

プロジェクト報告

International Peace Operations and Japan

Yukako Tanaka (Sakabe)

1. Outline

The aim of the project entitled “International Peace Operations and Japan” was to discuss new demands in modern peace operations by understanding the evolving security environment and the experiences of countries in dispatching missions under challenging conditions. Two workshops and one seminar were conducted for this project.

2. Workshop

“Empirically Evaluating the Effect of U.N. Intervention : Bridging Scholarship and Practice”

On September 14, 2018, Dr. Kiyoshi Matsukawa gave his presentation entitled “Challenges for evaluating sustaining peace.” As a United Nations (UN) official, he informed the audience about the concept of sustaining peace suggested by the current UN Secretary-General and the limited resources with which the UN assesses the effects of intervention. Participants in the workshop learned that evaluation and assessment are part of a necessary process to improve the UN’s performance. The participants (10 personnel from Aoyama Gakuin University (AGU) and other institutions) shared their views on the challenges related to selecting methods and implementing research regarding objects to be evaluated. Factors in the selection of

methods could include the level of analysis (i.e., by country, cross-national situation, case, project, or personnel) and the area covered (i.e., peace enforcement, traditional peacekeeping, peacebuilding, peace mediation, or conflict prevention).

3. Workshop & Half-day Seminar

“Participating International Peace Operation in Africa — Experience of the Netherlands in MINUSMA”

On November 26 and 27, 2018, by inviting Dr. Niels van Willigen from the Institute of Political Science, Leiden University, the project carried out a workshop and half-day seminar (at the project team’s invitation), with the aim of deepening knowledge regarding the experience of the Netherlands in international peace operations.

The workshop entitled “The Netherlands’ Constitution Article 100 and Public Opinion on participating Peace Operations” covered the legal basis, legal process, and political situation (often called “domestication”) that allows the Dutch government to dispatch troops overseas for maintaining international legal order. Article 100, which was amended in 2000, specifies that the government should report the decision to dispatch in advance, whereas the Frame of Reference (1995) is a guideline for the government to ensure the political plausibility and military feasibility of dispatching troops. In terms of a relationship with the public, Dr. van Willigen mentioned that the government utilizes a 3D (“Diplomacy, Development, Defense”)/ comprehensive approach, which is meant to use both military and civilian expertise to deal with complex emergencies and which has an impact on the mobilization of public support.

The half-day seminar was conducted on November 27, 2018. The aim of the seminar was to understand the experience of the Netherlands in dispatching military force to the Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), which is often regarded as the UN’s most dangerous operation. This dispatch since 2014 is among a variety of contributions by the Dutch to international peace and security, such as joining in a multilateral force led by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) missions of the

European Union (EU). Seminar discussions included what led the Netherlands to send and maintain its participation in MINUSMA for years. Panelists pointed out the position of the Dutch government in international, regional, and domestic contexts—all of which have influenced decisions to send and withdraw troops.

Twenty-five representatives from AGU and various organizations participated in the seminar. The following is the list of panelists and discussants:

Dr. Niels van WILLIGEN, Associate Professor, Leiden University

“The Dutch experience with peace operations: The Mali mission and beyond”

Dr. Masahide KOBAYASHI, Associate Professor, Shobi University

“Multiple multilateral approaches in peacekeeping operations: The case of Mali”

Dr. Katsumi ISHIZUKA, Professor, Kyoei University

“MINUSMA and the European Perspective”

Dr. Hikaru YAMASHITA, Head of the Government and Law Division, Japan’s National Institute for Defense Studies

Minister Cees ROELS, Minister, Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Tokyo

Professor Mika INOUE, Associate Professor, Toyo Gakuen University

Dr. van Willigen, whose paper is presented in the next section, discussed three main factors behind the decision of the Netherlands to dispatch troops to MINUSMA: a security issue related to the “ring of instability” concerning the European continent, a campaign to gain a non-permanent seat in the UN Security Council, and internal politics that point to the need for compromise under the coalition government. Though the efforts were operationally successful, in late 2018, the government decided to withdraw troops from Mali based on a report from the Court of Audit that referred to lack of material capability to conduct assigned tasks. Dr. van Willigen noted that such material and effective constraints shall become main factors behind government decisions in the future.

Dr. Kobayashi emphasized that a variety of international interventions in Mali is a typical example of a trade-off between the rapidity/effectiveness and legitimacy/neutrality of international missions. Since the deterioration in security following the

Arab Spring, Mali received French troops that aimed to swiftly stabilize the situation. Separately, the International Support Mission to Mali (AFISMA) led by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), as well as the EU Technical Mission (EUTM) Mali and EUCAP Sahel Mali (formed by the EU), were sent. AFISMA was succeeded by MINUSMA. Though unilateral intervention has the advantage of rapidity, EU and UN missions are preferred because of their legitimacy under UN Security Council authorization. Another possible actor, NATO, has the military capability but not a preference for being sent to the African continent. Given the situation that MINUSMA is a new type of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations (UNPKO) that dispatches to areas where operations for stabilization are ongoing, analyzing its role is a critical process for intervening states.

Dr. Ishizuka reviewed the European countries' decisions to send troops to UNPKO, given that participating in NATO missions (i.e., missions to Yugoslavia and Afghanistan) have been prominent in the post-Cold War period. He pointed out a reason for the Europeans' involvement in MINUSMA—that is, the end of the mission in Afghanistan (i.e., International Stabilization Assistance Force). This phenomenon has brought incentives to utilize countries' knowledge and experiences in UNPKO.

Although European countries had sent 1,322 military personnel to MINUSMA as of September 2018 (constituting less than 10% of the total of MINUSMA peacekeeping force), composing the All Sources Information Fusion Unit (ASIFU) was the main contribution of Europeans (including the Netherlands). The action was based on the expertise accumulated in Afghanistan. Concurrently, five countries (Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden) took responsibility for aerial operations. As MINUSMA is the first UNPKO to stipulate counterterrorism in its mandate, the success of Europeans in MINUSMA could encourage other countries' UNPKO participation, according to Dr. Ishizuka.

Following the presentations, Dr. Yamashita noted the uniqueness of the country's contributions to UNPKO. Although the country's troops experienced the Srebrenica incident and had alternatives to participating in EU and NATO missions, the dispatch to MINUSMA and contributions toward forming Action for Peacekeeping (A4P) at

UN Headquarters reveals perplexing factors in terms of the Dutch government's decisions. Dr. Yamashita made three broad observations about the similarities between the Netherlands and Japan. These include the availability of countries to contribute to non-UN peace operations, the impact of coalition politics on both nations' debates, and traditional/conventional security threats faced increasingly by both nations.

DHOM Roels emphasized the importance of communicating with the public on the basis of a well-balanced risk analysis, based upon lessons learned with earlier missions. Sharing information with the public about the risks of operations is imperative. In the phase of deciding to dispatch, the integrated/3D approach is an essential part of both contributing to an effective mission as well as enhancing broader support by the domestic population. Further, because the intervening countries will never control the situation, a basic analysis of hosting countries and the nature of the conflict is a must for meaningful planning and implementation.

DHOM Roels also highlighted the comparable features of NATO-led missions and UNPKO that impact intervening countries. Whereas a NATO mission is effective for interoperating the knowhow and technology, the UNPKO is still in a process of improving this element in preparing and implementing missions. Through participation in NATO-led multilateral force missions, the Netherlands learned about continuous efforts to work on capacity building after military intervention.

Professor Inoue raised the issue of regional organizations, such as the African Union—a key figure in UNPKO operations—and the kinds of measures/support needed in African countries with limited resources.

The highlight of the discussion was the elaboration of lessons to be learned from the Dutch experience. With respect to peacekeeping reforms taken by Japan, one participant mentioned that it is advisable to start slowly, operate on a small scale, and pick a niche area of expertise and be good at it. A second point was that new countries entering this field should approach peacekeeping operations with the assurance that counterinsurgency or counterterrorism strategies are in place. The

third point shed light on the need for a national consensus in Japan regarding peacekeeping, as most Japanese people are not aware of peacekeeping operations. Finally, another participant noted that Japan should create a good legal framework for peacekeeping operations in order to acquire the necessary equipment for engaging in current peace operations and the new security environment.

The project team would like to express deep gratitude to the Aoyama International Center for supporting this project. The project team would also like to thank Ms. Prasad Nidhi for taking notes during the discussions in the half-day seminar.