

博士論文審査結果報告
Report on Ph.D. / Doctoral Dissertation Defense
National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies (GRIPS)
Professor Yusuke Takagi.

審査委員会を代表し、以下のとおり審査結果を報告します。

On behalf of the Doctoral Thesis Review Committee, I would like to report the result of the Doctoral Dissertation Defense as follows.

学位申請者氏名 Ph.D. Candidate	Solomon Haile Gebrezgabher		
学籍番号 ID Number	PHD16406		
プログラム名 Program	GRIPS Global Governance Program (G-cube)		
審査委員会 Doctoral Thesis Review Committee	主査 Main referee	高木 佑輔 TAKAGI, Yusuke	主指導教員 Main Advisor
	審査委員 Referee	KHOO, Boo Teik	副指導教員 Sub Advisor
	審査委員 Referee	KARUSIGARIRA, Ian	副指導教員 Sub Advisor
	審査委員 Referee	PRESSELLO, Andrea	博士課程委員会委員長代理 Acting Chairperson of the Doctoral Programs Committee
	審査委員 Referee	武内 進一 (東京外語大学大学 院総合国際学研究院) TAKEUCHI, Shinichi (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Institute of Global Studies)	外部審査委員 External Referee
論文タイトル Dissertation Title (タイトル和訳)※ Title in Japanese	Property rights and State-society Relations in Conflict-Affected Settings: A Case Study of Land Conflicts in Adiquala Sub-region, Eritrea 紛争影響地域における所有権と国家社会関係—エリトリア、アディクアラ 地区の土地紛争に関する事例研究		
学位名 Degree Title	博士 (政策研究) / Ph.D. in Advanced Policy Studies		
論文提出日 Submission Date of the Draft Dissertation	2021年7月1日	論文審査会開催日 Date of the Doctoral Thesis Review Committee	2021年7月29日
論文発表会開催日 Date of the Defense	2021年7月29日	論文最終版提出日 Submission Date of the Final Dissertation	2021年9月1日
審査結果 Result	合格 Pass		

※ タイトルが英文の場合、文部科学省に報告するため、和訳を付してください

Please add a Japanese title that will be reported to MEXT.

1. 論文要旨 **Thesis overview and summary of the presentation.**

The dissertation is a detailed case study of land conflicts in Adiquala, Eritrea. This area has suffered a series of land conflicts but has been understudied for a long. Most researchers studying Eritrea are more interested in border conflicts between Eritrea and Ethiopia or the nature of authoritarian rule by a strong man for decades. Against this background, the candidate conducted a detailed case study on land conflicts in Adiquala, one of the country's most conflict-prone areas. Aside from the usual literature survey, he conducted fieldwork in the village for two months with some follow-up communication via social network services. He carried out a series of focus group discussions with the people living in the area, conducted in-depth interviews with those familiar with the situations there, and conducted a survey with a questionnaire.

Chapters one and two explain the research questions, data collection, the framework of the study, and historical background. In terms of data collection, the following two points are noticeable. First, the candidate conducted two hundred seven household surveys to understand the perception of the people suffering from land conflicts during his fieldwork. Second, he conducted important archival works at the local government's public relations office, handling the land conflicts on the grounds. These rich sources he collected during the fieldwork are an essential contribution to those interested in land conflicts in Eritrea, where the researchers often face severe challenges in conducting a survey.

The candidate has not stopped his efforts by collecting data but tries his best to contextualize the finding in the framework of state-society relations. He explicitly adopts the framework of the everyday form of state formation in which scholars describe various types of interfaces between state institutions and social demand. In the candidate's case, he painstakingly traces the process where the people have engaged arbitration mechanism designed by the government.

Chapter three explains the nature of land conflicts mainly based on surveys. He finds that there are three types of land conflicts: individual level, inter-village level, and area-administration (the administrative category bigger than a village in Eritria) level. Another major finding in this chapter is that most people appreciate the policy but are not satisfied with how the government officers at the local level implement or not implement it at all. The chapter serves as an introduction to the case studies in the following three chapters.

Chapter four traces the process of land conflict at the individual level, where the candidate adopts the framework of the everyday forms of the state formation. The stakeholders are not necessarily satisfied with the result but still engage the arbitration mechanism through which the state faces social demand.

Chapter five is about the land conflict at the village level in which he finds the resilient influence of *resti* mentality or the mentality shaped by custom. Not the law, but the *resti* mentality often shapes the action of the people. The successive government in Eritrea attempted to understand the cause of social demand but failed to convince the claimants who depend on the *resti* mentality. The candidate observes that the interaction between the claimants and state authority is a dynamic process of state formation.

Chapter six analyzes the land conflict at the sub-regional level, where the conflicts between the farmers and grazers or the conflicts over the entitlement of the retired soldiers for the land. In these cases, the candidate observes the limitation of the state policy partly because of corruption or the strong autonomy of the people who prioritize ethnicity rather than nationality when it comes to entitlement for land.

In conclusion, the candidate summarizes the findings. He argues that land conflicts are rampant because the state designs the arbitration mechanism but fails in appreciating the cause of social demands for land, such as local custom and ethnicity. He finds that the various governments organized in Eritrea have attempted to solve the land conflicts but failed to

appreciate the social demands because of a series of war or conflict-affected settings, as the candidate claims in the dissertation's title. He nonetheless concludes that the land conflicts have brought people close to the state institutions because they need arbitration mechanisms anyway. Land conflicts generate the everyday forms of state formation.

2. 審査報告 Notes from the Doctoral Thesis Review Committee (including changes required to the thesis by the referees)

The committee members agree to the following three points. First, the dissertation is a rich case study on the history of land conflicts in Eritrea, which has not been studied well. The candidate has carefully collected rare and essential data from the survey, focus group discussion, and archival research at the local administration office. Second, the committee members are confused about his mixed usage of the framework of (every day) state formation highlighting institutions and the explanation based on cultural elements and expect that he could strengthen the dissertation by elaborating the framework at the beginning revising the concluding chapter.

There are several comments and questions by individual committee members. One of the committee members expressed his reservation about the candidate's emphasis on the cultural factor to explain the land conflicts. Other members understood his reservation and suggested the candidate explain the mechanism where the cultural factor has remained throughout history in the revised version.

The other major comments and questions are:

1. The candidate should delete repetition in his explanation.
2. He should explain the nature of the survey and archival sources more carefully to highlight the value of the study.

3. He may want to enrich the discussion by citing some voices of the people who joined the focus group discussion.
4. He should polish the way he cites, especially when he cites the source of the same author but published in different years.

The committee members agreed that after addressing the main concerns listed by the examiners, the revised version can be submitted to the review committee again.

3. 最終提出論文確認結果 Confirmation by the Main Referee that changes have been done to the satisfaction of the referees

About a month after the defense, the revised version submitted by the candidate was sent to the committee members. They checked the new version, and the majority found that the revisions were made satisfactory. They left the final check entirely to the main adviser. The main adviser checked the revised version, together with the result of the plagiarism check by Turnitin, and told the candidate to make a few minor revisions. On September 10, 2021, the final version was submitted, and the main adviser found it satisfactory.

4. 最終審查結果 Final recommendation

The doctoral thesis review committee recommends that GRIPS award the degree of Ph.D. in Advanced Policy Studies to Mr. Solomon Haile Gebrezgabher.