

## **FROM UTOPIA TO DYSTOPIA: CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF ONE WORLD GOVERNMENT.**

**Anacletus Ogbunkwu PhD**  
**Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki.**  
**franacletus@gmail.com**

### **Abstract**

The paper aims at a critical examination of the claims of one world government. We use the philosophical method of hermeneutics and Turabian documentation in the attempt to give a detailed and critical examination of the possibility of one world government. The paper studies the utopic assumptions of one world government, concept of one world government, variants of one world government such as globalization and liberal internationalism while using United Nations and European Union as models or foretaste of one world government. Similarly, the paper studies the challenges to one world government such as the premillennialist Christian claims regarding the end time antichrist, triumph of a particular individual, group or political interest, e.t.c. Our findings make it obvious that though state sovereignty or multilateral governance in the world faces terrible lack of trust, abuses and unmitigated corruption, one world government is not immune from these vices. Also, the proponents of one world government claim that the values of globalization and technological advancement make it convincing that one world government is possible. Nevertheless, we make bold to note that globalization and technological advancement are mere tools to support better life than a system of government. One of the strongest claims of one world government is that it would be a surge of diplomacy and honest broker of peace in a world ruined with chaos, corruption and impunity. Nevertheless, our appraisal of one world government shows that it would be a failure on arrival minding the complexity of the human person and the undeniable regional differences in the world. It is good enough that UN sets out about 70-80% of their budget to peace and security but since every state or country does not have the same degree of peace and security challenges, what happens to their peculiar needs? It is obvious from the studies that even the very values one world government seeks to protect would face terrible blow such as classism, neo-colonization, denigration, lack of government presence, dictatorship and inhuman treatment. Hence if one world government is possible, why the brexit of the United Kingdom from EU? Why the quest for Biafra from Nigeria? Why the failure of the great Roman Empire? The implication of the study proves that one world government claim is a deception and denial of stark reality minding regional needs and governance. Hence after careful examination of one world government, the paper dissuades the quest for one world government as a practice of such would amount to total collapse of governance, order, security, active participation and economy.

**Key word: One world, government, religion, globalization,**

## **Introduction**

The idea of one world government has been a hot debate round the world. This hot debate over one world government has always been between global governance against nationalist vanguards of state sovereignty. While the former believes that the whole world can be best governed by surrendering every state to a one big world government, the latter has deep suspicions minding the threat such global government poses to nationalism, autonomy of states and grass root development.

Obviously, history teaches us what to expect lest we expect the near-impossible. Historically, there have been incessant but failed attempts on one world government. It has always begun with sweet and utopic ideologies but dies off in dystopia. It should be noted that utopia here describes an impulse for social dreaming. It originated from the popular work of Thomas Moore, *utopia*, translated as ‘the good place which is no place’<sup>1</sup>. Here, Moore described utopia as an imaginary and solidarity island where everything seems to be running smoothly. It is a society setting wherein the people experience ideal and perfect possible life. It is an imaginative reference to a hypothetical construction<sup>2</sup> synonymous to paradise.

By contrast, dystopia shows a sharp opposite of utopia. Hence it can be referred as anti-topia or kakptopia. Being a sharp contrast of utopia which in this contest, is an imaginary global government marked by smooth running and successful government, dystopia signifies a place extremely unpleasant in which living and working conditions are so unfavorable, burdensome and unbearable. Here the society is chaotic, unruly and can be described as a ruined civilization.<sup>3</sup>

Hence the argument on the possibility of one world government in this paper dangles between the two pendulum of utopia and dystopia. The advocates of one world government seem to be in the world of utopia while forgetting that such claims are mere imaginative wishful thinking and short sightedness from the damn of dystopia. Global government advocates are seduced by the allurements of their imaginative thinking on perfect society characterized by peaceful co-

existence and as such this paper refers to this attempt as *utopic*. Conversely, this imaginative thinking meets its Waterloo in practical experience since the success of such government will be dead on arrival; leaving the world in ruins and chaos. Hence this paper refers to this state of ruins as dystopia.

The various attempts on such global government had always ended with disappointment. The Christian Bible reports such attempt in the Tower of Babel. Man had an ulterior motive of being like God or even overthrowing God and in attempt to achieve this aim desired to go the uphill task of meeting God physically. This attempt was aborted by God and as such scattered humanity across the earth by dividing the languages of men<sup>4</sup>. Since this time, several attempts by man to achieve this purpose met its own end and fell into ruins. Further examples where the human person is said to have attempted or modeled such global reign or governance include; the Babylonian Empire, Roman Empire, European Union, United Nations, United States of America, e.t.c<sup>5</sup>. These attempts are not very perfect in themselves because they have not and cannot succeed in a global government or one world government for the whole universe.

### **Understanding the Concept of One World Government.**

One-World Government is the idea of a central government whose authority embodies the whole world. It is a government where the many countries of the world join together in a federation under one central government. This means that the nations on earth would supposedly abandon or surrender their sovereignty to the will or reign of the global government or one biggest government<sup>6</sup>.

The advocates of one world government such as liberal globalists believe that humanity is progressively approaching this utopia of one world government where humanity is both culturally and nationally unified in peace and harmonious existence<sup>7</sup>. Little wonder Mueller admonished that ‘we must move as quickly as possible to a one world government; a one world religion; under a one world leader’.<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, nationalists understand the whole deal about one world government as unrealistic and a dystopia.

In the same vein, Einstein had high regard to one world government. Hence he disregarded nationalism or sovereign state government as a disease but preferred a borderless world

government. Minding this intention, Einstein struggled for the formation of the ‘United States of Europe’ during the first World War, the ‘League of Nations’ in 1919 and the ‘United Nations’ ca. 1945. For Einstein, only world government can have power to sustain peace in the world and avert the menace of world war and exterminate bad governance in the globe. At a time, Einstein began to consider himself as a world citizen when he stated; ‘I am a Jew, by citizenship a Swiss and by make up a human being without any special attachment to any state or national entity whatsoever’.<sup>9</sup>

Following these efforts, a provisional World Government of World Citizens was declared in 1953 in Ellsworth by Garry Davis leading to the World Service Authority in 1954. The world Service Authority was saddled with the responsibility of issuing documents like World Citizens Registration, World Passport, e.t.c. Nevertheless, this attempt though had some impart but did not succeed in the formation of one world government or global government<sup>10</sup>.

### **Variants of One World Government**

Variants of one world government here refer to those minor versions, preconditions/prelude or foretaste to one world government. Perloff claims that progressive globalization is among the necessary preconditions for the possibility and genuine one world government.<sup>11</sup> According to the globalists, these preconditions are substructural and auspicious signs to the possibility of one world government. These preconditions can be seen as forerunners and requirements and at the same time; foretastes to a complete one world government. Hence we refer to them as variants of one world government. They are earlier variants of one world government because they not only pre-exist in the attempt to prepare the world for the presumed coming one world government which the globalists insist would best serve the world but they show earlier versions of one world government.

According to Alex Newman, these variants are seen in the evolving historical development of supranational organizations such as;

1. Worldwide Time Zone {adopted by most countries by 1900}
2. League of Nations {1920}
3. United Nations {1945}

4. World Bank and International Monetary Fund {1945}
5. European Union, {1957}
6. Soviet Union
7. World Trade Organization, {1995}
8. Schengen Area {1995}
9. International criminal Court {1998}<sup>12</sup>

Obviously, globalization has been a catalyst towards the success of these variants of one world government. Together with technological advancement, globalization has brought enormous progress: huge increase in wealth, reduction in poverty, improved welfare, international relationship, information dissemination, e.t.c.<sup>13</sup>

In the ancient times, there existed some successive world ruling empires but ended in ruins. The most powerful of these empires were the ancient Babylonian empire, Greco-Macedonian Empire/civilization of Alexander the Great, Roman Empire, Medo-Persian Empire, e.t.c. These empires and civilization rose to become world power in governance so much so that their authority was recognized and gained loyalty across the globe. The great Babylonian empire conquered many cities to their governance such as the kingdoms of Judah which was seen as the chosen people of God in the past. In spite of the great power controlled by Babylon, it came to ruin, shattered and destroyed like clay.<sup>14</sup>

In the Christian Bible, the prophets claim that one world government is both imminent and immanent at the same time. It is immanent following creation story because God who had power to create the earth still has control over his creatures and as such remains in the world ruling the whole universe. In the same vein, the prophets claim it is imminent because they presume that the coming of Christ will be a perfection of the world government when everything will be gathered under the reign of Christ who will perfect the divine plan for one world government<sup>15</sup>. Hence the idea of one world government began to grow gradually among the Christians. Prophet Isaiah stated that this kingdom has the power to stop oppression, rebellion, injustice and war because the ruler of this kingdom is a prince of peace, wonderful counselor, e.t.c.<sup>16</sup>

Unfortunately, some Christians gave a surplus material and physical interpretation to this prophecy on one world government and forgetting the spiritual import. Hence we ought to note that the prophets refer to three sets of times in this world government prophecy:

1. The time when after several years of wallowing in the wilderness, the people of God would reach and possess the Promised Land<sup>17</sup>.
2. The time of freedom for the people of God held captive by both Assyrian and Babylonian empires.
3. The time after the earthly sojourn humanity goes to dwell in the kingdom of God (Heaven).

Besides the ancient times, in the modern times, the prominent variants of one world government as stated by Newman have its greatest kernel in the United Nations<sup>18</sup>. This is made up of about 193 member countries. The inscription made of sculpture outside of the United Nations in New York depicts a man beating a sword into a plowshare symbolizing the transformation of the world from destructive methods to productive methods whereupon nations shall not lift up sword against nations and they shall learn war no more<sup>19</sup>. In 2015, the United Nations took a giant step towards a global government as manifest in the document, ‘Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’ and the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to improve life on the planet<sup>20</sup>. Though UN has gone a long way uniting nations on earth but is yet to achieve the authority of a world government.

Speaking during the United Nations Summit, Guterres highlighted what he referred as the three-way essential reform in United Nations as following: peace and security strategies, operational setups and bilateral relationships, and development. Nevertheless, Guterres made it clear that UN votes about 75% resources to peacekeeping and security operations but lamented bitterly, that much of this is spent in areas ‘where there is no peace to keep’<sup>21</sup>. Hence we conclude that such huge sum of money in the end becomes a waste since the purpose is not achieved.

Guterres went further to bemoan the management reform strategies of UN. According to him, there are bottle necks in the form of rules and regulations that make effectiveness very challenging and seemingly paralyzing the business of UN. This situation has created a mutual suspicion and lost of confidence in UN as a model of one world government. Hence UN has lost

the capacity of creating a win-win confidence among member states. It is unarguable therefore that sovereign states are more nimble, agile and more decentralized such that government intervention plans become more timely, productive and valuable.

European Union {EU} is another variant of one world government. This brought the European countries together towards economic unity minding free trade, common weight and measures, unified currency and political unity. Hence it ensured economic unification and political reinforcement<sup>22</sup>. According to Barroso and other anti-sovereignty extremists, there is need for political union manifest in world government as complementary and cement to the already existing fiscal union, banking union and political union of the Eurozones. No doubt, great fit was achieved towards the unity of European Nations<sup>23</sup>. Nevertheless, this has not and has no possible tendency of actualizing the quest for one world government.

A popular member of the European Parliament, Nigel Farage, challenged the fairness of European Union campaign for member countries to join the union. The most recent member to surrender its sovereignty is Croatia. Farage remarked that this was not a free choice but they were compelled by campaigns threatening people's pensions which resulted in voters opting to join the European Union. He challenged the EU as:

illegitimate regime filled with former communists and criminals. The so-called European project is destined for inevitable failure and possibly violence if European Union leaders do not cease and desist in their efforts to abolish national sovereignty and self-government<sup>24</sup>.

### **Evaluating the Arguments and Motivations for One-World Government.**

It has always been a difficult debate over one world government between liberalists who support global governance against nationalist vanguards of state sovereignty. The advocates for one world government insist that the best route to peaceful co-existence and good governance is by the formation of global government whereas the nationalists argue that the claims to one world government is a neo-colonization for less powerful nations such that global government imposes strong threats to nationalism and autonomy of states.

These globalists argue on the benefits of uniting the world under one common rule as a motivation in support of one world government. Little wonder Einstein considered himself as a world citizen and argued that it is only world government that can have power to sustain peace in the world and avert the challenges of world war, poverty and social inequality while exterminating bad governance everywhere in the world<sup>25</sup>. In the argument of the liberalists, such one world government will lead to superpower that has the capacity of boasting political, economic and military authority across the globe and address sustainable management of ecological resources.

These globalists insist that in a world where everything is global; it becomes difficult for individual countries to manage themselves amidst global human problems and climate change. The advocates of one world government claim that we live in a world that is no longer bipolar or unipolar yet not multipolar but a radical and chaotic world. Hence there is need for a surge of diplomacy for peace<sup>26</sup>. According to Ratner, one world government has the capacity of addressing global threats such as disasters, wars, comets, epidemics, e.t.c. One world government gives opportunity for globalization and sharing of knowledge even among nationalistic or sovereign countries. Invariably, this degree of globalization leads to overall improved standard of living and scientific advancement<sup>27</sup>. In their claims, a global response to these global issues is found in one world government hence the quest for a global government becomes an inevitable reality in their reckoning.

The afore mentioned benefits sound so thrilling that the liberalists build their castles of utopic ideologies on one world government. Ivy Roberts contends this utopia stating that there are lots of unbearable outcomes of one world government which are highly overpowering<sup>28</sup>. Therefore, our argument here is that one world government is at best an ideology or a concept of academic prowess. This is because an attempt on one world government amounts to dystopia and global chaos. These three objections are the concerns of some Philosophers and Political Theorists regarding one world government:

- Is such a thing even possible?
- Is such a thing even desirable or necessary?

- What is the possibility of one central authority representing the world's diverse cultural and political agendas?<sup>29</sup>

The realists and communitarian approaches to international or world government accuse the liberalists' proposal for one world government as wishful-thinking and utopic. Such a system of government is away from fruition. These critiques accuse global government to be unwieldy, unaccountable and undesirable such that its necessity, possibility and acceptability become highly questionable. It rather falls a victim of the very pitfalls of sovereign states it presumes to solve<sup>30</sup>.

In attempt to describe one world government as a difficult and unrealistic idea, Hans Morgenthau stated that the global empires of the past used military might to achieve powerful control over nations. Humanity has overgrown this barbaric method of achieving control over nations and will inevitably resist such dehumanizing attempt. Hence Morgenthau stated what he described as false solution for world conquest as following:

it follows that the one state created by conquest can hold peace by the weight of soldiers and policemen to enforce its rule upon an unwilling humanity. Such a world will be a totalitarian monster resting on the feet of clay and the very thought of which startles the imagination<sup>31</sup>.

Furthermore, it is obvious that the fallacy of wrong association and over generalization of relating the variants of one world government as signs of the possibility of one world government is unfounded. These variants such as United Nations, Empires of ancient times, European Union, e.t.c. have not fulfilled the expected mandates and cannot by any means metamorphosize to one world government. Little wonder Farage complained that minding the degree of economic failure, mass unemployment, civil unrest in European states; the United Nations or European Union can be said to be a *Titanic* that has hit an iceberg<sup>32</sup>.

Our argument here is that global government is a mere sedimentary aggregation of sovereign states of the world. Just like sedimentary rock breaks up at every slightest change of temperature and pressure so does such aggregation of nations under one world government. Hence one world government claims to create a community of mutual dependence to the central government but not one of mutual trust and respect. No doubt is that the lack of mutual trust and respect

virulently leads to mutual suspicion and rivalry<sup>33</sup>. Most unfortunate is that such mutual suspicion is capable of blowing up the entire system. Hence the opened barrier for interrelationship turns to battlegrounds and the aim for one world government becomes defeated. This mutual fear and distrust ends up in conflicts and destructions leading to tearing apart of the sediments of sovereign states such that the different nations become hostile camps<sup>34</sup>.

An imagination of the possible logical consequence of one world government sends goose pimples to skins. It leads to marginalization and denigration of the less powerful states leading to further underdevelopment of the developing countries<sup>35</sup>. Individual states' distress calls would be frustrated by delayed and unqualitative response from the central government especially on matters concerning the less powerful states. Peacekeeping becomes a matter of convenience and routine without passion. Justice and fairness would be difficult to access since the different states would not have equal footing in the global government. What is the place of an African country in such global government and what is the possibility of the Europeans permitting a Nigerian to be the president or Prime Minister of such a global government? Little wonder, Ratner feared that such a government will eventually lead to dictatorship<sup>36</sup>.

## **Conclusion**

The effort so far has been an attempt to evaluate the claims of one world government as a competent alternative system of government capable of solving the problem of bad governance in sovereign states round the world. After careful examination, we have been able to establish that one world government has some utopic ideas that are very alluring to the mind. In the first look, the promises of one world government are very attractive and irresistible. One world government promises to build a bridge for peace and healthy international relationship, free trade, easy migration, e.t.c<sup>37</sup>. The result of the evaluation makes it auspicious that we dismiss one world government since its promises are shadows of utopia and bumper harvest of dystopia.

The claims of liberalists on one world government is accentuated and highly motivated in the modern times by the achievements of globalization in the world. Hence Perloff sees globalization as a genuine precondition, motivation and acid test for the possibility of one world government<sup>38</sup>. Globalization and advancement in world technology has aided some of the affairs of the variants

of one world government especially in the areas of information dissemination, infrastructural and technological advancement, World Bank and International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization, e.t.c.<sup>39</sup> Our claim is that it is a fallacy of over generalization to conclude that globalization can on its own bring about one world government just because it has aided the variants of one world government. Nevertheless, we make bold to note that globalization and technological advancement are mere tools to support better life than a system of government.

From our findings, it is obvious that though state sovereignty or multilateral governance in the world faces terrible lack of trust, abuses and unmitigated corruption; one world government is not immune from these vices. One of the strongest claims of one world government is that it would be a surge of diplomacy and honest broker of peace in a world ruined with chaos, corruption and impunity<sup>40</sup>. Nevertheless, our appraisal of one world government shows that it would be a failure on arrival minding the complexity of the human person and the undeniable regional differences in the world.

Most unfortunate is that even the very values one world government seeks to protect would face terrible blow such as classism, neo-colonization, denigration, lack of government presence, dictatorship and inhuman treatment. More so if the presumed variants of one world government such as United Nations, European Union, e.t.c suffer incessant disintegration; what then would be the fate of one world government. One would quickly ask; why the brexit of the United Kingdom from EU? Why the quest for Biafra from Nigeria? Why the failure of the great Roman Empire? The implication of the study proves that one world government claim is a deception and denial of stark reality minding regional needs and good governance. Hence after careful examination of one world government, the paper dissuades the quest for one world government as a practice of such would amount to total collapse of governance, order, security, active participation and economy<sup>41</sup>.

Hence it becomes obvious that one world government pits nationalism and sovereignty of states and by extension pits growth in developing countries. It makes developing countries 100% dependent on a distant and leprous world government that does not really feel their most cogent needs but gives them butter when they have no bread and wine when they have no water. Hence the world government is an outsize utopian dream. Thus a choice of one world government is a

touch of tragedy to the world. Therefore, we state without equivocation that the attempt on one world government is a grandiose delusion.

## End Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Moore, *Utopia*, eds. George Logan and Robert Adams, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 3.

<sup>2</sup> Frye Northrop, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), 193.

<sup>3</sup> Fortunati Vita and Raymond Trousson eds. “Utopia” in *Dictionary of Literary Studies*, (Paris: Champion Press, 2000), 153.

<sup>4</sup> Gen. 11: 1-9.

<sup>5</sup> Andrus Hyrum Leslie, *Joseph smith and World Government*, (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Books, 1958), 22.

<sup>6</sup> Kang Yu-wei, *The One World Philosophy*, trns. Thompson Lawrence, (London: Obits, 1958), 85

<sup>7</sup> Derwent Whittlesey, *German Strategy of World Conquest*, (Essex: F. E. Robinson & CO, 1942), 26

<sup>8</sup> Robert Mueller, *The World’s Last Dictator*, (Garcia: Great Books, 1992), 23.

<sup>9</sup> Paul Ratner, “Why Einstein Thought a World Government was a Good Idea” in <https://bigthink.com/paul-ratner/should-we-have-a-world-government-einstein-thought-so> accessed on October, 2016.

<sup>10</sup> Heater D. B., *World Citizenship and Government: Cosmopolitan Idea in the History of Western Political Thought*, (London: Macmillan, 1996), 72

<sup>11</sup> James Perloff, “Council on Foreign Relations”, *The New American*, Thursday 23, July 2009. in <https://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/foreign-policy/item/1213-council-on-foreign-relations> accessed on January 21, 2019

<sup>12</sup> Effendi Shoughi, *World Unity Goal*, (Illinois: Baha’I Publishing, 1938), 203.

<sup>13</sup> Anthonio Guterres, “Opening remark at the One World Government Summit of 2017” <https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/speeches/2017-02-13/secretary-general%E2%80%99s-remarks-world-government-summit> accessed on February 04, 2019.

<sup>14</sup> Daniel 2.31-34.

<sup>15</sup> Richard F. Ames, “The Coming One World Government” in *Tomorrow’s World*, July 2018, <https://www.tomorrowworld.org/magazines/2018/july-august/the-coming-one-world-government>, accessed on January 23, 2019.

<sup>16</sup> Isaiah 9:6–7

<sup>17</sup> Waltz K. N., *Theory of International Politics*, (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 1979), 45.

<sup>18</sup> Alex Newman, “Euro-Globalists Pursue EU Military for “Empire of Peace” The New American, Wednesday Nov. 14, 2018. <https://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/europe/item/30645-euro-globalists-pursue-eu-military-for-empire-of-peace> accessed February 01, 2019.

<sup>19</sup> Micah 4.3

<sup>20</sup> Jeffrey Ludwig, “The United Nations wants a one-world government in less than twelve years” *American Thinker*, November 5, 2018.

<sup>21</sup> Andreas Bummel, *A World Parliament: Governance and Democracy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*, (London: Alpha dam, 2008), 18

<sup>22</sup> Alex Newman, “The European Union: Regionalization Trumps Sovereignty” *The New American*, Tuesday, 20 August, 2017 in <https://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/item/16343-the-eu-regionalization-trumps-sovereignty> accessed on January 12, 2019.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.,

<sup>24</sup> Tannsjo T., *Global Democracy: The Case for a World Government*, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), 104.

<sup>25</sup> Paul Ratner, “Why Einstein Thought a World Government Was a Good Idea” , October, 2016, in <https://bigthink.com/paul-ratner/should-we-have-a-world-government-einstein-thought-so> accessed on February 06, 2019.

<sup>26</sup> Clarence Streit, *Union Now: The Proposal for inter-Democracy Federal Union*, (London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1940), 31.

<sup>27</sup> Marchetti R., *Global Democracy: For and Against*, (New York: Routledge, 2008), 54.

- <sup>28</sup> Ivy Roberts, “One World Government: Definition & Concept” in <https://study.com/academy/lesson/one-world-government-definition-concept.html> accessed on February 09, 2019.
- <sup>29</sup> Falk R., *On Humane Governance: Towards a New Global Politics*, (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania University, 1995), 201.
- <sup>30</sup> Reinhold Niebuhr, “The Illusion of World Governemnt”, in <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/1949-04-01/illusion-world-government> accessed on February 07, 2019.
- <sup>31</sup> Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, Fourth Edition, (London: Great prints), 496.
- <sup>32</sup> Alex Newman, “The European Union: Regionization Trumps Sovereignty” in *The New American*, August 20, 2013, <https://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/item/16343-the-eu-regionalization-trumps-sovereignty> accessed on 06/02/19.
- <sup>33</sup> Weinberg Gerhard L., *German, Hitler and World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 36.
- <sup>34</sup> Clarence Streit, *Union Now: The Proposal for inter-Democracy Federal Union*, 1940, 34.
- <sup>35</sup> Archibugi D., *The Global Commonwealth of Citizens: Toward Cosmopolitan*, (Princeton: Princeton University, 2008), 56
- <sup>36</sup> Paul Ratner, “Why Einstein Thought a World Government Was a Good Idea” , October, 2016, in <https://bigthink.com/paul-ratner/should-we-have-a-world-government-einstein-thought-so> accessed on February 02, 2019.
- <sup>37</sup> Ankerl Guy, *Global Communication without universal Civilization*, (Geneva: INU Press, 2000), 43
- <sup>38</sup> James Perloff, “Council On Foreign Relations”, *The New American*, Thursday 23, July 2009. in <https://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/foreign-policy/item/1213-council-on-foreign-relations> accessed on February 01, 2019.
- <sup>39</sup> Alex Newman, “Euro-Globalists Pursue EU Military for Empire of Peace” *The New American*, Wednesday Nov. 14, 2018. <https://www.thenewamerican.com/world-news/europe/item/30645-euro-globalists-pursue-eu-military-for-empire-of-peace> accessed on February 04, 2019.
- <sup>40</sup> Macdonald T., *Global Stakeholder Democracy: Power and Representation Beyond Liberal States*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 89.

<sup>41</sup> Cabrera L. *Political Theory of Global Justice: A Cosmopolitan Case for the World State*, (New York: Routledge, 2004), 76.