

Minutes of the 2014 International Council

Konstanz, Germany

03.08.2014 – 08.08.2014

Compiled by: Anne Stickers

Proof readers: Lucas Johnson, Geraldine Bridges

Minute takers :

Sunday evening: Anne Stickers

Monday: Andrei Trubceac

Tuesday morning: Isaac Beachy

Tuesday afternoon: Geraldine Bridges

Tuesday evening: Isaac Beachy

Wednesday morning: Anne Stickers

Wednesday afternoon: Isaac Beachy

Wednesday evening: Andrei Trubceac

Thursday morning: Andrei Trubceac

Thursday afternoon: Gretchen Honnold

Thursday evening: Millius Palayiwa

Friday: Gretchen Honnold

Table of Contents:

Delegate Attendance	3
Selection of Council Coordinating Committee and Nominating Committee	4
Executive Committee Reports	5-10
Program Reports	12-15
BGA Reports	15-42
Election of International Committee	51 and 54
Decisions on Proposals:	52
Appendix 1. Treasurer's Report	59
Appendix 2. Official Communiqué	61
Appendix 3. Council Participant List	63

Day 1: Sunday 03.08.2014

20.00 – 22.00

USA executive director Kristin Stoneking led Council in prayer.

A few moments were dedicated to remember deceased IFOR friends. Twelve names were read out.

Branches in attendance and number of voting delegates:

Italia: 1

USA: 3

Zimbabwe: 2

Austria: 1

Germany: 1

India: 2

England: 2

Congo: 1

Norway: 1

France: 1

AKKAPKA: 1

Agir Pour la Paix: 1

Wi'am Palestine: 1

Sweden: 2

Kerk & Vrede: 1

Japan: 1

Suisse: 1

Burundi: 1

**Many branches were represented by more than one person although they were restricted in their voting delegates by the IFOR Constitution. See Appendix 3.*

It is pointed out that the Coordinacion Latina America (CLA) from SERPAJ (IFOR Affiliate) is also present this Council: Ana Juanche, Patricio Labra, and Blas Garcia Noriega.

IFOR Affiliate in the Netherlands, Doopsgezinde Wereldwerk was also represented. IFOR Affiliate based in Thailand, the International Network for Engaged Buddhist was present for opening session. Abdullah Mouihdin (ANTAR Society Bangladesh) expressed interest in joining IFOR as an affiliate and was invited to stay as an observer.

At the start of the meeting the council was still expecting IFOR Representatives from ONAD in South Sudan, Moses John and Light Aganwa as well as from Sudan Mahmoud Abdallah of SONAD but difficulties securing visas prevented their attendance.

The following representatives to the UN are also welcomed: Maria Antonietta Malleo (UNESCO), Derek Brett (UN Geneva), Mark Johnson (UN New York), Pete Haemmerle (UN Vienna).

Jean Pierre Massamba, Zoughbi Zoughbi, and Denis Beaumont together formed the preparatory committee. Jean Pierre welcomed the Council and called upon the delegates to have patience with IFOR and work together in the spirit of reconciliation.

Election of Council Coordinating Committee

Elected are: Gretchen Honnold (FOR USA), Tatsushi Nozoye (FOR Japan), Nahmo Sithole (FOR Zimbabwe).

Chair: Virginia Baron

Co-chair: Moses John

Staff representative: Lucas Johnson

Nomination Committee

Kyoko Itaka (FOR Japan), Suseela Mathews, Samya Korff (FOR Germany).

Robert Reischer pointed out that current ICOM members are not allowed to be on the Nomination Committee. Lucas Johnson responded that the Preparatory Committee decided to make an exception because Kyoko Itaka is not running for any position.

Elected members are: Jérôme Peraya (FOR Belgium, Agir pour la Paix), Jacques Poaty (MIR Congo), Mark Johnson (FOR USA).

Day 2: Monday 04.08.2014

9.00 – 12.30

Prayers were led by Denis (FOR England) and Volker (Germany and Stichting). Denis read from 'Carols at Christchurch' – "The Fellowship is Born". Volker said a few words and then they re-enacted the famous handshake of 1914.

Executive Committee Reports:

Report by Davorka Lovrekovic (2010-2014 Vice President)

- Hans Ulrich Gerber had to step down from the presidency. David Mumford had to step down from the Treasury. Lili Baxter has supported the ICOM team.
- When ICOM started in 2010 there were 6 staff persons, but no international coordinator. There was no written record before we started working. It was difficult to obtain information and the information we got, was very selective/scarce. Meltem came in 2011 and helped with this issue.
- Women Peacemakers Program: It was difficult to institutionalize the WPP, and we decided to set up a small working group in this regard. We worked with an outside consultant in setting up a new program and setting up a new Stichting under Dutch law. Every decision that has to do with finances has to go through the Stichting. The IFOR Stichting is not involved in the content of the programs, but they were included in the WPP working group because there were financial issues including contracts.
- With regards to filling the International coordinator position Francesco Candelari was chosen.
- Office building in Alkmaar: ICOM requested Francesco to start an internal process with regards to the building. It was decided to sell the house, because:
 - Too big (half empty)
 - Difficult (expensive) to maintain
 - Community around the house has aged or moved
 - It didn't fit the current work dynamics of the IFOR secretariat

Thanks to Annelies Klinefelter, Roel Meihuizen and Anne Stickers for their work related to selling and cleaning up the house.

- SERPAJ: A process was initiated to strengthen the ties with SERPAJ and discuss ways of cooperating and the possibility for SERPAJ branches to join IFOR.
- BGA Structure: During the Centennial preparations and Constitution review, ICOM had a long discussion about the membership. ICOM talked about making the membership more flexible and also to make it possible that more than one branch per country can join IFOR.
- In 2013 a meeting of Youth took place in Berlin, the preparation for which was done to a large extent by Lucas Johnson who played a big role.
- In 2012 the first Fellowship School was in Alkmaar. This was a new project started by Francesco. The second Fellowship school in 2013 was coordinated by Gretchen Honnold who is now a staff member of FOR USA.
- Conflict arose between Francesco and the Youth Working Group and the financial matters connected to it. Additional conflicts surrounding Francesco absorbed a big amount of time and resources. After many months a settlement was reached in a Dutch court of law. A recovery meeting was set up in the beginning of 2014, which included staff and international body members. At this meeting in Laufdorf the position of International Coordinator was delegated to Lucas Johnson.
- We have to thank Hans Ulrich for his work in difficult circumstances.

Questions & Remarks

Lucas Johnson - Anne Stickers and Gretchen Honnold deserve to be especially thanked for doing the work of the Secretariat in the absence of an International Coordinator. Also thanks to Robert Reischer for stepping in as Treasurer.

Tess Ramiro(AKKPAKA) - What is now the status of the Office? Where is the International Secretariat based?

Davorka Lovrekovic (IFOR VP): Peace work needs roots. The plan is to have another physical secretariat. We are still looking for a place to stay and Lucas needs the security of workplace and staff to support him. The office will probably be in Köln (Germany) for 1 year. The office can move to another location and we recommend it stay in Europe for financial, practical, and strategic reasons. It is still a working process. We have to clarify many details related to costs, laws and efficiency. The current postal address is Obrechtstraat 43, 3572 EH Utrecht.

We started the legal procedures for Lucas to stay in Europe and be legally employed by IFOR. In 2 months' time the process should be finalized.

The books from the library are in the Mennonite Centre in Amsterdam. There are more options of moving them including the creation of a Peace Centre. At the moment the library is not available. It's stored in 45 boxes.

Lucas Johnson (International Coordinator): it is related to where I can get a visa. The secretariat is registered in the Netherlands. There is still a lot to be determined before we can say for sure we are moving to Köln. There are around 4 options we are currently analysing.

Millius Palayiwa (FOR England) - There is a tendency for organizations to have a bigger survival rate when they own property. It is important in the context of an office.

Davorka Lovrekovic (IFOR VP): IFOR has been running on deficit budgeting for many years and it has managed to survive.

Peter Aeberhard (FOR Switzerland) – It is a question of management of IFOR. Hans Ulrich feels it is difficult to manage IFOR. We work with a 100-year-old structure. It is time to create the working group on restructuring/optimizing IFOR.

Jérôme Peraya (FOR Belgium) – We also need a working group on strategic matters.

Beena Sebastian (FOR India) – It is painful to see that the issues surrounding Francesco are considered private. It is because we haven't made timely interventions. We are paying the price for our mismanagement. We have to learn from the past and therefore we need to have all the information.

Davorka Lovrekovic (IFOR VP): The issue of IFOR is the compliance with the regulations and procedures. We can change procedures, but we can't act on our own.

Treasurer's Report by Robert Reischer (IFOR Treasurer)

And Roel Meihuizen (IFOR Bookkeeper)

- Presentation of the financial numbers. See Appendix 1.
- Only 17 of the BGAs have paid their annual contribution to IFOR. This needs to change in order for IFOR and the International Secretariat to survive. Less than half the number of

branches had paid their contributions but it is up to each branch as to how they calculate 10% of their core budget.

Questions & Remarks

Millius Palayiwa (FOR England) – our contribution is subject to decrease (from 6 to 5 thousand pounds). The current formula for branch contributions is 10% from the core budget. What do we get for that money?

Robert Reischer (IFOR Treasurer)– It is up to the branch to decide to calculate the contributions. The trend is to get fewer contributions than in the previous years.

Denis Beaumont (FOR England) – there must be a minimum contribution as a requirement for membership.

David Mumford (Scotland) – Branches should be able to pay contributions in various ways (financially or non-financially). We are a fellowship, so we have the duty to contribute. There is also a responsibility to support branches in other parts of the world that have little or no money.

Tobias Lohse (FOR Germany) – how will the budget affect the work and employability of IFOR? So far, we have managed to do a lot with little resources, because people were doing more than they were paid to do. This is neither sustainable nor desirable.

Pete Haemmerle (FOR Austria) – Gains vs. costs discussion within the branch. EU funding? Is there any record about in-kind contributions (i.e. working time)?

Robert Reischer (IFOR Treasurer): EU grants – we received a part of the money. The last part (8.000 euros) will arrive after the audit report. Expenses are included in the report. It is difficult to quantify it in reporting.

If you cannot pay your annual contribution please write and explain why. Being a member also implies constant communication about activity, challenges in the work, funding opportunities.

Meltem Basara (IFOR Volunteer)– We should focus on external income opportunities and she proposed to create a fundraising group, as it is a challenging period for IFOR. Depending on who secured the funding, a certain percentage would go to them. Also try to develop common projects with partner organizations.

Ewert Bentgossen (FOR Sweden) – form a budget group and come with a budget proposal for the coming year. I would be happy to lead it, as I have experience.

Kristin Stoneking (FOR USA) – FOR USA has been challenged for the last few years and restructuring is taking place. More than half of the budget is from fundraising from individual donors. We need to tell the story specifically and compellingly of what FOR is doing. We need good financial reports accompanied by a narrative and photos.

Millius Palayiwa (FOR England) – We are aware that we owe 12 thousand pounds and we are going to pay it.

Davorka Lovrekovic (IFOR VP)– We have had a Fellowship School and a Centennial and we hope that we can make the best out of that. We have to spend money in order to get money. We have to be careful when we set up the secretariat. It is not possible for Lucas to be the only full-time staff member.

Jacques Dieudonne Poaty (MIR Congo) – Most of our contributions come from individual donations. The report is not detailed enough. Communication with the branches is very important.

Pete Haemmerle (FOR Austria) – it is important to know and appreciate that we are a part of big international network and not only 400 people isolated in Austria. Please include us in decision making and in the global processes so we can make the best of the contributions.

Jérôme Peraya (Agir Pour La Paix) – Belgium has only contributed 100 euros. I cannot explain this. I can only apologize. I will try to find out the reasons for that. I know that there are programs of the EU that might fit the framework of IFOR.

Ruhi Das (BASTOB)– BASTOB is not able to contribute financially because of bank regulations, but happy to contribute in ways other than financially.

Kyoko Iitaka (FOR Japan) - JFOR membership is decreasing because the membership is aging and passing away, but we keep paying same contribution to IFOR because we believe in its importance. Let's think how we in each branch can contribute to IFOR. Ask not what IFOR can do for you, but what you can do for IFOR

Lucas Johnson (IFOR International Coordinator) – I want to clarify a few points. Currently I am the only full time staff person of IFOR, but I am not the only one working at the Secretariat. We have Anne Stickers as Liaison Officer coordinating UN Representatives and Roel Meihuizen as Financial Administrator, both working less than 20 hrs. /wk. I started half time in March. This ICOM has been reluctant to enter into long-term employment agreements with anyone in light of the new ICOM coming so soon. There are no contracts currently that are extending beyond the next 6 months.

Tobias Lohse (FOR Germany) - It is also possible to do fundraising for individual persons. The German branch is open to this idea. Start smaller groups from different countries to help support IFOR; not everyone needs to be elected in order to do work for IFOR. Proposes to start a group to do promotional work and public relations interests.

Zoughbi Zoughbi (Wi'am FOR Palestine) – The Global South hasn't contributed more than 3,000 and might thus feel like a burden because it is not contributing. Would like to rethink and find ways to be more active. There are possibilities to get EU or Canadian funding in the Global South. Palestine can offer space at Wi'am for IFOR during visits

Beena Sebastian (FOR India)– I brought our promised contribution. Good to have good programs and projects as opportunities for fundraising.

There was a general feeling that better communication between the Secretariat and branches was needed. Regular financial reports with a narrative from the Secretariat would help branches understand what the money was spent on and aid in fundraising.

Day 2: Monday 4.08.2014

15.00 – 18.00

Amos Gvirtz on Israel and Palestine

(The report was offered at this point because of Amos' early departure)

Israel had the conception that it was a matter of survival to support the interests of the USA and the West. During the Cold War, it served US interests against the USSR. In return the US closed its eyes on the human rights violations by Israel. The West and the US keep closing their eyes with regards to the occupation. Right now, in the war in Gaza, the Obama administration is asking Turkey and Qatar to be mediators for the ceasefire. Israel has asked Egypt to be the mediator. Israel is trying to bring the US back to war against the Muslim world.

We have different understandings however of war. For Israel it is an act of violence between two parties. For the Palestinians it is a much larger definition. Israeli actions (land confiscation, water stealing, deportations) are all one-sided acts of war.

Israel is creating a security need by making Palestinians seek revenge for all the atrocities. Israel is hiding the one-sided acts of war, because they don't want to lose the international support.

It is important to build an alternative media. International media is serving the interests of the Israeli side. Very few people know that in 7 years they destroyed 7000 settlements and took over a lot of land. There are people writing unbiased news in Haaretz (an Israeli newspaper) and there are International Organizations writing weekly and monthly reports. Today there is a growing alternative media and we have to follow up on it. The campaign I am trying to promote is "Don't think we didn't know". People in Israel don't want to know the crimes that its government is carrying out.

It is important to build dialogue structures to prevent the cultural war. The 'Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions' campaign gives Israel the option to stop the occupation at any moment. It is our duty to support nonviolent struggle in Israel-Palestine. There are many grassroots organizations more being situated in Jerusalem. They need the collective responsibility and a third party to jump-start the

process and ensure that both sides are following the process. People internationally committed to the BDS campaign are being arrested on allegations of anti-Semitism. There are campaigns encouraging people not to do business with companies involved in building settlements.

The interfaith dialogue is important, because these two religions are among the biggest and the potential for transformation is great.

How come we persecute and systematically kill the Arabs and Palestinians after the occupation when the Jews had a record of being persecuted themselves?

Program Reports:

The Institutionalization of the Women Peacemakers Program

Kees Nieuwerth

- Kees is the Secretary of the Board of WPP and the only link between the WPP and IFOR. . There are no institutional bridges, but there are personal connections. WPP have a new Constitution
- WPP is working at the UN level in NY
- WPP continue their training programmes in Asia and the Middle East and their fieldwork with teachers
- Publications with Peace Bureau and conference with people working in the field (24th of May)
- WPP moved to The Hague because of many NGOS are based there and it seemed suitable.
- WPP is very active in securing subsidies from the Ministries and are exploring fundraising options. Coalitions are good for subsidies.
- Even though WPP is independent now, in the first 2 years it was initiated by and was a part of IFOR.

Questions & Remarks

Suseela Mathews (FOR India) - we should not be discussing the WPP because it is independent from IFOR.

Davorka Lovrekovic (IFOR VP) - WPP was costing IFOR money that it did not have. IFOR had to preserve its own financial stability. The communication was not very good with the BGAs about it. The institutionalisation was decided at the last Council meeting, that's why the process moved forward.

Zaira Zafarana (FOR Italy) - We should maintain WPP within the IFOR family.

Davorka Lovrekovic (IFOR VP): It is up to WPP to request membership. IFOR is open to accept it.

Pete Haemmerle (FOR Austria) - We need to have a working group on lessons learned particularly about developing programs, ownership of the process, process and procedures

Zoughbi Zoughbi (Wi'am Palestine) - I feel we should have a dialogue and have a clear point whether a rapprochement will happen or whether we will be two separate entities

The Fellowship School

Gretchen Honnold (former IFOR Fellowship School Coordinator)

The Fellowship School is a 9-week program for 18 to 28 year olds, bringing a small group of young adults together to acquaint them with IFOR work and community. It consists of an internship (Monday - Thursday) and a Training part. These trainings provide entry points to the international peace movement. The Fellowship Schools worked on spreading and sharing the expertise and knowledge existing within the network. In 2013 they had an 11K budget from the EU. No fee is charged for the program, expenses are reimbursed and a stipend offered. Lucas reported that the Fellowship School is currently on hold.

Gretchen, Lucia Haemmerle and Danielle have completed the programme and Amos Furaha reported that after he had completed the Fellowship School training he went back to Rwanda and started a radio show and designed a two-day workshop focusing on local problems. Andrea from Moldova reported that he has built 50% of a peace website and Iannes is his mentor.

Questions & Remarks

Millius Paliyawa (FOR UK) - Would IFOR be interested in doing a Fellowship School in the Global South especially with regards to reconciliation in post-war situations?

Lucas Johnson: If there is a new Fellowship School this would take place the soonest in winter 2015.

Day 2: Monday 04.08.2014

19.30 – 21.00

At the 7:30 pm session there was a request for people to volunteer to join working groups on the constitution, finance and promotion.

IFOR Representation at the United Nations and other International Organizations

Anne Stickers (IFOR Liaison Officer)

Why have representations in IOs (UN institutions, EU institutions)? Anne explained that because of the International dimension of peace work, the complexity of social issues and the interconnectedness of global challenges, IFOR needs representation at these forums. She also reported on the past and current status of that representation and future plans. There is a need to bridge the horizontal efforts with vertical efforts (changing laws, international treaties, global campaigns, etc.)

We have had special consultative status since 1979. We have three representatives in New York, Mark Johnson, John Kim and Patricia Ackerman? Covering peace and conflict, disarmament, sustainability, women's rights; one representative in Geneva, Derek Brett, covering human rights, conscientious objectors, children's rights; one representative in Vienna, Pee Haemmerle covering disarmament; and one representative in Paris, Maria Antoinette Malleo covering culture of peace, peace education, prized and youth work. Currently there are no representatives at the UN office in Nairobi as nobody has opted to do that. The office in Nairobi does not handle the top priority issues.

Questions & Remarks

- **Jérôme Peraya (Agir Pour La Paix)** It is important to join the right coalition of NGOs.

- **Kees Nieuwerth (Kerk en Vrede, Netherlands)**- we have to prioritize the issues, find our own niche when choosing the priorities
- **Namu Sithole (FOR Zimbabwe)** – Is there an African Union representative?
- **Akadim Chikandamina (FOR Zimbabwe)** – Are there financial obligations to representatives?
- **Anne Stickers (IFOR Liaison Officer)** - It's voluntary work. Some representatives are self-funded
- **Millius (FOR England)** - How often do the representatives produce reports and how can they be distributed to the IFOR network?
- **Anne Stickers (IFOR Liaison Officer) and Lucas Johnson (IFOR International Coordinator)** - Communication efficiency has to be improved
- **Sofia Walan (FOR Sweden)** – Are there any success stories from representatives?
Anne: Biggest success story is the Resolution for the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World, 2001-2010
- **Beena Sebastian (FOR India)** - How can we reach UN Women with regards to WPP? Resolution 1325?
- **Pete Haemmerle (FOR Austria & IFOR UN Representative Vienna)**–In the variety of work that can be done. In the big system of the UN it is really difficult to affect change and we have to have realistic expectations. It is important to have a holistic perspective with the work we want to do.

Branch Group and Affiliate Reports

FOR USA Report

We had to let go of 5 and a half positions. We had to make severe cuts in our budget. We have to make an appeal to our members with regards to IFOR. We need to know more broadly of what the IFOR stories are. We are making a plea for transparent fiscal management.

Local groups feel disconnected from FOR USA. There is a need for more engagement, networking, and outreach with members, groups, chapters, and religious fellowships.

FOR USA is facing similar challenges to those that IFOR is facing, i.e., facilitating and coordinating the chapters and local activist hubs, revamping the website and integrating more multimedia options. We are still publishing 'Fellowship' - it is the oldest continuously published peace magazine in the USA.

We are working with young adults around issues of incarceration as well as with activists who want to run various campaigns in their university campuses.

FOR Peace Presence - FOR USA is in a fiscal sponsorship with the project. It is moving towards being independent so that the mission can move to another location where it is needed. The vision for it is to evolve into a transnational branch.

The FOR USA Centennial is in November 2015 and a conference will be in spring 2016.

Interfaith Peace builders developed into an independent organization and is doing well, added a new staff person this year. They are organizing peace delegations to Palestine.

Day 3: Tuesday 05.08.2014

9.00 – 12.30

We started with prayers from the Buddhist tradition.

Pan-Africa Presentation by Jean Pierre Massamba

In November 2010 the Baarlo Council adopted the principle of an IFOR program in Africa. It had asked ICOM to develop and implement the program. During the last 4 years the program project has been elaborated by ICOM and then ratified by the RCC in September of 2013. It should focus on four areas: the culture of nonviolence and peace, reconciliation and nonviolent conflict resolution, women and nonviolence, and networks and solidarity.

In Baarlo we said the global goal of an IFOR program in Africa is to contribute to reduce violence or to promote reconciliation and peace in Africa through nonviolence. More general goals were: to strengthen capacities of those working on the ground in order to promote reconciliation and a culture of peace in Africa. We also wanted to sensitize the population about nonviolence, reconciliation and conflict resolution. In order to organize and train as many as possible at the base, we focused especially on women and young people.

It will be a matter of working as a network in order to share and utilize our resources, to share our know-how and energy. This should happen between national actors and at the regional level in Africa, but also internationally in relationship to those who have relations to Africa.

This program as it has been thought of is not a program of Africans. It's an IFOR program, because IFOR since the council of 2010 has committed itself to work in Africa each according to their context. That's why we don't speak about 'IFOR Africa', but an IFOR program in Africa. There is no such thing as FOR Africa. For practical reasons, the implementation of the program will be carried by an African branch in collaboration with the International Secretariat and under the supervision of ICOM. Of course, before the program can be implemented the membership of IFOR will be consulted and we need the expertise of everyone.

Questions & Remarks

Marion Schreiber (FOR Austria): I remember in Pointe Noire you talked about an African conference. Is this still your intention? There might be some institutions in Austria where we could apply for money to support such a conference.

David Niyonzima (FOR Burundi): I remember in Baarlo we set up a network but what happened to that network? Also, how will we decide which African branch will implement the program? Thirdly, I want more clarifications when you say this is not an African program, what does that mean?

Beena Sebastian (FOR India): What does the Africa network look like and what is their involvement in this body? Who constitutes your executive or advisory body?

Tess Ramiro (AKKAPKA): Please clarify what you mean when you say that there is no IFOR Africa, but IFOR in Africa. Then the Agenda says it is a pan African report, but there is only you presenting. Lastly, I miss the representation of Madagascar in this council.

Akadim Chikandamina (FOR Zimbabwe): In Africa we have a number of groups that would like to have an input if that program will ever take its course. I was a bit disturbed that neither Madagascar, Tanzania, Uganda, nor Zambia knew about this conference. I don't see any program that touches Africa can be running without the people from Africa being involved.

Jean Pierre Massamba (IFOR-ICOM): Some of the questions are coming up again and again. I want to start with the questions of IFOR Africa versus IFOR in Africa. We do not want to isolate Africa. Africa should work together with all the other regions. We don't want to go in the direction of having an office in Africa. There is only one IFOR in the world and it is present in various regions. That's why we don't say IFOR Asia, IFOR Europe. We don't want to have a description like that for IFOR in Africa either. IFOR is present in Northern America in Europe and Africa. We don't want to be disconnected from the other branches or countries. Secondly, we don't want it to be a program for Africans. It is a commitment of IFOR work in Africa.

As far as the implementation of the program; it is being set up. A technical committee will be set up. In relation to the international Secretariat, because we don't want this to be something that Africans only do with one another we need to have a relationship with the international Secretariat and ICOM. The idea of having the conference is one of the ideas that have to be

developed. Concerning all the groups that are not here, Nigeria, Madagascar, etc. It is not the role of this program to have them come to this council. We have to deal with the reality of Africa. Between the branches we communicate very little in Africa. It is our hope that through this program we will set up some collaboration between the groups/branches. We think that it's fundamental to do networking in Africa. When there is a conflict, neighbouring countries are concerned by this conflict. It's our hope that through networking we can create the possibility of helping each other with such conflicts. It's our hope that every group in Africa could find their place in this program. We do not have a structure currently for all of Africa. RCC African representatives will be involved in this program, but up until this point they haven't had a well-defined task.

Nahmo Sithole (FOR Zimbabwe): 15 years ago a lot of consultations were done in several countries in South Africa. We need to communicate so everyone is aware of what is happening.

David Niyonzima (THARS Burundi): four years ago in Baarlo we tried to establish a network we set up a Google group. We thought that would be an answer to a lack of communication between African branches. Four years later it is not done. What happened? Another issue, this program was validated by a group. How much input did you have for that program from the other BGAs?

Akadim Chikandamina (FOR Zimbabwe): When Pierre is speaking he says, "we". Who is "we"?

Millius Palayiwa (FOR England): I hear dissent and division among our brothers from Africa. Is there anything this council can do to help with this discussion between you all?

Peter Aeberhard (FOR Switzerland): I think this is a crucial part of the decision if we are having geographical or thematic programs. My vision says we need a program on war demilitarization, in healing and reconciliation and in a culture for peace. These are the key points for me to be implemented in all regions. How it will be implemented is up to Africa. I would opt for thematic programs rather than geographical.

Because of the communication problems the African delegates met during the dinnertime to discuss more communication and collaboration.

FOR Austria Report

- Peace education.
- National peace policy: our long-term engagement for small arms control was rewarded by a law that passed parliament.
- International solidarity: we cooperate in the accompaniment program in Colombia in San Jose de Apartado. We have sent 3 volunteers so far.
- A successful peace program was held this year in Sarajevo. It was a peace event where we cooperated with ten other peace NGOs. 2000 participants and 150 workshops participated and it was a big event.
- You are already familiar with the biking for peace tours that happen every year: In 2011 to Sarajevo; in 2013 to Turin; and this year to Konstanz.
- The youth group has been active in Austria despite the turmoil last year in IFOR. Activities of the youth group focused on nukes' abolition and the organization of nonviolence trainings. Reaching out to people from the east, i.e., Romania, Armenia, Georgia, etc. was a priority and an objective we adopted in Tokyo. Our aim was to reach out to the countries that the iron curtain divided from us.

FOR Zimbabwe Report (Nahmo Sithole)

- Lights for Learning is a program we started in 2010. FOR Zimbabwe are working with an organization in Swindon with 4 engineers putting lights in 29 schools, 18 clinics and 2 police huts. We are interested in primary schools. We are putting lights in less privileged areas in all areas. In Zimbabwe we rely on hydropower and it is not often available there. We have put light in three clinics. This is very important for pregnant women. The communities are most of the time very grateful. There is better retention in the schools and clinics because nurses and teachers don't need to worry about paying for the lights.
- Concerning election monitoring. We've been involved in election monitoring for almost 15 years. The situation is still bad, but no major fighting or killing each other. This election it was very quiet and no incidents. We were able send 240 observers throughout the

country. The number was not enough though. They were monitoring the procedures of the elections and the violence.

- Peace clubs. People from various schools are learning from each other. This has helped the students and the community in different provinces as there are many dialects

Ruhi Das (Bangladesh): You mentioned you put lights in the police station, in context of Bangladesh there are no good relationships between police and people.

Nahmo Sithole (FOR Zimbabwe): You can't bring in people from other countries without consent from the government. These police stations they are very rural and the community asked us to put the lights in the police station. It was not out of a relationship with the government or because we have decided but because the request came from the community.

FOR England Report (Millius Palayiwa)

We have been involved in five key areas:

(1) Global solidarity in the area of development and the promotion of nonviolence. For this we have the international peacemakers fund. We give funds to nonviolent organizations in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. So far we have given grants to projects in Kenya, Congo, India, Zimbabwe, Israel, and Palestine. After Baarlo, we got 39 requests for over 1 million pounds.

We also want to be a visible part of IFOR. We take part in European regional meetings and Scottish and Welsh branch meetings. We took part in the first fellowship school and hosted the international coordinator.

(2) Education on peace and non-violence with 'Called to be Peacemakers', a peace education conference for people aged 18-30, as stall at the Christian Greenbelt Festival and membership of other peacemaking organisations.

(3) Campaigning, engaging and being a public voice. We engage with policy shapers and decision makers, and take part in cross party parliamentary groups, one on drones since in 2010 we released a ground breaking report on drones. We also took part in the cross party parliamentary group on Iraq and there is a group on Palestine we are part of. (4) There is a commemoration of WWI from 2014-18 And there is fear that it will be militaristic. Had meetings with the government to have the ministry of defence not involved. Government has commissioned a lot of radio and television

programs and we want to make sure the voices of peace are included and conscientious objector's voices are heard.

(5) Outreach to groups of faith and spiritual support. We try to build bridges with other organizations.

Finally, we have worked on assuring the financial stability of the organization. The wells are drying up. Our money comes from donations from membership. No membership fee. 1,068 members. 200 young people as part of young peacemakers network. We usually get a lot of funds from legacies. It has been decided that we will no longer budget for legacies.

Highlights since Baarlo: made a drones quilt, preparations for the centennial, peace pilgrimage on Iona Island attended by young people from the United States. Have produced a book, 'FOR: 100 Years of Nonviolence'. It gives the whole history of FOR over the past 100 Years.

Doopsgezinde Wereldwerk (Annelies Klinefelter)

For a few years the relief work was overshadowing the peace work. For the past 2 and a half years we've been doing more peace work. We've been involved with the work of the Christian peacemaker teams. They do more than accompaniment. There is a team in Hebron, Kurdistan, Colombia and an indigenous community in Canada. We've started the peace academy up again. Working with one of the affiliates of IFOR we reach out to groups and people interested in nonviolence, training, empowerment. Also we do a lot of mediation work with the local churches. Also do work on the environmental consequences for indigenous groups around the world. In the next seven years we will be working on a peace pilgrimage initiated by the world council of churches. There is about ten of us, so that is about all we do. One of the new projects of the CPT is in Europe. There was a gathering at the end of April. There is an island off the coast of Greece where refugees try to swim to get to Europe. Want to have a long-term witness there to first see what happens there and make it more visible.

FOR Burundi (THARS) Report (David Niyonzima):

Trauma Healing and Reconciliation Services was accepted as an affiliate in Baarlo in 2010. My organization has been involved in promoting peace in Burundi, as there is lots of violence between

Hutus and Tutsis. In 1993 there was genocide, about 300,000 Burundi people died. Our work is to prevent violence and war in the country. Since 2010 we have been doing a study on how violence has impacted the population so they can resist a recurrence of violence. We are trying to see if Burundi people are ready to say no to violence. And we have found that many need healing from trauma. You can see the study on our website (www.ThAR.org).

I want to mention an issue that is hot in the country. Burundi is talking about implementing a truth and reconciliation commission similar to the one in South Africa. It is controversial because currently it does not include prosecution of those that committed the violence. There are a lot of talks about it right now about how effective the commission will be to prevent war and violence. We are part of a group of 13 organizations including Quakers and Mennonites using the Quaker peace network model which included-s, (1) truth telling; (2) accountability, that the UN would call justice; and (3) forgiveness. (4) Positive relationships whereby communities have to relate with each other positively; and (5) leadership development and community empowerment. With those five points of the Quaker model we think we will be active in the country. We have been involved with the Alternative to Violence Program (Quakers). We have found this program to be successful among the young people who are the targets of the politicians. Elections are next year and there is some fear there will be violence. With AVP we think we can counter the violence. We would like to invite you all to join us in this work. Last year Burundi refugees have been forced to come back. When they come back they find that their land has been taken by those who stayed. So we work to mediate between the refugees and those that have stayed so that it doesn't become violent. We have been using the self-help group approach as a way of community empowerment. With people needing so much they fight with those that have things.

Jahanara Hasan (BASTOB): Can you clarify about the healing process in 2010.

David Niyonzima (THARS Burundi): The Healing process consists of three areas: 1. Sensitivity training so people know it is natural to have conflicts in post conflicts, but there is a way out. 2. Training that includes a technique of active empathetic listening. We think empathy is crucial for healing, and 3 Therapeutic processes in community rather than with individuals. We bring together Hutu and Tutsi together in a group. 4. Bring people together to create products together and help them model their products.

FOR Switzerland Report

The German and French branches have united into one. Integration of weak branches will make us stronger.

We have volunteers that want to work with us and it's a great opportunity to reorganize as a branch. We will work on making a newsletter on peace and bring more peace organizations together and have more meaningful programs.

We had training programs for Somalian migrants for integration. We want to work more with arts and we have had discussions with artists and art therapists to use art as a tool for peacebuilding and reconciliation. Creativity is an important tool for self-esteem and therapy.

Virginia Baron (FOR USA) – What about the languages? How were you able to bring the German and French groups together?

Peter Aeberhard (FOR Switzerland) - Hans Ulrich played a crucial role, he knew the people. We moved the office at the border in a bilingual town and to be close to each other for meeting. We translated and merged the constitutions. We left it as a provisional constitution for 2 years. We have a bilingual newsletter and we have volunteer translators and all documents are translated.

Marion Schreiber (FOR Austria) – Regarding the art project, who is it aimed at?

Peter Aeberhard (FOR Switzerland)- the project is in the design phase. It is a nonverbal powerful tool. We will build a network in Switzerland and once we have this established we can start outreach. It is also a matter of conception with regards to what is and what is not art.

FOR Norway Report

The board currently consists of Lise Simpson, Heidi and myself and we do most of the work. We have no office but a mailbox in the peace house in Oslo. We are still involved with the peace tax campaign. Our biggest project is a culture of peace project. It is to promote the heritage of nonviolence of Martin Luther King. We've celebrated MLK day by setting up stands, leaflets, and a powerful comic book. It has been well received, but we've received no new members from that. We've set up a committee to plan a celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Nobel peace prize given to MLK and it will be on the 14th of September. We are doing some networking and I went to

the Cardiff meeting. Lise is part of web conferencing with the IFOR youth network. Locally we participate in the day of religions. We met with the Norwegian peace alliance. In our last meeting we decided to change our name from IFOR Norway to Peace and reconciliation IFOR Norway.

Tobias Lohse (FOR Germany): As a young branch what do you think IFOR can do to help you to grow? Do you have any suggestions as a young innovative branch about how you can grow?

Trond Rasmussen (FOR Norway): Our group was founded in 1946. Our best asset is our name, IFOR. It's a good brand and we are promoting it. There is a lot of opportunity for creating twinning projects in Europe. There is a lot of funding in Norway for these projects, but we are too small to do what is necessary to get this funding. We are at a level where we are too small to grow and it is dangerous and we are aware of this.

FOR Germany Report

We have a new General Secretary, Miriam Mahler. The German branch is a network of people that have different activities going on. The German branch revolves around an annual meeting. In 2011 we had a conference about Afghanistan and in 2012 an annual conference about civil society awareness. In 2013 the conference was about acting differently economically and had guests with experience in alternative economic lifestyles. This year the conference was on abolishing war and establishing peace. There has been a lot of activity in the past years on Israel and Palestine. There are also regional groups. There is always a group in Munich for the Munich security summit. They organize an alternative peace summit, not just protesting, but also holding their own summit on building security without military forces. There are always a lot of events going on organized by members, not by IFOR, but we of course publish about it in our magazine. At times we've collaborated with Church and Peace and Pax Christi. Lastly, the youth work has been more active since 2010. We created a youth working group in the German FOR. The first youth conference was in 2012 where we discussed what ideas we have for the future. The youth work has been growing and we currently have the youngest board in a long time.

Marion Schreiber (FOR Austria): When does youth end in Germany? How do you finance yourself?

Tobias Lohse (FOR Germany): We have a very intergenerational approach. We don't want to have just youth groups and other groups. We want it to be one. I think it would be something like under 30, but it doesn't really matter how we define that. We have member fees, but also have other ways of fundraising. Some projects are funded by special donors, occasionally some legacies.

Annelies (FOR Netherlands): In the Mennonite world there are all kinds of young people. Are you also thinking about doing something with young people with other branches?

Tobias: There is potential for better communication structures. This youth camp is a good start. Hopefully this is the type of work that IFOR can facilitate.

Zoughbi (FOR Palestine): Please elaborate about the Middle Eastern program.

Tobias: Someone more involved in that work would be better suited to answer that question.

Davorka: Clements is hired to do work on the Middle East, Iran and Afghanistan. He does a lot of speaking events throughout Europe. I wanted to draw attention also to the work being done by the German branch on military chaplaincy. During the centennial there was the creation of an international campaign against military chaplains.

Presentation of the Proposals for Changes to the Constitution

By Jean Pierre Massamba (IFOR ICOM)

We know that changing the constitution of a movement like ours will bring some reactions, that's normal. Remember in Baarlo in 2010 though, we decided that we would revise the constitution of IFOR. In 2010 the international council of IFOR had set up a working group made up of Arfon who died, and our brother Kees Nieuwerth. Both have done a great job and they reported to ICOM about their work. Both gave their report in 2012 at the meeting of the ICOM in Atlanta. ICOM examined the proposals they made. Then IFOR decided to strengthen the team working on the constitution. The work of this new group was presented in September of 2013 in Point Noir and the RCC adopted the broad lines of the proposal and three persons were asked to finalize the work: Arfon, Hansuli, and myself. As you know Hansuli had to quit for health reasons and Arfon left us. With the other members of ICOM we pursued our work until the meeting in Feb 2014 here in Germany. Today we have the delicate mission of presenting the broad lines of these changes. We

know that our work is not perfect. The working group will have to improve the work that has been done because there are probably some mistakes in it. We thought it would be good if the work of the working group would be nourished by the council. The first question is why such modifications? There were two realities: we have a new context of violence in our world, but IFOR had also changed. IFOR was confronted with more and more challenges that called for more credibility in the world. In a changing world it seems we must reaffirm the fundamental values of IFOR, but it's also necessary for us to really find our mission. We had to rethink our strategy to accomplish our mission. We are faced with two questions: Who are we? Are we just an NGO or a movement? Which structures do we need to implement our strategy? This reflection led us to several points. We need a restructuring. We need to modify structures. We need to redefine roles and responsibilities. And we also have the financial question. Our structures shouldn't weigh on our functioning. We must also be able to answer to our new partners like SERPAJ. Those are the questions that led us to make proposals to the constitution.

Day 3: Tuesday 05.08.2014

14.30 – 18.00

Youth Working Group Presentation

By Bettina Schieraus (FOR Austria)

I have two duties, I am leading youth training and coordinating training. We will go after Constance to Berlin to teach the youth how to keep motivated. The other part of my role is the participating in the German Youth camp. I am happy we have brought the youth here.

For the last couple of years I was co-convenor of the youth working group and will give you a report. I will report on why we stopped and are no longer the youth working group.

Lucia from Austria, Luciani Jos'Oint from Madagascar and Pranu Sebastian from India joined Bettina on the podium.

At the last council we told you how important youth work is. There was a lot of positive energy and we had a big plan and had a lot of support at the council and left with big plans. There was approval and a mandate for our plans which was that the youth working group would exist for another 4 years and go on with 3 projects that were already drafted and we should maintain a youth office. We left

with this mandate and a request that the working group should be more international. Also, let's call it a small challenge, we were told we had to come up with the money as well but we were positive about this.

Lucia and I agreed to start the work and find international members. To reach out sometimes takes time and it took us a while but we found Pranu and Luciani and by mid-2012 we had a functioning group with a connection to ICOM through Lucas. We decided to then start raising the money. In 2012 we got a new international co-ordinator and started communicating with Francesco. We had different takes on youth work. We think it important to work on a consensual level but working with Francesco was difficult as it felt like working with a top to bottom structure with a supervisor who treated us as interns. So, the situation was tense from the beginning.

Next, we had tried to generate money and we applied for a grant that would allow us to operate. We did this and it was accepted and in 2013 we got notice we would get 35,000 euros for the group. It is often that when money comes in the conflict explodes and this happened to us. While the YW group wanted to go ahead as we had planned as we had set up over the previous years and we wanted to start on our projects. Francesco thought that now is the time with the money we can start to rethink of ways of how to use the money and he had his own ideas.

One of the projects we had in mind was to keep an on line journal but Francesco wanted to hire a communications person to handle this and use the money to hire this person. We didn't think it made sense. Adding to that the working methods weren't agreed on. We felt that we were only giving input of ideas but that we couldn't go ahead with our projects. We thought we could not solve this problem so the next step was to include EXCOM in the conversation and we sent a letter explaining about the grant problem and that the working methods and structures we wanted were what had been agreed by IFOR and that it was disrespectful not to follow this so we sent a cry for help. The replies were not helping as much as we wanted by EXCOM and they did not see the gravity of the situation but encouraged us to try and co-operate. So, without help from the outside we felt we couldn't go on with our work, as we couldn't do it, as we wanted. Also, there was an additional time pressure as the grant was an annual grant and we had handed in a working programme and we had to go through with the programme in order to receive the funds. So we had a lot of pressure. So we felt we could not start working so we stopped and we quit our jobs and it wasn't a quick action. Lucas had realized the gravity of the situation and it was important to us that YW could be continued. So we provided information for future YW but were not part of the group any more so Francesco could go through with his plans. It was not long before Francesco was not the

International Co-ordinator anymore. Lucas took over the Berlin meeting to start one of the projects we had suggested. So when the time came for the grant we helped write the final report so that the money could be saved that had been spent.

One important point is that it cannot be reduced to a personal clash but it is very clear that the structures within working groups are not clear enough and when it was time to take over responsibilities it wasn't clear who was responsible for making decisions. The second point is that at the last council we talked a lot about the future of IFOR and somebody said when you are talking about youth you are talking about the future. At some point we are happy to share your experience but it is important to see that we have wisdom and experience too. All the people who are standing in front of you all have experience so cooperation is important but it is necessary that there is enough trust and no hierarchy.

Questions & Remarks

Tess Ramiro (AKKAPKA-Philippines): On behalf of the Philippines we are very proud of you and hopeful for IFOR because you are there.

Milius Palayiwa (FOR England): Thank you for that informative report. On the grant are you saying that it was returned or not used for the purposes it had been applied for?

Bettina Schieraus (FOR Austria): It was not returned and was used for the Fellowship School. Also for the Berlin Meeting it was used for an in person meeting and a small part was used for paying rent for the Youth office in Austria for 6 months.

Statement from the Youth Camp by Marco Greue and Sarah Boose from (FOR Germany)

We are the organising team of the youth camp and also the bike tour. We had a wonderful meeting this morning with the other group and to give you background. The German meeting is quite active and there are now 2 reps on the German board with a place always reserved for them. A new young woman started on the German board and a youth council represents the Board.

We set up a youth camp in the South of Germany on the farm of one of our members and this is our biggest project. We worked on it for 18 months.

We have been on the board for 2 years, the Centennial, and when asked what youth could add to the centennial celebration we came up with the bike ride to give some visibility for IFOR so we started from Cologne where IFOR started, to Constance. We heard about the other group and we got the idea to establish a youth camp, which is now organized by the German branch. We have young adults from Sweden, Austria, Japan and Russia. On the way down we did some actions in front of weapons producers and we got into several different topics with them.

Yesterday we started the youth camp and we'll have workshops.

The question of membership status was introduced on the agenda and Ana Juanche, representing the Coordinating Leadership Committee of SERPAJ responded to the agenda item:

SERPAJ Presentation by Ana Juanche

Thank you for giving me the space to explain our request for membership. We obviously understand the concerns about our being part of the organisation. There are different points that I want to make clear that have been developed since we have been active in our continent.

I would like to express that IFOR has been present in Stockholm, in Buenos Aires and Santiago and Chile. SERPAJ was also present in places important for IFOR in Costa Rica, Congo, et cetera. We had also many activities between 2003 and 2007. We had other activities in France, USA and Austria. We have also had a lot of results working with the organisations. We have worked with EUFOR and USA and set many priorities against military bases and spending on the military. This process of the membership, becoming part of the organisation has been discussed many times and that is why we express it has been discussed in the SERPAJ Assembly where we approved the mandate of our willingness to be part of IFOR. You are asking why now. We are celebrating 100 years and we are celebrating the 40th year of founding of SERPAJ and I was nominated to be the first coordinator. That's why the assembly established the mandate to become an active part of the organisation and I will explain the process.

First of all, SERPAJ is an international movement present in 13 Latin American countries. We have one unique constitution for all 13 branches of our organisation. There is only one SERPAJ, which is present in 13 countries. That's why we want to express our willingness to apply for our members as one entity and that is how we want to become part of IFOR.

Finally, we want to say that we are very thankful for this nomination and my nomination to ICOM that the US branch made. We are firmly determined to work as a service entity. I want to confirm that we are thankful only if this avoids conflicts if not we prefer to remain as part of the organization as we have been until now. We also want to stress that independently we will continue with our work and willingness to be part of this organisation the same as we have always done.

Questions & Remarks

Denis Beaumont (FOR England): The council coordinating committee met over lunchtime to see how we could proceed with Ana being nominated before SERPAJ becomes a member.

As you can see in the pack we are going to make decisions and our recommendation to council is that we make a provisional nomination for Ana and the committee, after making the final decisions about member applications, so the application would stand if it is passed otherwise it won't.

Does council agree or not?

David Mumford (FOR Scotland): FOR Scotland has had no applications for IFOR membership before this council and this is something that needs adequate prior opportunity to take decisions. Are there other organisations being considered for membership and we haven't had any applications for?

Can I ask if the constitutional position can be checked?

Zaira Zafanara (FOR Italy): I agree with David but we did not have prior knowledge. I think we can still do things in order and if there is the issue let's proceed step by step. First consider the membership and then decide.

So first we talk about membership and then decide. We should discuss membership at the beginning – now, today, and ask ICOM to inform us of all groups asking for membership.

Marion Schreiber (FOR Austria): On page 6 you will find this process should take place early in the council.

Tobias Lohse (FOR Germany): I don't see why we can't vote about it now. I would like to have a vote now.

Virginia Baron (International Council Chair): Those in support of Denis' proposal for SERPAJ to become a branch, please raise your card.

There was no consensus.

Future of IFOR Report

By Lucas Johnson (IFOR International Coordinator)

Lucas: It's an honour to be in service to this community. I started my experience through the Baptist Peace Fellowship and then involved in a local chapter of FOR where I met Lili and then to the National Council of the US branch and then to ICOM in 2010. You have all been my teachers and mentors over the last four years and I look forward to getting to know those I don't know so well. Also, I want to begin with a simple recognition. As you look around you this is not all of IFOR. According to the books, we have 64 members in 40 countries but only 23 present. Should I break the trend and survive to the next council, I commit to you that there will be 65 members representing the 40 countries that are part of our fellowship. The conversation we just had hits me with a particular feeling of regret. I know I was in correspondence with BGAs and correspondence didn't come on time and this was frustrating. I think that we did our best, all that we could, but our history and pattern of dysfunction preceding councils is going to have to stop if we are ever going to follow our procedures and guidelines. So, as we have these conversations about reviewing and what it takes to be an organization, I hope we will produce some meaningful reform that will help us move forward. I had very much hoped the youth who were here would be part of the next conversation. This section of my report was to describe my core responsibilities over the next 4 years and use this time to get guidance from you as to what you understand my responsibilities to be because they need to be similar.

Areas of focus:

1. Communication - What does it take for us to develop a culture and pattern of communication that allows us to be the community we want to be with each other?
2. How are we communicating to those outside and what priorities do we expect from the international secretariat in that communication? We had a press conference on Thursday but I would be curious as to what you think that should look like. Tobias' work is related to this.
3. Co-ordination. As each of our branches are engaged what does it mean for that to be co-ordinated at international level? I think you understand it individually but it is not collectively understood.

Peter Aeberhard (FOR Switzerland): I'd like to know whether there will be a list of five or ten priorities?

Once a new ICOM is elected we can come up with clarity on this but I don't know how to come up with the collective will of the council.

Lucas: So here's where I was going. I would like some clarification on the future of our work in relationship to gender and violence now that WPP is its own institution. What does this mean for our body moving forward? So I was going to ask for some small group conversations.

The second thing is in response to Amos and Zoughbi's statement on interfaith and identity. What does this mean for the future of IFOR on interfaith?

The third was following up on our UN representation. What are the ideas and visions around that?

A fourth area would be youth work. What are we thinking about this and the priorities in our work?

Finally, the question of regionalisation and regional groups. Feedback on what that means to us.

There's been some discussion around Africa and small groups that have begun like the promotions group and finance working group and I'm happy they are happening. But I want us to begin those conversations of what we envision and break into small groups. My hope is that people will be present among all the conversations.

Chair: We have 40 minutes to begin meeting in groups.

Gender and Violence

Interfaith

UN and representation

Youth Work
Regionalism.

Derek Brett (IFOR UN Representative-Geneva): Just to say and I'm not suggesting we change again but before we split, let me express it is unfortunate that this breakout is before the UN reps report.

Peter: It is a good point to say how I feel. We get 5 points from Lucas, his opinion, and in my understanding this is the council, the body of members of IFOR. On the one hand, we have a council co-ordinating committee trying hard to put up an agenda but there is a lot of dissatisfaction because we are not talking about the real issues. We don't have the chance to bring in the issues we should be dealing with. Until now, we have talked of the WPP, the Youth Work and are now dealing with questions coming up in these discussions and I am uncomfortable that we are dealing with formal procedures etc. but no dealing with issues in the room. I make an appeal to all of us because we are the council that we concentrate our energy and be aware that this is the place and time only every 4 years to make things better. IFOR is in crisis and we have experienced this and we go on as 'business as usual' and to go on like this for 4 more years is not healthy.

Lucas: I have chosen these things not from my ideas but from work that you have prioritized. I need clarity and if you have a concrete suggestion about what needs to be discussed please make it but if the issue of youth and WPP.

Chair: You are seeing how difficult it has been in the last 4 years. A President who had to step down for health, a previous international coordinator who did not work. And that we are even here is truly through the grace of God and we are trying to pull together our movement and people had to step in and do the best they could. I think these 5 issues have been thought out carefully and they are not all the issues and we need to support Lucas at this time and take the issues he is talking about and take time to review them. We should respect his suggestion and meet in groups and come back.

Virginia Baron: I suggest that some suggestions should come to the council. I think there should be something that relates to militarism and split into small groups.

Christian Renoux (FOR France): We should work in co-operation and perhaps Lucas should ask the council to tell the points we would like to discuss and have some of the spirit of Jesus.

Lucas: Tell me what you want to do.

Gretchen Honnold (FORUSA): We have 1.5 hours blocked out for Wednesday to discuss what you said, Christian.

Harky Klinefelter (Doopsgezinde Wereldwerk): This seems to be a list of some of the things people think are important and perhaps we should add other issues that are important that the council feels and then decide what groups?

Lucas: These things I have named are things I need to reflect on soon. It was not intended to represent the priorities of the movement. I hear there is a different need so let's address that and I'm going to the board and accept suggestions.

Anne Stickers (IFOR Liaison Officer): We were asked for a consensus before the break and it was dropped. What is the position on it?

Chair: It was tabled and we shall deal with it tomorrow.

Peter Aeberhard (FOR Switzerland): I think it good to have a brainstorming session. For the next 4 years what is the priority from the members.

Kyoko Iitaka (FOR Japan): We had a workshop on nuclear free world. We'll put that on the board.

Kees Nieuwerth (Kerk en Vrede): To make war illegal.

Peter Aeberhard (FOR Switzerland): Healing and reconciliation

David Niyonzima (THARS Burundi): To encourage reflection on what makes for peace, reconciliation and non-violence in each of our communities.

Tess: Formation and training of young people is important for the next 100 years

Harky Klinefelter (Doopsgezinde Wereldwerk): I was impressed by the demonstration over the military profits. Martin Luther King said there is a triple problem of war, poverty and racism. This all results in new nationalism etc. so I would put the relationship of new military conflicts

Tobias: I would like what Lucas had suggested. We also think about what spirituality means in a non-religious context for IFOR.

Maria Antonietta Malleo (IFOR Representative to UNESCO): In encouraging non-violence and peace in Arab countries.

Mark Johnson (IFOR Representative to UN-New York): The environmental crisis

Marion Schreiber (FOR Austria): Have RCC reps in the groups.

Davorka Lovrekovic (IFOR VP): Nonviolent Peace Force.

Beena Sebastian (FOR India): Emergency task force

Marion Schreiber (FOR Austria): Thanks to the flexibility of the Chair.

Suseela Mathew (FOR India): Underprivileged children.

All of the suggestions were written down by Lucas on a flip chart.

Chair: Next item on the agenda

Day 3: Tuesday 05.08.2014

19.30 – 21.00

Presentation FOR Japan (Katsuyoshi Sekimoto)

We were founded in 1956 so we are 88 years old this year. We are involved in international activities and Japan has been in special consultations with the UN since 1999. We are an anti-nuclear movement and are trying to speak about Article 9 of our Constitution – the renunciation of war and the right to peace and trying to win the Nobel Peace Prize. We are joining in the lawsuit against the Government. The Prime Minister wants to change the interpretation of Article 9 and make our troops take part in war. We support the Friends International Youth Group and we worry about future generations with nuclear power plants. We think that the evacuation of children must be paid by the Japanese Government.

Presentation FOR Bangladesh BASTOB (Ruhi Das)

- Education Programme
- Health Programme
- Making Migration better for the Labour Migrants in Bangladesh
- Climate Change Project
- Microfinance Programme
- 24% interest rate, declining

Presentation MIR France (Christian Renoux)

We were founded in 1923 but we are not a strong branch

- Magazine, The Quarterly of Reconciliation (in French), beginning in 1926 still published quarterly and electronically and is the oldest peace magazine; you can send information to us.
- We are focused on the theology of non-violence and we are involved in the work against military chaplaincy – a least 4 books have come out about the ‘good work’ they are doing.
- We are involved in the French Coalition for Education for Peace and Non-Violence.
- Advocacy in the national parliaments so that teachers are trained in non-violent conflict resolution since we introduced into law the non-violent resolution of conflict in schools and written the document that has been approved. Working together with the Ministry of Education to implement this in the curricula in schools.
- Coalition Anti-Nuclear Arms
- 2014 new Coalition anti Arms Trade Fairs. Together with 13 other NGOs a protest was organized. The next Fair and protest will be in 2016. Other BGAs are invited to join.
- Cycle of Silence: protest against the situation of undocumented migrants. There are currently more than 200 Cycles of Silence throughout France.
- Coalition for Peace in Palestine
- Much contact with French-speaking IFOR BGAs in Africa

Presentation FOR Palestine Wi’am (Zoughbi Zoughbi)

- Palestinian Conflict Resolution Center founded in 1994, later changed to Palestinian Conflict Transformation Center
- Interdisciplinary approach
 - Ministry of reconciliation - conflict transformation, restorative justice
 - Trauma coping using art therapy, peer mediation
 - Gender issues to empower the work of women
 - Nonviolence as a way of life which includes beautiful resistance - vigils and demonstrations
 - Citizen Diplomacy/Ethical or Alternative Tourism, ‘meet the living stones’ spirituality which includes and respects others.
 - Interfaith dialogue

- Networking: Ecumenical Accompaniment Program of World Council of Churches, for example
- In the process of creating Arab Partnership for the Prevention of Violence and a group of mediators in the Arab world
- Publications
 - The right of women to inherit (legal assistance also)
 - Manuals on peer mediation
 - Intended to celebrate 20 years since foundation, but in light of current violence is postponed

Presentation FOR Philippines AKKAPKA (Tess Ramiro)

- 30 years old, born out of work of Jean and Hildegard Goss-Mayr, Richard Deats and US FOR. In 1972 marshal law was declared by President Marcos and we built a movement for the non-violence seed to grow with Father Blanco; in 1988 we became a branch.
- FIT Program:
 - Formation
 - Nonviolence trainings
 - We offer 3 and 4-day seminars and two retreats a year to deepen spiritual roots. A lot of women report abuse to us when they attend our seminars. We monitor domestic violence like incest and rape.
 - Information
 - Building networks: media and unity/harmony partners
 - Transformation
 - Advocacy
 - Environmental focus; relief and rehabilitation of victims of natural disasters; tree planting
 - Feeding programs for children
 - Women/gender task force groups
- Core group of 40, 20 core youth, 7 volunteer staff, 3 full time staff, and board
- Funds

- Fundraising
- Recycling
- We specialize in project proposal writing to funding agencies
- Also specialize in consultancy work

Presentation FOR India (Beena Sebastian)

We started in the 1950s with members scattered all over India from different religious groups. We are involved in non-violent education training programs, providing training to police (we have a peace prize for policemen) and newly elected parliamentarians. We publish many books and flyers and members network in many areas. We are trying to help the government in writing policies and one has been written in collaboration with other NGOs. Gender work is a major area as there is no peace without justice for women. We try to help youth to enter into areas of non-violence and train students and peace pilgrims from around the world. We demonstrate against India developing nuclear weapons and nuclear power. We organize annual conferences for peace building and it is an opportunity for members to come together. We are strengthening communities and asking the government to give land to survivors in need. There is the Hoover movement, giving land to the landless, and Viva Palawi, a disciple of Gandhi, is interested in this. We focus on religious harmony and in Kerala there is harmony between the different groups.

Presentation Sweden (Sofia Walan)

I have been the General Secretary of FOR Sweden for 3 years and Evert is the Treasurer (he has worked for FOR for 40 years). We have 14 employees and a €2M per year turnover. 90% of our income is from government grants and we have to get the other 10%, which is difficult for us so we try to be creative. We do work in Guatemala and work with a network in Latin America called SARVE (against armed violence). We are involved in Salam Friends where Moslems and Christians work together. We work with church leaders through arts and activism and are part of the ecumenical movement. We have political campaigns against Swedish arms exports (Sweden is one of the biggest exporters of arms particularly to Arabic countries).

Presentation Agir Pour La Paix Belgium (Jérôme Peraya)

We have a long history and are the biggest peace organization that has protested against armaments. Also we obtained legal status for conscientious objectors. This year is the 50th anniversary of the right to conscientious objection and we have done a lot of work with that all year and relaunched the status of COs. In 1994 conscription was abolished. I came to the organization 3 years ago and there was only one person left who was old and he couldn't do all the work. Belgium have the same situation as Sweden as we have to work in a specific framework specified by law which is in the area of education which is a good thing for education in non-violence. We do a lot of training in activism with arts and I can give more details to those who are interested. We are lobbying about the military industrial complex. We have to struggle against all causes of war, which includes the environment, social struggles, and in all these areas we contribute our knowledge.

Presentation Kerk en Vrede (Kees Nieuwerth)

The Church and Peace Alliance is celebrating its 19th anniversary. The branch has a small part-time staff and volunteers. We work in the area of theology with the World Council of Churches (WCC) and at the national churches level. I represent the Quakers on the council of WCC. We have produced a book of research on how the media are 'Selling War' and we have a political working group. After the fall of the Berlin wall NATO expanded and surrounded and isolated Russia; the US is doing the same by building bases around Korea. We have a national stamp saying 'Make War Illegal' and we commemorated the 300th anniversary of peace at Utrecht with 'Songs for Peace'. At the nuclear summit at The Hague we demonstrated, were put in jail and our flags and banners were all taken down.

Presentation MIR Italy (Zaira Zafarana)

The Movimento Internazionale della Riconciliazione was founded in 1952. We have no paid staff, all are volunteers and very committed. Many of our 100 members have been active and we work with other organizations involved in peace work. We have 8 local groups. The National Board and National President are elected every 2 years. We had recent problems and look forward to the healing process so we can improve our team-working group. We co-operate with the civil Peace

Corps network and a network for peace associated with Assisi and Perugia. We create space to collaborate and are a member of the Italian Committee on Peace and Non-Violence. We are also a member of Pax Christi and an ethical bank. We have had 10 years of peace with Austria, Hungary and France and we have collected work of the last 10 years. We did 150 workshops at the Sarajevo peace event. The local groups have different priorities and some work in ecumenicalism, some disarmament. We have nuclear weapons with storage in Italy and people have already said that we don't want this. The local group in Piedmont works on environmental issues, one being the high speed train construction. We hold peace camps with specific topics and workshops. We are working in collaboration with other organizations on 'Discover Peace in Europe' with peace trails. We have published a leaflet to promote this initiative and all trails are on the website (www.discoverpeace.eu).

Presentation MIR Congo Brazzaville (Jacques Poaty):

We are going through a post-conflict period. MIR Congo is located in 3 towns and we have a national coordinator. We are using flyers, broadcasting and training for youth for the desensitization against violence. We are working in collaboration with other IFOR branches, especially France, on a programme for reconciliation. We are working on healing and reconciliation for child soldiers through agricultural projects and forgiveness projects. We want to extend the 'Field of Peace' project to other villages where people died but we need financial help to do this. Women and children are trying to work on the peace education project.

Day 4: Wednesday 06.08.2014

9.00 – 12.30

The session opens with a ceremony performed by FOR Japan and FOR USA where they sign a new Peace Agreement as a substitute for the one signed by the two nations in 1945.

Presentation SERPAJ – by Ana Juanche

SERPAJ is a Latin American movement that was founded in 1974, following a long discussion in which IFOR also took part.

Thanks to John and Hildegard Goss-Mayer that the interfaith communities were able to come together and cooperate.

First steps towards founding were already taken from 1962.

IFOR has inspired SERPAJ in a spiritual way as well. SERPAJ considers IFOR as a parent.

Inspiration is rooted in peace and nonviolence.

Current work:

- President is Nobel Peace Prize winner Adolfo Perez Esquivel
- 13 countries in Latin America
- Principal decision-making body is the four-annual continental assembly. The Collegiate Council is the second decision-making body that meets more frequently. The Latin American Coordination (CLA) is responsible for the political decisions that the organization takes.
- SERPAJ Peru is the 13th regional secretariat but is not active yet; it is in development.
- The regional secretariat works together through regional councils. The regional secretariats are not independent. They work together on a continental basis, under one single constitution.

Core values:

- Promotion and education on a culture of peace and nonviolence
- Human rights promotion, defense and education on human rights
- Demilitarization

The work is characterized by:

- From and with excluded, impoverished and violated people
- Grassroots work. SERPAJ is not limited to grassroots work, but it is indispensable for the organization.

Cooperation with IFOR:

During the last 4 years the link between IFOR and SERPAJ has increased. This was a result from the decisions taken at the IFOR Council in Baarlo.

A 2012 meeting in Bogota gave a crucial impulse for the increased cooperation. A plan for cooperation was developed with the following 3 pillars:

- Accompaniment Program in Colombia
- Demilitarization and Awareness Raising about Demilitarization
- Regular communication: monthly contact

Virginia Baron (Council Chair): apologies towards SERPAJ concerning the disorganization and the confusion concerning SERPAJ's status and its ability to become a member during this Council.

Lucas Johnson (IFOR International Coordinator):

No new applicants for membership status. That leaves us with:

- ANANDO in Bangladesh is still an unresolved issue.
- AKKAPKA faces a similar situation
- SERPAJ

David Mumford (FOR Scotland): I blocked consensus yesterday because IFOR regulations were not followed:

- A relationship between IFOR and the applicant must be proven to be present
- Existing IFOR BGAs must be notified beforehand. At least a 6-month notice must be given to ICOM. ICOM can make a recommendation towards BGAs. 6-week notice who will be considered for membership.
- Delegate power to incoming ICOM so that when all due regulations have been followed, the ICOM will have the power to admit SERPAJ as a branch.

However, I have come to the following considerations:

There were administrative difficulties while preparing Council, and we know SERPAJ. The relationship has clearly been established. Same goes for AKKAPKA. Therefore: if Council decides today that AKKAPKA and SERPAJ shall be accepted as Branches, I will no longer block consensus.

Virginia Baron (Council Chair):

- Is anyone blocking consensus concerning SERPAJ membership status?
- Declares SERPAJ to be officially admitted to IFOR as a Branch.
- SERPAJ receives a standing ovation.
- Is anyone blocking consensus concerning AKKAPKA membership status?
- Declares AKKAPKA to be officially admitted to IFOR as a Branch.
- AKKAPKA receives a standing ovation.
- Beena raised the issue that AKKAPKA has not presented any reports like SERPAJ did. Also, there are other AKKAPKA groups as well.

Lucas Johnson: unfortunately there was no ability to reach out to the other AKKAPKA groups due to lacking contact details. ICOM however is aware of this issue.

- **David Mumford:** is it possible to have several Branches from the same country? This is not an issue to worry about now, but only if other groups from the Philippines apply for Branch status.
- It is decided that the power to decide on the status of Anando remains delegated to ICOM.
- **Tess Ramiro:** thanks David for the flexibility shown and calls upon Council to amend the Constitution and the Procedural Guidelines so that the injustice that has been done to AKKAPKA for many years will not hurt other movements in the same way.

Future of IFOR – Small Group presentations

Following the discussion on Tuesday in which Lucas aimed to discuss IFOR's future, the delegates broke into small groups and discussed what IFOR's approach should be in the next years concerning 6 key areas. A 7th topic, the Environment, was identified as a priority for IFOR but remained undiscussed.

Demilitarization

- Status quo: SERPAJ has its own Demilitarization program; FOR USA no such program; FOR Japan is active in its advocacy for their Article 9 in the Peace Constitution; some European countries are active in this area but not all.
- Focus areas should be:
 - Show positive alternatives to arms like non-violent activities
 - Nuclear disarmament
 - Arms trade
 - Japanese Article 9
 - Civilian peacekeeping teams
 - Cooperation with other organizations and coalitions

Interfaith Cooperation

- Focus should be on:
 - Reconciliation
 - Non-religious spirituality
 - Encouraging personal meetings and dialogue; bring people together
 - Information exchange between conflict and non- or post-conflict areas
- Funding possibilities are probably more available at the national BGA level.

Representation at the United Nations and other International Organizations

- It is necessary for the IFOR Secretariat to have coordination in this field of work as has been started now by Anne Stickers.
- The consultative status of IFOR, SERPAJ and JFOR at the UN is valuable and should be a priority in IFOR's work.
- Representatives need input from BGAs; information and knowledge from the ground is very valuable in institutions like the UN.
- Representatives need a strategy, vision & mission statements, and priorities.
- ICOM should decide on budget allocation. It is recommended to keep a liaison officer at least part-time at the IFOR Secretariat.
- Recommendation to assign Anne the task of compiling a 'Starting Document' which should contain this working groups' notes, an overview of the status quo of the representatives'

work, and contact details. This Starting Document should subsequently be used to develop a long-term strategy for IFOR's advocacy at the UN and other International Organizations.

Gender Issues

- Focus:
 - Gender roles in society
 - Gender inequalities in society
 - Gender in IFOR's own structure and bodies
- At the IFOR level a Gender Working Group should be established (but only after the governance structures are cleared up).
- BGAs can and should act unilaterally to develop their own programs on these issues.
- NB: Gender issues are not a women's topic or problem. All of us should be working on it.

Trauma & Healing

- This topic is central to post-conflict reconciliation and should therefore be at the core of IFOR's work. It should be stated clearer and more consistently throughout our work and activities.
- Recommendation to start a Working Group on the issue.

Youth Issues

- Youth should be more visible and structurally integrated into IFOR. Youth involvement should be within the existing structures, not (merely) parallel to it.
- IFOR should be more explicitly intergenerational (not just inter-faith).
- The website should have a central section about youth involvement.
- Social media should be used more intensively.
- Young people should be equal partners in any decision-making process.

Day 4: Wednesday 06.08.2014

14.30 – 18.00

Reports on IFOR's Historic Relationships

by Davorka Lovrekovic (IFOR VP), Kees Nieuwerth (Kerk en Vrede), and Lucas Johnson (IFOR International Coordinator)

Davorka: There are mainly 4 organizations IFOR has been connected to in the past: Eirenne (which IFOR helped to form), War Resisters International, Non-Violent Peace Force, and Church & Peace. We thought it was important to bring IFOR back into the networks where it used to be present. ICOM has asked Lucas to take part in Eirenne meetings.

Eirenne mostly has programs in the south but is starting to have some programs in the global north. It is a growing organization and our relationship with them is very low key. Eirenne is open if BGAs are interested in collaborating with some of their programs. Church & Peace is a network of churches and institutions. It's a Christian organization that is currently opening up a little bit toward interfaith dialogue. It is growing especially in southeast Europe, the Balkans. They have also tried to reconnect with the World Council of Churches. Kees Nieuwerth has been IFOR's representative to two WCC councils.

Kees: In 2011 and 2013 the mainstream churches have started to engage in a dialogue about the concept of Just Peace. Organizations like IFOR, Church & Peace and others should continue to try and push the WCC in this direction.

Davorka: Non-Violent Peace Force has had some tough organizational challenges in the past. Their last council meeting was 8 or 9 years ago because they didn't have the funding to bring in all their delegates. They've decided to make a drastic cut and have a virtual meeting, which will take place in 2 weeks. We might be able to learn from this experience; there is the possibility for ICOM to meet virtually in between the physical meetings. NPF decided to set up a foundation that would send out the programs. The foundation will have a board of 7 people, but they will not have any members any more. There is the question of what will happen to the former members. There has been an alliance formed by the ex-members of NPF to support that body of only 7 people. IFOR didn't stand in the

way. NPF wanted to make sure to maintain the grassroots connections. IFOR sent Derek Brett as a representative; IFOR therefore is a founding member of the NPF alliance.

Lucas: War Resisters International (WRI) had their 90th anniversary gathering in Cape Town, South Africa and were very warm and welcoming towards an IFOR rep, which was I. The event was well attended, especially from the African continent. Desmond Tutu came in person to welcome WRI to South Africa. WRI organized their gathering a little differently. Instead of having the centennial and then the meeting, they had them running parallel. It was an interesting way of infusing some of the thematic needs into the energy of the business meeting and it's worth considering. There were three statements passed: one on Ukraine, one on self-immolation and Article 9 in Japan, and a statement on Israel's assault on Gaza. You can see those statements on WRI's website. Several IFOR branches have dual membership in WRI and IFOR. It was good to see some of our membership: Moses John from South Sudan and Mahmoud from Sudan. The WPP did trainings before the WRI gathering. They were a big part of that event and they were well received. In general the WRI gathering was a success. I invited the new chair of WRI to our centennial and we were glad to receive her as well.

To add to Davorka's report, Eirenne also supported IFOR's centennial financially.

Questions & Remarks

Pete Haemmerle (FOR Austria): Are there any other memberships, formal or informal, that IFOR has at non-governmental bodies?

Davorka: No. There were not many records in the office. These were the ones we could establish. John had cancelled our membership to European Peace Liaison Office (EPLO) because it was too expensive. I think it was a mistake given what is happening in Europe.

Volker Grotefeld (IFOR Stichting): We are still a member of the International Peace Bureau.

Derek Brett (UN Rep, Geneva): We now have a representative in Brussels: Sam Biesemans. If IFOR decided to pay up to be part of EPLO I'm sure he'd be willing to represent us there.

Tess Ramiro (AKKAPKA): What is our historical relationship with the International Network of Engaged Buddhists (INEB) and what is our current relationship with them?

Lucas: With many of these relationships the lack of our ability to have consistent administration in our offices has affected our ability to stay in contact with these partners and networks. Our house is just not yet in order. In terms of INEB, they are an affiliate of IFOR and I believe they have been since their founding.

Christian Renoux (FOR France): IFOR was also a founding member of the international decade for peace and nonviolence. It would be great if IFOR could be there.

Constitutional Revisions by Ad Hoc Working Group

Presentation by Peter Aeberhard

There was not enough time to discuss all the constitutional changes that need to be made. The Working Group has focused on what needs to change with immediate effect. The rest will be referred to ICOM, which can make decisions that subsequently should be confirmed by Council 2018.

Adopted amendments with immediate effect:

- Revise membership status allowing multiple membership per country
- Revise role of RCC, according to proposal by RCC Members
To be added to 4.2: “The RCC stimulates regional meetings, cooperation, and programs.”
Four other amendments were discussed but deferred to next Council:
 - ICOM includes the RCC in major decisions and when there is internal conflict
 - RCC assesses organizations that apply for IFOR Membership
 - RCC holds regional meetings once a year and Skype meetings throughout the year.
 - ICOM and EXCOM provide RCC with their Meeting schedule and minutes.
- Revise governance within ICOM to guarantee its continuity.
5.2: “... the International Committee is authorized to fill any vacancy which may occur. It does so in close consultation with RCC.”
6.2: “... he/she does so in close consultation with the Vice President.

5.2: “In case of incapacity of the President, the Vice President with the consent of ICOM acts as President.”

Not discussed in ad hoc working group but necessary to address by ICOM as soon as possible:

- How to integrate youth representation in constitution
- Governance structures concerning working groups

Council extends the following mandate to ICOM: to elaborate a new draft Constitution and Rules & Procedures in consultation with all members, and to formally submit these documents for final decision at next Council.

Davorika Lovrekovic (IFOR VP): The number of official languages should be cleared up.

David Mumford (FOR Scotland): In Baarlo it was suggested to have 3 official languages instead of 2 (including Spanish). This needs to be formalized still.

Proposal to change the Constitution in order to guarantee youth representation at ICOM:

Tobias Lohse (FOR Germany): The proposal is to allow for an additional seat in ICOM that would be filled by two young people. The reason is that this would provide a bigger voice for youth and give a bigger entry point for young people into the process. We included the option of a team of two because youth are in difficult periods in their life. By youth we mean people from 16-35 years old.

Davorika Lovrekovic (IFOR VP): I think it's a good proposal because it reminds the branches to nominate young people. It is a good practice to send the young people out in pairs so they can support each other so they feel supported. So I think it's a good enforcement.

Jean Pierre Massamba (IFOR ICOM): In the proposal we have taken into account the preoccupations of the young people. But it's difficult in the framework of a constitution to fix to a precise number of young people. We don't just have the question of age, but the religious dimension and the balance between women and men. We had proposed to reformulate the first article. The article should stipulate a balance between gender, religions, regional representation, and age.

Due to fierce debate on the desirability of having two people filling one seat; questions regarding gender, religion, and regional representation of these young people; desirability to put this in the

Constitution; desirability of such affirmative action; and a second proposal to include youth in the RCC instead of ICOM, the afternoon concluded without this youth proposal being voted upon.

Day 4: Wednesday 06.08.2014

19.31 – 21.00

The Nominations Committee presented the Slate of Nominations to Council. It had 7 names, two from Africa, one from the Americas, one from Asia and three from Europe. The first slate was blocked by about a quarter of the voting delegates as it was considered weak on experience. Due to a lack of consensus, new meetings were necessary and the final decision got postponed.

Art, Non-Violence and Democratization of Public Space in the Arab Spring. Presented by Maria Antonietta Malleo

The presentation had a focus on Libya, Palestine, Egypt and Tunisia, countries visited recently by Maria.

In the history of non-violence, creativity and artistic spirit were crucial in many places around the world. Visual occupations of a historical place and a place of political power are a way of protest. In the Arab Spring this has been used a lot. It is a sort of historical dialogue, and writing in the public space builds identity and people power.

Semiotics is important to study in order to overcome stereotypes that people in the West often have.

Day 5: Thursday 07.08.2014

9.00 – 12.30

Opened with Jewish prayers led by Liliane Baxter (USA) who read a poem called, 'The Soul of Every Living Thing'

Decisions on Proposals:

Proposal 1 from the Finance Working Group (FWG):

The sale of the IFOR Office in Alkmaar represented a one-time distribution into liquid assets of IFOR. The FWG desired that the proceeds be carefully stewarded in order to ensure the future stability of IFOR. To that end the FWG recommended the following:

1. "What is left of the proceeds of the sale of the house should be invested in an interest bearing account (ethical)
2. No more than 10% of the principal balance and the annual increase in value (interest + gain) shall be used as operating income in any one year, and
3. For budgeting purposes, the principal value shall be calculated on the value of the fund on September 30th in the year preceding the fiscal year in which it shall be used."

This proposal was passed by Council.

Proposal 2 from Denis Beaumont (FOR England) and David Mumford (FOR Scotland):

"Council call on ICOM to ensure that when working groups have successfully applied for funding, that the WG has primary responsibility for authorizing expenditure for that funding. The Secretariat and ICOM should only intervene to ensure honesty and compliance with the donor's requirements. Where possible application for external funding should provide for an administration fee for IFOR general funds."

This proposal was NOT passed by Council.

Proposal 3 from Lucas Johnson:

This was a request from Paolo Candelari (MIR Italia) for a Truth and Reconciliation Commission to be set up. "We propose that the IFOR set up a process of careful analysis of the situation and problems

that occurred in IFOR during the last 15 years and on this basis revise the structures of IFOR and make proposals for Chapters accordingly. This can serve as an instrument to strengthen the ownership of the members of IFOR. This process should be led by a “task force/steering group” and be given a limited time frame.”

This proposal was passed by Council but with the alteration that two groups be set up:

1. One to deal with the “healing and reconciliation” of the most recent problems at IFOR and bring those to a close. The group is to be composed of Zaira Zafarana (Italy), David Niyonzima (Burundi) who works with trauma healing and reconciliation and Beena Sebastian (India). Suseela Mathew who is a psychotherapist will also have input. The group will design the process and David and Beena will be listening to those involved in the conflict; and
2. The other to be a strategic structural analysis group to look at the situation going back 15 years made up of Pete Haemmerle, Ana Juanche, Christian Renoux, Geraldine Bridges and Lily Baxter. This group will design steps, timeframes and ways to present the information gathered from all branches regarding problems, conflicts and concerns over the past 15 years so that it can propose ways to strengthen the organization. It will be driven by branches and members and will include the current ICOM and its predecessors.

Proposal 4 from Tobias Lohse (FOR Germany):

This was a proposal for Council to establish a Spiritual Advisory Group

This proposal was NOT approved by Council.

Proposal 5 from 6 branches:

This was a proposal to set up a “Standing Mediation Team” to deal with crisis and prevent conflict happening or escalating. There would be one expert from each region.

This proposal was NOT passed by Council.

Proposal 6 from Tobias Lohse (FOR Germany):

At least one place on ICOM should be reserved for a young person.

This proposal was NOT passed by Council

Proposal 7:

For Council to note that Working Groups on possible work items were set up in Konstanz.

This proposal was passed by Council.

Second Report Nominations Committee

Election of the 2014-2018 International Committee. A revised slate was presented and approved by Council:

Davorka Lovrekovic (FOR Germany) - President

Tobias Lohse (FOR Germany) – Vice President

Stacey Mitchell (FOR USA) – Treasurer

Annelies Klinefelter (FOR The Netherlands)

Tatsushi Nozoye (FOR Japan)

Jean Pierre Massamba (MIR Congo)

Ignatius Mukunto (FOR Zambia)

Reports from IFOR Representatives at the United Nations

Derek Brett (IFOR UN Geneva):

Before becoming a representative of IFOR, funding his own work, he worked in Geneva on Conscientious Objection with regards to Taxes, and this led him to working on Conscientious Objection in the military. His work is funded by a three-year grant of 90,000 Swiss francs from the Joseph Rowntree Trust. The money is paid through MIR Switzerland. The UN IFOR accreditation should be seen as a tool. The role helps IFOR to identify opportunities of areas in which it works and develop expertise and use those opportunities and networking to inform IFOR. Through his work in Geneva he finds contacts that can be helpful to IFOR. He has been working on Human Rights issues, including Bangladesh migrant workers; the use of private military companies; and Drones. He does some work in several Open Ended Intergovernmental Working Groups, which are based in Geneva. If branches have issues they want him to raise at the UN in Geneva, they should not hesitate to write to

him. Derek submitted a 3-page report of his representation at the UN Geneva 2013/14 to members attending the Council at Constance.

Mark Johnson (IFOR UN New York):

His first contact with the UN was in the 60s and 70s in the Middle East. He finances himself for the work. He sees himself as a volunteer. He works on Disarmament including the abolition of nuclear armaments. Success stories included the Decade for Peace and the conference on Women in 2012. The current General Secretary of the UN has chosen disarmament as an area of concern. Mark contributed to his conference at the 'High Level' talks. He has also helped with the preparation on talks about carbon emissions with the aim of educating politicians and policy shapers and will be engaging in the next round of talks. Attention is being given to education in the US. FOR USA is involved in an effort to bring 1 million people to New York on September 21st 2014 (Day of International Peace and International Day of Prayer and Action).

Pete Hämmerle (IFOR UN Vienna):

The 2007 talks on the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty were held in Vienna. NGOs were allowed to be observers. The meeting agenda was blocked by Iraq and for the first day nothing happened. That was his first experience of the workings of the UN. He is on the NGO Committee on Peace, which consists of 20 NGOs and meets every 6 weeks to discuss issues of disarmament. He represents IFOR at the five yearly conferences on the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The next conference will be in Vienna this December. Civil society and the Youth will be allowed to attend. The NGO Committee that Pete is on also organizes action on Hiroshima day and the International Day for Peace. He feels that IFOR could be more effective working in collaboration with other NGOs on nuclear weapons and small arms. Like the other representatives, he has no budget for this work. He will raise issues in Vienna should branches and members wish him so to do.

Maria Antonietta (UNESCO - Paris):

She was very pleased when Palestine was admitted as a member of UNESCO. This led to the USA reducing its financial contributions to UNESCO, leading to a financial crisis. The UNESCO constitution has this sentence in it: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defense of peace must be constructed." With the coming to an end of the Millennium Development goals, they are looking for new priorities post 2015. There would be an Africa and

Gender Equality Action Plan for Africa (2014 -2021) The Africa “Plan” includes: Youth Empowerment and inclusion of Youth in policy planning and global governance; Intercultural approaches to cultural diversity, culture of peace and sustainability; Human Rights; and Conflict and post conflict peace building. There is also work on “a Road Map for Democracy in the Arab World.” Most of the programs are aimed at “social transformation through links with researchers, civil society actors and governments.” UNESCO welcomes the participation and contributions from NGOs and civil society. Maria hopes to introduce IFOR and BGAs to UNESCO and organize IFOR Working Groups at UNESCO. She is facilitating an IFOR grant application to UNESCO. BGAs were encouraged to have contacts with regional branches of UNESCO.

Day 6: Friday 08.08.2014

9.00 – 12.30

Opened with prayers from the Buddhist tradition

Reports from Regional Groups
and Selection of Regional Representatives (RCC members)

The delegates convened into regional groups and presented their candidates for the Representative Consultative Committee to be affirmed by the International Council.

- **Asia (Lucas al Zoughbi, Wi'am Palestine):** Tess Ramiro (FOR Philippines) and Beena Sebastian (FOR India) were chosen to represent Asia on the RCC.
Aims: to meet once a year; to produce a regional website; to work on joint regional programs; to fundraise for the region.
- **Europe (Marion Schreiber, FOR-Austria):** Zaira Zafarana (MIR Italia) and Jérôme Peraya (MIR Belgium) were chosen to represent Europe on the RCC.
The European branches meet annually in EUFOR meetings the weekend after Easter. This system works well and will be continued.
- **Africa (Jean Pierre Massamba, IFOR ICOM):** Akadim Chikandamina (FOR Zimbabwe) and Moses John (South Sudan) will represent Africa on the RCC. This was a break with tradition in that both representatives were from English speaking countries. Normally they had one English speaker and one French speaker. Communication between African branches needed to improve.
They were concerned that there had been so little African representation at this Council. They hoped for a bigger representation at the next Council. They hoped to organize a meeting in Africa soon.
- **Americas (Mark Johnson, UN Rep New York):** Patricio Labra (SERPAJ) will be one of the representatives on the RCC. In addition to Patricio, they are hoping to find a bilingual representative from Latin America.

Approval of Members of IFOR Stichting

Volker Grotefeld and Paul Kruiswijk were both approved to continue their service on Stichting for another 4 years.

Approval of Personnel Committee

The following names were put forward and approved by Council:

Geraldine Bridges (FOR England)

Kees Nieuwerth (FOR The Netherlands)

Annelies Klinefelter (FOR The Netherlands)

Volker Grotefeld (FOR Germany)

Approval of Representatives to the United Nations and other International Organizations

The names of the current representatives were ratified by Council:

In New York:

John Kim

Mark Johnson

Patricia Ackerman

In Geneva:

Derek Brett

Michelle Monod

In Vienna:

Pete Haemmerle

In Paris:

Maria Antoinetta Malleo

Christian Renoux

Adoption of the Official Communiqué

The Official Communiqué of Council held in Konstanz 2014 was adopted. (See Appendix 2)

APPENDIX 1: Financial Reports

Treasurer report to Council 2014

General:

This report covers the period from January 2013 to June 2014.

After David Mumford resigned as treasurer, I was asked in December 2012 to take over for the interim period. Up to this time Arjan Dekker kept the bookkeeping and financial administration running, but his contract was terminated by end of January 2013.

There was a draft budget 2013, which was in some ways unrealistic. The budget figures for expected income from BGA contributions and donations, which meant that the reality of the deficit was hidden.

In Dec. 2012 IFOR kept several bank accounts with the total amount of 220.000 Euro, therefore we were able to cover this deficit.

To do / done:

The main challenge was to find funds to support Centennial and Council. Although trying hard, I achieved only € 15.000 from donors and € 10.000 from individuals and members. Many applicants asked for reimbursement of their travel costs to enable them to come to Constance, the finally promised amount of reimbursement is approx. € 40.000.

The most important source of income for IFOR is the member fees from the BGAs. In recent years the income has been decreasing and is now close to a dangerous situation. Contributions from our largest members has declined:

The support from US-FOR went down between 2010 and 2013 from € 68.000 to € 20.000.

The total contribution from others changed from € 37.000 to € 18.000.

Termination of the contract we had with our previous International Coordinator resulted in IFOR having to spend about € 40.000, including the bill of our lawyer. On the other hand, selling the house in Alkmaar brought € 250.000 into our accounts.

The draft budget 2014 shows a surplus of € 122.000, but the salary expenses will increase towards the end of 2014.

Conclusion:

I strongly insist that BGAs fulfill their commitment of paying their member fees!

I recommend that IFOR look carefully at the salaries and employment costs in relationship to the reduced number of staff, the limited resources and compared to the needs and possibilities of the IFOR branches

Robert Reischer

26. July 2014

APPENDIX 2

IFOR Council Konstanz 2014: Official Communiqué

In conjunction with its centennial celebration, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR) held its quadrennial International Council of delegates from August 3 to 8, 2014 in Konstanz, Germany. Participants came from 30 countries from around the world.

The International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR) is an International, spiritually-based movement of people who, from the basis of a belief in the power of love and truth to create justice and restore community, commit themselves to active nonviolence as a way of life and as a means of transformation—personal, social, economic and political.

Among the delegates, were representatives of the peace movements from both Israel and Palestine. Great concern was expressed for the peace activists on both sides whose voices for active nonviolent resistance, healing and reconciliation are drowned out by the sounds of rockets, bullets and missiles resulting in violence and death of many civilians.

Delegates representing a number of different African branches shared their stories of trauma and healing work in Burundi, integrating child soldiers into civil society in Uganda, and reconciliation after civil wars in Congo-Brazzaville.

After a long working relationship, SERPAJ joined IFOR as a regional branch. SERPAJ represents a coalition of 13 national groups committed to work on peace and nonviolence as a way of life and strategy for struggle, and interfaith and ecumenical dialogue. The 13 groups are located in Mexico, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Chile, Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay and Peru.

The IFOR Council commemorated Hiroshima Day, August 6th, in the form of a “Peace Security Agreement” signed by the delegates from Japan and the United States in which they promised to “commit to each other’s security and mutual peace through relational interdependence, honest communication and advocacy on each other’s behalf” for a nuclear free world.

The gathering affirmed the nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize of the Japanese people upholding the endangered Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution renouncing war.

Future activities were planned. This included working groups on retaining Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, gender equality, and trauma, healing and reconciliation in former conflict areas.

Attention was given to the involvement of young adults throughout the structures of IFOR. During their time together delegates from 23 different branches shared about their work and selected a new seven member international board composed of representatives from four regions: Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas. Davorka Lovrekovic was elected president. Notable is the fact that the youngest vice president in IFOR history, Tobias Lohse, was also elected.

IFOR, with its consultative status at the United Nations and UNESCO, works on a range of topics in New York, Geneva, Vienna, and Paris.

The hope is that when the IFOR meets again in four years at its next International Council the work decided at this Council will have resulted in more people committed to nonviolence as a way of life and a strategy for justice and reconciliation.

APPENDIX 3:

2014 International Council Participant List

Family Name	First Name	Branch	Email
AFRICA			
Sithole	Namu	FOR Zimbabwe	nhamomf@yahoo.com
Chikandamina	Akadim	FOR Zimbabwe	chikandamina@gmail.com
Niyonzima	David	FOR Burundi	ndamukiza@yahoo.com
Okwera	Richard	PDF Africa	okwerar@yahoo.com
Furaha	Amos	IFOR Fellowship School	a.furaha@yahoo.com
Poaty	Jaques	MIR Congo	
	Jean		
Massamba	Pierre	ICOM 2010-14 MIR Congo	JeanPierre.Massamba@eni.com
AMERICAS			
Johnson	Mark	IFOR UN New York	markjohnson@clbsj.org
Baxter	Liliane K.	IFOR ICOM 2010-14	lilixbaxter@gmail.com
Baron	Virginia	Intl Council President 2014	vobaron@gmail.com
Honnold	Gretchen	FOR USA	honnoldg@forusa.org
Beachy	Isaac	FOR USA	isaacbeachy@gmail.com
Stoneking	Kristin	FOR USA	kstoneking@forusa.org
Dekar	Paul	IFOR Historian & FOR USA	pdekar@yahoo.com
Kaufman	Gus	FOR USA	gkaufmanjr@aol.com
Juanche	Ana	SERPAJ-AL (Uruguay)	ana@juanche.net
Garcia			
Noriega	Blas	SERPAJ-AL (Colombia)	bjgn27@hotmail.com
Labra	Patricio	SERPAJ-AL (Chile)	patricio.labra@serpajchile.cl

Family Name	First Name	Branch	Email
ASIA			
Ramiro	Tess	AKKAPKA Philippines	tessrr@hotmail.com
Das	Ruhi	BASTOB Bangladesh	bastobbangladesh@gmail.com
Hasan	Jahanara	BASTOB Bangladesh	pannabastob@gmail.com
Sekimoto	Katsuyoshi	Japan FOR	sekimoto@sta.tenrui-u.ac.jp
Iitaka	Kyoko	Japan FOR	iitakakyoko2@gmail.com
Ohtaka	Zenyo	Japan FOR	z.ohtaka656tm5@kbh.biglobe.ne.jp
Nozoe	Tatsushi	Japan FOR	nozoye02@gmail.com
Sebastian	Beena	RCC 2010-14 FOR India	culturalacademy@gmail.com
Mathew	Suseela	FOR India	suseela_mathew@yahoo.co.in
Al-Zoughbi	Lucas	Wi'am Palestine	lucas.zoughbi@gmail.com
Zoughbi	Zoughbi	RCC 2010-14 Wi'am Palestine	hope@alaslak.org
Gvirtz	Amos	Shefayim (Israel)	amosg@shefayim.org.il
EUROPE			
Hâmmerle	Pete	FOR Austria	petehaemmerle@versoehnungsbund.at
Reischer	Robert	Treasurer 2013-14 (Austria)	basisbuero@a1.net
Schreiber	Marion	RCC 2010-14 (FOR Austria)	marion.schreiber@speed.at
Peraya	Jérôme	Agir Pour La Paix (Belgium)	jerome@agirpourelapaix.be
Beaumont	Denis	FOR England	denbeaumont@aol.co.uk
Palayiwa	Millius	FOR England	director@for.org.uk
Bridges	Geraldine	FOR England	geraldinebridges@hotmail.co.uk
Renoux	Christian	MIR France	c.r@infonie.fr
Grotefeld	Volker	IFOR Stichting	vgrotefeld@gmx.net
Lovrekovic	Davorka	IFOR VP 2010-2014	DavorkaLo@web.de
Lohse	Tobias	FOR Germany	tobias.lohse@me.com
Korff	Samya	FOR Germany	chess29@web.de
Zafarana	Zaira	MIR Italy	zaira_zafarana@yahoo.it
Nieuwerth	Kees	RCC 2010-14 Kerk & Vrede (NL)	k.nieuwerth@wxs.nl
Klinefelter	Annelies	Wereldwerk (NL)	pluspunt@antenna.nl
Klinefelter	Harky	Wereldwerk (NL)	pluspunt@antenna.nl
Rassmusen	Trond	FOR Norway	trond@mac.com
Trubceac	Andrei	IFOR Fellowship School	andrei.trubceac@gmail.com
Mumford	David	FOR Scotland (Treasurer 2010-11)	dmumford@phonecoop.coop

Aeberhard	Peter	MIR Suisse UN Rep Geneva 2010-14 (MIR Suisse)	pu_aeberhard@bluewin.ch
Brett Walan	Derek Sofia	FOR Sweden	derekubrett@gmail.com sofia.walan@krf.se
Bengtsson	Ewert	FOR Sweden	ewert@cb.uu.se

The 2014 International Council Minutes were approved for distribution by the International Committee during their meeting in Utrecht, May 2015.