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On December 17 the international World Federalist Movement - Institute for Global Policy (WFM) announced the appointment of Sandra Coyle as the organization's Consulting Executive Director, working with the organization from January through May 2021 to realign the organization's strategy, structure and financing.

Ms Coyle's area of expertise lies in strategic communications and strategic planning. She has worked with a number of international organizations and associations, most recently serving as Chief Communications Officer for the African Economic Research Consortium, which fosters economic research, training and capacity-building in Sub-Saharan Africa. She is currently based in Nairobi, Kenya.

Following are her answers to a few questions from Mondial.

What was it about the World Federalists that attracted you to the organization?
The concept of global solutions to global problems attracted me the most. We all learned a very valuable lesson in 2020 with the onset of a global pandemic, that lack of a strong global, coordinated response left many countries in economic and social tatters. Strong international institutions, that are held accountable, can help all of us navigate issues that affect all of us. Operating as individual nation-states is leading to more pain and chaos for individual citizens and a stronger, global body is needed.

How do you assess the WFM organization's inherent assets and potential value-added? What role do you see the organization playing in the years ahead?
My background is in communications, with a specialization in branding. I have had the opportunity to rebrand organizations and industries over the years. I analyse organizations through that lens and look at three key areas to determine value and future sustainability – brand heritage, mission relevance, potential impact. WFM - IGP in its entirety has all three characteristics to help the organization not only be fit for purpose in this decade, but to shape the future of governance.

My hope is that WFM - IGP becomes more public, providing guidance at the national, regional and global level on creating a federalist approach to governance. At the same time, to actively reach out and mobilize young people, including in Africa, Asia and South America, where most populations are young, to embrace the concept of World Federalism. And lastly, to ensure the organization is sustainable over the long-term to ensure our efforts live on and can be as broadly impactful as possible.

As you begin this work, what are some of the immediate challenges you seek to address?
The immediate challenge is to determine the current and future relevancy of our work to young people across the world. Does the young generation believe in the concept of
federalism? By young, mainly Generation Z. Would they support a federalist movement in its current concept. In branding terms, determining what level of engagement they would be willing to have. Without young people involved, globally, we would not have the momentum to continue.

Secondly, looking at the alignment of our work in terms of the needs of national and regional government bodies. Are there other ways we can help make an impact? Is there expertise we can offer?

Thirdly, is seeking efficiencies in how we operate internally and opening the doors of the organization to build consensus and community among our supporters and stakeholders. Together we are strong and can make World Federalism a reality, divided we cannot.

Is there anything else you would like to say to an audience of Canadian and US world federalists?

Both Canada and the US are of interest to me as both are federations. Growing up in the US, I was required to Pledge Allegiance to the Republic every school morning as a child so federalism is a concept I am familiar with and one that I have benefitted from. The question is what’s next? How can we expand an understanding of what it means to be a federation to other countries and regional bodies? Do we have expertise to provide others? Can we improve both current federations? The US in particular appears to be in a dynamic stage of its evolution – will it continue to hold as a leading example of a Federalist Republic or will the internal pressure for change cause it to amend its foundations?

My message to World Federalists in Canada and the US is to seek out new ways to educate on the federalist system – both the advantages and disadvantages – and to actively seek out young people to explain the concept to them. By passing on our knowledge to them, they will be able to take on the idea and advance it for the future world they will soon inherit.

Broad consultations planned for the S-G’s follow up to UN75 Declaration

On 21 September 2020, world leaders adopted the UN75 Declaration, which sets out twelve commitments to action across the global agenda, including sustainable development, pandemic response, climate action, prevention of violent conflict in fragile states, protecting biodiversity, upholding arms control, non-proliferation, and disarmament agreements, enhancing democratic governance, addressing digital trust and security, and safeguarding human rights.

The Declaration also calls on the Secretary-General to report back to the General Assembly “with recommendations to advance our common agenda and respond to current and future challenges.”

At a time when the world is focused on the COVID-19 pandemic, including the distribution of vaccines, the requirement for a UN75 follow up report has given rise to efforts to take stock of the UN’s current capacities, with the expectation that the Secretary-General’s report will initiate a reform process to strengthen multilateralism. According to the Secretary-General, his office has initiated a period of “profound reflection,” including consultations not only with Member States but also with “thought leaders,” youth, and civil society.
In a speech January 28 outlining his priorities for 2021, the Secretary-General stated, “The challenges ahead clearly demand a more inclusive and more networked multilateralism. I have also called for a New Global Deal among countries to ensure that power, benefits and opportunities are shared more broadly and fairly. Developing countries merit a larger voice in global decision-making. Young people must also be at the table – as designers of their own future, not as recipients of decisions of elders who have, let’s be honest, failed them in so many key respects. My report in September should be seen as the beginning of this reset. Strengthening global governance to deliver global public goods is possible.”

For the Coalition for the UN We Need (C4UN, formerly the UN2020 Campaign) these developments represent progress. The campaign has not only adopted a change of name. Wide consultations among civil society organizations and networks led to the adoption in December of a three-year strategic plan to prepare for the period following the Secretary-General’s report (expected early September), when the international community’s efforts to strengthen international institutions is expected to gather momentum.

At a January 13 C4UN-sponsored online videoconference, Maria Fernanda Espinosa, former President of the UN General Assembly commented on the COVID pandemic’s impacts on the effectiveness of the UN system:

“This crisis, which has caused so much loss and suffering, has also been a stress test for multilateralism. While reinforcing humanity’s shared vulnerability and a sense of global solidarity, the pandemic has further illuminated so many problems – the reasons why global cooperation is needed in the first place. To name just a few: inequalities and growing poverty, the pandemic’s disproportionate impacts on women and girls, and vaccine nationalism. . . .

“And then there are the direct impacts that the necessary pandemic responses have had on the day-to-day operations of the UN system. Diplomacy by videoconference is a poor substitute for the real thing. Without the meetings, negotiations, stakeholder engagement, and all the other trappings of normal work at the UN, the international community has pressed “pause” on too many important multilateral processes.

“It is therefore no surprise that reinvigorating and rejuvenating the multilateral system has become a central ask of citizens, organizations and a large majority of Member States.”

**ICC UPDATE**

By Monique Cuillerier

The International Criminal Court is currently engaged in eight preliminary examinations, and has thirteen situations under investigation.

Preliminary examinations are currently being conducted in Bolivia, Colombia, Guinea, Iraq/UK, Nigeria, Palestine, the Philippines, Ukraine, and two separate examinations into Venezuela.

**Afghanistan**

In March 2020, the Prosecutor was authorized to begin an investigation into alleged crimes against humanity and war crimes since 2003 in Afghanistan, as well as other alleged crimes committed on the territory of other States Parties since 2002 but linked to the conflict in Afghanistan.

**Bangladesh/Myanmar**

In November 2019, an investigation into alleged crimes of deportation, persecution, and any other crimes relevant to the Court against the Rohingya people was begun.

In February, a delegation from the Court traveled to Bangladesh to explain to the public how investigations are conducted.

A redacted, public version of the “Registry’s Second Report on Information and Outreach Activities” regarding this situation was made available in December 2020.

**Burundi**

An investigation into crimes under the Rome Statute that may have occurred in Burundi was authorized in 2017 and currently focuses on alleged crimes between 2015 and 2017.

The investigation is focused on alleged crimes of murder and attempted murder, imprisonment or severe deprivation of liberty, torture, rape, enforced disappearance, and persecution.
Central African Republic (I)
Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo, Aimé Kilolo Musamba, Jean-Jacques Mangenda Kabongo, Fidèle Babala Wandu, and Narcisse Arido, were found guilty of offences against the administration of justice in October 2016 and sentencing took place in September 2018. All convictions and acquittals are now considered final and imprisonment sentences are complete.

Central African Republic (II)
The Government of CAR referred this situation to the Court in May 2014.
The situation focuses on alleged war crimes and crimes against humanity committed since 1 August 2012, in the context of the conflict between Muslim Séléka and Christian anti-balaka groups.
An arrest warrant was issued in November 2018 for Alfred Yekatom and he was surrendered to the Court shortly thereafter. A further arrest warrant, for Patrice-Edouard Ngaïssona, was issued in December 2018 and he was arrested five days later. The two cases were joined in February 2019. The trial began in February 2021. Mahamat Said Abdel Kani was the subject of a warrant issued in 2019. He was surrendered to the Court on January 24 2021. A confirmation of charges hearing is tentatively schedule for October 2021.

Côte d’Ivoire
The cases of Laurent Gbagbo and Charles Blé Goude, charged with crimes against humanity allegedly committed in Côte d’Ivoire in 2010 and 2011, were joined in March 2015 and the trial began in January 2016. In January 2019, both were acquitted. The Appeals Chamber will consider the appeal filed by the Prosecutor in this case.
The case against Simone Gbagbo remains at the pre-trial stage as she is still not in the custody of the Court.

Darfur, Sudan
The situation in Darfur, Sudan was referred to the Court by the UN Security Council in March 2005.
There are several open cases concerning the situation in Darfur, Sudan with four suspects -- Ahmad Harun, Omar Hassan Ahmad Al Bashir, Abdallah Banda Abakaer Nourain, and Abdel Raheem Muhammad Hussein -- who remain at large.
Ali Muhammad Ali Abd–Al-Rahman surrendered himself to the Court in June 2020. The confirmation of charges hearing is scheduled for May 2021.

Democratic Republic of the Congo
In 2012, Thomas Lubanga Dyilo was convicted and sentenced to 14 years of imprisonment. He has transferred to a prison in DRC in 2015 where he continues to serve his sentence. Implementation of the collective reparations decision continues.
The trial of Bosco Ntaganda began in September 2015 and he was found guilty in July 2019 of 18 counts of war crimes, and crimes against humanity committed in Ituri, DRC between 2002 and 2003. In early November 2019, Ntaganda was sentenced to thirty years imprisonment. The verdict and sentence are subject to appeal and the victims’ reparations are still to be considered.
Sylvestre Mudacumura, for whom an arrest warrant was issued in 2012, remains at large.

Georgia
An investigation into crimes against humanity and war crimes allegedly committed in and around South Ossetia, Georgia in 2008 was begun in January 2016 and continues.

Libya
Mahmoud Mustafa Busayf Al-Werfalli, Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, and Al-Tuhamy Mohamed Khaled all remain at large and, as such, their cases are still pending.

Kenya
Arrest warrants for Walter Osapiri Barasa and Philip Kipkoech Bett for various offences against the administration of justice remain outstanding.
Paul Gicheru surrendered in November 2020. The confirmation of charges procedure will be conducted in writing, with documents expected to be filed in February 2021.

Mali
Al Hassan Ag Abdoul Aziz Ag Mohamed Ag Mahmoud was surrendered to Court’s custody in March 2018. His trial, which began in July 2020, is ongoing.

Uganda
The case against Joseph Kony and Vincent Otti remains pending as they are still at large.
The trial of Dominic Ongwen began in December 2016 and a judgement was delivered in February 2021. Ongwen was found guilty on 61 counts.

Other
123 countries have ratified the Rome Statute -- 33 in Africa, 19 in the Asia-Pacific area, 18 in Eastern Europe, 28 in Latin America and the Caribbean, and 25 in Western Europe and other states.

Election of the next Prosecutor
Following a prolonged and fraught process that resulted in a vote, rather than a consensus decision, Karim Khan, of the United Kingdom, was chosen as the next ICC Prosecutor on February 12th. Following a prolonged and fraught process that resulted in a vote, rather than a consensus decision, Karim Khan, of the United Kingdom, was chosen as the next ICC Prosecutor on February 12th. He will begin his term on June 16, 2021.
In a second round of voting, Khan received 72 votes from 123 countries. Concerns regarding transparency and lack of vetting were raised by civil society during the election process.

Khan worked in the Offices of the Prosecutor at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the Prosecutor at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.
Khan was also Lead Counsel for Kenyan Deputy President William Ruto at the ICC. The case was terminated on the basis that the Prosecution had insufficient evidence. Khan also served as counsel for Saif al-Islam Gaddafi, for whom a warrant has been issued by the ICC. Most recently, he was with the United Nations Investigative Team for the Promotion of Accountability for Crimes Committed by Da’esh/ISIL in Iraq.
The Conference on the Future of Europe was proposed jointly by the European Commission and the European Parliament in late 2019. The Conference is intended to consider the future of the EU and possible reforms. Citizens, including particular groups such as youth, along with civil society and European institutions, are to be included within the process.

The Conference was originally planned to begin in 2020 and last for two years. This timeline has been delayed, in part, as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic.

There has also been disagreement over who should take a leadership role. An early proposal was that the Conference would be led by an “eminent European personality.” This resulted in disagreements over who that should be and a failure of more than one frontrunner to gain sufficient support across countries.

A more recent compromise suggestion is that the Conference be led by a small group -- the respective heads of the European Commission, the European Council, and the European Parliament.

This proposal would also add an executive board which would include officials from the European Commission and European Council along with MEPs from each political group.

The general outline has already been agreed upon and the delays in starting the Conference are considered by many to have reached a critical point.

In a statement, Brando Benifei, a Member of the European Parliament who is also a member of the Spinelli Group, an initiative intended to reinvigorate federalism within the EU, expressed concern that the current plans for the Conference do not include sufficient possibilities for participation and that the possibility of Treaty change should not be excluded from the outset.

The Union of European Federalists (UEF) has produced an “Appeal to the European Institutions and Governments of the Member States” that presents wide-ranging recommendations intended to strengthen the European community, including a European migration policy, the development of autonomous European defence, and completing the Economic and Monetary Union. The Appeal is also concerned with defining the foundations of a “genuine European democracy.”

The UEF sees the Conference as “an historical opportunity towards a sovereign, democratic and federal Europe” that should address key issues regarding the EU’s system of government. They would like to see a new Treaty result, one that would overcome current problems.

Further detail about the Conference and UEF’s proposals can be found at https://www.federalists.eu/
Sir Brian Urquhart who died January 2, 2021, just weeks before his 102nd birthday, left much to remember as a thoughtful soldier, an exemplary international civil servant, a brilliant scholar and a champion of peace.

He was internationally recognized as a key advisor to UN Secretary-Generals; a calm arbitrator of crucial conflicts that had the potential to go nuclear; a pioneer of UN peacekeeping, and as a stellar UN Under-Secretary General for Political Affairs.

Nothing was gifted -- Brian took his share of hard knocks. While a British paratrooper and intelligence officer in WWII, and his parachute didn’t open, Brian pounded into a tree (coincidently in front of General Dwight Eisenhower). He was hospitalized for six months. During the ill-fated “Operation Market Garden” he tried to issue a warning to senior commanders, but failed to stop the massacre and capture of thousands of his colleagues. Yet he was clearly not the sort of person to stay down. He went on to help liberate the Bergen-Belsen death camp and personally captured the ‘Beast of Belsen’, Josef Kramer.

After the war, Brian Urquhart advised Sir Gladwyn Jebb on British plans for the UN, then served as personal assistant to the first UN Secretary-General, Trygvie Lie. After the horrors of war, to work for peace, was in his words, “a dream fulfilled.”

Urquhart inherited from his mother high principles about what was “worthwhile.” He cared little for fashion and the lifestyle of success; to get to his apartment one had to side-step through a human hair snip-shop.

Brian was an idealist. In his words, “I think idealism is the only form of realism because unless you’re idealistic to some extent, you don’t have anything to look forward to, you don’t have anywhere to go. And I think there’s no point in being pessimistic. After all, we’re only on this world once as far as we know. You might as well make the best of it.”

Brian considered the UN’s crucial role was to intervene to stop wars -- it was an ongoing “experiment in progress.”

Along with his mentors Ralph Bunche and Dag Hammarskjold, he directed the first attempt at UN peacekeeping in the Suez crisis, followed by an awkwardly challenging operation in the Congo. As a UN Under-Secretary General for 17 years, he oversaw missions in the Middle East, Cyprus, Namibia, Lebanon and Kashmir.

This was new ground and Brian conceded, “we had to make it up as we went along.” For him, the purpose of peacekeeping was to prevent war, de-escalate conflict and protect the vulnerable. Further fighting and any unwarranted use of force were, in his view, deeply regrettable.

Aside from his pivotal role in peace operations, he was a straight-talking mediator and negotiator who led discussions on the peaceful uses of atomic energy and the creation of the International Atomic Energy Agency. More than a few observers described Urquhart as “the heart of the UN.” Yet he did not shy away from constructive criticism of the UN system’s failings. His response was blistering when confronted by Member States who only offered lofty rhetoric but were reluctant to reform or help on the ground.

Frequently, Brian was pressured to explain that the UN had no standing army and no substantive reserve funds available in emergencies. The UN’s lack of a rapid deployment capacity to enforce international law continued to rankle – he revitalized Secretary-General Trygvie Lie’s original idea of a UN volunteer legion. An earlier review of this work noted that, “His [Urquhart’s] pieces on the UN volunteer force and the responsibilities of the UN system published in The New York Review of Books in 1993 and 1994 have set the terms of the debate for all future discussions of rethinking the UN system.”

In the mid-1990s Brian agreed to co-chair the Canadian study, Towards A Rapid Reaction
Capability For the United Nations, submitted to the UN General Assembly on its fiftieth anniversary in 1995. He was adamant that a new approach had to be tried. Building on the Canadian proposal, Brian advocated for a UN Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS), and helped to develop detailed plans for the new service. He seldom missed a chance to champion the idea.

Addressing King’s College, he explained: “I am convinced that the UN, if it is to be taken seriously in the peace and security field, has to have some capacity to act effectively on the ground within 24 to 48 hours of a decision by the Security Council. Every year provides examples of what happens when it can’t do that,” and until it can, “…the UN is not going to work very well.”

Canada was one country that Brian respected sufficiently to write: “it has stood with the organization in good times and in bad. It also has a tradition of encouraging new ideas and new thinking about international affairs. Not many countries do this.”

It would have pained him to see successive Conservative and Liberal governments drop the UN ball in the ensuing period, especially with hollow claims of “being back”.

The leadership that Canadian, David Malone, brought to the New York based International Peace Institute prompted Brian to lend his name to what’s now their “Brian Urquhart Center for Peace Operations.” The IPI faces a tall order to live up to his expectations.

In 1986, Brian Urquhart officially retired from the UN although he remained an unofficial senior advisor and continued to encourage substantive reforms for global governance.

Urquhart’s first book, A Life At Peace and War, offers an insider’s perspective of the UN system -- and makes wonderful reading.

He also wrote two acclaimed biographies: the first, Hammarskjöld, detailing his preferred Secretary-General’s dynamic, principled diplomacy; and a second on Ralph Bunche: An American Odyssey, about his colleague who found peaceful solutions to near-hopeless conflicts (which won Bunche a Nobel Peace Prize in 1950). While at the Ford Foundation, Brian co-authored with Erskine Childers three books on reforming the UN’s leadership, its administration, its financing and the need for a more coherent organization of the myriad UN development agencies.

Celebrating Brian’s 100th birthday, UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres was succinct: “…we are grateful for his brilliant and incomparable contributions as a stalwart servant of we the peoples.”

Recognizing humanity’s survival challenges, Brian suggested:

*The urgent necessity is to give serious thought to the problems of the future, to support constructive change, and to try to make the UN system better able to deal with the new dangers that we will soon have to face. I don’t think it’s an exaggeration to say that the reasonable survival of the human race on this planet cannot be taken for granted if, for lack of governmental vision and massive public support, this effort does not succeed.*

Sir Brian Urquhart wouldn’t hesitate in encouraging people everywhere to pull together and aim higher. His unique spirit, inspiration and ideas will continue to clarify what’s most “worthwhile.”

---

**Join Our Global Movement**

The World Federalist Movement - Institute for Global Policy has Member Organizations (MOs) around the world that are dedicated to spreading the ideas of World Federalism. Currently our MOs are working on diverse issues such as raising support for the International Criminal Court, strengthening the European Constitution, creating a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly, and reducing small arms trafficking. In addition to the WFM Member Organizations and Associate Organizations, WFM-IGP’s programs CICC and ICRtoP also have thousands of members around the world. For more information on their members, please visit [www.coalitionfortheicc.org](http://www.coalitionfortheicc.org) and [www.responsibilitytoprotect.org](http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org).

WFM-IGP also welcomes your individual membership in our global efforts to promote the principles of international democracy, federalism, global governance and human rights.
Late last year the UN Development Programme released its 30th anniversary Human Development Report. First published in 1990, the annual report sought to enshrine a new way to conceive and measure progress. Instead of using growth in GDP as the primary measure of development, the world’s countries were ranked by their human development: by whether people in each country have the freedom and opportunity to live the lives they value.

Over the years these reports have not only compiled statistics, benchmarks and country indicators that track the course of human progress. The report has occasionally risen above the political fray, marshaling independent, empirically grounded perspectives that have shaped innovative thinking on what is understood as “development.”

Some of the notable examples where the Report consolidated leading-edge thinking to further drive UN development system norms and understandings include:

- The 1994 Report that focused on “human security,” linking security with the welfare of people rather than territories, and relies on human rights and the rule of law more than arms and the coercive use of force.
- The 1995 Report on the required progress in reducing gender disparities, such as female education, equality of opportunities and compensation in the workplace, sexual and reproductive health and rights, and more.
- The 1993 and 2002 Reports that focused, respectively on “people’s participation” and on the requirements of providing democracy as an essential element of good governance.
- The 2000 Report that had human rights as a central theme. After the Cold War rights could assume a much greater part in development programming. And the 2000 Report also put forward the proposition that human rights and human dignity are essential to a fairer “new era of globalization.”
- The 2006 Report that focused on the linkages between poverty and water scarcity worldwide.
- The 2007/8 Report that focused on responses to climate change, “the defining human development challenge of the 21st century.”
- The 2009 Report that focused on human mobility and development, i.e. growing migration, both within and beyond borders.

- The 2019 Report that brought renewed attention to inequalities as a roadblock to human development, their causes and the range of policy responses.

The theme for the Report in 2020 is “The next frontier: Human Development in the Anthropocene.” “Anthropocene” is a geological term meant to convey that the current age is one in which human activity has become the dominant influence on climate, the environment, indeed most of the earth’s biological systems.

Global warming, biodiversity collapse and oceans pollution and acidification are evidence that we have not adequately dealt with human impacts on the natural world. These impacts interact with existing inequalities, threatening significant development reversals.

The 2020 Report suggests that “Nothing short of a great transformation – in how we live, work and cooperate – is needed.” But alas, one looks in vain for a clear indication of the scale and speed of those required transformations.

At one point it is acknowledged that “At present the global community has no system for measuring the comprehensive wealth of countries—that is, tracking changes to environmental assets alongside human-made assets—so even if we were achieving the sustainability criterion, we would not know. Developing such a system is a major challenge, but it is an essential step towards building global institutions that can account for global environmental changes while balancing the economic interests of current and future generations.”

The 2020 report begins to sketch out the values, priorities and lifestyles – the green economy, etc. - that will need to characterize development in the Anthropocene. And there is an effort to develop a new, experimental “Planetary pressures-adjusted Human Development Index.”

But clearly we humans have much more to understand.
We are meeting in November, the month of Remembrance Day, a time to give honour and thank all who sacrificed their lives so we can enjoy the freedoms of today. But not only to remember. It becomes our sacred duty to build on their sacrifice. They fought so future generations would not have to struggle like they did. We still have to develop the means to create a world without war under the rule of law and justice, so future generations do not have to make such a sacrifice.

The need to develop international law and build international organizations is part of the lessons of World Wars I and II. At the end of WW I, the world realized it needed a place for nations to meet and resolve disputes. So a League of Nations was created. But it was given only weak powers and did not gain support, with the US not even joining. During World War II, the US realized its mistake and worked to create a stronger international organization: the United Nations.

US support has waxed and waned over the years, with the UN taking a beating over the four years of the Trump administration. But, since our last annual meeting, we have had the election of a new US president, and better prospects for US re-engagement in the United Nations, including paying its dues.

President-elect Joe Biden has already started to sow the seeds of healing after four years of division. Instead of Trump’s America-first strategy, we have a uniter. As he said, it’s a time to heal. This applies to the world and the world’s premier organization, the United Nations.

The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrates how interconnected our world is, with disease spreading worldwide in a matter of months. As we world federalists often say, “global problems require global solutions.” The World Health Organization (WHO) has been central to international efforts to respond to the pandemic. And it needs to be further strengthened. We need to “build back better” not only nationally but also internationally. The WHO needs more verification / enforcement powers, including the ability to visit hospitals without blockage arising from a national right of refusal. After the 2003 SARS crisis, the WHO created new standards: the 2005 International Health Regulations (IHR). Reporting became
quicker and better, so China reported on COVID-19 within weeks of the outbreak rather than the months taken for SARS. But we still do not have an independent system for verification through WHO inspections. That’s what the next effort at IHR should include.

We know that it is not just the WHO that needs to be strengthened. Much of the UN system needs to be reinforced as the international community emerges from the pandemic. With the adoption of the UN’s 75th anniversary Declaration in September, there is now some acknowledgement that a dedicated international process to strengthen the UN system is warranted. As Canadian World Federalists we should take pride in the role our staff, Fergus Watt and Monique Cuillerier, have played in the global civil society campaign that has mobilized opinion around the idea of using the 75th anniversary of the UN as an occasion to take stock and strengthen multilateralism. After four years, it’s great to see that campaign gathering momentum.

Against the inertia of the current Canadian government, we Canadian federalists must keep the flame of hope and belief in our cause alive. We represent a powerful vision, the idea that humanity may one day be united in a democratic world federation. But in the meantime we can also work to realize a stronger form of global governance than is provided by the current UN. We can work in the near term to strengthen the UN, to turn it into an organization with the ability to maintain peace and enforce international human rights covenants.

We are world citizens, and we have a right to express our citizenship through support of the United Nations and our call for a better UN, a third generation of international organization for a brighter future.

WFMC Honours Carol Greene

On February 9, 2020 Carol Greene was honoured with the Hanna Newcombe Award. Named after prominent peace researcher Dr. Hanna Newcombe, the award recognizes an individual’s service and contribution to the cause of world federalism over a lifetime. Dr. Newcombe was the first recipient of this award in 2006 and it has since been awarded to Peter Langille, William Pace, Dr James Christie and Mary June Pettyfer, among others.

The award, a beautifully engraved crystal vase, was presented by Nic Baird on behalf of the World Federalist Movement - Canada.

I chatted with Carol about her lifelong concerns with social justice and peace issues.

Carol’s mother was a letter writer – writing to editors of local papers on all sorts of topics (she even wrote to Winston Churchill concerning the right of Princess Margaret to marry Peter Townsend) – so Carol saw activism modelled from an early age. Carol’s sister Marilyn (older by 11 years and a great influence in her upbringing) was very active in the League of Women Voters, and Carol herself became very interested in government. Although she did not join at the time, Carol first became aware of the World Federalist Movement through the student chapter at Oberlin College (Ohio).

In 1970, Carol and Frank moved their family to Montreal, and she became interested in the differences between the U.S. government and Canada’s parliamentary system. Carol cites two books as having been influential in her thinking: The Wild Flag: Editorials From The New Yorker On Federal World Government And Other Matters by E.B.White, and One World or None: How Canadians Can Take the Lead to Abolish War and Democratize the UN by Ross Smyth, a Montrealer, whose frequent letters to the editor caught her eye.

In Montreal, the World Federalist Movement again came to Carol’s attention. While carpooling to work she met WFMC member Patricia McGraw whose husband Jack was then president of the local WFMC branch. Then Marie-Berthe Dion approached the Unitarian Church, of which Carol and Frank were members, to provide space for the WFMC Montreal’s Issues Action Group of letter-writers. Through her engagement with the WFMC, Carol met a number of knowledgeable, like-minded souls who contributed to her understanding of world issues; she notes particularly Marie-Berthe Dion and Warren Allmand.

Over the years Carol has worked steadily to support her ideals. In her words, she feels better if she is trying. She has engaged with the social justice activities of the Unitarian Church and has volunteered for various positions in the WFMC, including Montreal Branch president.

Carol has shepherded the Issues Action Group on her own since Marie-Berthe Dion retired from that commitment. Bill Hartzog instigated its renaming as the Marie-Berthe Dion Issues Action Group in her memory.
Today, at 85, although at times discouraged by rising nationalism and the need for UN reform, Carol still remains hopeful. She speaks of keeping up a “pessimism of the mind, optimism of the will” (à la Gramsci) attitude, of reading and listening to such individuals as Nobel Prize winner Shirin Ebadi (Iran Awakening) who maintain integrity and never give up working for a better world. Quoting Vaclav Havel, she has written: “We cannot assume that our microscopic, yet truly unique everyday actions are of no consequence simply because they apparently cannot resolve the immense problems of today” (His “Address to the World Economic Forum”, Tuesday 4 February 1992, Davos, Switzerland). Carol keeps abreast of national and world events by following the news, reading voraciously, engaging in discussion and continuing her engagement with WFMC by sitting on the branch executive and convening the MBD Issues Action Group. Fergus Watt noted in the letter of congratulation that he sent her, “ideas don’t work unless we do”—and Carol continues to do her part. We have been privileged to have the opportunity to express our thanks and appreciation to Carol for many years of contribution to our movement, especially at the local level. She has been a beacon to all of us in her quiet yet engaging way. The recognition is so well deserved.

Other Montreal branch activities
During the pandemic, Montreal Branch has been hosting frequent Zoom-based events with guest speakers. In February, Alyn Ware, 2014 recipient of WFMC’s World Peace Award, spoke on “Security without nuclear weapons: how international law and global governance can help abolish nuclear weapons.” The Branch’s annual general meeting was held via Zoom in October, followed by a presentation on Universal Basic Income by François Labonté and Myron Frankman. And in September, the Branch hosted Ntebo Ebenezer Awungafac, speaking about “Access to Justice in the Rural Southern Cameroons.”

Getting from Here to There

by Mike Nickerson

Since 2006 The World Federalist Foundation has been a supporting partner of “The Sustainability Project,” led by Mike Nickerson. His book, “Life, Money and Illusion; living on Earth as if we want to stay,” provided the backdrop for over 600 lectures, workshops, meetings and other public speaking engagements across Canada.

On a good day one can sense, through the fog of our world’s problems, a faint light, a glimmer of a place where humans live in balance with the Earth and with each other. Viewed from the challenges of today, that place seems to be a long way off. And it is. The values by which people manage themselves must change. Sometimes it helps to state things in simple terms. Basically we need to pursue “More Fun, Less Stuff.” Renewable energy and electric equipment will be needed, but they are not enough. A positive future requires a shift in social values.

No longer can growth be our goal. No more producing and consuming, earning and spending ever more! We need to maximize fulfilment from living, with the least possible material entanglement. Let’s see who can get the most satisfaction from living with the least material throughput.

Almost every dollar we spend represents extracted resources and pollution. The benefits go to enrich the top 1% and leave the bottom part of the population to deal with the waste. If your purchase won’t cause waste or inequity, go for it! Learning, love and laughter, sport, music, dance, creativity, appreciation and helping others offer unlimited opportunities for satisfaction, with minimum material requirements. And they’re fun.

Material necessities of food and shelter can be sustained by integrating sustainably with the natural world. Humans can eat well forever if we use our intelligence to avoid overshooting local capacity. Air, water and a handful of soil elements are the building blocks for all living things. These elements can cycle indefinitely through soil life, plants, animals, ourselves and back to the soil. By caring for soil, communities can have everlasting life.

For shelter, buildings can be assembled that require almost no outside energy. Comfort is maintained by facing the sun to capture its warmth when needed, and
for cooling, we can engage shade trees, hold onto the cool of the nights and tap the chill of underground. Health care at the preventative level, and education, rely mostly on the unlimited resources of knowledge, and our willingness to help each other. If secure, healthy life is what we want, we can quickly shift our over-productive economy to systems that fulfill our basic needs. The energy from wind and sun can keep these systems going, with the surplus used to make other useful items designed for durability. The problems and waste of today will become a chapter in history books.

More Fun, Less Stuff. Can such a meme nudge its way past the well-funded directives to earn and spend, earn and spend, grow, grow, grow? These four syllables can lead us out of our overgrown self-destructive place toward a place that can assure the grandchildren a world in which to raise children of their own. Not that hard to imagine, is it?

## Next Steps for Canada’s Feminist Foreign Policy

by Monique Cuillerier

In the fall of 2020, Global Affairs Canada began a process to consolidate and build on the Government of Canada’s Feminist Foreign Policy, which included soliciting submissions from interested parties. The government suggested areas for discussion, including lessons that can be learned from the experience of other countries, the effectiveness of Gender-Based Analysis Plus (GBA+) tools, methods for building multilateral alliances for gender equality and inclusion, feminist approaches to evaluation, and relevant emerging policy areas.

Since the 2015 federal election, a range of policies and program initiatives have been introduced by the federal government to apply a feminist approach across international policy areas, including Canada’s Feminist International Assistance Policy, the Trade Diversification Strategy, the “Strong, Secure, Engaged” Defence Policy, the second National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security, the Elsie Initiative for Women in Peace Operations, and the appointment of a Women Peace and Security Ambassador.

As described in the scene-setter released by the government for this review, feminist foreign policy “aims to be the international expression of these ongoing, coordinated, and whole-of-government efforts.”

In the mandate letter given to newly appointed Foreign Affairs Minister Marc Garneau in January 2021, he is tasked with “building on ongoing consultations, continue to develop and implement Canada’s feminist foreign policy with the support of colleagues and partner organizations.” Feminist foreign policy was not mentioned in previous mandate letters.

The federal government’s outreach for input on feminist foreign policy was accompanied by a series of civil society consultations in November, conducted by the Feminist Foreign Policy Working Group, an informal group of civil society organizations. A summary of the inputs received during these consultations, along with resulting recommendations, are available at amnesty.ca/ffp

As well, the Women, Peace and Security Network - Canada launched a blog series in December that is continuing, with contributions from members on different aspects of Canada’s feminist foreign policy as an additional contribution to the current discussion.

Global Affairs have indicated they will produce a report when their process is complete.

WFMC provided the following submission to Global Affairs Canada:

The World Federalist Movement - Canada is a not-for-profit research, education and advocacy organization that supports the application of the principles of federalism to world affairs, in order that global governance becomes more equitable, just and democratically accountable.

This challenge of finding the means, the legal and political structures, to adequately and democratically address global problems is in line with the development of a feminist foreign policy and we are grateful for the opportunity to contribute to this consultation.

We recognize the efforts that have been made by the federal government to incorporate elements of a feminist foreign policy, as demonstrated through the second National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security and the Elsie Initiative for Women in Peace Operations, which were both launched in 2017, along with the appointment of Canada’s first Ambassador for women, peace and security in 2019.

Furthermore, the development of Canada’s feminist international assistance policy and the current defence policy are clear steps towards a broad-based integration of a feminist foreign policy.

We also acknowledge, though it is outside of our
In December 2020, WFMC President Walter Dorn appeared before the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade to offer his insights on Bill S-2, Act to amend the Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act. This amendment to the original legislation removes material that has been superseded and refers to the updated schedules that are held by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, which is the implementing body for the Chemical Weapons Convention.

The following excerpts are from Dr Dorn’s testimony. [...] The mechanisms to control weapons of mass destruction concern us all. And we in Canada have a history of both governmental and non-governmental contributions to those mechanisms of control.

The Chemical Weapons Convention is the most progressive implementation treaty of any arms control regime. It has very strong implementation machinery. The Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention needs strengthening, including some of the same mechanisms. It needs a verification protocol, at least as a confidence-building measure.

Furthermore, Canada should support the prohibition of all classes of weapons of mass destruction under strict and effective international control. Canada is party to treaties that ban two of the three classes of WMD: chemical and biological weapons. It should sign up to the treaty that bans the third class, nuclear weapons. The treaty will enter into force next month, unfortunately without Canadian support.

Finally, there are lessons to offer our COVID-affected world. We should consider giving the World Health Organization the powers that the OPCW has in the CWC. These are anywhere, any-time inspections without right of refusal, to using a process of managed access. It’s so important that we create international mechanisms
to enforce international law. It's sadly lacking in the world today. Enforcing the rule of law is stronger than it ever was in history, thanks to treaties like the Chemical Weapons Convention, but we have to explore more.

One of the ways is by putting pressure on countries like Syria. You already heard that Syria could lose its vote in the Conference of States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention. There should be other mechanisms, automatic responses to violations that have been confirmed. There should eventually be an international court that could hear such cases. If the International Criminal Court in The Hague could hear cases of chemical weapons use dealing with the four categories of genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, then we should explore international accountability and individuals brought before that court. I think we have to strengthen that mechanism. Canada does wonderful work to support the ICC, including chairing the committee that’s choosing the next Chief Prosecutor. We can do more to support the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. We could provide a designated lab, which we have not yet done, that the OPCW can send samples to.

In international law more generally, the final enforcement provision in the CWC and in most treaties goes to the UN Security Council, where there is a veto by the five permanent members. Finding ways to get around the misuse of the veto is one of the key issues in all of international law.

On the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, the main reason, in my mind, that Canada did not sign on and actually opposed the treaty is that, as a member of NATO, it supports the same line as the other NATO members, i.e. that nuclear weapons are the “supreme guarantee” of peace. I find that nuclear weapons are actually the ultimate weapon for the destruction of humanity. The only way to secure them is for their total elimination, just like in the Chemical Weapons Convention. I hope we eventually can have a nuclear weapons convention. In the meantime, we just have a prohibition treaty, which will be entering into force in January as it gains the necessary number of adherents. Hopefully Canada can find wiggle room in order to allow NATO countries to be more positive towards the TPNW and we can find ways where eventually we could sign on to that treaty.

Better Climate Governance Matters!

by Christine Peringer

As countries begin to recover from the Covid-19 pandemic, the upcoming COP26 (Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change) taking place this November in Glasgow Scotland provides an occasion for the international community to make up for lost time in the global effort to keep climate-altering emissions of greenhouse gases within the limits agreed at the 2015 Paris Agreement.

Recall that the Paris Agreement established a goal to limit global warming to well below 2, preferably 1.5 degrees Celsius, compared to pre-industrial levels. Often world federalists are critical of a treaty structure that sets a global goal but then leaves it to national governments to individually determine what their contribution will be toward achieving that goal – as the Paris Agreement does through what are known as nationally determined contributions (NDCs).

It’s a fair criticism. But we should also remember that the Paris Agreement negotiated in 2015 was probably the best that could be achieved at the time. An earlier treaty attempt, in Copenhagen in 2009, failed to achieve consensus.

One thing that can be said in favour of the Paris Agreement is that it provides an obligation on participating states to do better, year after year. The treaty works on a 5-year cycle of increasingly ambitious climate action carried out by countries. The intention was that the 5-year conference, initially scheduled for 2020, would be an occasion for governments to submit more ambitious plans for reducing emissions. Since the pandemic forced the cancellation of last year’s conference, this year’s COP26 takes on added significance.

On behalf of World Federalist Movement – Canada and Mediators Beyond Borders International, I have joined with colleagues in the UK (Newcastle University) to explore ways that the governance arrangements for these meetings could be better managed, and potentially yield better outcomes. Our findings point to the utility of mediation and facilitation approaches as a means to overcome disagreements.

This work has led to examination of other ways that international climate negotiations could be improved. At a conference taking place (online) this April 19, we will explore:

1) How can UNFCCC decision-making and knowledge-sharing be improved, e.g., which formats support a culture of communication that is more conducive for effective negotiation and climate action?

2) How can countries best leverage the learning of others, e.g., through knowledge transfer and capacity building?

3) How would formats need to change to make better use of non-state actors?

The conference will share the Better Climate Negotiations Toolkit. It will also launch a “Better Climate Governance Network” of leading actors interested in improving the effectiveness of climate governance within and beyond the UNFCCC.
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