

## *Politicizing Indiscriminate Terror: Imagining an Inclusive Framework for the Anti-Landmines Movement*

ASMERET ASEFAW BERHE

*Landmines are indiscriminate weapons of mass terror that detrimentally affect human beings, the ecological system they live in, the regional economy, and political stability. Despite the extensive nature of the impacts, the landmine crisis is almost exclusively advocated on the basis of human rights principles. A comprehensive framework that considers environmental degradation as a principal aftermath of the global landmine crisis is critically missing from the broader matrix of variables around which the anti-landmine movement converges. This article discusses the current humanitarian framework of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines; its shortcomings to address the interconnected impacts of landmines on the environment; and attempts to describe what an inclusive, environmentally sensitive framework would have to incorporate to address the overall landmine impacts effectively.*

**Keywords:** *landmines; war; environmental degradation; environmental rights; issue framing; environmental movements*

**L**andmines are indiscriminate weapons of mass terror that detrimentally affect human beings, the ecological system they live in, the regional economy, and political stability. Studies from as far back as the late 1970s have pointed to the environmentally destructive nature of these weapons (Berhe, 2000; Gray, 1997; Nachón, 2000; Newton, 1997; United Nations Environment Programme UNEP/IG.4/3, 1977; United Nations General Assembly UNGA/A/38/383, 1983). In addition, favorable conditions of heightened environmental awareness, sensitivity, and advocacy have been prevalent. However, the mobilization of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL, also referred to as the anti-landmines movement) has been conducted largely on a human rights basis. Consideration of rights of future human generations and nonhuman life-forms; employment of an inclusive, environmentally sensitive framework; and championing by environmental organizations has been slow even during this very long and favorable window of opportunity.

The objective of this article is to discuss the current humanitarian framework of the ICBL, its shortcomings to address the interconnected

---

AUTHOR'S NOTE: The author wishes to thank Kate O'Neil, Jorge Balsiger, and an anonymous reviewer for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this article.

*The Journal of Environment & Development*, Vol. 14, No. 3, September 2005 375-393

DOI: 10.1177/1070496505280186

© 2005 Sage Publications

impacts of landmines on the environment, and attempts to describe what an inclusive, environmentally sensitive framework would have to incorporate to address the overall landmine impacts effectively. The purpose of this thesis is not to critique the work of the ICBL but rather to contribute to the advancement of the movements' success by proposing a complementary approach that broadens its agenda.

The "humanitarian holocaust" (Gray, 1997) of landmines is outrageous. Thus, understanding the environmental impacts of these insidious weapons and accordingly describing the accompanying, essentially human rights-based, movement agendas as environmentally sensitive is complicated at multiple levels: (a) There has been no definite accounting and consensus on the type and extent of environmental impacts of landmines; (b) in the effort of trying to frame the issue as an environmental problem lies the distinct possibility of being perceived as giving more weight to the impacts suffered by future human generations and nonhuman life-forms in front of very excessive current human problems; and (c) adoption of an environmental framework in such a crisis like landmines (where the problem is largely prevalent in the developing world that is also suffering from multiple natural and manmade disasters) is likely to invoke the question, Do we care more for and prefer to rescue people or nature? This thesis acknowledges the importance of these concerns and makes a conscious effort to give them proper consideration in the subsequent discussions on imagining potential amendments that may improve the effectiveness of the current humanitarian framework of the anti-landmines movement.

The article is organized as follows. A background to the global landmine crisis and environmental impacts of landmines are presented next. The background information is followed by the history of the anti-landmines movement, the humanitarian framework they employ, and its perceived shortcomings. Afterwards, the proposed inclusive, environmentally sensitive framework is presented along with requirements for its implementation and practical challenges that are likely to be ahead. The article then ends with concluding remarks. Although not directly relevant to the issue of landmines, many of the arguments in the next sections are inspired by works of Gamson and Meyer (1996), Keck and Sikkink (1998), Sachs (1995), Schlosberg (1999), Tarrow (1996), and Wapner (1996).

## *Background*

### LANDMINE CRISIS

Landmines are victim operated, explosive traps (Croll, 1998). Mines are extensively used because of their effectiveness as precise weapons

and their very cheap price (Landmine Survivors Network, 2003). It is estimated that there are about 80 to 120 million landmines dispersed in approximately 90 countries, with roughly another 230 million waiting to be deployed in 94 countries (Landmine Monitor, 2002). Landmines are responsible for killing 800 people and disabling another 1,200 people per month, totaling deaths of more people than nuclear and chemical weapons combined (Cameron, Lawson, & Tomlin, 1998).

Former secretary general of the United Nations, Boutros Boutros-Ghali (1994), declared, “[Long after the drums of war have been silenced], landmines remain in the ground as brutal reminders that successful peace building and development are still beyond the horizon.” Landmines trigger a *desperate ecocide* or human interference in environmental processes (resulting from a reckless quest for survival, poverty, ignorance, and population pressures) that sets in motion a series of personal, socioeconomic, and ecological disasters (Blaikie & Brookfield, 1987).

#### ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF LANDMINES

Environmental impacts of landmines represent all ecological disturbances, including death or injury of human beings, whose effect can transcend biophysical/biochemical considerations to influence social, political, and economic systems of a region (a comprehensive review of landmine impacts on the environment is given in Berhe, 2005). In this case, environmental impacts represent all the impacts instigated by human beings and suffered by individuals, society, and the ecological system as a whole. Environmental degradation can be both a cause and a consequence of the landmine crisis. The impact of landmines on the environment depends on the number of mines in a unit area, the composition and toxicity of mines, and the temporal and spatial scales considered. Generally, environmental impacts of landmines can be classified as primary or secondary. The primary environmental impacts of landmines are manifested in a variety of ways, including the following.

*Denying access to vital resources.* Globally, landmines are blamed for denying access to or degrading 900,000 km<sup>2</sup> of land (Buenker, 2000). Consequently, movement of people and animals is restricted in or around vast areas of arable lands, pastures, forests, migratory paths, coastal areas, and important infrastructures including bridges, roads, electrical installations, canals, water sources, and so on.

*Killing and injuring myriad flora and fauna in a region when they explode.* Landmine explosions mostly cause death or loss of limbs of injured human beings and animals. Despite the fact that landmines are intended to target militaries or spies who work for them, about 90% of the wartime

victims and almost all the postconflict victims are civilians (McGrath, 1994). Very few data exist on the effects of landmines on plant and animal populations. Nonetheless, in the last half of the 20th century alone, landmines are believed to have killed 57,000 animals in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Cambodia, and Mozambique (Andersson, da Sousa, & Paredes, 1995), and another 125,000 camels, sheep, goats, and cattle were reported killed and injured in Libya (Gray, 1997). Generally, landmines affect individuals, but in some cases, they are implicated to threaten extinction of endangered species. Because many of the landmine-affected regions of the world overlap with diversity hotspots, landmines are believed to be threatening the extinction of endangered species of elephants in Africa and Sri Lanka, European brown bears in Croatia, silver-backed mountain gorillas in Rwanda, gazelles in the Sudan, and leopards in Afghanistan (Gray, 1997; Nachón, 2000; Roberts & Williams, 1995).

*Disruption of the micro-relief.* When a typical 250-gram antipersonnel landmine detonates, it has the ability to create a crater with a diameter of up to 30 centimeters. The structural disturbance caused by the explosion can facilitate soil erosion or compact soil around the sides of the crater. The impact is more serious in areas with dry, loose soil with little or no vegetative cover and when multiple landmines explode simultaneously or consecutively. In warm and humid regions, the crater can hold stagnant water and serve as a breeding ground for mosquitoes and other disease vectors (Troll, 2000; United Nations General Assembly UNGA/A/38/383, 1983).

*Introducing harmful chemical contaminants to the soil and ground water.* Landmines are commonly made of metal, timber, or plastic casing and 2,4,6-trinitrotoluene (TNT), hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX or Cyclonite), or tetryl. As the metal or timber casing of the mine disintegrates, landmines introduce nonbiodegradable, toxic waste of TNT, RDX, tetryl, depleted uranium, and to a lesser extent, heavy metals including cadmium, chromium, copper, iron, lead, manganese, mercury, nickel, and zinc (Gray, 1997; Orehovec et al., 1998).

*Decreasing resource productivity.* A combination of the environmental impacts described above reduces the productivity of land resources. In 2000, it was reported that in the absence of the landmine crisis, crop productivity in Afghanistan could have increased by 88% to 200%, 135% in Cambodia, 11% in Bosnia, and 3.6% in Mozambique compared to pre-war conditions (Troll, 2000).

The multifaceted environmental degradation presented in the above list, along with the already desperate state of the economy of many of the

landmine-affected nations, inevitably leads to complicated indirect or secondary impacts that are perpetuated as socioeconomic and political crises for the affected populations and regions. Many of the affected developing nations have too many landmines but too little resources to deal with them. During wars that are fought in the name of freedom and subjugation, life is rated of secondary importance to national political and power disputes. As a result, a large number of children, farmers, herders, and internally displaced persons (many of whom are heads of households or financial sources of families) returning from exile continue to fall victim. The resulting environmental problems tend to be manifested as further exploitation of resources beyond their ecological carrying capacity, famine, unemployment, poverty, social marginalization, desperation, migration, aid dependency, regional instability, and underdevelopment.

### *The Anti-Landmines Movement*

The anti-landmines movement is a very dynamic system of advocacy for landmine victims. Its achievements are probably best described by the following two quotes. When the ICBL received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1997, Senator Patrick Leahy (Democrat, Vermont) said, “[The ICBL-facilitated global ban on landmines] is a fantastic humanitarian achievement, a gift to the 21st century” (cited in Carroll, 1997, p. A31). In the same article, James Carroll (1997) of the *Boston Globe* wrote,

More than 1,000 grass-roots organizations in more than 50 countries make up the campaign [ICBL]. At the end of the most violent century in history, the human race has been offered a rare chance to change the way it resolves conflict. If soldiers won’t seize that chance—here is what the Nobel Peace Prize means this week—civilians will. (p. A31)

#### **HISTORY OF THE ANTI-LANDMINES MOVEMENT AND IDENTITY OF THE ACTORS**

The International Campaign to Ban Landmines is a global network of more than 1,400 organizations from 90 nation-states that coordinate civil society-based initiatives to secure a total ban on the use, production, stockpiling, and transfer of antipersonnel mines and to facilitate humanitarian mine action<sup>1</sup> and provision of assistance to landmine victims. Anti-war crusaders and internationally renowned humanitarian nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that they represented first

1. Humanitarian Mine Action is an integrated approach to demining where the technical aspects of demining are part of a larger socioeconomic context that considers regional impacts of landmines.

formed the movement to ban landmines. The campaign was formally launched in October 1992 when (in alphabetical order) Handicap International (from Belgium and The Netherlands), Human Rights Watch (USA), Medico International (Italy), Mines Advisory Group (Canada), Physicians for Human Rights (USA), and Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation (USA) jointly agreed on the urgent need for the coordination of initiatives to ban antipersonnel landmines. Unlike the founding organizations that were predominately humanitarian, the focus of the international movements that joined the ICBL later included human rights advocacy, humanitarian assistance, social welfare, demining, peace and disarmament, religion, minority issues, development, and environmental management (Matthew & Rutherford, 2003).

The ICBL is a decentralized, flexible network that is administered by a Coordination (previously called Steering) Committee that is currently made up of 13 organizations (DanChurch Aid/Lutheran World Federations; Handicap International; Human Rights Watch; Kenya Coalition Against Landmines; Landmine Survivors Network; Mines Action Canada; Norwegian People's Aid; and the Afghan, Brazilian, Cambodia, Italian, and Sri Lankan Campaigns to Ban Landmines). The campaign has six staff members based in five countries in North America and Europe; all the other personnel who contribute to the work of the campaign are either employed with the member organizations, interns, or volunteers. Since 1999, the ICBL's coordination office has been located in Washington, DC, and overlooks campaign coordination, resource distributions, and youth projects. Another office located in Paris, France, deals with international relations with governments and multilateral organizations (International Campaign to Ban Landmines, 2004). The ICBL is funded through monetary and in kind donations, including office space, personnel, and office supplies and costs, from the member organizations, governments (principally, [in alphabetical order] Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom), the European Union, and private individuals and organizations. From 2001 to 2003, the ICBL reported average income of \$2.2 million per year from grants, sponsorships, and other sources (International Campaign to Ban Landmines, 2001, 2002, 2003a).

One of the most powerful weapons of the ICBL has been the research and publication of the Landmine Monitor, a yearly civil society-based system of monitoring and reporting. The power of their information<sup>2</sup> plays a critical role in exerting peer pressure. They use the Landmine Monitor to play information politics to (a) promote change by reporting

2. Information refers to the data the International Campaign to Ban Landmines has been able to collect on the use, transfer, and production of landmines.

the overwhelmingly incontestable facts about Mine Ban Treaty (MBT) compliance; (b) put governments' secrets out in the open; (c) send a message that the whole world is watching; and at the same time, (d) expose the actions of those who don't align with their cause in order to reassure themselves that they do matter and that they can bring about effective change.

The global network of the ICBL serves a mutual purpose to achieve or strengthen the needs of different movements. Through the network of the ICBL, more resourceful northern NGOs are linked with local, national southern movements and organizations that are largely set and operated by affected populations. For the less resourceful and powerful southern movements, the network provides them with exposure and facilitates access to resources and influential international systems that they lack. Whereas, for the more powerful and resourceful northern movements, the coalition grants them more credibility for their causes because it gives them the legitimate right to claim that they are not only struggling for but also with the victims.

#### THE ICBL'S HUMANITARIAN FRAMEWORK

Before discussing the ICBL's humanitarian framework and its weakness of not being inclusive of all the victims, it is important to first acknowledge some inherent properties of social movements and the reality they operate in. The processes of issue framing, resource mobilization, and political opportunity structures are vital characteristics of triumphant social movements (Benford & Snow, 2000). And unlike environmental frameworks, humanitarian frameworks are relatively easier to find quick support for because people usually respond and form sustained campaigns when they can identify with the victims or if the problem is felt immediately, nearby, and in a manner that is not hidden from plain view. Definition of the problem and issue framing provide legitimate claims around which different actors can converge to look for viable solutions. In transnational advocacy networks such as the ICBL, the framing of a movement agenda is a complicated task of striking a delicate balance between logical, acceptable, and effective strategies. They have to frame the issue in such a way that it appeals to a wide range of belief systems, experiences, myths, and folk tales of the international movement they represent, on one hand, and the politicians, organizations, and nations that they are appealing to, on the other hand.

Nearly all aspects of the landmine crisis, ranging from the definition of the problem to the most influential treaties and guidelines issued with regard to the crisis, are derived from and reflect the beliefs of human rights principles and humanitarian laws that are shared across the board and easy to define. The transnational movements and their different partners have been attempting, and to a large extent succeeding, to

manipulate humanitarian values, norms, and modes of discourse to revise people's view on the reality that should exist in a world free of mines. The ICBL has effectively used the platform of the growing global humanitarian concern to frame the landmine issue within the larger human rights agenda of governments—and some non-state<sup>3</sup> actors—violating the rights of citizens to life and safety. Moreover, the movement has used this political opportunity to structure and create a chance to mobilize action against the governments and non-state actors that produce, transfer, or use landmines, and also hold them accountable to the suffering these weapons cause to civilian populations. Because the international mobilized effort to ban landmines primarily addresses the humanitarian toll suffered from the impacts of the weapons, the governing laws—including the MBT, the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW),<sup>4</sup> and the Bill of Rights for Landmine Survivors<sup>5</sup>—advocate for the welfare of people.

The ICBL created a movement-worthy issue out of the landmine crisis by presenting it as a very urgent humanitarian problem, disguised as a matter of national security. They provided dramatic evidence to show that landmines kill unintended victims (civilians) and stay in the ground to perpetuate misery for generations. They proclaimed that it is unacceptable for militaries to use such indiscriminate weapons at a time when they are equipped with very sophisticated, precise defense armaments. The ICBL overturned the conventional wisdom on the ethics and inappropriateness of landmines—weapons that are essentially conventional and, in some circumstances, acceptable tools for protecting garrisons and military establishments (Carroll, 1997). This framing strategy was very effective in changing the perception of landmines from acceptable military defense hardware to indiscriminate, unacceptable weapons of human rights violation and mass murder.

Besides publicizing the imprecise nature of these conventional weapons, they got the landmine issue on the debate agenda of the most influential governments and organizations, including the United Nations. They encouraged and managed to develop discursive and hegemonic allegiance with many national governments and other influential actors in international policy. Through these allegiances, they challenged and

3. The term *non-state actors* is used to indicate armed groups or factions in a region that are not part of the government, such as guerilla movements or other opposition groups.

4. Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) is the 1980 convention on the prohibition and restriction of the use of certain conventional weapons that may be deemed excessively injurious or having indiscriminate effects. Protocol II of the CCW restricts the use of landmines and limits their injurious effects (Roberts & Williams, 1995).

5. On July 11, 1998, Her Majesty Queen Noor of Jordan presented the Bill of Rights for Landmine survivors, that is, "the right to an environment that allows freedom of movement and transportation in a safe and secure manner" (International Campaign to Ban Landmines, 1998).

cut across individual nations' governmental red tape and secrecy and were able to convince states and powerful international actors to endorse their cause. By mobilizing a global effort to influence policy from local to international levels in a very short period of time, they were able to change behaviors and overall political world order. Consequently, the MBT<sup>6</sup> was upheld, resulting in internationally significant procedural change on the use, production, and transfer of landmines. The speed with which the movement was able to get its message across to formulate and make states sign the MBT in December 1997 and have it passed into law in September 1998 is impressive by any standard.<sup>7</sup> An in-depth analysis of the movement's evolution is given by Matthew and Rutherford (2003).

#### SHORTCOMINGS OF THE HUMANITARIAN FRAMEWORK

The accomplishments of the current humanitarian movement are undisputable and human rights laws and principles are by far the most institutionalized and common within the global civil society, but they also have their share of inadequacies with regard to landmines. First, the need to restrict landmine advocacy to one type of rights is unjustified because the landmine issue can rightly fit in an argument based on any one of the three categories of rights: human rights, environmental human rights, and rights of the environment (nature). Landmines violate the provisions of human rights<sup>8</sup> because they hurt individuals.

6. The Mine Ban Treaty (MBT), also known as the Ottawa Treaty, is the convention on the prohibition, use, production, transfer, and stockpiling of anti-personnel landmines and on their destruction. It was signed in Ottawa, Canada, in 1997 to set an international norm of illegality for the use, stockpiling, production, and trade of landmines and to bind countries to attend to the urgent need for demining and victim assistance (Grange & Larson, 1998).

7. So far, the MBT has been signed by 147 countries and ratified by 134. In September 1998, after 40 countries had signed and ratified their commitment to be bound by its provisions, the treaty became an international law (Berhe, 2000; International Campaign to Ban Landmines, 2003b).

8. Initially, human rights were typically created to protect human beings from each other. More recently, human rights principles have transcended exclusive agendas that advocate just for the rights and freedom of humans. Human rights principles currently attempt to protect all conceivable spheres of a human's being including people's freedom to life, wealth, power, property, and self-expression. However, human rights principles contain no premises to stop humans from degrading nature or harming other nonhuman life-forms (Bosselman, 1999; Johnston, 1995).

9. The growing awareness of environmental processes, realization of environmentally problematic aspects of the human rights principles, and increasing impact of human beings on the environment brought about the development of ecologically sensitive human rights principles and clauses. The recognition of the close links between preservation of the health of the environment and promotion of human rights has paved the way for the anthropocentric basis for human rights to acquire an ecological dimension that advocates for nature protection. Consequently, the United Nations General Assembly in 1990

Landmines interfere with established principles of environmental human rights<sup>9</sup> because they limit human beings' freedom to a safe environment. And landmines also violate the right of the environment<sup>10</sup> by killing and injuring nonhuman life-forms and resulting in physical and chemical degradation of land resources. The ICBL's strategy of employing a humanitarian framework to get immediate attention to the crisis has succeeded. The success can now be furthered if the strategic focus extends to accommodate what's appropriate. The ICBL has the moral responsibility to demonstrate the complicated nature of landmine impacts. Moreover, this is an effective approach for the movement to extend its appeal to more people than just those who are horrified by the humanitarian toll of the weapons.

Second, framing the landmine issue primarily as a human rights agenda poses the risk of distancing the issue from environmental or developmental consideration. The ICBL's anthropocentric, humanitarian framework fails to properly describe the equally horrendous impacts of landmines on different life-forms and life-support systems. This narrow definition of the problem poses the risk of fragmenting the complex reality of landmine-affected regions into discrete methodical units that carry critical risks. There is typically less mobilization around issues that have the potential, but are not yet grave enough, to affect human beings. Thus, the humanitarian framework denies the true

---

passed a declaration for environmental human rights that states that every individual is entitled to live in an environment sufficient for his or her health and well-being (Bosselman, 1999). The arguments for environmental human rights stem from the notion that protecting the environmental rights of human beings from abuse is one way of securing the rights of future generations to inherit a world that is still worth inhabiting (Sachs, 1995). However, environmental human rights principles foster anthropocentric biases for environmental protection. The philosophy behind environmental human rights takes nature for granted. Here, the well-being of the environment and its protection are within the discretion of human beings. Furthermore, environmental human rights are perceived as serving human attitudes of conquering nature that are the behavioral causes of environmental degradation to start with (Bosselman, 1999).

10. Some environmental movements advocate for the respect of the right of the environment—respect for the inherent right of nature. This third notion of rights supports the claim that, regardless of its value to human beings, nature—along with the flora, fauna, and soil—is intrinsically valuable in itself and should be accorded rights of its own (Johnston, 1995). Accordingly, numerous environmental movements have sprung from this notion to protect or reclaim the integrity of the natural ecosystem from danger by human beings that supports the notions of human rights or environmental human rights. However, even among resolute environmentalists, the principles advocated by the right of nature are not very popular. The main problem with this view of rights is that it is sometimes perceived to be a notion that is extreme or promoted by the privileged few in the developed world. It is believed that those individuals or movements that support the protection of the environment's rights for the environment's sake are those that can afford the socioeconomic luxuries that many of the poor are trying to get, during which processes they are degrading the environment.

nature of the landmine problem and complicates the process of looking for a solution to some extent (Johnston, 1995). This is particularly problematic because it complicates risk assessment efforts in landmine-affected regions. Demining, for example, is already a very time- and labor-consuming process; a landmine that costs as low as \$3 to manufacture can demand between \$300 and \$1,000 to clear (Nachón, 2000). Because demining activities are directed by risk assessment, where priority is given to areas of higher danger, if the risk of landmine impacts is not properly addressed, it has potential to lead to cycles of impoverishment. If people don't imagine there is grave danger, they will postpone demining in favor of other areas, an action that could result in potentially more harm to individuals and the environment.

The seriousness of the landmine danger extends to societies when individuals face danger exposing the society to loss of income, resultant poverty, migration, and so on. And when people are desperate and they get no or minimal help to deal with the problem, they employ home-grown methods of risk assessment (e.g., rumors, guesses, and detonating landmines by sending livestock into areas suspected to be mined), which may expose them to more personal and societal impairment. When their livelihood is affected, people have shown tendencies to resort to abusing natural resources in their quest for survival. On the other hand, if they get help that is not suited for their problem or they manage to abuse the aid they get, it may lead to aid dependency, which can potentially lead them back into the vicious cycle of war and landmines that started it all in the first place (Berhe, 2000).

As a result of the above concerns, recently, there has been increased awareness of the need for a more holistic framework for the movement to ban landmines. The ICBL's Landmine Monitor year 2000 report included a section on the environmental impacts of landmines (Landmine Monitor, 2000; Nachón, 2000). Furthermore, the ICBL has since highlighted the need for an integrated approach and has adopted the Bad Honnef Guidelines that call for an integrated approach and involvement of local populations in mine action (International Campaign to Ban Landmines, 1999). Moreover, the International Peace Research Institute in Oslo (PRIO) has been conducting a series of studies on the impacts of landmines on societies and regional development (Harpviken, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 2000; Harpviken, Juergensen, & Nergaard, 1999; Millard, 2000; Millard, Harpviken, & Kjellman, 2002).

### *An Inclusive Framework*

An inclusive, environmentally sensitive framework is comprehensive by definition. An environmentally sensitive framework is one that

would have the ability to provide a full accounting of all the victims of these insidious weapons of mass destruction, including injuries, medical costs to society, the loss of income sources, poverty, migration, and impoverishment of societies and regions. This comprehensive framework requires utilization of a development-oriented approach that (a) recognizes and assigns proper definition to the complete aftermath of landmines by identifying all the victims and stakeholders, along with the inextricable linkages between human and environmental rights; and (b) translates the wide-ranging impacts of landmines into movement agendas, which can lead to the creation of narratives that can raise awareness and shift perception of the problem.

To be effective, the inclusive framework for the anti-landmine movement has to be one that (a) promotes awareness of the broader trends of landmine impacts; (b) presents a causal chain of explanation for the impacts of these weapons starting from the producers of the landmines and their environmentally harmful practices, to militaries and governments that plant the weapons in the land and cause harm to people and nature; (c) enables provision of more effective and lasting assistance to the victims; (d) guarantees participation of local communities in decision making; and (e) facilitates restoration of the environment from degraded stages. A framework that does the above things can effectively use the political opportunity structure<sup>11</sup> that currently exists. The above-stated points are very important to consider because how the issue is framed will largely determine what regime will flourish (domestic or regional institutions and networks methods), while local participation serves as a motivation for the affected population to act as stewards of the environment and its sustainable development.

The amendment to the ICBL's humanitarian framework, along with adoption and dramatization of the comprehensive definitions of the problem, would be helpful to bring on board more environmental organizations and get a broader contextual basis for the issue. Active involvement of environmental movements would require making environmental issues integral parts of the paradigms and analysis of the anti-landmine movement. The inclusive discourse is likely to put into contention the dominant belief system in the anti-landmines movement by depicting the everyday realities of the landmine-affected regions and revealing the intricate linkages between the different ecological, societal, and political components of the earth system.

11. Tarrow (1996) defines political opportunity structures as "consistent signals to social or political actors which either encourage or discourage them to use their internal resource to form social movements." The political opportunity structures can include availability of a political access, changing alignments of political actors, and getting influential allies and elite support.

#### IMPLEMENTING AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE FRAMEWORK

After presenting an argument for an inclusive framework, it becomes necessary to ask the question, How can the above-proposed framework be implemented to derive the most efficiency? What steps need to be followed? Does it require elaborate sociopolitical arrangements that may compromise its appeal?

Framing the landmine issue as a humanitarian or environmental agenda is essentially a struggle to change perceptions, beliefs, and behaviors of people. What needs to be pursued in the international political arena is a war of words, feelings, ideas, and images. Changing the vocabulary of the movement to include considerations for environmental and development impacts is important to register the acknowledgment and adoption success of an environmentally sensitive framework. The translation of the rhetoric to an effective movement agenda becomes easier to recognize when the new vocabulary is converted into a causal story that clearly describes the chain of events—from production of the weapons to the way they affect people and the ecological system.

It is of paramount importance to note that getting the issue to be accepted as an environmental issue is only half of the challenge for the anti-landmines movement. Another half of the challenge lies in enabling the framework to get across as a valid, agreed-on, and sound movement action—transforming the willingness to frame the issue as an environmental problem and enabling the willingness to take action. New movement ideas—impacts or strategies—have a better chance of successively being adopted by movements if they fit well in the already agreed-on ideas and ideologies, in particular, cultural settings (Keck & Sikkink, 1998). The inclusive framework would have a better chance of adoption and success if it can fit with already available institutions. The idea here should be to complement the existing system, not to replace it entirely.

#### *Problem Recognition and Definition*

The major issues that are likely to face the promotion of an inclusive, environmentally sensitive framework are shortage of information and lack of tangibility. Focused studies that describe the environmental effects of landmines at appropriate levels of analysis—spatial (local or regional) or temporal (immediate, delayed, or prolonged)—are in very short supply. And whatever information exists is scattered and fragmented into smaller problem areas. Furthermore, the impact of landmines on people or nature weighs differently for different places and different groups of people depending on location (rural agrarian society vs. urbanities; wilderness vs. human settlements). Although some environmental impacts of landmines have been identified as so, many of the ecological and the resulting socioeconomic impacts of landmines are diffi-

cult to define or trace to only landmines, especially in a short time—in particular, problems such as loss of biodiversity, poverty, and migration.

Therefore, the foremost thing that needs to be accomplished is to close the information gap of the environmental effects of landmines. Centralization of the existing information is the logical first step to properly define landmines as weapons of environmental degradation and promote awareness of the issue. The areas that need further assessment can then be identified, prioritized, and pursued. At this stage, what is necessary is establishing and recognizing connections between human and environmental welfare and associated rights with explicit acknowledgment that the individuals represent a subset of the environment.

#### *Recognition and Involvement of Stakeholders*

Recognition and accounting of all landmine victims is important for formulation and enforcement of any binding legislation and solicitation of donations. The stakeholders in this respect are many, including the victims, communities that they are part of, future generations of landmine-affected regions, decision makers, donors, users (mostly militaries and non-state actors), producers/exporters, and the anti-landmines movements. The discourse and the environmentally sensitive framework for the movement have to appeal to all these stakeholders.

The two issues of protecting the victim (whether it is the individual person or the environment) from harm rather than having to deal with the consequences of a ruined prospect of a decent livelihood and sustainable development are very related, at least conceptually. Environmental and human rights issues and movements share a lot of common ground around the interconnection and manifestation of impacts, politics surrounding the issue, overlap in the movement agenda, tactics, and so on. As a result, environmental movements are likely to bear a lot of the responsibility in promotion of an environmentally sensitive framework because of their focus, resources, and experience.

#### *Norm Creation and Domestication*

After all the victims are identified, the next step has to be creating a balance between evidence and emotions. Although agreed-on definitions and accurate numbers make up the basis of the argument presented in this article, convincing narrative that doesn't solely rely on numbers is also crucial. It is very important to establish and highlight the interconnections between effects and present them as a sequence of events that can potentially lead to significant environmental impacts.

Norm building starts with an appropriate framework that is needed for formulation of viable policies. The desired norm has to be one that is straightforward and one that would have wide appeal to victims, pro-

ducers, advocates, and donors. Norm domestication is then necessary to influence the rhetoric and change peoples' attitudes toward the problem. To be effective, the norms have to be built and domesticated after the environmental effects are understood and realized. The most important norms here are those that can mobilize activity by shifting the current perception of landmines violating peoples' right to live in a safe environment. This can be adopted into the desired norm and framework by connecting the safe environment with sovereignty, for example, a neighboring country violating the rights of people to live in their territory by putting landmines in their home land. Alternatively, this argument can be extended to point to the fact that landmines not only violate peoples' right to live at the present but also affect the environment and thereby compromise the ability of future generations to survive in a safe environment.

Adapting an inclusive framework for the issue that links human rights and the environment, and identification of the impacts as a process rather than a fixed definition, is also a reasonably effective way of expecting to derive compensation for the individual victims and the environmental degradation caused as a result of landmines. This way, it would potentially be easier to hold someone accountable and derive compensation for the suffering of the human victims and the environment, not only through humanitarian principles but also environmental ones that advocate for environmental human rights and rights of the environment. Unless this connection is made explicit, the issue faces a threat of being treated as only a humanitarian one and could potentially and indefinitely remain at the present level of effectiveness.

#### PRACTICAL CHALLENGES ALONG THE WAY AHEAD

Accommodating the rights of the environment within the largely anthropocentric discussions of law to create an effective movement agenda out of it is challenging. Moreover, the framing of and mobilization around the landmine issue is complicated with global political and military security issues. Because the movement to ban landmines is primarily targeting governments, their militaries and their national security agendas, they constantly face opposition from all perceivable levels of bureaucracies. Moreover, the landmine issue and relevant environmental impact assessments are complicated due to multiple socio-politico-economic problems of the affected developing nations. Identifying one cause for many interrelated environmental impacts, in the midst of various potential causes, is unquestionably difficult. Furthermore, in those situations, framing of the issue as environmental, humanitarian, or anything else is not likely to be a priority. In these circumstances, the immediate focus lies in doing what is needed to save lives as soon as pos-

sible. But, the dilemma is that the potential to save lives depends precisely on how the issue is framed and how much technical, financial, and other resources are generated and allocated.

The next step in pursuing the proposed inclusive framework has to include finding appropriate answers to the following unanswered but critical questions:

1. How can the legalities of the environmentally sensitive framework be entrenched in international legal principles?
2. Who has responsibility to uphold environmental human rights and right of nature for landmine victims? Does the international community have a moral responsibility in upholding these rights for landmine victims across boundaries?

### *Conclusion*

Environmental movements, and other social organizations, partly chose their causes based on not only the ecological problems they represent but also existing circumstances, including the ease of framing the problem, the effectiveness of the framework to represent the issue, the nature of the movement itself (their identity), and the prevailing sociopolitical situations. The ICBL has definitely succeeded in registering the landmine crisis as a global movement agenda. The ICBL has also paved the way for the future mobilization around the environmental impacts of landmines. But the success of the movement to ban landmines has meant losing numerous opportunities to further its cause due to the manner the movement has chosen to frame the issue. This is indicative of a broader pattern of correlation between issue framing and adoption/endorsement by movements. To gain support for and mobilize action around the environmental impacts of landmines, the movement needs to invigorate their ecological sensitivity campaign. It should be commonplace that landmines represent an ecological problem of an extremely insidious nature. Seeking a world safer from landmines could be a lot easier to advocate for if the landmine crisis is framed as a lot larger than just a present-day humanitarian concern.

### *References*

- Andersson, N., da Sousa, C. P., & Paredes, S. (1995). Social cost of land mines in four countries: Afghanistan, Bosnia, Cambodia, and Mozambique. *British Medical Journal*, *311*, 718-721.
- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing process and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 611-639.

- Berhe, A. A. (2000). *Landmines and land degradation: A regional political ecology perspective on the impacts of landmines on environment and development in the developing world*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Berhe, A. A. (2005). *Landmines and land degradation: Environmental aftermath of a conventional weapon of mass destruction*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Blaikie, P. M., & Brookfield, H. (1987). *Land Degradation and Society*. London: Methuen & Co.
- Bosselman, K. (1999). *Human rights and the environment: Redefining fundamental principles?* Paper presented at the Environmental Issues and Legal Process Conference. Retrieved from <http://www.arbld.unimelb.edu.au/envjust/papers/allpapers/bosselmann/home.htm>
- Boutros-Ghali, B. (1994). The landmine crisis: A humanitarian disaster. *Foreign Affairs*, 73, 8.
- Buenker, M. A. (2000). Landmines: A threat to wildlife and sustainability. *World Conservation*, pp. 19-20.
- Cameron, A. M., Lawson, R. J., & Tomlin, B. W. (1998). *To walk without fear: The global movement to ban landmines*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Carroll, J. (1997, December 9). The people vs. landmines. *Boston Globe, City Edition*, p. A31.
- Croll, M. (1998). *The history of landmines*. London: Leo Cooper.
- Gamson, W. A., & Meyer, D. S. (1996). Framing political opportunity. In M. N. Zald (Ed.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 275-290). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grange, M., & Larson, R. (1998). *The landmine campaign still needs churches*. The Lutheran World Federation, World Alliance of Reformed Churches and World Council of Churches, Chevallier Imprimeurs, France.
- Gray, B. (1997, July 14-17). *Landmines: The most toxic and widespread pollution facing mankind*. Paper presented at "A colloquium, towards Ottawa and beyond—Demining the region, The environmental impacts," International Campaign to Ban Landmines, University of Sydney, Australia.
- Harpviken, K. B. (1999a). *A community study of landmines and humanitarian demining: Cassua, Kwanza Norte, Angola* (Landmine Memo No. 7). Oslo: Assistance to Mine Affected Communities (AMAC), International Peace Research Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.prio.no/amac>
- Harpviken, K. B. (1999b). *Community-based mine awareness: AMAA's project in Herat Province, Afghanistan* (Landmine Memo No. 4). Oslo: Assistance to Mine Affected Communities (AMAC), International Peace Research Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.prio.no/amac>
- Harpviken, K. B. (1999c). *Towards community-based demining? AREA's project in Nangrahar Province, Afghanistan* (Landmine Memo No. 3). Oslo: Assistance to Mine Affected Communities (AMAC), International Peace Research Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.prio.no/amac>
- Harpviken, K. B. (2000). *A community study of landmines and humanitarian demining: Cassua, Kwanza Norte, Angola* (Landmine Memo No. 7). Oslo: Assistance to Mine Affected Communities (AMAC), International Peace Research Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.prio.no/amac>
- Harpviken, K. B., Juergensen, O., & Nergaard, P. (1999). *Towards new indicators of success in humanitarian mine action*. Paper presented at Report From Roundtable Discussion at the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo.
- International Campaign to Ban Landmines. (1998). *Bill of rights for landmine survivors*. Retrieved from <http://www.icbl.org>
- International Campaign to Ban Landmines. (1999). *Final statement of Bad Honnef II*. Retrieved from <http://www.icbl.org>
- International Campaign to Ban Landmines. (2001). *Financial statement from independent auditor—2001*. Retrieved from <http://www.icbl.org/content/download/6929/159149/file/2001audit.pdf>

- International Campaign to Ban Landmines. (2002). *International Campaign to Ban Landmines, annual report 2002*. Retrieved from [http://www.icbl.org/campaign/annual\\_reports/2002](http://www.icbl.org/campaign/annual_reports/2002)
- International Campaign to Ban Landmines. (2003a). *International Campaign to Ban Landmines, annual report 2003*. Retrieved from [http://www.icbl.org/campaign/annual\\_reports/2003](http://www.icbl.org/campaign/annual_reports/2003)
- International Campaign to Ban Landmines. (2003b). *Ratification update*. Retrieved from <http://www.icbl.org/ratification/>
- International Campaign to Ban Landmines. (2004). *Campaign history*. Retrieved from <http://www.icbl.org/campaign/history>
- Johnston, B. R. (1995). Human rights and the environment. *Human Ecology: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 22, 111-124.
- Keck, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Landmine Monitor. (2000). *Towards a mine-free world*. Belgium: International Campaign to Ban Landmines.
- Landmine Monitor. (2002). *Towards a mine-free world: Executive summary*. Belgium: International Campaign to Ban Landmines.
- Landmine Survivors Network. (2003). *Human rights advocacy: The fight against landmines*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Matthew, R. A., & Rutherford, K. R. (2003). The evolutionary dynamics of the movement to ban landmines. *Alternatives*, 28, 29-56.
- McGrath, R. (1994). *Landmines: Legacy of conflict: A manual for development workers*. United Kingdom: Oxfam.
- Millard, A. (2000). *A community living with mines and demining: The case of Bandua, Mozambique* (Landmine Memo No. 6). Oslo: Assistance to Mine Affected Communities (AMAC), International Peace Research Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.prio.no/amac>
- Millard, A. S., Harpviken, K. B., & Kjellman, K. E. (2002). Risk removed? Steps towards building trust in humanitarian mine action. *Disasters*, 26, 161-174.
- Nachón, C. T. (2000). *Environmental aspects of the international crisis of antipersonnel landmines and the implementation of the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty: Thematic report* (Landmine Monitor Report 2000). Retrieved from <http://www.icbl.org/lm/2000/appendices/environment.html>
- Newton, M. (1997, February 25-28). *The scourge of the earth: The impacts of landmines on the environment*. Paper presented for the workshop on Landmines and the Environment, 4th International NGO Conference on Landmines: Toward a Mine-Free Southern Africa, Maputo, Mozambique.
- Orehovec, Z., Music, S., Palinkas, L., Miko, S., Ristic, M., & Bokan, S. (1998). *Danger of land mines, unexploded shells, and environmental consequences of the recent war on the territory of the Republic of Croatia*. Retrieved from [www.http://members.xoom.com/dassur/croatia.doc](http://members.xoom.com/dassur/croatia.doc)
- Roberts, S., & Williams, J. (1995). *After the guns fall silent: The enduring legacy of landmines*. Washington, DC: Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation.
- Sachs, A. (1995). Eco-justice: Linking human rights and environment. In J. A. Peterson (Ed.), *World Watch paper 127. December 1995*. Washington, DC: World Watch Institute.
- Schlosberg, D. (1999). Networks and mobile arrangements: Organizational innovation in the US environmental justice movement. In C. Roots (Ed.), *Environmental movements: Local, national and global* (pp. 122-148). United Kingdom: Frank Cass.
- Tarrow, S. (1996). States and opportunities: The political structuring of social movements. In M. N. Zald (Ed.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 275-290). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Troll, K. (2000). *The impact of anti-personnel landmines on the environment*. Geneva: United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.
- United Nations Environment Programme UNEP/IG.4/3. (1977). *Intergovernmental expert group on environment and development and on environmental impacts arising from uses of natural resource*. Nairobi, Kenya: United Nations Environment Programme.
- United Nations General Assembly UNGA/A/38/383. (1983, October 19). *Problem of remnants of war—Report of the secretary general. Development and international economic cooperation: Environment* (38th session). New York: United Nations.
- Wapner, P. (1996). *Environmental activism and world civic politics*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

*Asmeret Asefaw Berhe is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Environmental Science, Policy, and Management, University of California at Berkeley. She holds an M.Sc. in resource development from Michigan State University and a B.Sc. in soil and water conservation from the University of Asmara, Eritrea.*