1

Human Security and the Mine Ban Movement I: Introduction

Richard A. Matthew

The Age of Global Issues

FOR MOST OF HUMAN HISTORY, THE EARTH'S PARTS HAVE APPEARED TO BE FAR more important than its whole. Since the first humans evolved some one to five million years ago, countless people have been born and educated in the same place in which they eventually would work, worship, raise families, and die. Most of them had no direct contact with the world beyond a fifty-mile radius of their birthplaces, and the indirect contacts that touched on their worlds were typically—although not always—diffuse and rare. While over the millennia there were massive movements of people from one region to another, the peopling of the planet was generally a slow and cumulative process, in that most individuals had little or no personal experience of dislocation or change. Indeed only a thousand years ago, small communities could plan enormous projects—such as the great cathedrals of medieval Europe and the towering temples of Southeast Asia—that would take centuries to complete, secure in the belief that their small villages and their descendants would always be available to continue the labor and, one day, to appreciate its hard-won fruit.

This situation began to change five hundred years ago when advances in maritime technologies made it possible to lose sight of the coastline, explore the vast domain of the oceans, visit new lands, and still have a reasonable chance of finding one's way back home months or years later. But it is only in the twentieth century that we can speak of the planet as a

shared home in ways that make sense to almost everyone. The emergence of a truly global village and the development of a sense of shared purpose and fate that stretches across borders and cultures are recent phenomena.

Technological innovation has played a special and essential role in enabling this remarkable transformation in perceptions of the planet and its inhabitants. The process is often called *globalization*, a term that embodies a wide range of values, beliefs, practices, and institutions that have been affected by new technologies.[1] Advances in communications make it possible to see and to speak to people anywhere in the world in more or less real time. New transportation systems rush food, medical supplies, tourists, and militaries across thousands of miles in a matter of hours. Medical breakthroughs can be shared instantaneously; funds can be gathered and sent anywhere in seconds; scientific information can be placed in databases immediately available to everyone who has access to a computer. The political leaders of countries can, and do, meet on a regular basis to discuss issues of common concern. Businesses explore new opportunities, form partnerships, and move skills and capital around the globe in ways that were unimaginable just decades ago.

The various technology-driven processes that are bringing the world together in so many ways have also laid the groundwork for new political activities by uncovering problems that are global in magnitude and that require multilateral cooperation to address them effectively. The global agenda that has emerged in the age of globalization, and which would have been unthinkable in the not-too-distant past, is now widely familiar.[2] It involves, for example, multilateral efforts to control weapons of mass destruction, fight poverty, eradicate infectious diseases, stop terrorism, promote human rights, help refugees, advance the status of women, and protect the environment. The roots of these problems vary. What is common is that, first, they transcend national borders and are relevant in some way to everyone on the planet; and, second, they often require extensive, if not universal, cooperation in order to be resolved.

The global agenda poses a considerable challenge to people around the world. Responsibility for a given problem, such as biodiversity loss or terrorism, often is distributed unequally from one country to the next.[3] The same may be true of the social and other impacts of a given problem, and also of the resources needed to address it. What does one do if country X unintentionally and disproportionately causes a global problem that is felt most acutely in country Y, and only country Z has the effective means to resolve it? It can be very difficult to persuade the various parties to work together, especially if they are unequal in power; if they disagree in their analyses of the problem's causes, effects, and solution; and if they have as their primary political goal advancing the interests, especially short-term ones, of the people they represent over the interests of all others.

The United Nations and many other regional and ad hoc forums exist to bring state leaders together to discuss items on the global agenda. This political process, however, can be undermined, slowed, or diluted by particular objectives and tangential areas of disagreement. Fortunately, many global problems have been adopted in recent years by transnational networks or coalitions of concerned groups and individuals who are dedicated to gathering information about a given problem, educating the public about it, identifying solutions to it, and mobilizing the support and resources needed to implement the solutions. Thus, while global problems can appear to be enormous problems inevitably destined to become worse and worse over time, and people are rightly frustrated by the difficulties involved in bringing the vast resources and skills of the world to bear on these problems, there are grounds for cautious optimism. And these grounds are growing. According to the scholar James Rosenau:

> The transformation [taking place in contemporary world politics] is marked by a bifurcation in which the state-centric system now co-exists with an equally powerful, though more decentralized, multi-centric system. Although these two worlds of world politics have overlapping elements and concerns, their norms, structures, and processes tend to be mutually exclusive, thus giving rise to a set of global arrangements that are new and possibly enduring, as well as extremely complex and dynamic.[4]

In this volume, a diverse group of authors describes, analyzes, and evaluates what has arguably been the single most successful transnational coalition so far: the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL).[5] The insights of activists, scholars, government officials, and journalists, most of whom have had extensive experience with some aspect of the mine ban movement, as well as the commentaries of landmine victims themselves, have been gathered to tell a dramatic and inspiring story.[6] It is a story that is fascinating in its own right. It is a story that is instructive for those tackling other global issues. And it is a story that makes an important contribution to our understanding of the profound changes taking place today in the international system.[7]

In the following pages I provide a brief preview of this story, discuss the objectives and structure of the volume, and summarize its contents.

The Transnational Mine Ban Movement

The movement to ban antipersonnel landmines (APLs) is rooted in concerns raised by the International Red Cross in the 1950s,[8] but these

concerns were quite marginal to the global agenda until the 1990s, when members of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) working in mine-infested countries became aware of the toll APLs were taking on civilian populations, and began to suffer casualties themselves. In 1991, Asia Watch (AW) and Physicians for Human Rights (PHR) published *A Coward's War: Landmines in Cambodia*, and appealed to the world to ban these destructive weapons that tended to do so much of their damage after hostilities had ended. Throughout the world, tens of millions of landmines (a commonly cited estimate was over 100 million) had been left behind by the troops that had placed them.[9] Hidden along roads and paths, in fields and pastures, and even in schools and hospitals, APLs could sit silently for many years before exploding under the pressure of a child's footstep or beneath the hands of a woman pulling vegetables from a garden.

Infuriated by the world's apparent lack of concern for some 26,000 civilian victims a year, the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation (VVAF) decided in 1991 to unite with Medico International to coordinate a global mine ban movement. Both groups had extensive experience working in mine-infested states, and their members were aware of the great humanitarian costs APLs extracted. Within a year, they were joined by the French NGO Handicap International, Human Rights Watch-USA, Britain's Mines Advisory Group, and the PHR, together forming the ICBL.

The high-profile membership of the ICBL immediately gave it a fair amount of political leverage. In response to its first attempts to apply pressure on political leaders, the European Union asked its members to ratify the 1980 Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW), which included a protocol designed to limit the use of landmines and agree to a voluntary five-year ban on mine exports. That same year, 1992, President George H. W. Bush signed the Leahy–Evans moratorium on landmine exports. Senator Patrick Leahy had worked with the VVAF in designing this piece of legislation.

At this time, the ICBL developed a two-prong strategy for attaining its ultimate goal of a global mine ban. It would focus on building a transnational coalition of NGOs that would (a) educate publics, mobilize domestic support, and apply pressure on national governments and other relevant parties, and (b) urge governments to work toward a complete ban through the existing Convention on Conventional Weapons. Because the United States was not a signatory to the CCW, attention for (b) was focused through Handicap International on the French government. In early 1993, President François Mitterand was presented with a petition, containing over 22,000 signatures, demanding an end to the "coward's war." A week later, in Cambodia, Mitterand called for a review of the CCW, noted France's voluntary abstention from exporting mines, and urged other nations to follow suit. In December, the UN General Assem-

bly, at the request of the French ambassador, agreed to convene a CCW review meeting the following year.

The other track of ICBL's master strategy was pursued with equal vigor. In May 1993, fifty representatives from forty NGOs met in London at the ICBL's first NGO International Conference on Landmines, where agreement was reached to intensify efforts to mobilize public concern and support. Accordingly, Human Rights Watch-USA and Physicians for Human Rights produced *Landmines: A Deadly Legacy*. Public interest grew, and soon Bofors, a Swedish company, announced that, for moral reasons, it would no longer produce landmines. A pathway to the business community had been established, and the NGO movement was starting to affect behavior.

A second NGO International Conference on Landmines was held in Geneva in May, 1994. At the conference's keynote session, VVAF President Bobby Mueller argued that the ICBL

> must go beyond the structures of government. . . . We must build public awareness of what landmines are doing around the world directly. Only by building such awareness are we going to get the additional movement forward that this campaign critically needs. . . . If we continue the path of courting the military, if we continue the path of courting the political figures on an insiders-game basis, we will lose. We have to up the ante. We've got to take it public.[10]

Over the next eighteen months, commitment to the vision of a mine-free world grew: UNICEF, UNCHR (UN Commission on Human Rights), and the Vatican expressed support for a total mine ban; Mines Action Canada held its first meeting in Ottawa and began to apply pressure to the Canadian government to emulate the forward-looking policies of European middle powers; a report from the UN secretary-general concluded that a total ban would be the most effective approach to dealing with the problem; a large number of NGO Web sites were posted; and President Clinton, in a speech to the United Nations that raised hopes around the world, called for all countries to work toward the elimination of antipersonnel landmines.[11]

Unfortunately, the first CCW Review Conference, held in Vienna in September 1995, dampened NGO enthusiasm considerably. It became clear to the small group of NGO representatives attending the meetings that government officials had no mandate to work toward a mine ban, and were very quickly negotiating themselves into a procedural gridlock. Immediately the ICBL adjusted its strategy to place pressure on the governments of sympathetic countries while intensifying the mobilization of public support. Its members hoped that countries like Canada, France,

and Sweden would form a bloc that would push the CCW review in a more positive direction. When this strategy failed in subsequent review meetings, the ICBL began to consider ways of working toward a ban outside existing mechanisms for arms control negotiations.

In April 1996, the ICBL organized a meeting with representatives from fourteen pro-ban states at the Quaker United Nations Office in Geneva. At this meeting, the Canadian representative, Robert Lawson, suggested that Canada might host a conference of pro-ban states outside the CCW framework. Enthusiastically supported by the ICBL, the conference was held that October in Ottawa, and proved to be a turning point in the campaign. Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy proposed working outside the UN system, with the NGO mine ban community, toward the goal of signing a convention banning APLs by the end of 1997.

Throughout the remainder of the year and into 1997, the ICBL organized meetings around the world to mobilize support, educate the public, and apply pressure to governments. The public space was flooded with statistics and images of mine victims; celebrities such as Princess Diana and Queen Noor lent their support to the campaign; and then, in October, the ICBL was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, a high-profile acknowledgment of the humanitarian importance of its campaign.

Although the United States rejected the ICBL/Ottawa Process and expressed its commitment to working within the constraints of the CCW, and although other major and middle powers including China, Russia, Pakistan, and Iraq followed the American lead, the transnational political effort of the ICBL proved unstoppable. NGOs around the world had brought the issue to the public's attention. They had collected and published extensive data on the extent of the mine problem, and the high costs it forced onto individuals and societies. They had developed compelling moral, economic, and military arguments in support of a ban.[12] And they had shared in the creation of a vast transnational network that was successful in applying pressure to governments at every level and on every continent. On December 3, 1997, 121 countries signed the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction—the Mine Ban Treaty—at a ceremony in Ottawa attended by four hundred ICBL representatives.[13]

The effects of the Mine Ban Treaty (MBT) have been as dramatic as the transnational process that produced it. According to a report prepared in December 2000 by Canada's Mine Action Team, established in the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, the MBT is working as desired.[14] Canada has focused considerable effort on the implementation phase of the treaty, developing *An Agenda for Mine Action* immediately following the signing ceremony. According to statistics presented in this report, which are based on a global assessment effort,

global production of APLs has declined enormously since 1997, and for the first time in three decades more mines are being cleared than are being laid. Extensive tracts of heavily mined areas in Nicaragua, Cambodia, Afghanistan, and Jordan, countries that had seemingly irreversible problems five years ago, have been cleared and declared safe for human use.[15] Thirty-three of thirty-four countries known to have been APL producers have taken official steps to end the production and transfer of mines. By 1999, casualty rates had declined tremendously in mine-infested countries: for example, by 89 percent in Bosnia, 45 percent in Mozambique, and 41 percent in Cambodia, from peaks experienced in the mid-1990s.

Although a number of major powers have refused to sign the ICBL, they appear, according to Robert Lawson, for the most part, to be acting in accordance with its regulations.[16] The country of greatest concern to many has been the United States, which once led the mine ban effort—at least according to its own rhetoric. In January 2001, President Clinton summarized the U.S. position as follows:

> Our goal has been to end the use of all anti-personnel landmines outside of Korea by 2003, and we have aimed to sign the Ottawa Convention by 2006 if suitable options can be found that will allow us to maintain the war-fighting capability and safety of our men and women in uniform.[17]

It will take some time to fully assess the impact of the MBT, and especially to assess the extent to which it has shaped behavior (versus, say, acknowledging and codifying changes already in progress). Preliminary assessments, however, are widely regarded as highly positive, and there is a conviction among NGO and government parties to the process that it would not have succeeded without the energetic, innovative, unrelenting, and transnational NGO effort.

Objectives and Structure of Volume

Is the mine ban movement an early indicator of the changing character of world politics? Can we expect more successes to arise through transnational politics, perhaps in areas such as counterterrorism, poverty alleviation, environmental rescue, preventing computer sabotage, and controlling illegal sales of small arms? What can we learn from the mine ban movement about the requirements for effective transnational efforts? To begin to answer these questions, we need a comprehensive, multiperspectival analysis of the mine ban movement. How did it happen? Was it exceptional? What lessons can be learned from it? What has

its impact been? This volume is designed to answer the specific questions, and formulate some tentative answers to the more general ones.

Against this background, the volume has three explicit objectives. First, we seek to demonstrate the value of participatory research. We share a conviction that an authentic account of the mine ban movement can only emerge from bringing together the diverse perspectives and experiences of practitioners and observers who had been involved at every stage of the process. Chapters in this volume are written by those who founded and directed the ICBL; those who joined the coalition from both developed and developing countries; those who have been affected by the MBT—especially deminers and survivors; celebrities attracted to support this humanitarian cause; journalists and scholars who had studied the behavior of the ICBL as an important example of transnational politics; officials representing countries that support the MBT as well as countries that do not; individuals skeptical of the goals or actions of the ICBL; and military specialists familiar with the use and value of APLs in battlefield situations.

Second, we want to make a theoretical contribution to the academic literature on global civil society and transnational activism. In particular we are interested in using the case of the ICBL to assess the extent to which NGO networks can and do shape world politics, examine the processes through which this occurs, and consider ways in which these processes might be criticized.

Finally, we hope to offer practical lessons and insights to the NGO community. While many of the contributors do this, part 4 of this volume brings together these lessons in a very straightforward and compelling manner.

To realize these objectives, *Landmines and Human Security* is organized into four parts:[18]

- Part One, "The Global Landmine Crisis," provides an annotated chronology of the mine ban movement from 1991 to 1997, and a detailed description of the magnitude of the problem before and after the treaty, with special emphasis given to the challenges faced in the developing world.
- Part Two, "Perspectives on the Mine Ban Movement," brings together a diverse group of experts from the academic, governmental, and nongovernmental arenas in both the North and the South, each addressing the questions, What happened? Why? What is the significance of this phenomenon? How effective has it been? What do we learn from it? What remains to be done?
- Part Three, "Related Issues: Demining and Victim Assistance," provides supplementary analyses of specific aspects of this case in order to ensure that the reader has as complete an understanding of it as

possible. This section includes a critical view of the focus of the mine ban movement and an argument about the continuing military utility of APLs. In addition, the special case of the United States is examined in detail by several authors; experts comment on the technical and other requirements of effective demining and victim assistance; and an environmental specialist considers the extensive ecological effects of APLs, reminding us that this humanitarian challenge also has an environmentally destructive dimension to it.

- Part Four, "Implications of the Mine Ban Movement," responds directly to the specific and general questions raised in part 2 with commentaries by two leaders of the ICBL and a scholar who specializes in NGO coalitions and transnational politics.

Brief Summaries of Chapters

Landmines and Human Security begins with four forewords written by individuals who have committed their time and effort to supporting the mine ban movement. Her Majesty Queen Noor, the Honorable Lloyd Axworthy, Lady Heather Mills McCartney and Sir Paul McCartney, and Senator Patrick Leahy offer very personal statements about why they have supported the ICBL, and what, from their unique perspectives, the ICBL offers the world as a model for tackling global humanitarian issues. Their contributions also underscore an NGO strategy that has been facilitated by contemporary communications technologies, and that was used to great effect by the ICBL: generating interest and support in a cause by attracting highly regarded, celebrity spokespeople, whose presence extends across borders of all kinds.

The first section of the volume offers a detailed account of the mine ban process itself. In chapter 2, "The Global Landmine Crisis in the 1990s," Bryan McDonald offers a chronology and analysis of the main events and steps taken from the decision to form the ICBL in 1991 to the signing of the MBT in 1997. The structure of this chapter provides a framework for analyzing the mine ban process, aspects of which are examined in detail in subsequent chapters. The process is divided into four parts: identifying the problem and making a commitment to addressing it; developing a transnational organization with this purpose; framing the problem in order to attract broad public and governmental support; and writing, implementing, and monitoring the treaty itself.

Completing the first section of the volume, Leah Fraser draws on several sources to describe the impact the MBT has had on the developing world since 1997. In chapter 3, "Evaluating the Impacts of the Ottawa Treaty," Fraser notes that while there are many reasons to be encouraged

by the treaty's effects, the world is still awash with landmines, the needs of victims remain costly and, in many areas, inadequately met, and a few countries continue to manufacture and use APLs.

The second section of the volume examines in great detail the impacts of the mine ban movement from the vantages of NGOs, states, and survivors in both the North and the South. Kenneth R. Rutherford, a landmine survivor who cofounded the Landmine Survivors Network and also wrote his PhD dissertation on the mine ban process, brings his insights as activist and scholar to bear on the issue of NGO involvement in chapter 4, "Nongovernmental Organizations and the Landmine Ban." Rutherford argues that NGOs led on this issue, and the success of the MBT has been largely due to NGO activity.

In chapter 5, "Clearing the Path to a Mine-Free World: Implementing the Ottawa Convention," Kerry Brinkert and Kevin Hamilton, who both worked for the Mine Action Team in Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, offer a detailed analysis of the diverse global activity that has been generated by the MBT, with a special focus on Canada. This line of inquiry is expanded in chapter 6, "Europe and the Ottawa Treaty: Compliance with Exceptions and Loopholes," written by scholars Paul Chamberlain and David Long. They examine how different countries in Europe have responded to the various provisions of the MBT, pointing out some of the exceptions and loopholes that have resulted in suboptimal outcomes. In spite of this, their overall assessment of the treaty's value is highly positive.

In chapter 7, "Perspective from a Mine-Affected Country: Mozambique," former Ambassador Carlos dos Santos writes about the impact the MBT has had in the Southern Hemisphere. According to dos Santos, the inclusive character of the ICBL allowed small, mine-infested countries like Mozambique to play a significant role in world politics—often for the first time. Instead of being relegated to the margins of discussion and negotiation, as so often happens in world affairs, they were welcomed into the center of activity, and their views and concerns were taken seriously. Not only has this led to significant progress in demining, mine awareness, and victim assistance in the developing world, but as countries in the South have come to realize the depth of multilateral commitment it has strengthened democratic practices, empowered NGOs and civil society, improved human security, and convinced many of the enormous value of international cooperation.

Finally, in chapter 8, "Victim Assistance: Landmine Survivors' Perspectives," Raquel Willerman discusses the impacts of the MBT from the perspective of landmine survivors. Landmines are a diabolical weapon, designed with the goal of disfiguring and maiming people for life. The victims of APLs may lose their livelihoods, be abandoned by their spouses

and other family members, and find themselves shunned by their communities. Physical rehabilitation, psychological counseling, and job training are expensive and not always available when and where they are needed. The MBT is unique in its sustained focus on the needs of survivors, and Willerman argues that much has been learned about how to assist victims and reintegrate them into lives of dignity and productivity. At the same time, the needs of landmine victims continue to be great, often taxing local resources and making the maintenance of global assistance programs essential.

The third part of this volume brings together a diverse group of authors writing, sometimes enthusiastically and sometimes critically, about different aspects of the mine ban process. Michael J. Flynn begins this section with an incisive discussion of a rift in the ICBL between those focused on the ban and those focused on demining. In chapter 9, "Political Minefield," Flynn points out that there have been serious disagreements over priorities and suggests that these may have weakened the ICBL.

In chapter 10, "Tackling the Global Landmine Problem: The United States Perspective," Stacy Bernard Davis and Donald F. "Pat" Patierno describe in detail the U.S. position and the extensive humanitarian effort it has designed and funded over the past decade. Key figures in the Humanitarian Demining Program, Davis and Patierno provide a rare and highly informative look at what the United States is doing—rather than what it has failed to do. This chapter serves to remind us that even countries that fail to sign international treaties may act in ways that advance treaty objectives, as the United States has done. In this case, pressure applied by the NGO community—which has been remarkably active and ambitious in the United States—cannot be discounted insofar as shaping the behavior of the United States is concerned. Nor can the NGO movement be deemed a failure simply because it has not yet persuaded the United States to become a signatory of the MBT. The United States is a singular state at this point in world history, but it is not above sharing the world's concerns about the humanitarian crisis posed by abandoned fields of APLs and joining, on its terms, the struggle to respond to this crisis.

Mine clearance is a key provision of the MBT and it receives careful consideration in three chapters in this section. In chapter 11, "Demining: Enhancing the Process," Colin King, widely regarded as the world's leading expert on the technologies of demining, examines the nuts and bolts of optimizing the mine-clearing process. His extensive field experience undergirds a powerful account of the complicated real-world situations deminers face.

In chapter 12, "Public–Private Demining Partnerships: A Case Study of Afghanistan," Oren J. Schlein describes creative efforts to fund demining programs. As director of the United Nations Association of the USA

Adopt-A-Minefield program, Schlein has played a key role in a successful experiment to personalize demining activities and encourage private and public entities to provide financial support for clearing specific minefields around the world. Not only has this strategy brought together actors ranging from the U.S. government to anonymous individuals and grade school classes, it has raised enough funds to have a significant impact in mine-infested countries such as Afghanistan. Schlein's analysis of civil society working in close collaboration with government bodies is an excellent illustration of the depth and versatility of transnational politics.

Nay Htun, who works with the University for Peace in Costa Rica, rounds out this trio of chapters with a discussion of the need to address the high political, social, and economic costs that accrue when land is denied by APLs. In chapter 13, "Landmines Prolong Conflicts and Impede Socioeconomic Development," Htun argues that an integrated approach to demining is essential. By this he means that the funds and expertise for clearing mines must be accompanied by assistance for resettling people and for economic and social rehabilitation and recovery. The dramatic cases of Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Laos—three of the most heavily mined places on the planet—are used to clarify and illustrate the author's argument.

Part of the program Htun recommends is covered in the MBT provisions for victim assistance. In chapter 14, "The Victim Assistance Provision of the Mine Ban Treaty," Glenna L. Fak interprets these provisions, examines legal and other limitations on their implementation, and makes extensive recommendations for how to help victims most effectively. Fak describes a range of valuable activities that can be undertaken by states and NGOs.

The humanitarian focus of the ICBL was intentional and a key to its success. However, landmines have also inflicted great damage on the natural environment—an aspect of their destructiveness that is not widely known or studied. In chapter 15, "The Environmental Impacts of Landmines," Claudio Torres Nachón provides a richly detailed description and analysis of this aspect of the landmine problem. Torres, a key figure in the ICBL, presents the results of extensive research on this issue in Africa and the Americas, provides a lucid discussion of the legal basis for action on this front, and offers concrete recommendations on the steps that need to be taken.

Finally, one of the great dividing lines on this issue pertains to arguments over the military utility of landmines. While no one denies that APLs have been used effectively on the battlefield, mine ban advocates contend that the humanitarian costs greatly outweigh military benefits in any theater of conflict. From their perspective, alternatives to APLs are available for virtually every scenario one can imagine—effective alternatives that would be greatly preferable to APLs from both moral and eco-

nomic perspectives. The militaries of the United States and other nonsignatory states have disputed these claims, suggesting that APLs play important and irreplaceable roles in efforts to maximize national security and provide soldiers with adequate protection on the battlefield.

In chapter 16, "A Necessary Evil?: Reexamining the Military Utility of Antipersonnel Landmines," Ted Gaulin explains why some fifty of the world's militaries have been reluctant to forego the use of landmines. A former U.S. Army officer with extensive combat experience, Gaulin describes in detail the military value of landmines, analyzes the limitations of alternatives, and concludes that APLs will retain their tactical utility in the years ahead.

In the final chapter of this section, "Are Landmines Still Needed to Defend South Korea?: A Mine Use Case Study," J. Antonio Ohe investigates the principal U.S. argument against signing the MBT. A master sergeant in the Army National Guard and a specialist in weapons of mass effect, Ohe draws on extensive military documentation to assess the role of APLs in defending South Korea. His conclusion is forceful and unqualified: APLs are not required in this case and their use may, in fact, be undesirable. From Ohe's perspective, the U.S. refusal to sign the MBT is due to institutional inertia and aversion to change rather than sound assessments of the military utility of APLs.

The volume concludes with a section on the broader implications of the mine ban movement for world politics. In chapter 18, "The Campaign to Ban Antipersonnel Landmines: Potential Lessons," Stephen Goose and Jody Williams draw on their unparalleled experience with this issue to suggest lessons that will be of great interest to participants in other transnational coalitions. Williams is the former coordinator and current international ambassador of the ICBL and also the corecipient of the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize. Goose is program director for the Arms Division of Human Rights Watch. Their chapter offers hard-won lessons in two areas: the first includes campaigning, coalition building, and organizing; the second refers to what they call the "new diplomacy" model. This model includes behavior structured outside the formal UN system with extensive NGO participation, key roles played by middle powers, a rejection of consensus rules, and geographic diversity. The lessons Goose and Williams share are the lucid and practical conclusions of years spent on the front lines of transnational politics. This brilliant chapter summarizes many of the claims made throughout the rest of the volume, and anchors the book to the real world as only the insights of highly experienced practitioner-observers could hope to do.

It is complemented by chapter 19, "The Campaign to Ban Antipersonnel Landmines and Global Civil Society." Written by Paul Wapner, a scholar whose award-winning work on global activism and transnational

politics has been influential in the field of international relations, this chapter adds the dispassionate eye of a gifted academic to the volume. Wapner uses the case of the mine ban process to illuminate and defend the concept of global civil society. When the field of international relations emerged after World War I, it focused mainly on states and their foreign policies. Over the years, interest has grown in the activities of nonstate actors, but many remain skeptical about the significance of this dimension of world politics. Wapner argues that global civil society is a significant force in world affairs that is indeed global (rather than Western), civil (rather than self-interested), and societal (rather than unstructured). From his analytical perspective, the MBT is evidence of what global civil society can do in a world that is formally and legally organized into some 210 sovereign states. It is a case that rightly offers great hope for those who want to tackle other global challenges.[19]

The volume concludes with chapter 20, "Human Security and the Mine Ban Movement II: Conclusions." This chapter offers a brief evaluation of the book's success in achieving three objectives: encouraging participatory research, contributing to the academic literature on transnational politics, and drawing practical lessons from the mine ban case that might be used by political activists working on other transnational issues. Three "next steps" are suggested, based on this evaluation. The first is to apply a participatory methodology to other cases as we believe this provides valuable insight into contemporary global politics, and would generate a body of work that could be used to refine and revise existing theories. The second recommendation concerns the need to examine more carefully the implications of NGO-driven transnational politics for issues such as accountability. Transnational movements are able to mobilize enormous resources and shape policy that affects people worldwide. It is important that power generated and exercised in this way be accountable to the public it affects. A third and final recommendation is to ensure that the ICBL does not diminish at a time when great progress has been made, but much remains to be done. It seems that all too often NGOs bring considerable resources to bear on global problems, but are forced to withdraw before their work is done, because their funding depends on the shifting priorities of governments, foundations, and the public.

Conclusions

Landmines and Human Security is unique in bringing together the diverse perspectives of scholars, government officials, activists, and journalists from around the world to provide a comprehensive account of a very im-

portant example of successful transnational politics. Although the volume has a celebratory tone that reflects the views of many of the contributors, it also includes critical perspectives, counterarguments, and extensive discussions of the challenges that remain in this area. The editors believe that this inclusive, participatory approach to research and analysis is especially appropriate to the study of transnational activism. We feel that, taken as a whole, the volume is insightful, educational, balanced, and pioneering, and we invite readers to wander through its contents, secure in the knowledge that many years of hands-on field and research experience are represented in these pages.

Notes

1. I define globalization as a process driven largely by technological innovation (in the global context of expanding capitalism and democracy) that has empowered nonstate actors in ways that have no precedent during the modern age of the sovereign state. Globalization is characterized in large measure by an enormous increase in the speed, density, and character of cross-border transactions that states have not been able to regulate or manage (e.g, information flows and sales of goods and services via the Internet). Its impacts on fundamental human issues such as justice, security, welfare, and environmental quality have been mixed, and debate has raged over whether its negative effects will overwhelm its positive ones. Transnational processes can strengthen local communities fighting injustice or insecurity; they can also exploit communities and transform them into hubs for sex tourism or cheap labor. For a discussion of the negative effects, see Robert Kaplan, "The Coming Anarchy," *Atlantic Monthly* 273 (1994): 44–76; Benjamin Barber, *Jihad Versus McWorld* (New York: Times Books, 1995); and Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1998). On the positive effects, see Paul Wapner, *Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics* (Albany: State University of New York, 1996); Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Avon, 1993); and Thomas L. Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1999).

2. Perhaps the most influential and familiar recent attempt to formalize a global agenda is the World Commission on Environment and Development's *Our Common Future* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).

3. For a discussion, see Richard A. Matthew and George Shambaugh, "Sex, Drugs, and Heavy Metal: Transnational Threats and National Vulnerabilities," *Security Dialogue* 29, no. 2 (1998): 163–176.

4. James N. Rosenau, *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 11.

5. Certainly the environmental and human rights movements have also been impressive. The mine ban movement is notable for the speed with which very concrete results have been achieved.

6. This participatory approach to scholarship brings together the knowledge, experience, and analytical skills of participants, observers, and participant-observers. The great diversity of perspectives provides wonderful insights into the mine ban movement, ranging from commentaries on the nuts and bolts of developing effective political strategies to dispassionate analyses of what this phenomenon tells us about the changing character of world politics. Writing styles, objectives, and standards for evidence vary among the contributors to this volume. We have not sought to impose an analytical framework that might rationalize the various contributions, however, because we feel that by accepting the validity of each voice we are able to tell a story that is both authentic and valuable.

7. An earlier, and very influential, version of this story is Maxwell J. Cameron, Robert J. Lawson, and Brian W. Tomlin, eds., *To Walk without Fear: The Global Movement to Ban Landmines* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

8. Landmines first came into wide use during World War II.

9. Shawn Roberts and Jody Williams, *After the Gun's Fall Silent: The Enduring Legacy of Landmines* (Washington, DC: Vietnam Veterans Foundation of America, 1995), 3.

10. Robert Mueller, "The International Campaign to Ban Landmines: Where Do We Go from Here?" Keynote address, presented at the Second NGO International Conference on Landmines, May 9–11, 1999.

11. Under pressure from the Department of Defense, Clinton quickly retreated from his own call, claiming that American APLs were needed to protect U.S. soldiers, and noting that American mines were "smart" mines that deactivated automatically after a short period of time. For a discussion of the U.S. position, see Richard Matthew and Ken Rutherford, "Banning Landmines in the American Century," *International Journal of World Peace* 16, no. 2 (June 1999): 23–36.

12. These arguments are reviewed in detail in Matthew and Rutherford, "Banning Landmines"; and Richard Matthew and Ken Rutherford, "The Evolutionary Dynamics of the Movement to Ban Landmines," *Alternatives* 28, no. 1 (2003): 29–56.

13. Also referred to as the Ottawa Treaty.

14. Information in this paragraph is based on an unpublished report written in 2000 by Kerry Brinkert and Kevin Hamilton.

15. On recent trips to Cambodia (2000), Jordan (2000), and the Afghanistan border (1999), I have been able to observe a remarkable amount of activity related to mine education, mine clearing, and survivor assistance. For example,

travel to Siem Reap in Cambodia is possible today because of effective mine removal since 1997.

16. Based on personal communication, May 8, 2000.

17. The White House, "Final Statement on Landmines," January 19, 2001. Available on-line at: http://www.humptydumpty.net/in_the_press./asp.

18. The concept of human security received its most familiar definition in the United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP's) 1994 *Human Development Report*:

   security has far too long been interpreted narrowly: as security of territory . . . or as protection of national interests . . . or as global security from the threat of nuclear holocaust. . . . Forgotten were the legitimate concerns of ordinary people who sought security in their daily lives.

   The authors of the UNDP report suggest "human security" as a concept that can recover the earlier on-the-ground focus of the state's security practices.

   Human security can be said to have two main aspects. It means, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life.

19. It should be noted that the editors had intended to include resource materials in this volume. However, these materials were left out of the final version of the volume due to space considerations. As such we have made these resources available online. These resources include the full text of the Mine Ban Treaty as well as an extensive listing of bibliographic and other resources on landmines complied by Julia Gelfand, the applied sciences librarian at the University of California–Irvine. These resources may be found at http://www.cusa.uci.edu/landmines and human security.htm.