

# The War System and the Wisdom of Federation

*I represent a party which does not yet exist—  
the party of . . . civilization. . . There will come  
from it first a United States of Europe, and  
then a United States of the World.*

—Victor Hugo

**W**orld federation is a form of international organization in which the nations of the world *share power* in order to achieve common goals—chiefly the abolition of war. As we will see in this chapter, a federation of nations is the political technique by which the scourge of the war system shall finally be removed from the face of the earth.

In our discussions of global governance, we have been assuming the supremacy of the federal model of power sharing. Federation appears to be the only viable option among several possible approaches to integrating national sovereignty within a larger global structure. There is genius and wisdom in the federation approach.

Inspired world-citizen activists will one day form the crucial constituency for a global government, but our elected national leaders will also have a key role. It is they who must some day play the courageous central role of surrendering a part of their nations' sovereignty in order to create the

*federation* of nations that will be the political backbone of the government of humankind.

The minimalist approach to world government best illustrates the beauty of federation; by joining the federation, member-nations agree to forever abolish war as a method for solving problems between them. They will do this by simply delegating the work of maintenance of international peace and security to the executive branch of the new federation. The world federation will create global courts (as described in its constitution) whose initial purpose will be the binding adjudication of all international disputes, thus replacing war and terrorism as an institution for solving such difficulties. National and local disputes would still be left to national and local authorities—with the exception that the minimalist world federation would have certain limited jurisdiction over civil wars within states.

The world legislature would likely be the supreme organization operating under the auspices of the federation. It would represent the will of the world's people in regard to those matters of global importance that are delegated to the world body by the member-nations.

### **The war system has an insidious effect**

We have already demonstrated that war will never cease as long as nations cling to the illusive notion of unlimited national sovereignty, and unless they delegate their war-making powers to a super-sovereign entity. In recent times, we have also seen convincing evidence that virtually all terrorism is state-sponsored or is surreptitiously supported by the state apparatus of rogue states that regard terror as one means of exercising their supposed sovereign right to make war. We are

proposing an end to war and terrorism by the voluntary surrender to a world federation of this supposed “right” of nations to use force in international affairs.

A world federation would maintain order only by deploying a world police force; like federal marshals in the US, world marshals would enforce the laws of the federation as these apply to individuals (including individual terrorists), not entire states. Even in the case of a rogue state run amuck, the enforcement action of the federation is brought against individual leaders of the state, not against the entire nation and its people. This is obviously rather different from the use of force implied in the military action of nations against one another or in the case of civil wars within nations. Police are trained to use the minimum force against individuals as is required to restore lawful order or to make an arrest of a person or persons while avoiding injury to innocent bystanders; by contrast, military action is a maximum force based on the survival imperatives of a nation or subgroup within a nation, and is designed to take control of a general area with less regard for innocent civilians. In simpler words, police arrest individuals—they don’t drop bombs on nations. Inside federations like that of the United States, police force is the only force used for all domestic law enforcement short of civil war. It is in this sense that it can truly be said that the eventual elimination of the use of military force anywhere in the world is the aim of a world federation.

We may wax eloquent on this thesis, but let us pause to consider the meaning of these visionary ideas from the standpoint of a newly elected liberal prime minister of, say, a democratic nation in Asia or Africa. This leader of ours, of course, must deal with the world as it is *today*. He or she must operate in the absence of the security protections of a

federation of nations about which we luxuriously theorize. His or her predicament, presented below, shows how difficult and how crucial it will be to *first* abolish the global war system if one is to truly liberate this politician for effective service to his country.

Sitting for the first time at the center of a national government no doubt brings a stark clarity of mind to our imaginary prime minister. As he begins to look around, he soon perceives a myriad of dangers staring back at him, including international terrorism, a proliferation of WMDs on his continent, neighboring countries ruled by dictators, an impotent United Nations, and incursions by predatory forces of economic globalization. Suddenly, this person's constitutional responsibility to defend the homeland in the face of these threats begins to look somewhat more solemn. His original intent to pursue and fund liberal domestic programs to address the needs of his people starts to seem less important.

And what are the rules of the international system into which the prime minister has been thrust?

It quickly becomes clear to him that the first rule is this: The threat of war will always exist. He wonders if there is a force that can guarantee the nation absolute safety. Indeed there is none. "We must rely on our own military prowess," he realizes. "War can and will break out, and with it comes the possibility of defeat. With defeat come the loss of sovereignty and the likelihood of economic ruin. Defeat could even mean the destruction of the nation. That's one of the rules of this system. If it is not some war fomented by one of our neighbors, or by the imperial United States, terrorists could infiltrate our country and wreak havoc."

What national leader would want to be blamed for such things? Certainly not our prime minister.

One can then ask: What is the prime minister's most rational response to the ever-present threat of a contest of force and the looming consequences of defeat? Clear thinking dictates that preparations for war and defense against all possible forms of aggression must become his top priority.

Our leader now realizes that every aspect of national life must be evaluated in terms of the capacity to fight and win a war, if and when such measures become necessary. Planning for this exigency should not be seen as "militarism" on his part. It is only fair to see it as reasonable behavior, given the rules of the war system he cannot control.

Every day, generals in the armed forces are on hand in the national palace to remind the prime minister of his grim responsibilities. Indeed, these generals appear to be sane and logical people, genuine realists. They are professionals whose lifework is the mastery of the rules of the war system.

This example can suffice to show how the system works, and how it creates a lockstep mentality in all of the players. In the final analysis, it is this anarchic system that is to blame for our warlike ways on this planet—not any individual leader, and certainly not the presence of certain weapons or the greed of the industrialists who manufacture and ship them. With a problem as serious as warfare in the age of WMDs, we must be disciplined enough to distinguish true causes from mere effects.

### **The war system is toxic in each country**

We should not be surprised then if our prime minister, once a liberal democrat, now starts subordinating industrial, agricultural, welfare, and other domestic policies to the imperative of national defense. If mounting a proper defense seems

to require educating more scientists, then it would only be rational that he ask the legislature to subsidize their education. If victory in war seems to depend on the size of the population, then we should not be surprised if he starts encouraging large families. If neighbors or dominant nations have WMDs, we shouldn't be stunned if he seeks to secretly build a national stockpile of suitable WMDs. If adversaries are seen as wily and deceitful, then we shouldn't blame the prime minister for expanding the budget of his intelligence agencies.

"Our liberal legislators who are urging cooperation with other countries should be highly suspect," says the prime minister to himself. A treaty with a neighbor may create some advantages, but how can one ensure that some tyrant doesn't come to power inside that country and simply ignore the treaty? "In the end you can't trust those other countries," the prime minister whispers to his wife one night.

Soon the prospect of manipulating and even lying to rival nations, through "diplomacy," begins to make supreme sense to him. "No doubt the other side has thought of using deception," says one of his generals. "And if not, it's best to deploy it first. After all, these treaties cannot be relied upon!"

It has become easier now to justify shrewdness, deception, weapons stockpiling, and a general fortress mentality. If the prime minister does not listen to the logic that supports these conclusions, perhaps the threat of a military coup can keep him in line. The military men know the requirements of the system, after all.

Indeed, in the war system, promoting national security is what counts; the morality of international relations is almost irrelevant. National power is the basis of getting what you want and the security you need. Everything else must be secondary to that. It's nobody's fault, but everyone is to blame.

If war does break out, the logic of the war system then reaches its apex. Killing, destruction, and deception of the enemy become supreme virtues. Dropping a nuclear weapon on one or two of their cities may seem to be the very height of military virtue. This gives a reason for our imaginary leader to do what he can to get his own nukes.

The upshot is this: Wars that end in terrible destruction are not just happenstance. They don't just occur because of a few whimsical leaders. *War is the central feature of the system.* War is the court of last resort in a world of anarchy; all nations must be prepared to face warfare or they will perish.

It should be obvious that the next step in this narrative is domestic repression. Our prime minister now decides that, in the interest of national security, it will be necessary to hide the truth about the nation's defense policies from his people. A secret "black budget" must be created in order to fund biological and nuclear weapons development programs. The legislature simply cannot be trusted with this strategic decision, he realizes. It is too inwardly focused, too riddled with amateur political thinkers—even members of his own party. Furthermore, young people must be taught militaristic values, and the importance of subordinating their rights to those in authority. This will prepare them for the confrontations to come.

"It is not hard to see," writes world federalist scholar Ronald J. Glossop whose book *World Federation?* is the source of the above argument, that "[the] anarchic international system encourages a 'militaristic' kind of expediency which is directly opposed to the concern for justice, human rights, and open discussion of policy options on which democratic governance is founded." A toxic cult of militarism that feeds off and responds to the war system almost directly confronts the democratic sympathies of the general population, acting as a

brake on the forward evolution of national life. (For vivid examples, consider the recent history of nations such as Chile, Israel, Burma, Turkey, or even the United States.)

It may seem to the progressive forces of a country that the kind of militarism we have been describing is excessive, even paranoid. But we have analyzed the dilemma faced by our prime ministers, as seen through his eyes. He is being called an aggressive warmonger by the leftist forces within his country, but the truth is that he has little choice. If he strikes a conciliatory attitude toward other countries, the results could be disastrous. If he listens to the peace activists and cuts the military budget, the country could be coerced into unacceptable agreements. Regardless of his own personal sympathies, he and all other elected leaders on this planet must dance to the tune of the war system until the system has been replaced.

### **World federation is the solution to the war system**

Each phase in the evolution of political sovereignty must contend with what we have called the “scaffolding stages” of the previous developments in political organization. This is true because human loyalties, once mobilized to deal with the stark necessities of one age, are hard to change as a new era approaches.

For example, the loyalty to a tribal chief that once made possible the survival of the tribe makes very difficult the evolution of the “supertribe”—the nation. (One can see this, for example, in the conflict between tribal sheiks in Afghanistan and the central government in Kabul.) Likewise, the same loyalty that makes possible the evolution of the nation-state, patriotism and “rational” militarism, vastly complicates the evolution of the government of all humankind.

Even with this dose of realism, it still remains the case that “international law” can never bring permanent peace to mankind; the logic of the war system is far more compelling. Collective security measures are a step in the right direction; an international police force can prevent or contain many minor wars, as the UN has done at times. But the UN as it is currently structured will never be effective in preventing major wars, ending great-power conflicts like the ruinous Cold War, or stopping unilateral conquests by a superpower, such as the US invasion of Iraq in 2003.

In the end, peace will not come to this planet until every so-called sovereign nation surrenders its power to make war into the hands of a representative government of all humankind. Political sovereignty is innate to the peoples of the world. When all the peoples of earth one day create a world government, they have the right and the power to make such a government SOVEREIGN, and when such a representative or democratic world power controls the world’s land, air, and naval forces, we will have an end to war.

These memorable words were spoken on October 19, 1999 by Walter Cronkite, on the occasion of winning the Norman Cousins Global Governance Award:

...We must strengthen the United Nations as a first step toward a world government patterned after our own government with a legislature, executive and judiciary, and police to enforce its international laws and keep the peace.

To do that, of course, we Americans will have to yield up some of our sovereignty. That would be a bitter pill. It would take a lot of courage, a lot of faith in the new order.

But the American colonies did it once and brought forth one of the most nearly perfect unions the world has ever seen.

...We cannot defer this responsibility to posterity. Time will not wait. Democracy, civilization itself, is at stake. Within the next few years we must change the basic structure of our

global community from the present anarchic system of war and ever more destructive weaponry to a new system governed by a democratic UN federation.

...In their almost miraculous insight, the founders of our country invented 'federalism,' a concept rooted in the rights of the individual. Our federal system guarantees a maximum of freedom but provides it in a framework of law and justice.

Today we must develop federal structures on a global level. We need a system of enforceable world law—a democratic federal world government—to deal with world problems.

### **World federalism arose in response to World War II**

The idea of creating a political union of states in order to abolish war may be traced back for centuries—back to Woodrow Wilson, Immanuel Kant, and even to the poet Dante. However, until the collapse of the League of Nations in the 1930s that led to the horrors of WWII, most proposals of international union were not federalist. The great German philosopher Kant, for instance, spoke only of a confederation of free and independent states. President Wilson's own proposals for world peace were far from advocating world federation.

It turns out that the modern doctrine of a global federation has its roots in surprisingly recent developments, despite the longstanding success of the federal union of the United States of America, the prototypical example of a successful federation. World federalism arose in the 1940s as the most brilliant response to the hard lessons of the first part of the twentieth century.

The search for radical new solutions began in the late 1930s with the ignominious collapse of the League of Nations. Many argued, as did Clarence Streit in the famous book *Union Now!* (1939), that the League failed because it had tragically

preserved the principle of the absolute national sovereignty of states. Streit was one of the first to show that the transfer of a portion of national sovereignty was necessary to prevent war. He argued that the principle of federal government had already proven its ability to create peace as illustrated in the constitutions of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and other nations whose constitutions were based on a federation of smaller states. Streit's proposals were, however, limited to a federation of democratic nations.

It was none other than Albert Einstein who was a primary influence for the next phase of the evolution of the idea of world federalism. It happened that, shortly after the US bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki and in the midst of the horror of those events, journalists visited Einstein and asked for his opinion on the question of world peace after Hiroshima. His reply was unequivocal: We need a world government. Einstein then urged the journalists to read a new book by Emery Reves entitled *The Anatomy of Peace*. With Einstein's endorsement, this book became an instantaneous bestseller. The ideas in this book were enormously influential in launching the "one world" movement of the late 1940s.

Reves was a journalist who directed a large press service in Europe and New York, before and during World War II. He provided the first articulation of world federalism as we know it today. The extensive excerpt from this text below references the early days of the debate over the adoption of the UN Charter early in 1945.

There is only one method that can create security against destruction by the atomic bomb. This is the same method that gives the states of New York and California (non-producers of the atomic bomb) security against being erased from the surface of the earth by the states of Tennessee and

New Mexico (producers of the atomic bomb). This security is real. It is the security given by a common sovereign order of law. Outside of that, any security is but an illusion.

Many of the scientists who released atomic energy, frightened by the consequences of this new force, warn us of the dangers that will result if several sovereign states possess atomic weapons, and urge control of it by the United Nations Security Council.

But what is the United Nations Security Council, except "several sovereign states"?

What is the reality of the Security Council beyond the reality of the sovereign nation-states that compose it?

What matters if the American secretary of state, the Soviet foreign commissar, and His Majesty's foreign secretary meet as members of the United Nations Security Council or outside that organization in a "Conference of Foreign Ministers"? In either case they are but the sworn representatives of three conflicting sovereign nation-states; in either case the final decisions rest with Washington, London and Moscow. These representatives can only arrive at agreements or treaties and are without power to create law applicable to the individuals of their respective nation-states.

Many of those who realize the inadequacy of the San Francisco organization [i.e., the United Nations Organization, or UNO] feel that the people must not be disillusioned, that their faith in the organization must not be destroyed.

If that faith is not justified, it must be destroyed. It is criminal to mislead the people and teach them to rely on a false hope.

The pathetic defenders argue that the UNO is all we have and we should be practical and start from what we have. A reasonable suggestion. It is scarcely possible to start from anywhere except from where we are. If a man has measles, no matter what he plans to do, he must start with the measles. But this does not mean that measles is an asset, a welcome condition, and that he could not do things better without measles. The mere fact of having something does not automatically make it valuable.

The San Francisco Charter is a multilateral treaty. That and nothing else. Each party to it can withdraw the moment it desires, and war alone can force the member-states to fulfill their obligations under the treaty. For several thousand years man has given innumerable chances to treaty structures between sovereign power units to demonstrate that they can prevent war. With the possibility of atomic war facing us, we cannot risk reliance upon a method that has failed miserably hundreds of times and never succeeded once.

A realization that this method can never prevent war is the first condition of peace. Law and only law can bring peace among men; treaties never can.

We can never arrive at a legal order by amending a treaty structure. To realize the task before us, the heated debates of Hamilton, Madison, and Jay in Philadelphia should be read and reread in every home and every school. They demonstrated that the Articles of Confederation (based on the same principles as the United Nations Organization) could not prevent war between the states, that amendment of these articles could not solve the problem...establishing an overall federal government with power to legislate, apply and execute law on individuals in the United States. That was the only remedy then and it is the only remedy now.

Such criticism of the United Nations Organization may shock people who have been persuaded that the UNO is an instrument for maintaining peace.

The San Francisco league is not a first step toward a universal legal order. To change from a treaty basis to law is one step, one operation, and it is impossible to break it into parts or fractions. This decision has to be made and the operation carried out at one time. There is no "first step" toward world government. World government is the first step.

Some remark patronizingly: "But this is idealism. Let us be realistic, let us make the San Francisco organization work."

What is idealism? And what is realism? Is it realistic to believe that treaties—which have been tried again and again and have always failed—will now miraculously work? And is it idealistic to believe that law—which has always succeeded wherever and whenever it was applied—will continue to work?

Every time our foreign ministers or the heads of our governments meet and decide not to decide, hurry to postpone, and commit themselves to no commitments, the official heralds proclaim jubilantly to the universe: "This is a hopeful beginning." "This is a first step in the right direction."

We are always beginning . . . We never continue, never carry on, complete or conclude. We never take a second step or—God forbid—a third step. Our international life is composed of an unending sequence of beginnings that don't begin, of first steps that lead nowhere. When are we going to tire of this game?

It is of utmost importance to look at these things in their proper perspective. We must reject the exhortations of reactionaries who say: "Of course, world government is the ultimate goal. But we can't get it now. We must proceed slowly, step by step."

World government is not an "ultimate goal" but an immediate necessity. In fact, it has been overdue since 1914. The convulsions of the past decades are the clear symptoms of a dead and decaying political system.

Whether the change from treaty structure to a legal order takes place independently of the United Nations Organization or within it is irrelevant. To amend the San Francisco Charter—if that is the road we choose—we will have to rewrite it so drastically to get what we need that nothing of the document will remain except the two opening words: "Chapter One." The change has to come about in our minds, in our outlook. Once we know what we want, it makes no difference whether the reform is carried out on top of the Eiffel Tower, in the bleachers of the Yankee Stadium, or on the floor of the United Nations General Assembly.

The stumbling block to transforming the San Francisco league into a governmental institution is the Charter's basic conception expressed in the first phrase of the first chapter: "Members are the states."

This makes the charter a multilateral treaty. No amendment of the text can alter that fact until the very foundation is changed to the effect that the institution will have direct relationship, not with states but with individuals.

But—argue the defenders of the Charter—the preamble says, “We the Peoples of the United Nations. . . .” Suppose someone publishes a proclamation opening, “I, the Emperor of China. . . .” Would this make him the Emperor of China? Such an action would more probably land him in a lunatic asylum than on the throne of China. “We, the people. . . .” —these symbolic words of democratic government—do not belong in the San Francisco Charter. Their use in the preamble is in total contradiction to everything else in it, and only historians will be able to decide whether they were used from lack of knowledge or lack of honesty. The simple truth requires that “We, the Peoples. . . .” in the preamble of the Charter be accurately read: “We, the High Contracting Powers. . . .”

The most vulgar of all objections, of course, is the meaningless assertion made by so many “public figures”: “The people are not yet ready for world federation.”

One can only wonder how they know. Have they themselves ever advocated world federation? Do they themselves believe in it? Have they ever tried to explain to the people what makes war and what is the mechanism of peace in human society? And, after having understood the problem, have the people rejected the solution and decided they did not want peace by law and government but preferred war by national sovereignty? Until this happens, no one has the right to pretend he knows what the people are ready for. Ideals always seem premature—until they become obsolete. Everybody has a perfect right to say that he does not believe in federal world government and does not want it. But without having faith in it and without having tried it, nobody has the right to preclude the decision of the people.<sup>1</sup>

### **Federation is radically different from confederation**

At this juncture, let us revisit and once again clearly distinguish a confederation of “High Contracting Parties,” as Reves mockingly puts it above, from a federation of states that genuinely represents “We the people of planet earth.”

A confederation is nothing more nor less than a voluntary association of states as may be reflected in a treaty, a convention, or an organization such as the UN or NATO. States are still understood to be sovereign, though in fact by joining a confederation—just as in entering into treaties and alliances—they accept minor limitations on their freedom of action. At the same time, in accordance with “international law,” states retain the right to reject the confederation’s recommendations. In addition, member-states enforce the confederation’s decisions only by means of their own national laws, or by the *principle of collective security*.

The great weakness of confederation is vividly shown in this notion of collective security, the primary mode of enforcement used by the United Nations. While it is true that collective security is an improvement on the unbridled national adventurism of the past, its solutions involve the very cumbersome imposition of sanctions and ultimately war on the entire people of the offending state itself—rather than the operation of enforceable law applied to individuals.

That explains in large part why the UN’s efforts to prevent war have been so ineffective and counterproductive. At the UN’s founding, a debate arose about this notion of imposing economic sanctions or waging war as the UN’s favored mode of punishment of violators of international law. Understandably, the great powers and many other nations objected to this proposed enforcement mechanism as being indiscriminate and onerous. But the solution adopted was a bizarre compromise: These framers of the UN Charter included debilitating protections against the egregious effects of its own enforcement mechanism! They found themselves resorting to the technique of unanimity—and the option of a veto for the largest powers—in the very council that they

envisioned for making these enforcement decisions.

It is especially the veto power of the large states that vitiates the logic of the whole UN system. It prevents enforcement in the cases that really matter, and it establishes a psychological climate of inaction and powerlessness that has led many around the world to reject the entire concept of global solutions to global problems.

It is little wonder that mainstream politicians within the United States and elsewhere have turned away from the UN, and for several decades have been in search of other solutions to issues of war and peace. It is not only contempt for international restraints on America's ability to act that drives this search; this sentiment represents a genuine frustration with the way that the system itself generates poor decisions and ineffective enforcement by anyone's measure.

Historically, the collective security mechanism of the United Nations has been exercised in significant ways only twice, with questionable results: first, when the United Nations deployed military forces against North Korea in 1950 in an action dominated by the US and, later, in the Gulf War with its US-led alliance of nations that attacked Iraq in 1991.

In the years since its founding, UN "peacekeeping" forces (lightly armed for patrol and observation purposes only) have also conducted a few dozen valuable operations designed to stabilize cease-fire lines and to encourage negotiations, but they have had little impact on the 200 wars that have occurred since 1945, in which an estimated 30 million have perished.

### **The benefits of federation are many**

In the final analysis, the nations of earth have never possessed real sovereignty; they never have had a sovereignty

that could protect them from the ravages and devastation of regional or world wars. In the creation of a global government of humankind, the nations are not giving up sovereignty so much as they are actually creating a real, bona fide, and lasting world sovereignty which will be fully able to protect them from all war. Toward this end, world federation offers a simple and elegant formula: Local affairs will be handled by local governments; national affairs, by national governments; and international affairs will be administered by the world government.

World citizens—the constituents of a global government who will one day elect a world legislature—will enjoy far more liberty under the government of humankind. Today Americans are taxed and regulated almost oppressively because of the onerous requirements of the war system and a military-industrial complex that has spun out of control. Much of this interference with individual liberties is based on a rational response to the “rules” of the war system, but this rollback of civil liberties will vanish when our government sees the wisdom of entrusting its sovereignty as regards to war-making into the hands of global government.

Under a global government all national groups will be afforded a real opportunity to realize and enjoy the personal liberties of genuine democracy. The fallacy of absolute national sovereignty will have ended. With global regulation of money and trade will come a new era of worldwide peace, as has already been seen in microcosm in the European Union and other successful federations. In time there will even be the hope that religions with a liberal, tolerant, and “worldcentric” viewpoint may come to dominate the cultural landscape. Such would be a welcome change from the proliferation of fundamentalist variants of Christianity and Islam that seem to be on

the rise across the world as ordinary people desperately attempt to grapple with the spiritual impact of global anarchy and unregulated economic globalization.

Which approach sounds most realistic? A patchwork reform of the UN that leaves in place the framework of a confederation—or a world federation? World federalists say that it is they who wish to extend the rule of law, who are the realists. They maintain that those who put their faith in a league of sovereign states are the delusional ones.

Paradoxically, under today's system of collective security mixed with international anarchy—a system ostensibly contrived to protect national sovereignty—the nation-state as such is actually *undermined*. It is a world federation above all that will preserve what is unique and culturally essential about nations, while transcending and leaving behind those characteristics of national sovereignty that offer nothing of value to the evolution of humankind.

A federation of nations, in which countries are united to a significant degree, but maintain much separateness, is the most logical arrangement. Such a federation would provide for different levels of government. Under the American system of federal government, states and cities are allowed to make certain independent decisions. For example, gambling is legal in Nevada but illegal in most other states. However, the right to make war and enter into international agreements is reserved for the national government. A federation shares power with the different levels of government, in contrast to a unitary state, in which all decisions are made by a central authority. Federal global government would simply complete the American system of federal government by adding the missing highest level.

The goal of a world federation is international unity, not uniformity. However, once a nation joined the global government, it would give up some of its right to independent action. For instance, it would not have the right to secede, just as in the 1860s the southern states did not have the right to secede from the US and were forced back into the union. The obligations of government are never voluntary. This is the difference between a confederation, in which obligations are voluntary, and a government, in which they are binding.

World federalism is in fact the most acceptable way, in an interdependent world, by which legitimate features of national and local sovereignty can be preserved; they *must* be preserved, under a world federation, as sources of law that are better adapted to national and local circumstances. In the final analysis, world federation is the only acceptable form of international organization that is strong enough to abolish war, yet not so strong as to endanger the political and cultural diversity of mankind. Federation is the wise approach to global governance. “Unity in diversity” will undoubtedly be the watchwords of the future federation of all nations.

*Mankind's desire for peace can be realized  
only by the creation of a world government.  
With all my heart I believe that the world's  
present system of sovereign nations can only  
lead to barbarism, war, and inhumanity.*

—Albert Einstein