



**IPB**  
International  
Peace Bureau

# *Newsletter*

June 2017



## **Under the Shadow of the Ban Treaty**

### **The first preparatory committee of the NPT Review Conference**

The first preparatory committee for the NPT Review Conference started on Mai 5<sup>th</sup> 2017 in Vienna.

Lots of it was as usual, long speeches with little significance from many diplomates, a blocking attitude from the nuclear weapons states and a big effort of civil society to make progress in nuclear disarmament.

However, the Prepcom was influenced by a new quality, which lit new hope – the ban treaty or the very successful first round of discussions on a ban treaty. The spirit of the possibility of reaching nuclear disarmament was floating above the Conference, inspiring many participants and civil society representatives with optimism. This pushed the discussion into the direction either disarmament to Zero or an implied danger to destroy the whole planet.

This shown optimism and an actual possibility of a historic agreement was contrary to the arms race of the nuclear weapons states and their allies. It was a place where the disarmament public opinion clashes with advocates of armament, their armament programs that are called “modernisation”. This session in Vienna also showed how difficult it is to enforce nuclear disarmament. The ban treaty actually starts a new discussion how to achieve this goal under new circumstances.

These thoughts are surely influenced by the four side events IPB held at the UN in Vienna (our program in Vienna: [http://www.ipb.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Flyer-Vienna\\_web.pdf](http://www.ipb.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Flyer-Vienna_web.pdf)). Civil society representatives, touched by the optimism, but also realism, discussed different ways toward a world

without nuclear weapons. Arguments for how to implement the ban treaty successfully were developed. The Event about the Middle East stressed out how important regional nuclear weapons free zones are for nuclear disarmament processes. All IPB events had a special focus on the challenges for the peace movement.

Without actions on the streets there is no success! This is the reason why IPB was intensively supporting the action of the Austrian peace movement in the city centre.

Another important event was a half-day Conference, initiated by IPB with support partners, about the ambiguous role of the IAEA. It's unlimited support for the so called civil use of nuclear energy is not only a dangerous politics, but also an attempt to preserve an outdated and overpriced energy form. It's verification mechanisms need a close look from the civil society as it is not free of conflicts of interest. The international peace movement should closely follow this international organisation.

My total impression of the first Prepcom in Vienna: a depressing conference with no disarmament visions on one side, and on the other, optimistic government and civil society influenced by the ban treaty.

The end of the negotiations in New York will show us results. More pressure on nuclear weapons states is needed.

Also, I met many old and new friends.

*Reiner Braun*

*IPB Co-President*

## The Public Conscience Awakens

### Draft Nuclear Weapons Ban Treaty – An Overview

*Amela Skiljan, IPB Coordinator*

On Monday, 22<sup>nd</sup> of May, the Draft Convention on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons was publicly released by Ambassador Elayne Whyte Gomez, the president of the United Nations Conference to Negotiate a Legally Binding Instrument to Prohibit Nuclear Weapons, Leading Towards their Total Elimination.

It is the result of the first discussion round held in New York 27-31.03.2017.

It builds on “the catastrophic humanitarian consequences that would result from any use of nuclear weapons and the consequent need to make every effort to ensure that nuclear weapons are never used again under any circumstances”. Civil society has been warning from the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons nuclear weapons for more than 70 years, so it is appropriate and necessary that this paragraph is at the very beginning of the preamble. In this regard, the preamble pays respect to “victims of the use of nuclear weapons (Hibakusha) as well as of those affected by the testing of nuclear weapons”. The draft contains a positive obligation for states to assist victims of use or testing of nuclear weapons.

The Draft Treaty gives a very strong prohibition in its operative section using the wording “never under any circumstances” at the very beginning of Article 1. Accordingly, it is prohibited to “develop, produce, manufacture, otherwise acquire, possess or stockpile nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices”. It is more than necessary to include all of these actions in this prohibition provision.

The use of nuclear weapons is prohibited in Art. 1.1. (d). Moreover, the Draft declares that “any use of nuclear weapons would be contrary

to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and in particular the principles and rules of humanitarian law”. This paragraph reinforces the exciting law that already prohibits the use of nuclear weapons. As the Treatyrelays on international law, it reinforces its provisions and makes them clearer and stronger.

However, the draft does not mention the threat of use of nuclear weapons. The illegality of the threat of use was intensively discussed during the first round of the negotiations. There were arguments in favour of this prohibition relaying on the UN Charter or on the fact that many states relay on nuclear deterrence. By the prohibition of the threat of use the cooperation or reliance on nuclear weapons would be undermined.

The Draft, further, prohibits nuclear weapon tests. Furthermore, it reaffirms “the vital importance of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty as a core element of the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime”. Besides the CTBT, the Draft mentions the NPT reaffirming its crucial importance and it clearly states that it does not affect the obligations of the state parties under the NPT.

Transfer of nuclear weapons or the (direct or indirect) control over nuclear weapons is prohibited by this Draft as well. To receive the transfer or the control is also prohibited. This provision is especially important in terms of nuclear sharing, as it addresses situations in which are hosting countries involved such are Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Turkey.

The Draft has no clear prohibition on financing nuclear weapons. However, it prohibits to “assist, encourage, or induce, in any way,

anyone to engage in any activity prohibited ... under this Convention". To seek or receive any assistance is prohibited as well. Financing the production of nuclear weapons could be seen as a form of assistance, but this is a point, which has to be further discussed in the second negotiation round. A clear prohibition on financing is definitely necessary.

The Treaty would come into force 90 days after the 40<sup>th</sup> ratification. Considering that 132 have participated in the first discussion round, this is a relatively low threshold. This would mean that there is a Treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons on the international law level. As more states join this Convention, the "embarrassment effect" of those who did not grows. The process of stigmatizing nuclear weapons would have more and more success.

Another important question (not) addressed by the Draft is the accession of nuclear weapons states. The Draft has an article on measures for states that have eliminated their nuclear weapons. It requires states that "have manufactured, possessed or otherwise acquired nuclear weapons after 5 December 2001, and eliminated all such weapons prior to the entry into force of the Treaty for it, to cooperate with International Atomic Energy Agency for the purpose of verification". Unfortunately, the draft does not mention states that have stationed nuclear weapons in this regard, which would be important for hosting states.

The date 5 December 2001 marks when the Lisbon Protocol under the START I Treaty was implemented. The reason for this is that the Draft considers states that have given up voluntarily on nuclear weapons (Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine) and wants to avoid duplicative verification mechanisms for them. However, the Draft calls for an agreement between a state party and the IAEA, but does not specify which party should prepare this agreement.

The Draft also requires state parties to encourage states to ratify this Convention. This makes the Treaty a political tool to make pressure on nuclear weapons states. On the other hand, each state party should help other state parties to implement the Convention. They shall meet regularly in order to discuss the implementation of the Treaty and possible further steps. Unfortunately, there are no strong verification mechanisms for the implementation process and the important role civil society has in such verification processes. This point should be further discussed in the second negotiation round.

IPB also expects the Treaty to become a political tool, as it should unite the state parties in their efforts of reaching nuclear disarmament against the arms race undertaken by the nuclear weapons state and their allies. This whole process represents a transformational moment for two reasons. Firstly, it takes place at the UN against the will of the permanent members of the Security Council, and secondly, it showed an impressive and (until now) unique cooperation of representatives of governments and of civil societies.

In addition, this is what IPB aims and hopes for, to strengthen the nuclear disarmament "coalition" in power and courage including government and civil societies, and to strengthen the arguments for nuclear disarmament based on international law.

The first Draft included almost all provisions upon which there was consensus or near-consensus during the first negotiation round. The debate continues with in June 15 and ends, hopefully with a Treaty on July 7<sup>th</sup>. Ambassador Whyte Gomez stated that this is "an achievable goal".

Once entered into force, our tasks begin – to stay united, governments and civil society, and to persuade nuclear weapons states to sign and ratify the Treaty– in order to get a nuclear weapons free world.

## **Draft UN nuclear weapon ban released**

### **ICAN Statement**

The first draft of the United Nations treaty to prohibit nuclear weapons was released in Geneva, Switzerland, on 22 May. Elayne Whyte Gómez, the Costa Rican ambassador who is presiding over negotiations of the historic accord, presented the text to diplomats and members of civil society, before answering questions from the media.

The draft was developed on the basis of discussions and input received during the first round of negotiations, held at the UN headquarters in New York from 27 to 31 March 2017, with the participation of 132 nations. The negotiations will resume on 15 June and continue until 7 July, with the draft as the basis.

ICAN welcomes the release of the draft as an important milestone in the years-long effort to ban these indiscriminate weapons of mass destruction in light of their inhumane and catastrophic impacts. Once adopted, the treaty will constitute a major step towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

The draft provides a solid basis for a strong, categorical prohibition of nuclear weapons. ICAN expects further constructive debate on certain provisions as the process moves forward, and will be campaigning to ensure the strongest possible treaty. We are confident that the treaty can be agreed by 7 July.

“We are particularly happy that the text is rooted in humanitarian principles and builds on existing prohibitions of unacceptable weapons, such as the conventions banning biological and chemical weapons, anti-personnel landmines and cluster munitions,” said Beatrice Fihn, the executive director of ICAN.

Nuclear-armed and nuclear alliance states should engage constructively in these discussions, she said. “Whilst they will be able to join the treaty once it has been agreed, failure to participate in the negotiations

undermines their claims to be committed to a world without nuclear weapons.”

“Nuclear weapons are morally unacceptable. They are intended to kill civilians indiscriminately,” Ms Fihn said. “Their continued existence undermines the moral credibility of every country that relies on them. A treaty to ban them, as a first step towards their elimination, will have real and lasting impact.”

## **We have a ban treaty draft**

### **IPPNW Statement**

The Draft Convention on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons was released today in Geneva by the president of the negotiating conference, Elayne Whyte Gomez of Costa Rica. The draft is based upon proposals made and discussed by participating states and civil society during the first negotiating session in March, and will be the starting point when negotiations resume in June.

In a cover letter accompanying the draft, Ambassador Whyte urged the negotiators to “work together, with a sense of urgency toward a successful Conference that will conclude by agreeing on a legally binding instrument prohibiting nuclear weapons.”

The preamble to the specific provisions, which describe the prohibitions and positive obligations established by the treaty, underscores the “catastrophic humanitarian consequences that would result from any use of nuclear weapons and the consequence need to make every effort to ensure that nuclear weapons are never used again under any circumstances.”

That phrase “under any circumstances” is important, because it sets an early marker that the parties to the treaty reject the argument frequently made by nuclear-armed states and those in extended deterrence relationships with nuclear-armed states, that they must continue to rely on nuclear weapons and be



prepared to use them, “if necessary,” for their own national security.

This has been IPPNW’s message for almost 40 years, and the implicit reference to our evidence about nuclear famine and the climate effects of nuclear war in one of the first sentences of the draft is a clear indication of the impact this evidence has had on the entire process leading up to this moment. The recognition early in the draft of “the suffering of the victims of the use of nuclear weapons (Hibakusha) as well as those affected by the testing of nuclear weapons” is appropriate and essential. Provisions in the operative sections of the draft treaty assert the rights of those victims, including their right to medical, social, and economic assistance.

Article 1 of the draft treaty lists prohibitions against development, production, manufacture, acquisition, possession and stockpiling of nuclear weapons. There are also specific prohibitions against nuclear testing; the use of nuclear weapons; the transfer or receipt of nuclear weapons, directly or indirectly, “to any recipient”; and assisting anyone to engage in any prohibited activities.

Additional articles in the draft deal with implementation measures, such as verification procedures for states that join the treaty once they have eliminated their nuclear weapons.

Article 13 requires each state party to “encourage States not party to this Convention to ratify, accept, approve or accede to this Convention, with the goal of attracting the adherence of all States to this Convention.” This is a clear indication that the ban treaty is viewed by the negotiators not only as a legal instrument prohibiting nuclear weapons, but also as a political tool intended to bring pressure upon the nuclear-armed and nuclear-dependent states to eliminate their outlawed weapons.

The draft stipulates that the treaty will be of unlimited duration, is not subject to reservations (although amendments are possible), and will enter into force once it has been ratified by 40 states.

The draft appears to capture most of the elements on which there was consensus or near-consensus during the March negotiating session. Debate will continue in June on some unresolved topics.

With a strong draft now in hand and three more weeks of negotiations beginning on June 15, during which the final treaty can be made even stronger in order to close the legal gap completely, it’s important that all governments now prove their commitment to a world without nuclear weapons by participating in this historic process to outlaw them.

## IPB Program – UN Ban treaty Negotiations

*June 17 - July 5, 2017 | New York*

---

### PARLIAMENTARIANS' ACTIONS TO PROHIBIT NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Tuesday, June 20 | 1.15 - 2.30 pm | CR B

Acronym Institute for Disarmament Research (UK), CND (UK), IPB, Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung NYC and PAX (International / the Netherlands) invite you to

#### a Roundtable Discussion

about **democratic strategies to take forward and implement the nuclear ban in nuclear-armed and umbrella states** with parliamentarians from:

Germany - Jan van Aken  
Scotland - Bill Kidd  
United Kingdom - Caroline Lucas

---

### LESSONS FROM CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL CONVENTIONS FOR THE BAN TREATY

Thursday, June 22 | 10 am - 1 pm | CR B

Moderation: *Arielle Denis*, IPB, France

- **Jan van Aken**, MdB, Germany
- **John Burroughs**, IALANA, USA

Organised by IALANA, IPB & Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung NYC

---

### CONTENT OF THE BAN TREATY “OVERCOING CONTROVERSIES”

Wednesday, June 28 | 1.15 - 2.30 pm | CR B

Moderation: *Lucas Wirl*, IALANA, Germany

How to find common ground for the ban treaty and how can civil society and peace movements contribute.

- **Arielle Denis**, IPB, France
- **Sergio Duarte**, Pugwash, Brazil
- **Daniel Högsta**, ICAN, Sweden
- **Elizabeth Minor**, Article 26, USA

Organised by IPB & Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung NYC

---

## **IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPACT OF THE BAN TREATY**

Wednesday, July 5 | 1.15 - 2.30 pm | CR B

Moderation: *Joseph Gerson*, AFSC-US, USA

“How can civil society and peace movements contribute to a successful implementation process and get countries to become part of the ban treaty”?

- **Kevin Martin**, Peace Action, USA
- **Linnet Ngayu**, African Council of Religious Leaders, Kenya
- **Susi Snyder**, PAX, the Netherlands
- **Lucas Wirl**, IALANA, Germany

Organised by IALANA, IPB & Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung NYC

---

## **WOMEN'S MARCH TO BAN THE BOMB**

Saturday, June 17 | 12.00 –4.00 pm  
New York City

12.00 pm | Meeting at the assembly point: Bryant Park along W40th Ave street  
12.30 pm | Beginning of the March from Dag Hammarskjold Plaza  
4.00 pm | End

---

## **SPECIAL EVENT**

IALANA will present the lawyers' letter on the abolition of nuclear weapons during the second week of the negotiations.

To read the letter and get more information visit:

[www.IALANA.info](http://www.IALANA.info)

---



## NATO Summit in Brussels: Armament and war but also „we will not be silent!“

At the NATO Summit in Brussels US President Trump wants to collect imaginary debts and the European heads of state reiterate their willingness to spend 2% of GDP on armament. A large wave of armament is coming, for Germany 2% military spending means an increase from 37 billion Euro to 69 billion Euro, for Europe an increase of 200 billion to more than 300 billion Euro. The Europe of crisis and joblessness should pay for preposterous interventions and wars while the military industry rejoices. And there will be cuts in education, science, health care and environment.

The Summit agreed on NATO's participation in the so called "war on IS". In reality this "war on IS" is a series of illegal wars in which Germany now will participate more actively than before. This so called "war on IS" brings terror to a whole region and therefore is provoking terroristic acts. An even more brutal war of bombs will follow with NATO's decision. The majority of the victims are the innocent. Each innocent death strengthens IS and allied "groups of terrorists". The war in and for Syria will be increased turning the whole region into an even more difficult to control tinderbox. The continuous war on terror will also fail because wars do not solve problems but solely increase them by destabilizing whole societies, countries and regions.



© Lucas Wirl

The "3 Cs" of the summit – cash, capabilities, contributions – can be easily translated into more money for modern weapons and for more wars worldwide.

But Brussels was more than a city of the active and cold warriors.

More than 12,000 protesters were marching through Brussels in a colorful, young, broad, impressive and loud demonstration on 24 May. For many hours a trail of peace was moving through the city of Brussels. The actions were creative, musical and international. Many countries with many slogans – an impressive atmosphere. Everywhere "no to NATO" was echoing through the streets. The common demeanor for peace activists, critics of globalization, gender activists, and environmentalists was a clear "no" to further armament. This demand forged a broad coalition of resistance with diverse political backgrounds.



© Lucas Wirl

More than 200 people attended to counter summit of the Belgian and international peace movement on 25 May. It was characterized by its internationalism and by discussions on challenges to peace. In an atmosphere of solidarity and mutual tolerance several common points became obvious:

- The peace movements' challenge is to work against the new round of armament towards the 2% of GDP and to struggle for real disarmament: disarmament for development and disarmament for the solution of the social and global challenges. The participants of the conference were prepared to work more intensively towards achieving these challenges.
- The UN ban treaty of nuclear weapons must become reality. There needs to be nuclear disarmament instead of the modernization of nuclear weapons. This is the message to all nuclear weapons states. And Europe finally has to become free of nuclear weapons.
- Cooperation instead of confrontation is not only meaningful but necessary and possible. Especially with Russia. All enemy constructions and bashings serves the preparations of war.

- An end to wars of intervention – in Mali, Afghanistan and many other places of NATO's wars – is the condition and requirement for a peaceful and just development of the world.

NATO wants to “effectively evaluate” its Brussels decisions of armament and war. We will annually answer with a evaluation for peace highlighting the peaceful alternatives to this politics.

In conclusion, a strict “No to NATO” and a continuous delegitimation of NATO is necessary. Aim has to be the overcoming of NATO. NATO and global peace are not compatible. Peaceful cooperation is needed. These main positions of the international network No to War – No to NATO were broadly agreed upon.

This will only become reality with a broad, manifold and diverse but also commonly active and mobilizing international peace movement.

To make peace great again was the “homework” some participants of the counter summit felt like taking back home with them.

The optimistic atmosphere of the protests and the counter summit encourage to reach this great aim. The next actions, among others at the G-20 summit in Hamburg or the protests at Air Base Ramstein will be a next gauge – not just for Germany.



© Lucas Wirl





**June 20th, World Refugee Day | Marienstrasse 19-20, 10117 Berlin | 4-6pm**

**An estimated 12 million people live in refugee camps worldwide and only 0.1% are resettled, repatriated, or integrated into normal society each year.**

The feature-length documentary, *Warehoused*, explores the plight of long-term refugees living in Dadaab, Kenya, one of the world's largest refugee camps. We see the camp's inner workings through one man's journey to do everything in his power to provide for his family. This man's story is not unique however; it accentuates the much larger problems that long-term refugees have faced for centuries.



V.i.S.d.P.: Reiner Braun, IPB  
Design: Noé Cassi, IPB  
Cover Images © Warehoused

## Global Justice – a fairytale?

### *IPB at the International Student Week of Technical University of Ilmenau Lucas Wirl*

From May 12-21 the [International Student Week \(ISWI\)](#) took place at TU Ilmenau. ISWI is a biannual conference started in 1993 by students who after the first conduction created a non-profit organization to ensure the continuity and transfer of knowledge of ISWI. The contact to ISWI goes back to the IPB World Congress 2016 in Berlin, where one of the ISWI-organizers participated in the youth gathering.

For IPB Alicia Cabeduzo and Reiner Braun were present. Alicia spoke on Alicia Cabeduzo – Education for Global Justice – Vision, Goals and Actions. Reiner Braun participated in a panel discussion on “Social Engagement – why?” with other representatives of civil society. Furthermore, IPB participated in an exhibition called FairFair. Here the organization could

present itself and discuss with interested persons on their agenda. The stand at the FairFair was taken care of by Lucas Wirl.

The ISWI was a great exchange of information and making IPB known in student circles in Germany and beyond. Most debated issues at the FairFair stand were military spending and military research. In a workshop conducted by IPB, INES and Scientists for Peace the issue of military research, also at Technical University of Ilmenau, was presented and discussed.

We are hopeful that a lasting relationship to ISWI is growing and we are looking forward to participating in it in 2019.

Get more information about the

**White Book for Peace**

from

**Le Mouvement de la Paix**

at

<https://www.mvtpaix.org/wordpress/le-livre-blanc-pour-la-paix-un-ouvrage-collectif/#>

## Global Solidarity Summit

July 5-6, Hamburg, Germany

### Globalization reloaded—The G20 and global crisis management

Neoliberal globalization brought about the major crisis of capitalism which has taken on different forms since 2007—from the mortgage crisis in the US to the global financial crisis to the crisis of the euro, which in the end undermined European cohesion and provoked political crises in a number of countries.

We are currently confronted with a rise of authoritarian populism, nationalism, and racism, as well as protectionist tendencies. The G20 considers itself a global crisis manager, but given the opposing national interests and political approaches taken by Trump, Merkel, Erdogan, and others, is it capable of taking action at all?

How is BRICS, the club of rising economic powers, positioning itself in light of changing political and economic power relationships? Does it stand for alternatives or for old wine in new bottles?

What do changes in the work environment due to digitalization and automation mean for workers' rights and union representation? What are the implications of post-industrialism in our societies and catch-up development in the global South? How are we handling new technologies to combat global warming? How are all these challenges changing social and gender relations? How can deepening of the inequality between and within our countries be prevented?

**Wednesday, 5 July 2017**

**4:30 to 6:30 pm**

### Peace politics beyond NATO and the militarization of the EU — Alternatives for peace

NATO is now expanding to become active at the global scale. It is involved in militarizing international relations in Asia, Latin America, and Africa, too. Cooperation agreements with Japan, South Korea, Singapore, the Philippines, Australia, and Thailand involving intense military cooperation were concluded at the NATO summits in Wales and Warsaw. All this goes far beyond the inclusion of non-members in the context of the "Partnership for Peace."

Many of these new cooperation partners are G20 countries, so the challenges faced by NATO are increasingly linked to the G7 and G20 summits. But international law is constantly being violated elsewhere as well; the law of the powerful prevails, not the power of the law; the UN as the institution of international law is pushed aside or instrumentalized. Peace requires law and disarmament.

Panelists:

**Colonel Ann Wright** (US peace movement, Codepink)

**Corazon Valdez Fabros** (Spokesperson, Stop the War Campaign, Philippines)

**Rainer Braun** (Co-President, International Peace Bureau, Germany)

**Nuray Sancar** (Peace movement in Turkey/Deputy Chair, Emek Partisi (Labour Party))



Facilitators: **Willi van Ooyen** (Bundesausschuss Friedensratschlag), **Kristine Karch** (No to war—No to NATO).

**Thursday, 6 July 2017**

**4:30 to 6:30 pm**

**Cooperation, not confrontation—How can we implement common security as a paradigm for future policy?**

The policy of confrontation with Russia and China is resulting in a dramatic global military build-up. Common interests are being set aside in favor of a political, economic, and ideological confrontation, which devours disproportional amounts of resources worldwide that are no longer available for social or ecological issues. A policy of confrontation endangers peace and may lead to war, even to major (nuclear) wars. The alternative is a policy of détente and common security.

Panelists:

**Norman Paech** (Expert on international law, Germany)

**Kate Hudson** (General Secretary, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), UK)

**Colonel Ann Wright** (Whistleblower, Codepink, US peace movement, USA)

**Arielle Denis** (International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN), France)

Facilitator: **Hamburger Forum & Bremer Friedensforum**

Disarmament and the abolition of nuclear weapons are key elements of cooperative security policy.

Civil society must fight for the rule of law as well as peace and cooperation around the world against those who benefit politically and economically from military build-ups, war, and destruction. Our panel discussion is to identify strategies through which our efforts can succeed.



## International Congress on Military Bases

### And their importance for global wars

September 8 – 9, 2017

Versöhnungskirche, Leipzigerstraße 5,  
67663 Kaiserslautern

Without global military bases wars would be impossible. For that reason, the closure and conversion of these bases, for example to civil production places, is a fundamental aim of the international peace movement.

US-military bases are predominant in foreign countries. Their presence is legitimised by contracts with “hosting state”. These contracts can be terminated successfully, as examples in Latin America and Central Asia have shown. The German government could cancel the agreement on the Air Base Ramstein as well. With this congress, we aim to critically examine the geo-strategic role of military

bases and to illustrate the demands and chances of movements within the realm of civil society. In the past there were already established very good starting points for a worldwide network against military bases.

The goal is to reactivate this cooperation. We are pleased about the participation of numerous international guests, who are able to give an overview of the current developments in their home countries and with whom we are planning to establish a new cooperation in terms of an international resistance.

### Friday, 8 Sept | 1 - 6 pm

1 - 3 pm	<p><b>Opening Speeches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Welcome Speech (Connie Burkert-Schmitz, Karl-Heinz Peil)</li> <li>· Global Military Bases and their geostrategic importance (Ann Wright)</li> <li>· The importance of US Ramstein as Military Base (Fee Strieffler/ Wolfgang Jung)</li> </ul> <p>Moderation: Pascal Luig, Cooperation for Peace</p>
3.30 - 5.30 pm	<p><b>Working Groups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Global Military Bases (Karl-Heinz Peil)</li> <li>· The relevance of US Ramstein (Fee Strieffler/Wolfgang Jung)</li> <li>· Military Bases within the global NATO-Strategy (Klaus Hartmann)</li> <li>· Social and ecologic effects of Military Bases, regarding the gender aspect (Kristine Karch)</li> </ul>
5 pm	<p><b>Poster Session</b> to present the mentioned Military Bases</p>

**Saturday, 9 Sept | 9.30 am - 1.30 pm**

9.30 - 11.30 am	<p><b>Panel Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Examples for local resistance, i.a.:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Okinawa, Japan: Ikuko Ueno (Secretary General of Nago City Peace Committee)</li><li>· South Korea: Hohyun Choi (People's United Party)</li><li>· Shannon, Ireland: Michael Youlton, John Lennon (IAWM)</li><li>· USA: Ann Wright (Codepink)</li><li>· Great Britain: Dave Webb (CND)</li><li>· Estonia</li></ul></li><li>· Presentation of planned local activities: for example at Büchel, Jagel, Ramstein, Eucom, Kalkar</li></ul>
12 1.30 pm	<p><b>Final Round</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Strategic considerations</li><li>· Concept of networking, i.a. with Claudia Haydt (IMI), Anne Rieger („Bundesauschuss Friedensratschlag“), Ann Wright, Michael Youlton, Ikuko Ueno.</li><li>· Closing Words: Reiner Braun</li></ul>

The International Congress about Military Bases is part of the project „Stopp Air Base Ramstein“ (<https://www.ramstein-kampagne.eu/>).

Participants who are explicitly interested into the congress, are also welcome.

The congress will be held in German and English.

Please register at: [info@ramstein-kampagne.eu](mailto:info@ramstein-kampagne.eu)

## **First announcement World Peace Youth Conference 2018**

**First week of September or first week of October in Berlin**

The world of the 21st century appears to be full of ideas and concrete steps leading to a more peaceful, just and sustainable future. Our vision is a world in peace and without war and violence. A peaceful world is the basis for societal progress as peace is not everything, but everything is nothing without peace. Disarmament and peacebuilding are first important steps towards peace. However, achieving peace is only possible with actions for peace starting from the individual level.

Young people are agents of change and need to discuss and exchange on these matters much more. We want to organize to amplify our voices and to engage much more in peace processes and struggles for societal progress. This in conclusion means that we should exchange with stakeholders on eye-to-eye level.

The world youth congress is a youth-led congress, contributing to the vision of a world in peace and without war and to the vision of a more peaceful, just and sustainable future. The idea of the youth congress derives from the preparatory process of the youth gathering of the IPB World Congress "Disarm! For a Climate of Peace – Creating an Action Agenda" ([www.ipb2016.berlin](http://www.ipb2016.berlin)). Some of the discussions of this congress will be continued at the world youth congress.

The congress will focus on steps of transformation towards a more peaceful, just and sustainable future. This will be achieved by informal learning, developing senses for personal responsibility, by achieving ways for concrete actions. The youth Congress will engage youth from various different backgrounds and with varying perspectives and approaches to peace, justice and sustainability as well as diverse experts and lays from different fields related to the congress' issues.

The congress is being prepared by the IPB Youth Network It is the youth branch of IPB. The IPB Youth Network sees itself as an open network. It aims to provide a platform for discussion,

exchange and common action for young people working on peace and demilitarization. The first large common action is the world conference youth, demilitarisation, and transformation in 2018. This is being discussed and prepared right now in frequent phone calls with participants from Africa, the Americas, Europe, and Asia.

**Editorial:** Amela Škiljan  
IPB  
Marienstraße 19-20  
10117 Berlin  
Germany  
[www.ipb.org](http://www.ipb.org)