

The Role of NGOs in Conflict Prevention

国際シンポジウム「紛争予防におけるNGOの役割」

June 9-10, 2000

平成 12 年 6 月 9-10 日

Takanawa Prince Hotel

高輪プリンスホテル

Organized by

The Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA)

日本国際問題研究所主催

In cooperation with

The Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy (JCPD)

日本予防外交センター協力

Supported by

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA),

The Mainichi Newspapers

The Japan Times

外務省、毎日新聞社、ジャパントイムズ後援

は し が き

- 1．当研究所は、平成 12 年度に外務省の委託を受け、国際シンポジウム「紛争予防における NGO の役割」を開催したが、本報告書は、同シンポジウムの基調報告及び議論の概要をまとめたものである。
- 2．冷戦の終結は、様々な要因に基づく国内紛争の増加をもたらしたといわれている。国内紛争の影響は、単に紛争発生国一国に留まるものではなく、周辺国や地域を巻き込むという意味において、国家間の戦争と同様、国際社会全体の問題としてこれに対処し、かつ可能な限り紛争の発生を予防する必要があることはいうまでもない。国内紛争の多発とその解決、そして紛争そのものの予防において特徴的なことは、国家や国連などの国際機関に加え、いわゆる「非政府機関 (Non Governmental Organizations: NGO)」が重要な役割を担うようになってきたということである。紛争地域での人道援助活動、紛争後の平和構築活動、そして紛争のない社会を創るための地道な社会開発のいずれを取っても、NGO の活動なくしては十分な効果をあげ得ないことは明らかになっている。その一方で、NGO は組織・活動の規模がまさに千差万別であり、紛争予防における積極的な役割とともにその限界も指摘されるところである。
- 3．かかる観点から、当研究所は、本シンポジウムを開催して、内外より 100 余の NGO の代表者参加を得て、幅広い観点から紛争予防における NGO の役割について議論を行った。本報告書に表明されている見解は、全て参加者個人のものであり、参加者の所属する組織あるいは当研究所の意見を反映するものではないが、我が国の今後の紛争予防研究にあたって貴重な資料となり得るものと確信するものである。
- 4．最後に、本シンポジウム開催にあたりご協力頂いた外務省総合外交政策局国連政策課他関係各位に対し、改めて深甚なる謝意を表明するものである。

平成 12 年 7 月

財団法人 日本国際問題研究所
理事長 小和田 恆

Preface

The Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) held an international symposium entitled “The Role of NGOs in Conflict Prevention” sponsored by the Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs in June 2000. This is a report on the symposium proceedings comprising the six keynote addresses and the summaries of two panel discussions.

Since the end of the Cold War, the world community has witnessed an increase in the number of internal conflicts. Such conflicts rarely remain within the country concerned, however, and usually have serious, disastrous effects on neighboring countries and regions; thus, how to prevent internal conflicts and how to build confidence in post-conflict situations are crucial issues that the international society must address.

One notable development in the area of conflict resolution has been the emergence of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) as important actors alongside nation-states (governments) and regional and international organizations. NGOs are playing an increasingly large role throughout the process of conflict prevention -- early warning, emergency humanitarian relief, peace-building activities (e.g., mine clearing and small arms reduction), socio-economic development for peaceful, stable societies, and civil society building – and their efforts have been well received. On the other hand, however, the limitations of NGOs, which may arise from their very nature as voluntary, non-profit civil society associations, have also become clear.

JIIA aimed to provide a unique opportunity to the more than 100 participating NGO representatives, both from Japan and abroad, to share their experiences and to discuss their capabilities and limitations in preventing conflict. The views presented in this report are personal, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of either JIIA or the organization to which the participants belong. I do hope, nonetheless, that this report will be an important contribution to future discussions and analyses of conflict prevention.

Finally, I would like to express again my sincere gratitude to the Foreign Policy Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to the participants, and to all those who assisted us in hosting the symposium.

Hisashi Owada
President
Japan Institute of International Affairs
December 2000

目次
Table of Contents

はしがき	i
Preface	ii
河野外務大臣挨拶	1
Remarks by Mr. Yohei Kono, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan	3
会議の概要	5
Summary of Discussions	9
Keynote addresses (基調報告)	13
Mr. Kensaku HOGEN, Under-Secretary-General, the United Nations	13
Prof. Kevin P. CLEMENTS, Professor, Secretary General, International Alert	19
Mr. THUN Saray, President, Cambodian Human Rights and Development Association ADHOC	26
Prof. Nobuhiko SUTO, President, InterBand	32
Mr. Kensuke ONISHI, Chief Coordinator, Peace Winds Japan	37
Mr. Paul van TONGEREN, Executive Director, European Centre for Conflict Prevention	39
Appendixes (付録)	45
議事次第	45
Agenda	47
List of Participants (参加者リスト)	50
2000年6月22日掲載 毎日新聞社提供記事	55
2000年6月17日掲載 The Japan Times 提供記事	56

国際シンポジウム「紛争予防におけるNGOの役割」

レセプションにおける河野外務大臣挨拶

(竹内外務省総合外交政策局長代読)

ご列席のみなさま

本日、ここに国際問題研究所主催国際シンポジウム「紛争予防におけるNGOの役割」参加者のためのレセプションに際し、一言ご挨拶を申し上げます。

本年はご承知のように九州・沖縄サミットが開催されます。私は、昨年ベルリンで開催されました紛争予防に関するG8外相会合で、紛争を予防するためには、あらゆる政策手段を利用して地道な努力を積み重ねることが重要である旨主張して参りました。また、私は昨年12月にコソヴォを、今年4月に東チモールを訪問し、紛争の爪跡が今なお生々しく残されている現場を視察し、紛争予防の重要性を改めて痛感しました。本年の宮崎でのG8外相会合においても、紛争予防は主要テーマの一つであり、これまでの議論を大いに深めていきたいと思っております。

紛争予防には、国連その他の国際機関、地域機関、国家、NGO、個人といった様々な主体が連携しつつそれぞれの役割を果たすことが重要です。今日の世界では、国内の民族間の争いが武力紛争に発展する事態が頻発しています。NGOの皆様の中には、こうした紛争の火種を抱える地域社会の中にも積極的に入り込み、国家ではなかなか行い得ない草の根レベルで、当事者の相互理解の促進や和解に努めるなど大きな役割を果たされている方も多数いらっしゃると思っております。私が訪問したコソヴォや東チモールでも多くのNGOの方々が活躍をされており、大変心強く思いました。今日、こうしたNGOの皆様の地道な努力がより成果をあげられるような市民社会と政府との一層の連携が早急に求められております。私は政府の一員としてこのようなシンポジウムの機会を通して、そうした連携を探求していきたいと思っております。

こうした観点から、本日、国際シンポジウム「紛争予防におけるNGOの役割」に参加頂いたNGOの皆様の意見についても、十分に拝聴させて頂き、日本のそしてG8の政策に反映できるように努めて参りたいと思っております。

2000年という節目の年を迎え、私は、私たちが私たちの未来の世代の幸福を見据えながら、現在の政策を策定し、実施していかなければならないとの思いを強くしております。紛争のない未来を造り出すためにも、私はあらゆる機会を利用して、繰り返し紛争予防の重要性を各般に訴えていきたいと思っております。

私は、本日のシンポジウムや来週日本国際問題研究所が主催するもう一つの国際シンポジウム「包括的紛争予防を目指して」などにおいて、紛争予防の議論がますます深められることを期待しております。最後に、NGOの皆様方と私たち政府、それに国際機関・地域機関などとの間の協力が、より平和な世界の構築に大きく貢献していくことを祈念し、ご挨拶とさせていただきます。

Remarks

By Mr. Yohei Kono, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan for the Reception for International Symposium “The Role of NGOs in Conflict Prevention” hosted by the Japan Institute of International Affairs

(Read by Director-General of Foreign Policy Bureau Mr. Yukio Takeuchi on behalf of Foreign Minister Kono)

Amb. Owada, President of the Japan Institute for International Affairs, Distinguished participants to the Symposium, Representatives of Non-Governmental Organizations from all over the world, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my great honour and pleasure to address at this reception held for the distinguished participants in the symposium whose theme is the “Role of NGOs in Conflict Prevention” hosted by the Japan Institute of International Affairs.

G8 Kyushu-Okinawa Summit is going to be held in July this year. Last December, the Foreign Ministers of G8 gathered in Berlin to discuss the issue of conflict prevention. In this meeting, I expressed my view that, for conflict prevention to be successful, steady and consistent efforts mobilizing all policy tools available are required at each stage of conflict, from peacetime to post conflict stage. I also had an opportunity to visit Kosovo last December and East Timor this April, where I was shocked to see the sheer illustration of damages inflicted upon the local community by conflicts. This experience brought home to me afresh the vital importance of conflict prevention.

Conflict prevention is expected to be one of the main agenda items of G8 Foreign Ministers' meeting in Miyazaki next month. I sincerely hope and will try my best to bring the present discussions on conflict prevention further forward.

Successful conflict prevention requires collaboration among the actors such as the United Nations, international and regional organizations, states, and civil societies including NGOs, and individuals, with each actor making its own contribution. In today's world we frequently witness ethnic hatred developing into armed conflicts, and many NGOs are playing a vital role on grass-root level, by going to the spots of potential conflicts with a view to promoting mutual understanding and reconciliation among the parties concerned. These grass-root functions cannot easily be shouldered by state governments. I was encouraged very much both in Kosovo and East Timor to see many NGO members playing very active and important roles.

Today, further collaboration between the civil societies and states governments is urgently required, which will make NGOs' steady and significant efforts still more fruitful. I, as a member of the

government, would like to explore ways to develop such collaboration by making the best use of such opportunities as this symposium.

I am very much interested in the views expressed in this Symposium and I will try to reflect them where possible in formulating the government policy of Japan as well as that of G8.

At this important juncture of year 2000, I feel more strongly than ever that when we formulate and implement policies of today, we should look for the happiness and well-being of our future generations. I will take every opportunity to emphasize the importance of conflict prevention with a view to creating a future that is free from tragedy of conflicts.

I expect that discussions on conflict prevention will be further deepened at this symposium as well as another international symposium titled "A Search for Comprehensive Conflict Prevention" which will be organized by the Japan Institute for International Affairs next week.

I would like to conclude my remarks with my sincere wish that cooperation and collaboration among us, NGOs, governments, international and regional organizations, and other actors, will significantly contribute to building a world which is more peaceful.

Thank you for your attention.

会議の概要

1. 2000年6月9、10日、日本国際問題研究所は、日本予防外交センター（JCPD）の協力を得て、国際シンポジウム「紛争予防における NGO の役割」を開催した。本シンポジウムは、九州・沖縄サミットにおいて「紛争予防」が重点事項の一つとされていた中で、紛争予防において、NGO が国家や国際機関と並んで重要な役割を果たしていることから、とくに NGO に焦点をあてたシンポジウムとして企画したものである。本シンポジウムの開催にあたっては、事前に国内の有力 NGO のメンバーも交えた「紛争予防研究会」を4回開催し、そこでの問題提起も踏まえて論点の絞り込みを行うと同時に、研究所関係者が国外の NGO や関連の国連機関を訪問して、参加依頼やあり得べき論点について事前の議論を行った。

結果的には、内外から 100 名以上の NGO 関係者が出席することとなった。JCPD や国内 NGO から提供された情報も参考にしつつ、また現地出張を踏まえて、シンポジウムへの招請を行い、当日はアフリカから 3 団体、アメリカ（南・北）6 団体、中央アジア 2 団体、中国 3 団体、南アジア 8 団体、東南アジア 13 団体、ヨーロッパ 8 団体の合計 43 の NGO の代表が来日し、これに国際機関等の 12 団体（駐日事務所からの参加を含む）の代表と日本の NGO 25 団体から 48 名が参加し、会議参加者数が 100 名を超える大規模なシンポジウムとなった。

2. 議事次第は本報告書にも収録したが、初日午前、小和田恆・当研究所理事長による開会挨拶の後、法眼健作・国連事務次長（広報・NGO 担当）、ケヴィン・クレメンツ・インターナショナル・アラート（英国）事務局長、トン・サライ・カンボジア人権開発協会（カンボジア）理事長、首藤信彦・インターバンド代表、大西健丞・ピースウインズ・ジャパン主任調整員およびポール・ファン・トンヘラン・ヨーロピアン・センター・フォア・コンフリクト・プリヴェンション（オランダ）所長により、それぞれの立場から、紛争予防と NGO の役割について包括的に問題提起が行われ、議論の枠組を提供する基調報告が行われた。それぞれの基調報告は、本人の同意に基づき、本報告書に収めてあるのでご覧頂きたい。

午後から会議参加者は五つのグループに分かれ、分科会（非公開）形式のディスカッションを行った。各分科会に提示されたテーマは、紛争の予防において NGO が果たすべき役割が増大する一方、NGO 自身の人的財政的限界や NGO 自身が担う責任、関係国や国際機関との連携という新たな問題が認識されるようになっており、NGO 間のネットワークを構築することがこれらの問題を解決・改善し得るか、というきわめて広範なものであった。

また、二日目の午前には、グループとテーマを入れ替え、小型武器、緊急人道援助、社会開発、市民社会構築と東南アジアの 5 グループのなかで、それぞれの NGO の活動領域との関係において初日同様、ネットワーク構築の意義について議論が行われた。

3. 二日目の午後は、各々の分科会の議長をパネリストとするパネル・ディスカッションが行われ、各グループ内での議論が紹介されるとともに、紛争予防における NGO の役割とあるべきネットワークの姿について、出席者全員による議論が行われた。

(1) 午後の前半では、二日目午前に行われた、個別の活動分野に基づく分科会で議長を務めた参加者がパネリストとなった。

「小型武器」グループからは、紛争予防活動が対象とする多くの紛争において小型武器が主たる武器であることから、その数を減らし、流通を監視することが紛争予防の第一歩であるとの認識が示された。この分野での NGO の活動として、小型武器の取引状況の監視とともに、反・小型武器キャンペーンを通じての世論形成が挙げられる。また、これらの監視活動を通じて、関係国政府に対する政策提言的活動も重要である。また、紛争後の不安定な状況の中で、NGO が小型武器の回収などに役割を果たすことを通じて、他国政府による復興支援のための経済協力を実施しやすい環境を整備することが可能であるとの認識が示された。

「緊急人道援助」グループからは、紛争状況下における NGO の「公平性 (impartiality)、透明性、予見可能性 (predictability)」こそが、活動において全当事者から信頼を得るために重要であるという議論があったことが紹介された。和平交渉の早い段階から NGO の関与を求めるのか、それとも NGO は「人道的な活動」に特化すべきであるか、という点については、南東欧の事例とフィリピンの事例を比較しても明らかなように確たる結論は無い。また、NGO 間及び NGO と政府の間での信頼性及び透明性の確保が重要である。さらに、NGO 自身の「政治化」に関連して、NGO が特定の当事者や地域情勢に優れた知見を持つに至ることそのものは排除されるべきではないが、その結果として中立性や公平性を損なう恐れがあることは予め認識しておくべきであろう。従って、NGO の「ネットワーク」を考える場合でも、特定の活動目的のためのネットワークと、それ以外の一般的なネットワークを区別する必要があるとの指摘が紹介された。

「社会開発」グループからは、「社会開発を通じての紛争予防」ということの意味と、そのための具体的な活動について議論があった旨紹介された。前者については、単なる経済発展というだけでなく、開発の政治的及び文化的側面も含めて理解されるべきである。従って、紛争「予防」も広義に解釈される必要がある。また、具体的な支援にあたっては、包括的 (inclusive) かつ住民による参加型のアプローチが必要であると同時に、社会の構造的な問題の改善に取り組む必要がある。同グループは、「社会開発」の究極的なゴールは、人種・民族・宗教的な背景に拘らず個人の尊厳を確保し、尊厳ある生活を確保することであり、それを NGO の活動の指導的原則とすべきであるとの結論に達した。

「市民社会構築」グループは、紛争の予防と社会の発展のためには、「健全な」市民社会が必須であり、国家や軍隊では必ずしも紛争を解決できない、という観点で「市民社会」を理解するところから議論が行われた。具体的には、自らの利害を自律的に表明できる団体（女性団体、労働組合、NGO など）のネットワークである。このような市民社会と国家との関係については、国家の姿勢如何によって、対立型であったり、協調型であったりすることになる。従って、市民社会自身は、社会の非軍事的部分であり、人道主義・平和主義・同胞主義を基調とするものとなる。また、紛争によって破壊された市民社会を紛争後に再構築することは極めて困難であり、多大の労力を必要とすることがカンボジアの経験などからも指摘された。また、近年「国際的市民社会」という概念の有無が議論され

るが、今回のシンポジウムに多くの NGO が参加していることは、伝統的な「国境の中に留まる」市民社会を超えた「市民社会」が生成されつつある証左であるとの発言があった。

最後に、地域問題を扱った唯一のグループである「東南アジア」グループからは、東南アジアの紛争の何が問題で、NGOは何を為し得るか、という観点からの議論が紹介された。東南アジア地域での紛争の背景は様々であり、一部には国家間の枠組みでの対応が為されているものもあるが、同時に NGO 間のネットワークを通じて、状況を監視し、紛争を予防することも有益であろう。また宗教や民族、さらには天然資源の有無が、時として地域の人々を分断する道具として用いられることがある。その結果として紛争が発生するということは、民主主義システムの問題というよりも、市民社会の脆弱性と市民社会の声に適切に対応できない国家の問題ということになる。また、東南アジアで最大の問題はミャンマーであり、NGO 間の協力が必要であるが、その際に注意しなければならないことは、ミャンマー「のために」活動するのではなく、ミャンマー「と共に」活動するという姿勢が必要である、という意見が表明された。

(2) 午後の後半は、初日午後に行われた分科会の議長がパネリストとなり、「紛争予防における NGO の役割」についての総括的な報告が行われた。各パネリストからは、進行役の提案により、グループ毎ではなく、テーマ別に発言が行われた。

「他のアクターとの協力」について、NGO だけを切り離して考えることは不適當であるにも拘らず、特定の NGO を取り上げて一般化する傾向があることへの懸念が示された。また個別の状況において NGO の役割も変わり得るし、各 NGO の活動分野によっても分けて考える必要があると指摘された。これは、平和構築における軍隊の役割が紛争地域によって異なることと同じ状況である。政府との関係については、紛争下で活動する NGO、紛争後に活動する NGO 及び民主制が根付いたところで活動する NGO を区別し、それぞれの NGO と政府との関係のあり方を議論する必要があるとの議論があったことが紹介された。この点に関連して、NGO の活動については、相互補完的な関係があり一義的に「役割分担」を考えるのは難しいとの意見もあった。NGO が国（政府）や国連機関から資金援助を受けることで、NGO がこれらの「執行機関」になってしまうことについては、否定的であった。

「NGO のネットワーク」に関しては、国によって状況に差はあるが、紛争予防に限らず、一般的な意味でのネットワークが構築されつつある状況であることが紹介された。その場合、3つのレベル 国内、地域、国際 でのネットワークが考えられる。その中で最も重要なものは、国内のネットワークである。但し、なぜネットワークを構築する必要があるのかについて意見の一致があることが重要である。また、国際的なネットワークについては、参加者が平等の地位に立つ必要がある。同時に、自由に意見を交換できる体制を確保することが肝要であろう。その一方で、ネットワークの有用性を認めつつ、現状では、国際 NGO がネットワーク構築の中心になっていることへの懸念が、ローカルな NGO を中心に示された。

「NGO の行動規範」について、透明性とプロフェッショナリズム、責任の所在の明確化という観点から肯定的な意見が大勢を占めた。その一方で、行動規範を策定しても、活動

の過程でそれが破られること すなわち、実効性の確保 への懸念も示された。他方、行動規範を策定し、それがネットワーク上で公開されることで、NGO の責任や差別化が行われるようになり、結果的には、どの団体がどのような活動に適しているかがわかりやすくなる、との意見もあった。また、UNHCR なども協力して、既に国際的な行動規範作りが進行中であることも紹介された。

「早期警戒メカニズム」については、メカニズムそのものの問題に加えて、その実効性が議論となった。情報の存在と同時に、その情報を的確に分析し、かつ実行に移すことが困難だからである。従って、異なるセクターが円滑に情報交換を行うことが、より重要であるという見解が示された。また、ある種のメカニズムは必要であるが、システムとして構築されたものである必要は無く、必要に応じて情報を収集し、その内容を検証できるようなものがあれば有益であろうとの意見も出された。

4 . 本シンポジウムの最大の目的は、NGO が数的にも増加し、活動領域も広がりを見せつつあるなか、何らかのネットワークが構築されていることの有用性を NGO と共に検討することにあつた。全体の結論として、NGO 相互の情報交換や他のアクターとの連携においてネットワークは、有益と考えられる一方で、すでにネットワークが存在する地域とそうではない地域の間で格差があり、これから新たにネットワークを立ち上げる場合には、既存のものと競合しない、相互補完的なネットワークとする必要があるということであろう。その一方で、現実においては、豊富な人的財政的資源を有する NGO (主として欧米) はネットワークに頼らずとも活動を行うことができ、これに対して潜在的紛争発生国で地道な活動を行っているローカルな NGO は国際的なネットワークを通じて財政的な支援を得たいという、NGO 間でのネットワークに対する需要にギャップが存在すること、また、ローカルな NGO が国際的なネットワークに組み込まれることで、現地の文化的伝統に根ざした活動が脅かされる恐れもあることには注意が必要である。

5 . 今回のシンポジウムの企画では、紛争予防の分野で先進的な活動をしている欧米の NGO の話を聞く一方で、日本にも立派な活動を行っている NGO があることを広報し、同時にアジアのローカルな NGO との連携関係の構築に寄与していくという目的もあった。100 名以上が参加し、和気藹々とした雰囲気の中で活発な議論が行われたことは、新聞にも取り上げられ、議論の中身においても、また、NGO が一堂に会する、という意味でも、本シンポジウムは成功だったと考えられる。改めて、参加者にお礼を申し上げたい。

(山田 哲也 (財)日本国際問題研究所研究員)

Summary of Discussions

1. On June 9 and 10, the Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA), in cooperation with The Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy (JCPD), held an international symposium on the “Role of NGOs in Conflict Prevention”. While the topic was an important agenda item at the Kyushu/Okinawa Summit, the symposium was designed to focus on NGOs, based on the fact that not only states and international organizations, but NGOs as well play an important role in preventing conflicts. A JIIA study group on conflict prevention, including representatives from leading domestic NGOs, met four times before the symposium to narrow down the points for discussion. Using information provided by the JCPD and Japanese NGOs, members of JIIA personally visited each NGO and related UN bodies to ask for their participation in the symposium and to discuss the topics to be covered.

The symposium featured a large number of participating NGOs, both from Japan and abroad. In the end, 43 NGOs -- three in Africa, six (total) in North and South America, two in Central Asia, three in China, eight in South Asia, 18 in Southeast Asia, and eight in Europe -- sent representatives. Twenty-five Japanese NGOs sent 48 representatives, and 12 international organizations participated as well (some from their representative offices in Japan). Total participants thus numbered more than a hundred, making the symposium a rather large-scale one.

2. In the morning of the first day, following an opening address by Ambassador Hisashi Owada, the President of JIIA, keynote speeches were delivered by Mr. Kensaku Hogen, UN Under-Secretary-General for Communications and Public Information, Mr. Kevin Clements, Secretary General of International Alert (United Kingdom), Mr. Thun Saray, President of Cambodian Human Rights and Development Association ADHOC (Cambodia), Mr. Nobuhiko Suto, President of Inter Band, Mr. Kensuke Onishi, Chief Coordinator of Peace Winds Japan, and Mr. Paul van Tongeren, Executive Director of the European Center for Conflict Prevention (Netherlands). The agenda, and all of these speeches are included in this Report. In their remarks, the keynote speakers raised a number of issues related to conflict prevention and NGOs, providing the framework for subsequent discussions.

In the afternoon, the participants were divided into five groups for discussions in closed workshops. Given that NGOs now have a greater role to play in preventing conflicts, various new problems have been recognized -- limits on human and financial resources, questions as to what the precise responsibilities of the NGOs should be, coordination with the countries involved and international organizations, etc. -- and it was considered whether it would be possible to solve such problems, or at least improve the situation, by establishing a network among NGOs.

In the morning of the second day, the participants were re-divided into five new groups -- small arms, emergency humanitarian relief, social development, civil society building, and Southeast Asia -- discussing again the significance of a network in terms of each NGO's area of involvement.

3. In the afternoon of the second day, two panel discussions were held among the chairpersons of the individual workshop groups, including presentations of the results from each group, followed by a

discussion among all participants on the role of NGOs in conflict prevention and on the forms and nature of NGO networks.

(1) Chairpersons of the workshops served as panelists for the first Panel Discussions, held in the morning of the second day.

From the “Small Arms” group, it was pointed out that small arms are a prime tool being used in conflicts so that reducing the number of such weapons by restricting supply would be a first step for conflict prevention. For the role and activities of NGOs in this field there would be, *prima facie*, watchdog-type activities towards illicit smuggling and anti-small arms campaigns for the general public. It would be also important for NGOs to make policy recommendations to the governments as advocacy. Also, it was pointed out that the NGOs could play a very useful role as a link between local grassroots activities and economic assistance for reconstruction provided by the public sector.

From the “Emergency Humanitarian Relief” group, it was pointed out that impartiality, transparency and predictability of NGOs in their activities would be crucially important in conflict situations to build trust with all parties concerned. There would be no fixed answer whether the NGOs should be involved in a peace process or peace negotiations or whether the NGOs should instead limit themselves to humanitarian endeavors, according to the lessons learnt from what has been happened in Southeast Europe and the Philippines. Furthermore, regarding the “politicization” of the NGOs, it was pointed out that we must keep in mind that some NGOs might undermine their neutrality and their impartiality in their activities -- and that there are risks involved in that -- when they had a good knowledge of local circumstances or groups in a particular area. Therefore, in terms of networking, maybe two different sorts of networks should be identified, i.e., one of like-minded organizations and the other based on exchanges of information.

The “Social Development” group started to discuss the meaning of “conflict prevention through social development” and, further, the concrete role of NGOs in this field. For the former, it was understood that not only economic development but also political and cultural aspects of development should be included in this context. It also meant that the term “conflict prevention” should be understood in its broader sense. It was pointed out that a participatory and inclusive approach was needed and the structural problems must be addressed in the course of the NGOs’ activities. In conclusion, the group felt that the ultimate goal of social development was to enhance the dignity of each and every person, regardless of race, ethnic and religious background, in leading a life of dignity, and that this should be the guiding principle of NGOs in conflict prevention.

The “Civil Society Building” group declared that there was a general agreement among the group that a healthy civil society was simply essential for preventing conflicts and for development in general, and that neither the State nor the military were capable of resolving conflicts on their own. Therefore, what is needed is a network that articulates the interests and needs of a wide range of autonomous groups, including women’s groups, trade unions and NGOs. Regarding the relationship with States, NGO could cooperate at some times and could be a counterbalance to them at others. Therefore, civil society could be better defined as the non-military component of society that focuses on humanism, pacifism and

cosmopolitanism. It was also pointed out that the reconstruction of civil society in a post-conflict period is a highly difficult and time-consuming process, as can be seen from the experience in Cambodia. Also, the group pointed out that there have been some discussions of the role of the emerging international civil society, and, if there is such a thing, it could be said that gatherings such as this Symposium would represent an emerging international society that transcends traditional country boundaries.

Finally, the “Southeast Asia” group, which was the only group dealing with a regional topic, stated that they had discussed the role of NGOs in the region from the viewpoint of potential causes of conflict in the region. It is known that there have been various causes for the conflicts in the region. While some have been dealt with at the governmental level, it would also be helpful for NGOs to build a network around those issues to monitor situations and to prevent further conflicts. Moreover, religion, ethnicity and natural resources may be used as tools for dividing people. If these factors do bring about conflicts, it is more likely because of the weakness of the civil society and the inability of the government to deal with the situation appropriately than because of the weakness of the democracy. There has been a big concern about Myanmar. In this connection, the view was expressed that NGOs in the region should liaise; at the same time, it was pointed out that it is important for them not to “work for” but to “work with” local officials.

(2) At the second Panel, chairpersons of the workshops held in the afternoon of the first day served as panelists. As the topic was the “role of NGOs for conflict prevention” in general, the moderator asked the panelists to offer observations on specific topics.

Regarding “working with other actors,” it was pointed out that there was a tendency to lump all NGOs together and generalize from the examples offered by specific NGOs. Also, the view was expressed that the roles of NGOs could depend upon the circumstances and the characteristics of each NGO. This is similar to the fact that the role of military varies in accordance with the region of conflict. Regarding cooperation with governments, it was pointed out that it is necessary to divide NGOs into 3 categories – NGOs operating in conflict situations, NGOs operating in post-conflict situations and NGOs operating in long-established democracies. It was suggested that relations with government should be discussed in the context of these categories. In this connection, it was pointed out that the activities of NGOs are complementary in nature. However, a critical view was also expressed that it would be dangerous for NGOs to become tied to the executive branches of governments or international organizations or to be totally financed by them.

Regarding “networking”, networks have emerged that are not limited to conflict prevention but are more general in nature, despite differences among countries. Three different levels of networking – national, regional and global – were identified. Though most important is networking in national level, we had to establish a common ground of understanding on why we needed such a network. Concerning international networks, it was pointed out that all the participants thereof should have equal status and full liberty in information exchange. On the other hand, concerns were expressed by local NGOs that, in their eagerness to build networks, international NGOs might end up treating local NGOs as branch offices.

Regarding “the code of conduct”, many participants agreed, in principle, that each NGO should develop

its own code of conduct with a view to increasing the transparency and professionalism of their activities as well as clarifying their accountability. At the same time, a view was expressed about the binding power of such codes over NGOs that might violate them in practice. It was pointed out that once NGOs have established codes of conduct and been placed in the network structure, accountability and differentiation among NGOs would make it easier to identify which NGO was doing what. It was suggested that the drafting of codes of conduct be done with assistance and cooperation from relevant international organizations.

Regarding “the early warning mechanism”, the effectiveness of such a mechanism was discussed, as was the mechanism itself, because verifying facts accurately and taking concrete steps is sometimes more difficult than just getting information. Also, it was pointed out that it is very important to think about some kind of a mechanism, not necessarily a systemized and structured mechanism. A mechanism by which we can collect and verify information would be a very useful thing to consider.

4. The main purpose of this Symposium was to consider, together with NGOs, the usefulness of having some kind of network among NGOs as the number of NGOs increase and their spheres of activity expand. There was general agreement that some areas had networks in place of one sort or another; and that any newly created network should not conflict with an existing one but instead be complementary. It was also noted that the purposes of any network would have to be made clear, in the sense that there would naturally be differences between ones that simply listed NGOs around the world, and others linking NGOs with specific positions on specific issues. In reality, the degree of interest in a new network also varies with the NGO. Those with sufficient human and financial resources (mainly in Europe and the United States), for example, can function well more or less on their own, while NGOs in countries where there is greater risk of conflict are looking for financial assistance through an international network. The concern was also expressed that an international network might erode the sensitivity to cultural traditions now shown by local NGOs, thereby impeding their activities.

5. Other objectives of this Symposium were to hear from the ‘international NGOs’ already involved extensively in conflict prevention, to publicize the fact that there are NGOs in Japan also doing good work, and to build cooperative relationships among NGOs in Asia. The media covered this Symposium, both in Japanese and in English, reporting that lively discussions were conducted in a friendly atmosphere with frank discussions among more than 100 participants. It could be said that the Symposium was successful in both the number of participants and the substance of the discussions. Taking this opportunity, JIIA would like to express its deepest appreciation to all the participants again.

(Tetsuya Yamada, Research Fellow, the Japan Institute of International Affairs)

NGOs and Conflict Prevention: A United Nations Perspective

Mr. Kensaku Hogen

**Under-Secretary-General for Communications and Public Information,
United Nations Department of Public Information**

Ladies, Gentlemen, Distinguished NGO Representatives. I am honoured to have been invited to address this symposium on the role of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in conflict prevention, and am pleased to bring to you some thoughts on the subject from a United Nations perspective.

The decision to build this capacity and understanding among non-governmental actors reveals remarkable foresight on the part of the organizers of this symposium. I salute Ambassador Hisashi Owada and the Japan Institute of International Affairs for putting these valuable consultations in motion. There is no doubt that effective conflict prevention, with input from many partners, will help avoid untold suffering in the years ahead.

While the United Nations was established in 1945 precisely to avoid the scourge of war for future generations, the elimination of violent conflicts between nations remains all elusive goal even for this uniquely representative and universal organization. Indeed in recent years, the tasks before the United Nations in addressing violent conflicts have become steadily more complex and demanding. For one thing, the very nature of conflicts has changed, becoming more local in nature. Our understanding of the roots of conflicts has also become more complex, and our approach to their resolutions enormously more complicated and demanding.

I will limit my remarks to you this morning to some observations, drawn largely from recent experiences on the current concerns of the United Nations regarding conflict prevention in the contemporary context.

I will also emphasize the central role that we believe civil society organizations and in particular non-governmental organizations involved in economic and social development, human rights and peace and security issues, may play in the long-term efforts to eliminate the causes of violent conflicts among nations and, especially, among peoples. I will also cite some of the experiences in conflict prevention that we have witnessed in other parts of the world, and suggest some of the areas which we believe will require special attention in the years to come.

One of the vital links between the global and the local, between the international community and the communities that comprise our city neighbourhoods around the world, is the community of NGOs. NGOs can act as intermediaries between the global and the local and can be dynamic facilitators of people-centered development. Their role in conflict prevention is a logical extension of this thinking.

In the face of violent conflict, the United Nations has long argued that prevention is better than cure; that we must address the root causes, not merely their symptoms. In most cases, however, our aspiration has yet to be matched by effective action. As a consequence, the international community

today confronts unprecedented humanitarian challenges.

Conflict prevention is, first and foremost, a challenge of political leadership. As United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan points out in his visionary *Millennium Report* to the *General Assembly* entitled "We the Peoples: The Role of the United Nations in the 21st century", released last April, political leaders find it hard to sell conflict prevention policies abroad to their public at home. The costs of conflict prevention, he says, are "palpable and immediate, while the benefits - an undesirable or tragic future event that does not occur - are more difficult for the leaders to convey and the public to grasp." He calls on NGOs to press for this political commitment at the national level.

What had seemed a gradual but hopeful trend towards a world with fewer and less deadly wars seems to have lost momentum in the past two years. Moreover, the impact of wars on civilians has worsened because internal wars, now the most frequent type of armed conflict, typically take a heavier toll on civilians than inter-State wars, and because combatants increasingly have made targeting civilians, particularly women and children, a strategic objective. This brutal disregard for humanitarian norms and for the Geneva Conventions on the rules of war, also extends to treatment of humanitarian workers -from NGOs and international civil servants alike -- who are all too frequently denied access to victims in conflict zones or are themselves attacked.

Confronted with the rapidly escalating human and financial costs of renewed armed conflicts, our task is twofold. The immediate priority is to bring relief to victims and to ensure the protection of civilians. But the long-term and far more effective effort should be focused on devising strategies to prevent emergencies from arising in the first place.

It is not realistic or acceptable that we simply address violent conflicts after the damage is done. Conflict prevention is clearly where the NGOs are essential to emerging strategies, whether in making policy decisions, or carrying out programmes in the field.

The causes of war are inherently more difficult to explain than those of natural events. Social behaviour is not subject to physical laws in the same way as cyclones or earthquakes; people make their own history, often violently and sometimes inexplicably. Those that are particularly tragic and unacceptable are those conflicts that arise from scarcity of resources, of land, of water, of gainful employment, that pit neighbours and friends and even families against each other. Causality is therefore complex and multidimensional and it differs, often fundamentally, from conflict to conflict, war to war.

A study recently completed by the United Nations University shows that countries that are afflicted by war typically also suffer from inequality among domestic social groups. It is this inequality, rather than poverty, that seems to be the critical factor. The inequality may be based on ethnicity, religion, national identity or economic class, but it tends to be reflected in unequal access to political power that too often forecloses paths to peaceful change. These are problems whose solutions lay in large part with Governments and macro-economic policies and partly, though perhaps principally with local players, NGOs among them. The United Nations gladly takes on the role of bringing these parties together.

Economic decline is also strongly associated with violent conflict, not least because the politics of a shrinking economy are inherently more conflictual than those of economic growth. In some instances the impact of radical market-oriented economic reforms and structural adjustment programmes imposed without compensating social policies can undermine political stability. More generally, weak Governments -- and, of course, so-called failed States -- have little capacity to stop the eruption and spread of violence that better organized and more legitimate Governments could have prevented or contained.

Conflicts also arise over scarcity of resources. The United Nations, together with many NGOs' are acutely aware of these problems as they affect economic and social development and the environment. United Nations funds and programmes are hard at work identifying the many areas which are probable cause for civil conflicts where neighbour turns against neighbour over access to, and control of, dwindling resources like farmland and water. Water disputes take place not just between states, but also within them. The growing scarcity of water and regional disparities, have either caused or could cause conflict.

A 1991 study of the Horn of Africa by the World Conservation Union found that "the disenfranchisement of local peoples from traditional land and water rights has been a major factor fuelling conflict and instability." Unable to affect the larger forces at work, in several cases they have struck against closer targets - other groups of pastoralists or small farmers, all of whom find themselves in greater competition for water and land. Examples of this pattern can be found in other parts of Africa.

The United Nations makes the argument that prevention is far less costly than conflicts and should be seen in this light. The Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict estimates that the cost to the international community of the seven major wars in the 1990s, not including Kosovo, was \$199 billion. Last month, the reputable British publication *Jane 's Intelligence Digest*, calculated the NATO intervention in Kosovo, including the military, humanitarian and reconstruction, cost a total of \$48 billion. The Carnegie researchers argue that most of these costs could have been saved if greater attention had been paid to prevention.

More effective prevention strategies would not only save tens of billions of dollars, but hundreds of thousands of lives as well. Funds currently spent on intervention and relief could be devoted to enhancing equitable and sustainable development instead, which would further reduce the risks of war and disaster.

Building a culture of prevention is not easy, however. While the costs of prevention have to be paid in the present, its benefits lie in the distant future. Moreover, the benefits are not tangible; they are the wars and disasters that do not happen. So we should not be surprised that preventive policies receive support that is more often rhetorical than substantive.

There is more. History tells us that single-cause explanations of war are invariably too simplistic. This also means that no simple, all-embracing, solutions are possible. To address complex causes we need complex, interdisciplinary solutions. The fundamental point is that implementing prevention

strategies requires cooperation across a broad range of different agencies and creative new partnerships between governments, intergovernmental organizations and civil society organizations.

For the United Nations, the main short- and medium-term strategies for preventing non-violent conflicts from escalating into war, and preventing earlier wars from erupting again, are preventive diplomacy, preventive deployment and preventive disarmament. "Post-conflict peace-building" is a broad policy approach that embraces all of these as well as other initiatives. Longer-term prevention strategies address the root causes of armed conflict.

Whether it takes the form of mediation, conciliation or negotiation, preventive diplomacy is normally non-coercive, low-key and confidential in its approach. Its quiet achievements are mostly unheralded; indeed it suffers from the irony that when it does succeed, nothing happens. Sometimes, the need for confidentiality means that success stories can never be told. As former Secretary-General U Thant once remarked, "the perfect good offices operation is one which is not heard of until it is successfully concluded or even never heard of at all". It is not surprising, therefore, that preventive diplomacy is so often unappreciated by the public at large.

Preventive diplomacy must draw on the talents and good will of many players, including NGOs. Private individuals as well as national and international civil society organizations have played an increasingly active role in conflict prevention, management and resolution. So-called "citizen diplomacy" sometimes paves the way for subsequent official agreements. For example, in the Middle East peace process, it was a small Norwegian research institute that played the critical initial role in paving the way for the 1993 Oslo Agreement. One of the little known but striking examples of NGO and civil society mobilizations for peace that has evolved over the past decade is in Colombia, a country that has been battered by nearly four decades of civil war. Here, as everywhere else in the world, the principal victims of the conflict are civilians. In the early 1990s, in response to the deteriorating situation, a national network of regional and local peace initiatives coalesced under the name *Redepaz*, a national organization that has given strength and resonance to citizen's actions.

Today, *Redepaz* is the largest peace network Colombia has ever known. It is backed by two hundred non-governmental organizations, including business associations and the Catholic church as well as by national and regional authorities. Popular demonstrations have rallied up to five million Colombians in unprecedented protests, offering citizens an alternative logic to the war's logic of violence as a solution to conflicts. In October 1996, together with UNICEF and NGOs, *Redepaz* organized the votes of 2,700,000 children in a 'Mandate of Children for Peace' which resulted in a permanent 'Children's Movement for Peace'. This Children's Crusade was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize in 1999.

The active participation of women in virtually all these conflict prevention initiatives is essential. The United Nations, at its world conferences and in the elaboration of international law, has steadily integrated the special needs and contributions of women in conflict situations. Many United Nations organizations work closely with women's NGOs. UNIFEM, for example, has undertaken studies which explore ways to draw on women's expertise around conflict situations. With a clear

international mandate and wealth of practical experience in building peace within communities, women are taking their rightful place at the peace tables, promoting a community-based vision of peace and social justice.

What has come to be known as post-conflict peace-building is a major and relatively recent innovation in preventive strategy. During the 1990s, the United Nations developed a more holistic approach to implementing the comprehensive peace agreements it negotiated. From Namibia to Guatemala, post-conflict peace-building has involved inter-agency teams working alongside non-governmental organizations and local citizens' groups to help provide emergency relief, demobilize combatants, clear mines, run elections, build impartial police forces and set in motion longer-term development efforts. The premise of this broad strategy is that human security, good governance, equitable development and respect for human rights are interdependent and mutually reinforcing.

Long-term prevention strategies, in addressing the root causes of conflict, seek to prevent destructive conflicts from arising in the first place. They embrace the same holistic approach to prevention that characterizes post-conflict peace-building. Their approach is reflected in the recent United Nations University study that found that inclusive government is the best guarantor against internal violent conflicts. Inclusiveness requires that all the major groups in a society participate in its major institutions – government, administration, police and the military.

These conclusions are consistent with the so-called “democratic peace thesis”, which states that democracies rarely go to war against each other, and that they have low levels of internal violence compared with non-democracies. The former proposition is still the subject of lively debate among academic experts -- in part because of the changing meanings of “democracy” across time and geography. The later proposition is less controversial: in essence, democracy is a non-violent form of internal conflict management.

The international community should do more to encourage policies that enhance people-centred security in conflict-prone States. Equitable and sustainable development is a necessary condition for security, but minimum standards of security are also a precondition for development. Pursuing one, in isolation from the other, makes little sense. Security from organized violence is a priority concern of people everywhere, and ensuring democratic accountability and transparency in the security sector should receive greater support and encouragement from donor States and the international financial institutions.

I would like to conclude my remarks by pointing out to you that today virtually every United Nations organization has an NGO liaison component that is actively seeking academic, programmatic and policy oriented partnerships with civil society. Often these collaborations specifically target conflict prevention and work hard to identify local initiatives that are the basis in effective and sustainable efforts. This is especially true, of course, for the Department of Peace Keeping Operations and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. UNICEF, UNESCO, UNDP and UNIFEM as well as UNEP and the World Bank all recognize the central role that NGOs must play

in achieving progress in this critical area.

NGOs, for their part, are reciprocating and working closely with the United Nations to create new programmes, especially at the local levels. NGO conferences, such as last year's Hague Appeal for Peace and the just-concluded Millennium Forum of civil society which met last month to adopt proposals for consideration at this September's Millennium General Assembly, are examples of this.

I can also say that my own Department, which maintains working relations with over 1,600 NGOs around the world, is addressing this issue at the 53rd annual DPI/NGO conference in August. This conference is entitled "Global Solidarity: The Way to Peace and International Cooperation" and will address the growing role of NGOs in international decision making. I would like to conclude by extending an invitation to each of you to come to New York to participate in this conference from 28-30 August.

Thank you.

Civil Society and Conflict Prevention

Prof. Kevin P Clements

**Secretary General, International Alert and Professor of Conflict Resolution,
George Mason University**

Thank you very much, Mr. Ozawa, and thank you, Ambassador Owada. Thank you to the Japan Institute of International Affairs also for initiating and organizing this conference, which I think is a very important step in terms of the development and enhancement of conflict resolution capacity in the Asia-Pacific region.

I hope you've had a chance to look at your list of attendees, because the very first thing I want to do is to compliment and congratulate and salute all of you who are here, from all of your different organizations and from all of your different backgrounds, for the individual work that each of you is doing for peace. It's an honor to be asked to help articulate and represent some of your interests, but I'm equally in debt to the ways in which each one of you, whichever part of the world you're from, is working for peace and for justice. I have a long paper, which you are going to get, so I don't propose to read it, but I'd just like to say at the very outset that the business of peace-building and peacemaking is extraordinarily complex, and requires high levels of courage, high levels of intelligence, and high levels of imagination and creativity. I think it's extremely important at the outset to acknowledge the diverse contributions that each of us makes, and to get some greater sense of the ways in which those individual contributions do or do not add up to a meaningful whole. You can, for example, argue that the most important and primal peace-building is the successful relationship of a mother and child. Indeed, there is an aphorism that "there is no way to peace, peace is the way." I think we need to underline that we generate a peaceable world by the ways in which we individually act, and the ways in which our organizations and the different movements of which we are a part do or do not act. So, I want just to highlight this fact at the beginning, and to reiterate what my colleague from the UN has already said, that there is no single path to peace and no magic solution to any of the violent challenges facing the world community and, because of that, it's really crucial to acknowledge the diverse contributions of many diverse forces, and to adopt a multifaceted, multilevel, integrated strategy toward Pre- and Post-conflict peace building.

The second point I want to make is that until the beginning of this millennium, we labored under the illusion that state systems, both politically and militarily, could deliver peace. While they make an absolutely invaluable contribution to local and national law and order, and, indeed, can make a powerful contribution to whether there is or is not peace between nations, I think that what we have discovered over the course of the 20th century is that state systems alone, either in terms of their political or military activities, cannot generate stable, peaceful relationships. It requires much more commitment than that, and it certainly, and most importantly requires a major contribution from civil society. There will be no peace as long as civil society-that plurality of non-governmental interests

and groups-remains at odds with itself and at war with each other. The third point I want to make, therefore, is that adding civil society and non-governmental organizations to the business of peace-building is not an optional extra; it is an absolute prerequisite for any possibility of generating stable, peaceful relationships. State systems alone cannot generate peace. Civil societies alone and NGOs cannot generate peace. What we need is an adequate understanding of the ways in which both sectors contribute to peace; the specific contributions of state and civil society organizations, some recognition of their competence and their incompetence, and some greater understanding of the ways in which all of us can work together in this enterprise. So I very fervently hope, at the beginning of this millennium, that there is a recognition that we're all in this together, and that any one party alone will not be able to succeed in the difficult task of peace-building. As I say in my paper, that will require a certain softening of state systems and equally, an acknowledgement on the part of civil society of the specific roles that the state and governmental systems can play in law and order because, as we know, without effective governance, without democratization, without institutions that facilitate the participation of all members of society, there will be no structural stability or lasting peace.

So there are my first three points. The fourth point is: What are the specific roles of the different civil society groups in this enterprise? I want to highlight that there are a large number that are working in this area, some of which don't even acknowledge that they are working for peace. The role of academic research institutions, for example, and the role of institutes of international affairs are, in their own ways, making contributions to a peaceful world. There are religious organizations and a variety of philanthropic and humanitarian organizations which make their own contributions. We need to understand the specific roles and contributions of each in relation to the peace-building process. Those groups working in conflict zones can be divided into four groups: those who supply the absolutely essential emergency relief and assistance; those who work on medium- to long-term economic and social development issues; those concerned with social justice, human rights and advocacy, and the monitoring of these; and, finally, those specifically focused on the nonviolent resolution of conflict and long-term peace-building. Whether or not there should be efforts to combine all of these different kinds of activities is an interesting question. At minimum, there should be awareness of what each is doing and an attempt to try to develop high levels of conceptual integration among the activities of these groups; at maximum, there is a need for much, much higher levels of coordination and combined planning.

One of the things which I think irritates the hell out of the United Nations and regional organizations is when we get a complex emergency, and all of a sudden 15, 20, 60 NGOs materialize from somewhere in the world, helicopter in and offer their good services, and simply confuse everybody. So, it's very important that we get some awareness of the ways in which we can combine and coordinate our activities and make the best use of the scarce resources available. The groups that are available have now developed, I think, a good track record of experience: Oxfam, Médecins sans Frontières, Save the Children Fund, CARE, International Alert, the Carter Centre, ACCORD, the Conflict Management Group, Conciliation Resources, the community of Sant' Egidio, Search for

Common Ground, the Centre for Conflict Management, and many, many others that are represented in this room, have developed a track record in conflict zones. We know what works and we know what doesn't work. We're getting some sense of what constitutes good and best practice. We're becoming much more professional in the delivery of conflict prevention processes and we're becoming much more aware, or humble, about what we can and cannot contribute. For example, International Alert, Conciliation Resources and many people in Australia and New Zealand were very actively involved in the facilitation of processes to help negotiate a new constitution after the last Fijian coup. We thought we had one that worked, and it did work for a while, but now it has been overturned in an armed coup.

One of the other sobering things about coming back to this side of the world is that there is no room for complacency in the Asia-Pacific region. Those areas that we once thought were stable are demonstrating signs of instability, and there is what I call an arc of instability which goes from Sri Lanka through Indonesia, through Papua New Guinea and Melanesia, into the South Pacific. I want to say right now that a major challenge to organizations in the Asia-Pacific region is going to be dealing with this arc of instability in a preemptive and proactive fashion. It may be too late for preemption and prevention, but it is not too late for designing and catalyzing regional and global responses to this new perceived social and political fault line which is manifesting itself in this part of the world. My fifth point is that those of us who are fortunate enough to live in zones of peace have to acknowledge that the zones of instability and unpeacefulness are actually expanding and becoming more intractable. That means that there is no long-term security for us in the zones of peace until we have dealt with the sources and causes of the instability in those not-so-peaceful areas of the world.

So what do conflict transformation NGOs do? My definition is as follows: We are national or international, nonprofit, charitable organizations committed to working with local and international actors in analyzing, understanding and responding to violent conflict in constructive and creative ways. I want to underline the importance of analysis in this process. There can be no effective intentional engagement in any conflict unless there is a detailed analysis. My colleague Ed Garcia is fond of saying "text without context is pretext". It is really important for us to understand that glib analysis, quick analysis, or analysis which doesn't take into account deep, historical, cultural and linguistic contexts and doesn't take into account all the diverse variables influencing conflict zones is not helpful. Without decent analysis we cannot design effective conflict resolution processes.

NGOs work at multiple levels of engagement and deal with the short- and long-term consequences of violence, but they try to enable locals-and I want to underline this-to catalyze the changes that will remove the structural, behavioural and attitudinal conditions conducive to violence. One of the learnings that I think International Alert has made over the last few years is that external organizations do not solve other people's problems. If they try to persuade you that they do, they are engaged in a deception. All that external organizations can do is to provide a safe space, or some space, within which the local parties to conflict themselves might be able to begin addressing the sources of their conflict and solving them themselves. So, the most important principle in this work is that it is those

parties in conflict, the locals themselves, that will get to solve their own problems. The elite representatives of those locals cannot deliver solutions either. Richard Holbrook, for example, knocked heads together at Dayton and got a Bosnian agreement which was absolutely critical in terms of stopping ethnic cleansing, but it did not resolve the underlying sources of the conflict in the Balkans. It did not remove the animosities from the different groups at civil society level that still exist. It did not address the underlying sources of the violence and, most importantly, it didn't address the historic grievances in the Balkans which to some extent continue to surface today. That's one of the most challenging issues confronting any organization dealing with this. Governments and politicians are looking for quick-fix solutions. A friend in the State Department said: "You know, we don't have any chance to do forward planning; we're dealing with the crisis from yesterday and it has to be solved today." Well, what we are discovering in this kind of work is that unless you deal with the historic sources of the problems, and they are laid to rest in ways that are satisfactory to people, there will be no solution to the immediate presenting problems.

I want to highlight the fact also that this is a very multitrack approach. This is confirming what I said at the beginning. We need the intergovernmental organizations. We need bilateral engagements. We need the unofficial forums that have already been mentioned. We need citizen diplomacy, economic diplomacy and we need better targeting of assistance through overseas aid and development to promote structural stability and sustainable peace. Our organization and others are now doing a lot of work on peace and conflict impact assessment in order to ensure that development assistance yields more stable, peaceful relationships.

We need to incorporate the private sector much more. As part of corporate social responsibility, it is absolutely vital that the private sector is involved in these activities. International Alert, the Prince of Wales Business Leaders Forum and the Council on Economic Priorities have just produced a book called *The Business of Peace*, which is on the role of business and corporates in conflict prevention, conflict management and crisis management. If we let the corporate sphere think that it can do business in zones of instability without assuming any responsibility for that instability, we leave a critically important actor out in the cold. So, at minimum, companies shouldn't contribute to conflict escalation; at maximum, it's really vital that they play a crucial role in conflict prevention, and we're trying to work out ways in for them to do that.

There is peace diplomacy through religious organizations. There are good examples of this: Sant' Egidio, the Quakers, the World Council of Churches, Buddhist organizations and so forth. We need to make sure that they have a place in all of this.

Diplomacy through women's movements has already been mentioned, and I just want to highlight the fact that women are and can be effective peacemakers, and they have been excluded for far too long from negotiating processes and from peace and security discussions. We, along with about 108 other women's organizations, have got a whole campaign now called "Women Building Peace-From the Village Council to the Negotiating Table," and we are trying to bring more women into negotiating processes.

Then there is communications diplomacy, and my colleague John Marks and Search for Common Ground do wonderful things here with their Radio Ujamba and Radio Talking Drum and other programs like that. They use the media to quell rumors and to encourage people to think of peaceable solutions and deal with problems in a creative and nonviolent fashion.

Then there is peace diplomacy through social movements. Here, our Filipino colleagues have made great moves in terms of “peace zones” and “peace corridors.” The Community Relations Council in Ireland has done good work in this area also. We mobilize people's movements and neighborhood groups to start building peace from the bottom up, as well as from the top down.

And then there is the whole issue of peace through education and training, and I want to remind you that this is the year of the “Culture of Peace” and the decade of the “Culture of Nonviolence.” Let's try to give it some shape, some meaning and some substance.

Finally, there is creative diplomacy using art and theater and entertainment.

So, there are many tasks and many groups that can play a role here, and we need to develop a much more imaginative way of incorporating these groups into the activities.

So what are some of the lessons we've learned? I've already mentioned the necessity of incorporating a whole variety of different groups in the process. Second, I think I need to mention that we will not deal with these problems effectively unless we deal with the structural sources of violence. As much attention needs to be given to the structural underlying sources of the conflict as to the presenting symptoms. Here, the OECD DAC Committee on Economic Assistance is making a very powerful contribution. It was interesting, incidentally, in relation to the discussions between FARC and the government of Colombia, that the first items they wanted on the negotiating table had to do with economic justice, rather than political participation and security. They wanted access to health, education and land. So, we need to begin getting a much more nuanced view of the key issues that need to be addressed first.

Third, I think we need to understand that there is no such thing as permanent peace, as Fiji has reminded us. Rather, there are a series of negotiated agreements or plateaus or understandings which enable us to consolidate or provide spaces for the consolidation of economic, social and political relationships. That's why I think it's important to think in terms of conflict transformation, rather than conflict resolution. We change relationships in order to enable alternative possibilities. Also, it's absolutely important in all of this work that those of us who are doing it never claim credit for positive outcomes. There is a conflict resolution jinx. The moment any organization or individual claims credit for peace, there is a high probability that peace will immediately unravel. I have a theory about this, which is the Clements inverse law of conflict prevention. The more your ego and concern for your own reputation is involved, the less effective you are going to be as a peace builder and a peacemaker. The less your ego and concern for your own reputation are involved, the more effective you are going to be because you will allow those who are party to the conflict to get the recognition for the successes and you can assume responsibility for the negative consequences, that's all to the good.

Fourth, it is really important to focus on healing and reconciliation issues. I don't know how you put Sierra Leone back together again. It's not Humpty Dumpty. There are people wandering around there who've got no limbs-no legs, no arms. This is a graphic example and constant reminder of the savagery and brutality of most current conflicts. How can we bring people who have suffered to the point where they can acknowledge those who have perpetrated the harm, and begin contemplating the next step, when they might begin to accept the others as human beings. This is a long and painful process. So the question is, how do we prevent vicious cycles from taking over and contradicting virtuous cycles? Parallel to any of these processes has to be a real concern for healing and reconciliation, and that is a long-term, desperately difficult process.

I've already mentioned the essential importance of establishing the primacy of people in the solution of their own conflicts. The sixth problem is how to develop equal and emancipatory partnerships with those in conflict, and this is a fundamental problem; especially for organizations based in the North. It is very sobering doing work with partners on the ground in Burundi and elsewhere, and coming with resources which are sometimes greater than those available to government ministries. So how can we say we have an equal partnership when we're coming with highly unequal resources? This is also another highly critical area that I hope we can address over the course of this meeting-how do we develop equal and emancipatory partnerships? We're beginning to frame this problem in terms of how to stand alongside those in conflict-not in front of, not leading, not directing, not providing solutions, but accompanying those in conflict in ways which are going to be genuinely liberating and will enable them to generate stable peace. This is a very, very difficult task. It's difficult for NGOs, but it's more difficult for governments, because governments come in with lots of carrots and lots of sticks. But it is a really crucial issue. It's difficult when you're dealing with people who've encountered slavery and colonialism, and the lingering suspicions that these generate about humanitarian groups.

Eighth, the whole issue of safe spaces for dialogue is another important goal. Ninth, and this is a critical task, is how to strengthen the institutional capacity of public and private institutions in conflict zone in order to begin and sustain ant post-conflict peace. There is a need for safe spaces for dialogue, but there's also the necessity to develop and strengthen civil society and state mechanisms. Finally, there is the question of how to close the early warning-early response gap.

I want to finish with a poem, because poets can say these things better than we can. Seamus Heaney says, in an extract from his poem *The Cure at Troy*:

History says, Don't hope
On this side of the grave
But then, once in a lifetime
The longed for tidal wave
Of Justice can rise up
And hope and history rhyme

So hope for a great sea change
On the far side of revenge
Believe that a further shore
Is reachable from here
Believe in miracles
And cures and healing wells

Thanks very much.

The Role of NGOs in Conflict Prevention Cambodian Experience

Mr. Thun SARAY

President, Cambodian Human Rights and Development Association ADHOC

Distinguished and respected representatives,
Ladies and gentlemen,

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the Japan Institute of International Affairs which organizes this important and useful symposium and invited me to give a speech on the role of Cambodian NGOs in the conflict prevention. It's a great honor for me to be present today here with all of you.

Situated in the quarreling South East Asian region between the West and the East during 1970-80, Cambodia could no longer maintain its peaceful situation and fell down in war in 1970. Since then, Cambodian people received very negative affects from the Cold War and they suffered a lot from all kinds of violence and human rights violations in a period of more than 2 decades. In this period, 5 political regimes succeeded each other.

After the Cold War had ended, Cambodia had a chance to find the conflict settlement with the Peace Agreement signed on October 23, 1991 in Paris by the 4 Cambodian warring factions and 19 countries who had been involved in the Cambodian conflict. A sizable intervention of more than 20,000 UN peace keepers were taken place in Cambodia from 1992 to 1993 (around 18 months) for implementing the Peace Agreement. It was conflict settlement and not conflict resolution, because the UN mission just came to Cambodia for organizing the general election in order to interrupt hostilities for the time being without attempts to eliminate the root causes of destructive conflict and left immediately after the 1993 election. The failure to disarm all factions in conflict, the failure to insure a minimum standards of security and the failure to create trust between the different factions were the important factors of the failure to solve the conflict. The time constraint was the main cause of the conflict resolution's failure of the UN mission. Since the root cause of conflict was not solved, the fighting between the Khmer Rouge force and government force still continued after the election. And the power competition conflict between the two main political parties (royalists and former communists) in the first coalition government had increased until explosion by violence in July 1997. The Cambodian people have enjoyed a full peace situation only after the 1998 general election.

Despite of those weak aspects of the UN intervention, some elements of the post-conflict peace-building emerged during that period especially the emergence of NGOs and civil society, the adoption of a liberal democratic constitution, freedom of expression and press, etc. The emergence and development of NGOs and civil society has played a great role in contributing to solve and prevent conflict. I would like to raise six aspects of NGO's activities which contribute to prevent the

conflict as follow:

- Provide and improve the human rights understanding to the people
- Insure the security from organized violence
- Strengthen democratic institutions and electoral process
- Promote the good governance
- Insure development policies do not exacerbate the risks of conflict
- Justice and peace; Khmer Rouge Tribunal

From their first days of activities, Cambodian NGOs considered respect for human rights a very important factor to ease the tension and conflict between the different quarrel factions. A wide range of human rights education activities are carried out by human rights activists for the police, military, gendarme, students, government officials, teachers, farmers, monks and grass roots people. The most popular forms of human rights education are training, publication of human rights materials and radio, TV broadcasting programs. In the beginning, human rights activists met a lot of difficulties and obstacles because the existing government officials, they didn't understand what is NGO or what are human rights. For example, in December 1992, one provincial authority used more than one hundred soldiers, police and one tank to close down the office of my organization in that province. This act showed us clearly that even human rights activists were considered by the authority as their enemy. But through their human rights education program implementation in the last several years, human rights activists have successfully changed the old enemy's behavior of the warring factors to become more cooperative to each other today. Even though, NGOs could not prevent the factional fighting in July 1997, but NGOs contributed to calm down the tension and improve the political atmosphere and conditions of the 1998 elections. And now, everybody agrees that the political situation has improved a lot and 1999 was considered the first year in the last 3 decades that Cambodian people have enjoyed full peace.

Human rights activities cannot only contribute to solve the political conflict but also contribute to solve and prevent the family conflict and the conflict in the community. Women rights education and other activities of different NGOs have positive impact to promote the role of women in the family, community and the society which contribute to reduce domestic violence and the violence against women.

Security from organized violence is a priority concern of people everywhere. Cambodian NGOs have put this issue as their priority concern in their activities because security is an important factor for conflict prevention and conflict resolution. NGOs have done serious investigations of politically motivated killings, harassment cases and have made strong public condemnations of those acts. They have also lobbied with the international community and have made appeals to the international human rights organizations to help stopping those organized violence acts. The result of the investigation of those cases was also documented and NGOs filed complaints to the court. Now, the political cases

have almost disappeared but we still worry they would reappear when the commune election approaches. Taking into account the positive impact of the NGOs activities and the increased level of people awareness, we expect, from one to another election, the political violence will be decreased every time.

After almost 30 years of wars and internal armed conflict, the overwhelming presence of small arms and their widespread use is one of the many crucial issues that Cambodia must deal with as it emerges as a post-conflict society. The Working Group for Weapons Reduction in Cambodia (WGWR), a coalition of local and international NGOs was established to address this issue through advocacy, networking, public education. This working group has closely watched the government weapons collection campaign and has actively lobbied with the government to organize public destruction of collected weapons, integrate disarmament as part of the demobilization plan, address issues of police and military reform and respect for rule of law.

Democracy is a non-violent form of internal conflict management, improving and strengthening the democratization process is another important factor for conflict prevention. Separation of power and democratic institutions must be strengthened and developed. Through many workshops, seminars and lobby-advocacy activities, NGOs have worked hard in contributing to achieve the above objectives. Election alone is not democracy, but election is an important element of democracy, NGOs have made a lot of efforts to improve the electoral process through their monitoring and voter education activities. Round table discussion among the different political party representatives, election authority, government and NGO people have been arranged by NGOs in order to find appropriate measures for preventing violence and irregularities at each step of the electoral process. Monitoring activities for improving the political atmosphere of each election is also the priority concern of the election watchdog organizations. Voter education represents an important contribution to empower the voters to become the real masters of the power in the democratic society and to make election meaningful.

Another conflict prevention policy is the need to pursue what is generally referred to as good governance. In practice good governance involves promoting the rule of law, tolerance of minority and opposition groups, transparent political process, a commitment to eradicate corruption, an independent judiciary, an impartial police force, a military that is strictly subject to civilian control, a free press and vibrant civil society institutions. Preventive strategy is predicated on the assumption of good faith, the belief that Government will seek to place the welfare of the people as a whole over narrow sectional interests. Sadly, we know that this is often not the case in practice. This is a big challenge for Cambodian NGOs to change the behavior of Cambodian politicians to put welfare of the people as a whole over political party interests.

Through the process of the Consultative Group Meeting (CG Meeting in which donors, NGOs and the Government annually discuss on the Reconstruction and Development of Cambodia, NGOs have played an active role to lobby with the donors to establish a formal working group on rule of law or good governance.

At the CG Meeting in February 1999, the Meeting decided to create different working groups in order to facilitate the reform process. Until now, they established already 5 formal working groups on forestry, demobilization, administrative reform, fiscal reform and social reform with the Government, donor and NGOs representatives. But rule of law or good governance remains until now an informal contact group composed by the representatives of donors only. Why NGOs would like to formalize this working group because we think the formal working group will elaborate benchmarks of progress for the reform of this aspect concretely and we can measure the progress later on. This is better than an informal contact group which only provides recommendations to the government without any concrete plan of action for improving the reform. Even though this working group has not yet been established, NGOs have worked hard through many workshops, seminars and lobby-advocacy activities in order to improve the situation by requesting the government to transform the judiciary to become independent, the military and police to become impartial. This process takes time and can improve only step by step.

Last year, human rights NGOs produced a report on impunity in Cambodia and formulated several recommendations for reducing impunity and strengthening the rule of law. The report was used to sensitize the public opinion about the impunity issue inside and outside the country. It was also used for lobbying with the donor community to establish a formal working group on rule of law or good governance. A group of Cambodian NGOs had drafted one anti-corruption law and proposed it to the government. But the government rejected the NGO's draft law and proposed a new one which could not eliminate or reduce the corruption. One important reason that the government does not like to have a good anti-corruption law is that the government does not yet have the political will to combat corruption seriously. NGOs have to work with the donor community to create this political will in the government. One national seminar on good governance was organized already by the government with participation of NGOs, government people and donors. It's a good start but not enough, NGOs have to continue and increase their efforts to get a good law and enforce it effectively.

Freedom of press for written media is relatively acceptable but broadcasting media (radio and television) is still strongly controlled by the Government. NGOs continue to pay more attention in order to provide more freedom to the public to get access to the broadcasting media. Cambodian civil society has grown up and developed very fast in the last several years but they still lack of human and financial resources and legal framework. Among 600 local NGOs, less than half of this number can operate regularly and they have absorbed this year around 15% of the total funds for NGOs. Almost 200 international NGOs still absorb a big portion of 85%. Despite of this weakness, Cambodian NGOs and civil society have done a lot of activities like the peace marches and have played an important role in contributing on conflict prevention as described above.

Another long-term strategy to prevent conflict is to put greater effort into insuring that development policies do not exacerbate the risks of conflict - by increasing inequality between social groups, for example. In this aspect, NGOs have lobbied with the Government to decrease as soon as possible the military and security's expenditure in the national budget and increase the social budget

(health and education especially) in order to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor, between cities and the country side. NGOs have lobbied also with the financial institutions by requesting to them to consult with civil society during the process of elaborating and adopting their country assistance strategies for Cambodia. NGOs have participated closely in the reform process which started recently to make sure that the reform is going in the right direction and does not increase the inequality between the different groups of the society. They have proposed to the Government many recommendations to improve the new draft land law in order to protect the land rights of the poor people in the country side and the highland people in the north east region of the country. They have also done a study on the situation of land-less people, the causes of this phenomenon and have sensitized the result of this study to the public. Apart from this, they have provided material assistance and services to the marginalized, vulnerable people and to the poorest of the poor in order to alleviate the poverty and reduce inequality between the rich and the poor.

The question justice and peace has posed recently in Cambodian society when the problem to try the Khmer Rouge leaders or not came up. After the Khmer Rouge movement was dismantled completely, the Government proposed to the public, earlier last year, to forget the past that means forget the genocide by the Khmer Rouge regime from 1975 to 1979. The Government used the argument that we need the peace now and if we go to try the Khmer Rouge leaders, we will have another war. But, NGOs didn't agree with the Government proposition, they had consulted with the people by collecting signature and thump print from the people who would like to try the Khmer Rouge leaders by an international tribunal and they collected one hundred thousand signature and thump prints in two weeks. Since then, NGOs have lobbied with the international community to help to establish a credible tribunal to try the Khmer Rouge leaders. Why we would like to have the tribunal for those leaders now? Because we think that we cannot have the sustainable peace without justice, the purpose of a trial is firstly to bring justice to the Cambodian people and to the society; and secondly to prevent the genocide in the future. Who will guarantee that genocide does not happen again in Cambodia if we don't prosecute now? We must all act to prevent the attitude: "If I am the big boss I can do whatever I want because if Pol Pot killed two million people, and I just kill 5,000, why punish me?". Now, the agreement to establish a mixed tribunal under international standards between the Cambodian Government and the UN is almost reached. NGOs still continue to watch closely this process of dialogue whether the international standards of fair trial will be met or not. The fair trial will be realized only when the conditions of international standard of the tribunal are respected.

Why we didn't succeed to have an international tribunal to try the Khmer Rouge leaders, because Cambodian Government didn't agree to establish an ad hoc tribunal by using the argument to protect the national sovereignty. Further more at least one of the permanent members of security council of the UN will veto to the proposition to establish an international tribunal. The reason why the UN Secretary General proposed to the Cambodian Government to establish a mixed tribunal with international standard.

In summary, Cambodian NGOs and civil society have contributed in many aspects to strengthen the peace-building during this post-conflict period in order to prevent the conflict in the future. This contribution could not achieve its objectives in preventing conflict without the support and collaboration of bilateral, multilateral donors and international NGOs especially Japanese Government and NGOs included JVC (one of Japanese NGOs which has been working hard for peace and stability in Cambodia). Cambodian NGOs still need more support and collaboration from donors for their activities in contributing to conflict prevention because the present stability and peace are still fragile. A lot of things have to be done more to strengthen the elements of the peace-building in this post-conflict period. Better collaboration between Cambodian NGOs and Government can also contribute further in this peace-building process.

Thank you for your attention.

Perspectives of Japanese NGOs in the Efforts of PCPB and DDR

Prof. Nobuhiko Suto

Professor, Tokai University and President, InterBand

Thank you very much for the kind introduction, Mr. Chairman. I would like to talk about PCCB, or Post-conflict peace building, and then DDR, or demobilization, disarmament and reintegration, which are expected to solve serious and complex problems idiosyncratic to the contemporary conflict-affected areas, and to hinder the outbreak of future conflicts. At the same time, I would outline what Japanese NGOs have achieved in these fields, as well as our future prospects in tackling the problems.

To begin with, I would like to refer to the general misunderstanding, actual difficulties and some hope in peace-building. The first and common misunderstanding is that, as most people believe, with the end of conflicts, there will be peace. Frankly speaking, I, too, subscribed to that view initially. In reality, however, our efforts and hope for the quest of peace have been betrayed in most cases and we finally came to understand that peace and restoration take a long time after the ceasefire. Sometimes, conflicts resume frequently, and even new conflicts occur during the peace-building process and as a result of it. In other words, there is a significant and enormous gap between the end of conflict and the start of peace, so we have to address this “gap”.

Since the collapse of Cold War System which had stabilized the World by the threat of nuclear warfare, we have seen a large number of violent conflicts around the world, triggered by ethnic, religious, political, social and economic reasons. In 1992, former Secretary-General Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali issued his landmark achievement in peace-building, *An Agenda for Peace*, which advocated the active participation of the United Nations in peacekeeping operations. Many people working in the field of peace-building had hope in these initiatives to restore peace in conflict-torn areas. With the rampant increase in PKO costs and the failure in Somalia and Rwanda missions, however, such optimistic hope is now waning. There are areas that have experienced long-term killing, destruction and mass violation of human rights, and in areas such as Cambodia, Bosnia and Rwanda, even after the ceasefire, peace treaty, resumption of foreign aid, economies have not yet been rebuilt and new governments have found it difficult to become fully capable in maintaining fundamental economic structure. Actually, they are exposed to another internal or external political conflicts with poor economy on the verge of collapse. What this means is that peace cannot be achieved with poor economic capacity and without proper governance. The potential for conflict still exists even within this very precarious state of peace. Again, the fundamental misunderstanding in the international community is that with the end of violent conflict, political stability will ensue automatically, democracy will be restored by the new government, and the sustainable economic development will be achieved. This is totally untrue, though. It takes a long time after the intervention of the UN peacekeepers and others, and the establishment of a new stable society which may lead to the economic development resume. In other words, there is a big gap between ceasefire and development, which is called the “Gap Theory”.

My contention is that this is not merely a physical and temporal gap that we can reclaim with former elements. What is really missing is that we do not know what is really needed to fill the gap. In other words, there is a missing link between ceasefire and economic development—not a gap, but a missing link—because we have no idea what is needed to fill the gap. We have to create a whole new package to link the past and the present.

I represent a Japan-based NGO called InterBand, which has been involved in PCPB since 1992. I have learned, in particular, through the reconciliation process in Rwanda that we have been tackling since the Genocide in 1994, that what is missing there is not just political or economic means for reconstructing the country, but the total package of social system including something that were missing in the former society before the conflict. In other words, in order to restore the society, time is not on your side. You have to create it as soon as possible before serious problems and contradictions emerge, and for that we have to have a minimum social package in search for future sustainable social development. A comprehensive “germ” or “seed” of society is needed to restore the social, economic and political systems. I think there is a lot that various NGOs can contribute in order to create such “MSP: Minimum Social Package”. Large-scale aid using massive resources for the reconstruction of infrastructure is difficult for NGOs, but the provision of a MSP—including the reuniting of family members who have been separated, construction of shelters and community buildings, the establishment of a minimum justice and ethics system making the best use of traditional social systems, and the provision of local jobs yielding income and providing training and chances to the local people—are the area where NGOs, which are close to the problem and people, can play the significant and crucial role in peace-building. I would add in this context, in the scope of NGOs in the early post-conflict stage, the support for the newly-born infant governmental organizations and institutions could also be involved as one of new tasks charged on the shoulder of NGOs.

I came to this conclusion as a result of several personal experiences. For example, I worked for the reconstruction of Mozambique in 1993. We had a small and experimental project called “From Guns to Hoes,” the objective of which was to collect guns, melt them down and transform them into productive tools, such as hoes and ploughs. We partnered with Mr. Masaru Kataoka, who heads an NGO called the Third-World Shop in Japan, and with Ms. Graca Machel, who is now the wife of President Nelson Mandela of the Republic of South Africa, to implement this project. As you are aware, even when a conflict ends in one region, guns can be transported to other parts of the world to create new conflicts. In other words, there is a recycling of guns. The aim of our project was to put an end to that vicious recycling.

From the very beginning, we confronted with complexity of elements involved in DDR. Even in such a small scale project, we had to face the reality of small arms issues. Today, this project to collect guns and other small arms is still going on, to some extent, by the hand of Cristian Council of Mozambique and is considered to be one of the few successful DDR activities in the World. Back in 1993, however, larger Western NGOs considered it too unrealistic, too provincial and too idyllic, so European and American NGOs suffering from aid fatigue were not extensively involved in this project. In fact, collecting guns is a very costly and sensitive process, as you can easily imagine. Moreover, you have to have military

professionals' involvement—amateurs and private citizens cannot do it on their own. When you look at the guns that have been collected, most of them are rusted and thus no longer usable. In other words, although guns are being collected, many are guns that would have been disposed of anyway. We know that the reusable, recyclable guns are being taken care of well and stored in somewhere for the next conflict.

In reality, hoes and other agricultural tools were not very attractive for ex-combatants. These tools were not regarded as sexy items that they may be willing to throw guns and exchange to it. Then, we collected at minimum cost, abandoned bicycles around railway stations which had been giving troubles to local government, and transported them to Mozambique to exchange for the guns. In this way, Japanese NGO's initiative could play a *marginal* but meaningful role in order to attract more attentions of the Western society.

Another area in which we, InterBand, were involved was the Social Impact Assessment of the Landmine Removal activities in Cambodia. To our great disappointment, as you may be aware of, landmine clearance activities are losing support today. Interest of the International Community is waning with the death of Princess Diana and with the award of Nobel Peace Prize to ICBL (International Campaign for Ban of Landmines), but mines are still there giving threat to local people and actually hindering farmers to cultivate fertile lands and even the access to water supplies. At one point in time, landmine removal activities attracted a great deal of attention, but unfortunately, that is no longer true. On the contrary, corruptions within the mine clearing public organization has surfaced in Cambodia, and that accelerated people's apathy for demining.

My question to you, though, is whether it is really a good thing to clear landmines. You might say, "Are you stupid? Of course landmine clearance is good!" However, when I went to the state of Battambang, near Pailin, the strong hold of ex-Khmer Rouge in Northwestern Cambodia, I saw many refugees and IDPs rushing to return to their native villages where landmine clearance is said to be starting, but actual demined areas are too small and limited compared with the number of returnees and their expected activities as villagers. Some had settled in places that had not been cleared, meaning their lives were in even more danger. As a result, many hit mines and yielded casualties.

Another gruesome reality is that you cannot really clear all the landmines. It is particularly difficult to clear landmines on hillsides or water ways. You can afford to clear only those in flat areas, and as the demined flat areas are usually arable and productive, they are usually claimed by influential Generals, local political leaders and capitalists, meaning that the original villagers who owned the land lose it. People are thus afraid that once landmines are cleared, they will lose the land that they have inherited from their ancestors. To prevent this, many tried to block mine-clearing activities, re-building their house just in the midst of mine fields, which are really counterproductive in terms of what International Society are trying to do.

There are lots of Awareness Programs for landmine education, and field seminars are attended by lots of people, but most of them are women and children. Why? Because, even if men know well the danger of landmines and where they are, they do not care since they have families to support.

When I visited a village called Chisan, the village chief mentioned at my field interview that the number of death, especially those of children, by Malaria far exceeds the casualties by mines. They need to engage farming in minefields and they need to collect firewood in mountains to obtain cash for buying medicine, and in doing so they expose themselves to the danger of landmines again. What is really needed is a social impact assessment of landmine clearance, so we decided to address this. For details, please refer to the brochures on our organization outside.

The bottom line is human resources to be needed in this field. After all, this is again a very complex issue. Most of those who have interest in preventive diplomacy and conflict resolution are traditionally those who majored in international relations, politics, ethnic or regional studies, and economic development at best. However, the problem that we are trying to resolve is in the field of complexity. For instance, DDR or the collection of guns, once involved, you will soon find that you also need expertise in marketing, campaign and social psychology etc. My point is that people with different backgrounds and in different disciplines such as management, marketing, small enterprise, gender, social care etc. are all needed, since they have to make up a new small society in harsh and chaotic environment after the conflict.

I would like to take the next five minutes to speak on future prospects for Japanese NGOs and their activities. Because of the reflection of military invasion to Asian neighbors, and due to the severe constraints within the framework of Article 9 of the Constitution which prohibits any military activity to protect national interest, Japan does not have experience in dispatching armed combat forces for conflict resolution and peace-building. This is the very difference between Western NGO staff members who have fundamental military knowledge and experience somehow and Japanese counterparts who are almost complete amateur. However, I still think that there are several areas in which we can make contributions. Number one, we have non-Western, non-Christian values to judge the situations and behave different ways. For example, at countryside in Cambodia, I saw some people asking to a Western NGO working for landmine clearance to start demining from a narrow path leading to a ruined Buddhist temple destroyed by Khmer Rouge. But the Western NGO said, "No, we need to clear the landmines from this farmland at first, for the benefit of people of this village". The local people responded, "No. We need to clear the landmines from this path leading to the Buddhist temple and that is the symbol of the recovery of peace", and that was quite understandable for me.

Another advantage we have is that we have the experience of disarming people completely on three different occasions in history i.e. after World War II, after the Meiji Restoration, and after the Warring States Period in the 16 Century. In fact, absolute authority of military government and its strict policy implication were needed. Simultaneously, however, they used social technique and paid enormous social campaign efforts so that to make the population convince that arms are no more needed. Perhaps we might be able to put this expertise to use in contemporary conflict resolution.

The point I am trying to make Today is that we need *new thinking*. What is also needed is an experimental, trial-and-error process, as well as practical approaches.

Unfortunately, we have to admit that not only NGOs but also civil society itself is still vulnerable and premature here in Japan. Currently, most of Japanese NGOs have to rely either on the government or

business enterprises for financial support. In Japan, civil society is still undeveloped and it is neither capable nor accustomed to support NGO activities. With all hardships, however, what I do expect for Japanese NGOs, is to maintain the moral or spiritual independence. The empowerment of NGOs is the urgent task and the civil society has to develop as the third pillar, in addition to the two existing pillars, namely the public and private sectors, to support our society. This third pillar should not easily align itself with either the government or the business sector; rather, it must be autonomous in order to establish an alternative and new stabilizer function in this crisis-prone society. In that sense, Japanese NGOs, with such a short history, still have a long way to go although future is bright and promising.

Perhaps, we can take advantage of being a late comer and will rapidly catch up with new thinking and new resources that have yet to be tapped. Civil society is one area in which Japan lags far behind, but *wisdom, courage and effort*—not money—is where we would like our focus to be.

Thank you.

In Search of a New Partnership: Japanese NGOs in Networking

Mr. Kensuke Onishi

Chief Coordinator, Peace Winds Japan

Thank you very much for your kind introduction. My name is Onishi. Since I came back from East Timor, I have worked very long without taking any breaks. I thought I would lose weight, but that did not happen. Instead, I have fallen a bit ill, but I would like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to this audience here today. Before I begin, I would especially like to thank the people at JIIA for paying special attention to conflict prevention and conflict resolution, and the role of NGOs in this area, and also for giving us the opportunity to promote our activities in this area. You had to deal with a large number of documents and so on, but you have done a wonderful job.

When we think about conflict resolution in the post-Cold War era, we cannot ignore the role of NGOs. One reason for this is that the nature of conflicts has changed, as we see in the cases of Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, where the states themselves collapsed. In other words, NGOs—we call them non-governable organizations!—have played a role because many of the conflicts today are internal wars and thus cannot be dealt with at the governmental level. NGOs can act rather freely in responding to the needs of the victims of war on the ground. About 10 Japanese NGOs are now working in the areas of conflict prevention and conflict resolution. JEN, or Japan Emergency NGOs, is working in Kosovo, for instance. Associations to aid refugees are also working in the Kosovo area to deliver goods to minority civilians. I understand this area is very, very dangerous, with rock-throwing and gunfire not uncommon. In Asia, the Japan International Volunteer Center is providing a workshop service for skill training in Cambodia. Watch in Action is also working in that country. In Myanmar, KARAMOSIA, an NGO based in Kagoshima Prefecture, in Kyushu, is working in the mountainous areas—the so-called Golden Triangle—helping produce alternative crops to narcotics. The governments of different countries are trying to negotiate with the Myanmar government, without success, but this organization is working very hard in this area. In Mozambique, in Africa, another organization, Ehime Global Network has also taken up the “From Guns to Hoes” project initiated by InterBand and The Third World Shop. The Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy is working in Bangladesh and Indonesia.

I see some familiar faces here. Reverend Terasawa is a Buddhist priest who, when the Chechen conflict escalated in 1995, went there on a fact-finding mission together with Russian staff. The Asian Human Rights Fund, where I used to work, was, I think, a coorganizer. While there, Reverend Terasawa was arrested and disappeared. As it happens, I was in Kanazawa at that time on vacation, and the local paper interviewed Reverend Terasawa’s mother and she said something very impressive. She said, “My son believes in what he does, so I believe in my son.”

There are a number of NGOs involved in the field, although not in an organizational manner. Why is it that I am involved in conflict resolution, rather than prevention? I would like to allude to

my personal experiences. At Peace Winds, we have organized five refugee camps in the northern Kurdish Autonomous Region in Iraq, providing shelter and medical and social services. This is a nongovernmental-level humanitarian intervention which is not sanctioned by the Iraqi government. I hope that no one from the Iraqi government is here today, because if anyone is here representing Iraq, my ranking on their blacklist is sure to go up! Why are we doing this in Iraq to help the Kurdish refugees? Our organization, by nature, focuses on emergency relief efforts. In northern Iraq, there are a number of violent conflicts. Every time we organize refugee camps for food, water and other supplies to be given out, I feel as if I have to swallow sand in the desert because it seems like there is no end to what we are doing. That is why we felt that in addition to the emergency relief efforts; we needed to be involved in more continuous, long-term efforts there, namely to put an end to the conflict itself. Since we are there, we do have the advantage of being able to contact the parties to the conflict.

This is a new field for Japanese NGOs, and we are really suffering from the lack of human and financial resources. We are also suffering from a shortage of experienced workers and from the limited sharing of information. I am not feeling too well, and I am beginning to sound a little pessimistic. I apologize for this. Anyway, we have been trying to address these deficiencies by setting up a new network of NGOs. We call this the Japan Platform, using a term borrowed from the computer and automobile industries. In other words, individuals and organizations with different backgrounds—NGOs, government agencies, corporations, media, research institutes—can all come together to share their expertise in conflict prevention and conflict resolution, as well as in emergency relief. The key characteristic of this new initiative is that not just NGOs are involved. There is participation from other sectors as well, including the government and the private sector, in the form of both moral and financial support. We have good models, such as the European Platform, where NGOs are involved in conflict prevention and conflict resolution. We still have a long way to go here in Japan. We are also trying to create a global network so that Japanese NGOs can make a greater contribution. This is still a new initiative, but before closing, I would like to thank the Japan Institute of International Affairs for giving us the support that will facilitate our efforts.

Significance of NGO Networking

Mr. Paul Van Tongeren

Executive Director of the European Centre for Conflict Prevention

Thank you. Thanks also to the Japan Institute of International Affairs, and especially to Ambassador Owada and Mr. Ozawa for inviting me. I think it is very important that this conference has been organized.

Being the sixth speaker—and a lot has been said by important speakers—I will try to summarize some of my points. I hope that it is not too long for you to listen to six speeches!

First, I would like to give you some sense of the great importance of conflict prevention. We are aware of it, but I would like to stress some points.

In his important report to the UN, Kofi Annan said: “Today, no one disputes that prevention is better, and cheaper, than reacting to crises after the fact. Yet, our political and organizational cultures and practices remain oriented far more towards reaction than prevention... The transition from a culture of reaction to a culture of prevention will not be easy, but the difficulty of our task does not make it any less imperative.” I would like to look at what should be done to help, to better support, that culture of prevention, and to give it more tools.

Civil wars today cause massive suffering and gross violations of human rights among the population. The costs of such humanitarian disasters are not only visible in human suffering, but also in the political and social costs of the destruction of a democratic or other political system or, in some cases, the disintegration of a state. Violent conflicts threaten international security, and the traditional answers of the international community are inadequate.

Measures to prevent conflict from escalating into violence are much less risky than military action for restoring peace once violence has become rampant. Moreover, the costs of prevention are many times cheaper than responding to or after a conflict. In the past few years, there has been a development within many northern governments and development organizations, like the World Bank, i.e., the setting up of Conflict Resolution units, from where policy is focused on conflict prevention and peace building. More and more, governments are starting to see the importance of this, but NGOs too have a key role to fulfill.

Kevin Clements already gave a very good presentation about the role of civil society. I think his presentation and Mr. Thun’s summary of the important roles NGOs played in Cambodia were good illustrations of how civil society and NGOs really have a crucial role to play, so I will summarize some of my points.

I think NGOs play a very important role in this respect. One way of describing it the way that John McDonald, in his book on multitrack diplomacy, divides society into 12 different sectors, such as NGOs, the media, women’s organizations, and so on, and looks at how those sectors have additional, complementary functions and advantages, and how they should fulfill their roles. As an organization,

we put out a book titled *People Building Peace*, which we will put on the table outside. In this book, we described a lot of those sectors, particularly women's organizations, churches and so on, and the roles they can play, with some inspiring stories. That is, I think, an important way of describing roles to fulfill. Another way is more issue-based, and less concerned about describing sectors.

I think NGOs have a very important role in early warning and in early preventive action, because they are much more related to grassroots movements and are aware earlier of what is happening. Governments can't fulfill that role so well: They are not in the rural areas and so on. Second, NGOs, especially development NGOs, often have long-standing relationships with groups. They know what is happening. They know the differences. They know from developments how tensions are growing. They can see the difference, and, because of the drift of the local people, they can see them earlier, and with openness and frankness. They hear what is happening, and they can send out early warning signals.

Related to that is also the monitoring of the human rights situation, and how NGOs can link what is happening at the local level with the mobilization of support in other regions. NGOs have really to bring the attention of the broader public, the media and politicians, to these facts and to warn them about what should be done. Another important role is to strengthen civil society. As Kevin also said, finding solutions for peace and the solving of conflicts are the roles of the local actors. This can't be done by groups outside. But such groups can strengthen and facilitate processes. They can facilitate training. They can support the local actors in a lot of ways—by organizing exposure programs, for example, in which persons from a conflict zone are invited to South Africa or Northern Ireland or some other place to study how the people there solved similar problems. This is very meaningful. You can learn a lot, and it can be very stimulating to learn how others in similar situations accomplished this. So, these are the types of activities that can be really helpful.

Another thing, also, in the Cambodian example that was given, was educational work, i.e., how to educate, for example, the policy officers, the administrators and the officials, so that they are more aware of what they are doing, and so that they don't, as you see so often, come to your office to close it with 100 men and a tank! So that they see that you are different, and that there is no need to invade your office with tanks. I think that the educational part is very important, as well.

Last, just to mention some examples. NGOs also have crucial roles to play in the field of reintegration and reconciliation. Collectively, when you look to the roles that NGOs are especially qualified for, often they are ones that governments and others can't fulfill. NGOs are less constrained by narrow mandates of, say, foreign policy imperatives. They have a broader mandate. They have more access to areas inaccessible to official actors. They can talk to several parties without losing their credibility. They can directly deal with grassroots populations, which is often not possible for government officials. And, it is more possible for them to act in obscurity, without media or public scrutiny. Also, because they often have long-standing relationships, build on trust, with civil society, they can better see the differences, or the growing tensions, and can put them in a broader perspective and context. That is also a very important difference, because a lot of media and

politicians are just looking for very short notices. They are not looking for a long-term perspective, but are just looking until the next elections, or the papers they'd like to publish the next day. But the NGO attitude is much more toward to long-lasting relationships and trust and finding ways to build sustainable peace. These are important differences and, in general, I think that NGOs, especially, can fulfill important roles in implementing this long-term perspective.

I know that there are also a lot of possible criticisms about what NGOs can do, and that they are not saints. But I would like to stress that these are important roles—and I think that this should be more recognized—and that there is really a need, also, for governments and NGOs to have take a more coherent, integrated approach, to cooperate in terms of the different, complementary roles they can play and in formulating this into a more integrated policy. To mention an example, I'd like to look at how our European Platform was established and what the different functions we, as a national platform and a European platform, should fulfill.

The European Platform was established three years ago, after a large conference with 1,200 participants in Amsterdam. There was a clear demand at the conference, a need expressed for the different organizations in Europe—in Germany, in Sweden, in Holland, in Portugal, in Greece—to meet more often and know each other better, because the different conflict resolution and peace building organizations were not meeting. They had very little contact, and a lot of different languages. Unlike the development NGOs and human rights NGOs and so on, which had their own secretariats and networks, these NGOs in Europe had nothing, so they asked me if I could identify the key organizations in Germany, in Sweden, in the UK, to bring them together. So that is what we did. In 1997–1998, we had some 30 or 40 key organizations. Now, we have an expanding network of contacts—about 130, just including the key contacts—in Europe, and we try to convene meetings twice a year—although sometimes it's once a year—to bring those groups together to discuss common concerns, common interests and how we can cooperate. This is seen more and more—if you have watched the processes of the past three or four years—as a very, very important task.

Another key task is to facilitate networking among organizations working in this field. Because it is a new field, nearly all the organizations are very small and totally understaffed. In a lot of countries, they only have one or two people, or just volunteers. So, covering this field, with all the disciplines, with all the things happening, with the very broad issues, is a hell of a job. None of has that kind of staff. We don't have a research department and a library, with 10 people in the library and 20 in the research department. I think that the majority of conflict prevention and conflict resolution organizations in Europe have perhaps one or two people, no more. Some are larger, but they are the exceptions. So, a lot has to be done, and it is very good to share information with others, and thus important that you have e-mail and Web sites into which this information is put. So the key point is to facilitate networking and share information. We published a book, for instance, a directory of the 500 key organizations in the world in this field. This was seen as very valuable because that information had not been available previously.

A second point is to provide an overview of conflicts and increased knowledge of conflicts and

their impact through the production of conflict surveys that describe the textual dynamics of conflicts and the organizations involved in the resolution. You can find information on the background of conflicts, but it is very difficult to know, for example, what are the key organizations involved in bringing peace and reconciliation in Algeria or in Rwanda, or who are the key actors in Sudan. We thought it was very important to make concise surveys of these conflicts, and also have surface information on the key organizations involved. It is very difficult to obtain such information, and it is a really great help and support for local organizations, because when they are in Africa or other, sometimes remote countries, with few contacts, it is very important that the key organizations, which are doing a wonderful job, are exposed more to the international audience. Then, when media or development organizations approaching those countries come for humanitarian or relief work, they know directly which are the most important groups. So we started a project. *Searching for Peace* in Africa was the first book, together with ACCORD and Vasu Gounden, who is sitting there, and we always look for cooperation with groups in the region. We will publish a similar book on Europe in spring next year, and we are planning to put out one—and I think it will be perhaps twice as thick as this one—on the conflicts and who is working for peace in Asia. I think this is a very challenging and very important project, and I hope that with a lot of you present, we can discuss ways to cooperate to make this book on who is searching for peace in Asia, because such an overview, such a book, doesn't exist.

That was another task for us as a European Platform: To try to catalyze and stimulate activities in this field. The third important task is to increase the profile and reputation of conflict prevention and information through publications, media productions and other activities. The fourth, and I will be a little bit shorter, is to raise conflict presentation issues in the political arena, though advocacy and lobbying activities aimed at the European Union and governments. I'd like to mention one example, which I think fits very well with this audience. Hearing that there would be a summit next July in Okinawa that would deal also with conflict presentations and that the G8 would meet there and that they would discuss conflict prevention, after a declaration made in December last year in Berlin, we thought that it would be very good and a challenge to make a document from the conflict resolution community. There are a lot of conflict resolution and peace building organizations in the world, and we should address the G8 and tell them what we demand from them, what our wishes are. So, together with International Alert and Safer World, the European Platform made a document, which will be presented to the ministries of foreign affairs of the G8 countries. The document is quite new, and those who are interested in endorsing it, please contact me. We would like really to have a list of 200 NGOs, mainly from the G8 countries, but also other NGOs, and say to the G8 what is important in field of conflict prevention, and we really expect that when you address this in Okinawa, you will focus on these areas.

Now we come to the significance of NGO networking. I have already mentioned several of the tasks we developed as the European Platform, but I think these tasks should be taken to a higher level. I think that there is a need not only for a European network. I'm just expounding what I understood

from Vasu, but in Africa you have a lot of activities aimed at building up networks. I heard here in Japan last year, at the Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy, that they are building up some kind platform, first at the national level, and are also planning to work on a sort of network for the Asia-Pacific region. So I think it is really time for us to build more on international networking, going higher than the national or regional level, and looking at how we can organize this.

I think there are six crucial tasks for such an international network. The first is the networking itself, and how to organize it. This is just an anecdote, but when I talked to the organizers the day before yesterday about the G8 document, they were not so pleased that we from Europe committed the G8 document to this conference, and that there had not been earlier consultation. And they were right. They were totally right. I think that at this moment we lack the structures at the international level to have conceptualization and planning on how to deal with such topics. So, these things should also be done more on the international level, and not coming from one region, from the States or Europe. International networking is the first task. The second is to provide support to national platforms. I think it's crucial in such a structure that we have more national platforms and key contacts in countries, and that they can disseminate information in their country, in their language. You can't do that from Washington or Brussels or Tokyo. It is really important that you also have national contacts and national platforms. Third, encourage cooperation and the exchange of information among the members of such networks. Fourth, support coordinated advocacy and lobbying activities—take the example of G8. Fifth, indicate innovative activities, such as educational, media and advocacy projects. Last, strengthen capacity and expertise. This is a very new, weak field; we really lack staff capacity and resources, and I think it is very important that we look at how we can enhance and strengthen our field, so that more people are knowledgeable, so that you can study it at university, that you can get relevant training, and so on. So these are tasks, but you also get more credit, get more weight, when it is done at the national and international level.

I've seen that I have to summarize, to close. I think that coalition building—the last two points—in Asia is crucial. I hope also that this conference can be substantive in supporting and simulating work on coalition-building in this field in Asia, and that the key organizations from conflict zones, as well as those from Japan and other countries not in conflict zones, come together to look for a common agenda and for ways to support each other, and look to those six tasks I described. I think that really this step should be taken, and I really hope that this conference can play some role in this. Because when you look at what is happening now in Asia—for example, the developments of the past one or two years in Pakistan and Kashmir, with the nuclear issue, in Indonesia and Fiji, and I won't even talk about China—there are a lot of potential problems. Potential problems are big problems. And where is the community in Asia concerned in this? Where are the programs and plans for dealing with it? We have to organize our field. We have to organize our constituency and look at how we can plan these things. I don't think that after tomorrow, it will be more peaceful. I think that there is a great risk, even looking just at those examples, that there will be more tensions, more conflicts. It is our responsibility, our task, to come with concrete plans to organize this and also to

work for coalition-building, because when we don't have an infrastructure for conflict prevention, when we don't have an infrastructure of committed and experienced organizations—we can learn a lot from each other, but if we don't have that infrastructure—everybody is looking at the other and saying, “This one has to do this, and they have to do this...” And the government, and also yourselves and your community, has an important task to fulfill. So I hope that this conference will play a role in moving closer to coalition building in Asia.

Thank you.

国際シンポジウム 紛争予防におけるNGOの役割」

(平成12年6月9日 - 10日 於：高輪プリンスホテル)

主催：日本国際問題研究所

協力：日本予防外交センター / 後援：外務省、毎日新聞社、ジャパン タイムズ

6月9日(金)

午前：全体会合 (公開：日・英同時通訳付)

国際館パミール2階“福寿の間”

- 9:00-9:20 開会挨拶
小和田 恆 (日本国際問題研究所理事長)
- 基調講演
- 9:20-9:40 「NGOと紛争予防：国連の展望」
法眼 健作 (国際連合事務次長)
- 9:40-10:00 「市民社会と紛争予防」
ケビン・クレメンツ (インターナショナルアラート事務局長)
- 10:00-10:20 「カンボジアの経験」
トン・サライ (カンボジア人権・開発協会理事長)
- 10:20-10:40 コーヒー・ブレイク
- 10:40-11:05 「紛争後平和再建及び武装解除・再統合における日本のNGOの展望」
首藤 信彦 (東海大学教授・インターナント代表)
「日本のNGOとネットワークの模索」
大西 健丞 (ピースウィズ・ジャパン主任調整員)
- 11:05-11:20 「NGOネットワークの意義」
ポール・ファン・トンヘラン (ヨーロッパプラットフォーム所長)
- 11:20-11:50 質疑応答
11:50-12:00 分科会取り進め方についての説明
- 12:10-13:30 昼食

国際館パミール2階“末広の間”

午後：分科会セッション1 (非公開：英語のみ)

さくらタワー2階コンファレンスフロア

*参加者は5グループに分かれ、共通のテーマについてディスカッションを行う。

- 13:30-17:30 セッション1
- 共通テーマ 「NGOの役割と限界」
- 国家や国際機関との連携のあり方
 - ネットワークの必要性、あるべき姿
 - NGOの(現場での)責任と保護
 - NGOによる早期警戒
- 議長：第1グループ：遠山 清彦 (ピースウィズ・ジャパン 平和政策エグゼクティブディレクター)
第2グループ：長 有紀枝 (難民を助ける会常務理事)
第3グループ：ジョン・マークス (サーチフォアモンクアウト理事長)
第4グループ：バージニア・ガンバ (ISS軍備管理プログラム長)
第5グループ：アーヌルフ・トブジョンセン (UNHCR・NGOコーディネーター)

(15:20-15:40 コーヒー・ブレイク)

18:00- 小和田恆・日本国際問題研究所理事長主催 レセプション

国際館パミール1階“暁光の間”

6月10日(土)

午前：分科会セッション2 (非公開：英語のみ)

さくらタワー2階コンファレンスフロア

*参加者は5グループに分かれ、各テーマについてディスカッションを行う。

9:00-12:30 セッション2

第1グループ：「小型武器」

議長：堂之脇 光朗(日本予防外交センター副会長)

第2グループ：「緊急人道救援」

議長：フランシス・アマー(赤十字国際委員会国際機関課長)

第3グループ：「社会開発」

議長：長谷川 祐弘(UNDP東京事務所駐日代表)

第4グループ：「市民社会構築」

議長：ベン・レイリー(インターナショナル IDEA シニア・プログラマディクター)

第5グループ：「東南アジア」

議長：テレサ・ブシャール(CECI人権部長)

(10:40-11:00 コーヒーブレイク)

12:30-14:00 昼食

さくらタワー3階“七軒茶屋”

午後：総括全体会合 (公開：日・英同時通訳付)

国際館パミール2階“福寿の間”

14:00-15:20 パネル・ディスカッション(分科会セッション2について)

モデレーター：明石 康(日本予防外交センター会長)

パネリスト：堂之脇 光朗(日本予防外交センター副会長)

フランシス・アマー(赤十字国際委員会国際機関課長)

長谷川 祐弘(UNDP東京事務所 駐日代表)

ベン・レイリー(インターナショナル IDEA シニア・プログラマディクター)

テレサ・ブシャール(CECI人権部長)

15:20-15:40 コーヒーブレイク

15:40-17:00 パネル・ディスカッション(分科会セッション1について)

モデレーター：小和田 恆(日本国際問題研究所理事長)

パネリスト：遠山 清彦(ピースウィンズ・ジャパン 平和政策エグゼクティブ・コーディネーター)

長 有紀枝(難民を助ける会 常務理事)

ジョン・マークス(サーチ・フォー・コングラウド 理事長)

バージニア・ガンバ(ISS軍備管理プログラム長)

アーヌルフ・トブジョンセン(UNHCR NGO コーディネーター)

17:00-17:30 質疑応答

17:30 終了

International Symposium “The Role of NGOs in Conflict Prevention”

June 9-10, 2000

The Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIJA)
In cooperation with The Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy (JCPD)
Supported by Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), The Mainichi Newspapers and The Japan Times

A g e n d a

9 June, Friday

Opening Plenary (English/Japanese)

Venue: Fukuju Room, 2nd Floor, PAMIR

- 09:00-09:20 Opening Remark:
Ambassador Hisashi OWADA, President,
The Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIJA)
- Keynote Speeches:
- 09:20-09:40 “NGOs and Conflict Prevention: A United Nations Perspective”
Mr. Kensaku HOGEN, Under-Secretary-General, the United Nations
- 09:40-10:00 “Civil Society and Conflict Prevention”
Prof. Kevin P. CLEMENTS, Professor,
Secretary General, International Alert
- 10:00-10:20 “Cambodian Experience”
Mr. THUN Saray, President
Human Rights and Development Association ADHOC
- 10:20-10:40 Coffee Break
- 10:40-11:05 “Perspectives of Japanese NGOs in the Efforts of PCPB*¹ and DDR*²”
Prof. Nobuhiko SUTO, President, InterBand
“In Search of a New Partnership: Japanese NGOs in Networking”
Mr. Kensuke ONISHI, Chief Coordinator, Peace Winds Japan
- 11:05-11:20 “Significance of NGO Networking”
Mr. Paul van TONGEREN, Executive Director, European
Platform for Conflict Prevention and Transformation
- 11:20-11:50 Questions and Answers
- 11:50-12:00 Explanation of Closed Working Group Sessions
- 12:10-13:30 Lunch for Participants
Venue: Suehiro Room, 2nd Floor, PAMIR

Closed Working Group Sessions (English only)

Venue: Conference Floor, 2nd Floor, SAKURA TOWER

*Participants will be divided into 5 small groups. Each group will discuss suggested topics.

13:30-17:30 Session 1

"The Potentials and Limitations of NGOs"

- Working with Other Actors (States, Regional Organizations, International Organizations)
- Networking of NGOs (especially in Asia)
- What should the Code of Conduct be?
- What is an effective Early Warning Mechanism?

Chairs

- Group 1: Dr. Kiyohiko TOYAMA,
Coordinator of Peace Research Unit, Peace Winds Japan
- Group 2: Ms. Yukie OSA, Managing Director,
Association for Aid and Relief (AAR), Japan
- Group 3: Mr. John MARKS, President, Search for Common Ground
- Group 4: Ms. Virginia GAMBA, Head of Arms Management Programme,
Institute for Security Studies (ISS)
- Group 5: Mr. Arnulv TORBJORNSEN, NGO Coordinator, UNHCR

(15:20-15:40 Coffee Break)

18:00- Reception hosted by Ambassador Hisashi OWADA, President of JIIA
Venue: Gyoukoh Room, 1st Floor, PAMIR

10 June (Saturday)

Closed Working Group Sessions (English only)

Venue: Conference Floor, 2nd Floor, SAKURA TOWER

*Participants will be asked to join one of five different groups. Each group will discuss a specific topic.

09:00-12:30 Session 2

Group 1: Small Arms

Chair: Ambassador Mitsuro DONOWAKI, Vice Chairman, JCPD

Group 2: Emergency Humanitarian Relief

Chair: Mr. Francis AMAR, Head of International Organization Division, ICRC

Group 3: Social Development

Chair: Mr. Sukehiro HASEGAWA, Director of Tokyo Office, UNDP,

Group 4: Civil Society Building

Chair: Dr. Ben REILLY,

Senior Programme Officer, International IDEA
Group 5: Southeast Asia
Chair: Mrs. Therese BOUCHARD,
Director of Human Rights Department, CECI

(10:40-11:00 Coffee Break)

12:30-14:00 Lunch for Participants
Venue: Shichikenjaya Restaurant, 3rd Floor, SAKURA TOWER

Closing Plenary (English/Japanese)

Venue: Fukuju Room, 2nd Floor, PAMIR

14:00-15:20 Wrap-up Panel Discussion (Session 2)
Moderator: Mr. Yasushi AKASHI, Chairman, JCPD
Panelists: Ambassador Mitsuro DONOWAKI, Vice Chairman, JCPD
Mr. Francis AMAR, Head of International Organization
Division, ICRC
Mr. Sukehiro HASEGAWA, Director of Tokyo Office, UNDP
Dr. Ben REILLY, Senior Programme Officer, International
IDEA
Mrs. Therese BOUCHARD,
Director of Human Rights Department, CECI

15:20-15:40 Coffee Break

15:40-17:00 Wrap-up Panel Discussion (Session 1)
Moderator: Ambassador Hisashi OWADA, JIIA
Panelists: Dr. Kiyohiko TOYAMA
Coordinator of Peace Research Unit, Peace Winds, Japan

Ms. Yukie OSA,
Managing Director, Association for Aid and Relief (AAR),
Japan
Mr. John MARKS, President, Search for Common Ground
Ms. Virginia GAMBA, Head of Arms Management Programme,
Institute for Security Studies (ISS)
Mr. Arnulv TORBJORNSEN, NGO Coordinator, UNHCR

17:00-17:30 Questions and Answers

17:30 End of Symposium

*1 PCPB: Post-Conflict Peace Building

*2 DDR: Disarmament, Demobilization and Re-integration

International Symposium
 “ The Role of NGOs in Conflict Prevention ”

June 9-10, 2000

The Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIJA)
 In cooperation with The Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy (JCPD)
 Supported by Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), The Mainichi Newspapers and The Japan Times

List of Participants

AFRICA			
South Africa	ACCORD	Mr. Vasu GOUNDEN	Executive Director
South Africa	Institute for Security Studies (ISS)	Ms. Virginia GAMBA	Deputy Director and Head of Arms Management Programme
Senegal	Department of Political Science, University of St-Louis in Senegal	Dr. Ousmane KANE	Professor
AMERICAN CONTINENTS			
Canada	Alternatives	Mr. Robert DAVID	Project Officer - East Asia
Canada	Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE)	Ms. Karen DALKIE	Program Manager
Canada	The Canadian Centre for International Studies and Cooperation (CECI)	Mrs. Therese BOUCHARD	Director of the Human Rights Department
Guatemala	Centro de Mediacion Negociacion Internacional (CMN)	Mrs. Lucrecia ARRIOLA de Paniagua	Senior Adviser in Negotiation and Mediation
USA	Program Quality and Support Department, Catholic Relief Services	Mr. Jaco CILLIERS	Justice and Peacebuilding Senior Technical Adviser
USA	Global Coalition for Africa (GCA)	Amb. Ahmedou OULD-ABDALLAH	Executive Secretary
USA	Search For Common Ground	Mr. John MARKS	President
ASIA (CENTRAL)			
Kazakhstan	Centre for Conflict Management (CCM)	Dr. Elena SADOVSKAYA	President
Tajikistan	Tajik Center for Citizenship Education	Mrs. Gulchekhra NOSIROVA	Director
ASIA (EAST)			
China	China Foundation For International and Strategic Studies (CFISS)	Mr. PENG Hongwei	Deputy Secretary General
China	Non-Governmental Organization Research Center (NGORC), Tsinghua University	Mr. WANG Ming	Director
China	Dept. of Political Science and Public Administration, Peking University	Prof. SHI Hexing	Associate Professor and Deputy Chairman

ASIA (SOUTH)			
Afganistan	Norwegian Church Aid Afghanistan Programme (NCA)	Mr. Mohammed Haneef ATMAR	Programme Manager
India	Institute for Conflict Management (ICM)	Dr. Ajai SAHNI	Executive Director
India	Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (IPCS)	Mr. P. R. CHARI	Director
India	International Center for Peace Initiative (ICPI)	Mr. Karan R. SAWHNY	Director
India	International Centre for Peace Studies	Dr. Ashok K. BEHURIA	Assistant Director
Sri Lanka	Center for Development Alternatives (CDA)	Mr. Sathivale BALAKRISHNAN	Executive Director
Sri Lanka	National Peace Council of Sri Lanka (NPC)	Mr. Tyrol FERDINANDS	General Secretary
Sri Lanka	Sewa Lanka Foundation (SLF)	Ms. Lakshi S. ABEYASEKERA	Director Special Projects
ASIA (SOUTHEAST)			
Cambodia	Cambodian Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCCR)	Mr. Sopheak OKSEREI	Co-Chairman and Coordinator
Cambodia	Cambodian Human Rights and Development Association ADHOC	Mr. THUN Saray	President
Cambodia	Working Group for Weapons Reduction in Cambodia (WGWR)	Mr. Edgar JANZ	WGWR advisor
Cambodia	Working Group for Weapons Reduction in Cambodia (WGWR)	Mr. Sinthay NEB	Excecutive Coordinator
East Timor	Catholic Relief Services	Ms. Maria Ida (Deng) GIGUIENTO	Project Manager for Peace and Reconciliation Programs
Indonesia	Indonesian Legal Aid and Human Rights Association (PBHI)	Mr. Rachland NASHIDIK	Vice-President
Indonesia	Volunteer Team for Humanity (TRK)	Ms. Ayu RATIH	Staff at the Education and Public Campaign Division
Malaysia	Research and Education for Peace (REP)	Dr. Kamarulzaman ASKANDAR	Coordinator
Philippines	Gaston Z. Ortigas Peace Institute (GZO-PI)	Mr. Esmeraldo B. LAMPAUOG	Deputy Executive Director
Philippines	National Council of Churches in the Philippines (NCCP)	Ms. Maureen Belen LOSTE	Program Secretary (Program Unit of Faith, Witness and Service)
Thailand	Asian Network for Free Elections (ANFREL), Forum-Asia	Ms. Somsri BERGER	International Coordinator for ANFREL
Thailand	Foundation for International Human Resource Development (FIHRD)	Dr. Chira HONGLADAROM	Secretary-General
Vietnam	Vietnam Marine Science and Technology Association (VIMASTA)	Mr. NGUYEN Huy Mac	Member of Standing Committee of VAMASTA, Editor-in-chief of Ocean Magazine

EUROPE			
Belgium	European Centre for Common Ground	Ms. Sandra MELONE	Executive Director
Belgium	Institute for International Assistance and Solidarity (IFIAS) Brussels asbl	Rv. Junsei TERASAWA	Field Activist and Conflict Mediator in Caucasus
Netherlands	European Centre for Conflict Prevention	Ms. Monique MEKENKAMP	Project co-coordinator regional programme, Asia
Netherlands	European Centre for Conflict Prevention	Mr. Paul van TONGEREN	Executive Director
Netherlands	European Centre for Conflict Prevention	Mr. Hans van de VEEN	Researcher
Sweden	International IDEA (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance)	Dr. Ben REILLY	Senior Programme Officer
UK	Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford	Dr. Owen GREENE	Professor
UK	International Alert	Prof. Kevin P. CLEMENTS	Secretary General
JAPAN			
	The Africa Society of Japan(ASJ)	Mr. Yasushi KUROKOCHI	Vice-President
	Amnesty International Japanese Section	Mr. Shin FURUYA	Staff member, Campaign & Action Department
	Amnesty International Japanese Section	Ms. Juli MORIZAWA	Secretary General
	Asian Community Trust	Mr. Toshihiro MENJU	Acting Executive Secretary
	Association for Aid and Relief (AAR), Japan	Mr. Tadamasa FUKIURA	Vice-President
	Association for Aid and Relief (AAR), Japan	Ms. Hiroko NIIMURA	Programme Officer
	Association for Aid and Relief (AAR), Japan	Ms. Yukie OSA	Managing Director
	FASID International Development Research Institute	Dr. Kazuo TAKAHASHI	Director
	Heisei International University	Prof. Naoki SAITO	Professor
	Hiroshima Peace Institute	Mr. Masamichi KAMIYA	Visiting Research Fellow
	Institute for International Policy Studies (IIPS)	Mr. Tetsuo SHIOGUCHI	Senior Research Fellow
	InterBand	Ms. Kae MATSUURA	Secretary General
	InterBand, African Reconciliation Committee	Prof. Nobuhiko SUTO	President
	International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR)	Mr. Ryo ONOYAMA	International Secretariat, Secretariat
	Japan Alliance for Humanitarian Demining Support (JAHDS)	Mr. Tetsuya KANAZAWA	Staff member
	Japan Alliance for Humanitarian Demining Support (JAHDS)	Mr. Hiroshi TOMITA	Executive Director, Secretary General
	The Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy (JCPD)	Mr. Yasushi AKASHI	Chairman

	Diplomacy (JCPD)		
	The Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy (JCPD)	Ambassador Kuniaki ASOMURA	Executive Director
	The Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy (JCPD)	Ambassador Mitsuro DONOWAKI	Vice-Chairman
	The Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy (JCPD)	Mr. Ichiji ISHII	Vice-Chairman
	The Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy (JCPD)	Prof. Kenichi ITO	President
	The Japan Center for Preventive Diplomacy (JCPD)	Mr. Naoki TOMITA	Acting Executive Secretary
	The Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA)	Ambassador Shinsuke HORIUCHI	Adjunct Research Fellow
	The Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA)	Prof. Toshiya HOSHINO	Adjunct Research Fellow
	The Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA)	Prof. Tsutomu KIKUCHI	Adjunct Research Fellow
	The Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA)	Ambassador Hisashi OWADA	President
	The Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA)	Mr. Toshiro OZAWA	Acting Director
	Japan International Volunteer Center (JVC)	Mr. Kyung Mook KIM	Research Fellow, Watch & Action for FR Yugoslavia
	Japan International Volunteer Center (JVC)	Mr. Michiya KUMAOKA	President
	Japan International Volunteer Center (JVC)	Mr. Maki SATO	Director of Palestine Office
	Japan International Volunteer Center (JVC)	Mr. Kiyotaka TAKAHASHI	Research and Policy Advisor
	Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation (JANIC)	Mr. Michio ITO	Managing Director
	JEN	Ms. Yoko ASAKAWA	Programme Officer
	JEN	Mr. Yuji MORI	Secretary General
	KARAMOSIA International	Mr. Kenichi KATO	President
	Medecins Sans Frontieres Japan	Mr. Hajime SEKIGUCHI	Vice-President
	MeRU Medical Relief Unit, Japan	Mr. Yasujuro KAMATA	Chairman & C.E.O
	MeRU Medical Relief Unit, Japan	Mr. Kenya KUWAHATA	Deputy Executive Secretary
	National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA)	Dr. Akiko FUKUSHIMA	Senior Researcher
	OISCA-International	Mr. Hiroshi HAYASHI	Programme Coordinator, International Affairs Division
	PARinAC Japan Forum	Mr. Hiroaki ISHII	Focal Point
	Peace Winds Japan (PWJ)	Ms. Miho KISHITANI	Project Officer
	Peace Winds Japan (PWJ)	Mr. Kensuke ONISHI	Chief Coordinator

	Peace Winds Japan (PWJ)	Dr. Kiyohiko TOYAMA	Peace Research Unit Coordinator
--	-------------------------	---------------------	------------------------------------

	Peace Winds Japan (PWJ)	Mr. Koichi YAMAUCHI	Project Officer
	Refugee Assistance Headquarters (RHQ), Foundation for the Welfare and Education of the Asian People	Ms. Yumiko FUJIWARA	Director, Planning & Coordination Division
	Refugee Assistance Headquarters (RHQ), Foundation for the Welfare and Education of the Asian People	Mr. Kazumi SUZUKI	Director-General
	Soka Gakkai, Office of Activities for Peace and Culture	Mr. Kimiaki KAWAI	Program Coordinator

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

USA	United Nations	Mr. Kensaku HOGEN	Under-Secretary-General for Communications and Public Information, Department of Public Information
Japan	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP Tokyo Office)	Mr. Sukehiro HASEGAWA	Director
Switzerland	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	Mr. Arnulv TORBJORNSEN	NGO Coordinator
Japan	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Regional Office for Japan and the Republic of Korea	Mr. James KOVAR	Senior Liaison Officer
USA	The World Bank	Mr. Kazuhide KURODA	Knowledge Management & Partnership Coordinator, Social Development Department, Post-Conflict Unit

OTHERS

Switzerland	International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)	Mr. Francis AMAR	Head, International Organizations Division
Japan	Japanese Red Cross Society (JRCS)	Mr. Akira NAKATA	Director of Development Cooperation Division, International Relations Department Operations Sector
Japan	Japan Committee for UNICEF	Mr. Akihiko MORITA	Head of the Information and Public Affairs Division
Japan	Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	Mr. Yuichi SASAOKA	Senior Advisor/Development Planning Specialist
Japan	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA)	Mr. Katsuhiko OKU	Director of the United Nations Policy Division
Japan	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA)	Mr. Yukio TAKEUCHI	Director-General of the Foreign Policy

	(MOFA)		the Foreign Policy Bureau
Singapore	United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), Singapore	Dr. Kanwaljit SOIN	Chairperson