

# mondial

PUBLISHED IN CANADA BY THE WORLD FEDERALISTS

NOVEMBER 2000

*Dowdeswell tells world federalists*

## Climate change response inadequate

*“Great company, great food, and stimulating speakers made for a very memorable event,” commented Bruce Hanson, one of 81 guests who attended the World Federalist Foundation special events at Toronto’s historic Arts and Letters Club on October 28. World federalists from Ontario, Québec and British Columbia, members of the Toronto Branch of the United Nations Association and their friends gathered to support the work of the Foundation. (Twenty-five others who were unable to attend made donations.)*

*The theme of climate change was evident throughout the evening—in the banquet speeches and silent auction presentation. Rev. Karen Hamilton, chair of the World Federalists of Canada Council, was master of ceremonies. Speakers included Shirley Farlinger, Rabbi Gunther Plaut, the Hon. Charles Caccia, artist and writer Kelley Aitken, and Elizabeth Dowdeswell, Toronto management consultant and former executive director of the United Nations Environment Programme. Here are some excerpts from her speech:*

“... The global community’s collective response to the climate

change issue is woefully inadequate. There is an enormous gap between what is being discussed and what has been achieved, let alone what the situation warrants....

Why is this public policy question so particularly perverse, so difficult? [There are] three elements to the answer: climate change requires decision-making in the face of **uncertainty**; climate change is a problem of unprecedented **scope and complexity**; and, climate change is the quintessential issue of global **interdependence**.

### Uncertainty

“...changing patterns of precipitation, warming and severe weather are not yet completely understood. The uncertainties are genuine. Although the models have become more accurate and reliable in the last 30 years, the role of clouds and of the oceans requires better definition. While we know something about global forecasts, we know less about regional and local change and impacts. We are better about predicting temperature than precipitation. Climate systems are complex, non-linear systems rife

with mathematical chaos and subject to surprises. Establishing cause and effect with precision remains a challenge....

But the science of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) gives evidence of clear and present danger. The latest IPCC report confirms that man-made pollution has contributed substantially to global warming and that the earth is likely to get hotter than previously predicted.

While the early days of negotiations often saw misrepresentation of facts, cynical selective interpretation, and drawing of questionable conclusions about the science, such skepticism has been largely replaced by the wisdom of precaution. The cost of inaction is too high. The sheer rate of change poses an unprecedented adaptation challenge for the earth’s ecosystem. Increasingly, potential impacts such as sea level rise, changes to the hydrologic cycle, extreme weather events, adverse effects on human health and agriculture are being studied, measured and mapped....

*Continued on page 6*

---

**“...man-made pollution has contributed substantially to global warming and the earth is likely to get hotter than previously predicted.”**

---

Outgoing President

# WF a 'first-class' NGO

*In the new year, Flora MacDonald takes over as president of the World Federalists of Canada. In a recent interview, outgoing president Lois Wilson reflects on her years at WFC's helm.*

"More and more, world federalism is being recognized as not only a legitimate but a first-class NGO. People look to it for leadership and governments occasionally include us in their consultations," says outgoing WFC president, Senator Lois Wilson.

Sen. Wilson pointed to the work of World Federalists to bring about three major global events in the past few years—the Hague Appeal for Peace, the global meeting that brought the Rome Statute for an International Criminal Court into being, and the Millennium Forum, a meeting of NGOs at the UN which preceded the Millennium Summit of world governments.

"Those are three things where World Federalists have contributed way beyond our membership strength," Sen. Wilson says.

"On the global scene, it's still pretty well a western movement... and still very male. We've a long way to go.

"My perception is that World Federalists have very strong, excellent people at the top—Bill Pace and Fergus Watt, for example—but on the ground, we're not so strong."

Sen. Wilson sees the hiring of a WFC fundraiser (Paul Dilse) as having more than financial benefits. It has "attracted people because they see us getting it together. The annual meeting in

Ottawa was very good and I think, in terms of numbers, it was one of the biggest. It was quite vigorous and that built morale a lot."

Sen. Wilson points to the resource material produced by WFC—"our issue sheets are first class"—and suggests collaboration with other organizations as a way forward. "I've always thought we should be doing more things in common with the UN associations but I find some are reluctant to do that. I'm not quite sure why. I think there should be a more lively dialogue between the two."

And Sen. Wilson suggests the moderate path followed by WFC as a way for the future as well. For example, on the World Trade Organization, "I think it's to the credit of World Federalists that we go into that debate not radically on either right or left but right down the middle. Despite all the protests that have taken place around the world relating to the WTO, World Federalists are saying 'there's this thing and we'd like to use our leverage to see how it can be made more accountable,' which is a more creative way of approaching it than simply condemning it and wishing it out of the way. That's going to pay off in the future."

As for her own future, "I want to write a book about the Senate. I've kept a diary but I'll have to wait until I leave the Senate before I publish it." For now, she plans to work on "international human rights and how they are implemented domestically in Canada..."



Published quarterly by the World Federalist Foundation (WFF) and the World Federalists of Canada. The World Federalist Foundation is a Revenue Canada registered charitable organization (reg. #:123998957RR0001). The World Federalists of Canada (WFC) is a national non-profit membership organization which advocates more just and effective global governance through the application of the principles of democratic federalism to world affairs. The WFC President is Senator Lois M. Wilson. WFC is a member organization of the international World Federalist Movement (WFM), which includes world federalist organizations in 24 countries around the world. The WFM President is Sir Peter Ustinov.

The WFC Advisory Board includes: Alan Beesley, Hon. John Bosley, Hon. Iona Campagnolo, L'Hon. Solange Chaput-Rolland, Andy Clarke, Marion Dewar, Maj. Gen. Leonard Johnson, Hon. David MacDonald, Hon. Flora MacDonald, Elizabeth Mann Borgese, Ovide Mercredi, Geoffrey Pearson, Rabbi Gunther Plaut, Prof. John Polanyi, Ernie Regehr, Senator Douglas Roche, Most Rev. Edward Scott.

Articles entitled, "Climate change response inadequate," "Toward preventing deadly conflict," "Federalism an opportunity for humanity," "Human security Axworthy legacy," "UN financial woes continue, U.S. owes most," "European Union as case study," "Water wars or water treaties," "Tough questions and consequences," "What did Millennium Summit do?" and "Gentle civility will be missed," are the responsibility of WFF and are denoted by M concluding the article. Material is not copyrighted. Submissions are welcome. Il nous fera plaisir de publier les articles présentés en français.

ISSN number: 1488-612X

Mondial's editorial working group:

Leonard Angel, Donna Lindenberg,  
Simon Rosenblum, Fergus Watt.

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

E-mail: wfcnat@web.ca

Web site: <http://www.web.net/~wfcnat>

Options for UN peace operations

## *Toward preventing deadly conflict*

**By Geoffrey Pearson  
and Peter Langille**

Rwanda, Kosovo, East Timor, Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We may not know precisely where deadly conflict will happen next, nor are we certain of how the international community will respond. Yet, most do understand that we could and should do better.

The critical question of 'how' elicits a range of preferences. A few are confident in leaving such tasks to the great powers, on the off chance that actions taken advance their own national interests. Similarly, there has been much talk of regional organizations, although NATO is still virtually alone in having such capabilities, if not the will after its approach on Kosovo failed to inspire wider support.

There is also interest in delegating such jobs to 'coalitions of the willing,' modeled on the Australian-led multinational force that restored a semblance of order in East Timor after most of the cleansing and killing had subsided. Even private mercenary forces have tried to stake a claim to peace operations, albeit with little success in selling the notion that guns for hire are the best that we can aspire to. And still others suggest that we do nothing to help the victims, but isolate ourselves behind continental defences.

Then there is the United Nations—founded to give us another, possibly a final, chance to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. Its legitimacy is largely derived from its

Charter commitment to the common interest and universal membership. One obligation of membership, spelled out clearly in Chapter VII, includes the provision of adequate financial and personnel resources to allow the UN to fulfill its assigned tasks in maintaining international peace and security.

Of course, promises are easier to make than to keep. Four of the peace operations mounted in the past year entailed a Chapter VII mandate, but the authorization for the possible use of force made it even tougher for the UN to attract the necessary help. Regrettably, again the responses tended to be too little, too late, with insufficient well-trained personnel, inadequate equipment and too-few resources.

Although there are exceptions, the notion of protecting one's own citizens at home is quite familiar to most governments most of the time. Protecting other citizens in other countries, however, is a relatively new standard that many sovereign states find quite challenging. For some of the more brutal states, the fear is that 'what goes around might come around.' Confronted with the prospect of entering into agreements that bind them to commit to conflicts elsewhere, it's easy to see why some are unnerved.

Events such as World Wars I and II, the Korean War, and even the end of the Cold War, led the international community to agree on the need for collective security, but little was actually done to empower the UN or pro-

vide it with a mechanism to act as a '911' global emergency service for preventing deadly conflict.

Yet, as the recognized risks and costs of inaction generate new standards, they will also prompt tighter agreements and, eventually, the development of dedicated UN mechanisms. Rather than await another crisis, it is time to consider how to build on and beyond the UN's rudimentary foundation for peace operations and how to accelerate the current reform process.

In August, the Brahimi Report (by the Panel on UN Peace Operations) identified an array of related problems, as well as 56 recommendations, ranging from a sweeping overhaul of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to mandates permitting the use of force when warranted.

The report pointed to the difficulties of pulling together a collection of battalions that are unfamiliar with each other. It encouraged member states to enter into partnerships to establish coherent brigade-size forces (approximately 5,000 troops), using common doctrine, training and equipment standards. Although there are no guarantees, it was suggested such an arrangement might facilitate deployment within 30 days rather than the 1990s average of three to six months.

This is a promising idea, but not entirely new. In fact, the development of a multinational standby high readiness brigade

---

*"...the notion of protecting one's own citizens at home is quite familiar to most governments most of the time. Protecting other citizens in other countries, however, is a relatively new standard that many sovereign states find quite challenging."*

---

*Continued on next page*

## Fewer excuses, faster UN responses

*Continued from previous page* \_\_\_\_\_

(SHIRBRIG) has been underway for over five years. The SHIRBRIG stemmed from a Danish-led initiative, designed to offer the UN prompt access to a versatile force of approximately 5,000 well-equipped soldiers. The intent was to provide the UN with a 'jump start capability' to deal with the first phases of an emerging or spreading conflict.

After several years of joint planning and common training standards, we should be seeing fewer excuses and faster responses. Response times (from initial notification to actual deployment) were to be within 15-30 days. Nations can still decide whether they will participate in any specific mission, but there is now more flexibility and a larger pool to draw from. This initiative succeeded in attracting 13 participants, including Argentina, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Jordan, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Spain and Sweden.

Most agreed to provide at least a battalion of roughly 500 troops, as well as a few personnel for planning—which hardly represents a major 'drain' on any defence establishment. In January, the SHIRBRIG was declared to be 'available' to the UN. It may soon face a demanding first-test. Despite lingering concerns about insufficient support arrangements and logistics, the SHIRBRIG is finally being readied for deployment to Ethiopia and Eritrea.

There have already been a few

delays, partially because it needs an operations headquarters.

Canada formerly championed the establishment of a permanent, headquarters arrangement within the UN's Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the UN Secretary-General authorized it in 1996. This spring, the UN Committee on Peacekeeping demanded the staff, but it still needs eight, qualified people.

SHIRBRIG is one advanced mechanism within what is now a far more substantive UN Standby Arrangement System (UNSAS), a growing list of personnel and resources that numerous governments have offered the UN on a conditional basis.

By May 2000, 88 member states confirmed their willingness to provide standby resources, representing a total of 147,900 personnel. All governments still retain the right to say 'no' on a case-by-case basis. However, a number of the more supportive have already earmarked specific units to be on a high state of readiness and 33 countries have signed a UN Memorandum of Understanding to firm up their commitments. Regrettably, others, such as Canada, haven't.

The current level of redundancy should enable the UN to draw on alternate sources if those initially selected are unwilling, unable or too slow to respond to deadly conflicts. Combined, the recommendations of the Brahimi report, the SHIRBRIG and the UNSAS, may have the potential to restore wider public and political confidence in the UN. Support and confidence are likely to

be prerequisites to stable funding. Of course, complementary national defence reforms would also be helpful, particularly the provision of well-trained, earmarked forces, air- and sea-lift, as well as an operational headquarters.

It would be premature to raise hopes that these arrangements will prevent deadly conflict. As currently stipulated, both the UNSAS and the SHIRBRIG have been designated solely for Chapter VI peacekeeping operations, which effectively limits deployment to the more demanding, recent operations that have entailed a Chapter VII mandate and the possible use of force.

Events of the past decade clearly indicate the limitations of conditional arrangements that depend on national units and the authorization of every participating member state. They provide a useful foundation but one that remains insufficient to provide universal protection and one that urgently requires more ambitious measures.

Success in other 'soft power' initiatives suggests that we can do better, that with further cooperation, educational efforts and new partnerships, we might restore the vision and political will to initiate a dedicated UN mechanism. **□**

*Ambassador (ret.) Geoffrey Pearson is the president of the United Nations Association of Canada. Dr. Peter Langille is an adjunct professor in the Department of Political Science, University of Western Ontario, where he teaches conflict prevention.*

---

***“Combined, the recommendations of the Brahimi report, the SHIRBRIG and the UNSAS, may have the potential to restore wider public and political confidence in the UN.”***

---

# Federalism an 'opportunity for humanity'

*Excerpts of speech by Dr. James Christie, the current chair of the council of the World Federalist Movement, delivered to the national meeting of Japanese World Federalists this October in Kyoto.*

“... The World Federalist Movement, as an idea, emerged spontaneously in those fragile and hopeful years after World War II from Tokyo to Toronto, from London to Los Angeles. It coalesced into a movement in the Montreux Palace Hotel, Montreux, Switzerland, in 1947. It arose out of a conviction that a great opportunity lay before humanity, an opportunity to reshape the course of human affairs, and that the great dream of the United Nations was just not great enough in either vision or reality to seize that opportunity.

In the early days, the ideas of the movement seemed so obvious, its truths as self-evident as those articulated by the founders of the American Republic. The great and the good flocked to the banner of world federalism. Philosophers, statesmen and poets alike declaimed in favour of our ideas....

With the onset of the Cold War, a bi-polar world seemed to render the federalist vision obsolete. Many of our number gave up hope; we were marginalized to the sidelines of the peace movement, at least in North America and Europe. But an idea does not lose its validity simply because it ceases for a time to be fashionable. And there were



Jim Christie, chair of WFM Council and past president of WFC.

many around the world, some in this room, who were determined to keep the vision alive for a new generation to be captured by it. And they succeeded....

And so the torch of World Federalism is being taken up by a new generation, but the strategies of the movement are changing, and this is not easy. It has led to a new federalist debate, one that is changing the nature of our strategies, but not our goal.

## The Federalist Debate

For more than four decades, adherents of the World Federalist Movement promoted plans and programs which have been called “maximalist.” This is to say that they focused on the language of world government, and promoted the idea of lobbying governments to convene conferences dedicated to the writing of world constitutions and such. This is, of course, a caricature, and like all caricatures, carries within it both truth and gross distortion....

The programs required more, much more than our resources, material and human, could provide. And so it was that in the early 1990s, with a new International Secretariat under the leadership of Bill Pace, the World Federalist Movement began to take a leaf from the book of Jean Monet, the great European Federalist, and the practical originator of what I have called incremental federalism.

Monet’s thesis and strategy were simple. Undertake a small and manageable federal project, succeed, and use this success as the foundation for the next step....

And so it is that the World Federalist Movement embarked on its most remarkable project ever, the Non-governmental Coalition for an International Criminal Court, which led to the landmark Rome Statute in 1998.

At first blush, it has seemed to many Federalists to be a side-issue to our major themes. Not so. For justice and peace are inseparable, and a world united in justice and peace must have a mechanism by which justice can be determined....

The federalist vision, to be at all valid, must be functional in a multi-faceted world. Myriad global questions impinge on the application of federalist principles at the dawn of this new century, among them the migration of peoples, global trade, electronic communications—indeed the media in general—ecological issues, religion, and, of course,

---

***“The federalist vision, to be at all valid, must be functional in a multi-faceted world.”***

---

*Continued on page 7, ‘WFM...’*

# Climate changes shows our interdependence

Continued from page 1

## Scope and complexity

The second characteristic of this policy problem is its unprecedented scope and complexity. Climate change is not simply about meteorology, but about energy. Fundamentally, it is about the basis of our economic development, our security and our ways of life. And so, we must not expect miracles. Our patterns of energy consumption have grown up over centuries and have become entrenched in the life of nations, society and culture. This cannot be changed easily....

In 1990, Canada emitted 601 million tons of greenhouse gases (two per cent of the global total). By 1997 that figure had risen 13.4 per cent to 682 million tons. And, in 2010 greenhouse gases are projected to be 25 per cent above 1990 levels. We are one of the world's highest per capita emitters. Our economy has been dependent on fossil fuels and our reliance on international trade raises worries about competitiveness if we were to act unilaterally.

And when the questions 'who is responsible?' and 'who should take action?' are asked, constitutional tensions are ever present. The federal government can sign international agreements, but the provinces have the authority to implement them. In 1996, Ontario and Alberta accounted for 58 per cent of total net emissions; Quebec and British Columbia for 22 per cent. The transportation sector emitted

24.5 per cent of the total, followed by the industrial, electricity generation and fossil fuel production and distribution sectors. In this federation, cooperation between the federal and provincial governments and the public and industrial sectors is essential, but apparently difficult....

## Interdependence

Climate change illustrates our interdependence with all other nations. While we once considered environmental problems to be purely local concerns—urban air pollution or sewage discharges—we know now that the impacts can be felt hundreds and thousands of kilometers away. Sometimes the source can be traced. Most often it can't.

The fact is that the eruption of a volcano in the Philippines can affect European climate; that the oil fires in Kuwait can perturb the ecological balance of the Himalayas. We know that a slight change in the ocean currents can seriously affect the economy of a country....

And it goes without saying that there is a profound difference between developing and industrialized countries. Developing countries are not likely to compromise their objective of economic growth in response to a problem created by rich countries. As developing countries are fond of pointing out, with justification, it is the industrialized countries that have benefitted from using the global atmosphere as a sink for their carbon byproducts and that now propose

limits on the use of that shared resource. Curbing greenhouse gases is not the highest priority of developing countries, and in any case, their response would require an infusion of money and technology....

Similarly, rapid growth in population in countries in the south sounds an alarm bell in the north with cries for more responsible behaviours. Emissions in developing countries are expected to rise exponentially in the next 20 to 30 years and account for nearly 50 per cent of carbon dioxide emissions by 2010....

I would not wish to be seen as an apologist for the almost paralytic pace of international decision-making and national action but I think it is important to understand the nature of this policy problem—the characteristics of uncertainty, scope and complexity and interdependence. Without doubt, this issue more than any in history tests our skill in public policy-making and diplomacy as well as our political will....

I firmly believe that what will be required is the synergy of a generation of sound science, the mobilization of social consensus and the development of effective public policy. If we want real and meaningful change, we need more than a scientific report; we need to understand how to change people's attitudes and behaviours and we need to design effective public policies to bring about that change - both as consumers and citizens.

---

***"...it is the industrialized countries that have benefitted from using the global atmosphere as a sink for their carbon byproducts and that now propose limits on the use of that shared resource."***

---

Continued on opposite page

# WFM a global 'thought web' and lobby

Continued from page 5 \_\_\_\_\_

the ongoing and continuing role of nation states, especially those emerging during the past several decades of the post-colonial era....


The implications of the World Wide Web are almost beyond calculation. Let it be said that, for better or for worse, modern technology has already exceeded Marshall McLuhan's wildest projections, transforming his projected global village into the global neighbourhood. No tyrant is free from scrutiny, and yet reasonable privacy is seriously at risk. How will the global neighbourhood organize its affairs?...

World federalism is first a global "think tank;" more accurately,

a "thought web," concerned with developing strategies for global governance. We undertake research and writing on global issues covering the full spectrum of the factors I enumerated above. We publish those ideas in such media as may be from time to time available, and we seek to generate comparable research among like-minded persons and groups around the planet.

Secondly, we are a global lobby, seeking to influence policy makers at national and international levels to become familiar with federalist principles, to explore our propositions and, from time to time, as in the case of the International Criminal Court, to enact them.

Thirdly, and most difficult, we seek to be a popular movement. But popular movements with complex ideas seem almost to be an oxymoron in this day of the sound-bite with film at eleven, as we say in Canada. Perhaps we must inevitably rely on the poets and the artists sympathetic to our cause to find the means to touch hearts even as we hope to touch heads.

In the long run, I am convinced that our ideas and our vision will prevail. Humanity is like an adolescent: full of promise, constantly at risk. But the task of creating human unity is unavoidable. As the late Rabbi Harry Joshua Stern said, "There will be one world or no world." 

---

**"...the task of creating human unity is unavoidable.... 'There will be one world or no world.'"**

---

Continued from opposite page \_\_\_\_\_


For governments to act aggressively, there needs to be a reasonable prospect for political support at home, greater public understanding of its importance and greater public preparedness to be part of the solution. In Canada, although public awareness is increasing and recent polls speak to a willingness to make a contribution, the results are fragmented and anecdotal. Governments need to hear that this issue matters to you!

Several non-governmental organizations run climate change campaigns. The David Suzuki Foundation launched a website to present community solutions and to help people get the message to the Prime Minister and

their Premier. The United Nations Association in Canada is suggesting direct actions such as auditing your own mode of transportation to reduce dependency on the private car; make sure your home is optimally insulated, buy and use energy-efficient household appliances and retire needless appliances. Others suggest buying locally produced food in season and separating waste. The market needs to hear from you that this issue matters.

The climate change treaty is really about how we cope with a changing world. How we share burdens fairly. How we build confidence. The kind of leadership we need goes well beyond bean-counting - to imaginative and knowledgeable statesmanship to overcome the powerful

momentum toward mediocrity.

I know that action will not happen simply because at a visceral level environmentalists want to save the planet. Even exquisite logic is not alone going to convince our publics to disrupt our comfortable way of life. But, we must not be the generation that squandered this opportunity or paralyzed our future. Our common vulnerability must be met with courage and boldness. I hope that you will be part of that constituency of concern." 

*Since this speech was delivered, President Lois Wilson and staff have followed up with correspondence to the Hon. Charles Caccia concerning Canada's position at The Hague negotiations.*

# 'Human security' Axworthy legacy

by **Simon Rosenblum  
and Fergus Watt**

The news of Lloyd Axworthy leaving Canadian politics to re-enter academia has occasioned a significant number of commentaries dedicated to assessing his performance as Minister of Foreign Affairs. We now add our two cents' worth to this discussion, and we do so from the perspective of two long-time foreign policy activists who have a deep respect for the contributions made by Lloyd Axworthy to Canadian public life.

The ban on landmines and the treaty to create an International Criminal Court are the most identifiable signature items of the Axworthy years. Both are still works in progress but have already contributed to the betterment of the international community. They demonstrate his dogged persistence to effect significant (and difficult) change in matters of international disarmament and global justice, and to do so in close partnership with NGOs. Notable as well was his determined (but unsuccessful) attempt to get NATO to adopt a nuclear no-first-use doctrine.

But his contribution really goes much further — into the essential framework that shapes foreign policy-making in the post-cold war era. Here his advocacy of a new paradigm based on notions of "human security" gives impetus to a tremendously important way of looking at our global responsibilities to one another. Like us, Mr. Axworthy is a "one-worlder" and insists that people take precedence over



Lloyd Axworthy

states. In "human security," Mr. Axworthy has elevated a set of ideas which offers foreign policy practitioners valuable new guideposts in an interdependent world.

Human security is not a new idea, and certainly isn't Mr. Axworthy's idea. Quite simply, human security places a focus on the security and protection of people. In practice, within the confines of a foreign affairs apparatus for a middle-power state like Canada, human security complements, but does not replace, national security as a guiding approach to policy and action — a fact often forgotten by Mr. Axworthy's critics.

What Mr. Axworthy has done in his four years as foreign minister is to take human security and build an international agenda around the concept. The effects are noticeable in Canadian diplomacy on a wide range of issues, including UN peace support operations, promoting democratic governance, peacebuilding, the reform of international institutions, refugees and

internally displaced persons, drug trafficking, and humanitarian intervention to name but a few. The human security approach has also led to new ways of implementing policy, including different sorts of partnerships with intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and the corporate sector.

For world federalists, human security makes abundant good sense. Fundamentally, sovereignty resides in the individual, who delegates decision-making authority to various levels of governing authority. A human security paradigm offers much potential for the evolution of global governance in ways world federalists would favour.

Significantly, Mr. Axworthy's efforts have not gone unnoticed by his peers. By demonstrating the day-to-day utility of a human security framework, a "Human Security Network" has evolved and now includes over a dozen states utilizing this approach. And "human security" has percolated through many of the speeches of UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, as well as other world leaders.

As Mr. Axworthy recently put it, there is an imperative for the international community to "ensure that indifference and inaction... are no longer an option" when people are at risk. While the emphasis in the human security agenda is clearly on such matters as early crisis identification, conflict prevention



Simon Rosenblum is a member of the WFC Executive Committee.



Fergus Watt is executive director of the World Federalists of Canada.

---

***"...there is an imperative for the international community to 'ensure that indifference and inaction... are no longer an option' when people are at risk."***

---

*Continued on opposite page*


# UN financial woes continue, U.S. owes most

The financial state of the United Nations remains precarious. As of September 30, 2000, member states owed the UN more than \$3 billion for current and past assessments—\$2.5 billion for peacekeeping, \$533 million for the regular UN budget, and \$54 million for international tribunals. The largest debtor, the United States, owes the UN \$1.9 billion for past and current assessments, two-thirds of the total due. This debt includes

more than \$430 million for the regular budget and just over \$1.5 billion for peacekeeping and international tribunals.

In order to deal with recurring budget deficits, the UN has periodically borrowed from peacekeeping funds. As a result, the organization is unable to reimburse promptly those countries which provide troops and equipment to peacekeeping operations. As of August 31, 2000, the UN owed 73 countries a total of more

than \$800 million for troops and equipment.

However, there have been fewer peacekeeping operations in recent years and therefore less cash in that account to cover the regular budget deficit. On the positive side, more states are paying their regular budget assessments in full each year—131 countries had paid up at the end of September 2000, with more expected by year's end, compared with 75 nations at the end of 1994. 

*Continued from opposite page*

and elimination of dire poverty, human security can also include the use of force. Witness Mr. Axworthy's support for NATO's military intervention in Kosovo/Serbia.

The criticisms of this NATO operation are well-known. Our problem is not with the concept of military humanitarian intervention but rather with the way in which that particular mission was carried out, i.e. the inept diplomacy that preceded the armed conflict and with its reliance on bombing instead of using ground troops. When and how the United Nations—or if need be, others—should set aside national sovereignties and intervene in civil conflicts is a major piece of the human security agenda that needs much work. After all, as William Shawcross recently argued in his study of UN peacekeeping *Deliver Us from Evil*, a pure application of the principles of humanitarian military intervention could very well lead to a world with never-

ending humanitarian wars.


Here again, Lloyd Axworthy has stepped forward in an effort to bring some clarity to this difficult subject. Under his leadership, Canada has recently put together an international commission—led by Algerian diplomat Muhamed Sahnoun and former Australian Foreign Minister Gareth Evans—to examine the hows and whens of military humanitarian interventions. In launching the commission, Mr. Axworthy stated, "In the absence of clarity, we will certainly be faced with the same questions, the same paralysis and the same lack of clear criteria, with the same tragic results" that occurred in Rwanda, Bosnia and elsewhere. Among such criteria are the following questions:

- Have all other peaceful dispute resolution means failed and is there a threat of massive human suffering?
- Could intervention prevent an internal conflict from spreading across borders and threatening regional or international security?

– Would the intervention stand a realistic chance of making a difference and what is the appropriate military response?

Needless to say, coming up with clear norms on intervention will be difficult enough. Getting the key nations to agree to follow them poses an even greater challenge.

Lloyd Axworthy is, of course, not without his critics. From the right, there is the charge that he has been merely engaged in self-righteous "pulpit diplomacy," or "foreign policy on the cheap," and from the left that he has made too many concessions to the United States. We ourselves could easily identify many matters on which we have taken exception to Lloyd Axworthy's policies, but that would be to miss the big picture.

Lloyd Axworthy's term as foreign minister has pioneered an approach to foreign policy which will lead others to make clearer choices toward a more democratically accountable and safer world. This is a worthy legacy for a fine and decent politician. 

---

**"...Lloyd Axworthy's term as foreign minister has pioneered an approach to foreign policy which will lead others to make clearer choices toward a more democratically accountable and safer world."**

---

# European Union as case study

**By David Blackwell**

When leaders of the 15 member states of the European Union meet at their December summit in Nice, France, they will be considering a couple of issues of crucial importance to their federation: how members make decisions democratically and if some members are allowed to integrate more closely than others.

With the prospect of 12 more countries joining the EU, possibly by as early as 2003, there is a pressing need for decisions on these issues.

World federalists will recognize the same sorts of issues, at the global level, as very much their own in their efforts to bring into being the supra-national institutions required to enact and enforce the global laws needed to effectively address problems like the environment, poverty, armed conflict, and denial of civil rights.

## Limiting vetoes

Limiting the power of veto by individual nation states and extending majority voting that fairly reflects population size is critical if an enlarged EU is to function effectively.

At present, no less than 73 articles and sub-articles in EU treaties require unanimous decision-making. A substantial number of these will need to be changed to decision-making by majority vote and a system of voting that is better weighted to reflect a member country's population size. However, achieving this change in voting procedures will require the unanimous consent of EU members on every article and sub-article.

The Council of Ministers, where member state ministers with the same portfolios—for example, agriculture, foreign affairs—conduct much of the EU's business, is one EU institution where reform of the voting rules is particularly needed. The institution remains the EU's most powerful legislative body. The elected European Parliament has much less authority to enact laws, though its ability to legislate has been increasing over time, helping to remedy the EU's democratic deficit.

As things currently stand, there are two types of voting in the Council of Ministers. Decisions on important (fiscal, migration, foreign, security and EU treaty amendment) matters, require unanimity. Decisions on matters of lesser importance do not expressly require unanimity and voting is weighted to partially reflect a country's population. For example, Germany, France, the UK, and Italy (the EU's largest member states) each has 10 votes, while Luxembourg, the EU's smallest member, has two.

Large member states complain that the present voting rules in the Council of Ministers allow smaller EU countries to use their vetoes to overrule them on matters of key concern, and that the weighted majority vote gives disproportionate clout to member states with smaller populations. With the imminent accession to the EU of smaller and much poorer countries of Eastern Europe, the voting rules now in place would exacerbate tensions. And because changes to the present voting rules require unani-

mous consent, the governments of larger EU member states could well bar those on the waiting list from becoming EU members.

## Two-speed Europe

Ironically, Germany and France, whose mutual enmity was very much at the core of the 20th century's two World Wars, have, along with other countries, been championing the idea that some EU member states could, on their own, take a faster track to closer political, economic, judicial, social, external affairs and defense integration.

The idea reflects the frustration of some EU members at the slow pace of EU integration, and may also be aimed at getting 'euroskeptics' like Britain to quicken their pace of integration for fear of being marginalized.

The European Council (heads of state/governments of EU member countries) made some progress on a 'two-speed' Europe at its October meeting in Biarritz, France, but full agreement on proceeding with the idea, and how to do so, remains to be achieved. Theoretically, however, a group of EU countries who wished to could opt to proceed more quickly to 'ever closer union' without necessarily violating existing EU treaties.

The idea of a two-speed world federalism has even been floated within WFC in recent years. Indeed, the EU provides a fascinating and instructive case study of the dynamics of an increasingly large number of diverse countries—all sharing a common commitment to stable democratic institutions. **□**



*David Blackwell is a retired educator and mental health professional and is currently on WFC's Strategic Planning Committee.*

---

***"At present, no less than 73 articles and sub-articles in EU treaties require unanimous decision-making."***

---

# Water wars or water treaties

by **David B. Brooks**

A few years ago, then-World Bank Vice President Ismail Serageldin stated that "the wars of the 21st century will be about water."

The late King Hussein of Jordan is alleged to have said that water was the only conceivable reason for Jordan to go to war with Israel (though no one has been able to prove that he actually did say this).

Some people have written books about water wars or what academics prefer to call "the hydraulic imperative."

All such statements, to say nothing of the books, lack substance. Nations faced with conflicting claims to water have historically found ways to collaborate rather than to fight. Water wars may make good press but they seldom make good politics. Even in the Middle East, where water is scarcer than anywhere else in the world, water has more often been a source of co-operation than of conflict.

That does not mean that we will avoid conflicts over water in the future. On the contrary, there will be many of them, and in developed as well as in developing countries. However, such conflicts will seldom if ever result in hot wars.

## Growing water shortage

With the exception of global climate change, lack of fresh water is the most serious natural resource problem facing the world. The facts are stark and every year they get more so. More than one billion people

drink dirty water every day and some 10,000 die daily from the most common water-borne diseases.

Within the next 25 years, a third of the world's population will experience severe water scarcity, and another third moderate scarcity.

And the world's major water problem is not water to drink but water to grow food. It takes 100 times as much water to grow the food we eat as the water we drink.

These problems are accentuated in the drier parts of the world:

- Watersheds located in arid and semi-arid regions are home to about one-fifth of the world's population, but contain 70 per cent of the world's poorest people, and 44 per cent of the children stunted by malnutrition.
- Of 20 nations with internal renewable fresh water availability below 1000 cubic metres per capita-year (a commonly used measure of water stress), 15 are in the Middle East and North Africa. The other five are Hungary, South Africa and three countries in East Africa. As well, large parts of China and India are under the line.

## What water wars?

Growing shortages of fresh (and clean) water may make the idea of water wars plausible but, ironically, it is realpolitik that makes them unlikely. About two-fifths of the world's population and about half of the world's land area is found in the 264 river basins shared by more than

one country. Yet, there have been only seven minor skirmishes over international waters in modern history, and each of these involved factors in addition to water. In contrast, hundreds of international treaties have been negotiated to deal with water management, about 150 in the past century alone.

For example, despite three wars and numerous skirmishes since 1948, India and Pakistan have managed to negotiate and implement a complex treaty on sharing the waters of the Indus River system. It is significant that during periods of hostility neither side has targeted the water facilities of the other nor attempted to disrupt the negotiated arrangements for water management.

In Africa, where 11 countries share the basin of the Nile, co-operation over water is more evident than conflict. Egypt and Sudan have a treaty that regulates how much water will flow northward across the border, and upstream nations have been cautious about extracting too much water from the Blue and the White Nile, which have their sources in Ethiopia and Uganda respectively. All of the nations participate in a number of processes designed to facilitate more equitable use and to resolve conflicts before they become dangerous.

Closer to home, the International Joint Commission, which manages waters shared by Canada and the United States, and the Prairie Provinces Water

---

*"Nations faced with conflicting claims to water have historically found ways to collaborate rather than to fight."*

---

*Continued on next page*

# Water more often brings dialogue

Continued from previous page \_\_\_\_\_

Board, which manages waters in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, are considered such models of success that they are being emulated by other nations.

In short, the presence of water on (or, in the case of aquifers, under) an international border is more likely to provide a catalyst for co-operation than conflict between the countries that depend on it. Researchers working under Professor Aaron Wolf at the University of Oregon have compiled a Transboundary Freshwater Dispute Database. In examining the cases generally considered to be examples of international water conflict, they have arrived at a surprising conclusion. Instead of fighting, countries that share water resources tend to maintain dialogue and negotiation leading to treaties for joint management of water.

One of the reasons for avoiding a hot war is that it is so expensive. In a set of calculations, Professor Frank Fisher of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology showed that the total value of water in dispute between Israelis and Palestinians cannot exceed \$600 million per year, which is not very much in international terms. The annual cost for loss of water appears to be well under the daily cost of modern warfare.

Another reason is that only a surprisingly small share of the world's water is needed for direct consumption. Agriculture accounts for by far the bulk of water use in most countries—

two-thirds of all water around the world for irrigation alone, more if water for animals is included. (Canada is one of the few exceptions.) Even in urban areas, non-potable uses of water are several times larger than potable.

The message here is that potable water is highly valuable; agricultural water is not. Nations may be willing to go to war to get drinking water; they seldom are to irrigate fields. Moreover, there are no substitutes for drinking water; there are many for irrigation water. Modern irrigation techniques or shifts to less water-consuming crops can cut water use by one-half to two-thirds.

Of course, there are occasional examples of shots being fired or bombs dropped on water installations. Syrian attacks on Israeli construction sites in the 1960s forced relocation of the mouth of National Water Carrier and, perhaps in retaliation, Israel bombed a partially completed Jordanian-Syrian dam on the Yarmouk late in the 1967 War. Iraq destroyed much of Kuwait's desalination capacity before retreating near the end of the Gulf War.


However, to go from these examples to a general proposition of water wars ignores the fact that Arab-Israeli warfare has never been motivated by the desire to assert control over water resources. And there is nothing to suggest that water was a factor in strategic planning by any of the armies before periods of hot war. In some cases, belated decisions were made to secure water sources

when, in the course of the war, it became evident that they were within reach, but this is hardly evidence for a "hydraulic imperative."

## Water and local conflict

If water wars are unlikely, does this mean that we need not be concerned about conflict over water? On the contrary. Ever since Biblical days, and no doubt before, water has been hotly contested in the fertile crescent and it is no less hotly contested in many other parts of the world, including the most highly industrialized countries.

However, the conflicts resulting from shortage of fresh water are much more likely to occur within countries than between countries—urban dwellers seeking drinking water versus farmers seeking irrigation, farmers versus pastoralists, or local interests versus national plans for high dams.

Such conflicts are not to be ignored. They have the potential to cause suffering, to destabilize governments, and to lead to riots with attendant loss of life. The violence that erupted earlier this year in Cochabamba, Bolivia, following tariff increases for municipal water illustrates the kind of water conflict that we can expect to see. But such conflicts are likely to lead to internal disruption, not international war. 

*David Brooks is acting director of the Environment and Natural Resources Management Program, International Development Research Centre, Ottawa.*

---

***"The annual cost for loss of water appears to be well under the daily cost of modern warfare."***

---

# Transforming the global financial system

by **Carol Greene**

MONTREAL—In the wake of the Seattle and Prague meetings, a frequent response to protesters was “We now know what you are against, but what are you for?”

At a Teach-In and Counter-Summit of non-governmental organization (NGO) representatives meeting in Montreal on the eve of a G20 gathering in the city, panelists and participants had no trouble drawing up a wish list around the conference theme Transforming the Global Financial System.

Heading the list was the removal of the power to make decisions affecting health care, education, and water supplies from bodies which meet behind closed doors and are not accountable to the population which will be affected. An end to the secrecy and undemocratic nature of international financial institutions was a key demand, and reclaiming national sovereignty from them was framed with a World Federalist term—subsidiarity.

The meetings made specific proposals for the G20 finance ministers and central bankers to consider—all aimed at progressive reform of the international financial system towards financial stability and relief for the related crises—massive and growing poverty, social inequity, and environmental destruction.

Conference participants supported a currency transaction tax as a means of reducing financial volatility and generating revenue. The ‘Tobin tax,’ as it is known, is gaining considerable support. This summer in Geneva, with Canada playing a key role,

more than 160 countries signed on to an agreement for a UN study on this measure. There is hope that the study will include strong NGO representation from the groups which have already done much of the groundwork.

In Canada, the Halifax Initiative has been carrying the ball. Activists from France (ATTAC), the UK (War on Want), and Belgium (NCOS) spoke at the Montreal gathering. The European groups are networking their efforts to sign up parliamentarians, both at the national and European Parliament levels, and are focusing on a European summit in Nice, France in December. There is now a Quebec ATTAC group and a Tobin tax initiative in the U.S., with a concurrent resolution now before both houses of the U.S. Congress.

The feasibility of such a tax has been established. The next phase of research is underway on the means of implementing the tax and allocating the revenue. It is estimated that even a small percentage tax (between 0.1 and 0.25%) might generate \$100 to \$300 billion yearly.

Another proposal on the wish list is for an appropriate international institution to deal with the debt crisis. An international debt arbitration tribunal or bankruptcy court could be modeled on Chapter 9 of the U.S. bankruptcy rules. Under Chapter 9, municipalities which are in default positions are expected to continue to offer public services, while the tribunal works out restructuring of the debt with the municipality and the creditors.

To prevent future debt crises,

some form of lender liability was suggested as a means of preventing debts incurred by dictators or corrupt governments from falling on their populations.

Other means of transforming the global financial system on the wish list include feasible methods of closing tax havens, and the defensive use of capital controls. Malaysia is a case in point. Malaysia’s application of capital controls (legally under an IMF article) shielded the country against the worst effects of the Asian crises of 1998. In spite of an uproar over the possible flight of investment, productive investors stayed because they saw reduced volatility and a stable currency as an advantage for planning.

Teach-in participants also heard an account, by Oscar Olivera of the Coalition for the Defense of Water and Life, of heroic (and successful) efforts to stop the privatization of the water supply in a large Bolivian city. Under the private monopoly, some residents were paying 20 per cent of their income for potable water. Lives were lost in the protests and members of the military are now being brought to justice for those deaths.

The mood of the Montreal meetings was both urgent and optimistic. Post-Seattle, post-Prague, the international financial institutions are now vulnerable. The protests have highlighted widespread recognition of their failures and of the dimensions of the crises. A window of opportunity now exists for a desired transformation.

*Carol Greene is a WFC member living in Montreal.*

---

***“An end to the secrecy and undemocratic nature of international financial institutions was a key demand and reclaiming national sovereignty from them was framed with a World Federalist term—subsidiarity.”***

---

# Tough questions and consequences

*Excerpts of a speech by Howard Pawley, former premier of Manitoba, to world federalists in Winnipeg.*

“...Massive scientific changes have truly introduced epic economic and social consequences for all. Today, an increasingly unfettered marketplace is no longer regulated by national state governments. Now, the transnational global corporation enjoys global dominion. Power is increasingly centralized under the tight control of non-elected and unaccountable corporations. We are daily assured by both political and business leadership that the unfettered marketplace is the most reliable vehicle for guaranteeing prosperity and social justice throughout the global community....

Rapid technological changes and heightened international competition are increasingly fraying the job markets of the major industrialized nations. With the exception of the 30s, the 90s, saw more stagnation in income growth than any other decade in the 20th century. Despite Parliament's declaration pledging more than a decade ago to eradicate child poverty, it's numbers have soared. Homelessness, unheard of 15 years ago, is now a common occurrence. In addition, worldwide in the last 25 years, the disparities between the wealthiest and the poorest countries have sharply risen. Inequality is dramatically widening everywhere. Between 1960 and 1995, the gap in the per

capita income between the richest one-fifth of the world's population and the poorest one-fifth has more than doubled, increasing from 30:1 to 82:1. Of the 4.4 billion people in the so-called developing nations, almost three-fifths lack basic sanitation, one-third have no safe drinking water and one-quarter have inadequate housing, while one-fifth are undernourished.

National state governments are confronted with severe limitations in any quest to successfully combat poverty. Corporate concentration means that of the world's top 100 economies, 51 are corporations. Wal-Mart, No. 12 corporation in the world, is worth more than the economies of 161 nations. On a balance sheet, 161 nations aren't worth as much as a chain of discount stores. Greece, the home of democracy and the birthplace of the city state, is lower on the list than Wal-Mart. Poland isn't as big as Wal-Mart. Israel, the cradle of Judaism and Christianity and the Moslem world, isn't worth as much as Wal-Mart....

Today, with the click of a mouse after entering a few numbers into the computer, bond markets and transnational corporations can change the course of any nation's development. Responding to the pressure of financial markets, corporations can allocate production wherever labour and environmental laws are either weak or non-existent. Speculative transactions are funneled to numerous off-shore banking enclaves. Taxes for corporations are constantly being


reduced. The subsequent drain of billions of dollars reduces state revenues, and the outcome has been continued weakening of the social infrastructure and the nation state. Canada is no exception....

Clearly a new set of values is emerging in government and, I fear, in the hearts and minds of some Canadians. It's about granting the race to the so-called strong and running from those considered weak. It is the "frontier mentality...."

The questions we face as we enter the new millennium are:

- first, are human beings capable of advancing spiritually, socially and morally in this new global age, at a pace equal to the scientific and technological revolution?
- second, can we build a world to reflect those spiritual, social and moral values?

Those very tough questions will have very tough consequences if we fail to answer them sufficiently....

If the world is to survive, we must be prepared to demonstrate that same type of foresight, courage and vision displayed by the fathers of Confederation.... They recognized that certain powers must be entrusted to the federal government while other responsibilities should be left with the provincial government. Likewise, 133 years later, equal vision and courage are required if we are to successfully respond to the new economic and social challenges within the global environment...." 

---

***"On a balance sheet, 161 nations aren't worth as much as a chain of discount stores. Greece, the home of democracy and the birthplace of the city state, is lower on the list than Wal-Mart."***

---

# Noble goals! Now some action?

by **Simon Rosenblum**

Two events particularly captured my attention this fall, neither of them the Olympics.

The first was the Millennium Summit in New York City where world leaders committed to halve by 2015 the 22 per cent of the world's people who live on less than a dollar a day, and to ensure primary education for all by then also. (Related item, page 16)

Toward this end, the summit declaration calls on the industrialized world to adopt a policy of duty- and quota-free access for exports from the least-developed countries, and to be much more generous about debt cancellation. Noble statements to be sure, but will they be seriously acted upon?

Let us not forget that Western leaders promised in June last year that 25 countries would benefit from debt relief by the end of 2000. Only nine countries, however, have qualified so far for debt relief and none as yet has received any debt cancellation. The reason is the thicket of conditions imposed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank when they agreed a few years ago to help the world's 37 most-indebted poor countries.

It's not that there should not be conditions attached—otherwise some countries might, for example, simply spend the freed-up money on weapons acquisition—but rather that the poorer countries simply have too many hoops to jump through in order to qualify. No wonder that Paul Martin has told the World Bank

and IMF to cut the red tape.

This brings us to event No. 2, the recent annual meetings of the World Bank and IMF in Prague, and the accompanying protests. We hear a great deal about the slavish devotion of these two institutions to the so-called “Washington consensus,” that developing countries must quietly balance budgets, reduce the size and role of governments, permit free capital mobility, pursue low inflation, privatize and deregulate, as the only way to achieve growth and create jobs. IMF and World Bank policies, through rigid structural adjustment programs—what former World Bank chief economist Joseph Stiglitz has called “beggar thyself” policies—have clearly resulted in harmful macroeconomic policies in the developing world, and much unnecessary human suffering.

At the same time, however, we must not lose sight of the fact that inefficient and corrupt economic management in developing countries is still responsible for much of their problems. We also should not forget the significant economic gains made over the past 25 years by the world's poor—witness the progress in eradicating abject poverty in India and China.

It is of some significance that the World Bank and the IMF have recently had the grace to acknowledge some of their failings. When World Bank President Jim Wolfensohn stated that “something is wrong when the richest 20 per cent of the global population receive more than

eighty per cent of the global income,” it reflected a pronounced shift in that institution's thinking on poverty and development. In its latest World Development Report, poverty is now described as a “multidimensional” problem that includes powerlessness, voicelessness, vulnerability and fear—as well as mere lack of food, shelter and other economic necessities. Combating poverty therefore requires not only economic growth, it is agreed, but also “security” and “empowerment.”

Empowering poor people, says the Bank, means strengthening their ability to shape decisions that affect their lives—by removing discrimination, promoting equity (for instance, between the sexes) and ensuring that government institutions are more open, accountable and oriented towards the poor. The World Bank now recognizes that institutions, public goods and services, and participation all matter, and it realizes that it should no longer impose one-size-fits-all reform strategies on its clients. Reform should be designed mainly by poor countries themselves on the basis of a national dialogue with various civil groups.

In this report and elsewhere, one sees the views of Nobel prize-winning economist Amartya Sen—whose book *Development As Freedom* is an absolute must read—frequently noted and respected. This is all to the good and we eagerly await these policy re-evaluations being reflected in a full range of World Bank and IMF programs.

---

***“Let us not forget that Western leaders promised in June last year that 25 countries would benefit from debt relief by the end of 2000. Only nine countries, however, have qualified so far...”***

---

# What did Millennium Summit do?

by **Fergus Watt**

From September 6 to 8, the United Nations played host to the largest-ever gathering of heads of state and government in history. Armour-plated limousines sped along Manhattan avenues. Sirens howled, sniffing dogs paced nervously, men in dark suits with earplugs roamed busy streets, and snipers prowled along the rooftop of the General Assembly building.

The occasion was the UN Millennium Summit, a call to world leaders to address “the role of the United Nations in the 21st century.” But did anything actually happen?

Not really, according to most media reports. For many, the Millennium Declaration, a vague menu of non-binding commitments, simply confirms people’s worst stereotypes of the UN as a sterile and ineffective talking shop. For the record, in the declaration which emerged:

- Leaders declared that the central challenge of today is to ensure that globalization becomes a positive force for all, acknowledging that at present both its benefits and its costs are unequally shared;
- Member States were called upon to eliminate weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons;
- There were commitments to make the right to development a reality for everyone, calls for duty-free and quota-free access for exports from the least-developed countries, and an enhanced program of debt relief for the heavily

indebted poor countries;

- World leaders resolved to cut in half by the year 2015 the proportion of people with income of less than one dollar a day, and those suffering from hunger and lack of safe drinking water; to ensure equal access to all levels of education for girls and boys and primary schooling for all children everywhere; to reduce maternal mortality by three quarters; and to begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS, malaria and other major diseases.
- There were calls to bring the Kyoto Protocol into force, for better management of forests, for sustainable exploitation of water resources and for full implementation of conventions on biological diversity and desertification.
- Leaders resolved to reaffirm the central position of the United Nations General Assembly, and to intensify efforts for a comprehensive reform of the Security Council.

The Declaration also sets goals for promoting human rights, democracy and good governance, protecting the vulnerable, and meeting the special needs of Africa. Of the myriad issues discussed at the summit, globalization and poverty were the most central.


This may have an “I’ve heard it all before” ring to it. But that doesn’t mean the Summit was a failure. For starters, the Summit itself was part of a larger series of millennium events which took place this year.

In May, 1400 civil society representatives gathered at the UN for the Millennium Forum. The week before the Millennium Summit, parliamentarians and religious leaders also gathered for meetings at the UN. And during the Summit, a host of parallel events were held, including a high level meeting of the State of the World Forum and an International Forum on Globalization.

Many leaders used the occasion to announce support for various UN treaties and organizations. For example, several expressed support for the International Criminal Court, with Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Jamaica, Dominican Republic, Kuwait, and Morocco signing the treaty, and New Zealand, Luxembourg and Botswana ratifying.

The whole process leading to these Millennium events was instigated by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan. It was a political risk he didn’t have to take. But he did, and the UN is probably better off now than if none of this had occurred.

The UN is losing ground as a meaningful institution of governance in a globalizing world. Its role will be reinvigorated only if the political will exists to do so.

So, although the UN system wasn’t reformed overnight, at least 99 heads of state, three crown princes and 47 heads of government showed up to present their views on the role of the United Nations in the 21st century. All in all, 187 Member States were represented. And thousands of citizens around the world tuned in. 

---

***“The UN is losing ground as a meaningful institution of governance in a globalizing world. Its role will be reinvigorated only if the political will exists to do so.”***

---

# *WFC active in ICC ratification*

On July 7, 2000 the Government of Canada ratified the Rome Statute for an International Criminal Court. At the time, Canada was the 14th state to ratify the ICC treaty. By early November, 25 states had ratified. The Court comes into being when 60 states have ratified.

The ICC will be the world's first permanent judicial body with a mandate to hold to account those individuals, including political and military leaders, accused of war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide.

In Canada, the World Federalists of Canada (WFC) has taken the lead in administering the Canadian Network for an International Criminal Court (CNICC). This fall, the CNICC organized two meetings at the Department of Foreign Affairs: an NGO Briefing with members of the Canadian Delegation to the Preparatory Commission for an ICC, which was to meet at the UN November 27 to December 8; and another meeting for NGOs and government officials to discuss plans for a Youth conference on the ICC to be held in March 2001.

Meanwhile, at the International Conference on War-Affected Children September 10-17 in Winnipeg, Elaine Harvey of the Canadian Unitarian Council represented the CNICC. The ICC Statute criminalizes certain activities which affect the welfare of children in conflict zones, such as the use of children as combatants in armed conflict, and the displacement of civilian populations in times of war.

The Winnipeg conference was

in three parts: a meeting of Canadian and international war-affected youth (September 10-12), an experts meeting (September 13-15) and a ministerial-level meeting (September 16-17).

On September 13, Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy travelled to the UN for the launch of the Government of Canada's international campaign to promote the signing, ratification and implementation of the International Criminal Court. Canada's campaign includes diplomatic initiatives promoting signing and ratification of the ICC Statute, and public outreach including activities in conjunction with the CNICC. The Government of Canada's web site for the ICC is at <http://www.icc.gc.ca>.

WFC is partnering with three other organizations to implement a Government of Canada-funded global campaign to promote ratification of the ICC treaty. Partners in this project, which began in August, include Rights and Democracy (formerly called the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development, based in Montreal), and two Vancouver-based organizations, the Institute for Media Policy and Civil Society (IMPACS), and the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy. The project aims to provide legal technical assistance for government officials, media training, and civil society mobilization in targeted francophone and anglophone states in the global South.

This project, called the International Criminal Court Technical

Assistance Project (ICCTAP), got underway in October in the South Pacific. Seminars for government officials were held October 19 and 20 in the Cook Islands alongside a meeting of the Pacific Islands Law Officers Meeting (PILOM). Then, on October 24 in Auckland, New Zealand, a joint meeting was held for journalists and civil society representatives. Subsequently, a Pacific Islands NGO Network for the ICC has been created to continue to push many of these small states to follow up in the process of ratifying.

The meeting at the UN November 27 to December 8 was expected to see continued tension over U.S. efforts to place limits on the jurisdiction of the Court. The U.S. wants to be able to prevent the surrender of its nationals to the Court. Once the Court is up and running, even if the U.S. remains outside the ICC treaty, American nationals could be indicted for crimes committed in states which are within the ICC's jurisdiction. The U.S. wants the power to prevent its nationals from being delivered to the Court in any circumstances, and are expected to table a proposal within the context of the ICC's Relationship Agreement with the United Nations. The Americans may seek a U.S.-specific exemption, or a general exemption.

Two additional Preparatory Commission meetings at the UN will be held in 2001. The New York-based Coalition for an ICC has set July 17, 2002 (four years after the Rome treaty) as the target date for 60 ratifications and entry into force of the ICC Statute.

---

***“WFC is partnering with three other organizations to implement a Government of Canada-funded global campaign to promote ratification of the ICC treaty.”***

---

## Donor feels good helping to make world a better place

Well, there I was, 18 years after retirement, living comfortably and fairly healthy, and revising my will. I'm not going to tell you who I am, but I'm going to tell you what I've done in the last six months that makes me feel just great!

My children are living well, and my grandchildren that I helped through post secondary education are getting well established. They don't need my money. A good pension, medicare, dental and health insurance and something set aside for care in my later years and I've got all I need and much more. What to do?

Give it to people that will use it to make this world a better place. I decided to keep my RIFs to add to my pension for the rest of my life, but I don't need life insurance any more, and I don't need my investments in Mutual Funds. The provincial universities here are setting up a United Nations Chair with Director, staff, resource centre and curricula. What a wonderful project! They are now the beneficiary of my largest insurance policy. Other insurance policies provided gifts to the World Federalists of Canada, the United Nations Association of Canada, the Unitarian Service Committee, and the Coalition Against the Arms Trade. I cashed in Mutual Funds to make donations to The Humanist Association of Canada, Veterans Against Nuclear Arms and my church.

And you know what? The cash surrender values of your insur-

### *In memoriam*

## Gentle civility will be missed

Those who knew him experienced great sadness at the passing of Barrie Jeffery on July 30, 2000. As a personal friend who got to know Barrie during his time as WFC's Treasurer, I will forever miss his gentleness, civility, quiet determination, and not least, that enigmatic little smile that used to appear when something amused him.




Barrie Jeffery

Barrie graduated in engineering physics from the University of British Columbia and went on to a career as an aeronautical engineer at the National Research Council, Computing Devices of Canada and Nav-Canada, as well as in his own business. One of his great loves was gliding: in 1952, he captained the first Canadian team to enter the World Soaring Championships in Spain. The magazine *Free Flight* recently described Barrie as one of "soaring's great old-timers."

Barrie was also a passionate sailor, canoeist and reader. He enjoyed writing, and had unbridled curiosity about almost everything. I can personally attest to how his 'wicked' sense of humour helped sustain the spirits of others to the end.

For many years, Barrie was a strong supporter of the World Federalists. He was active in providing leadership to the local branch in the National Capital Region. His years as WFC Treasurer were exemplary in their dedication and professionalism. At the 1998 National Members Meeting in Toronto, he received a special award recognizing his service to WFC. And it was indeed fitting that Rev. James Christie, WFC Past-President and current Chair of WFM Council, co-officiated at Barrie's Memorial Service August 2 in Ottawa.

Our special wishes go out to Barrie's loving wife Muriel. He is also survived by his five children, a sister, a 'special cousin' and 15 grandchildren. Barrie's wish for world federalists would be that we don't let up on the good fight. — D.B. 

*Editor's note: It was Barrie's wish that any donations in his memory be made to the World Federalist Foundation.*

ance policies are donations and get tax receipts as do the donations you make from your investments. I won't have to pay income tax for years!

I feel satisfaction in knowing I have assisted some very good causes. And all that money—I don't even miss it.

# Branch News

TORONTO—Eighty people attended the World Federalist Foundation special fundraising event at the Arts and Letters Club, October 28. Elizabeth Dowdeswell, former Executive Director of the UN Environment Programme, was the keynote speaker, discussing “What we can do about Climate Change” (see page 1). In addition to the event proceeds, \$2,640 was raised through the “Victoria Branch Challenge,” the results of which were announced by Rev. Karen Hamilton. Victoria Branch matched amounts donated to the World Federalists of Canada by other WFC branches, including the following contributions: \$100 from Montreal Branch; \$300 from Toronto Branch; \$520 from the Guelph group; and \$400 from Vancouver Branch.

MONTREAL—For those who weren’t able to attend the fundraiser in Toronto on October 28, the Montreal Branch held a wine and cheese reception on that date. Gerry Pascal, of the Centre des ressources sur le non-violence, spoke on the active work of the centre in education, training, and observation for non-violent conflict resolution. A group of young people from the Democratic Republic of Congo will be arriving this month for training sessions. Gerry also spoke on the background of the International Year for the Culture of Peace. The Montreal Branch was to hold a holiday brunch on Sunday, December 10, Human Rights Day, at the Bay’s

7th floor restaurant. A French-speaking Issues Action Group has held its first meeting, convened by Chantal Rouleau. Carol Greene continues to organize the English IAG.

VANCOUVER—Duncan Graham spoke to the branch about his travels to Puerto Rico to observe the Parliamentary Conference of the Americas. This large meeting brought together parliamentarians from national and sub-national (state and provincial level) parliaments from all countries in the Western Hemisphere.

In October, the monthly meeting was a discussion on Globalization and Localization of the economy. The regular third Thursday event in November was co-sponsoring an all-party candidate meeting with the Social Justice Committee of the Unitarian Church. WFC’s Jennifer Wade was moderator for the meeting. As a sponsor, branch president Leonard Angel asked the first question on support for a Permanent Volunteer UN Peace Force.

VICTORIA—On September 29, Victoria Branch discussed the topic of a Parliamentary Assembly for the World Trade Organization at its monthly members’ meeting. Many present expressed their preference that such a parliamentary body be directly elected.

The branch held a networking event on October 13, attended by representatives from 13 local peace and conflict resolution organizations. Brief presenta-

tions were interspersed with music and a keynote address by long-time peace activist Walt Taylor. The event led to development of a list of phone numbers and e-mail addresses of 19 organizations, plus four schools with active anti-bullying programs.

A committee has been formed as a result of a General Members’ Meeting resolution last June to study and report to WFC members at the next GMM on ways our organization can respond more quickly and democratically to global and other issues that concern us. To participate or find out more, contact Philip Symons, 2125 Lansdowne Rd., Victoria, B.C., V8P 1B5; <philmar@islandnet.com>.

WINNIPEG—More than 40 people attended the annual Robson Lecture on September 10. Howard Pawley was the guest speaker this year (see page 14 for excerpts). A number of branch members attended parts of the international conference on War-Affected Children held in September in Winnipeg.

OTTAWA—The National Capital branch has held four public meetings since last June’s national members’ meeting. Recent speakers have included Elaine Harvey from Kingston reviewing results of the Winnipeg Conference on War-affected Children, and Bruce Ritchie, a British world federalist discussing “New Horizons in Peace-keeping.”

# Climate change – things you can do

*Here's a partial list of actions individuals can take to help reduce climate change. This list was circulated at the Toronto special event on climate change October 28.*

## As a Consumer

- Audit your own modes of transportation. Walk or bike, take public transit, and reduce your dependency on the private car. Car pool. Live close to work, or work from home. Escort children to school on foot or by bicycle. Travel between major centres by train, and get to your vacation destination by train. Sell your car if you think the occasional taxi ride will suffice. If you need a car, drive the most fuel-efficient model and keep it in peak running condition.
- Heat your home with natural gas or combination systems that use solar power. Insulate, making sure to avoid toxic insulation materials and taking extra care in old houses. Install energy-efficient light bulbs. Turn the air conditioning down or off. When buying or renting a new dwelling, choose the smallest amount of space you need.
- Refrain from buying the latest motor-driven gadget, and

retire needless appliances. (For example, don't use an electrical wand to blow fallen leaves off your dooryard or lawn; use a broom or a rake.) Replace worn appliances with energy-efficient ones, and let manufacturers know you are purchasing on that basis.

- Cut your lawn with a hand mower; or better still, replace the lawn with a garden. Plant trees. If you own rural property that is not used for farmland, plant trees on it. If you live or work in a flat-roofed building, get a rooftop garden planted.
- Buy locally produced food in season. Consider the distance it takes for a product to travel to you before buying.
- Refuse to patronize companies that demolish, or needlessly renovate, their premises for new commercial images.
- Separate your waste – paper and cardboard; glass, aluminum and plastic containers; and food scraps – and recycle or compost them. And reduce your waste of recyclables, including water.

## As a Citizen

- Ask your municipal representative what your local government is doing about climate

change and whether the municipality has adopted a plan through the Cities for Climate Protection Campaign.

- When the municipal official plan which controls physical development in your municipality is under review (about every five years), advocate policies that will result in compact land use, the reuse of existing buildings, the preservation and planting of trees, improvement of the public transit system, facilitation of bicycle riding, energy conservation and waste reduction.
- Lobby your municipal council and local bureaucrats to invest in fuel-efficient, alternatively-fueled and electric vehicles.
- Lobby your municipal council and local bureaucrats to purchase a portion of the municipality's electrical demand from wind, solar and micro-hydro energy sources.
- Lobby your municipal council and local bureaucrats to step up recycling efforts.
- Lobby your municipal council and local bureaucrats to have and enforce a tree by-law, maintain street and roadside trees, and plant trees on municipal property.

# mondial

145 Spruce Street, Ottawa,  
ON, K1R 6P1  
Phone: 613-232-0647  
Fax: 613-563-0017  
E-mail: wfcnat@web.ca  
November 2000

