

GLOBAL COMMUNITY & INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

A Citizen Action Guide of the American Humanist Association

Executive Summary

The time has come to reevaluate the foundations of global governance that were laid out by the victors of the Second World War. As human societies continue to evolve, as global social dynamics continue to change, and as we gain a greater understanding as to our species' interdependence with our planet, we must be willing to rethink the way that nations, and peoples, relate to each other. The time has arrived to repeal the "law of the jungle" and humanity must create a global system that moves beyond the parochial self-interest of nations. Civil society that is cosmopolitan and sophisticated must be established, not simply in isolated pockets, but on a global scale.

To strengthen the nascent beginnings of a global civil society, there are three areas in particular within the context of international affairs that humanists must focus on in order to bring the world closer to a global order grounded in empathy and dignity:

- **Support for the international system of global governance.** The basic structure of global governance must be reevaluated, including reformation of the UN Security Council, more emphasis on the role of regional courts in creating global rule of law and defending the "universality, objectivity and non-selectivity of human rights," via the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- **The need to reduce—if not outright eliminate—the use of violence by state or non-state actors when addressing disputes.** Preventative measures, such as deradicalization of terrorists, strong adherence to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and humanitarian intervention must be taken in order to avert acts of terrorism, slow nuclear proliferation and end crimes against humanity.
- **A call for a new type of "balanced development" that works to responsibly raise the level of development of the global poor.** As poorer countries rise up and seek models to emulate, it would be disastrous for their development to mirror the path taken by the United States and Western Europe. The West's obligation to reevaluate its own lifestyle must be matched by the willingness of poorer countries to better heed general social and environmental concerns, and not view GDP as the only measure of growth.

The society we create must aim to provide justice and equity for all of those in the here and now, as well as create a solid foundation for future generations to build upon. The creation of a stronger system of global governance, the reduction of all forms of violence around the world, and set of development tools that provides a balanced rise for the world's poor, will go a long way in meeting these goals.

“The responsibility for our lives and the kind of world in which we live is ours and ours alone.”

-- from Humanist Manifesto III

Introduction

In an era of increasing global interdependence, humanity must be willing to reevaluate the traditional norms and ethical values that we have used to guide global relationships among countries. Traditionally, foreign policy has been driven by tribalism and division. However, these old ways can no longer hold sway as humanity attempts to address a new era of challenges. Advances in technology, coupled with the breakdown in the world’s social, economic and political barriers have amplified—and given a new twist—to the many difficulties that human societies strive to overcome. For example:

- Estimates show that Chinese Internet users surpass the number of users in the United States,¹ reflecting the ubiquitous growth of the Internet in China. This means that more Chinese citizens than ever before have access to information on the World Wide Web; however, much of the information they seek is censored by the Chinese government via the ‘Golden Shield.’
- Growing urbanization has led to, for the first time in history, urban populations equal in size to their rural counterparts.² Megacities (defined by the United Nations as cities with over 10 million inhabitants) can serve as incubators for prosperity and innovation if municipalities can offer strong leadership and avoid the decline of their sprawling metropolises into slum-cities.
- Increases in African and Middle Eastern immigration to Europe means a greater flow of remittances back home,³ but it also leads to rising social tensions as immigrants attempt to strike a balance between assimilation and maintaining their cultural identity. All the while, Europeans are being tested in the limits of their tolerance for different cultural practices.

These examples show a range of positive and negative consequences that are inherently derived from the deepening expansion of globalization and technological advancement. Humanity is beginning to acknowledge that the challenges we face can no longer be contained to a single country, or region of Earth. Pollution in China, atrocities in the Democratic Republic of Congo, drug wars in Mexico and the failure of sub-prime mortgages in the United States have all had an impact reaching far beyond each individual country’s borders. This is a new age; the age of interconnectivity. Solutions to these challenges will require a new mode of thought and action, best matched with a universal ethic based on empathy and the recognition of the dignity of all people.

Empathy, derived from our evolutionary origins and influenced by our experiences, is the capacity to identify with the thoughts and emotions of someone else. The inherent dignity of each individual is derived from the respect that is accorded each person’s existence.

These principles, writ large, serve as the most effective ethical foundations to manage international relations.

The time has come to repeal the “anything goes” attitude in global politics. It is no longer acceptable or desired in international relations for powerful countries (whether it be militarily, economically or politically) to dictate terms to others. We must create a global system that moves beyond the parochial self-interest of nations. Civil society that is cosmopolitan, sophisticated and nuanced in its worldview must be established, not simply in isolated pockets, but on a global scale.

To strengthen the nascent beginnings of a global civil society, there are three primary areas within the context of international affairs that humanists must focus on in order to bring the world closer to a global order grounded in empathy and dignity:

- Support for the international system of global governance;
- The need to reduce—if not outright eliminate—the use of violence by state or non-state actors when addressing disputes, and;
- A call for a new type of “balanced development” that works to responsibly raise the level of development of the global poor.

Global governance is no longer a utopian hope held by wide-eyed idealists, nor is it an insidious attempt to force a “one-world government” onto people. Human history has been filled with strife and division, but there has also been the slow trend over time of alliances and unions. Countries have fought bloody wars for their independence, and then freely given up a share of their sovereignty in the hopes, as the Framers of the U.S. Constitution said, “...to form a more perfect Union.” That sentiment is more pronounced today, as humanity begins to contemplate the challenges we face, not as individuals or citizens of any nation, but inhabitants of one single planet. Concrete steps must be taken to further the establishment of the kind of global governance that acknowledges the systemic challenges we face.

Global governance can play a strong hand in deterring threats and acts of violence; violence that is both state sanctioned, as well as perpetuated by non-state actors. This includes, but is not limited to: war, acts of genocide, terrorist activity and attempts to procure nuclear materials and weapons. During the dawning years of this new millennium, we have already seen terrorist attacks by Islamic extremists; invasions and insurgencies in Afghanistan and Iraq; protests, uprisings and suppression in Tibet and the Islamic Republic of Iran; and genocide in Darfur. These violent episodes erode the already strained social bonds of communities that are in conflict, and can cause indescribable pain and trauma to those who are caught in this violence. Despite the legitimacy of grievances, conditions must be established which deter governments and non-state actors from seeking violence as the first or even last resort.

Humanity faces the additional challenge of the crippling poverty that so many find themselves in. Governments have the responsibility and duty to improve the quality of life of their citizens, to move their people beyond the struggle of survival on a mere

subsistence level. However, as these poorer countries receive aid from wealthier nations, the onus exists to ensure that their rise does not harm the environment and deplete natural resources as has the West. The planet is facing numerous environmental challenges, such as global warming, population growth, and the dumping of hazardous waste. These problems, resulting from the West's rise, will be exacerbated if poorer countries do not partake in a more balanced development.

Addressing these three issues is only the first step in creating an approach to international affairs based on the principles of empathy and dignity. The following sections provide an overview of humanist positions on the strengthening of global governance; strategies to reduce violence by state and non-state actors; and an approach that ensures balanced development for the world's poor.

Strengthening and Supporting the International System of Global Governance

There already exist frameworks for basic global governance, via international organizations such as the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, the International Court of Justice, Interpol, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the World Bank. The byzantine structure of global governance that exists today is based primarily on treaties, in which nations openly give up a small portion of their sovereignty in exchange for a greater good.

For example, when a nation joins the WTO, it means that they enter into a legally binding agreement that restricts some of the actions that they take (i.e., the U.S. cannot arbitrarily set high tariffs on Chinese goods because they suspect that the Chinese government is artificially depressing their currency). Though WTO members lose a sliver of sovereign right to take certain actions, they gain access to a rules-based arbitration system that serves as an objective mechanism to resolve trade disputes.

The WTO serves as one example of global governance, because like most international organizations, its purpose is to serve as a neutral forum that exists to manage relations between nations, and not act as a way to control or force countries to make certain decisions or to submit to an international authority. Action is only taken when the nations themselves agree that a specific issue may be addressed.

As these institutions develop, policy makers must remember that the idea and practice of global governance will be strengthened by ensuring that its application is minimally intrusive and democratically orientated. Global governance will require a uniform set of laws that universally apply. However, as much as is practically possible, local and regional authorities should have the power to make laws that are in accordance with global proscriptions. And for the citizens of the world that must follow these laws, there must be democratic accountability of those who create and implement the laws. It's unlikely that a system of global governance will survive over the long term if people are unable to have a say in the process.

Security Council

For international institutions such as the UN Security Council, which is less a neutral forum, and more an arena for international powers to flex their muscle, there is an immediate need for reform. The makeup of the permanent, veto-wielding members of the Security Council—the United States, the People’s Republic of China, the United Kingdom, France and Russia—is an echo from the state of international affairs that followed the end of World War II. If a Security Council were to be constructed from scratch in the present day, the makeup would surely be different. Countries that had very little voice or influence half a century ago—such as Brazil, India and South Africa—are now emerging as regional and global powers.

For the Security Council to remain a relevant and legitimate voice in global affairs this new reality must be accepted and the Council reformed accordingly. The permanent members of the Security Council are unwilling to relinquish their veto powers which leave two paths of reform that have promise. The Security Council should be enlarged by inviting new permanent and non-permanent members. Or, the use of veto power by the permanent members could be limited.⁴

Regional Courts

Though the Security Council passes resolutions, it is not the only forum to resolve international disputes. Many international courts of law have been established, including the UN’s own International Court of Justice, the WTO’s court system for trade grievances, and the International Criminal Court, the first permanent, treaty-based global court of law. Regional courts—often overlooked—such as the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, the European Court of Justice, and the African Court of Justice and Human Rights are also carving the way toward a jurisprudence that goes beyond national legal systems.

Good governance requires the rule of law, and these regional and international courts are laying the groundwork for a system of global accountability. Accountability is not only required for legal and institutional purposes in the global community, it is an ethical priority as well.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), adopted in 1948, expresses a fundamental and universal set of human rights applying to all people. Parts of the UDHR are generally accepted as customary international law⁵, and many global declarations and covenants—such as the Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Declaration on the Right to Development, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child—amplify principles laid out in the UDHR.

The UDHR, however, should be seen as more than a legal document. The document’s authors aspired to provide an ethical basis for how all peoples should be governed and

treated by their leaders. The promises in the UDHR should apply, no matter the cultural background of a person, or what sort of government they are living under. The rights promised in the UDHR and the International Bill of Human Rights (which consists of the UDHR, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its two Optional Protocols) are only applicable, if, in the words of the 1993 Bangkok Declaration on Human Rights, people acknowledge "...the universality, objectivity and non-selectivity of all human rights."⁶

This concept, which underlies the idea of rights and the entire project of global governance, is under attack from two seemingly unique, but actually intertwined sources. The first source is demands by some religious believers that speech must be curtailed in order to ensure that those religious believers are not "offended" by opinions and expressions that question or critique religion or religious belief. The Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), as one example, has been working to promote the concept of "defamation of religion" at the UN⁷ and working to squash talk that is perceived to be "offensive" to Islam,⁸ at the UN Human Rights Council.

In its charter, the OIC states one of its goals is to "to defend the universality of Islamic religion."⁹ In the context of the UN, it results in the OIC taking a culturally relativist position on global affairs. For example, the OIC authored and promoted the Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam,¹⁰ which is viewed as an "Islamic version" of the UDHR. The OIC, along with some other religious advocates, is taking a relativist stance that the UDHR cannot apply to all of the world's people because of religion or culture. Their relativism puts them alongside other postmodernists who claim that such a wide gulf exists between cultures and civilizations and that no set of universal standards (ethically, aesthetically, politically, or socially) can exist between differing people.

If no standards and values can cross cultures, then it becomes difficult to justify promoting the concept of human rights with any kind of universality. Cultural relativists and many religious believers deny the shared universality of our common humanity in favor of arbitrary distinctions based on culture, heritage, religion, circumstance and geography. Though the uniqueness and diversity of cultural traditions are to be cherished and respected, this is not an acceptable excuse for any sort of unjust actions.

If we found ourselves in a situation where human rights are not universal, cannot be objectively decided upon, and are arbitrarily applied, the expected outcomes would be outrageous. The global community might remain silent about female genital mutilation in West Africa, ignore re-education through labor camps in China, and condone the use of child soldiers in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Through such faulty reasoning the perpetrators of these acts would be able to justify themselves by claiming their choices were made within a cultural context.

There is no "Chinese version of human rights" or "Muslim version of human rights." Human rights cross all cultures and borders, and speak to a universal set of aspirations that people strive toward, even if they cannot articulate specific articles found in the

UDHR. The varied institutions that play a role in global governance are all geared in one way or another toward creating a world where the UDHR is not just the hoped for vision of a better world, but the hard reality on the ground. Strengthening our system of global governance will help bring us to a world where, as it states from the preamble of the UDHR, “Recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.”

Reducing Levels of International Violence

Violence has always been an option in human societies. As societies have evolved, the social impacts and ethical implications of violence have made it a less desirable option amongst neighbors. As societies have become more peaceful, governments have worked to monopolize violence, both inside their societies, and in relation to other nations.

The twentieth century has seen two major global wars and numerous regional conflicts take the lives of tens of millions of people. The justifications and excuses for war—that all other options had been exhausted—ring hollow in light of international legal mechanisms that formed since the end of World War II to help resolve disputes, when nations themselves cannot come to an agreement.

The complexities for how nations reach a decision to go to war provide many opportunities to prevent a spiral into violence. There must be more reliance on using peaceful methods to achieve results, as opposed to appealing to the UN Security Council as a last resort before initiating violence. No matter the number of grievances held or offenses noted, the costs upon a society that must fight and send sons and daughters to die in a war can be devastating. Though the idea of war can unify a community or a nation against a common perceived enemy, this is a hollow victory when compared to the loss of life and the devastation that is inflicted on all.

Genocide and Humanitarian Intervention

This is not to say that there are no justifications for using violence. Nonviolence is ideal, but we hardly live in an ideal world. Pacifism and inaction in the name of nonviolence are hardly justifiable in certain cases, such as genocide. Genocide has been defined by the United Nations, in their Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, as acts

“...committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;

(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.”

Genocide is a clear case where humanitarian intervention is justified after other options are exhausted over a reasonable period of time. Humanitarian intervention, the “principle that troops should sometimes be sent to prevent the slaughter of innocent foreigners,”¹¹ is not a new concept and has long been the project of those who support the ideas of universalism and human rights.

The decision to militarily intervene in the affairs of a sovereign nation is not one to be taken lightly, nor is it a blank check to declare war on other nations under the guise of humanitarian intervention. However, people are growing aware that there is a global responsibility to protect vulnerable populations against genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. Humanitarian intervention is justified only if non-military means have been exhausted; such intervention is not cover to achieve imperialistic goals; broad metrics for an exit strategy are established; and there is consensus for action among local, regional, and global stakeholders.

These four justifications are complementary to the 2001 Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, which defined their “just-cause threshold” for humanitarian intervention to be:

A. *Large scale loss of life*, actual or apprehended, with genocidal intent or not, which is the product either of deliberate state action, or state neglect or inability to act, or a failed state situation; or

B. *Large scale ‘ethnic cleansing’*, actual or apprehended, whether carried out by killing, forced expulsion, acts of terror or rape.¹²

It is unfortunate, but we still live in a world where some violence, as a last resort, can be justified in order to prevent greater tragedies and atrocities. Though some may choose to outright dismiss humanitarian intervention because of its military aspect, the lack of international response to the Rwandan genocide in mid-1990s and Darfur in the present-day are prime examples of legitimate circumstances where humanitarian intervention might be applied to save the lives of hundreds of thousands of innocent people.

Terrorism

Much like genocide, terrorism is another method of violence that can lead to large scale loss of life. Following the attacks of Sept 11, 2001, terrorism was incorrectly conceptualized as an ideology in its own right, instead of a means used by extremists toward a specific, and usually violent, end. Ideologues that use terrorism do so because of a variety of motivations—religious, nationalistic, territorial and secular. Though they share a desire to use violence to reach their goals, the goals themselves are varied and cannot be considered a consistent ideology.

Terrorism's effectiveness as a weapon of fear comes from its erasure of the line between civilian and combatant. When militaries engage in combat, they strive to avoid the "collateral damage" that comes with hitting civilian targets—or at least pay lip service to the concept. Terrorists do not share that concern and indeed may declare it is their specific goal to attack non-combatants.

Reducing violence by terrorists is not only a physical confrontation, but an ideological one as well. Serious attempts must be made to deradicalize terrorists of all stripes by showing them that their recourse to violence will not cause the change that they seek. As exemplified in Indonesia, deradicalization programs can have a positive impact, if part of a holistic approach to the radicalized ideologue¹³. More study and analysis is necessary in order to better understand the deradicalization process in order to improve its effectiveness.

For deradicalization programs to be successful, it is also important not to assume that a "one size fits all" approach will work. Terrorists, their motivations and the organizations they support cannot simply be viewed as part of a monolithic whole. They all have distinctive goals and motivations and the appearance of homogeneity is more a result of outsiders not having a clear grasp of internal politics, ideological minutia and grievances that have built up over time.

Nuclear Proliferation

One goal of certain terrorists groups around the world, notably al-Qaeda in recent years, is the desire to acquire nuclear weapons. Between the "loose nukes" that are a result of the fall of the Soviet Union, and the proliferation network of Pakistani scientist A.Q. Khan, the materials, technology and know-how of nuclear weapons development has been dispersed far and wide. This has benefited nations with nuclear ambitions, such as Iran and North Korea, as well as non-state actors, such as al-Qaeda. Non-state actors especially present a global security challenge since they are less likely to be deterred by threats of retaliation.

If a non-state actor detonated a nuclear weapon, the initial confusion and desire to strike back could bring the world to the brink of nuclear annihilation, if nations (especially those holding nuclear weapons) fear that retaliation will be visited upon them. The world could also be dragged into a regional nuclear conflict, such as the nexus of India-Pakistan-China, with devastating results. The best measures to assure that these situations do not spiral out of control are preventative.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty should be vigorously adhered to, and enforced in order to reduce the dangers outlined. State parties that are found to be violating any of the "three pillars"¹⁴ of the NPT—non-proliferation, disarmament and peaceful uses of nuclear power—by the International Atomic Energy Agency should face sanctions and other incentives to immediately halt their behavior. More funding from international organizations should be put toward providing better safeguards to ensure that "loose nukes" from Russia do not make their way out onto the international black market.

Countries without nuclear weapons may go about seeking them for reasons such as national pride and security, but these alone are not reason enough to justify the acquisition of such weaponry. Instead of moving toward a world where there are more nuclear weapons, we must move toward nuclear disarmament in order to prevent future disasters.

“Balanced Development” for the World’s Poor

When discussing global affairs, development and the world’s poor often take a backseat to issues of defense and diplomacy. The world’s poor are usually viewed either in the context of a security paradigm or as something best left for humanitarians to deal with. The rise of the world’s poor, however, has much broader ethical implications.

Richer countries have devoured resources and introduced technologies that have affected the planet’s environmental balance. These technologies, of course, have not remained confined to more prosperous nations. Globalization has allowed for the spread of polluting technologies to nations that are hard pressed to restrict them, for fear of slowing down their own development.

Now, as poorer countries rise up and seek models to emulate, it would be disastrous for their development to mirror the path taken by the United States and Western Europe. The environmental damage alone would be unsustainable. The projected 8.9 billion humans,¹⁵ all trying to achieve a standard of living equal to a middle class American or European citizen is a significant danger to the very hospitality of our planet.

This is not a call to restrict the development or rise of nations. Improved standards of living will reduce crippling poverty, provide people with greater access to resources such as health care and education, offer better job opportunities, reduce social inequalities, and allow governments to build up their nation’s infrastructure and provide a broader range of possibilities for all its citizens. However, the way to a better future for the world’s poor is to ensure a “balanced development,” which will improve quality of life while also ensuring that once people are elevated out of extreme poverty, that they will have something of this world to enjoy.

There may not have been anything “balanced” in the rise of the United States and Western Europe, but this is not justification for poorer countries to make the same mistakes. A call for balanced development is not made out of a desire to deny people a better life, nor is it a case of cultural arrogance against poorer countries. It comes from the very real need to ensure that the Earth has the capacity to provide the minimal quality of life that all people strive for.

For balanced development to succeed, both rich and poor countries will need to do their part. Richer countries with their high quality of life must be willing to seriously reevaluate all aspects of their lifestyles, in order to modify behaviors that are causing damage to the environment. This includes methods of food production and their

distribution networks; the geographies of cities, suburbs and exurbs; urban and regional transportation planning, and carbon emissions from buildings. Rich countries must be imaginative and take a creative analysis of their lifestyles, in order to effect real changes. Carbon pricing is one example of an action that a nation (rich or poor) could take. By taxing its carbon emissions, a society will become more incentivized to reduce their dependence on carbon.

Richer countries also have a special obligation to ensure the rapid spread of technology that can help poorer countries reduce their carbon footprint. If rich countries are able to develop filters that will allow power plants in China that use fossil fuels to emit reduced emissions, the Chinese government should be pressured by the global community to install the filters as rapidly as possible. As “green” architectural techniques become more standard in the United States (where buildings discharge fully half of the country’s greenhouse gas emissions)¹⁶ and Western Europe, there must be easy methods to ensure that architects around the globe can learn how these systems work, and how they can be utilized.

Governments of poorer countries must also agree to better heed general social and environmental concerns, and not allow the percent change in Gross Domestic Product to be the only factor in deciding if something will be favorable or not for their nation. Governments must provide incentives, and non-governmental organizations must create environmental campaigns to raise awareness of these issues, such as with deforestation. Education must continue on birth control issues, so that women can understand and maintain control of their bodies when it comes to reproductive issues.

The Millennium Development Goals already serve as a strong program of international development that has the support of the global community. The eight areas that it addresses—ending poverty and hunger; universal education; gender equality; child health; maternal health; combating HIV/AIDS; environmental sustainability; and global partnerships—will do much to improve the standard of living in poor countries. Efforts toward balanced development will supplement the MDGs, by focusing on the broader development challenges our world faces, as well as what specific contributions rich nations can play in assuring a smooth ascendancy of the global poor.

Conclusion

While our present situation may be fraught with difficulties, the future of human society is limited only by our imaginations. When our ancient ancestors emerged out of the savannahs of Africa, they could not have even begun to imagine the type of society their descendants would create. Focused only on matters of day-to-day survival, they likely did not have time to give much consideration to future generations. In the present, however, people have the luxury of not only contemplating the day-to-day events of life, but can afford to take a long view of what our species needs to create an even better world.

The society we create must provide justice and equity for all of those in the here and now, as well as create a solid foundation for future generations to build on. The creation of a

stronger system of global governance, the reduction of all forms of violence around the world, and set of development tools that provides a balanced rise for the world's poor, will go a long way in meeting these goals.

The work of creating a global civil society is not swift, the road away from violence is beset by challenges, and a new way forward in development will not be accepted without resistance. However, it is in these struggles—some bureaucratic, some intensely personal, and some life and death—that we as a species can find our purpose and meaning. Can we create a more “ideal” world? Only our children will be able to tell us if we have succeeded. But we can never stop aspiring, never stop trying and never stop working toward a better world for all.

¹ China Internet Network Information Center. *Statistical Survey Report on the Internet Development in China Abridged Edition* <http://www.cnnic.cn/download/2008/CNNIC22threport-en.pdf>

² United Nations. *World Urbanization Prospects The 2007 Revision* http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/wup2007/2007WUP_ExecSum_web.pdf

³ World Bank. *Migration and Development Brief 5* http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPROSPECTS/Resources/334934-1110315015165/MD_Brief5.pdf

⁴ Reform the UN. *Security Council Reform* <http://www.reformtheun.org/index.php/issues/1737?theme=alt4>

⁵ International Law Observer. *Human Rights Day 2007 – Remember the UDHR?* <http://internationallawobserver.eu/2007/12/10/human-rights-day-2007-remember-the-udhr/>

⁶ Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. *Report of the Regional Meeting for Asia of the World Conference on Human Rights* <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu5/wcbang.htm>

⁷ Organization of the Islamic Conference. *Statement on Islamophobia Issued by the OIC Ambassadorial Group at the UN in New York on 29 February 2008*

http://www.oic-oci.org/topic_detail.asp?t_id=871&x_key=

⁸ International Humanist and Ethical Union. *Discussion of religious questions now banned at UN Human Rights Council* <http://www.iheu.org/node/3193>

⁹ Organization of the Islamic Conference. *Charter of the Organization of the Islamic Conference* <http://www.oic-oci.org/is11/english/Charter-en.pdf>

¹⁰ University of Minnesota Human Rights Library. *Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam* <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instree/cairodeclaration.html>

¹¹ Bass, Gary J. *Freedom's Battle: The Origins of Humanitarian Intervention* (New York: Knopf, 2008) 3

¹² International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. *The Responsibility to Protect* <http://www.iciss.ca/pdf/Commission-Report.pdf>

¹³ International Crisis Group. “Deradicalisation” and Indonesian Prisons <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=5170&l=1> (for executive summary; registration required for full report). Also see Combating Terrorism Center at West Point. *Why Terrorists Quit: Gaining From Al-Qa`ida's Losses* <http://www.ctc.usma.edu/sentinel/CTCSentinel-Vol1Iss8.pdf>

¹⁴ U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee. *Testimony of Susan F. Burk Nominee for Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the Rank of Ambassador* <http://foreign.senate.gov/testimony/2009/BurkTestimony090422p.pdf>

¹⁵ United Nations. *World Population to 2300* <http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/longrange2/WorldPop2300final.pdf>

¹⁶ Metropolis Magazine. *Turning Down the Global Thermostat* http://www.metropolismag.com/html/content_1003/glo/