues that largely fall outside of the existing fragile states discourse.

In most cases of center-periphery conflict, the center's approach for managing the periphery is characterized by strengthening central institutions, state penetration, and combination of coercion and cooption. These approaches can result in discriminatory policies or governance practices; skewed resource distribution; key grievances of minority group unaddressed; limited participation of minority group in local and national affairs; failure of state to provide equal protection to a minority group or region. Those factors will exacerbate center-periphery conflicts.

Recommendations for Donors

Regarding those issues, there are some recommendations to address center-periphery conflict in Asia. Firstly, donors should focus their conflict mitigation strategies on center-periphery conflict and sub-national problems. Fragile states

approaches should be more responsive to local conditions, and focus on sub-national challenges. Second, donors should expand support to non-state actors, especially those from conflict-affected regions, to complement funding to government. Donor support must be driven by a nuanced understanding of local conflicts. Finally, donor support must utilize long-term approaches that address underlying problems.

Strategic Approaches for Addressing Violent Conflict

Steven Rood, Philippines Country Representative, The Asia Foundation

Violent conflict in Asia

In violent conflict in Asia, there are some common problems. At first, peripheral conflict is typical in Asia and peripheral areas is often country's poorest. In peripheral areas, social indicators such as health and education which accumulate human capital are low and state education systems are viewed with suspicion that education is part of attempt of central state to assimilate diverse identities. The second problem is that such an area is trapped in a cycle of violence and poverty. In conflict area, human and financial capital flow away because people tend to invest in peaceful area more than conflict area and as a result, difference between conflict affected area and peaceful are is exacerbated. The third is that exacerbation of conflict because of short term economic development assistance. Short term economic development assistance threaten monopoly control of resources of state and can also make non-state economic entity nervous and as a result, that threatens both state and non-state local power structures. The fourth is poor understanding of multiple causality of conflict. Each conflict has different characters and lack of understanding of them will worsen the situation so there is necessity to try to understand nature of conflict. The Asia Foundation (TAF) attempts to meet the challenges of those problems through foreign assistance.

Difficulties in addressing protracted conflict

In involvement in conflict, there are some difficulties. At first, there are real physical risks to personnel. Internationals are viewed with suspicion. They are attractive targets for terrorist or lawless violence by government and as a result, local national staff cannot get guarantee of "community support" which make staff safe. They still will be vulnerable. In addition, confusion of security and development missions makes civilian worker at risk because they are misunderstood as military and

target of terrorist.

Next is that inadvertent assistance will exacerbate conflict. For example, selection of one project in one area can be viewed as unfair for others. In addition, excessive focus on one conflict aspect skews solutions because conflicts have multiple causalities so that there is a necessity to consider all of them. Moreover, donor fatigue or short planning cycles will invite an inadequate deal with long-term problems.

Thirdly, there are critical governance problems to tackle those problems. For central government, periphery areas are peripheral in state's focus and they do not try to challenge peripheral problems. In addition, weak structures of governance in peripheral areas are also a problematic issue. Government in the periphery which is poor in planning, budgeting, treasury, personnel functions will make money usage unclear and this is particularly worrisome for donor purposes. Moreover, weak associational structures that make private sector undeveloped and civil society organizations less prevalent are also problematic.

Regarding those circumstances, there is a necessity to promote coalitional relationship between center and periphery power structures.

Interaction with Local Population

Cooperation with local power will be beneficial because local knowledge and practices manage conflict and can leave local citizens in an intact local structure. In addition, interaction with local power structures will promote mutual dependence; tacit or explicit interaction with non-state actors can be part of negotiation processes. As a result of these interactions, long-term hope, kick-starting social capital accumulation, neutrality of outside donors, and "mowing the grass" – keeping conflicts manageable – will be brought.

However, there are some problems in interaction with local population. Illicit interaction is one aspect of weak governance and often opposed by state-affiliated lower power structures. In addition, this interaction impedes the build-up of legitimacy of the central state as local people do not recognize central state as center. Moreover, interaction is hard to institutionalize, often personalized.

Strategic Approaches of TAF

Strategic approaches of TAF to tackle conflict are aimed at solving causality of conflict, promoting donor coordination and understanding of weak governance to avoid exacerbating situation, and demonstrating success to citizenry and linking individual successes to larger overall process.