

## Section I

---

# ***POLICY AND JUSTICE: A GLOBAL IMPERATIVE***

In years past, global or international discussions, if at all included in a text, were typically the last chapter, almost an “oh, by the way.” But in today’s world, a global perspective is foremost in our thinking. Every day the impact of global issues is felt by all people, from volatile oil prices that translate into roller-coaster gas prices to the war in the Mideast, which siphons off millions of dollars that otherwise could be spent on human service programs. Today’s world is much smaller, and our neighborhood now extends to countries tens of thousands of miles away.

It is most appropriate to begin this volume with a chapter written by a remarkable individual, Jody Williams, who is the 1997 Nobel Peace Laureate. Spearheading an initiative by civil society, she helped bring together nations from around the world to sign a global treaty to ban land mines. Sadly, the United States, along with Iraq and Iran, remains among the few nations not to have joined the world in signing this treaty. Ms. Williams introduces this volume with a new paradigm that resonates very closely to the heart and soul of social work: human security. Clearly juxtaposing her proposal against the current U.S. federal program of homeland security, Williams sees justice and peace directly tied to the health and well-being of the global community. Human security is “the fundamental linchpin upon which rests all security” and reduces conflict if people’s needs are met.

Robin Sakina Mama, PhD, is recognized for her international work, particularly with the promotion of social work in the United Nations. She brings to our attention the strong position that social workers have played and will continue to play on the global stage. International social work is not new to the profession, whose early efforts started shortly after World War I. Recognizing the importance of globalization, Mama writes, “Social work is also well prepared to work on policy that leads to solidarity and peace building among nations, which will have a direct impact on global social policy.”

Joseph Kin Fun Kwok, PhD, provides a detailed discussion of social justice from an Asian perspective. Kwok explores the dimensions of justice with a detailed discussion of Asian policy and practice while noting particular challenges faced by human services. As does Mama, Kwok believes that social workers, based on their unique and diverse practice experiences, are in an excellent position to add their expertise in policy development.



## Chapter 1

---

# ***THE HUMAN SECURITY PARADIGM: PEACE WITH JUSTICE AND EQUALITY?***

*Jody Williams*

At the end of the cold war, many people around the world spoke of their hope for a different world. Perhaps governments would consider bold new attempts to define national—and global—security in a now unipolar world. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and corresponding diminished threat, maybe standing armies and military budgets could be reduced, along with the number of nuclear weapons in silos and submarines and airplanes around the world. There was guarded optimism that perhaps war and militarization would no longer define the contours of our future. Maybe such changes could even spur a dramatic decrease in the global arms trade and conceivably result in a “peace dividend” to be used to resolve some of the intractable problems facing humankind. If such changes did occur, arguably the globe as a whole would be more secure.

But not everyone was contemplating peace dividends and a world full of new possibilities. A more sober view recognized that crafting a new approach to a changed and changing world would require deliberate and concerted efforts. Pessimists—some might call them “realists”—had little doubt that the sole remaining superpower would begin to seek new global enemies, in part because real threats exist, but also to justify its continued militarism as the United States contemplated how to react to—and, more important, how to consolidate—its unique position as the military, economic, and technological behemoth in the post–cold war world.

Now, faced with the emergence of new global powers such as China and India—nations requiring increased access to limited resources to fuel their economic growth—new tensions are arising and the world is experiencing an ever increasing divide between the global haves and have-nots. Throw into the mix the attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, and the resulting declaration of “war” on “terror,” and instead of a “brave new world” in the twenty-first century, we find ourselves sliding back into the bunker mentality of the cold war era. Or perhaps that mentality was never seriously challenged.

The post-9/11 world appears to be caught between terror and hope. In the current tension between terror and hope is also a struggle about how we as a global community define security. Will we continue to define security in terms of bigger weapons and more militarization, or will security be defined in terms of international law and human security? Will democracy, justice, and human rights continue to be eroded around the world to protect us from “terrorism,” or can we step back from the collective brink and make hard and sober assessments of what framework will best ensure peace and justice and security in an increasingly globalizing world?

#### 4 The Human Security Paradigm: Peace with Justice and Equality?

### **(RE)DEFINING SECURITY IN THE GLOBALIZED WORLD**

Since the mid-1600s, power in the world has been defined almost exclusively by the military and economic might of individual, sovereign nation-states. In this Westphalian model, global stability—or peace—is maintained through a balance of power among these sovereign nations (O'Donnell, 2004). This security framework continues to dominate thinking even as we are increasingly coming to grips with the facts that in today's world, like it or not, there is not much that is not interconnected, there are now many factors that influence power among states, and many of those factors are transnational in character.

Globalization immediately brings to mind the seemingly effortless movement of capital and business around the world with little apparent regard for “sovereign borders.” Economic globalization is seen by some as a positive force that will inevitably lead to the democratization of the planet. Others question the relationship between democratization and corporate entities that, largely lacking in accountability, have little apparent regard for workers' rights, the environment, or their impact on the social fabric of any particular country.

In the global economy, for example, today's corporations and even some individuals amass fortunes that can dwarf the entire budget of a nation—or an entire region of the world. The rules of the game of the global marketplace continue to evolve, and the worldwide reach of business calls into question the very relationship between the nation-state and such corporate entities. For many of us, it is these financial aspects we think of when the term “globalization” comes to mind, yet globalization is not confined to the economic sphere alone.

Other linkages are also increasing exponentially. The mass movement of people, coupled with 24-hour access to information, helps fuel a global marketplace of ideas and blurs the lines between what traditionally have been seen as domestic or international issues. As people, ideas, and images move with lightning speed around the world, the challenges grow for individual states to try to predict and manage the outcomes of such interactions. Security threats also have more serious global implications through this spread of knowledge and information.

Gone is the time when the state can effectively isolate its citizens and focus their concerns on domestic issues, while claiming sole purview over the international sphere. Often the domestic impact of foreign policy decisions has become too glaring for citizens to ignore. One horrific example, of course, is the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, which have roots in decades of U.S. foreign policy decisions toward the Middle East viewed as unfair by people in the region and that have fueled intense dislike and distrust of the country.

We are faced not only with war, terrorism, and armed violence around the world, but also with weapons proliferation, including weapons of mass destruction; global organized crime, including the trafficking of human beings, particularly women and children; perhaps irreversible destruction of our environment and the threats posed by global warming; widespread, pervasive poverty (this since time immemorial); and new and deadly diseases—to name but a few. Many actors influence both the evolution of the problems themselves and also possible responses to them. In addition to global business, international and regional institutions, as well as nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and (transnational) civil society all have an impact on today's world.

With such a complex array of variables, it has become increasingly difficult for individual states to predict and manage the outcomes of many issues. Old concepts of state-based security in our global political and economic environment no longer offer long-term answers to today's global threats and challenges. Yet the resistance to meaningful analysis and discussion of what will bring us security—collectively and individually—is extremely strong and pervasive. Despite the resistance, discussion about what kind of security we should seek must take place.

## **HUMAN SECURITY: A NEW PARADIGM FOR GLOBAL SECURITY?**

During the 1990s, some bold new initiatives provided collective solutions to various problems of global scope. One of those initiatives was the movement to ban antipersonnel land mines. The land mine campaign is important not only because it led to an international treaty in 1997 that, for the first time in history, eliminated a long and almost universally used conventional weapon. It also provided a successful model of government–civil society–international institution partnership that offered a concrete example of how the global community could work together to resolve common problems. Another successful, similar effort resulted in the creation of the International Criminal Court after 50 years of work to create an independent court to try war crimes and crimes against humanity.

Partly inspired by these efforts, the nucleus of a movement began to be explored that seeks to enhance global security not by increasing the number of weapons being developed, produced, and traded in an already overweaponized world, but by addressing “human security” needs as the fundamental linchpin upon which rests all security. Any number of governments, international institutions, and civil societies are exploring the framework as a distinctive concept for addressing global insecurities and are increasingly working to pursue policies that actively apply the human security framework.

One such effort grew out of discussions between Canada and Norway, expressly resulting from their work in the land mine ban movement. The Human Security Network was founded by a group of like-minded countries at a ministerial meeting in Norway on May 20, 1999. It seeks to apply a human security perspective to political processes that are aimed at the prevention or resolution of conflict as well as promoting peace and development. Ministers of the member countries have met annually since the Norway meeting to maintain a “dialogue on questions pertaining to human security” (Human Security Network, n.d.).

In 2000, an independent Commission on Human Security was launched at the UN Millennium Summit. The Commission describes human security as a framework that “encompasses human rights, good governance and access to economic opportunity, education and health care” (Commission on Human Security, 2003, p. 4). Human security is advanced (a) through protection, primarily the state-based responsibility to protect people from critical and pervasive threats, with institutions, civil society and nongovernmental actors, and the private sector also playing a key role in that protection; and (b) by empowering individuals and communities to develop their capabilities to make informed choices and to act on their own behalf (pp. 10–12). These elements together mean not only protecting people from threats, but also “creating political, social, environmental, economic, military and cultural systems that, when combined, give people the building blocks for survival, livelihood and dignity” (p. 4).

## 6 The Human Security Paradigm: Peace with Justice and Equality?

Thus at the core, human security policies seek to enhance both individual and societal security by promoting “freedom from want” and “freedom from fear.” This concept has been underscored by observations of UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan that security, development, and human rights are interlinking elements of real security and that if all those elements are not advanced simultaneously, ultimately none will prevail.

Human security holds that in a globalized world, many actors can have an impact on outcomes, so means to address issues must be as broadly multilateral as possible. Dialogue, cross-cultural understanding, and conflict resolution enhance human security. Globalized relations, interaction, and communication enhance human security. The use of force is not scorned, but it is recognized as the absolute last resort, employed only if all other methods to resolve conflict have failed.

Part of the logic behind this thinking is that if the basic needs of the majority of the people of the world are met, providing them with a stake in and hope for their own future, the root causes of conflict are diminished. When a small minority has access to the majority of goods, services, and resources of the planet, those who have nothing have nothing to lose in giving up their lives on a suicide mission. Considering even a few of the commonly used statistics on poverty in today’s world is numbing. The World Bank has defined the international poverty line as \$1 to \$2 a day.<sup>1</sup> In 2003, out of the developing world’s 4.8 billion people, some 1.2 billion were living on \$1 a day; another 2.8 billion were living on \$2 a day (Infoplease, 2000–2007). In 2003, the richest fifth of the world’s population received 85% of the total world income, while the poorest fifth received just 1.4% of the global income (Infoplease, 2000–2007).

As even George W. Bush—the world’s strongest champion of a “muscular” approach to his war on terror—opined in a speech at the United Nations on September 14, 2005, we share a “moral duty” to fight not only terrorism but also the poverty, oppression, and hopelessness that give rise to it (Baker, 2005, p. A8). All the weapons in the world will not save us from angry and desperate people willing to fly airplanes into buildings to take the lives of thousands and sow the seeds of terror. The human security framework would sow seeds of hope by providing for socioeconomic justice and more equitable distribution of the world’s resources.

### NATIONAL SECURITY VERSUS HUMAN SECURITY

The national security “realists” have a very dim view of any meaningful debate about human security. It has been painted as a wishy-washy effort by “lesser powers”—read irrelevant—who do not have the military might or the “spine” to deal with real security issues. “Real” security is the purview of the individual, sovereign state based on nation-to-nation interaction. Utopian, unrealistic, idealistic—a concept not worthy of real discussion.

The human security framework is also criticized as being too vague and a catchall attempt to try to resolve all problems facing humanity rather than confine itself narrowly—therefore

---

<sup>1</sup>This is measured in 1993 purchasing power parity (PPP), which the Bank defines as “a method of measuring the relative purchasing power of different countries’ currencies over the same types of goods and services. Because goods and services may cost more in one country than in another, PPP allows us to make more accurate comparisons of standards of living across countries” (Infoplease, 2000–2007).

effectively, of course—to real security issues. Critics of human security also imply that those who do support the framework see it as an either/or situation: Either you are for human security or you are for national security, but apparently they cannot coexist. And how could such a “vague” security framework possibly replace the centuries-old system of nation-states interacting through a delicate balance—or not—of a global chess match of power?

In this chess match, states with the most access to resources tend to dominate global politics and back that dominance with military might. Security, then, is as the ability of the state to advance and maintain its interests, generally at a cost to other states. Because security is state to state, realists also argue that national security is generally far too complex for the average citizen to understand, let alone have a voice in.

Admittedly, this view was shaken with the successes of the mine ban movement as well as the establishment of the ICC, but opponents of the Ottawa Process and government–civil society partnerships have sought to paint that process as a “one-off” success and return to “diplomacy as usual” in a state-based system. Even if some had been able to delude themselves in the immediate period after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the 9/11 attacks and ensuing war on terror should have dispelled all notions of a different kind of world after the fall of the Soviet Union.

Others argue that human security rhetoric is not matched with “concrete policy that makes a difference to the safety of people whose security is threatened” (Hataley & Nossal, 2004, p. 1). This argument seems to imply that the critical measure of a human security agenda is whether or not a state engages in humanitarian intervention to “ensure the safety of ordinary people in other places” (p. 3). Humanitarian intervention is a hotly debated issue in and of itself and is not, or should not be, the sole or even primary measure of a human security approach to global security.

For some, particularly U.S. neoconservatives, discussion of a human security framework is not just an attempt at an objective assessment of what really would make the world as a whole more secure, but should be seen for what it really is: an attack on American values. As one article states:

This is a dramatic and fundamental distortion of the right to be secure. The effort to “broaden our view of what is meant by peace and security” obscures and runs counter to the long-standing right of nation-states to secure their own territories and populations from external threats—a principle upon which international legal traditions and treaty organizations such as the U.N. are based. The human security agenda has the potential to undermine not only the nation-state model on which the U.N. was founded, but also the principles of sovereignty, accountability, and national security that the United States holds as fundamental. (Carafano & Smith, 2006)

The human security framework is not an attack on the values of any nation. It is an attempt to respond to security needs in the dramatically different world of the twenty-first century. However, it is not primarily concerned with the security of the nation-state in isolation from the security of people inside and outside the confines of national boundaries. Terrorism, crime, and war are all examples of violence that destabilize the security of people. Their security is also affected by deprivation, whether it is the result of poverty or environmental pollution or disease and malnutrition or illiteracy or all of them combined. Piecemeal and scattershot responses to individual problems and crises will not address the root causes of

## **8 The Human Security Paradigm: Peace with Justice and Equality?**

violence and conflict or enhance global security. Because the human security framework looks at the myriad problems that have an impact on security, effectively enhancing security means attempting to take an integrated approach to addressing the problems.

Those who advocate that a human security agenda enhances the security of us all generally do not necessarily see human security and national security as mutually exclusive. The two, instead, can be complementary parts of a whole. But to meaningfully carry out a human security agenda would require, for example, significant reallocation of the billions and billions of dollars spent around the world annually on war, on “defense” and preparations for war, and for the equipment of war. All of the aspects described in the previous section must be pursued coherently for such a human security agenda to make sense and to change lives. Security, development and empowerment, and human rights are mutually reinforcing; and if all do not advance together, no one aspect will prevail ultimately. To make human security really work requires a major shift in policies, institutions, and choices about global resource allocation to address the basic needs of people everywhere rather than providing for the security of the relative few who make those policies and control those resources. This obviously is a huge challenge in today’s world.

## **IS THERE A FUTURE FOR A HUMAN SECURITY FRAMEWORK?**

### **The Role of Governments and International Institutions**

Even if one accepts human security as a feasible approach to global security, why hasn’t it had more traction? Considering the launch of the Human Security Network, it can convincingly be argued that the same governments that have promoted and sung the praises of the land mine ban movement and the civil society–government partnership that is its hallmark wanted to limit the reach of such partnerships. Though not likely wanting to return to status quo ante, when governments did meet in Oslo to discuss and launch the Network, NGO involvement even in the discussions about the concept was minimal at best.

In today’s world of increasingly active and involved transnational civil society, trying to advance a new security agenda based on a top-down effort not built on an effective and broad government–civil society partnership seems doomed to limited success, if not failure. Given the long-standing relationship of many of the same NGOs with those governments and that the Network should want solid support from them on a human security agenda, the exclusion is hard to understand.

The Network appears to seek NGO involvement in events related to specific issues that it deems to be components of a human security agenda. However, there does not seem to be any mechanism for ongoing discussion and/or action between governments and NGOs/civil society to address the human security framework writ large. If advancing the framework must be done through broad and integrated responses to global problems, this fragmenting of issues and answers to them does not serve the human security agenda well, nor does an ad hoc approach to working with NGOs and civil society.

The situation appears much the same in the work on human security at the UN. Neither the UN’s Commission on Human Security nor the subsequent Advisory Board on Human Security have either NGO/civil society involvement or even informal mechanisms for



ongoing dialogue with them regarding this “people-centered” framework. For example, the report of a February 2006 workshop on human security organized by the government of Mexico in cooperation with the government of Japan seems to underscore this disconnect.

The section of the report titled “Civil Society and Human Security,” states that the role of civil society in “making the concept of human security operative consists mainly in assuming the challenges of building human capacity through education and the promotion of renewed perceptions, as well as in pursuing new strategies to safeguard the security of people.” The strategies put forward essentially refer to documenting abuses and promoting human rights and public security in the post-9/11 world (Report of the Workshop, 2006).

Although human rights is an area of intense work by civil society and NGOs, it is not the only issue of the broad human security agenda that NGOs address. If, as the Report of the Workshop (2006) says, the “concept of human security is a response to the needs of civil society throughout the world,” surely civil society and NGOs have a much larger role to play than just dealing with various aspects of human rights.

### **The Role of Nongovernmental Organizations and Transnational Civil Society**

But it is not just governments and international institutions that are at fault: Both NGOs and civil society in general have done little to connect the dots on human security and promote the agenda. Even though the words “human security” appear more frequently, the concept does not yet resonate for the general public—or even for many NGOs. Nongovernmental organizations must actively promote the concept of human security as the appropriate framework for global security in a globalized world. People must be educated to understand that by advancing human security, the security of the globe is advanced.

To raise awareness and advocate for this change, NGOs must identify their individual work as part of a larger human security agenda when reaching out to the broader public. Everyone must understand that protecting and promoting human rights is work that enhances human security. Efforts to advance sustainable development enhance human security. Every time the flow of weapons of war is limited or weapons are banned outright, human security is advanced. Involving women meaningfully in all aspects of conflict prevention and peace building and, in fact, in decision making in general is enhancing human security. Addressing poverty through debt repudiation, fair trade, and better aid—coupled with promoting good governance and tackling corruption—is enhancing human security.

Yet too often, opportunities are lost to make those connections. Too often, NGOs limit their own work and a broader ranging effectiveness by choosing to not make those connections. Every time those issues are de-linked, NGOs undercut collective efforts to promote a broader understanding and acceptance of a human security agenda as the framework to better prevent violent conflict. To effectively campaign and lobby, NGOs must find and use every opportunity to make the general public understand that our common security is increased by working together to meet the most basic needs of the majority of the planet—by working collectively to free women, men, and children from fear and to free them from want. By providing that majority with a stake in and hope for their own future, the root causes of conflict can be diminished. The opportunities to move away from reacting to violent conflict and toward its prevention are increased and, along with them, the development of a sustainable peace.

## 10 The Human Security Paradigm: Peace with Justice and Equality?

### CONCLUSION

As stated in the introduction, the post-9/11 world appears to be caught between terror and hope. In this tension is also a struggle about how we as a global community define security. Will we continue to define security in terms of bigger weapons and more militarization, or will we define security in terms of international law and human security? Will democracy, justice, and human rights continue to be eroded around the world to protect us from “terrorism,” or can we step back from the collective brink and make hard and sober assessments of what framework will best ensure peace and justice and security in an increasingly globalizing world?

To really begin to move the world away from a strictly national security view of global security, governments, international institutions, and NGOs alike must work consistently and collectively to change the global mind-set about what constitutes real global security and about what peace building really is—particularly in this post-9/11 world. A fundamental element of effective campaigning and advocacy to change that mind-set is setting the agenda. So far, it appears that neither governments nor NGOs have come anywhere close to setting an effective agenda to advance a clearly articulated human security framework and how it should be applied in today’s world. Broad and deep and bold involvement by governments and NGOs and transnational civil society is also key to bringing about such change.

In his 2003 book, *War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning*, Chris Hedges, a nonpacifist war correspondent for about 20 years, captures some of the difficulties inherent in changing the collective mind-set about violent conflict—and therefore how best to counter it. He writes:

The effectiveness of the myths peddled in war is powerful. We often come to doubt our own perceptions. We hide these doubts, like troubled believers, sure that no one else feels them. . . . The myths have determined not only how we should speak but how we should think. The doubts we carry, the scenes we see that do not conform to the myth are hazy, difficult to express, unsettling. . . . We struggle uncomfortably with the jargon and clichés. But we have trouble expressing our discomfort because *the collective shout* [emphasis added] has made it hard for us to give words to our thoughts. This self-doubt is aided by the monstrosity of war. (p. 74)

As Hedges notes, the myths peddled in war are powerful. But perhaps the myths peddled *about* war are more so, particularly in the post-9/11 world. Moving beyond *the collective shout* that insists that if you want peace you must prepare for war is a huge challenge. Moving beyond *the collective myth* that creating a peaceful world is the fuzzy dream of human security idealists is a huge challenge. Governments and NGOs must work together to meet those challenges and raise our *collective awareness* about the rights and responsibilities of civil society in working to move beyond reacting to violence and toward actively setting the agenda to prevent it.

Finally, thinking about violence must be demystified. People can no longer hide behind the dismissal of violence with the commonly heard explanation that it is simply “human nature” to be violent. Violence is a choice—whether it is the choice of a man to beat the woman he supposedly loves, or the choice of one nation to invade another in the name of “freedom” or any other name, or the choice of terrorists of any stripe to attack civilian

targets anywhere in the world to make their political point. *Violence is a choice*. The human security framework promotes the making of nonviolent choices to resolve conflicts. It is a feasible alternative to militarism and violence and war that can actively move the world beyond *the collective myth* that building peace is a fuzzy dream of utopian idealists.

A world increasingly dominated by the few, who give the impression of not caring much for the needs of the many, can only become increasingly insecure as the desperate and disenfranchised try to equalize the playing field. There is something wrong in a world that spends close to a trillion dollars on weapons and defense while spending a few billion on education globally. There is something profoundly unjust in a global economic system in which a handful of billionaires have more income than entire regions of the world.

Until the global community works together to address the common threats to human security posed by gross political, social, and economic inequalities we will not live in a secure world. But hope for a more secure world is not enough. Neither governments nor NGOs can abdicate their individual and collective responsibilities to participate in developing new strategies and policies to ensure our collective security. No one government, no one institution can possibly provide for the needs of us all. New coalitions must seek new solutions to seemingly intractable problems. Change will not happen overnight. But that should not be an excuse to not seek change.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, P. (2005, September 15). Bush, at U.N., links anti-poverty agenda to war on terrorism. *Washington Post*, p. A8.
- Carafano, J. J., & Smith, J. A. (2006, September 1). *The muddled notion of "human security" at the U.N: A guide for U.S. policymakers* (Backgrounder #1966). Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation. Retrieved November 7, 2007, from [www.heritage.org/Research/WorldwideFreedom/bg1966.cfm](http://www.heritage.org/Research/WorldwideFreedom/bg1966.cfm).
- Commission on Human Security. (2003). *Human security now*. New York: Author. Retrieved November 7, 2007, from [www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/English/FinalReport.pdf](http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/English/FinalReport.pdf).
- Hataley, T. S., & Nossal, K. R. (2004, February). The limits of the human security agenda: The case of Canada's response to the Timor crisis. *Global Change, Peace and Security*, 16(1), 5–17. Retrieved November 7, 2007, from [http://post.queensu.ca/~nossalk/papers/hataley-nossal\\_timor.pdf](http://post.queensu.ca/~nossalk/papers/hataley-nossal_timor.pdf).
- Hedges, C. (2003). *War is a force that gives us meaning*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Human Security Network. (n.d.). *The network*. Retrieved November 7, 2007, from [www.humansecuritynetwork.org/network-e.php](http://www.humansecuritynetwork.org/network-e.php).
- Infoplease. (2000–2007). *Measuring global poverty*. Boston: Pearson Education. Retrieved November 7, 2007, from [www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0908770.html](http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0908770.html).
- O'Donnell, P. S. (2004). *Sovereignty past and present*. Retrieved November 7, 2007, from the International Consortium for the Advancement of Academic Publication web site, <http://globalization.icaap.org/content/v4.1/odonnell.html>.
- Report of the Workshop on Human Security*. (2006, March 24). 60th Session of the U.N. General Assembly, Agenda Item 120, Follow-up to the Outcome of the Millenium Summit; Letter dated March 27, 2006, from the Permanent Representatives of Japan and Mexico to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary General (Report of the Workshop on Human Security, organized by the Government of Mexico in cooperation with the Government of Japan, Mexico City, February 9 and 10, 2006), A/60/739.

