

A World Security Community of democratic nations

Project description

Group leaders: Chris Hamer and Didier Jacobs



Working group members: Olivier d'Argenlieu, Afroza Begum, Cornelia Beyer, Daniel Blewitt, Michelle Cavanagh, Daryl Le Cornu, John Davenport, Peter Davidse, Radhiga Dey, Zeny Edwards, Farsan Ghassim, Chris Hamer, Wali Islam, Didier Jacobs, Guy Kennedy, Allen Luke, Ton Macel, Austin Mackell, Domenico Moro, Richard Ponzio, Chris Powers, Ralph Pullman, Richard Rosecranz, Brett Samuel, Dion Sampson, Camilla Schippa, Silvia Solidoro, Brian Hyouk Son, Keith Suter, Quoc-Hung Tran, John Vlasto, Pera Wells, Rick Wicks and James Yuncker.

Acknowledgment: We are extremely grateful to the Global Challenges Foundation for their generous support, which has brought our project to where it is today.

	Index	Page
Summary		2
Introduction		2
Our Proposal		5
Background to the proposal		7
Benefits		9
Possible Problems		13

Looking to the Future	14
Notes and References	16

Summary.

Humanity faces some catastrophic risks to the future well-being of our children. Foremost among them are the ongoing threat of nuclear annihilation, and the new dangers posed by unchecked global warming. It is clear that all of us as world citizens must work together to counter and remove these risks, and for this purpose we need stronger institutions of global governance.

Ideally we need some form of global parliament, where our representatives can decide what needs to be done collectively to solve these problems, and have the power to implement these decisions by means of binding laws and regulations. Democracy must be a fundamental principle of any such system, in order to uphold basic human rights and to guard against any danger of tyranny or autocracy at the global level. Up till now, however, all attempts to reform the United Nations in this direction have failed. Democracy itself is under challenge at the moment from a rising tide of autocracy in some quarters of the globe.

We propose as a first step towards a safer world that democratic nations around the globe should join together to form a World Security Community, embracing various existing alliances such as NATO, ANZUS and the Quad. Acting strictly in conjunction with the UN Security Council, this Community would form a very powerful new force for peace and security in the world. It would be able to guarantee the security of all its members, and also provide strong new facilities for peacebuilding in the wider world in collaboration with the UN.

Such a community would form a natural starting point for the evolution over time of a genuine global parliament, copying the strategy of stage-by-stage international integration which has led to the present European Union. Working alongside the OECD, which should also deepen collaboration among democracies on collective economic, social and environmental policies, the new Community would lay the foundations for our ultimate vision of a democratic world federation able to deal effectively with all our global problems and catastrophic risks.

Introduction

There is increasing recognition that the international system is in crisis, as emphasized in 2018 by the first Peace Forum in Paris, and the New Shape Prize Forum sponsored by the Global Challenges Foundation (GCF) in Stockholm. An authoritative recent report from the Commission for the Human Future (2020) in Australia enumerates ten 'global catastrophic risks' which we need to address. All human beings, regardless of their nationality, have many fundamental interests in common, and face some enormous common problems and catastrophic risks, such as:

- Global warming and other forms of damage to the environment have become an alarming new threat to our children's heritage. This could be humanity's greatest challenge.

- Seventy years after World War II, mankind still faces a looming threat from nuclear weapons. There are still many thousands of nuclear warheads in existence, which have the potential to literally destroy human civilisation as we know it
- Conflicts and wars have displaced around 70 million people, a number greater than the entire population of France, forced to abandon their homes or become refugees.
- Billions of the world's poor still face the ever-present dangers of famine, disease and war. Each day, to our shame, many thousands of children still die needlessly.
- The basic human rights of many thousands of people are trampled on every day, without means of redress.

It is obvious that global problems need global solutions, and clearly, the nations of the world must work more closely together to find solutions to these challenges.

Several of the astronauts have commented, looking back at the Earth, that the artificial boundaries between nation-states are invisible from space. Ideally, we need some form of democratic world federation, including a global parliament, which would be empowered to make binding laws and regulations in order to deal effectively with all these global issues. A recent article by Luis Cabrera (Cabrera 2017) has emphasized this conclusion anew, focusing particularly on the human rights aspect. The present United Nations is not adequate to the task.

A very difficult question is, how do we get there from here? World federalists have been grappling with this problem ever since World War II (Wittner 1993, WFM-IGP, Raskin 2017). They have mostly concentrated on campaigning for reform of the United Nations, only to be stymied by the rigid UN Charter. One of the most lively current initiatives on this front is the Campaign for a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly (CUNPA, Leinen and Bummel 2018), aiming to introduce at least some elements of democratic representation into the UN system.

Uniting seven billion people in nearly two hundred countries – each jealous of its sovereignty – is an enormous task. Like climbing Mount Everest, it will not be achieved in a single giant bound. We will only get there gradually, through a series of base camps (Yuncker 2018). In the Schuman Declaration (1950) for example, the founding document of the European Union, it is stated that “Europe will not be built in a day, or according to a single plan.” The same applies to the global system of governance.

The Europeans have provided the example or template for integration at the regional level, starting from a smaller group (the original ‘Six’), and proceeding stage-by-stage through a series of Treaties to build up the European Union and the European Parliament that we see today. Now we need to emulate that process at the global level. The EU is going through some trials and tribulations at the moment (e.g. Brexit), but the primary objective is secure - there will almost certainly never again be a war between France and Germany.

On the global stage, the integration process should start with the democracies (Streit 1939, Hamer 1998). To guard against autocracy and abuse of power, and to preserve the liberty, human rights and equality of all its citizens, any world federal government must be chosen by means of free and fair elections, with guaranteed freedom of organized groups to stand in opposition to the government in power. Democracy is the only form of government with a 'safety valve', whereby the people can replace the government if it is doing a bad job. And a more practical reason for restricting membership to democratic states is that democracies are demonstrably more peaceful, and less prone to internal conflict, as documented by the Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP 2017).

This working group believes that the path toward a democratic world federation starts with a World Security Community of democratic nations, which could itself evolve out of today's North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Security is at the heart of geopolitics. To be credible, any global governance design must be anchored in the actual balance of power in the world today, while to be acceptable, in our view, any global governance design must be democratic and inclusive. Given that not all nations accept democracy at this time, however, inclusivity cannot yet mean universality (i.e. including all countries).

Democratic nations could lead the way, with a security community open to all countries meeting appropriate criteria. That community could then progressively expand over time to take in the entire world. Through collaboration with other bodies, particularly the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, it could also progressively expand its mandate to tackle other global challenges like economic development, climate change, financial stability, or trade.

The idea of a League or Concert of Democracies was floated about fifteen years ago by a number of politicians, military leaders, and academics. It did not get sufficient traction at the time for two related reasons.

First, the idea of a League/Concert of Democracies had a fatal flaw. Its proponents framed it as an alternative to the United Nations, a body that could intervene where the United Nations failed to act. Given the legacies of the Cold War and imperialism, this view alarmed Russia and raised suspicion among non-Western democratic nations. The security community we propose would work entirely under the authority of the United Nations, and strengthen it, rather than compete with it. The World Security Community of democratic nations should not be a threat to the rest of the world.

Second, the idea of a League/ Concert of Democracies suffered from poor timing. It was developed when the West was at the height of its power, thus reinforcing the suspicion of imperialism, but was quickly overtaken by the 2008 financial crisis, which ushered an era of stalemate in global governance as "emerging" countries asserted their new power while Western countries dug in.

The time is ripe for our proposal of a World Security Community of democratic nations. While populists and nationalists have held the initiative, a counter-movement exemplified by President Biden is beginning to emerge. There is a clear

sense that both democracy and the rules-based world order are threatened, and that the populist and nationalist alternatives are disastrous. Can national democracy survive economic globalization (Kuttner, 2018)? Our response is that we need global democracy to cope with global challenges (Jacobs, 2007).

The recent election of Joe Biden as President of the US offers an exciting opportunity to push forward these ideas. Joe Biden wrote an article in the March/April issue of *Foreign Affairs* entitled '*Rescuing U.S. Foreign Policy after Trump*' (Biden 2020). The centrepiece from our point of view is the promise that during his first year in office, '*the US will organize and host a global **Summit for Democracy** to renew the spirit and shared purpose of the nations of the free world. It will bring together the world's democracies to strengthen our democratic institutions, honestly confront nations that are backsliding, and forge a common agenda.*' He specifies three areas for discussion: fighting corruption, defending against authoritarianism, and advancing human rights. '*The Summit for Democracy will also include civil society organizations from around the world that stand on the frontlines in defense of democracy.*'

We would advocate that:

- 1) A **World Democracy Summit** should be held every year, to function as a council of heads of government to coordinate and plan cooperation between the community of democratic nations around the world;
- 2) A new international institution should be set up to support and implement these plans, some sort of World Community of Democracies. The Summit should set up a commission to draft a new '**Treaty of Washington**' (or whatever) for this purpose, modelled after the Treaty of Rome in Europe;

In the next section our proposed global governance design is presented in some detail. The following section gives some background, and puts this proposal in the context of previous work. Then we discuss country by country or region by region the benefits and the usefulness of the design in bringing about peace and security, and its political feasibility. Finally, our conclusions are summarized

Our Proposal

Our proposal for a World Security Community (WSC) of democratic nations then consists of the following basic elements:

- (1) The Community would be a defense alliance ("an attack on one is an attack on all") and its primary mission would be to guarantee the security and freedom of all its members. Its secondary mission would be to act as their peacebuilding and peacekeeping arm in the wider world, under the aegis of the United Nations. It should include or embrace existing defense alliances among democracies, such as NATO, ANZUS and the new Quad alliance.
- (2) The Community would be a global organization with its membership open to all states committed to democracy, human rights and international law. The membership requirements would be as follows:

- a. Human rights: The founding members would define a list of human rights required for membership, and candidate members would need to figure out for themselves whether they are ready to adopt them or not. In the short term, most of the 87 nations rated as 'fully free' by Freedom House should be eligible without major institutional reforms (Freedom House 2018). In the long run, it is envisaged that the Community would become universal, as democracy eventually spreads to the rest of the globe. Different forms of democratic institutions may be possible, e.g. representative or deliberative systems (newDemocracy).
- b. International law: Community members should not commit aggression; they should use force only in collective self-defense, or when authorized (and indeed called for) by the UN Security Council, in compliance with Articles 2.4 and 51 of the UN Charter. Members of the community should pledge to settle any disputes among themselves by peaceful means, according to international law or by mechanisms set up by the community itself. Community members should also accept the binding jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice to settle disputes with external states peacefully.
- c. Military readiness: Members should contribute their fair share to the collective defense burden by allocating a certain amount to their military budget according to a formula set from time to time by the Community according to the evolving geopolitical environment. Their armed forces should pass an assessment of inter-operationality with other members' armed forces carried out by the Community's Secretariat.

The detailed structure of the Community can only be determined by the commission set up to draft the new Treaty establishing the new organization. But elements we would like to see include:

- (3) Avoid the dysfunctional decision-making system that plagues most intergovernmental organizations including NATO by adopting a 'qualified-majority' voting system, preferably at all levels, as advocated in the past by senior military officials (Jones 2007, Naumann 2007). Such a scheme has been used by the European Union. This would transform the alliance into a 'security community', which we are proposing might be named the *World Security Community* of democratic nations.
- (4) To ensure compliance with its rules, the Community should have the power to suspend the voting rights or even expel members that fail to meet the membership requirements or implement decisions.
- (5) The Community should also channel a fraction of its funds to new peacebuilding facilities, to help prevent future conflicts, and reconstruct failed states after previous conflicts, in conjunction with the new Peacebuilding Commission at the United Nations.
- (6) Structure the organization with prototype organs of democratic governance, following the pattern pioneered in Europe:

- (a) The Community should have a supreme Council of heads of state or government meeting periodically to approve broad Community policy. NATO already has the North Atlantic Council to fulfil this role, **for instance**.
- (b) The Community should have a Council of Ministers from the member states meeting regularly to prepare and approve detailed policy decisions, as in Europe.
- (c) The Community should have a Secretariat of civil servants, whose role would be to oversee the day-to-day operations of the Community, and prepare detailed policy proposals for approval. It could be headed by a Commission on the European model. Within NATO **for instance**, a bureaucracy in Brussels already exists, headed by the Secretary-General, and the regular budget is about \$6 billion per annum, which is already larger than the UN core budget.
- (d) The Community should establish a Parliamentary Assembly, as the nucleus for an eventual elected parliament. NATO already has the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, which could **possibly** play this vital role.
- (e) A Court needs to be established to settle differences over the interpretation of the founding treaty, and to arbitrate any intractable disputes between the member states. This would form the embryo of an eventual system of binding world law.

In addition, we propose three institutional reforms to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in order to deepen relationships among democracies in partnership with the WSC, and contribute to solutions to global catastrophic risks in fields beyond peace and security.

- (7) The OECD should revise its membership requirements and accession process, such that its membership largely but not necessarily entirely overlaps with that of WSC.
- (8) The OECD should start convening summits of its members' heads of state concurrently with the WSC to coordinate their economic, social and environmental policies.
- (9) The OECD should channel funds to foster development in the less developed member states under the principle of 'solidarity' established by the European Union. This would promote a feeling of community among the member states, and provide a strong incentive for new states to join in (Yuncker 2014).

Such an association would be much more flexible than the UN, able to change and grow through successive treaties, and could indeed form the nucleus for an eventual full-scale system of democratic global governance.

Background to the proposal

With the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, NATO lost its original role as bulwark of Western Europe against a possible Soviet attack. Since then it has been slowly developing a new role, remaining as an umbrella organization for the defence of the Atlantic democracies, but now also acting as their "out of area" security and

peacekeeping arm, first in Bosnia, then in Afghanistan and Libya. Members of the EU are still debating whether they should continue to rely on NATO for their collective defence, or establish their own European armed forces.

A number of Eastern European countries have recently joined NATO, which now has 30 members. This puts the old consensus model of decision-making under great strain. At his parting session with the Atlantic Council in 2007, General James Jones, the outgoing Supreme Allied Commander-Europe, called for a stronger political structure for NATO (Jones 2007): “Sooner or later, NATO will have to address whether you want 350 committees all acting on the rule of consensus,” he said. “What’s the logic of one or two countries being able to block action by the remaining 24 members? Why not have a system where they can just opt out?”

Later, a group of five very distinguished military men put forward (Naumann 2007) a ‘Grand Strategy’ for renewing NATO, echoing General Jones’ call. They were all former chiefs of staff in their respective countries (the US, Britain, France, Germany and Holland), headed by General John Shalikashvili of the US. Among many other suggestions, they suggested a shift in NATO decision-making from consensus to majority voting, and the abolition of national caveats in operational matters. This change alone would transform NATO from a mere alliance into a genuine Community.

Along with new members, many countries further afield have become NATO “Partners”. It is therefore not a huge step to envision expanding NATO membership to democracies outside the traditional boundaries of Europe and North America. Former Spanish Prime Minister Aznar advocated just such an expansion (Aznar 2006). Emphasizing the new threat of terrorism, he argued that NATO should develop a new dimension of homeland security to counter it, including integration of intelligence information and security services across all the democracies. He thus concluded that stable democracies such as Japan and Australia should be invited to join. This call was echoed on the other side of the Atlantic by Senator John McCain during his 2007 run for the US presidency, who advocated a League of Democracies (McCain 2007). Reinforcing this theme, the former Danish Prime Minister and Secretary-General of NATO, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, has recently published a book offering a bold plan for an Alliance for Democracy, a “strengthened American and European alliance, joined by like-minded liberal democracies such as Japan and Australia, to create a military, political, and economic bulwark against the forces of tyranny” (Rasmussen 2016).

Many of these changes have also been called for by the NATO Parliamentary Assembly (Resolution 337). Academics have further debated the concept of a League or Concert of Democracies (Ikenberry and Slaughter 2006; Daalder and Lindsay 2007).

In recent years **however**, NATO has been recalled towards its original purpose by the revanchist behaviour of Russia under Vladimir Putin. Russia was alarmed and suspicious when its former Soviet satellites in the Baltic states and Eastern Europe elected to join NATO after the breakup of the Soviet Union. Russia’s recent annexation of the Crimea, and destabilisation of the eastern Ukraine, has in turn

alarmed the Baltic states and the Eastern Europeans, fearing that they may be the next Russian targets. They have called for more concrete support from NATO as insurance against such a possibility, and indeed NATO has responded to these requests. At the Warsaw summit in 2016, NATO members agreed on steps to “reinforce our collective defence, enhance our capabilities and strengthen our resilience” (Warsaw 2016). But disagreements have emerged about the stance NATO should adopt toward Russia, with some decision-makers preferring confronting Russia over her aggressive behaviour, at the risk of provoking her, while others prefer appeasing Russia, at the risk of emboldening her. This ongoing debate underscores the tension inherent to NATO’s expansion. At the most recent NATO Summit (2021), European leaders Angela Merkel and Emmanuel Macron were wary of expanding NATO’s mission and starting a new Cold War with China, and wanted NATO to concentrate on its original mission of defending against possible attacks from Russia, e.g. in Ukraine.

Benefits

Let us look at the advantages of this scheme from several different points of view.

a) NATO

Advantages of the scheme from the point of view of NATO members would include

- It would provide a virtually ironclad guarantee against external attack for its members. The more members, the bigger their collective power;
- It would enable them to share the responsibility, and pool their resources, in providing for the common defence and carrying out peacekeeping and security operations;
- It would cure the dysfunctional decision-making procedure presently operative within NATO
- It would provide a new legal framework for settling international disputes between members
- It would give NATO an extended and hugely important mission for the future towards achieving world peace.

b) OECD

There is a large overlap between the countries who are members of NATO and the OECD. Some 22 countries are members of both organizations.

There are 6 countries which are members of NATO but not the OECD, namely Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Romania. They would presumably be happy to become members of the new Community.

On the other hand, there are 12 countries which are members of the OECD but not NATO, namely Australia, Austria, Chile, Finland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Sweden and Switzerland.

Several of these latter countries are neutrals, including Austria, Ireland, Sweden and Switzerland. Japan has a well-known clause in its Constitution forbidding the formation of armed forces. These countries might be happy to join the new global Community, however, given its dedication to ensuring the peace and security of all. There has been considerable internal debate recently within Sweden and Finland, for example, as to whether they should in fact join NATO, fuelled by the revanchist behaviour of Russia. If NATO were to become a global security community, working in conjunction with the UN, that might very well tip the balance and persuade Sweden and other neutrals to join the new organisation.

Others in this group are not now members because they lie outside the North Atlantic area, but they are already allied with the US under individual defense treaties. Australia and New Zealand, for instance, are already allied with the United States under the ANZUS Treaty, which is seen as the bedrock of their security. They also share intelligence with the United States, Britain and Canada via the 'Five Eyes' network. Australia had the largest contingent of troops of any non-NATO nation in the Afghanistan campaign, for example. Japan also has a strong bilateral defence treaty with the United States. Joining the new Community could only strengthen their collective security, and would help to counter the perceived threat of growing Chinese influence in the Pacific. Already there has been some talk of a "NATO of the Pacific" (Thomas 2018).

c) UN

Acting in tandem with the UN, the new Community could bring important advantages

- Acting strictly at the behest of the Security Council, the Community would provide a powerful means of enforcement for the resolutions of the Council. It could play a role very like that originally envisaged for a standing security force under Article 47 of the UN Charter, in collaboration with other countries volunteering their resources. It would only intervene in an external state if authorized to do so by the Council; but conversely, like its member states, it would be obliged to lend support to any security enforcement actions which were in fact mandated by the Security Council, under article 43 of the Charter. It would thus provide a strong right arm to back up any security actions of the UN.
- Furthermore, the new Community could quite easily set up rapid reaction units to carry out the role advocated for UNEPS, the proposed UN Emergency Peace Service. It could and should also set up mechanisms to reconstruct failed states after conflict, perhaps a Reconciliation and Reconstruction Commission, following the outstanding example of the Marshall Plan after World War II. This would give the Community a very positive role to play in healing the wounds created by armed conflict, something conspicuously absent after the recent overthrow of regimes in Iraq and Libya. Such developments would be in full accord with the role of the new Peacebuilding Commission at the UN.

Thus the UN and the Community together would make up a greatly strengthened and more effective system of common security and international governance.

d) USA

One of the Republican contenders for the U.S. Presidency in 2008, John McCain, proposed the formation of a 'League of Democracies' in order to build an enduring peace based on freedom (McCain 2007). "We Americans must be willing to listen to the collective will of our democratic allies," he said. On the Democratic side, Ivo Daalder, formerly the U.S. Permanent Representative on the Council of NATO, together with James Lindsay, proposed a 'Concert of Democracies' in order to form an "international institution capable of prompt and effective action both to prevent, and where necessary respond to threats to international security" (Daalder and Lindsay 2007). The idea of a Concert of Democracies was also promoted in an authoritative, bipartisan report from the Princeton Project, "Forging a World of Liberty under Law" in 2006 (Ikenberry and Slaughter 2006). So it seems there could be support for such ideas from both sides of politics in the U.S.

The main advantage for the US would be the opportunity to share with its partners the burden and responsibility of acting as 'global policeman', which no single nation has the right to assume in any case. In these times of financial stringency, the cost is a major consideration. In recent years, the astronomical cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, plus an expenditure on armaments roughly equivalent to the rest of the world put together, has taken a heavy toll on the US budget, so that the national debt now stands around 100% of GDP. Action to cut costs needs to be taken urgently, and sharing more of the security burden would help enormously. A move towards shared responsibility and collective security is clearly the right thing to do in any case.

The fact that spokesmen on both sides of US politics have advocated somewhat similar ideas indicates that a scheme of this sort should have a good chance of acceptance in the US, and if the US leads the way, the other members of NATO and the OECD are very likely to follow. The Summit of Democracy promised by President Biden in **December** (Biden 2020) could provide an ideal starting point.

e) Europe

Europeans have already had long experience with transnational cooperation through the European Union. The Chancellor of Germany, Angela Merkel, is very much in favour of multilateral cooperation, as is the President of France, Emmanuel Macron. An ex-prime-minister of France, Edouard Balladur, has gone so far as to suggest a full union between the USA and Europe to deal with the full range of global foreign policy issues (Balladur 2007).

Despite this, the Europeans have apparently been very wary of the idea of a 'global NATO', being fearful of being dragged into neo-imperialist adventures under the dominance of the United States. These fears would be answered by an explicit declaration that the new Community would never use force to intervene in an external state unless authorized to do so by the Security Council, or else if it was itself under external attack. Furthermore, under a qualified majority voting scheme the US would have the largest voice, but by no means a dominant voice, in the councils of the Community. The introduction of qualified majority voting would give the Europeans a full voice in the decisions of the Community.

Very recently, debate has been revived in Europe as to whether a European army should be set up. Jean-Claude Juncker, the President of the European Commission, called for the EU to create a “common military force”, including a command headquarters in Brussels. “We have to take responsibility for protecting ourselves and the European way of life”, he said (Juncker 2016). Britain has always been firmly opposed to this idea, but now that the Brexit vote has taken place, this impediment has been removed. The Eastern Europeans are also opposed, being more concerned that the Atlantic alliance, i.e. NATO, should reinforce its presence in the East as bulwark against the perceived Russian threat. NATO has indeed agreed to station four battalions in the Baltic states and Eastern Poland (Stoltenberg 2016).

Establishment of the Community would probably settle the long-running debate as to whether Europe should build up its own armed forces for external defence. Europe would be able to rely on the Community for its external defence, and thereby save a considerable amount of money.

f) Emerging democracies

Most Latin American countries, as well as India, Indonesia, South Africa, and some other democratic countries in Africa and Asia would likely soon qualify to apply for membership in the Community. They would benefit from the guaranteed security offered by the Community, as well as the pooling of resources and access to WSC expertise. Joining the WSC would give them more influence and the opportunity to play a more active role in global affairs. That is also true of joining the OECD.

To attract these countries, the Community will need to shed the perception of ‘Western imperialism’ that NATO has suffered from in some quarters. Strict respect of the UN authority and genuine democratic power sharing within the Community are necessary in that regard.

Many countries in the ‘global South’ would not immediately qualify to join the Community. They would still wield the same influence as at present through the United Nations, however. Furthermore, the ‘Arab spring’ a few years ago testified to the yearning for democracy among young people worldwide, and we would expect more countries in the global South to join up as their governance systems improve. In Africa, Tunisia, Botswana, and Senegal might already qualify as candidates, along with South Africa, for instance.

g) Russia and China

During the Cold War, the USSR looked on NATO with fear and suspicion, regarding it a threat to their very existence. Russia evidently continues to hold that viewpoint today, while China and the US view each other as rivals. But if the new Community could only intervene militarily when authorized by the Security Council to do so, then Russia and China would effectively have a veto over Community operations in the outside world. This should allay their fears, especially when combined with the promise that they could eventually earn entry into the Community themselves.

Submitting the Community to UN authority would reaffirm the grand bargain between the biggest military powers that created the UN. The Community, Russia and China

would have to work together as equal partners to promote peace and security outside of their borders. Surely one should expect the UN's performance to improve overnight

Of course we would look forward to the day when Russia and China do qualify to become full members of the Community. At that point, the struggle for world peace would virtually be over. One possibility here is that the Community could create an Associate Member category of aspiring full members who may not qualify as full democracies, and invite Russia to join on that basis, since Russia professes to be a democracy, and does hold elections. Since all members pledge to settle disputes by peaceful means, that would immediately guarantee peace for the border regions between Europe and Russia, at least.

h) Other authoritarian states

The Community's military power will make wars against its members extremely unlikely. By renouncing violence without UN approval, the Community will forsake wars of aggression outside its borders. The only violent conflicts that will continue are conflicts between, or within, states that are not members of the Community. If the world continues to grow more unstable, democratic states will have a strong incentive to join the Community. Only authoritarian states would remain vulnerable to wars. As the Community together with Russia and China builds trust over time, some conflicts among or within authoritarian states could also be contained or resolved, but probably not all of them. In the end there is no panacea and peace will not be achieved in a day. The Community is meant to act as a pioneer of peaceful resolution of conflicts, but it will not impose itself onto the rest of the world. It must expand by attraction, not coercion.

Possible Problems

a) Polarization of the international community

Non-member states of the new Community may feel excluded, and suspicious of the motives behind it. If the Community interfered in their affairs, they would feel resentful, and would tend to regard the Community as an "enemy", creating a split between "us" and "them". Such a polarization of the international community should be avoided at all costs.

Thus it would be important to make overtures to non-members, as the far-seeing Harmel Report recommended for NATO many years ago. It should be emphasized that membership of the Community is open to all countries, provided only that they satisfy suitable criteria for democratic governance and peaceful relations with their neighbours.

Furthermore, the Community should guarantee never to undertake a military intervention in a non-member country, unless authorized to do so by the Security Council of the UN. This would be a contentious issue in the US in particular. Most US foreign policy professionals believe that the US should retain the discretion of using force unilaterally, particularly to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and sometimes for humanitarian purposes. More generally, coercive

diplomacy is viewed as a legitimate tool to promote US interests. Giving Russia and China a veto over the external interventions of the Community would place severe restrictions on the role the Community could play in serving US interests. But in fact such a policy is obligatory under international law, as laid down in the UN Charter (Articles 2 & 42). It would also allay fears in Russia and China that the new Community was aimed against them.

b) Conflict with the role of the UN

A related problem is that the Community might be seen as competing with the role of the UN, in that both would be global security organizations. It will be vitally important to demonstrate that the Community would function in a manner complementary to the UN, rather than competing with it. Again, the Community should only intervene in a non-member state at the behest of the Security Council. The forces at the Community's disposal would then provide powerful reinforcement to the decisions of the Security Council. In fact, they would effectively supply the place of the standing armed forces originally envisaged for the UN under Article 47 of the Charter.

In summary, far from conflicting with the role of the UN, the new Community would fit in very neatly as the Security Council's strong right arm.

c) Forcing 'Western' values on other cultures

It might be charged that requiring democracy of new members is tantamount to forcing Western ideas of government onto what is meant to be a global community. But that is not a sustainable argument. Government "of the people, by the people, for the people" is a universal concept, not a purely Western one, and the thriving democracies in Japan and India are convincing examples of this. As more non-Western members join the Community, these fears should quickly be allayed.

Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi's speech at the Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore on 1 June 2018 (Modi 2018) was remarkable for two reasons. Modi extolled the virtues of a law-based society, openness and pluralism, civilisation founded on compassion, and a rights-based global order where everyone can thrive. He poignantly linked a domestic sensibility with foreign policy. He said of Singapore "and when they embrace diversity at home, they seek an inclusive world outside". The implication was that intolerance and fear of diversity at home is intimately linked with creating an exclusionary world order.

Looking to the Future

In summary, the new Community would bring many benefits. It would produce a powerful new global security community, which acting in tandem with the Security Council would be a strong force for peace and freedom in the world. It **could also** cure some of the major problems within the present NATO system.

Spokesmen on both sides of politics in the US have put forward similar schemes in the past, so there is a good chance that a plan of this sort would be acceptable to the USA. The Europeans would most likely be happy to follow, and so the proposal should have a good chance of being implemented.

As noted previously, this scheme is envisaged as only the first stage in a process of global integration. If the Community is open to new members, subject to suitable criteria of democracy and peaceful relations with their neighbours, then one can envisage many new members joining up, attracted by the assurance of guaranteed security, together with the prospect of new structural adjustment funds coming their way. The membership could soon include the majority of the world's nations, as more countries become democratic. Eventually, one may hope that membership in the Community would become universal.

The European Union provides a useful template for this process. The EU has devoted a large fraction of its budget to 'structural development' funds, aiming to help the less developed member states to catch up with the rest under the principle of 'solidarity'. We would hope the new Community would spend an increasing fraction of its total budget in this way, and thus follow the Biblical injunction of 'beating their swords into plowshares'!

One possibility is that the OECD could be folded into the new Community to undertake this role. In its earlier glory days following World War II, this organization played a similar role in managing the Marshall Plan for the reconstruction of Europe.

With the addition of a Court, and the adoption of qualified majority voting, the association would become a community on the European model. It would provide a convenient forum for discussion and the making of common policy on matters beyond the security sphere, including trade, finance and the environment.

Future stages, following the example of the European integration process, could involve:

- A Federal Union of Democratic Nations, as envisaged by Clarence Streit many years ago (Streit 1939), and later advocated by the Atlantic movement (Deutsch 1957, Yuncker 2018);
- And eventually, a genuine, universal and democratic world federation, capable of managing effectively and overcoming the serious global challenges which confront all of us in common.

Such a global parliament or world federation would help enormously in managing the severe global problems which are facing us. It would involve a binding system of world law, ensuring the peaceful settlement of any international disputes. The great powers could then safely discard their nuclear weapons, finally removing this catastrophic risk for ever. In the meantime, we would urge all nations to accede to the new Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, approved at the United Nations with 122 nations voting in favour, and which recently reached the threshold of 50 ratifications require to bring it into force.

The global parliament would also provide a proper forum for making decisions on how to prevent further climate change and preserve the global common environment, while sharing the financial burden in a just and fair manner. It would enable us to address other global problems in a much more effective manner. In fact,

it would open up a whole new and bright future for humanity, as prophesied long ago by H.G. Wells in his great work *The Outline of History*:

“There can be little question that the attainment of a federation of all humanity, together with a sufficient measure of social justice, to ensure health, education and a rough measure of equality of opportunity to most of the children born into the world, would mean such a release and increase of human energy as to open a new phase in human history.” (Wells1922)

What can we do as global citizens to help implement this strategy? The world federalist movement (WFM-IGP) has implemented a successful strategy, forming large Coalitions of NGOs in support, first of all, of an International Criminal Court, and secondly, of the UN doctrine of Responsibility to Protect. Both of these campaigns achieved success in a relatively short time. Correspondingly, we have set up a Coalition for a World Security Community of democratic nations, which is still in its infancy (Coalition 2018).

The Summit of Democracy proposed by President Biden during his first year in office (Biden 2020) could provide an ideal starting point for this scheme. As noted in the Introduction, we would like to see:

- 1) The Summit should become a yearly event, to function as a council of heads of government to coordinate and plan cooperation between the community of democratic nations around the world;
- 2) A new international institution should be set up to support and implement these plans, some sort of World Community of Democracies. The Summit should set up a commission to draft a new **'Treaty of Washington'** (or whatever) for this purpose, modelled after the Treaty of Rome in Europe.

Notes and References

Aznar 2006. Jose Maria Aznar, *'NATO: An Alliance for Freedom'*, RUSI 151, no.4 (2006), http://www.rusi.org/go.php?structureID=articles_journal&ref=A44DCA72D99D0C.

Balladur 2007. Edouard Balladur. *'Pour une Union occidentale entre l'Europe et les Etats-Unis'* (Paris: Fayard, 2007).

Biden 2020. Joseph R. Biden, Jr., *'Why America Must Lead Again: Rescuing U.S. Foreign Policy After Trump'*, in *Foreign Affairs*, March/April issue 2020, see <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-01-23/why-america-must-lead-again>

Cabrera 2017. Luis Cabrera, *'Global government Revisited: From Utopian Vision to Political Imperative'*, Great Transition Initiative (October 2017), <http://www.greattransition.org/publication/global-government-revisited>

CUNPA. Campaign for a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly, <http://en.unpacampaign.org/>

Coalition 2018. Coalition for a World Security Community of democratic nations,

<https://worldsecuritycommunity.org/>

Commission for the Human Future 2020. Report '*Surviving and Thriving in the 21st Century*'. http://humansforsurvival.org/sites/default/files/CHF_Roundtable_Report_March_2020.pdf

Daalder and Lindsay 2007. Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay, "*Democracies of the World, Unite*", *The American Interest* 2, no. 3 (2007): 5-15.
<http://www.theamerican-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=220>.

Deutsch 1957. K.W. Deutsch et al., "*Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*" (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1957)

Freedom House 2015. '*Freedom in the World*', annual report published by Freedom House, <http://www.freedomhouse.org/reports>

GCF. The Global Challenges Foundation, see
<https://globalchallenges.org/>

IEP 2017. Institute for Economics & Peace. Positive Peace Report 2017: '*Tracking Peace Transitions Through a Systems Thinking Approach*', Sydney, October 2017. Report number 54, see
<http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2017/10/Positive-Peace-Report-2017.pdf>, Figure 1.8

Hamer 1998. Christopher Hamer, '*A Global Parliament: Principles of World Federation*' (Oyster Bay Books, 1998). Available through Amazon

Ikenberry and Slaughter 2006. G. John Ikenberry and Ann-Marie Slaughter, Co-Directors, "*Forging a World of Liberty under Law: U.S. National Security in the 21st Century*", Final Paper of the Princeton Project on National Security
<http://www.princeton.edu/~ppns/report/FinalReport.pdf>

Jacobs 2007. Didier Jacobs, "*Global Democracy: The Struggle for Political and Civil Rights in the 21st Century*" (Vanderbilt University Press, 2007)

Jones 2007. James Jones, '*Stronger Political Structures for NATO*', *Freedom and Union* 2, no.1 (2007):10-11.

Juncker 2016. Jean-Claude Juncker, "*We need a European army*", 9 March 2016,
<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-31796337>

Kuttner 2018. "Can Democracy Survive Global Capitalism?" (W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., New York, 2018)

Leinen and Bummel 2018. Jo Leinen and Andreas Bummel, "*A World Parliament: Governance and Democracy in the 21st Century*" (Democracy without Borders, Berlin, 2018). A recent, detailed and comprehensive account of the world federalist movement, and the campaign for a UN Parliamentary Assembly.

McCain 2007. John McCain. "*McCain Remarks*", Hoover Institution (speech,

- Stanford University, Stanford, CA, May 1, 2007).
http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/McCain_05-01-07.pdf.
- Modi 2018. Speech at the Shangri-La Dialogue, Singapore, 2018, see
<https://indianexpress.com/about/narendra-modi>
- NATO Summit 2021. Communique, see
https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_185000.htm
- Naumann 2007. Klaus Naumann et al., *'Towards a Grand Strategy for an Uncertain World –Renewing Transatlantic Partnership'*, (2007).
[http://www.worldsecuritynetwork.com/documents/3eproefGrandStrat\(b\).pdf](http://www.worldsecuritynetwork.com/documents/3eproefGrandStrat(b).pdf)
- newDemocracy. See the newDemocracy Foundation,
<https://www.newdemocracy.com.au/>
- Penrose 1946. L.S. Penrose, *'The Elementary Statistics of Majority Voting'*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society 109, 53 (1946); W. Slomczynski and K. Zyczkowski, *'Penrose Voting System and Optimal Quota'*, Acta Physica Polonica B37, 3133 (2006); *'Voting in the European Union: The Square Root System of Penrose and a Critical Point'*, Acta Physica Polonica B37, 3133 (2006).
- Raskin 2017. Paul Raskin, *'How Do We Get There? The problem of Action'*, Great Transition Initiative (December 2017),
<http://www.greattransition.org/publication/how-do-we-get-there>
- Rasmussen 2016. Anders Fogh Rasmussen, *"The Will to Lead: America's Indispensable Role in the Global Fight for Freedom"* (Broadside Books, New York, 2016)
- Schuman 1950. The Schuman Declaration,
https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/symbols/europe-day/schuman-declaration_en
- Stoltenberg 2016. Jens Stoltenberg, announcement June 13, 2016.
<http://www.rferl.org/a/nato-baltics-poland-russia-ukraine-battalions/27795258.html>
- Streit 1939. Clarence K. Streit, *'Union Now!'* (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1939).
- Thomas 2018. Jason Thomas, *'Pacific Alliance our Safest Bet'*, opinion piece, "The Australian", October 30.
- Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, see
<https://www.un.org/disarmament/wmd/nuclear/tpnw/>
- Warsaw 2016. Warsaw Summit Communique (2016)
http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_133169.htm
- Wells 1922. H.G. Wells, *'The Outline of History'* (George Newnes, London), p. 754

WFM-IGP. The World Federalist Movement – Institute for Global Policy. See <http://www.wfm-igp.org/>

Wittner 1993. L.S. Wittner, *'One World or None'* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1993).

Yuncker 2014. James Yuncker, *"Global Marshall Plan: Theory and Evidence"* (Lexington, 2014).

Yuncker 2018. James Yuncker, *"Evolutionary World Government: Approach to Global Federation"* (Hamilton, 2018).