JICA Research Institute

JICA-RI Working Paper

Re-evaluating Japan's development cooperation in the context of the post 2015 agenda

Embracing Human Security: New Directions of Japan's ODA for the 21st Century

Sachiko G. Kamidohzono, Oscar A. Gómez and Yoichi Mine

No. 94

March 2015

JICA Research Institute

JICA Research Institute

Use and dissemination of this working paper is encouraged; however, the JICA Research Institute requests due acknowledgement and a copy of any publication for which this working paper has provided input. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official positions of either the JICA Research Institute or JICA.

JICA Research Institute
10-5 Ichigaya Honmura-cho
Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 162-8433 JAPAN
TEL: +81-3-3269-3374
FAX: +81-3-3269-2054

Copyright ©2015 Japan International Cooperation Agency Research Institute
All rights reserved.

Embracing Human Security: New Directions of Japan's ODA for the 21st Century

Sachiko G. Kamidohzono[*], Oscar A. Gómez[†] and Yoichi Mine[‡]

Abstract

In today's world, communities and individuals are exposed to old and new threats such as civil wars, terrorism, natural disasters, infectious diseases, economic downturns, climate change and famines. Human security is an idea and an approach developed to address the pressing needs and moral imperatives arising from those insecurities faced by all humankind. The idea urges to secure fundamental freedoms for everyone, i.e., freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom to live in dignity, by combining top-down protection and bottom-up empowerment. While the importance of such an idea has been increasingly discussed since its emergence in the mid-1990s, the ways to operationalize it in practice remain a contested matter. In particular, the practice of Japan's ODA has received less attention despite Japan being the only government fully committed to the promotion of human security, with ODA as its major tool since 2003. Aiming to inform practice in coming decades, this paper explores the ways how to operationalize the idea, by following the recent history of Japan's ODA activities related to human security. After briefly recounting the connection between Japan's ODA and the idea of human security at the policy level, we trace the evolution of its practice, mainly focusing on bilateral contributions by JICA, in the four emblematic areas linked to human security: natural disasters, climate change, infectious diseases and violent conflict. Our examination reveals that Japan's ODA practice has, in general, been evolving in a way that resonates with the idea of human security. In order to consolidate this trend and to further operationalize human security, however, there still remains much to be done. We have identified three significant directions that can be taken to further operationalize human security: emphasizing prevention, realizing seamless assistance, and caring for the most vulnerable.

Keywords: human security practice, natural disasters, climate change, infectious diseases, violent conflict

[*] Corresponding Author. Research Fellow at JICA-RI.(Goto.Sachiko@jica.go.jp)
[†] Research Fellow at JICA-RI.
[‡] Professor at Graduate School of Global Studies, Doshisha Univeristy, and Visiting Fellow at JICA-RI.

We would like to express our sincere appreciation to Arefu Araki, Haruka Ezaki, Mitsuo Isono, Tsukasa Katsube, Naomi Kawahara, Eri Komukai, Satoru Kurosawa, Masafumi Nagaishi, Naoyuki Ochiai, Yasuko Oda, Kazunori Oshiyama, Kazuhiko Sakamoto, Yasuko Shimizu, Tomonori Sudo, Kimio Takeya, Yutaka Tatewaki, Yukichi Usui, Kae Yanagisawa, and Norihito Yonebayashi, for their valuable information and comments, which were crucial for us in writing this paper. We are also grateful to Ryutaro Murotani, Takao Toda, and Keiichi Tsunekawa, for their insightful comments and advice that helped us a lot in elaborating our discussion. Our gratitude also goes to Hiroshi Kato, John Page, and Yasutami Shimomura, who gave us substantial comments and suggestions on the different versions of our manuscript.

Introduction

On March 11, 2011, the northeastern coast of Japan's main island was hit by a colossal earthquake and tsunami wave, which claimed the lives of nearly twenty-thousand people in a moment. Facing a totally unexpected massive disruption, no less than 163 countries – including aid recipients – extended a helping hand beyond the North-South divide, coming to the assistance of one of the major ODA donor countries. That year, Japan was the sixth largest recipient of international humanitarian aid, surpassing Sudan, Kenya and Haiti (Development Initiatives 2013, 39).

In addition to the disaster in the eastern part of Japan, the vast numbers of victims of the earthquake in Sichuan, China, in 2008 and of Typhoon Yolanda in the Philippines in 2013 also remind us of the ferocity of nature. Moreover, our ability to safely manage human-made machinery has been seriously questioned in such cases as the Fukushima nuclear disaster, which generated a multitude of internally displaced persons (IDPs), even in one of the world's most 'developed' countries. Beyond East Asia, countries in the Middle East and North Africa are being ravaged by violent conflicts, and the global economy is widening the gaps between the wealthy and the destitute.

Human life is precarious and as such, demands close attention to the ever-evolving sources of harm. Human security is an idea and an approach developed to address such pressing needs and moral imperatives arising from insecurities faced by all humankind. The importance of such an idea has been increasingly discussed since its emergence in the mid-1990s. Still, ways to promote human security in practice remain a contested matter. Identifying appropriate means for its operationalization has been the main emphasis of scholars and practitioners (e.g. Kaldor, et al. 2007; Gomez et al. 2013; Acharya et al. 2011). In this respect, however, the practice of Japan's ODA, particularly that of JICA, has received less attention despite Japan being the only government fully committed to the promotion of

human security, with ODA as its major tool. Thus, taking this opportunity to reflect on Japan's ODA history, we shed light on how Japanese ODA practitioners have tried to address human insecurities on the ground and identify directions to realize human security in the coming decades.

Since our focus in this chapter lies on practice rather than broader policies, we only briefly describe the policy background, which has been widely explored elsewhere (e.g. Hsien-Li 2010, Kurusu 2011), concentrating instead on Japan's ODA activities, especially bilateral contributions through JICA, related to human security.[1] Our examination reveals that Japan's ODA practice has, in general, been evolving in a way that better promotes human security. However, there still remains much to be done. We have identified three significant directions that can be taken to further operationalize human security, to which we will return in the last section.

1. Japan's Embracement of the Idea of Human Security

1.1 The Idea of Human Security

In today's world, communities and individuals are exposed to serious threats such as civil wars, terrorism, natural disasters, infectious diseases, economic downturns, climate change and famines. When those 'downside risks' become reality, they inflict grave anxieties and acute deprivation on people, narrowing the range of choices of affected individuals and ruining the achievement of human development built up over decades. These hazards and perils cross national borders easily. As stated by Mahbub ul Haq, "the emerging concept of human security forces a new morality on all of us through a perception of common threats to our very survival" (ul Haq 1995, 116).

In the face of emerging threats at present and in the future, the human security approach aims at securing fundamental freedoms for everyone (freedom from fear, freedom

[1] See chapter 15 in this book, also Gomez (2012) and Takasu (2013) for multilateral contributions.

from want, and freedom to live in dignity) by combining top-down protection and bottom-up empowerment. On the one hand, realizing freedom from fear and want has been the founding ideal of the United Nations. This resonates with the spirit of the Japanese Constitution of 1946: "We recognize that all peoples of the world have the right to live in peace, free from fear and want" (Preamble). On the other hand, freedom to live in dignity is associated with our moral obligations to help protect the human rights of others in face of humiliation. Beyond legal entitlements, dignity can be achieved only when all stakeholders unequivocally esteem the agency of people who suffer unfreedom and work towards the aim of realizing their individual human rights.

Human security and state security are not mutually exclusive. Protecting citizens against threats to secure fundamental freedoms for them is the primary responsibility of nation states. Nonetheless, if the capacity of some of those states is noticeably weak, or restricted for historical reasons, outside actors are expected to extend a helping hand. As long as good governance of nation states contributes to the human security of all individuals, the assistance to nation building remains vital. As Ogata affirms, "human security reinforces state security but does not replace it" (CHS 2003, 5).

However, human security also requires actions that explicitly go beyond the scope of traditional nation states. First, if a government that is supposed to protect its citizens fails to do so and even becomes the very source of their insecurities, it is necessary for outside actors to cross borders to help the people under threat. This practice had been common in NGOs and other voluntary organizations long before the conditions of large-scale humanitarian interventions started to be discussed by the United Nations after the Cold War, and more recently under the framework of the responsibility to protect (R2P).

Second, there are pervasive, cross-border risks that cannot be adequately dealt with even by an efficient and capable government, making collaboration beyond national

boundaries the *sine qua non* to achieve human security[2]. In the case of tsunami disasters, for example, it is the multilateral networks of early warnings that are expected to provide accurate information about the scale and the time of reach of the surges. Prior coordination among authorities and experts across borders is the precondition for combining protection and empowerment effectively when natural disasters occur. The same applies to a wide range of other human insecurities, such as infectious diseases pandemics, trans-national criminal activities and sudden macro-economic downturns.

This idea of human security has gradually evolved over at least two decades. The concept was originally discussed in UNDP's *Human Development Report* (UNDP 1994) soon after the end of the Cold War, and further elaborated in the final report of the Commission on Human Security (CHS), *Human Security Now* (CHS 2003). Regarding the challenges of protecting citizens from mass atrocities, the idea of R2P, widely understood as the Canadian version of human security, has also attracted substantial attention since the turn of the century (ICISS 2001). Whereas the R2P approach challenges the inviolability of national sovereignty in certain critical situations such as genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing, the term 'human security' is now understood from a broader perspective, as shown in the consensus-based UN General Assembly Resolution adopted in September 2012. The agreed concept of human security is designed to address "widespread and cross-cutting challenges" with "people-centered, comprehensive, context-specific and prevention-oriented" methods, combining "peace, development and human rights" (UN General Assembly 2012).

1.2 Human Security and Japan's ODA

The Japanese government was quick to accept the human security idea and has been instrumental in developing and disseminating the concept. While Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama used the term at the UN General Assembly as early as in 1995, it was Foreign

[2] See the typology of Asahi (2014) that succinctly presents three categories of human security.

Minister and Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi who gave full weight to the idea when responded to the issues of anti-personnel landmines as well as the economic and social hardships caused by the Asian financial crisis in 1997 (Kurusu 2011). The Japanese government founded the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS) in 1999. The government then supported the establishment of the above-mentioned CHS co-chaired by Sadako Ogata, who had served as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) from 1991 to 2001, and Amartya Sen, the Nobel Prize-winning economist. In 2003, the Japanese government adopted a new ODA Charter, which incorporated the idea of human security for the first time as one of its basic principles.[3]

At the same time, the idea of human security started to take roots in the practice of JICA under the leadership of Sadako Ogata. She was appointed President of JICA in 2003, the year in which the report of CHS was released and the ODA Charter including the idea of human security was adopted. Since then, Ogata's reasoned idealism and activism has wielded a profound and lasting influence on JICA's organizational culture. Ogata assumed JICA's presidency in the context of administrative reform in Japan, which required JICA to undertake an intensive organizational reform in return for expanded autonomy as an ODA implementation agency. Human security became one of the three pillars of the reform, in which the importance of focusing on people and combining top-down protection and bottom-up empowerment was stressed. The two other pillars also had critical implications for operationalizing human security. One pillar was *genbashugi* (promotion of field-oriented activities). Literally, the emphasis on the field entailed relocation of human and financial resources from JICA headquarters in Tokyo to overseas offices; 261 staff members, about 20 percent of the total number of staff, were transferred overseas in 2004 and 2005 alone (JICA 2005a; 2006). The other pillar entailed responding to the needs from the field in a *swifter and more effective* way. Moreover, Ogata brought to the organization an unfulfilled task from her

[3] The latest Charter revised in 2015 follows the predecessor in upholding human security as one of the basic policies.

years at UNHCR – that of bridging *the gap* between humanitarian and development aid, which later became known as providing “seamless” assistance.

In parallel to those pillars and tasks from the top, there was also a bottom-up attempt by JICA practitioners to identify the best way to reflect the human security idea in their operations. In June 2004, “seven perspectives on human security” were internally disseminated, which later became four “perspectives” and four “approaches.” While there are a few differences, those perspectives/approaches share most of the components included in the ODA Mid-Term Policy (Japan. MOFA 2005) — see Table 1.

It is important to notice, however, that those perspectives/approaches did not necessarily lead to any significant transformations in operations. Rather, practitioners found that they had already been practicing human security when the idea was introduced against the backdrop of a growing awareness since the 1990s about the importance of “people-centered” approaches, in response to aid fragmentation (Toda 2009). Seen from this perspective, the evolution of Japan’s ODA practice related to human security, which we will review in the next section, was not the result of the introduction of the new idea of human security; rather the opposite seems more plausible, i.e. the evolution in practice had facilitated the acceptance of a newly embraced universal idea among practitioners.

Table 1. Approaches on assistance to achieve 'human security' by MOFA/JICA

ODA Mid-Term Policy (MOFA, 2005)	Four Perspectives and Four Approaches (JICA, 2004~2015)	
	(Perspectives)	(Approaches)
Focusing on people and their needs	(As "Basic Principle") Focusing on people and their needs	
Strengthening individuals and communities in addition to governments	Realizing both protection and empowerment	Combining top-down and bottom-up approaches
Empowering people as an agency for development rather than recipients of aid		
Focusing on the people in crisis and the potentially vulnerable	Focusing on the socially vulnerable and those under crises	
Providing cross-sectoral aid		Providing cross-sectoral aid
Respecting cultural diversity and human rights		
	Tackling both 'fear' and 'want'	
		Partnership with various actors
	Responding to cross-border threats	Managing downside risks

2. ODA and JICA's Human Security Practice: A Brief History

In this section, we trace the evolution of Japan's ODA related to human security, aiming at identifying transformations that have emerged in the practice, which could serve as a significant guide for considering the future directions to further operationalize human security. We select four emblematic areas linked to human security for the review: natural disasters, climate change, infectious diseases and violent conflict.

2.1 Natural Disasters

Giving support to disaster-affected populations is as old as international cooperation. The first available annual report of JICA (then Overseas Technical Cooperation Agency) published in 1963 mentioned that four experts were deployed to Iran after the Buin Zahra earthquake

(OTCA, 1963, 49). Since then, contributions to global agenda setting in relation to natural disasters have been a conspicuous feature of Japan's ODA. All major world conferences on natural disasters have been held in Japan: Yokohama 1994, Kobe 2005 and Sendai 2015. Japan has actively provided funds to international organizations and initiatives working on disaster control, and remains one of the largest humanitarian donors in this respect (Development Initiatives 2014, 32).

The evolution of ODA practice in disaster management can be seen as the very slow convergence of three different areas of action—first, prevention, including disaster preparedness, now better known as Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR); second, emergency response; and third, recovery/reconstruction — actions that have come to be understood, in principle, as a cycle. To trace the history of disaster management is to make the cycle rotate backwards. Cooperation started with actions for *recovery,* through which societies were supported during the rebuilding process. Projects in the recovery phase are basically related to the reconstruction and rehabilitation of infrastructure, offering the opportunity to introduce preventive measures, in as much as the new structures can be designed to resist future disasters such as the one that destroyed them. Surprisingly, this preventive role of reconstruction has not been explicitly included in the disaster management frameworks of either Japan's ODA or the international community, and the present mantra of "building back better" emerged only after the Indian Ocean Tsunami in 2004 (Kennedy et al. 2008).

During the latter part of the Cold War, international pressure to actively engage in *emergency responses* to major humanitarian crises led to the creation of the Japan Disaster Relief Team (JDR). JDR is the main face of Japan in the field when disasters are at their peak. It started with the Japan Medical Team, created in 1979 in response to the humanitarian crisis in Cambodia; a search and rescue team followed after the 1985 earthquake in Mexico, where such support was badly needed but not provided by the Japanese team. JDR was consolidated into JICA in 1987 and since then multiple deployments have been made, including primary

goods (464 times), medical teams (54), search and rescue teams (18), other civilian experts (42) and Self Defense Forces (SDF) (14), as of May 2014.

It is extremely difficult to quantitatively assess whether the deployment of JDR has been growing over the decades, since the necessity of humanitarian assistance depends on the occurrence of shocks, which fluctuate and extend beyond human control. Besides, an increase in quantity should not always be interpreted as better because the overprovision of help can also cause problems. Meanwhile, substantial advancement can be identified qualitatively: experts have increasingly played an important role in adapting humanitarian actions to new threats, as well as bridging emergency responses with recovery. The former includes activities in oil spill clean ups and support to contain pandemics as discussed below. The latter is the result of JDR deployments working as a channel for quick assessment of needs required to transit from the response to the recovery phase. Although there were earlier informal efforts, this practice has gradually taken shape at least since the Bam Earthquake in Iran in 2003. Furthermore, in order to speed up the transition from response to recovery, new financial tools such as stand-by loans have been also created (Yonezawa 2013).

The last piece of the disaster cycle is *prevention* itself, which emerged in the international arena as a reaction to the rapid growth of emergency response, as indicated in IDNDR (1994) and the themes of the World Humanitarian Summit 2016. As was the case in recovery/reconstruction, prevention in Japanese ODA was initially introduced through infrastructure and city planning. Technology developed in early warning systems and risk assessment has also been shared through capacity development projects in Peru (1986), Chile (1988) and Turkey (1993). Since the 1990s, JICA's activities related to disasters were designed to involve vulnerable communities and local governments more explicitly in order to help people prepare themselves to cope with catastrophic events (JICA 2011). This includes innovative models of South-South/triangular cooperation (Hosono 2012, Saito 2012). This approach can be seen as combining top-down protection with bottom-up empowerment.

A proposal for strengthening the framework of disaster management was brought forward by the Japanese government in the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002, and later natural disasters were included as one of the major threats to human security that demanded ODA attention. Despite the long tradition of work on natural disasters, a section dedicated to DRR was not created in JICA until 2003. The first integrated policy for international cooperation on disasters was formulated in 2005 as an input for the conference in Kobe, which linked human security with community-based disaster management. Later in 2009, JICA laid down its first specific guidelines on disaster management, through which the Disaster Management Cycle has been mainstreamed, recognizing the challenge of realizing 'seamless' assistance through all stages of the cycle. The guidelines have reaffirmed empowerment and protection of the most vulnerable people as one of the main aims of disaster prevention, framed as the most basic contribution to human security.

2.2 Climate change

When climate change first came to the global community's attention in the late 1980s, the most prominent issue at stake was how to curb the emissions of greenhouse gases, i.e. the effort of *mitigation*. Behind this emphasis lay the belief that climate change could be prevented if appropriate measures were taken. Particularly, global environmental issues including climate change were highlighted as one of the main issues in the agenda at the 15th G7 Summit (Summit of the Arch) at Paris in 1989.[4] Given the successful Japanese experience on energy efficiency during the 1970s and the 1980s, the mitigation efforts to counter climate change were seen as an opportunity to share learnt lessons. At this summit, Japan announced the provision of 300 billion yen of environmental ODA over 3 years (FY1989-FY1991), followed by a new commitment at the first Rio meeting in 1992 to provide around 900 billion to 1 trillion yen over 5 years (FY1992-FY1996).

[4] Details available at: http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/1989paris/communique/environment.html (Accessed July 12, 2014).

After the first Rio Summit in 1992, the Japanese government became an early broker of international agreements, supporting the signing and implementation of the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). In 1997, the year when Japan hosted the 3rd Conference of the Party to the UNFCCC (COP3) in Kyoto, Japan announced a new initiative called Initiative for Sustainable Development toward the 21st Century (ISD) followed by the Kyoto Initiative, through which special preferential terms of ODA loans in the environmental sector were introduced. As early as in the late 1990s, environment-related ODA was already linked to the idea of 'global human security'[5], which later became simply 'human security' in the Environmental Conservation Initiative for Sustainable Development (Eco-ISD) in 2002. This was then taken over by successors such as the Cool Earth Partnership, Hatoyama Initiative and Actions for Cool Earth (ACE).

Despite all these efforts at prevention through mitigation, by the mid-2000s, the limitations of the existing tools and the inevitability of some degrees of climate change started to affect the tone of global discussions. Pessimism about stopping climate change gave rise to attention to *adaptation,* i.e. helping populations adjust to actual or expected climate change and its effects. This was one of the main messages of the IPCC's 4th Assessment Report (AR4) in 2007, which was later re-emphasized in a special report on extreme events (IPCC 2012) as well as in AR5 in 2014, which includes a chapter on human security.

However, providing ODA to promote adaptation involves additional complexity, since the actual activities overlap broadly with those of traditional development cooperation and thus combine multiple approaches to aid. In the case of Japan's ODA (2010-2012), while 94% of mitigation resources are loans, resources for adaptation comprise equal shares of loans and grants (36% respectively), as well as technical cooperation (11%) and multilateral aid (17%)[6]. In fact, in 2006, the OECD expressed that adaptation was not a "stand alone" agenda, and

---

[5] The Japanese word 'jinrui no anzen hosho,' which means the security of the whole of humanity, was translated as 'global human security.' See http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/gaiko/summit/denver/isd_h.html (in Japanese) (Accessed July 12, 2014).

[6] Based on data provided by JICA's Climate Change Office.

started efforts to integrate climate change adaptation into development co-operation (OECD 2009), which JICA internalized in 2011 by way of a new financial tool[7]. The main sectors through which adaptation is being addressed are disaster prevention (40% of climate change adaptation ODA), water resources (23%) and agriculture (25%), prominent examples of which include projects in drought-affected areas in Ethiopia and Sudan. While in principle these sectors reflect human security's emphasis on the downside risks and the most vulnerable, there is no further elaboration about how the idea has been operationalized through climate change adaptation activities.

2.3 Infectious Diseases

In the area of infectious diseases control, tuberculosis (TB), parasitic diseases such as malaria, and childhood diseases that are preventable by immunization as targeted in WHO's Expanded Programme on Immunization (EPI) were traditionally the major targets of Japan's ODA. Although assistance to fight those diseases started from the 1960s (JICA 2007a, 26), no clear policy on this area can be found until the mid-1990s, when the government announced the Global Issues Initiative on Population and AIDS (GII) in 1994, followed by other initiatives such as the Okinawa Infectious Diseases Initiative (IDI) in 2000.

The emergence of two distinctive transformations related to human security at the operational level coincided with such policy elaboration; one was the change in target settings and the other was increasing actions related to pandemics. The former can be described as *a shift from the laboratory to the field:* while much of the assistance in the 1990s focused on virology research at national-level laboratories (JICA 2002, 100-101), capacity development of local health facilities for effective service delivery became the emphasis of interventions in the 2000s. The trend was particularly evident in the assistance related to HIV/AIDS, which has

[7] See the Climate Finance Impact Tool (JICA Climate-FIT) at: http://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/climate_change/overview.html (Accessed February 13, 2015).

rapidly expanded under GII since the mid-1990s, becoming the largest among all assistance for infectious disease control by the late 2000s (JICA 2002, 75; JICA 2010a).[8]

The shift to the field has involved two changes in the focus of assistance. On one hand, there has been an increasing trend towards community-based activities. Many of these were motivated by a special concern for vulnerable populations, as typically seen in the assistance to so-called "community DOTS (Directly Observed Treatment with Short-course Chemotherapy)", a method of TB control to ensure early case detection as well as proper drug-taking by the patients through the utilization of community resources in areas where access to health facilities is limited. On the other hand, among four steps of infectious disease control – prevention, diagnosis, treatment and care – JICA's assistance has come to address not only the former two but also the latter two since the mid-2000s. For instance, in Zambia, following the decade-long provision of assistance for HIV/AIDS in the country since the mid-1990s, a component to improve treatment and care services was included for the first time in 2006 (JICA 2008a). As treatment and care require special attention to psycho-social aspects, besides technical measures, several projects addressing this aspect, such as empowering the people living with diseases and reducing discrimination against them, were launched around the mid-2000s. Due to the nature of the intervention, those projects were grassroots-oriented, and many of them were conducted in partnership with NGOs.[9]

The second transformation, an increase in *actions related to pandemics,* follows from the growing number of JDR dispatches to address the spread of infectious diseases. During the 1990s, there were only two cases in which JDR was deployed to respond to disease outbreaks, but the number tripled in the 2000s.[10] In particular, when severe acute respiratory syndrome

---

[8] Prior to 2001 just one out of 18 technical cooperation projects regarding HIV/AIDS was aimed at services delivery, yet after 2001 16 out of 25 projects were targeted at improving services delivery (based on the project lists in JICA (2002) and JICA Knowledge Site http://gwweb.jica.go.jp/km/km_frame.nsf (Accessed July 12, 2014).

[9] For instance, two projects on providing psycho-social care to those living with HIV/AIDS were implemented in South Africa in partnership with Japanese NGOs.

[10] Based on JDR database of JICA

(SARS) broke out in China and South East Asia in 2003, JDR experts were dispatched to Viet Nam and China to assist the authorities in controlling the pandemic. It was the first case of dispatching JDR personnel tasked with preventing the further spread of the disease, instead of providing goods or treating patients that had been typical of JDR activities in natural disasters. At the time of writing this chapter, another case of such personnel contribution is underway in an effort to fight against Ebola pandemics in West Africa.

In addition to emergency responses, technical assistance to prevent pandemics by enhancing preparedness for the potential risk of infectious diseases outbreaks is also growing after experiencing SARS and avian flu (2005). All such assistance has so far targeted Southeast Asia, and tends to stress the importance of regional mechanisms to respond to diseases. For instance, the project launched in Vietnam in 2011 includes "building a system of information sharing with neighboring countries" as one of the expected outputs (JICA 2010b), indicating that a cross-border feature of threats is recognized in the field.

2.4 Violent Conflict

Directly addressing violent conflict used to be outside the scope of Japan's ODA as well as international development in general. At the end of the Cold War, however, the new agenda of 'peacebuilding' as advocated by Boutros Ghali (1992) began to draw significant attention, and remarkable developments have taken place in this area since then. The first peacebuilding experience in Japan's ODA was the post-conflict reconstruction assistance in Cambodia starting from 1992, followed by activities in Palestine, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Timor-Leste. However, such assistance was not labeled as 'peacebuilding' but described as reconstruction and development at that time.

Peacebuilding as a distinctive policy framework of Japan's ODA began to take shape around 2000. The ODA mid-term policy released in August 1999 mentioned "conflict and development" as one of the priority issues, and indicated Japan's willingness to play an active

role in conflict prevention and post-conflict recovery (Japan. MOFA 1999). In July 2000, the government announced "Action from Japan," expressing its intention "to pursue development cooperation that is better suited to conflict prevention" (Japan. MOFA 2000). JICA's involvement in the area also began in 1999, by launching practice-oriented research on peacebuilding. This eventually led to the development of "Thematic Guidelines on Peacebuilding in 2003," in which the objective and priority issues in this area of practice were articulated. In parallel, tools for embedding conflict sensitivity into JICA's operations also started to be developed in the form of Peacebuilding Needs and Impact Assessments (PNA).

The methods of peacebuilding assistance differ from country to country, and practical needs in a given country may also change over time, since peacebuilding is a long process of social transformation. Focusing on the modality of initial assistance, however, three distinctive generations can be observed, through which JICA's peacebuilding work has been taking shape, as a whole, to a more comprehensive and people-centered approach. The cases in the first generation include those in Cambodia, Palestine and Bosnia and Herzegovina, where JICA's initial assistance was characterized by the rehabilitation of large-scale infrastructure, for example, trunk roads, electric power plants and higher education institutions, through the provision of grants.[11] Two common features can be discernible in this generation. First, although multiple rehabilitation projects were implemented, most of them were isolated and rarely interlinked with each other. Second, those projects were mostly designed through the consultations between Japanese side and the national government of the recipient country.

In the second generation, which started with the recovery assistance to Timor-Leste since 1999, a new modality of assistance was introduced: beginning post-conflict intervention not only with financial assistance to rehabilitate infrastructure but also with technical assistance to develop a broader reconstruction plan. This practice was further promoted in Afghanistan where the recovery process began in 2002. One of the earliest tasks JICA

[11] Based on the database of reports on JICA's projects in JICA Library: https://libportal.jica.go.jp/fmi/xsl/library/public/Index.html (Accessed July 12, 2014).

grappled with was to develop reconstruction plans for two major cities, Kabul and Kandahar. This was aimed at correctly prioritizing and responding to massive needs, while taking into consideration not only short-term recovery but also mid- to long-term reconstruction. Based on the plans developed, critical infrastructure was rehabilitated as Quick Impact Projects (QIPs) (JICA2004; JICA 2005b), contributing to harmonization among individual rehabilitation projects as well as swift responses to urgent needs on the ground. Nonetheless, the initiative to identify the needs for rehabilitation still rested on the Japanese side and the central government rather than the ultimate beneficiaries of these projects.

In the third generation, while the practice of combining reconstruction planning and infrastructure rehabilitation through QIPs continued, another method of assistance also emerged. Perhaps the first attempt of this kind can be observed in a technical cooperation project launched in northeastern Sri Lanka in March 2004, which marked a fundamental distinction from the past patterns of assistance: *the focus on the community* not only as a target of assistance but also as an agent for recovery. The purpose of the project was empowering people in resettled communities to regenerate their own livelihoods. The project helped people develop Community Action Plans (CAPs), rehabilitate community infrastructure based on the CAPs and join socio-economic activities such as the training for revitalizing agricultural production (JICA 2008b).

In this third generation, in contrast to the top-down modality of assistance in the previous generations, it is the members of the communities affected by conflicts who are expected to play the principal role in the recovery process. This has led to a more people-centered and thus comprehensive method of assistance, which was different from simply providing assistance to many sectors in parallel. It also entailed a growing awareness about the importance of connecting people and the government by strengthening the capacity of sub-national governments as well as communities. Furthermore, groundbreaking experiments with regard to swiftness were also observed in this stage: entering conflict areas

before a peace agreement is signed – such timing was traditionally outside the scope of Japan's ODA. Following the example of Sri Lanka, similar approaches have been adopted in other conflict-affected countries/areas such as Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of Congo, northern Uganda, and Mindanao, in the Philippines.

3. Stepping Forward to Realize Human Security

The transformations reviewed in the last section show that Japan's ODA practice has evolved in a way that resonates with the idea of human security. In order to consolidate this trend and to further operationalize human security, there are three directions that we believe will be of particular importance in the coming decades, as we briefly describe below.

3.1 Emphasizing Prevention

Efforts in natural disaster management have resulted in the cyclical understanding of prevention, response and recovery as a model for practice. Even if this understanding cannot be mechanically applied to other human security issues, the cyclical view enables ODA practitioners to take proper actions while being fully aware of different needs of the respective phases and the interlinkages between them.

In this cycle, the critical importance of prevention must be stressed. As a matter of fact, prevention was one of a few basic principles when the concept of human security was initially proposed (UNDP 1994), and has been repeatedly emphasized in the reports and resolutions related to human security in the UN. Even the original document of R2P emphasized that prevention "is the single most important dimension of the responsibility to protect" (ICISS 2001: xi).

In Japan's ODA practice, efforts to address climate change and infectious diseases have traditionally put prevention at the center of the activities; in natural disaster management,

awareness of the importance of prevention has been rapidly growing since the late 1980s and 1990s. Growing commitment to peacebuilding has been based on the recognition of the critical importance of conflict prevention. However, the task of prevention has not been explicitly articulated as a way to promote human security.

Given the critical importance of prevention, there are at least two kinds of threats that will present particular challenges in the coming decades. First, we must be prepared for "low frequency, high risk" disasters such as large-scale earthquakes. Worryingly, recent growing attention to climate change adaptation can divert the resources for DRR only to climate-related disasters. In order to prevent catastrophes, due attention to those disasters should be maintained based on the long-term perspective of disaster cycle management. Second, political instability and violent conflict may creep into today's middle-income countries. Conflict can be triggered by sudden social downturns such as financial crises, to which no country is immune. Inter-group inequalities embedded in society may fuel conflict processes (Mine et al. 2013). In order to promote the effort of prevention, particular contextual knowledge of societies as well as global forces that might trigger conflict have to continuously inform ODA practice as well as national policies in relatively 'developed' countries.

It is worth stressing that production and accumulation of knowledge is critical for preventing not only violent conflicts but also other types of human insecurities. Without wider and deeper knowledge, potential threats will not receive sufficient attention in time, and even if they do, people may not know how to respond, as the case of 2014 Ebola outbreak has typically shown.

3.2 Realizing seamless assistance

When prevention is not possible, actions in the next phase of crisis management cycle, i.e. emergency responses, are required to cope with the outright manifestation of risks. Japan's ODA has been accumulating experiences, especially through the repeated deployment of JDR

to places afflicted by natural disasters. While experience in natural disaster settings has grown, emergency responses to infectious diseases and violent conflict are still at an inchoate stage in Japan's ODA. The inclusion of emergency responses or humanitarian activities inside ODA should not be interpreted as suggesting that a single country can cover every crisis — no individual country or actor can. It rather emphasizes the importance of making sure the full crisis management cycle is covered in the efforts by the international community as a whole. Therefore, the efforts of various stakeholders in providing humanitarian and development assistance should now be streamlined as 'seamless' assistance.

Japan's ODA has tried to realize seamless assistance mainly through improving swiftness, as is shown in recovery/reconstruction needs assessments by JDR, establishment of stand-by loans and QIPs as mentioned in 2.1 and 2.4. The increased speed, however, also necessitates an improvement in other aspects of seamlessness, particularly *filling the gaps among different actors.* The evolution of Japan's ODA embodies some approaches in this respect, such as integrating activities of different sectors and aid modalities and promoting partnerships with other organizations. In the conflict in Mindanao, for instance, JICA was engaged in the peace process (Tsunekawa and Murotani 2014), a task usually managed by the political sphere, and thus traditionally outside JICA's mandate as well as the scope of ODA. A partnership program with UNHCR since 1999 and JDR's participation in UN coordination strategies, such as the UN Disaster Assessment and Coordination (UNDAC) team, are examples of increasing efforts to strengthen partnership with other actors.

Still, compared to the engagement in traditional development, much more can be done and plenty of hurdles can be seen ahead. Participants in the JICA/UNHCR program interviewed for this research indicated the difficulty in matching organizations and practitioners with different visions, priorities, skills and experiences together at the same time. Gaps among actors do not exclusively exist on the side of aid providers: gaps are also common between providers and recipients as well as local actors themselves. In this respect, JICA has

been increasingly emphasizing the importance of connecting people and local governments (Murotani and Mine 2015).

There is an increasing recognition that the difference between humanitarian and development assistance is becoming less important (Barnett and Weiss 2011, 30). This implies the necessity of securing long-term and comprehensive commitment to the transformation of societies that remain fragile. Realizing seamless assistance, not only in terms of time sequence but also in terms of actors, will thus become an even more important task for future international cooperation architecture.

3.3 Caring for the Most Vulnerable

The gaps among local actors, especially between governments and people at local communities, signify the importance of reaching directly the people in the field, which is the essence of *genbashugi*. As long as we work with people rather than an abstract average citizen of a country, we should look at disparities between different categories of people and their different degrees of vulnerability to risks (e.g. UNDP 2014). In this respect, the development community is increasingly focusing on the 'people left behind' as the most important target of aid. Eradicating the extreme poverty that persists has been given the highest priority in the debates on the post-2015 development agenda. In order to achieve this goal, attention should be paid not only to people in the countries left behind but also to particular groups of people who are in 'developed' or 'emerging' countries but unable to enjoy the benefits of growth.

Japan's ODA has, in line with the above international trends, increasingly focused on those left behind, as seen in JICA's mission statement that upholds "inclusive" development. In the areas of natural disaster management and climate change, a growing awareness of disparity can be seen, for instance by recognizing that "the people who are most likely to be affected by natural disasters are the poor who reside in vulnerable residential environments" (JICA 2013). The recognition of such differential vulnerability highlights the necessity of examining

conditions inside a country, regardless of the level of national development as mentioned above.

Reaching out to the most vulnerable directly and designing projects that reflect their real needs in the field cannot be achieved by a state-centric perspective alone. Whereas ODA practitioners have tended to attach weight to top-down protection, we cannot realize sustainable human security without empowering people themselves (CHS 2003, 10-12). Japan's ODA is putting an increasing emphasis on community and field-oriented activities in addressing natural disasters, infectious diseases and violent conflict as discussed in the last section. Among those activities, two trends deserve special attention: one is an increased awareness of the psycho-social aspects of the vulnerable, with consequent activities such as eliminating prejudice and discrimination against the people living with diseases as mentioned in 2.3; the other is a growing perspective in which people are regarded as active agents rather than passive beneficiaries as described in 2.4. These new trends are of great importance, since this will promote a critical and yet still underrated element of human security: *freedom to live in dignity.*

While we can see some progress in addressing internal disparities and reaching the most vulnerable, challenges abound for further advancement. One of the most puzzling dilemmas for Japan's ODA is that the places where aid is urgently needed tend to be in places where the staff is likely to be exposed to the most serious physical insecurities. This trade-off is particularly intractable due to the strict security standards in Japanese public organizations like JICA. Although practitioners have been trying to reach those places through multiple means, for instance in collaboration with other partners such as the UN and NGOs, many vulnerable groups still remain out of the coverage of Japan's ODA.

Cooperation with middle-income countries can be equally problematic. That is partly because the Japanese taxpayers, tired of decades-long economic stagnation, tend to be against using their own national budget for rapidly growing economies. Moreover, recipient

governments' pride as emerging powers as well as skepticism toward 'interventionist' approaches from donors can make them reluctant to admit their insufficient capacity to address human insecurities.

Conclusion

In the last twenty years, the idea of human security has gradually taken root in the international community, culminating in the acceptance by the UN of a broader definition of human security along the lines of Japanese understanding. As reviewed in this chapter, JICA's activities resonate and converge with the idea of human security in a wide variety of fields. Exploring the idea in practice through Japan's ODA can contribute to revitalizing the discussion on how to operationalize human security at global, regional and national levels beyond any North-South divide.

Although we should continue mobilizing ODA to help distressed nations catch up with wealthy ones, if we succeed, the very effectiveness of ODA may bring about a situation in which the transfer of resources between states is not relevant any more. This is the ultimate, self-negating goal of ODA. However, even though national poverty may disappear in the near or distant future, human insecurities will remain. Contingency is part of human life and so we have to extend our helping hand to vulnerable people crossing the borders of nation states. We could even foresee that, if anything remains of Japanese ODA in 60 years time, it would be in crisis-oriented activities such as JDR. Even with the world in such a state, JICA will fulfill its proper responsibility as the Japanese agency for international cooperation.

References

Acharya, A., Singhdeo, S.K. and M. Rajaretnam, eds., 2011. *Human security: From concept to practice*. Singapore: World Scientific.

Asahi, H. 2014. Foreword. In S. Bae, and M. Maruyama, eds., *Human security, changing state, and global responses: Institutions and practices,* xii-xiv. London: Routledge.

Barnett, Michael, and Thomas G. Weiss. 2011. *Humanitarianism contested: Where angels fear to tread*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Boutros Ghali, B. 1992. An agenda for peace: Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping. A/47/277, S/24111. New York: United Nations.

CHS. 2003. *Human security now*. New York: Commission on Human Security.

Development Initiatives. 2013. *Global humanitarian assistance report 2013.* Bristol: Development Initiatives.

———. 2014. *Global humanitarian assistance report 2014.* Bristol: Development Initiatives.

Gomez, O. A. 2012. What is a human security project? The experience of the UN Trust Fund for Human Security. *Global change, peace & security* 24 (3): 385-404.

Gomez, O. A., D. Gasper, and Y. Mine. 2013. Good practices in addressing human security through national human development reports. Occasional Paper, Human Development Report Office, New York: UNDP.

Hosono, A. 2012. Climate change, disaster risk management and South-South/triangular Cooperation. In H. Kato, ed., *Scaling up South-South and triangular Cooperation,*15-41. Tokyo: JICA.

Hsien-Li, T. 2010. Not Just global rhetoric: Japan's substantive actualization of its human security foreign policy. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 10 (1): 159-187.

ICISS (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty). 2001. *The responsibility to protect.* Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

IDNDR. 1994. *Yokohama strategy and plan of action for a safer world*. World Conference on Natural Disaster Reduction, Yokohama May 23-27.

IPCC. 2012. Managing the risk of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Japan. MOFA. 1999. [ODA Mid-term Policy]. Tokyo: Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Accessed July 12, 2014.
http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/gaiko/oda/seisaku/chuuki/sei_1_4.html

———. 2000. *Action from Japan*. Tokyo: Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Accessed July 12, 2014.
http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/sector/conflict/pdfs/action_from_japan.pdf

———. 2005. *ODA Mid-term policy*. Tokyo: Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Accessed December 15, 2014. http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/mid-term/policy.pdf

JICA. 2002. [Approaches for systematic planning of development projects: Basic education, anti-HIV/AIDS measures, promotion of small and medium enterprises and rural development]. Tokyo: JICA.

———. 2004. [Japanese summary of the final report on the study on the urgent rehabilitation programme of Kabui City in the Islamic State of Afghanistan: Education, health and broadcast]. Tokyo: JICA.

———. 2005a. [Performance report in Japanese fiscal year 2004]. Tokyo: JICA.

———. 2005b. [Japanese summary of the final report on the study on the urgent rehabilitation programme of Kandahar City in the Islamic State of Afghanistan]. Tokyo: JICA.

———. 2006. [Performance report in Japanese fiscal year 2005]. Tokyo: JICA.

———. 2007a. [Thematic guideline on tuberculosis control]. Tokyo: JICA.

———. 2008a. [Report of the terminal evaluation on the integrated HIV and AIDS care implementation project at district level in Zambia]. Tokyo: JICA.

———. 2008b. [Main report of the finale report on Mannar District rehabilitation and reconstruction through a community approach project]. Tokyo: JICA.

———. 2010a. [Introductory guide on infectious disease control ver. 1.1]. Tokyo: JICA.

———. 2010b. [Ex-ante evaluation report on the project for capacity development for laboratory network in Vietnam of biosafety and examination of highly hazardous infectious pathogens]. Tokyo: JICA.

———. 2011. JICA's assessment of its contribution to the Hyogo Framework for Action. Global Environmental Department. Tokyo: JICA.

———. 2013. Urban Growth for Inclusive and Dynamic Development. Tokyo: JICA.

Kaldor, M., M. Martin and S. Selchow. 2007. Human security: A new strategic narrative for Europe. *International Affairs* 83 (2): 273–88.

Kennedy, J., J. Ashmore, E. Babister and I. Kelman. 2008. The meaning of 'build back better': Evidence from post-tsunami Aceh and Sri Lanka. *Journal of contingencies and crisis management* 16 (1): 24-36.

Kurusu, K. 2011. Japan as an active agent for global norms: The political dynamism behind the acceptance and promotion of "human security." *Asia-Pacific Review* 18 (2): 115-136.

Mine, Y., Stewart, F., Fukuda-Parr, S., and Mkandawire, T. eds. 2013. *Preventing violent conflict in Africa: Inequalities, perceptions and institutions.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Murotani, R. and Y. Mine. 2015. Bridging the state and local communities in fragile states: Sub-national institutions as a strategic focus to restore state legitimacy. In Laurence Chandy, Hiroshi Kato and Homi Kharas, eds.,**24** *The Last Mile in Ending Poverty.* Washington DC: Brookings Institution.

OCTA. 1963. [Technical cooperation yearbook]. Tokyo: OCTA.

OECD. 2009. Integrating climate change adaptation into development co-operation: Policy guidance. Paris: OECD.

Saito, S. 2012. The *Taishin* triangular initiative in Central America: Co-creating quake-resistant construction methods for popular low-cost housing. In H. Kato, ed., *Scaling up South-South and triangular cooperation,* 173-190. Tokyo: JICA.

Takasu, Y. 2013. Japan and networked human security. In M. Martin, and T. Owen, eds., *Routledge handbook of human security,* 239-250. Abingdon: Routledge.

Toda, T. 2009. [The process of the mainstreaming of human security in development assistance: Possibility of social transformation intermediated by institutions and ideas]. Ph.D. diss., Nagoya University.

Tsunekawa, K. and R. Murotani, 2014. Working for human security: JICA's experiences. In B.M. Howe, ed., *Post-conflict development in East Asia*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.

ul Haq, M. 1995. *Reflections on human development.* Oxford University Press: New York.

UNDP. 1994. Human development report 1994: New dimensions of human security. New York: UNDP.

———. 2014. Human development report 2014: Sustaining human progress: Reducing vulnerabilities and building resilience. New York: UNDP.

UN General Assembly. 2012. Follow-up to paragraph 143 on human security of the 2005 World Summit outcome. A/Res/66/290. New York: UN.

Yonezawa. H. 2013. Wagakuni ODA no aratana torikumi [New approaches of our country's ODA]. *OCAJI* 8&9: 23-26.

Abstract (in Japanese)

要約

今日の世界では、内戦、テロ、自然災害、感染症、経済不況、気候変動、飢饉など、個人やコミュニティが様々な脅威にさらされている。これらの中には従来から存在した問題と近年新たに生じてきた問題の双方が含まれるが、いずれも全人類が直面する脅威であり、人間の安全保障の概念およびアプローチはこうした脅威から生じる差し迫ったニーズと道徳的責務への対応を目的として発展してきた。人間の安全保障が求めるのは、3 つの根源的自由——恐怖からの自由、欠乏からの自由、尊厳をもって生きる自由——を上からの保護と下からのエンパワメントを組み合わせて保障することである。1990 年代半ばに同概念が登場して以降、その重要性は次第に認識されつつある一方で、それを現場でどのように実践するかについてはいまだ議論が多く、残された課題となっている。日本は人間の安全保障の推進に政府が全面的なコミットをしてきた唯一の国であり、2003 年以来 ODA がその主な手段として掲げられてきたが、こうした事実にも拘らず、人間の安全保障の実践をめぐるこれまでの議論において、日本の ODA にはほとんど注意が向けられてこなかった。そこで本稿では、今後の実践で参考としうる知見の抽出を目的として、人間の安全保障に関わる日本の ODA 事業の歴史を振り返り、同概念を実践化していくための方策について考察を行った。初めに、政策レベルにおける日本の ODA と人間の安全保障との関わりを概観し、その上で、自然災害、気候変動、感染症、暴力的紛争の 4 つを人間の安全保障を脅かす象徴的な課題として取り上げ、日本の ODA における各課題への実践的取り組み、とりわけ JICA による二国間ベースの事業に主な焦点を当てて、その展開を辿った。同分析から、当該 4 課題に対する日本の ODA の実践は、概ね人間の安全保障の概念に沿う方向へ変遷・発展してきていることが確認された。一方で、こうした傾向を確固たるものとし、人間の安全保障の実践をより一層推進していくためには、いまだ残された課題も多い。今後、人間の安全保障のさらなる実践化に向けては、予防を重視すること、切れ目なく（シームレス）包括的な支援を実現すること、そして最も脆弱な立場にある人々をケアするという 3 つの方向性を推進していくことが特に重要である。