

Chapter 6

Problems and Objections

I happen to like war. It kills off a lot of rascals and clears the air.

Tonini, in *Don Camillo and the Prodigal Son*,
by Giovanni Guareschi

There have been many critics or opponents of the idea of world federation over the years. The ‘realists’ dismiss the idea as naive and impractical, while others see world government as downright dangerous, and liable to lead to an Orwellian super-state.

The arguments raised by these commentators need to be addressed.. It has to be shown that there are satisfactory and logical answers to their criticisms, or else the whole case for world federation falls to the ground. Furthermore, their analyses are extremely valuable in pin-pointing the obstacles to be overcome on the way to federation.

Luckily, there is always the crucial example of the European Union to show that a federation between sovereign states is feasible. The principles which have been adopted by the EU have been expressly designed to answer the objections of the critics and allay their fears.

The Problem of National Sovereignty

Members of the realist school of political science, led by men such as Professor Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago, have tended to regard world federalists as naive and Utopian dreamers, ignorant of the realities of world politics. International politics is all about the struggle for power, they claim. National leaders and national governments guard their sovereignty and independence jealously, and will never agree to give them up to a supranational authority.

The views of Morgenthau himself are not quite so negative as this would suggest. He actually agrees, in theory at least, that world government is the correct answer to the problem of warfare. “The argument of the advocates of the world state is unanswerable”, he says. “There can be no permanent international peace without a state extensive with the confines of the political world.”¹ He argues, however, that such a world state is simply not practicable or feasible at the present time. “No society exists coextensive with the presumed range of a world state. The nation is the recipient of man’s highest secular loyalties. Beyond it there are other nations, but no community for which man would be willing to act regardless of what he understands the interests of his own nation to be. In other words, the peoples of the world are not ready to accept world government, and their overriding loyalty to the nation erects an insurmountable obstacle to its establishment.”² A little later he concludes that “a world state cannot be established under the present moral, social, and political conditions of the world. In no period of modern history was civilization more in need of permanent peace and hence, of a world state, and in no period of modern history were the moral, social, and political conditions less favourable for the establishment of a world state. There can be no world state without a world community willing and able to support it.”³

Thus Morgenthau’s primary conclusion is that a world community must precede a world state. He goes on to discuss ways in which such a world community might be built up,

through the functional approach, and by international organizations like UNESCO, NATO, and the European Communities. For the time being, he concludes, we must content ourselves with the amelioration of conflict by means of diplomacy.

The problem of national sovereignty was already noted three hundred years ago by William Penn, who examined the proposition: "*That Sovereign Princes and States will hereby become not Sovereign: a Thing they will never endure*". He answers that this is a Mistake: "*they remain as Sovereign at Home as ever they were. Neither their Power over their People, nor the usual Revenue they pay them is diminished. So that the Sovereignties are as they were, for none of them have now any Sovereignty over one another: And if this be called a lessening of their Power, it must be only because the great Fish can no longer eat up the little ones, and that each Sovereignty is equally defended from Injuries, and disabled from committing them.*"⁴ Under a federal system, the internal sovereignty of national governments over their own people would remain essentially the same, guaranteed by the principle of *subsidiarity*.

It must be admitted, however, that the nation-states would lose much of their individual freedom of action in external relations. There is no blinking the fact that any national government would be making a very large commitment by joining a world federation. As Inis Claude has said: "The leaders of nations and their constituents must be prepared to subordinate to the requirements of the collective security system their apparent and immediate national interest - to incur economic loss and run the risk of war, even in situations where the national interest does not seem to be involved, or when this policy seems to conflict with the national interest or to undermine established national policies. This means that states must renounce both pacifism and the right to use war as an instrument of national policy, while standing to resort to force for the fulfillment of their international obligations."⁵ In return for this sacrifice, of course, the states would receive a guarantee of their own security, along with other great benefits from the federation.

This loss of sovereignty over external relations is perhaps more apparent than real. It has often been pointed out that states are not free to do exactly as they please in foreign affairs. They are constrained by international treaties and conventions. They cannot dictate policies to other states, but must sit down and negotiate new agreements with them by diplomatic means. A world federation would merely provide more formal mechanisms for arriving at these agreements and regulating them. Even the security commitments mentioned above are not very different to those made by a nation entering an alliance, for example. The only difference is that a nation may find it easier to evade its obligations under an alliance agreement.

If the realist critique was intended to prove that nations will never voluntarily abridge or diminish their sovereignty under any circumstances, then it was clearly wrong. Two notable counter-examples have occurred since World War II. One was when the Soviet Union voluntarily withdrew its forces from Eastern Europe under Mikhail Gorbachev. The second and much more important example has been the gradual integration of the nations of Western Europe to form the European Union. This has demonstrated that national statesmen and their constituents can, very occasionally, show enough vision and foresight to give up part of their national sovereignty for the common good. Politics does not always consist solely of a naked struggle for power.

It is certainly true, however, that national sovereignty forms a major obstacle to world federation. Under normal circumstances, national leaders *are* very reluctant to give up any of their power, and they will take a great deal of convincing before they will admit it is necessary. The resistance of nationalist leaders like Charles de Gaulle and Margaret Thatcher in Europe has demonstrated the powerful hold of national sovereignty on the popular imagination. This has been the factor primarily responsible for the slow pace of European integration. The battle between the federalists and the nationalists still continues to

this day, and the balance between the two camps will ultimately determine the shape of the European federation. This is no more than a normal and healthy political process. A similar process of ‘punctuated evolution’ may be expected to occur as the eventual world federation takes shape: for a long time nothing will happen, and then every so often a shift will occur, and a step forward will be taken.

The Problem of Diverse Values

We come now to an even more fundamental question. Is the sense of community and solidarity between the peoples of the world yet strong enough to form the basis for a world federation? Are the values which are shared between them sufficient? It is difficult to assess the answers to these questions, but they are crucial to the viability of the whole idea.

Many writers in the past have given a negative answer. “For a machinery of central justice to work satisfactorily, its judgments would have to be based upon a worldwide community of values”, said W.T.R. Fox, for instance. “That community of values does not exist today.”⁶ The theologian Reinhold Niebuhr wrote an essay in 1949 on *The Illusions of World Government*, in which he argued very forcefully that no world government can be created without the prior existence of a world community, which in turn requires the gradual growth of what he calls “social tissue”. “The fallacy of world government can be stated in two simple propositions”, he claims. “The first is that governments are not created by fiat (though sometimes they can be imposed by tyranny). The second is that governments have only limited efficacy in integrating a community ... Governments cannot create communities for the simple reason that the authority of government is not primarily the authority of law nor the authority of force, but the authority of the community itself. Laws are obeyed because the community accepts them as corresponding, on the whole, to its conception of justice.”⁷

Niebuhr admitted that the international community is not totally lacking in social tissue, noting for instance the increasing economic interdependence among nations, their fear of mutual annihilation, and the moral sense of obligation to their fellow-men. The primary differences in the conception of justice in the world do not spring from religious and cultural differences between east and west, he argued. “The primary differences arise from a civil war in the heart of western civilization, in which a fanatical equalitarian creed has been pitted against a libertarian one .. Russia has become the national center of the equalitarian creed, while America has become the outstanding proponent of the libertarian one.”⁸

Finally, Niebuhr concluded that “the forces which are operating to integrate the world community are limited. To call attention to this fact does not mean that all striving for a higher and wider integration of the world community is vain. That task must and will engage the conscience of mankind for ages to come. But the edifice of government which we build will be sound and useful if its height is proportionate to the strength of the materials from which it is constructed.”⁹

During the period of the Cold War, it was perfectly clear that the sceptics were right. The East and West had different economic systems, Communist versus capitalist, as well as different political systems, totalitarian versus democratic. The two systems were competing in a bitter struggle for world power and influence. There was never more than a forlorn hope that they would recognize sufficient community of interest to join together in a world federation. As David Mitrany remarked, “if a federal house cannot be half free or half slave, neither can it be half capitalist and half communist.”¹⁰

The picture has changed dramatically since the fall of the Soviet Union. The Communist system was unable to meet the aspirations of the people. Russians became fed up with the inconvenience of having to queue for hours to purchase a loaf of bread, for example, and in the end the system collapsed like a house of cards, to the great surprise of the rest of the world. The remaining Communist superpower in China has meanwhile embraced capitalism

in practice, while nominally remaining Communist in theory, and has so far escaped the fate of the Soviets. The Western doctrines of free enterprise and capitalism in the economic sphere, and liberty and democracy in the political sphere, rule virtually unchallenged in the theoretical arena. Socialism remains a living ideal, but even the socialist parties in the West seem to be falling over themselves to embrace 'economic rationalism'. Thus the great civil war in the heart of western civilization has been resolved, and there has been a major convergence of values between the two sides. That is the argument of Francis Fukuyama.

More recently, Samuel Huntington has challenged the Fukuyama thesis on behalf of the realists. He sees major fault-lines remaining between the "declining" civilization of the West and the growing civilizations of Asia and Islam, which adhere to different values. The concepts of individual liberty and political democracy are unique to Western civilization. Huntington rejects the ideas of multiculturalism and "universalism". Claims that Western values are universally relevant are false, immoral and dangerous: - immoral, because they are imposing Western values on other societies, and dangerous, because they lead to undue interference by the West in other people's affairs, which could even lead to war between the civilizations. He argues that the West should pull up the drawbridge, and mind its own business. My viewpoint here is very much closer to Fukuyama's than Huntington's.

What exactly are the common values which would be sufficient to form the basis for a world federation? Of course there is no necessity for all values to be held in common: the watchword is "unity in diversity". The federation should be able to embrace different religions, different social systems and different political and economic systems. The basic requirements consist of an agreed set of common goals, based on common interests, and an agreed set of principles of association, upon which a loose federal structure could be built.

The common goals were discussed in Chapter 1, and can be summarized in terms of the five great world order values: peace, economic well-being, social justice, ecological stability, and positive identity for all. There is unlikely to be much dispute about these general aims. The World Order Models Project team, which includes participants from all over the world, has spent a good deal of effort ensuring that they express universal aspirations.¹¹ The mere existence of the United Nations already testifies to the fact that the nations of the world recognize a number of common interests, and are willing in some degree to associate to meet these aims.

In the previous chapter we have tried to identify the basic principles of association upon which a world federation could be founded: the major ones are democracy, the rule of law, subsidiarity, human rights and solidarity. They have already been endorsed by the countries of the European Union (i.e. the West); and the United Nations has also recognized them through its Charter and Conventions, with the single exception of the principle of democracy. Democracy has not yet been universally adopted, but it offers advantages which are universally applicable - whether it originated in the West or not is irrelevant. The prime examples of India and Japan show that a democratic system can take root and flourish in a non-Western context.

It all comes back again, perhaps, to the problem of transition. Morgenthau and Niebuhr are perfectly correct in saying that a world government cannot be created in a single giant leap, by means of a grand constitutional convention, unless a sufficient sense of world community already exists. A worldwide consensus for change would be needed, which has certainly not existed up to the present time. The sense of international community is growing stronger year by year, as exemplified by festivals like the Olympic Games, where the whole world can admire the endurance of distance runners from Ethiopia or South Africa, say, or the grace of springboard divers from China. Nevertheless, the world still does not appear ready for complete political integration, achieved in one fell swoop.

The more relevant question is whether the world might be ready to begin the integration process in a more gradual and evolutionary fashion, following the European example. After

all, the sense of community cannot have been very strong when the European Coal and Steel Community was founded in 1950, only five years after the battles and massacres of World War II. The loyalty of European citizens towards the EU is still not very strong, even today. Yet the Europeans were able to recognize some common needs and common purposes, which were sufficient to allow the association to establish itself and grow. The political superstructures of Europe have been built in a stepwise fashion, in tandem with various slowly growing “social tissues”. Can we now begin to duplicate this process on the world stage?

The Problem of Enforcement

Within its sphere of responsibility, the federation must have the right to make binding regulations and legislation, with a ‘police force’ or security force empowered if necessary to enforce that law. Many people have agonized over the difficulty of enforcing laws upon an autonomous member state. A nation obviously cannot be treated like an individual criminal malefactor, and clapped up in a prison cell. If a serious disagreement were to arise between the federation and a member state, and the federation attempted to impose a solution by force, the result could be an outbreak of civil war, which would be catastrophic for all parties.

This problem has been discussed by Inis Claude in his book *Power and International Relations*. He makes an analogy with the problem of dissident groups within an individual nation. If a disagreement arises between the national government and a dissident group, such as a trade union for instance, then the best way of settling the problem is by a process of political adjustment, rather than coercion. The dissident group will in general have legitimate interests or grievances, which need to be accommodated by means of discussions and political compromises. The use of force only hardens attitudes on both sides, and makes things worse; it should be considered very much as a last resort.

The best analogy of all is that of the relationship between the states and the federal government in one of the existing federal systems, such as the USA. The state governments, by and large, are made up of practical and responsible men and women. If a disagreement arises with the national government, it will either be settled by political means, or referred to a court for adjudication. The judgement of the court, after any appeals process has been gone through, will generally be automatically accepted. Thus the problem of enforcement hardly ever arises. The modern, democratic federal systems of Canada, Australia and Germany, for example, have never experienced the final calamity of a civil war during their entire existence.

One great exception to this rule was of course the American Civil War, fought out over the issues of abolition of slavery and states’ rights, which was indeed very destructive. One can never guarantee that such disasters will not occur; but at least they are very rare within democratic states. As Inis Claude remarks, “Americans today regard civil war as unthinkable; the threat and reality of such internal disorder has become a historical memory. This fundamental change of outlook seems to me to be based upon confidence in the adequacy of our political process for working out compromises and promoting accommodations of interest among the diverse and overlapping groups which constitute American society. We expect to be able to cope with disaffected or recalcitrant groups not by imprisoning their leaders but by negotiating with them.”¹²

Thus one expects that a serious problem of law enforcement upon member states will seldom if ever arise; and if it does arise, it will usually be settled by some process of political adjustment. A remarkable example is provided by the European Union. The EU at the present time has no security force of its own, and no way of physically enforcing community law; yet it has hardly even noticed the lack. The member states usually obey their legal

obligations under the treaties in an essentially automatic fashion.

There are several different ways in which the federation could penalize a member state without resorting to force, including fines, forfeitures, embargoes and sanctions. The European Commission was given the right to fine member states under the Maastricht Treaty. Just recently the Commission has announced that it will impose fines in a number of relatively minor cases in which a state, despite being condemned in the European Court of Justice, has still not acted on Union law. One case concerned some professional teachers who were prevented from opening a language school in Greece, despite having valid qualifications from the UK.¹³ It is already routine for the Commission to fine companies for taking part in unlawful cartels or other restrictive trade practices. Thus we have some concrete examples of how federal law would work in practice.

The enforcement problem does, however, provide another reason for restricting membership of the federation to democratic states. Non-democratic states are often run by a single autocrat rather than a democratic group, and are thus much less responsible and more prone to conflict.¹⁴ Hence the enforcement problem would be likely to arise much more frequently, and in more serious forms, if non-democratic states were admitted to the federation.

Another aspect of the problem concerns what are called 'non-justiciable' disputes. The war in Vietnam, for instance, began as an anti-colonial revolt, and then developed into a struggle between two different ideological systems, capitalist and Communist. There was never any possibility that the issues could be settled in a court of law, or that both sides would even recognize the jurisdiction and legitimacy of the same court. Similarly, the continuing outbreaks of violence between the Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland, or the Muslims and Hindus in Kashmir, or the Croats, the Serbs and the Muslims in Yugoslavia, are not disputes which can be settled in a court of law. The antagonism between these communities has deep historical roots, which cannot be removed at the stroke of a judge's gavel.

Grant Gilmore has commented that "there are some issues which it is not healthy to bring before an international court because they escape or transcend judicial competence. 'Adjudication' of such issues will be fruitless and inconclusive at best, and at worst prejudicial to peace."¹⁵ He states that "the function of courts is essentially conservative - to maintain, or to settle incidental disputes within the framework of, a status quo satisfactory to the [community]. When the existing order is radically altered, courts go out of business for a time. Revolution and war are not justiciable .."¹⁶

How would a world federation cope with issues like these? There is no easy answer to this question, and it is idle to suggest otherwise. The settlement of major conflicts and adjustments to the status quo are political questions rather than legal ones. Ethnic and religious conflicts are liable to break out periodically under any system, and the only real answer is for the different communities themselves to learn to accept each other and live in peace together. Many of these conflicts occur within national boundaries in any case, and would remain the responsibility of the national governments.

A world federation would nevertheless play a vital role in reducing and eventually eliminating these disputes. First of all, it would limit and control any international outbursts of violence, in the same way that the United Nations does now, but much more effectively. Secondly, it would provide new political and legal avenues for the settlement of grievances and disputes, thus removing the original causes of conflict. Disputes over territory or individual rights could be settled in the courts, while ideological and political contests could be settled at the ballot-box. Thus the causes and occasions for violence would be progressively reduced, and new armed disputes would be less likely to arise in the first place. The second phase of the Vietnam war might have been avoided, for instance, if South Vietnam had kept its promise to hold elections after the departure of the French from Indo-

China.

Despite this hopeful scenario, there can be no guarantee that organized violence would ever be eliminated entirely. Once a conflict between two different communities has begun, and fear and hatred have developed between them, it seems very hard to stop the violence. The Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland have had all the resources of liberal and democratic government at their disposal, and yet they have still found it difficult to live at peace. Infinite patience and time seem to be the only answers for deep-seated problems like these. We cannot hope to wave a magic wand and eliminate all wars and all violence overnight; but we can aim to progressively reduce their occurrence by providing other avenues for resolving tensions and settling disputes.

A detailed and exhaustive documentary history and analysis of the enforcement problem has been given by Benjamin Ferencz, formerly prosecutor at the Nuremberg war crimes tribunal, in a series of six volumes entitled *An International Criminal Court - A Step Toward World Peace*; *Defining International Aggression - The Search for World Peace*; and *Enforcing International Law - A Way to World Peace*. These works cover the issues in much greater depth than we can do here.

The Fear of Tyranny

There are many people who instinctively reject the whole idea of world federation. The phrase "world government" evokes for them a nightmare picture of a tyrannical world super-state, with all individual liberties crushed out under the jackbooted heels of a world police force resembling Hitler's SS squads. Their immediate reaction is to oppose any federalist proposals.

Much of the blame for this unfortunate state of affairs can be laid at the feet of authors such as Aldous Huxley and George Orwell. Their horrifying visions of the future seem to have become part of the global consciousness. All we can do here is to analyze these fears rationally, and show that the dangers are actually quite remote.

In *Brave New World*, Huxley satirized the visions of progress put forward by scientists and philosophers (such as his own relations, no doubt). He pictured a world in which humans were bred into different castes by eugenic techniques, and fed drugs to keep them happy and compliant. "A life-span without war, violence and the dread of cruel disease - is it not worth the silly slogans, the scent organ, the Feelies and the lack of an unknown freedom?" asks one of the supervisors.¹⁷ Ironically enough, Huxley himself was actually sympathetic to the idea of world federation. Although his main interest was the decentralization of power, he remarks in passing while discussing the problem of atomic weapons that "Enlightened self-interest will unquestioningly vote for world government, international inspection, and the pooling of information."¹⁸

George Orwell created even more powerful images in *Animal Farm* and especially in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. He pictured the state as 'Big Brother', controlling the population by the power of the Thought Police and the propaganda of the Ministry of Truth. "War is Peace. Freedom is Slavery. Ignorance is Strength" ran the slogans of the Ministry. "Big Brother is watching you." The hero Winston Smith is eventually broken by the interrogators under the threat of having his face being eaten by rats. Many people now seem to associate these images with the idea of world government!

Orwell's real intention was to satirize the totalitarian régimes of the time, such as Fascist Italy, Spain and Germany, and Stalinist Russia. He was certainly afraid that they might represent the future, and that the confrontation between East and West might end up with two or three monolithic and totalitarian super-states facing up against each other; but fortunately no such dreadful scenario has eventuated.

Many members of the peace movement seem to share these fears of tyranny. They reject

the Big Brother image of world government, and hold instead to the credo “Small is Beautiful”. Jonathan Schell, in a book on the elimination of nuclear weapons entitled *The Abolition*, writes as follows. “The heart sinks at the thought of world government not because it is “unrealistic” but because it is all too real. We want relief from the nuclear peril, but if we sign up for world government as the means of getting it we find that global institution after global institution is inexorably delivered on our doorstep thereafter, each one equipped to meddle in some area of our lives.”¹⁹ Later he remarks “if a lawless government were to assume control of the world .. the horror of the situation would be beyond all imagining. Even if one regards these worst-case nightmares of world government run amok as unlikely, the prospect of a supreme political power ruling over the whole world remains chilling. Anarchy is not liberty, yet it could be that in anarchy, with all its violence, the human spirit has greater latitude to live and grow than it would have in the uniform shadow of a global state.”²⁰ Unfortunately, this leaves him with no very credible alternative proposal for eliminating nuclear weapons.

Schell appears to be contemplating the old simplistic and unrealistic idea in which the sovereign nation-state is entirely superseded by a world government of universal extent and powers. But world federalists nowadays conceive a world in which the nation-state still exists, and regulates most aspects of national life just as it does now. Individual rights and freedoms would receive even firmer guarantees than they do at present, under the principle of human rights, according to conventions such as those recognized by the UN and the EU. Political freedoms would be guaranteed under the principles of democracy and the rule of law, as they are in Europe. International travel, trade and finance would certainly be regulated by the world federation, but these activities would be virtually transparent to the ordinary citizen, being overseen by expert international committees much as they are at present. How many of us can claim to have had a global institution “delivered on our doorstep”, or “meddling in our daily lives”?

Another example of this viewpoint is the book *The New World Order*, by the right-wing American broadcaster and evangelist Pat Robertson. Robertson claims to have uncovered a conspiracy between millionaire capitalists, the liberal Establishment, New Agers and Communists to foist world government upon us, and to extinguish the liberty and sovereignty of the American people. He apparently believes that this plot is inspired by the Devil! The theory is nonsensical, as most conspiracy theories are; but it is interesting to note that Robertson himself proposes the establishment of a Community of Democratic Nations, which leaves him not very far from our final position.

In the end, a world federation should actually *enhance* world freedom, and remove the threat of tyranny. In the present semi-anarchy of world affairs, there are still many states run by cruel and autocratic régimes, which regularly engage in arbitrary arrest, torture, and all sorts of horrible violations of human rights and dignity. Within a world federation, on the other hand, all such abuses would be forbidden under enforceable international law.

The only danger that could possibly arise would be the overthrow of the democratic government by some sort of coup. It would certainly be a catastrophe if any future world federation was subverted to become an autocracy or dictatorship, and every precaution would have to be taken to ensure that no such disaster could happen. All the usual ‘checks and balances’ would have to be built into the Constitution, including an independent judiciary and parliament, and a security force which is pledged to uphold the Constitution at all times. Perhaps even a ceremonial head of state might be necessary, charged with ensuring that the Constitution was upheld.

Experience has shown that the democratic form of government is very stable, once it is well established. The United States government has existed now for over two hundred years, and the idea of its being overthrown by a totalitarian group is virtually inconceivable, except in the fevered minds of pulp fiction writers. It is over three hundred years since the

last revolution in Britain, although the government has evolved substantially over that time. Many other examples might be quoted: the Nordic countries, Switzerland, Holland, Canada, Australia and New Zealand all have long traditions of peaceful democratic government. Japan and India are thriving examples of democracy in Asia.

There are some counter-examples which might be raised. Democracies have sometimes been supplanted by military juntas in South America, for example, where overthrowing the government has seemed at times to be a national sport. One can only plead that these countries were relatively undeveloped, both economically and politically, with a very small governing class and no strong democratic traditions. Another example is that of Germany in the 1930s, where Hitler was voted into power, and then overthrew the Weimar Republic. The circumstances there were very special, however. The Weimar Republic was newly established after World War I, and was tainted by association with the hated Versailles Peace Treaty, while the economy of Germany had been savagely battered first by war reparations and then by the onset of the Great Depression. These factors are more than enough to account for the fatal weakness of the fledgling Republic.

The stability question does provide a further reason for limiting membership of the world federation to democratic states. If the member states all have a strong and well-established democratic tradition, so that their citizens would never dream of attempting to subvert the government, then the federation itself will be stable and secure.

The final, clinching factor which would provide a virtually iron-clad guarantee of the federation's stability would be the support of the member states. The United States, for instance, would never stand idly by and allow the federation to be subverted by a non-democratic group. The other member states would likewise take action, and thus any attempt at subversion would be doomed to fail.

All this is illustrated once again by the European Union. The EU is often accused of bureaucratic meddling and officiousness, and the European Parliament needs to be given more power to restrain these annoyances; but that is a far cry from actual tyranny. No-one has ever seriously suggested that the Union is liable to be taken over by a totalitarian group, as far as I am aware. Such an idea is simply not within the bounds of practical possibility.

Thus the fear of world tyranny is really little more than a chimaera or fantasy. If a democratic world federation was once securely established, its overthrow or subversion would become virtually inconceivable. The present danger lies all in the opposite direction. The world security system today is far too weak, and needs to be strengthened - it seems perverse to worry about whether it might one day become too *strong*. The issue is essentially that of government versus anarchy. World federalists argue that we need a democratic world government to achieve peace and order in the international arena; whereas their opponents prefer to have no government at all, because of their fear of world tyranny. Yet on the domestic scene, they would mostly accept the necessity for a national government without question.

The Fear of Loss of Identity

Another objection sometimes raised by opponents of world federation is that it would lead to a loss of national and cultural identity for the member states. They fear a "homogenization" of world culture. It would certainly be a tragedy if all the fascinating and diverse societies of the world were to be replaced by a single bland and homogeneous world culture. But the principle of subsidiarity adopted by the EU is intended to prevent this: it declares that each nation and each region must be left free to manage its own affairs, whenever possible. We have already discussed how national sovereignty would be preserved, for the most part, under this principle. Cultural independence would be protected in a similar way. The preservation of cultural diversity is also a major aim of UNESCO and

the United Nations. The watchword is 'Unity in Diversity', once again.

The major threat to cultural diversity has nothing to do with government, in fact, but arises from the power of the global media. The worldwide reach of the American film and television industries means that we are all in danger of being submerged by the culture of Walt Disney and Hollywood. Perhaps this is the price we pay for belonging to the global village; but it has nothing to do with the question of world government. Each different culture will have to find its own way of withstanding the onslaught from the global media barons.

'War is Good'

Coming now to the less serious objections, there may be some people who would oppose common security and world federation on the grounds that war is a natural and useful aspect of human society. War is part of human nature, they might say, and will never be eradicated. War allows a stronger society to replace a weaker one, and thus leads to social progress and evolution. The law of "survival of the fittest" should continue to operate, for the good of human society. Even at the individual level, they might argue, war eliminates the weaker members of society in favour of the fitter and stronger ones, leading to improvement of the human race. It may even help to solve the problem of overpopulation!

Such savage arguments can hardly be taken seriously in this day and age. They would certainly be regarded as 'politically incorrect', and one can only expect to find them in the writings of a Nietzsche or an Adolf Schicklgruber. Let us only make a few brief remarks. Firstly, in the era of mass destruction, war is liable to kill both weak and strong without distinction. Bravery and strength are of no value against atomic bombs, or high-tech weapons guided by remote control. Secondly, there are more humane ways of dealing with the population problem. And finally, war has already been largely eliminated within the boundaries of the more advanced nation-states, and more peaceful and democratic means of political evolution have been developed. Surely it is time to try the same experiment on the world stage.

Want of Employment

There is one final objection which was raised by William Penn, namely: "That there will be a great Want of Employment for younger Brothers of Families; and that the Poor must either turn Soldiers or Thieves." The answers to this will be left as an exercise for the reader.

Summary and Conclusions

Even during the first flush of popular enthusiasm for world federalism, in the years immediately following the Second World War, there were plenty of critics to inject a more sober and realistic note into the discussion, such as Hans Morgenthau, Inis Claude, and the theologian Rienhold Niebuhr. Significantly, none of these commentators disagreed with the concept of world federation as the ultimate means of securing world peace; but they argued that it was an impractical and unrealistic aim at that point in time. Instead, they maintained, it was better to concentrate for the time being on more mundane and achievable targets, such as establishing functional co-operation between nations, strengthening international organizations like the UN, and establishing better diplomatic procedures for avoiding or settling international disputes.

Some enormous hurdles which must be surmounted on the way to world federation were identified. The strong attachment of each people to their own national sovereignty, the absence of any strong feeling of international community, and the lack of common values and social fabric make it very difficult to achieve the target. A large segment of popular opinion is

actually opposed to the idea of world federation, for fear that it might lead to worldwide tyranny. But the greatest of all obstacles in the early days was the deepening chasm between East and West. The onset of the Cold War and the increasing tension between the United States and the Soviet Union stifled all hopes of further integration between the nations for the time being, and led to a prolonged decline in the world federalist movement.

Almost fifty years have now passed since those early days, and some momentous changes have occurred. Gradually and imperceptibly, the “social tissue” of the world community has been strengthened. The old divisive forces of colonialism and apartheid have been vanquished. The structure of international law has been reinforced with a network of new treaties and conventions covering arms control and disarmament, human rights, the law of the sea, trade and development, and many other areas. There is a spreading consensus of international opinion on all these issues. Environmental problems have been recognized as another vital issue confronting the whole world in common. Joint peacekeeping operations have become a major focus of the United Nations. Most important of all, the Cold War has ended, the divisive symbol of the Berlin Wall has been torn down, and the nuclear arms race between the superpowers has been halted and reversed.

Meanwhile, the development of the European Union has provided a crucial example to show that the objections raised by the critics are not insuperable. National statesmen can occasionally be persuaded to cede a little of their sovereignty for the common good. The process of European integration was successfully begun, in pursuit of a well-defined common purpose, despite the fact that France and Germany had only recently been wartime adversaries, so that there was little sense of community between them. By now, the EU forms a loose and decentralized federation in all but name. It has encountered no significant problems in the enforcement of Union law. It has a stable and well-established political structure, providing secure guarantees of liberty to its citizens; and its overthrow by some sort of anti-democratic coup is virtually inconceivable.

The principles which have been adopted by the European Union have been designed to satisfy the doubts of the critics. The principles of democracy and human rights ensure that individual freedoms are protected, while the principles of subsidiarity, solidarity and participation ensure that national and regional identities and cultural diversity are preserved as far as possible. Experience has shown that a democratic federal structure is a very stable form of government, and that the member states may be expected to obey the federal laws in an almost automatic fashion.

One might question, perhaps, whether Europe really provides a good model for the rest of the world. The mutual understanding and common values shared within Europe are obviously much greater than those shared at a global level, and the impediments to federation are correspondingly much less. Nevertheless, the same principles should apply equally well in both cases.

Finally, our discussions have reinforced two of the tactical lessons drawn from the European experiment. The first is that integration is most likely to be achieved in a gradual and evolutionary fashion, starting from a smaller association of progressive states with limited aims and scope, and building upwards from there, as Jean Monnet and company did with the European Coal and Steel Community. The popular support and sense of community are still not strong enough in our global village to allow world federation to be established in one grand constitutional leap. It is better and safer to proceed in stages as the Europeans have done, pausing to consolidate and reinforce the cohesion within the association after each stage.

The second lesson to be drawn is that membership of the prototype association should be restricted to democratic states only. There are a number of compelling reasons for this, which can be recapitulated as follows. Firstly, it would violate the key principle of democracy to include a non-democratic state in the association, and would lead to

impossible constitutional and legal anomalies. Inclusion of a non-democratic state would violate many of the civil rights that ought to be guaranteed by the association; and the association could not tolerate a situation where, in guaranteeing the security and integrity of its members, it found itself propping up an autocracy or dictatorship. Secondly, democratic states are much less prone to conflict and to violations of international law than non-democratic ones. Given the huge difficulty and costs, both human and material, of enforcing international law against a recalcitrant nation-state, it is best to avoid such problems as far as possible by excluding non-democratic states from the outset. Furthermore, democratic states are much more stable politically, so that restricting membership to democracies would minimize the likelihood of internal instability in a member state, when the association might be forced to intervene to settle a domestic conflict. Finally, the restriction to democratic member states would ensure that the federal association itself remains stable and free from tyranny.

Many people will object that this would leave the non-democratic states out in the cold, including many of the poorer states of Africa and the Third World, thus violating many of the original aims of world federation. The answer to this is that the association would grow over time until eventually it would become universal, and embrace all the nations of the earth. Each nation, as it advanced politically and acquired a stable and democratic form of government, would 'graduate' as a member of the association. Over half the nations of the world already have democratic governments, although a number of them are democratic in name only, and are rated only 'partly free' by Freedom House. In concept, there is hardly any serious challenge to the principle of democracy in the world today; and the benefits flowing from membership of the association could provide an important incentive for nations to modernize their forms of government in order to qualify. In the meantime, the needs of the non-democratic states would be partly catered for through the United Nations, which is already universal.