

# The roles of international organizations in advancing nutrition rights

**George Kent**

*Professor of Political Science, Department of Political Sciences, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822, USA*

**The right to adequate nutrition has been affirmed in many international instruments, but it has not been implemented. Primary responsibility for implementation rests with national governments, but the international community could do a great deal to help. To start, it should be recognized that, as a matter of principle, there is a legal obligation of the international community to provide services to assure that every child is adequately nourished. The specific services to be provided on the basis of this obligation would then have to be worked out. They would center on helping national governments do what needs to be done to assure that children are adequately nourished.**

Keywords: nutrition rights, children, human rights

There is a long history of concern with the right to food or, more broadly, the right to adequate nutrition, in international law. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 provides that 'everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family, including food'. Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recognizes 'the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger'. Two articles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child address the issue of nutrition. Article 24 says that 'State's Parties recognize the right of the child to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health ...' and shall take appropriate measures 'to combat disease and malnutrition' through the provision of adequate nutritious foods, clean drinking water and health care. Article 27 says that State's Parties 'shall in case of need provide material assistance and support programmes, particularly with regard to nutrition, clothing and housing'. The means of implementation are left to national governments to work out.

The nutrition rights idea was voiced frequently at the International Conference on Nutrition held in Rome in December 1992. In his address opening the conference His Holiness Pope John Paul II said:

It is up to you to reaffirm in a new way each individual's fundamental and inalienable right to nutrition. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights had already asserted the right to sufficient food. What we must now do is ensure that this right is applied and that everyone has access to food, food security, a healthy diet and nutrition education.

The conference's concluding *World Declaration on Nutrition* begins with these words

We, the Ministers and the Plenipotentiaries representing 159 states and the European Economic Community at the International Conference on Nutrition (Rome, December 1992),

declare our determination to eliminate hunger and to reduce all forms of malnutrition. Hunger and malnutrition are unacceptable in a world that has both the knowledge and the resources to end this human catastrophe. We recognize that access to nutritionally adequate and safe food is a right of each individual.

So far policymakers have not taken the idea of the right to adequate nutrition very seriously. There have been many nutrition programs within nations and internationally, but they have been provided as a matter of charity, not rights and duties. There has not been any legal recourse for those who fail to receive service. The right has not been effectively implemented. My purpose here is to explore the ways in which international action could help to advance nutrition rights throughout the world.

In recent years there has been a vigorous debate over *humanitarian intervention*, referring to assistance provided without the consent of the government of the nation receiving the assistance. Such assistance has been provided to the Kurds in Iraq, Bosnians and Croats in what had been Yugoslavia, and Somalians<sup>1</sup>. These discussions have been mainly about the *right* of outside parties to provide assistance; they are not about a *duty to* provide assistance. Rights of the needy to receive international assistance, as distinguished from rights of outsiders to provide assistance, are rarely discussed in the legal literature<sup>2</sup>. The argument here is that there should be not only a right but also a duty to provide international assistance under some circumstances<sup>3</sup>. A good place to start would be to recognize clear international obligations to assist children who are extremely malnourished.

#### **Nutrition rights within nations<sup>4</sup>**

Before studying the role of the international community, we should clarify the bases of nutrition rights within nations. The working assumption here is that recognition of nutrition rights should begin with children, but the argument can be adapted to other groups as well.

##### *Rings of responsibility*

Our principal obligation toward children is to promote their development, understood as empowerment or increasing self-reliance. The task is to help increase children's capacity to define, analyze and act on their own problems. Who is responsible for carrying out these obligations? Many different social agencies may have some role in looking after children, but what should be the interrelationships among them?

As children mature, the first priority is to help them become responsible for themselves. So long as they are not mature, however, children ought to get their nurturance from their parents. Failing that, they ought to get it from their local communities. Failing that, they ought to get it from the local governments. Failing that, it should come from their national governments. Failing that, they ought to get it from the international community. The responsibility hierarchy looks like this:

child  
family  
community  
local government  
state government  
national government  
international non-governmental organizations  
international governmental organizations

We can picture this as a set of nested circles, with the child in the centre of the nest, surrounded, supported and nurtured by family, community, government and, ultimately, international organizations.

This is straightforward. The idea that needs to be added is that in cases of failure, agents more distant from the child should not simply substitute for those closer to the child. Instead, those who are more distant should try to work through and strengthen those who are closer to help them become more capable of fulfilling their responsibilities towards children. To the extent possible, local communities should not take children away from inadequate parents but should help parents in their parenting role. State governments should not replace local governments but should support local governments in their work with children. The international community should help national governments in their work with children. To the extent feasible, those in the outer circles should try to empower those in the inner circles so that they can meet children's nutritional and other needs.

#### *The principle*

Some free market advocates feel that governments should take no direct responsibility for dealing with hunger. They see government involvement as an unwarranted intrusion, distorting the play of market forces and creating economic inefficiency. The view taken here, however, is that regardless of the type of economy, it is the duty of governments to assure that all their citizens can at least subsist. The point is reaffirmed in Principle 25 of the *Limburg Principles on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* which says that 'State's Parties are obligated, regardless of the level of economic development, to ensure respect for minimum subsistence rights for all'<sup>5</sup>. It is the duty of governments to structure their societies in ways that prevent malnutrition.

Perhaps capable adults should not be fed by the state, but few would argue that small children in crisis should be ignored. Certainly the responsibility for feeding children falls, in the first instance, on the child's family but the community and the government bear some responsibility as well. *There should be a recognized legal obligation of government to provide services to assure that every child is adequately nourished.* There needs to be acknowledgement of this principle, enshrined in law.

The services provided should take several different forms, with direct feeding programs only a small part of the package. Adequate nutrition requires not only access to food but also adequate care of women and children, access to basic health services and also a healthy environment. This is why we should speak of a right to adequate nutrition and not simply a right to food. There may be some debate over which particular services are required, but there should be no disagreement over the principle that government is required to provide some sort of services to assure that children are adequately nourished.

The family and the community have responsibility too, but there should be a clear obligation on government to do what needs to be done if the family's and community's response is inadequate. This obligation then helps to assure that government is motivated to support the community in fulfilling its responsibility. Community groups working on the local malnutrition problem should be able to rely on their local and state governments for help, whether for money, endorsements, transportation or moral support and encouragement. It is the responsibility of government to help such community groups. Moreover, the government should be grateful for the opportunity to help the community use its resources to deal with local malnutrition, for otherwise the burden would fall on the government itself.

*Soft versus hard rights*

There are many good things for which there is no acknowledged right. Some of what we may agree are rights in principle or a matter of 'natural law' are not yet codified in the written 'black letter' law. The focus here is on formal rights as explicitly stated in the law. One can pursue interests in alleviating malnutrition in many different ways, but to use the language of rights about these interests means that one is going to use the law. Promoting nutrition rights requires that we talk about the creation of new law or the implementation of existing law relating to nutrition rights.

Soft rights are not spelled out in the law, or if they are there is no strong and effective mechanism to assure their implementation. The Convention on the Rights of the Child and other human rights instruments only describe soft rights. They can be transformed into hard rights if national and local governments create suitably strong national and local laws along with effective agencies to implement the rights in the convention.

Hard or strong rights are clearly articulated in the law and are accompanied by effective implementation and accountability mechanisms. Hard rights have a history of case law through which their meaning is tested and refined. There is clear recourse in law for individuals whose rights are not fulfilled and clear public accountability.

In the USA, for example, people have a right to freedom of religion. This means that the national government has a duty to protect people's freedom of religion. This has been clearly established as a hard right through a long record of implementation by the legislature, the judiciary and the executive branches of the government. We know the right exists not simply by the fact that people practice many different religions but also by the fact that we see well-established institutional mechanisms to protect this diversity. If there is a hard right, it must be articulated in the law and there must be institutional mechanisms in place to assure that the right is fulfilled for every individual.

Rights are important because, without clear rights, those who are more powerful, more highly educated or better connected have an advantage in obtaining services. Clearly established rights empower the weak, levelling the playing field a bit so that the weak are not so disadvantaged.

Governments can do many different things that enhance the likelihood that their people will be adequately nourished. They can see to it that the economy functions smoothly, provide for health and sanitation services, undertake land reform programs, subsidize staple foods, create social security programs, impose legal obligations on parents, and many other things. However, the position taken here is that there is no hard right unless the government serves as back-up, accepting the obligation to fulfil the need in cases of failure of other more indirect means of fulfilling it. *There is no hard right to adequate nutrition unless the government guarantees to meet the need if other means fail.*

It would be neither possible nor wise to provide a hard right in this sense for all claimants. The argument here is that it should be feasible at least to some extent for those who are most vulnerable: small children who are clearly malnourished. Adequate nutrition for children should be recognized as an assured, unqualified right. Once the principle is accepted we can go on to discuss details of how it is to be fulfilled in different circumstances.

Past efforts to ameliorate malnutrition have all been valuable, but they have been matters of charity and chance and not the implementation of real rights. True implementation of a right to something means not just providing some amount of that thing to some people; it means *assuring* that every individual who is entitled to it gets his or her full share of it.

The soft international human rights law we now have can be viewed as a guide to the formulation of national-level human rights law. It is at the national rather than the inter-

national level that we expect to see it hardened first. Nations will be willing to look after their own most vulnerable children before they are willing to look after the world's most vulnerable children.

#### *Implementation within nations*

In December 1992 in Rome, just prior to the International Conference on Nutrition, a Task Force on Children's Nutrition Rights was established. Functioning under the umbrella of the World Alliance for Nutrition and Human Rights, the task force promotes the strengthening of children's nutrition rights in local, national and international law. I serve as its coordinator. The Task Force facilitates and encourages a variety of activities such as research and lobbying on the issue, but its work centres on encouraging the organization of national workshops on the theme. These national workshops are designed to launch locally-based long-term campaigns to strengthen children's nutrition rights, giving attention both to their articulation in the law and the effective implementation of that law. Individuals from both governmental and non-governmental organizations are invited to participate.

The workshops use a variation of the 'triple-A approach' recommended by UNICEF: 'a continuous and self-refining process of *assessment*, *analysis* and *action* (followed by reassessment, clearer analysis, more focused action, etc.)'<sup>6</sup>. While UNICEF uses this approach to help communities and governments develop overall strategies for dealing with malnutrition, in these workshops the focus is narrowed to the ways in which children's nutrition rights, explicitly stated in the law, can be developed and strengthened. The *assessment* of the situation involves describing the current nutrition problems and responses to them, and also requires examination of existing law. The *analysis* explores explanations for why the nutrition situation is as it is, and why the law is as it is. On the basis of these foundations, the workshops then consider *action*, developing strategies for strengthening children's nutrition rights in the nation.

The first workshop was held in Guatemala in February 1993, the second in Mexico in May 1993 and the third in Nigeria in October 1993. Others are planned, and discussions are underway with potential organizers elsewhere. Organizers invite individuals to their workshops who might arrange similar programs in other nations in their regions. Hopefully this will lead to an ongoing process of facilitation, networking and learning. It is too early to show results, but we are confident that this process will lead to increasing recognition of children's right to adequate nutrition.

#### **The principle internationally**

There is much discussion of international protection of human rights, but what does that mean? A 1990 brochure from UNICEF and the UN Centre for Human Rights says in its title that *Children's Rights Need International Protection* and suggests that the new Convention on the Rights of the Child responds to that need. I do not agree that the convention establishes international rights – certainly not hard international rights. If one party has a hard right to something, some other party must have the duty to provide it.

Children's rights would really be international only if, upon failure of a national government to do what needed to be done to fulfil those rights, the international community was *obligated* to step in to do what was necessary with no excuses. There is now no mechanism and no commitment to do that. Currently, 'international law imposes no obligation on states to respond to requests for assistance or to make offers of contributions for relief operations in other countries'<sup>7</sup>. The international human rights instruments are concerned primarily with the responsibilities of State's Parties to their own people, not to people elsewhere.

Article 11 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights does require

State's Parties individually and through international cooperation to take the measures needed to implement 'the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger', so the language does in fact speak of international obligations. In practice, however, there is no clear, hard duty with corresponding measures to assure accountability. There is no international history of case law with respect to the right to nutrition. This shows that there is no hard international law with respect to the right to nutrition.

The international community should take responsibility and not allow small children to be sacrificed when their governments are unwilling or unable to fulfil their needs. *There should be a recognized legal obligation of the international community to provide services to assure that every child is adequately nourished.* After all, children of particular nations are also children of the world. There could be an international agreement that certain kinds of international assistance programs *must* be provided, say, to children in nations in which infant mortality rates exceed a certain level.

In the rings of responsibility image described above, the international community is the outer ring, the last resort in looking after the well-being of children. The very outermost ring is comprised of the international governmental organizations (IGOs). Just inside that ring are the international non-governmental organizations (INGOs). The international bodies' task is not to deliver services to children directly but, to the extent possible, to empower agencies in the inner rings. What can the international community do practically to help all the inner rings do what they can to assure that children are adequately nourished?

### **Implementation internationally**

If the idea that there should be international nutrition rights is accepted in principle, we must attend to the issue of implementation: how do we make it happen?

In advancing nutrition rights within nations it is wise to work with nutrition programs that are already in place. It is usually possible to revise the rules under which people have access to these programs so that those who are most needy are assured of receiving services. Similarly, we should recognize that there already are institutional arrangements for dealing with nutrition issues at the global level, and see how their methods of work can be adapted to advance nutrition rights.

The most prominent IGOs concerned with nutrition are the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the World Food Council (WFC), the World Food Programme (WFP), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). They are governed by boards comprised of member states. Responsibility for coordinating nutrition activities among these and other IGOs in the United Nations system rests with the Administrative Committee on Coordination/Subcommittee on Nutrition (ACC/SCN). Representatives of bilateral donor agencies such as the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) also participate in ACC/SCN activities. There are also numerous international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) concerned with nutrition.

There is a great deal that each of these organizations could do to promote nutrition rights by modifying aspects of the ways they work. Consider, for example, the arrangements through which the World Food Programme provides food supplies in emergencies. In 1975 the United Nations General Assembly established the International Emergency Food Reserve (IEFR) to provide a rapid-response facility. The minimum annual target for the IEFR was set at 500 000 tons of cereals, to be placed at the disposal of the WFP for urgent, unconditional use in emergencies:

In actual practice, however, the IEFER has been seriously circumscribed by (among other things) donors too often pledging *ad hoc*; earmarking for specific countries only; and designating the source of purchase and/or type of commodity from which WFP must procure against a pledge. The further requirement of a number of donors for case-by-case approval of use of their IEFER pledges causes serious delays in even starting to move food towards an emergency. Average response time now often exceeds three months. WFP has repeatedly had to resort, in emergencies, to borrowing money from shipments intended for food for development (including school-feeding) with disastrous consequences for those projects.

Another very serious handicap is that the IEFER does not receive enough straight cash to cover anything like the full needs in two other vital elements of emergency food aid – ability to buy supplementary commodities from wherever needed to ensure that recipients have a minimally balanced diet, and money enough to actually transport food to them.<sup>8</sup>

These difficulties might be overcome if IEFER supplies were to be provided on the basis that under certain explicitly specified conditions the needy had a right to assistance. The entire program could be rationalized on a contractual basis, with donors asked to subscribe over a sustained period. Through this contract, they would forego direct operational control and would instead be asked to agree to the specified principles of operation.

Nations that wanted to maintain control over their contributions would have to give directly to the receiving nations without going through the IEFER system. Some current contributors, seeing that they would have less direct control under this new method for providing emergency food supplies, might be less willing to donate to the effort. However, their withdrawal might be more than compensated by a new willingness of other nations to support a program that is well managed and truly effective.

Of course the idea of ending serious malnutrition in the world through establishment of a regime of hard international nutrition rights is idealistic. Nevertheless, the idea can be useful in setting the direction of action. We can move toward the ideal by having IGOs establish their own clear rules and procedures which they would follow *as if* they were firm duties. Thus we can think of the IGOs as having specific duties with regard to the fulfilment of nutrition rights.

Currently the main role of the IGOs is not to feed people directly but to help nations use their own resources more effectively. In much the same way, a new regime of international nutrition rights would not involve massive international transfers of food. Its main function would be to press and help governments to address the problem of malnutrition among their own people using the food, care and health resources within their own nations. There may always be a need for a global emergency food facility to help in emergency situations that are beyond the capacity of individual nations, but a different kind of design is needed for dealing with chronic malnutrition. Moreover, as chronic malnutrition is addressed more effectively, nations would increase their capacity for dealing with emergency situations on their own. Over time the need for emergency assistance from the outside would decline.

The IGOs could use their leverage to press for the establishment of nutrition rights within the nations they serve. For example, the World Food Programme could make it known that in providing food supplies for development it will favour those nations that are working to establish clear nutrition rights for the most needy in their nations<sup>9</sup>. All of the IGOs could be especially generous in providing assistance to those nations that create national laws and national agencies devoted to implementing nutrition rights. Poor nations, relieved of some of the burden of providing material resources, would be more willing to create programs for recognizing nutrition rights. Such pledges by international agencies could be viewed as a precursor to recognition of a genuine international duty to recognize and effectively implement rights to adequate nutrition.

The IGOs could encourage and support nations in conducting national workshops on children's nutrition rights of the sort described earlier. With very modest incentives, many nations might be willing to review their existing nutrition programs to determine ways in which the rules governing access to those programs might be improved through careful use of the law.

Currently, international assistance (including food aid, development aid, health services and other forms of assistance) is intended to serve a very broad range of purposes. Only a small fraction of the total is intended to alleviate malnutrition directly. When wastage of different kinds is taken into account, the proportion of international assistance that is used to alleviate malnutrition directly is very small indeed. When such assistance is provided it is usually in acute crisis situations such as famines, natural disasters and armed conflicts. Most international assistance bypasses those who are chronically malnourished or reaches them only indirectly. The argument here, however, is not that there should be massive increases of international assistance, but rather that there should be more systematic targeting to assure that extreme malnutrition is ended everywhere. International assistance programs would become more orderly and effective if they were based on the principle that, under specified conditions, the needy have a *right* to assistance.

### **A global action plan**

The IGOs are concerned with the problems of famine and chronic malnutrition, but these are only a part of their broad agendas. For example, the FAO gives a great deal of attention to the interests of food producers and WHO deals with the full range of health issues. UNICEF, too, addresses a very broad range of subjects. Moreover, the division of responsibilities among the IGOs for dealing with nutrition has not yet been worked out adequately. Thus malnutrition has not yet received the commitment of attention and resources needed to really solve the problem. The concept of moving progressively toward a global regime of nutrition rights could be the basis for working out a *global program of concerted action by the IGOs*.

How can the world deal decisively with the problem of widespread chronic malnutrition? Imagine that a global meeting was held in which all governments and concerned international organizations were represented. Imagine further that they were determined to end malnutrition in the world and wanted to draw up concrete action plans toward that end. We can also suppose that they agreed to commit resources to the effort at a rate up to, but no greater than, the overall amounts now spent on food and nutrition-related international assistance programs.

What might the action plan look like? In some respects it would echo the *World Declaration on Nutrition* and the *Plan of Action for Nutrition* approved by the world's governments in Rome in December 1992. Certainly the early parts of those texts describing the nature of the problem and the seriousness of the governments' concerns would be similar. The big differences would be in the operational sections specifying who exactly is making what commitments to do what, in what time frame, with what sorts of accountability. The conference participants in 1992 went as far as they could go, but in the new agreement contemplated here we would look for a businesslike contract, with clearly elaborated responsibilities and commitments.

At the 1992 meeting, the major parties were the nations of the world, and the concerned IGOs stood to the side as facilitators of the meeting. The focus was on the formulation of national plans of action, not a global plan of action. In the new negotiations envisioned here, the IGOs would be at centre-stage, working out *their* roles in the new nutrition rights regime. They would have to work out the division of responsibilities among them so that

each could make its own best contribution to assuring that every single human being is adequately nourished. Of course it would always have to be recognized that the IGOs are not independent agents, but are instruments of, and accountable to, their member nations.

Strategically, the program of action could begin the work of alleviating malnutrition with the very worst cases and then, as those problems were solved, move to dealing with less severe situations. Rules could be established so that the targets of action would be selected on the basis of clear measures of need, thus reducing the possibilities for making politicized selections. The IGOs could continue to carry out other functions, but with regard to the challenge of addressing severe malnutrition their actions would be coordinated under the new global program of action, the contract adopted at the meeting.

At the core of the new arrangement would be the establishment of a new global body that had responsibility for seeing to it that the terms of the contract negotiated at the meeting were carried out. This new agency, created by national governments working together with the IGOs, would see to it that those that made agreements, and thus incurred obligations, carried out their obligations in fact.

The IGOs would help and pressure national governments to deal with malnutrition among their own people, beginning with the most severe cases. Local and international non-governmental organizations would be a part of the system in that they would help to identify and report serious cases of malnutrition, they would help to provide services and they would monitor to make sure that national and local agencies carried out their work of alleviating malnutrition.

It would be agreed that where there was very severe malnutrition and national agencies could not or would not solve the problem, the IGOs would have the capacity and the duty to become directly involved. The nature of that involvement would have to be worked out. Concrete programs of action would have to be designed to fit particular cases, but the planning exercise would establish general procedures and guidelines for action. Consideration would have to be given to issues of consent, costs, logistics, risks, and so on. Intervention would not be automatic and indiscriminate, but there would be an agency in place that would be prepared to assess the situation and act under suitable internationally accepted guidelines. Initially, the international community would have a firm duty to assist only where there was consent from governments of the nations receiving assistance.

Where international assistance is provided on a purely discretionary basis, there is no acknowledgement of a responsibility to assist, and the assistance that is provided is likely to be handled politically and wastefully. However, the gradual regularizing of assistance is a mark of 'the development of what we may call global civil society, in which members of global society are starting to try to make the state system responsible'<sup>10</sup>. Systematic assistance to the needy under the law is a mark of civilization within nations. We should begin to recognize that children everywhere have a right to adequate nutrition and that, consequently, the international community has a positive obligation, recognized in law, to help fulfil that right.

## Notes

1. On the developing doctrine of humanitarian intervention, see Yves Beigbeder, *The Role and Status of International Humanitarian Volunteers and Organizations: The Right and Duty to Humanitarian Assistance*, Martinus Nijhoff, Dordrecht, 1991, pp 353–384; Richard B. Lillich, *International Human Rights: Problems of Law, Policy and Practice*, 2nd edition, Little, Brown, Boston, 1991, pp 372–441; David J. Schefer, Richard N. Gardner and Gerald B. Helman, *Post-Gulf War Challenges to the UN Collective Security System: Three Views on the Issue of Humanitarian Intervention*, United States Institute of Peace, Washington, DC, 1992; Fernando R. Tesón, *Humanitarian Intervention: An Inquiry into Law and Morality*, Transnational Publishers, Dobbs Ferry, New York, 1988. There also have been numerous articles in the law journals.
2. However, see the three papers by Sandoz, Plattner and Torrelli in *International Review of The Red Cross*,

- 1992 May–June, No. 288. They speak of a duty to assist civilian victims of armed conflict under international humanitarian law. Despite Torrelli's argument, that duty is not strongly grounded in the victims' right to assistance. Those rights are not well articulated in international humanitarian law.
3. In 1988 the French proposed a General Assembly resolution for disaster relief based on explicit recognition of the rights of the needy to receive assistance. That aspect disappeared by the time the resolution was finalized. See Beigbeder, *The Role and Status of International Humanitarian Volunteers and Organizations: The Right and Duty to Humanitarian Assistance*, Martinus Nijhoff, Dordrecht, 1991, pp 354, 380–383.
  4. This analysis regarding nutrition rights within nations summarizes my paper 'Children's right to adequate nutrition' in *International Journal of Children's Rights* 1993 1 (2). That paper will soon be republished in the United Nations University's *Food and Nutrition Bulletin*.
  5. The Limburg Principles, published in United Nations document E/CN.4/1987/17, Annex, were reprinted in the special Symposium issue on *The Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of the Human Rights Quarterly* 1987 9.
  6. *Food, Health, and Care: The UNICEF Vision and Strategy for a World Free from Hunger and Malnutrition* UNICEF, New York, 1992.
  7. Peter Macalister-Smith, *International Humanitarian Assistance: Disaster Relief Actions in International Law and Organization* Martinus Nijhoff, Dordrecht, 1985, p 56.
  8. Brian Urquhart and Erskine Childers, 'Strengthening international responses to humanitarian emergencies' in *Towards a More Effective United Nations*, special issue of *Development Dialogue* Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation, Uppsala, Sweden, 1991, pp 41–85, at pp 79–80.
  9. This argument should be placed in the context of the ongoing discussion of whether international assistance of different kinds should be provided conditionally to advance specific policies relating to human rights, economic ideologies, nutrition or other considerations. See, for example, Mark W. Charlton, *The Making of Canadian Food Aid Policy* McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal, 1992; Edward Clay and Olav Stokke (eds) *Food Aid Reconsidered: Assessing the Impact on Third World Countries* Frank Cass, London, 1991; Francis M. Deng and Larry Minear, *The Challenges of Famine Relief: Emergency Operations in the Sudan* The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC, 1992; Rachel Garst and Tom Barry, *Feeding the Crisis: US Food Aid and Farm Policy in Central America* University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1990; Tony Jackson, *Against the Grain: The Dilemma of Project Food Aid* Oxfam, Oxford, 1982; Larry Minear, *Humanitarianism Under Siege: A Critical Review of Operation Lifeline Sudan* Red Sea Press/Bread for the World, Trenton, New Jersey, 1991; Lars Adam Rehof and Claus Gulmann, *Human Rights and Domestic Law and Development Assistance Policies of the Nordic Countries* Martinus Nijhoff, Dordrecht, 1989; Paul B. Thompson, *The Ethics of Aid and Trade: US Food Policy, Foreign Competition, and the Social Contract* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992; Katarina Tomaševski, *Development Aid and Human Rights* St. Martin's Press, New York, 1989; Steven L. Varnis, *Reluctant Aid or Aiding the Reluctant? US Food Aid Policy and Ethiopian Famine Relief* Transaction, New Brunswick 1990.
  10. Martin Shaw, 'Global society and global responsibility: the theoretical, historical and political limits of international society' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 1992 21 (3), 421–434, at p 431.