

The Conceptual Framework: Security, Peace, Accountability and Rights

SANAM NARAGHI ANDERLINI AND JUDY EL-BUSHRA WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY SARAH MAGUIRE

The adoption of **Security Council Resolution 1325** in October 2000 was a watershed in the evolution of international women's rights and peace and security issues. It is the first formal and legal document from the Security Council that requires parties in a conflict to respect women's rights and to support their participation in peace negotiations and in post conflict reconstruction (see appendix for full text and the chapter on international policies and legal mechanisms for a detailed discussion).

Resolution 1325 did not, however, emerge in a vacuum. It was the outcome of a concerted effort by a number of international women's organisations and networks, working in partnership with supportive governments and UN entities.¹ It was also a result of the changing climate of opinion among policy-makers throughout the 1990s. This opinion has increasingly stressed the need for the international community to embrace principles of human rights, diversity, good governance and participation when responding to situations of insecurity and violent conflict. The discussion below provides an overview of the evolving policy and conceptual discourse related to peace and security broadly and women more specifically. It also provides a broader context for the analyses and information provided in other chapters of this Toolkit.

WHY WOMEN?

International Alert and Women Waging Peace have chosen to present the challenges and opportunities of peacebuilding from the point of view of women peace activists for two reasons. First, women's profiles in peacebuilding, as in many other areas of life, have been unrealistically low and undervalued. Yet in conflicts and war-torn countries across the world, women are often at the forefront of peacemaking and peacebuilding efforts. They are leading households, caring for the sick and the old and sustaining and ensuring the survival of their families and communities. Even in refugee camps and despite their own traumas or victimisation, women shoulder the responsibilities of others. In many instances (as documented throughout this Toolkit) women initiate peacemaking efforts. It is often women who are the mobilisers and the voice of civilians silenced by violence and atrocities. Long after international aid and support have ended, women are left to handle the trauma and violence that comes home with men whose lives have been

devastated by war and to provide the continuity that enables families and communities to heal and move forward. Yet time and again, women are depicted simply as silent passive victims. This Toolkit is part of a broader effort to shed light on women's roles and their contributions to peace.

Second, women's organisations and women peace activists tend to have inadequate access to information and resources. While their strength is their ability to work at the grassroots level, develop distinct and context-specific approaches and network effectively with other women's groups, it is also a limitation. Women's organisations are often distant and disconnected from developments and processes under way at regional and international levels. Even donors and institutions that support their efforts tend to compartmentalise them—supporting individual projects but rarely integrating them into their mainstream programmes on peacebuilding and reconstruction. This Toolkit seeks to bridge these gaps. It provides the information and tools needed by women to enable

their systematic inclusion in peace processes. In doing so, it also seeks to strengthen women's capacities to draw on their own experience and expertise and to advocate for changes and improvements in existing international efforts.

Throughout the Toolkit we also address issues of **gender equality**—that is ensuring that the interests, needs and priorities of both women and men are taken into consideration. It also means that achieving rights, responsibilities and opportunities for men and women are not dependent on their sex.² We firmly embrace the goal of attaining relations between men and women that are based on equality, justice and mutual respect. While this is a long-term aim, however, a key approach taken in the immediate term is focusing on the empowerment of women. Many organisations worldwide are dedicated to supporting women and regard this as a fundamental step towards gender equality.

THE POLICY FRAMEWORK

There are four inter-related elements in the evolving framework related to peace and security.

1. First, there has been a shift in policy discussions about security, away from national security and toward greater emphasis on **human security**. This shift requires governments and other powerful global bodies to recognise the importance of placing human beings and not states, at the centre of security concerns.
2. Second, there has been a shift in thinking on conflict and peace, away from focusing peacemaking efforts on mediation and formal agreements and toward a broader and more inclusive concept of **conflict transformation**, which requires dismantling unjust structures and policies that exacerbate violent conflict and replacing them with mechanisms, processes and institutions that enable grievances to be recognised, heard and dealt with.
3. Third, standard-setting in the humanitarian and relief profession is evolving and, with it, open and effective ways of holding humanitarian actors to these standards. This move towards

humanitarian accountability is an essential step in, for example, improving the treatment women should receive from the international community during humanitarian emergencies.

4. Finally, there is increasing acceptance of **women's rights** within the global policymaking framework. In this process, the basic rights of women have been spelled out in successive international legal instruments. They have been progressively incorporated into established policy and practice, including policies on which responses to conflict and war are based.

Respect for the human rights and dignity of every person is not only central to, but is in many ways the starting point for these developments (see chapter on human rights). In practice, however, different approaches have been taken to reach this goal. In the context of peace negotiations, for example, dilemmas arise over the question of amnesty, particularly acute in cases where victim and perpetrator may be forced to live in proximity to each other. Offering amnesty to perpetrators may be objectionable when viewed from a human rights perspective alone, as it offers no justice to victims. But it may be a necessary gesture, not only to limit the risks of violent resurgence and further violations of human rights, but also to move the process forward, so that in the long term the human rights of everyone are respected. In effect it may mean trading short-term concessions for long-term benefits. These approaches may contradict each other, but the complexity of war and its aftermath does not allow for one-dimensional responses. Each of the four is discussed more fully below.

1. THE HUMAN SECURITY FRAMEWORK

Historically, security has meant keeping states safe from external enemies. Threats to international peace and security were usually thought of as threats to states from forces outside it. In the 1990s, with the end of the Cold War and the prevalence of insecure conditions within countries, however, notions of security changed. There was acknowledgment that material poverty and bad governance—including the oppression of ethnic or religious groups and political dissidents and external economic and political pressures—all contribute to instability on local and global scales.

In the years leading up to the Millennium, at the UN and other organisations, the concept of “**human security**”—putting the individual and her/his rights at the centre of security concerns—grew in prominence.³ Human security, first defined by former Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy, is:

a condition or state of being characterized by freedom from pervasive threats to people’s rights, their safety, or even their lives... It is an alternative way of seeing the world, taking people as the point of reference, rather than focusing exclusively on the security of territory or governments.... Human security entails taking preventive measures to reduce vulnerability and minimize risk, and taking remedial action when prevention fails.⁴

He further stated that:

A human security agenda must go beyond humanitarian action, by addressing the sources of people’s insecurity. Building human security, therefore, requires both short term humanitarian action and longer term strategies for building peace and promoting sustainable development.⁵

The UN Secretary General, in his 2000 Millennium Report,⁶ described this coming together of rights and security as “freedom from want and freedom from fear.” The **Commission on Human Security**⁷ accepted this as the basic definition of human security and addressed it through four main components:

1. critical and pervasive threats;
2. human rights;
3. protection; and
4. building on people’s strength.

Critical and pervasive threats are factors in the physical or social environment that are likely to have a severely destructive effect over a long period, undermining people’s ability to recover from shocks and disasters. What constitutes a critical and pervasive threat is likely to vary according to circumstances: a natural disaster, for example, will have a bigger impact in some contexts than in others.

For instance, an earthquake in a developed nation might result in no fatalities, whereas the same in a developing country where building regulations are non-existent in the areas where poor people live, might cost thousands of lives. In this case, the underlying problem of unregulated building is the “critical and pervasive threat,” rather than the earthquake itself. Taking a human security approach would require building regulations to be enhanced and implemented to reduce the threat of earthquake damage to poor communities.

Many other critical and pervasive threats are widely believed to contribute, in different ways, to the occurrence or perpetuation of armed conflict. Corruption, exploitation, unequal development investment, discrimination and political repression can all lead to disaffection and to support being given to armed opposition movements. Poverty and displacement make young men vulnerable to recruitment by armed groups that offer the promise of a livelihood. High rates of HIV/AIDS undermine governance when administrators, parliamentarians and other qualified people get sick and die. Small arms proliferation leads to an increase in gun-related violence and organised crime, including trafficking of drugs and women. Violence in the home reduces women’s access to decision-making in the public sphere. Tensions and conflicts in host countries exacerbate the social problems faced by refugees and can reawaken old hostilities.

Human rights are the rights of all human beings to fundamental freedoms (see chapter on human rights). The concept of human security helps us understand that basic human rights, as stated in the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights**, are inter-related. In other words, a person cannot be free from discrimination if she/he is facing religious persecution. Human security complements human rights law by drawing attention to international humanitarian law in the context of armed conflict, environmental security and other issues. For people not specifically protected by measures in international law—such as older, internally displaced or disabled people—insisting on human security means that their rights are especially protected because they face particular critical and pervasive threats.

Sometimes, human rights are overridden or ignored for the sake of state security. Human security puts

people first, emphasising that human rights are central to state security. Many nation states, including those with questionable human rights records, often describe state security as of paramount importance. But state security is often ill-defined, masking the economic or other interests of elites or other powerful groups and pretending that these interests are for the common good. Often, when the state breaches human rights and oppresses particular sectors of society, its actions prompt the emergence of armed opposition groups that in turn threaten the state's security.

Protection is a constant theme in human security discourse. It refers to the notion of taking a proactive approach to ensure that people's human rights are respected at all stages of a conflict, not left until "later" after political settlements have been agreed on. Protecting citizens affected by violent conflict is a priority for all agencies and governments. All security or military organisations should have an understanding of and commitment to, the concept of human security.⁸

Considering security from a human rather than a state perspective means that people are considered capable of creating positive change, and the state encourages **building on people's strength**. For women particularly, this means that instead of treating women only as victims, governments and agencies should enable them to participate in decision-making, whether at the ballot box or the peace table. To make this happen in a comprehensive way, violence has to be eradicated from women's lives and women must have sufficient economic and political power to feel secure in stating their own case.

Responsibility for promoting human security lies with everyone: states, civil society (including corporate bodies and the media), international financial institutions and multilateral institutions, individuals and parties to armed conflict. This does not mean, however, that individuals or non-governmental organisations (NGOs), for instance, should take over the responsibility of the state. Primary responsibility for protecting and promoting human rights still lies with the state. However, human security does require concerted action at societal and state levels, as well as sound global governance. International financial institutions, NGOs and inter-governmental organisations must embody the *values* of human security.

In many national liberation struggles, women have made the connection between security and rights, insisting that the struggle for equality and social justice go hand in hand with the struggle for national independence.

In the years since the September 11, 2001, attacks in the US, the discourse has again tilted towards militaristic notions of security. This is true, for example, in the case of the US government's doctrine of pre-emptive action. Under this doctrine, the US government reserves the right to use offensive action in the face of a perceived or actual threat, rather than using force only to defend against attack. The concern that many critics voice is that offensive military action alone not only results in more death and hardship in the lives of innocent people, but also fuels anger and resentment, thus perpetuating the cycle of insecurity. Moreover, there is concern that the underlying factors that contribute to the rise in violence and terror are being ignored.

The human security framework alone does not have answers to all security threats. But in concert with other frameworks, it can and does add value to our understanding of the causes of conflict and insecurity. Proponents of this approach have engaged in the debates around terrorism and have addressed some of the root causes and symptoms of the threat. Yet in the international discourse on these issues, their voices remain marginalised and largely unheard.⁹

2. THE CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION FRAMEWORK

Conflict specialists have made some important shifts over the last decade in the way they understand and analyse conflict and peace. In the past, conflict specialists tended to consider conflict as a set of events leading to a political crisis at an international or national level, requiring outside mediators with special skills to resolve the dispute. They now recognise that conflict, in its most general sense, is a natural expression of social difference and of humanity's perpetual struggle for justice and self-determination. The challenge is not to abolish conflict, but rather to put a stop to the cyclical nature of *violent* conflict by first acknowledging that different interests exist and then by channelling the struggle in constructive directions. In other words, there is understanding that if managed effectively, conflict can be positive and creative.

While armed conflicts involve powerful political and military actors, they may just as easily involve and overwhelm ordinary people at a local level facing everyday life struggles. Factors that operate at international, national and local levels are interlinked. Unravelling violent conflict needs to take place at all these levels simultaneously.

The role of peacebuilders has changed accordingly. Mediating disputes between politicians to bring an end to fighting (**conflict resolution**) is important (see chapter on peace negotiations and agreements), but it is only one of many peacebuilding tasks. It should be seen as part of a wider process (**conflict transformation**), in which the deeper structural issues that give rise to and perpetuate armed conflict are addressed. Conflict transformation describes a broad range of activities aimed not only at halting armed conflict, but at promoting structural changes that also address the root causes of conflict. These activities might include:

- peacemaking (dialogue, mediation, contributing to and monitoring peace accords);
- advocating to promote awareness of peace, disarmament, justice and human rights issues;
- leading and participating in political processes and encouraging popular participation and confidence in those processes;
- providing social services to ensure that the survival and basic needs of all, especially the more disadvantaged, are met;
- contributing to and strengthening civil society; and
- undertaking community-level development and social reconstruction work.

Conflict transformation is no longer the preserve of a small group of elite mediators, but is increasingly seen as the responsibility of all. Indeed, it cannot be fully achieved unless actors at all levels participate. So, while national negotiations might establish a formal peace deal between belligerents, international players (e.g. other governments with interests in the region, multinational commercial interests) also need to be involved.

Local people affected by the conflict in their communities and homes must also be included in the

process. The experience of transitional justice in post-genocide **Rwanda** illustrates one way in which this might happen. The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda has been slow, expensive and largely ineffective at promoting reconciliation at the local level. Meanwhile, at the national level, tens of thousands remain in prison, as suspected genocide perpetrators awaiting trial, but the judiciary has been unable to process the large number of cases within an acceptable time limit. The re-establishment and adoption of a traditional, community-based justice mechanism—the *gacaca* courts—is designed to enable all citizens to participate directly in some aspects of justice and reconciliation. Though *gacaca* has been criticised by many human rights activists because it does not meet international legal standards, if fully implemented, it could ensure that local people are included in the conflict transformation process.

Broadening the scope from conflict resolution to conflict transformation also recognises the work of civil society in all phases of a peace process. Civil society forms a counterweight to other forms of power (political, commercial or military) and provides citizens with a channel for expressing their views. Civil society organisations operating in war zones carry out a wide range of activities, including provision of welfare and service, defending human rights, policy lobbying and community development. All of these can be described as conflict transformation when they support those most directly affected by conflict and seek to end the violence and dismantle the forces of oppression.

Women take part as key actors in all activities around conflict transformation. They influence popular opinion for or against war, monitor the actions of the international community and of local conflict actors, provide support and protection to the vulnerable and contribute to the growth and strengthening of civil society. Women's groups and organisations often get involved in peace-related work as a result of their frustration with mainstream politics and what they see as the lack of moral justification for the violence being committed in their names. Women peace activists have described their role as promoting the “feminisation of protest”—transforming attitudes and practices, structures and competences, to lay the groundwork for local and global changes that permanent peace

requires. Women's peace activism addresses women's rights and equality and the broader societal goals of equality, justice and reconciliation: both are necessary elements to conflict transformation.

3. HUMANITARIAN ACCOUNTABILITY

The concept of “**humanitarian accountability**” evolved out of discussions in the early 1990s among humanitarian agencies seeking to clarify the basic principles of assistance and ensure that they adhered consistently to these principles. Humanitarian work is concerned with the immediate relief of human suffering as a result of natural or man-made disasters. Humanitarian emergencies resulting from war (especially emergencies resulting in population displacement) grew in number and intensity following the Cold War, placing rapidly increasing demands on the international community's capacity to respond.

Lack of a coordinated policy resulted in many emergencies being ignored, while in others, agencies were unable to absorb all the funds donated. Humanitarian aid was often provided on the basis of the foreign policy priorities of donor countries, rather than on humanitarian need. Emergency responses sometimes inadvertently fuelled conflict by boosting the economic resources accessible to warring groups, and humanitarian agencies were accused of causing harm by short-term thinking.¹⁰ Practical work on the ground was often hampered by the conflicting policies of different agencies. From the standpoint of gender issues, projects were criticised for ignoring women's active role in supporting their families and communities and for failing to recognise the different needs of men and women (e.g. for protection or health services). Moreover, a few individuals working on assistance programmes were found to be misusing their power and abusing their beneficiaries in various ways (sometimes committing serious sexual abuse) with impunity.

As these problems became more widely recognised, agencies providing humanitarian assistance worked to agree on basic principles and to establish mechanisms for holding the humanitarian and relief profession accountable for upholding these principles. The four **Humanitarian Principles** have been defined as

1. **humanity**, meaning the centrality of saving human lives and alleviating suffering wherever it is found;
2. **impartiality**, meaning the implementation of actions solely on the basis of need, without discrimination between or within populations that are affected by crises;
3. **neutrality**, meaning that humanitarian action must not favour any side in an armed conflict or other dispute where such action is carried out; and
4. **independence**, meaning the autonomy of humanitarian objectives from the political, economic, military or other objectives that any actor may hold regarding areas where humanitarian action is being implemented.¹¹

Accountability: Accountability is exercised at three levels.¹² The first is between the recipients of assistance and the organisations that help them. People have a right to assistance and to have it offered to them in ways that preserve their human dignity and capacity for independent action. Those who suffer as a result of disasters are hardly in a position to voice protests if provisions are inadequate, if they are treated without dignity or if assistance providers abuse them. To overcome this sense of helplessness, many agencies have adopted a “rights-based approach” to their work, recognising that victims have a basic right to aid. They are therefore not simply beneficiaries; they are claimants. In some instances, agencies also provide mechanisms for them to submit complaints if needed.¹³

The second level concerns the accountability of states in providing for and protecting their own people. Internal mechanisms for calling a state to account do not always function effectively. Ensuring accountability internationally runs up against the problem of sovereignty, which states often claim, against interference by other states. In establishing a balance between citizens' rights on the one hand and sovereignty on the other, international law does offer standards, which states are expected to keep to, as well as mechanisms to ensure compliance. For example, the 1998 **Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement** (see chapter on refugees and internally displaced persons) summarise the responsibilities of

states in international law to protect the internally displaced. The most important international mechanism to date is the **International Criminal Court (ICC)**,¹⁴ which can prosecute people accused of crimes against humanity, genocide and crimes of war.

Third, donor governments realised that, in addition to applying humanitarian principles as criteria in decisions about funding, they also needed to apply them to their own efforts. Donor governments have been criticised for being too influenced by political considerations in their decisions about which emergencies to support. Much of the work on accountability by donors to date involves streamlining the processes through which UN agencies combine their requests for funds to assist in specific emergencies, for example, the Consolidated Appeals Process.

Frameworks, Principles and Codes of Conduct: The basic accountability framework is the **Red Cross/Red Crescent Code of Conduct**.¹⁵ This Code, based on existing international human rights law, enshrines 10 principles including the impartiality of aid, respect for local custom and the dignity of aid recipients. Other frameworks have built on this Code. The Sphere Project, for example,¹⁶ was launched in 1997 by the Red Cross/Red Crescent movement and NGOs. It aims to extend and strengthen the Code of Conduct by supplying a handbook setting out minimum standards in four operational sectors (water, sanitation and hygiene; food security, nutrition and food aid; shelter, settlements and non-food items; and health services). The Sphere Project also includes the **Humanitarian Charter**, a revised version of the Code of Conduct, which NGOs are invited to sign.

The **Good Donorship initiative**¹⁷ aims to promote accountability standards among donor governments. The **Humanitarian Accountability Partnership International (HAPI)**¹⁸ outlines principles of accountability for NGOs, including the principles that claimants' rights must be respected and promoted; that they should be meaningfully involved in project planning, implementation, evaluation and reporting; and that they have the right to make complaints and seek redress in safety. The HAPI has instituted mechanisms whereby such complaints about its member organisations can be heard and resolved.

Clearly, donors, states and humanitarian organisations have acknowledged their responsibility to ensure accountability for adhering to humanitarian principles and standards. The impact of this effort, however, has been limited. For example, after massive sexual abuse of aid recipients was uncovered in **Sierra Leone** in the 1990s, investigations resulted in some improvements in protection. But no managers were held accountable and there were no prosecutions.¹⁹ Internationally, civil society organisations such as the **Humanitarian Practice Group** at the **Overseas Development Institute** in London are monitoring progress and sharing information.²⁰ Organisations such as **People in Aid** are developing international standards for the management and support of staff in the field.²¹ Locally, it is important for recipients of humanitarian aid to be supported in developing their own organisations to provide people with a voice and ensure that their opinions are directed into appropriate channels.

During the 1990s, much of the humanitarian profession resisted calls for reform in respect to gender awareness on the supposed grounds that “the tyranny of the urgent” required them to provide only the most immediate necessities and do so without seeking to understand social differences. However, more recently it has been acknowledged that many women and their families have suffered avoidable neglect and deprivation as a result of the absence of a gender-aware policy and practices in humanitarian agencies. Women working within these agencies have done much to raise this awareness.²²

The frameworks and codes of conduct mentioned above began by making no specific reference to women, just as many major international instruments include women's rights within overall human rights. However, following pressure from women within some agencies and a review by the **Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children**, the Sphere Project handbook now includes notes about the specific concerns of women and girls within each sector and indicators of women's access and participation. The **International Committee of the Red Cross** also undertook a study of the implications for women and girls of international human rights and humanitarian law prior to establishing a campaign to make these more widely known within the international community.²³

4. THE WOMEN'S RIGHTS FRAMEWORK

Women's rights have been seen as part and parcel of human rights work more generally. Women's rights have been implicitly included in, for example, the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights**.²⁴ However, there was little recognition of the specific ways in which women's human rights are violated.

In part, the lack of consideration of women's human rights stemmed from the nature of the violations that women experience. Many, although not all, occur in the private sphere of the home or family, in the form of physical violence or sexual abuse. Often, customary or religious laws violate women's economic or political rights (e.g. by forbidding women to inherit property).

While women's human rights violations do not always involve state actors, in most cases, the state has either condoned existing practices, allowed the passage of discriminatory laws or instigated policies and programmes that are inherently discriminatory against women.

For many years following the adoption of the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights** and other international instruments that protected civil and political rights, the primary focus of the international human rights community was rights in the public sphere—particularly in relation to political and civil issues.²⁵ As a result, women's human rights and violations of those rights that occurred in the home or community were often overlooked.²⁶ There is a growing conviction in the international community that women's rights are in danger of being taken for granted unless the specific implications of human rights principles for women and girls are spelled out.

In 1975, to coincide with the International Year of Women, the first world conference on women was held in Mexico. It set in motion a global movement that has gathered strength in the intervening years with a broad focus on three themes: full gender equality and the elimination of discrimination; the integration and full participation of women in development; and the increased contribution of women to world peace.²⁷

It also led to a series of international instruments that provide detailed statements defining women's rights in practice and setting new standards for gender equality. The **Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of**

Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) is the seminal document for the promotion of international women's human rights. Often described as the international bill of rights for women, CEDAW defines discrimination against women and requires states that are party to the convention to incorporate gender equality into their legal systems, establish institutions for the protection of women and ensure the elimination of all acts of discrimination against women. It also requires states to submit national reports on their progress.²⁸ The Convention was adopted in 1979 and came into force in 1981. By March 2004, 177 countries had ratified CEDAW—over 90 percent of the UN's member states.

Declarations, recommendations and resolutions drawing on CEDAW have been adopted at the regional and international levels that address various aspects of women's human rights and gender discrimination. In addition, some countries have incorporated provisions from CEDAW into their constitutions and legislation, including **Uganda, South Africa, Brazil and Australia**.²⁹

The 1995 **Beijing Platform for Action (BPFA)** that emerged from the fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, China, was the next milestone in the international community's evolving recognition of women's rights. The BPFA expanded the Mexico principles by outlining twelve critical areas of concern regarding women's lives, equality and rights:

1. the persistent and increasing burden of poverty on women;
2. inequalities and inadequacies in and unequal access to education and training;
3. inequalities and inadequacies in and unequal access to health care and related services;
4. violence against women;
5. the effects of armed or other kinds of conflict on women, including those living under foreign occupation;
6. inequality in economic structures and policies, in all forms of productive activities and in access to resources;

7. inequality between men and women in the sharing of power and decision-making at all levels;
8. insufficient mechanisms at all levels to promote the advancement of women;
9. lack of respect for and inadequate promotion and protection of the human rights of women;
10. stereotyping of women and inequality in women's access to and participation in all communication systems, especially the media;
11. gender inequalities in the management of natural resources and in the safeguarding of the environment; and
12. persistent discrimination against and violation of the rights of the girl child.

Under each theme, the problems are articulated and strategic objectives stated for concrete actions

to be taken by different actors. The BPFA is not only comprehensive but has also set clear benchmarks and a vision for improving women's lives. With 188 states as signatories, it is an influential international document on women's rights. At Beijing, the impact of armed conflict on women was noted as a specific emerging issue requiring attention. Its inclusion in the Platform for Action spurred the growth of a global women's peace movement and the revitalisation of anti-militaristic feminism.

Security Council Resolution 1325 drew on the energy of this movement and built on the strengths of previous policy instruments. But as the first formal acknowledgement of the role of women's rights and women's roles in the domain of national and international peace and security, it is a critical milestone. The emergence and implications of Resolution 1325 and other policy instruments relating to women's involvement in peace and security issues are elaborated in the section on International Policies and Mechanisms.

ACRONYMS

BPFA	Beijing Platform for Action
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
HAPI	Humanitarian Accountability Partnership International
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ICC	International Criminal Court
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
UN	United Nations
US	United States

ENDNOTES

1. Adrian-Paul, Ancil. "Legitimising the Role of Women in Peacebuilding in the United Nations: A Campaign Approach." *NGOs at the Table: Strategies for Influencing Policy*. Dublin, Ireland: INCORE, 2003.
2. For an authoritative set of definitions of gender, gender equality and gender mainstreaming, see the Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women of the UN at <<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/conceptsanddefinitions.htm>>. Gender is defined here as referring to "the social attributes and opportunities associated with being male and female and the relationships between women and men and girls and boys, as well as the relations between women and those between men.... Gender determines what is expected, allowed and valued in a woman or a man in a given context."
3. For more information about the origins and use of the term human security, see Goldberg, David. *Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy's Concept of "Human Security" and Canada's Contribution To Peacemaking In The Middle East*. 10 September 2004 <<http://web.idirect.com/~cic/canadaIsrael/political/axworthy.html>>.
4. Axworthy, Lloyd. *Human Security: Safety for People in a Changing World*. Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 1999.
5. Ibid.
6. United Nations *The Millennium Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations*, 2000 <<http://www.un.org/millennium/sg/report>>.
7. Commission on Human Security, <<http://www.humansecurity-chs.org>>.
8. Commission on Human Security Final Report, 2003, overview available on <<http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/outline.pdf>>.
9. For a discussion on human security and controlling terrorism, see Bell, Dick and Michael Renner. *A New Marshall Plan? Advancing Human Security and Controlling Terrorism*. Worldwatch Institute, 2001. 10 September 2004 <<http://www.worldwatch.org/press/news/2001/10/09/>> and Sommaruga, Cornelio. *State and Human Security in the Age of Terrorism: The Role of Security Sector Reform*, 2nd Joint UNOG/DCAF Seminar, Geneva, January 2004. 10 September 2004 <http://www.gichd.ch/pdf/staff_statements_articles/SOC/SOC_040126_DCAF_Geneva.pdf>.
10. Anderson, Mary. *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—Or War*. Boulder, CO & London: Lynne Rienner, 1999.
11. From text adopted by the International Meeting on Good Humanitarian Donorship, Stockholm, June 2003 <<http://www.reliefweb.int/ghd/imgd.pdf>>.
12. Taken from Humanitarian Exchange 24, July 2003. Humanitarian Policy Group, London: Overseas Development Institute.
13. For a discussion on humanitarian actions and a rights-based approach, see <http://www.humanitarian-review.org/upload/pdf/ConradHiltonAdvertorial_4.pdf>.
14. For more information about the functioning of the ICC, see <<http://www.icc-cpi.int/home.html>>.
15. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, <<http://www.ifrc.org/publicat/conduct>>.
16. Sphere Project <<http://www.sphereproject.org>>.
17. The initiative is currently being overseen by a group of donor representatives in Geneva, chaired by the Swedish and Canadian governments. For more background, see Macrae, Joanna and Adele Harmer. "Good Humanitarian Donorship: A Mouse or a Lion?" *Humanitarian Exchange* 24, July 2003.
18. Humanitarian Accountability Partnership International, <<http://www.hapinternational.org>>.
19. Naik, Asmita "West Africa Scandal Points to Need for Humanitarian Watchdog." *Humanitarian Exchange* 24 July 2003.
20. The Humanitarian Policy Group manages the Humanitarian Practice Network, "an independent forum where field workers, managers and policy makers in the humanitarian sector share information, analysis and experience." See <<http://www.odihpn.org>> for details of activities and publications.
21. People in Aid was set up in the mid-1990s following a survey of aid workers which showed that many felt unsupported and unguided. PiA operates an award scheme under which good employers are awarded "kitemarks." It launched updated guidelines in 2003, available on <<http://www.peopleinaid.org>>.
22. Two accounts of this struggle are: Abdela, Lesley. "Kosovo: Missed Opportunities, Lessons for the Future." *Development in Practice* 13: 2 and 3, 2003; Williams, Suzanne. "Conflicts of Interest: Gender in Oxfam's Emergency Response." *The Post-War Moment: Militaries, Masculinities, and International Peacekeeping*. Eds. Cynthia Cockburn and Dubravka Zarkov. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 2002.
23. Lindsey, Charlotte. *Women Facing War*. Geneva: ICRC, 2001.
24. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, available at <<http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>>.
25. See chapter on human rights for more information about international human rights instruments.
26. Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs "Silence Breaking: The Women's Dimension of the Human Rights Box." *Human Rights Dialogue* 2.3, 2000.
27. First World Conference on Women, 14 September 2004 <http://www.choike.org/nuevo_eng/informes/1453.html>.
28. *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women*, available at <www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw>.
29. United Nations. *CEDAW: The Treaty for the Rights of Women*. New York: The Working Group on Ratification of the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), 2004. 5 September 2004 <http://www.womenstreaty.org/CEDAW_Book.htm>. See also chapter on constitutional rights and legislation for more information on how to incorporate CEDAW into domestic law.