

**Mainstreaming Disability Issues
in Japanese and Finnish Development Policies and Practices**

By Hisayo Katsui
(hisayo.katsui@helsinki.fi)

Working Paper 1/2008

**Institute of Development Studies
Helsinki University**

Contents	Page
Acknowledgement	3
Abstract	4
Disability in Development Today	5
Methodology	7
Mainstreamed or Not?	9
Japan	9
Finland	11
Mainstreamed? Perception of Japanese and Finnish Actors	14
Background Factors behind the Changes and Stagnation	17
Personal Factors	17
National Factors	18
International Factors	21
Disability-Specific Factors	24
Development-Specific Factors	26
Analysis on Mainstreaming Disability in Development	28
Negotiation Process	28
Actor Politics	29
Connecting the Findings to Theories and Practices	31
Implications towards Mainstreaming Disability in Development:	
Concluding Remarks	32
Epilogue	36
References	37
Reference Homepages	
Annex 1. Article 32 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	
Annex 2. List of Interviewees in Japan and Finland in the Alphabetical Order of Surnames	
Annex 3. Information Sheet	
Annex 4. Informed-Consent Form	
Annex 5. Rapid Handicap Analysis, Version 4	
Annex 6. A Newspaper Article, “Employment and Social Security Decrease Poverty Sustainably”	
List of Back Numbers of the IDS Working Papers	

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank the following institutions and persons. This study was part of the research project, “Health and Disability in International Development Policy,” which was financially supported by The Tokyo Foundation under the Joint Initiative Program (JIP). Dr. Richard Wamai of School of Public Health at Harvard University was in charge of mainstreaming health issues in development, while I worked on mainstreaming disability. Richard has been an inspiring colleague for this entire project period. Institute of Development Studies at Helsinki University kindly gave me the chance to publish this article in its Working Paper Series, which provided peer reviewers, Docent Pekka Valtonen and Dr. Timo Kyllönen. Both spent many hours to improve the quality of this article. I deeply appreciate their great support. Docent Antti Teittinen made valuable comments on the previous version of the manuscript, improving the quality of this article. I would also like to express my gratitude to all the research participants of this study who shared their experiences with me and made precious comments to the previous version of this article. Without their active involvement, this study would have been impossible. My husband, Jerri Loikkanen, took part of my maternity leave to take care of our baby, Io, who was born during the project period. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my family. Needless to say, all the responsibility of the text is solely on me.

*This work is dedicated to Taija Heinonen
who had actively promoted mainstreaming of disability in development
and passed away in October 2008.*

Abstract

This study has focused on the complex issue of mainstreaming disability in development policies and practices in Northern contexts. The case study was conducted to investigate the process of mainstreaming disability in the present Japanese and Finnish development policies and practices with a special focus on civil society actors. All together 30 persons (15 from Japan and 15 from Finland) participated in the study during the spring-summer 2007. The study found out that both countries have experienced progress in mainstreaming disability in development, particularly in then Finnish policy, while implementation has been quite limited. The research participants were critical to the current situation in both countries. The study analysed and summarised five significant sets of factors affecting the progress and stagnation of mainstreaming: 1) individual factors, 2) national factors, 3) international factors, 4) disability-specific factors and 5) development-specific factors. These groupings of factors clarify the challenges of mainstreaming the issue. Subsequently, the theme was further analysed in terms of negotiation process and actor politics in relation to implementation strategy. This reveals the mechanism that explains the difficulty of disability to be mainstreamed from the aforementioned analytical lens. Subsequently, the findings are connected to the theories of Development Studies and Disability Studies towards creating sustainable, positive change to the quality of life of people on the ground. On the basis of these findings, the conclusion is that all stakeholders have to build more capacity to be able to mainstream disability both in policies and practices. Finally, five most important implications for mainstreaming disability in development are enlisted on the basis of the findings: 1) Northern DPOs and disabled people have to be empowered, 2) relevance has to be understood by mainstream actors, 3) political will of the governments is necessary, 4) good practices have to be accumulated and lessons should be learned from bad practices, and 5) Southern disabled people have to be empowered.

Disability in Development Today

On 3rd of May 2008, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities¹ entered into force, which was initiated by the vigorous campaign of Mexico that stressed its need in UN Assembly in 2001. Disability has at last become an important issue at an international policy level. However, it is not a very recent trend that international policy has mainstreamed disability. The UN has adopted various international conventions and rules that are to promote the equal rights and opportunities of disabled people during the five decades starting from The Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. At the early stage, disabled people were not mentioned as a significant minority but were implied to be included into “everyone”. Disability came into the mainstream of international policy with the Declaration on the Rights of Disabled Persons in 1975 and with the UN International Year of Disabled Persons in 1981. In the following year, the World Programme of Action Concerning Disabled People was published. At this stage, the concept of disability, however, was still mostly medical both at policy and practice levels. Under the **medical approach² to disability** that is exemplified in the definition of the International Classification of Impairment, Disability and Handicap (ICIDH) by World Health Organisation (WHO), disability is the direct consequence of the individual impairment. Therefore, medical cure or rehabilitation is the natural solution for disabled people from the viewpoint of scientific authenticity. This has been the predominant definition of the terminology until very recently.

In spite of the mainstreaming of disability as a theme in international policies, disabled people have not been satisfied with this international trend on the basis of the medical approach. Disabled people and their organisations (DPOs) started to organise themselves in 1960s and 1970s and established the **social approach to disability** that challenged the very assumption of “normality” and re-defined disability as social oppression (French, 1994). In other words, the problems are not within individual disabled persons but within society (Oliver, 1990). The disability movement has led to the change of the medically-oriented, positivistic concept of disability into a more interpretive one. For instance, WHO renewed its

¹ Please see <http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtml>

² In literature of disability studies, medical “model” or social “model” are more common names to distinguish the theoretical differences. In this article, I deliberately use “approach” rather than “model” because different approaches as means are important in conceptualising the relationship between North and South rather than fixed model as such. Furthermore, my academic background is both Disability Studies and Development Studies, the latter of which use human rights-based approach as one integral strategy of development. Thus “approach” synchronises both disability and development discourses better in this article.

concept of disability in its International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF)³. Along with the reflection on its historical development of disability discourse, the participation of disabled people themselves and their organisations has become indispensable. “Nothing about us, without us” became the slogan for the disability movement. This history is still the backbone of disability movement today.

Currently, for example in the above-mentioned UN Convention, disability is understood as a human rights issue. With the **Human rights-based approach to disability**, the concept of discrimination on the basis of one’s impairment is defined as violation of human rights. This approach challenges the fundamental inequality and sheds light on root causes of discrimination. This approach and social approach are continuum and mutually reinforcing (Bickenbach, 2001; Katsui, 2005). Human rights ideology has four implications: 1) intervention has to be rights-focused rather than charity, 2) legal obligation of the government is required, 3) transnational obligation gives legitimacy to interventions beyond country borders (Khan, 2005), and 4) it brings in all people into the mainstream discourse, including the most vulnerable groups of people (Katsui and Kumpuvuori, 2008). Human rights-based approach has become an important instrument towards the equality of socially marginalised groups of people beyond national borders. Nevertheless, intervention to improve the quality of life of disabled people has been limited.

At present, the share of disabled people of the total world population is estimated to be between 10-12 percent (World Bank, 2007). 80 percent of disabled people in the world are estimated to live in the South⁴ (WHO, 2003; UN/Division, 1999). Despite the significant number in the South, only 2 percent of them receive some kind of support (United Nations, 2000; San, 1999). This helps to explain the figure that 17 percent of the poor people are disabled people according to the World Bank (Haar, 2005). Thus, in practice disabled people in the South are largely ignored both by the governments and international community. Human rights-based approach to disability connects this largely neglected part of the world population into the discourse with its non-discrimination principle. Intervention towards

³ Please see <http://www.who.int/classifications/icf/en/>

⁴ I use **South** as so-called “developing countries” and recipients of development cooperation, while **North** as “developed countries”. The concept of “development” is not universal and thus I believe that countries cannot fit into this simple dichotomy between “developed” and “developing.” For instance, many “developed countries” do not necessarily fit into the category when human rights perspective is applied. This solution to use “North” and “South” is to politicise “development” rather than to capture the world in geographic terms (e.g. Australia).

policies and practices for disabled people both in Northern and Southern countries is increasingly necessary, because the market force does not result in security, equity and equality of disabled people but rather jeopardises the reality of many (Coetzee and Wiman, 1999). On top of that, the growth of both ageing population and HIV/AIDS has followed prevalence of disabled people, which makes the situation even more urgent. Nevertheless, “too many governments are uninterested in disabled people” (United Nations, 2000). In this way, disability has become an emerging issue especially in the development discourse.

Many actors of disability in development have started to have the consensus that a twin-track approach is important. This approach combines attempts of mainstreaming disability into development with those of supporting specific initiatives to empower disabled people. “Mainstreaming implies that all development interventions are planned and implemented in such a way that people with disabilities, their needs, rights and potentials, are taken into account on equal terms with those of other population groups” because “[t]here are people with disabilities in any target or beneficiary group” (STAKES, 2003, 69). This study elaborates the first track of mainstreaming and its process in development, because one of the main problems for disabled people is the exclusion from the mainstream. Nagata (2007, 31) says that mainstreaming is more important than empowerment. Despite the fame of this approach, mainstreaming has not been on agenda until very recently (Albert, 2006). The aforementioned UN Convention emphasises the importance of mainstreaming disability issues as an integral part of relevant strategies of sustainable development. The Convention is considered as proactive because it addresses international cooperation in its Article 32 (see Annex 1), which was not the case for the Conventions for the rights of children or women. This study focuses on how disability has been mainstreamed in the development policies and practices in Finland and Japan.

Methodology

Semi-structured face-to-face interviews and communications through e-mails were conducted in the spring-summer 2007 both in Finland and in Japan with the key actors of disability in development: civil society actors (including DPOs and NGOs for disabled people), government officials in charge of the issue and researchers (see Annex 2 for the list of interviewees from both countries). 15 people from Finland and 15 from Japan participated in the study. In the selection of the NGOs, attention was paid to different types of

impairments and also to include big and small ones. NGOs that work in the field of disability in development were widely made contact with to call for their participation in this research firstly through e-mails and phone calls. However, the final decisions were made by the organisations approached whether they would like to participate in this research. Information sheet and consent form were delivered to each participant prior to one's engagement in the research (see Annex 3 and 4). For the geographical convenience, interviews were carried out with those located mostly in Tokyo and Helsinki areas respectively, while e-mail communications were the main method for those located outside the above-mentioned areas. One research participant was interviewed through an internet phone. The communication was carried out in English, Finnish, Japanese and Japanese sign language with the help of two sign language interpreters. The transcriptions of the interviews in English were handed back to the research participants so that they could make possible corrections in the nuances of their statements even after the interviews. The draft of the manuscript was also delivered to the research participants so that they could check their cited statements in the report. Exceptionally, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) as an organisation expressed its willingness to check the manuscript under the condition that I would not be pressured in any way with its intervention. In these ways, validity was assured in this research. The definitions of "disability" and "development" were left to each research participant because that is partly the explanation for the complexity of the issue.

Japan and Finland were selected in the first place for the practical convenience of the researcher who speaks both languages. Secondly and more importantly, these two donor countries have started to become increasingly sensitive towards disability in development in their development practices. This study, however, is not a comparative one as such. This is because development agencies are so different in nature from each other in terms of their policy and organisational practices that it makes it too difficult for comparisons (Albert, Dube and Riis-Hansen. 2005). For instance, Japanese official development assistance (ODA) in 2004 spent 6.3 billion Euros in total which equals to 0.19% of gross national income (GNI), while Finland 527.5 million Euros in the same year which equals to 0.35% of GNI. This exemplifies already the challenges of comparison as such. Therefore, this article is not structured so as to compare the characteristics of these countries' development policies. The experiences of the two countries are to point out the specificities and the contemporary trend in this field.

Interviews or mail exchanges were set to ask the perceptions and experiences on: 1) to what extent disability has been mainstreamed in the development policies and practices of the country in question⁵, 2) how disability has been mainstreamed and 3) future vision as an actor of disability in development. With these questions, the study addresses the current status of mainstreaming in both countries. Subsequently, the perceptions of the interviewees both on the achievement and stagnation of mainstreaming in their countries are elaborated. The fourth chapter investigates the factors for the process of mainstreaming. Those main factors are 1) personal factors, 2) national factors, 3) international factors, 4) disability-specific factors and 5) development-specific factors. Throughout the article, participation of disabled people themselves in the process is shed light on. The second last chapter further analyses the findings on negotiation process and actor politics in relation to implementation strategy. This part reveals the mechanism that explains the difficulty of this issue to be mainstreamed from the aforementioned analytical lens. Subsequently, the findings are connected to the theories of Development Studies and Disability Studies towards creating sustainable, positive change to the quality of life of people on the ground. As concluding remarks, implications for future are enlisted on the basis of the findings.

Mainstreamed or Not?

Japan

In Japan, the development policy paper (ODA Charter) mentioned “disabled people” in the version produced in 1992 as a group of socially vulnerable people. The current paper issued in 2003, however, does not mention the concept any more. Instead, it is considered that disabled people are included into “socially vulnerable people.” The key actors in governmental development cooperation are Ministry of Foreign Affairs, JICA and Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC)⁶ which are in charge of grant, technical support and ODA loan respectively. JICA started its activities on disabled people in 1976 by sending an occupational therapist to Malaysia (Kinoshita, 2005). In 1987, Foreign Ministry started to dispatch disability experts to UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). In the early 1990s, Foreign Ministry dispatched one disability expert to UN. JICA

⁵ The intention of the study was originally to investigate the issues around policy process. However, practice is often different from policy in reality. Furthermore, accumulation of practices is part of the policy making process: when good practices are accumulated, policy can be affected to follow the same direction. Therefore, the interviews elaborated both policy and practice in this field.

⁶ The function of JBIC dealing with ODA loans was merged into JICA from 2008 onwards.

prepared a report on participation of disabled people in 1995 and 1996. Until recently, projects for disabled people were centred to medical rehabilitation, education and vocational training by non-disabled professionals.

The only activity that involved disabled people as a central actor in development cooperation was the leadership training that started in 1986. In 2002, JICA started a bilateral technical cooperation project with Thailand to work on the empowerment of disabled people and on mainstreaming disability into development. Asia-Pacific Development Center on Disability (APCD) project was planned, implemented and evaluated by disabled people and their organisations. In 2003, JICA created a guideline for the development cooperation for disabled people together with a special committee composed of DPOs and NGOs for disabled people (JICA, 2003). Since 2004, JICA created Social Security Team that is in charge of disability projects and mainstreaming of this field into JICA activities. At present, JICA has more than 10 training courses for disabled people with different impairments in Japan that are mostly outsourced to Japanese civil society actors. In addition, it also implements bilateral projects in this field. However, disabled people were objects rather than subjects of these projects until very recently (Kinoshita, 2005, 152). When it comes to JBIC which is loaning large amounts of money mainly to infrastructure projects, disability has not been specifically mentioned neither in its policy nor guidelines. It is considered to be included in one of the poverty reduction aspects. There has not been any disability-specific project in its history. However, JBIC has implemented various infrastructural projects mainly since 1995 that paid reasonable attention to disabled people in the form of barrier-free designs (Dobashi, 2006, 160). JBIC has also started to appoint a staff to deal mostly with disability issues since 2003. The current staff includes a disabled person since 2005. In 2005, a mailing list on disability and development was created by a Deaf researcher belonging to a governmental research institute⁷. That is, the individual governmental actors started to focus on the activities of disabled people in this field. For instance, in 2005, Foreign Ministry commissioned a study to the Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development (FASID) on this field. FASID is a think tank for JICA and thus this is a good example to prove that this field has been mainstreamed to some extent⁸. Almost all authors who contributed to this study project were not non-disabled professionals but those from DPOs,

⁷ At present, 250 people belong to this mailing list. They are composed of those working in international agencies or JICA, students who have interests in disability and development, staffs of DPOs and NGOs, and those who are interested in developing countries. (Soya Mori, IDE.)

⁸ Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University.

which illustrates the change. In the framework of human security, the concept of which has been promoted by the Japanese government, disability in development has drawn more attention than ever before.

When it comes to non-governmental activities in this field, both DPOs and NGOs for disabled people have been mostly implementing their projects in Asia and the Pacific region. Activities in Africa are rare. Non-governmental activities in this field started at around 1980s. DPOs and NGOs started to make international contacts mostly with Northern countries in the beginning. It was rather an international networking than development cooperation⁹. In 1993, Japan NGO Network on Disabilities (JANNET) was established to function as a network among Japanese DPOs and NGOs that work in this field. Presently, 34 member organisations belong to this network. Its secretariat is located in the Japanese Society for Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities. They have organised seminars due to the fact that they did “not know much about the reality of disabled people in the South¹⁰.” The number of organisations dealing with disability in development is gradually increasing. Major DPOs on different impairments have been implementing JICA funded training and projects. At the same time, a few non-governmental foundations focus on grants and scholarships to disabled people. In 1999, *Duskin Ainowa* Fund, a non-governmental foundation, started to give scholarships to young disabled people from Asia and the Pacific region to visit Japan for their leadership training. Japan Foundation, another non-governmental foundation, increasingly channels funds to disability-specific projects as one of the two major fields of its international cooperation and has also created a post a few years ago which deals with disability projects¹¹. These series of superficial information both from governmental and non-governmental actors verify that disability in development is an emerging issue in Japan, particularly during the last decade.

Finland

In Finland, disability in development has drawn attention at around the same time but has been more visible both at policy and practice levels. In the late 1980s, mainstreaming disability particularly in international development policy has become a Finnish focus and a

⁹ Yukiko Nakanishi, Asia Disability Institute.

¹⁰ Etsuko Ueno, Japanese Society for Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities

¹¹ Maki Honda, Japan Foundation.

commitment to UN¹². In 1990, Finland sent a disability expert to UN. In the development policy outlined in 1993, one of the three goals of development cooperation was the promotion of equality and human rights. In 1996, National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health (STAKES) published the Manual for Inclusive Planning for the UN. This manual included Rapid Disability Analysis, which is the foundation for current Rapid Handicap Analysis (RHA) (see Annex 5). RHA is a practical tool for mainstreaming disability into development. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (1996) formulated the policy as follows, “to attain the goal of poverty reduction, the Government will draw particular attention to the status of disabled people in the developing countries.” In 2000, the Nordic countries held a conference, “Conference on Disability in Nordic Development Cooperation,” to mainstream the disability aspect into development project plans. That is to say, disability was not included in the mainstream policies yet. The Nordic countries proposed to increase their financial contribution to the disability field in development by earmarking 1% of total development funds for disability specific projects and 1% of any project budget for inclusive measures in mainstream programmes in bilateral as well as in multilateral contributions (Nordic Conference on Disability and Development, 2001). However, mainstreaming disability in development was left as a recommendation and not as a binding policy¹³. In 2002, an external disability expert was appointed to support disability-related activities of the Foreign Ministry. In 2003, Foreign Ministry commissioned an evaluation study to STAKES (2003) on this field, which clarified the following points: 1) Finland allocates 5% of its ODA into disability-related activities, 2) most of the activities are outsourced to NGOs which means that bilateral and multilateral activities are limited, and 3) most of such activities are disability-specific ones and not mainstreaming ones. In 2003, the first Global Partnership of Disability in Development (GPDD) meeting was held in Helsinki. In 2004, Finnish disabled activist and disability expert became task force group members of the GPDD. Finnish government is one of the three governments that financially support this multilateral mainstreaming activity of disability in development.

At present, Finnish Development Policy of 2004 articulates disability as one of the cross-cutting issues in Finnish development policy together with gender and environment (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, 2004, 8). In this way, disability has been

¹² Ronald Wiman, STAKES.

¹³ Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA.

mainstreamed at policy level as a relevant issue to tackle in all development cooperation activities. The aforementioned policy also addresses disability issues as follows:

Community-based rehabilitation is the most inexpensive way to assist people with disabilities to find a way in which they will again be able to find their own contribution to the development of their societies. Prevention of disabilities is a priority. In all development cooperation, Finland advocates the idea – based on Finland’s own experience - that it is possible, often with only minor changes, to make society “obstacle-free” so that even permanently disabled people can live an independent life and do productive work (ibid.24).

Disability in development, therefore, has been paid a reasonably good attention in the Finnish development policy.

When it comes to civil society activities in this field, both DPOs and NGOs for disabled people have been implementing their projects mainly in Africa and about a quarter in Asia. Projects in Latin America are rare (STAKES, 2003, 42). Non-governmental activities in this field started in the 1980s. In 1989, Finnish Disabled People’s International Development Association (FIDIDA) was established. 7 member DPOs belong to this organisation. It has facilitated the cooperation of different organisations in this field. At the same time, this organisation is the channel between the government and DPOs for mainstreaming disability into development. For instance, FIDIDA negotiates these issues with the government as well as teaches a compulsory training class on disability in development for the Foreign Ministry staffs going abroad. In 1991, the Foreign Ministry decreased the self-funding share for disability-specific projects to half of that of non-disability-specific projects: 10% and 20% respectively. In 1998, Abilis Foundation was established, which is a DPO granting project funding for DPOs in the South. This foundation is financially supported by the government. In 2004, FIDIDA was assigned to screen project applications by NGOs and DPOs in this field for the Foreign Ministry in order to grant project funding to high quality projects. In 2005, self-financing share for disability-specific projects was further decreased to 7.5%, while for non-disability-specific ones to 15%. At around one-third of the disability-specific projects of NGOs and DPOs are targeted at deaf people (STAKES, 2003, 45). In 2007, there were about 50 on-going disability-specific projects supported by Finnish ODA money and implemented by NGOs and DPOs (FIDIDA, 2007). It was about 2 million Euros in volume.

As this part summarised, the recent history of Finnish development cooperation also highlights that this field has become increasingly visible.

Mainstreamed? Perception of Japanese and Finnish Actors

The previous sub-chapters presented the objective facts on disability in development in Japan and Finland. An attention to this field has been paid only quite recently in both countries. It is rather easy to collect the information of such superficial facts. However, it is harder to understand why and how this field began to be an emerging issue, because the background information tends not to be documented and recorded¹⁴. Therefore, I interviewed key actors and collected the information on the process of the series of changes.

Many Japanese actors feel that some “development” has taken place in this field. “There was nothing before, so there is a development.” This is a common perception particularly regarding governmental intervention¹⁵. For instance, at a policy level, disability in development started to be recognised¹⁶. In 2003, JICA created a policy on disability, which highlighted a twin-track approach. The annual report of JBIC of 2007 also mentions this issue for the first time¹⁷. In that sense, mainstreaming has attracted more attention at a policy level¹⁸. Therefore, the recognition of this field is growing. However, staffs of government agencies show little interest in this issue¹⁹ which is supported by the result of a survey conducted by JICA among its staffs in 2005 on mainstreaming. Most of the staffs agree upon the necessity of mainstreaming disability into development, while they do not know what to do in practice (Kinoshita, 2005, 154). In other words, consciousness does not lead to a concrete action, which thus shows that mainstreaming has not been promoted much in the Japanese development practice. Practice of mainstreaming is the “area that Japan did not do much²⁰.” Few good practices were introduced. A disability expert was included in the government delegation members for the Social Development Summit Plus Five in 2000²¹. Infrastructural aspect has also included the concepts of “barrier-free” or “universal design”. For instance, there are JBIC funded projects that have paid attention to the accessibility of

¹⁴ Mariko Kinoshita, JICA.

¹⁵ Mariko Kinoshita, JICA; Soya Mori, IDE.

¹⁶ Taisuke Miyamoto, DPI-Japan; Mariko Kinoshita, JICA.

¹⁷ Yoshito Dobashi, JBIC.

¹⁸ Kenji Kuno, JICA.

¹⁹ Michiyo Kato, AAR Japan.

²⁰ Etsuko Ueno, Japanese Society for Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities.

²¹ Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University.

disabled people²². JICA also remodelled its domestic facilities to be accessible in 2004²³. These are the few examples of mainstreaming. Infrastructure is considered to be easy to tackle for the Japanese as it is the strength of the Japanese society and development cooperation²⁴. However, this aspect of Japanese development cooperation is not known because Japanese governmental actors are not good at advertising their achievements²⁵. The analysis of such good practices is also missing. Thus theories and principles are much discussed but that does not lead to concrete action on the basis of the evidence-based analysis of good practices²⁶.

Aside from these good practices, other activities in this field are mostly disability-specific and the focus is on empowerment rather than mainstreaming²⁷. “Mainstreaming is non-existent”²⁸. Some interviewees think that it is not yet the right time to act on mainstreaming because empowerment has to come first²⁹. They think that people with different kinds of impairments are not included into the development discourse much³⁰ and thus they have to be empowered first. Another factor that pin-points the underdevelopment of mainstreaming is the availability of funds for activities in this area. There are not much private funds or government money available for disability in development as a whole, let alone money for its mainstreaming³¹. Research on this field did not receive funds until very recently³² and thus experts are either on disability or development and not disability in development³³. Under these circumstances, Japanese actors feel that not much mainstreaming has been achieved even though positive changes have taken place.

In Finland, both governmental and non-governmental actors mostly share the common perception that disability is “mainstreamed at a policy level³⁴.” At the same time, Finnish

²² Yoshito Dobashi, JBIC; Yutaka Takamine, Ryukyu University.

²³ Mariko Kinoshita, JICA.

²⁴ Yutaka Takamine, Ryukyu University.

²⁵ Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University.

²⁶ Taisuke Miyamoto, DPI-Japan.

²⁷ Nakanishi, Yukiko, ADI.

²⁸ Mori, Soya, IDE.

²⁹ Chuji Sashida, National Committee of Welfare for the Blind in Japan; Keiji Gotou, Japanese Federation of the Deaf.

³⁰ Chuji Sashida, National Committee of Welfare for the Blind in Japan; Keiji Gotou, Japanese Federation of the Deaf; Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University.

³¹ Michiyo Kato, AAR Japan; Maki Honda, Japan Foundation.

³² Soya Mori, IDE.

³³ Maki Honda, Japan Foundation.

³⁴ Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Pekka Puustinen, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Anja Malm, Finnish Association of the Deaf; Asko Alajoki, Operaatio Mobilisaatio; Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA; Newcomer NGO;

actors realise that the policy was not the solution for the practice. Finnish actors typically have much ownership over mainstreaming process of disability into the Finnish development policy and practices. Finnish non-governmental actors feel the ownership because they lobby their issues to the government particularly through FIDIDA. They feel that they have promoted this field because “if disabled people themselves are not doing it, the mainstreaming process can remain as a written thing only³⁵.” Lowering the self-financing share below that for the non-disability projects, for instance, is the achievement of vigorous and continuous lobbying. On the other hand, the governmental actors also feel ownership over this issue because the Finnish administration body of the government’s development cooperation is quite small and each staff plays a significant role in raising some issue forward. However, these achievements are considered to be negative in a wider context. For instance, the existence of FIDIDA is not a totally direct channel to the government because it is an outsider. Thus FIDIDA and other DPOs do not receive essential information from the Ministry³⁶. The preferential self-financing percentage is also criticised for hiding the underdevelopment of this field as a cross-cutting issue at the Ministry. It is “easy for them to change this one number” and the Ministry “buys good consciousness with that (number) for them³⁷.” The same percentage is also criticised for discouraging mainstreaming activities and for rather forcing Finnish NGOs to choose either disability-specific or non-inclusive activities³⁸.

Good practices in mainstreaming have been accumulated to some extent particularly in the field of education³⁹. For instance, Finnish bilateral support that started in 1974 in Zambia developed into sector-wide approach by involving Denmark and Ireland. The long-term involvement enabled local capacity building of DPOs, special education teachers and decision makers among others to understand the importance of “Education for All”. This has led to national policy development (STAKES, 2003). Some NGOs have witnessed mainstreaming as a result of their disability-specific projects over a long period of time⁴⁰. However, many other fields including urgent humanitarian aid and bilateral projects do not

Sisko Rauhala, Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities; Sirpa Vääntinen and Tero Hokkanen, One Way Mission; An NGO.

³⁵ Kalle Könkkölä, Threshold Association.

³⁶ Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA; Kalle Könkkölä, Threshold Association.

³⁷ Taija Heinonen, Abilis Foundation.

³⁸ An NGO.

³⁹ Newcomer NGO; Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA; Pekka Puustinen, Finnish Foreign Ministry.

⁴⁰ Asko Alajoki, Operaatio Mobilisaatio; Sisko Rauhala, Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.

mainstream disability issues much. The government is also criticised for outsourcing the interventions of this field mostly to NGOs (STAKES, 2003). As a result, most of the interventions are disability-specific because Finnish NGOs work on empowerment of Southern DPOs as the first step which is expected to result in mainstreaming in the South⁴¹. Furthermore, new development modalities such as budget support and sector-wide approach tend to ignore disability in the South but Finnish disability activists cannot do much about it⁴². Under these circumstances, Finnish actors, both governmental and non-governmental, are quite critical to the current situation except for their positive perception of their policy.

Actors from both countries, therefore, are not satisfied with the current situation in terms of mainstreaming. Actors in both countries work on prerequisite conditions for implementing mainstreaming practices.

Background Factors behind the Changes and Stagnation

Mainstreaming disability into development policies and practices is a very complicated process due to various factors in the North. Thematic data analysis of the interviews led to five main factors that affect the changes and stagnation of the mainstreaming of disability in the selected case contexts: 1) personal factors, 2) national factors, 3) international factors, 4) disability-specific factors and 5) development-specific factors. This part firstly elaborates different levels of factors starting from personal to international and secondly different thematic layers of factors, namely disability and development.

Personal Factors

In both countries, development cooperation activities linked to disability started from personal contacts. Particularly, disability in development moved forward greatly due to disabled parliamentarians. Eita Yashiro was elected as a parliamentarian in 1977 in Japan, while Kalle Könkkölä in 1983 in Finland. This was the time when disability came to the international agenda after United Nations International Year of Disabled Persons in 1981. This was also the year when Disabled Peoples' International (DPI) was established which separated them from the rehabilitation-centered discourse and started to focus on the ownership of disabled people over their own issues. Yashiro became the chairperson of DPI

⁴¹ Taija Heinonen, Abilis Foundation; Kalle Könkkölä, Threshold Association.

⁴² Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA; Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Kalle Könkkölä, Threshold Association.

in the Asia and Pacific Region. It was the time when the participation of civil society actors was not common yet. Thus it was important that these disabled persons were in their political positions to influence decision making on disability in development. Yashiro visited UN ESCAP office at around 1986 and realised that the building was not accessible and there was no programme on disability even though it was during the UN decade for the rights of people with disabilities⁴³. He then pressured the Japanese government to launch its contribution for the decade as a developed country in this region. Japan was spending the biggest ODA budget ever due to the booming economy of that time and consequently decided to dispatch a disability expert to ESCAP to start activities in this field, particularly at the Asia and Pacific regional level due to the engaged geographical framework of ESCAP.

Similarly, in 1989, Könkkölä attended a UN experts meeting on Disability and Human Resources Development in Tallinn. “Disabled people’s leading figures including Kalle Könkkölä and Joan Westland sort of took over the UN meeting and we redrafted the whole draft conference document that was originally provided by a UN staff. That’s the way it started⁴⁴.” Later, in the 1990s, Könkkölä was elected as the chairperson of DPI in 1990s. Both these disabled individuals engaged themselves into international and national arenas. Both of them became key persons who pushed this field forward in the two countries. In addition to these two figures, several other individuals promoted this field. For instance, Liisa Kauppinen, herself a Deaf, also began to commit to this field. Many more disabled and non-disabled people followed them and implemented activities in this field. The personal commitments of disability activists explain the major part of changes mentioned earlier. At the same time, the personal contacts created during the 1980s and 1990s among disabled people in the world are very important assets to develop this field further today⁴⁵.

National Factors

Northern national factors also play a role in explaining the series of changes. The first part introduces the relationship between the government and civil society actors. The personal contacts and DPO networks mentioned previously have been made good use of in the current activities. The second part focuses on the different backgrounds of Japan as a “developing

⁴³ Yutaka Takamine, Ryukyu University; Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University.

⁴⁴ Ronald Wiman, STAKES.

⁴⁵ Shoji Nakanishi, Human Care Association.

country in disability⁴⁶” and that of Finland as a “developed country”. This part deals with the reality where Japanese actors are busy with domestic problems to tackle with, while Finnish actors enjoy more preferable national preconditions for their activities in developing countries. The description of these national factors explains why implementations by the Japanese actors are more limited compared to the Finnish ones.

Civil society actors including DPOs and NGOs for disabled people started their development cooperation activities much earlier than the governments⁴⁷. Therefore, “in 80s, the situation was totally different in the sense that disability issues were totally unknown in the (Finnish) Foreign Ministry⁴⁸.” Under the circumstances, civil society actors had to fight with the governments to gain the relationship of today. “We (government and civil society organisations) were like enemies for a while because we thought they (the government) could do more about disability⁴⁹.” However, it was soon realised that the government plays a big role and so cooperation started to be considered as a better strategy⁵⁰. Thereafter, civil society actors have been the experts who share their expertise and networks with the governments. Now, the governments provide funds for the activities which go well with their policies. This mutually dependent relationship was observed in both countries⁵¹. It is important to mention that the governmental actors experience no problem with this relationship⁵². Conversely, civil society actors tend to feel asymmetrical power relationship favouring the governments⁵³. For instance, when FIDIDA was assigned to screen the applications of disability-specific projects, the decision “suddenly” came from the Ministry. The Ministry also demanded FIDIDA to start this operation in a short period of time although FIDIDA asked the Ministry to give one year for preparation⁵⁴. Another example from Japan confirms the same aspect of their relationship in favour of the government. Japanese ODA system is rather complicated for an NGO to seek funding because the first initiative officially has to come from the Southern governments, which usually do not give

⁴⁶ Yutaka Takamine, Ryukyu University.

⁴⁷ Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Hans Rönnlund, Finnish Lutheran Overseas Mission; Yukiko Nakanishi, ADI; Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University.

⁴⁸ Kalle Könkkölä, Threshold Association.

⁴⁹ Etsuko Ueno, Japanese Society for Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities.

⁵⁰ Etsuko Ueno, Japanese Society for Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities.

⁵¹ Newcomer NGO; Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA; Asko Alajoki, Operaatio Mobilisaatio; Soya Mori, IDE; Sisko Rauhala, Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities; Anja Malm, Finnish Federation of the Deaf; Keiji Gotou, Japanese Federation of the Deaf.

⁵² Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Yoshito Dobashi, JBIC; Mariko Kinoshita, JICA.

⁵³ Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA; Keiji Gotou, Japanese Federation of the Deaf; Chuji Sashida, National Committee of Welfare for the Blind in Japan.

⁵⁴ Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA.

high priority on disability issues⁵⁵. This condition reinforces “this phenomena that NGOs work independently from the government⁵⁶.” That is, the superficial facts and changes can mislead to an easy conclusion that the mainstreaming is going rather well through the collaboration between the governments and civil society actors. However, when looked at more carefully, difficulties in mainstreaming this field are partly due to the relationship between the governments and civil society actors, particularly due to the highest level of government structure making strategic decision makings which is even beyond the reach of the government officials themselves⁵⁷.

Secondly, different backgrounds on the development of domestic disability field in Japan and Finland also explain some of the gaps between Japan and Finland in this field. Both governmental and non-governmental Finnish actors point out that many of their DPOs are “strong, active, professional and also rich⁵⁸”. Some DPOs were established more than 100 years ago and have played big roles in forming the hitherto disability policies and practices in Finland. The relatively disability-sensitive, rights-oriented policies and practices are the achievement of vigorous advocacy and lobbying of disabled people themselves. “Nordic idea of basic service for all and universal approach to social policy⁵⁹” is part of the Finnish foundation. “Nordic countries place more emphasis on disability issues than many other countries because it came from the Nordic society that certain progress has taken for a long time and disability issues are really part of the normal jargon, normal life⁶⁰.” That is, Finnish nation has seen the examples of disabled people promoting their own issues. Thus supporting disability in development is a natural matter of course. The basic social security in the North is explained as a preferable precondition to promote activities in disability also in development⁶¹. This theory was introduced by many other Japanese actors⁶² to explain Japanese reality in both positive and negative ways. As for the positive side, Japanese improvement in physical accessibility of public spaces and transportation after the series of

⁵⁵ Chuji Sashida, National Committee of Welfare for the Blind in Japan; Keiji Gotou, Japanese Federation of the Deaf; Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University.

⁵⁶ Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University.

⁵⁷ Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Pekka Puustinen, Finnish Foreign Ministry.

⁵⁸ Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Taija Heinonen, Abilis Foundation; Anja Malm, Finnish Federation of the Deaf; Pekka Puustinen, Finnish Foreign Ministry.

⁵⁹ Ronald Wiman, STAKES.

⁶⁰ Pekka Puustinen, Finnish Foreign Ministry.

⁶¹ Taija Heinonen, Abilis Foundation.

⁶² Taisuke Miyamoto, DPI-Japan; Soya Mori, IDE; Chuji Sashida, National Committee of Welfare for the Blind in Japan; Kenji Kuno, JICA; Michiyo Kato, AAR Japan.

enactment of domestic laws have been reflected well in development cooperation activities⁶³. The impact of this domestic change has been important to the Japanese development cooperation which has paid high priority to the field of infrastructure. When it comes to the negative side, “before talking about how to change ODA policy, it is first important to change the national policy to a disability sensitive one”⁶⁴, especially after the new law was enacted in 2006. This law, which was supposed to support independent living of disabled people, worsened the quality of life of those people so much that DPOs work hard to change it (DPI-Japan, 2007). This is not the only example of a negative reflection of the domestic development. For instance, education and employment are also not inclusive sectors, which are expected to hinder Japan from ratifying the new UN Convention⁶⁵. “[Japanese] people say, ‘Why something in foreign countries? We are struggling here in Japan.’”⁶⁶

Furthermore, Japanese civil society actors are “small and weak” which is the other side of the coin⁶⁷. Increasing opportunities are ready for the Japanese disabled people to be involved in the field of disability and development. However, human resources among the Japanese disabled people are still limited, which reproduces the status quo that disabled people are under-represented in development activities. “There are lots of medical specialists” but few disabled leaders who could be specialists in implementing development activities⁶⁸. That is, mainstreaming on the Japanese side is difficult due to the underdeveloped domestic environment for both disabled people and for DPOs. However, a few actors expressed their counter-argument that the disadvantageous domestic conditions lead to development cooperation activities that are not to repeat the same history again in the South⁶⁹. These national factors were mentioned that led either to the changes or stagnation in this field.

International Factors

Government policies change not only by the domestic but also by the international pressure. Both are intertwined to create pressure on governments. It is noteworthy that international

⁶³ Yoshito Dobashi, JBIC; Taisuke Miyamoto, DPI-Japan.

⁶⁴ Taisuke Miyamoto, DPI-Japan.

⁶⁵ Etsuko Ueno, Japanese Society for Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities.

⁶⁶ Chuji Sashida, National Committee of Welfare for the Blind in Japan.

⁶⁷ Yutaka Takamine, Ryukyu University; Kenji Kuno, JICA; Yoshito Dobashi, JBIC; Soya Mori, IDE; Chuji Sashida, National Committee of Welfare for the Blind in Japan; Yukiko Nakanishi, ADI; Taisuke Miyamoto, DPI-Japan; Keiji Gotou, Japanese Federation of the Deaf; Mariko Kinoshita, JICA; Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University.

⁶⁸ Mariko Kinoshita, JICA; Yukiko Nakanishi, ADI.

⁶⁹ Shoji Nakanishi, Human Care Association; Keiji Gotou, Japanese Federation of the Deaf.

factors have influenced the changes more than domestic ones⁷⁰. Various international events as well as their preparation processes became the turning points for the development of this field both in Japan and Finland. Both international events and activities have strengthened this field. The UN year of people with disabilities in 1981 is the first such event, which was followed by the UN decade between 1983 and 1992. As was already mentioned, the decade was a great justification to legitimise any new initiatives. Throughout the 1990s, civil society actors increasingly participated in the process of events and activities at international level. Making of Standard Rules is one such process that involved international DPOs. “A committee was established, where international DPOs were involved, which afterwards became then IDA (International Disability Alliance) and it’s still influential and functional⁷¹.” The Standard Rules are not a binding convention but it had an effect around the globe. Finland, for instance, closely followed up and contributed to the UN events and improved its policy accordingly. Finnish actors deliberately use UN and other international frameworks for pressuring the Finnish government, which is found to be an effective strategy⁷². The part-time disability and development advisor for the Finnish Foreign Ministry actively involves himself in UN activities, including the drafting of important guidelines and documents. Finland has promoted the idea of “Society for All” since the preparation of Standard Rules in UN, which then circulated back to the Finnish society. Finland, for instance, has today a disability policy that is anchored in the philosophy of “Society for All”. Another similar strategy is used by the Nordic network of International Disability and Development Consortium (IDDC). The comparison among the members allows them to pressure their own government by saying they are not doing as much as the neighbouring countries⁷³. In this way, international channels and networks have been well utilised to pressure one’s own government as well as to mainstream the issue.

The UN international year and the following UN events woke up many people to start new activities and networks around the world. However, later on it was regretted that the impact was observed mostly in Northern countries but not much in the South during the decade. Therefore, aforementioned Yashiro from Japan took the initiative to start the Asia and Pacific Decade of Disabled Persons between 1993 and 2002 within the UN ESCAP

⁷⁰ Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA; Yoshito Dobashi, JBIC.

⁷¹ Ronald Wiman, STAKES.

⁷² Ronald Wiman, STAKES; Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA.

⁷³ Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA; Taija Heinonen, Abilis Foundation.

framework. This decade is a significant event for Japan⁷⁴, which was the host country as the co-initiator and the primary funder. The highlight of the decade was the establishment of Asia-Pacific Development Centre on Disability (APCD) and Biwako Millennium Framework (BMF)⁷⁵ in 2002. BMF is the action plan for the second decade that shifted the focus more on development. These steps were then followed by the second decade (2003-2012). APCD is the bilateral development cooperation project between the governments of Japan and Thailand. This was a turning point for Japanese actors because disabled people won the control over the project. APCD aims at empowering disabled people and mainstreaming disability in thirty-two countries in this region. That is, disabled people are the implementer and target group at the same time. Although this is a disability-specific project, it is expected to affect mainstreaming process in many countries in this region including Japan.

Under the domestic circumstances mentioned in the previous sub-chapter, international conferences held in Japan also exposed many Japanese people to this issue⁷⁶. The World Assembly of Rehabilitation International in 1988, that of the World Federation of the Deaf in 1991 and that of DPI in 2002 were mentioned to have had a powerful impact on Japanese people including Japanese government to have more belief in the power of disabled people. The appointment of Judith Heumann as a disability advisor in the World Bank in 2002 is another turning point for Japan⁷⁷. A staff at the World Bank Tokyo Office introduced an interesting episode right after Heumann was appointed to the post⁷⁸. He was responsible for her visit to Japan. When he heard of her coming, he had to clear all physical barriers in the World Bank buildings to start with. Furthermore, he was to make appointments with relevant governmental agencies for her but the arrangement was difficult because no agency had any focal point of this issue except for JICA. That is, up until then the government agencies did not pay much attention to the issue. After her visit, JBIC established a focal point of disability and development, for instance. The impact of her position as the disability advisor

⁷⁴ Shoji Nakanishi, Human Care Association; Keiji Gotou, Japanese Federation of the Deaf; Chuji Sashida, National Committee of Welfare for the Blind in Japan; Soya Mori, IDE; Taisuke Miyamoto, DPI-Japan; Yoshito Dobashi, JBIC; Yutaka Takamine, Ryukyu University.

⁷⁵ The content of it is on <http://www8.cao.go.jp/shougai/asianpacific/biwako/1.html> (in Japanese).

⁷⁶ Soya Mori, IDE; Keiji Gotou, Japanese Federation of the Deaf; Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University; Taisuke Miyamoto, DPI-Japan.

⁷⁷ Koichi Omori, World Bank Tokyo Office; Kenji Kuno, JICA; Etsuko Ueno, Japanese Society for Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities; Yoshito Dobashi, JBIC; Taisuke Miyamoto, DPI-Japan; Soya Mori, IDE.

⁷⁸ Koichi Omori, World Bank Tokyo Office.

in the Bank was big to increase the visibility of disability in the mainstream development. The most recent international event that should not get unmentioned is the new UN Convention. It came into force in May 2008 and is highly expected to become a working tool towards mainstreaming. “Convention was a big achievement. There are many different opinions on care, for instance. But we put our efforts together to make this Convention. So the government cannot make an excuse and say, ‘DPOs say different things’. DPOs became one force, which was a good consequence⁷⁹.” This diversity of DPOs is discussed in the following sub-chapter.

Having gone through various challenges at different levels, different actors started to realise that individual actors alone cannot mainstream disability because many actors are involved in mainstreaming the issue both at policy and practice levels. Thus international networking such as Global Partnership for Disability and Development (GPDD) was started to be realised as one strategy to move forward⁸⁰. International networking has been and will be important also due to the disability-specific reasons.

Disability-Specific Factors

Disabled people are one of the marginalised groups of people like women, children, and indigenous people. Gender issues and children’s issues have been started to be mainstreamed, while disabled people have not attracted that much attention. Partially, disability-specific factors explain this phenomenon. The following interview statement is illustrative in describing the complexity of disability:

*The reason why it is not mainstreamed is that there are **many competitions among different themes to be mainstreamed**. Woman is always prioritised. In relation to poverty reduction, HIV/AIDS is also another theme which is central in human development. Disability, however, is, what I thought before and also explained to others that it is **not a life or death question**. HIV/AIDS is. Children’s death is, mothers’ death is. These are all something that people die if interventions are not made. But disabled people don’t usually die, just left to suffer and live with it. And then this is also feared to be **a special area** where there is **not much information**. And people don’t believe to intervene because disability is not one thing. It’s not*

⁷⁹ Taisuke Miyamoto, DPI-Japan.

⁸⁰ Ronald Wiman, STAKES.

*easy to intervene because **when going under one general theme of disability, there are hundreds of different questions and problems.** It's like this and there is no one solution for those. They all need different attention*⁸¹ (emphasis added).

“Disability” covers so many different impairments and conditions around them that it makes the understanding rather difficult⁸². The needs of deaf people are very different from those of blind people or people with learning difficulties. “Just because someone is disabled does **not** mean they have an automatic insight into the lives of other disabled people (Shakespeare, 2006: 195) (emphasis added).” Thus it takes a long time to even partially understand what disability is. It is even hard for different DPOs to understand the genuine needs of each other⁸³. Therefore, even if one realises the issue of disability, taking it seriously into account requires time and energy. The ignorance of non-disabled people on this complexity of disability intentionally and unintentionally excludes disabled people from their mainstream activities⁸⁴.

Moreover, disabled people in the South face discrimination at many different levels in their lives starting from their own family to their government. Disability is a social taboo in many places⁸⁵. In addition, they are too often poor in multiple ways. This means that intervention to disabled people in the South takes a long time to make a positive impact. At the same time, it also means that impacts are hardly self-evidently sustainable when the interventions are withdrawn. Therefore, when the complexity of disability is understood to some extent, it can be even harder to start any intervention because intervention for only a short period of time is not enough. When the civil society actors themselves are not strong in Japan, disability is not an appealing theme to tackle with⁸⁶.

Furthermore, one more dimension of complexity leads to the difficulty in mainstreaming disability in development. When the needs are different depending on different impairments, each DPO focuses on certain impairment-specific needs and thus tends not to work together

⁸¹ Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA.

⁸² Yutaka Takamine, Ryukyu University; Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA; Pekka Puustinen, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Chuji Sashida, National Committee of Welfare for the Blind in Japan; Anja Malm, Finnish Federation of the Deaf.

⁸³ Anja Malm, Finnish Federation of the Deaf.

⁸⁴ Mariko Kinoshita, JICA.

⁸⁵ Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Shoji Nakanishi, Human Care Association; Sisko Rauhala, Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.

⁸⁶ Michiyo Kato, AAR Japan.

in practice⁸⁷. On top of that, there are disputes among different groups of people on the modalities. In Japan, many actors expressed that the conflicts between disability activists and professionals are still going on⁸⁸. Therefore, voices are harder to be heard. When there is severe competition among different minorities to be mainstreamed, disability is not given a priority due also to its aforementioned disability-specific factors.

Regardless of these challenges, actors put their efforts together for a bigger cause such as the UN Convention⁸⁹. Furthermore, solidarity of disabled people around the world has followed a chain reaction to support disabled people in poorer conditions⁹⁰. Peer support and solidarity mobilises Northern actors to support Southern disabled people. This is the strength of disability actors. In this way, each actor has been working very hard to improve the quality of life of disabled people in the South. However, support to this field is limited.

Development-Specific Factors

As became clear from above, disabled people are not the most prioritised group of people especially when compared to women and children. This low priority is a decisively negative aspect when development-specific factors are taken into account. This sub-chapter deals with yet another obstacle that has to be cleared in order for the field of disability to be mainstreamed in development.

Development has so many trends. For instance, “social development” started to attract attention in the 1990s and it facilitated that disability was to be shed light on at a later stage⁹¹. “Disability was the last agenda that had not been taken into account⁹².” Thus the trend partially contributed to bringing disability in development up to the surface, while on the other hand vigorous disability movement around the world pushed this forward on the agenda. This was a positive trend for the field. Another recent trend is to transfer the ownership to the Southern counterparts⁹³. This is a negative trend at the moment from the

⁸⁷ Keiji Gotou, Japanese Federation of the Deaf; Yutaka Takamine, Ryukyu University.

⁸⁸ Due to the sensitivity of this issue, the names of the research participants are kept anonymous upon their request.

⁸⁹ Chuji Sashida, National Committee of Welfare for the Blind in Japan.

⁹⁰ Shoji Nakanishi, Human Care Association; Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University; Anja Malm, Finnish Federation of the Deaf.

⁹¹ Koichi Omori, World Bank Tokyo Office; Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University; Yoshito Dobashi, JBIC.

⁹² Koichi Omori, World Bank Tokyo Office.

⁹³ Ronald Wiman, STAKES; Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University; Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Pekka Puustinen, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Kalle Könkkölä, Threshold Association.

point of view of mainstreaming when careful attention is missing. The new development modality of budget support and sector support give decision making power to the Southern governments, so that they are to decide what they prioritise together with the donors. In this modality, “Disability has to struggle with all these trends⁹⁴.” However, as has been mentioned repeatedly, disability is not given a high priority both from the majority of donors and the Southern governments⁹⁵. Consequently, disability is not included on the agenda and is thus excluded from the mainstream development in practice. That is, “DPOs in developing countries also need their government officials to have capacity, understanding, commitment and resources to do this work. This is the biggest missing part⁹⁶.” Due also to this aspect in development, implementation of mainstreaming is not an easy task.

Another aspect within development-specific factors is the power of donors. They tend to require quantifiable immediate impact for the money provided⁹⁷. Their project cycle is also short and thus long-term activities are difficult although some actors prefer to receive smaller amount for a longer time⁹⁸. Consequently, implementing short-term disability-specific projects are the main activities, if they succeed in the fundraising at all. However, mainstreaming takes a long time before visible impact is observed. “Impact is small and silent⁹⁹” in this field when multiple barriers hinder it to take place easily. Moreover, paper works for donors overload civil society actors, which limit their available resources to the actual implementation of their works. Furthermore, the turn-over of the staff is very frequent in development agencies, including the fund giving ones¹⁰⁰. This means that civil society actors have to spend their limited time and energy to even train new staff in charge to understand disability on top of their main activities. As a result, mainstreaming activities are hardly implemented due also to development-specific factors.

⁹⁴ Pekka Puustinen, Finnish Foreign Ministry.

⁹⁵ Sisko Rauhala, Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities; Shoji Nakanishi, Human Care Association; Michiyo Kato, AAR Japan; Taija Heinonen, Abilis Foundation; Kalle Könkkölä, Threshold Association; Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Yukiko Nakanishi, ADI.

⁹⁶ Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry.

⁹⁷ Etsuko Ueno, Japanese Society for Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities.

⁹⁸ Newcomer NGO; Michiyo Kato, AAR Japan.

⁹⁹ Kalle Könkkölä, Threshold Association.

¹⁰⁰ Asko Alajoki, Operaatio Mobilisaatio; Yukiko Nakanishi, ADI; Yoshito Dobashi, JBIC; Anja Malm, Finnish Federation of the Deaf; Sisko Rauhala, Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities; Maki Honda, Japan Foundation; Mariko Kinoshita, JICA; Etsuko Ueno, Japanese Society for Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities; Michiyo Kato, AAR Japan; An NGO.

Analysis on Mainstreaming Disability in Development

On the basis of this study, the findings on mainstreaming can be summarized in terms of negotiation process and actor politics in relation to implementation strategy, which is followed by the significances of the research findings in the theoretical and practical contexts of Disability and Development Studies.

Negotiation Process

The case study traced back the development of mainstreaming activities on disability in development in order to clarify how the theme was negotiated on today's agenda, not necessarily into a policy in a written development policy (cf. ODA Charter). The theme has been vigorously negotiated primarily by the disabled people themselves in the North despite its marginal status and limited number of supporters. The individual promoters including disabled people and certain governmental officials in charge of this matter have been playing key roles in negotiating the space for this theme and pushing it forward. Even if the final decision making on policy is made by the governments in both countries, different actors have been accumulating experiences, particularly of empowerment-oriented activities rather than mainstreaming ones to get the theme on the mainstream agenda. In other words, mainstreaming-oriented activities are limited. Overall, mainstreaming a theme into a policy in North is difficult when the theme is a minor one.

When it comes to priorities of sub-sectors under the bigger theme of disability, the priorities and expertise of Northern countries on certain sub-sectors tend to be more easily implemented than others, particularly when the interventions are project-based. In addition, the implementation of an increasing number of disability-specific projects does not necessarily promote mainstreaming of disability but sometimes specialises the theme. Different sub-sectors need different kinds of attention, which makes disability something "special" that requires special expertise to work on. Without any doubt, impairment-specific attention is important. However, that alone has delayed the mainstreaming process. That is, commitment to the theme alone does not equal to commitment to mainstreaming it. When only project-based funding is available, mainstreaming is left out from the agenda. This mechanism of development cooperation is one of the fundamental reasons why the

mainstreaming of marginalized issues has been difficult, particularly when it comes to the implementation in the South.

This is further complicated by the Southern contexts, as the process involves many bilateral donors, international agencies and the Southern governments and other stakeholders. Even if disability is properly included at a Northern or international development policy level, it is often evaporating along the operationalisation process due to the mechanism of current implementation strategies. Development policies under the study work more as voluntary goals than as binding commitments. At the same time, the different modalities in the South do not necessarily secure sustainable, positive outcomes. On one hand, impairment-specific activities are an “add on” to current development without challenging the fact that disability has not been mainstreamed. On the other hand, multilateral support including direct budget support and sector wide approach often blur Northern commitment to disability issues and allow disability to evaporate when Southern priorities are different from the Northern policies. Thus mainstreaming disability into implementation in the South is challenging. The negotiation process requires pressures both in the Northern and Southern countries so that some development in mainstreaming disability into development policies and practices can be observed.

Actor Politics

Another important analysis made is on the actor politics related to the mainstreaming. I discussed the role of NGOs and the relationship between NGOs and the governments in the two countries. I observed that NGOs have played significant roles in different ways. In Northern countries, NGO actors and individuals have been the driving force in taking the initiative to mainstream disability, when governmental actors were still ignorant to this issue. Such initiatives were crucial in constructing the current relationships between NGOs and the governments in the two countries. The relationship between NGOs and the government was previously thin but was gradually strengthened in order to move the issue forward together. The good relationship was regarded important when the government was lacking expertise on the issue, while NGOs lacked resources. In Finland, most of the NGOs currently use government funding to implement their projects and programmes in the South. In Japan, several disabled people are deeply involved in the government agencies as special advisors, while an increasing number of NGOs also receive funding from the government. In this way, NGOs are “independent” in their individual policies and actions and at the same time

interdependent with the governments in the discourse on disability and development. The boundaries between actors are blurred to some extent.

NGOs in both countries have some networking/umbrella structures to make their voices heard (JANNET in Japan and FIDIDA in Finland). Nevertheless, asymmetrical power relationship in favour of the governments is one of the hindrances in mainstreaming disability. The mainstreaming of disability was not much exercised in any particular form of activities by both NGOs and the governments except for several individuals and NGOs in both countries who were concerned with it. Actually, in both countries, disability-specific activities are ample, while mainstreaming activities are extremely limited. Mainstreaming a theme was considered out of the scope of any single NGO in both countries but the task of networking/umbrella NGOs which were to raise common issues rather than specific activities. In this way, actually nobody is responsible of the mainstreaming in the North except for a limited number of NGOs. When it comes to the Northern governments, they are already too busy with balancing competing themes to mainstream and tend not to work voluntarily on the mainstreaming of disability without domestic and/or international pressure. It was particularly so for those who hold the strategic decision making power on policy making within the government structure. The elaboration of actor politics in this discourse, therefore, reveals that the relationship between NGOs and the governments in the Northern contexts explains the fundamental failure of the development mechanism and the reasons why disability has had difficulty in being mainstreamed in practice.

A closer look at the actor politics revealed a noteworthy aspect that different kinds of networking are instrumental. That is, mainstreaming activities require multiple approaches. Three main approaches were prominent in mainstreaming disability in development policies and practices: networking among NGOs (bottom-up approach), political will (top-down approach) and networking with international actors to pressure the governments (bottom-oriented top-down approach). The NGOs concerned are networking in their countries to make their voices heard so that their issues would be included properly into the mainstream development policies and practices. This bottom-up approach has become one of the legitimate procedures for the governments to make policies due to the participatory nature of the civil society. Nevertheless, the decision making power of the governments are inevitably great, and cannot be so easily influenced merely by the bottom-up approach. Therefore, political will for a positive change also remains important. This leads to the next approach of

bottom-oriented top-down approach in which NGOs network internationally to create bigger pressure. For instance, this type of approach affected the UN Convention draft making process, which will be expected to pressure the governments to ratify it and implement it. The balance of these three major approaches among others to synergize effects is an important strategy.

Connecting the Findings to Theories and Practices

Both Disability Studies and Development Studies developed their underpinning philosophies from positivism to constructionism and further into humanism where human rights have come to the forefront (Desai & Potter, 2006; Katsui, 2005 etc.). The human rights discourse legitimises mainstreaming of the most vulnerable group of people including disabled people, which nobody would challenge when it is a voluntary aspiration on the theoretical and/or policy level. Both Japan and Finland accommodate the idea of mainstreaming disability into development with the key concepts of their policies: human security, and equality and solidarity respectively. The difference is that Japan is implicit, while Finland explicit. Despite the different backgrounds of Japan and Finland, both countries have been visible actors in the field of disability in development. Mainstreaming, however, is not as natural in practice as they are treated in the human rights talk. The findings of this study indicated that vulnerable people are vulnerable because of deeply rooted structural causes including the complexity of making a positive change, as was exemplified in terms of the five different factors affecting mainstreaming of disability into development. That is, the vulnerability of vulnerable people comes from the complex web of barriers to escape from the status quo. With this in mind, positive measures are to be taken by all actors for shifting the policy aspiration or mere consciousness into practice to make real changes on the ground for the better quality of life of vulnerable people. Human rights-based theory itself has hardly reached to the actual change on the ground. Underpinning philosophy of humanism, therefore, is a necessity but not the end in itself. It is rather a means for making sustainable, positive changes on the ground. When this is confused, then policy making ends in destructing the operationalisation process (Kennedy, 2004: 118). Operationalisation, therefore, should be focused and elaborated in the future research.

Implications towards Mainstreaming Disability in Development: Concluding Remarks

This study elaborated the mainstreaming of disability in development policies and practices in the Northern contexts, namely Japan and Finland. The needs of mainstreaming disability in development and such consciousness have barely followed concrete action in practice. This study investigated this particular point by focusing on the complex and intertwined factors affecting the process of mainstreaming, which led to the deeper understanding of how mainstream proceeds or stagnates in the studied contexts. This chapter concludes by providing future implications. One of the most important finding is that implementation of existing policies and guidelines are extremely limited in the field of mainstreaming disability in development practices. The guidelines made by JICA to mainstream disability in development are quite a thorough one (JICA, 2003: 41-50). Even that does not change the practice much. Different factors expressed earlier indicated that positive changes at all levels would create the best possible preconditions that finally something concrete in this field could be implemented. In that sense, mainstreaming at a policy level itself is not the realistic goal among the current actors at present knowing that the implementation anyways tends to forget disability component when the capacity of all stakeholders to properly deal with disability is limited. That is the reason why they first focus on disability-specific programmes that for sure implement and make some changes even for a limited number of people unlike mainstreaming activities. Both mainstreaming efforts and disability-specific activities are necessary to increase the visibility of this theme in general and further uplift disability as a natural and positive component of development. At present, in both countries, it can be said that empowerment is more highlighted than mainstreaming. The concentration on disability-specific activities so far is also due to the development system that does not prioritise disability as well as unavailability of resources for mainstreaming activities but rather for disability-specific ones. The actor politics also revealed difficulties of disability to be mainstreamed when the relevance is not seriously understood by various mainstream actors. Hence the general conclusion is that **all stakeholders have to build more capacity to be able to mainstream disability both in policy and practices**. In this concluding chapter, five most important implications for mainstreaming disability in development are enlisted with supporting arguments: 1) Northern DPOs and disabled people have to be empowered; 2) relevance has to be understood by mainstream actors; 3) the political will of

the governments is inevitable; 4) good practices have to be accumulated and lessons should be learned from bad practices; and 5) Southern disabled people have to be empowered.

Firstly, **empowerment of Northern DPOs and disabled leaders** is an important implication. This has to do directly with the disability-specific challenge that it is having a low priority among many competing issues in development. Without reminding continuously of its necessity, operationalisation is easily forgotten even if disability is mainstreamed at the policy level as is the case in Finland. Northern DPOs have to pressure persistently their governments to assure the implementation of mainstreaming. At the same time, DPOs should be able to provide concrete advises. For that, DPOs have to work on their capacity building so that they can deal with government officials and professionals¹⁰¹. However, empowerment is not a prerequisite for mainstreaming, because disabled people are also empowered on the process of mainstreaming activities. That is, the lack of capacity of DPOs and disabled people should not be the reason for mainstream actors not to include them in mainstreaming process. Widening the scope also to non-disabled people would lead to understanding supporters and as a result facilitate to turn the voices louder¹⁰². The empowerment of disabled people should not isolate them from non-disabled people, rather there is a need to approach them. Disability-specificity should not narrow this field too much down to isolate it from other fields because human rights and equality are not exclusive only for disabled people, although disability-specificity is surely important to be taken into account. This leads to the next implication.

Mainstream actors and non-disabled people in general should be aware of the **relevance** – this is an important precondition. Disability is not an issue of only disabled people. When families of disabled members are also counted, disability is a relevant issue for a significant number of people¹⁰³. Moreover, disability is everybody's issue because of the aging society where everybody has the possibility to become disabled during one's lifetime¹⁰⁴. Furthermore, disability is an issue also for non-disabled people when disabling physical and mental environment made by non-disabled people create big barriers for them towards equal opportunity. Non-disabled people are also stakeholders that reinforce and worsen the situation if no change is made. Particularly non-disabled people in the North are playing a

¹⁰¹ Yutaka Takamine, Ryukyu University; Kenji Kuno, JICA.

¹⁰² Yutaka Takamine, Ryukyu University.

¹⁰³ Yutaka Takamine, Ryukyu University.

¹⁰⁴ Kenji Kuno, JICA.

big role in deteriorating the lives of disabled people in the South by not changing the development practices that do not include disabled people as part of the stakeholders and implementers. Many on-going Northern interventions still create further barriers for disabled people in the South. In this sense, the relevance of this issue should be properly understood so as to motivate hitherto ignorant people to act. This awareness-raising of relevance is one of the preconditions for implementing mainstreaming into practice “as a positive enthusiasm¹⁰⁵”. Disability as a positive additional value is an important image to build in order to finally take disability as a natural component of development.

In the meantime, **political will** of the government side is also necessary both in the North and the South. The recent history has proved that unless disabled people are specifically mentioned among the “vulnerable groups of people,” “marginalized people” or “poor people” they tend to be forgotten (Dube, 2005). Inclusive policy making is one of the first steps. The idea of a “Comprehensive Social Policy¹⁰⁶” was proposed by the Finnish governmental actors (Please see Annex 6). Policy making processes have the pitfall of marginalising disability aspect even further without enough attention to disability. Disabled employee and/or a focal point such as disability advisor in the concerned Ministry would be a good daily reminder¹⁰⁷. Even with such a person, the diversity of disability can be easily forgotten. In this sense, continuous learning is also necessary for all actors including governmental actors, particularly the highest level of them who hold the strategic decision making power. Lack of institutional support has resulted in the current situation where mainstreaming is not operationalised or not even on the policy agenda. Thus proper institutional support on the basis of political will is highly expected.

Fourth implication would be **accumulation of good practices AND lessons learned from bad practices** that can lead to better know-how of concrete actions that are sensitive to the diversity of disability¹⁰⁸. Good practices can surely promote mainstreaming with concrete examples. The initiative of USAID to mainstream disability into its all existing intervention in Uganda is a unique trial of its kind (Albert, Dube and Riis-Hansen, 2005). This is expected to accumulate good general know-how. Nevertheless, having gone through

¹⁰⁵ Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry.

¹⁰⁶ Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry, Ronald Wiman, STAKES

¹⁰⁷ Timo Voipio, Finnish Foreign Ministry; Kalle Könkkölä, Threshold Association; Ronald Wiman, STAKES; Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA.

¹⁰⁸ Mariko Kinoshita, JICA; Yoshito Dobashi, JBIC; Kenji Kuno, JICA.

different factors that affect mainstreaming, making good practices demands a lot and thus is difficult to produce over a short period of time. Moreover, every intervention is context-specific to some extent and thus applying one remedy does not solve all the problems in another context. Therefore, learning from bad practices is easier to start because they are plenty. The absolute bottom line is that development activities should not enlarge the existing gaps between disabled and non-disabled people. When examined, compilation of information and analysis on good and bad practices is also necessary to learn from but should be in a concise form so that information is not overloaded further¹⁰⁹.

Last and most importantly, it has to be reminded that the central actors of this whole discourse are disabled people in the South. Aside from the North-oriented mainstreaming, a possibly more powerful means for promoting the mainstreaming of marginalized themes both at policy and practice levels is to raise the capacity of the Southern stakeholders and listen to their voices. Thus **empowerment of Southern disabled people** is obviously important. When they are strong enough, possibilities to negotiate with professionals, governments and/or donors start to increase. This is particularly a valid point when budget support modality and other similar methods have been increasing to secure ownership of the Southern stakeholders but also to allow disability and other marginalised issues to evaporate along the process to select their priorities. Direct budget support is very important in principle but has its pitfall in easily leaving marginalised issues behind. Southern disabled people constantly need to remind the decision makers to include disability into mainstream development and to build the capacity of the decision makers to be able to deal with this issue. In this regard, the empowerment of Southern disabled people is inevitable. In the current era of globalization, it is the norm in the international development system that Southern governments, NGOs, communities and actors participate in the development of policies affecting them at every relevant level. It was beyond the scope of this study to deeply focus on this question. Mainstreaming this field in the Northern context is important because many interventions towards Southern disabled people deeply involve Northern actors, particularly when Southern governments do not prioritize disability but legitimize the status quo due to their resource constraints. This study focused only on the Northern process in two Northern contexts. However, the challenges in the North indicate a number of difficulties that are also applicable for Southern actors in order to mainstream this field in the

¹⁰⁹ Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA.

Southern context. The study focused on the Northern process, which does not presuppose that development starts from the North. On the contrary, Southern actors have a lot of local knowledge to share with the Northern actors when it comes to disability issues because no country has ever succeeded in equality. This is the theme for further research¹¹⁰.

It should be reminded repeatedly that the capacity of all stakeholders has to be built in order to mainstream disability to development policies and practices and to tackle discrimination because disability is deeply rooted in discrimination at all possible levels. The North-South dichotomy for solving the issues has been losing its relevance when all the stakeholders are interdependent and responsible for making sustainable, positive changes. This is the conclusion and the central message of this paper.

Epilogue

Throughout the paper, the latest version of development policies were especially elaborated in both Japan and Finland, namely Japanese ODA Charter of 2003 and 2004 version of the Finnish development policy programme. On 18th of October 2007, while finalising this paper, Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs produced its Development Policy Programme (25 pages) for the new government. In this version, “disabled people” is mentioned only once under the cross-cutting themes of the Finnish development policy. In my understanding, this version focuses much more on environmental sustainability than ever before and dropped out many more human-centred themes such as disability which used to be paid much more attention to. Mainstreaming disability is a never ending task, as this example eloquently speaks. In the end of this paper, I recommend that actual implementation of the policies of both Finland and Japan ensures the involvement of disabled people both as stakeholders and implementers on the ground in order to seriously tackle the poverty reduction in real terms. Mainstreaming talks tend to be focused on the policy level, while the actual process of mainstreaming starts only on the ground.

¹¹⁰ Please see <http://disability-uganda.blogspot.com/> for our further research project on “Human-Rights-Based Approach to Disability in Development: Interplay of Disability-Sensitive Development Cooperation and National Policy in Uganda” and my individual research on “Human Rights-Based Approach to Development Cooperation: A Case Study of Disabled Women’s Rights to Development in Uganda” under the research project.

References

- Akiyama, A. (2007) "Dai 2ji Asia Taiheiyo Shougaiisha no Junen Chukannen hyouka to Kongo no Kadai (Mid-term Evaluation of the Second Decade of Asia and Pacific Decade of People with Disabilities)." Normalisation June 2007. p.10-13.
- Albert, B. (2006) In or Out of the Mainstream? Lessons from Research on Disability and Development Cooperation. The Disability Press. Leeds. On. www1.uea.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.38971/offprint_ch1.pdf Visited on 30.6.2007
- Albert, B., Dube, A. and Riis-Hansen, T. C. (2005) Has Disability Been Mainstreamed in Development Cooperation? On http://disabilitykar.net/docs/thematic_main.doc Visited on 3.7.2007.
- Bickenbach, J.E. (2001) "Disability Human Rights, Law, and Policy." in G. L. Albrecht, K.D. Seelman and M. Bury (eds.). Handbook of Disability Studies. Sage Publication. London. P. 565-584.
- Coetzee, P.H. and Wiman, R. (1999) "Building up Social Sustainability: the case of Namibia." In R. Wiman and T. Partonen (eds.). Putting People at the Centre of Sustainable Development. Gummerus Printing. Saarijärvi. P.183-200.
- Desai, V. & Potter, R. B. (eds.) (2006) Doing Development Research. SAGE Publications. London.
- Dobashi, Y. (2006) "Shogai to Kaihatsu: Kokusai Kyoryoku Ginkou ni okeru Torikumino Genjo to Kadai (Disability and Development: Current Activities of JBIC and Its Challenges." In Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan and FASID (Eds.). Ningen no Anzenhosho wo Fumaeta Shogai Bunya no Torikumi: Kokusaikyoryoku no Genjo to Kadai. (Activities on Disability on the Basis of Human Security: Reality and Challenges of International Cooperation.) On http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/gaiko/oda/shimin/oda_ngo/shien/05_shogai_hb/index.html Visited on 21.6.2007
- DPI-Japan. (2007) Mondai Tenkomori: Shougaiisha Jiritsu Shien Hou (Many Problems: Law to Support Independence of Disabled People). Kaihou Shuppan Sha. Osaka.
- Dube, A. (2005) "Participation of Disabled People in the PRSP/PEAP Process in Uganda". On http://disabilitykar.net/docs/uganda_prsp.doc Visited on 3.7.2007.
- FIDIDA. (2007) "Yleistävammaishankkeista (Disability Projects)." On <http://www.fidida.fi/vammaishankkeet/> Visited on 25.6.2007
- French, S. (1994) "What is Disability?" in S. French (ed.). On Equal Terms. Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd. Oxford. P. 3-16.
- Haar, A. T. (2005) "Discussion Article: People with Disabilities Excluded from Millennium Goals?" Newsletter of Dutch Coalition on Disability and Development No. 11. On www.dccd.nl?2810 visited on 18.11.2005.
- IDE-JETRO. (2006) World Trend. No.135. December 2006.
- JANNET. (2006) JANNET 10 nen no Ayumi (JANNET Activities of Last Decade). JANNET. Tokyo.
- JICA. (2003) Kadaibetsu shishin Shougaiisha Shien (Guideline to Support for disabled people) On <http://www.jica.go.jp/global/disability/report/word/001.doc> Visited on 14.4.2007
- Katsui, H. and Kumpuvuori, J. (2008) Human Rights-Based Approach to Disability in Development in Uganda: A Way to Fill the Gap between Political and Social Spaces? Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research Volume 10 Issue 4. P.227-236.

- Katsui, H. (2005) *Towards Equality: Creation of the Disability Movement in Central Asia*. Helsinki University Press. Helsinki.
- Kennedy, D. (2004) *The Dark Sides of Virtue: Reassessing International Humanitarianism*. Princeton University Press. Princeton.
- Khan, I. (2005) "How Can the Role of Civil Society and the Private Sector Be Made More Effective in Global Governance?" Presented in 14th Wilton Park Conference: Contemporary Global Governance: Does the Current Institutional Architecture Meet the Needs? 5-7.9.2005. Helsinki. Finland.
- Kinoshita, M. (2005) "JICA no Torikumi (Activities of JICA)." In FASID (ed.) *Ningen no Anzenhoshou wo Fumaeta Shougai bunya no Torikumi (Activities on Disability in Development Cooperation on the Basis of Human Security)*. On <http://www.fasid.or.jp/chosa/kenkyu/ngo/pdf/handbook.pdf> Visited on 21.6.2007 P.148-156.
- Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. (2007) *Kehityspoliittinen Ohjelma 2007: Kohti Oikeudenmukaista ja Kestävää Ihmiskuntapolitiikkaa (Development Policy Programme 2007: Towards Rights-based and Sustainable Humankind Policy)*. On <http://formin.finland.fi/public/download.aspx?ID=22346&GUID={C8A2F682-07F8-413A-B7C5-8CBB52EB9D8D}> Visited on 22.10.2007.
- Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. (2004) *Development Policy*. On <http://www.formin.fi/public/download.aspx?ID=12405&GUID={BDBC7108-180B-4F65-A6D4-FD55BFCE7952}> Visited on 21.6.2007
- Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. (1996) *The Decision-in-principle on Finland's Development Co-operation*. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. Helsinki.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. Former Official Development Aid Policy. On http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/gaiko/oda/seisaku/taikou/sei_1_1.html Visited on 21.6.2007
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan and FASID. (2006) *Ningen no Anzenhosho wo Fumaeta Shogai Bunya no Torikumi: Kokusaikyoryoku no Genjo to Kadai. (Activities on Disability on the Basis of Human Security: Reality and Challenges of International Cooperation.)* On http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/gaiko/oda/shimin/oda_ngo/shien/05_shogai_hb/index.html Visited on 21.6.2007
- Nagase, O. (2007) "Shogaigaku to Kokusaikyoryoku wo Jiku to shite (On the Basis of Disability Studies and International Cooperation)." In K. Kubota and E. Asano (eds.) *Kokusai Borantea no Arukikata (Life Stories of International Volunteers)*. Kokusaikyoryoku Shuppankai. Tokyo. P.32-43.
- Nagata, K. (2007) *Kaihatsu to Shogai, Kaihatsu Senmonka no Shiten kara Mita Kokuren Shogaisha Kenri Joyaku: Shogai no Kaihatsu heno Mainstream-ka wo Jitsugensurutame no Shudan (Development and Disability, United Nations Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities from the Perspective of Development Expert: Methodology to Realise Mainstreaming of Disability in Development.)* Rehabilitation Kenkyu No. 131. P.30-37.
- Nakanishi, S. and Ueno, C. (2003) *Tojisha Shuken (Sovereignty of the Persons Concerned.)* Iwanami Shoten. Tokyo.
- Nordic Conference on Disability and Development. (2001) "Highlights from the Final Report of the 2000 Nordic Conference on Disability & Development." *Disability World* No.7, March-April 2001. On http://www.disabilityworld.org/03-04_01/news/nordicconf.shtml Visited on 1.9.2004.
- Oliver, M. (1990). *The Politics of Disablement*. Macmillan. London.
- San, Y. (1999) "Social Sustainability and the Future of Social Policy: empowering disabled persons in the ESCAP region." In R. Wiman and T. Partonen (eds.). *Putting People at the Centre of Sustainable Development*. Gummerus Printing. Saarijärvi. P.145-182.

Shakespeare, T. (2006) Disability Rights and Wrongs. Routledge. London.

STAKES. (2003) Label us Able. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. On <http://formin.finland.fi/public/download.aspx?ID=13528&GUID={C2043295-F121-4ED1-984D-B394F821C13D}> Visited on 21.6.2007

Takamine, Y. (2007) "Dai 1ji junen kara dai 2ji junen he, chukannengo no kadai wo kenshousuru (Challenges after the mid-term, from the first decade to the second one)." Normalisation. June 2007. p.14-17.

United Nations. (2000) Fundamental Rights of Disabled Persons constantly violated around the World. On www.scienceblog.com/community/order/archives/L/2000/A/un000169.html Visited on 1.9.2004.

UN ESCAP. (2006) Hitome de Wakaru Shogai Kanren Joho: Asia Teiheiyō 28 no Kuni to Chiiki no Profile (Disability-related Information at a Glance: Profile of 28 Countries in Asia and Pacific Region). Japanese Society for Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities. Tokyo.

World Bank (2007) Data and Statistics on Disability. On <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALPROTECTION/EXTDISABILITY/0,,contentMDK:21249181~menuPK:282717~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:282699,00.html> visited on 26.7.2007.

Yashiro, E. (2002) The Role of Government in Developing Disability Strategies Nationally and Regionally. On http://www.adb.org/Documents/Events/2002/Disability_Development/yashiro.pdf Visited on 30.6.2007

Reference Homepages

APCD project, <http://www.apcdproject.org/>

Eita Yashiro, <http://www.e-yashiro.net/>

FIDIDA, <http://www.fidida.fi/>

GlobalPartnership for Disability and Development
<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALPROTECTION/EXTDISABILITY/0,,contentMDK:21036173~pagePK:210058~piPK:210062~theSitePK:282699,00.html>

International Disability and Development Consortium <http://www.iddc.org.uk/>

Kalle Könkkölä, www.konkkola.fi

Annex 1. Article 32 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

Article 32 - International cooperation

1. States Parties recognize the importance of international cooperation and its promotion, in support of national efforts for the realization of the purpose and objectives of the present Convention, and will undertake appropriate and effective measures in this regard, between and among States and, as appropriate, in partnership with relevant international and regional organizations and civil society, in particular organizations of persons with disabilities. Such measures could include, inter alia:

- a. Ensuring that international cooperation, including international development programmes, is inclusive of and accessible to persons with disabilities;
- b. Facilitating and supporting capacity-building, including through the exchange and sharing of information, experiences, training programmes and best practices;
- c. Facilitating cooperation in research and access to scientific and technical knowledge;
- d. Providing, as appropriate, technical and economic assistance, including by facilitating access to and sharing of accessible and assistive technologies, and through the transfer of technologies.

2. The provisions of this article are without prejudice to the obligations of each State Party to fulfil its obligations under the present Convention.

<http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtml>

Annex 2. List of Interviewees in Japan and Finland in the Alphabetical Order of Surnames

The research participants' affiliation is at the time of the interviews (spring-summer 2007).

Research Participants in Japan

- Mr. Yoshito Dobashi, JBIC (Japan Bank for International Cooperation).
- Mr. Keiji Gotou, Japanese Federation of the Deaf.
- Ms Maki Honda, Japan Foundation.
- Ms Michiyo Kato, AAR Japan (Association for Aid and Relief Japan).
- Ms Mariko Kinoshita, JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency).
- Mr. Kenji Kuno, JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency).
- Mr. Taisuke Miyamoto, DPI-Japan (Japan National Assembly of Disabled Peoples' International).
- Mr. Soya Mori, IDE (Institute of Developing Economies).
- Mr. Osamu Nagase, Tokyo University.
- Mr. Shoji Nakanishi, Human Care Association.
- Ms Yukiko Nakanishi, ADI (Asia Disability Institute).
- Mr. Koichi Omori, World Bank Tokyo Office.
- Mr. Chuji Sashida, National Committee of Welfare for the Blind in Japan.
- Mr. Yutaka Takamine, Ryukyu University.
- Ms Etsuko Ueno, Japanese Society of Rehabilitation of Persons with Disabilities.

Research Participants in Finland

- Mr. Asko Alajoki, Operaatio Mobilisaatio.
- Ms Tuija Halmari, FIDIDA (Finnish Disabled People's International Development Association).
- Ms Taija Heinonen, Abilis Foundation.
- Mr. Kalle Könkkölä, Threshold Association.
- Mr. Matti Lahtinen, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.
- Ms Anja Malm, Finnish Federation of the Deaf.
- Mr. Pekka Puustinen, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.
- Ms Sisko Rauhala, Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.
- Mr. Hans Rönnlund, Finnish Lutheran Overseas Mission.
- Mr. Timo Voipio, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.
- Ms Sirpa Vääntinen and Mr. Tero Hokkanen, One Way Mission.
- Mr. Ronald Wiman, STAKES (National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health).
- A Newcomer NGO (This person did not want to be identified in the report).
- An NGO (This person did not want to be identified in the report).

Annex 3. Information Sheet

Information Sheet

Project Title: Health and Disability in International Development Policy

Investigator: Hisayo Katsui (Ph.D.)

Phone: +358-40-7236680

E-mail: hisayo.katsui@helsinki.fi

Address: Institute of Development Studies, P.O.Box 59 00014 Helsinki University

I am a Japanese researcher at Helsinki University researching Disability and Development. For a research project commissioned by Tokyo Foundation, I am interviewing relevant key actors including governmental and non-governmental actors who could share their knowledge and experiences on the process of mainstreaming disability into development policy and practices in Japan and Finland.

The purpose of this research project is to explore to what extent health and disability are mainstreamed in the policies and implemented in the field. My part investigates the relationship between NGOs and governments in mainstreaming disability issues in Japanese and Finnish development policies. (The other case study conducted by another researcher is on the evidence of the mainstreaming of health issues in the British and Japanese development policies on the ground in Ethiopia and Kenya with a special focus on NGO implementation.)

I wonder if you would be willing to take part in my study for attaining the purpose.

Your participation will be in the form of interviews and e-mail exchanges. During these interviews, questions will be asked and tape-recorded regarding your experiences about being an actor in the field of disability in development. These tapes or written data will not be shared with anybody including the other researcher of this project. If you do not mind, your name will be disclosed when citing your interview statements in the final report. If you hesitate to do so, you are identified with an unidentifiable code name such as “an NGO staff”. The project is planned to be finalised by mid-October 2007. The final report will be available at the end of the study if you or your organisation would like to have a copy.

If you agree with participating in my research, would you please fill in the attached informed consent form. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely Yours,

Hisayo Katsui

Annex 4. Informed-Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

Project Title: Health and Disability in International Development Policy

Investigator: Hisayo Katsui (Ph.D.)

Phone: +358-40-7236680

E-mail: hisayo.katsui@helsinki.fi

Address: Institute of Development Studies, P.O.Box 59 00014 Helsinki University

I would like to agree to participate in the above named project.

I understand that the information may be published, but my name will not be disclosed if I want it to be.

I understand that I am free to deny any answer to specific questions during the interviews and communication. I also understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and terminate my participation at any time without penalty.

I have been given the opportunity to ask whatever questions I desire, and all such questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

Participant

Researcher

Date

Name (please PRINT) _____

E-mail Address _____

Telephone _____

Annex 5. Rapid Handicap Analysis, Version 4

Is Your Project Handicapping?

Ten checkpoints to be applied to a basic project document

A. Situation and problem analysis

1. Is the project relevant from the disability perspective?
2. How relevant:
 - a) Is it disability-specific?
 - b) Does it have a disability component?
 - c) Does it address issues of high relevance to people with disabilities?
 - d) Is it not particularly relevant to people with disabilities?
3. Have people with disabilities been consulted or involved in the planning process in an adequate way?

B. Goals and activities of the intervention

4. Are the objectives in line with international standards?
5. Are the activities and results accessible to people with disabilities?
6. Is the participation of people with disabilities ensured?

C. Assumptions and risks

7. Is it ensured that disability is kept on the agenda at every stage of the process?

D. Compatibility and sustainability

8. Is the inclusion of disability backed by adequate inclusive policies, organisational arrangements and appropriate technology?

E. Implementation, organisation and resources

9. Are people with disabilities and their organisations involved in the implementation, and is their inclusion supported by budgetary provisions?

F. Monitoring, reporting and evaluation

10. Are people with disabilities involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the intervention to the extent required by the nature of the project?

Annex 6. A Newspaper Article, “Employment and Social Security Decrease Poverty Sustainably”

“Terrorism is not conquered with weapons but by promoting social development, equality, employment and basic social security.”

How can we more efficiently decrease poverty, inequality and insecurity that threaten human beings in developing countries? People around the world wish to have decent work and income security.

Poverty in developing countries is a threat also to rich countries’ future. In development cooperation, it’s time to turn the course from individual poverty projects into supporting sustainable national social and employment policies. Finnish government is currently preparing a new development policy programme that will channel and direct Finnish development cooperation funds until 2011. The previous programme raised the issue of social and employment policy as a means to sustainably decrease poverty, but development money was not channelled to it at all.

The UN is best possible existing forum where governments around the world can seek for common strategy for one of the biggest problems of the mankind. According to the UN Declaration of Human Rights, every person has the right to social security but much work is needed to make this right to come true. At the moment social security covers less than one fourth of the world population. Discrimination against women and disabled people violate the foundation of human rights. Also right to employment and income is one of the human rights that UN agrees upon.

UN member states have unanimously stated that the inequalities within and between countries is one of the biggest challenges in the world. Terrorism is not conquered with weapons but by promoting social development, equality, employment and basic social security.

The world government leaders recommended at the UN Summit of 2005 that developing countries should prepare comprehensive, more ambitious and equitable national development strategies. In this work, they need the support of UN.

UN in turn needs Finnish support. Right now there is an acute need to strengthen ILO’s, UNDP’s and UNICEF’s and other UN development agencies’ joint work in developing countries.

The national economic liberalisation programmes funded through the World Bank during the last 25 years have not succeeded to eradicate poverty. In order to deal with the causes of poverty and to achieve sustainable and balanced development, economic measures need to be accomplished by comprehensive social policy for employment, income redistribution, social security and social inclusion. If economic policy is good, it provides people also employment, income and social security to those who are too old, young, disabled or sick to be able to escape from poverty with their own work.

This was the opinion of international social policy experts who gathered at the invitation of the Finnish government to Kellokoski last November. The initiative for the meeting came from our Tanzanian partners. According to their opinion, voices of the Southern developing

countries are not heard at the global discussions. At the meeting of Kellokoski, the voices of African partners got the first priority. The dialogue was summarised in a book on "Comprehensive Social Policies for Development" that was delivered also to all UN member governments.

In the book, the experts presented examples of the experiments of social policy which successfully dealt with poverty. In India, there is an experiment going on to guarantee employment to poor people in countryside. In Western Africa health insurance systems have been created with the support of ILO, Germany and Portugal. In Namibia and South Africa, there are national social pension arrangements. It has been found that the trickle-down effects benefit children's nutrition and education. Child allowances have added the consumption power of mothers and strengthened the demand for national production and consequently employment. In Latin America, conditional income support programmes have been used to, for example to facilitate the keeping of children in schools or regularly visiting health centre. Even though employment and social security were the method to decrease poverty in industrial countries, funding the idea of social security arrangements and active employment policies is new in development cooperation. Development of national social security systems is more efficient and sustainable means to reduce poverty than individual poverty projects. ILO has calculated that basic security is affordable even to poor nation.

Wasting national human and social capital is going to be more expensive than a gradual construction of social security. Also Finland was very poor when the society started to develop social security. Our development partners reminded us that there is much to learn from Finnish history. They would like to understand how it is possible that nation can raise during one generation from a poor country based on subsistence agriculture to one of the world's most competitive and equitable information society.

In the near future, Finland will prepare a new development cooperation policy programme. It should emphasize those fields where Finland is well-known and good such as social and employment policies.

Timo Voipio
Global Social Policy Advisor, Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Ronald Wiman
Manager, Socially Sustainable Development Group, Stakes
Vappu Taipale
Director General, Stakes

Helsingin Sanomat 16.4.2007, Page C4, Under Mieliä (opinion)

(Informally translated by myself from Finnish to English and checked by Ronald Wiman)

List of Back Numbers of the IDS Working Papers

Many of the following IDS Working Papers and other publications can be found at <http://www.valt.helsinki.fi/kmi/english/publications.htm>

1/06 VIHEMÄKI, Heini:

Developments and Conflicts of Forest Conservation in Africa

2/05 HEINONEN, Hannu:

Structural Changes in the International System and Regionalisation

1/05 HEINONEN, Hannu:

Economic Integration in Southern Africa

3/02 JERMAN, Helena:

Dimensions of Ethnicity in the African Context: Some reflections on research approaches

2/02 SALOKOSKI, Märta:

Ritual regicide versus succession strife. On divine kingship as an order creating element in the political life of two Owambo kingdoms. A re-evaluation of the political significance of sacred kingship.

1/02 KILJUNEN, Kimmo - OJANEN, Julia:

Debt relief and the HIPC initiative in African countries. Case study of five African countries

3/01 WEISS, Holger:

Zakât in Pre-Colonial Sub-Saharan Africa. A tentative Survey. Part Three

2/01 RAUMOLIN, Jussi:

Shift from Environmental Education to Education for Sustainable Development

1/01 MARJOMAA, Risto:

Recruitment among the Yao of Nyasaland (Malawi) for British Military Service between 1895-1939

4/00 WEISS, Holger:

Zakât in Pre-colonial Sub-Saharan Africa. A Tentative Survey. Part Two.

3/00 TEIVAINEN, Teivo:

Privatization in Peru.

2/00 WEISS, Holger:

Reflections on Zakât in Northern Ghana: Not an Institution but a Goal to be Achieved.

1/00 WEISS, Holger:

Zakât in Pre-colonial Sub-Saharan Africa. A Tentative Survey. Part One.

11/99 COWEN, Michael:

Quakes of Development.

10/99 ISOTALO, Riina:

Different Meanings of Palestinian Nationalism: The Politicisation of Culture.

9/99 WEISS, Holger:

German Images of Islam in West Africa.

8/99 HAKKARAINEN, Outi:

Women, Urban Popular Movements and Political Parties in Guadalajara, Mexico.

7/99 ZDANOWSKI, Jerzy:

Some Comments on Islamic Welfare: the Case of the Wahhabi State.

6/99 POHJONEN, Pirjo:

A Community Perspective Towards the Malnutrition of Under Five-year Old Children: A case study from Mtwara Region, Tanzania.

5/99 HAUTANIEMI, Petri:

Street Children and Multicultural Education in Kathmandu, Nepal.

4/99 WEISS, Holger:

The 1889-90 Famine and the Mahdiyya in the Sudan: An attempt to implement the principles of an Islamic Economy.

3/99 KONTTINEN, Tiina:

The Activity Theoretical Approach for Studying NGOs in the Process of Development.

2/99 WEISS, Holger:

The Concept of Islamic Economy as articulated in Sokoto: Social Justice and State Responsibility.

1/99 WEISS, Holger:

THEY DID NOT WANT US TO BE HERE: Finnish Missionary Activity in Northern Namibia and its First Setbacks, 1869-1872.

16/98 SALOKOSKI, Märta:

For the Birds or the Kings? An analysis of the Big-Bird Ritual and its relation to the consolidation of kingship during the mid-1800s in the Owambo societies of northern Namibia.

15/98 POHJONEN, Pirjo:

Women's Health in Southern Tanzania: The Gender Impact of Maternal Mortality.

14/98 SOIRI, Iina:

Local level – Always a Missing Link in Decentralisation Process? The politics of Decentralisation in Mozambique.

13/98 KEINÄNEN, Mikko:

Rationality and Values in the Context of Global Social Change: Some Theoretical Observations on Democracy and Civil Society.

12/98 ZELLER, Wolfgang

Development aid and institutional change in rural northeastern Namibia: White Toyotas and dust devils in Ibbu.

11/98 COWEN, Michael:

Trust in Development

10/98 LOGHMAN, Pireh Babi:

Reflections on the Role of Civil Society in the Democratisation Process of Third World Countries.

9/98 SEPPÄNEN, Maaria:

Street Vendors in the Historic Centre of Lima: Utilitarian Space Versus a Museum City.

8/98 JERMAN, Helena:

The Cultural Process of Development: Some Impressions of Anthropologists Working in Development.

7/98 COWEN, Michael - KANYINGA, Karuti:

The 1997 Elections in Kenya: the Politics of Communalism and Locality.

6/98 WEISS, Holger:

The Illegal Trade in Slaves from German Northern Cameroon to British Northern Nigeria. Part 2: Hidden but Known.

5/98 WEISS, Holger:

The Illegal Trade in Slaves from German Northern Cameroon to British Northern Nigeria. Part 1: An Outline of German Policy.

4/98 MARGOLD, Jane A. - SZE PING, Lo:

Democracy with Hong Kong Characteristics: 1990s Student Activism During the Transition.

3/98 SEPPÄLÄ, Pekka:

Challenges of Professionalisation in Tanzania.

2/98 MARGOLD, Jane A:

From "Cultures of Fear and Terror" to Violative State Practices: an Ethnographic Critique.

1/98 SOIRI, Iina:

Why the 1997 Local Authority Elections in Namibia Were Postponed.

14/97 KORTTEINEN, Timo:

Social Hierarchies in Flux: Change of Social Organisation in Peninsular Malaysia.

13/97 WEISS, Holger:

Flight to survive: Migrations During Times of Drought and Famine in Early Colonial West Africa.

12/97 OVASKAINEN, Marko - NIVALAINEN, Satu - MOISIO, Antti - VEHNÄMÄKI, Mika - KOBINA MARKIN, Nat Papa:

Multiple Dimensions of the Lomé Convention: Case Evaluations of The European Union's Development Cooperation arrange.

11/97 WEISS, Holger:

A Tentative Note on Islamic Welfare: Zakât in Theory and Praxis in the Sokoto Caliphate.

10/97 COWEN, Michael - NGUNYI, Mutahi:

Preludes to the 1992 and 1997 Elections in Kenya: Reconciling Reform within a Chain of Events.

9/97 AUBYNN, Anthony Kwesi:

Liberalism and Economic Adjustment in Resource Frontiers: Land-Based Resource Alienation and Local Responses. A Reflections from Western Ghana.

8/97 KEINÄNEN, Mikko:

Non-Governmental Organisations in the Ghazi-Barotha Hydropower Project: participation and political space.

7/97 POLUHA, Eva:

Conceptualizing Democracy - Elections in the Ethiopian Countryside.

6/97 SEPPÄNEN, Maaria:

World Heritage, Local Politics and the Making of Geographical Scale: the case of the historical centre of Lima.

5/97 KWESI AUBYNN, Anthony:

Beyond the Transparent Ballot Box: Reading the wave of democratisation and the significance of the 1996 Elections in Ghana.

4/97 ENGLUND, Harri:

Hybrid Democracy: from Patronage to corruption in Malawi.

3/97 LAAKSO, Liisa:

Elections with History - Approaching Constitutional Development, Party-System and Electoral Competition in Zimbabwe.

2/97 NEOCOSMOS, Michael:

Elections, State Power and Rural Urban Differences. A Comparative Study of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland.

1/97 COWEN, Michael - LAAKSO, Liisa:

An Overview of Election Studies in Africa.

15/96 WEISS, Holger:

'Dying Cattle' - A Study of the Impact of Cattle Epizootics in the Central Sudan during the Nineteenth Century.

14/96 PAKKASVIRTA, Jussi:

Nationalism and Continentalism in Latin American History.

13/96 KWESI AUBYNN, Anthony:

Sapping the Environment? The Case for Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) and its Environmental Implications for Ghana.

12/96 TAPIO-BISTRÖM, Marja-Liisa:

Food Aid in Tanzania: From Dependence to Independence?

11/96 DIJABA, Zuhair:

Globalization: The Last Sky.

10/96 HOSSAIN, Masud:

Regional Conflict Transformation. Comprehending and Explicating the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC).

9/96 GOULD, Jeremy:

Beyond 'Negotiation.' Challenges of Participatory Projects for the Anthropology of Development.

8/96 WEISS, Holger:

Who Cries 'Famine'? A Strange Telegram, a Complex Report and Official Silence in Northern Nigeria of 1904.

7/96 LAAKSO, Liisa:

Nordic Development Cooperation and the Promotion of Democracy: In Search for Strategies.

6/96 EL-BATTAHANI, Atta:

The Social and Political Impact of Economic Liberalization and Social Welfare in Sudan.

5/96 EL-BATTAHANI, Atta:

Economic Transformation and Political Islam in Sudan: 1975-1989.

4/96 DEUTSCH, Jan-Georg:

Weidner's Slaves: A Misunderstanding in German Colonial Thought.

3/96 MOMOH, Abubakar:

Popular Struggles in Nigeria (1960-1982).

2/96 UUSIHAKALA, Katja:

Hisstories: White Kenyan Life Histories.

1/96 KURUS, Bilson:

Economic Interdependence and Control: Implications of the 'Natural Economic Territories' among the ASEAN States.

5/95 WEISS, Holger:

Doing and Not-Doing: The Debate about Famine Relief Schemes in Early Colonial Northern Nigeria.

4/95 GOULD, Jeremy:

On the Genealogy of the Post-Colonial State - Lugard and Kaunda on Cooperatives and Authority in Rural Zambia.

3/95 ENGLUND, Harri:

Whither Malawi?: Competing Discourses on the Postcolony.

2/95 SEPPÄNEN, Maaria:

Tolerable Levels of Fear Set the Limits to Knowing': Space and the Body Politics of Fieldwork.

1/95 LAAKSO, Liisa:

Relationship between the State and Civil Society in the Zimbabwean Elections 1995.