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The second term of Ban Ki-Moon, the current Secretary-General of the United Nations, expires in December 2016 and the process to identify a successor is well underway.

Although the Secretary-General is appointed by the General Assembly, this is done on the recommendation of the Security Council. Traditionally, the Security Council recommends a single candidate following a closed door process. The current process, however, has seen increasing pressure from civil society and General Assembly member states for a different, more transparent, approach.

Last April, the UN General Assembly held a thematic debate on the selection process. Member states, including Canada, made it clear that they support specific proposals to make the procedures more inclusive, transparent, and fair.

These include:

- The publication in advance of formal nomination and selection criteria, and a clear timetable;
- The opportunity for all UN Member States to hear from candidates, with civil society participation in accordance with General Assembly procedures;
- Consideration of the recommendation of two or more qualified individuals by the Security Council to the General Assembly;
- Consideration of a single, non-renewable 7 year term of appointment for the Secretary-General.

The 1 for 7 Billion campaign, initiated by the international World Federalist Movement, is a broad-based civil society-led effort to make the process for selecting the next United Nations Secretary-General more transparent and democratic. Because the need for the UN has never been greater, it is of profound importance that the best possible person is selected to lead the organization in the coming years. Reflecting best practices in the selection of other top public leaders, the 1 for 7 Billion campaign has developed seven principles -- such as being based on formal criteria and qualifications, grounded in best practice on equality and diversity, and transparent to both the wider UN membership and civil society -- that they would like see the selection process for the next UN Secretary-General include.

Other civil society-led efforts have specifically addressed the value of choosing a woman as the next Secretary-General.

As of the beginning of April, there are eight official candidates to succeed Ban Ki-Moon. Four of the eight are women.

Member States were invited to submit letters presenting candidates for the position. Those letters are available from the UN for the current candidates: Dr. Srgjan Kerim (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Prof. Dr. Vesna Pusić (Republic of Croatia), Dr. Igor Lukšić (Montenegro), Dr. Danilo Türk (Slovenia), Ms. Irina Bokova (Bulgaria), Ms. Natalia Gherman (Republic of Moldova), Mr. António Guterres (Portugal), and Ms Helen Clark (New Zealand). Further candidates are expected over the next several months.

In March, a General Assembly debate on the subject showed that there was interest in a single, non-renewable term for the next Secretary-General, which is demonstrated by the two-thirds of Member States who would welcome further discussion of the proposal. Member States were also generally supportive of the recommendation that more than one candidate be recommended by the Security Council to the General Assembly. The 1 for 7 Billion campaign has compiled lists of country support on these issues. They are available in the campaign news section of the website.

Despite this trend toward reform among the Member States in the General Assembly, the five permanent members of the Security Council are less interested in any further changes to the selection process.
From April 12th to 14th, the candidates will be given the opportunity to interact with Member States in the General Assembly. The sessions will be webcast. Prior to this, questions for the candidates were solicited by the UN’s Non-Governmental Liaison Service (UN-NGLS) and vetted by a group composed of NGO representatives. Up to date information, as the process moves slowly forward, can be found both on the 1 for 7 Billion website: 1for7billion.org

Building a World Parliament – Your help is needed!

HELP WANTED: Small non-profit organization with big ideas seeks volunteers to enlist parliamentarians from across Canada in campaign to democratize global governance.

Sound crazy? More than just a little ambitious? Maybe so. And in all likelihood you won’t see this “help wanted” ad in your community paper, or on the bulletin board at the grocery store.

But the World Federalists do aim to make global governance more democratic. . . . And we do need help with the campaign that has as its primary objective these lofty and ambitious (and also pragmatic!) goals.

In Canada’s last parliament there were 72 parliamentarians, from all parties, who endorsed the International Appeal for the Establishment of a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations. Now that a new crop of MPs has been elected, our goal is to get more than 100 Canadian parliamentarians signed up. More than 103 of our parliamentarians would move Canada ahead of Germany as the country whose parliament includes the most UNPA supporters.

**Characteristics of a UN Parliamentary Assembly**

With a growing number of important decisions being taken at the international level, many of the world’s citizens do not feel sufficiently

---

Plan to Attend:

World Federalist Movement – Canada 2016 Annual Meeting and World Peace Award Presentation

Join us in Montreal this August!

The World Federalist Movement - Canada will be participating in the World Social Forum, which runs from August 9 to 14. The WSF is expected to attract over 50,000 participants, with dozens of meetings taking place each day at multiple locations in Montreal. This is the first time the Forum has been held in a city outside of the global south.

On August 11, from 11:30am to 4pm, WFMC will hold it’s annual general meeting. Members are welcome to attend. **If you do plan on attending, please indicate your intentions at http://bit.ly/WFM-AGM**

Resolutions for submission to the WFMC annual meeting must be received at the national office no later than July 27, 2016.

Later on August 11, from 6 to 7:30pm, the 2016 WFM-Canada World Peace Award will be presented to the Hon. Justice Murray Sinclair, Chairperson of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. Justice Sinclair will receive the award and participate in a forum co-sponsored by the World Federalists and McGill University Faculty of Law.


Additionally, during the World Social Forum, WFMC will be presenting a number of workshops on topics such as a UN Emergency Peace Service, democratizing global governance through a UN Parliamentary Assembly, and How to Reform the UN. Further details will be made available in the coming months.

---
Building a World Parliament – continued

represented by their government in international institutions and negotiation processes. A UNPA would address the global democracy deficit by including citizen representation in global decision-making, initially through the participation of elected officials.

In its first phase, a UNPA could be composed of members of national and possibly regional parliaments. Their selection would have to reflect the political composition of the dispatching parliaments. In the long run, partial or complete direct election of its members is intended.

The distribution of seats in a UN Parliamentary Assembly should take into account population distribution, and possibly other factors. The size of the UN’s parliamentary chamber would have to be negotiated by governments. It has been suggested that the upper limit may be around 900 delegates.

Initially, a UNPA would be endowed with largely consultative powers. It would provide oversight of UN activities and functions; disseminate information in national capitals; generate reports, proposals, conduct hearings and help ensure accountability of UN officials and programs. Eventually it would evolve to become a UN principal organ complementing the UN General Assembly.

The range of political issues that the UNPA would be entitled to deal with would be defined similarly to that of the UN General Assembly, i.e. to “discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter.”

One reason for the UNPA campaign’s growing popularity is the recent support from the high level Commission on Global Security, Justice and Governance. Chaired by former U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and former Nigerian Foreign Minister and UN Under Secretary-General Ibrahim Gambari, the Commission’s report called for a “UN Parliamentary Network.” This would constitute a “pragmatic approach toward strengthening UN-citizen relations and overcoming the world body’s democratic deficit.” Such a body would be institutionally rooted in the UN system, as it would be “established by the UN General Assembly according to Article 22 of the Charter.” Its establishment is understood as “a vital step that can be taken in the immediate term” that is complementary to long-term efforts towards “the creation of a standing, formally constituted UN Second Chamber.”

The support evidenced by the Global Commission, whose report was published last summer, has led to expressions of support for a UNPA from four governments at the United Nations. The UNPA campaign is optimistic that additional member state support in future will lead to a coalition of governments and NGOs that would help build political momentum further.

In Canada, WFMC Board member Blake MacLeod is coordinating the 2016 UNPA campaign. According to MacLeod, “Given the composition of our new parliament, Canada has a real opportunity to lead. But more MPs need to get on board. The challenge we face is getting individual parliamentarians to take the time to consider this issue. For some, the UNPA seems a bit removed from the Canadian political scene and the needs of constituents. With so many demands on their time, most MPs need a reminder or two before they take the step of completing the paperwork that documents their endorsement of the campaign.”

So we’re serious about the “Help Wanted.”

This Spring WFMC – Canada is sending parliamentarians a personalized request for their support for the establishment of a UN Parliamentary Assembly. Help is required in the follow up process, i.e. sending reminder emails, speaking to parliamentary staffers, ensuring our request is considered.

Can you help? If so please contact Blake MacLeod (emailbc@telus.net) or the WFMC national office (wfcnat@web.ca).
The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is the idea that the world’s citizens are entitled to protection from certain “atrocity crimes.” In 2009 UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon presented a three-pillared approach reflecting global consensus on the meaning of R2P. States have the primary obligation to protect populations. But if a state fails to protect civilians within its territory or is in fact the perpetrator of crimes, according to the third pillar the international community must be prepared to take stronger measures, including the collective use of force through the UN Security Council.

An Original Purpose of the UN Charter

The United Nations was established in the shadow of World War II and the Holocaust. A core purpose and principle, as made plain within Article 2 of the U.N. Charter, was “promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion...”

Referenced several times in the Charter, human rights promotion and protection is assigned to the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights and the Trusteeship Council.

The Human Rights Commission was established under Article 68. It evolved into the Human Rights Council, and in 2006, a Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process was established by the General Assembly. The UPR is a cooperative process through which all member states are expected to report (and be challenged on) the status of their adherence to human rights and fundamental freedoms. Recommendations are non-binding but the effort, at minimum, makes states more accountable.

But beyond these measures which promote the development of human right standards and encourage states to live up to them, the question remains: Can the UN’s enforcement machinery be called upon to protect citizens whose rights are manifestly at risk?

British lawyer Geoffrey Robertson, in his widely-read study, Crimes Against Humanity: The Struggle for Global Justice, writes that Charter language is primarily meant to prohibit “armed attacks which are inconsistent with Charter purposes.” This restriction, he argues, permits use of force “where it is directed not to the conquest of territory or the overthrow of a political system, but to the rescue of innocent persons at risk of extermination.”

Mechanisms Other Than the Charter

An umbrella of agreed human rights principles, also lacking an explicit enforcement mechanism, is known as the International Bill of Human Rights, and it includes the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, along with two Optional Protocols.

Max Yalden, a former Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Human Rights Commission, wrote that beyond the Charter, the Vienna Declaration’s Article 5 states quite unequivocally that “human rights are universal, and that it is the duty of States, regardless of their political, economic and cultural systems, to promote and protect all fundamental rights and freedoms.”

The UN Charter and Practice in Interpreting Threats to the Peace

The UN Charter’s Chapter 7 delegates to the Security Council the authority to determine threats to international peace and security, and to take appropriate action, up to and including “coercive measures.” Does this mean that the UN Charter protects human rights within a state (for atrocity crimes)?
Chapter 7 (in Article 39) refers to “any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression.” Similarly, Article 1.1 of the UN Charter refers to “prevention and removal of threats to the peace.”

As with all foundational constitutional documents, the UN Charter has evolved over time and has been adapted to changing circumstances. This includes the legal interpretation of “threat to the peace” as understood by customary international law and practice. And as Yalden emphasizes, “there is general agreement that according to Article 24(2) of the Charter, the Security Council must act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the UN [which include promotion and protection of human rights] and the provisions of the Charter.”

How has “threat to the peace” or threat to international peace and security been interpreted and applied in practice? There are several cases where the Security Council addressed atrocity crimes within a state, for example: Iraq and the Kurds (1991), Somalia (1992-4), Yugoslavia, Rwanda (1994), Haiti, Angola, Libya (2011) and Sudan.

In the case of Rwanda in 1994, as is pointed out by Monica Lourdes de la Serna Galvan in her useful study of Article 39 of the Charter, the Security Council “considered as a threat to the peace the killing of civilians on a genocidal scale and also the fact that not bringing the persons responsible for such killings to justice constituted a continuing threat to the peace even if the actual killings had stopped.”

There have been concerns about this interpretation of Chapter 7 of the Charter -- and specifically that the Security Council has been widening its reach. But as Canadian human rights lawyer Jules Deschénes wrote years ago, “It is by now a settled rule of customary international law that crimes against humanity do not require a connection to international armed conflict.”

Not every state agrees with this interpretation of the UN Charter. Russia and China, among others, caution that R2P can be improperly used to violate sovereign borders. However, UNSC Resolution 1970 (responding to atrocity threats in Libya) was supported by both Russia and China, and determined that Colonel Gaddafi’s use of force putting down an internal revolt could justify International Criminal Court jurisdiction over human rights crimes committed (or threatened) in this internal civil conflict. This benchmark Security Council Resolution, referencing Chapter 7 of the Charter, was approved with the unanimous consent of all 15 members of the Council.

**So, does the UN Charter protect human rights?**

The UN Charter was framed in part to recognize and promote a universally applicable body of human rights law. But it also recognized the sovereign equality of member states. This flexibility, Geoffrey Robertson argues, was “a consequence of Article 2(7) of the Charter, which allows enforcement measures ordered under Chapter VII to override the bar on UN intervention in matters that are essentially within the jurisdiction of any state.”

In 2011, the UN Secretary-General said: the drafting committee of the San Francisco Conference in 1945 had declared that “if fundamental freedoms and rights were grievously outraged so as to create conditions which threaten peace or obstruct the application of provisions of the Charter, then they cease[d] to be the sole concern of each State.”

It would appear that the strength of human rights norms and our understanding of “threats to international peace and security” have evolved; and that at least insofar as universally accepted atrocity crimes like genocide and crimes against humanity are concerned, these are legitimately within the scope of the Security Council.

A widening international human rights protection norm is in transition. Our challenge is to now find ways to make the actions of the Security Council more effective and reliable: clearer resolutions; more explicit rules of engagement that don’t simply outsource enforcement measures to regional organizations (like NATO); the development of standing capacities for quick intervention, such as the proposed UN Emergency Peace Service; and agreement to not use the veto when grave atrocity crimes are imminent or underway. These are among many measures that may allow the UN to do more in the years ahead to protect populations from the most heinous violations of human rights.

*A longer version of this article is available online at: http://www.worldfederalistscanada.org/Collins_CharterHumanRights.pdf*
When the Rome Statute was adopted in 1998, it provided for an International Criminal Court with jurisdiction over four offenses: genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and the crime of aggression. Following the 60th ratification of the Statute in 2002, the Court began operations in The Hague, and has carried out investigations and prosecutions for genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity in 23 cases. (For an update on recent events at the Court see page 19.) However the crime of aggression was only included in the Statute as a last-minute compromise. In Rome, some governments were of the view that aggression (i.e. waging aggressive war) is the supreme international crime; that it makes no sense to prosecute the worst excesses of war (genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity), and not prosecute the individuals who plan and initiate such wars; and that, since aggression was prosecuted at the post World War II trials at Nuremberg, this legal legacy should be continued in the Rome Statute. Other governments felt that aggression is a “political crime” and should be dealt with by the UN Security Council, a view shared (unsurprisingly) by the permanent members of the Council; that asking a legal body like the ICC to prosecute aggression was asking too much of the Court. And some NGOs, notably the large human rights organizations, didn’t take a position, because “aggression was not a human rights issue.” Another problem was the lack of a satisfactory internationally agreed definition of what constitutes an act of aggression. At the time when the ICC treaty was being negotiated, a 1970 resolution by the UN General Assembly provided the most recent and up-to-date benchmark. The compromise negotiated in 1998 in Rome led to inclusion of aggression among the crimes to be prosecuted by the Court. But the Court would not exercise jurisdiction over aggression until state parties to the Statute agreed on a definition and also on the conditions for exercising the Court’s jurisdiction. Lo and behold, at a subsequent, 2010 treaty review conference (held in Kampala Uganda), and after years of preparatory discussions, state parties did agree a definition for the crime of aggression, as well as the process and conditions for activating the Court’s jurisdiction. In addition to the definitional issues, the 2010 amendment conference decided that the Court’s jurisdiction would (a) require ratification by 30 states parties, and (b) be subject to a decision to be taken some time after 1 January 2017 by a two-thirds majority of state parties. How has aggression been defined? In essence, three elements are required. First, the perpetrator must be a leader, i.e. a “person in a position effectively to exercise control over or to direct the political or military action of a State.” Second, the Court must prove that the perpetrator was involved in the planning, preparation, initiation or execution of such a State act of aggression. Third, such a State act must amount to an act of aggression in accordance with the definition contained in General Assembly Resolution 3314, and it must, by its character, gravity and scale, constitute a manifest violation of the UN Charter. This implies that only the most serious illegal uses of force between States can be subject to the Court’s jurisdiction. Genuine cases of individual or collective self-defence, as well as action authorized by the Security Council would thus clearly be excluded. As of March 2016, 26 governments have ratified the amendments on the crime of aggression. A representative of Liechtenstein (one of the governments campaigning in support of the amendments) expects that the required 30 state ratifications will be achieved this summer. What about Canada? Historically, Canada has been a leading supporter of the International Criminal Court. However, former Prime Minister Harper has never liked the Court and under the previous administration Canada sought to limit the Court’s budget. Understandably, Canada has not been an active player in discussions regarding the ICC Statute amendments.
pertaining to the crime of aggression. Hopefully Canada will be among those states helping to strengthen the international legal norm against waging aggressive war. A decision by Canada on ratification is expected by the end of his year.

As noted above, the activation of the ICC’s jurisdiction over the crime of aggression is a two-stage process. Not only does the amendment require ratification by 30 governments, but a subsequent decision of the ICC’s Assembly of States Parties, taken by a minimum two-thirds majority vote, is required to “activate” the Court’s jurisdiction over the crime of aggression.

As a member of the group of states ratifying the amendments, Canada would be well-positioned to influence the subsequent discussions at the Assembly of States Parties to the ICC on when and how to activate the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court over the crime of aggression.

NEW RELEASE:
Developing a United Nations Emergency Peace Service: Meeting Our Responsibilities to Prevent and Protect

This book makes the case for a standing (i.e. permanent, individually recruited) United Nations Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS). With this one development - effectively a UN first responder for complex emergencies - the organization would finally have a rapid, reliable capacity to help fulfill its tougher assigned tasks.

The author addresses the primary roles, core principles, and requirements of a UNEPS, as well as the arguments for and against such a dedicated UN service. Further, the book assesses lessons learned from recent peace operations reform exercises, discussing what has worked, what may work and, equally important, what won’t.

To date, the UNEPS initiative has encountered an unreceptive political, fiscal, and security environment. Yet overlapping crises are now inevitable and the need for improvements to UN operations increasingly evident. Consequently the proposed Peace Service is gaining new adherents among the policy and academic communities, where there is a growing recognition of the need to define a broader and more relevant mode of UN peace operations. Recent support for the proposal includes endorsements from Sir Brian Urquhart, Gareth Evans, Thomas Weiss, Mary Kaldor, Sadako Ogata, Gwynne Dyer and others.

The detailed and rigorous case for such a standing capacity provided by this book provides an essential complement to this growing body of support.
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When we talk about security, we're talking about protecting individuals, providing them with freedom from threat -- whether of hunger, human rights abuses, disease, sexual violence, repression, etc.

As a result of entrenched gender inequality, women have long been excluded from decision-making processes, including those related to peacemaking and addressing sexual- and gender-based violence. The women, peace and security agenda seeks to make space for women's participation and the general move towards gender equality.

In order to be viable in the long-term, security needs to be linked to empowerment, so that individuals are able to protect themselves in the future. Because of women's different perspectives, which come from different life experiences, priorities, and participation, the inclusion of women is necessary for strong, lasting peace. When women are excluded, post-conflict strategies are weakened, as are peace processes.

Peace and development require that all individuals are able to participate in their communities and be free from exploitation and uncertainty.

The women, peace and security agenda -- and the first UN Security Council Resolution to address it, 1325 -- explicitly recognizes that security is experienced differently for women and men and, if we want long-term, sustainable peace, women will need to be fully involved in the process.

UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000) described the need for women's participation in peace processes, gender training in peacekeeping operations, protection of women's and girls' rights, and gender mainstreaming in reporting and implementation related to conflict, peace, and security. Prevention, protection, and participation are three key pillars of the agenda.

In the years since 1325, there have been a series of other UNSC resolutions: UNSCR 1889 on the participation of women in peace processes; UNSCR 1820, 1888, and 1960 on sexual violence in conflict; and UNSCR 2122 on women's leadership in conflict resolution and peacebuilding. During the 15th anniversary of 1325 in October 2015, there was a High-level Review during the Security Council's Open Debate on Women Peace and Security, which resulted in the latest resolution 2242, which aims to further integrate women, peace and security concerns across country-specific situations, as well as in areas such as peacekeeping.

2015 also saw the UN undertake a Global Study on 1325, the final report of which was titled “Preventing Conflict, Transforming Justice, Securing the Peace.” As the study's executive summary says, "The world has changed since the Security Council adopted resolution 1325 in October 2000. The nature of conflict in certain regions is qualitatively different, the content of what we mean by ‘peace’ and ‘security’ is evolving, and the understanding of what we mean by ‘justice’ has also transformed. This ever-changing and ever evolving reality poses major dilemmas for the four pillars of Security Council resolution 1325 and its subsequent resolutions: these pillars of prevention, protection, participation, and peacebuilding and recovery."
Part of 1325 is the call for UN Member States to adopt their own national plans for implementing the resolution through addressing the key pillars of prevention, protection, and participation in the contexts of their own programs, projects, and country situation.

In Canada

Canada has had a National Action Plan on women, peace and security since 2010. The five year plan expired at the end of March 2016. While no new plan has yet been developed, there are tentative plans for a consultation process for the development of a new NAP with members of civil society and the various government partners.

Additionally, interest in the women, peace and security agenda has come from legislative sources. The Liberal Senate Forum Open Caucus, which provides space for non-partisan discussion of issues of interest to parliamentarians, members of the public, and the media, held a discussion on women, peace and security on March 8th. The panel of experts was comprised of Pamela Goldsmith-Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs), Beth Woroniuk (representing the Women, Peace and Security Network – Canada), Diana Sarosi (Nobel Women’s Initiative), and Furio DeAngelis (Representative in Canada, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).

As well, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development has begun a study on women, peace and security that was initiated through a motion by committee member Hélène Laverdière. To date, the committee has heard testimony from six witnesses, representing Global Affairs Canada, as well as two NGOs (CARE Canada and Oxfam Canada). The study will continue through April.

In April, the Women, Peace and Security Network - Canada, of which WFMC is a member, is hosting a discussion called "Canada’s National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security: How Far Have We Come, and Where are We Going?" that is based on WPSN-C’s recent publication, *Looking Back, Looking Forward*.

‘Creating a Workable World’ conference

The ‘Creating a Workable World’ conference, hosted by the Humphrey School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota, Oct. 9 to 10 2015, marks a well orchestrated push for world federalists and their goal of realizing an empowered United Nations system.

UN reform may seem politically niche, but it still draws high level focused attention from the institution’s observers. Advancing reform requires that an improved UN is easily imagined. Steps to democratizing its power structure into a politically feasible assembly of nations are detailed by Joe Schwartzberg, in his book ‘Transforming the United Nations System: Designs for a Workable World,’ 2013.

While the book is interesting as an academic roadmap in its own right, Schwartzberg intends it as kindling to light the political movement. To this end, he established the Workable World Trust, dedicated to promoting his published ideas. The body’s first major initiative was the ‘Creating a Workable World’ conference.

The conference had 220 attendees, almost all from the US or Canada. It was organized and executed in large part by volunteers, students, and the Minnesota Chapter of Citizens for Global Solutions (a U.S. member organization of the World Federalist Movement). Moderator John Trent, a familiar face to Canadian world federalists, kept the program moving and discussions on topic.

The mandate of the Workable World Trust is to spread the vision of Schwartzberg’s revamped UN. The book’s content inspired the conference, rather than dominating it. Presentations included a range of opinions, but fell within a world federalist worldview for the most part. The blending of the academic and political/operational sides of the
movement was achieved, though it leaned more towards the latter.

“We are observing the emergence of a multi-centric system,” said keynote speaker Andy Knight, Director of the Institute of International Relations at the University of the West Indies. Knight described the existing world system as a network with multiple centres of authority at multiple levels, and he encouraged adopting this perspective to advance global governance.

Far from setting the tone for the rest, Knight’s approach was strategically different than the other speakers, as well as being the most abstract, and one of the denser presentations. Some speakers, such as Hilary French on UN environmental frameworks or Barbara Frey on human rights, discussed inoffensive subjects relevant to distinct international affairs topics. However, most speakers incorporated more political rhetoric, especially those with a focus on global governance, like William Pace from the World Federalist Movement – Institute for Global Policy. A few fell in between. Robert Johansen’s informative talk on a theoretical standing UN emergency peacekeeping force led, during the discussion period, to an argument on the merits of interventionism.

Musical interludes by folk musicians Maryam Yusefzadeh and Tim O’Keefe broke up the speeches. One song even featured world federalist lyrics. Filmmaker Arthur Kanegis participated actively in the conference, and previewed his film ‘The World is My Country’, a biography of world citizen Garry Davis as an activist and 1950s pop culture icon.

The inclusion of the artistic community brought the proceedings out of academic discourse and added a stronger emotional context. In the same way, several speakers approached this conference as the political launchpad it was meant to be. Rabbi Michael Lerner, from the Network of Spiritual Progressives, outlined psychological hurdles people face conceptualizing a workable world. A guide to political messaging from a spiritual leader is an uncommon touch, but shows that world federalism has a community of interest outside its primary, policy-oriented circles.

The ongoing campaign for an elected parliamentary assembly at the UN was discussed by Andreas Bummel, Director of the Committee For A Democratic UN, Berlin. Bummel stood out as the strongest real-world tie-in to the reform advocacy from Schwartzberg’s book.

The conference reported nearly half of the attendees as students. A reception for the youth was hosted by Nancy Dunleavy, a member of The Workable World Trust and a key organizer of the event. Feedback was positive, but several were confused by the political slant to the subject matter, and in some ways, the event’s purpose. While everyone was impressed by the quality of the speakers, there was a call for greater international representation at future conferences.

“Our conference has spelled out the nature of world problems and potential solutions,” Trent said in his closing remarks. “[But] we have not stopped ourselves to ask about the ‘how’ rather than the ‘what’” How to get from ‘A’ to ‘B’?

The EU’s step-by-step approach, responsibility to protect weakening the P5 veto, and the emergence of networks of forward-looking governments demonstrate momentum in the right direction. Trent’s remarks were anchored in reality, but remained optimistic.

The conference ended on a hopeful note. Trent reminded the attendees that the UN was not deaf to the cry for governance reforms. The Peacekeeping Summit and Paris Conference on Global Warming, among other initiatives, show that the UN is not idle on these critical issues that demand a global guiding influence. The speakers with personal involvement in the UN made this clear as well.

Besides the inspired content, the conference showed the appetite and effort of many to continue these world federalist discussions. Trent closed by alluding to another hopeful possibility. He suggested the Workable World Trust would help sponsor a new conference on ‘Creating Workable Global Institutions’ the following year. Either way, Schwartzberg can be proud of his legacy.
At the 2015 Paris Climate Change Conference, Canada’s new government made commitments to reduce emissions as part of a plan to keep global temperatures “well below” 2.0°C and “endeavour to limit” them even more, to 1.5°C. Given this country’s lamentable track record in meeting emissions targets in the past, it is understandable we will ultimately be judged by our actions. The challenges ahead to realize those commitments are somewhat daunting.

Climate experts tell us that if we want to have a shot at keeping warming below 2 degrees, developed economies need to have begun their energy turnaround by the end of this decade and to be almost completely weaned from fossil fuels by 2050.

Following the Rio Conference in 1992, Canada made a commitment to start that turnaround by reducing emissions from 1990 levels. 23 years later we are 18.5% above those 1990 levels. Other countries took their commitments seriously and Germany for example has reduced emissions from 1990 levels by 27%. They started their turnaround in the 1990s. We are still in the starting blocks by comparison.

In Paris governments also committed to limit the amount of greenhouse gases emitted by human activity to the same levels that trees, soil and oceans can absorb naturally, beginning at some point between 2050 and 2100. At first blush the thought of decarbonizing our economy to near zero emissions by 2050 appears to be a tall order. Is it possible? In 2013 the report of the Federal Environment Agency of Germany presented a scenario to demonstrate it was possible to become ‘almost’ GHG neutral by 2050 with 95% reduction from 1990 levels. More recently Germany has made the political decision to reduce emissions by 40% from 1990 levels by 2020 and 80% by 2050. It is clearly an ambitious target but of all countries Germany has had the most success with reductions and is better positioned than any to make that assessment. It is all the more remarkable that they have also pledged to eliminate nuclear energy altogether.

Since the 1990s German citizens have accepted that the transition to renewables comes with the price of higher energy costs, and they continue to support their government’s most recent ambitious target. A recent Nanos poll shows that while Canadians want to see their country’s international reputation restored they are somewhat less keen than their European cousins to pay higher taxes for fuel and other energy goods.

One of the first tasks of our new government will be to educate the electorate of the climate change consequences to Canada and the rest of the world if we don’t make the Herculean effort to curb emissions and that there is no free lunch. Making the transition to renewables will cost the taxpayers money. Politicians at all levels have been waffling for decades, which is why we have made no meaningful progress. That must change.

Currently, developed countries representing 20% of the world’s population emit 70% of the GHGs. That is why the 195 countries who ratified the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in 1992 enshrined the principle that while everyone is responsible for being part of the solution, the countries that have emitted more over the last half century should be the first to cut and should also help finance poorer countries to switch to clean development models.

At the Paris Conference, Canada and a number of wealthy countries pledged to contribute their fair share as part of a joint effort to mobilize $100 billion per year to finance climate change measures. The Paris agreement requires rich nations to maintain the $100bn a year funding pledge beyond 2020, and to use that figure as a “floor” for further support agreed by 2025.

If Canada wishes to be a player it must help underdeveloped countries that lack the financial resources to effect the transition to renewables.

Another concern for the oil producing provinces lies in the 2011 breakthrough report of the Carbon Tracker Initiative, a London think tank which identifies 2,795 gigatons of oil reserves on the books of fossil fuel companies. This compares with 565 gigatons, the amount of carbon which can safely be burned between now and 2050 if we are to have a solid chance of capping warming to 2 degrees. In other words, we have to keep 80% of the known reserves in the ground.

The Pembina Institute estimates that the production of tar sands oil generates between 3.2 and 4.5 times the levels of GHGs than oil resulting from the production of conventional crude. When president Obama made his decision to reject the Keystone XL pipeline project he stated that to approve the project would “incentivize the extraction of some of the dirtiest
oil on the planet and undermine the case” for urgently cutting carbon emissions at the Paris Conference.

It would be wise for Canada to face up to the reality that increasing the production of the most GHG intensive oil on the planet cannot be part of a plan to decarbonize the world by 2050. Of all the oil on the planet that ought to remain in the ground, tar sands oil would be at the top of the list because of its ecological footprint.

The Keystone decision must be viewed as entirely symbolic. But oftentimes symbolism is important. Seattle-based environmental policy expert K.C. Golden calls it the 'Keystone Principle.' According to Golden, “Keystone isn’t simply a pipeline in the sand... It’s an expression of the core principle that before we can effectively solve this crisis we have to stop making it worse. We must cease making long term capital investments in new fossil fuel infrastructure that locks in dangerous emission levels for many decades... Step one for getting out of a hole: stop digging!”

The Northern Gateway project is unlikely to proceed because of the serious risk of an oil spill which could have catastrophic consequences. According to a poll, 80% of British Columbians would like to see the banning of oil tanker traffic in northern waters and Prime Minister elect Trudeau’s election promise to kill the pipeline because “it is just not a place for a pipeline” is likely to be fulfilled.

But our new government is so far keeping an open mind regarding the Kinder Morgan twinning project and the proposed Energy East pipeline. It is realistic to think that as a nation we will need a long time to transition to renewables. And we will have a need for oil in the meantime. But it also seems realistic, having regard to our commitments to reduce emissions, that it would be reasonable to make any new pipeline approval, if otherwise justified, to be conditional on ‘cleaning’ the process of removing the bitumen from the sand by using green energy or, as Shell is doing, capturing and storing the carbon dioxide generated in the process of producing the product. In this way oil, sands oil would stand on a level playing field with conventional oil vis a vis its carbon footprint. Otherwise, following the Keystone Principle, we should leave it in the ground. A hefty carbon tax may incentivize companies to address the problem but there is the danger with increased oil prices that they will simply be treated as a cost of doing business. The public interest would be better served by insisting the carbon footprint be reduced as a condition of government cooperation in building the infrastructure required to market the product.

It is hard to believe but true that the oil and gas industry of this country receives government subsidies amounting to close to $1.3bn. Research in Canada has found that if this amount was spent on renewable energy, public transit or energy efficiency it could create 17 to 20 thousand jobs, six times as many jobs that the same money generates in the oil and gas sector. A good kick-start to a new energy policy based on renewable energy would be to end the subsidies and redirect the monies to where it is needed.

If the decarbonization of the planet proceeds as hoped, the fossil fuel industry will slowly contract over time. The fact is, we can’t afford to hang on to a fossil fuel-based economy. We must embrace a new economy based on renewable energy if we are to live up to our new reduction commitments.

To effect meaningful reductions we also have to think differently. Every decision that is made has to pass through the climate change filter. We must readjust the highly consumptive economic model pioneered in wealthy western countries and tread more lightly. The status quo is not an option; our atmosphere can’t take it.

The new economy must be based on a new relationship to the planet and to each other. As Miya Yoshitani, executive director of the Asian Pacific Environmental Network, put it “When climate justice wins, we win the world that we want. We can’t sit this one out, not because we have too much to lose but because we have so much to gain... We are bound together in this battle, not just for the reduction in the parts per million of CO2 but to transform our economies and rebuild a world we want.”

Let the journey begin.
Ernie Regehr: Disarming Conflict

Review by Simon Rosenblum

As our new Liberal government casts about seeking advice on how to alter Canada's foreign affairs and defence policies, it would be well advised to give Ernie Regehr's new book a close read. Regehr, through his long-time association with Project Ploughshares and his writings, is deservedly thought of as the dean of peace studies in Canada. For purposes of disclosure, I should note that I have been long associated with him both as a former colleague and co-editor along with being a close personal friend. Not too many a day passes without us arguing over something or another. Today will be no different. You will therefore understand why I refer to him as "Ernie" in the rest of this review.

The subtitle of the book: "Why peace cannot be won on the battlefield," reveals its main thesis: that a major global shift away from the preparation for and conduct of war needs to be made and resources dedicated to creating the conditions for stable governance and durable peaceful outcomes. The book - which might have been titled "Everything You Wanted to Know About War But Didn't Know Where to Find Out" - covers an enormous amount of ground and reveals much knowledge and serious thinking. Chapters include How Wars Start, How Civil Wars End, How International Wars End, The Limits of Force, and Disarming Security: Preventing War. Readers will find a healthy skepticism of the utility of military force and plenty of cases examined over the past quarter century that reinforce that skepticism. Not surprisingly I largely - but not wholly - share that wariness concerning "the utility of military force in settling highly complex military disputes."

Yes, to be sure, a great deal more needs to be done preventing conflict and using diplomacy to lessen the impact of conflict when it appears. As it unfortunately will. It is also very much the case that military force - whether used by nation-states or international coalitions - does not exactly have a sterling record of success when it comes to ending complex conflicts and that is true even when the motivations involved are reasonably sound. Think Afghanistan.

Currently, we need to look at the dilemma that the Islamic State (ISIS) poses. Without doubt, ISIS has expansion of its geographic reach very much on its agenda and it poses a clear and present danger to those in its way and under its sway. Creating stable states in Iraq and Syria must be of the highest priority so that these areas are much less vulnerable to ISIS growth. Much as the diplomatic and economic assistance to do so is of paramount importance, there is sadly no reason to be very optimistic that it will be particularly successful in the near future. A persuasive case can be made that ISIS will need to be simultaneously militarily contained and not all those making such an assessment are militaristic in nature. Reasonable people - even World Federalists - will disagree amongst themselves and Ernie and I will likely continue arguing over this but even when doing so will agree that military operations alone will not conclude with a peaceful outcome. It is no understatement that the alternatives are hardly particularly promising and a decent lack of hubris would become us all.

Ernie Regehr is by no means a pacifist. He was and remains a persistent supporter of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and is not hesitant to note that the international community "has shown itself to be extremely reluctant to meet that responsibility." As he writes "when prevention fails, it is neither politically nor morally acceptable for the international community to stand idly by." How militarily coercive the international forces would need to be would obviously depend on the situation and the possibilities for success and Ernie is most correct in drawing attention to the tasks that need to be undertaken before such conflicts erupt into a full crisis. Where I would strongly differ with him is with his insistence that the use of R2P "must include UN authorization when it includes coercion, no matter how noble the claimed reasons..." Given the veto power held by permanent members of the UN Security Council, and their willingness to cast this veto, many in the R2P community cannot support such a constraint and recognize that in certain situations there will need to be international "coalitions of the willing" ready willing and able to carry out R2P missions.

Disarming Conflict may not be the last word on a number of troublesome issues but it is a very good place to begin the conversation. I learned much from reading it and strongly recommend it to all. By the time you have finished Ernie's book you will no doubt wish that war would go away.
At the United Nations, governments have been discussing reform of the Security Council since the early 1990s – just after the end of the Cold War. Broadly, there are two areas of negotiations in the IGN (the Intergovernmental Negotiations) the acronym for the current open-ended Security Council reform process – one on expansion of the membership of the UN Security Council from 15 members to 22-27 members. The second is euphemistically called “working methods” of the Security Council.

The first area – expansion - is the most politically explosive. Several so-called emerging powers are seeking new permanent seats like the existing five permanent members received in 1945 (the P5, China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, United States). The emerging power seekers are the G4 (India, Brazil, Japan, Germany), while the African Union demands 2 African seats. Officially all of these governments are calling not only for a permanent seat, but also for the right of veto. Expansion of the Security Council is a Charter amendment and requires two-thirds majority vote of the General Assembly, as well as ratification by two-thirds of the UN member parliaments/governments, including all five existing permanent members.

The P5 are not likely to all agree to any new single permanent member, much less to a group of four to six new permanent members. The General Assembly member states also would not agree to put forward only one or two new permanent seats, and are very divided about the 6-7 governments seeking permanent seats. And since the P5 are absolutely not going to agree to giving the veto to any new member – this is why the 24 years of no progress could become 124 years of no progress.

Thus, not only are the existing P5 going to block adding several new permanent members, it is clear many if not most governments in each UN region will not agree to anoint one or two emerging powers in their region to become permanent members – i.e. hegemons. So, for example, Japan is opposed by South Korea and many Asia states and China; Germany is opposed by Italy, Spain, Canada and many others in the Western region; India is opposed by Pakistan, Indonesia, Malaysia; Brazil is opposed by Argentina, Chile, Peru, Colombia, etc. etc.; South Africa, Nigeria, Egypt are each opposed by many African governments. The 24-year standoff is not surprising.

The political situation is complicated by the paradoxical fact that – given the above – most UN Member States are nevertheless unwilling to oppose adding new permanent members to the Council – even though most do not want a new member from *their* region! This is because opposing new permanent members would mean allowing the 1945 ‘victors’ of World War II to be the permanent members forever. And it is widely held that a change in Council membership is necessary because the 1945 geopolitical power arrangement is outdated, and furthermore many think the original Council configuration based on permanent members with a veto was a mistake, and must be corrected.

There are 14 or so governments that are so opposed to a new regional permanent member, they are in favor of expanding the council only by additional non-permanent members. But, this grouping, named Uniting for Consensus, actually is so afraid that any voting by the GA could lead to a regional hegemon that they are willing to stall the negotiations for another century.

The tragedy for much of WFM’s work is that the second area in this negotiation process – on ‘working methods’ – has been held hostage to the first, the expansion issue. However, in the last few years this has begun to change, as 20-30 governments have been working to effectively separate the non-Charter issues from the Charter issues. For example, WFM has been supporting the governments pressing for the P5 to be forced politically to refrain from their misuse of the veto – especially in situations involving major war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide. We are succeeding dramatically in getting the GA to reform the procedures for the appointment of the UN Secretary-General – a process in which the veto has been massively misused. Improving Security Council working methods is important to broadening support for the Responsibility to Protect and for the International Criminal Court. We hope on issues like peacekeeping, conflict prevention, peacebuilding and peace enforcement that major political pressure to improve procedures and mechanisms can be achieved.
In my view it will only be when global civil society – a critical mass of NGOs from all regions and sectors - agree to some basic democratic global governance reforms that there is hope for fundamental reform of the Charter. And, unfortunately, most NGOs stay away from these issues of global governance structures and constitution – they campaign for specific issues, but not governance structures. And most Southern NGOs, especially from emerging powers countries, probably agree with their governments that they should have permanent membership on the Security Council to balance out the US, UK, France, Russia and China.

WFM members have supported getting rid of the veto, comprising the Security Council membership based on EU and other Regional Organization memberships, and many other formulas.

And, let me state that I believe it is highly likely that the UN has prevented World War III – that is a war between P5 governments using nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. I very much wish NGOs, governments, academia would openly debate this question.

Finally, some WFM advocates presume that a Charter Review conference would lead to a stronger, more democratic, rule of law based third-generation UN. But, it isn’t necessarily the case. Most UN experts disagree with this assumption – and are worried a review could/would cause massive disintegration in the international legal order and risk taking the progress of the last 70 years back 100 years. Some of this cautionary view is based on justifiable beliefs that in our current chaotic political world, many of the excellent international norms and laws and institutional machinery could not be adopted today – like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the ICC treaty, EU treaty, etc. etc.

I know these observations could be viewed as overly pessimistic, and I would like to offer some more hopeful reflections. But first I should emphasize a major, major caution. It is crucial that NGOs and governments handle the rejection of new permanent seats very carefully and strategically. If the emerging powers, especially in the global south, view the rejection as massive insults by the P5 and western powers, it is the emerging powers that could abandon the UN and try to install a G10 or G20 in its place, or equally or perhaps more dangerously, could start an alternative UN. Recently, for example, because of the extremely stupid U.S. Congress blocking voting reforms at the World Bank, China started its own new world bank – the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank.

For reasons explained above, to me the first step is to mobilize global NGO opposition to any new ‘permanent’ seats, and to support perhaps a new class of longer-term seats – 5 to 10 years. Perhaps when NGOs make it politically acceptable for governments to accept no more permanent seats can the expansion negotiations move forward in a potentially constructive way. This step could be a ‘tipping point’ for larger reform. In the meantime, the negotiation standoff is, unfortunately, a gift to the P5.

However, change is possible. The process that led to the Rome Statute for the International Criminal Court – creating a global civil society coalition of organizations from all regions and many sectors,
then linking up with a network of small and middle-sized democracies – also from the South and North – this strategy is one WFM continues to try to promote in a host of democratic global governance issues. Those of us who know of how the ICC process got going know its joint governmental and NGO roots. The idea to create a criminal court scraped along decade after decade since the time of the Nuremberg Tribunal. And then, amazingly, came a tipping point – the mixture of the end of the Cold War, Mandela, the Security Council establishing the Yugoslavia and Rwanda tribunals, the array of ‘world conferences’ in the framework of the 50th anniversary of the UN - the extraordinary good fortune of synergy of these events. Sadly we had only a very few years of this historic window of opportunity. Then came fierce blowback against our “gains” by major powers, government groupings, and disastrous new leadership in the US and Russia beginning in 2001 – bad leadership that became worse after the 9/11 attacks in the US.

Thus, getting ready for the next great moment of opportunity (or tipping point) should be our overarching focus and strategy.

The visionary reforms of the UN system advocated by WFM and supporters for seven decades must be continued and energetically supported. So very few people of any background seriously consider structural global governance issues, much less democratic global governance structures. Even in the high interest area of peacekeeping, peace operations, peace enforcement, most so-called serious proposals for improvements amount to reupholstering the deck chairs on the Titanic. Meanwhile, WFM has nearly seven decades of important advocacy for a myriad of proposals for world law, world parliaments, world citizenship, world courts, disarmament and economic justice.

As our long-time President Sir Peter Ustinov told us, (paraphrasing badly) “we can see the mountain tops we are seeking, but there are many, many paths to these summits.” I am certain recognizing this has been fundamental to WFM’s long survival and success. There is no single correct path to world law and peace; our movement encourages many pathfinders.

In Memoriam Richard Splane


Dick Splane joined the World Federalists in the 1950s. His interest in the cause evolved during his successful career working in the Government of Canada. He joined Canada’s Department of Health and Welfare and worked in the development and administration of federal-provincial shared cost programs – becoming known as the chief architect of the Canada Assistance Plan. His work also involved attending meetings at UNICEF and preparing Canadian submissions to the UN’s Social Commission.

His active involvement with the World Federalists followed a career as Professor of Social Work at the University of British Columbia. As he writes in his memoirs “In 1992, I was one of the WFC members in Vancouver who received telephone calls from Mary June Pettyfer who had come from Victoria to rouse the Vancouver members to organized action […] Her endeavours were strongly followed up by Duncan Graham whose arrival in Vancouver marked a turning point in the fortunes of WFC in this city.”

His papers also recall close working relationships over the years with Herb Gilbert, Joyce Brown, Isobel Nairn, Charlotte Fee, Wayne Nelles, Leonard Angel, Marta Friessen, E. Margaret Fulton, and Ted McWhinney, who was elected as MP for Vancouver Quadra in the Liberal sweep of 1993.

Dr. Splane served as Branch President until 1998. The branch held monthly meetings as well as meetings to discuss Issues Action Papers developed by the WFMC national office. WFMC President, the Hon. Allan Blakeney visited Vancouver on several occasions, often guesting on a controversial Vancouver talk radio show hosted by Rafe Mair.

For many years now the Vancouver World Federalists have teamed up with the Liu Institute for Global Issues, the UBC School of Social Work and the Vancouver chapter of the UN Association to co-sponsor the “Dr. Richard Splane Lecture in Social Policy.”
Montreal

In Montreal, the Marie-Berthe Dion Issues Action Group continues to meet each month, focusing on a particular topic at each meeting. Recent topics have included Bill C-51, peacekeeping, the WFMC federal election toolkit, and the new government’s platform, including the Arms Trade Treaty.

Chantal Havard, from the Canadian Council for International Cooperation, was the guest speaker February 7 at the annual Montreal Branch Brunch. Havard addressed Canada’s changing development policy under a new government and in the framework of the UN’s recently-adopted Sustainable Development Goals. On March 9 WFM – Canada Executive Director Fergus Watt was the guest speaker at the Montreal Branch Annual Meeting. Claire Adamson was elected as Branch President.

Ottawa

Monthly Global Issues Trivia Nights continue in Ottawa. In addition to regularly recurring categories of geography, current events, world history, and famous people, each month features a topical, special category. Recent topics have included the environment, world philosophy, and elections around the world.

Vancouver

Vancouver Branch’s September meeting was on the topic of “Global solutions require a transformation in economics” and featured Tom Green, School of Environment & Sustainability at Royal Roads University speaking on the move from a focus on GDP toward an ecological economics. In October the Branch screened the film The Drop: Why Young People Don’t Vote and followed it with a panel discussion. November’s regular Branch meeting addressed the topic of “Cosmopolitanism vs Nationalism: A world view through the nationalist lens” with UBC professor emeritus Dr. Philip Resnick.

Also in November was the annual Splane Lecture, which is co-sponsored by WFMC – Vancouver, UNA Canada’s Vancouver Branch, the Liu Institute for Global Issues and the UBC School of Social Work. Sadly, Professor Splane passed away shortly before this year’s lecture. WFMC Vancouver President Vivian Davidson recalled Dick Splane’s work as Branch President through much of the 1990s and UNA-Vancouver Past President Patsy George added “It is always sad to hear of someone passing away, but he had 99 years of great life.” The speaker at this year’s lecture was Piita Irniq, former Commissioner of Nunavut Territory, on the topic of “Making Peace: Policies and Practices for Healing Inuit Colonial Experiences.”

December’s meeting was on the topic of “World Federal Government - a Discussion” and addressed the basic ideas involved and what can be done to change the nation-state system. In January, a short film, A World Parliamentary Assembly: The Key to Global Democracy, featuring Andreas Bummel of the United Nations Parliamentary Assembly (UNPA) campaign was shown and was followed by a discussion. In February, WFMC Executive Director Fergus Watt addressed the Vancouver branch at their monthly meeting. Mary June Pettyfer, long-time world federalist, was presented with the Hanna Newcombe award for lifetime achievement.

Victoria

In December, with the Paris Climate Change ongoing, Bill Pearce spoke on “Canada’s Climate Change Challenge.” The evening focused on challenges, such as the impact climate change policies will have on oil production and the US Keystone decision and implications for the Northern Gateway, Kinder Morgan, and Energy East pipeline applications, as well as the society-wide changes needed to achieve a decarbonized economy.

In January, the Branch hosted Robert Morales, who spoke on the topic, “The Road Ahead: Post Truth & Reconciliation.” Mr. Morales is Coast Salish and a member of Cowichan Tribe, as well as a lawyer specializing in First Nations rights. The Branch was visited by WFMC Executive Director Fergus Watt in February, who gave an update on activities of the movement nationally and internationally.

Mary June Pettyfer and Fergus Watt

BRANCH NEWS
By Monique Cuillerier

Over the course of its existence, there have been twenty-three cases in nine situations brought before the International Criminal Court. Preliminary examinations are currently being conducted in a number of situations including Afghanistan, Colombia, Guinea, Iraq, Nigeria, Palestine and Ukraine.

**Uganda**

The cases of The Prosecutor v. Joseph Kony, Vincent Otti, and Okot Odhiambo and The Prosecutor v. Dominic Ongwen are currently being heard.

Dominic Ongwen was surrendered to ICC custody in January 2015 and 70 charges against him have been confirmed. The case will be assigned to a Trial Chamber in the coming months. Joseph Kony and Vincent Otti remain at large.

**Democratic Republic of the Congo**

Six cases from this situation have been brought before the Court.

Lubanga Dyilo has been convicted and sentenced to 14 years imprisonment (less time served). The Trust Fund for Victims is drafting an implementation plan for collective reparations.

In the case of The Prosecutor v. Germain Katanga and Mathieu Ngudjolo Chui, Mathieu Ngudjolo Chui was acquitted of all charges and released. In February 2015, an appeal of the acquittal was denied. Germain Katanga was found guilty, as an accessory to one count of crimes against humanity and four counts of war crimes and sentenced to twelve years (less time already spent in detention).

The trial of Bosco Ntaganda, on 13 counts of war crimes (including rape and sexual slavery of civilians; rape, sexual slavery, enlistment and conscription of child soldiers under the age of fifteen years and using them to participate actively in hostilities) and 5 counts of crimes against humanity (including murder and attempted murder; rape; sexual slavery; and forcible transfer of population), began in September 2015.

In December 2015, Thomas Lubanga Dyilo and Germain Katanga were transferred to a prison in DRC to serve their sentences. This marks the first time the ICC has designated a State for the enforcement of a sentence.

**Darfur, Sudan**

Suspects in four cases (Ahmad Harun, Ali Kushayb, Omar Hassan Ahmad Al Bashir, Abdallah Banda Abakar Nourain, and Abdel Raheem Muhammad Hussein) remain at large.

**Central African Republic (I)**

This situation was referred to the Court by the Government of the Central African Republic in 2004. A verdict was reached in the case The Prosecutor v. Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo in March. Gombo was found guilty of two counts of crimes against humanity (murder and rape) and three counts of war crimes (murder, rape, and pillaging). Mr Bemba was in a leadership position with regards to the troops that committed the crimes. Sentencing will follow, as well as issues regarding reparations to victims. This verdict is particularly significant because, as Prosecutor Fatou Bensouda said, it “has highlighted the critical need to eradicate sexual and gender-based crimes as weapons of war in conflict by holding accountable those who fail to exercise their duties and responsibilities that their status as commanders and leaders entail.”

The trial against Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo, Aimé Kilolo Musamba, Jean-Jacques Mangenda Kabongo, Fidèle Babala Wandu, and Narcisse Arido, for offences against the administration of justice allegedly committed in connection with the case above began in September 2015.

**Kenya**

Arrest warrants for Walter Osapiri Barasa, Paul Gicheru and Philip Kipkoech Bett, for various offences against the administration of justice are outstanding.

In early April, the case against Deputy President William Ruto and Joshua Sang, for crimes against humanity committed in the post-election period in 2007, was declared a mistrial “due to a troubling incidence of witness interference and intolerable political meddling.” This follows the collapse of the case against President Uhuru Kenyatta in 2014 for similar reasons.

**Côte d’Ivoire**

The trial of Laurent Gbagbo and Charles Blé Goudé, who are accused of crimes against humanity, began in late January 2016. An arrest warrant against Simone Gbagbo is outstanding.

**Mali**

In March 2016, charges related to the war crime of the destruction of historical and religious monuments against Ahmad Al Faqi Al Mahdi were confirmed. Mr Al Mahdi has expressed his wish to plead guilty. This will be addressed when the case comes before the trial judges.

**Central African Republic (II)**

A second investigation in Central African Republic is ongoing, pertaining to crimes committed during the recent conflict.

**Georgia**

As of the end of January 2016, the Prosecutor has begun an investigation into crimes allegedly committed in and around South Ossetia, Georgia in 2008.
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