Abatement, which utilizes country assessments. As an enhancement to the standard assessment process, the WBA program seeks to develop concurrent plans, in coordination with the various country hosts, to assist using a fast-track approach so that serious threats can be addressed much more expeditiously than with other methods. Under this methodology, as country assessments reveal threats, the information is shared with the host country and discussions include possible solutions to the threats. As the assessments continue, the solution sets are fine-tuned, and it quickly becomes obvious which option is best to mitigate the specific threats. Once the solution is mutually agreed upon by the Department of State and the host country, the same teams that are conducting the assessments can be expanded to handle the implementation. The benefits of this improved approach are numerous but include faster response to identified threats, a more cost-effective mitigation of threats, a fast-tracked timeline (the same teams expand to handle the solution; there is a minimal learning curve for personnel) for response, and ongoing host-country buy-in to the solution. The Department of State has done an admirable job in constructing a highly efficient, responsive, accretive and timely program for weapons removal and abatement.

In conclusion, there is an irrefutable relationship between landmines and other remnants of war. Their origins are complex and independent; their technology and cost components are quite different; their general manufacturing and deployment sources are different; but both excel as weapons since the effectiveness of any weapon depends upon two factors:

1. Its ability to damage or destroy men and material
2. The morale effect of its use, or threat thereof, upon the enemy

Both of these threats have many names, and I am certain someone somewhere is thinking up a new name for landmines and other explosive remnants of war. Regardless of the new tortured phrases we will be forced to endure, let us not forget that “A rose by any other name would smell as sweet,” but these threats are the thorns of the rose.
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Targeting Landmines Focuses on Latin America

Targeting Landmines is a project created by Vinicius Souza and Maria Eugenia S& of MediaQuatro designed to begin a global discussion on and generate governmental support for mine awareness, mine clearance and victim assistance initiatives. The group presented its first exhibit for the Targeting Landmines project in January 2006 in Caracas, Venezuela. The exhibition took place as part of the World Social Forum.

The body of work uses photos, articles and documentary materials to disseminate information and spark interest for the Latin American landmine problem. Partial funding for the project has been provided by the International Committee of the Red Cross, but more support will be necessary soon for the project to fulfill its goals. Through extensive work with several humanitarian organizations operating in Colombia, Peru and Ecuador, MediaQuatro will continue to document the breadth of the landmine issue in Latin America.

To learn more about Targeting Landmines, view some of the riveting images, and contact the artists, visit: http://mediaquatro.sites.uol.com.br/minas-eng.html.

News Brief

The cluster munition campaign, following the precedent of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, is beginning to make an impact on state views of banning or restricting cluster munitions. This article examines the history behind the fight to ban or restrict cluster munitions and its ties to the ICBL. The author also discusses the most recent developments in the process to ban or restrict cluster bombs.

by Robin Collins (World Federalist Movement-Canada)

T he end of the Cold War has a lot to do with the greater attention the world now gives to humanitarian grievances. Unexploded ordnance impact data has been accumulating, but without the precedent of the anti-personnel mine campaign and the Ottawa Convention, the Belgians would probably never have considered banning cluster munitions in 2006.

Most of the ICBL’s 1,400 members have limited themselves to APM eradication, victim assistance and other Convention goals, but have not yet rallied in similar numbers to the cluster munitions effort. The Cluster Munition Coalition, formed in late 2003, has approximately 170 members. Many of the ICBL’s members and leadership, however, are seasoned campaigners. Familiar to ICBL-watchers are Handicap International, Human Rights Watch, Landmine Action (UK), Mines Action Canada and Pac Christi, who are among those sitting on CMIC’s 10-member steering committee.

The ICBL and its dynamic partnership with like-minded APM ban states (the Ottawa Process) was an innovative and collaborative way of quickly moving the ban agenda forward. Disappointment with the existing Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons’ process, in which a single reconciliator state can dilute or block Convention provisions supported by the majority, led to the new parallel process.

The parties to the Ottawa Process focused on the idea that humanitarian impact can trump military utility. This idea was not new because international humanitarian law and an array of treaties from the mid-1800s onwards already referred to obligations towards civilians during conflict, containing such ideas as proportionality, discrimination, military necessity and humane treatment.

The CMIC effort has followed the precedent of the ICBL, struggling through the slow CCW process and challenging the stragglers. If cluster-munition campaigns were unprepared for the inadequacy of the prevention measures of the Convention’s Protocol V, that were agreed to by governments, they have sober expectations about their

The cluster munitions campaign, following the precedent of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, is beginning to make an impact on state views of banning or restricting cluster munitions. This article examines the history behind the fight to ban or restrict cluster munitions and its ties to the ICBL. The author also discusses the most recent developments in the process to ban or restrict cluster bombs.

by Robin Collins (World Federalist Movement-Canada)
prospers now at the CCW. At a minimum, preventing UXO meant establishing ac-
ceptable data bases, humanitarian fin-
ancing configurations and destroying aging munitions. The ICBL was the first to
prevent UXO (including cluster munitions)
appeared in the final text. Instead, it stated, ‘\textquote{...ICBL and other interested Par-
yes is encour-
aged to take generic preventive measures aimed at minimising the occurrence of ex-
ploding submunitions.}’ The High Contracting Party may, on a voluntary ba-
sis, exchange information related to efforts to promote and establish best practices (emphasised added).\textquote{…}

While not dismissing the mark, cam-
paigners continue to press governments to sign on as a first step to recognizing a problem. Some nongovernmental organiza-
tions now mull over the idea of an “Ottawa Process” to deal with cluster munitions. While not dismissing any future process outside the CCW, Human Rights Watch has called for a new protocol focussed on cluster munitions: “The mandate and the protocol should be broad, and should deal with both the technical reliability issues and the targeting and use issues… [A] new proto-
col should prohibit the use of unreliable and inaccurate submunitions to avoid their destruction. The billions of unreli-
able and inaccurate submunitions already in the arsenals of more than 70 nations are the primary humanitarian concern. They must never be used to avoid a humanitarian and socioeconomic disaster exceeding that created by millions of land-
mines globally.”

Human Rights Watch, one of a handful of early adopters,\textquote{...} was willing to call for a moratorium on UXO in 1999, and in 2003 it named a specific list of prob-
lematic cluster weapons that should not be used in Iraq because of their known hazard-
ous failure rates.\textquote{...}

Explosive Remnants of War

Even before the Ottawa Convention was signed in 1999,\textquote{...} and 2000, and the ICBL, where many felt that their priority
was to complete work in progress on APMs.\textquote{...}

In December 2001 at the final plenary review conference of the CCW, the ICBL
issued its first clear statement in support of those calling for “a moratorium on the use, production and trade of cluster munitions.”\textquote{...}

Recent Developments

Wilpe, a consultant to the Mennonite Central Committee and law profes-
sor at the University of St. Thomas, described a key presentation by the U.S. rep-
resentatives at the CCW in November 2003 as “a jerking head moment.” The official
bowed heavily from a recent task force re-
port that had found no identifiable, ‘compre-
henent approach—empirical observation or
otherwise—to determine and document

\textquote{...}
Mines and ERW

Due to the history and nature of conflicts in the Ethiopia/Eritrea area, cleanup presents specific considerations and hazards. The lessons learned by the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea Mine Action Coordination Centre in mine/explosive remnant-of-war (ERW) cleanup are presented, as well as recommendations on clearance operations for situations with mixed mine/ERW like that in Ethiopia and Eritrea.

by Bob Kudraya [UNMEE MACC]

Mines and explosive remnants of war continue to affect many parts of the world. One such area is the Horn of Africa, where wars have continued for the better part of the 20th century. The U.N. Security Council Resolution 1293 formally established the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea in November 2000. At the same time, the U.N. Security Council formally established a Mine Action Coordination Centre within the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea. The resolution requires the MACC to coordinate and provide technical assistance for humanitarian mine action activities in the “TSZ” (temporary security zone) and area adjacent to it.

History of the Mine and ERW Problem

The mine and ERW problems of Ethiopia and Eritrea stem from the prolonged conflict that occurred around the 19th century. During the Second World War, British and Indian forces fought a number of battles across Eritrea, culminating in a major siege on the town of Keren in 1941, which lasted nearly three months. These battles were fought in a conventional manner, consisting of aerial bombardments, heavy small-arms fire and mine emplacement. Certain areas around Keren are considered hazardous today due to suspected contamination by mines and unexploded ordnance, particularly in the hills surrounding the township. Keren was the scene of a major battle again during the independence war years between 1961 and 1991.

After the Second World War, Ethiopia was governed by Great Britain until the early 1950s, when it was handed over to Ethiopia in accordance with the federated system. Nonetheless, Ethiopia became its northermmost province. There was a resurgence of Eritrean nationalism in the early 1960s when the Eritrean population began an insurgent campaign for independence against Ethiopian forces. This rebellion gradually developed into a more conventional war as the Eritreans gained support for their cause, won key battles and held ground. This struggle for independence lasted 30 years and affected the entire country. The Eritrean struggle for independence is possibly one of the most successful examples of a liberation war. Eritreans are justifiably proud of the establishment of their country, as it was won at great cost to the population and without “outside” help or support from other nations.

After the state of Eritrea was established in 1993, following a U.N.-monitored referendum in which the population voted overwhelmingly for independence, the relationship between Eritrea and Ethiopia was cordial. This relationship continued until several issues soured it, including the introduction of a new currency, the nakfa, which replaced the Ethiopian birr. The situation eventually deteriorated into a war lasting from 1998 to 2000 over former-demarcated border. Then in 2002, Algiers brokered a peace accord. This border war was an intense conflict, with both sides employing conventional war strategies that developed into a carefully planned and executed military operation reminiscent of World War II. The war was fought at terrible cost with an estimated 70,000 people killed and thousands more displaced. As a result of this conflict, the entire border area between the two countries from the Sudan in the west to the Djiboutian border in the east remains contaminated with mines and ERW today.

Interrelationship between Mines and ERW

For the conflict zones, most of Eritrea and the northern areas of Ethiopia remain contaminated with mines and conventional ERW. In a recent incident, a truck driver collecting stones for a building site was killed when his vehicle drove over a landmine on a vacant site just off a main road near the capital, Asmara. This mine was a remnant of the independence war years, quite possibly overlooked when the area was vacated.

In examining the history of the conflicts that have engulfed the region, mines and ERW are interwoven narratives rather than separate events. It is not safe to just walk out to unexploded ordnance or an abandoned tank and attempt to remove or destroy items without...