

Multicultural Human Security Approach

İdris TURAN*

Ekrem Yaşar AKÇAY**

Geliş Tarihi (Received): 28.09.2020 – Kabul Tarihi (Accepted): 04.03.2021

Abstract

Multiculturalism and the Human Security approach both came into prominence after the end of the Cold War. Multiculturalism is defined as various cultural groups in a country living in peace. The Human Security approach, on the other hand, refers to the transformation of the realist paradigm valid during the Cold War into human-centered security studies. Both of these approaches are proven to have global effects. In this regard, the modern “state of nature” in the 20th and 21st centuries can be perceived through arguments of war & securitization, economic problems and challenges in dialogue. This study dwells upon a thorough analysis of the concepts of multiculturalism and human security on the basis of their combination to form Multicultural Human Security approach in an attempt to demonstrate the benefits of this conjugated approach creating the modern “state of nature”. A balanced and fair mechanism may well be argued to be possible in the international system composed of states, communities and individuals by means of this new approach in the rest of the 21st century.

Keywords: Modern “state of nature”, Human Security, Multiculturalism, Multicultural Human Security approach

Çok Kültürlü İnsani Güvenlik Yaklaşımı

Öz

Çokkültürlülük ve İnsani Güvenlik yaklaşımı Soğuk Savaş’ın bitiminden sonra öne çıkmıştır. Çokkültürlülük çeşitli kültürel grupların bir ülkede barış içinde yaşaması şeklinde tanımlanır. Diğer taraftan İnsani Güvenlik yaklaşımı, Soğuk Savaş döneminde geçerli olan realist paradigmanın insan-merkezli güvenlik çalışmalarına evrilmesini işaret eder. Her iki yaklaşım da küresel etkileri olduğunu ispatlamıştır. Bu bağlamda, 20. ve 21. yüzyıllardaki modern “doğa durumu” savaş ve güvenleştirme, ekonomik problemler ve diyaloktaki zorluklar vasıtasıyla anlaşılabilir. Bu çalışma Çokkültürlülük ve İnsani Güvenlik kavramlarının birleştirilmesi ile oluşacak Çokkültürlü İnsani Güvenlik yaklaşımı üzerinde durmaktadır. Ayrıca bu yeni yaklaşım modern “doğa durumu”na karşı faydalarını göstermeye yarayacaktır. Dengeli ve adil bir mekanizma bu yeni yaklaşımla birlikte devletler, topluluklar ve bireyler için 21. yüzyılda söz konusu olabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Modern “doğa durumu”, İnsani Güvenlik, Çokkültürlülük, Çokkültürlü İnsani Güvenlik yaklaşımı

* Asst. Prof., Hakkâri University, FEAS, Political Science and International Relations Dep., turan.idris@gmail.com

** Assoc. Prof., Hakkâri University, FEAS, Political Science and International Relations Dep., ekremyasarakcay@hakkari.edu.tr

Introduction

Individuals, communities, states, as well as the international system in the 21st century are governed by a modern “state of nature”, which can be comprehended through several arguments: 1. Mediums for dialogue are used for propaganda purposes rather than understanding the “other”. 2. Economic aids are very limited, and wealth is not fairly distributed. 3. The issue of securitization has led to numerous wars/conflicts.

The study is developed through the following research question: How is it possible to synthesize the community-based approach required by multiculturalism with the individualistic approach required by the Human Security approach so as to transcend the modern “state of nature” in the 21st century? Both the Multicultural Approach and the Human Security Approach took their place in the international discourses after the 1990s. In this context, the Human Security Approach reflects the individualistic aspect of liberalism, and the Multicultural Approach is based on doing what needs to be done to find the habitat of collective rights.

After elaborating on Will Kymlicka's analyses on the evolution of Multiculturalism as a Sustainable Global Multicultural Approach, this study presents the Multicultural Human Security Approach emerging as a synthesis with the Human Security Approach.

In the first half of the 20th century, collectivists came into prominence with their studies and multiculturalism was debated in this context. However, the interaction between individuals and subgroups within different cultural groups in the same century suggests that multiculturalism should be considered not only among distinct cultural groups, but also among individuals, subgroups and dominant groups.

Will Kymlicka refers to the gaps in human rights – based approaches, addressing the integration of collective rights in order to fill these gaps. He argues that the gaps in approaches pertaining to human rights affect each other, thus they cannot be considered separately. Accordingly, individual rights will be incomplete when considered without collective rights as individual rights are often found within a group/community.

Kymlicka argues that "the theory of minority rights should be added to traditional human rights principles" in order to find an equitable solution to some of the most important and controversial issues of cultural minorities (Kymlicka, 1998, p. 31). In his theory, Kymlicka focuses mainly on two groups: National groups in minority status within multinational states and groups with different ethnicities in multiethnic states.

In this study, the following samples are presented under three titles demonstrating the modern “state of nature” in order to illustrate the necessity of Multicultural Human Security Approach. First, the war & securitization argument is elaborated. Under the second title, the economic argument is elaborated and under the third title, the argument on dialogue is explained. Subsequently, this article assesses the Multicultural Human Security Approach followed by a thorough conclusion.

1. A Sustainable Global Multiculturalism Approach

The international system as well as the number of actor in it has been observed to grow exponentially, while the actor in this system affects each other to a great extent. In this regard, there is an urging need to answer the following question as Kymlicka argues: “How the existing multicultural environment can be made "manageable"?”

One of the most important tasks entrusted to the cosmopolitan justice is to extend full-scale human rights enforcement to include individuals and to make an end to reference to certain people with regard to crime and justice only due to issues of legitimacy (Benhabib, 2006, pp. 176-177).

In an ideal multicultural society and its civilian culture, individuals are not outside the protection of courts and the police (Rex, 1996, pp. 17-19). In other words, the legitimate state in an ideal multicultural society indicates that there is not any group/individual not deserving protection under its umbrella. Every different formation has the legitimate right to protection as long as they do not violate the living spaces of other formations.

In political terms, different groups have political forces at different levels in pluralistic societies. It is assumed in an ideal multicultural society that all individuals and groups have similar rights such as the political right to vote. This argument does not disregard conflicts in a society, yet not any group or individual is regarded to be exposed to governmental self-imposed conflicts (Rex, 1996, p. 19). In this context, identity or ideals are about whom individuals are. Individuals do not automatically choose their identities; however manifest certain inclinations towards specific identities in accordance with flexibility of units or organizations (Rex, 1996, p. 27). Thus, it can be argued that the only system of ideas that should be illegal in a multicultural society is the one that imposes inequality of opportunity for individuals or groups (Rex, 1996, p. 28).

According to the Gestalt theory, "the whole is more than the sum of the parts" (İşsevenler, 2012, p. 55). This expression can be extended as the whole is not equal to the sum

of parts. In this regard, it would not be wrong to interpret this expression as follows: If communities are not living in a harmonious and fair level, there will be a risk of conflict (economic, political or armed), and therefore there is the possibility that the social capacity will be consumed by its own internal tensions leading to a lower level of capacity and resulting in divisions rather than a comprehensive improvement. In other words, since the resources used to maintain the fragmentation will be used for the general population, it will have a return far above the progress that can be achieved with the individual collection of parts.

In Will Kymlicka's theory, it is mentioned that a fair and equitable order for ethnic groups and national minorities may be possible with the mechanism of "internal restrictions" and "external protections". In fact, the components of the multicultural environment do not consist only of national minorities and ethnic groups.

A development approach that is sensitive to cultural diversity will see a key role in solving interdependent economic, social and environmental problems in the world (UNESCO, 2009, p. 27). The development of a sustainable multiculturalism discourse at systematic level will play an active role in attaining this objective.

In reality, discourses transform each other varying on the basis of their red lines or restrictions. From a critical point of view, the perception and reality of states, international organizations, national non-governmental organizations, societies and groups are in constant interaction (especially *constructivism** and *post-structuralism***).

Partly due to the nature of this interaction and the impossibility of keeping any culture in a fixed form, the overall impacts of globalization have brought about the call for a sustainable multiculturalist approach. Nonetheless, achieving such a multiculturalist approach at local level does not seem to be possible. In this regard, any development today in any region of the world is geographically deemed as "local/regional", while it is regarded global in political and social terms.

The Sustainable Global Multicultural Approach is a system based on processes, identities/differences in a republic and democratic rule allowing a sort of agonistic public sphere

* *Constructivism is a branch of social sciences suggesting that social reality and social knowledge are both constructed. It can be seen as a means of meta-intellectual analysis rather than a structure such as the well-known international relations theories. Mustafa Küçük's article "Understanding the 'Constructivist Transformation in International Relations' can be examined for ontological and epistemological details. (Küçük, 2009).*

** *It can be observed in discourse analysis that structuralism emerged on the basis of linguistics. It is based on the assumption that words are meaningful according to perceptions that reflect the real world and formed in the human mind. Words find their counterparts in minds, not in the real world. Meaning is completely artificial and concentrates on the reality that is created through discourses. For a detailed explanation see: (Konar, 2011).*

that renders it possible to establish sub-constructs that can provide multiculturalism in domestic politics. Identity and sociality are sustainable as such a structure permits cultures to change form in time. Within this context, the Sustainable Global Multicultural Approach allows agonistic areas to push back fixed and single-centered formations and accepts the identity of different cultures. It is a republican and democratic system-based approach aimed at centralizing the equality of its members and participation in governance in an attempt to ensure fair representation.

Even though the crisis of nation-states has come to an end, the transformation of the nation-states as well as the way they have been overthrown must be scrutinized without ignoring the initial requirements for the formation of nation-states and the gains they have brought in. On the other hand, the Multicultural Human Security Approach, which can be put forward as the synthesis of the Sustainable Global Multiculturalism Approach and the Global Security-based Human Security Approach, has the potential to overthrow nation-states and provide a solution to the global and local obstacles in front of global/local peace.

2. Human Security

In general terms, the aim of Human Security is to defend individuals against any threat (Neag & Coman, 2010, p. 126). Human Security is an important step in transforming the concept of rights in the classical sense. However, its concentration in a way that emphasizes individuals brings certain questions to mind. The fact that it is individual-centered and willy-nilly raises the question of whether the right to multiculturalism has been left on the backdrop.

2.1. The Theoretical Assumption of Human Security

Human Security can be interpreted as the liberation of men as a theoretical approach liberating people and their freedoms from fragility as well as intense, widespread, ongoing and comprehensive threats (Gharaibeh, 2011, p. 230). In general, Human Security aims at defining security for human life threatened by civil wars, natural disasters, or collapse of states (Graf, 2010, p. 335).

In light of the above definition, it is people who have created today's world system and they have the same ability to reshape the world (Roberts D., 2010, p. 3). In security studies that

take "humans"^{*} as the initial subject at global and local level (Roberts D., 2010, p. 160), human security can provide road maps^{**} that can play a role in this reshaping of the world system.

Looking from historical and philosophical perspective, the Human Security view is based on two concepts within the scope of the liberal tradition: The first is to ensure rights and duties of individuals while the second is that sovereign institutions are supposed to protect these individual rights and duties.

In brief, Human Security is inevitably and complexly concerned with the relationship among citizens as well the relationship between citizens and the state (Krause, 2007). Moreover, Human Security tends to ensure that people, who are not under the responsibility of the state – those who do not have citizenship rights such as asylum seekers – are also addressed for their security needs.

3. Modern “State Of Nature” in the 21st Century

While the Human Security Approach has an important place in security studies together with the centralization of human beings, it does not necessarily address the individuals, who have not found an opportunity to get involved in social life or the groups which find it hard to adapt to the social structure in a country. It is believed that tackling the Human Security Approach with reference to multiculturalism will contribute to the achievement of human beings’ honorable life standards as well as the international peace and security. The integration of the multiculturalism approach will surely contribute to fill the gaps in existing human security studies in the international context, since there seems to be no possibility for individuals to coexist in dignity in an environment by ignoring the identities of others as well as the multicultural demands. The following arguments^{***} can further be taken into consideration when evaluating the necessity for the synthesis of the Multicultural Human Security Approach. Furthermore, these arguments point out to the existence of the modern “state of nature”.

^{*} “States live only if you facilitate people’s lives” stated by Sheikh Edebali to Osman Bey must be noted here. Within the scope of the Turkish state tradition, this statement that shaped the government’s view towards people is reflected in the international dimension with the Human Security Approach.

^{**} It has the potential to respond to variable demands for sustainability. With the multicultural perspective that will expand to the system level with sphericity, it is thought that the elements in the system and the sub-structures will contribute to its applicability. It may be possible to take this Sustainable Global Multicultural Approach together with the Human Security Approach. And this forms a combination that is called the Multicultural Human Security Approach.

^{***} The arguments listed here have been chosen for illustrative purposes from various regions including Central Asia, the Caucasus, the Far East, Europe, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America. Although not all the examples can be mentioned here, similar arguments can be found in almost every region of the world.

The argument on war and securitization is relevant in the context of the Multicultural Human Security Approach, since the world history is almost full of wars/conflicts and securitization processes. Thus, international relations and the international system are based on these processes. In turn, the international system affects states, communities and individuals and vice versa. Certain cases are referred in this study to clearly demonstrate the effect of wars/conflicts as well as securitization processes.

The Economic argument is also relevant in that it illustrates the economic relations affecting the international system, states, communities and individuals. This argument pertains to the needs and conjuncture of the developing states as well as their effect on developed countries of the world.

The argument of dialogue is tackled here to manifest the communicative relations among states, communities and individuals. This argument affects the entirety of international relations and the international system harboring states, communities and individuals. Within the body of this argument, certain samples are chosen to show problems in dialogue processes.

To sum up, it can be uttered that states, communities, and individuals in the international system have complex relations. The Multicultural Human Security Approach can provide honorable and peaceful life space from individual level to the level of international system. As a result of the Multicultural Human Security Approach, modern “state of nature” can be transcended.

3.1. The War and Securitization Argument

The former US President Benjamin Franklin draws attention to the following fact pertaining to the American Statue of Liberty: "If we ignore the freedoms for our safety, we can ultimately provide neither our freedom nor our safety" (Bozkurt & Kanat, 2007, p. 160).

In the Objectives and Principles chapter and other articles of the UN Treaty (UN Official Website, n.d.), it is highlighted that respect to the sovereignty of all states is essential and it is a must to prevent attacks to other states. At the time of writing these principles, the rule of law and the responsibility of the UN were damaged due to the conflicts in principles and objectives. Another point is that giving special status to major states by ignoring the argument of equality contradicts with the main principles of the UN.

Use of force is banned in the UN Treaty with two exceptions: Self-defense and humanitarian intervention (Taşdemir, 2006, pp. 100-103). Yet, there is ambiguity as to how to decide on the legitimacy of specific situations to fall under these exceptions in terms of

sovereignty and human rights. Thus, Article 53 of the UN Treaty gives enemies and potential enemies the right to attack without a Security Council decision (Bozkurt, 2003, p. 23). Unlimited use of force, according to the *jus ad bellum* principle, cannot be considered on the axis of self-defense. Country politics have to be in harmony with the reciprocity principle. Another important issue is how to decide whether or not any specific intervention conflicts with Human Security. If the rule of Human Security is violated, what kind of coercion can be imposed by the UN? There is no framework for this in the present UN Treaty. If any practice contradicting with the Human Security Code comes from any member state to the Security Council, sanctions cannot be imposed due to the institutional structure of today's UN (Emiroğlu, 2006, p. 65).

The UN's harmony with universal values will be an important step for international peace. However, the privileged position given to the major powerful states under the conditions of the Second World War has become a serious problem today. The concept of equality among sovereign states can be possible when the UN actually undergoes a process of transformation that is consistent with universal values. Thus, the UN will be able to play a more active role peaceful solution of problems between small and large states. Yet another important problem arises from the provision that "the UN members must act according to the decision of the Security Council". This provision is accepted in reference to Article 25 of the UN Charter and is not in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality (Emiroğlu, 2006, p. 67).

Another significant point to consider in this context is the number of civilians lost in conflicts and wars. According to the December 2003 report of the Council of Europe, four million people died in wars between 1990 and 2003, 90% being civilians (Roberts A., 2009, pp. 25-26). Since 2003, 2 million civilians lost their lives in countries including Iraq, Syria and Libya. However, attacks must be directed only at military targets according to the international law on armed conflicts (Taşdemir, 2006, p. 90), whereas more civilians died and were wounded than soldiers during the operations initiated by the Western Bloc. According to the September 11 Commission's final report, it was inferred that the American homeland was our planet, citing the assault on its territory against distant American interests (Ferstman, 2010, p. 535). However, these extraordinary interpretations are not in line with legal terms (Ferstman, 2010, p. 537).

The US attacked Afghanistan without any attempt to take approval through a UN decision, even though the country advocated the presence of conditions that would lead to such a UN decision. Thus, the UN's system of general security was disabled. This situation

constitutes a major problem for the effectiveness and long-term interests of the UN's security system (Taşdemir, 2006, p. 160).

The attitude of the UN in the First Gulf War, and conflicts in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Chechnya, and Armenia may well be a sign of implementing double standards (Bozkurt, 2003, p. 246). While the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait was not legal, it was also illegal to massacre civilians and for the troops to travel to Iraq during the implementation of UN resolutions against Iraq. According to the Geneva Convention on 12 August 1949, states - unlike terrorist organizations - should avoid using unnecessary force in wars, especially against civilians (Bozkurt & Kanat, 2007, p. 29). Nonetheless, the UN food and medicine embargo during the First Gulf War negatively affected civilians and caused tremendous death toll as numerous civilians died and suffered. In this regard, the governmental bill – which was a mistake – was reflected harshly on rural areas and civilian residential areas. The unacceptability of such a decision to harm civilians is crystal clear for the UN.

Iraq's invasion is another disaster. Although the UN weapons inspector Hans Blix stated in March 2003 that Iraq had improved international co-operation and asked for additional time for adaptation, the military operation was started with *fait accompli* (Yeşilbursa, n.d.). The United States met negative reactions from the international community due to this unfavorable and illegal attitude. The point to be noted here is to ask whether the international reaction would only be criticism if any country other than the United States waged such a war.

According to various reports, 625 thousand Iraqis were killed in Iraq in 2011 (Anonymous, 2011). Another source indicates that this number was a million (Goldberg, 2010). While 2 million Iraqis were displaced outside their country during the war, another 2,2 million were internally displaced (Knight, 2007). Furthermore, more than 4 million people were directly affected by the war as they lost their properties, in addition to a million-death toll. The US stroke the cities and historical-cultural buildings with air bombardments.

The UN is legally responsible for the fact that the United States bombarded civilian targets in Iraq with the claim of protecting its interests and rights. In cases such as the use of disproportionate force or killing of civilians, the UN has to make decisions on censure, sanctions and even intervention. However, it can be observed that states having close ties with the US refrain from condemnation at the very least, while others are prevented from decision-making processes as well as the right to reprimand the US for its illegal commitments due to the position of permanent members, which leads up to a very negative image for the universality claim of the UN. From this perspective, the structure of the UN should be transformed into a

structure that allows it to demonstrate the necessary response without distinction of any region, culture, race or religion while developing policies against human rights and unlawful situations.

The practice of Permanent Membership in the Security Council is a controversy. To resolve this controversy, the principle of equality of states should be removed from the UN Charter, or the legal or non-legal practice should be abolished by repealing or reformulating the permanent membership status. Elimination or reshaping of permanent membership status is essential in terms of human rights, equality and superiority of the international law. The UN was established under the terms of 1945 to give privileged status to major states for the establishment of international peace. However, current conditions are very different from those in 1945. Today, especially powerful states are leading the principles of democracy, freedom, equality. While this is the case, it is necessary for the UN to integrate these principles into the system by starting from its own in practical terms. The UN has to be transformed in the name of international peace.

Rawls emphasizes that international representatives should act in concert with the fundamental principles of international law - equality of states, self-determination, non-interference in internal affairs, *pacta sunt servanda* and self-defense (Dağı, 2010, p. 213). When social trust in justice is destroyed, the quest for justice continues in an anarchic manner and, even if not desired, it will inevitably result in conflicts.

Another example in this regard is the Syrian crisis having continued since 2011. In the Syrian civil war, hundreds of thousands of civilians died, and numbers are still counting. Assad used chemical weapons on civilians. On the other hand, other countries lack the ability to take decisions against the Assad regime so as to stop the civil war. Russia and Iran on the same side face the USA on the other side in this proxy war in Syrian territory and Syrian civilians are being crushed between these two sides. The war has been continuing since 2011, which means for 8 years. However, the UN – the so-called protector of peace in the world – cannot act effectively to stop the civil war in Syria.

Common problems in all the afore-mentioned cases* are:

- The outdated UN structure (especially the Security Council mechanism) shall be reshaped in order to create equality of sovereign states.

* The Vietnam War, Russian invasion of Ukraine, Chili coup, France in Algeria and Libya as well as many other cases can be given to indicate the common problems under the argument of wars and securitization.

- Civilians and cultural heritages shall be protected during wars and conflicts. And the UN has to react actively against loss of civilians and cultural heritages. Countries get away with what they have done in wars. Against this situation, the UN has to be transformed in order to be able to act against countries destroying other countries as well as theirs.

- The securitization processes caused death of civilians and destroying cities, etc. Therefore, an effective mechanism shall be created in the UN against civil wars and unjust securitization processes.

The Multicultural Human Security Approach suggests the following solutions to the common problems in wars and securitization processes in international and local level:

- Prevention of unauthorized securitization initiatives in the international system.

- While gains of nation-states are to be protected at state level, states must act as instruments serving for human beings/societies. International mechanisms such as a transformed version of the UN in the future shall prevent violence against states and state-based violence against civilians.

- At the level of communities, safeguarding arguments that may arise between subgroups shall be prevented.

- Violence that may arise internally in a society involving individuals shall be hindered. In the field of socialization, freedom of movement shall be provided for all groups.

As is seen in the afore-mentioned cases, individuals and communities are crashed during wars. Furthermore, states also collapse as a result of wars and armed conflicts. In this context, securitization is a key in the process of wars/conflicts. Securitization may emerge within the framework of individuals creating their own enemies as well as communities that may also create enemy communities. Thus, wars/conflicts may well be prevented from taking place via taking the securitization process under control or directing it in an amicable manner, which will yield good results since wars have extensively negative impacts on the international system, states, communities and individuals.

In this regard, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of Turkey utters that “War is murder except defense of the homeland.”

3.2. The Economic Argument

UNDP declared 2030 SDG targets (Sustainable Development Goals) in January 2016 (UNDP, 2016a). In this context, 795 million people are undernourished (UNDP, 2016b). 57 million children do not attend school and 103 million young people are illiterate (UNDP, 2016c). Access to water is limited for 800 million people (UNDP, 2016d). More than a billion people do not have access to clean water (UNDP, 2016e). 900 million workers live together with their families for less than \$ 2 per day (UNDP, 2016f).

Out of the annual \$ 1.4 trillion needed to achieve the SDG targets, (Anderson, 2015) \$ 396 billion will be spent for telecommunication, 347 billion for modern energy, \$ 194 billion for education, \$ 189 billion for transportation, 148 billion for agriculture and food, \$ 89 billion for healthcare, \$ 45 billion for water and sewerage, \$ 28 billion for ecosystem recovery, \$ 23 billion for emergency interventions and \$ 0.5 billion will be spent for data processing.

On the other hand, some annual expenditures in the world are as follows: \$ 60 billion for cosmetics in 2016, (Anonymous, n.d.), and the beauty industry is worth \$ 382 billion across the world (Kratofil, 2017). The ice cream market was worth \$ 150 billion in 2014 (Barber & Parmenter, 2015). The pet industry was worth \$ 66 billion in 2016 (Gantz, 2017). The entertainment industry in the world cost \$ 2 trillion by 2016 (Bond, 2013). The global cost of smoking was \$ 1 trillion in 2017 (Anonymous, 2017). Global drug market was worth \$ 426-652 billion in 2014 (May 2017) and military spending in 2016 was \$ 1.69 trillion (SIPRI, n.d.).

The annual budget for the 2030 SDG is 18 per thousand of the total world GDP in 2016. Inequality is due to the global and regional economic relations (Bond 2008, p. 2). The reason for the existence of poor countries in the world is the central countries that transfer profits from their surrounding countries (Grabowski, 2007, pp. 16-17). Due to these exploitation activities, the responsibility of saving the developing countries from the human crises that they are experiencing primarily belongs to the developed countries. The amount of GDP produced in the world was \$ 75641 billion in 2016. The total GDP of developed countries with high income levels was \$ 48407 billion in the same year (Anonymous, 2017). If the high-income countries transfer the \$ 1.4 trillion source needed for the SDG, the resources they need to transfer are 29 per thousand of GDP.

International peace and security will be built more easily with advances in discourses and practices that will attach importance to wealth-boosting rather than military investments. If basic needs are met, transition to terrorist organizations will be reduced to a great extent. This

will make a great contribution to the need to ensure security – normally driven through military expenditures – in a peaceful way.

There is a prevalent view that poverty and various social troubles are the results of globalization (UN, 2002). Also, as Kofi Annan, the UN Secretary-General between 1997 and 2006 expressed at the World Economic Forum, if the poor countries are left alone with their own poverty, the conflict and anarchic atmosphere in these countries could create both regional and global security threats (UN, 2002).

Although equal income distribution is not fully possible in the world, economic policies and reforms can be directed at providing a distribution of income at which people can at least attain honorable living standards. Education and health services will ensure life safety and reduce the human resources of terror groups considerably in an attempt to ensure people attain honorable living standards. Terrorism is not a problem that can be solved only at the global level, but one that also requires solution at local level.

Another issue falling under the economic argument is migration. The general reason for migration is that people do not have the necessary income to live on. In this regard, people may feel forced to join terrorist groups due to high rates of unemployment and lack of education. With uncontrolled migration, problems such as increased domestic security problems, xenophobia – especially in Western countries – and intolerance to the “other” may emerge. Europe is diversified with the largest migrant movement of human history and accommodates more than 70 million immigrant populations that form 10 percent of its overall population (Neşţian, 2011, p. 146). When certain immigrants join terrorist groups, the irregular population distribution causes an increase in international terrorism. Even if the ideological basis of terror cannot be overcome, monetary and human resources of terrorism can be stopped by global and local economic reforms.

States often believe that peace should be built to produce policies harmonious with both legal and moral arguments to solve problems (Dağı, 2010, p. 207). This process may be accelerated, if the UN can make its own transformation to support the construction of such a harmony. This arrangement should prevent the dominance of a few states and be constructed so that a state cannot restrict the sovereignty of another state.

Finally, the UNDP projects (in Africa, Middle East, etc.) and efforts by international organizations further indicate the distribution of wealth among developing countries. These are

good examples, yet far from being sufficient. For example, Africa, Middle East and India still need support for a sustainable economic development.

These facts can be reinforced by facts given under the economic argument:

- 2030 SDG targets cost less than 2 per cent of the world's total GDP or less than 3 per cent of high-income countries' total GDP. If a global campaign begins, people in developing poor countries will be in better life conditions in 2030.
- Peace and security can be achieved via spending in peaceful methods instead of military growth.
- If developed countries do not support developing countries, international security threats such as terrorism will continue to spread from poor countries.
- Migration creates domestic security issues in developed countries. The root cause of migration can be eliminated by means of local economic measures.

The Multicultural Human Security Approach can provide solutions to these problems at the economic level by:

- Ensuring equal distribution of resources and global economic stability as well as development on the global scale.
- Protecting states against dangers in the international economic system.
- Allowing effective economic shares in such a way that communities can reflect their own identity and culture, while the achievements of a society cannot be pushed back.
- Creating honorable living conditions for individuals supported by institutional and legal mechanisms.

3.3. The Dialogue Argument

Dialogue is a prerequisite to know each other. Prejudices, misunderstandings and lack of information will prevail in environments where there is no dialogue, and these often result in the emergence of situations that will prevent diversity.

The first state coming to mind in relation to the Western world is the United States, and the US sensation in Iran is generally supported by hostile arguments. Therefore, the US should take steps to reduce the problems in the Middle East and other troubled regions. These steps should be taken by drawing rational road maps that are idealistic enough to start a dialogue

process with the entire world in accordance with the political realities in the international system instead of grounding on US interests while ignoring other parts of the world.

If the world states continue to exhibit policies of prioritizing their interests in the world as they did during the colonial period in the 19th and 20th centuries, as well as fueling the divisions in societies, the possibility of a large-scale war to become inevitable is high. On the other hand, global peace can be established through a comprehensive dialogue process (Schnapper, 2005, p. 56). It is therefore essential that the major powerful states of the world take into account the interests of other nations as well as their own interests by applying policies on territories in order to create both a peaceful future and a setting for solid and amicable dialogue.

Western societies need to be prepared and prepare the Middle Eastern, Asian, and Latin American communities for dialogue. Instead of making programs that focus on the negative aspects of these societies in the media, it is first essential to show the cultural qualities and unique beauties of the regions. Organizations should ensure that cultures recognize each other in every platform in addition to the media. In this way, prejudices can be destroyed. It should not be forgotten that groups, persons or societies will not be able to enter into dialogue by approaching with prejudices, misunderstandings and lack of information about the “other”.

If it is desired to live in peace and prosperity in the future, the world states must take on responsibilities in order to initiate healthy dialogue processes. International representatives' approaches to various events should be in the way of empathetic dialogue and the UN decisions must be taken in compliance with the international law to ensure establishment of perpetual peace and security. Global and local dialogue movements in this regard will affect individuals, communities, states and the international relations. The critical points of the dialogue argument* are:

- Prejudges, misunderstandings and lack of information have to be destroyed via communication channels. These channels have to be used to know each other instead of creating hostilities.

* *The China-USA relations in the middle of the Cold War, Turkey- Syria relations in 21st century (except during the civil war), EU-Turkey relations in first decade of 21st century, and Iran-USA relations after the nuclear agreement can also be regarded under the dialogue argument. These historical cases show détente between countries or international organizations. Thus, dialogue channels could be initiated.*

- The USA and other countries have to take an initial step to start a dialogue process in global scale to understand the “other”. Dialogue can be possible via media channels and organizational efforts.

- Communication channels have to be used to understand the “other” instead of propaganda purposes.

The Multicultural Human Security Approach can supply the following benefits through dialogue:

- Establishing empathic dialogue in global scale by respecting the “other” and enabling effective dialogue channels

- Providing empathic approach in international communication and effective dialogue with justice in representation of states

- Ensuring justice in representation in the dialogue channels and communication of the differences away from prejudiced language against each other

- Offering communication channels between individuals and other communities

- Last but not least, solving problems of misunderstandings and biases as well as lack of recognition via empathetic dialogue to prevent hostilities and establish friendship among people

3.4. Other Arguments

In addition to the above arguments, there are other complementary arguments pertaining to the modern “state of nature”:

- People’s God-given rights are violated, and liberalism is turned into a tool of economic imperialism.

- Propaganda has been used as a weapon in every condition and every place. Infinity of communication opportunities serve for fueling conflicts instead of effective dialogue.

- States which have imperial profits (USA, Russia, France, etc.) declare war so as to create market area and to control energy sources.

- The idea of democracy has also become a tool for taking the control of countries instead of a means to set perpetual peace. For example, Sisi came to power via

a military coup in Egypt and Western states did not react effectively. However, military coups are the opposite of what democracy is. The covered operations of the US to support military coups in Latin America are also in contradiction with the international law, as well.

- The US delivered thousands of containers of weapons to PYD/PKK, which is a terrorist organization to control the oil supplies from Northern Iraq to the Mediterranean Sea.

- The US, UK and Russia use covered intelligence operations (black-ops) against the countries they cannot normally take under control.

4. Evaluation of the Achievements by the Multicultural Human Security Approach

Multiculturalism and Human Security approaches both reinforce honorable and peaceful coexistence. However, it is observed that protection and development of differences and sub-groups are ignored in the Human Security Approach. These gaps can be filled through integrating the Multicultural Approach to the Human Security understanding. Yet, this integration may partially be insufficient at intra-state level contrary to the inter-state level. For that reason, the international system needs to evolve in order to foster such an integration. In simple terms, the Multicultural Human Security Approach supplies livable environment for individuals and cultural groups. This can be possible by incorporating this approach at international and local levels. Thus, the modern “state of nature” situation can be overcome.

4.1. The Level of International System

From the perspective of the international system, the greatest obstacle is observed to be the negative impacts of policies against non-liberalized governments that deepen the problems of human security and multiculturalism. In this context, radicalizations that threaten the system due to pressures and sanctions are finding their ideological resources. What needs to be done is to look for ways to reshape non-liberals who want to stay different in a legitimate frame in a way that will not harm the other instead of impositions, as multiculturalism defines. It should not be forgotten that it is not possible for non-liberal societies to be forced to transform presently when there is no uniformity even within liberal societies. The only limitation is for the practices that would limit others’ sphere of sociality. The Multicultural Human Security Approach can prevent unauthorized securitization initiatives such as between liberalized and non-liberalized countries at the level of international system.

The external protection mechanism of the Multicultural Approach provides a vision to prevent the damage to states and sub-state elements on the basis of the international system. If external protection within the borders of a state aims to prevent violence between groups and provide a living space for each other, it will ensure the prevention of interstate violence and protection of each other's habitats by functionalizing the external protection mechanism at the level of international system. The UN particularly has important responsibilities in this regard. With its institutional structure, the Security Council's functions have a clear contradiction with the UN's basic principles. At least the permanent membership status in the Security Council should be removed. Thus, any legitimate sanction against a member of the Security Council will not be prevented. In distributing economic resources on the global scale, members of all societies shall be granted equal income rates through economic institutions to have decent life standards instead of allotting the majority of the resources to the Western countries. It is absolutely necessary to redistribute resources at the global dimension. Under present conditions, the huge gap in the distribution of income and resources between the north and south, east and west leads to severe problems in domestic and international security.

New channels offered at institutional level beyond the liberal culture renders it possible to establish effective dialogue in the international system. In the absence of various channels for dialogues reaching out to the regions outside the Western world, the existing problems in the world scene will not be perceived with all their dimensions. The Multicultural Human Security Approach in this regard can ensure establishing a global setting for empathic dialogue by respecting the "other" and enabling effective dialogue channels among different international societies.

4.2. The State Level

The first and foremost contribution of the Multicultural Human Security Approach is that this idea predicts states with administrative and social systems can coexist without interfering in each other's habitat. From the perspective of the Human Security Approach, liberal systems are argued to coexist peacefully in the same line. Evaluating the entirety of the world system, however, there is a significant number of countries with large populations that are fairly far from applying liberal principles. In general, the process of liberalization stumbles an obstacle in societies that lack social structure which facilitates implementation of liberal principles, contrary to the Western societies that have democratic culture. At this point, multiculturalism offers a policy-making approach as a solution by respecting and not restricting the life space of the "other". As an exception, when a certain culture takes over another culture's

right to exist, the idea of multiculturalism reaches its limits and preventive measures are required in this case.

Assessing the securitization practices from the perspective of multiculturalism, security of all cultures is provided as an answer to the questions about the definition of 'safe'. However, large scope of protective responses cannot be provided to all the different compounds in a society when looking only from the Human Security perspective.

From the economic point of view, fair distribution of financial resources is deemed necessary for states that are located outside the dominant global economic system and lack life standards with dignity due to low income rates and this is also valid for states which do not receive equitable shares in financial resources even if they are located in the dominant economic system in the world. In this context, there has been a wave of migration from labor-intensive countries to capital-intensive countries as a consequence to the period of colonialism. Subsequently, the issue of domestic security has emerged in these countries which laid the ground for the rise of multiculturalism in turn. There is a clear need for reverse migration for groups failing to adapt and make room for themselves in the host countries and the economy of the source country must be brought to such a level that it can withstand reverse migration. Here, reverse migration does not refer to coercion, but is intended to mean development initiatives in the sending countries so that they offer a solution for the domestic security problems and immigrants overcome their identity problems and voluntarily migrate back to their countries.

Communication channels that will provide effective dialogue at the international system between intergovernmental actors (political parties, NGOs, economic communities, etc.) and interstate actors (diplomats, international NGOs, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, etc.) should be built. In this construction process, actions must be taken in a wide and flexible framework provided by multiculturalism.

4.3. The Community Level

This level is the one to contribute the most to the idea and functioning of multiculturalism. Underscoring individual safety, the Human Security Approach does not provide a clear framework for community safety. At this point, multiculturalism offers policies - internal restrictions and external protections - that will provide a habitat for individuals, subgroups, and dominant cultures in a country. It emphasizes the provision of living spaces to

ensure coexistence of several groups – dominant and subgroups – within the state as well as states at the point of security.

Evaluating economy from the perspective of the multicultural approach, it is anticipated that communities will be able to create organizations that can live in their own culture of community and identity. In this regard, the necessary substructure will be established by adopting the multicultural approach in order to bring in decent living conditions for individuals belonging to these groups. While creating areas where subgroups will enjoy their identities, the attempts to harm or impair the identity of the group(s) in the dominant culture must be prevented. Otherwise, the domination of the minority by the majority group occurs and this leads to the risk of radicalization of the dominant classes. This situation makes it impossible for different groups coexist harmoniously in a country.

Dialogue is the most important condition for living together. Institutions need to be set up in a way that the parties allow the other to express themselves without prejudices. The role of the state is very important at this point. The state should take the necessary measures providing different groups to establish channels for harmonious dialogue among themselves and build up the necessary institutional infrastructure as well as preventing them from restricting each other's habitat. The position of the state should be as close to the parties as possible at this point. The state should also take measures to protect the country against threats from outside.

4.4. The Individual Level

If individuals and societies are not safe, their nation-states are not safe as well, and sooner or later the whole region where such societies are located will be dragged into instability. Then, insecurity cannot be restricted or isolated because it tends to spread everywhere. There are several cases in international relations in this regard such as the Middle East and Afghanistan-Pakistan regional conflicts (Neag & Pricopi, 2010, p. 309). The Human Security Approach does not only transfer security from the state to the individual, but also advocates the combination of development and security (MacNeil, 2011, p. 8). The Multicultural Approach also ensures that security is distributed not only in a way that it focuses on individuals, but also in a way that it accepts groups/communities and societies as a subject. The reason for this is that group(s)/community(s) offer areas of sociality in which individual can enjoy their identity.

If the international economic system can supply an environment that countries can be rich enough to supply honorable life conditions for their people, then individuals will live

dignified life standards in their own country. Therefore, they will not migrate to developed countries and this will prevent domestic security issues triggered by immigrants in developed countries.

As stated before, dialogue is essential for good relations among individuals. If states can provide empathetic dialogue environment for their citizens via communication channels and organizations, this will enable more peaceful life conditions for individuals.

Conclusion

It can be deduced from the above cases (the number of these cases can be increased) and arguments (war & securitization, economic, dialogue) that:

- There is not prioritization of international law.
- Universal human rights are violated.
- UN's mission to guarantee international peace and security does not work.
- Protector mechanisms of global peace are not working.
- Most of the global wealth is accumulated in certain chosen minorities.
- And dialogue channels are congested, and these channels are directed for propaganda purposes.

As a summary, there is the rule of *homo homini lupus* from individual level to the international system level in the modern "state of nature".

The entire world appears to be in chaos from the level of international system to the individual level in the modern "state of nature". War and securitization processes are used to justify the illegal policies of states the economic system is extensively unfair at all levels especially at the level of the international system. The method of dialogue is not used to create bridges among different cultures and different identities. As a response, the Multicultural Human Security Approach can supply peaceful and fair systems at all levels in the 21st century.

The Multicultural Human Security Approach provides guidelines for a harmonious and fair order in the international system formed by states, communities and individuals after modern "state of nature". If this new approach can find sufficient space in local and global discourses, the first step will be to form a global system that will benefit not only the developed countries and citizens, but also the developing countries and their citizens.

Problems that seem to be local have international dimensions, on the other hand. Similarly, global problems have certain local dimensions. Without considering the local and global dimensions, it may well be rather difficult to comprehend the transformation of the current international system as well as its adaptation to changing situations from local to global level and vice versa, while preserving the benefits offered by the nation-state model. In this regard, disregarding the local and global factors will also make it difficult to give hope to individuals in oppressed regions who are victimized by the global and regional forces or who cannot obtain the level of welfare and dignified life standards that they deserve.

The current international system was formed after consecutive wars. Thus, is not it possible to create a new world order through peaceful methods? Is a new world war necessary to create a new international system?

In this context, the international system designates levels of developments in societies. Realism became the dominant ideology after the 2nd World War had negative impacts on the entire international system, state policies, community relations and life of individuals. If the Multicultural Human Security Approach becomes dominant in discourses and practices in the international system, it is projected that individuals, communities, states and the entire world will be in peace in the 21st century.

The Multicultural Human Security Approach will be able to ensure the transformation of the modern “state of nature” and to enhance the international system and the conditions for its actors (states, communities and individuals). For that, the first action to be taken is to offer sufficient room in discourses for this approach in the international area. Therefore, a new international social contract is needed to transcend the modern “state of nature”. The Multicultural Human Security Approach is presenting essentials of this new contract.

REFERENCES

- “Gross domestic product 2016”. (2017).
<http://databank.worldbank.org/data/download/GDP.pdf>.
- “Political Overview in Iraq 2011”. <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?hid=109&sid=e43084c10c24-4c4f-9001-18e49f9de9af%40sessionmgr114&vid=1>.
- “Revenue of the cosmetic/beauty industry in the United States from 2002 to 2016 (in billion U.S. dollars)”. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/243742/revenue-of-the-cosmetic-industry-in-the-us/>.
- “Smoking Costs the Global Economy Over \$1 Trillion Annually”. (2017).
<http://fortune.com/2017/01/10/smoking-costs-who-cancer-institute-trillion/>.
- Al Gharaibeh, F. (2011). “Human Security, Terrorism and Human Rights in the Middle East: Implications for Social Work Practice”. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 20, 228-239.
- Anderson, M. (2015). “\$1.4tn a year needed to reach global goals for world's poorest”. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2015/nov/18/14tn-dollars-a-year-needed-to-reach-global-goals-for-world-poorest>.
- Barber, L. and Parmenter, C. (2015). “Which countries eat the most ice cream in the world? Here's the scoop”. <http://www.cityam.com/220727/which-countries-eat-most-ice-cream-world-heres-scoop>.
- Benhabib, S. (2006). *Ötekilerin Hakları Yabancılar, Yerliler, Vatandaşlar*. (B. Akkıyal, Trans). İstanbul: İletişim Edition.
- Bond, P. (2008). “Global Uneven Development, Primitive Accumulation and Political-Economic Conflict in Africa: The Return of the Theory of Imperialism”. *Journal of Peacebuilding&Development*, 4/1, 1-14.
- Bond, P. (2013). “Study: Global Entertainment Industry Poised to Top \$2 Trillion in 2016”. <http://www.billboard.com/biz/articles/news/global/1565728/study-global-entertainment-industry-poised-to-top-2-trillion-in>.
- Bozkurt, E. (2003). *Birleşmiş Milletler Sisteminde Kuvvet Kullanımı*. Ankara: Nobel Edition.

Bozkurt, E. and Kanat, S. (2007). *Uluslararası Toplumun Paradoksu: Terörizm, İnsan Hakları, Güvenlik ve 11 Eylül Sonrası Meydana Gelen Değişiklikler*. Ankara: Asil Edition.

Dağı, İ. D. (2010). “Normatif Yaklaşımlar: Adalet, Eşitlik ve İnsan Hakları”. In A. Eralp, (ed.) *Devlet, Sistem ve Kimlik* (pp. 185-226) İstanbul: İletişim Edition.

Emiroğlu, H. (2006). “Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Birleşmiş Milletler: İşlevi-Sorunları”, *C.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 7, 59-81.

Ferstman, C. (2010). “The Human Security Framework and Counter-Terrorism: Examining the Rhetoric Relating to ‘Extraordinary Renditions’”, In A. Edwards & C. Ferstman, (Eds.), *Human Security and Non-Citizens* (pp. 532-560). UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gantz, A. (2017). “Pet industry spending topped US\$66 billion in 2016”, accessed December 15, 2017, <http://www.petfoodindustry.com/articles/6370-pet-industry-spending-topped-us66-billion-in-2016>.

Goldberg, M. S. (2010). “Death and Injury Rates of U.S. Military Personnel in Iraq”. *Military Medicine*.

Grabowski, R. (2007). *Economic Development: A Regional, Institutional, and Historical Approach*, New York: M. E. Sharp.

Graf, R. (2010). “Between National and Human Security: Energy Security in the United States and Western Europe in the 1970s”. *Historical Social Research*, 35, 329-348.

İşsevenler, O. V. (2012). “Suç Kavram ve Teorisine Dair Bir Deneme”. *İÜHFİM*, 70, 51-58.

Knight, S. (2007). “In the Face Of Death”. *Newsweek (Pacific Edition)*, 150.

Konar, A. K. (2011). “Originators of (Post) Structuralism: A Search for New Truth”. *IUP*, 14-21.

Kratofil, C. (2017). “Can You Guess How Much a Woman Spends on Makeup in Her Lifetime? (We Were Way Off!)”. <http://people.com/style/how-much-does-a-woman-spend-on-makeup/>.

Krause, K. (2007). "Towards a Practical Human Security Agenda". *Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) Policy Paper*, 26.

Küçük, M. (2009). "Uluslararası İlişkilerde 'Konstrüktivist Dönüşü' Anlamak". *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 9, 771-795.

Kymlicka, W. (1998). *Çokkültürlü Yurttaşlık*. (Abdullah Yılmaz, Trans.) İstanbul: Ayrıntı Edition.

Macneil, L. (2011). "Securing the Afghan People? Canadian Foreign Aid Policy And The Perils of Human Security". *Undercurrent Journal*, 8, 6-16.

May, C. (2017). "Transnational Crime and the Developing World". *Global Financial Integrity*, http://www.gfintegrity.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Transnational_Crime-final.pdf.

Neag, M. and Pricopi, M. (2010). "A Rational Choice Model for the Human Security Decision". *International Journal of Academic Research*, 2, 308-311.

Neag, M. M. and Coman, D. (2010). "Dimensions of The Human Security Concept". *Revista Academiei Fortelor Terestre*, 1, 124-128.

Neştian, G. (2011). "The Human Security in the Information Age". *Revista Academiei Fortelor Terestre* 2, 143-155.

Rex, J. (1996). *Ethnic Minorities in the Modern Nation State, Working Papers in the Theory of Multiculturalism and Political Integration*, London: Macmillan Press.

Roberts, A. (2009). "The Civilian in Modern War". *Yearbook of International Humanitarian Law*, 12, 13-52.

Roberts, D. (2010). *Global Governance and Biopolitics, Regulating Human Security*, London and New York: ZedBooks.

Schnapper, D. (2005). *Sosyoloji Düşüncesinin Özündü Öteki ile İlişki*, (A. Sönmezay, Trans.) İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Edition.

SIPRI. "Military expenditure". <https://www.sipri.org/research/armament-and-disarmament/arms-transfers-and-military-spending/military-expenditure>.

Taşdemir, F. (2006). *Uluslararası Terörizme Karşı Devletlerin Kuvvete Başvurma Yetkisi*. Ankara: USAK Edition.

UN. (2002). “Globalization ‘best hope’ to cure world’s problems, Annan tells World Economic Forum”.

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=2800&Cr=economic&Cr1=forum>.

UN Official Website. “UN Charter”. <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/>.

UNDP. (2016a). “UNDP Support to the Implementation of The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”.

http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/SDGs/SDG%20Implementation%20and%20UNDP_Policy_and_Programme_Brief.pdf.

UNDP. (2016b). “Goal 2 Targets”.

<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals/goal-2-zero-hunger/targets/>.

UNDP. (2016c). “Goal 4 Targets”.

<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals/goal-4-quality-education/targets/>.

UNDP. (2016d). “Goal 9 Targets”.

<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals/goal-9-industry-innovation-and-infrastructure/targets/>.

UNDP. (2016e). “Goal 12 Targets”.

<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals/goal-12-responsible-consumption-and-production/targets/>.

UNDP. (2016f). “UNDP Support to the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 8: Promoting Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth”.

http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Sustainable%20Development/8_Growth_Jan15_digital.pdf?download.

UNESCO. (2009). UNESCO World Report No. 2: Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue. Paris.

Yeşilbursa, B. K. “Geçmişten Günümüze Irak Meselesi”.

http://www.gefad.gazi.edu.tr/window/dosya_pdf/2009/5/72.pdf.