

UNITED WORLD
CDWG NEWS AND VIEWS
Gary K. Shepherd, Editor
401 S. Dixon
Carbondale, IL 62901

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Editor's Corner | 2 |
| Letters to the Editor | 4 |
| Decline and Decision | 5 |
| by Hank Stone | |
| A Global Civilization For the People of the Planet | 8 |
| by Duncan Graham | |
| The Uniting Of Nations: An Essay On Global Governance | |
| By John McClintock | 10 |
| A Book Review by Ronald J. Glossop | |
| Autonomy Or National Sovereignty | 13 |
| by Harold S. Bidmead | |
| News and Notes from All Over | 15 |

UNITED WORLD/CDWG NEWS AND VIEWS is an independent journal of Unitist thought sponsored by the Coalition for Democratic World Government. Subscriptions are \$12.00 (U.S.) per year or 12 ounces worth of International Reply Coupons (IRC). Submissions are welcome. All articles copyright of the authors unless otherwise specified. Send to:

UNITED WORLD/CDWG NEWS & VIEWS

Gary K. Shepherd, Ed.

Box 1363

Carbondale, IL 62903

< uwcdwg@yahoo.com >

Visit our website at <http://www.geocities.com/uwcdwg>

Editor's Corner: And the Answer is . . .

Few people like being told what to think. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that few people like to think they are being told what to think. When peoples' ideas and deeply rooted convictions are challenged, their natural reaction is to dig in, become defensive, and attempt to doggedly refute any assault. In cases like this, arguing can actually be counter-productive, and the better one's debating points, the less likely they are to persuade the person one is trying to convince.

The ancient Greek philosopher Socrates understood this, and thus he developed what has come to be known as the Socratic Method. Instead of telling his students what they should think, Socrates would ask them a series of questions, designed so that in the process of answering these questions, they would be forced to re-examine their ideas and assumptions. Thus, with this subtle and gentle form of persuasion, Socrates could guide them into arriving at the correct conclusions by themselves. If practiced correctly, this method can not only teach someone something new, but also can leave the person convinced that the new ideas they have discovered are entirely their own creation.

It would be beneficial for those of us in the world unity movement to learn this two thousand year old lesson. After all, we are challenging assumptions that have been in place for centuries, that are so deeply imbedded in our culture that most people are not even aware that they are making them. No matter how logical our arguments, not matter how accurate our facts may be, we are not going to convince anyone if our method is simply to rhetorically bludgeon our opponents into admitting defeat.

Instead of answering claims and declarations of belief with counter-claims and declarations, we need to be asking questions. The questions need to be carefully crafted, and we need to be prepared to actually listen to peoples' answers, not only so that we can ask them more and better questions, but also so that we can truly understand where these people are coming from.

What I would like to propose, is a guide book of questions to ask when someone makes a statement or declaration with which we disagree. It would be something like an episode of the television game show, Jeopardy, in which the contestants are given the answers, and must come up with the questions. Unlike Jeopardy, however, there would not be just one single ‘right’ question for each answer. Instead, there would be a series of questions, leading to an epiphany that would come, not from the outside, but from within the person’s own soul and mind.

I will give one example of the kind of thing I have in mind:

Answer: Democratic World Government is simply impossible. I’m not going to waste my time and energy working for something that can never be achieved.

Questions: What is it about Democratic World Government that makes it impossible? Haven’t many things that were once considered impossible, like airplanes or women’s suffrage, later come about? Isn’t everything impossible until somebody succeeds in doing it for the first time? If we live in a world of infinite possibilities, how can we say that anything is truly impossible? If enough people come to believe that DWG is possible, then will it become possible? What will that take? What would have to happen for it to demonstrate it is possible?

I’m sure you get the idea. We invite our readers to submit their own lists of answers and questions, based on their own experience talking with people of different opinions. Hopefully we will get enough responses. to compile them into a guidebook for members of the movement to use when they run into opposition to their ideas. . . which they almost certainly will. If we hope to succeed in creating the most revolutionary change the world has ever seen, we need to train ourselves to be powerful advocates of our beliefs.

Any questions?



Letters to the Editor

Dear Mr. Shepherd

Please excuse me that I have forgotten to send the next fee for the “United World” since March 11. Thanks for sending me the newsletter despite the fact that I didn’t pay! Enclosed are \$24 ill March 13. Meantime, I am 88 years old and I hope to stay healthy for some more years, in order to e able to help in my thoughts for world peace and a United World.

Best wishes for you and your work,

Diemut Kuebart
D82152 Krailling
Ahornstrasse 2
Germany

Dear Gary,

Delighted to see the email forwarded by a World Federalist colleague. Ten years ago we were exchanging newsletters. The Purple Dawn has been phased out, but [I’m] still circulating global citizens proposals.

Best wishes.
Duncan Graham
1404-1650 Haro St.
Vancouver BC V6G 2X9
Canada

Editor’s Note: Has it really been ten years? We remember Purple Dawn very fondly. Thanks for sending us one of your proposals – printed later on in this issue – and for the many world unity related quotations.



Decline And Decision

by Hank Stone

So many issues face our country and our world that normal people shrug them off, and concentrate on doing their jobs, raising their children, and keeping their households together. But there is something simple to understand, and something simple to do: the Decline and the Decision.

The Decline: World population is 7 billion, after doubling twice in the last one hundred years. Meanwhile world production of cheap oil has peaked. A growing population faces decline of the resource base that has brought prosperity to the developed world.

Peak oil calls world food production into question because tractor fuel, fertilizer, insecticides, transport and processing all depend on vast amounts of fossil fuels. Fresh water for irrigation and arable land are also peaking. As long as technology could serve up faster and faster resource use to match our growing numbers, we didn't have to face the truth. Now we do.

Our success at procreation and our endless appetite for resources have denuded the landscape. Now, like a global game of musical chairs, we can no longer take for granted that children born today will have the food they need to live.

For our whole lifetimes, advancing technology gave us increasing efficient ways to use natural resources. Some believe that technology can be substituted for oil, or fresh water; it cannot. The U.S. uses 21 million barrels of oil EVERY DAY. No substitute energy source is available in real time. Wind and especially solar energy can potentially replace fossil fuel energy, but not without decades and probably generations to build new infrastructure.

World population growth will inevitably end. It's simple: anything unsustainable cannot be sustained. It will stop. World populations, which have been growing since the Black Plague, will peak and decline.

The Decision: Rampant population growth will end. But it can end in two basic ways. We human beings face a decision.

If we continue on the present path, the rich and powerful will do what they must to preserve their possessions and privilege. They will acknowledge neither the decline nor the decision and claim the right to be surrounded by plenty. After all, God helps those who help themselves.

This would be a reasonable choice for the rich, except that it forces people whose families are literally starving into desperate acts, including theft, terrorism, revolution, and genocide. In the age of nuclear weapons, no one is safe until everyone is safe. Furthermore, if we expect to confront climate change, the world will have to act together.

What alternative response could there be, to dramatically reduced resources per capita? Suppose we wanted to live sustainably, so that no crisis like this one would happen for the foreseeable future. Suppose we wanted an arbitrarily high standard for living for everyone, with wilderness preserved, and enough resources of all kinds? Suppose we wanted to work toward a future world in which everyone had enough?

We would have to make FOUR DECISIONS.

One human family: First, all human beings are in this together. Civilization will not be sustainable with outsiders so desperate they have nothing to lose. Climate change requires joint action. Utopian or not, we need "the brotherhood of man".

Cooperation: Second, we retool societies worldwide for efficiency, renewable energy, and climate change recovery. We share best practices for farming, manufacturing and operating an economy. We do this cooperatively, as an alternative to war as a jobs program. Where there are disagreements, we set up discussion, mediation, arbitration, and laws to resolve them. If individuals break the law, they are individually subject to arrest, but justice requires an end to the war system.

Population: Third, we agree to intentionally limit fertility to bring population, in every region of the world, back into balance with sustainable

carrying capacity. This should be done with non-coercive incentives and disincentives. Animal populations that overshoot their carrying capacity die off. That would be a tragedy for the human family.

Share: Fourth, we prepare for energy and population decline. We plan for sharing during hard times. What basic necessities does life with dignity require? Everyone needs potable water, clothing, shelter, basic education, basic healthcare, and a sustainable food supply. The grain now fed to livestock, if consumed by human beings directly, could end hunger. Eating meat is unsustainable while people are starving.

These are radical decisions, but not unreasonable, unwise or unkind. They are likely to be welcomed by most of the world's inhabitants as deserving support.

Do not underestimate the importance of personally making these decisions. Society has a lot of inertia, but will go where the people lead.

Life on Earth has existed for at least three billion years. Modern humans have existed for perhaps two million years. Recorded human history is just thousands of years old. And we have known the basic layout of the Universe for less than 100 years. We humans are just starting out.

With luck and care, humankind can prosper on Earth for billions more years. That's a long adventure story. That's a lot of time to have fun, to make mistakes and learn from them. That's a lot of opportunity to figure out how to live and thrive.

But it depends upon recognizing the decline and deciding on civilization.



A Global Civilization for the People Of The Planet

by Duncan Graham

We are in a white-water of global chaos in the present state of international finances, climate change, rogue-failed states, wealth disparity, environmental and ecological degradation, and more. Basic issues of security, economic and social justice are planetary in nature, and though we have a human mosaic of cultures, languages and spiritual aspirations, we are also a brotherhood and sisterhood of humankind: the Global Village. However, there is no self-government for this Nation of Humanity. There is a political vacuum at the planetary level. A civilized world promised in so many declarations and treaties is largely unfulfilled. (Pact of Paris, 1929; UDHR, 1948; Complete and General Disarmament in the McCloy-Zorin Accord, 1963; Summit for Children, 1992; and the Millennium Project, 2000.)

The present Westphalian model of world society based on sovereign nation states is dysfunctional in the present reality. Since the Hague Conference of 1899, we have had 111 years of blood, sweat and tears in the struggle to create a world of peace and justice – but it was a start. The League of Nations after WWI was an effort (First Parliament of Mankind, The Globe, Toronto, 15 Feb. 1919). World War II saw the creation of the pre-nuclear United Nations, perhaps the best possible in 1945, but there was no UN Charter Review in 1955. The same five Permanent Members of the UN Security Council of 1945 are still entrenched, and “saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war” is a lost cause in the arms bazaar of \$1,600 billion *annual* expenditures. The United Nation has played a positive role in many areas. The UN specialized agencies have a mixed record. Our legacy to our children and their children, however, is being debased, curtailed and stolen.

History is being telescoped. We are in the childhood of our species, and our right of passage to the beauty of humankind is glowing at the horizon of human consciousness. The status quo is not an option.

Progression for the next quantum leap to a human civilization is already in the minds of those in the foremost files of time. To explore, discuss and debate the political, moral and spiritual dimensions of planetary governance should be the provenance of an in-gathering of representatives from sub-national political constituencies – provinces, states in federal systems, mega-cities, and the 100 smaller nations of the U.N. These political entities have a mindset and an outlook that appreciates the reality of being part of a greater whole. They have an understanding of the planetary ecumene. (The whole is greater than the sum of the parts.) They more directly represent the world’s people than the 193 member states of the United Nations.

Electronic population-weighted voting would democratize the process and guide the agenda. A dynamic could develop to envision a planetary political base as legitimate as the nation-state system. A confluence of concerns could play the catalytic role in creating the centripetal political will and energy that could fuse the disparate threads into a coherent pattern. Evolving an effective planetary federal government for our seven billion people and the inter-connected web of all life would be a political Copernican Revolution – a metanoia in how we see the evolution of our human society.

The rationale for this approach first surfaced at a meeting of the Second Parliamentary Conference on the Americas, Puerto Rico, 2000, where the topic was a Free Trade Area of the Americas and the themes were accountability to people, transparency and the need for equity and solidarity for the most vulnerable. The participants were legislators from regional and sub-national constituencies in the Americas. At one point the chair, Jean-Pierre Charbonneau, president of the Quebec National Assembly, cautioned the meeting that they were discussing resolutions to be forwarded to national governments, *not* setting up a Parliament of the Americas. A coalescing equation had been generated.

“There is no question there will be a global government this century. The questions are will it be totalitarian, benign, or participatory democratic, and whether it will come by cataclysm, incremental steps, or rational design; the probabilities being in that order.” Saul Mendlovitz, Prof. of World Order Studies, Rutgers University, and 1991 recipient of the UNESCO Peace Education Award.

The Uniting of Nations:
Essay On Global Governance
A Book Review by Ronald J. Glossop

Editor's Note: This review originally appeared in the Winter, 2012, issue of *Global Solutions News*.

The Uniting of Nations (P.I.E. Peter Lang, 3rd ed., 2010) argues for the need for a governed world community and uses the European Union as a model for how that could be accomplished. One must start with small steps and proceed gradually in such a way that national governments will want to join to gain something specific for themselves. The European Union would be the nucleus and other countries could join this global political union separately, but they would then be required to work together to form their own regional organizations. Thus eventually there would a world federation made up of regional federations, one of which would be the European Union which initiated the new global organization.

McClintock begins the book with a summary for those “who do not have time to read the whole essay” (p. 17). The world faces many problems, problems which no country by itself can solve and which can only get worse. The only way forward is for countries to work together. Europe is a region of the world demonstrating how nations can share sovereignty in order to improve both their national welfare and the welfare of the whole group. “What Europe has done, the world needs to do. This essay explains how.” (p. 18).

The many current global problems not being handled shows that “the present system of global governance is dysfunctional” (p. 18). The basic problem is the lack of a sovereign governing body for the whole global community which can make and enforce laws as sovereign national governments do within countries. Just as citizens share sovereignty in order to establish a governing body within their nations, so national governments need to share sovereignty in order to establish a governing body at the global level. The European Union is a good example of a governing body over nations which

has both sovereign powers and political legitimacy. On the other hand, the U.N.'s Security Council has impressive powers on paper, but not in the real world. The U.N. Security Council also lacks political legitimacy, because five countries are permanent members with a veto power, while at any one time only seven percent of the 193 countries are represented at all.

The global community must do two things: assist the failing nation-states and “bring into being a governing body which can act effectively at the global level” (p. 23). But the first task itself requires “a system of global governance that works” (p. 24) and the rules set up by the U.N. Charter are such that the Security Council can never be reformed. “Something new needs to be created” (p. 25). This new global organization could be initiated by “the European Union and around half-a-dozen or so pioneer states” (p. 26)

As was done in Europe the new global governance community could start with a few countries focused on a single problem like food security (p. 27) and then “a community for climate, energy and prosperity” (p. 28). As the European Community was furthered by the *Zeitgeist* of a united Europe, so the current *Zeitgeist* of globalism can support the creation of a Global Union. Perhaps future historians will see the European Union as an experiment in sharing sovereignty by states that could be followed by the whole world.

Having given the overall thesis, McClintock turns to the details. The global threats not being handled by the current global governance system are “War and Conflict,” “Acts of Terrorism,” “Nuclear Weapons,” “Depletion of Natural Resources,” “Instability in the Domain of International Finance,” “The Outsourcing of Jobs,” “Migration,” “Indebted Countries,” “The Violation of Human Rights,” “Climate Change,” “The Concentration of Corporate Power,” and “Pandemics”. McClintock documents each of these problems and how the existing global system is not dealing with them. International organizations exist but they “are not in a position to make and enforce law” (p. 74). They do not possess sovereign powers (which is what Hobbes noted a government must have) and they don't have political legitimacy (which Rousseau and Locke noted that a government must have).

In chapter three, McClintock focuses on the problem of failing states and asks what is necessary for a state to succeed as a state. The two pre-conditions for success are a sense of national unity and a benign international environment (pp. 84–85). He gives a detailed history of Sierra Leone and a brief reference to India to substantiate his view. Chapter four gives a history of the European Union emphasizing its successes while chapter five gives a history of the U.N. recognizing its successes but emphasizing its shortcomings. Chapter six argues that the European Union is a better and more legitimate governing body than the U.N. Security Council. Chapter seven, titled “A World of Chaotic Anarchy” marks the culmination of McClintock’s thesis that the basic cause of our global mess is “the fact that the behavior of states is unregulated” (p. 159).

Part II, “What Are The Options?” has only one chapter, chapter eight. The options he considers and rejects are: (1) reforming the Security Council; (2) Expanding the European Union; (3) merging existing regional organizations; (4) expanding the G-8 or NATO or the Commonwealth of Nations or the Non-Aligned Movement or the Conference of Democracies to include all nations; (5) getting the United States to become an enlightened global hegemon; and (6) strengthening the roles of international law (p. 172). McClintock concludes “that if the world is going to avail itself of a governing body that can be effective, it has no choice but to create such a body” (p. 186). His specific proposals on how to do that, following the example of the European Union, are set forth in Part III (chapters 9–14).

Chapter nine is a general discussion of the new global organization that would put forward technical solutions that would be “politically acceptable to all the parties concerned” (p. 189). The principles to be followed are gradualism, voluntary membership, membership availability to all nations which could share sovereignty in the relevant area, do no harm to states outside the community, and all states would be required to gather into regions so that the global community would have “at most 15 to 15 members – one member for every region of the world”. (p. 193) Nations could originally join with other nations in the same region to form a single regional organization. The global community as a whole would have three institutions (a legislature, a judiciary and an executive) plus other organs. It would seek

good relations with all countries which aren't yet members, but could as a last resort take tough measures such as suspending trade and cooperation. In chapter 12, McClintock lays out a food security plan which might be the first practical project for the global community. In chapter 13 he describes a second project, "a community for climate, energy and prosperity" (p. 189).

Despite the great contribution this book makes to thinking about global governance, it is not without deficiencies. No mention is made of the role of NGOs or of the International Criminal Court or the language problem facing Europe and the global community. Even though McClintock is arguing for the need for a world federation, he says nothing about the arguments of other well-known advocates of world federalism such as Alexander Hamilton. From a world federalist point of view, it is surprising that there is nothing about the difference between a confederation and a federation, although that distinction is at the very core of McClintock's main thesis about the need for a more effective global organization. But McClintock does successfully address what has been a huge issue for world federalists, namely, how do we begin to move forward from where we are now?



Autonomy Or National Sovereignty **by Harold S. Bidmead**

President Wilson's doctrine of self-determination appears to have been widely misinterpreted – even by him (witness the League of Nations) as an argument for the survival of national sovereignty, a myth as outdated as the divine right of kings. None can dispute the right of every nation to settle its own private affairs in its own fashion, but it is equally indisputable that no nation ought to claim the right to act as judge and jury in its own case if it involves the rights and interests of other nationals. In other words, autonomy is good, national sovereignty is evil.

That is what national sovereignty means. It is consequently the prime cause of war, to which all other causes are secondary, such as poverty, greed, totalitarianism, armament kings, social injustice and the like, National sovereignty is the reason for the pathetic failure of the League of Nations and its mirror image the U.N., of the basic disunity of the European “Union” and of all other international instruments based on the fallacy that “the state is all”.

Struggles, even wars, are taking place at this very moment all over the world to establish self-determination for peoples who feel themselves oppressed by others – ethnic Albanians, Kurds, Tamils, Basques, Palestinians... the list seems endless. All are demanding independence, by which they mean autonomy, since those who attain independence no sooner obtain it than they realize that for many purposes they are seriously dependent on many – if not all – of their neighbors. The fact is that the old Soviet Union, the old Yugoslavia, and other similar coagulations are breaking up into what could become constituencies of future wider federations, since a federal constitution is the only instrument known to modern political science that guarantees true unity whilst ensuring non-interference by the union government in the legitimate private affairs of the constituent member states.

World War Two was waged against three enemies whose motto was “the state is all”. The victors then created the U.N. based on the same fallacy: “National Sovereignty is the divine right of states” (Art. 2.1). They should have realized that by returning to the year 1919 (League of Nations – also based on national sovereignty – which failed as miserably as the U.N.) they were creating not a peacekeeping authority but a mere debating society.



News and Notes from All Over

Errol E. Harris 1908–2009

It is with great sadness that we at *UNITED WORLD* just recently learned about the death of one of its long-time subscribers and contributors, Prof. Errol E. Harris, who passed away more than two years ago. Prof Harris was born in 1908 in South Africa, and was educated there and in Great Britain. He served in the South African army in World War II (during which he met his wife Sylvia). He returned to South Africa to teach, but in the 1950s left the country permanently because of his opposition to its apartheid policy. He taught philosophy in a number of universities in the United States and Britain, including Yale, Edinburgh University and Northwestern University, and was considered a world expert on the work of Hegel and Spinoza. He officially retired in 1976, but continued to lecture and write for many more years, publishing his last book when he was 99.

Harris was the author of more than thirty books, including *Earth Federation Now!*, *One World or None: Prescription for Peace*, and *Atheism and Theism*. He served for many years as vice-president of the World Constitution and Parliament Association and traveled and lectured extensively on the subject of World Federalism. He was a tireless advocate of the Constitution for the Federation of Earth, and was honored for his work by the Provisional World Parliament meeting at Bangkok in 2003. He died on June 21, 2009 at the age of 101.