

An Analysis of the Activities of Japanese Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Relation to Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) and Forest Conservation in East Asia

Trevor Ballance

INTRODUCTION

Though increasingly challenged by China, Japan's economic strength and influence in East Asia remains considerable. The country's Official Development Assistance (ODA) despite falling in recent years, remains one of the world's largest and continues to bring with it preferential treatment for Japanese economic and political interests. Since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, the Japanese Government has been supportive of sustainable development and, as Agenda 21 made clear, the cooperation of various 'major groups' – mostly non-state institutions, including NGOs – is vital if progress is to be made. A central question of this paper is whether Japanese environmental non-governmental organizations (JENGOS) are able to exploit this power and influence in order to conserve East Asian forests and promote sustainable development. To answer this question, research was carried out to analyze the way that JENGOS active in forest conservation in Asia conceive their role and how they view their position in Japanese society.

This analysis includes an assessment of the contribution made by JENGOS working in East Asia. It asks if, through their activities, JENGOS are effective at promoting sustainable development, and particularly sustainable forest management (SFM). In addition it also seeks to identify what roles they fulfil, whether these roles are appropriate, and what problems they have in meeting the expectations attached to these roles.

A questionnaire with follow-up interviews provided the source of primary data for this research. Specifically the questionnaire sought to identify (1) the roles that JENGOS believe they have in the conservation and sustainable management of forests in the region, (2) the activities they conduct that operationalise those roles, (3) the nature of

their relationship with the government, the business community and the citizens of Japan, and (4) the extent to which JENGOs perceive they are restrained or supported by Japanese civil society.

A large part of the Japanese post-war economic boom was founded on the exploitation of the natural resources of South-East Asia. Today, Japan's consumption habits continue to have environmental consequences in the region. The price paid by the developing countries of South-East Asia still remains largely unacknowledged in Japan, however. Although Japanese Government environmental aid has grown large, it has, for a variety of reasons, been ineffective (Dauvergne, 1997). In addition, Japanese corporations, although no longer linked directly to the environmental damage caused by unsustainable logging practices, continue to be instrumental in forest loss via practices such as informal purchasing agreements and hidden trade ties (Dauvergne, 2001).

According to the UNEP, South-East Asia alone lost over 23 million hectares of forest in the decade from 1990 to 2000, a one percent reduction of forest each year (UNEP, 2002). Japan's historical connection with Asia would appear to offer a clear role for civil society groups like environmental NGOs to contribute to the protection of forests and their effective management. Indeed, it may be said that JENGOs represent an important conduit for the dissemination of key sustainability concepts, and, indirectly, the future health of the region's economic prospects.

Following the introduction, the paper will present a literature review, then a section on methods used for the questionnaire and interviews. The bulk of the paper will comprise a two-part discussion of the research results, which will then be followed by the paper's conclusions.

The first part of this research identifies from among those JENGOs surveyed what they believe to be their roles. This was the focus of the first section of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to decide (based on a five-point scale) how important they perceive particular roles to be in the conservation and sustainable management of forests. This served to reveal (1) the issues that currently concern JENGOs, and (2) the priorities that these organizations have in the area of forest conservation and management.

In addition to this, the first part of the questionnaire aimed to provide an indication of what JENGOs consider to be their capacity for action, as these organizations are more likely to highlight as important those issues in which they are able to exert some influence. Of equal importance was to uncover the extent to which financial restraints (common to nearly all ENGOs) and cultural restraints (specific to Japanese organizations) affect potential activity. The perception of roles and capacity may be seen to have a close link.

The second part of this research attempts to show how JENGOs are implementing the roles they see as important. This was covered in the second section of the questionnaire. In this section, respondents were asked about their activities and invited to briefly describe them. As part of civil society, JENGOs have both advantages and disadvantages in terms of resources, influence, self-determination and capacity. A key question for this research was to find out how effective JENGOs are in what they do. What are their strengths and weaknesses and how do they seek to exploit those strengths and minimize their weaknesses? Their activities will be set against what background literature (Balsiger 1998; Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu 2002) argues they could and should be doing.

The current state of the third sector in Japan and the activities that NGOs pursue within it has obviously been greatly influenced by how Japanese society itself has developed. Discussion within the NGO sector seeks to shed light on what “civil society” might mean for Japanese people, because, in its imported form, it has often caused confusion among many who see little role for NGOs in their modern form. Although in the past a kind of civil society (in which, paradoxically, the Government played a key role) existed in Japan (Garon, 2003), it is not a concept that is as deeply entrenched as in Europe and the continent of America. As a result, NGOs have occupied (arguably until recently) an awkward position on the fringes of Japanese society generally invoking mistrust and suspicion, particularly from state organizations.

The third part of this study analyzes JENGO views on how civil society affects their roles and activities. In the final part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement to ten statements aimed at revealing JENGO attitudes to civil society. A key question focused on how much JENGOs feel empowered or constrained by civil society and whether this is likely to influence the kind of projects

they may or may not attempt. JENGOs that are generally positive about the direction in which civil society is moving may be encouraged to be more pro-active and look to expand their influence. However, organizations that feel pessimistic about future civil society support may become insular, conservative and marginalized from society. How do opinions on these issues affect what JENGOs attempt to do? A key element of this section was an analysis of how JENGOs see the relationship with government developing. This was intended to give an indication of the level of engagement JENGOs are contemplating in the future.

This research paper ends with a discussion of the JENGO role in promoting sustainable development in the region. Asia continues to develop economically at a rapid, though uneven, rate. However, this development is consuming resources at unsustainable levels and, as a result, growth is viewed as unstable (IGES, 2005). There is real tension between development and conservation aims. JENGOs could play a role in resolving this tension. More specifically, they could make a significant contribution to sustainable development through the protection and sustainable management of Asian forests that are, at present, disappearing at an alarming rate.

LITERATURE REVIEW

It is now generally accepted that NGOs represent an important element of civil society, and therefore by extension, have a contribution to make to sustainable development. The nature of that role is still very much contested, however. Edwards and Hulme (2001) describes the neoliberal viewpoint which sees NGOs as primarily service providers in the 'global soup kitchen', taking the place of government provision by virtue of their grassroots links, their flexibility and local knowledge. Other interpretations see a more extensive role for NGOs and include activities such as helping the democratization of societies, inspiring social change and altering behaviour in the effort to achieve sustainable development (Ahmed and Potter, 2006).

The discussion on how NGOs may help promote such development can be advanced by asking questions about their potential: what do their capacities allow and in what areas can they stake a role? The answer to these questions will depend on a large number of factors, but it is possible to identify in concrete terms what NGOs may be in a position to do well and, perhaps, better than other organizations.

Before embarking on this literature review, it is necessary to comment briefly on 'sustainable forest management' (SFM). Debate over its meaning has to some degree mirrored that of sustainable development. The concept is multi-faceted, but takes as its underlying principle the understanding that forests will not be left alone. The stewardship of forests is unlikely to be disassociated from how forests serve human development. Therefore, SFM is about creating healthy relationships between forests and those who own them, live in them, subsist on their products, study them, protect them and harvest them. In echoes of Brundtland, SFM has been defined as

...maintaining or enhancing the contribution of forests to human wellbeing, both of present and future generations, without compromising their ecosystem integrity, that is their resilience, function and biological diversity. (Sayer et al, 2005, p.266).

The sustainable management of forests in Asia is vital to the prosperity of the region. Nevertheless, between 2000 and 2005, close to 40 million hectares of forest globally disappeared, representing approximately one percent of total coverage (Worldwatch, 2006). In the last 25 years Asia has lost half of its forest cover while over 30% of agricultural land has become degraded (IGES, 2005).

In the area of forest protection and sustainable management Balsiger (1998) identifies several activities that Asian ENGOs have the capacity to conduct. These are (1) disseminating information, (2) providing technical training for field staff, (3) educating community leaders in issues of conservation, protection and rehabilitation of forests, (4) implementing field projects including community forestry and alternative agricultural practices, and (5) developing networks of local and international ENGOs.

We may expand this list by looking at the area of environmental governance. Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu (2002), identify five roles for ENGOs which include (1) information gathering, (2) contributions to policy development, (3) implementation of policies, (4) assessment of environmental conditions and monitoring compliance, and (5) advocacy.

There is a degree of overlap here, but it is possible to make out two broad categories of action emerging from the literature that we can use in a discussion on ENGO effectiveness. The activities in these categories may be distinguished by the scale at

which they are conducted. Glassman (2001), discusses the issue of ‘globalization from below’ and the importance of social movements developing the ability to “jump scales” from local level to global level action. The same point could be made of ENGOs. Only if they can function at several levels (for this is a continuum which includes regional and national aspects) and “jump scales” when different forms of action are required can they arguably become truly effective.

Although a continuum, for the sake of clarity in analyzing the literature, we can describe the two categories of action referred to as having a *local bias* and a *global bias*. Activities that have a *local bias* are those that are generally grounded in specific (usually local) communities, and are project-based with short- to mid-term concrete outcomes. Examples would include the training and education of forest dwellers and the implementation of forestry projects. In these activities the traditional strength associated with NGOs, namely, the positions of trust they occupy, their local knowledge, flexibility of purpose, etc can be utilized. In contrast, activities that have a *global bias* are those where ties to a specific place are weaker, activities are generally open-ended and outcomes difficult to measure. Here we might include consciousness-raising, advocacy, policy input and international agreement monitoring and other governance issues. In this category of activity, it can be argued that NGOs are less able to employ their traditional strengths. The literature tends to suggest that ENGOs are more effective in activities with a local bias, but less so in activities with a global bias.

Balsiger (1998) argues that the power of ENGOs comes from their diversity, and acknowledges their effectiveness at the local level. He differentiates between northern ENGOs which espouse ‘First World environmentalism’ and focus on forest protection, and southern ENGOs which promote ‘Third World environmentalism’ and are concerned with forest use. Although both groups engage in grassroots work and environmental education, Northern ENGOs, with their emphasis on forest protection, have greater involvement at regional, national and international levels than Southern groups which work at the local level and emphasize the use of forests in the securing of livelihoods. Balsiger implies that, although good work is done at the local level, chances of ENGOs achieving success in the global arena are low. He lists population growth, rising urbanization and rapid economic development as the forces which are likely to have significant influence on forests in the next few years; forces over which ENGOs have “little or no impact” (p.3).

In support of NGO activity with a global bias, Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu (2002), describe NGOs as “a driving force” in mobilizing public support for international agreements (see also Speth, 2002). They argue that NGOs have developed a better understanding of how international policy-making processes work and as a result, are better placed to influence such processes. Among other things, NGOs are able to do this by giving expert advice, providing intellectual challenges to governments, and legitimizing global decision-making by broadening the information available on which decision-makers arrive at policy choices.

Betsill and Corell (2001) similarly support ENGO activity at the global level. They propose an analytical framework that triangulates ENGO activity, access and resources in the attempt to measure overall ENGO influence. They also point out the increasingly significant role that NGOs play in lobbying due to greater NGO access to different political arenas, including the United Nations.

In its support for more participatory processes in the forestry sector, the Center for International Forestry Research implies that a role exists for ENGOs in policy formation (Byron, 1997). A report states that National Forestry Policies are only likely to become effective if greater participation helps lead to better informed policies which, with regular feedback, could also strengthen the commitment of communities. It is also argued that such participation could help clarify the potential contributions of ENGOs, in the area of monitoring policies, for example.

Several commentators however subscribe to the view that ENGOs can exert only marginal influence, especially in the area of governance, and that forest protection and management can be handled better by other institutions. Research by Fuchs (2006) argues that organizations like the Forest Stewardship Council which represent public-private and private-private partnerships, rather than ENGOs, offer the main hope to prevent tropical deforestation. This goes against the view that ENGOs are effective in activities with a local bias. In addition, Fuchs believes that ENGO influence at the global level is minimal because their resources are inadequate for the long haul that policy processes inevitably require. This is exacerbated because a lack of cohesion among ENGOs dissipates their energy and focus. Moreover, Fuchs states that the lack of resources also affects their ability to monitor existing policies – seen as a key role for ENGOs.

Research on ENGO influence on international forest policy-making over a period of 15 years to 2001 (Humphreys, 2004), also arrives at a negative conclusion. The conditions necessary to allow NGOs to make a difference to texts of international agreements are highly circumscribed. Unless ENGOs get access to the start of negotiations, subscribe to the neoliberal agenda, and make suggestions that are already established in the mainstream, their chances of achieving success are slim. Although it can be argued that ENGOs are now more able to be in at the beginning of negotiation processes, preventing them from promoting radical alternatives by tying their thinking to the predominant world view would seem to be negating one of their key advantages.

In a more general way, this argument is advanced by Eccleston and Potter (in Parnwell and Bryant, 1996) who emphasize the political context in which environmental issues are located. Most ENGOs must inevitably find themselves facing up to governments and powerful business interests “buttressed by global economic, ideological and political structures of power” (p.50) that seek short term profit motives or development over long-term environmental benefits. The implication is that ENGOs, even at the local level, are relatively powerless.

In research on corporate logging practices, Dauvergne casts doubt on ENGO activity related to forest protection and management – the area in which ENGOs are supposed to be strong (Dauvergne 1997, 2001). Despite increasing numbers, he argues that local ENGOs in East Asia have had little effect in preventing forest destruction owing to minimal resources and indifferent support. In states with authoritarian tendencies, ENGOs may additionally face harsh legal restrictions and human rights abuse, further restricting their activities. Dauvergne accepts that ENGOs in countries with stronger civil societies may make some progress, but Asian ENGOs (with the exception of the Philippines) are noticeably weaker than ENGOs in other areas of the world. In addition, he raises doubts over SFM as a way of managing forests, citing the fact that there are few examples of SFM practice in the region, and that the concept “may simply be unrealistic...[particularly] for large scale operations” (Dauvergne Working Paper 1997, p.24). Dauvergne concludes that ENGOs (among others) do not fully understand the complex relationship of factors that cause deforestation and is a reason why they are unlikely to bring about major change.

Regarding Japanese ENGOs involved in the conservation and sustainable

management of forests in the region, Dauvergne is equally critical, arguing that they are “small and inconsequential” (Dauvergne, 2001, p.60). These criticisms may be justified, but it is important to ask to what extent JENGOs have been affected (positively or negatively), by the evolution of Japanese civil society. It is widely accepted that NGO development in the country has been slow, and that the capacity of most NGOs remains weak. Several reasons have been cited. These include (1) the implicit trust that Japanese people, until recently, have had in their government, (2) the psychological tendency of Japanese to focus on the welfare of people within their own in-group, and (3) the lack of a religious imperative or charity ethic (Yamakoshi, 1994).

Coupled with this have been significant historical events and movements that have worked against the development of a vibrant NGO sector. Garon (2003) believes that the close alliance of emerging social movements with the state that followed the Meiji Restoration of 1868 “impeded the emergence of a truly autonomous civil society” (p.56). In post-war times, the adversarial relationship NGOs developed with industry over high-profile pollution issues left both corporations and citizens with the impression that NGOs sought only confrontation – an image that has only started to dissipate in the last 20 years. In addition, as Hirata (2002) states, groups tended to form for *ad hoc* purposes and were essentially “parochial” in nature (p.16).

The legacy of this has been significant. Today, Japanese NGOs still struggle against the restrictions originating from the state’s long-held dominance over “civil society”; an unsupportive legal environment, ill-defined roles, lack of political space in which to work, and a residual attitude on the part of government and bureaucracy that NGOs are merely servants doing government bidding (Yamamoto, 1998). Within such an unfriendly environment, it might be unsurprising to note the relative weakness of Japanese NGOs.

METHODS

Data was collected in two forms: by questionnaire and semi-structured interview. The questionnaires, translated into Japanese, were sent via email in January 2009 and replies were gathered between January and April, 2009. Following an analysis of the questionnaire data, interviews were conducted between May and June and were recorded, with permission, for later analysis.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was sent to 46 Japanese environmental non-governmental organizations (JENGOS). Organizations suitable for receiving questionnaires were defined as (1) involved either exclusively or partially in forest conservation or forest management, and (2) working in countries outside Japan, specifically in East Asia. Organisations involved in forest issues outside this area, for example in Africa, were not included, as one of the purposes of the study was to identify how Japan's historical exploitation of East Asia's natural resources has affected the attitudes and activities of JENGOS.

The names of appropriate organizations were obtained from the database of The Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation (JANIC). Their 'Directory of Japanese NGOs Concerned with International Cooperation' lists 289 Japanese non-governmental organizations with a wide variety of interests but all either supporting or being involved in overseas activities. The database is extensive and provides details of each organization's overseas operations, the number of employees, sources of funding, and operational budget. In addition, it includes the names of international organizations (both governmental and non-governmental) with which each Japanese NGO has established connections. This Directory was thus deemed an appropriate source for identifying JENGOS to target for data gathering.

The 46 organizations chosen were those NGOs out of the 289 which stated that issues of forest conservation and management were an important area of activity, and fitted the definition of JENGOS active in East Asia. The questionnaire was divided into three sections containing 40 questions in total. Below is a discussion on the format and the factors considered in its construction.

Section One The 17 questions in this section used a five-point Likert scale in which respondents were asked to choose from 'extremely important' to 'not important'. Questions were framed according to the current literature on forestry issues (See Appendix 1). This section was designed to elicit information concerning the roles that JENGOS believe to be important for the protection of forests.

Section Two The 13 questions in this section were a simple 'yes/no' type in which those organizations answering 'yes' were invited to provide brief details about their activities.

Questions were framed according to the traditionally-assigned activities of NGOs as well as what Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu (2002) argue NGOs should be doing in the realm of environmental governance (See Appendix 1). This section was designed to elicit information on the activities JENGOs conduct.

Section Three The ten questions in this section used a five-point Likert scale in which respondents were asked to choose from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. Questions were based on what the literature identifies as being the most significant influences on the formation of Japanese NGOs, and the challenges that currently face them. This section was designed to collect data about the condition of JENGOs in Japanese society.

The Interviews Three organizations consented to an interview. The purpose was to follow-up on the questionnaire in four ways. First, organizations were to be given an opportunity to make clarifications or comments and expand upon anything they were asked in the questionnaire, as well as to add anything they felt was not catered for by the questionnaire. Second, representatives were given the opportunity to expand on any aspect or characteristic of their organization that would lead to a greater understanding of what it does. Third, following an analysis of the questionnaire returns, it became clear that some points needed clarification while other points would appear to merit a more expansive discussion. Finally, interviews were an opportunity to identify weaknesses and/or omissions in the questionnaire and to rectify them through the clarification process of the interview format.

DISCUSSION

Fourteen out of 46 organizations responded to the questionnaire and three surveyed organizations agreed to be subsequently interviewed. The 46 organisations identified from the list of nearly 300 in the ‘Directory of Japanese NGOs Concerned with International Cooperation’ represent those NGOs in Japan that are most active internationally and could be said to be the most appropriate organizations for the gathering of data for this research. However, there are certainly a number of organizations working in the area of forest conservation that are active overseas but are not included in the list and therefore were not surveyed. In addition, although the overall numbers of JENGOs involved in SFM in Asia are undoubtedly few, the data

gathered from 14 organizations still represents a small sample of those active in this area and this should therefore be kept in mind during the following discussion.

Discussion of the results will be divided into two parts. The first two sections of the questionnaire will be discussed together as they link JENGO's perceived roles with the work they do and the projects they implement. Where relevant, data gathered from the interviews will be added to clarify and expand particular points. The second part of the discussion will cover Section Three of the questionnaire where again relevant data from the interviews will be included. The organizations that were interviewed are identified by the initials 'A', 'J' and 'O'.

PART 1: Questionnaire Sections One and Two with Interview Comments

It is evident from the responses to Question 1 that when JENGOs are asked about SFM, they assign significant importance to the concept however they define it. The idea that forests cannot be conserved unless they are also managed appears to be accepted. Unfortunately, as with the concept of sustainable development itself, the devil often lies in the detail. Like sustainable development, SFM can also be all things to all people and available for interpretation in a wide variety of ways, many of which may be seen on closer inspection to be in conflict. Nevertheless, on the evidence presented, the JENGOs surveyed acknowledge that there are social and economic aspects to the environmental objectives of forest conservation, even if these elements do not always take a central position in JENGO activities and projects. An analysis of the results indicates a wide range of activities, of which the large majority contains social and economic features as well as environmental aspects. Activities varied though most stressed the central position of local people – the social and/or community aspect – in the projects. This would imply strong support for SFM. For example, in North Sumatra one organization supports the development of forest management activities run by local people through the establishment of formalized principles of forest use among the community users, linking this by promoting leadership skills, for which local people may receive a period of training in Japan. Another JENGO is involved in giving instruction in techniques for the development and promotion of forest products in East Kalimantan, for which it provides a market back in Japan. In a separate project, this same organization has been involved in the recording and preservation of traditional forest management techniques of local groups of forest dwellers.

A number of groups briefly gave details of activities that have a more environmental focus to forest conservation. One project in Indonesia provides and plants teak trees for the afforestation of land that has been abandoned by local people. Similarly, another group has been planting trees at an orphanage in the Philippines for educational purposes and to support a local youth NGO. A further group, also active in the Philippines, has been working on a reforestation project for the purpose of preventing the siltation of a river that provides a vital source of water for a rural community. Three further groups were involved with mangrove conservation and plantation projects, two of which stated that, though having an environmental focus, are implemented with local people. A sustainable agroforestry project of one JENGO involves work with a rural community that occupies and farms hillside slopes in Vietnam. Local people grow corn, root vegetables and peanuts both as subsistence crops and cash crops.

Moreover, all three JENGOs that were interviewed confirmed the central position of SFM in their work. In its interview, Organization ‘A’ said,

All the activities of our organization are for local people who, because of disappearing forests, are in danger of losing not only their livelihoods but their traditional lifestyles as well.

This was echoed by Organization ‘O’ who said that one of the most important activities is to protect the environment, but at the same time, “help local people to use their own land sustainably so that they can pass it on to their descendents”. The emphasis of Organization ‘J’ was slightly different. While accepting the central role of forest dwellers and users, the accelerating rate of forest disappearance forces it to focus primarily on projects aimed at reducing wood consumption through consciousness-raising and attempts to change the corporate practices of paper consuming industries in Japan.

However, at first glance, a central role for SFM claimed by JENGOs (and somewhat evidenced in their activities), did not appear to be supported by the data collected from the more specific questions in the questionnaire, particularly when comparing the overwhelming JENGO support for protected forests and action against illegal logging. JENGOs seem to exhibit a less than total commitment to SFM. The three issues for which JENGOs showed a decreasing level of support were (1) securing land tenure and

property rights for indigenous groups, (2) encouraging local participation of such groups, and (3) working with local grassroots organizations and NGOs.

Question 6 found that only 57% of organizations believed that securing land tenure and property rights for indigenous forest dwellers was extremely important. A further 21% attached some degree of importance to it. Similarly, in Question 7 (regarding the participation of local people), only 14% of organizations recognized it as extremely important with some level of importance assigned to it by a further 57% of groups. For Question 8, concerning the importance of working together with local organizations, only one organization saw it as extremely important while seven other groups (50%) believe it has some importance.

What might account for the discrepancy between the JENGO claims to be strong supporters of SFM and the rather lower commitment revealed in the questionnaire responses about SFM activities?

There are several interpretations that can be drawn from these data. First, it might be said that the commitment of JENGOS to the concept of SFM is only superficial. JENGOS could simply be supporting the idea because it represents the prevailing thinking, particularly with its connection to sustainable development, acknowledged as important even by the Japanese Government. In addition, an effect of a questionnaire on forest management and conservation might be to discourage organizations from responding critically about the concept in general terms while being more forthcoming on specific issues. However, there is enough evidence to suggest that JENGO projects and activities are vigorous enough to discount the view that it may be mere lip service.

A second interpretation could be that the SFM approaches of some of the JENGOS surveyed were not captured by the questions, in other words, some organizations saw their commitment to SFM being manifested in other ways or alternatively, in a more generalized, holistic way. Though organizations were invited to mention other factors that might be relevant to their beliefs and activities in the questionnaire, this was not a numbered question and so may have made organizations less inclined to offer data. However, in the interviews the organizations when asked did not think that this was a major consideration.

A third interpretation may be derived from the limited capacity of JENGOS. An

organization with limited capacity is of course forced into making difficult decisions when prioritizing its activities. For JENGOs this may, in turn, lead to the perceived importance of certain aspects of SFM being reduced. Although it could be said that an organization is unlikely to pursue activities in which it does not believe, and that if a group is not able to achieve much in a particular realm it will naturally see that realm as less important, it is also possible to conjecture that JENGOs' views about SFM are affected by their ability to implement projects and SFM-related activities.

Examples of the problems that limited capacity causes may be found in some of the details provided by several organizations in Section Two of the questionnaire. It can be seen that much of the work done by JENGOs in the area of promoting indigenous rights is indirect, through either support of local organizations financially or otherwise, or through consciousness-raising activities such as lectures, seminars and workshops. These details may indicate that, though the issue is central to SFM, it is, as a result of limited capacity, more peripheral to the work of JENGOs.

This interpretation explaining the discrepancy seen in the questionnaire results is supported by a number of interview comments. Regarding the land tenure issue, Organization 'O' said that it represented a more effective use of its resources simply to provide funds to local organizations in the struggle for land rights. It conceded that other organizations may be more suited to the task. In addition, Organization 'A' said that they have, in the past, attempted to take a more passive role by facilitating connections between local groups. However, it is possible that JENGO reluctance could also have another source. On the issue of working with local organizations, Organization 'J' said that, at present, few local NGOs have the capacity to be effective partners. Organization 'A' commented that few local organizations can be trusted to represent the interests of local people, and therefore it was necessary "to grow them" before becoming partners with them. In its focus on environmental considerations, Organization 'J' said that short term goals require a focus on protection while it is a feature of longer term goals to emphasize social and community objectives. This may beg the question as to how much effort is currently being put into developing local organizations but, among the JENGO respondents, a reluctance to work with local groups may be due to unsuitable circumstances rather than a rejection of the importance of cooperative effort. Nevertheless a whiff of paternalism can be detected here and may indicate the presence of First World environmentalism among some

JENGOs.

Nevertheless, despite nearly half the surveyed organizations assigning little importance to working with local NGOs, 71% of JENGOs still responded in Section Two with details of activities in this area. It could be that while some JENGOs entertain doubts as to the efficiency of the relationships with local groups, they still recognize the importance of working with them. A further explanation could be the fact that some groups focus on work with communities and community leaders, women and marginalized groups rather than local organizations as such. During its interview, Organization 'O' said that a key objective of its work at local level was to improve the incomes and status of women whose use of forest resources differ from men, and, as a result, rarely benefit from the male-dominated projects that are often implemented.

Regarding the issue of preventing forest being changed to agricultural purposes (Question 3), and in which all but two of the organizations (86%), indicated that it was important or quite important, two somewhat contrary interpretations can be drawn. Firstly, it could be argued that JENGOs are against the re-designation of land for the reason of forest conservation. Land changed to agricultural use is rarely re-converted back to forest, and so represents forest loss. However, it could also be argued that changing forest to agricultural use is resisted because it prevents communities from pursuing SFM principles, and, as one organization stated, destroys traditional lifestyles and livelihoods. Unfortunately, interviews did not provide conclusive evidence in support of one interpretation. While Organization 'J' commented that it is vital to stop forest land being turned into agricultural land because of climate change considerations, thereby stressing the environmental aspect, Organization 'O' said that it is important to provide security for locals by strongly defending current land use and strengthening social and historical connections.

Concerning the three issues of (a) preventing the illegal harvesting of timber, (b) establishing protected areas of forests, and (c) setting up plantations, (Questions 4, 5 and 2), JENGO views were highly consistent. All surveyed organizations stated that the prevention of illegal logging was important or extremely so. Equally, there was significant support for the establishing of protected areas (36% saying it was important and 50%, quite important), and, although not quite as emphatic, support was still high for the creation of plantation forests (14% stating it was important and 71%, quite

important). Together these results appear to provide a clear indication of traditional thinking in the area of forest conservation and management.

It is clear that reducing illegal logging occupies a central role in the work of JENGOs in Asia. This reveals several further things. First, in making it a prominent element of their work, it shows awareness among JENGOs of the destructive effect Japan has had on Asia's forests as a result of Japanese economic expansion. Though Japanese companies are now less complicit in unsustainable logging, there is still a strong historical legacy which helps to explain why efforts on the part of JENGOs to stop illegal logging practices remain central. Second, and less positively, these data appear to show that JENGOs in forest conservation retain an inordinate focus on illegal logging and may perhaps illustrate a general tendency of Japanese NGOs, that is, to view issues in a one-dimensional fashion, possibly to the detriment of the more multi-faceted SFM approach. It could be argued that because preventing illegal logging has a high-profile it tends to distract from complementary but lower profile activities which are nevertheless equally important. However, the relatively strong support JENGOs give to the straightforward, arguably simplistic even controversial, solutions to the problem of illegal logging – that of establishing protected forests and/or creating plantation forests – may lend credence to the criticism leveled at Japanese NGOs that they fail to fully appreciate the complexities of forest conservation. It certainly could be argued that it represents less of an integrated SFM approach and more of an over-emphasis on environmental considerations.

In interviews, two organizations offered justifications for their environmental preoccupation. Organization 'J' said that work against illegal logging remained a primary activity because of the extensive exploitation by Japanese companies of Asian forests, which, going back many years has created a dependency among forest communities for trade with such companies, and has contributed to the loss of their resources and degradation of their environment. The organization believes that it is important to continue to focus on the consequences of this. It also believes that, in the short term at least, working to establish areas of protected forest is an effective approach, even for local communities. Similarly, Organization 'A' stated that working against unsustainable logging was a central part of its activities. However, it also said that the need to help create opportunities for local people so that they could choose alternative ways of making a living was of equal importance. They added that a key

consideration was the “conversion” of local people. Initiatives to prevent illegal logging had to come from local communities or else they would fail. Prevention of illegal logging was still vital, but the stimulus for change it believes has now to come from local people and organizations rather than from JENGOs. Although this is something that requires time to achieve, Organization ‘A’ strongly believes that it represents a legitimate form of SFM.

JENGOs appear to be making the argument that if there is inadequate emphasis on the environmental side of conserving forests, the potential of SFM cannot be fully realized. This would account for their strong support and preoccupation with the environmental side of forest conservation while at the same time insisting that people are still central to their thinking and project choices.

Data analysis showed that all the surveyed organizations believe working with national and international groups has some degree of importance (Question 9). This result should not be too surprising for, as well as the obvious advantages to be gained from working together and sharing data and expertise, all JENGOs have a connection with JANIC, the organization formed for the facilitation of networking between Japanese NGOs and international like-minded groups. The belief in the pooling of resources, knowledge and information is strongly held in these organizations.

Perhaps more surprisingly was the high level of support accorded to working with government- and business-related organizations (93% saying it was important or quite important). This was mirrored in the support given to establishing certification of timber and forest products. Eighty-six per cent of organizations gave it some degree of importance and, although no organization provided details in Section Two of any current activity, (once again a lack of capacity maybe the cause), we can assume that the JENGOs surveyed would consider working in close cooperation with business in this area, should an opportunity arise. The willingness is there, if not the capacity to act upon it. It is possible that this could signify a thawing of relations between traditionally antagonistic groups and a result of growing mutual comprehension of the need for cooperation in tackling the world’s problems. However such a conclusion needs to be treated cautiously, not only because of the small sample size, but also because the NGOs surveyed may, as a result of their focus, have a unique outlook and so not reflect the beliefs of NGOs working in other areas.

Of similar importance to JENGOs appears to be information dissemination (generally used for outreach work) which according to Balsiger (1998) is one of the more traditional areas of activity. All organizations indicated that increasing citizen's knowledge about forests (question No.12) was important to some extent. Outreach is universally accepted as being important for NGOs, but for Japanese organizations, particularly so, where funding mostly comes from public donations (42%) and from membership fees (8%), but only 11% from funding agencies, including government (JICA, 2006). Respondents to Section Two of the questionnaire listed various ways in which they do this from websites and newsletters to NGO 'festivals' and events.

Monitoring has traditionally been an area of involvement for NGOs, though it is an area that could have a wider scope than it has had so far, at least according to Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu (2002). The degree of support from JENGOs for monitoring could be said to be strong but not emphatically so (see questions No.13 and No.14). Monitoring the activities of business and government both received a spread of opinions from the respondents, with the need to monitor government of slightly more importance than business. A possible reason for this is the inherent difficulty in monitoring forests and forest use where illegal activities can be easily hidden, areas that require monitoring are remote and extensive, and human resources for monitoring are inadequate. The responses in Section Two of the questionnaire (Questions 23 and 24) support this view, and in interviews Organization 'J' stated that it could not devote more than occasional attention to it because it would use up too much of the organization's resources. Organization 'O' stated that effective monitoring at their level of involvement could only come from the communities. For JENGOS there are unique logistical as well as financial problems related to effective monitoring, so it has of necessity a lower priority. However, no organization appears to be monitoring or even considering monitoring compliance to environmental agreements, policies or statements by either governments or businesses. This would seem to be an area beyond the capacities of JENGOs and strongly suggests that hopes for NGOs to expand their realm of activities into this area are unrealistic.

The importance JENGOs attach to the making of a Global Forest Convention (Question 15) could be said to be fairly strong (79% saying it was important or quite important). This issue is another of the roles for which Gemmill et al (2002) identify for environmental NGOs. However, this support contrasts sharply with the lack of positive

responses in Section Two (Question 22) in which organizations were asked to detail any activities in which they have provided input to agenda-setting and policy development processes. Furthermore, the only question in the survey to receive no responses was that asking for details of any JENGO involvement in creating SFM criteria or indicators. This would seem to illustrate clearly the low priority of this area for JENGOs, at least in terms of capacity for action. In addition, interviews revealed some critical views implying that inactivity may not merely reflect a lack of resources. Organization ‘J’ questioned the benefit of a Global Forest Convention, saying it would require immense effort and a great deal of time to reach an agreement which would then have minimum application. This is a valid point. The failure to reach an agreement on forests at the 1992 UNCED conference in Rio is one among several well-known examples. Only an NGO with significant resources would be able to devote the time and effort in what would undoubtedly be a long-term project. Organization ‘A’ said that although it believes a Convention to be important, because of limited resources, field projects would always take preference. The organization also said that it would find it difficult to justify using resources for something that had “uncertain value”.

This highlights the fact that to some extent, funding and the accountability that goes with it may serve to restrict the activities of JENGOs. They need to continually take into account the reaction of their supporters and donors and their willingness to contribute funds. Only a reckless organization would risk its existence to pursue activities that are likely to jeopardize its funding sources. This brings up a further point. When funding via donations and contributions comes from the general public (as opposed to professional bodies), views of how their money should be used may tend to be simplistic. An organization is seen to be “successful” and “dynamic” when it can show some measurable achievement, for example, in a particular community, and not to be too cynical, with accompanying reports and glossy photographs. The much more subtle process of negotiation and discussion that goes into setting agendas and forming policy, no matter how important, does not carry the same appeal. The greater need for accountability has served to limit the activities of JENGOs.

Regarding the collecting of data for the purpose of research and analysis – a further area identified by Gemmill et al (2002) into which environmental NGOs could increase their influence – there is, among JENGOs a much lower emphasis. Of the five organizations who responded in Section Two (Question 21) only one appears to be

involved in information gathering on a regular basis through its collaborative local action research. One organization referred to information sharing through a local network, while two other groups said they gathered information on an *ad hoc* basis only. Unfortunately no data that would expand on this were forthcoming during the interviews. However, it would appear that, in this area at least, JENGOS are not increasing their activities in the sphere of information gathering. There is evidence that some groups are attempting to do this at a local level, but there was no evidence to show that information is being used at a global level, or that information on environmental conditions is being presented to policy making groups.

Advocacy is the final activity identified by Gemmill et al (2002) in which environmental NGOs could play an expanding role. Responses to this issue were widely spread though support was quite high. Advocating changes to consumer attitudes (79% giving some degree of support) was slightly more important to JENGOS than advocacy work in the government or corporate spheres (Questions 26 and 27). In the former, JENGO activity is mainly educational and focused on activities in public settings such as festivals, however, in contrast, no activity is taking place in the latter area among the JENGOS surveyed. Once again we may see that JENGO aspirations differ from their ability to conduct activities. However, as seen earlier, attitudes may also be exerting an influence, for the negative opinion expressed in Section Two of the questionnaire could be a further reason for inactivity. In interview all organizations indicated that advocacy work was almost all aimed at the general public rather than governmental organizations. Given this, we may conjecture that advocacy in the area of environmental governance is of very low priority despite the fact that advocacy per se is seen to be important.

PART 2: Questionnaire Section Three with Interview Comments

In the statements considering JENGOS and civil society (Statements 31 and 32), it was seen how opinion is divided among the organizations. JENGOS remain relatively unconvinced that civil society is healthy. This is no doubt linked to the fact that respondents also felt NGO influence had not increased during the last ten years for it is natural that NGOs would equate a healthy society with an active third sector. In interviews, various possible reasons were advanced. Organization 'A' said that it thought the Japanese were still too pre-occupied with their own lives and that despite superficial appearances to the contrary, Japanese still had difficulty "relating to the

conditions in which people live in the rest of Asia.” This echoes the comments of Yamakoshi (1994) who, while describing barriers to increased NGO involvement, noted that the Japanese have “an insider/outsider mentality” and are “less concerned with those outside their immediate group” (p.1). Organization ‘O’ blamed the economic condition of Japan which, it argued, has been in gradual decline since the late 1980s. The organization strongly rejected the idea that Japan was a ‘post-materialistic’ society. People were still more concerned with the welfare of their families, and, in a more critical comment, with acquiring the latest fashions.

With regard to how NGOs are viewed by Japanese citizens (Statement 33), there was cautious agreement with the idea that JENGOS are enjoying a growing reputation. It is commonly held among many commentators in Japan (see Saotome, 1997) that the national praise NGOs received following their work after the Great Hanshin Earthquake of 1995 did much to change perceptions of NGOs. However, it is interesting to note that there has been a knock-on effect beyond the area of emergency assistance NGOs. It may also suggest that the increasing national media coverage they receive is being seen as having a positive effect.

Concerning JENGOS and their relationship with other sectors of society (Statements 34 and 35), we saw that JENGOS believe it was becoming easier to work with government and business (71% and 79% respectively agreeing to some extent). One of the reasons for this may well be the gradually changing attitudes in government, manifested in ODA funding becoming available to NGOs. In fact, this funding has been increasing over recent years and somewhat bucks the trend which shows ODA spending overall to be decreasing (Kuroda and Imata, 2002). In interviews, organizations however appeared more wary. Organization ‘J’ referred to an incident several years ago when a government minister sought to have two NGOs removed from government discussions on Afghanistan. Organization ‘A’ said that it will continue to exercise caution and vigilance in contact with governmental organizations. The organization believes that a ‘government-knows-best’ attitude is still prevalent among both politicians and bureaucrats. However, Organization ‘O’, which, of the three groups interviewed have the closest relationship with government, argued that the connection with government is empowering and are confident that they can maintain the integrity of their programs even those with ODA funding. They had no particular concerns that the tail will end up wagging the dog. The dissenting minority may be a reflection of how

some groups fear the loss of independence that NGOs may suffer if they accept larger amounts of money from ODA sources. This issue is a remarkably sensitive one in Japan for NGOs are passionate in the defence of their identity. This probably owes something to their small size and the constant fear of having their existence threatened.

The improving relationships with business may be due to a large array of factors ranging from the changing nature of economic activity to the growing need of businesses to appear more environmentally sensitive. Certainly JENGOS have a strong justification to suspect the motives of businesses which still require substantial natural resources from Asia, so the fact that the large majority of JENGOS surveyed accept that business are making efforts to work together is perhaps significant. In interview, Organization 'J' said that its approach is one of raising awareness among businesses rather than an adversarial approach. This may reflect a policy change based on experience, or it might merely show that JENGOS operate from a position of weakness for clearly they lack the financial and political power that a company such as Mitsubishi Heavy Industries undoubtedly has. The relationship between JENGOS and business is clearly an unequal one, and therefore an unstable one.

A more serious restraint on NGO activities seems to come from their continuing problems stemming from their legal status, although opinions among the surveyed JENGOS would appear at first glance to be rather curious (Statements 36 and 39). All organizations but one agree to some extent that NGOs generally work under difficult legal conditions and yet a majority implied that their organizations specifically were not directly encumbered by it. In interviews this view was confirmed. Organization 'O' which is incorporated, said that its status obviously carries numerous advantages, the most important of which was that its options for implementing projects were increased as a result. Organizations 'A' and 'J', which are unincorporated, appear to accept the situation as it is at present but do not discount the possibility of applying for incorporation in the future. This take-it-or-leave-it attitude may be explained by the fact that the number of Japanese NGOs who have become incorporated remains small despite a 1998 NPO law that was enacted to simplify the process of incorporation. The reason for this is that securing incorporation still represents a laborious task for groups that are small, as are most NGOs in Japan. In addition, it could be said that many NGOs have got used to working under such restrictive conditions and indeed may prefer to remain small and work under the radar of government attention (Furuoka, 2008).

Third sector organizations anywhere in the world can always make use of more funding and JENGOS are no exception. It is therefore not surprising to see a high level of agreement to the statement that lack of funding is one of the biggest constraints they operate under (Statement 37). What is of more interest is the response to how JENGOS feel about the future (statement 40) in which 36% replied negatively. It is difficult to conjecture accurately on what might be responsible for low morale among a third of JENGOS, but it is not difficult to imagine that it will have significant influence on the activities such organizations choose to conduct. They are more likely to pursue activities of low risk and repeat activities that have succeeded in the past, but lack the motivation to expand their roles and adopt dynamic or radical policies to increase their effectiveness. This would imply that JENGOS who fear for their future are not going to be leading the vanguard of greater NGO involvement in pursuing SFM or seeking a greater role in environmental governance.

CONCLUSIONS

This research has attempted to show the way that Japanese environmental NGOs (JENGOS) active in forest conservation in Asia conceive of their roles and how they regard their position in Japanese society. There are several major aspects worthy of attention which deeply affect the character of JENGOS and their ability to operate. These aspects concern the organizational structure of JENGOS, the issue of funding, the particular nature of civil society in Japan, and the historical legacy that attaches itself to NGOs in the country.

The relationship between JENGOS and SFM (and by extension, sustainable development) is complex and is one that exhibits a degree of tension. JENGOS appear genuinely committed to the principles of both SFM and sustainable development, but in several connected ways, their implementation of it through their projects and activities is in varying degrees compromised and inhibited.

First, JENGOS are compromised by their size. The majority of NGOs in Japan are small. This is a result of many factors, but, it is suspected that in a lot of cases, the decision to remain small is a conscious one. One reason is the importance of remaining distinctively separate from the Japanese Government, where smallness as a quality contrasts with the gigantism of state activity. But smallness carries with it a

substantial burden for JENGOs, not least in the inability to fully exploit the potential of SFM in the areas where they work, and this was seen on several occasions in the research. Activities are well-intentioned and generally well-implemented under sustainable development principles, and most of the JENGOs surveyed are active in the areas identified by Balsiger (1998). However, it is difficult to escape the impression that JENGO's work is piecemeal and lacks understanding of the bigger picture. It was noticeable that among the interviewed JENGOs, the biggest and the only one with corporate status, Organization 'O' was the most confident about its work.

Second, JENGOs are inhibited by funding problems. This, of course, is not a situation unique to these organizations but certain factors appear to make their difficulties of a greater magnitude. One of these factors is related to where most of their funding derives, namely from membership fees and donations. While grants from Foundations and other professional bodies remain low and government funding continues to be tied to incorporation, JENGOs will continue to struggle to extract funding from groups which may already be fully exploited. It may prove difficult for JENGOs to draw out more resources from such groups who have no tradition in giving to 'outsiders'. In addition, justifying the expansion of activities that may not be fully understood by donors would be problematic at the very least. Moreover, while trust in government does appear to be gradually increasing along with greater access to ODA funds, still too few organizations are receiving financial benefits from this source. It means that unless JENGOs can attract a larger amount of funding and with it more stability, JENGOs will have difficulty in pursuing long-term goals which planning for SFM requires.

Third, JENGOs are compromised by the society in which they function, particularly by their lack of legal status. While they remain on the fringes of Japanese society it is difficult to imagine them being able to exert any real influence, either generally or in terms of promoting sustainable development. They appear to be content to hold their current, somewhat niche position (evidenced in the fact that they acknowledge the constricting situation but claim it doesn't greatly affect them), rather than upset an uneasy equilibrium, though given the relatively weak hold that civil society has in Japan, their caution is not without justification. Though they claim that advocacy is important, they appear not to be involved in instigating real change in Japanese society and as a result, are not fully exploiting the possibilities of SFM and its potential for social change in the countries in which they work.

Fourth, JENGOS are held back by their limited capacity and therefore may not be able to pursue what we might call ‘deep’ SFM. Undoubtedly a strong thread of SFM permeates their work but capacity limitations serve to undermine their efforts. There is a sense that JENGOS are forced to pick and choose those aspects of SFM that are easiest to implement, namely projects with visible and clearly measurable outcomes, etc. This of course is no bad thing, (particularly when considering issues of funding) but ultimately this will reduce the influence they may have in bringing about change in Japanese society and in their chances for playing a role in the environmental governance of forests at the national and international level. Lack of capacity is a major key reason why JENGOS are not expanding their roles. Clearly no organization is going to become involved in new ventures when resources remain tight and require careful, judicious, use.

Finally, JENGOS are inhibited by their historical legacy. Although this should not be overstressed, a traditional suspicion of government remains part of the NGO make-up in Japan (though it should be acknowledged, not so much among those JENGOS surveyed) to the extent that many appear to take it as a badge of honour to describe themselves as “poor but pure”. This however could be changing if research results accurately reflect opinions. It is possible that NGOs may be prepared to move to a greater level of involvement. Regarding the destructive activities of Japanese corporations in the past, it appears that there is no significant historical hangover. JENGOS do not seem to carry any particular guilt over this issue, and demonstrate a strong conviction in the worthiness of their work.

These factors combine to make JENGOS into surprisingly conservative organizations. They seem to have more trust in the traditional activities that they know are tried and tested, and within these confines, they operate competently. Furthermore, they hold a belief that SFM can only follow from a strong environmental base rather than as a partner in joint development. Nevertheless, they are in many ways contributing to the dissemination of sustainable development and SFM within the communities in which they work. In this regard, JENGOS could be said to be effective. Evidence from this research however, strongly suggests that they are not taking on any of the additional roles as envisaged for them by Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu (2002). Nor are they showing any particular indication of pursuing activities that “jump scales” and impact on the global level of SFM and forest conservation. As a result it is difficult to say that

JENGOs are exercising influence in the region on account of their almost complete focus on the local level. This is not to be overly critical. JENGOs have significant barriers to overcome in their daily existence, and what they choose to focus on is entirely legitimate. Given this, we can perhaps say that JENGOs are as effective as their limitations allow. However, they do not appear to be presenting societies either in Japan or the rest of East Asia with practical alternatives of development nor challenging existing paradigms.

We can discern a contradiction here: SFM could be argued to have a strong local bias, often preoccupied with unique local conditions, and therefore arguably not wholly appropriate for use as leverage for a higher level of involvement. SFM represents a challenge to JENGOs. Beyond using models of SFM 'good practice', they need to find ways in which they can present SFM as a relevant tool in preventing forest destruction and degradation anywhere in the world, and as a result raise its importance in the policy-making domain. This could be done by developing more active, international networks in which the limitations of a local bias can be overcome with extensive dissemination of experience through information technology. The localized experiences of large numbers of small NGOs could coalesce into an authoritative taxonomy of SFM principles accessible to all who are active in forest conservation and management.

Pursuing new and more participatory networks, nationally and internationally, could also help JENGOs to cope with funding and capacity problems. Together with other organizations in the development arena, for example, those involved in health, agriculture and education, JENGOs may be able to create different ways of realizing the aims of SFM, perhaps by looking for closer cooperation on projects with other NGOs and government organizations. In addition, JENGOs could re-examine how they operationalise their roles and consider making long-term partnerships with each other, or even consider amalgamation, which would represent a more efficient use of scarce resources. Further, closer co-operation might contribute to a greater sense of security for small groups, reduce fears of eroding identity, and lead to more innovative visions and activities. JENGOs could also explore how SFM could be more closely bound to forest protection and conservation for the purpose of putting SFM into a more central position in the thinking of government policy makers. If SFM came to be accepted as a vital element of sustainable development, then it would likely attract wider attention and greater funding. Finally, JENGOs should attempt to find ways to raise their profile

in society through, for example, more innovative forms of outreach, so that when opportunities present themselves for higher level involvement, they can be seen as a natural choice for consultation and expert analysis. By showing themselves to be valuable partners, organizations of the third sector can start to take on the roles that many expect of them.

APPENDIX : THE QUESTIONNAIRE

This is an English version of the questionnaire sent by email to 46 organizations.

SECTION 1: THE ROLES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION

For each question please indicate how important your organization perceives each role. (On a scale of 1-5, where 1 is “extremely important”, 3 is “quite important” and 5 is “not important”.)

For the conservation of forests in Asia (including Japan), how important is the role of ...

1. ...promoting Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)?
2. ...establishing areas of protected forests?
3. ...preventing the changing of land to agricultural uses?
4. ...preventing the illegal harvesting of timber?
5. ...creating plantation forests?
6. ...securing land tenure and property rights for indigenous forest dwellers?
7. ...securing the participation of indigenous and forest-dwelling peoples?
8. ...working with local grassroots organizations and NGOs?
9. ... working with other national / international environmental organizations?
10. ...establishing certification of timber and forest-related products?
11. ... working with government-related and business-related organizations?
12. ...increasing citizens' knowledge of the importance of forests?
13. ...monitoring the activities of business?

- 14. ...monitoring the activities of the government?
- 15. ...working to achieve a Global Forest Convention?
- 16. ...advocating changes in government policies and corporate practices?
- 17. ... advocating changes in consumer attitudes?

.....

SECTION 2: THE ACTIVITIES OF YOUR ORGANIZATION

Is your organization involved in...

- 18. ...agroforestry, social forestry and/or community forestry projects?
- 19. ...implementing projects of forest conservation?
- 20....supporting forest-dependent local communities, NGOs and grassroots organizations?
- 21. ...collecting, analyzing and/or disseminating data about forests?
- 22. ...providing input to agenda-setting about forests and contributing to policy development processes?
- 23. ...monitoring compliance with environmental agreements?
- 24. ...monitoring the timber extraction activities of business?
- 25. ...promoting the rights of forest dwellers and indigenous groups?
- 26. ...informing the Japanese public about the condition of forests in Asia?
- 27. ...advocating policy options to organizations such as ITTO?
- 28. ...promoting lower levels of consumption and more efficient wood use and recycling

in Japan?

- 29. ...developing / creating Sustainable Forest Management criteria, indicators or codes of practice?
- 30. ...supporting the development, marketing, promotion or sale of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) in Japan?

.....

SECTION 3: YOUR ORGANIZATION IN SOCIETY

For each statement please indicate your level of agreement. (On a scale of 1-5, where 1 is “strongly agree”, 3 is “somewhat agree” and 5 is “strongly disagree”.)

- 31. Civil society in Japan has become more active in the last ten years.
- 32. The influence of NGOs in Japan has increased during the last ten years.
- 33. The opinions of Japanese citizens about NGOs have become more positive during the last ten years.
- 34. The Government of Japan has become more willing to allow an independent role for NGOs in society over the last ten years.
- 35. Businesses in Japan have become more willing to work with NGOs over the last ten years.
- 36. The legal status of NGOs makes it difficult for them to be effective.
- 37. One of the biggest constraints on your organization is shortage of funding.
- 38. One of the biggest constraints on your organization is lack of government support.
- 39. One of the biggest constraints on your organization is the legal status of NGOs.
- 40. The future of your organization is positive.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmed, S & Potter, D.M (2006) NGOs in International Politics, Bloomfield CT, Kumarian Press Inc
- Balsiger, J (1998) Perspectives of Environmental Civil Society Organizations on Forestry in the Asia-Pacific Region: Outlook to the Year 2010, Asia-Pacific Forestry Sector Outlook Study Working Paper Series: No: APFSOS/WP/37 Forestry Policy and Planning Division, FAO, Bangkok
- Betsill, M. M. & Corell, E (2001) *NGO Influence in International Environmental Negotiations: A Framework for Analysis*, in Global Environmental Politics 1:4, November, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Accessed June 2007
<http://www.colostate.edu/dept/PoliSci/fac/mb/NGO%20Influence.pdf>
- Bryant, R.L & Parnwell, M.J.G (1996) *Politics, Sustainable Development and Environmental Change in South-East Asia*, in Bryant and Parnwell (eds) Environmental Change in South-East Asia: People, Politics and Sustainable Development, Routledge, London
- Byron, N (1997) Challenges and Opportunities: Policy Options for the Forestry Sector in the Asia-Pacific Region: Working Paper No: APFSOS/WP/09 Asia-Pacific Forestry Sector Outlook Study, Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bangkok
- Byron, N & Arnold, M (2005) *What Future for the Peoples of the Tropical Forests?*, in Sayer, J (ed) The Earthscan Reader in Forestry and Development, London, Earthscan
- Clark, J.D (2003) Worlds Apart: Civil Society and the Battle for Ethical Globalization, Bloomfield CT, Kumarian Press Inc
- Dauvergne, P (1997) Shadows in the Forest: Japan and the Politics of Timber in Southeast Asia, Sydney, The MIT Press
- Dauvergne, P (1997) Globalisation and Deforestation in the Asia-Pacific, Working Paper No. 1997/7, Department of International Relations, Research School of Pacific Asian Studies, Canberra
- Dauvergne, P (2001) Loggers and Degradation in the Asia-Pacific: Corporations and Environmental Management, Cambridge, Cambridge Asia-Pacific Studies

- Eccleston, B & Potter, D (1996) *Environmental NGOs and Different Political Contexts in South-East Asia*, in Bryant and Parnwell (eds) Environmental Change in South-East Asia: People, Politics and Sustainable Development, Routledge, London
- Edwards, M. and Hulme, D. (eds), (1992) Making a Difference: NGOs and Development in a Changing World, The Save the Children Fund, Earthscan, London
- Edwards, M. and Hulme, D. (eds), (2001) Beyond the Magic Bullet: NGO Performance and Accountability in the Post-Cold War World, Bloomfield, Kumarian Press Inc
- Fuchs, D (2006) Private Actors in Tropical Deforestation Governance, Wittenberg-Zentrum fur Globale Ethik, Discussion Paper No. 2006-2, Accessed June 2007
[http://www.wcge.org/downloads/DP_2006-2_Fuchs - Private Actors in Tropical Deforestation Governance.pdf](http://www.wcge.org/downloads/DP_2006-2_Fuchs_-_Private_Actors_in_Tropical_Deforestation_Governance.pdf)
- Furuoka, F (2008) The Role of Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Japan's Foreign Aid Policy, MPRA Paper No. 7418, Accessed Feb 2009
http://mpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/7418/1/MPRA_paper_7418.pdf
 Accessed January 2009
- Garon, S (2003) *From Meiji to Heisei: The State and Civil Society in Japan* in Schwartz, F.J. and Pharr, S.J (Eds) The State of Civil Society in Japan, Cambridge, Cambridge
- Gemmill, B & Bamidele-Izu, A (2002) *The Role of NGOs and Civil Society in Global Environmental Governance*, Esty and Ivanova (eds) Global Environmental Governance: Options and Opportunities, Yale school of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale
- Glassman, J (2001) *From Seattle (and Ubon) to Bangkok: the Scales of Resistance to Corporate Globalization* in Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, Volume 19, pp 513-533
- Hirata, K (2002) Civil Society in Japan: The Growing Role of NGOs in Tokyo's Aid Development Policy, New York, Palgrave Macmillan
- Humphreys, D (2004) Redefining the Issues: NGO Influence on International Forest Negotiations, in Global Environmental Politics, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp 51-74

Humphreys, D (2006) Logjam: Deforestation and the Crisis of Global Governance, London, Earthscan

Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), (2005) Sustainable Asia 2005 and Beyond: In the Pursuit of Innovative Policies, Tokyo, IGES

Kuroda, K & Imata, K (2002) Shifting Paradigms for International NGOs and Constituency Building: Evolving Scene from Japan, Paper presented to ARNOVA Annual Conference (November 14-16). Montreal, Canada. CSO Network, Japan

Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) (2006) Understanding Japanese NGOs from Facts and Practices, Tokyo, JICA

Sayer, J (2005) *Challenging the Myths: What is Really Happening in the World's Forests*, in Sayer (ed) The Earthscan Reader in Forestry and Development, London, Earthscan

Schwartz, F.J and Pharr, S.J (eds) (2003) The State of Civil Society in Japan, Cambridge, Cambridge

Saotome, M (1997) Japan's NGO Activities and the Public support System, Foreign Press Center, Japan.
<http://www.gdrc.org/ngo/jp-ngoactivities.html> Accessed, July 2007

Speth, J.G (2002) *The Global Environmental Agenda: Origins and Prospects* in Esty, D.C & Ivanova, M.H (eds.) Global Environmental Governance: Options and Opportunities, Yale, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies

UNEP (2002) Global Environmental Outlook 3: Past, Present and Future Perspectives, London, Earthscan

White, A & Martin, A (2005) *Who Owns the World's Forests? Forest Tenure and Public Forests in Transition*, in Sayer (ed) The Earthscan Reader in Forestry and Development, London, Earthscan

Worldwatch Institute, The (2006) Vital Signs 2006-2007: The Trends that are Shaping Our Future, Worldwatch Institute, Washington D.C.

Yamakoshi, A (1994) The Changing Face of NGOs in Japan, JEI Report 27a
<http://www.gdrc.org/ngo/jpngo-face.html> Accessed, July 2007

Yamamoto, T (1998) *The State and the Nonprofit Sector in Japan*, in The Nonprofit Sector in Japan, Yamamoto, T (ed), pp119 -144, Manchester University Press

東アジアにおける持続可能な森林管理(SFM)と森林保全の促進にかかわる日本の環境非政府組織(JENGOs)の活動の査定

トレバー・バランス

要 旨

この研究の目的は、SFM の領域で活動する日本の NGO 団体の有効性を算定することである。この研究では、NGO 団体が、森林に近接して暮らしている貧しい共同体の発展と、森林の環境保護の必要性との対照考慮を、どのようにうまく組み合わせて活動しているかという範囲にまで答えを求めた。更にこの研究では、従来の NGO 団体の活動範囲の枠を広げるため、NGO 団体ができることを探すことも試みた。最後に、日本の市民社会が、NGO 団体の活動をどの程度援助するか、もしくはどの程度阻止しているかについても問うた。

データはアンケートとインタビューで集めたものである。46 の団体を今回のデータ収集に適するとみなし、そのうち 14 の団体から回答を得た。

日本の環境 NGO 団体は、プロジェクト事業や、持続可能な発展原則に基づいた事業の実施という分野においては、ハイレベルの有効性を持つことがわかった。しかしながら、これらの団体は、規模の小ささによる力量不足や資金不足、国からの援助の不足により、それ以外のより広い分野に効力をもつ活動がうまくいっていない。日本の市民社会における NGO 団体の位置づけが要因となり、団体の活動を抑制することもあるからである。

