

by Britain, Britain bases her title to Belice, apart from the treaty of 1859, on effective occupation, long and undisturbed possession.²⁵

The termination of the old dispute by international adjudication is highly desirable; it would also give the International Court of Justice a first case of great legal interest and considerable political importance. The decision of Great Britain to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in this dispute, which eventually may involve the fate of the colony, is certainly proof of Britain's earnest desire to base British policy on the United Nations Organization. Naturally the consent of Guatemala is necessary to give the Court jurisdiction; notwithstanding her attitude of 1937, it is earnestly to be hoped that Guatemala will give her consent.

JOSEF L. KUNZ

THE DEMAND FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT

The atomic bomb may produce as great a revolution in the field of political science as in that of physical science. The atomic scientists, more aware of what they have done, and shocked by this awareness into earnest and vigorous effort to secure social action to control the consequences of their discoveries, demand a strong international control over production and use of the bomb and are quite willing to follow the consequences of this logic into a system of world government. Even though depressed by consultation with political scientists they are not discouraged; they are steadily organizing and pressing for what they think is needed. There is no group in the country more socially conscious, more eager, or more potentially effective than the atomic scientists, and those who are interested in international law and order may gain greatly from association with them.

It is characteristic of the average human being that it requires disaster, or the immediate prospect of disaster, to rouse him to doing what his intelligence long ago told him to do, or to thinking of that on which he never before took the trouble to think. Many who had not troubled themselves to think about organization for the maintenance of international peace now look appealingly to the UNO, and ask for a commission to control the atomic bomb. Others who had complacently satisfied themselves that the UNO was a safe shelter for sovereign irresponsibility are now shocked into asking that what should have been done at San Francisco (by way of strengthening the Charter) should now be done. Some who had always demanded a stronger system now ask for world government, and find an increasing number of followers.

The demand for world government increases steadily, though those who support it would differ greatly as to its meaning or degree of authority. A number of distinguished persons met at Dublin, N. H., in October, 1945, and drew up a statement calling for a much stronger international system

²⁵ "Continuous and peaceful display of territorial sovereignty (peaceful in relation to other States) is as good as a title" (Huber, Arbitrator, *The Island of Palmas (Miangas)*, 1928).

than was provided in the charter of UNO. This was interpreted as asking for abandonment of UNO and construction *de novo*, though this interpretation was denied by some members. The group has continued its activities, meeting at Princeton in January, 1946, and sending a representative to London to present to the UNO General Assembly recommendations for specific amendments to the United Nations Charter.¹ "Americans United for World Organization," under the chairmanship of the radio commentator, Raymond Gram Swing, have changed their name to "Americans United for World Government," and announce a policy "for the development of the United Nations Charter into a world agency adequate in delegated sovereignty to enforce the peace." Dr. Arthur Compton has told us that "if we are wise we shall take immediate steps to form a world government." Mr. Ely Culbertson, not going this far, calls for a "Federative Alliance," employing his earlier quota plan. Mr. T. K. Finletter has written an article entitled "No Middle Ground"—either world government or the old anarchy of agreement among sovereign states.² A book by Emery Reves, *The Anatomy of Peace*, is becoming a best seller, worth two issues of the *Reader's Digest*. A dramatic statement by Mr. Norman Cousins in the *Saturday Review of Literature* has been distributed widely. World government has been debated over the University of Chicago Round Table and Town Hall of the Air, at the Norman Waite Harris Foundation meetings; it is increasingly the topic of forums and cocktail parties, not to mention meetings of political scientists. An organized group of distinguished authors has petitioned the President in its support. A resolution to this end has been introduced into Congress.³

Whereas a few months ago the issue before the American people was that between international organization and international government (with the former winning at San Francisco), the issue is now becoming one between international government and world government. What is the difference between them?

The former is sufficiently explained by the prefix "inter." It would be an association of states—sovereign states, if you wish—which establish some common organs and agree to certain rules and obligations for the maintenance of peace and the advancement of common interests. It has been argued in political debates over the UNO that such a system means no loss of sovereignty, but this involves questions of meaning and of degree. The United Nations Organization probably has too little authority to be called even "international government," much less "world government."

The latter phrase is not yet one of agreed meaning, but the chief char-

¹ The Dublin, N. H., conference was called together by Owen Roberts, formerly Justice of the Supreme Court, Robert P. Bass, former Governor of New Hampshire, Grenville Clark, and Thomas H. Mahoney. Its Chairman is now Alan Cranston of Washington.

² *The Nation*, New York, Atomic Bomb Supplement, December 22, 1945.

³ By Senator Glenn Taylor: Sen. Res. 183, 79 Cong. 1 Sess.

acteristics of the system which it denotes may be summarized as follows: a legislative body which can make new international law by majority vote, binding sovereign states without their individual consent; a court with compulsory jurisdiction, before which sovereign states can be called even without their consent; an international police force, not dependent upon the armed forces of sovereign states; and authority to reach down to individuals within sovereign states and uphold rights or require duties of them. The object of attack is national sovereignty.

This writer can accept these as logical and desirable objectives, but there remains the very important question as to the means by which they should be sought and the extent to which they can now be practicably pressed.⁴ Is the UNO so unavailing that it must be abandoned, and must we build *de novo*, from the ground up? If so it is a discouraging prospect which lies ahead for us.

When the atomic scientist has completed his formula with scientific proof his job is done; when the political scientist has demonstrated the logic of his formula his job has just begun. Acceptance of the latter, no matter how logical, depends upon the information and interest, the whims, prejudices, and economic situation, of the average citizen; it depends upon what the *Reader's Digest* chooses to print, upon radio talks by a Father Coughlin, upon the printing by the Hearst papers of petitions to be signed by readers and delivered by truckloads to Senators. Public opinion advances slowly, and not even the shock of the atomic bomb has produced, upon any wide scale, change of established beliefs concerning national sovereignty. The same public which welcomes with enthusiasm and admiration any scientific discovery, no matter how frightening in its consequences, looks with suspicion and skepticism upon the political scientist who proposes a social or governmental change to take account of these consequences.

This situation, for good or bad, is part of the problem; it can not be disregarded. Democracy moves slowly its wonders to perform; the people must be willing to accept and support the idea—probably under dictatorships as well. World Government can not spring full panoplied from the brain of the political scientist; it can be born only after long gestation and painful travail. Political progress rarely if ever appears as a complete break with the past; usually it builds upon what is already there.

These reflections lead to the conclusion that it would be unwise and

⁴Since the above was written, a report has been received summarizing the results of a questionnaire conducted for the *American Magazine* by the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University. Practically all of the 50 or 60 experts consulted were in favor of working toward a world government as a final objective. On the other hand, not one of them was willing to push ahead, independently of the UNO, and to seek to establish world government at once. They divided about equally as to whether an effort should be made at once to change UNO into a true world government, or whether UNO should gradually be strengthened and developed toward that goal.

probably impossible to scrap UNO and to substitute for it a new scheme of world government. The chances are that we would lose what we have gained—for UNO is a gain—and acquire nothing in its place. On the other hand it may be possible to develop UNO in the desired direction. Whatever changes are made, within or without UNO, must depend upon the agreement of sovereign states; and it would surely be easier to achieve this agreement by the procedures and pressures available under UNO, and by changes in UNO itself, than by thrusting a new system *in toto* upon public opinion throughout the world.

Taking the characteristics of world government as above suggested, what would be the possibilities? An independent police force, such as Governor Stassen has asked for, could be provided within the terms of the present Charter, without amendment—if members would agree to do it. All that is necessary to secure compulsory jurisdiction for the Court is acceptance by a few other states of the “Optional Clause” of the Statute of the Court; an example set by the United States in this regard (i.e., adoption of Senator Morse’s resolution) would be followed by many other states. These advances could be made without an entirely new system, and without even the necessity of amending the Charter.

Authority to legislate, to bind a state without its own consent, would require amendment. Though Mr. Bevin has strongly supported a World Parliament more opposition would be encountered here. Such amendment might be possible, however, for limited fields of legislative authority, such perhaps as regulations concerning control over materials needed for the atomic bomb. To remove the veto, which advocates of world government would regard as essential in this connection, would also require amendment.

Finally, the proposal to authorize the world government to reach down to individuals within sovereign states would change the character of UNO and make it a supra-national body. While this could, of course, be done by amendment, it would meet with passionate opposition from patriots of many nationalities. Responsibility and loyalty to an international authority by individuals would seem to be the key feature of world government; and certainly the individual human being is the unit to serve which all organizations exist. It is, however, in the sense of a general authority to supersede the jurisdiction of sovereign states over individuals, unattainable at present. On the other hand, the Charter of UNO itself contains the concept of international protection of human rights (and rights imply duties); the Nuremberg trials may establish a precedent for holding individuals liable for international crimes; and fear of the atomic bomb again might lead to acceptance of certain specific controls over individuals in the effort to control this weapon. Development would be possible under the UNO, step by step, where it would be impossible as a new system, overriding national sovereignty completely.

It thus appears that the issue is one of degree, and there is no reason why

it should split public opinion into factious opposition. What advocates of world government wish can be obtained, where possible of attainment, more easily through the development and strengthening of UNO than by scrapping UNO and building anew. It is a very common error to say that the only alternatives are sovereignty or no sovereignty. Sovereignty, certainly in the practice of today, is not an absolute matter, but a very relative one. It may be compared to individual liberty, which is never regarded as absolute freedom of action. Sovereignty likewise will be earnestly maintained, but sovereignty also is being progressively restricted. This process has been going on for years, and UNO, weak as it is, has added further restrictions upon sovereignty. This process should be continued, and can be, but it would not be possible to travel the whole distance in one leap. Few persons are satisfied with UNO as it now stands, and many believe that public opinion would have approved more authority for it than timorous Senators and statesmen were willing to confer upon it. With the added weight of fear of the atomic bomb upon public opinion there is little doubt that the American people would, with adequate leadership, approve various steps moving the UNO in the direction of world government, but it is very much to be doubted whether they would be willing to scrap UNO and again go through the travail of creating a new system. That would be a dangerous risk to take.

CLYDE EAGLETON

THE ALTERNATIVE TO APPEASEMENT

Once again the more important states of the world and their governments and their peoples are being confronted by the question of whether they shall seek international peace and justice by a process of appeasement. To some degree all states are placed in this position but it is states with more power to determine the course of international affairs and greater responsibility therefor, in a vague sense, and, conversely, with greater interests at stake, which are more gravely affected. It is also true that this question—that of trying to forestall recourse to violence and satisfy the demands of justice by concessions to national demands—is an ever present issue in international affairs, but the issue becomes more acute at certain times when some one or more states make especially drastic demands, accompanied by especially dangerous threats, express or implied. Such a situation developed in the world between 1922 and 1941, Italy, Japan, and Germany being the leading figures in the action, and it is widely felt that as a result of Russian policies and initiatives a similar situation confronts the world today.

It will be denied by many critics of appeasement that there is involved any question of satisfying just demands, or of doing justice beyond preserving peace, in such situations. This would seem to be an untenable, and also a very dangerous, attitude. In any such situation the demands of the complaining and aggressive (but not yet aggressor) states almost invariably contain a greater or less amount, or more or fewer items, of justice. Japan