

## Chapter 7

**How Do We Get There From Here?**

*“Then let us pray that come it may,  
 As come it will for a’ that,  
 That sense and worth, o’er a’ the earth,  
 May bear the gree and a’ that;  
 For a’ that and a’ that,  
 It’s coming yet for a’ that,  
 That man to man the warld o’er,  
 Shall brothers be for a’ that.”*

Robert Burns

If the final objective is world federation, by what path can we reach it? This is known in the trade as the “transition problem”, and it is an extremely difficult one to solve. Some of the hurdles to be overcome were discussed in the last chapter. It is impossible to predict exactly how the federation will eventually come about, but at least we can discuss some of the options which seem to be available at the present time.

*Reform of the United Nations*

The most obvious path would be a constitutional reform of the United Nations, to transform it into a genuine, democratic world federation of nations. This has been the primary aim of the World Federalists Association in the United States for many years. Proposal after proposal has been made, as outlined at the end of Chapter 3, but so far none of these efforts has had any success. The UN has never even convened a conference to review the Charter.

Many reasons might be found for this failure. One excuse commonly given is that the UN performs a useful though limited function as it stands, and that any attempt to amend the Charter might destroy the organization entirely. The Charter is extremely rigid and difficult to amend in any case. It requires the approval of all five permanent members of the Security Council, and a virtual consensus among the remaining 190-odd states in the General Assembly, to achieve any change. The UN is a huge and unwieldy organization, made up of nations of many disparate cultures and stages of development. As Morgenthau and Niebuhr pointed out long ago, the sense of community between them is weak, and the will to unite is not there. One cannot realistically expect all the member states to agree simultaneously on a revolutionary leap into an unknown, federal future - the hurdle is just too high, and no serious attempt has ever been made at the diplomatic level to overcome it. It might be better to look for some more gradual and evolutionary way forward, bypassing the UN for the moment, just as Jean Monnet bypassed the Council of Europe in setting up the ECSC.

In recent years, the federalists have fallen back on less ambitious proposals, such as the CAMDUN movement to set up a democratic Second Assembly of the UN, which could be introduced without requiring any formal amendment of the UN Charter. This is a useful and worthwhile proposal, which deserves to be supported. As a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, however, the new Assembly would have very little power or influence, and

would be in danger of becoming just another talkshop. It seems unlikely to provide the answer to our problem.

### *Enlargement of the European Union*

Another possible avenue might be the gradual enlargement of the European Union to become a world federation. The economic success of the community has already led to its expansion from the original six members to the present fifteen, with a long queue of prospective future members knocking on the door. A number of Mediterranean states are applying for membership, along with virtually all the former members of the Warsaw Pact in Eastern Europe. It is conceivable that Russia and other members of the CIS might also join in future years: Russia has always considered herself as a European power, and has already been admitted to the Council of Europe. In that case, the EU would already form a huge organization, embracing almost all of Europe and Northern Asia. Might it not then continue to expand in a gradual and peaceful fashion, until it embraced the entire world?

A little thought shows that this is an unlikely scenario, and probably unsuitable as well. The EU was never intended or designed to be a world organization. It has already rejected a membership application from Morocco, for example, on the grounds that Morocco is not a European nation; and the European Commission is actively encouraging the development of other regional organizations, among the Arab states, or in Africa. Furthermore, integration among the European nations has already proceeded further than would be possible or desirable in a world organization at present. It would hardly seem feasible to form a single market covering the entire globe, for instance, or to decree common citizenship with the right to work, live and study anywhere in the world. These might be worthy aims for the distant future, but at present the social and economic disparities are just too great. Europe might find itself swamped with millions of Chinese peasants looking for work, for example. It would probably be better to aim for a wider but shallower degree of integration at the world level for the time being.

### *The Functional Approach*

The functionalists such as David Mitrany would argue for what might be called the “look, no hands!” approach. The functional needs of the world community will demand their own solutions. Agencies and committees will be set up to handle these common problems, and little by little the various national sovereignties will be whittled away and transferred to the growing network of international agencies. There is no need to set up any formal political structures to achieve integration.

This functional integration has indeed been occurring at an ever-increasing pace over a period of some two centuries. The number and scope of international agencies and commissions has increased enormously since World War II, particularly in areas involving economic and technical co-operation, but also in the fields of international law, arms control and disarmament, and security matters. In 1989, there were nearly 300 international government organizations (IGOs) in existence, and 4624 international non-government organizations (INGOs).<sup>1</sup> These developments provide an indispensable underpinning for deeper political integration.

It was pointed out by neofunctionalists such as Ernst Haas, however, that the establishment of a true community, whether it be an economic, political or security community, does require a conscious act of political will. The deeper issues of national security and national sovereignty cannot be settled by default, or by stealth. “Functionalism and functional arrangements have little effect by themselves upon the eventual success or failure of efforts to establish amalgamated security communities”, argued Karl Deutsch. “The

outcome in each case is most likely to depend on other conditions and processes, particularly on how rewarding or unrewarding were the experiences associated with functional arrangements. The most that can be said for functionalism is that it avoids the perils of premature overall amalgamation, and that it gives the participating governments, élites, and peoples more time gradually to learn the habits and skills of more far-reaching, stable, and rewarding integration.<sup>2</sup> Functional co-operation is helping to build the “social tissue” of the world community, and laying the groundwork for an eventual world federation, but is not sufficient in itself to complete the process.

### *The Regional Approach*

Following the economic success of the European Common Market, organizations to promote economic integration and free trade have sprung up in many other regions of the globe. Recent examples have been the formation of the North American Free Trade Association (NAFTA) and the group for Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). Some other well-known associations are the Organization of American States (OAS), the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Nordic Council, and the League of Arab States. Economic integration is proceeding apace, although none of these other organizations has a political superstructure as powerful and well-developed as that of the European Union, and most remain as rather loose consultative groupings.

An interesting exception to this rule is the Andean Group, consisting of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela. In deliberate imitation of the European Community, they have aimed at both economic and political co-operation, and have established joint supranational bodies including an Andean Council, a Commission, a Parliament, a Court of Justice, and a “Junta”, which is a technical body to facilitate the fulfilment of the Cartagena Agreement which established the organization in 1969. The Parliament is directly elected, and comprises five members from each country. A common market has been established within the group, although some tariffs still remain, and trade within the group has been increasing by leaps and bounds.

These developments in regional integration represent important steps in the right direction, just as they did in the European case. Besides promoting economic development, each step in the integrative process makes the possibility of war between the member states more remote. Thus the association helps to bring peace and prosperity to the region.

The question at issue, however, is whether the process of regional integration will help to bring about world integration as well. Theorists of regional integration such as Ernst Haas, Amitai Etzioni and Joseph Nye believe that it will. Amitai Etzioni, for example, states that “the rise of regional communities may provide a stepping-stone on the way from a world of a hundred-odd states to a world of stable and just peace. Such an achievement seems to require the establishment of a world political community. The rise of a world community is by no means assured; at best it will be a long and difficult process. Nor does the evolution of every regional community serve to advance the cause of world community. And one must note that, so far, for every regional association that has succeeded, several have failed. But the increase in the number of regional communities and their growing success seems to indicate that the one avenue by which a world community - and not a world empire - might rise is the growth of regionalism.”<sup>3</sup> Later, he writes: “Few observers believe that a global state can be the next step in the development of political institutions. Many, however, view regional unions as a way of augmenting and eventually replacing the nation-state. Others have warned that the region-states might serve as a barrier on the way to one global state.”<sup>4</sup>

A spokesman for this latter viewpoint is Johan Galtung, who has warned that Europe

might develop into another superpower to rival the United States and the Soviet Union. He feared that a world divided into vast regional power-blocs might be subjected to even more destructive wars and oppression than we have seen in the past, just as George Orwell depicted in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. This would certainly be a disastrous state of affairs; but its likelihood seems to be extremely remote at the present time. None of the regional groupings, Europe included, has anywhere near the strength or the political cohesion which could make them the slightest threat to their neighbours.

Bruce Russett of Yale University imagined a debate on the issue in 1967 between a World Federalist and an Atlantic Unionist. "The Federalist emphasizes the need for overarching worldwide institutions .. only a global organization can prevent war and promote a co-operative effort for the good of all mankind. The advocate of Atlantic Union may accept much of this argument as the statement of a long-term goal, but for now he dwells on the divisions and heterogeneity so manifest among nations. For the present, he says, we must take whatever islands of relative similarity we find, and integrate them as units which can solve their own internal problems and contribute to the stability of the larger international system, without transforming it drastically. In the long run a world community may well be built by aggregating these units at a yet higher level of organization, in which they, not the existing nation-states, might be the basic building-blocks in a global federal hierarchy."<sup>5</sup> In connection with the problem of regional power-blocs, he then warns that: "Regional integration without concurrent pressures, and probably deliberate effort, toward integrating the entire international system would be at best a short-term and at worst a highly volatile "solution". If we take the Atlantic Unionist seriously, we must also take the World Federalist seriously. These are not yet mutually exclusive roads. The world is not now ready for amalgamation in the style of the Federalist; the basic ecological under-pinnings do not exist. Maybe we will want to work in that direction in the long run. At this stage, however, a central choice of strategy is not forced upon us. We can lay a multi-purpose foundation without now choosing the eventual form of the structure to be built, leaving room for the ingenuity and learning of later architects to devise a stronger habitation than we now know how to construct."<sup>6</sup>

The fact is that the process of regional integration is now well under way in several different areas of the globe, and is bound to continue onwards, by fits and starts. The benefits of economic integration are obvious, and are now universally accepted, and some degree of political integration is likely to follow at a later stage. These processes should be encouraged, because of the increased stability and prosperity which they will bring to each region. They also pave the way for integration at a higher level, by providing positive examples, and shaping public attitudes in favour of integration in general. But it is also a fact that regional integration and world integration are not at all the same thing. To achieve the final goal, a further level of integration will be required between either the different regional associations, or the individual nation-states. Ideally one would like these processes to occur in parallel, so that world integration should be well under way before the different regional associations have time to crystallize into powerful blocs, which might come into conflict with each other.

### *The Evolutionary Approach*

The best and most feasible way of achieving a world federation would seem to be an evolutionary approach, following the example set by Jean Monnet and the European federalists. The strategy is to begin with an association of a few of the more progressive states, with a specific and limited set of aims, and then let it evolve in a natural, stage-by-stage fashion towards a more deeply integrated community with wider membership. Several reasons have already been given why the membership should be restricted to democratic

states.

This strategy has a number of advantages. It means that the barrier to be overcome in starting the association is enormously reduced, because only a small number of relatively homogeneous and like-minded states will be involved, and the initial aims of the association are more limited and sharply defined. Secondly, each further stage of the integration process can be considered and appraised over a period of time, and will only proceed in accordance with the political equilibrium at the time: thus it should be possible to avoid any disastrous mistakes, and the member states will be able to choose how far and how fast they want to take the integration process as they go. And finally, as a fall-back position, much less harm is done if the association should turn out to be a failure. The crucial question then remains: how can we make a start? How can the first seed be planted?

### *A World Peace-Keeping Association*

One possibility which comes to mind is to set up an association which would complement the present United Nations, and remedy some of its shortcomings. Now the most important shortcomings of the UN are its “missing organs”: it has no democratically elected representative assembly, and no standing military or peace-keeping forces of its own. A very substantial international security force was proposed for the UN in its early days, but was abandoned because the United States and the Soviet Union could not agree on the conditions. Boutros Boutros-Ghali and Brian Urquhart have recently renewed calls for a standing peace-keeping force to be set up, which could be used in a “preventive” fashion, to try and prevent conflicts before they occur.<sup>7,8</sup>

This leads us to propose the establishment of what might be called a World Peace-Keeping Association. Its aims would include:

- ?? To ensure the security of all its member states;
- ?? To fulfill the external peace-keeping obligations of its member-states towards the UN, and to establish a joint, standing peace-keeping force which might be used, at the discretion of the Association and at the request of the UN, for “preventive” peacekeeping purposes;
- ?? To promote economic and political co-operation among its members;
- ?? To provide avenues for peaceful settlement of any dispute among its members;
- ?? To provide a basis for further integration among its members in the future, in whatever ways seem appropriate at the time.

The most obvious model for such an Association would be the pattern established in Europe, consisting of:

- ?? A Council of Ministers from the member states to approve policy, under a ‘weighted majority’ voting formula. Heads of government would meet periodically to formulate general policy, while regular meetings would consist of Foreign Ministers, Defence Ministers, or others as appropriate to the subject under discussion. Thus the member states collectively would maintain a controlling voice in the Association;
- ?? A democratic Assembly to represent the people of the member states, with an equal voice along with the Council in proposing and approving policy and the laws and regulations of the Association. This would provide the democratic heart of the organization, giving it a collective will and purpose of its own. To begin with, the Assembly might consist of representatives from the Parliaments of the member states. At a later stage, once the Association is well established, the representatives should be directly elected by the people of the member states;
- ?? A Commission to oversee the day-to-day administration of the Association, and to formulate new policy initiatives and laws and regulations, for approval by the Council and the Assembly. The Commission would act as Cabinet for the Association. Ideally it

should sit within the Assembly, and be responsible to it; and eventually its members should be elected from within the Assembly, even if at first they were appointed by the member states;

- ?? A Court of Justice, to see that the laws and regulations of the Association are observed, and to adjudicate on disputes between member states where necessary;
- ?? A joint Military Force to carry out the peace-keeping duties of the Association. This might consist partly of a permanent 'core' organization composed of volunteers from the citizens of the member states, plus rotating contingents from the armed forces of the member states. The permanent core force need not be very big: its main purposes would be to provide training for the national contingents in co-operative international action, to provide a rapid-reaction force in case of need, and to provide a basis for expansion in times of emergency. Its operations would be overseen by a Military Council or Staff Committee consisting of the Chiefs of Staff of the member states, or their representatives;
- ?? A Secretariat to carry out the administrative duties of the Association.

The Budget of the Association would presumably consist initially of agreed levies or contributions from the member states, but eventually the Association should be given its own independent sources of funds, made up perhaps from levies or taxes on international trade and financial transactions between the member states.

Membership of the Association should be open to any stable and democratic state, subject to approval by the existing members, with the aim of eventually achieving universal membership. This would demonstrate that the Association is not directed against any particular state or group of states, and that its aim is global security for all.

Such an association would form what Karl Deutsch calls a "security community". It would fill an obvious current need, by reinforcing the peace-keeping capacity of the UN, which is far too weak at present. It would provide a powerful new guarantee of the security of its member states. It would also allow the United States to share the burden of acting as 'global policeman', which is a role that does not properly belong to any single nation in any case. And finally, it would lay a suitable foundation for further integration at a later stage.

There is one drawback to this idea, according to neofunctionalist theory. Such an association would be based on military rather than economic co-operation, and thus the 'spillover' effect leading to further integration in other sectors would not be so strong. I have not proposed to begin with an economic association, because there seems to be no such obvious need for it at the present time. One could hardly propose to begin with a global community of coal and steel producers in this day and age; and under agreements such as GATT the trade barriers between the nations are rapidly being whittled away in any case. The association should by all means include an economic aspect, and the promotion of economic and political integration would undoubtedly be its most important and fruitful function, in the long run. The Assembly and the Commission might also be expected to provide an impetus towards further integration, as they have done in Europe.

Who might be prospective members of such an association? First on the list would be those middle-ranking powers which have been the most loyal and consistent supporters of UN peacekeeping efforts over the years, such as the Scandinavian countries Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Finland, together with British Commonwealth countries such as Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Next would come the members of the European Union, and of course the United States. Japan is an obvious candidate, having shown herself to be a model citizen of the world community since World War II. Many other states would also merit consideration.

There is an obvious question which arises at this point, namely: - where does NATO fit in? NATO is a powerful security organization which already exists, and involves many of the states we have mentioned. As a matter of fact, it could provide an ideal basis for the

proposed Peace-Keeping Association. Let us explore this option a little more closely.

### *The NATO option*

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was established by the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949, largely at the instigation of Ernest Bevin, Foreign Secretary in the British Labour government after World War II. Its purpose was to act as a defensive political and military alliance to protect Western Europe against the Soviet Union. Its original members consisted of the US and Canada, together with 10 European members. There are now 14 European members, consisting of Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. The neutral countries of Sweden, Austria, Ireland and Finland are not members. France withdrew from the integrated military structure of NATO in 1966 under Charles De Gaulle, but rejoined in 1995.

The organizational structure of NATO includes the following elements:

- ?? The North Atlantic Council, consisting of heads of state, foreign ministers, or their permanent representatives, which determines the policy of the organization by consensus;
- ?? A number of committees have been established under the Council, to oversee various aspects of the organization's work. They include a Military Committee, consisting of the allied Chiefs-of Staff or their representatives, as well as a Defence Planning Committee and others;
- ?? The Secretary-General is the operational head of the organization, and acts as Chairman of the Council and head of the international secretariat;
- ?? The military commands of NATO include an Allied Command Europe and an Allied Command Atlantic, as well as an Allied Command Europe Rapid Reaction Corps. The first Supreme Allied Commander Europe was none other than Dwight D. Eisenhower;
- ?? Finally, there is the North Atlantic Assembly, founded in 1955, which consists of an inter-parliamentary assembly formed to encourage Atlantic solidarity and provide a link between NATO and the member parliaments. It contains 188 members, with representation weighted according to population, so that the USA has 36 members, while Iceland and Luxembourg have 3 each. The Assembly is not formally part of the NATO structure, but maintains close relations with it. It addresses recommendations to the Secretary-General, and the Secretary-General presents a review of major alliance problems at annual plenary sessions of the Assembly.

The dominant member of the NATO alliance has traditionally been the United States, which has promised to protect its European allies with nuclear weapons if necessary, and fills the chief office of Supreme Allied Commander Europe. The early years of the organization involved a tense period of confrontation between East and West at the height of the Cold War. Then in 1967 a landmark was reached with the publication of the Harmel Report, which called for a shift in NATO policy to one of "deterrence with dialogue". Members undertook to pursue simultaneously a policy of maintaining adequate military forces for defence and deterrence, while also engaging the East in a dialogue designed to bring about realistic solutions to existing problems, and eventually the removal of the underlying causes of tension between East and West. This farsighted policy led to the establishment of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and to long-running talks on "Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions" (MBFR).<sup>9</sup> It contributed substantially to the lessening of tensions in Europe, and culminated after many years in the INF Treaty and the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty of 1991, which provided for major reductions in the numbers of tanks, aircraft, and other conventional weapons on both sides of the former Iron Curtain. At the same time, NATO's nuclear arsenal in Europe

has been reduced by 80%.

With the disbandment of the Warsaw Pact and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the original purpose of NATO was lost. An extensive review was begun in 1990, which resulted in a new 'Strategic Concept' for the organization. It reaffirmed NATO's role in ensuring the security of Europe, and called for further reductions of military forces within Europe, together with active involvement in international peace-keeping operations, increased co-operation with other international institutions, and close co-operation with Russia and the countries of Eastern Europe, the former adversaries of NATO.<sup>10</sup>

In recent years, NATO has been engaged in discussions with the European Union on the establishment of a common foreign and security policy (CFSP) for Europe, and a "European pillar" of the NATO force structure. The concept of Combined Joint Task Forces has been endorsed. In 1991, a new North Atlantic Co-operation Council (NACC) was set up to provide a forum for consultation with the countries of Eastern Europe, including the former Soviet republics. In 1993, a program of "Partnership for Peace" was inaugurated, and the first joint military exercises with former members of the Warsaw Pact were held in 1995. Some 27 countries are now participating in this programme. It is envisaged that NATO will eventually be enlarged by the admission of many of these countries, although strong opposition from Russia has delayed the process.

NATO has also been engaged in a peace-keeping operation for the first time in Yugoslavia and Bosnia. The Dayton peace accord provided for a NATO-led implementation force (IFOR) to ensure compliance with the treaty, under the authority of a Security Council mandate from the UN. This mission involved approximately 60,000 troops from 32 NATO and non-NATO countries. There were various setbacks and shortcomings in the operations on the ground, as one might very well expect, but this important new role which NATO has taken on represents a new landmark in the history of the organization.

In view of these developments, it would not take an impossibly large step to transform NATO further into a world peace-keeping association such as we have discussed above. The organization would need to be opened for progressive enlargement by the accession of stable and democratic states, not only from Eastern Europe, but also from other regions of the world. The security guarantees of the organization would then be extended to these new members, as well as to the North Atlantic states. Prime candidates for membership would include countries such as Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and others. In time, once stable democracy has become established there, even Russia would become a candidate. This would demonstrate that the organization is no longer directed against any particular country or group, but is dedicated to peace and security for all. Russia's objections to enlargement should then be removed.

The charter of the organization would need to be expanded to allow it to act as the principal peace-keeping organ of its members, under the aegis of the UN. This would represent no more than a continuation of current trends, and would release the USA from its self-imposed role as 'global policeman', which it has no right to assume anyway.

The administrative superstructure of the organization would need re-organizing to allow for greater co-operation and possible closer integration in the future. According to the European model, this would require the establishment of a Court, an independent Commission to replace the Secretary-General, and a democratic Assembly. The last feature could be achieved, in the first instance, by incorporating the North Atlantic Assembly as a formal part of the organization.

The economic and technical aspects of the organization would also need to be expanded. NATO already funds a strong program of scientific and technical collaboration, by means of fellowships, workshops and schools. One option for strengthening the economic side might be to fold in the OECD with the new association. The OECD already includes all the members of NATO, plus many prospective members of the enlarged organization, and it

already comprises a powerful economic organization.

This would imply a major revision of the North Atlantic Treaty, but would represent no more than a natural extension of current trends. It would give NATO a very powerful, important, and positive new role, to replace that which disappeared when the Soviet Union collapsed and the only realistic threat to Europe's security evaporated. It would allow the USA to share the burden of major peace-keeping operations around the globe, and give these operations the added legitimacy and authority of a common security organization. Finally, it would provide a ready-made and very substantial basis for further co-operation and integration between the democratic member states.

Many of the aims of the proposed peace-keeping association are already enshrined in the North Atlantic Treaty. Under the treaty, the parties undertook "to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means" (Article 1); declared that they "will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them" (Article 2); and that they "agree that an armed attack against one or more of them ... shall be considered an attack against them all" (Article 4).

The major obstacle lies in the fact that NATO is presently a mere alliance of sovereign states. NATO publications emphasize very heavily that "NATO is composed of sovereign states which retain their independence in all fields including foreign policy."<sup>11</sup> To allow for deeper integration, the members would have to agree to change the nature of the organization, in order to give it an independent voice of its own in the form of a Commission and an Assembly. They would also have to cede some of their sovereignty, and give the association the power to make binding regulations or laws in at least some of the areas for which it is responsible. These changes would involve some momentous changes in principle. The natural conservatism and inertia of the member states will make it difficult to reach an agreement for change, and one is likely to confront the old argument: "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." The organization performs some useful functions as it stands, so why meddle with it?

The answer to this question is that there are some far more useful functions which it could perform, as outlined above. Given that the original primary purpose of the alliance has recently been lost, a golden opportunity now exists to refocus NATO as the nucleus of a great new organization of common security for the world.

One would hope that the European members of NATO would be sympathetic to these ideas, which follow the established European pattern. The major question is whether the United States, as the dominant partner in the present alliance, could be persuaded to agree. It would mean that the US would have to accept a less dominant position, and resign a certain amount of its power and influence over international events to the new association, agreeing to a closer degree of co-operation and integration with its partners in the security field. Although this would clearly be for the greater common good, it would require a great deal of political foresight and courage in the White House to recognize that fact, and to persuade two-thirds of the Senate to agree to it, especially considering the long-term tendency in America towards isolationism and suspicion of entangling foreign alliances.

On the other hand, America has traditionally been a stronghold of the World Federalist and Atlantic Union movements. The ideas outlined above are actually quite close to those of the Atlantic Union movement founded by Clarence Streit, except that he proposed a radical leap straight to a federal union of all the Atlantic democracies, whereas we are advocating a much more modest toe in the water, in the shape of a loose peace-keeping association. This would also be in accordance with the Declaration of Paris, adopted by the Atlantic Convention of 1962, which called for "the creation of a true Atlantic Community", which would receive "a measure of delegated sovereignty" from its member states.<sup>12</sup>

An earlier call for the further development of NATO was made by Karl Deutsch and his collaborators in their interdisciplinary study, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area* in 1957. They argued that "The most progressive steps would seem to be more and

more towards the economic and social potentialities of this unique organization, and toward the greater political possibilities that might come from new organs of consultation and decision which could be built into it. There may well be an opportunity in the near future to make NATO much more than a military alliance and, without alienating any nonmembers within the area, to move at least some of its member countries closer toward integration. This may be one of the most effective ways to advance the development of political community in the North Atlantic area, and to contribute to the eventual abolition of war."<sup>13</sup>

In the event, closer integration was achieved within the European Community rather than via NATO. The majority of world federalists were not in favour of Atlantic Union at that time in any case. Everett Millard's study group CURE, for instance, feared that an Atlantic Union would perpetuate the East-West divide and intensify the arms race, and would also be seen as exclusive by those countries left out.<sup>14</sup> They preferred to work towards reform of the UN Charter.

The intervening years have seen some dramatic changes. The Soviet Union has now collapsed, and the divide between East and West is rapidly disappearing, so that the main objection of the federalists has lost its force. An association based upon NATO might even be joined by most of the countries of the former Soviet bloc within a short period of time. Just recently, the former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has suggested that "the Atlantic Alliance must deepen its political dimension", and that "the time has come to move the project of a North Atlantic Free Trade area from study committees to the action phase."<sup>15</sup>

Polls show that public opinion remains very positive upon these issues: for instance, a poll in the US on "The Emerging World Order" in 1991 showed that:

- 68% recognized the importance of an enlarged US peacekeeping role;
- 78% approved of the job being done by the UN;
- 90% thought the US should promote action on world environmental problems;
- 88% favoured standby peacekeeping forces for the UN;
- 67% favoured elections for the UN Secretary-General;
- 59% believed that "UN resolutions should rule over the actions and laws of individual countries, including the US."<sup>16</sup>

So there is reason to hope that a proposal such as ours might now be deemed acceptable by the American public.

### *Summary and Conclusions*

Several alternative routes to world federation have been discussed. It could happen by means of a reform of the United Nations; but that has proved extremely hard to achieve. Another possibility is that the European Union could expand over time to become a global organization; but that is probably an unsuitable path, and would be ruled out by the Europeans themselves. The functionalists would argue that it will all happen almost automatically, as functional organizations spread and international agencies proliferate; but in the last analysis it does require an act of political will to create a political community with a life and purpose of its own. Functional co-operation can lay the foundations, but eventually something more is needed.

The growth of regional organizations as a stepping-stone to world federation is a more likely option. Organizations for economic co-operation are already springing up rapidly in all quarters of the globe. These all help to provide examples of international collaboration, and lay the groundwork for worldwide integration; but they do not solve the problem in themselves. Unless worldwide institutions begin to develop in parallel, there is a real possibility (though hopefully a slight one) that the regional organizations could develop into warring power-blocs.

The most likely path seems to be an evolutionary one, starting from a small association of

stable and democratic states, and then expanding its membership and functions, after the European model. Some of the major deficiencies of the present UN could be repaired, for instance, by setting up a World Peace-Keeping Association of democratic states. This would provide a standing peace-keeping force, something the UN lacks, which could be used in a "preventative" peace-keeping role. The association should also include a democratic assembly, to give an independent voice to the organization, which the UN again does not have. It would provide a virtually cast-iron guarantee of the security of its member states; and it would relieve the United States from the burden of acting as global policeman on its own.

NATO could be transformed into the nucleus of such an association. A golden opportunity now exists, because the primary purpose of NATO in defending Western Europe against Soviet attack has now evaporated, and NATO has been searching for a new role. It has already begun to act as a peace-keeper in the European region, and to build new bridges with the countries of the former Warsaw Pact. Why not go further, and turn it into a democratic, world-wide peacekeeping association? An economic aspect might also be added, perhaps, by folding in the OECD with the new organization. This would be the quickest and most effective way to proceed; but the crucial question is whether the United States would agree to such a transformation. As the dominant member of the present NATO alliance, nothing could be done without the leadership and agreement of the US.

These are only examples of what might be done to begin the process of global integration. If these opportunities are not taken, no doubt some other avenue will be found eventually. The construction of a world federation is an enormous task, which might well take centuries of evolution to complete; and popular enthusiasm for the idea is not very high just now. The battle will be fought out in the hearts and minds of our global villagers, as they slowly become convinced of the need for a village council. But given the present climate of peace and co-operation between the superpowers, there has never been a better time to make a start. There is a need for some statesman on the international stage to assume the mantle of Jean Monnet, and show us the way forwards - a place in history awaits the one who can do it. A sensible and carefully limited proposal should generate substantial public support. The start of the new millennium, which is now close upon us, would be an ideal and auspicious date to begin some sort of new association, although the time available may already be too short.

The direction we want to go is clear. Increased international co-operation, leading to an eventual world federation, will bring peace and prosperity for all. In time it will allow the abolition of nuclear weapons, and even the eradication of war itself. It will allow a joint attack on the problems of environmental degradation, over-population, disease and poverty. It will establish new standards of human rights and democracy worldwide, and it will open a great new era of progress and harmony in human affairs, as energies are released from the unprofitable business of preparing for war.

The principles of association are also fairly clear. Democracy, human rights and the rule of law would be taken for granted as founding principles. Important principles established by the European experiment include subsidiarity, to preserve national autonomy wherever possible, and solidarity, to promote economic and social cohesion within the community. The ideas of participation, flexibility and equity have also been discussed.

The route by which we shall achieve these goals is much less clear, but the important thing to recognize is that everyone is pulling in the same direction. World federalists, UN reformers, functionalists, neofunctionalists, regionalists or Atlantic Unionists, all are working towards increased international collaboration and integration as the answer to the world's problems. We can see the new Jerusalem shining on the hill, and though it may take decades or even centuries to arrive there, the struggle will be well worthwhile in the end. This vision was beautifully expressed in a speech that Arthur Sweetser gave to his colleagues of the

United Nations staff when he retired after thirty-four years with the organization: <sup>17</sup>

*“You were born out of the labor and travail of these older days [of the League of Nations]; you are the successors of those who tried to build before you, got swept temporarily away, but still left foundations to which you could anchor. You have built prodigiously upon them; I would not, in those first days of 1920, have dared dream you would get so far so fast. Don’t underestimate this progress.*

*The great lesson of all this effort and suffering, even frequent disappointment, is that you are right, eternally right, in the fight you are making. You have got hold of all the big things of life; you are on the road to the future; you are working for all the ends that make life worthwhile on this planet - for peace, for the eradication of war, for human advancement, for human rights and decencies, for better living standards, better education, better travel and communications - in short, for the world as it ought to be.*

*This is the highest secular cause on earth. You deserve to be immensely proud of what you are doing, especially that you are privileged to be part of the permanent staff. During your low and grim moments, lift your eyes, I beg you, to those vaster horizons beyond: rise up out of the irritations and anxieties of the moment and realize that you have opportunities permitted to very few indeed.*

*You cannot feel too strongly that right is on your side and that your cause will win in the long run; it is your opponents who are wrong and on the losing side.”*