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**Summary.**

The geopolitical outlook at present is the gloomiest since World War II, with the intensifying struggle between democracy and autocracy on the world stage. Russia has recently invaded Ukraine, and there is a distinct possibility that World War III could break out in the next few years over China’s threatened invasion of Taiwan. To prevent this catastrophe, the world’s major democracies need to form an alliance formidable enough to deter China from any such use of force.

Besides this, humanity faces some catastrophic long-term risks to the future well-being of our children. Foremost among them are the new dangers posed by unchecked global warming, the ongoing threat of nuclear annihilation, and the rise of an Orwellian surveillance state in China. 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.

Democracy must be a fundamental principle of any such system, in order to uphold basic human rights and to guard against the danger of tyranny or autocracy. Up until now, however, all attempts to reform the United Nations in this direction have failed.

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 (WSC), which could embrace various existing alliances such as NATO, AUKUS, and the Quad. In cooperation with the UN Security Council, this Community would form a very powerful new force for peace and security in the world. Firstly, it would be able to guarantee the security of all its members; and secondly, it could provide strong new facilities for peacebuilding in collaboration with the UN. As a broadened democratic alliance, the WSC would enhance the incentives for all nations to adhere to the rules-based order necessary for peace and security.

We see this proposal as only the first step towards an improved system of democratic global governance, leading at later stages to a full Union of Democracies, and eventually a democratic world federation, following the pattern pioneered in Europe.

**Introduction**

The geopolitical outlook at present is extremely dark, and bears some alarming similarities with the prelude to World War II. A contest between democracy and autocracy has been going on, with autocracy advancing and democracy going slowly backwards for the past 17 years, according to Freedom House (2023). There have been threats made by the autocracies in Russia and China against the democracies in Ukraine and Taiwan, respectively. President Putin of Russia has vowed to retake Ukraine (Guardian 2022), claiming it was an integral part of the former Russian Empire. Russia has recently launched an actual invasion of Ukraine, which has shocked the entire world, and evoked memories of Hitler’s invasion of the Sudetenland in 1938. The West has been galvanized into action to support Ukraine in its brave resistance, supplying them with arms and ammunition. Sweden and Finland have [applied to join NATO](https://www.politico.eu/article/hand-in-hand-finland-sweden-pledge-to-join-nato-together/)**,** and the EU has been discussing ways to beef up its communal defence and security forces.

At the same time, President Xi Jinping of China has vowed in public to incorporate Taiwan with mainland China by 2049, using force if necessary (Council on Foreign Relations 2021). China is presently [building up its armed forces](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-59600475) and the facilities necessary to invade Taiwan as fast as they can go (BBC report 2022). It seems very likely that they will try the invasion much earlier than 2049 – Mark Milley, the former US Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has estimated that they will be ready to go by 2027 (Milley 2021). Japan has promised to help defend Taiwan, and the USA will feel bound to do the same, despite their public posture of ‘strategic ambiguity’. Thus we will quite possibly see World War III break out within a very few years over Xi Jinping’s invasion of Taiwan – this would be an unprecedented global catastrophe, dwarfing the terrible destruction in Ukraine. The statesman Henry Kissinger gave a stark warning of this possibility just before his recent death (Kissinger 2023). There is general agreement that we must do everything possible to deter China from embarking on such a disastrous enterprise.

On the longer timescale, there are other critical problems confronting us. All human beings, regardless of their nationality, have many fundamental interests in common, and face some enormous common problems and catastrophic risks, including:

• Global warming and other forms of damage to the environment have become an alarming new threat to our children’s heritage. Finding a sustainable way of living could be humanity’s greatest challenge;

• Eighty years after World War II, humankind 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, and the proliferation of these weapons threatens to spiral out of control;

* Conflicts and economic hardship have currently displaced around 110 million

people, a number greater than the entire population of Germany, forced to abandon their homes or become refugees;

• Billions of the world’s poor still face the ever-present dangers of famine, and disease. Each day, to our shame, many thousands of children still die needlessly from the lack of basic nutrition and medicines;

• The basic human rights of many thousands of people are trampled on every day, without means of redress. Some minority groups are heavily repressed in their home nations, or stripped of their citizenship rights altogether.

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.

Over the years, several astronauts have commented, looking back at the Earth, that the artificial boundaries between nation-states are invisible from space. In the long term, we need some form of global parliament, which would be empowered to make binding laws and regulations in order to deal effectively with all these global issues. The present United Nations is certainly not adequate to the task. Unfortunateky, however, the global integration process required to establish a global parliament is bound to take several decades, if it occurs at all.

Democracy must be a fundamental principle of any improved system of global governance. To guard against autocracy and abuse of power, and to preserve the liberty, human rights and equality of all its citizens, our representatives in any global parliament must be chosen by means of free and fair elections, with guaranteed freedom of organized groups to stand in opposition to the group in power. At its minimum, 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. Hence it follows that the integration process should begin with the democratic nations. 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 2022).

At the present time, however, democracy seems to be under assault in many quarters of the world. Autocracies have been increasing in power and influence, and have become increasingly assertive in places such as the Crimea, Ukraine, Syria, Venezuela and the South China Sea. Democracy has been destroyed in Hong Kong. “Presidents for life” have been installed in countries such as China, Turkey and recently, Russia. Even within Europe, democracy is under challenge in Hungary and Poland, and cyber-manipulation by autocratic regimes is growing. According to Freedom House (2023), global freedom has declined in 17 consecutive years up until 2023. In 2019, for example, individuals in 64 countries experienced deterioration in their political rights and civil liberties while those in just 37 experienced improvements. At the same time, the level of global peacefulness has decreased for nine consecutive years, according to the Global Peace Index (2023). It seems clear that democracies around the globe must work more closely together to counter these alarming trends, and form some sort of global Alliance of Democracies as advocated by various experts over the years (Daalder and Lindsay 2004, Rasmussen 2016, Stoltenberg 2020).

This working group believes that the path toward an improved system of global governance should start with a World Security Community of democratic nations, which could perhaps begin from today’s North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), or else an enlarged G7 grouping. 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 (Jacobs 2007). 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 climate change, economic development, financial stability, or trade.

In the next section our proposed design is presented in some detail. 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. Some possible problems are outlined next, followed by a discussion of possible routes towards the implementation of our proposal. 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 ideally include or embrace existing defense alliances among democracies, such as NATO, AUKUS and the Quad. Here we will make occasional comparisons with NATO.
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 should be as follows:
	1. 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 84 nations rated as ‘fully free’ by Freedom House should be eligible without major institutional reforms (Freedom House 2023). 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).
	2. 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. Community members should also accept the binding jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice to settle disputes with external states peacefully.
	3. 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:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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 Peacebuilding Commission at the United Nations.
4. Structure the organization with prototype organs of democratic governance, following the pattern pioneered in Europe:
5. 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.
6. The Community should have a Council of Ministers from the member states meeting regularly to prepare and approve detailed policy decisions, as in Europe.
7. 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, 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.
8. The Community should establish a Parliamentary Assembly, as the nucleus for an eventual elected parliament. NATO already has the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, which could play this vital role.
9. A Court needs to be established to settle differences over the interpretation of the founding treaty, and arbitrate any intractable disputes between the member states. This could form the embryo of an eventual system of binding world law.

In addition, we would 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.

1. The OECD should revise its membership requirements and accession process, such that its membership largely but not necessarily entirely overlaps with that of WSC.
2. The OECD should start convening summits of its members’ heads of state concurrently with the WSC to coordinate their economic, social and environmental policies.
3. 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.

**Benefits**

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

1. **Community members**

Advantages of the scheme from the point of view of members of the Community 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, for instance;

• It would provide a new legal framework for settling international disputes between members

• It would give members an extended and hugely important mission for the future towards achieving world peace.

1. **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. All would be prime candidates for membership in the new Community.

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, 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. Sweden and Finland, for instance, have recently applied to join NATO.

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, for instance, is already allied with the United States and the UK under the AUKUS 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. 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).

1. **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. (Unfortunately, this ideal situation might need to be subject to a qualification clause in the current murky geopolitical environment, see further discussion in section g) below).

• 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.

1. **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 an ‘Alliance 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 2004). 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 140% 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 previously 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, other members of NATO and the OECD are very likely to follow.

1. **Europe**

Europeans have already had long experience with transnational cooperation through the European Union. The Chancellor of Germany, Olaf Scholz, is very much in favour of multilateral cooperation, as is the President of France, Emmanuel Macron. A former 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.

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 Brexit occurred, 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.

Establishment of the WSC 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 WSC for its external defence, and thereby avoid unnecessary duplication of facilities.

1. **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.

1. **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, and even possible enemies. But if the new Community could only intervene militarily in external states when authorized by the Security Council to do so, then Russia and China would effectively have a veto over WSC operations in the outside world.

Submitting the WSC to UN authority would reaffirm the grand bargain between the biggest military powers that created the UN. The WSC, Russia and China would have to work together as equal partners to promote peace and security outside of their borders.

Unfortunately, the current status of actual or threatened military aggression by Russia and China themselves means that this ideal provision is not practical at present. This item in the Treaty would have to include an exception in the case that any external members of the Security Council were themselves involved in the conflict.

Of course we would look forward to the day, which unfortunately now seems impossibly distant, 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.

1. **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 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 (subject to the exception above). This would be a contentious issue in the US in particular. Most US foreign policy professionals believe that the US should keep 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 has sometimes been 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 primarily 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, providing the UN with the multinational security force that was envisaged at its beginning.

**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. The aspirations of young people in Middle Eastern, African and Latin American nations provide further evidence. As more non-Western members join the Community, these fears should quickly be allayed.

**Implementation of the proposal**

Proposals such as these have a long history. Even before World War II, the journalist Clarence Streit in 1939 proposed a Union of Democracies to combat the Fascist aggression of Mussolini and Hitler (Streit 1939). His ideas are still carried forward by civil society organizations such as the Streit Council and Federal Union.

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.

A number of Eastern European countries have recently joined NATO, which now has 31 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 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).

A new treaty would be the best way to broaden NATO’s mandate and membership, improve its burden sharing, and improve its collective decision making. In 2020, a new process called #NATO2030 was launched, to set NATO’s course for the next decade. The Secretary-General, Jens Stoltenberg, has called for greater unity politically, and a more global approach, working even more closely with like-minded countries in the Indo-Pacific like Australia, Japan, New Zealand and South Korea (Stoltenberg 2020). France and Germany, however, have ruled out any extension of NATO membership to the Indo-Pacific, and called for the organization to stick to its knitting in the Atlantic area. Any such extension would almost certainly be vetoed by Russian-oriented members such as Hungary in any case.

Following the successful strategy of Jean Monnet and collaborators at the beginning of the European Union (Schuman 1950), the best plan would be to start with a small core group of democracies, such as the ‘D10’ group advocated byJain and Kroenig (2021), consisting of the present G7 group plus the EU, Australia, and South Korea and possibly India in the Indo-Pacific. This group could agree quite soon to form an Alliance or Security Community of democracies, and set up a Commission to draft a new Treaty to that effect**.** The Community could then be opened for membership to other democracies around the globe.

An opportunity for such an agreement could arise at the next summit meeting of the G7. Boris Johnson did in fact propose extending the G7 to a D10 in 2021, when he chaired the G7, and India, Australia and South Korea have attended the G7 as invited observers ever since. The idea was apparently knocked on the head by France and Germany at the time (Maiko 2021), while Japan objected to the inclusion of South Korea. But times have changed dramatically since then with Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, and the proposal should now be well received by all parties.

**Looking to a Brighter 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 would also provide a powerful deterrent against any further military aggression by the autocracies in Russia and China.

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 in the long run, a genuine, universal and democratic world federation could emerge, capable of managing effectively and overcoming the serious global challenges which confront all of us in common, as advocated by the World Federalist Movement WFM-IGP.

Such a global parliament or world federation would help enormously in managing the critical 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. But such a final outcome is probably several decades away.

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 way. 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)
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