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Dear Ms. Carter Fay:

Please find enclosed and completed your reader-response survey as published in the latest issue of The Journal of ERW and Mine Action.

I feel it is important to introduce myself and say a few words about The Journal. Like many of your subscribers, I have a military career with the Royal Canadian Artillery and have served as a Military Police officer. I returned to the private sector to lead diversity and inclusion initiatives within the Canadian Forces. My role encompasses inclusion, diversity, and accessibility initiatives for the Artillery Branch. I have been receiving your publication for several years.

Please consider my comments as a resource library.

—John Baker, CIFP staff

In 2015, having returned to Canada, I had a chance to meet with a former colleague and was asked to join the Canadian Army. On posting, I performed a range of leadership roles, including serving with the Office of Impromptu Explosive Ordnance Disposal at NATO Headquarters in Kabul, Afghanistan, in 2007. I have been receiving your publication for several years. I feel you are an important voice in the "horrid" debate about anti-personnel mines, with your many articles and book reviews in The Journal as a resource library.

—Michael E. Lamoureux

Former Ammunition Technical Officer Canadian Army and British Army

If we print something that helps for your comment, submit your own letter to the Editor. Please keep your response short and to the point—200 words or so. Since we have limited space, we reserve the right to edit the comments to fit the space and have done so here. Send your letters to editor@maic.jmu.edu. Visit our online journal at http://maic.jmu.edu/journal/index.

Send your letters to editormaic@gmail.com. Visit our online journal at http://maic.jmu.edu/journal/index.

We Can Only Be “Mine Safe” When We Are “Mine Free”

Despite the fact that the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction makes no mention of the term “mine safe,” it is still a frequent term used by mine-contaminated states. However, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines maintains that in order for states to be safe from the dangers posed by mines, all mine areas must be cleared—not only those areas which are deemed to pose an immediate threat.

by Tamar Gabelnick | International Campaign to Ban Landmines

I n January 2011, Sri Lanka experienced its heaviest rainfall since 1917, bringing landmines and unexploded ordnance back into areas previously surveyed, partially cleared and deemed “safe” for populations to return. These populations are again at risk from injury according to the Sri Lankan Army, a risk that could have been avoided if all mined areas had been cleared rather than only high-impact regions. This example is just one of many reasons that the ICBL has insisted on the need for mine-affected states to fully clear all mined areas, not just those deemed to pose an immediate threat to the local population. Twelve years after the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction (also known as the Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention or APMC) entered into force, some mine-affected states (both States Parties and others) maintain that reaching such a goal is neither possible nor necessarily a desirable end state. The ICBL strongly disagrees.

The Article 5 Framework

Article 5 of the APMC requires States Parties to “make every effort to identify all areas under [their] jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced” and “to destroy or ensure the destruction of..."