



# Toward Democratic World Federation

Publication of the Democratic World Federalists

Vol. 16, No.3/4

Summer/Autumn 2007

## THE MEANING OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

by Ronald J. Glossop, Saint Louis

In Kenneth Boulding's very significant book titled *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century* he emphasizes the point that the Twentieth Century is the time in human history when the second great transition, that is, the industrial revolution, spreads to the whole world instead of reaching only a small part of it as occurred in the Nineteenth Century. That industrial revolution, that change from an agrarian society to an industrial society based on scientific knowledge of how nature works, changed much more than the way that goods are produced. It also changed the kinds of goods that are produced and available to us.

New means of transportation (steam engines for ships and trains, automobiles, bicycles, airplanes, and jet planes) changed the distances over which they could communicate. As we often say, "Modern technological innovations in the fields of transportation and communication are making the world smaller every day. Technological changes have also provided new ways for people to gain even more information about how nature works.

In 1964 when Boulding wrote *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century* he could note that "something like 90% of all scientists who have ever lived are now alive," and that percentage has certainly increased during the past 40 years. He also noted that "about 25% of the human beings who have ever lived are now alive," and that percentage has also increased since then. These changes brought about by new scientific knowledge and the new products of industrialization have in turn produced other changes in how we think about ourselves, about how we organize politically, and how we communicate with each other.

One aspect of nationalism is how individuals think of themselves, how they identify themselves. From the Middle Ages up to 1500 most people in Europe would have identified themselves on the basis of their religion, that is, "I am a Christian" or "I am Jew" or "I am a Muslim." During the next 150 years the identification would probably be narrower: "I am a Catholic" or "I am a Lutheran" or "I am a Calvinist."

The Thirty Years War from 1618 to 1648 marks an important shift in the system of identification in Europe. That war, which began as a religious war between Catholics and Protestants, ended as an international war between nation-state and nation-state. After 1648 Europeans were likely to identify themselves as Swedes or Italians or Spaniards or Dutchmen or Frenchmen, that is, by nationality rather than a religious faith.

A second aspect of nationalism, closely related to the previous point, is which language a person is accustomed to using. As time passes and a larger proportion of people learn how to read and write and in that way are able to gain information beyond what their own family and acquaintances tell them, the question of which written language one has learned becomes important, so control of the education system is more important to nationalism.

The third aspect of nationalism, also closely related to the previous points, is the focus of political loyalty. If a war starts between one king's army and another king's army, which side would you want to win? If you had to fight, to which side would you give your support? As already noted, after 1648 this political loyalty would often be more important than one's religious commitment.

As time passed these three aspects of nationalism became more and more difficult to separate from one another. The political authorities would determine which language would be used, especially by schools, and the social environment would lead people on the basis of both language and political loyalty to identify themselves even more with their nation-state.

Internationalism came to Europe much earlier than to the United States. The first international governmental organization was the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine, created by the Europeans in 1815. The second international organization was the European Commission of the Danube created in 1856.

The first worldwide international organization was the International Telegraphic Union. It was established in 1865 and incorporated into the International Telecommunication Union in 1932. Its work was much more important in Europe than in other parts of the world.

The formation of the European Union has moved Europe towards internationalism, but there is still much nationalistic restraint on that effort toward integration. The nationalism there is being overcome to a large extent by the feeling that integration is necessary to compete with the United States and China, but the language problem has not yet been solved.

The United States, separated by oceans from both Europe and Asia, tended to view internationalism as applying mainly to its domination of Latin America as exemplified by the Monroe Doctrine of 1823.

*continued on page 3*

# Toward Democratic World Federation

Vol. 16, No.3/4 • ISSN 1091-8965

Editor - John O. Sutter • Assistant Editor - Timothy Roscoe Carter

## Officers of the Democratic World Federalists

- President - John O. Sutter • Vice President - Fred Duperrault •
- Secretary - Mary E. Harris

## Advisory Board

Paul Anderson (MA), Bill Bryant (OK), Cleo Michelsen (MD),  
Joseph Schwartzberg (MN), Hank Stone (NY), Barbara Walker (NJ)

## Board of Directors (in addition to the Officers)

Roger Kotila (Chairman), Peter Bailey, Byron Belitsos, Urs Cipolat,  
Tad Daley, Esther Franklin, Robert Gauntt, Ronald Glossop,  
Bruce Kennedy, Robert Neumann, Shariar Sharei, Chuck Woolery

## Staff

Timothy Roscoe Carter, Sarah Wood

**Democratic World Federalists** is affiliated with the Coalition for Democratic World Government and the Community of World Citizens. Views expressed in articles published in *TDWF* do not necessarily represent those of Democratic World Federalists. Articles may be republished so long as the issue and source of publication (*TDWF*) are mentioned. Readers' comments are welcome. Subscription: \$25 for 1 year. The deadline for submissions for the next issue is January 31, 2008.

## THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF DEMOCRATIC WORLD FEDERALISTS ARE:

A. To promote an understanding of the principles of:

- Common Humanity** The people of the world, as interconnected members of a common humanity, must recognize that the well-being and safety of anyone should be of concern to everyone.
- Global Problems & Benefits** The people are confronted by global problems, such as war and civil conflict, crimes against humanity and anarchy, large-scale poverty and disease, and degradation of the environment. These can be dealt with, and peace and the well-being of the people promoted, through enforceable world laws.
- Sovereignty & Citizenship** The people, as sovereign citizens, are inherently endowed with the authority and the duty to govern themselves, either directly or through elected representatives, on all levels of society and ultimately the world. As citizens, they should respect the rule of law, which their civic participation creates and legitimizes.

- Good Government** The government of all political units must be open, democratic, and accountable to the people and have effective legislative, executive, and judicial branches, with checks and balances.
- Federation** Planet Earth, with unity in its diversity, requires a democratic, federal system of government, where problems from local to global are dealt with by governments at the appropriate level.
- Constitution** A world constitution with a declaration of rights should be promoted by any means possible, e.g., restructuring and democratizing the United Nations, federating a number of regional unions, expanding a community of democracies, or building a new set of institutions of government through a world convention.

B. To develop an organization/movement without borders and spread its message throughout the world via contacts with other civil-society organizations, educational institutions, the media, lawmakers, and the general public.

## ISRAEL-PALESTINE: PREPARING FOR A US-SPONSORED CONFERENCE IN NOVEMBER

by Rene Wadlow, Geneva, Switzerland

US President George W. Bush has proposed holding a conference on the Israel-Palestine conflict in November 2007. In addition to the Israeli Government and the Palestinian Authority, there would be representative of the "International Quartet": the USA, Russia, the European Union (usually represented by foreign policy specialists of the European Commission) and the United Nations (which in practice is represented by members of the UN secretariat). It is also hoped that some or all the members of what is increasingly called the "Arab Quartet" would attend: Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and the Arab Emirates. Former Prime Minister Tony Blair, who is now a representative of the International Quartet, would probably be present.

The Israeli-Palestine conference would be held against the backdrop of other interlocking Middle East issues: the Iraq conflict, the resurgence of Iran, Lebanon-Syria politics. However, although all these governments play a role in the Israel-Palestine conflict, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and Iran probably won't be invited.

While personally, I believe, that the USA has "burned all its bridges" in the Middle East and can not play a useful role in the Israel-Palestine issue, there are still some people who believe

that the USA can play a leading role as the international facilitator. What is true, I believe, is that there is no other State which can be the substitute leader in the short run. Therefore, we, as world citizens, have two months, September and October 2007, to try to influence US policy on the Middle East and to use what contacts we have to reach foreign policy specialists in Russia, the Arab Quartet, Israel, Palestine, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and Iran.

Since the Israel-Palestine conflict has been with us for just 60 years, since the UN proposals for a two-State partition were being drawn up, there are many for whom "my eyes glaze over" when the topic of Israel-Palestine is brought up. Nevertheless, the geo-strategic aspects of the conflict remain important, and the suffering of people in the area is real.

I believe that there are three points which we should stress in our efforts. These three points will probably not be on the agenda if people outside the governments do not first raise them:

1) Hamas, which controls the Gaza strip needs to be invited and should be a full participant. The President of the Palestinian Authority, Mahmoud Abbas, the Israeli Government, the US

*continued on page 4*

*"The Meaning of the 21st Century" continued from page 1*

One indication of the extent to which nationalism has remained the prevailing outlook in the United States is the fact that it is one of the two countries in the world (the other is the Sultanate of Brunei) which still does not use the International System of Units (the metric system) of measurement, despite the fact that Congress adopted a law in 1866 which says that no contract using the metric system can be invalidated by a court. Also official statements and laws supporting or requiring use of the metric system in this country have been adopted in 1964, 1975 and 1988.

Despite some movement toward internationalism, nationalism is still a very powerful force in Europe and even more elsewhere as nations continue to compete with each other economically and for status in all areas (science, entertainment, sport, art, literature). One should not forget that the two world wars were motivated by struggles for status between Germany and Britain, between Japan and China, and between Russia and Germany while the Cold War was a struggle for top status between the Soviet Union and the United States. We can see similar struggles for top status now developing between the U.S and China, between India and China, and between Europe and the U.S. Nationalism is hardly a spent force.

But let us look to the future. The key difference between internationalism and globalism is between perceiving the world as composed of a collection of nation-states and perceiving it as a single planet where national boundaries are relatively insignificant.

The appropriate images for internationalism is a map of the world or even a globe where the different countries are in different colors, each one bordered by a solid black line. The appropriate image for globalism is the photo of the Earth taken from Space where there are no national boundaries and the unity and solitariness of the planet is more evident. Although it is not possible to point to some single moment when the transition from internationalism to globalism takes place, it seems that a significant development relevant to this transition was the photographing of the Earth from space which was done in the late 1960's and early 1970's.

Let us discuss the how personal identity, language, and political loyalty apply to the distinction between globalism and internationalism. The first aspect is personal identity, how people think of themselves. In the case of internationalism people regard themselves as definitely members of one country but are very much aware that their country exists in a world where there are other countries with which cooperation is possible. In the case of globalism, people think of themselves primarily as Earthlings, as members of humanity on the planet Earth, and only secondarily as citizens of this or that country. Consider the way that most of us think of ourselves first as American and only secondarily as citizens of a particular state.

The second aspect of internationalism versus globalism concerns language use. With internationalism one accepts the situation that different nations and different nationalities use different languages and that communication will require interpreters and

translators. This internationalism will also function better if individual persons learn to use several different national languages. In the case of globalism there must be one common language for all the Earthlings, not only to facilitate communication but also to sustain community solidarity. When one begins to think of one language for the whole Earth, the natural question is, which language would it be?

At the moment it seems English is on its way to becoming the single language for the whole world, but the proportion of the world's population which uses English as its first language is declining, from about 10% in 1950 to about only 6% now. The logical solution to this world language problem is to use a language which is no one's native language but which has been designed to be easy to learn and to use. That was the aim of the Polish physician LL Zamenhof when he created Esperanto and gave it to the world in 1878. The use of Esperanto has spawned movements of idealists committed to the welfare of a global community based on a common language which at the same time will permit the preservation of national languages for national communities.

The third aspect of the internationalism-versus-globalism distinction is the locus of political loyalty. In internationalism the primary loyalty of the individuals is to the national governments. International policy making organization such as the League of Nations and the United Nations and the World Health Organization and the Universal Postal Union, etc. are to assist cooperation among the national governments, not individuals. In globalism the primary loyalty of individuals would be to some global government, some world federation which is over the national governments. Individuals may have greater commitment to the welfare of the whole global community than to their own national government, but until political institutions are changed they are likely to face obstacles as they try to act in accord with that commitment. Globalism will be fully implemented only when the various national governments of the whole world are integrated into a world federation.

Are we ready to make the transition from nationalism to globalism? Are we ready to think of ourselves primarily as Earthlings, as citizens of the world, and only secondarily as Americans? Are we ready to learn Esperanto (or some other global language other than English) which can form the linguistic support for our commitment to the global community? Are we ready to support political institutional change from the internationalistic United Nations to a global democratic world federation? Are we ready in the meantime to give our financial support and energy to globally oriented non-governmental organizations such as Amnesty International, Democratic World Federalists, Doctors Without Borders, World Constitution and Parliament Association, etc.? Whether we ourselves are ready to make this transition or not, are we ready to help our children and grandchildren make it? Are we, and they, ready for the global community of the Twenty-First Century?-- Prof. Glossop, author of *World Federation? A Critical Analysis of Federal World Government*, joined the D.W.F. Board of Directors in 2007.

## MY FIVE CITIZENSHIPS

by Raymond D. Watts, Rockville, Maryland

The U.S. Declaration of Independence states that, to secure certain rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

My basic assumption, that springs from that word "consent," is that sovereignty belongs to each individual human being: you, me, every person on earth. Only our need and desire to secure our rights, and to accomplish the complex tasks of our civilization through specialization, cause us individuals *to delegate large fractions of our sovereignty to assorted governments.* (Also, alas, in too many cases, people allow their sovereignty to be stolen by despots.)

Our forebears eons ago delegated sovereignty successively to family, clan, and tribe; later it was delegated to or stolen by kings and emperors. Today sovereignty resides with the nation-state-- a recent but wildly popular political invention. According to most prevailing political systems and values, sovereignty belongs to the nation-state, and each patriotic citizen of each such state must be ready to kill and die to keep it that way.

I reject that.

Sovereignty is vital, wherever it resides, because sovereignty is power.

Sovereignty, whether and wherever delegated or retained, is my "unalienable right" to assure that my material needs will be met, that I will be able to do what I want to do and not be compelled to do what I don't want to. The trouble is, of course, that fairness and "a decent respect for the opinions" of humankind require me somehow to accommodate the same right owned by you and everyone else. Enter government.

Most of us have delegated, with consent and often with pride, almost all our sovereignty. I, for example, am a governed, taxpaying, voting citizen of four real governments, and a citizen in spirit of a fifth, yet unborn, in which I long to live and vote and pay taxes.

To the City of Rockville, I have delegated my sovereign right to provide for my need for water-- and zoning regulations.

To Montgomery County I delegated sovereign power to educate my child. To the State of Maryland and the United States of America, I have delegated sovereign power to resolve my civil

*"Isreal-Palestine Conference" continued from page 2*

Government, and to a lesser extent the European Union, would like to see life conditions in Gaza get worse so that the Hamas administration will fail. Even if disintegration does not happen in the next two months, the idea is to leave Hamas "out in the cold" and have only Mahmoud Abbas negotiate for all the Palestinians. Such a policy is short-sighted and will lead to failure.

2) The second point is to stress the need for a wider economic zone so that prosperity will help integrate the Palestinians into a wider context. Such a wider economic zone would include Israel, Palestine, Lebanon, Syria and Jordan. The return from Lebanon, Syria and Jordan of the Palestinian refugees to Israel is impossible for political reasons. The return of the bulk of the refugees to the West Bank and Gaza is impossible for economic

disputes and punish my criminal offenses and offenders, through due process of law.

None of these governments is perfect; but I am, on balance, a still-hopeful citizen of each and all.

The European Union has a word for this: "subsidiarity." What that means is that all governmental tasks should be accomplished at the smallest, most local level of government competent to handle them.

Our children dread a likelihood that they may not live to old age. If nuclear proliferation or spreading global poverty doesn't get them, transnational pollution will. The smallest, most local level of government competent to solve those problems is planetary government, and we haven't got any yet.

The United Nations is a great idea, a great and useful institution, but only a start. Its Charter is not a World Constitution, and it remains a world forum, not a World Government. The good news is that more and more smart and powerful and ordinary people now realize that this must be changed, and soon.

The first World Constitution to be ratified won't immediately stop all war, injustice, pestilence and pollution, even in a world loosely federated with a majority's uneasy consent. That Constitution predictably will have moral evasions and shortcomings just as the American Constitution did. But the American Constitution was better than what preceded it, and it kept on improving. Our American experiment, which has mostly worked, must now be re-engineered and tried out globally, because the current sovereign nation-state system isn't working.

A constitutional federal world government at its start may well be only a little better than the bloody planetary anarchy we now endure. But if its founders are wise and lucky, it will improve with age. It will become ever more broadly and truly consensual, because with war and pollution under better control and some of the crushing costs of war shifted to poverty alleviation and population control, it will evolve into a government that is both democratic and just.--*Reprinted from WFA Committee on Women collation, Autumn 1994.*

and ecological reasons. Palestinians have been prevented from playing an active and positive political and economic role in Lebanon. This Lebanese policy should be modified if relative peace is established in the area. Only economic prosperity will build the foundation for greater cooperation.

3) The Israel-Palestine conflict needs to be placed in the wider Middle East context which currently lacks a security organization in which all States are members. There is a need to establish an Organization for Security and Cooperation in the Middle East on the lines of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe which played an important role in ending the Cold War.-- *Rene Wallow is the Representative to the United Nations, Geneva, of the Association of World Citizens and the editor of [www.transnational-perspectives.org](http://www.transnational-perspectives.org).*

## DISARMAMENT?

by Emery Reves

### Part One

*Emery Reves is author of the seminal The Anatomy of Peace (1945-46), which was translated into more than 20 languages. Fifteen years later he wrote this, which is reprinted from LOOK of 28 March 1961. We are indebted to D.W.F. Supporter Harvey Davidson, author of Nuclear War Is Coming: A Book on the Cause of War, for the text.*

DURING THE LAST spectacular session of the United Nations Assembly, the leaders of the world proclaimed disarmament to be the paramount requisite for peace. President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Prime Minister Harold Macmillan emphasized the urgency of resuming negotiations in order to arrive at gradual disarmament under the most stringent international controls. Nikita S. Khrushchev called disarmament the "problem of problems."

In one of his first public statements on foreign affairs after his election. President John F. Kennedy agreed with these leaders when he wrote: "The achievement of controlled disarmament is a necessity to guarantee world peace..."

In the face of this great array of opinion, is it permissible, is it possible, to express a doubt about the soundness of this conviction and to urge people to try to think over the problem without emotion and with an open mind?

No purpose is served in criticizing governments, since they are under a formidable pressure of opinion and cannot but swim with the current. What matters is that an unprejudiced discussion start on the fundamentals of this problem in the press and on the radio and television networks in order to clarify the real issue, which is peace, not disarmament.

To the writer of this article, who closely followed the discussions in the 1920's which led to the great Disarmament Conference of 1932 in Geneva, the present excitement about disarmament appears to be unbearably monotonous and repetitious. We express great surprise when Khrushchev proposes immediate and total disarmament, and forget that this was exactly what the Soviet Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinov proposed in the name of the Stalin government 30 years ago. And we follow with the utmost attention the American arguments that we must first establish controls before we disarm, forgetting completely that these were exactly the arguments of the French leaders Aristide Briand, Edouard Herriot and Leon Blum three decades ago. If one takes the trouble to compare the present passionate debate with the discussions of the 1930's, it is easy to realize that not one single argument is being raised today by either of the parties that was not discussed and argued over and over again in the 1930's.

Is there a possibility of arriving at a disarmament agreement between sovereign nation-states? And if we should succeed in achieving this supreme goal of present-day governments, would such a disarmament agreement bring peace?

Let us imagine that the American, Russian, British and French governments agree on all the problems concerning nuclear disarmament. Let us imagine that, in the near future, a treaty is signed providing that all further atomic tests will be banned, all production of nuclear weapons stopped, and all the existing plutonium and hydrogen bombs destroyed under a system of controls as effective as any scientist and military expert can devise. Suppose that such a treaty is signed and ratified, not only by the four atomic powers, but also by all the other members of the United Nations and those outside the United Nations, including Red China.

Is it imaginable that American military leaders, responsible to their nation for the defense of the people and the territory of the United States of America, will not suspect that, in spite of all the treaties and assurances, the Russians may hide a few nuclear weapons in some underground cave in the Urals, making it imperative for the U. S. secretly to keep some hydrogen bombs for self-defense in case of emergency? And is it possible to imagine that the general staff of the Soviet Army, whose responsibility it is to defend the people and the territory of the Soviet Union, will not have the same feeling toward the United States?

These are rhetorical questions. It is obvious that, if the political condition of the world made it possible for one sovereign great power to trust the present and future actions of another sovereign great power, there would be no need for disarmament, for the simple reason that there would be no need for armaments either.

BUT let us be incredibly credulous and accept the possibility that, in case our governments succeed in signing a treaty of complete nuclear disarmament, such a treaty will be honestly carried out. If there were not one single nuclear weapon left anywhere, and the intention to produce one were abandoned, would such a most unlikely achievement bring us peace or lead us nearer to it? Not much imagination is necessary to realize that, in such an event, we would be exactly where we were in 1939 and 1914--two not very peaceful years.

We have been spending almost 30 years in Geneva and elsewhere discussing disarmament in innumerable and endless conferences. These decades of disarmament negotiations were merely interrupted by the episode of World War II. Six years of fighting seem to have taught us no lesson; we continue to use the same arguments as before, like medieval theologians.

During the 1930's, our governments attempted to achieve peace by reducing the caliber of naval guns, limiting certain heavy weapons and prohibiting the bombardment of civilian populations. None of these negotiations led anywhere, for the same reasons mentioned in respect to nuclear disarmament. But if a disarmament treaty had been signed in 1935, incorporating in a generally accepted treaty all the aims of the 1932 Geneva Dis-

armament Conference, it would certainly not have prevented World War II. It would merely have reduced the technical conditions of the opening battles to the conditions existing in warfare during the 19th Century.

Thus we can go backward, century by century, to realize that, no matter what weapon we abolish and what armaments we prohibit, under certain specific conditions there will still be wars-- even without artillery, even without gunpowder, even without cavalry and without bows and arrows.

It is strange to realize how we swing between two contradictory concepts of peace. As long as we try to square the circle and maintain peace between sovereign power groups, we have to apply the age-old diplomatic formula of the balance of power. The peculiarity of the balance-of-power principle is that it can maintain peace only when power is not in balance. As soon as there is power balance, conflict invariably breaks out. During the phase of history when the power relationship is approaching balance, we try to prevent war by disarmament. And during the phase of the historical process when power is not in balance, we always try to maintain peace by superior armaments, by what we today call the "deterrent."

This is a highly misused and misunderstood term, as the superiority of power we like to call "deterrent" is actually an "incentive." Between 1945 and 1949, our statesmen said that peace was being safeguarded by the "deterrent" of the American atomic bomb. Unfortunately, to the Russians, the American atomic bomb did not appear as a "deterrent," but as an "incentive" which forced them to multiply their efforts to produce the same weapon and even to surpass their rival in the existing power relationship.

When the Russians produced their rockets and shot satellites into space, they called them a "deterrent" to American aggression. But to the Americans, the Russian rockets did not appear to be a "deterrent," but an "incentive" which stimulated them to double and redouble their efforts to produce bigger and longer-range rockets.

If we want to discuss seriously the problem of peace in this magnificent and highly dangerous age of nuclear fission and fusion, we must first realize that our thinking and our action are threatened by two fallacies:

\* The first fallacy is that we can secure peace by armament.

\* And the second fallacy is that we can secure peace by disarmament.

Endless historical evidence proves the incontrovertible fact that **peace is not a technical problem, not a military problem, but essentially a political and social problem.**

With more and stronger arms or with fewer and weaker arms, we may win or lose a war. But we shall never prevent it.

Within a certain political structure, no weapon, not even the hydrogen bomb or the long-range rocket, represents danger. The people of the State of New York and the State of Illinois are not afraid of the nuclear weapons manufactured in Tennessee and New Mexico or the rockets launched in California and Florida. But the people of the Ukraine are frightened by them. And the

people of the Ukraine are not afraid of the hydrogen bombs and the rockets manufactured and launched in central Siberia, but the people of New York and Chicago are.

**PEACE between conflicting groups of men was never possible, and wars succeeded one another until some sovereignty, some sovereign source of law, some sovereign power was set up over and above the clashing social units, integrating the warring units into a higher sovereignty.**

Once the mechanics and the fundamental cause of wars -- all wars -- are realized, the futility of the passionate debates about armament and disarmament must be apparent to all.

If human society were organized so that relations between groups were regulated by democratically controlled law and legal institutions, then modern technology could go ahead in devising and producing the most devastating weapons, yet there would be no war. But if we allow sovereign rights to continue to reside in the separate groups without regulating their relations by law, then we can prohibit every weapon, even penknives, and people will beat out each other's brains with clubs.

Most practical politicians will smile and say that any integration of the sovereign nation-states in a higher legal order is Utopia. This is debatable. But there can be no question that the ideal of disarmament between the highly industrialized sovereign nation-states of the 20th Century, with or without controls, is the Utopia of Utopias.

People are confused about the relationship between disarmament and a legal order. They ask, "If nations distrust each other so much that they cannot disarm, how could they unite?"

**Disarmament is conceived as being between two or several sovereign power units, each retaining its sovereign right to carry out or to violate a disarmament treaty.** On the other hand, a world-wide legal order can only be conceived as a result of a vast popular movement bringing representatives to power in two or several nation-states, with the mandate to carry out the necessary reforms. Further, it can only be the result of an evolutionary process. It is bound to begin with a few states and grow into a world-wide structure. If the problem of unification were presented to the national governments as they are constituted today, let us say before the U.N. General Assembly, there can be no doubt that the proposal would be unanimously rejected. A democratic constitution was not acceptable to the Bourbons, nor social security to Queen Victoria's prime ministers.

A radical change in public opinion is always the first condition for a change in institutions. -- *To be continued in the next issue.*

The 1970 Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, still affirmed by 188 nations, is failing. India, Pakistan, and Israel never signed, and many signers now regret giving the U.S., Russia, Britain, France, and China a nuclear weapons monopoly. With 40 countries now believed able to produce nuclear weapons, the world is edging toward the ultimate catastrophe.--Paul Miller in UNA Midpeninsula, July/August/September 2007

## WHAT WORLD FEDERALISTS NEED TO DO

by Timothy Roscoe Carter, San Francisco

What must supporters of democratic world government do to achieve our goal? We do not need to spend our time trying to convince the public that a democratic world government is a good idea. They already agree.

The evidence is overwhelming. The Summer 1993 issue of this publication reported that a survey financed by the then World Federalist Association (WFA) found that 58% of adult American citizens supported the establishment of a "limited, democratic world government," and 66% felt there should be a world constitution. A decade and a half later, do Americans still feel this way?

I have been unable to find recent polls that asked Americans what they thought about "world government". But there are plenty of polls that ask Americans what they think about the United Nations, and what changes to the UN they support. The answers show that Americans overwhelming support changes to the UN that would make it a de facto world government.

A study conducted in 2006 by The Chicago Council on Global Affairs and WorldPublicOpinion.org showed the following. Seventy-two percent of Americans favored "having a standing UN peacekeeping force selected, trained and commanded by the United Nations." Seventy-five percent of Americans favored "giving the UN the authority to go into countries in order to investigate violations of human rights." Sixty percent of Americans supported "giving the UN the power to regulate the international arms trade." Sixty percent of Americans agreed that, "When dealing with international problems, [the United States] should be more willing to make decisions within the United Nations even if this means that [the United States] will sometimes have to go along with a policy that is not its first choice." Seventy-nine percent of Americans consider "strengthening the United Nations" to be an important foreign policy goal. The idea of "creating an international marshals service that could arrest leaders responsible for genocide" is supported in the United States by 77% of Democrats and 73% of Republicans. Majorities in both parties believe the United States should agree to have an international body rule on disputes over: "where the exact border is between two countries"; "whether countries are enforcing their environmental laws"; "which countries have the right to fish in certain waters"; "whether countries are enforcing their labor laws"; and "what rights countries give to foreigners who are arrested and charged with a crime". WorldPublicOpinion.org also reports that according to a 2004 survey by the BBC, a solid majority of Americans, 57%, support allowing the rest of the UN Security Council to override the veto of any permanent member, even the United States.

To recap, by large majorities, the American people support giving the UN: its own military to keep the peace, which it raises, trains and maintains on its own; a police force that can enter any nation to investigate and personally arrest its leaders if they violate the human rights of their own citizens; the ability to rule on most international disputes between nations, which the World Court can do now only if both parties agree; and even rule on certain internal

matters that have global effect, such as environmental protection and labor laws; and requiring the US to follow UN policies while denying the US the ability to unilaterally veto those policies.

That is not "global governance". That is a world government.

Most interestingly, in a Gallup poll from February 2007, Americans were asked if the UN was doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face. Two-thirds, 66%, said the UN was doing a "poor job". Americans believe that the UN is doing a poor job, yet they want the UN to have more authority. Presumably this means they believe the problem with the UN is that it does not have the power necessary to do its job. This is precisely what world federalists have been saying since before the ink was dry on the UN Charter. And precisely what James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, George Washington, and Benjamin Franklin said about the Articles of Confederation.

We do not need to convince people that world federation is a good idea, because they agree. We do not need to spend our time responding to the crazies who think the UN sends out black helicopters at the behest of the Trilateral Commission. A February 2005 Gallup poll found that only 13% favor the US giving up its membership in the UN. Despite their claims and volume, this fringe does NOT speak for America, and can only gain in prominence from being taken seriously in a debate. Nor should we spend time arguing with those who avoid talking about "world government" because it will scare the ignorant masses. This fear is at odds with empirically verifiable reality.

So if the American people already agree with us, why is world government not on the national agenda?

A clue may be in the answer to a poll of Americans that Gallup took in 2000. A large majority, 58%, said that how their Senator voted on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty would not be a factor in their decision to vote to reelect their Senator.

This attitude may be illustrative of what Americans feel about global affairs in general. Intellectually, they KNOW world federation is important: When asked, 79% said that strengthening the UN should be an important foreign policy goal. But it is not something that captures their energy or imagination. It is not something they give money to, spend time on, or let affect their votes.

This is our job: Convince people that Democratic World Federation is IMPORTANT. They must know this not only in their heads, but in their hearts and in their bones. We need to give them a call to action. We should start with those who are already activists, people working for world peace, to clean up the Earth's environment, to free global trade while protecting worker's rights and end global poverty, to raise the status of women and protect human rights everywhere. These people need to understand that their concerns cannot even begin to be addressed properly until there is a government for all of Earth. And when all of these people begin to call for democratic world federation, the general public will come to realize the importance of this issue for all of humanity's most pressing concerns.

*“Stages Toward World Federation” continued from page 10*

authority applying federal law, and by federal institutions providing peaceful ways of resolving disputes.

The power struggles causing civil wars *within* member states are diverted into constitutional channels. Civil wars are a worldwide scourge which damages or destroys decades of costly and painstaking social and economic development.

**The fourth purpose is in global relations.** Federations would enable regions to exercise their fair share of political and economic power and influence. In global negotiations and conferences, picture delegations from the United States of Africa, South America, Central Asia, or South Asia, for example, rather than today's multitude of smaller states facing continental powers and large federations.

Some find regional federation inconsistent with global federation. Logically, that argument would require the break-up of existing regional federations and other sub-continental states, as a condition of entry into world federation. However, federation clearly makes sense for the US, Canada, India and Europe. Other regions of the world should have the same advantages.

In fact, many have already reached that conclusion and have started down the path. Some regional arrangements are of recent origin. Others, with a longer history but little to show for it, have recently taken on a new lease of life. Altogether, they are signs of the shape of things to come. (See footnote.)

Apart from these embryonic regional unions, existing large sub-continental states such as China have the makings of democratic regional federations. Their future path is the reform of their systems in respect of democracy and human rights, as well as true federation to which democracy is closely related.

**The fifth purpose of regional federation is its role in world federation.** If the preconditions of universal democracy and regional federation are met, a form of democratic world federation should be feasible. What form should it take?

The next step would be a world federation of regional federations. Since the regional federations would be unequal in size, the federal legislature would have to be based partly on equal representation of regional federations regardless of size, and partly on representation according to population, as in the US Congress. The federal administration, public service and institutions would face similar issues.

**A period of transition.**

When it is established, the first world federation will almost certainly fall short of true federation. This is because a fully fledged world federation requires a degree of social and economic development which cannot be achieved in the present international jungle. Nonetheless, to free the development process from the global conditions holding it back, a working model of democratic federation will be needed, however limited in the early stages. How long the period of transition will last is impossible to predict, but it will be a period of constant change, as social and economic development change the face of the planet and the world federation evolves in response.

Here is the paradox: world federation is needed to solve the world's most intractable problems, but there cannot be real world federation until they are largely solved. It will be limited in scope by the very problems it must address. An interim structure of federal world governance would have the mandate and institutions to impose world law and pursue global social and economic development in a climate of peace and cooperation. It will also include regional representation and regional autonomy in sufficient measure to allay mutual fears of foreign domination, whether by a majority or a minority. It will be the necessary bridge to cross from the old world to the new. -- *An economist, Peter Bailey sits on the DWF Board of Directors.*

**NOTES: Regional unions in the making:**

**Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN, 1967),** founded initially for economic cooperation, it is giving more attention to human rights (vis-à-vis Myanmar).

**Caribbean Community (CARICOM, 1973).** Its single market and economy came into effect on 1 January 2006.

**Cooperation Council for The Arab States Of The Gulf (1981)** aiming for a common currency by 2010.

**South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC, 1985)** - India, Pakistan and neighboring states. Its free trade agreement went into force on 1 January 2006.

**Pacific Islands Forum (2000)** includes Australia and New Zealand, as well several small island states.

**Eurasian Economic Community (2000)** - includes Russia and some former Soviet states, but not Ukraine. It aims for a common market, joint social and economic development, common policies and services.

**African Union (AU, 2002).** Successor to the Organization of African Unity, it aims to be modeled on the EU, but has a long way to go.

**South American Community of Nations (2004),** modeled on the EU. Hopes for complete union by 2019.

**MARK YOUR CALENDAR!**

**DEMOCRATIC WORLD FEDERALISTS**

Sunday, 13 January: Winter 2008 Meeting of the Board of Directors.

12 Noon, Brown-bag lunch; 1 p.m. Meeting Starts.

Room 221, 55 New Montgomery St., SF.

Directors, Supporters, and others interested in participating, RSVP 1-415-227-4880 or [dwfed@dwfed.org](mailto:dwfed@dwfed.org). Latecomers ring "#225" at intercom at front door of building.

**MySpace!**

Visit us at [www.myspace.com/dwfed](http://www.myspace.com/dwfed), newly created by Administrative Officer Sarah Wood

# CONCEPTS FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT: THE EARTH CONSTITUTION'S OMBUDSMUS

by Roger Kotila , Novato, California

The Earth Constitution, drafted over a period of thirty years by the World Constitution and Parliament Association, is a democratic federal world constitution whose design is intended to insure good government, and to eliminate bad government.

"Good" government is democratic, has effective checks and balances, protects human rights, minimizes use of violence, and serves the world public interest and the basic needs of its citizenry. "Bad" government violates democratic principles and inalienable rights, relies on secrecy and propaganda, resorts to threats and violence to achieve its goals, and serves narrow self-interest.

Checks and balances in the American government appear to be failing as the Executive Branch in collusion with its Justice Department has been able to assume new, almost dictatorial powers. Americans have seen loss of habeas corpus, use of torture under the cover of war, and what may be war crimes.

One remedy to such abuses can be found in the Earth Constitution which contains in its Judiciary and Enforcement System an independent Ombudsman fully empowered to protect "we, the people." If an Office of Ombudsman existed, it could have challenged the legal interpretations made by U.S. Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, which opened the door for the Executive Branch to adopt dictatorial powers.

The Earth Constitution's Office of World Ombudsman (Article XI) aims to prevent misplaced power in its defined role as public defender: "...To protect the People of Earth and all indi-

viduals against violations or neglect of universal human and civil rights which are stipulated in Article XII..."

Article XII, Bill of Rights for Citizens of Earth, states that "...Individuals or groups suffering violation or neglect of such (inalienable) rights shall have full recourse through the World Ombudsman, the Enforcement System, and the World Courts for redress of grievances."

"Inalienable" rights in the Earth Constitution include habeas corpus, prohibition against torture, prohibition against surveillance as a means of political control, a requirement of warrants for searches and arrests, and much more.

Taken in sum, although Americans may eventually regain their rights without constitutional reform, the Earth Constitution's Ombudsman provision, if adopted, could help Americans -- and other citizens of the Earth -- restore checks and balances. Better yet would be if the United States and other countries joined the Earth Federation/Earth Constitution. If government went bad and all channels for correction within the nation were blocked, the citizenry could appeal for redress at the world federal level.

For any citizen in any country where corruption has denigrated democracy and basic rights, access to another level of government such as symbolized by the Earth Federation/Earth Constitution would provide a new level of appeal to correct grievances and to obtain justice.--Dr. Kotila is Chairman of the D.W.F. Board of Directors and USA Vice President of WCPA.

---

**Help us share the knowledge that can lead to a just and sustainable world  
by supporting the Democratic World Federalists.**

Yes, I'd like to:

- become a Supporter of D.W.F.;
- make my annual *renewal* payment in order to retain my status as a Supporter of D.W.F.
- make a gift enabling the following to become a D.W.F. Supporter (info. below).

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Address: \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

**Suggested annual payment,  
\$50 and above; \$25 for  
limited income & youth.**

Donor-Supporters receive our publication, *Toward Democratic World Federation*, and (for those with e-mails) timely updates on news and policies relevant to the governing of our world. We also offer a free copy of Norman Cousins's *The Human Experience* to all Supporters anywhere in the world who make contributions of US\$250/Euro 175.00 and above.

I've enclosed a donation of:  \$50;  \$100;  \$250;  \$500;  \$1,000;  \$2,500;  Other \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
(or Euro equivalent where US \$100 = Euro 70) -- All contributions are tax deductible to the extent allowed by law.

Mail checks or money orders payable to the **Democratic World Federalists** to  
55 New Montgomery St., #225, San Francisco, CA 94105

MY INFORMATION:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

# STAGES TOWARD WORLD FEDERATION

by Peter Bailey, Ottawa, Ontario

A joint statement of the Union of European Federalists and the World Federalist Movement in November 2005 read in part as follows:

"The UEF and WFM call for:

1) the European Union to agree on a single seat in the UN Security Council which would pave the way for the entry of all regional groupings of states and transform it into a Council of the large regions of the world;

2) the states in other continents of the world to face the challenges of democratization and of globalization by promoting further development of their regional integration and by promoting solidarity and cooperation between their regional groupings within the United Nations."

The most persistent questions in the world federalist movement are: where do we start, what route should we take, how should democratic world federation be structured? In other words how do we get from Here to There, and what should There look like? The joint statement above gives us a clue.

The answers may lie in a three-stage development. The first stage would be key, namely the establishment of a global pattern of regional federation. The second stage would be a limited form of world federation to manage a transitional period of coherent global development in a climate of peace. The third stage would be true world federation with all the features of an open, free and democratic global society, leading in time to a transformation of the human presence on this planet.

Regional federation is the natural foundation for world federation for good reason. It serves several vital purposes.

**The first purpose is economic.** This can be seen without elaborate analysis. Compare the USA with Africa. If the American states were independent countries, with their own currencies and balance of payments, many would have the same problems as most African countries, namely chronic balance of payments problems and external debt crises reflecting weak economies and stunted development. Regional federation offers member countries the same mutual economic support that the American federation provides its states. The misery of illusory independence is replaced by the joys of political cohesion, combined resources, collective development and monetary union.

**The second purpose is political.** The difficult process of unifying different political systems under a federation brings democratic principles and practice into focus. An authoritarian regime may be able to function in a single state, but a regional union of many states, bringing a variety of interests, views and backgrounds to the table, must be based on equally fair representation, consultation, and consensus.

Above all, by any criteria **a federation cannot include both democratic and non-democratic states.** How could its legislature function, its laws be applied, its public service be staffed, its administration be effective? Regional federations are therefore natural instruments of democracy, forcing would-be members to align their political systems and practices if they wish to reap the benefits of union.

**The third purpose is the enforcement of peace.** Conflicts *between* member states are inevitably eliminated by supranational

*continued on page 8*

## Toward Democratic World Federation

*"World Peace with Justice through Democratically Enacted & Enforceable World Law"*

Vol. 16 No. 3/4  
Summer/Autumn  
2007

### DEMOCRATIC WORLD FEDERALISTS

55 New Montgomery St., Suite 225  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3421  
Phone & Fax: 1-415-227-4880,  
E-mail: [dwfed@dwfed.org](mailto:dwfed@dwfed.org)  
URL: [www.dwfed.org](http://www.dwfed.org)

Nonprofit Org.  
U. S. Postage  
**PAID**  
San Francisco, CA  
Permit No 11368

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

### Table of Contents

Meaning of the 21st Century .....	1
Israel-Palestine Conference .....	2
My 5 Citizenships .....	4
Reves on "Disarmament?" .....	5
What World Federalists Should Do .....	7
Concepts of Good Government -- Ombudsmus .....	9

*Naturally the common people don't want war. All you have to do is to tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country.*

**-- Reich-Marshal Hermann Goering**

