



**International Fellowship of Reconciliation**

Internationaler Versöhnungsbund  
Mouvement International de la Réconciliation  
Movimiento Internacional de la Reconciliación

---

*Spoorstraat 38, 1815 BK Alkmaar  
The Netherlands / Pays-Bas  
tel (+31) 72 512 3014 fax (+31) 72 515 1102*

# IFOR COUNCIL

14-20 JUNE 2002 in NEW YORK

Venues:

June 14 - 15, Mount Saint Vincent College, New York

June 15-20 Manhattan College, New York

## MINUTES

compiled and edited by

Anna Åkerlund, Johan Linnman and Kerstin Kollander

approved by the International Committee on 13. July 2003

Signed by

Jonathan Sisson

IFOR President

.....

Françoise Pétremand

IFOR Vicepresident

.....

---

## **Introduction**

The IFOR Council in New York June 14-20 was hosted by the US FOR and took place at the same time and venue as the US FOR annual national conference.

The minutes are written in the order events and discussions took place. Attached to the minutes are the new IFOR constitution, a list of participants, reports and proposals sent out to the Council participants and a list of groups.

The meeting of the International Committee in July 2003 in Alkmaar, The Netherlands, made a review of the minutes. The International committee decided that the IFOR Council minutes presented below represent a fair and true account of the decisions made at the IFOR Council in New York 2002.

### ***Day 1 - June 14, 2002***

#### **OPENING CEREMONY**

IFOR President Virginia Baron opened the Council and welcomed the participants to the IFOR Council 2002. Pat Clarke, US FOR National Coordinator said welcome on behalf of the US FOR and stated that the US FOR was happy to have the IFOR Council taking place at the same time and venue as the US FOR national conference.

Johan Linnman held an opening ceremony symbolizing the large network that the IFOR family is and to symbolize that we are a link in which our history is part of the present and important to take into account when forming the future.

An introduction exercise was done with the help of David Grant and a couple of cameras. Everybody got their picture taken and stories about each other were told.

### ***Day 2 - June 15, 2002***

#### ***Agenda***

- Opening & Orientation
- Review of the agenda
- Sharing our hopes and fears for council – a brainstorm
- Ground rules - agreements for the meeting
- Reports
- Nomination Committee – explanation of tasks during the Council
- Appointment of the Nomination Committee
- ⊖ Summary of the Consultation Process Results
- Transfer from College Mount Saint Vincent to Manhattan College

#### **INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME**

The convener of the Council Coordinating Committee (CCC) Diana Francis welcomed participants to the first Council working day.

#### ***Agenda review***

Robert Reischer introduced participants to the agenda. It was expressed that although the agenda is an ambitious one which might not be possible to complete in the five days of the Council, it should be possible to find a direction and create a process for each item on the agenda. It was explained that the agenda would develop as the conference ensued. Diana also mentioned that on the next day there would be time allocated for the discussion of visions and agenda items to deal with questions of where we are and where we hope to be.

There was an opportunity for everyone to express his or her hopes and concerns about the IFOR Council. These were written on wall notes and displayed for all to see.

It was pointed out that agreement on how to work together had been made and the ground rules for the process were described.

#### **REPORTS**

##### **Report from the President and the International Secretariat**

– by Virginia Baron & Susan Ross

A written report had been circulated in advance for all to read.

Short comments and questions of clarification were made. Council expressed their deep appreciation of the work that Virginia and Susan had made for IFOR.

### **Financial Report**

– by Eric Bachman, IFOR Treasurer

Eric gave a background to the financial report and the financial trouble/hurdles that IFOR has had to overcome during the past years since 2000. One of the major problems had been the high turnover of personnel at the International Secretariat (IS) during the past years. Due to financial problems and inadequate funding some IFOR programs had been suspended at the Mennorode Council in 2000. These were the program on Nonviolence Education and Training, Culture of Nonviolence and Youth and Empowerment

By September 2001 clarity had been reached on the financial status of the IFOR. Eric went through the income and contributions from BGAs and commented on the difference in contribution from branches, groups and affiliates.

In the ensuing discussion a comment was made that the differences in the contribution from branches were huge and the US FOR and the Swedish FOR were responsible for the major portion of the contributions to the IFOR. The question on what this means for membership and commitment was raised.

Another comment was made that to expect the countries of the South to contribute in the same monetary terms as the countries in the North would be impossible and instead, they should be encouraged to contribute in kind.

There were a few questions raised about the value of the building in which the International Secretariat is housed and what would happen to it if the IS were relocated. Brother Jacques Tieleman clarified that the building was financed by the Irmgard Schuchart legacy and the branch contributions from the BGAs were only a small part of the funds needed to buy the house. The original intention of the legacy was that the IFOR in its accounts would record a rent for its own use of the building. This income would then be earmarked to serve a specific purpose - training and nonviolent actions. It was also stated that the value of the house is recorded as half of the market value in order to prevent an over-estimation.

Br Jacques informed that there were also earmarked donations to the Pension Insurance Fund and only the interest could be used.

### **PROCESS DOCUMENT**

Denis Beaumont, SC member introduced the Process Document for the Council. He made clarifications about the changes that the Steering Committee had proposed to the Council Process Document and which the Representative Committee had decided upon the day before.

One of the proposed changes was that the Council Coordinating Committee (CCC) would be the same as the group asked by SC to facilitate the Council. The Council affirmed this and the CCC members are therefore Diana Francis (convenor), Virginia Baron, Denis Beaumont, Susan Ross, Anna Åkerlund, Robert Reischer, Netsai Mushonga, Lili Baxter and Jonathan Sisson.

It was clarified that there are differences between votes per branch and how many participants a branch can send. Each branch can send 3 branch representatives. But the number of votes for a branch is determined based on the number of members a branch has.

Steering committee suggested that we have people check that everything is done according to council constitution guidelines – like process monitors. Council appointed Denis Beaumont to do this.

## Constitutional Amendments

During the Council in 2000, it was noted that there are a few inconsistencies between IFOR Constitution and the Articles of Association of the Stichting IFOR. The Steering Committee presented a document with 3 proposals for amendments for the IFOR Constitution and the Stichting IFOR Articles of Association.

*Note:* During the Council a council working group worked on a proposal to change the Constitution especially with regard to the decision-making bodies. The amendments discussed below relates to old constitution. The full revised new constitution (as decided on the last Council day) is attached to the minutes.

Eric Bachman, IFOR treasurer, presented the proposal from SC to correct the inconsistencies between the IFOR Constitution and the Articles of Association.

### ***Proposed amendment 1: On the minimum number and the appointment of the Stichting Board Members.***

The proposed change corrects an inconsistency in the number of stichting members between the Stichting IFOR Articles of Association and the IFOR Constitution.

In the IFOR Constitution in Section 8. Legal recognition, **replace the sentences:**

“Recommendations to the individuals on its board are made by the Steering Committee and ratified at the meetings of the International Council. The board of the IFOR Stichting will have a minimum of four members, including the Treasurer, at least one member of the Steering committee, usually the IFOR President, and at least one Dutch Person.”

- with the **following** sentences:

“Recommendations to the individuals on its board are made by the Steering Committee. The IFOR Council will appoint three members to the Stichting IFOR Board. This will include the IFOR Treasurer, at least one member of the Steering Committee (usually the IFOR President), and at least one Dutch Person”.

The decision on the amendments in Proposal 1 was postponed until later in the Council. (See notes from June 19 – Session on constitutional changes).

*Note: in proposed amendment number 1 above it is proposed to delete the last part of the first sentence “... and ratified at the meetings of the International Council”. In the new constitution that was decided upon on June 19, that part of the sentence is not deleted.*

### ***Proposed amendment 2: On the Treasurer’s membership in the SC and Stichting Board.***

In the IFOR Constitution in section 6. IFOR Officers, sub-section 6.2, **replace** the sentence: “The treasurer is responsible to the Steering Committee and is an ex officio member of the Steering committee and the Representative Committee”

-with the **following** sentence

“The Treasurer is responsible to the Steering Committee and is an ex officio member of the Steering committee and the Representative Committee and the Stichting IFOR Board”.

And in the Articles of Association of the Stichting IFOR, **add** as a second sentence to Article 3: “The IFOR Treasurer is an ex officio member of the Board”.

### ***Proposed amendment 3: On the name “Executive Committee”***

The proposal is to change the Articles of Association of the Stichting IFOR by **replacing** wherever it is used:

“Executive Committee of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation”

- with the name of the decision-making body defined in the IFOR Constitution:

“Steering Committee of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation”.

**Council decided by consensus:**

- to accept the proposed amendments in Proposal 2
- to accept the proposed amendment in Proposal 3
- that if any of the names of the leadership bodies referred to in any of these amendments were changed at a later time during the Council, then the new name(s) would be used in the amendment.
- to continue the discussion on Proposed amendment 1 later during Council.

**NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE**

Kerstin Kollander, appointed by the SC to convene the Nominations Committee (NC), introduced the process the IFOR Council uses to develop a slate for the next Steering committee (future leadership). It was explained that the Nominations Committee would work during the Council accepting nominations for the future leadership. By talking and listening to the participants the NC presents a slate for the new leadership of IFOR. Five people are to be chosen by the Council to sit on the Nominations Committee. These five should represent the diversity of IFOR in terms of age, sex and regions. Participants were asked to contemplate which persons they would want to be on the committee, to be decided upon later this day.

**REPORTS - CONTINUED:**

**Report from the IFOR program: WPP – the Women Peacemaker Program (IFOR-WPP)**

- by Isabelle Geuskens, IFOR-WPP Program Manager and Shelley Anderson, IFOR-WPP Program officer

The background to the IFOR programme WPP was presented. At 1992 Council in Ecuador the council set a mandate to start examining the possibility for women's programming in IFOR. As such, the Women Peacemakers Program was instituted in IFOR and since then the IFOR-WPP program has grown enormously. Today, its reach has included the Dutch parliament and the UN Security Council. Regarding the next phase of WPP 2001-2005, it was noted that there are 4 areas of focus:

- o Nonviolence training in various countries
- o Networking and building regional capacity. The goal of this is to learn and teach more about building regional capacity.
- o Engendering the Peace Movement. To ensure that we build a culture of peace that benefits and involves all, IFOR-WPP wants to help IFOR create a gender program, that would include gender training and the development of an IFOR gender policy and an IFOR gender working group.
- o Women and Peace Media. The first women and peace media workshop in India is planned for October of this year and it is hoped that there will be a similar workshop in Africa next year.

Netsai Mushonga, Zimbabwe and Sushila Mathews, India then introduced the work of the IFOR-WPP in their respective countries.

**Comments and concerns from the floor:**

Concerns were raised about the balance between IFOR and WPP, and the role and position of the WPP as an IFOR programme within the IFOR structures. The IFOR-WPP staff responded by saying that the IFOR-WPP staff had played an instrumental role in introducing IFOR to countries where it had hitherto been unknown and that, it did so as a part of IFOR. Therefore, there was no question of balance between IFOR and WPP. It was clearly expressed by Shelley Anderson that IFOR-WPP is and remains a part of IFOR

Comments included statements about IFOR being a forum for the exchange of ideas and the propagation of ideas from one place to another. Another question were about IFOR-WPP's role in educating children

about the nonviolence and peace making movement. Sushila responded by saying that this was an integral part of their programs.

Council expressed their deep appreciation of the IFOR programme WPP presentation and the work done by the WPP programme and IFOR-WPP staff.

### **APPOINTMENT OF NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE (NC)**

The nominated people for serving on the NC were listed and the people nominated were asked to leave the room while the Council discussed the list. A concern was raised that there was no person listed with previous experience of serving on the Steering Committee. Therefore an additional name was added. Since there were more than five names on the list voting participants was asked to list which names they wanted to be on the NC.

#### ***Council decided by voting:***

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> to appoint the following persons to serve as the Nominations Committee for the duration of the Council 2002: Kerstin Kollander (convener), Vololona Razafindrainibe, Akadim Chikandamina, Suseela Mathew, Dave d'Albert and Trond Rasmussen.</li></ul> |
|---|

### **IFOR MEMBERSHIP CONSULTATION**

Awel Irene, IFOR Vice-President gave the background to the IFOR Membership consultation. At the Council 2002, the Steering Committee was asked to consult with IFOR members to begin and to continue a discussion among IFOR member organizations on IFOR's vision, objectives, tasks and structures. It was of special importance to hear from branches on whether the structure of IFOR was serving the needs of the branches etc.

The main questions to address were: Who we are as a movement and where are we going? And which structures enable us to work towards our vision?

A consultation questionnaire was sent to 62 IFOR member organizations, of which 15 branches and 2 groups responded. Additionally the African members consulted with each other and responded together. It was difficult to make a summary of the answers because of the diverse ways in which the answers were made. An overview of the replies was posted on the wall for all to review.

***Steering committee recommends*** that this Council take the next step as part of continuing process to develop a strategic plan for IFOR and in the next period find and apply the necessary expertise and resources to continue the consultation and to clarify IFOR's vision, to identifying the strategy and the structure IFOR needs to carry out this vision. This recommendation should incorporate work done at the Council. SC recommends that the Council should set up a working structure to continue the consultation after this Council and that the Council identifies individuals who will continue this work. This is necessary so that work on the consultation is shared rather than left to leadership.

The branches and groups were also asked to give feedback about the questionnaire.

#### ***Comments and concerns from the floor:***

Appreciation was expressed to Awel Irene for her work in summarizing the responses from the questionnaire. The questionnaire was certainly formidable. We worked together in order to learn and grow from the experience. It is hoped that we can take something concrete from this Council.

It was hoped that the next questionnaire should be simpler and shorter and that it would put emphasis on the important issues.

### **TRANSFER**

After this the Council sessions for this day ended and Council transferred from the College Mount Saint Vincent to the Manhattan College where the remainder of the Council took place.

**Day 3 - June 16, 2002**

**Agenda**

- Meditation
- Who we are and explanations
- Group Task
- Display
- Plenary

**INTRODUCTION**

A request had been made to make a short introduction to who we are. Members of the following groups were asked to identify themselves to other members of the council by standing up:

Staff at the International Secretariat, Steering Committee, Stichting, Representative Committee, UN Representative, Branches, Group, Affiliates, Facilitation Team, Branch Voting Delegates, First-timers at the Council, Everyone who has ever served on a Steering committee, Honorary President and Everyone that has been the IFOR President

**STEERING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND INFORMATION**

Virginia Baron, IFOR President, presented the SC selection for IFOR Treasurer and the SC proposal for new Stichting member.

- SC asks Council to ratify Robert Reischer, Austria, as Treasurer for the IFOR Steering Committee and Stichting Board.
- SC recommends Paul Kruysvijk as new Stichting member from the Netherlands. SC is waiting for the positive response from another proposed Stichting member.

Since changes to the IFOR Constitution might be made during the course of the Council the ratification of the new treasurer and Stichting will come at the same time as the election of the new leadership.

Virginia Baron also informed the Council that the Steering committee during its meeting the two days preceding the Council decided, that during the transition period after Susan Ross leaves her position in July 2002, until the new international coordinator is hired, Dorie Wilsnack will act as part time interim coordinator. Eric Bachman will also work at the international secretariat with part time office administration.

**SESSION ON THE IFOR VISION, STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES.**

Diana Francis introduced the group work planned for this day. The tasks of the eight groups are to discuss:

- Realistic visions, starting where we are
- Who will be doing what?
- How will we be using our strengths?
- How will we be supporting each other?

Council then divided into groups that first met separately and then joined together with another group to exchange ideas. In plenary the groups presented the keywords or sentences from their discussions.

***Katy Gray Brown presented for groups 3 and 4***

Important tasks for the IFOR were listed: Nurture the spirit of fellowship. Movement building. Networking. Communication – documenting, best practices. Facilitating exchanges between BGAs. Programs. IS based – international programs operated by a branch. Linking programs led by branches –

common themes issues. Common response to world events and new challenges. International representation and coalition membership

Requirements for this: Directions from Council. Steering committee carries out the directions of Council. Working secretariat.

What must be done: Confirmation of programs. In the context of the decade. Prioritizing.

How this must be done: Strategy team/Public Relations program. Funding. Lobbying.

The differences between the two groups 3 and 4 were on the question of implementation. The groups agreed that coordination must be decided upon before council disbands.

#### ***Angelica Schneider presented for Groups 7 and 8***

The group was comprised of two people from Africa, two from Asia and a bunch of Europeans thereby involving different perspectives and needs perceived from different parts of the world.

Issues outlined: Importance of networking and visits. Importance of rebuilding programs particularly the “Nonviolence”, “Youth,” “Interfaith”, and “Decade” programs. Support of groups. Membership development. Importance of continuing the gender program.

Different points to consider: Who can do it? Regional representatives? Travelling secretary? Priority for grassroots or lobbying? Imperative to develop a strong International Secretariat. Important to nominate a Steering Committee with skills and that will be able to act together. Implement stronger regional networking. Continue to develop vision. Bring Nonviolence into the anti-globalisation debate. Examine the need for a civilian peace force

A question about financing the International Secretariat was raised and the issue of how to develop membership remained to be determined.

#### ***Isabelle Geuskens presented for groups 1 and 2.***

Important issues listed were:

Organizational aspect of IFOR. Networking within IFOR and Outside of IFOR. Importance of Lobbying. Clear communication structures – between branches and groups. Coalition building with other organizations – focused on UN. Mobilizing. Spiritual basis of Nonviolence. Structural and Cultural violence

#### ***Dorie Wilsnack presented for Groups 5-6***

Important issues identified were:

- Unity within IFOR – to preface decisions with the exchange of views
- Priority on communication within the branches
- Groups working at grassroots organizing and some from a theoretical approach – to be appreciated
- IFOR needs to continue to explore what it means to be a multi-faith organization
- IFOR needs to feel and build up its confidence in the world in the current global situation by using, as an example, a strategic planning process
- IFOR needs to embrace all its programs as theirs – so WPP etc are not perceived as affiliated but recognised as IFOR programs
- Regional work can strengthen IFOR and be fully IFOR work
- IFOR needs to find the best location for the IS on the basis of the needs of programs etc

### **ESTABLISHMENT OF COUNCIL WORKING GROUPS**

Based on the work in the small-groups above, the Council Coordination Committee proposed to have four Council working groups to continue to work with four areas of work during the Council days. The groups would be:

- *Council Working group on the International Secretariat (IS) – core functions and IFOR activity beyond that.*

This group would discuss the minimal essential role of the International Secretariat, core functions and what international activities, priorities and how to do and how to fund?

- *Council Working group on Committee structure*

This group would review the present decision-making structures within IFOR and propose any changes deemed necessary to increase the efficiency of the IFOR.

- *Council Working group on branch status and membership*

This group would look into the criteria for branches and other membership related issues.

- *Council Working group on the location of the Secretariat*

This group would work with the proposal from the Swedish FOR on moving the IS, from Alkmaar to Geneva, Switzerland.

It was advised that everyone wear their gender glasses and finance glasses. It was also advised that a facilitator be appointed who would help to set out the task in each group.

The Council accepted this proposal and participants were asked to join the group that they wanted to participate in. At the end of the group session, the groups were asked to report on their progress so far.

## **REPORTS OF COUNCIL WORKING GROUPS:**

*Note:* In order to follow the discussions and the reports of the various groups the reports have been numbered. After each report to the Council participants were asked to give comments and raise questions of concerns that they wanted the council working group to take into account at their next meeting.

**Council Working group on the International Secretariat (IS) – core functions – report 1:** They had separated the issues that they needed to resolve. They had also discussed the basic core functions of the IS. They had also started to talk about wider outreach activities, program campaigns, lobbying work and had started to prioritise the programs.

**Council Working group Committee structure - report 1:** They had some recommendations and would continue their discussion the next day.

**Council Working group on branch status and membership –report 1:** They had articulated the questions and decided that there was a need to better define the responsibilities and rights of the IFOR organisation. The working group was dealing with structural problems and questions of whether IFOR could indeed function as a multi-faith organization. They had concluded that there was a need to set up a long-term solution in the form of a working committee that would continue to deal with these questions after the council.

**Council Working group on the location of the Secretariat – report 1:** They said that they needed more time to deal with the question.

### ***Day 3 - June 17, 2002***

#### ***Agenda***

- Spiritual Celebration
- Reports
- Group work continued
- Progress reports
- Nominations posted after closure at 11
- Gender Workshop
- 2nd branch bazaar exhibition

## **REPORTS FROM COUNCIL WORKING GROUPS:**

### **Council Working Group on Committee Structures: progress report no. 2**

The group suggested that IFOR should have a new Committee structure according to the following:

- International Council
- International Committee (ICom)
- Executive Committee (ExCom)
- International Secretariat (IS)

The ICom would be comprised of seven people, including at least one representative from each of the four regions: Europe, Africa, Asia and the Americas. Three of the members of the International Committee, i.e. the Treasurer, the Vice President and the President would make up the Executive Committee. The International Committee would meet only once a year and the Executive Committee would meet more often (as needed). It was suggested that an effort should be made to include at least one member in the ICom who has mediation skills.

It was noted that the suggested new committee structure would require a constitutional change.

#### ***Comments and concerns from the floor, for further consideration by the Council Working Group on Committee structures:***

Questions were raised about the International Council and issues of diversity, representation, balance issues, hierarchy issues, the role of branches, and costs.

### **Council Working Group on Int. Secretariat – Core Functions: progress report no. 2**

According to the group, there were 2 main considerations:

- Functions within the office which were summarized as tasks for the secretariat in order to support the internal needs of the IFOR movement and,
- Functions of the secretariat with respect to the outside world

It was also stated that there were three levels on which to think about this question:

- Internal IFOR
- IFOR as a movement, and,
- Outside of IFOR

Aims and Tasks for the IS, as seen by the group:

- Having the office running to take care of various tasks, personnel and finances
- Support the international structures such as committees etc.
- Expansion of the Branches, Groups and Affiliates through support, networking, communications
- Supporting programs such as WPP, through consultations, materials, publications and fundraising
- Lobbying and promoting IFOR's aims and connecting them to international organizations
- External function of programs such as building coalitions and responding to world events
- Outreach and publicity

Necessary Tasks for the IS, as seen by the group:

- Financing
- Communications with BGAs – networking
- Wider international tasks:
  - responding to world events
  - support for branches and groups
  - Programs campaigns coalitions – which, when, how? - NVETP and DECADE
  - Visibility
  - Lobbying

**Concerns from the floor, for further consideration by the Council Working Group IS – Core Functions:**

- How and why will this be different from what already goes on in IFOR?
- Call for a more practical and step-by-step recommendation.
- How will the International Secretariat be able to facilitate this communication and put people in touch with each other?
- Questions were also raised about the IS role in relation to the decision-making structure.

**Council Working Group on Branch Status and Membership: progress report no. 2**

Philip Bentley prefaced his presentation by saying that particular national conditions demand different approaches. Then he went through the different considerations and issues:

- IFOR needs to define how an organization becomes an IFOR group
- What are the steps – from group to branch status?
- For some countries it is advisable to register as an NGO and in other countries it is dangerous
- What are the requirements from IFOR?
- Questions about dues: a question was raised about the 12.5 percent figure of branch budget that is designated as dues to IFOR. It was explained that for some branches that is too much of the operating budget, for others, it is less so.
- What documents will be required?
- Does IFOR accept individual members?
- The rights and duties of branches need to be redefined.
- Should there be only one IFOR per country or can there be more?
- Is IFOR supposed to be interfaith or multifaith?

**Concerns from the floor, for further consideration by the Council Working Group on Branch Status and Membership:**

- There was a clarification of the percentage contribution as per the constitution. The latest percentage used for asking branch contributions is 10% and not 12,5%.
- How is one to define the core budget of an organization?
- Some branches have more money than others to spend, however, the extra funds might be earmarked for certain programs or local activities, and therefore it should not automatically result in higher dues for that branch.
- A suggestion was made that the next council should be enabled to reach answers to these questions through a proper process of preparation. Since membership is the lifeblood of the organization, we need to work ahead to find a way to support that by moving through a process such as email etc. so that the next council brings forth much bigger recommendations.
- There was a suggestion that branches be required to send in financial reports so that there is a more transparent process of financial reporting and the ten percent contribution could be determined and discussed on the basis of the report.
- Question about voting structures dealing with the difference between branches and groups etc.

The working group proposed to set up a working group to address these questions and continue the work of this group beyond the council.

**Council Working Group on Committee Structures: progress report no. 3**

Lili Baxter made a short progress report:

- The Executive Committee (EC) would be comprised of the President, Vice President, and Treasurer
- The EC works closely with staff
- The EC meets as needed

**Concerns from the floor, for further consideration by the Council Working Group on Committee Structures:**

- What criteria would define the composition of the representative committee?
- Questions raised about regional representation: it was recommended that representatives should not take the responsibility of being the voice for their regions
- Comment about the need to look at division of tasks and look at the trouble – shooting mechanisms that need to be in place
- Vacancy questions: how to replace someone who cannot fulfil his/her term.
- It was suggested that they go ahead with this structure so that it is possible for the nominations committee to go ahead and nominate an International Committee

**Council decided by consensus:**

- to agree in principle to accept a new committee structure composed of an Executive Committee, an International Committee and a Representative Consultative Committee.
- to ask Council Working group on Committee Structures to clarify the constitution and the responsibilities of the Representative Consultative Committee and to reallocate the responsibilities of the old Steering Committee and Representative Committee between the new committees.
- to ask the Council working group on Committee structures to review and propose processes for managing conflicts within the IFOR structures.

The proposals will be discussed further and decided upon later during the Council.

**NOMINATIONS FOR THE NEW STEERING COMMITTEE:**

Kerstin Kollander, convener of the Nominations Committee, presented the list of delegates who had been nominated to the Steering Committee and had accepted the nomination. The list were as follows:

- Lili Baxter, US FOR,
- Francoise Petremand, MIR Romand
- Junji Sakurai, FOR Japan
- Reijrio Shito, FOR Japan
- Angelika Schneider, FOR Germany
- Eric Bachman, FOR Germany
- Maria Antoinetta Malleo, MIR Italy
- Johan Linnman, SweFOR
- Netsai Mushonga, FOR Zimbabwe
- Nhamo Sithole, FOR Zimbabwe
- Denis Beaumont, FOR England
- Robert Reischer, FOR Austria
- Jonathan Sisson, IFOR-CH-branch
- Ocan Ali Onono, FOR Uganda
- Beena Sebastian, FOR India

**AFTERNOON AND EVENING ACTIVITIES**

In the afternoon the WPP held a much appreciated Gender workshop for the participants of the Council. They reported about the 5-day Gender and Nonviolence Training which had been held prior to Council in Nyack. The women stressed the need for a gender dimension in IFOR. In the evening a BGA bazaar and a plenary session with the US FOR took place on “ Gender, Religion and Globalization”.

The US FOR then hosted a reception for the IFOR participants.

**Day 4 – June 18, 2002**

**Agenda**

- Discussions and decisions based on reports from group work
- Proposals regarding various activity groups
- Continued group work

**REPORTS FROM COUNCIL WORKING GROUPS**

**Council Working Group on Secretariat Location: progress report no. 2**

Nico Francis reported from the Council Working Group on the location of the Secretariat. The recommendation from the group to the Council is to support the Swedish FOR proposal to move the IS to Geneva.

The council working group propose that the Council decide:

1. Take out the constitutional clause that states that the secretariat needs to be located in Alkmaar
2. To carry out a feasibility study, and, depending on the findings of a feasibility study:
  - To mandate the IC to set up a working group to carry out the relocation
  - To empower the ICom and board of Stichting to make a decision dissolving the IFOR Stichting if needed to make the move possible

Furthermore it was suggested that the feasibility study would include the following:

1. Timeline of the move
2. Report should be finished by Dec 2002
3. If accepted, the move would be completed by October 2003

The IFOR Honorary President Hildegard Goss Mayer then presented the Council Working Group's motivation of why move the IS to Geneva:

The globalization of the political military demands a global networking of nonviolent forces to efficiently respond to this challenge. Geneva with its proximity to human rights groups etc., offers the possibility to contribute directly to this task while continuing to strengthen and extend the work of nonviolent action to both the grassroots and the regional level.

**Concerns from the floor, for further consideration by the Council Working Group Secretariat Location:**

- Financial considerations of moving
- What will happen to the WPP program based in Alkmaar?
- What about grassroots mobilization?
- If the feasibility study found that the move was not feasible, what is the mechanism for reversing this proposal?
- Switzerland is more difficult to get to. Geneva is more expensive to get to.
- IFOR is beginning to reconstruct itself out of the crisis of two years ago and it still does not have adequate funding for all of its projects. Therefore, perhaps this idea should be kept in mind with a four year goal instead of the date of October 2003?
- Shouldn't this decision wait until we are clear on where the IFOR is going? Are we more focused toward internal needs in the secretariat or are we going to address more external needs?

- What about other locations?
- Is it possible to afford two offices? Not so if one is in Geneva – WPP will suffer and shouldn't be dissolved.
- The logic of the proposal was questioned. Shouldn't one first decide what the possibilities are, and then what the feasibility is and only then, taking into account what the motivation of IFOR is, decide a place.
- What will happen to the current office?
- Why not start to base people in Geneva with the Swiss branch and have them concentrate on the lobbying while keeping the Alkmaar office intact?
- The MIR-Romand suggested that there should be a consensus that we should move before a feasibility study be mandated to work on the details. It also stated that they would be willing to help search for locations if needed. It was confirmed that Geneva is more expensive, but it was also affirmed that there are places outside of Geneva that are less expensive.
- Salaries are higher in Switzerland, but there are also possibilities of finding more funding.
- There is a lack of basic discussion about priorities.
- Consider the emotional repercussions for the staff if the move will take place
- Could we think of structures where IFOR is located in separate/different places?

The Council Working Group on the Secretariat Location responded that it would be the task of the feasibility study to answer these questions. They also mentioned that the Working Group was representative and that most of the questions had already come up in the discussion within the group. They once again pointed out the need to have consensus before a feasibility study would be put in place that would answer these and other questions.

The Council first moved on the proposal to take the location out of the constitution.

Council decided by consensus:

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>❑ that the reference to Alkmaar in the IFOR Constitution should be deleted. This amendment takes effect immediately.</li></ul> |
|--|

The Council then moved to the proposal to move the IS to Geneva after a process of a feasibility study. To test the feelings of the group on the proposal Diana Francis proposed a straw poll to be made. This proposal was accepted.

- A straw vote ensued with a show of hands, indicating the mood of all people assembled: 33 were in favour of accepting the proposal, 14 were not in favour and 7 abstained
- Another straw poll indicated the opinion of the assembled delegates from branches with voting rights: 13 of the voting delegates were in favour of the proposal to move the IS to Geneva, 4 were opposed to the proposal, 4 abstained, and 1 voting delegate was absent

Kerstin Kollander was then invited to answer a question that had previously been raised about what other places that had been considered in the process leading up to the Swedish FOR proposal to move the secretariat to Geneva. She responded that the following places had been considered: Geneva, London, Paris, Amsterdam, Brussels, Harare, Berlin, Johannesburg and different locations in India.

It was decided that the Council Working Group on the Secretariat Location would meet once more to amend their proposal to see if Council could reach a consensus and to take some new questions into account. The new questions were as follows:

- To investigate how more work could be done in the South
- Could we work from more than one location

### **Council Working Group on Secretariat Location: progress report no. 3**

When the Council reconvened, Nico Francis presented the new proposal from the Council Working Group on the Secretariat Location.

The proposal was that the Council should decide:

1. To move the International Secretariat (IS)
2. To set up feasibility working group to study making Geneva the location of the IS and in addition to investigate other alternative locations
3. To empower the International Committee in consultation with the RCC to decide on the location of the IS based on the findings of the feasibility study
4. To empower the International Committee to execute those decisions

Furthermore it was reported that an alternative suggestion by Jonathan Sisson had been discussed in the Working Group. Jonathan now shared his suggestion with the larger group: the idea would be to set up a pilot office in Geneva, which would take on lobbying as a project. If it is successful, the IFOR could gradually enlarge the Geneva office, especially if and when the WPP funding runs out (and not before then). Or, IFOR could move to open an office in the south in conjunction with other developments.

After a failed attempt to reach consensus on the proposal above the convener Diana Francis called for a break to consider new proposals. After the break an amended proposal was presented by Nico Francis, in which the first line in the previous proposal had been deleted. A discussion followed and some expressed the viewpoint that Alkmaar should be included as one of the alternative locations. Nico answered that it would be natural to look at Alkmaar in order to compare locations and that no more changes to the proposal were necessary.

**Council decided by consensus:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>❑ To set up feasibility working group to study making Geneva the location of the International Secretariat and in addition to investigate other alternative locations</li></ul> |
|---|

- ❑ To empower the International Committee in consultation with the Representative Consultative Committee to decide on the location of the International Secretariat based on the findings of the feasibility study.
- ❑ To empower the International Committee to execute those decisions
- ❑ To ask the Council Working Group on the Secretariat Location to come up with suggestions on the composition of feasibility working group.

## **REPORTS FROM AD HOC ACTIVITY GROUPS**

### **During the Council, a group of participants formed a working group on IFOR response to world events. The group reported:**

The consequences of September 11, 2001, have resulted in the War on Terror which began in October 2001. IFOR has to look for how to share experiences and information on world issues. There is a need to challenge prevailing thought patterns of violence and victimization. Branches, groups and affiliates reacting to situations can build up coalitions with other groups. The group on IFOR response to world events therefore suggested that their work should continue via email.

### **Another group of participants reported on their discussions about IFOR activities:**

The group suggested the following criteria for choosing program activities:

- Support Branches Groups and Affiliates
- Strengthens IFOR fellowship
- Strengthens profile/visibility
- Attracts resources, people, financing
- Promotes internal and external networking
- Fits into chosen program areas

The group also had suggestions on necessary conditions for choosing program activities:

- Sound financing – no deficit
- Clear management responsibility
- Preference for programs that embody unique IFOR contributions
- First steps – initiative from below – strategy group/advisory group/project group

Finally, the group suggested that the following activities should take place:

- The setting up of travelling nonviolence training.
- Peace education by the Swiss branch
- Organizing a religious seminar for young adults
- Organizing human rights seminars
- Training of observers
- Inter-religious rebuilding process

It was recommended that branches/groups/affiliates interested in any of the above should discuss a decentralized way to put the ideas into action.

### **A third group discussed the UN Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence.**

A third group of participants reported on their discussions about the UN Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World. They had come up with the following suggestions:

- To have a representative in UNESCO in order to influence the Liaison Committee of NGOs, and to provide UNESCO with an IFOR vision of nonviolence and expertise in this field
- To develop partnerships for lobbying in the direction of active nonviolence through an international and inter-institutional coalition
- To set up an IFOR working group on the Decade for this purpose
- To promote a fundraising campaign with testimonials of Nobel Laureates
- To arrive to a major conference on peace and nonviolence (like the one on the environment in Rio or the one on women in Beijing) organized in cooperation by NGOs and UNESCO
- To choose one contact person by branch in order to launch the international project at the national level.

IFOR focus during the decade – IFOR Branches, Groups and Affiliates should use the Decade to launch their work worldwide in an easier and more efficient way in terms of mass communication and accessibility.

***In the short discussion that followed on the group report, the following issues were raised from the floor:***

- Has there been time to look at the World Council of Churches and how they are related to the Decade?
- Is there a group of people who are willing to carry out the suggested activities?
- How will this be financed? A comment was made that finances don't have to come from IFOR and that one should seek out grants or foundations that can give us this money.
- Comment stating that UNESCO etc. have set up a working group and not a committee on nonviolence.
- A suggestion for fundraising was to issue an IFOR calendar and sell it to raise money.

It was decided that a convener for this group was needed and Maria Antoinetta Malleo agreed to the task, which resulted in a standing ovation.

#### **Conclusion of the discussions from the ad hoc activity groups.**

It was noted that the accountability status of the groups that had been working on “responding to world events”, “IFOR activities” and the Decade was unclear. According to the IFOR Constitution, it is possible for the Council to establish priority areas around which international Working Groups would be formed. If any group that had been formed by Council participants during the Council would like to continue their work beyond the Council it was suggested that they formulate the suggested tasks, themes and concerns, in order to ask for a mandate from the Council. IFOR Working Groups are accountable to the IFOR governing bodies. However, it was also suggested that branches and groups within the IFOR family could network amongst themselves in the name of their own organizations, without any “IFOR status”. The different groups that had been formed during the Council were asked to discuss and decide amongst themselves what kind of accountability status they would like to have and report back to the Council accordingly.

*Note:* During the last day of the Council a list of suggested working groups after Council was listed and people were asked to sign up. Due to lack of time the Council did not return to clarify the various issues around the groups.

#### **REPORTS FROM COUNCIL WORKING GROUPS:**

##### **Council Working Group on Branch Status and Membership: progress report no. 3**

Katy Brown reported from the Council Working Group on Branch Status and Membership. The group had defined the following key issues:

- o Needs of Branches Groups and Affiliates

- News of other branches activities
- Access to international forums
- Financial support
- More younger members
- Support for areas of weakness
- Help with diagnosis
- Access to resources
- Guidance on how to respond to events
- Internal/domestic IFOR and External/international IFOR
- Spiritual support

The following actions were recommended by the working group:

- To revisit the questionnaire to identify the needs of Branches, Groups and Affiliates
- That a regional branch should coordinate the collection of news
- To identify expertise to assist Branches, Groups, and Affiliates in financial development
- To appoint travelling secretaries
- To set up a working group with regional representatives and an international coordinator to develop a plan for networking

Furthermore, the Council Working Group on Branch Status and Membership proposed:

- That the future Representative Consultative Committee should take a key role in the expansion and support of Branches, Groups and Affiliates.
- That the International Secretariat should give priority to working with the branches
- That the Representative Consultative Committee and the International Secretariat are liaisons for groups and affiliates
- That, if possible, an International Secretariat staff person should be available for coordination of BGA work; but that, in the absence of an International Secretariat staff person for BGA work, a member of the Representative Consultative Committee will be the designated coordinator for this
- That relevant branches are consulted in development of groups and affiliates
- That the budget for branches should be set up to assist in the expansion and support of groups and affiliates in their region
- That the Representative Consultative Committee should assist the Branches, Groups and Affiliates when there are differences or conflicts
- That International Committee members should participate in visiting BGAs

***Comments and concerns from the floor, for further consideration by the Council Working Group Branch Status and Membership:***

There was a comment about how the budget shouldn't be a constraint and instead one should think of the various ways of getting funding and the various people to write funding proposals. A concern was voiced that the responsibility for the coordination of BGA work would fall on the International Secretariat if it weren't already addressed in this Council. Therefore, it was suggested that a small working group take care of this issue and work on a proposal for the International Committee.

***Day 5 - June 19, 2002***

***Agenda***

- Brief Overview
- Discussion on process
- Nominations Committee
- Speech by Hildegard Goss-Mayr at the US FOR conference
- Discussions and decisions based on Council Working Groups reports

- Constitutional decisions
- Appointment of International Committee and Stichting IFOR
- Evaluation
- Closing party

The Day opened with an acknowledgement that many participants had been uncomfortable with the process for deciding on the IS location the day before.

Françoise Pétremand also addressed this issue in a short speech. She felt that there is need for internal peace as well as peace in the world, but the reality is often quite painful. The Steering Committee is physically present at the Council, but not present in dialogue. The staff members are also present and much more vocal. The Council should be an opportunity for the members to be heard, but the roles have been switched. This is not a question about power or submission. No one submits and no one commands. Françoise lamented the lack of respect given and shown. She said that therefore, after having expressed her reservations, she would like to have it noted that although she is not withdrawing from her nomination to the Steering Committee, she is concerned and therefore, she would like her name to appear in parenthesis.

Isabelle Geuskens made a comment about the way that things work and the fact that she felt that true intentions were not disclosed. She expressed her frustration about the way the Council had turned and said that “if it is real reconciliation then put your fears on the table because otherwise, people don’t speak their feelings and things don’t get done.”

#### **REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE**

Dave d’Albert spoke for the Nominating Committee: the NC had not been able to put together a slate for the International Committee. The delegates present were now welcome to submit more names. He added that these should be the names of people who are willing and able to take on a leadership role

#### **HILDEGARD GOSS-MAYR SPEECH ON NONVIOLENT TRANSFORMATION**

IFOR honorary President Hildegard Goss-Mayr had been invited to address the US FOR National Conference taking place at the same time at the Council. Council took a break to go and listen to this speech.

#### **REPORTS FROM COUNCIL WORKING GROUPS:**

##### **Council Working Group on IS – Core Functions: progress report no. 3**

The proposal from the working group was that the Council would give the group the mandate to explore and if possible to start international programs and projects, according to the criteria for choosing program activities. The programs and projects should:

- support BGAs
- strengthen IFOR fellowship
- strengthen profile/visibility
- attract resources
- promote international and external networking
- fit into chosen program areas

Necessary conditions would be:

- sound financing : no deficit
- clear management responsibility

Preference would be given to programs that embody critical IFOR contributions. The first step would be an initiative from below – from a strategy group/advisory group/project group.

***Concerns from the floor, for further consideration by the Council Working Group IS – Core Functions:***

- The International Secretariat (IS) would be dealing with this, so why set up a working group? The response to this was that at the moment, there is no capacity at the IS to start this. And there are a lot of requests coming from branches.
- The International Committee (ICom) has the authority and capacity to start programs. The Council has gone through an elaborate process of selecting the members of the ICom, so that they are representative and able to fulfil this task. The ICom will have the overview that is necessary for making wise decisions about launching programmes and venturing into new projects. How can an ad hoc group suddenly ask to receive that mandate from the Council? Only one body, the IFOR International Committee, has and should have the mandate to “explore and if possible start international programs and projects”.
- It is written in the Constitution that working groups are responsible to the Steering Committee – now ICom. We also need subgroups to do work and prepare reports to the leadership.

It was clarified that this recommendation was specifically for the individual programs, in this case the nonviolence program. It was then decided that since a working committee for the Decade of Nonviolence is already in place this conversation was redundant.

**PROPOSED WORKING GROUPS AFTER COUNCIL**

The names of the different proposed working groups would be written down on a chart and people were welcome to sign up if they were interested to join such a group. The groups that were listed were:

- Decade for Nonviolence Working Group
- Nonviolence Training and Education Working Group
- Responding to World Events Working Group
- Strengthening Branches Working Group
- Membership Criteria Working Group
- Reconciliation Working Group
- IS Location Feasibility Study Group

*Note:* Due to lack of time at the end of the Council this question was not discussed further at the Council. The tasks of the various groups were not clearly defined. No formal decisions were made to establish the groups and to decide which ones would be under the responsibility of the International committee with an IFOR paid budget and which ones would be under the responsibilities of specific branches or individuals. This will be the responsibility of the International committee to decide. The exception to this is the IS Location Study Group (see below).

For a list of the current working groups, conveners and participants please contact the IS.

There are also working groups that exist since the last Council in Mennorode or that has been established by the Steering committee, included here for information: the Women Peacemaker Program Advisory Group, the Finance Working Group and the Constitutional Working Group.

**MEMBERSHIP OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY WORKING GROUP ON IS LOCATION.**

The delegates of the Swedish FOR expressed through Kerstin Kollander that the majority support of their proposal to move the IS to Geneva had been encouraging. She also declared that some participants had criticized and did not understand the SweFOR delegates decision not to block the consensus on the final proposal concerning the IS location. Kerstin reminded the Council that SweFOR has for many years raised questions about the consensus decision-making as it is practiced within the IFOR, since it tends to make it impossible for the Council to make hard decisions. SweFOR has, however, always been loyal to

the IFOR process. In this case there was no consensus for the proposal until the first line (to decide to move the IS) was deleted. Kerstin expressed the hope that the process that had been put in place by the Council would eventually lead to the IS moving away from Alkmaar in accordance with the general feeling of the Council without alienating those who are now against such a move.

The Council then proceeded to select the women and men who would form the Feasibility Study Working Group.

**Council decided by consensus:**

- that the Feasibility Study Working Group would be comprised of: Nico Francis (convenor), Francoise Petremand, Netsai Mushonga, Kerstin Kollander, Jonathan Sisson and one staff person (to be selected at a later stage). Any questions to the group can be addressed to Nico by e-mail: Nico@francis97.freerve.co.uk

**REPORTS FROM COUNCIL WORKING GROUPS:**

**Council Working Group on Branches and Membership: progress report no. 4**

The membership group put forth their proposals for the process of acceptance of a new IFOR Branch:

An application for membership to IFOR would be required which would include the following:

- A record of the group's decision to apply for IFOR branch status
- The constitution of the group
- Registration with legal authorities where applicable
- List of members of the board
- It was also recommended that applications should be forwarded a year in advance

**Comments and concerns from the floor, for further consideration by the Council Working Group on Branches and Membership:**

A question was raised as to whether the Membership Group had taken the BGA proposals into account and the response was that no; this still has to be done.

As per the responsibilities of IFOR Branches:

- It will have its own program of work unless prevented by local conditions
- It shall contribute towards the international structure of IFOR
- It shall report to the international secretariat annually on its activities

The process of exclusion of an IFOR branch:

- Inability of the branch to undertake any activities

The following were recommendations made to pursue the branch contributions to IFOR:

- Cash or in kind contributions
- To maintain the Quito recommendation

In kind contributions could possibly be given as: Service, NVETP, Youth Program, Disarmament, Decade, Regional networking, Assist the IS, Publications and Hosting international meetings

The group recommended that these considerations be taken into account and the questions be dealt with by a working group of the Council.

**IFOR CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES**

**Based on Council Working Group on Committee Structures: progress report no. 4**

The Council Working Group on Committee Structures made the following proposal for the Representative Consultative Committee:

The RCC would be composed of two representatives from each region. Regional representatives are nominated and elected by the branches, groups and affiliates of their respective regions:

- Tasks are consultative – which includes evaluation and advising:
  - Give feedback and guidance to ICom
  - To hear and respond to reports of working groups and regions
  - To look at the progress of IFOR work in relation to decisions taken at Council
  - To review the current work of the Secretariat
- RCC also has the task of deciding the venue of the next Council, setting general directions for the preparation of that Council and determining the processes to be used during that Council
- RCC may also make decisions regarding the granting of IFOR affiliate or IFOR group status to new groups or organizations
- RCC may also be requested by Council or ICom to undertake additional tasks.

Furthermore, the Council Working Group on Committee Structures made the following proposal regarding the International Committee:

*The International committee (ICom) serves as principal decision making body for the International Fellowship between the International Councils.*

A sub-group of the Council Working Group on Committee Structures had prepared a paper outlining the full Constitution with the suggested amendments. Eric Bachmann presented it. Proposed changes to the constitution were explained and agreed to. (See addendum).

***Comments and concerns from the floor:***

- Question about meeting place of the RCC
- Comment that the ICom is part of the RCC- therefore the RCC is a means of widening the representation of the fellowship.
- Who can call for the RCC to meet?
- The ICom can make a recommendation to have the RCC further investigate something that they don't have time to do.
- There was a question requesting the clarification of the requirement for having a Dutch national in the Stichting now that the Netherlands is a part of the EU.

***Council decided by consensus:***

- to approve the proposed changes to the IFOR Constitution as presented in the enclosed Constitution document (see below).

**DECISION ON THE MEMBERS OF THE IFOR INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE AND ON THE STICHTING IFOR.**

**IFOR International Committee**

Kerstin Kollander introduced the nominations committee's proposal for a slate for the IFOR International Committee for the next four years:

- Jonathan Sisson, (Forum fuer Friedenserziehung), Switzerland -- President
- Françoise Pétremand, MIR Romand, Switzerland -- Vice-President
- Robert Reischer, FOR Austria -- Treasurer
- Beena Sebastian, FOR India
- Liliane Kshensky Baxter, FOR USA

Netsai Mushonga, FOR Zimbabwe

Junji Sakurai, FOR Japan

**Council decided by consensus:**

- |  |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> to accept the proposed slate as the IFOR International Committee. |
|--|

The Executive Committee will consist of the President, Vice-President and Treasurer

**Stichting IFOR**

Virginia Baron introduced the outgoing Steering Committees proposal for members of the Stichting IFOR. The Steering Committee recommended Willem Laan and Paul Kruyswijk, both from the Netherlands to form the Stichting IFOR together with the President Jonathan Sisson and the Treasurer Robert Reischer.

**Council decided by consensus:**

- |   |
|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> to appoint Willem Laan, the Netherlands, Paul Kruyswijk, The Netherlands, Jonathan Sisson, IFOR President and Robert Reischer, IFOR treasurer, as the members of the Stichting IFOR. |
|---|

**CONCLUDING BUSINESS**

**Steering Committee recommendations on branch status**

The outgoing Steering Committee wants to withdraw the recommendations about branches that it had sent out to the branches before the Council. In view of the discussions at Council concerning membership criteria SC withdraws its recommendations and asks that the new bodies deal with this matter once the working group on criteria has reported. Virginia Baron commented that no criteria existed for the acceptance or non-acceptance of new groups and branches. She felt that admission or non-admission would therefore be arbitrary and possibly unfair, and she called for a spirit of generosity.

The whole question about admission of new groups and branches did not reappear in plenary. Therefore no decision about membership of new branches and groups was taken during the Council.

**Thanks to Brother Jacques Tielemann**

A special word of thanks to Brother Jacques Tielemann from the Netherlands for all the years that he has stayed and been with IFOR as treasurer and during the past years as auditor. Council gave a standing ovation for Brother Jacques.

Brother Jacques said a few words: I have been the treasurer of IFOR for 11 years and auditor for 7 years. I am grateful for all those years and for years I have worked with my heart for IFOR and with my head for the finances. There is a time to arrive and a time to depart and I thank you for the applause and words and actions.

**Evaluation**

Concerns of the heart and ideas for the next Council by Johan Linnman and Awel Irene

It was suggested that the participants work in small groups to evaluate the Council. Each of the small groups discussed one of the following questions.

- 1. Democracy – How do we feel about the decision making process? How can the next IFOR council improve?

- 2. Self-understanding – What is council? What is IFOR? Who do we represent? National/Local levels
- 3. How to better respect each other? How do we respond to each other in these different groups? What to do about the listening process? Language and nonviolence? Cultural/language differences? Different levels of communication between branches, groups, affiliates, and International Committee and Representative Consulting Committee?

The Council reconvened and all the groups presented what they had been talking about.

*The first group (democracy)*

Concerns pointed out by this group.

- Lack of time for consensus building
- Decision-making abilities weren't brought to the forefront.
- Small groups didn't show the abilities of some council members to everyone
- Difference in status between groups and branches.
- Needed better structures beforehand – papers need to be produced – agendas agreed upon before council and work.
- Discussion about participatory process works in practice when there is so little time?
- North was too dominant, advocacy and committee styles were too European
- Need a business plan – what do people want from council and what does the work require
- Too much time discussing technicalities and council should think more about vision and content

*The second group (self understanding):*

The Self-understanding group had split in two and presented separately.

Group I

- Missed input for inspiration and vision sharing
- Wanted to spend more time getting to know each other
- Wanted more time to share resources and experiences
- In business issues, the consensus method was learning and teaching process for everyone. Being peacemakers this is the best method to learn but same time, when there is a time constraint, it is a bit difficult.
- Enriching time. Appreciated and acknowledged the work of the facilitators. Receiving attitude and tolerance of all the participants of the truth.

Group II

- Mainly dealing with international issues – council, programs, branch
- Almost neglected the kinds of activities and issues within the branches
- Lots of time was spent dealing with these agendas – therefore it is a hard group to facilitate.
- For a lot of people, this is the first council that they are attending – it is important that past decisions from previous Council are made known to people.

*The third group (respect):*

- Lost sight of fellowship ideas
- Great work involved and great difficulty in doing international group work.
- Too much time spent on business
- Not enough time to meet each other and have fun
- Came with high expectations and hopes and felt that sometimes, these were not met
- Felt that it was a great growth opportunity in how to deal with conflict and practise nonviolence
- Reached with greater clarity on the structure – hoping that the international committee will do the work.

- Thanks to the President – understand that it was a lot of work for the committee
- Appreciation to the US FOR for their contribution to the Council.

### **FINAL COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- There were some final comments about the attempt by the Steering Committee to set up a Reconciliation Working Group: The Steering Committee had attempted to set up a working group on reconciliation to reconcile with the pain and anger and hurt of the past within the IFOR family. But they had not been able to find anyone with enough time to participate. There was an offer from Eric Bachmann to continue this attempt at reconciliation and he asked for volunteers to join the group.
- It was suggested that the Council members meet in groups after the end of the last Council session in the regions they come from; Europe, Asia, Africa and North America to name the their respective representatives to the Representative Consultative Committee.
- Coalition for the decade – Maria Antonietta Malleo from MIR-Italy will coordinate the work around the decade. She brought up that there is a European Social Forum, which is part of the World Social Forum, in Florence later this year and she would like to invite an IFOR representative to attend this meeting.
- Philip Bentley from the Jewish Peace Fellowship invited interested participants to contact him in order to work on how we can work with interfaith considerations. He will try to find a way to communicate with branches, groups and affiliates to see who is interested in this question.

### **CLOSING**

Diana Francis made some closing remarks and congratulated the participants for all the work accomplished. A poem was read and Diana concluded with some words on the spiritual strengths of the IFOR. Thanks were expressed to the minute taker.

The final session closed with everybody being asked to write down one thing to make the IFOR ship move along on a piece of paper and to attach that to a big paper boat.

The Council ended with a party where thanks were expressed to the staff and Steering committee for all their hard work for the IFOR for the past years and for arranging this Council. Thanks were expressed to the US FOR hosting the Council in New York. Special thanks were expressed to Virginia Baron for her time as the IFOR president. Special thanks were also expressed to Susan Ross who will leave her position as Interim coordinator at the International Secretariat in July. Council participants expressed their great appreciation to the Council coordinating group. Special thanks were expressed to the Diana Francis for her excellent work in convening the Council.

Wishes of good luck for their work as the new International Committee were extended to the committee from the Council participants.

### **END of the IFOR COUNCIL 2002**

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **List of documents presented to the Council**

#### ***Governing Documents***

- IFOR Constitution and Procedural Guidelines
- IFOR Council Process Document
- Rights of Participants
- Guidelines for choosing Council Delegates
- Consensus document

#### ***Reports***

- Joint Report from the President and the International Secretariat – Virginia Baron & Susan Ross
- SC report on the Consultation Process and summary of the Consultation Process Results – Awel Irene
- Final Update of the IFOR Council 2000 Mandate, from SC and IS Women Peacemakers Program 2000-2002, by the WPP staff
- Treasurer's Letter on Financial report 2001 – by Eric Bachmann
- IFOR representation in Geneva 2001, by Jonathan Sisson
- IFOR representation in New York 2001, by K. Elaine Valdov

#### ***Council Proposals***

- Proposals on the location of the IS:
  - Letter from the Swedish FOR to SC
  - the International Secretariat in Alkmaar
  - Swedish FOR proposal to relocate the IS to Geneva
  - MIR Romand letter on Geneva proposal
- Proposals on leadership and structure
  - IS proposal on leadership structures
  - Lessons Learned and Recommendations from SC
- Gender Proposal, from WPP
- Constitutional proposal, from Robert Reischer
- Constitutional Inconsistencies and Amendments, by Eric Bachman
- Decade Coalition, from MIR France

#### ***Council papers***

- Thoughts on IFOR, by Virginia Baron

- Africa Consultation paper, by Rev. Ocan Ali Onono
- My Experiences with IFOR, by Akadim Chikandamina
- Communal Quakes, by Mathew George
- Kerk en Vrede (Church and Peace Netherlands) response to Consultation process and letter to SC

***Other***

Council Program

Participants list

Evaluation form for IFOR Council 2002

(All documents are available at the International Secretariat)

**The revised Constitution of the IFOR as decided by the Council in New York June 19, 2002**

**IFOR CONSTITUTION**

**1. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE OF THE INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION**

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.

**2. INTERNATIONAL STRUCTURE**

The International Fellowship of Reconciliation is composed of branches and groups of the organization, together with affiliates.

- 2.1 Branches: An IFOR branch is an organization of people committed to acting on the principles contained in the IFOR statement of purpose and to supporting the work of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, and which has been formally accepted as a branch by the IFOR International Council. The work and purpose of an IFOR branch normally are national or regional, rather than purely local, in scope.
- 2.2 IFOR Groups: An IFOR Group is a group with which IFOR has developed a working relationship and which may eventually seek branch status. Status as an “IFOR Group” is decided by either the IFOR International Committee or IFOR Representative Consultative Committee.
- 2.3 Affiliates: An IFOR Affiliate is an organization of people who wish to collaborate with IFOR and who find the IFOR statement of purpose and program compatible with their own spirit and program. An IFOR Affiliate will have been formally granted such status by the IFOR Council or IFOR Representative Consultative Committee.
- 2.4 Individual Members. Exceptionally, individuals may be granted individual membership of IFOR. Such status is granted by decision of the IFOR International Committee.

**3. INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL**

- 3.1 The IFOR International Council is the main governing body of IFOR. It takes place as necessary but at least once every four years and is made up of representatives of IFOR Branches, IFOR Groups (by invitation) and IFOR Affiliates. In the event of a conflict about representation of a group, affiliate or branch, the International Committee is empowered to determine which if any will be recognized and invited to the Council. The Council has the authority to review all determinations of representation by the International Committee.
- 3.2 The Principal Tasks of the IFOR Council are:

- to review the work done since the previous Council meeting by the Fellowship as a whole through its regions, branches, committees, any working groups and the international secretariat;
- to set priorities and directions for work to be undertaken in the next four year period;
- to choose the IFOR President and the members of the IFOR International Committee
- to ratify the appointment of the Treasurer and the IFOR Stichting members;
- to take major constitutional decisions;
- to recognize the admission of the Fellowship of new branches and affiliates or, if need arises, to decide on any exclusion or disaffiliation.

3.3 Basic decisions related to the organization of Council are made between Councils by the International Committee and the Representative Consultative Committee.

#### **4. REPRESENTATIVE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

4.1 The Representative Consultative Committee is composed of two representatives from each region and the members of the International Committee. The regional representatives are nominated and elected by the Branches, Groups and Affiliates of their respective region.

4.2 Its tasks are mainly consultative, which includes evaluation and advising:

- to give feedback and guidance to the International Committee on current aspects of its work;
- to hear and respond to the reports of working groups and regions;
- to look at the progress of IFOR work in relation to the decisions taken at Council;
- to review the current work of the Secretariat.

4.3 The Representative Consultative Committee also has the task of deciding the venue of the next Council, setting general directions for the preparation of that Council, and determining the processes to be used during that Council.

4.4 The Representative Consultative Committee may also make decisions regarding the granting of IFOR affiliate or IFOR group status to new groups or organizations.

4.5 The Representative Consultative Committee may also be requested by Council or the International Committee to undertake additional tasks.

#### **5. INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE**

5.1 The International Committee serves as the principal decision-making body for the International Fellowship between International Councils. Its members are responsible for translating the directions and recommendations decided upon by the International Council into a program of

work for the International Secretariat, monitoring the undertaking of this program of work, monitoring the work of regions and working groups and the coordination of that work, and determining and approving the budget each year for the work of the Secretariat. It decides on the size and shape of the IFOR staff and the setting of guidelines concerning staff conditions of employment, although legal responsibility for the employment of staff rests with the 'Stichting IFOR' (see below).

- 5.2 The members of the International Committee are chosen by the International Council. The International Committee remains in office until such time as a new International Committee is chosen by the next International Council. It is composed of seven members, including the President, Vice-President and Treasurer. At least one member of the International Committee will be from each region. No more than three will be from any one region. The International Committee is authorized to fill any vacancy which may occur. The International Committee usually meets once a year.

## 6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

- 6.1 The principal officers of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation are the **President, the Vice-President, and the Treasurer**. These three officers form the IFOR Executive Committee and are also members of the International Committee.
- 6.2 The **President** coordinates the work of the International Committee and is the chief representative of the International Fellowship in its external relations.
- 6.3 The **Treasurer** exercises the responsibility for the administration of IFOR funds. He/she therefore works in close cooperation with both the IFOR staff and the International Committee on all matters involving finance. The treasurer is responsible to the International Committee and is an ex officio member of International Committee and Representative Consultative Committee and the Stichting. 6.3 The International Council selects the **Vice-President**. The Vice-President assists the President in her/his tasks.
- 6.4 The **Executive Committee** is empowered to act on behalf of the International Committee between International Committee meetings. It is responsible to the International Committee. It should keep the International Committee fully informed of all business in progress and takes account of any views expressed by International Committee members.

## 7. THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT AND STAFF

- 7.1 The **International Secretariat**, coordinates and facilitates the international work of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, including the specific programs decided upon by the IFOR Council.
- 7.2 The IFOR staff work principally from the International Secretariat offices. In addition, field workers may be appointed. IFOR staff do their work under the guidance of and are responsible to the International Committee.

- 7.3 International Committee may appoint a Personnel Committee to help it in its tasks of guidance for the International Secretariat. Any decisions made by the Personnel Committee must be brought to the attention of and ratified by the International Committee.
- 7.4 Field workers may refer to local reference groups for help and guidance, but are ultimately answerable to the IFOR International Committee and Representative Consultative Committees.

## **8. LEGAL RECOGNITION**

The 'Stichting IFOR' (or IFOR Foundation) is the Dutch legal body allowing the organization to be recognized in and act from the Netherlands. It is also the body legally responsible for the staffing and financing of the International Secretariat. Where decisions by the Stichting IFOR are necessary, it acts under the guidance of the IFOR International Committee and IFOR Executive Committee. Recommendations as to the individuals on its board are made by the International Committee and ratified at the meetings of the International Council. The IFOR Council will appoint three members to the Stichting IFOR Board. This will include the IFOR Treasurer, at least one member of the Steering Committee (usually the IFOR President), and at least one Dutch person. The Stichting IFOR is registered at the Chamber of Commerce in Alkmaar, the Netherlands.

## **9. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS**

In undertaking its international work, IFOR seeks to cooperate with and work through international organizations and institutions working on similar issues and concerns.

## **10. AMENDMENTS**

The IFOR Constitution carries the authority of the IFOR Council, and a decision by Council is necessary for any change to it. Changes made in the constitution must be made by consensus or, if by vote, by a majority of 75%.

## **11. PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES AND PRACTICES**

Procedural guidelines and practices for the International Fellowship of Reconciliation are attached to this document. They are decided upon by the IFOR International Committee, acting in consultation with the branches of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Representative Consultative Committee.

## **12. DISSOLUTION**

The International Fellowship of Reconciliation can be dissolved by decision of the IFOR International Council after a thorough consultation with the member branches and affiliates of the organization.

## APPENDIX 3

### IFOR Council Participants 2002

= voting delegate

#### AFRICA

##### Madagascar

(FIEFA MIR MAD-branch)

H.Vololona Razafindrainibe (Mrs.)

##### Nigeria

(PARC - affiliate)

Grace Nta Igwe

##### Uganda

(JYAK- branch)

Mr. Ocan Michael

Ruth Draa Agondua

(SC 2000-2002)

Rev. Ocan Ali Onono

##### Zambia

(Youth Forum - group)

Ignatius Kabale Mukunto.

Prisca Chungu

##### Zimbabwe

(FOR/ZIMBABWE - branch)

Akadim Chikandamina

Netsai Mushonga

#### ASIA

##### Bangladesh

(BICPAJ - group)

Prof. Amy Gonzalves

(BANGLA-GERMAN SAMPREETI - affiliate)

Pain Shwe U Marma (Mr.)

##### Israel

(Palestinians and Israelis for Nonviolence-branch)

Amos Gvirtz

##### India

(FOR INDIA - branch)

Mrs. Beena Sebastian

Dr.Suseela Mathew

##### Japan

(FOR JAPAN - branch)

Reijrio Shito (Mr.)

Junji Sakurai (Mr.),

Shinichi Nomura (Mr.),

##### Nepal

(MILIJULI NEPAL - group)

Stella Tamang

##### Palestine

(MEND--Middle East Democr. & NV- part of branch)

Lina Qattan

(Wi'am - part of branch)

Zoughbi Zoughby

**Philippines**

**(PAG AALAY PUSO FOUNDATION - group)**

Ma.. Theresa Dalumpines

**EUROPE**

**Austria**

**(FOR AUSTRIA - branch)**

Robert Reischer

Hildegard Goss-Mayr

Irmgard Ehrenberger

**England**

**(FOR ENGLAND - branch)**

Nico Francis

Tracey Warren

**(SC 2000-2002)**

Denis Beaumont

**(Council facilitator)**

Diana Francis

**France**

**(MIR FRANCE - branch)**

François Dietz

Christian Renoux

**Germany**

**(FOR/Germany - branch)**

Angelika Schneider

Ms. Henny Demuth

**(SC 2000-2002)**

Eric Bachman

**Italy**

**(MIR ITALY - branch)**

Maria Antonietta Malleo

**Netherlands**

**(Kerk en Vrede - Branch)**

Jan Schaake

José Höhne-Sparborth

**(Doopsgezinde Vredesgroep - branch)**

Mrs. Jet Visser\_Romijn

Mr. Henk Blom

**(IFOR Guest)**

Br. Jacques Tieleman

**Norway**

**(FOR NORWAY-branch)**

Trond G. Rasmussen

Steinar Ims

**Sweden**

**(FOR SWEDEN-branch)**

Anna Åkerlund

Johan Linnman

**(NC Convenor)**

Kerstin Kollander

**Switzerland**

**(IFOR-CH-branch)**

Dave D'Albert

Eva Füssinger

Ruth Wildermuth

**IFOR UN Representative**

Jonathan Sisson

**(MIR Romande - branch)**

Bertrand Slavic □

Françoise Petremand

**Wales**

**(SC 2000-2002)**

Awel Irene

**NORTH AMERICA**

**United States**

**(FOR USA - branch)**

Richard Deats □

Lili Baxter □

Katy Gray Brown □

**(Jewish Peace Fellowship - Affiliate)**

Philip Bentley

**(SC 2000-2002)**

Virginia Baron

**Interpretation**

Francois D'Heurle

Daniel Leonard

**CANADA**

**(WPP gender workshop trainer)**

Corey Levin

**International Secretariat**

Susan Ross, Interim Coordinator 2000-2002

Shelley Anderson,

Women Peacemakers Program - Program officer

Isabelle Geuskens

Women Peacemakers Program - Program manager

Wannes van Stappen - financial administrator

Dorie Wilsnack - administrator