

mondial

PUBLISHED IN CANADA BY THE WORLD FEDERALISTS

JUNE 1999

Hague Appeal for Peace



Nobel Peace Laureates roundtable at the Hague Appeal for Peace opening plenary in mid-May included (from left) Rigoberta Menchú Tum, a translator, Archbishop Desmond Tutu, José Ramos-Horta and moderator David Andrews, Ireland's Foreign Minister. World Federalists played a big role in organizing the conference and more than 100 Canadians attended. See page 8.

Welcome to our 'mondial'

You are holding what used to be the *Canadian World Federalist*. It is still published by the World Federalists of Canada but you will notice a few changes, the name being the 'biggy.'

In the last issue of the *Canadian World Federalist*, we asked members to suggest a new name. Many responded. We thank you all for the creative energy that was put to the task.

'Mondial' was offered by Mira Yarwood of Victoria who suggested that the French word has been adopted by English speakers as well to suggest that which is global in scope. And that is our purpose on the pages beneath the flag that now appears on page 1.

For example, the war over Kosovo has given World Federalists much to ponder. In this issue as events continue to unfold in the Balkans, we highlight a number of reflections on the relationships between Kosovo, Yugoslavia, NATO and the United Nations. In a piece that begins immediately below, Graham Day has some ideas on the future inside Kosovo. On inside pages, Ed Broadbent, Hanna Newcombe, Ernie Regehr and Simon Rosenblum offer their insights and perspectives into the past months of conflict.

Kosovo - a case for trusteeship

by **Graham Day**

Behind the human tragedy of Kosovo is a structural political problem. The population of the region has lost all faith in the central government in Serbia and now views its security apparatus as agents of persecution, not of protection. The Kosovars have a right to security, which may or may not extend to full independence.

The basis of any future solution in Kosovo must be the

return of a large part of the population. Experience in Bosnia shows that many will not. The prime factor affecting their return is security. The present security regime must be replaced by one that the majority accepts as legitimate. Initially, this will have to be international while local community security mechanisms are developed. The primary layer of security will have to be military. An international force will need to guard against

incursion by the Yugoslav forces. Secondly, an international police presence will be required initially alongside local, primarily Kosovar, police.

One of the fundamental mistakes in Bosnia was a failure of the international community to take executive power firmly for a limited time in order for local institutions to mature and become sustainable. The most

Continued on page 2

Kosovo institutions in transition

Continued from page 1 _____

obvious manifestation of this was the elections schedule.

In Bosnia, in a post-conflict climate of fear, each ethnic group unhesitatingly elected hardline nationalists to defend them against their recent enemies. An identical dynamic will play out in Kosovo if not prevented. There must be no regional (national) elections for five years. Municipal elections can be held after a short period of "martial law" under an international administrator.

Balkan institutions are completing the transition from authoritarian/communist rule. They all need support and auditing from outside. It is a serious mistake to expect institutions to democratize overnight. Yet only democratic institutions, albeit with Balkan characteristics, will be sustainable. More important than the physical rebuilding is institution building.

Currently throughout the former Yugoslavia, hospitals are short of supplies, not because they are not being provided with supplies (although shortages do exist) but because materials and services are being stolen/defrauded by hospital workers supplying their own private practices. The process of privatization is ongoing, painful and necessary for a sustainable peace in Europe.

External support in the form of *Bankers and Auditors without borders* will be needed for the period of trusteeship.

Physical rebuilding will be required. Experience in Bosnia suggests that where aid is given

to local authority, abuse of varying scales will ensue. Implementing partners (mostly NGOs) are needed who can target and account for aid grants. Self-financing is also necessary in part but must also be guarded against corrupt local officials. There is no need for the international community to issue a blank cheque to Kosovo. Mortgages should be taken on all standing property by the international community, and the credit raised given to community banks (which have to be formed) for rebuilding. Communities can then "police" their own debt.

A single international administrator should run the entire effort in Kosovo with section heads dealing with military, police, institution building, reconstruction, civil administration and mission administration, all reporting to the administrator. Bosnia has been plagued by fractured leadership in the peace effort. Experience with the NGO community suggests that turf wars are as bitter as civil wars.

As for models of Trusteeship missions, the UN transitional administration in Cambodia, the UN transitional administration in Eastern Slavonia and the Namibia Transition to Independence mission come to mind. It is not necessary that the UN runs the mission, although it does have the most experience in missions of this sort. What is critical is that only one organization runs the mission and that the NGO community accepts that mission as the strategic co-ordinating body.

Any mission in Kosovo will rely on a security regime that invokes confidence to return. It will need accessible, durable peacetime institutions, the most important of which is a democratic and community-based police service. Kosovo will need help in post conflict and post communist transitions. A unified comprehensive transitional trusteeship that has the resources and political backing to stay the course is the only real hope that the region has for a sustainable peace.



Graham Day is a member of WFC Council and works for UN peace operation in Bosnia-Herzegovina. He submitted these views in his personal capacity.

mondial

Published quarterly by the World Federalists of Canada (WFC) and the World Federalist Foundation (WFF). Articles of a political nature or pertaining to the activities of WFC are the responsibility of WFC. Articles entitled "Kosovo action morally justified," "When intervention ≠ protection," "Hague Appeal for Peace," "NATO reviews policy on nuclear weapons," "On the need for functional federalism," and "Havel speak on UN, Kosovo," are the responsibility of the WFF and are denoted by **m** concluding the article. Material is not copyrighted. Submissions are welcome.

ISSN number: 0382-8662

Editorial working group: Fergus Watt, MaryJune Pettyfer, Simon Rosenblum, Donna Lindenberg

Address: Suite 207
145 Spruce Street
Ottawa, ON K1R 6P1

E-mail: wfcnat@web.net

Website: <http://www.web.net/~wfcnat>



Elizabeth Snell

World Feds make progress, but...

Recently we've been catalysts for assembling the world's biggest, most diverse peace conference and for creation of the International Criminal Court we'd been told was "an impossible dream." In the last few months, World Federalists of Canada presented Parliamentary Briefs on a policy of no first use of nuclear weapons for NATO and on making the World Trade Organization more accountable and democratic (See page 10). We have ideas to help avoid future Kosovos. Our staff, Fergus and Dee, are dedicated, knowledgeable and highly effective. Volunteers are keen.

Our problem is money. Generous members donated enough to hire a fund-raiser, an investment with great potential long-term returns. But in the short term, we're on the verge of painful decisions on layoffs of the very people that make WFC work.

Fund-raising is always a challenge. Each year WFC must raise money beyond our 1,000 supporters' memberships and donations. But recently, government granting institutions have disappeared. Some of our traditional fundraising events (e.g. bingo) have become less successful. And membership continues its slow decline (If you're moving, PLEASE send us your new address!).

WFC is long on good ideas and political analysis, but short on public outreach. Unlike most NGOs, our mission is not oriented to a single issue or encapsulated in a gripping photo. It involves changes in process, in ways of decision-making. It offers the means towards preventing problems other organizations seek to cure. Avoiding crises is a much harder sell than tackling them.

The new fund-raiser will guide us. But meanwhile, we are in particular need of your help. How?

- Organize a branch or IAG fund-raising event. Victoria Branch will match the first \$1,500 raised!
- Consider a donation. Options include recent highly advantageous tax changes allowing donation of stocks (WFC office has further details).
- Ask others to join. One Montreal member is distributing brochures to 50 colleagues in a YMCA lunch club. If you prefer, the national office will (in confidence and according to your instructions) send WFC literature to persons you suggest.

A few weeks ago, Bill Graham, Chair of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, praised WFC's experience and stressed parliamentarians' gratitude for our years of hard work on issues of democratic global governance. The Committee was intrigued with our ideas towards democratizing global economic institutions.

We're more relevant than ever! Let's stick together and stick around!

Elizabeth Snell
Executive Chair

Commons supports Tobin tax

In March, the Tobin Tax got the support of Canada's House of Commons when members voted 164-83 in favour of a motion urging the government to "enact a tax on financial transactions in concert with the international community."

Nobel laureate economist James Tobin proposed a small world-wide tariff on currency transactions to "throw some sand in the wheels" of speculation. The tax is designed to be low enough—0.1–0.25%—not to have an adverse effect on trade in goods and services but rather to cut into the profits of speculators who usually work with large amounts of money, small margins and rapid turnover.

What next? There is interest internationally in currency speculation control. On the heels of the Canadian vote, an International Tobin Tax Network was formed involving NGOs and Parliamentarians from 14 countries. Tobin tax campaigns have begun in Britain and Brazil and related actions were planned in Australia, Spain, the Philippines, France, Belgium and the US.

Here in Canada, continued pressure from citizens, through letters and public forums, is needed to move the federal government to act on the will of MPs. Among those to write might be Jean Chrétien, Paul Martin, your Member of Parliament, the governor of the Bank of Canada Gordon Theissen, and your bank's manager or president.

Kosovo action morally justified

by Ed Broadbent

Kosovo. No event in the post-World War II period has produced such anxiety about the best course of action for people of good will who believe in human rights and the rule of law. The following are some observations written on May 20th, following weeks of bombing, massive evacuation of hundreds of thousands of Albanian Kosovars from their homeland, and the violent deaths of Serbian and foreign civilians produced by NATO air attacks on Belgrade.


In principle, military intervention was morally justified. For once, a government that was embarking on war crimes (not genocide) against a portion of its own people was militarily challenged after diplomacy failed. As someone heading a human rights organization who had fruitlessly warned our own government and the United Nations many months before the event of the impending genocide in Rwanda, I responded favourably to the initial NATO decision. When the most serious crimes are involved, e.g. genocide or crimes against humanity, the otherwise important principle of state sovereignty must be abandoned. It's not a coincidence that Václav Havel and most others with a demonstrated record of defending human rights supported the difficult decision for military intervention.

The nature of NATO's intervention was flawed from the outset. NATO's exclusive reliance on air power greatly accelerated the "ethnic cleansing" of thousands of Kosovars, the opposite of what was intended. President Milos-

evic and the world should have been told that unless he met the negotiated conditions (which included restoration of the substantial autonomy for the Kosovars that had been removed from them 10 years earlier), he would be confronted with the full force of NATO, not with air power alone.

UN Reform. Having watched the UN do nothing about Rwanda until it was too late, and nothing about the Turkish and Iraqi governments' murderous assaults on their Kurdish citizens (including the use of poison gas by Saddam Hussein), I was not surprised that NATO leaders, knowing that China and Russia would veto military intervention, bypassed the UN. The veto power of the five permanent members of the Security Council must be abolished. This power has been used by each of them in self-serving ways that have been inconsistent with the international rule of law. While larger states must, for pragmatic reasons, continue to have more influence than others in the Security Council, two reforms are long overdue. The first is that other regions and states which reflect the current realities of the world should have permanent status. India, Germany and Japan should be there, as should South Africa and Argentina or Brazil. Second, the veto should be abolished and replaced with a new system of voting, i.e. one that would require a resolution on UN military intervention, to be supported by two-thirds of the permanent members of an expanded Security Council.

Russia and China must continue to be consulted, indeed included, as full participants in reaching a peaceful solution to the tragedy of Kosovo. It is worth noting in this context the hypocrisy of the Chinese government. June 4 was the 10th anniversary of the massacre of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of workers and students on Tiananmen Square who were simply demanding "more democracy." While the Chinese people and many others throughout the world have rightly deplored the bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, the Chinese government has cynically manipulated their own citizens through state-controlled media, portraying the tragedy not as a sad blunder but as another example of "Western imperialism."

In recent years, the Pinochet case, the establishment of the War Crimes Tribunal and the launching of the new global Criminal Court have all pointed in one direction: when fundamental human rights are involved, they must trump the old principle of state sovereignty. While governments should continue to have the authority to make their own decisions on the large majority of political matters, when basic rights are concerned this is no longer the case. The tragedy of Kosovo should be seen in this historical context. How it is ultimately resolved, most notably for the Kosovars and Serbs themselves but also in the context of further international institutional reform, will condition in crucial ways our final judgment on NATO's action. 

"The veto power of the five permanent members of the Security Council must be abolished...."

When intervention ≠ protection

by **Ernie Regehr**

NATO's war on Yugoslavia, enthused the *Globe and Mail*, proves that "bombing works" (June 5). It's true, we must hope and trust that peace will one day follow war, but it doesn't follow that the latter produced the former. The only thing that is certain is that when the bombing finally stops the situation will be much, much worse than it was when the bombing started.

The only possible defence of the bombing is the claim that without it the situation would have been even worse today, but there is no supporting evidence. The hard evidence confirms that bombing did not prevent the extraordinary dislocation of Kosovars, but that it bequeathed to all Yugoslavia a post-conflict environment of widespread physical destruction and entrenched bitterness.

The notion that "bombing works" is unlikely to catch on. Even its advocates will not be inclined to offer it as a compelling model for aid to vulnerable civilians in far-away places. Of one thing we can be sure: NATO bombers will offer their services only when NATO credibility is thought to be on the line.

The greater danger is that another more tempting but equally wrong lesson will be drawn from this debacle—namely, that the international community should stay out of such conflicts altogether. Much of the opposition to NATO bombing in Yugoslavia was based less on an aversion to bombing than an aversion to engagement in con-


flicts where national interests are not directly at stake. 'Don't get involved,' they said, 'except perhaps to build a fence around the conflict and let the Balkans do to each other what they have always done.' It is precisely that impulse to non-involvement that keeps the international community out of places like Rwanda and Sudan.

A "human security" paradigm carries with it an obligation to intervene in the domestic affairs of states if those states fail in their duty and capacity to uphold minimum standards of human rights and maintain minimal order. Sovereignty is not an acceptable barrier to assist people in grave peril. That leaves the international community with a major, two-fold challenge.

First, given that the UN Security Council decides intervention issues on the basis of the vital interests of its five permanent members rather than the perspectives of citizens in great peril, the international community must find other legally and politically credible means of authorizing intervention. Even more urgent is the second challenge—i.e. to find means of intervention that really do bring protection.

The latter challenge must be focussed on early and consistent engagement in troubled regions to create the kinds of social, economic and political conditions that respect human rights, sustain peace and prevent war. When war is not prevented, military intervention must be true to the human security imperative to

protect the vulnerable. Entering the war itself, whether through aerial bombardment or ground forces, will not bring protection.

How then does the international community actually enforce international standards and protect vulnerable people without simply escalating the violence? Protective forces outside the main arenas of armed conflict—to facilitate humanitarian relief and protect villages and refugees from marauders—represent the kinds of actions possible. Such restricted actions will necessarily leave many unprotected, but the lesson of Kosovo is that entry into direct battle, far from increasing protection, dramatically escalates vulnerability. 

Ernie Regehr, Director of Project Ploughshares, wrote this for Mondial.

Still short of goal

When the UN was created after World War II, "our founders knew that people all over the world were looking to them to make sure that such a nightmare would never be repeated.

"It was that hope, that expectation, which they captured so unforgettably, in words that echo down to us across the decades: 'determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.'

"My friends, I cannot pronounce those words before you this morning without a feeling of deep frustration. We all know how far, far short of fulfilling that great expectation we still are."

— Kofi Annan, speaking at the Hague Appeal for Peace

"...Entering the war itself, whether through aerial bombardment or ground forces, will not bring protection...."

No way to fight a war

by **Simon Rosenblum**

With all of my anxieties over how the Kosovo issue is being handled, I still wake up each morning hoping that this will be the day that NATO "wins." That Slobodan Milosevic's Serbs were involved in significant ethnic cleansing in Kosovo and were poised to escalate those actions seems undeniable. Consequently, there was an imperative for the international community to act.

Our traditions and core value systems strongly define what we understand to be imperatives. For me, as a Jew, I continue to suffer from post-Holocaust trauma, and the demand of "Never Again" becomes the cry of my generation.

Only five years ago, Rwanda suffered a horrific genocide and the world stood by. Our shame surely remains enormous and leads us to the proposition of humanitarian military interventions in situations where egregious crimes against humanity are being committed. Kosovo is such a situation and nobody but NATO had any intention to do anything about it.

But as a World Federalist, am I not upset that NATO's actions have no basis in international law? International law as I understand it provides mixed guidance. On the one hand, there is an evolving code of humanitarian law which condones military actions against sovereign states in order to prevent crimes against humanity. But there is also the United Nations charter which clearly demands that only

the UN can authorize such military actions. We all know that in this instance Russia and China would have used their Security Council vetoes to block approval. This obliges us to again discuss UN reform.

The UN Security Council structure is a sorely inadequate representation of the international community and also dysfunctional. To be a permanent Security Council member, it seems you have to be a nuclear weapons state. And the veto system is just plain wrong. Before there is integrity to the position that the UN is the sole arbitrator over whether humanitarian military interventions are to occur, much will have to change in regard to how the UN does its business. The sooner that happens, the better, because without the UN being a credible bedrock for a system of international law there are obvious negative consequences.

I began by noting my anxiety over the NATO/Kosovo issue. Anxiety might be too weak a word for the concerns that I have had since the beginning of this crisis. Although they will be quick to deny it, NATO officials thought it would only take a few days of bombing to bring Milosevic to his knees. It is indeed true that in 1995 NATO bombing in the Balkans had that effect, but only because the Serbs had been beaten up on the ground by the Croats. The odds of a quick air war this time were not high and the lack of NATO military planning is very troubling.

But more to the point is that, for purposes of a humanitarian military intervention, bombing was just the wrong way to go. The imperative was to provide protection to those in great danger, and the only way to really do this is to roll up one's sleeves and get in there on the ground to stand in harm's way. I am not talking of an all-out ground war but rather a limited military intervention which would use—or threaten to use—lethal force to prevent war crimes.

Such a humanitarian military intervention does, of course, have the potential to escalate into a larger ground war, depending on the degree that one has to fight one's way in and the degree to which the Serbs persist. It is equally possible that such a NATO military intervention would have been an effective deterrent, substantially and quickly reducing Serbian atrocities.

NATO's military intervention in Kosovo has been nothing of this sort. It has been predicated on a premise that there can be no NATO loss of life. Consequently, NATO engaged in an antiseptic warfare of bombing from high up, with less than precision targeting and civilian casualties. There is something surreal and maybe even immoral in all of this and, if nothing else, it has given the precedent of humanitarian military intervention a very poor beginning. The world has much to learn.

Simon Rosenblum is a Toronto-based foreign policy writer and a WFC executive member.



"...if nothing else, it has given the precedent of humanitarian military intervention a very poor beginning. The world has much to learn...."

Bombing not humanitarian

"...NATO governments knew very well that this situation was likely to happen long before the bombings began..."

by **Hanna Newcombe**

It is increasingly clear to many Canadians that the NATO bombing of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has resulted in a horrifying furtherance of death and destruction. Most appalling are the recent killings of unarmed civilians attributed to direct attacks by NATO missiles and bombs.

NATO's bombing campaign was not a "humanitarian mission," as our government has continuously stated, in that the number of civilian deaths in Kosovo province and elsewhere in Yugoslavia have dramatically increased since the first day of bombing.

The increase in the killing and expulsion of Albanian Kosovars by Serb forces was directly related to the NATO attacks. Astonishingly, NATO governments knew very well that this situation was likely to happen long before the bombings began. This is evident in statements made by NATO Commanding Officer Wesley Clark prior to bombing, when he clearly stated that it was "entirely predictable" that atrocities

and ethnic cleansing would increase dramatically once bombing began. That Canada was a part of such a violent, inhumane and counter-productive action is shameful to say the least.

Popular non-violent democracy movements, which have brought together Serbs and Albanians for many years in united opposition to President Milosevic, have not been sufficiently supported by the Canadian government or NATO. Indeed, the NATO bombing has only weakened the democratic opposition in Serbia and strengthened Milosevic.

Why was Canada not originally involved in the promotion of serious negotiations between the Yugoslav government and the Kosovo Liberation Army? According to international standards of conflict resolution, the bargaining with President Milosevic prior to the bombing was simply a demand and had nothing to do with fair and effective negotiations.

As a purely military organization, NATO bombing exacerbated the violence in Yugoslavia in con-

travention of the Charter of the United Nations. Canada should have supported peaceful alternatives to resolving the war in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, through the United Nations (UN) and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), not NATO. Russia should be involved, diplomatically and in any UN peace operation.

Canada has a tradition of promoting the values enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. It is unfortunate that the NATO bombing of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has undermined the authority and spirit of the United Nations forever.

In summary, the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia was: 1) unlawful, according to international law; 2) destructive of human life; and 3) ineffective (in fact counterproductive) in aiming to protect the people of Kosovo.

Dr. Hanna Newcombe is Director of the Peace Research Institute, Dundas, Ontario.



NATO to review policy on nuclear weapons

In a development overshadowed by the media's focus on the Kosovo crisis, the NATO Summit in Washington April 23-25 opened the door to a broad-ranging review of its nuclear weapons policy.

NATO's 1999 Strategic Concept showed only scant movement over 1991 on nuclear weapons, but the Washington summit communiqué states: "...the Alliance

will consider options for confidence and security-building measures, verification, non-proliferation and arms control and disarmament. The Council in Permanent Session will propose a process to Ministers in December for considering such options..."

At a news conference April 24, Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy confirmed

the willingness of NATO "to have a review initiated" of its nuclear weapons policies. The thrust of the recommendations came out of the report of Canada's Foreign Affairs Committee, (see *CWF June 1998*, p. 3) and Mr. Axworthy added a review was "the message that the Prime Minister took [to] certain NATO leaders..."

Hague Appeal for Peace

For Peace and Justice in the 21st Century

by Fergus Watt

There is no definitive story to be told or report to be filed on the Hague Appeal for Peace (HAP).

HAP 99, held May 11 to 15, was a peace conference unlike any other. This was no diplomatic conference of governmental representatives called to end a particular conflict. It was a global conference, led by citizens' organizations, aimed at nothing less than building the conditions which can prevent future conflicts and eventually abolish war.

Indeed, many governments wanted no part of such a conference. After successful UN conferences earlier this decade on environment and development, population, human rights, human settlements, social development and women, there was growing anticipation of an end-of-century peace conference. But when some major powers withheld support for another major UN conference, civil society organized the Hague Appeal for Peace anyway.

And when over 9,000 people from all parts of the world showed up, doubling expected attendance, it was all organizers could do to cope.

The conference featured a wide cross-section of people from civil society and government, North and South. The lineup included UN Secretary-General Annan, two heads of state, a handful of foreign ministers, heads of UN agencies and international organizations, three Nobel prize laureates, authors, performers, academics and representatives of

World Feds involved

The World Federalist Movement was one of the primary initiators of the idea for a conference on peace at the end of the millennium. In the absence of a UN-sponsored event, WFM put all of its energies behind organizing a conference sponsored by civil society.

The World Federalist Movement served on the four-member coordinating committee of the Hague Appeal for Peace. The other members were the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms, the International Peace Bureau, and the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. WFM housed and supported the largest of the three secretariat offices for the Hague Appeal in New York.

over 700 non-governmental organizations.

And for added drama, just down the street from the conference site the World Court was hearing the case brought by the former Yugoslavia against 10 NATO states.

However, most of all, this was an activist conference. It was a conference about identifying what has to be done and campaigning for change.

The role of citizens was a central theme throughout the event. Bill Pace, the HAP Secretary-

General (and Executive Director of the World Federalist Movement), told delegates "We are here because conventional approaches to peace have failed miserably in this century—and are continuing to fail miserably even as we meet."

UN Secretary-General Annan added, "No one ever promised it would be easy to rid the world of the scourge of war, which is so deeply rooted in human history.... Perhaps most important of all, this requires a deep change in civil society—the development of a culture in which statesmen and diplomats alike know what is expected of them. They have to know that, in the eyes of their fellow citizens, the ultimate crime is not to give away some real or imaginary national interest. The ultimate crime is to miss the chance for peace, and so condemn your people to the unutterable misery of war."

So what in actual fact do you get when you show up at such a massive gathering?

- A Global Forum, in a room the size of three hockey arenas, presented over 900 displays and information booths from around the world.
- More than 400 workshop sessions (some attended by hundreds of participants) were organized, each with speakers and then discussion on how to turn ideas into action.
- And there's a formal document, a conference action plan, called the *Agenda for Peace*

"The ultimate crime is to miss the chance for peace, and so condemn your people to the unutterable misery of war...."

– Kofi Annan

Continued on page opposite

Wilson speaks out on extradition

World Federalists have been concerned about an amendment to the Criminal Code to align Canada's laws with the requirements of the International Criminal Court. This matter has been before the Senate. WFC's president, Senator Lois Wilson, spoke to one concern – whether the minister should have “sole discretionary power” of extradition – which could mean the death penalty for someone being sent to the USA. Or, should Canada enshrine “the right to life” in our Criminal Code? Following are excerpts from her remarks in the Senate.

“...If we believe the death penalty is unjustified in Canada, then the moral imperative to oppose it does not stop beyond Canada's borders....”

... My view is that the international covenants (on civil and political rights) to which Canada is signatory do not outline mere goals, or policy objectives, but rather fundamental human rights. In this case the covenant speaks of the right to life itself, and protects the sanctity of

life.... If we believe the death penalty is unjustified in Canada, then the moral imperative to oppose it does not stop beyond Canada's borders. So it is that treaty and covenant commitments internationally must be transformed into Canadian law....

Will the amendment allow and encourage a flood of criminals from the USA into Canada? The world cannot be made safe for everyone all the time. Releasing incarcerated criminals within Canada is no guarantee they won't re-offend. Yet we do this....

One of the arguments against the amendment is that the Minister of Justice needs discretion, otherwise she will have no leverage to encourage the United States to eschew the death penalty. It can be argued that quite the opposite is true.... If the Minister has no discretion, the Americans will know that whatever threats they make, they cannot obtain an extradition without assurances

that the death penalty will not apply. The amendment will strengthen the Minister's hand because the maximum penalty available is life imprisonment without the possibility of parole. Given a clear choice between letting a murderer go free, or prosecuting without asking for the death penalty, it is impossible to imagine that a prosecutor could reasonably drop the charges.

If the Minister is given discretion, she has to work in a somewhat ad hoc manner and without clear legal parameters. That discretion can too easily be at the mercy of political pressures or other public influences. “Discretion” in the bill should have been set in a clearer legal context and defined more narrowly. The Minister's discretion also allows Canada to avoid responsibility for executions of people extradited, even though the executions are carried out elsewhere and by someone else.


Hague Appeal, continued from previous page

and Justice in the 21st Century, which reads like a long list of campaigns and proposals—more than 50 sections are expected in the post-conference version which won't be published until later this summer. The Agenda is organized according to the four strands of the Hague Appeal: international humanitarian and human rights law; disarmament and human security; conflict prevention and transformation; and building a culture of peace.

But beyond the documents, the displays and demonstrations, the endless meetings, the round-the-clock lineups at copying, faxing and computer centres, there was a constant buzz of activity which left most delegates with a feeling that, even though they'd only seen a small part of a very large event, they'd been part of a process which is reinvigorating a worldwide peace movement.

It is too early to identify tangible outcomes from such a historic event. Indeed, the reporting of what went on may be just as con-

sequential in determining outcomes as the events themselves. Those who attended are just now assessing the impact the conference had on them. Only time will tell what impact it has on the world.

A copy of the Hague Appeal *Agenda for Peace and Justice in the 21st Century* is available from the WFC office. 

Fergus Watt is Executive Director of the World Federalists of Canada. WFC served as coordinating agency of the HAP Canada Network and Preparatory Process.

Toward global democracy

Excerpts from a presentation to hearings of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade on the question of International Trade Priorities and Concerns. The presentation was made by Simon Rosenblum on behalf of the World Federalists of Canada April 27.

Globalization to some is guilty of high crimes in the areas of economic and environmental justice. To others it is a panacea for all that ails us. We subscribe to neither viewpoint, but rather support the ongoing trend toward liberal and open trading relationships—mindful at the same time that globalization has changed the relationship of the national state to society in ways that create a democratic deficit at home and call for increased attention to global governance in a number of important policy areas. I use the term “democratic deficit” here to point to the gap between the limited powers transferred to the bodies of global governance and those lost/reduced in the nation state....

Since it is more difficult now to tax mobile capital, globalization reduces the ability of governments to fund the welfare state.... Then—and most relevant to the mandate of this committee—there is the issue of unfair trade practices. Here we are not talking of low wages per se but those unfair practices (constraints on free trade unions, unregulated child labour, etc.) which may artificially force down the price of labour and not allow wages to

rise with productivity....

We would recommend to you that the WTO insert provisions which protect workers’ elementary rights to freely organize—as codified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. It is of some note that recent scholarly studies have shown that this very right is indeed the most significant bellweather for overall democratic rights in the developing world....

We are, of course, mindful that many people also wish the WTO to adopt provisions against child labour. This I believe is a much more complicated issue, one that requires standards as much as—or more than—prohibitions....

It is, of course, essential to integrate trade and environmental policy formulations. In the preamble to the 1994 agreement establishing the WTO, member countries agreed to protect and preserve the environment and to enhance the means for doing so....

Process and Production Methods (PPMs) are presently not taken into consideration by the WTO, i.e. an importing country cannot discriminate on goods which are manufactured in an environmentally destructive fashion. With its almost exclusive focus on the physical characteristics of a good, the WTO is, we believe, at odds with efforts to create rules of international commerce that encourage sustainable production and consumption....

It is now widely recognized that trade liberalization, and economic globalization more generally, contribute to what may be called a “global governance agen-

da.” However, citizens feel left out of the process. Public discourse on global governance issues is perceived to be dominated by transnational corporations, officials of national governments and faceless international agencies. Accompanying this growing governance agenda, there exists also a global “democratic deficit....”

We urge this Committee to support a strong commitment to public participation, accountability and transparency at the WTO. Specifically, we suggest two directions for an improved WTO process: 1) expanding the role of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs); and 2) support for a WTO Parliamentary Assembly. The first is an objective which could be pursued immediately; the second is a longer term goal.

Improving the institutional arrangements with NGOs at the WTO should include broader and faster access to working documents; opening dispute settlement and appellate body proceedings to public observation; mandatory consideration of amicus briefs; and participation by NGOs in WTO meetings and development of a better consultative process between the WTO, NGOs, member governments, and businesses....

However, NGOs by definition almost always represent specialized interests. Parliamentarians on the other hand, having been democratically elected, are more legitimate voices for the common interest. The trade and gover-

...We urge this Committee to support a strong commitment to public participation, accountability and transparency at the WTO...

Continued on page 14

Active spring for Canadian Network for an International Criminal Court

World Federalists are continuing their work as the coordinating agency for the Canadian Network for an International Criminal Court (CNICC).

Last summer, UN-sponsored negotiations led to the adoption of the Rome Statute for an ICC. To date, 82 states have signed the Rome Statute and three have ratified. (NOTE: Signature signals a government's intention to ratify, but a state is not bound to comply with a treaty until it ratifies it.) Sixty ratifications are required in order for the ICC treaty to come into force.

In February, the Network organized a briefing at the Department of Foreign Affairs with members of the Canadian Delegation to the UN Preparatory Commission for the ICC. Twenty-six NGOs and government officials attended the briefing.

The Preparatory Commission, which held its first of six sessions later in February at the UN, is mandated to prepare for the establishment of the ICC and complete discussions of some issues (especially rules of procedure and evidence) which were not completed at last summer's successful ICC treaty conference. Just below the surface and animating corridor gossip during the Preparatory Commission is the continuing American opposition to the ICC treaty. NGOs observing the February deliberations found the U.S. to be constructive and usefully engaged in the

process. The next Preparatory Commission meeting takes place for three weeks in July and August.

The Canadian Network is also campaigning to have the Canadian and other governments support follow-up efforts through the Commonwealth and Francophonie which would enable the ICC treaty to come into force more quickly.

In 1997, the CNICC successfully lobbied to have both of these organizations adopt language at their Heads of Government meetings supportive of the ICC negotiations. This was instrumental in building awareness among political leaders of the need for the Court.

This year, members of the Canadian Network asked Canada's Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy to support initiatives through the Commonwealth and Francophonie which would promote signature and ratification by member states. The request to Mr. Axworthy was made by Amnesty International, Canadian representatives of the Women's Caucus on Gender Justice, the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development, the UBC International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy, and World Federalists of Canada. Axworthy was asked to support:

- Declaratory language in the 1999 Commonwealth and Francophonie Heads of Gov-

ernment communiqués; and

- Technical cooperation programs related to legislative changes states need to make in order to come into compliance with the ICC treaty.

The Commonwealth and Francophonie, as international organizations of governments with shared traditions and values, offer useful frameworks for sharing information which would enable states to more quickly be in a position to ratify the ICC treaty.

The CNICC has not yet had a formal reply to the request but was encouraged to learn that Canada asked to have the matter considered at the May 4-7 Commonwealth Law Ministers meeting, and that the Law Ministers adopted in their communiqué language encouraging signature and ratification of the ICC treaty, as well as monitoring and participation by the Commonwealth Secretariat in the work of the UN Preparatory Commission for an ICC.

The CNICC has also drawn the need for cooperation on ICC-related legislation to the attention of a July meeting of Francophonie Parliamentarians.

The Francophonie Heads of Government meeting takes place September 3-5 in Moncton. Commonwealth Heads of Government meet in Durban South Africa at the end of October.

Ed Schreyer

On the need for functional federalism

Excerpts of a speech by Ed Schreyer, former NDP premier of Manitoba and former Governor General of Canada, to World Federalists in Winnipeg.

...some of the practices affecting resource use and therefore environmental effect are of a local or regional impact and can be dealt with by local or regional governance. (In a global sense, nations are regions.)

Some problems are of a nationwide, and indeed, an increasingly trans-national scale and, at times, a global scale with global impact. At least two factors make this so. One is the shrinking of the time-space equation, i.e., transport speed and communications; the other is the very scale and size of resource use by a global population that is growing almost 100 million per year in numbers and growing also in per capita use of resources and therefore, environmental impact. It is the combination or compounding of these two factors that is resulting in volumes of resource use, energy use and therefore environmental impact that are so large ... and so international that only global action can begin to be effective. If, globally we are consuming each year 80 billion tonnes of fossil fuel, 100 times as much as 100 years ago, and 1000 times as much as 500 years ago, is it any wonder that CO₂ emissions are now on such a scale that the very atmosphere of this planet is undergoing greenhouse gas buildup. Only

global action by treaty will make any difference—a form of governance, a form of federalism, functional federalism, becomes imperative.

The lessons of global resource use problems also applies to global finance and currency trading. There, too, is need for global governance—functional federalism....

Closing the gap between haves and have nots, which was a marked achievement of the era 1935-1985, came to a stall and now in the 1990s, this is reversing. This approach, which served the Western world so well for 35 years or more, fell into disrepute and was largely abandoned by the 1990s and now the gap is widening after 40 years of convergence. It has as yet no credible successor, except of course, we do hear the rhetoric of the 1990s which uses the buzzwords of “free market determiners,” “down-sizing,” “privatization,” “globalization of investment,” and of “currency-(de)stabilizing hedge funds.”...

One of the largest and most successful of the financial world's hedge fund operators and currency market speculators, George Soros, is now well and articulately on the record as advocating commensurate regulations and controls to match the size and scope of international financial markets. In the absence of regulation such manipulations in capital movements and currency speculation is and remains answerable to no one....

The question then arises: if the nation state is gradually losing its ability to monitor and regulate that transnational activity, (to some degree by inability to cope; to some degree a decision to quit even trying) then what is the consequence? Some might argue that monitoring (fact finding, data analysis and regulation) by governments exercising their democratic mandate and responsibility to protect the public interest is all replaceable by “free market forces” competing in the market place.

This may be certainly true with respect to most retail merchandising. It most certainly does not apply to major decisions in the energy and environmental field, airline safety, stock market and financial market manipulation. In short, in many sectors the market place works well. The presence of competition is real and genuine; in other sectors there is only an artificiality of competition and the marketplace is not an instrument for guarding the public interest. Indeed, if longer term considerations arise, it is at a major disadvantage. If there are to be any instruments of public policy to provide “peace, order and good government” there has to be a governance. That is elementary.

We must watch carefully to see whether the buzzwords of the 1990s—deregulation, privatization, downsizing—are merely a stroke of the pendulum or whether it is an ongoing effort to



... We must be on guard that the extremism and zeal of the deregulators does not poison the well of democratic governance...

Continued on page 14

Havel speaks on UN, Kosovo



Excerpts from a speech by Václav Havel, president of the Czech Republic, to a joint session of Canada's Senate and House of Commons April 29, 1999.

...It is in the interest of humanity—of human rights and liberties as well as of life in general—that there is more than one channel through which the decisions of planetary leadership flow to the citizens...

... I believe that in the coming century, most states will begin to transform from cult-like objects which are charged with emotional contents, into much simpler and more civil administrative units which will be less powerful and especially more rational and will constitute merely one of the levels of a complex and stratified planetary societal self-organization. This change, among other things, should gradually antiquate the idea of non-intervention; that is, the concept of saying that what happens in another state, or the measure of respect for human rights there, is none of our business...

One of the most important organizations in which all states, as well as major transnational entities, meet as equals for debate, and make many important decisions which affect the whole world, is the United Nations.

I believe that if the United Nations is to successfully perform the tasks to be imposed on it by the next century, it must undergo substantial reform.

The Security Council, the most important organ of the United Nations, can no longer maintain conditions from the time when the organization first came into being. Instead it must equitably mirror the multipolar world of

today. We must reflect on whether it is indispensable that one state—even if only theoretically—could outvote the rest of the world.

We must consider the question of which great, strong and numerous states do not have permanent representation in that body. We must think out the pattern of rotation of the non-permanent members, and a number of other things.

We must make the entire vast structure of the United Nations less bureaucratic and more effective....

Most importantly, I believe we should ensure that all the inhabitants of our earth regard the United Nations as an organization that is truly theirs, not just as a club of governments. The crucial point is what the UN can accomplish for the people of this planet, not what it does for the individual states as states. Therefore, changes should probably be made also in the procedures for the financing of the organization, for the applications of its documents and for the scrutiny of their application.

This is not a matter of abolishing the powers of states and establishing some kind of a giant global state instead. This matter is that everything should not always flow, forever, solely through the hands of states or their governments. It is in the interest of humanity—of human rights and liberties as well as of life in general—that there is more than one channel through

which the decisions of planetary leadership flow to the citizens, and the citizens' will reaches the planetary leaders. More channels mean more balance and a wider mutual scrutiny....

The (NATO) Alliance, of which both Canada and the Czech Republic are now members, is waging a struggle against the genocidal regime of Slobodan Milosevic. It is neither an easy struggle nor a popular one, and there can be different opinions on its strategy and tactics. But no person of sound judgment can deny one thing: This is probably the first war ever fought that is not being fought in the name of interest, but in the name of certain principles and values.

If it is possible to say about a war that it is ethical, or that it is fought for ethical reasons, it is true of this war. Kosovo has no oil fields whose output might perhaps attract somebody's interest; no member country of the Alliance has any territorial claims there; and Milosevic is not threatening either the territorial integrity, or any other integrity, of any NATO member.

Nevertheless, the Alliance is fighting. It is fighting in the name of human interest for the fate of other human beings. It is fighting because decent people cannot sit back and watch systematic, state-directed massacres of other people. Decent people simply cannot tolerate this... **m**

Memories of Arnold Simoni

Norman Alcock

There are great souls. Arnold Simoni would have been embarrassed to have been called one, but he was. Brilliant, humble, warm and generous—and honest. If Arnold didn't agree with your point of view he would say so directly, and never harbour even lingering recriminations or rancor; it wasn't in his nature. His vision included a peaceful world and his life was devoted to that vision relentlessly.

Though fully aware of future obstacles, his energy never seemed to flag.

Indeed over the decades I turned to him not only for his thoughtful take on any current issue, but as a source of renewed vitality. We would have lunch, often laugh with dark despair, but inevitably Arnold would want to test out some new idea which just might work. Then he would be tireless in carrying it out, and he'd make sure that you carried out your part.

Philosophically Arnold Simoni was idealistic, but he was also a pragmatist, for he had experienced personally all the European 'isms' of this century. The World Federalist successes of this past year would have pleased Arnold; now we will miss his cautions and warnings of the shoals ahead.

He was one of my dearest friends.


Functional Federalism

Continued from page 12 _____

dismantle governance in the economy. We must be on guard that the extremism and zeal of the deregulators does not poison the well of democratic governance. Furthermore, there is a parallel test going on globally in our global village. Will humankind have the means, the tools necessary to deal with global environment, resource stewardship and global financial capital movements, as I have mentioned?

If there is to be any means of meeting this challenge which is already here, it requires a countervailing global governance. This can take many forms: the UN and its agencies, intergovernmental panels (on an ad hoc or permanent basis), treaty obligations (some already successful (eg., CFCs), some in their infancy and struggling like the Kyoto 1997 Protocol). In the end, what is urgently needed is a continued idealism and persistence by people with solidly democratic commitment, stalwart enough to resist the idea that governance must give way to the marketplace in determining future goals, responsibilities and human values.

It is a case of governance at home and internationally, democratic and globally federal as an alternative to unseen forces, secretive, and unaccountable....

As for me, I would sooner rely on democratic accountability and global functional federalism than any 21st Century "Merchants of Venice"—accountable to very few, sometimes not even their own shareholders. Power corrupts accountability. 

Toward Global Democracy

Continued from page 10 _____

nance debate in so many respects boils down to a need for compromise, a need to reconcile competing public policy objectives. In any mature, democratic political community, the single most appropriate institution for enabling citizens to be represented is a parliament. Whereas the WTO is presently made up of representatives of governments who ultimately represent institutional interests within a nation-state system, a parliamentary assembly would bring a new and different voice to international

discourse on trade and governance issues.

The European Parliament and the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE provide important examples of how supranational political organs can begin and evolve. We believe this Committee should endorse the goal of creation of a Parliamentary Assembly for the WTO....

Our specific proposals today might be considered "minimalist" by some, but we very much hope that they will help facilitate a renewed enthusiasm for appreciating the role that global governance can play in meeting the challenges of globalization....

Branch News

Vancouver - "Who are the World Federalists? I've never heard of them," was a frequently heard comment as dozens of interested Vancouverites took in a series of three lively meetings sponsored by the WFC Vancouver Branch. The meetings explored some of the recent work of global financier and philanthropist George Soros, whose recent book, *The Crisis of Global Capitalism*, discusses the inherent dangers of an unregulated global economy and calls for bold measures to improve global governance of the international financial system.

Victoria - World Federalists were out in force at the 18th annual Earth Walk, Saturday, April 17. The Walk ended at the Legislative Grounds where some 50 organizations set up information tables. On May 1 the Branch Annual meeting was held at Pearson College. Prof. Phillip Resnick was the keynote speaker, on *Democracy: Ideals and Reality*. Dimitri Alpatof and Philip Symons were elected Co-Presidents. Five Victoria federalists attended the Hague Appeal for Peace in May. Follow-up meetings are planned, to identify which elements from the HAP Agenda for Peace and Justice in the 21st Century will be incorporated in future branch programs.

Windsor - The MAI-Day coalition and Windsor World Federalists sponsored a two-day human rights conference last November which drew 200 people to hear a number of expert speakers, mostly from Ontario universities (and as far away as Omaha). John Foster, Professor of Human

Rights Law at University of Saskatchewan, gave the keynote address. Themes running through both workshops and plenary sessions included ways of improving enforcement and compliance with international human rights norms, and bringing international economic organizations more directly under the umbrella of the United Nations. Some of the same themes were picked up a few months later, in a presentation to the Parliamentary Committee Hearings on Canadian interests in the next round of WTO trade liberalization talks, by branch member Vito Signorile.

Winnipeg - In addition to the Robson lecture address by Hon. Ed Schreyer (see page 12), Winnipeg Federalists organized a "Global Formation" with a large display of flags from around the world and a World Federalist banner at the Earth Day celebrations. Cec Muldrew attended the Hague Appeal for Peace and was to give a report at a meeting June 13.

Montreal - In May, the Issues Action Group followed up on the Tobin Tax issue by writing congratulatory letters to Paul Martin and Jean Chrétien, reminding them of Parliament's support for M239. (see page 3). Many at the meeting also wrote separate letters to the Prime Minister on the war in Yugoslavia. Marie-Berthe Dion represented World Federalists June 23 at a Networking Forum (a meeting of human rights workers from around the world) sponsored by the Canadian Human Rights Foundation.

Applications sought

The World Federalists of Canada (WFC) is a national non-profit membership organization. World Federalists support the evolution of political structures and international law to provide improved and more democratic governance for an interdependent global community.

WFC has created a half-time position for a one-year renewable contract. Reporting to the Executive Director and WFC Board, responsibilities include: coordinating the organization's annual membership drive and mail campaigns; new donor recruitment; expanding WFC's planned giving program; contacts with key donors; foundation and government fundraising. Salary level to be commensurate with experience.

The successful candidate will possess superior writing and communication skills. Computer literacy is essential. Bilingualism is an asset.

Interested individuals are invited to send a résumé and samples of written work in confidence, by August 15, 1999 to:

Fergus Watt
Executive Director
World Federalists of Canada
207 - 145 Spruce St.
Ottawa, ON K1R 6P1
Fax: (613) 563-0017
E-mail: wfcnat@web.net

Applicants may call to obtain further information. We thank all applicants for their interest in this position. Only those persons selected for an interview will be contacted.

Are you a World Federalist?

The time is right—the need is now—to join a world-wide movement working toward systems of global governance and international law which address the issues of globalization, democracy and justice. World federalist organizations are not affiliated with any political parties—federalist ideals cross all political boundaries.

Membership in the World Federalists of Canada includes a free subscription to *Mondial*, a quarterly journal of thought and opinion on international issues. A portion of WFC membership dues is remitted annually to the international World Federalist Movement. WFM includes 23 world federalist organizations worldwide. The international president is Sir Peter Ustinov.

Yes, I support the World Federalists of Canada. My membership payment is enclosed.

MEMBERSHIP RATES: Individual—\$35; Limited Income—\$12; Household—\$50; Contributor—\$75.

Name _____

Address _____

Postal Code _____ Telephone _____

Make payment to: World Federalists of Canada, 207-145 Spruce St., Ottawa, ON, K1R 6P1.

Please send me a tax receipt (make payment to the World Federalist Foundation).

mondial

145 Spruce Street, Ottawa, ON, K1R 6P1

Phone: 613-232-0647 Fax: 613-563-0017

E-mail: wfcnat@web.net

