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The Glasgow Climate Conference: What lessons will we learn?

by Fergus Watt

with files from Earth Negotiations Bulletin,

There are few more important events on the international calendar this year than the COP 26 UN Climate Change Conference – formally the “26th Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change,” hosted by the UK in partnership with Italy, that takes place from 31 October to 12 November 2021 in Glasgow, Scotland.

This Conference was originally scheduled to take place in November 2020 but was postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Below, we review the international legal and treaty context for this meeting; highlight a few of the major issues facing delegates meeting in Glasgow; and discuss some of the underlying challenges facing global climate governance.

1) Legal context

International agreement on a legal and political response to climate change began with the 1992 adoption of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which sets out the basic legal framework and principles for international climate change cooperation with the aim of stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHGs) to avoid “dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.” The UNFCCC was one of three treaties (along with the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention to Combat Desertification) adopted at the landmark 1992 Earth Summit.

To further the goals of the 1992 UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol was adopted in 1997. It committed industrialized countries and countries in transition to achieve quantified emissions reduction targets. The Kyoto Protocol’s first commitment period took place from 2008 to 2012. The 2012 Doha Amendment established the second commitment period from 2013 to 2020.

In December 2015, parties to the UNFCCC adopted the Paris Agreement, which establishes shared goals for reducing global warming, and requires governments to submit and regularly report on the pledges - called nationally determined contribution (NDCs) - that each undertakes to reduce emissions and/or build resilience to climate change.

(2) Climate Ambition

The Paris Agreement works on a five-year cycle of increasingly ambitious climate action. By 2020, parties to the Paris Agreement were to conduct a “Global Stocktake” of their collective progress on mitigation, adaptation, and provision of support to developing countries.

By the end of 2020, there were 48 new NDCs submitted by 47 countries and the EU. Additional NDCs were submitted in 2021, notably from the United States, which pledges to reduce emissions by 50-52% below 2005 levels by 2030. Some governments will announce their revised NDCs in Glasgow.

The UNFCCC Secretariat analyzed the NDCs submitted by the end of July 2021 and reported that the effects of the new, updated NDCs that cover about 59% of parties to the Paris Agreement and account for 49% of global greenhouse gas emissions. The good news is
that the NDCs represent a 12% decrease in emissions. The bad news is that the pledges may lead to a temperature rise of 2.7°C by the end of the century. Some major emitting countries, including Australia, China, and India, have yet to submit new pledges.

(3) Pledges – are they enough?
The Glasgow COP will bring added scrutiny to the adequacy of the central pillar of the Paris Agreement - the nationally determined contributions. Is a treaty system based on pledges made by sovereign nation-states sufficient to address a global problem like climate change?

This pledging approach has been called “bottom-up” governance. Countries put forward pledges toward a shared goal in the hopes that the sum of these pledges will safeguard the environment. It isn’t unique to the Paris Agreement. Other multilateral environmental agreements and other global initiatives feature similar types of participant pledging.

In the context of treaties, pledging has found a foothold. International treaties generally involve rules that guide or explicitly set out what countries will do. By reversing that logic and allowing countries to set their terms, more countries may be willing to sign up. It makes participating easier.

However, there are few rules governing what an NDC should contain. Under the Paris Agreement, having an NDC is a legally binding requirement, but it is up to participating states to decide its content. And reaching the targets set out in an NDC is not legally required.

And that’s the paradox of a treaty based on nation-state pledging: it helps to reach agreement or to mobilize a wide range of actors toward environmental goals. But, at the end of the day it’s a non-legally binding promise to be fulfilled in the future.

In the absence of adequate mechanisms for transparency, oversight and accountability to safeguard the promises, there are many who question the efficacy of this approach to addressing the challenges of mitigating climate change. In the years to come we may well see new negotiations - a renewed effort to build upon the Paris Agreement to strengthen further the international UNFCCC framework of climate governance.

An Integrated Movement:
The necessary steps to unite the world

I got involved with the Young World Federalists (YWF) in August 2020. By proxy, I got involved with the wider community of world federalists at that time as well. Since that time, YWF has introduced world federalism to young people around the world.

YWF could not have gotten where we are today without our Board of Advisors. Donna Park, Jim Barton, and John Vlasto have stepped up to mentor us kids and show us the ropes. YWF would not be the same without their support.

Back in August 2020, Daniel Blewitt was very active in the movement. As the co-founder of YWF, he was an outspoken proponent of a united movement. He spoke with great fervor, calling for a united, collaborative movement. A movement that is easy to understand from the outside looking in. A movement that shares resources and exemplifies world unity.

Daniel's call for a collaborative movement resulted in YWF reaching out to other world federalist organizations, and these organizations coming together to collaborate. Under the leadership of John Vlasto, they formed a "Working Group". This body met every two weeks, in two separate calls due to timezones. They designed collaborative projects like campaigns, model world parliaments, and a news site.

As we tried to sell these ideas to the wider movement, it became obvious that something was missing. Where was our umbrella? Where was the World Federalist Movement - Institute for Global Policy? How can we collaborate
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without them? Are we replacing them? These questions came to the forefront as we learned about WFM-IGP’s ongoing crisis.

The collaborative efforts of the Working Group paused. All attention turned towards WFM-IGP. The Working Group meetings became WFM-IGP Strategy Calls. We spent hours deliberating the pros and cons of the "Draft Strategic Plan" produced by WFM-IGP. Daniel Blewitt’s vision of a united movement was on hold for the foreseeable future.

The Advisory Council
At the WFM-IGP Congress in July, a new body, the WFM-IGP Advisory Council, was voted into being, tasked with revitalizing communication between WFM-IGP and its member and Associate Organizations. In a way, the Advisory Council is the spiritual successor to the Working Group. It was also agreed that the election of a new Executive Committee for WFM-IGP should be deferred until October, when some of the current uncertainties should have been resolved.

While a great success, the formation of the Advisory Council is only the start. Daniel Blewitt’s vision is still just a vision. Integrating our movement will take patience, persistence, and compromise. Yet it must happen. We must become a united movement for a world federation if we are to maximise our impact.

Right now, an outsider coming into our movement will likely find one small group of people. An outsider will see that this small group has limited resources. An outsider will see that passion is not a material resource. And an outsider won’t see room for growth. But we are not small! And we have many resources! And we have ample opportunities for growth!

The problem is not that we are weak. The problem is the division between us. Operating in silos makes us look weak. It makes our movement look like a bunch of utopians who couldn’t organize our way out of a junk drawer. We are a mess. Our strength lies beneath the recent in-fighting and apathy towards one another.

A clear and concise public image is necessary. A single, movement-wide membership option for youth and adults to pool resources. A single, movement-wide annual event to rally our supporters and gain new ones. A single, movement-wide system of chapters - with the same branding - to make it easy for people to move and find us again. A single, movement-wide governing body with equity for large and small organizations. A single, movement-wide logo on every website leading to the central hub for the movement. To get there from our current silos will take time, but in the short-term much can be achieved simply by recreating the umbrella function of WFM-IGP.

This was Daniel Blewitt’s vision that guided the formation of the Working Group. This is what is necessary to keep young people involved. This is how we build a world federalist movement that uses our diversity and our resources. And this is what I am pushing for as a member of the Advisory Council, and will continue to push for as a member of the Executive Committee if elected in October.

Review developments from the Week for World Parliament in October!
WorldParliamentNow.org
By Monique Cuillerier

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

Preliminary examinations are currently being conducted in Bolivia, Colombia, Guinea, Nigeria, Ukraine, and there are two separate examinations in 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.

In May 2021, the Prosecutor, then Fatou Bensouda and her team, met with a high-level delegation from the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Given more recent events, the state of the investigation is uncertain.

**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**
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 Ngaissona, 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 and the Prosecution is currently presenting its evidence.

Mahamat Said Abdel Kani was surrendered to the Court on January 24 2021. The opening of the confirmation of charges hearing is scheduled for October 5 2021.

**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 and the Appeals Chamber confirmed the acquittal in March. Gbagbo and Blé Goudé have returned to Côte d’Ivoire. The case against Simone Gbagbo has been vacated following the acquittals of Laurent Gbagbo and Charles Blé Goudé.

**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. Recently, Sudan has pledged to send Al Bashir to the Court, but no actions have been taken yet.

Ali Muhammad Ali Abd–Al–Rahman surrendered himself to the Court in June 2020 and the confirmation of charges hearing took place in May 2021. In July 2021, the charges of war crimes and crimes against humanity were confirmed and the trial is now scheduled to begin April 5, 2022.

**Democratic Republic of the Congo**
In 2012, Thomas Lubanga Dyilo was convicted and sentenced to 14 years of imprisonment. He was 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 and in March 2021, the conviction and sentence were confirmed on appeal. Reparations to victims were also ordered in March. The Trust Fund for Victims will design and submit an implementation plan to the Court. Ntaganda remains in the ICC detention center in The Hague pending a decision as to where he will serve his sentence.

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 remain 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. Charges were confirmed, for offences against the administration of justice, and
Gicheru has been committed to trial. These offences were allegedly committed to undermine the Prosecution in the Ruto and Sang case, which ended without charges being confirmed.

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.

The Philippines
The Prosecutor’s request to begin an investigation in relation to crimes on the territory of the Philippines between 2011 and 2019 in the context of the so-called ‘war on drugs’ campaign was granted on September 15, 2021.

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. The Defence has submitted a notification of intent to appeal. Additionally, the reparations phase has begun.

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.
Some key recommendations include:

- A Futures Lab to take full advantage of the organization’s capacity to predict and model the impact of policy decisions over time;
- The repurposing of the UN’s Trusteeship Council to make it a deliberative body on behalf of succeeding generations. [Note: Elsewhere in the report reviving the Trusteeship Council is proposed for a much broader remit, i.e. to “issue advice and guidance with respect to long-term governance of the global commons, delivery of global public goods and managing global public risks.”]

3. Urgent action to protect and deliver global commons – high seas, the atmosphere, Antarctica and outer space – and global public goods – such as peace, economic security, and global health.

Some key recommendations include:

- Better integration of the global financial system with other decision-making processes through a Biennial Summit between the G20, the UN’s ECOSOC (Economic and Social Council), the Secretary-General and heads of other international financial institutions;
- A new Agenda for Peace (building on the seminal “Agenda for Peace” document published in 1992 that framed UN peacekeeping and peacemaking in the 1990s). The new Agenda for Peace would set out a continuum of UN actions to promote peace “based on a better understanding of the underlying drivers and systems of influence that are sustaining conflict.”
- Better preparedness for future global shocks through an Emergency Platform that would be triggered automatically in response to large-scale crises;
- A Summit of the Future, scheduled for 2023, which would be preceded by preparatory events and consultations, to forge a new consensus on the most critical global concerns that the international system must deal with. As one of the OCA report’s most prominent recommendations, the Summit of the Future would address lagging progress on climate change, biodiversity and the sustainable development goals; a global digital compact and a declaration on the future; as well as the new agenda for peace, dialogue on outer space, and a cross-agency emergency response platform to respond to complex crises.
- A High-level Advisory Board, composed of former heads of State/Government, is proposed to inform the Summit of the Future and advance recommendations where governance improvements are most needed and propose options for how they can be implemented.

4. An upgraded UN that is fit for a new era – one that can offer more relevant, system-wide, multilateral and multi-stakeholder solutions to the challenges of the 21st century. This final section introduces reforms that are within the scope of the Secretary-General to initiate. The emphasis is on use of data, innovation, strategic foresight and predictive analysis.

Of course, it is the role of the Secretary-General to initiate and propose. It will ultimately be up to Member States to agree on next steps and take forward the recommendations in the OCA report.

After the report was launched September 10, a number of ambassadors took the floor to make statements. Russia and China sent lower level officials to the launch event, saying the report needs further study and cautioning against involving stakeholders other than governments in the work of the UN. However most ambassadors who spoke responded quite positively to the report. The U.S. did not provide immediate comment. Canada’s Ambassador, Bob Rae congratulated the Secretary-General on a report he described as “challenging, provocative and necessary.”

Many governments also referenced the OCA report later in September during the high-level opening of the 76th session of the General Assembly and at a September 23 meeting of the Alliance for Multilateralism, a 50+-state network led by Germany and France.

For the Coalition for the UN We Need (C4UN), the OCA report represents something of a milestone. The campaign has since 2017 had as its primary goal making the occasion of the UN’s 75th anniversary a vehicle to stimulate further strengthening of the organization.

Now that the OCA report is out, and is the subject of much discussion in foreign ministries around the world, C4UN campaigners will also undertake a process of consultation and reflection, to assess where progress will be possible in the coming months. A “People’s Forum” in December will bring together regional and global networks to frame a strategy and advocacy agenda to build on the openings for improving global governance provided in the Our Common Agenda report.
After a one-year delay due to the pandemic, the World Federalist Movement-Institute for Global Policy (WFM-IGP) conducted its first online Congress from July 14-17. It was attended by 39 delegates and 28 observers from 20 organizations on 5 continents.

In recent years WFM-IGP has experienced a number of changes, including:

- The retirement of Executive Director Bill Pace after more than 2 decades of service and his successful leadership in the creation of the civil society coalitions such as the Coalition for the International Criminal Court (CICC) and the International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect (ICR2P);
- The brief tenure WFM-IGP Executive Director Tawanda Hondora, and the arrival of a new Executive Director, Sandra Coyle;
- A sharp decrease in funding; as experienced by many NGO’s working in the international justice field;
- A transfer in the hosting of WFM-IGP’s two flagship programs, the CICC and ICR2P, to other NGO’s.

In response to these events and to assure the organization’s long-term sustainability, Executive Director Sandra Coyle, in partnership with the outgoing WFM-IGP Executive Committee, created a new Strategic Plan that was approved by the Congress. See https://www.wfm-igp.org/2021-23-strategic-plan/.

The election of a new Executive Committee to take forward the work of the organization in this time of programmatic renewal was deferred to a resumed session of the 2021 Congress, scheduled for October 30-31.

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 work of WFM Member and Associate Organizations, WFM-IGP’s programs support participation in the Coalition for the International Criminal Court, the International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect and the campaign for a North-East Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. 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.
2021 World Peace Award

On the evening of April 28th, the 2021 WFMC World Peace Award was presented to General John de Chastelain for his commitment to peace in Northern Ireland.

From 1997 to 2011 General de Chastelain served as Chair of the Independent International Commission on Decommissioning (IICD). The Commission facilitated the decommissioning of arms and reported to the parties to the Good Friday Agreement until March 2011.

General de Chastelain’s career highlights also include service as Deputy Chief of Staff of the United Nations Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) and Commander of the Canadian contingent there; as Commandant of the Royal Military College of Canada; as Ambassador of Canada to the United States; and as Chief of Defence Staff.

The online event was hosted by Rev. Karen Hamilton, Executive Chair of WFMC, and began with WFMC’s National President Dr Walter Dorn reflecting on what made General de Chastelain a worthy recipient of the World Peace Award.

General de Chastelain then offered remarks and anecdotes on his career as a soldier working towards peace and the impact of peace on the local community and individual.

Then Dr. Eamonn McKee, Ambassador of Ireland to Canada, spoke about what General de Chastelain’s efforts meant to Ireland and the Good Friday Agreement, along with the current situation.

Finally, Monique Cuillerier, Membership and Communications Director of WFMC, connected the accomplishments of General de Chastelain to the advocacy of World Federalists using examples from WFMC’s current advocacy and programs including peacekeeping, international justice, and women, peace and security.

As General de Chastelain kindly remarked, “Promoting, achieving and maintaining peace in the world has been vitally important in the past and it remains so today. The work of the World Federalist Movement continues to be a major contributor to that effort.”

The event concluded with questions from the audience.

WFMC presents the World Peace Award annually or every second year. Previous recipients have included Lester Pearson, Stephen Lewis, Flora MacDonald, and Louise Arbour.

A complete list of past recipients, dating back to 1972, is available on the WFMC website (at wfmcanada.org/about/world-peace-award/).

In 1972, the Executive of the World Federalists of Canada adopted a proposal, put forward by the Brantford Branch, that the organization establish a peace award.

The idea was introduced by Richard Pilant, who wrote:

“The stereotype of the military hero is outmoded today... We must, with due regard to our individual and collective security... construct a new model—that of the world peace hero... We feel that every day it becomes more imperative that we honour those among us who have the courage and the competence to lead us and our government so skillfully... We must honour those who show us how to help our neighbor nations around the world show us how to understand their problems and policies, so that we may all move forward harmoniously...”
Now that the federal election is over, how should the new government approach foreign policy and global governance? Important Canadian foreign policy priorities identified by the World Federalists in a questionnaire sent to the major Canadian political parties in the September election included the following:

**Question 1:** How should Canada support United Nations peacekeeping?

The United Nations currently has over 90,000 military, police, and civilian personnel serving in 12 peacekeeping missions. That's more troops in UN field operations than any actor in the world, including the U.S. Department of Defense and more than the UK, France, China, and Russia put together. During the UN's first five decades Canada was a leading contributor to peace operations, but Canada now ranks 68th in the world. Canadian contributions of personnel have declined under successive governments and now stand at (as of May 2021) 27 military personnel and 29 police. Public support for Canadian participation in UN peacekeeping missions has remained strong over the years and contributions from countries like Canada with advanced military and logistics capabilities are needed to increase operational effectiveness. However, in recent years Canada has maintained a small and diminishing presence in a handful of UN peace operations.

As a middle power with no significant external threat to its borders, a nation dependent on international trade that supports a stable, rules-based international order, Canada’s interest lies in supporting and strengthening the multilateral system. Until 1995, Canada had participated in every UN peacekeeping mission. Despite the current Liberal government’s stated goal of re-engaging in UN peacekeeping (including a 2016 public commitment to deploy 600 military and 150 police personnel), Canada’s contribution to UN peace operations remains low and future commitments remain uncertain.

Participation in UN peacekeeping is about more than just numbers, though. There is also a need for equipment and training. As part of the current federal government’s commitments to peacekeeping, they have launched the Elsie Initiative, a multilateral pilot project to develop approaches aimed at overcoming barriers to increasing women’s meaningful participation in peace operations.

Currently, Canada has 56 uniformed peacekeepers (combined military and police) which places it 68th among contributing countries. The largest contributor (Bangladesh) provides about 6500 peacekeepers. Canada could increase its commitment of peacekeeping personnel, but there are also other ways in which Canada could contribute to UN Peacekeeping, including increasing support for training (including through the Elsie Initiative) and the provision of equipment.

**Question 2: Global Climate Change - What should be Canada’s International Commitments?**

In 2015, Canada signed the Paris Agreement, under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The Paris Agreement commits parties to contribute to limiting average global warming to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. To meet this goal, each signatory commits to cut its carbon pollution, and submit a plan to reduce its annual greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs). This plan is known as its “Nationally Determined Contribution” (NDC). Canada’s NDC is a plan to cut GHGs by 30% below 2005 emission levels by 2030. To deliver on its Paris commitments, the current Canadian government developed the “Pan-Canadian Framework on Climate Change and
“Clean Growth” in 2016, which laid the foundation for subsequent policies and regulations designed to reduce emissions across all sectors of the economy.

Do we need to revisit Canada's Nationally Determined Contribution and strengthen domestic action? There are many possible actions the new government could take as we address this growing crisis.

Climate Action Network Canada, of which WFMC is a member, developed a list of policy priorities during the election period, as well as hosting a climate round table with representatives from the major parties. Further details can be found on their website, climateactionnetwork.ca

**Question 3: Nuclear disarmament: Which measures intended to promote the realization of a world without nuclear weapons should Canada support?**

The present international political climate is one where many governments, including some of the world's largest military powers, are demonstrating a reduced commitment to the rule of law and cooperation within the framework of international organizations like the United Nations.

One consequence of this crisis in multilateralism is a growing risk of nuclear catastrophe. Recent developments include: a deterioration in East-West relations, notably between Russia and NATO; U.S. withdrawal from the nuclear agreement with Iran; and U.S. and Russian withdrawal from the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty;

All of this is occurring within the context of a new nuclear arms race, precipitated in large part, by the U.S. allocation of over $1.5 trillion to 'modernize' its nuclear arsenal over the next 30 years. In fact all nine nuclear weapons states are modernizing and/or expanding their nuclear arsenals.

Despite these growing threats, Canada's nuclear arms control and disarmament policies have changed very little in over a decade. Recently the House of Commons Standing Committee on National Defence issued the following (all-party) recommendation:

“That the Government of Canada take a leadership role within NATO in beginning the work necessary for achieving the NATO goal of creating the conditions for a world free of nuclear weapons...”

There are many steps that Canada could take.

**A NATO policy of “No First Use”**

Any use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the international humanitarian rules of armed conflict. Yet Canada and others in the NATO alliance continue to maintain a strategic doctrine that permits the “first use” of nuclear weapons, even in response to a non-nuclear weapons attack.

A policy of No First Use would mean that NATO pledges that its members would never be the first to use nuclear weapons. This would be an important step toward bringing NATO’s Strategic Concept into line with its acknowledged international legal and political obligations.

**“De-Alerting”**

Both the United States and Russia keep about 900 nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert, ready to be launched in minutes. If satellites and radars send warning of an incoming attack, the goal is to be able to launch their missiles quickly, before the attacking warheads could land.

But the warning systems are not foolproof. There have been well-documented “false warnings” of nuclear attack in both the Soviet Union/Russia and the United States that led the countries to begin launch preparations and increased the risk that nuclear weapons would be used. Taking missiles off hair-trigger alert and eliminating options to launch on warning would end this risk.

**Support the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons**

Frustrated with the slow pace of progress toward nuclear disarmament, 122 governments came together in 2017 to negotiate the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW). The treaty is a powerful statement, grounded in an understanding of the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear explosions, of the political, moral, and legal standards enjoining non-use and elimination of nuclear arms, and of the need to redress the damage wrought by the nuclear age to people and the environment.

The TPNW reinforces existing treaty- and customary international law requiring the non-use and elimination of nuclear weapons. That law applies to states whether or not they join the treaty.

Signing the TPNW would oblige Canada to make changes to its policies and practices and make genuine efforts to bring NATO into conformity with the Treaty.

**Question 4: What can Canada do to strengthen the United Nations?**

World Federalists support the application of the principles of federalism to world affairs, in order that global governance becomes more equitable, just and democratically accountable. The organization supports a number of specific approaches to...
strengthening the United Nations.

Responsibility to Protect

WFMC monitors and supports the progressive development of the Responsibility to Protect normative framework, which addresses the international community’s failure to prevent and stop genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

The Responsibility to Protect stipulates that the State carries the primary responsibility for the protection of populations from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing and that the international community has a responsibility to assist States in fulfilling this responsibility. Additionally, the international community should use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to protect populations from these crimes. Crucially, if a State fails to protect its populations or is the perpetrator of crimes, the international community must be prepared to take stronger measures, including the collective use of force through the UN Security Council.

The ongoing situation in Myanmar provides a current example. Protestors there have called for the international community to uphold the R2P framework and respond to the violence they face from security forces. Photos on social media show “We need R2P” and similar messages on protest placards and written in candlelight on city streets.

The Campaign for a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly

WFMC participates actively in the Campaign for the Establishment of a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations (UNPA), a global network that advocates practical steps toward the goal of democratic representation of the world’s citizens at the United Nations. WFMC’s support for a UN Parliamentary Assembly is rooted in a dedication to the principles of democracy and the rule of law. In an era of globalization, many important decisions affecting the lives of the world’s citizens are made at the international level, by organizations like the United Nations and related agencies. To help ensure international cooperation and to enhance the legitimacy of the UN, people must be more effectively and directly included in the activities of the UN. A United Nations Parliamentary Assembly would give elected citizen representatives, not only states, a direct and influential role in global policy. Establishing a UNPA offers a pragmatic, gradual approach to this important global governance imperative.

Starting as a largely consultative body, the rights and powers of the UNPA could be expanded over time as its democratic legitimacy increases. The assembly will act as an independent watchdog in the UN system and as a democratic reflection of the diversity of world public opinion.

United Nations Emergency Peacekeeping Service (UNEPS)

WFMC-Canada supports the creation of a permanent, standing UN Emergency Peace Service, which would include civilian, police, judicial, and military personnel.

This would be a permanent, integrated UN formation that would be ready for immediate deployment upon authorization by the UN Security Council. A UNEPS would be paid for from the UN regular budget.

Estimates of the costs vary, but start-up expenses could be as high as $2 to $3 billion. Annual recurring costs would be approximately $1 billion. These costs would be shared among 193 member states. While these estimates may seem high, by comparison with the military expenditures of many UN member states, the cost of a UNEPS is modest. A UNEPS is specifically designed to help with the prevention of armed conflict; stopping genocide and mass atrocity crimes; protecting civilians at extreme risk; ensuring prompt beginnings to peace operations; and addressing human needs in areas where others cannot.

Follow up to the seventy-fifth anniversary of the United Nations

On 21 September 2020, the United Nations’ 193 Member States adopted the Declaration on the Commemoration of the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations (UN75 Declaration), which outlines a vision and twelve distinct commitments addressing the world’s most pressing threats and opportunities. The milestone UN75 Declaration also called for “the Secretary-General to report back before the end of the seventy-fifth session of the General Assembly with recommendations to advance our common agenda and to respond to current and future challenges.” That Secretary-General’s report, Our Common Agenda, was released by the second week of September 2021 and is expected to outline a framework of activities by member states to pursue a stronger, more effective UN system.
Overview of UN Peacekeeping and Canadian Deployments

The work of the United Nations to restore peace and security currently involves more than 90,000 military, police, and civilian personnel, serving in 12 peacekeeping missions around the world. Canadian contributions of military and police personnel currently stand at only 56 individuals (27 military and 29 police) deployed to UN operations as of May 31, 2021.

At the same time, UN peacekeeping is facing many challenges. Finding committed and capable nations to contribute peacekeepers is difficult. Adequate funding is also a challenge.

UN peacekeeping has always been insufficiently funded, struggling to attain the personnel levels mandated by the Security Council, as well as to properly equip and support ongoing missions.

The U.S. Biden administration is showing greater appreciation and support for peacekeeping than the previous Trump Administration. However, the US Congress continues to enforce an arbitrary cap on US contributions to UN peacekeeping, so the US financial contributions to peacekeeping remain in arrears.

The UN has approved a budget for Peacekeeping in 2021/22 of $6.4 billion (US), a slight drop from $6.6 billion (US) in 2020/21. This expenditure is less than 0.5% of total world military expenditure, which was $1.98 trillion (US) in 2021.

The Need For Peacekeepers Remains High

Since 1999, the size and number of UN missions grew, reaching a peak in 2015, then declining slightly. The recent decline is due in part to a natural winding down of some successful operations (in Haiti, Liberia, and Sierra Leone), reductions in authorized troop levels in others (notably in Darfur, and D.R. Congo, as the UN Department of Peace Operations faces cost-cutting pressures) and the inability of UN Security Council members to come to agreement on needed new deployments (e.g. Libya, Haiti).

There is an urgent need to increase the capacity of UN missions in Mali, South Sudan and D.R. Congo. New missions are desperately needed in conflict-ridden areas of the world. These actual and prospective missions face enormous challenges to support agreed peace processes and protect civilians.

Canada’s Peacekeeping Profile

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. The Canadian military contributes a total of only 27 personnel (8 to D.R. Congo, 5 to Mali, 1 to Cyprus, 9 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 68th position today with 56 total personnel currently deployed.

There are only 13 Canadian women deployed as peacekeepers. Given the small number of Canadian peacekeepers, this percentage of women deployed (23%) does meet the UN standard. Noteworthy also are some programs to support other nations’ women in peacekeeping that are finally being implemented, including the much touted Elsie Initiative.

Canada contributes financially to the UN peacekeeping budget according to a formula determined by UN Member States. In 2020/21, Canada was assessed a contribution that represented 2.73% of the peacekeeping budget.

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.

• In March 2018 Defence Minister Sajjan announced a commitment to deploy an Aviation Task Force to the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA).

• 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.”

Others Around The World Are Stepping Up

The world’s leading uniformed personnel contributors are Bangladesh (6,554), Nepal (5,571), India (5,525), and Ethiopia (5,488). Fellow NATO members, such as Spain (838), Italy (741), France (622), and Germany (552), are contributing considerably more troops than Canada. Ireland contributes over 508. Currently, Canada ranks slightly ahead of Belgium and Zimbabwe in personnel contributions.

As a middle power with no significant external threat to its borders, a nation dependent on international trade that supports a stable, rules-based international order, Canada’s interest lies in supporting and strengthening the multilateral system. Until 1995, Canada had participated in every UN peacekeeping mission.

The Liberal government has maintained a goal to re-engage in UN peacekeeping. This includes a 2016 commitment to deploy up to 600 military and 150 police personnel, and the 2019 mandate provided to the Defence and Foreign Ministers to “expand Canada’s support for United Nations peace operations.”

Notwithstanding these public commitments, Canada’s personnel contributions to UN peace operations remain at an all-time low and future deployments remain uncertain. The Canadian Quick Reaction Force, pledged at the 2017 Peacekeeping Ministerial Meeting, is taking years to deploy.

What Canada could and is failing to do

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 to align the priorities of Canada’s elected officials and military leadership in order for personnel commitments to fulfil public promises and for Canada to become once again a leader and prolific peacekeeper.
Update on Canada's National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security

by Monique Cuillerier

2020 was the twentieth anniversary of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325, the first Security Council resolution to specifically address women, peace and security. It was 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.


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 humanitarians 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 consequence of the federal election, this was not possible. (Fixed federal election dates ensures 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.

The Women, Peace and Security Network - Canada has in the past produced publications offering civil society assessments of the progress reports.

**UNDRIP: Will it be beneficial to Indigenous Peoples in Canada?**

by Bill Pearce

The United Nations Declaration of the Rights on Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) was adopted by the UN General Assembly on September 13th 2007 with 144 states in favour and 4 votes against (Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States). In November 2010, the Harper government endorsed the Declaration on the understanding it was an aspirational document that was not legally binding and without effect on customary law. In 2016 Minister Carolyn Bennett announced Canada was a full supporter of the Declaration without qualification. Bill C-15, being the ‘Act Respecting UNDRIP’, became law on June 21st, 2021.

Bill C-15 adopts the model created by British Columbia when it passed legislation on the same subject on November 28th 2019. In both cases the legislation affirms the application of the Declaration to the laws of Canada and BC by providing a requirement for the respective governments to take all measures necessary to ensure laws are consistent with the Declaration, with obligations to prepare Action Plans, and to make annual reports to the Legislative Assembly of BC and to Parliament on the progress made to implement the measures in the respective Action Plans, a process which is expected to take many years to establish.

While the respective governments have assured the public the Declaration doesn’t create any new rights and merely serves to provide a process to ensure laws are consistent with existing rights, a closer look shows that the implications are not as benign as the respective governments would like us to believe.

There are two areas of particular concern. One relates to the duty to consult and the need to obtain from Indigenous peoples their ‘free, prior, and informed consent’ (FPIC) before implementing legislative or administrative measures that may affect them (Art. 19) or before approving any project affecting their lands, territories or other resources (Article 32 para.2). Article 19 will require FPIC to apply to the legislative process.

The Supreme Court of Canada has ruled in the Haida case that the duty to consult requires meaningful consultation but that does not give Indigenous peoples a right to veto any project affecting their traditional territory. Virtually every square inch of land in Canada is claimed to be the traditional territory of one or more First Nations. If it turns out that FPIC means what it says it could have enormous implications and a chilling effect on any proposed resource development in the country.
The second area of concern relates to Article 3 which provides that Indigenous people have the right to self-determination by virtue of which they have the right to “freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.” Until recently this right was not accepted by Canadian governments.

The October 1996 Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples provides the source of this right to self-governance, postulating that the right of self-determination is inherent, exercised for centuries before the arrival of European settlers and was affirmed by Canada when our Constitution was amended in 1982 to include our affirmation of “existing aboriginal and treaty rights” in §35. What is important about Canada’s affirmation in s4 of Bill C-15 is that UNDRIP has application in Canadian law in that it effectively forecloses any arguments that §35 of the Constitution Act does not enshrine the right of self-determination.

To better understand what this self-government might look like, it is instructive to look at a recent treaty that was entered into with the Tla’amin First Nation. It provides a land base of 8322 hectares of land including the timber and mineral rights and right to the marine resources in the area. It also acknowledges the Tla’amin right to make their own laws respecting the land and resources and, for the most part, on reserve activities of their people.

And to enforce the laws their government is empowered to create offences and sanctions and laws respecting the qualification, training and powers of enforcement officers who will enforce the laws with prosecutions to be heard by the Provincial Court. All of this is to be done by a people who have had no experience in any of these fields except to a limited degree in municipal matters. The point being it will take a very long time for this First Nation to develop a civil service with the level of training and competence of non-Indigenous governments.

Thus, if down the road after the Tla’amin FN assume jurisdiction over education and protection of children it turns out years later that their children who were in need of protection were not being protected and their children were not beginning to meet provincial educational standards there is no mechanism which permits the federal or provincial government to take back its former jurisdiction over such matters and leaves little practical mechanisms in place for the parents or representatives of such children to remedy the deficiency.

Who is going to pay for this new experiment in self-governance? Article 39 of the Declaration states Indigenous peoples have “the right to have access to financial and technical assistance from States…for the enjoyment of the rights contained in this Declaration”.

I have identified a number of potential problems with the implementation of UNDRIP. At this stage it is difficult to forecast the success or otherwise of this project. If Indigenous governments fail to deliver on education and protection of children the experiment in self-governance will be a failure and Indigenous children in particular will pay the price. We all pray that won’t happen but if it does a solution will not be possible absent a change in our Constitution.

I believe most Canadians are supportive of reconciliation, but if it turns out that adherence to UNDRIP principles is impeding economic developments or is not achieving its purposes or it is perceived as being too expensive to operate, or a combination of the foregoing, it could create a backlash and worsen relationships. Again, getting things back on track will be a difficult task. The application of UNDRIP to our laws will require both sides to work together more than ever to make this grand project a success.
Ian Waddell Q.C. by Fergus Watt

Ian Waddell was a dedicated world federalist who participated in both national and Vancouver Branch meetings. He died at his home in Vancouver on March 14.

Gregarious, with a boyish smile and a fondness for storytelling, Ian enjoyed successful careers as a lawyer, politician, filmmaker and author.

For 14 years, Ian served as a New Democratic Party MP, first for Vancouver - Kingsway, and then for Port Moody - Coquitlam Port - Coquitlam. One of Ian's greatest political achievements was the key role he played in drafting the landmark 'Section 35' of the 1982 Constitution, recognizing Aboriginal and treaty rights.

In 1996, he was elected as an MLA for the riding of Vancouver – Fraserview and later served as BC Minister of Tourism, Arts and Culture. He helped secure in B.C. law the film tax credit, giving birth to a billion dollar industry, often called 'Hollywood North'.

As a politician he participated in the work of Parliamentarians for Global Action. He remained active in associations of current and former parliamentarians and supported campaigns for a UN Parliamentary Assembly that would democratize global governance.

He was a member of the Board of WFM – Canada since 2014 and was particularly proud of the organization's contributions, in Canada and internationally, to the establishment of the International Criminal Court.
Simon Rosenblum by Fergus Watt

Simon Rosenblum, who served on the WFM – Canada board of Directors from 1997 to 2014 died August 17, 2021 in Toronto following complications resulting from gastrointestinal tract injuries (perforated duodenum). He was 69.

Simon spent his life working on social and economic justice issues. He served on the staff of Project Ploughshares during the 1980s, writing and co-authoring (often with Ernie Regehr) several books and articles on disarmament and arms control issues. Later he served as chief of staff to Floyd Laughren, Treasurer for the province of Ontario during the NDP government led by Bob Rae.

Simon held a number of positions on the WFM – Canada Board, but was particularly valued for his in-depth understanding of international relations, his political judgment and ability to advance a peace and global governance agenda in the day-to-day realpolitik. In 1999 he led an initiative obtaining the endorsement of six former Canadian Defence and Foreign Ministers in support of Canada advocating a policy of “No First Use” of nuclear weapons. Canada did subsequently advocate (along with Germany and Norway) adoption of a No First Use policy in the context of a NATO strategic policy review. However the initiative did not gain majority support within the NATO alliance.

Simon also had leadership roles with organizations working on Middle-East peace issues, such as Canadian Friends of Peace Now, as well as organizations working on child poverty policy in Canada. He was known for his frequent published letters-to-the-editor of the Toronto Star and Globe and Mail. His personal interests were wide-ranging, from art collecting to opera to the world of sports, and he never grew tired of playing pranks on friends and colleagues.

Duncan Graham by Vivian Davidson-Castro

On July 15th this year the World Federalist Movement lost one of its most ardent, dedicated, and passionate supporters and advocates. Duncan Graham, a World Federalist of more than six decades, passed away surrounded by family in Gibson, BC at 92. Inspired by the similarities with the people he encountered on his trip with a friend to Africa and Europe in his twenties, Duncan realized that what unites us as humans is far greater than what divides us. From then on, he endeavoured to share his outlook for the unity of the Brotherhood and Sisterhood of Humanity.

Duncan attended the first national conference of the World Federalists of Canada (St Sauveur Quebec, 1961). He helped found the Toronto World Federalist Branch, and in the 1990s helped revive the Vancouver branch. When I asked him what he would like his legacy to be, his response was that we continue the vision he passionately embodied in hopes that our common humanity would unite us once and for all.

Duncan was a proud Scotsman who often wore his kilt, shared a smile readily, picked up trash on the streets with walker in hand, and loved all unconditionally. He liked to quote Alfred Lord Tennyson’s poem Locksley Hall, “Till the war-drums throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were furl’d In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.”

May we live In Duncan Graham’s footsteps and cherish one another for the fellow humans we all are.
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