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New and potential applications of artificial intelligence are often discussed in the media, sometimes as dystopian warnings and other times as indications of a hopeful, exciting future. And the uses of artificial intelligence have the potential to be either. Before we begin to discuss the global governance implications of artificial intelligence, it would be best to define what we are talking about when we use the term “artificial intelligence.”

Artificial intelligence, or AI, is often discussed, particularly in the mainstream media in a way that does not fully explain its meaning. At its most basic level, AI refers to intelligence demonstrated by machines (as opposed to the ‘natural’ intelligence of humans). AI is generally used to describe machines or computers that engage in learning or problem solving (although technically it encompasses a broader understanding of intelligence).

Common examples of AI already in widespread use are voice-activated assistants like Siri (from Apple) and Alexa (from Amazon) and so-called ‘smart home’ devices that include doorbells, cameras, thermostats and appliances (such as the Google Nest brand), but it also includes machine learning algorithms, like Gmail’s spam filter and smart email categorization or Netflix’s algorithm that determines ‘what else you might like.’

The UN Secretary-General’s Strategy on New Technologies, which has a broader reach than merely AI, is based on five principles: protecting and promoting global values, fostering inclusion and transparency, working in partnership, building on existing capabilities and mandates, and being humble and continuing to learn.

The strategy also includes four commitments: deepening the UN’s internal capacities and exposure to new technologies; increasing understanding, advocacy, and dialogue; supporting dialogue on normative and cooperation frameworks; and enhancing UN system support to government capacity development. These commitments are intended to direct technological advances at the common good, include those who are affected by them, and strengthen the capacity of Member States to engage in necessary policy decisions.

This broader discussion of AI has two elements. There is the oversight and management of AI and big data (extremely large data sets) from within the multilateral system. This speaks to who will control these new technological advances and the ethical implications that stem from them. In the article, “Artificial Intelligence and Global Governance: A Thought Leadership and Engagement Platform,” Eleonore Pauwels and James Cockayne write that “We are in the middle of a technological upheaval that will transform the way our multilateral system operates and exerts influence. AI may concentrate power over information in the hands of a few, or it may empower the many. Either way, the resulting power distribution will affect trust — trust in national institutions, trust among states, trust in the rules-based global order.”

This moment of change requires a broad discussion of how these changes will manifest. The Artificial Intelligence and Global Governance platform, a project of the United Nations University’s Centre for Policy Research, provides space in which the various interested parties can engage in this discussion. Amongst the areas that the platform looks to illuminate are considerations of this intersection of AI and the geopolitical order.
and “the governance of AI, considering how AI’s risks and unintended consequences are minimized and its social benefits are maximized through governance frameworks.” But additionally, there is also the question of how AI might be used to improve the multilateral structure in general and, more specifically, particular agencies and programs and how the ethical and other implications of AI will manifest in predictable and unpredictable ways.

An article from September 2019, "How Should UN Agencies Respond to AI and Big Data?" describes the three forces shaping the UN’s approach to AI and big data: “the broad mission of the UN and the specific mission of each UN agency; the rapid emergence of new technologies; and the political narratives that frame AI and big data.” The article briefly looks at how these forces interact and how UN agencies can use this understanding, using UNAIDS as a specific example.

For example, a testing device that connects to a smartphone could be a useful tool in UNAIDS’ goal of responding effectively to HIV, but it also raises issues around informed consent, privacy, and data storage.

Now is the time to have the inevitably challenging but necessary discussions on how the various forms of AI will be allowed to develop and influence our shared global space, physical and virtual.

Since 2017 the UN2020 Campaign has provided a platform for a diverse constellation of civil society organizations (CSOs) calling for the UN’s 75th anniversary to provide not only an occasion for celebrating past achievements, but also an opportunity to take stock of the challenges facing the multilateral system and advance a dedicated process for strengthening the UN system.

UN2020 campaigners were pleased last June when the General Assembly adopted a comprehensive resolution on the

“Commemoration of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations.”

The resolution identified an ambitious, forward-looking theme for the 75th anniversary: “The future we want, the United Nations we need: reaffirming our collective commitment to multilateralism.” This theme was meant to guide all activities, meetings and conferences organized by the United Nations in 2020.

It also mandated a High-level meeting for 21 September 2020, as well as additional commemorations on June 26 (Charter Day) and October 24 (UN Day). All member states were invited to contribute. There was a strong emphasis on youth involvement.

UN Secretary-General António Guterres launched an even more ambitious UN75 program of “global dialogues” on “The future we want, the United Nations we need.” From “classrooms to board rooms, village houses to houses of parliament,” the intention was to engage “We the Peoples” on the role of the UN system in addressing global challenges.

The UN at 75: The world planned a party. . . . Then the coronavirus showed up.
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But then, like the proverbial foreign object in the punch bowl, along came the COVID-19 pandemic.

Much of what was planned for this year’s UN75 commemoration had to adapt to the locked-down, socially-distanced realities affecting public life everywhere. The party moved online. Strangely, however the curtailment of so much of what had been planned for UN75 has not diminished political support for the core idea being advanced by the UN2020 campaign – that a dedicated process to renew and strengthen the capacities of the UN is long overdue.

On May 14-15 the UN75 People’s Forum for the UN We Need brought together over 600 civil society participants from 75 countries around the world. A UN75 People’s Declaration and Plan for Global Action, “Humanity at a Crossroads: Global Solutions for Global Challenges” was presented virtually in a formal handover ceremony to the 74th President of the United Nations General Assembly, H.E. Mr. Tijjani Muhammad-Bande, who later had the document circulated to all UN missions.

Meanwhile governments at the UN have negotiated a UN 75 Declaration for adoption this September that sets out a dozen commitments to action in important areas of UN activity. Significantly, this draft UN75 Declaration calls for the Secretary-General to report back before September 2021 “with recommendations to advance our common agenda and to respond to current and future failures.”

If the Secretary-General’s follow up process is to become a catalyst for the transformative changes urgently needed to address 21st century global challenges, he will need support – from small and medium sized governments as well as from civil society.

But change may yet be possible. The coronavirus pandemic has aroused a “we’re all in this together” political moment that, despite the widespread suffering, is also generating promises to “build back better” our national and international governance institutions.

At the opening of this year’s High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development, Secretary-General Guterres told governments, not unexpectedly, that the pandemic is causing additional setbacks for the global 2030 Agenda for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. 265 million people could face acute food insecurity by year’s end – double the number at risk before the crisis.

But he also suggested that “We can turn this around. . . . From the awakening that this crisis is providing, we have a chance to create a more inclusive, networked and effective multilateralism.”

Let’s hope he’s right.

To learn more about the UN2020 Campaign, visit un2020.org.
The International Criminal Court is currently engaged in ten preliminary examinations, and has eleven situations under investigation. Preliminary examinations are currently being conducted in Afghanistan, Colombia, Guinea, Iraq/UK, Nigeria, Palestine, the Philippines, Ukraine, and Venezuela.

Following the preliminary examination, the request to open an investigation into the situation in Afghanistan was rejected by the Pre-Trial Chamber in April 2019. Upon appeal by the Office of the Prosecutor, the Afghanistan investigation is now proceeding, amid much controversy and opposition by the United States.

**Bangladesh/Myanmar**

In November 2019, following a request from the Prosecutor, an investigation into alleged crimes of deportation, persecution, and any other crimes relevant to the Court against the Rohingya people. At question was whether the Court had jurisdiction over crimes that took place only in part in the territory of a State Party. Myanmar is not a State Party, but Bangladesh is.

**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 sentencng took place in September 2018. Later in 2018, Bemba filed an appeal, which was heard in September 2019. The November 2019 judgment on the appeal led to Mr. Bemba's acquittal.

**Central African Republic (II)**

The Government of CAR referred this situation 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 on November 17. A further arrest warrant, for Patrice-Edouard Ngaissona, was issued on 7 December 2018 and he was arrested five days later. The two cases were joined by the Pre-Trial Chamber in February and the confirmation of charges hearing took place in September and October 2019. The judges will now assess whether there is sufficient evidence to continue with the case.

**Côte d'Ivoire**

The cases of Laurent Gbagbo and Charles Blé Goudé, 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. In July 2019, the Trial Chamber filed reasons for the acquittal and the Prosecutor will, in response, file a notice of appeal.

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 current 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.

Following the recent political changes in Darfur, the situation regarding Al Bashir in particular may change, as there have been calls from within Sudan to have him turned over to the Court. To date, however, the situation remains unchanged.

Ali Muhammad Ali Abd–Al-Rahman (aka Ali Kushayb) is now in the Court's custody and has had his identity verified and been informed of the crimes he is alleged to have committed. The confirmation of charges hearing is scheduled for December 2020.

In June 2020, Ali Muhammad Ali Abd–Al-Rahman's case was severed from that of Ahmad Harun since Harun in not in the Court's custody.

**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. An appeal is possible. As well, 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 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 are all still at large, and, as a result, their cases remain pending.

**Kenya**

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

**Mali**

Al Hassan Ag Abdoul Aziz Ag Mohamed Ag Mahmoud was surrendered to Court's custody at the end of March 2018. The Pre-Trial Chamber confirmed charges of war crimes and crimes against humanity in a confidential decision at the end of September 2019. A redacted version of this decision will be made available at a later date.

**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. The closing briefs were filed on 24 February 2020. The closing statements took place from 10 to 12 March 2020. A decision will be pronounced in due time.

**Other**

123 countries had 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.
Existing Legal Limits to Security Council Veto Power in the Face of Atrocity Crimes

By Jennifer Trahan, Clinical Professor of Law, New York University
Cambridge University Press, August 2020

Review by Fergus Watt

It is often assumed by casual observers of the United Nations that the power to veto resolutions on the maintenance of international peace and security wielded by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (China, France, Russia, United Kingdom and the United States – the “P5) is untrammeled and simply a matter of their own discretion.

Not so. Jennifer Trahan’s latest book powerfully explains that when permanent members of the UN Security Council threaten or use their veto power to block measures aimed at preventing or punishing genocide, war crimes or crimes against humanity, they may be acting contrary to international law.

Whereas the veto may appear to be treated as a carte blanche (a permanent member may exercise the veto for whatever reason), the veto, created in the UN Charter, actually sits within a system of international law.

As Trahan illustrates, three distinct legal arguments, based on existing international law, demonstrate that there are in fact legal limits that constrain the use of the veto in the face of genocide, crimes against humanity, and/or war crimes.

(1) Jus cogens

Under international law jus cogens norms are, hierarchically, the highest level of law, from which no derogations are permitted and which must be respected in all circumstances. Because the veto is conferred upon the P5 by the UN Charter, it is subordinate to jus cogens in terms of the hierarchy of legal norms.

Legal prohibitions of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes are widely acknowledged as universal, jus cogens law. Consequently, use of the veto to prevent action by the Security Council in the face of these atrocity crimes is contrary to international law. Trahan’s book cites numerous examples of unacceptable use of the veto, particularly in Syria and Darfur. The book also delves into the considerable power that accrues to the P5 in Council deliberations on account of their ability not only to wield, but also to threaten to use the veto.

(2) The Veto and the UN Charter

The veto is created by the UN Charter. But the Charter also provides limitations on the Security Council’s power. Under Article 24(2) the Council must act “in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.” The purposes and principles of the UN, as outlined in articles 1 and 2 of the Charter, are quite broad. They include respecting “principles of justice and international law,” “promoting and encouraging respect for human rights,” and “good faith.” Trahan points out that this argument as to limitations to veto use provided by the Charter has been reflected by a number of states in formal statements at the UN. This demonstrates that states have not acquiesced to a practice of unlimited veto use in the face of atrocity crimes; rather, states are persistently lodging objections to such veto use.

(3) The Veto and Foundational Treaties

Finally, Trahan reminds us that the treaty obligations of individual permanent member states - - for instance under the Genocide Convention -- include an obligation to “prevent” genocide. Security Council members must respect these treaties. The permanent members are not free to act in complete disregard of these foundational treaty obligations.
Trahan's work has been endorsed by a number of important legal scholars, including Hans Corell, the long-time UN Under Secretary-General for Legal Affairs. Although she is not the first person to make these arguments, her book provides a compelling case for a fresh look at these existing legal limits to the use of the veto by the P5.

Of course, those inclined toward a more realpolitik view of world affairs might argue that the actual exercise of the veto by the permanent members constitutes important precedent which should equally condition any understanding of when and under what circumstances the veto power may legitimately be used. Well, sure. Power politics co-exists uneasily alongside actual international legal obligations. The existence of legal obligations is no guarantee that they will be observed in practice.

This points to some of the important take-aways from a consideration of Trahan's arguments. Governments and civil society organizations committed to strengthening the rule of law can take steps to strengthen observance of these "existing legal limits." Trahan, to her credit, discusses many of the actions that can be considered. These include:

- Seeking a ruling at the International Court of Justice clarifying legal issues surrounding use of the veto;
- Empowering the Security Council's non-permanent members, for example to strengthen their advocacy of Security Council "Codes of Conduct" and calls for veto restraint particularly in the face of atrocity crimes;
- Strengthening the options for action through the General Assembly when the Security Council fails in its responsibilities to maintain international peace and security.

In a time of turmoil and change at the UN, Jennifer Trahan's scholarly work provides much-needed clarity on some essential old truths, and points to measures that can strengthen a system better grounded in the rule of law.

Albert Einstein from Pacifism to the Idea of World Government
Lucio Levi, editor (Federalism Volume 12; Centro Studi sul Federalismo)
Peter Lang, Brussels, 2020

“Albert Einstein from Pacifism to the Idea of World Government” is a collection of articles that explores the development of Albert Einstein's thoughts on such overlapping topics as the causes of war and how to prevent it and the differences between antimilitarism and pacifism as well as internationalism and federalism.

As Giampiero Bordino writes in the forward, “In a world increasingly characterized by opportunistic, culturally and humanly inadequate political leaderships, Einstein's reflection on peace and war, and in particular on nuclear war, should be re-proposed and spread out, not only among intellectuals, but among the political classes and leaders, and among all the citizens of Europe and the world.”

Specific topics included in the collection cover Einstein as a global intellectual, the letters on the abolition of war exchanged between Einstein and Freud, different perspectives on Einstein's thoughts on pacifism, an overview of Einstein's evolving thoughts on federalism, and personal recollections of Einstein's time at Princeton.

In addition to the articles, a series of annexes include excerpts from relevant articles and letters written by Einstein including open letters to the UN General Assembly and a letter to Franklin Roosevelt.
Update on Canada’s National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security

by Monique Cuillerier

2020 is the twentieth anniversary of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325, the first Security Council resolution to specifically address women, peace and security. It is also the 25th anniversary of the Beijing Declaration and Platform of Action (on women’s rights and gender equality).

However, challenges in the implementation of the women, peace and security agenda remain, despite the development of national action plans by 83 countries to date. Fragile and politically unstable contexts result in a variety of barriers to the implementation of the agenda, as well as the ongoing challenges against women’s and LGBTQ2I+ rights found in multilateral forums.

Canada’s current National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security, which covers the period 2017 to 2022, has a fiscal year that covers April 1st to March 31st.

Overseen by Global Affairs Canada, the other government partners to the Action Plan are the Department of National Defence, the Canadian Armed Forces, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Public Safety, Women and Gender Equality, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, the Department of Justice, Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs, and Indigenous Services.

Each of the partners produces a departmental implementation plan, which are considered for revision each year in response to the annual progress report.

The government considers the Action Plan to be central to Canada’s Feminist Foreign Policy, which also includes the Feminist International Assistance and Canadian defence policies.

The Action Plan’s objectives include increasing the meaningful participation of women in conflict prevention and post-conflict situations; addressing sexual and gender-based violence in conflict, as well as sexual exploitation and abuse by peacekeepers and other international personnel; promoting gender equality and the rights of women and girls in conflict and post-conflict settings; meeting the needs of women and girls in humanitarian settings; and improving the capacity of peace operations to advance the WPS agenda.
The current Action Plan states that progress reports are to be tabled in Parliament by the end of September each year. This year, as a result of the federal election, this was not possible. (Fixed federal election dates ensure this issue will arise regularly.)

The subsequent disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in the progress report finally being tabled in early June and the advisory group, composed of government representatives, Indigenous partners, and civil society, met in late June.

The progress report provides examples of the steps being taken by the federal government to meet the Action Plan’s objectives.

Examples of successful contributions in global leadership include the Elsie Initiative for Women in Peace Operations and Canada’s turn at the leadership of the WPS Chief of Defence Staff Network. There are also examples of partnerships for change that include the June 2019 Women Deliver Conference in Vancouver and Canada’s contributions to the Women’s Peace and Humanitarian Fund (WPHF).

Regarding the domestic implementation of the Action Plan, the progress report notes the appointment of Canada’s first Ambassador for Women, Peace and Security, Jacqueline O’Neill in the summer of 2019. As well, the Action Plan has been expanded to address the experiences of Indigenous women and girls through the inclusion of Indigenous organizations and experts, as well as the departments of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs and Indigenous Services.

Difficulties continue to be posed in how best to accurately measure results and how to address the length of time necessary for some targets to demonstrate tangible results. Many of the issues being addressed are complex and, as a result, it is difficult to determine the impact of specific efforts.

Attempts have been made to provide ratings on how successful the federal government’s work on the Action Plan’s objectives and targets have been. The ratings are on a scale of too early to report, attention required, mostly on track, on track, and target achieved or surpassed. This effort, while appreciated, remains vague.

The next progress report, covering the period between April 1 2019 to March 31 2020, is due to be tabled in the House of Commons before the end of September of this year. As the current Action Plan covers 2017 - 2022, planning for a mid-term review has begun, although it remains in the very early stages.
Peacekeeping Update:
Canada’s support for UN peace operations falls far short of government commitments

The Canada and UN Peacekeeping 2020 update, released each year on August 9 by WFMC, demonstrates that the number of Canadian peacekeepers has reached historically low levels.

Canadian contributions of military and police personnel now number only 34 individuals (24 military and 10 police) deployed to UN operations as of June 30, 2020.

According to WFMC President, Dr Walter Dorn, “This year’s numbers are particularly disappointing. Canadians were told that this country would do more, not less to support UN peace operations. When it comes to deploying boots on the ground, we’re just not seeing promises being kept.”

Contributions from countries like Canada with advanced military and logistics capabilities are much needed to increase the UN’s operational effectiveness. However, in recent years Canada has provided only a small and diminishing presence in UN missions. Aside from the departing air force contribution to Mali, the Canadian military contributes a total of only 23 personnel (7 to D.R. Congo, 1 to Cyprus, 11 to South Sudan and 4 to the Middle East).

Canada has fallen from being the single largest contributor of UN peacekeepers, a position it held until 1992, to 80th position today with 34 total personnel currently deployed.

There are 8 Canadian women deployed as peacekeepers. While small in number, this does set an example in the percentage of women deployed (23%). Noteworthy also are some programs to support other nations’ women in peacekeeping that are finally being implemented, especially the much touted Elsie Initiative.

One bright spot is the renewal of Canada’s provision of a C-130 military transport aircraft to the UN for a second year, from August 1, 2020 to July 31, 2021. Canada’s C-130 will be based at Entebbe, Uganda and will service multiple UN peace operations.

“This is a positive development,” says Dorn. “However, Canada can and should do more. Ideally, Canada would make a renewed commitment of military and police personnel in Mali. We left after only a year, while three-year rotations are more common practice for UN troop contributors.”
In recent years Canada has made political commitments that have been only partly fulfilled.

For the record:

- Upon election in 2015 Justin Trudeau promised that Canada would re-engage in UN peacekeeping. The Prime Minister gave explicit instructions to this effect in Defence Minister Harjit Sajjan's Mandate Letter.
- At the September 2016 Peacekeeping Ministerial Meeting in London, Canada announced new personnel pledges (“up to” 600 military and 150 police).
- At the November 2017 Ministerial Meeting held in Vancouver the Prime Minister specified the nature of the previous pledges. The 2017 commitments included training and a new project dedicated to increasing women’s participation in peace operations.
- The December 2019 Mandate Letter from Prime Minister Trudeau to Harjit Sajjan tasked the Defence Minister to “Work with the Minister of Foreign Affairs to expand Canada’s support for United Nations peace operations, including with respect to new investments in the women, peace and security agenda, conflict prevention and peacebuilding.”

The Trudeau government has sought to be a leader in the deployment, training and support of UN peacekeepers. But this has not been achieved. Much needs to be done for Canada to become once again a leader and a prolific peacekeeper.

Surviving Dystopia: World Federalism Eclipsed

by Myron J. Frankman

...what lies between us and extinction is horrifying enough, and we have not yet begun to contemplate what it means to live under those conditions...  

David Wallace-Wells, The Uninhabitable Earth: Life After Warming (2019), p 34

A characteristic of the advancing Anthropocene is that we have entered an unpredictable and unstable phase in the Earth’s history. Institutional arrangements and norms shaped over millennia to assure a degree of stability, predictability and governability are crumbling even as efforts are made to sustain them. Our accustomed sedentary lifestyles may prove a fatal obstinacy in the face of extreme heat and cold, uncontrollable forest fires, rising tides, extreme rainfall and drought, pandemics and other catastrophes. Similarly, obstacles to crossing national boundaries, whether procedural or physical, may become even more deadly. Yesterday’s dream of a peaceful realm, with or without world democratic federalism, already seems unattainable.

In addition to these challenges, independent of climate change, many types of employment are disappearing and societal breakdown is advancing. Individual well-being declines when jobs vanish as a result of offshore and automated production. Proposals for a basic income, present for more than a half-century, are now being extensively discussed, albeit at the level of sub-national units and with, at best, pilot projects replete with conditionalities and exceptions. These rarely lead to full-blown commitments and, to date, basic income is not
considered a right of residents or citizens of local, sub-national or national political units. A planet-wide unconditional citizen’s income, along with the abolition of borders, should be seen as critical conditions for human survival in a world where we are connected electronically, but still physically separated by a multitude of border walls and increasingly subjected to unpredictably destructive natural forces which humanity has unleashed through our flagrant disregard of the environmental impact of our undertakings. The “good news” is that many of those walls may well be either swept away by floods or crumble owing to extreme weather events.

In my 2004 book, World Democratic Federalism: Peace and Justice Indivisible, I wrote “When the dust finally settles, we may realize that the attainment of substantive global democracy, peace, and justice was the cultural impact of the electronic process.” Basic income, open borders and behaviour guided by planetary consciousness, both local and global facilitated by the “electronic process” may well be the only options open to humanity to weather the unpredictable disruptions that lie ahead. The electronic process may provide the warnings necessary to escape from major cataclysms and to locate safe havens. It is a process that could potentially unite us across skin colour, nationalities, language, and distance. If, however, we hunker down behind what were once envisioned as impenetrably sealed national boundaries, it may merely result in our own demise.

Yikes! - Trump’s Middle-East “Peace Plan”

On 28 January, US President Trump held a press conference at the White House to announce his plan to end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The plan, officially titled “Peace to Prosperity: A Vision to Improve the Lives of the Palestinian and Israeli People,” calls for the incorporation of existing Israeli settlements in the West Bank, including the Jordan Valley, and East Jerusalem into the state of Israel, and for Jerusalem to become the undivided capital of Israel.

Soon after, the agreement between Benjamin Netanyahu and Benny Gantz to form a coalition government in Israel included possible provision for a bill to come before the Knesset allowing the permanent annexation of Palestinian lands, along the lines that had been given the green light by the US Peace Plan.

This lopsided plan has quite understandably been rejected by the Palestinian Authority, as it does not begin to match their aspirations to turn most of the occupied territory into the new state of Palestine. It has also been condemned by many governments around the world, including most European governments, the EU and numerous UN officials.

According to the NGO Canadians for Justice and Peace in the Middle East (CJPME), Canada’s response has, comparatively, been timid. However that changed following an open letter to the Prime Minister from over 50 former diplomats, ambassadors and Cabinet Ministers. Their letter pointed out that, “The unilateral annexation of territory is strictly prohibited under international law. This is a centerpiece of the Charter of the United Nations, San Francisco, 26 June 1945, and has been consolidated by treaties and resolutions, judicial rulings and scholarly writings ever since.”

On 30 June 2020 a letter sent on behalf of the World Federalist Movement – Canada also called on Prime Minister Trudeau to strengthen Canada’s opposition to possible Israeli annexation of significant parts of the Palestinian West Bank.
According to Bill Pearce, President of the WFMC Victoria Chapter, “If the annexation proposal is passed it will without doubt be the final nail in the coffin of the long sought two state solution peace plan. This will change the conversation to a question of what kind of single state will emerge, a state which cements de facto apartheid in which Palestinians are denied basic rights, or a state where Palestinians and Jewish Israelis are treated as equals under the law.”

The prospect of a new form of apartheid in Palestine – strong language for some - was underscored in a letter signed by 47 UN international law experts – all holders of Special Procedures mandates from the Human Rights Council: “What would be left of the West Bank after the annexation would be islands of disconnected land completely surrounded by Israel and with no territorial connection to the outside world. Israel has recently promised that it will maintain permanent security control between the Mediterranean and the Jordan River. Thus, the morning after annexation would be the crystallization of an already unjust reality: two peoples living in the same space, ruled by the same state, but with profoundly unequal rights. This is a vision of a 21st century apartheid.”

The WFM – Canada letter to the government also suggested that Canadian officials give consideration to adopting a position in favour of recognizing Jerusalem as a “corpus separatum,” a jurisdiction that would be administered by the United Nations. According to WFMC’s Pearce, who has written a legal history of the idea, “The Corpus Separatum was the basis for UN resolutions on the new state of Israel after it was created in 1948. The concept has never been abandoned by the UN, but was also never implemented. At the time, in the early 1950s, Israel didn’t go along due to security concerns.”

“If adopted, a corpus separatum would not settle the Palestinian – Israeli issues entirely. But it would help bring peace to Jerusalem and may well serve as a stepping-stone to a wider comprehensive agreement between the parties. It is difficult to imagine Israel agreeing to this without a lot of diplomatic pressure. But then again prospects for a two-state solution, which is the default position of Canada, most of Europe and many Arab governments, are also looking pretty dim these days. At least talk of a corpus separatum raises the possibility of a greater role for the UN – not a bad idea when the US government is looking less and less like an “honest brokers” of a credible Middle East Peace Plan.”

Ed. Note: As Mondial went to production, an August 2020 agreement to normalize relations between Israel and the United Arab Emirates included provision for suspending temporarily Israel’s plans to annex parts of Palestinian territory on the West Bank.

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 ICtoP also have thousands of members around the world. For more information on their members, please visit www.coalitionfortheicc.org and 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.
Only time will tell what will come of the recent escalation of hostilities between the U.S. government and the International Criminal Court (ICC).

A June 11 Executive Order authorized by President Trump enables U.S. officials to take action against individuals (and their property in the U.S.) who carry out work on behalf of or cooperate with the ICC, when their work includes investigations of U.S. nationals or those of U.S. allies.

This could mark another instance of the current U.S. administration’s many well-documented attacks on multilateralism and the rule of law. Or, the Executive Order could amount to a lot of smoke but no fire – just so much bluster aimed at potential Trump supporters in an election year.

Court officials have taken the threat seriously. Days after the U.S. Executive Order O-Gon Kwon, President of the ICC Assembly of States Parties, called an extraordinary meeting of the Bureau of the Assembly. And a statement on the Court’s website in response to the Executive Order declared that “The Court stands firmly by all its officials and staff, who perform, with integrity and dedication, essential duties for the ICC’s mandate on behalf of its 123 States Parties. . . . . As an independent and impartial judicial institution, the ICC and its organs act strictly within the mandate bestowed upon them by the Rome Statute, the ICC’s founding treaty.”

On March 5 this year, the Appeals Chamber of the ICC authorized the Prosecutor to open an investigation into alleged war crimes and crimes against humanity in Afghanistan. The investigation is expected to cover not only accusations of torture of detainees by U.S. forces, but also alleged crimes by the Afghan government and the Taliban.

While American officials claim that any actions taken against their service personnel constitute a violation of U.S. sovereignty, the Rome Statute is clear: the ICC may exercise its jurisdiction over crimes committed on the territory of states parties (or by nationals of states parties). Afghanistan became a state party to the Rome Statute in 2003.

Court supporters also point out that the ICC is “a Court of last resort.” It can only exercise jurisdiction when national judicial systems prove unable or unwilling to address atrocity crimes. Therefore U.S. personnel would not be at risk now if the U.S. civilian and military justice systems had undertaken proper investigations when allegations of torture and mistreatment of detainees first came to light.

Of course, such arguments fall on deaf ears in today’s Washington.

The fact that current U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo was CIA Director at the time when many of the “black site” detainee torture centers are alleged to have operated may also fuel the anti-ICC rancor and
rhetoric that pervades the current American government.

It is the responsibility of ICC States Parties to demonstrate to the U.S. government the diplomatic costs of these unwarranted attacks on the Court and the international justice system embedded in the Rome Statute.

That’s why Canada’s reaction to these latest threats to the ICC will matter.

In March 2019, when American officials announced that the kinds of measures contained in the recent Executive Order were being considered, a public statement issued by Global Affairs Canada affirmed Canada’s longstanding support for the ICC and stated unequivocally that, “Personnel of the International Criminal Court should not be targeted for the important work that they do.”

But a year later, faced with the reality of the U.S. actions, Canada’s response has been more muted. Canada joined nearly 70 other ICC states parties as signatory to a formal statement on the ICC website condemning the American actions.

Canada should be more outspoken. The ICC is a Canadian diplomatic success story. Foreign Minister Champagne’s mandate letter from the Prime Minister includes instructions to “reinforce international institutions like the International Criminal Court, the World Trade Organization” (another Trump target) and others, including by providing additional resources to promote and uphold international law.”

It is time for Canada to stand up for the ICC once more.

Remembering Norman Dyson

Norman Dyson, Honorary President of the Toronto branch of WFMC, died on May 30th, 2020, at the age of eighty-eight.

Dyson graduated from Osgoode Hall Law School in 1958 and was a practising lawyer until 1995 when he was appointed to the Superior Court of Justice, where he served until 2007.

An enthusiastic athlete, Dyson played football and basketball at high school and university, and competed in track and field. He enjoyed tennis and sailing and was a year-round cyclist.

In the late 1990s, Dyson was active in the work towards establishing the International Criminal Court, joining meetings of the “Canadian Network for an International Criminal Court” that was hosted by WFMC.

As well, Dyson was a supporter of numerous environmental groups and programs supporting the homeless and elderly.

Dr Rose Dyson, Norm Dyson’s wife of more than fifty-five years, is on the board of WFMC’s Toronto branch.
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