The 1st International Symposium

An international symposium on "The International Context of Conflicts in the Middle East and Asian Approaches to Conflict Resolution" sponsored by this Centre was held for two days, March 4 and 5, 2006, at the Omiya Campus of Ryukoku University.

The symposium opened with a special lecture entitled "Peace: Mutual Understanding of Religions and Contribution by Buddhism" by His Eminence Monshu Ohtani Koshin Jodo Shinshu Hongwanji-ha. Various sessions were then held, in which specialists from Japan and around the world, including the Middle East and the United States, participated in lively discussions. With more than 100 participants, this first international symposium ended as a great success. In this issue, we look back over each of the sessions of the symposium.

◆ First Session

Peace Process of the Middle East (Palestine-Israel Conflict)

The theme of the first session was the process of working toward peace between Israel and Palestine. Prof. Yezid Sayigh discussed the peace process as seen from the Palestinian standpoint, and Prof. Elie Podeh discussed the issue from the Israeli standpoint. Prof. Hidemitsu Kuroki also presented a paper on the prospect of peace for the Middle East as a whole from the standpoint of two Arab states (Lebanon and Syria) that are still at war with Israel. The session developed into a lively discussion focusing on how the peace process will develop after the dramatic changes in the Palestinian political climate brought about by the Hamas victory in the January 2006 Palestinian Legislative Council elections.

Hamas, which has long been in opposition to the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization), has denounced the 1993 Oslo Agreement, thus refusing to recognise Israel. As such, the Hamas victory tends to be regarded as having a negative impact on the peace process. However, Prof. Sayigh argued that the Hamas victory itself should not be seen as the problem. Rather, he argued, the biggest concern is that the Fateh, which do not want to accept the Hamas victory, may work to destabilize conditions within Palestine in hopes of seeing the Hamas government fail. The decision to participate in the election is, in itself, an indicator of the progress within the Hamas. The Hamas victory in a fair and democratic election should be considered to be legitimate. Prof. Sayigh warned that if the Fateh begin showing resistance to the Hamas, with both parties having great stockpiles of guns and weapons, enormous damage could result. Therefore, he emphasised that the Fateh hold an important key to not only the domestic situation in Palestine, but to the peace process with Israel as well.

While Prof. Sayigh spoke about the future outlook following the Hamas victory, Prof. Podeh examined the twists and turns involved in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process since the Oslo Agreement, dividing the process into four periods. The Oslo Agreement made it possible for negotiations to take place about the construction of two national states, Israel and Palestine, on land about which there has long been sovereignty disputes between the Jews and Palestinians (Period 1). However, the peace negotiations reached a deadlock, and in 2000, the PLO declared Intifada and began using violent measures (Period 2). Period 3 is characterized by the progress of the peace process through unilateral initiatives of the Israeli government, with the withdrawal of the Israeli army from Gaza at the core of these initiatives. With the Hamas victory, a new period (Period 4) began. Prof. Podeh argued that in order to resume peace negotiations, it is vital for the Hamas to discard their ideological stance and shift to a pragmatic orientation, and he emphasised that there is sufficient potential for this to occur. In Israel, which was preparing for elections to be held a few weeks later, it is almost certain that moderate factions that are willing to continue the peace negotiations, such as the moderate Kadima party, will be in power after the elections. Therefore, he concluded that while negotiations may be deadlocked for a short period of time as a result of the Hamas victory, in the long run, changes within the Hamas will lead to the resumption of peace negotiations.

(Prof. Yezid Sayigh)
◆ Second Session
The International Context of Conflicts in the Middle East (Iran, Kurd, and Pakistan)

The second session focused on various aspects of conflicts in Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, etc., including Islamic issues, ethnic issues, issues with nationalism, and the on-going anti-colonial struggle against the West. The session encompassed motivated approaches striving to clarify the complexity and multiplicity of these issues.

In this session, Prof. Sano pointed out that there are two trends that exist in parallel among the Azerbaijani people, one of Iran’s minority peoples, regarding the nation-state of Iran. On one hand, there is a movement to actively strengthen Iranian nationalism, while on the other hand, there is a federalist movement advocating the autonomy of the Azerbaijani people. However, even the latter group is not pushing for an Azerbaijan separation from Iran, but rather, strives to expand the autonomy of the Azerbaijani people. A common aspect of both groups is the emphasis of the necessity of maintaining Iran’s independence. The Islamic Republic of Iran following the Islamic revolution could be considered a testing ground for an Islamic version of a nation-state that combines the concept of equality under the laws of a modern nation state with the concept of equality under Islam.

◆ Third Session
The Oil Issue in the Context of the Middle Eastern Conflicts

The themes for the third session were oil problems and conflicts in the Middle East. In regard to Dr. Herman Franssen’s presentation entitled “Middle East Conflicts and Oil Markets: Past and Prospective”, Dr. Tsutomu Tochi and Mr. Michael Lynch each commented from their respective standpoints.

Dr. Franssen emphasized the differences between the oil crisis of the 1970s and the global oil market of recent years, from the standpoint of aspects such as the relationship between the United States and Saudi Arabia, and pointed out that the excess production capacity of Saudi Arabia, which has greatly contributed to stabilizing the supply of oil, has now reached its limit. Dr. Franssen made reference to the growing demand in recent years for oil in Asia, China and India in particular, and predicted that this increased demand will lead to a doubling of oil consumption by the year 2020, which today averages approximately 20 million barrels per day in Asia, and indicated that the increasing oil consumption in Asia is what is maintaining today’s high oil price of US$60 per barrel.

In terms of threats to oil security, in the past, the Soviet Union posed the threat, while now, threats are posed by terrorist organizations such as Al Qaeda. Today, the Strait of Malacca is vital to the transportation of oil bound for Asia. If terrorists were to attack the strait, there would be no way to avoid a disruption of oil supply to Asia. The construction of a pipeline is considered an effective way to prevent such problems.

Furthermore, political instability in oil producing nations is another factor leading to instability in oil supply. The relationship between democratization in the Middle East and production stability was also discussed from this standpoint. Dr. Franssen emphasized that the realization of democratization results in increased support for the protection of resources, thus leading to the introduction of strict restrictions on production. He introduced Iran as one example. It was also noted that democratization does not necessarily lead to the types of results for which the West is hoping. For example, if the Islamic political party began to gain power, the relationship with the West could worsen and further instability could result. As Prof. Podeh pointed out, when Iraq was under the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, there was actually a very stable supply of oil. Dr. Franssen expressed scepticism about the relationship between democratization and the stabilization of oil supply, but opposing views were also expressed in the discussion.

There is also a very strong possibility that the growing economies of Asia, in China and India in particular, will lead to great increases in oil consumption. It is possible that conflicts over oil will arise between these large Asian consumers and Japan, and this is an issue that requires further study. (RA Daisuke Yamanaka)
In the first part of the session, Prof. Bose and Prof. Nagasaki, who specialize in peaceful relationships, based on the historical experiences of Asia.

According to Prof. Bose, there exists a concept of multi-layered sovereignty, which differs from the European concept of sovereignty by which sovereignty over a specific region (land or sea) belongs to one party. For example, in ancient India, people held the idea of Dharma (law and justice), which had authority exceeding that of a king, if a king failed to abide by the Dharma, people would often assassinate the king, or relocate en masse. Here, the sovereignty existed in the concept of Dharma, which exceeded all worldly authority. Prof. Bose emphasized the importance of constructing a new concept of sovereignty that is based on the long-held ethos of India, but which also takes contemporary conditions into consideration.

In the second part of the session, papers were presented by speakers who have been central players in the process of creating peace in countries such as Sri Lanka and Cambodia, acting as mediators in the peace process. Here, Mr. Akashi spoke from his own experiences as he discussed concrete methods for active intervention by a third party in the negotiations between parties involved in a conflict. The conflicts of Cambodia are vestiges of the Cold War, and as such, the peace process has involved various countries and international organizations. In the past Cambodian experiences, the flexible responses of diplomats working at the front lines of the negotiations, based on their individual assessments of the situations, were of great advantage to the development of the peace process. Meanwhile, the nature of the conflict in Sri Lanka is complex, involving various factors such as ethnic politics, power struggles, and class conflicts. However, the viewpoint that regards the conflict in Sri Lanka as a religious conflict is one which must be negated. This is because it is more effective to distinguish the moderate Buddhists who are in the majority and support peace from the radical Buddhists, placing the former at the centre of the peace process.

One of the main points discussed in the Concluding Session was the issue of whether, in the resolution of conflicts in Asia, a creative method should be conceived that redenies the very existence of the sovereign nation system, or, if a practical response based on the presumption of existing sovereign nation-state regimes must take preference. This point was also discussed during a report by Prof. Kawabata at the Asia Group 4 Second Meeting held in November 2005, with that discussion focusing on conflict resolution in Africa. Looking at this issue on the surface, there is a tendency to perceive the conflict as arising from the different stances taken by idealists and realists, and to think that the assertions of both follow parallel courses of action, without reaching agreement. However, for example, the argument of Prof. Bose’s “Multi-layered Sovereignty” is also backed by a contemporary analysis of conditions in which the concept of “sharing authority”, which formed the background of the Belfast Accord in Ireland in 1998, plays an important role. Mr. Akashi, noting that the framework of the United Nations and the principle of sovereignty inviolability must be respected, also recognized the effectiveness of policies that share or yield a portion of authority. There is a demand for efforts to hammer out measures for “idealistic and realistic” policy resolution measures that can be applied to specific individual cases, while making an earnest effort to find points in common and maintaining a creative dialogue between theory and actual conditions.

(RA Shinya Ishizaka)
In 2005/2006, the Afrasian Centre for Peace and Development Studies held two joint seminars and one international seminar to which Prof. Tirthankar Roy, an expert in Indian economic history at the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, India, was invited.

At the first joint seminar, Prof. Pauline Kent (Faculty of Intercultural Communication, Ryukoku University) and Prof. Tsuyoshi Kato (Faculty of Sociology, Ryukoku University) gave talks about the two major concepts of this research project, “conflict” and “poverty”, clarifying the historical changes that have taken place in each of these concepts.

With the verification of these concepts, the theme for the second joint seminar was “Democracy and Conflict Resolution”. At this seminar, Prof. Kenichi Matsui (Faculty of Intercultural Communication, Ryukoku University) discussed the formation of international regimes with respect to energy issues, Prof. Aditya Mukherjee (Centre for Historical Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India) discussed the relationship between democracy and economic development in India, and Prof. Mridula Mukherjee (Centre for Historical Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India) discussed non-violent resistance movements in India’s struggle for independence. There was great interest in all of these presentations, but due to space restrictions, here I only the discussions of Prof. Kent and Prof. Mukherjee will be briefly introduced.

Prof. Kent pointed out that the concept of “conflict” has a broad range of connotations and is used at various levels. It is a mistake to consider the term “conflict” to be restricted to negative aspects such as “confrontation” or “violence”, which we usually associate with this word. A conflict exposes the tense relations within a society, but it also promotes effort in people to work to resolve tense situations. As such, within conflict there are positive aspects found in the potential to deepen the understanding of others through the resolution of tense situations, and to better unite society. Focusing attention on this double nature of conflict, the importance of analysing the conflict resolution process becomes clear.

Based on these discussions at the first joint seminar, various methods (processes) of conflict resolution were discussed at the second joint seminar. Prof. Mridula Mukherjee examined, based on the findings of an oral history project organised by the Jawaharlal Nehru University where she is based, the reasons why peasants chose non-violent methods of protest in India’s struggle for independence. Non-violent resistance was a strategy used by Gandhi and other leaders of India’s freedom struggle. In addition to the leaders, the peasants who participated in this struggle also had a sufficient understanding of the effectiveness of this strategy. With the spread of mass civil disobedient resistance, the British government came to realize that it would no longer be able to rule India without using violent, oppressive means. When the British government began to strengthen its oppression, the people of India began to adopt more violent means of resistance. Prof. Mukherjee’s presentation, which focused on the experiences and collective wisdom of the common people in India’s struggle for independence, provided insightful suggestions for this project, which searches for the mechanisms of conflict resolution rooted in each local region. (PD Chizuko Sato)