

## 論文の英文要旨

論文題目

A Study on the Humanitarian Access Strategies  
-A Comparative Study of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the UN Humanitarian Agencies-

氏名

Takeshi Niinuma

Many humanitarian organizations have long adopted a set of "humanitarian principles," consisting of the four operational principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality, and independence. However, humanitarian principles have been criticized. In internal armed conflicts, parties to conflict have increasingly targeted humanitarian agency personnel. They have also used humanitarian aid as a policy instrument to advance their own military and political interests. The effectiveness of humanitarian principles is, thus, questioned when faced with such obstructionism.

In the face of this situation, the humanitarian community is faced with two different approaches: "Classic Humanitarianism," which is based upon the above-mentioned humanitarian principles and oriented toward aid limited to life-saving; and "New Humanitarianism," which revises aid strategies based on the humanitarian principles and seeks to make aid coherent with other sectors so as to address the root causes of armed conflicts — such as security, rule of law, and development. Classical Humanitarianism has been oriented toward the "acceptance-based approach" as a strategy for ensuring humanitarian access. This approach aims to build trust and acceptance through dialogue with conflict parties and local populations, from the standpoint of adherence to humanitarian principles. New Humanitarianism, on the other hand, has been oriented toward the "hardened approach." This approach addresses threats from the parties to the conflict and ensures humanitarian access through the effective use of civil-military defense assets.

While studies dealing with humanitarian access strategies are accumulating amid the challenges of ensuring humanitarian access, no previous studies have attempted to conduct a comparative analysis using objective data to determine whether the humanitarian access strategies adopted by humanitarian agencies have facilitated humanitarian access.

This dissertation aims to examine whether humanitarian access strategies based on the humanitarian principles of classical humanitarianism are still relevant today. This is a qualitative case study of humanitarian aid in Somalia. It uses data regarding the funding of the ICRC and UN humanitarian agencies, as well as security incidents involving the personnel of each humanitarian agency as a scale to measure the relevancy of each access approach. For information on humanitarian aid in Somalia, ICRC news releases and the OCHA's situational reports were consulted. Articles related to humanitarian aid have been contributed to academic journals to supplement the data obtained from these primary sources. Semi-structured interviews were also conducted with aid workers.

This dissertation consists of seven chapters, including an introduction and conclusion. The introductory chapter summarizes the trends of previous studies, focusing on the controversy between "Classical Humanitarianism" and "New Humanitarianism," which is the analytical perspective of this study, and describes the objectives and methods of the study.

Chapter 1 examines the development of the principles governing humanitarian aid from the publication of *Memories of Solferino* by Henry Dunant, founder of the Red Cross, to the present day.

Chapter 2 examines the structural and operational challenges facing humanitarian principles. This chapter first reviews the definitions and structures of humanitarian principles. It then emphasizes that among the humanitarian principles, the principle of "neutrality," which calls for a clear distinction between military and political agendas and humanitarian aid, is the most important issue in contemporary armed conflicts, where the distinction between combatants and the general population is blurred. Against this backdrop, it identifies a movement to re-examine the relevance of humanitarian principles.

Chapter 3 analyzes the process of integration of the UN's humanitarian, security, and development sectors, focusing on the "integrated approach." This ensures that the diverse capacities of the UN are consistently and mutually supportive in order to maximize their contribution to countries in conflict. This analysis shows that the trend toward integration has raised concerns that it would lead to the militarization and politicization of UN humanitarian aid. Therefore, the guidelines of the integrated approach refer to humanitarian considerations.

Chapter 4 analyzes the differences between the two approaches to humanitarian access strategies: the "acceptance-based approach" and the "hardened approach." This chapter refers to policy documents published by the ICRC and the UN's humanitarian agencies for the purpose of

analyzing the characteristics of security management and aid policies. It then identifies the ICRC's tendency to take an "acceptance-based approach" and the UN humanitarian agencies' tendency to take the "hardened approach."

Chapter 5 examines the relevancy and limits of the "acceptance-based approach" and the "hardened approach" by focusing on humanitarian aid in Somalia from 2005 to 2014 as a case study. The chapter first identifies how humanitarian agencies face political (state-building and international counterterrorism) and operational constraints (violence against aid workers and bureaucratic regulations) in securing humanitarian access. It then examines whether differences have emerged in terms of humanitarian access between the ICRC and the UN's humanitarian agencies in the face of these constraints.

The conclusion draws the following implications. First, the strengthening of security arrangements throughout the UN system encourages overly risk-averse behavior and hampers the ability of UN humanitarian agencies to respond to the needs of the affected population. Second, the trend within the UN system to integrate humanitarian aid with political agendas — such as state-building and counterterrorist measures — has resulted in the escalation of violence by al-Shabaab against UN humanitarian agency personnel and has increased bureaucratic restrictions on humanitarian aid. Third, although the ICRC's humanitarian access was hampered by Al-Shabaab's bureaucratic restrictions, it was more successful in gaining humanitarian access than UN humanitarian agencies through continued dialogue and persuasion based on humanitarian principles. These implications drawn from the case study examination in Chapter 5 shows that humanitarian access strategies based on the humanitarian principles of classical humanitarianism are still relevant.