Words to Deeds

A New International Agenda for Peace and Security:

Oxfam's 10-point Plan

'There are many people in the world for whom [September 11] might have no particular meaning, because 2001 was not different from 2000 or 1999. It was just another year of living with HIV/AIDS, or in a refugee camp, or under repressive rule, or with crushing poverty, or of watching crops dwindle and children go hungry, as the global environment comes under greater threat.'

Kofi Annan, 19 December 2001

Oxfam International

Summary

The abhorrent acts of September 11, and the subsequent international response has significantly challenged the Western world's most commonly held views on peace, security, and justice. But as Kofi Annan said, September 11 did not change the world. In most respects, and for the vast majority of people, the world today looks very similar to how it did on September 10.

What *has* changed since September 11 is the political imperative for international action, and the prospects for addressing some of the underlying and chronic imbalances that continue to undermine the security of states and peoples. World leaders have drawn connections between the acts of terrorism on September 11, the rise in violent extremism, and the global crisis of poverty, inequality, failed diplomacy, and persistent humanitarian need. While there clearly is not always a direct link between poverty and terrorism, Afghanistan has shown the world that widespread suffering and failed states can breed terrorism and instability. It is becoming yet more apparent that achieving human security – focused on the protection of the lives and livelihoods of people - is a key to achieving global security. Politicians are turning their attention to the links between the crisis in global security and the crisis of globalisation, whereby the exclusionary effects of current trade rules have caused extreme polarisation and frustration around the world.

September 11 has forced Western leaders to confront the deep structural imbalances and historical animosities that fuel violence and extremism, and to recognise that there can be no global security without global social justice. World leaders are now among those that are making proposals to transform international action, to shift radically the patterns of globalisation in favour of the poor, and to create a more just and inclusive approach to development.

At the Financing for Development conference in Monterrey, the first signs emerged that world leaders are prepared to do more to tackle global poverty. The US, EU, Canada, and others all announced increases in aid in support of efforts to achieve the Millenium Development Goals. The United States, the UN, the EU and key Arab governments have all shown signs of seeking a renewed peace intiative for the Middle East. The British government is among those leading efforts to build a new engagement with Africa. Such proposals from politicians go some way to meet the demands of citizens everywhere pressing for action, exemplified by the growing US public support for increased foreign aid, the significant international clamour for humanitarian protection in Afghanistan, and the rising involvement by people, particularly young people, in citizens' movements pushing for greater economic justice.Such commitments could become a basis for a new international agenda. However, political action to match these good intentions must be much more significant and sustained.

For most of the world, the face of the new international engagement from Western leaders since September 11 has been primarily one of war. The war in Afghanistan, and threats of extending military action to other countries, has dominated the international agenda. International humanitarian law – and

respect for the rights of civilians in conflict – has been routinely ignored by all warring parties. Major anti-terrorism laws restricting civil liberties have been passed in most countries. Increases in aid have been almost exclusively directed towards military allies. Meanwhile, the chronic conflicts causing suffering around the world have continued or intensified. The significant increase in violence between Israel and the Palestinians, the explosive tensions between India and Pakistan, and the many other less visible conflicts across Asia and Africa have only worsened since September. One of the greatest opportunities for change was missed in November 2001 – a time when the world was eager to see concrete measures in international political relations – when the wealthy nations of the world closed the doors to greater trade equity at the World Trade Summit in Doha. The world has seen little of the promised international engagement to build the foundations for lasting peace and security that so many of its leaders have promised.

Afghanistan highlighted the need to deal with the root causes of conflict and insecurity if the effort to stop acts of terrorism and achieve global peace and prosperity is ultimately to be successful. It is not sustainable to have billions of people excluded from basic opportunities, to ignore the plight of dozens of states and millions of people affected by violent conflict, and for part of the world to get richer while the rest gets poorer.

Taking action to address these fundamental injustices is not only a moral imperative; it is also in the security interests of the world community. It requires new international partnerships and collaboration. There has been significant rhetoric pointing in this direction. Now what is needed are the policies and strategies that will turn these words into deeds. It is time to make globalisation work for the poor, and to reform a range of interconnected policies that lie at the heart of achieving human and global security.

Oxfam is committed to seeing these reforms through. It will be working with its partners and constituencies around the world to make a real difference to the underlying causes of the current global crisis, and pressuring world leaders to take tangible steps to turn their political commitments into action.

'Today's real borders are not between nations, but between powerful and powerless, free and fettered, privileged and humiliated. Today, no walls can separate humanitarian or human rights crises in one part of the world from national security crises in another.'

Kofi Annan

December 2001

Oxfam's 10-point plan for international action

1   Fulfil the commitment to rebuild Afghanistan.

2   Establish a new basis of engagement with the Arab world and the Middle East.

3   Renew efforts to resolve chronic emergencies and conflicts.

4   Restrict profiteering from war.

5   Curb the flow of arms that fuel conflict.

6   Reaffirm the rule of international humanitarian law and human rights law.

7   Support an international system of justice.

8   Fight against discrimination and the exclusion of women.

9   Increase aid and debt relief to meet the 2015 targets for poverty reduction.

10 Make globalisation work for poverty reduction.

Taking concrete steps that show real progress on each of these issues would build confidence that the international coalition united to combat terrorism is also serious about addressing the injustices that fan the flames of violent extremism. To do otherwise would risk exacerbating the tensions that continue to undermine global security and prosperity.

Oxfam's 10-Point Plan

1: Fulfill the commitment to rebuild Afghanistan

More than two decades of conflict, combined with three years of recent drought, earthquakes and floods have caused widespread human suffering and massive displacement of the Afghan population, both within the country and into neighbouring countries. After years of civil war, and the devastation brought by four months of bombing, Afghanistan's infrastructure has been destroyed or degraded, its human-resource base severely depleted, and its social institutions ruined. Afghanistan's indicators of maternal and infant mortality, health, education, and access to water and sanitation rank among the worst in the world. Women and children have been the hardest hit by the long years of deprivation and war and after decades of war, and seven years of a fundamentalist regime, the difference in life chances for men and women have further widened.

The end of the Taliban tyranny, the prospects of a transitional government, and engagement by the international community have offered previously unimagined hope to the people of Afghanistan. The World Bank has estimated that it will cost $15bn to establish the institutional, human, and material foundations necessary for a stable society. The most optimistic forecasts are that a 10-year timeframe will be needed to achieve these goals. Given the social, psychological, and cultural impacts of the war, it will take several decades of investment in social development for Afghanistan to rebuild its lost human capital.

At the January conference on Afghanistan in Tokyo, donors pledged more than $4bn over the next two years. This is a far cry form the neglectful policies of donors prior to September 11. Yet only a fraction of the money pledged in Tokyo - $671m – has been disbursed. Much of this money is funding much needed immediate emergency assistance but neglecting urgent reconstruction needs.

The interim administration needs strengthening and support, yet donor funds to pay salaries have been slow to arrive. The humanitarian situation – especially for those displaced inside the country – is still worsening. Mines and unexploded ordinance pose a daily threat to lives and limbs. Many parts of the country remain very insecure, inhibiting the delivery of humanitarian assistance, the political process and Afghanistan's longer-term reconstruction and development.

Afghanistan continues to serve as a test of international commitment to tackle the causes and consequences of conflict and terrorism. The international community has both political and moral obligations to rebuild Afghanistan, both to avert further conflict in the region, and to reverse the decades of suffering endured by millions of people across the region.

Recommendations

1. The reconstruction of Afghanistan will only be possible if security is restored and maintained. The international community must make security their highest priority. Innovative partnerships between the UN, the International Security Assistance Force, the new Afghan Administration, and local governors are critical to this. Donors should invest in training programmes for local police and in DDR programmes (demobilisation, disarmament and reintegration of ex-combatants). There should also be long-term funding to re-establish a civilian police force and judicial system, in order to provide security throughout the country. Civil society will have an important role to play in pressing for these structures to be accountable to the Afghan people.

2. Donors must deliver and disburse their pledges of $3bn for the next two years of transition, to ensure adequate funding and institutional support for reconstruction and development in both Afghanistan and Pakistan. It is essential that donors coordinate effectively with one another to minimise conflicting demands on the Transitional Administration. The Implementation Group should link closely with existing donor co-ordination and consultation mechanisms, including the Afghan Support Group and the Afghan Reconstruction Steering Group.

3. Donors, the UN and the interim administration need to ensure that the voice and views of civil society are heard in the planning and decision making governing the use of aid, in recovery and reconstruction management, and in fund management. Particular attention is needed to include women and other marginalised groups in this.

4. Commitments to women's organisations in Afghanistan should be upheld, including the incorporation of women in public office, hiring gender advisors to key institutions, and establishing specific budgets for women's development. Similar specific commitments should be made to marginalised groups who are not currently represented in the transition government.

5. The impact of large influxes of international aid and organisations should be monitored. Donor registration, co-

ordination, and adherence to existing Codes of Conduct (such as the SPHERE Standards) should be upheld. Donor investments should seek primarily to build the capacity of local organisations to take forward the long-term task of rebuilding Afghanistan. International organisations should respect the Code of Conduct, drafted by ACBAR, the Afghan NGO network, and supported by donors at the Bonn conference, which sets out appropriate standards for employing Afghans in international organisations.

6. Respect for human rights should be the foundation for reconstruction. This requires investment in systems of human rights protection and justice, including specific measures taken to address women's rights. All peacekeeping and security forces should have mandatory training of security personnel in human rights and in the specific issues relating to women's security and gender violence. A human rights mission should be established, as proposed by Mary Robinson.

7. Debt relief will be an important form of funds for Afghanistan. The Afghan administration should be able to use all its resources for reconstruction. Afghan governments in the 1970s built up approximately US$45m in multilateral debt. As a first step, the international community should cancel this sum. The elaboration of a PRSP, with the involvement of Afghan civil society, should be a condition for the provision of debt cancellation.

Point 2: A new engagement with the Arab world and the Middle East

The current crisis has in many ways awakened the world to the bankruptcy of Western policy towards the Middle East, and the deeply undemocratic nature of many Middle Eastern states that are considered close allies of the West. Oil and strategic interests have led to a tacit acceptance of human rights abuse, repressive states, and undemocratic regimes throughout the region. Economic and military aid, combined with preferential trade agreements, have strengthened these regimes and closed the avenues for political debate, constructive opposition, and

> *'Violence is frequently born out of frustration. Those who have nothing, risk nothing by taking up arms. This is not a justification for conflict, even less for the terrible terrorist attacks of last month. But it is a recognition that poverty and deprivation provide the breeding ground for discontent and anger, where ethnic and religious issues are easily exploited and magnified.'*
>
> Javier Solana, EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy
>
> 21 October 2001

the pursuit by civil society of reforms that would benefit the growing numbers of poor people in the region. Repression and violence are fuelled by massive influxes of military aid to the region.

The costs of this policy are now painfully clear. Many regimes that were once the triumphant result of anti-colonial struggles are now among the most repressive in the world. The stability of these regimes is only maintained by restrictions on individual freedoms and the promotion of extreme forms of nationalism and religious fundamentalism. The disappointment within the Middle East over the failure of the post-colonial regimes, combined with growing levels of poverty, unemployment, and lack of education among large sections of the population, has contributed to the rise in support for religious militancy as a political alternative.

Western states must begin engaging in a long-term process of social and political development in the Middle East. This must be based not on winning an ideological war, but on achieving tangible improvements in people's civil and political rights, reversing the rise in poverty across the region, and building the accountability of states to their people. The foundation for engagement with the Middle East must be the consistent and universal application of internationally accepted laws and standards governing human rights. This will require a fundamental shift in Middle East policy in the US and Europe, with concrete steps taken to reduce the influence of the politics of oil in sustaining undemocratic regimes.

As noted by most political leaders, resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and an end to people's suffering in Iraq must be priorities. These conflicts have a deeply destabilising and polarising effect throughout the region, and undermine any efforts to build a new engagement with the Middle East. In the case of Israel and the Palestinian Territories, immediate steps must be taken to stop the bloodshed, protect civilians, and ensure that international law is respected.

In case of Iraq, the Iraqi government continues to commit widespread and gross violations of human rights, including the arrest of political opponents, extra-judicial executions, restrictions on the freedom of expression, and direct persecution of Kurds and Turkmen. The sanctions on the regime continue to dig deeper, yet the impact on the regime is negligible, and the costs are borne by the weakest sections of the population.

The combination of government policies, an internal economic crisis, a devastating drought, and sanctions have led to massive humanitarian suffering that has caused outrage across the Arab world and in many other countries. A 1999 study by UNICEF

reported that the death rate for children under five had doubled in the ten years of sanctions. An estimated 800,000 children are chronically malnourished. Over 700,000 people are internally displaced and living without access to food and basic services. New approaches to sanctions and the oil-for-food programme must be explored to avert further loss of life.

There are real concerns regarding the threat of Iraq in its production and potential use of chemical and biological weapons. However, for the past decade, the international community has failed to engage with Iraq in a way that assists the ordinary people of the country. There must now be an international policy that tackles the poverty of Iraq's people at the same time as tackling the weapons of the regime. Military action against Iraq could have significant humanitarian implications for the Iraqi people, and a destabilising effect in the region.

Recommendations

1   To review relations with Middle Eastern states against the framework of human rights, establishing a basis by which respect for human rights and humanitarian law becomes a condition of trade agreements and of economic and military aid.

2   To increase support to civil-society efforts across the region, particularly human rights, women's, and social policy organisations, as well as independent media and information networks.

In relation to Israel and the Palestinian Territories

3   The international community must explore immediate measures to protect Palestinian and Israeli civilians and to prevent further loss of life. An international body to monitor human rights and protection mechanisms should be established to diminish the direct loss of civilian life and the most flagrant abuses of human rights.

4   The international community must press the Israeli government and the Palestinian Authority to abide by UN and other international conventions governing wartime and occupation, as stated in the 4th Geneva Convention and in UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, and to uphold international human rights law in the prosecution of justice. This is a duty of the signatories of the Geneva Conventions.

5   The Israeli government must be pressed to lift generalised closures, restrictions on civilian movements, and security

measures with a view to allowing normal economic activity and the provision of services to resume.

6 The Israeli government must be held to account for the direct destruction of water systems and basic infrastructure in the West Bank and Gaza, with immediate measures taken to repair damages, resume normal services, and compensate civilians and local government authorities for economic losses.

In relation to Iraq

7 The UN Security Council should mandate and support a comprehensive assessment of the humanitarian situation in Iraq, with a view to lifting those sanctions that have a clear impact on civilian lives and health and reviewing the most appropriate forms of humanitarian assistance given the grave deterioration in basic services.

8 The review of sanctions by Western governments and within the UN Security Council should evaluate the appropriateness of sanctions in Iraq as a means of achieving political change.

9 Any military action against Iraq should consider the potential humanitarian consequences as well as the destabilising influence such an action could have in the region.

Point 3: Renew efforts to resolve chronic emergencies and conflicts

Global security can only be achieved if the personal security of millions of people living in conflict zones is addressed. Conflict has created an estimated 14.5 million refugees and 24 million internally displaced people (IDPs), the majority of them in Africa. Dozens of countries suffer from failed or corrupt governments that only serve to sustain war. Afghanistan was once one of these forgotten emergencies. As the world now turns to the immense task of rebuilding Afghanistan, it is essential that other countries are not allowed to slip into the same state of crisis.

One priority is ensuring sufficient and sustained funding to meet humanitarian need and to build a foundation for development. Despite increasing wealth in the developed world, the percentage of gross national product (GNP) given in aid has dropped significantly in recent years, indicating a serious lack of commitment to share the responsibility for humanitarian emergencies across the donor community. This is despite the fact that assisting civilians in conflict is an international obligation and that public support for aid remains

consistent; some 70 per cent of OECD citizens are in favour of international aid.

In addition, support by OECD countries for hosting refugees has come under threat. The measures taken by the Australian Government towards asylum seekers are just one example of a rich country turning its back on its humanitarian obligations. By contrast, the countries most generous in hosting refugees are often among the poorest in the world, and receive little aid to shoulder this burden. Guinea, for example, has the third highest ratio of refugees-to-host population – one refugee for every 19 Guineans. Even so, the 2001 Consolidated Appeal (CAP) for West Africa received only 33 per cent of the funds it needed.

Although there is debate about how to determine aggregate levels of humanitarian need, the CAP process is one way to estimate this and to measure donor response. The past five years have consistently shown that the distribution of assistance is highly uneven, with some emergencies receiving the lion's share. In 1999, emergencies in the former Yugoslavia received approximately $207 per person through the CAP, while in the same year Sierra Leone received $16 and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) $8. In 2001, the CAPs for Africa were funded to only 42 per cent of their needs.

While the cost of assistance and other factors influence this disparity in per capita figures, the differences suggest a serious lack of commitment to assist civilians suffering in some of the most desperate crises. A global safety net is required, which will ensure there are minimum levels for survival below which no human being is allowed to fall.

Yet humanitarian aid cannot tackle the causes of chronic emergencies. This requires much more sustained political engagement and diplomatic attention to the world's forgotten crises. Sudan, Somalia, and the DRC are just some of the chronic emergencies that urgently require greater action from world leaders.

Part of the package is to address the weak capacity of some states to deal with chronic conflict. Many of the world's worst crises are perpetuated by government complicity, corruption, or weakness. The decades-long tragedies in countries such as Sudan, the DRC, and Liberia will never end unless the international community applies political pressure to ensure that private interests are not allowed to distort national investment and public expenditure. Investment is needed in building strong state institutions, particularly to increase the professionalism of the justice and security sectors.

Working with relevant regional organisations is also critical, although often the effectiveness of such organisations is weakened by

the very conflicts among members that the organisation is asked to resolve.

Recommendations

1   The international response to humanitarian crises should be determined by need, not by strategic interest or media coverage. All donors should significantly increase their aid budgets to increase funds for humanitarian assistance. All countries should make explicit their plans for reaching the target of 0.7 per cent of gross national product (GNP) given in aid, and earmark a portion of this to humanitarian aid.

2   The UN Security Council has a particular role to play to ensure that humanitarian assistance and protection are backed by political and economic action, to uphold international humanitarian law, secure access, and ensure the protection of non-combatants.

3   All donors should publicly commit themselves to the collective provision of a global safety net, which will ensure humanitarian assistance and protection to all those in need.

4   All actors in humanitarian response should improve the consistency and quality of aid delivery through the dissemination of, and adherence to, the Sphere Standards.

5   The international community must demonstrate sufficient political will to tackle today's forgotten chronic emergencies. Without concerted political pressure, sustained diplomacy and tailored aid packages, both the personal security of millions, and global security continue to be under threat.

Point 4: End profiteering from war

In many chronic conflicts there is a strong link between legal and illegal commercial interests and the perpetuation of violence. Intense diplomatic efforts to broker peace in these countries should be complemented by a much tougher stance in dealing with those who profit from corruption or from the illegal exploitation of natural resources such as diamonds or oil, whether they be the ruling elite, the military, business leaders, or multinational companies.

The part played by the exploitation of natural resources in fuelling conflict all over the world should be more explicitly recognised and addressed. In recent years various principles, codes of conduct, guidelines, and standards have been developed which attempt to govern the behaviour of global companies. However, these initiatives have lacked strong government involvement and the necessary

institutional structures to ensure that they are effectively implemented and contribute to an improvement in corporate and state behaviour.

The disastrous war in the DRC is just one painful example. An estimated 2.5 million people have died since it began in 1998. A UN panel investigating the conflict has repeatedly shown a direct connection between the presence of foreign troops (from countries including Rwanda, Uganda, Angola, and Zimbabwe), the extraction of mineral wealth, and the perpetuation of conflict and related human suffering. The same story is repeated in many countries across Africa, Central Asia, and East Asia, as opportunistic individuals and private companies, in collusion with national governments and militaries, plunder local resources while sustaining conflict. Some efforts have been made to control this illegal activity. More than 35 countries involved in the production and trade of diamonds have agreed to implement an international scheme for the certification of rough diamonds – known as the Kimberley Process scheme - in order to single out 'conflict diamonds' that are mined or traded by those that are using the proceeds to fund war. The challenge now is to ensure that all national governments put in place legislation to implement the scheme in their countries, and to strengthen the monitoring and compliance provisions in the scheme to enable consumers to be sure that the diamonds they buy are funding development not fuelling war.

> *'One way in which we have to ensure that nothing is the same again, is by making absolutely certain that an international campaign has not just to deal with some of these specific issues of terrorism ... but also to deal with the connections between poverty and environmental degradation, and the dark side of globalisation, and trade, and development.'*
>
> Chris Patten, EU Commissioner
>
> 18 October 2001

Recommendations

1   To stop the trade in illegal and unethical exploitation of natural resources, the international community should agree a UN protocol or convention on the conduct of business, based on the Human Rights Principles and Responsibilities for Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises drawn up by the UN Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights. These principles should be the basis of an international regulatory framework that is binding on states and business enterprises.

2   Governments should implement the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, and ensure that the designated National Contact Points are given greater prominence, with

powers for monitoring and enforcement. A company's willingness to implement the OECD guidelines should be a condition of eligibility for all Northern government guarantees and export credits.

3   All countries should publicly and actively support the implementation of the Kimberley Process rough diamonds certification system and press for stronger, independent monitoring of participants' compliance with the scheme.

Point 5: Curb the flow of arms that fuel conflict

The proliferation of small arms has changed the nature of conflict in many parts of the developing world. It has increased the power of warring parties and the devastation caused by conflict. In even the poorest countries, the degree of sophistication in weaponry is unprecedented, with automatic and semi-automatic weapons readily available to anyone willing to fight. Some estimates put the figure of small arms circulating in the world today at around 500 million, which would mean one weapon for every 12 people on this planet.

The human cost of this proliferation is abhorrent. In the 1990s, around five million people died as a direct result of conflict. Colombia provides just one grim example, where it is estimated that there are 22,000 violent deaths each year involving firearms.

In July 2001, the United Nations held the first UN Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons. Significant progress had been made in the lead up to this conference, with specific conventions agreed at a regional level in Africa, including the Organisation of African States (OAS) Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition and Explosives and other Related Materials. The European Union also introduced a Code of Conduct on Arms, linking arms sales to human rights, regional stability, and development criteria. At the UN Conference, it was hoped that an international programme of action could be mapped out to introduce more effective controls. Unfortunately, progress on these initiatives was blocked, primarily by the US government. It is a tragic irony that in the face of a global campaign against terrorism, the most immediate tool of terror – small arms – continues to proliferate at a terrible human cost.

Recommendations

1   The international community should agree an international convention on arms exports and transfers based on human rights, international humanitarian law, and development criteria.

2   The UN embargo system should be strengthened with improved monitoring and implementation procedures. Substantially increased resources should be made available to monitor the observance of UN Security Council sanctions, both in conflict-affected countries and in the countries of origin.

Point 6: Reaffirm the rule of international humanitarian law and human rights law

The international effort to combat terrorism has prompted important debates on the protection of human rights in relation to achieving national and global security. There are real security considerations that must be taken into account, and governments must have the scope to close the loopholes that allow terrorists to operate. But this cannot be at the expense of international law. The dangers are clear: sacrificing human rights in the interests of security opens the way to justifying a range of abuses by all actors. To undermine human rights and international humanitarian law in the pursuit of security would undermine the very rule of law that terrorism seeks to attack.

The conduct of the international coalition against terrorism has highlighted a number of key areas of international law that must be reaffirmed and consistently applied. One concern is the tolerance by Western governments of human rights abuses by those who undertake to co-operate with the military effort. The lifting of sanctions on Pakistan, and the silence over Russian activities in Chechnya, are just two examples. Reinforcing the norms of human rights should be part of the anti-terrorist strategy, not an area that is sacrificed in the short term in order to secure political allegiance.

> *'There can be no global stability without global social justice.'*
>
> Rt. Hon. Clare Short MP, UK Secretary of State for International Development
>
> 20 October 2001

The war in Afghanistan has seen the rights of refugees and asylum seekers seriously undermined. Afghanistan's neighbours closed their borders, prohibiting civilians from seeking asylum as protected under international refugee law. While host governments have genuine concerns about security and capacity, the protection of people fleeing persecution must be upheld as a fundamental human right. If the burden falls too heavily on a single state, then the international community should devise a plan to share the cost and responsibility. Refugee rights have been further restricted in Europe, with blanket powers to detain suspected terrorists indefinitely and without due legal process. The Australian government's treatment of asylum seekers also falls foul of the 1951 Refugee Convention. It is essential

that domestic security measures do not curtail the rights of many thousands of refugees who have no reason to be suspected of criminal or terrorist activity.

Protection of civilians in situations of conflict as set out in international humanitarian law must be an international priority and be observed by all warring parties. Across Africa and South Asia, and in other chronic conflicts such as those in Colombia and Indonesia, millions of civilians die each year at the hands of state, insurgent, and paramilitary forces. International protection and peacekeeping forces often fail to materialise until situations have broken down entirely. Moreover, some of the most delicate peacekeeping operations, such as in Sierra Leone, have suffered from under-funding and a lack of commitment. In a context of heightened global insecurity, the protection of civilians must lie at the heart of international action.

Given the tensions in South Asia, the increasing restrictions on domestic civil liberties, and the possible extension of the military campaign to other parts of the world, it is essential that all governments respect and uphold international law. The costs of doing otherwise are immense, both for people's lives and for the legitimacy of governments' actions.

Recommendations

1   The US, UK, and other coalition governments should publicly reaffirm their commitment to uphold the Geneva Conventions, particularly in relation to the protection of civilians. All parties should contribute to an independent review of the application of humanitarian law in the context of the Afghan conflict with the goal of ensuring that any future military action is firmly grounded in these international instruments.

2   Any future military action should be vetted by the UN Security Council as a key body for ensuring international accountability and respect for international humanitarian law.

3   In the face of any new refugee crises, the international community should work together to devise a burden-sharing agreement that puts refugee rights at the forefront. Genuine protection should be guaranteed for asylum-seekers in fulfilment of the 1951 UN Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees.

Point 7: Support an international system of justice

Two events in the middle of 1998 should in hindsight have had a remarkable connection. In Rome, 120 governments signed the statute of a new International Criminal Court (ICC). In Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, terrorists attacked the US embassies. The Al Qaeda suspects were based in a country whose *de facto* government was not internationally recognised. This was just the type of case in which the ICC could have been the most useful.

Sadly, these acts of terrorism did not galvanise governments to ratify the ICC as soon as possible. The 1990s had seen a host of cases, from the Balkans to West Africa, in which the impunity of war criminals had allowed brutal conflicts to drag on without resolution. Yet governments were slow to ratify the ICC statute and the Court lacks full international support.

The events of September 11 threw a harsh light on th deesperately slow diplomatic progress to ratify the court's statute. But the Afghan crisis also illustrated the challenge of how to apply to every particular crisis the principle that war criminals should be brought to justice. At least so far, the arrangements which have brought a partial peace to Afghanistan since the Taliban fled Kabul in November have been based not on prosecution, but on the accommodation of different factions, many of them with records of gross violations of human rights and humanitarian law.

The world must develop the norm that war criminals will be prosecuted either by legitimate national judiciaries or where absent (as in Afghanistan under the Taliban) by the International Criminal Court. The ICC's responsibility for considering gender-based violence must also be maintained. With these considerations at the fore, there should be an urgent push to establish the Court with the political will behind it to make it work.

But the implementation of justice (international as well as domestic) needs always to take account of the specific case. There is no 'one-size-fits-all' solution to uphold international humanitarian and human rights law. As in South Africa in the 1990s, there will be cases when prosecuting the guilty will provoke more conflict than it will resolve. The only absolute should be that those who have suffered, the women and men and civil-society organisations, should be consulted whether any post-conflict settlement simply brings war criminals to justice or finds some kind of accommodation with them. Past experiences suggest that the international community should

only support post-conflict deals that have this genuine popular support.

Recommendations

1 Governments should support, not undermine, the Court's establishment, protecting its remit to pursue cases of gender violence.

2 Governments should support popular and civil-society participation in all post-conflict settlements, to ensure that the women and men who have been affected are involved in the decision whether or not to bring all war criminals to justice.

Point 8: Fight against discrimination, intolerance and the exclusion of women and minorities

The events of September 11 exposed some of the divisions among the world's peoples. Different attitudes towards religion, politics, and gender rights came suddenly into view. The international response to September 11 threatened to deepen some of these divisions, for example provoking anti-Western and anti-Islamic sentiment among different groups. Such sentiments have also manifested themselves in horrifying acts of violence against Muslims and Christians apparently as a result of their faith. This manifestation of fears and frustration highlighted once again the implications of extremism and intolerance of different political and religious beliefs or ethnicity.

Some government leaders have sought to counter these polarising tendencies, preaching the importance of greater understanding between different faiths, and denouncing the racist attacks that have increased in some places. Such efforts will look like window dressing without more systematic steps to counter xenophobia, discrimination and intolerance of diversity and difference, whether due to differences in religion, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation.

> *'There can be no true dialogue without addressing the sources of hatred and xenophobia. We may be one human family, but we remain divided by language, religion, and culture. We are still separated by poverty and affluence, and millions experience racism, xenophobia, and other forms of intolerance on a daily basis.'*
>
> Mary Robinson, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
>
> 15 October 2001

International attention on the plight of women in Afghanistan has brought the question of the different opportunities and experiences of men and women once again onto the international political agenda. The brutality of the Taliban regime offered an extreme

example of what is true beyond the boundaries of Afghanistan: that gender continues to be one source of inequality between human beings. In Afghanistan, international leaders and institutions have committed themselves to engage with women's groups and to support women's development and rights as a priority in the rebuilding of Afghanistan. Numerous gender advisers and liaison posts have been created, and commitments have been made to specific aid programmes for women. These commitments must be turned into concrete benefits that tackle discrimination against Afghan women and support women to achieve their human rights.

Yet perhaps the greater challenge is to ensure that this concern for the discrimination against Afghan women is truly a new global commitment to address women's rights and inequalities based on gender. Such awareness should permeate domestic as well as foreign policy. One aspect of this is the ratification and implementation of the provision of the Convention to Eliminate Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). This is the only document on women's rights that is legally binding, but although 167 states have ratified the Convention – with the USA one of the notable exceptions – levels of implementation are extremely varied. This needs concerted international action.

There is currently greater international awareness of the dangers of exclusion and inequity based on gender, ethnic, or religious identity. At its most extreme, such exclusion and discrimination leads to death and suffering. At the core of such measures are injustice and the denial of fundamental human rights. There are signs that some leaders are prepared to tackle such discrimination, ignorance and intolerance. It is important that this is sustained. Stability and long-term security clearly depend on more inclusive and equitable political systems nationally, and internationally, and a respect for the equal rights of all human beings.

Recommendations

1. Governments and political leaders should ensure that their policies and actions do not exacerbate intolerance and exclusion of different groups for example on the basis of religion, ethnicity or gender. Political leaders have a vital role to preach tolerance and respect. Asylum and immigration policies are one concrete expression of this. The active recruitment of minority groups to public office and private institutions is another.

2. The international efforts to address gender inequity in Afghanistan should be extended to all bilateral relations, with a specific initiative to work with governments to ratify CEDAW

and the Beijing Platform of Action, and to develop national action plans for their implementation.

Point 9: Increase aid and debt relief to meet the 2015 targets for poverty reduction

A world with more than one billion people living with less than $1 a day and 900 million illiterate people cannot be a safe place for all. At the UN Millennium Summit in September 2000, representatives of 191 nations committed themselves once again, among other things, to halve the proportion of the world's people living in poverty and to achieve universal primary education by 2015. But it is highly likely that these targets will be missed, unless there is a significant and concerted effort to increase investment in social and economic development in the world's poorest countries.

Oxfam estimates that $150bn is required each year to reach the 2015 targets. Yet international development assistance from OECD countries amounted to only $53.7bn in 2000. If all OECD countries fulfilled their commitment to dedicate 0.7 per cent of their gross national product (GNP) to development aid, there would be US$114bn available for development. At the Financing for Development conference in Monterrey, the first signs emerged that world leaders are prepared to do more to tackle global poverty. The US, EU, Canada, and others all announced increases in aid in support of efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. These announcements are significant and set a positive momentum. But the total requirement must be fulfilled if there is to be hope for significant poverty reduction. The commitments represent a small fraction of the additional $100bn needed annually, and most of the aid increases will be phased in over a number of years, whereas the money is needed now.

The new global context should be seen as an opportunity to achieve a renewed aid effort to address the structural factors that are feeding global insecurity, such as poverty and inequity.

Recommendations

1   OECD countries should substantially increase their support to poverty reduction and social development, and deliver on their commitments to reach the Millennium Development Goals by 2015.

2   Northern governments must honour their commitment to increase real ODA flows to 0.7 per cent of GNP within ten years,

and focus this on achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

3   Donors should significantly increase aid to developing countries that are committed to poverty reduction. Donors must make every effort to coordinate aid in support of development priorities that are identified within developing countries' own national planning processes, for example the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper process.

4   A review of debt sustainability criteria should be conducted by the IMF and the World Bank, linked to the financing requirements of the 2015 goals in indebted countries, and including other non-HIPC low-income countries.

5   Education should be given top priority, with full support given to the Education for All action plan to address the massive education deficit in developing countries.

Point 10: Make globalisation work for poverty reduction

Most major international gatherings, such as the World Trade Organisation meetings and the World Bank/IMF annual meetings, are now characterised by massive public protests and widespread public debate about the accountability of the multilateral system that governs trade, aid, and development policy. There is little public confidence that these institutions are responsive to the public interest. Rather, they are seen as functioning to protect the advantages of the most powerful states and private corporations. This deep sense of injustice in the international system further fosters the polarisation between North and South, East and West.

The rapid expansion of world trade through globalisation has been accompanied by painfully slow progress on poverty reduction. Poverty has in fact deepened in many parts of the world. Over one billion people live in extreme poverty, while income disparities between rich and poor, men and women, and urban and rural have grown. And because exports account for a growing share of global wealth, and rich countries account for most of this, trade is fuelling these inequalities.

> *'People who feel the world is tilted against them will spawn the kind of hatred that is very dangerous for all of us…I think it's a healthy sign that there are demonstrations in the streets. They are raising the question of 'is the rich world giving back enough?'*
>
> Bill Gates, Chairman, Microsoft Corporation, speaking at the World Economic Forum, New York
>
> 3 February 2002

Globalisation and trade do not necessarily have to work against the poor. Participation in global trade offers access to markets for producers and opens the flow of technologies and ideas, many of which are essential to securing public health and development. As a force for human development, trade is far more important than aid. A mere two per cent increase in the exports of developing countries would generate $150bn, or three times annual aid flows. A shift of this nature could allow for the kind of investments required within these countries if they are to meet the 2015 international development targets.

Yet under current trade rules, developing countries are slipping further into the most volatile, low-revenue sectors within the global market place, such as commodities and low value-added technology. This is in large part due to the rules governing world trade, which put poor countries at a distinct disadvantage. Not only are these countries starting with a significantly lower resource base, but they also face double standards: forced to liberalise their own markets while being denied access to potentially more profitable Northern markets. National enterprises are further disadvantaged by powerful transnational companies, which not only hold significant financial advantage but are subject to very few controls in terms of both labour standards and investment back into the communities where they operate.

Trade is potentially a tremendous force for good. But for this to be realised, the world trade system requires stronger systems of governance that put poverty reduction and equity at their centre. An effective system of global governance, operating in the broadest possible public interest, requires a combination of formal representative governance structures, compensatory mechanisms to create a level playing field in negotiations, and consultative mechanisms that bring debates and decisions into the public domain. Most multilateral institutions lack all three.

A new economic system must also be able to ensure global financial stability, in order to avoid repeating the financial crises that have hit the poorest people in particular in several middle-income countries during the last decades. A review of the Capital Account Liberalisation policies imposed in Southern countries, and more effective policies governing tax havens, offshore financial centres, and the movement of capital, are essential measures for a safer financial system.

Greater equity in world trade will require deep reform of decision-making structures within existing multilateral structures to tackle the dominance of the world's most powerful economies and give greater

voice to developing countries. It will require clear rules that recognise the disadvantages that developing countries bear in entering global markets and negotiations. Above all, it will require a consensus among world leaders that globalisation, if it is to continue with any level of public support, must be harnessed in such a way that it meets the great challenges facing the poorest and most marginalised groups in the world.

Recommendations

1   WTO decision-making processes should be reviewed in order to increase effective participation by developing countries. WTO documents should be automatically de-restricted, in order to increase public scrutiny of trade policy making at the WTO through more active involvement of national parliaments and regular consultations with civil society.

2   As a new trade round is initiated in the follow-up to the World Trade Summit in Doha, world leaders should take the opportunity to build an explicit poverty reduction and democratising agenda into trade negotiations. This must include concrete steps to open Northern markets to developing countries, develop standards that regulate the behaviour of transnational companies, and address the devastating impact of volatility in commodity prices on the world market.

3   A new international framework should be developed by the World Bank and the IMF for dealing with financial havens and their effects, and for curbing the damage of capital flight on weak economies.

Putting this 10-point plan into action

As important as agreeing an ambitious agenda for change is the need for action plans which will move from words to deeds, putting policy into practice. Oxfam believes that governments should identify opportunities to agree specific policy changes from the series of meetings taking place over the coming months. The coming months offer important opportunities to reach concrete agreements.

June 2002, G8 Leaders Meeting, Canada

The G8's agenda includes discussions of international efforts to reach the 2015 education goals, and to further African development. The meeting should agree a clear timetable for reaching the 0.7 per cent aid target, provide sustainable debt relief, and commit to trade reform in support of international efforts to reach the development

goals. Commitments for aid to basic education, and to tackle African conflicts are also key.

June 2002, the World Food Summit

This will address the right to food. Governments should make a renewed commitment to sustainable agriculture as the basis of development and food security, and make more generous contributions in the renegotiation of the Food Aid Convention.

September 2002, World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg

The Summit is an opportunity for world leaders and civil society to review progress towards the international development goals.

October 2002, World Bank/IMF annual meetings

These should review progress on education plans and on debt relief.

October 2002, ACP/EU

Negotiations start between the ACP and the EU on post-Lomé arrangements. These should agree new aid and trade arrangements to benefit the poorest countries.

December 2002, European Council, Denmark

The Danish government will prioritise sustainable development and the issues arising at the EU. The World Summit on Sustainable Development will take place during its Presidency. This gives the EU the opportunity to lead international efforts in support of poverty reduction.

Oxfam International is a confederation of twelve development agencies which work in 120 countries throughout the developing world: Oxfam America, Oxfam-in-Belgium, Oxfam Canada, Oxfam Community Aid Abroad (Australia), Oxfam Germany, Oxfam Great Britain, Oxfam Hong Kong, Intermón Oxfam (Spain), Oxfam Ireland, Novib, Oxfam New Zealand, and Oxfam Quebec. Please call or write to any of the agencies for further information.
Oxfam International Advocacy Office, 1112 16th St., NW, Ste. 600, Washington, DC 20036 Tel: 1.202.496.1170, E-mail: advocacy@oxfaminternational.org, www.oxfam.org
Oxfam International Office in Brussels, 60 rue des Quatre Vents, Brussels, B1080 Tel: 322.501.6761
Oxfam International Office in Geneva, 15 rue des Savoises, 1205 Geneva Tel: 41.22.321.2371
Oxfam International Office in New York, 355 Lexington Avenue, 3rd Floor, New York, NY 10017 Tel: 1.212.687.2091

Oxfam Germany
Greifswalder Str. 33a
10405 Berlin, Germany
Tel: 49.30.428.50621
E-mail: info@oxfam.de
www.oxfam.de

Oxfam-in-Belgium
Rue des Quatre Vents 60
1080 Burxelles, Belgium
Tel: 32.2.501.6700
E-mail: oxfamsol@oxfamsol.be
www.oxfamsol.be

Oxfam Community Aid Abroad
National & Victorian Offices
156 George St. (Corner Webb Street)
Fitzroy, Victoria, Australia 3065
Tel: 61.3.9289.9444
E-mail: enquire@caa.org.au
www.caa.org.au

Oxfam GB
274 Banbury Road, Oxford
England OX2 7DZ
Tel: 44.1865.311.311
E-mail: oxfam@oxfam.org.uk
www.oxfam.org.uk

Oxfam New Zealand
Level 1, 62 Aitken Terrace
Kingsland, Auckland
New Zealand
PO Box for all Mail: PO Box 68 357
Auckland 1032
New Zealand
Tel: 64.9.355.6500
E-mail: oxfam@oxfam.org.nz
www.oxfam.org.nz

Intermón Oxfam
Roger de Lluria 15
08010, Barcelona, Spain
Tel: 34.93.482.0700
E-mail: intermon@intermon.org
www.intermon.org

Oxfam America
26 West St.
Boston, MA 02111-1206
Tel: 1.617.482.1211
E-mail: info@oxfamamerica.org
www.oxfamamerica.org

Oxfam Canada
Suite 300-294 Albert St.
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1P 6E6
Tel: 1.613.237.5236
E-mail: enquire@oxfam.ca
www.oxfam.ca

Oxfam Hong Kong
17/F, China United Centre
28 Marble Road, North Point
Hong Kong
Tel: 852.2520.2525
E-Mail: info@oxfam.org.hk
www.oxfam.org.hk

Oxfam Quebec
2330 rue Notre-Dame Quest
Bureau 200, Montreal, Quebec
Canada H3J 2Y2
Tel: 1.514.937.1614 www.oxfam.qc.ca
E-mail: info@oxfam.qc.ca

Oxfam Ireland
9 Burgh Quay, Dublin 2, Ireland
353.1.672.7662 (ph)
E-mail: oxireland@oxfam.ie
52-54 Dublin Road,
Belfast BT2 7HN
Tel: 44.289.0023.0220
E-mail: oxfam@oxfamni.org.uk
www.oxfamireland.org

Novib
Mauritskade 9
2514 HD. The Hague, The Netherlands
Tel: 31.70.342.1621
E-mail: info@novib.nl
www.novib.nl