

“Religious Support for Democratic World Federation”

David C. Oughton, Ph.D.

The first time that many religious representatives met with each other was at the World Parliament of Religions in Chicago in 1893. Three of the goals of this gathering were to show “what and how many important truths the various Religions hold and teach in common;” to discover “what light Religion has to throw on the great problems of the present age;” and “to bring the nations of the earth into a more friendly fellowship, in the hope of securing permanent international peace.” (1) The president of this Parliament proclaimed, “Henceforth the religions of the world will make war, not on each other, but on the giant evils that afflict humanity.” (2) But after two world wars, the Cold War with massive nuclear proliferation, and over eighty wars since the end of the Second World War, many people representing many different religions realized the need for modern Parliaments in order to address our current global problems.

At the 1993 Parliament of the World’s Religions in Chicago, Professor Hans Küng emphasized the principles of the Declaration toward a Global Ethic: “no peace among the nations without peace among the religions;” “no peace among the religions without dialogue among the religions;” and “no new global order without a global ethic.” (3) The Parliament of the World’s Religions has since met in Cape Town, South Africa (1999), Barcelona, Spain (2004), Melbourne, Australia (2009), Salt Lake City, USA (2015), and Toronto, Canada (2018).

Many representatives of different religions at the latest Parliament in Toronto spoke about humanity’s most pressing problems: violence, human rights atrocities, poverty, racism, gender inequality, war, nuclear weapons, and environment degradation due to global warming. (This Parliament added a fifth section “Commitment to a Culture of Sustainability and Care for the Earth” to the Declaration toward a Global Ethic.) Many representatives of different religions called for all religions to condemn the causes of these global problems and seek cooperation among the religions and nations of the world in order to solve them. But very few speakers addressed the main reason why these major problems are not being adequately solved: global anarchy, an international system of sovereign nation-states that lacks world law and world order. (4)

At my presentation at the Parliament in Toronto, I explained how some religions, especially the Baha’i Faith and the Roman Catholic Church, have developed teachings about world peace in order to counteract the systemic problem of global anarchy. I argued that if these teachings were instituted by creating a just and democratic world federation, then humanity would be much better able to actually solve our major global problems.

Baha’i Teachings on World Peace

Baha’is believe that Mirza Husayn-Ali (1817-1892), a Shia Muslim from Persia (5) and known by the title Baha’u’llah (the Glory of God), was the most recent but not the last manifestation or prophet of God. Baha’is believe that revelation from God is progressive and never finished. They recognize

Krishna, Buddha, Confucius, Moses, Zarathustra, Jesus, Muhammad, and others as previous messengers of God who taught people in various cultures in a pre-scientific age. Baha'u'llah's mission was to bring God's message to the global community in a scientific age. Baha'u'llah and the Baha'is emphasize the harmony between religion and science.

The three main principles of the Baha'i Faith are the oneness of God, the oneness of religion, and the oneness of humanity. Baha'is do not believe that there should be only one religion but that the religions of the world should work together in order to achieve universal peace and justice. They do not believe that all people should be the same or have identical beliefs. But Baha'u'llah and the Baha'is do believe in the equality of all people. They therefore condemn all forms of prejudice. They stress that men and women should have equal opportunities and rights. They call for the independent search for truth and universal education for all. They define worship as work or actions that benefit others.

Realizing that much violent conflict has occurred because of unjust economic systems, Baha'is teach that extreme wealth and extreme poverty should be abolished so that everyone is fed, housed, and educated. Baha'is envision a time when every nation will follow a universal system of weights and measures as well as an equitable global system of fair trade.

Along with these social, economic, and political principles, Baha'is call for the spiritual unification of our planet. They believe that the unity of the human family is the will of God. There is only one race, the human race. World unity means that people around the world view themselves as members of the human family and as world citizens. It means everyone sharing a responsibility for protecting and taking care of our common planet. According to Baha'u'llah, "it is not for him to pride himself who loves his own country, but rather for him who loves the whole world. The earth is but one country, and mankind its citizens." (6) These Baha'i teachings are the ways and means for building the necessary foundations for a world peace system.

An important aspect of the Baha'i teachings is the creation of a global parliament, world executive, and supreme tribunal. Abdu'l-Baha (1844-1921), the eldest son of Baha'u'llah and official interpreter of the Baha'i Faith between 1892 and 1921, said that the leaders of the national governments of the world "must make the Cause of Peace the object of general consultation, and seek by every means in their power to establish a Union of the nations of the world. They must conclude a binding treaty and establish a covenant, the provisions of which shall be sound, inviolable, and definite." (7) A global legislature composed of representatives of every country would create laws that would make war and the weapons of war obsolete. A world executive would have the authority to enforce the laws enacted by a democratic world parliament against individuals who violate them. A world tribunal would be able to adjudicate conflicts between nations through compulsory rulings and binding arbitration.

In order to promote the sense of a world community and to facilitate a world democratic legal system, Baha'u'llah and many of his followers have emphasized the need for a universal secondary language such as Esperanto as an essential tool for a world democracy. Abdu'l-Baha realized that "a universal language would make intercourse possible with every nation. Thus it would be needful to know two languages only, the mother tongue and the universal speech. The latter would enable a man to

communicate with any and every man in the world! ... Esperanto has been drawn up with this end in view... Therefore appreciate Esperanto, for it is the beginning of the carrying out of one of the most important of the Laws of Baha'u'llah, and it must continue to be improved and perfected.” (8)

Shoghi Effendi (1897-1957), the grandson of Abdu'l-Baha and guardian of the Baha'i Faith between 1921 and 1957, wrote this in The World Order of Baha'u'llah as a summary of the Baha'i teachings on peace: “A world federal system, ruling the whole earth and exercising unchallengeable authority over its unimaginably vast resources, blending and embodying the ideals of both the East and the West, liberated from the curse of war and its miseries, and bent on the exploitation of all the available sources of energy on the surface of the planet, a system in which Force is made the servant of Justice, whose life is sustained by its universal recognition of one God and by its allegiance to one common Revelation—such is the goal towards which humanity, impelled by the unifying forces of life, is moving.” (9)

After the deaths of Abdu'l-Baha and Shoghi Effendi, Baha'u'llah's teachings have been promoted by the Universal House of Justice which is composed of Baha'is who are elected every five years. Baha'is believe that justice should be the main principle of a new world order that was envisioned by Baha'u'llah. After meeting at the Baha'i world center in Haifa, Israel, the members of the Universal House of Justice in 1985 issued “The Promise of World Peace.” They emphasized that “world order can be founded only on an unshakable consciousness of the oneness of mankind, a spiritual truth which all the human sciences confirm. Anthropology, physiology, psychology, recognize only one human species, albeit infinitely varied in the secondary aspects of life. Recognition of this truth requires abandonment of prejudice—prejudice of every kind—race, class, color, creed, nation, sex, degree of material civilization, everything which enables people to consider themselves superior to others.” (10)

Creating a world parliament is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for lasting world peace. Baha'is refer to the creation of a democratic world federation as the Lesser Peace. When the religions and nations of the world unite to form a human family on Earth, then the promise of Baha'u'llah will be fulfilled: “These fruitless strifes, these ruinous wars shall pass away, and the Most Great Peace shall come.” (11)

Catholic Christian Teaching about a World Public Authority

The messianic mission of Jesus of Nazareth was to begin the kingdom or reign of God on earth as it is in heaven. (12) The fulfillment of this ultimate goal would be the time of peace and justice for all. Because Jesus taught “blessed are the peacemakers,” “turn the other cheek if someone strikes you,” “love your enemies,” and “whoever lives by the sword will die by the sword,” (13) early Christians were pacifists. They refused to join the Roman army because that would have meant affirming “Caesar is Lord” instead of “Jesus is Lord.” Like other groups of pacifists, Christian pacifists believe that peace is a precondition for justice.

When the Roman Empire was attacked after Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire in the late fourth century, St. Augustine of Hippo began the development of the Christian just

war tradition. This teaching said that Christians could fight only in cases of self-defense that is declared by legitimate authority and as a last resort. If such a war is declared to be just, then it must be fought by moral means: weapons and tactics must produce more good than evil and civilians must never be directly targeted. These conditions for limited warfare were developed when war involved hand-to-hand combat between soldiers while civilians were usually mere spectators. Most Christians throughout the history of Christianity accepted the teaching that if fighting a war is the only way to defend and protect people and their rights, then war must be rare and limited. Christians who have accepted the just war teaching believe that justice is a precondition for peace.

Because the limitations of the just war teaching were not always followed and because of the destructiveness of modern conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction which cannot discriminate between combatants and noncombatants, many Christian scholars have questioned the practicality and morality of the just war tradition in modern times. Because so many national leaders have justified their wars in terms of national interest and because more civilians are killed or suffer in modern wars than combatants, many modern Catholic leaders and theologians have been developing teachings about eliminating the war system by means of a system of global law and order.

Pope John XXIII wrote his 1963 encyclical “Pacem in Terris” in light of the proliferation of nuclear weapons during the Cold War and in response to the Cuban Missile Crisis. He taught that “today the universal common good poses problems of worldwide dimensions, which cannot be adequately tackled or solved except by the efforts of public authority endowed with a wideness of powers, structure and means of the same proportions: that is, of public authority which is in a position to operate in an effective manner on a worldwide basis. The moral order itself, therefore, demands that such a form of public authority be established.” (#137)

The Catholic bishops of the world emphasized this teaching at the Second Vatican Council. They taught that everyone should “work for the time when all war can be completely outlawed by international consent.” They realized that such a goal requires “the establishment of some universal public authority acknowledged as such by all, and endowed with effective power to safeguard, on the behalf of all, security, regard for justice, and respect for rights.” (14)

In their response to the nuclear arms race in the 1980s, the American Catholic bishops issued the pastoral letter The Challenge of Peace in 1983 as a contribution to the debate about the Reagan Administration’s policies on nuclear weapons. The American bishops wrote that the world must go beyond the nation-state system because “we are now entering an era of new global interdependencies requiring global systems of governance to manage the resulting conflicts and ensure our common security.” (#242) They argued that “mutual security and survival require a new vision of the world as one interdependent planet.” (#244)

In his 2009 encyclical “Caritas in Veritate,” Pope Benedict XVI called for a reform of the United Nations Organization and for “a true world public authority.” (#67) He emphasized that such a global authority should be based on the principles of subsidiarity and solidarity. The principle of subsidiarity in Catholic social teaching means that problems should be dealt with at the lowest level possible. Local problems need to be solved by local governments and officials. National governments must solve problems within each of their borders. But global problems need to be

solved by the world community acting together. The principle of solidarity recognizes the growth of global interdependence. The decisions of any one country can affect the well-being of the rest of the world. According to Catholic social teaching, each local and national government must base its policies and laws on the common good. According to Pope Benedict, what is needed to manage globalization, solve global problems, and promote the common good of all humanity is a global authority that is universally recognized.

In their response to global economic tensions, the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace wrote in 2011 that a supranational authority “should have a realistic structure and be set up gradually.” It should support sustainable development and social progress for all. The Pontifical Council argues that globalization is unifying people around the world and will eventually lead to the rule of law on the global level. A future global legal authority must promote global social justice. It must focus on “financial and monetary policies that will not damage the weakest countries, and policies aimed at achieving free and stable markets and a fair distribution of world wealth, which may also derive from unprecedented forms of global fiscal solidarity.” In order for a world public authority to be moral and just, “humanity needs to be committed to the transition from a situation of archaic struggles between national entities, to a new model of a more cohesive, polyarchic international society that respects every people’s identity within the multifaceted riches of a single humanity.” Such a global authority can serve the human family and the common good. (15)

In order to solve our major global problems, especially the negative effects of global climate change, Pope Francis wrote in his 2015 encyclical “Laudato Si” that in order to create systems of renewable energy, sustainable agriculture, better management of marine and land resources, and universal access to clean drinking water, “enforceable international agreements are urgently needed.” (#173) In order to achieve this goal, he concluded that “there is urgent need of a true world political authority.” (#175)

The Inadequacies of the Current United Nations System

Many Baha’i and Catholic leaders, as well as many other leaders of other religions, (16) have been teaching that the current anarchy between national governments and the lack of a global system of world law are preventing humanity from adequately solving the major problems concerning war, weapons of war, genocide, economic insecurity, climate change, and protection of our oceans, air, atmosphere, outer space, and other “common areas” of our planet.

Previous and current forms of international order have been important steps in the evolution of global governance but they are now inadequate in our interdependent global society. The League of Nations, created after the First World War, was based on unanimous voting in both its Assembly and Council. That meant that just one member could veto any resolution. The League was unable to prevent the aggression of the Axis Powers that led to the Second World War. The United Nations Organization was formally created on October 24, 1945 in order to “save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.” (17) The UN has accomplished many improvements in the world. (18) It has overseen the decolonization of many parts of world. It has provided many countries with

developmental aid. It has improved the health and infrastructure of the world through its Specialized Agencies. It has provided many examples of peace-keeping and peace-building operations.

The Bahá'í International Community has been recognized since 1948 as an international non-governmental organization at the United Nations. Baha'is from around the world have promoted many UN programs and have been instrumental in discussions about UN reform.

The Holy See has official observer status in the United Nations. When Pope Paul VI addressed the UN General Assembly in 1965, he said that “people turn to the United Nations as if it were their last hope for peace and harmony” because it is based on the principle that relations between nations must be “regulated by reason, justice, law and negotiation, and not by force, violence, war, nor indeed by fear and deceit.” He told the leaders of the world that “the edifice which you have constructed must never fail; it must be perfected and made equal to the needs which world history will present. You mark a stage in the development of humanity for which retreat must never be admitted, but from which it is necessary that advance be made.” (19)

Even though the United Nations has been successful in preventing a third world war, the UN system has often been weak and ineffective in preventing many wars or solving many global problems. This is because the United Nations Organization, like the League of Nations, is a confederation of national governments. It is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all national governments. The UN is unable to outlaw war. In fact, the UN is based on the principle of collective security (for example, the Korean War and the First Persian Gulf War).

The UN General Assembly is not democratic. Each of the current 193 member-nations have the same one vote, regardless of the size of its population. China with a population of 1.4 billion people, Nauru with a population of 9,300 people, and all of the other 191 member nations in the UN have the same one vote. It is thus possible for a resolution in the UNGA to pass by a two-thirds majority that represents only 8% of the world's population. The sixty-five least populous countries with a combined population below one percent of the world's population can block the passage of a substantive resolution in the UNGA. (20) The UNGA can only pass non-binding resolutions which state how nations should behave. Even if a member-nation votes for a UNGA resolution, it is not required to follow it.

The UN Security Council has often been impotent in preventing or ending wars because of the veto power of any one of the five permanent members (U.S.A., U.K., France, Russia, and China), even if all of the other fourteen members of the UNSC vote for a resolution. Whenever any one of the five permanent members or their allies are involved in a conflict, a veto or the threat of a veto has been used. (21)

The UN system must rely on dues from national governments, which are not always paid. (22) The UN is based on international law which is a system of customs (traditions about how nations should treat each other, such as granting diplomatic immunity) and treaties. But nations are not required to enter into treaties. The United States and some other countries have refused to become parties to the Law of the Sea Treaty and the Treaty of Rome concerning the International Criminal Court. (23) The United Nations International Court of Justice will only accept cases about treaty violations if all national governments involved in the case agree to have it heard and abide by its decision. National

leaders suffer no consequences for violating or for withdrawing from international treaties. Even though most nations keep most of their treaties most of the time, national governments violate or withdraw from treaties when they feel it is in their national interests without any concern for the common good. (24)

From World Anarchy to World Law

Instead of basing international relations on treaties, I argue that the global community needs to develop a system of world laws that would be created by a democratic world parliament. Instead of each country having the same one vote as in the United Nations General Assembly, the number of representatives from each nation voting in a democratic world parliament should be determined by its population and other factors. A resolution would become binding world law when it is approved by a super majority of representatives and reflects a super majority of the world's population. World laws would concern global problems and the relations between nations.

In order to transform the current UN confederacy into a democratic world federation of national governments, (25) a world executive committee would be needed to enforce world laws against individuals who violate them. Economic sanctions against an entire nation would not be done as in the present international system. Such an executive committee would not have veto power over enforcing world laws or prosecuting individuals.

Individuals (including national leaders) involved in genocide, crimes against humanity, and international terrorism would be prosecuted by world courts if national courts are unable or unwilling to prosecute. Border and land disputes between countries would be settled non-violently by binding arbitration in world courts.

Just as local, state, and national police arrest those who violate local, state, and national laws, a world police force would be needed to arrest those who violate world laws. Those who are convicted of violating world laws would be incarcerated in world prisons.

In order to create this system of world laws, the peoples of the world need to engage in a debate about the provisions in a world constitution. The powers and limitations of the organs of the world federation; the checks and balances between them; the rights, powers, and limitations of national governments; and the rights and responsibilities of all world citizens would need to be explicit in a world constitution.

Under a democratic world federation, the war system (which currently costs over 1.5 trillion U.S. dollars each year) could be eliminated. A common misconception is that wars can never be eliminated because there is always conflict between people. There will always be conflicts of interest between individuals (even between spouses who love each other) and between many different groups of people but conflicts do not have to become violent and can be resolved nonviolently. The problem is whether political power is determined by conflicting groups in a nonviolent democratic process, or whether it is determined by violent conflict between opposing groups through violent revolutions and wars.

Besides outlawing war and enforcing world laws against individuals, a world federal government would be better able to solve global problems than individual national governments or the United Nations Organization are now able. For example, there is a need to manage the global economy. Transnational corporations need to be regulated. Companies and individuals who contribute to global warming could be prosecuted. Rain forests could be bought and managed as world parks.

The present international system obviously promotes national citizenship and patriotism (loyalty to “the fatherland”) in order to be able to fight wars against humans in other countries. A democratic world federation could promote world citizenship and humatriotism (loyalty to the human family). (26) World citizenship and world democracy can be promoted by a pledge of allegiance to the world, a world flag and global symbols, a world anthem, and the celebration of some world holidays.

One way in which a democratic world federation could be formed is to first create regional federations of nations that would solve problems for different parts of the world. If these regional federations are effective, then they could eventually join together in order to form a world federation. Another incremental way that a world federation could be created is to first focus on a particular world problem such as climate change or nuclear weapons and form a global agency that would be able to create an enforceable legal system that would eliminate nuclear weapons and regulate nuclear energy.

Various proposals have been made about how to fund a world federation. One way would be to require each nation to pay 0.1% of its gross national income. (27) Another way would be to charge a user tax on nations, corporations, and individuals for international travel and for exploring and using the resources of the common areas of the planet.

The Role of the Religions in Building a Firm Foundation

As long as many people hold on to their deep-seated nationalistic feelings and obsession with national sovereignty and national interests, it is unlikely that a democratic world federation could be created in the near future. But the role of the world’s major religions is to build a firm foundation so that a future democratic world federation can be just, effective, and responsible for promoting the common good. The world’s religions should fulfill this role by emphasizing the reality of a world community, world citizenship, and the human family as stewards of our common planet. The world’s religions need to emphasize what has been realized because of many years of interreligious dialogue: that they share different versions of the Golden Rule (28) and many common commandments such as “do not murder, steal, lie, or be unchaste” or “respect life, rights, truth, and sexuality.” All of the major religions teach about love and compassion in order to help those who are suffering. These ethical teachings are the basis for the Declaration toward a Global Ethic and the Charter for Compassion (29) that have been highlighted at the Parliaments of the World’s Religions.

The world’s religions should teach that world peace for a world community requires a democratic system of world law and order. (30) The Baha’i Faith and modern Catholic social theology have been teaching this for many years. Many individuals in other religions agree that there is a need for world law and order. When a critical mass of religious people around the world agree on this need,

then the dream of the ancient Jewish prophets can finally be realized: “They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. One nation shall not raise the sword against another, nor shall they train for war again.” (31)

1. Rev. John Henry Barrows, Chairman of the 1893 Parliament, The World’s Parliament of Religions, Volume I (Chicago: The Parliament Publishing Company, 1893), p. 18.
2. Charles Carroll Bonney, President of the 1893 Parliament, ibid., p. 186.
3. Professor Hans Küng is the main author of the Declaration of a Global Ethic that was accepted by the Parliament of the World’s Religions in Chicago on September 4, 1993. He argues that globalization requires a global ethic. A global ethic is a minimal basic consensus relating to binding values, irrevocable standards, and moral attitudes which can be affirmed by all religions despite their theological differences. See his Global Responsibility: In Search of a New World Ethic (New York: Continuum, 1991) and A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).
4. Swami Agnivesh was an exception. At one of the plenary sessions of the Parliament in Toronto, he said, “Is it not ironic that while we are raising our voices for peace, 1,700 billion U.S. dollars are being spent annually on armaments and the war machine? We, the people of the World, need to unite and demand a world government and a world parliament based on the Earth Constitution.” In a conversation with me after his speech, Swami said, “Without a world government, we can’t solve our major world problems.”
5. Baha’u’llah was born on November 12, 1817 in Tehran, Persia. He was a disciple of Siyyid Ali-Muhammad, known as the Bab (the Gate). After the Bab was publicly executed in 1850, Baha’u’llah was imprisoned in the Black Pit in Tehran. He was then exiled to Baghdad. In 1863 he was banished to Constantinople and Adrianople. In 1868 he was sent to the prison in Akka. He died while under house arrest in Akka on May 29, 1892.
6. Baha’u’llah, “Gleanings from the Writings of Baha’u’llah, CXVII” in Writings of Baha’u’llah (New Delhi: Baha’i Publishing Trust, 1994), p. 590.
7. Abdu’l-Baha, “The Secret of Divine Civilization” in Writings and Utterances of Abdu’l-Baha (New Delhi: Baha’i Publishing Trust, 2000), p. 34.
8. Abdu’l-Baha, “The Eighth Principle—Universal Peace” in Writings and Utterances of Abdu’l-Baha, pp. 777-778. World community, world citizenship, and world democracy could be enhanced by the Baha’i proposal to have everyone learn a universal auxiliary language in addition to their native language. A universal language should not be a native language such as English because that would mean one group of people would only need to learn one language. An artificial language such as Esperanto would be the best choice for a universal auxiliary language because it is grammar-coded with basic rules and no exception to those rules. See Ronald J. Glossop, "Language Policy and a Just

World Order," *Alternatives*, Vol. XIII, #3, July, 1988, p. 396, and John Roberts, "World Language for One World," *Esperanto/USA*, 1994 (2).

9. Shoghi Effendi, The World Order of Baha'u'llah (Wilmette, IL: Baha'i Publishing Trust, 1965), p. 204.
10. Section Three of "The Promise of World Peace," a Baha'i Statement on Peace by the Universal House of Justice, 1985. In January, 2019, the Universal House of Justice wrote a letter about world peace to the Baha'is of the world. In this document they said, "Fostering unity, by harmonizing disparate elements and nurturing in every heart a selfless love for humankind, is the task of religion." They also stressed that "the establishment of peace is a duty to which the entire human race is called."
11. Baha'u'llah said this in an interview in 1890 to Professor Edward Granville Browne of Cambridge University. This saying is quoted in Section Four of "The Promise of World Peace."
12. Matthew 6: 9-10.
13. Matthew 5: 9; Matthew 5: 38-39; Matthew 5: 43-44; Matthew 26: 52.
14. Second Vatican Council, The Church Today, Part II, Chapter 5, #82.
15. Quotes in this paragraph are from "Towards Reforming the International Financial and Monetary Systems in the Context of Global Public Authority" by the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace.
16. For example, see Swami Satprakashananda's "World Peace—How?" (Vedanta Society of St. Louis, 1973) and Nikkyo Niwano, A Buddhist Approach to Peace (Tokyo: Kosei, 1977). Niwano says that if people follow Buddha's teaching about relieving suffering through love, compassion, and nonviolence, then the whole world will become one "Buddha-land." In order to work for this goal, Niwano says that a world federation should be our blueprint.
17. Preamble to the United Nations Charter.
18. For a description of the many accomplishments of the United Nations Organization, see Chapter 11 of Ronald Glossop's Confronting War (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2001, 4th edition).
19. Pope Paul VI addressed the United Nations General Assembly on October 4, 1965. Pope John Paul II spoke at the UNGA on October 2, 1979 and on October 5, 1995. Pope Benedict XVI spoke about human rights at the United Nations on April 18, 2008. Pope Francis spoke at the United Nations on September 25, 2015.
20. These statistics are from Joseph E. Schwartzberg, Transforming the United Nations System (United Nations University Press, 2013), p. 6. In order to solve this problem of "one nation, one vote" in the UNGA, Schwartzberg proposes a system of weighted voting where a nation-member's weighted vote would be determined by this formula: dividing by three the total of its percentage of the total population of all U.N. members, its financial contribution as a percentage of the UN budget, and the percentage of the total number of UN members (0.518). For example, the weighted vote for China would be 10.587; the weighted vote for the United States would be 9.237; India's weighted vote would be 7.051; 178 countries would each have a weighted vote under 1.000; the least populous countries such as Tuvalu and Nauru would have a weighted vote of 0.173. According to Schwartzberg's proposal, decisions of the UNGA about global and general questions would become

binding law if made by a two-thirds majority of the weighted votes, provided that the total population of the concurring members represents a majority. Some other questions would require a three-fourths majority. See Chapter 2 of this book for further details.

21. This has been the case with the Vietnam War, the Israeli-Palestinian conflicts, the British-Argentina conflict over the Falkland Islands, China's involvement in Tibet and in Darfur, the war in Iraq, Russia's involvement in Ukraine, the civil war in Syria, and many other violent conflicts. In order to eliminate the veto of the permanent members in the United Nations Security Council, Joseph Schwartzberg has proposed a system of weighted voting for twelve seats, each representing a major region of the world. Because the United States, China, and India have a large enough weighted vote in the UNGA, they would each have their own seat in the UNSC. The other nations of the world would be grouped together according to geographic regions. Each of these regions would have a weighted vote based on their collective population and contribution to the UN. According to Schwartzberg's proposal, a resolution would be binding if passed by a two-thirds majority that reflected at least 50% of the world's population. See Chapter 4 of his Transforming the United Nations System (*ibid.*) for further details.
22. The United States government withheld some of its UN dues during the 1990s in order to pay a smaller percentage to the UN annual regular budget (from 25% to 22%). Eventually the U.S. government paid its UN dues. The annual regular budget of the United Nations system is now about 5.6 billion dollars. (Compare this with recent annual U.S. military budgets which are around 700 billion dollars; the rest of the countries of the world together spend approximately that same amount each year.) Almost every state in the United States has a larger annual budget than the UN system.
23. The permanent International Criminal Court is different from the ad hoc tribunals that have been created by the UN Security Council. The ICC can investigate and prosecute individuals for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide only if national courts are unable or unwilling to prosecute them. About two-thirds of the national governments of the world (but not the United States, China, or Russia) are now parties to the workings of the ICC.
24. The Trump Administration's decision to withdraw from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty with Russia, President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the Iran Nuclear Treaty and the Paris Climate Treaty, plus the violations of the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty by North Korea and some other countries demonstrate the problem of dealing with global order through a system of treaties.
25. The history of the United States could be a model for this transformation from a United Nations confederation to a democratic world federation. During the 1780s after the American Revolutionary War had been won, the newly independent Americans debated whether to transform the Articles of Confederation into a different system that would unite the thirteen sovereign states into a single country under a federal constitution. See Carl Van Doren, The Great Rehearsal: The Story of the Making and Ratifying of the Constitution of the United States (New York: Viking Press, 1948). For the differences between a confederation and a federation, see Ronald Glossop's World Federation?: A Critical Analysis of Federal World Government (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 1993), pp. 26-30.

26. Theodore Lentz, founder of the Peace Research Laboratory of St. Louis, coined the term "humatriotism." He maintained that through education, "we must find a way to lift our consciousness from the narrow or local level to the global." Humatriotism. (St. Louis: The Futures Press, 1976), p. 20.
27. This is Joseph Schwartzberg's proposal in his Transforming the United Nations System, *op. cit.*, pp. 216-221.
28. For example, Confucius said, "Do not do to others what you would not have them do to you." (Analects 15: 23) Jesus said, "Treat others the way you want them to treat you." (Matthew 7: 12)
29. The Charter for Compassion was created by Karen Armstrong and was first promoted by the Parliament of the World's Religions in 2009. Since then, several hundred cities around the world have declared themselves to be "compassionate cities." See <https://charterforcompassion.org>.
30. However, some religious groups and their leaders oppose democratic world federation. Some conservative Christians such as Pat Robertson have argued against any type of world government as an evil secret conspiracy that is actively opposing God and religion. In his book The New World Order (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1991), Robertson claims that a "man-made new world order" is not Christ's will for humanity. He sees any type of world government as the Kingdom of the Anti-Christ. (Baha'is, Catholics, and others who argue for the need to create a world public authority/democratic world federation do not favor a nondemocratic "one-world government" that would be the only government in the world that would eliminate national governments and impose uniformity on everyone in the world.) For other objections to world federation, see Ronald Glossop, World Federation?: A Critical Analysis of Federal World Government, *op. cit.*, Chapter 5. He responds to each of these objections in Chapter 6.
31. Isaiah 2: 4 and Micah 4: 3.

David C. Oughton earned his interdisciplinary doctorate in "Philosophies and Theologies of Peace and Justice." His dissertation is entitled "The Implications of Henry Nelson Wieman's Philosophy of Creative Interchange for World Peace." He teaches courses in the world's religions in the Department of Theological Studies at Saint Louis University. He is the co-author of Jewish-Christian Relations in Light of the Holocaust. He is the president of Interfaith Partnership of Greater St. Louis. He serves on the national board of Citizens for Global Solutions.

