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Introduction

The main question that I wanted to answer when I started my research on the subject was to see if there are good arguments in favor of forming a world government. The general idea behind this was quite a simple one. Individual nation states as well as international governmental bodies, as UN, have not been able to find solutions for problems of global warming, world poverty, war and crimes against humanity and many other problems that seem to be affecting the whole globe. The question is what should be done and if it is necessary to establish some sort of a global political entity capable of handling these problems. On the other hand right from the beginning it was evident that it is not easy to say what a world government is. World government, world governance, world state, world federations were all terms that are used in these discussions but sometimes is very hard to understand what is exactly meant by them.

The first chapter of this paper is exactly an attempt to understand better what is as world government in the first place. I analyze three approaches to this subject, two of them on world government and world state and the third one on world governance and shared sovereignty, the ideas of Torbjorn Tannsjo, Kai Nielsen and David Held. I try to present these views as fair as possible and arguments in their favor. In the second chapter I turn to an additional question that was present in all of the three approaches, the question of democracy.

I take a stand that a world government or world governance has to be democratic one. I give arguments both in favor and against Tannsjo’s proposal on world government as democratic. I also argue that the basic idea of shared sovereignty is more favorable in promoting democracy, while accepting that there are serious objection to Held’s proposal of world confederation of nation states.

Starting with a general question if there are good arguments in favor of establishing world government, I change this approach to the question what system would be more democratic. Two answers are presented with different problems. The democratic world government with monopoly on violence that still holds some threat of tyranny (of majority at least) while on the other hand a proposal of a confederation with shared sovereignty is potentially unstable. My conclusion is not conclusive, and even with some thoughts what would be more realistic to achieve I leave an open question on subject.
Three approaches to world government and governance

In the following chapter I analyze three different approaches to questions regarding world government and world state. Two of the theorists whose work is analyzed, Torbjon Tannsjo and Kai Nielsen, have a fairly similar view that one sovereign government of the world with complete control over legitimate means of violence is a desirable political goal. On the other hand David Held even though acknowledging many of the reasons that both Tannsjo and Nielsen give for their global political framework, offers a different perspective, taking a stand that a political change of the current global order while necessary, should not lead “all the way” to one world state and government. He suggests a more complex system of global governance with shared sovereignty on different levels, and not one supreme government or one state but a democratic world confederation.

In each of these three cases I will try first to show what exactly is meant by world government or world governance. What could this mean in practical matters in the sense of forming new political institutions and restructuring the current ones. Secondly, what arguments are provided in support of these different claims. And what objections theorists acknowledge, as well what answers they try to provide to the critics. At this time I will not be interested in taking a stand on these issues, but more to give a description and analysis with recognizing differences between these views on how to restructure current international order.

Tannsjo- World Government as a solution to global problems

Torbjorn Tannsjo in his book “Global Democracy, The Case for a World Government”¹ argues for the necessity and desirability of a global sovereign political power. The idea behind the world government is quite straightforward, in his words: “there are many problems facing humanity which seems to be intractable if tackled on a less than global level. We need, therefore, a world government.”² Tannsjo accepts that it is far from obvious that a world government is a solution to any global problem. In fact, proponents of the world government have always been in clear minority and the political philosophy of the 20th century with John Rawls, as the most significant figure, have been more inclined to follow Kant’s view on the matter and his rejection of such a government, while holding that what is

²Ibid. p. 1.
needed is a better international cooperation of more or less independent nation states.\(^3\)

Contrary to these views Tannsjo believes that a world government is the best political option for resolving global problems and that it is not a utopian ideal but a real political possibility that should be pursued.

**Democratically elected sovereign of the world**

Tannsjo argues that a world government is both necessary and sufficient for obtaining global peace, global justice and good (global) environment. Before going into details about these global problems, let us first see how this government would look like. Similar to nation state governments we have today a world government would be an absolute sovereign power with the sole monopoly on the use of violence all over the globe and not one state. There would be no higher authority than the government and its decisions would be final.

The idea that only the world government should have sovereignty entails that current nation states would have to be politically degraded. The nation governments and parliaments would still have political functions but their power would not be greater than the political authority of municipalities in current day states. Tannsjo’s rejects the idea of a confederation of more or less sovereign nation states, because this “compromise position”, as he calls it, would not be a stable solution. He claims that:

> Even if it could be established, it would not last for long. [S]earching for solutions to global problems through voluntary agreements between independent nation-states is that such agreements cannot be found to with respect for many pressing global problems facing humanity. Furthermore, even when solutions can be found, these will be temporary and unstable unless a world government is established.\(^4\)

New “municipalities” would not legislate, would not have their own arm forces and would have to work in compliance with the central global government, especially in measures that have to be taken to provide global peace, global justice and good environment. Even though the world government would confine itself on solving global problems, leaving the rest of political decision to local authorities, it is the world government that is “sovereign in its decisions to which [level] a certain decision belongs to”.\(^5\)

---

\(^3\) See Tannsjo 2008, p. 2; Compare to John Rawls 1999, p. 36: “[…] a world government - by which I mean a unified political regime with the legal powers normally exercised by central governments – would either be a global despotism or else would rule over a fragile empire torn by frequent civil strife as various regions and peoples tried to gain their political freedom and autonomy”.

\(^4\) Tannsjo 2008, p. 4.

\(^5\) Ibid. p. 74.
There are two *conditions* that a world government has to satisfy, in Tannsjo opinion. First it has to be **realistic**; it has to gain global support, if we want to establish it, especially in a peaceful way. And second, it has to be **efficient** in solving global problems previously mentioned. Tannsjo argues that “nothing less radical than a populist global democracy would be considered worth striving for.”\(^6\) Not only a world government *should be* democratic but it is only possible *as* democratic. When forming the world parliament and the world government:

The crucial thing is that the method used guarantees that, if there is a unique will of the people, then this will is going to prevail. The most obvious way of seeing to this is perhaps to meet ‘under the oaks’ [...] to have everybody putting forward his or hers proposals, to have a public discussion about them, and then take a vote where the majority, if a unique majority exists, will have its way.\(^7\)

Given the number of people living today meeting ‘under the oaks’ is not a realistic option. That is why we have the *representative* method in democracy, where people choose their representatives, ideally they should meet, put forward ideas, discuss and reach decision as same as would those who elected them would, if they could meet. The most appropriate way to achieve, as Tannsjo suggests, is not by elections but by taking a statistical sample of the group, in the case of a world parliament a statistical sample of the whole population of the world.

Proposal like this would, probably, not be accepted as it looks *too radical*. This is why we have political parties and professional politicians in nation states, and we will have to rely on this system of representation on the globe as well. What is important is that on the world level there a strict proportionate electoral system has to be established, which “allows the various different parties to be represented in a way that is similar to how the preferences are distributed within the electorate”.\(^8\) The world parliament should be elected directly by the people of the world. The parliament should proceed to elect the world government, and only then we could say:

We are allowed to say that, again in a figurative manner of speaking, it is the world population who, through their representatives, legislate for themselves and elect their own government.\(^9\)

The current national-states could play the role of electoral constituencies. Global political parties would be present in the political life, with different views on how to solve

---

\(^6\) Ibid. pp. 78-79
\(^7\) Ibid. p. 72.
\(^8\) Ibid. p. 73.
\(^9\) Ibid. p. 74.
global problems. What Tannsjo rejects is “elitist” democracy. We must not allow a system (that is usually represented by a two political party system) in which a representative that is disliked by the majority could still be elected to a position. In a populist democracy a representative that does not have a majority could (and should) be elected but only as a representative of a certain minority.  

As Tannsjo notices: “The median voter in the world population is relatively and absolutely speaking a poor person” and if we manage to replicate this picture of the world to the global parliament and consequently to the government, than there would be no possibility for rich minority to control the world and shift the burden of solving problems (or really not solving) mainly on to the poor. If the “elitist type of democracy” is put to power in the world under this Tannsjo’s understanding, there would be no popular support from the poor, nor is it likable that this government would make necessary, if any, moves toward the solution of pressing global problems.

**Global problems and solutions**

There are three global problems that, Tannsjo sees that, a world government would be able to provide solution for. If a world government could provide world peace, global justice and safe environment, that we would have good reasons for pursuing it.

In Tannsjo’s opinion “unless a world government is established, there will be war in the world.” How would a world government stop wars? In the same way as nation states are securing peace within their borders, the same idea of monopoly of legitimate means of violence is raised to a global level. In the same way as nation states are dealing with security problems a world government would do the same. However, this analogy between nation state governments and a world one has its drawbacks. Nation states have been usually established in a forceful manner while in Tannsjo’s opinion current distribution of power between states, gives us hope that a world government could be established in a peaceful manner. I will come back to this idea.

Is the world government the only solution for world peace? With or without a world government or even without any form of federation among states, if all the countries in the world were democratic, would they wage war on each other? Tannsjo gives a two-way

---

10 Tannsjo uses the term ‘elitist democracy’ in a somewhat unusual manner. What is usually criticized under this notion, is the bureaucratic organization of political parties, where there is a strict discipline, and where the power within a party rests on those who work there continuously as professional politicians. The representatives become “Yes” man in the parliament, and the real political power is in the party not the people. See Held, 1995. 270.

11 Tannsjo 2008, p. 84.

12 Ibid. p. 10.
answer to this question. First it is not evident that democratic states do not fight wars with other states, even other democratic states. And even if there is a relation between democratic government and non-aggression, a global peace could only be secured if all the nation states would become democracies. The number of states that are becoming democratic, at least in some sense, is rising in the last few decades, but this does not give us a reason to expect that this positive trend will continue and reach every country in the world.

One more problem for nation states is the possibility of civil war. It would be of course possible for a nation or any other group to arm itself, illegally, even in the world state, but any conflict would be far less serious than if there were, today’s, nation armies present. As long as there is a single military power under one direct authority the peace would be secure and even with some room for conflicts and danger of terrorism it does not seem probable that a world government could be effectively challenged. However, it is possible that a world peace will be secured without a world government, as we said, if all the countries would become liberal and democratic. But how much should we be optimistic about this is a different question.

[I]f we could establish a world government this would very much facilitate the establishment of world peace. Yet each year that we postpone the project, many innocent people will get killed. So the argument arising from peace to world government, if not conclusive, has a lot of force indeed.13

The second argument for world government is that it could provide a solution to the problem of global distributive injustice. The world is a very diverse place, concerning living conditions and the distribution of resources. Tannsjo gives some statistics showing that one fifth of the global population is living on less than one US dollar per day, while almost half live on less than two US dollars.14 People are dying every day in huge numbers not as much as a result of incurable diseases, like we usually presume, but from the lack of clean water and food.

What it means to talk about unjust distribution is, in Tannsjo’s view, a way of saying that there should be a redistribution of resources.15 There has to be such a redistribution at least to prevent people dying from the lack of basic necessities. There are different approaches to the question how to solve the problem of redistribution. What Tannsjo stresses is that “all or nearly all, plausible moral theories tend to identify a common feature of today’s

14 Ibid. p. 30.
15 Ibid.
world as unjust”\textsuperscript{16}, and what he tries to show is that without any difference to which of the views we are personally inclined to or what we believe is enough to make justice on the globe, the world government is the way to achieve this.

Tannsjo analyses three different approaches to the problem: utilitarianism, egalitarianism and moral rights view, claiming that a world government would be necessary for obtaining any of the goals they suggest. For an example if we accept that under moral rights view only those who have been wrong have a right for compensation and if we agree upon the fact that people in most poor countries have had their rights violated by the rich countries (usually in the past but also in present), a redistribution of resources as a compensation is what is right. Or if we think that a solution could be a global recourse tax the idea presented by Thomas Pogge, that Tannsjo mentions, in both of these cases there has to be someone who could implement decisions. As he says:

\begin{quote}
In principle one could have all sorts of elaborate form of international law and legal adjudication without the existence of a global state […] But when important economic interests are at stake, such international law will have no real teeth unless backed up by a sovereign world government.\textsuperscript{17}
\end{quote}

International companies are also one of the causes of low life standard in the world. It is not a secret that many of these companies blackmail governments of poor countries, not allowing them to make policies protecting rights of workers or securing natural resources. The companies usually have a very simple solution – they threaten to move to another country and find cheaper labor there. If there is a world government with authority all over the world, moving to another country for these companies would not be an option anymore, as the laws protecting workers (and environment for that matter) would be basically the same. The argument once again is not conclusive as there could be (and there are) international laws on these issues, but without a world government these laws have no real teeth.

\textit{The third argument} is the one concerning environment. One of the biggest problems that is being discussed in recent years is global warming. It seems that there is a consensus between all the governments of the world that something has to be done. Primarily what should be done is to radically cut down the emission of greenhouse gases. The problem is that this would also mean that industrial production has to be halted and in the long runs changing to green technologies would become necessary. Both of these things are costly and even though governments do proclaim their pledge to these goals, little is being done.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[	extsuperscript{16}] Ibid. p. 31.
\item[	extsuperscript{17}] Ibid. p. 31.
\end{footnotes}
Governments of developed countries are not prepared to burden their citizens with costs of changing to different, more environmental friendly, way of living as these measures are usually seen as unpopular. People in the developed world making the most pollution are still not the ones who are drastically affected by environmental changes and still do not see it as their interest to make any change.

Tannsjo thinks that a world government would choose a compromising position that would be accepted by every reasonable person in the world regardless where he lives.\(^{18}\) There are difference ideas that could be put into practice\(^{19}\), but as long as there is a global sovereign power that can command global resources it seems promising that it could find a solution that everyone would accept as the fairest one.

In principle the argument given here is the same as two other ones, concerning world peace and justice. If what is needed are laws and policies that have to be put in practice globally a government that has an authority and capacity to implement decisions on the whole globe will be the quickest and easiest way to achieve this. On the other hand if we wait for individual nation states to agree on measures that should be taken, especially as most powerful ones are still not affected by the climate change, it may be too late for all of us no matter where we live.

**How to form a world government?**

The road to a global parliament and government has to lead from the biggest international institution we have today, the United Nations. First a reform of General Assembly should take place with making two Houses of parliament. The Lower House, the Global People’s Assembly, which should be elected in a proportionate manner by the citizens of the world. And the Upper House that would have representatives of national governments with each country having one representative with a vote. Both houses would then elect, *in some way*\(^{20}\), a government. (With an option that some permanent members could be allowed, at least in the beginning.)\(^{21}\) In the long run, the idea would be to abandon the Upper House so that People’s Assembly would take over the whole power and elect the government on its own. If some countries would not want to allow their citizens to take part in the elections, the

\(^{18}\) Tannsjo 2008 pp. 59-60.

\(^{19}\) The most promising, Tannsjo thinks is the idea of giving individual quota, to every citizen, on how much pollution he is allowed to produce with driving car, heating his house and similar. Then a person could be able to buy additional quota from someone that does not need the full quota. Tannsjo points out to the fact that as much as 40% of carbon dioxide is produced in this *individual* way. See Tannsjo 2008, p. 60.

\(^{20}\) This is in Tannsjo’s opinion.

\(^{21}\) Ibid. p. 97.
seats from these regions would stay empty. In Tannsjo’s opinion this would provide a strong incentive for governments to overcome their fear. And citizens of these countries would make more pressure to their governments to be allowed to take part in the governing of the world.

The question of monopoly on violence, which was previously mentioned, has to be taken into consideration. We saw that, in Tannsjo’s opinion, a global military force has to be established, replacing the individual national armies, if we want to secure world peace and provide coercive power for implementing laws and decisions. Why would national governments agree to this? First the countries who feel secure would give up their military defense for a guaranty that their borders would be respected and defended by the world government. When there is only one superpower in the world, the US, Tannsjo believes, that almost all the countries would very quickly agree to this, as there is no point to have armies that could be easily defeated, as their upkeep is very costly. If Tannsjo is right and if the countries in the world would be prepared to give up the control of their armies the US could still in the beginning stay resistant to comply with this. At this point US could keep their forces and stand opposite to the Global military organization. If this happens, Tannsjo suggests that what the UN should do is “turn the other cheek” and start disarming their own forces. Over time discontent among the citizens of US will rise as their government will not be able to give good enough reasons for enormous expenditures on military. There would be no good reason why US should compete with the UN over military supremacy, as long as the new world government could provide peace and is democratic.

This is just a short overview on how should we proceed in forming the world government. There will be much struggle on the way, but what is important in, Tannsjo’s opinion, is that people have to realize that the strife to provide world peace, global justice and better environment is not just a matter of forming institutions. What is essential for this to succeed is that people get personally involved. Especially those living in developed countries as their governments are the ones who can take decisive steps toward the new world order.

**Objections to World Government and World State**

First objection, that Tannsjo examines, is that the world government would lack democracy. He agrees that forming a world government is a process that has more than one step and it is true that some of these steps would be less democratic than the others. Still it is not the case that the government itself formed at the end would lack democracy nor that the road to the government would be as undemocratic as some may think.
In the beginning with the reconstruction of UN there would be three political bodies, the Government and two Houses of Parliament, there would be permanent members and possibilities of veto, as similar to the situation present now, with the General Assembly and the Security Council. Objections that the US would be too influential and that it would in practice control the world government are for Tannsjo misplaced, from the very fact that US is already ruling the world through UN. However there is an importance difference between current situation in the UN and what Tannsjo is proposing. If the Lower House of the Parliament is formed in a way that previously described, representing the will of the whole world population over time this Assembly will grow in power as it will have greater support among people. The history of parliamentarism in nation states was the same, it took time for the people and the parliament to take the power in their own hands.

*Communitarian tradition* in political philosophy points out to a different problem with the world government. Their objection is that *citizenship*\(^\text{22}\) cannot be a matter of the whole globe, but that it has to be confined within smaller communities, where people share common history, values, culture and language. A political unity of the globe would have to presuppose, in their opinion, a closer unity among people. Tannsjo agrees that looking for a close unity among the people of the world is absurd, but this is not what is needed nor desirable. Different cultures with different values would still be left to flourish. The world government would not require a close unity.

When a global democracy is established, this is in order better to handle pressing problems to do with peace, justice and the environment. A world government should deal with these problems, but it should no meddle with all sorts of other problems, which are better left for national and local governments where they should be delegated to the appropriate levels.\(^\text{23}\)

Further question is if the solution to the problem of global justice requires such a close unity. Tannsjo’s answer is that this is true only if the solution for the injustice in the world is in heavy taxation and a huge redistribution of resources. It is not realistic to assume that people will accept paying special taxes from the solidarity they feel about those on the other side of the globe, nor they would accept a drastic change to their life styles. But this is not what is necessary:

> [S]uch a redistributive scheme is not required in order to establish global justice. What is required is merely a common understanding that local empowerment all

---

\(^\text{22}\) Citizenship, here, could be defined in general as a status of individuals granting them equal political right, liberties and constraints in a political community.

\(^\text{23}\) Tannsjo 2008 p.117
over the world is a reasonable requirement, as well as a shared interest in global peace and a good environment\textsuperscript{24}

Furthermore Tannsjo thinks that the basic communitarian assumptions about cultural and national identities, and values, would in fact go very well with his idea of world state. National minorities in current nation states feel more threaten and more “suffocated” as they are not members of the majority culture. A world government would not be interested to promote one culture as nation states are, at least to a degree. In a global political community there would be no such thing as a majority culture, and given the experience we have with EU, it does look like that minorities would feel more accepted and the local autonomy more capable to preserve their unique identities.

A world government would not “meddle” in all sorts of problems and it would be confined in resolving the global ones, still, shared sovereignty between the world government and nation states is not an option for Tannsjo. He strongly rejects the idea that it is enough that national sovereignty is given up only on some issues. The world parliament, and consequently world government, should have absolute sovereignty and be the only ones that could decide on what level a certain decision should be taken. Tannsjo claims that the reason for this radicalism is simple, because no algorithm assigning decisions to the appropriate level can be provided. Which questions are international and which are national is becoming unclear. And the idea “that those who are affected by a decision should make it is far too vague to be of much help.”\textsuperscript{25} In cases where there is a conflict of interests and opinions on what should be done, there has to be a final authority to make the ruling and implement the decisions.

Only one sovereign political power may exist delegating questions downwards in the hierarchy, as we cannot know in advance what question should be dealt on which level. If nation states are left with power to claim their own individual (political) interests and enact laws by themselves, the system will soon fall apart. The world government would still recognize different interests of nations and groups and there could be different decisions put in practice in different regions of the world. But current nation states should not be given the right to decide on what issues they should be the ones legislating and making the final say.

One of the most used arguments against world government is that it may turn into tyranny. Referring to Kant and Rawls, Tannsjo accepts that there could be a dilemma to

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid. p. 118.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid. p. 125.
accept an association of independent democratic states than one power with the whole control of means of violence. Hopefully these independent states would have a peaceful cooperation. But in Tannsjo view this is exactly what is utopian to expect. Waiting for independents states to become democratic and establish some sort of mutual agreement seems unreasonable given the urgency and seriousness of the problems we are discussing.

But are there any guarantees that a world government would not become totalitarian? If we recall what Tannsjo said about the steps toward forming one global military force, the last step was the acceptance of US to surrender the command of its arm forces. Tannsjo thinks that the US would not surrender its forces unless it is certain that this new army will not be very strong, and that the world government is democratic. Only after they are sure that there is no danger from the world government or their military the US would accept such agreement.

Even if this is true a democratic world parliament could in future turn into a non-democratic one. Tannsjo accepts the fact that no system is bulletproof. It could be possible than one interest group take over the global parliament. But if the parliament is constructed in a way we described with true representation of interests of the whole world population, the possibility of one interest group taking the power is very improbable. This possibility is much more probable in a nation parliament than in a global one.

**Summary**

I will not say much more, here, on Tannsjo’s, as we will be back to most of the arguments and objections in the following sections. For now I will just stress the main characteristics of the world government previously described. A world government has to be democratic and efficient in solving global problems. It has to be the only sovereign political power on the globe, and to have the last say in any dispute. The complete control of all military forces is a necessity because without it, it could not provide complete security and peace, nor the implementation of laws and policies. To achieve all this reconstruction of United Nations is need in a way that the new assembly has to be elected directly by and from the people of the world, representing their true will and interests.

**Nielsen- World government as an ideal**

Kai Nielsen is another philosopher, who has put some arguments in support of a world government. Nielsen did not elaborate much on the idea how a world government should look like, and has only provided an outline. Still some of his conclusions could be
very beneficial for our discussion. In his more recent work on global justice and globalization, Nielsen does not speculate about the world government although we will see in what way his different approaches come together when dealing with global justice.

**World government and the better world**

Nielsen is not optimistic about the possibility of forming a world government. What he describes is an *ideal theory* “which does not ask how we get from here to there but asks what it is, ideally and generally, we would like to see achieved”\(^{27}\). Because of this approach many practical questions that we were dealing with in the previous section will be left aside.

In the paper “World Government, Security, Global Justice”\(^{28}\), Nielsen is defending the desirability of a world government as “a single final authority, a court of last appeal, […] in a fraternal, worldwide, cantonal system of diverse peoples.”\(^{29}\) What we are looking for is a *better world*, a world:

We would like for human beings everywhere such that this world would provide people with the security and meet their needs, would be just and humane, and would be a place where human flourishing could be maximized. One feature of such a world, I shall argue, is that it will have a world government.\(^{30}\)

The world that Nielsen is describing, should be a *loose federation* of cantonal type, with a *constitutional democratic government* that would have an absolute control over legitimate means of violence, and final authority in any dispute. In the same way we have different political programs, different values, cultures and different opinions altogether, in nation states, the same would be within the world government. The cantonal system would be an instrument to preserve differences within the world, while still having a central political power as the final authority that could implement decisions and make rulings on disputes between cantons. There would be “an [world] army, world state executives, a world parliament, and a judicial system, all not creatures of any individual canton or clique of cantons, representing wider interests.”\(^{31}\) Even though Nielsen sees the government as the ultimate sovereignty on the other hand he talks about a (loose) world federation where cantons would have wide political autonomy. Sadly he does not specify this any further. If the world government would have a judicial system, while cantons would not, this still looks

---

27 Nielsen 2003, p. 270; Even though there is no movement toward a world where a global government could be possible, he does hope that “unfoldment of the dialectic of the Enlightenment and the development of the forces of the production will eventually make such a world”; Nielsen 2003, p. 270p 280.
29 Ibid p. 270.
30 Ibid p. 270.
31 Ibid p. 277.
like very close to Tannsjo’s proposal, where the government would delegate questions to cantons. I will be back on this question, in later chapters.

**Global security and global justice**

There are two goals that a world government would have to be able to solve, or otherwise it would be useless. First, it would have to provide security, and second, a world government would have to institute global justice.

On the first matter Nielsen says:

For security, if not nothing else, we need a world state with international law capable of enforcing its verdicts. Justice and a more humane order aside, a peace, secure from the alarms of war, most particularly nuclear war, makes a world state, as an institution capable of securing that, very desirable indeed. International law without teeth - our present state of affairs- cannot ensure that.32

Exactly because individual nation states do not comply with the decisions of UN, international courts and other global institutions we have a world that is neither peaceful nor just. The rule of law is not effective if there is no authority to provide effective sanctions against those that do not comply.

Presently the UN does have some military power through their members. There have been cases when the UN was able to react against sovereign states that were behaving in a hostile manner. Furthermore there is a number of peace keeping missions under the command of UN. Still this has not been enough to provide sanctions to all those who deserve it. Even though there is an International Court of Justice there are limited possibilities to implement its decisions. In Nielsen’s words the “teeth” of international law are not strong enough. As long as there are nation armies there will be conflicts and the members of UN will be hesitant to give their troops for military missions. With an absolute monopoly on coercive power a world government would, unopposed, implement policies, and deal much easier with executing sanctions on those who do not obey.

When Nielsen was writing this he was mostly worried about the possible nuclear war between US and SSSR. A world government if it could be established, would take the control of military arms including nuclear ones, and over time proceed with destruction of all nuclear and most of the conventional weapons. It could still be argued that a world government though the sole military power, would be incapable of securing world peace. In the same way as Tannsjo, acknowledge this, cantons could illegally arm themselves, and given the huge
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differences and animosity between nation states, today and cantons tomorrow, the possibility of hostility cannot be completely excluded in future.

If we tried to form a world state, even the federation I spoke of, it would be inherently unstable and would either break up or lead in time, in trying to hold these disparate and hostile elements together, to a repressive dictatorship.\(^{33}\)

I will come back to the conclusion given above but for now I will proceed and analyze the other main goal that a world government, according to Nielsen, is intended to resolve, the problem of injustice in the world.

Division of the world on the first and second is no longer an adequate description in military and political terms. Even though the SSSR is no longer on the political map of the world and the “threat” of communism is no longer present, “things have become worse in the world since the collapse of the Berlin Wall, which was supposed to herald such hope for accountable democracies and for improved economies giving rise to better life conditions.”\(^{34}\)

Another division of the world a much bigger one that the one during the Cold War has divided the world between the rich “North” and poor “South” and is becoming bigger and bigger. Thirty thousand people daily die from hunger and curable diseases, and they do not need a nuclear war to disappear from the face of the Earth.

Nielsen is a proponent of an egalitarian form of global justice. What he believes in is a “moral community that would be identical with our biological species […] a world where everyone has equal moral standing.”\(^{35}\) With this in mind he holds that there should be a global redistribution of resources such that would provide that “no human child lacks the opportunity for individual development, the life-chances, available to any other human child”.\(^{36}\)

We have already seen some arguments against global justice that Tannsjo is examining relating to the opinion that all this talk about global redistribution of resources has to presuppose a very close unity between the people over the globe. If this close unity does not exist, it does not seem likely that the people from developed countries would accept any kind of redistribution negatively influencing their life standards.

In the paper written some 15 years before the book, Nielsen did not declare himself so strongly in favor of egalitarian form of global justice. If we are advocating a world federation and a world government a somewhat intermediate position could be more
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appropriate for everyone in the world to accept. After all the question of a world government is a political one, and it would reacquire in theory and practice some compromises. Still with all the differences:

There are enough common needs and interests among people to give us a basis for some common policies and some commonly justifiable moral judgments (including judgments on global justice) on which a world government could act in accordance with the pervasive interests of its citizens.37

With all the differences between people of the world, their different ethical background, different histories, cultures and values, different opinions about justice and socioeconomic order some basic rights have to be accepted and protected everywhere. Nielsen accepts the idea of social basic rights as those rights that are necessary to be satisfied before enjoyment of any other rights.38 This is exactly what a world government should provide for everyone:

A central aim of a good world government is to secure these socially basic human rights for everyone, and with the continued development of the productive forces it will become increasingly possible to do so.39

In any possible dispute between cantons given their possible different interests, or any other dispute within the federation, the government as the supreme authority would always have to rule in accordance to provide the most extensive satisfaction of these rights.40 These rights are bases for establishing global justice.

However there are arguments that even accepting this minimal idea what should be provided for every person in the world is basically impossible, as it would require a massive transfer of resources. This is what is usually called the “physical impossibility argument”.41 According to this even providing food and water for everyone is entirely infeasible given the magnitude of the problem, and people will object to this redistribution. People who should give resources would not make such transfers and they cannot be forced to accept it and “even if there was anyone willing to try and with the power to initiate such a program”42 it would fail. But contrary to these claims, referring to Thomas Pogge and his research, Nielsen concludes that no impoverishment of the “rich” is needed. Given the empirical fact that the richest countries of the world have well over 90% of the whole world income and that the

37 Ibid p. 274.
38 Nielsen borrows the idea from David Luban. These right include so called security rights(not be killed or tortured) and substance rights (water, food, and other life necessities). See: Nielsen 1988, p. 275.
40 Ibid.
41 Nielsen 2003, p. 253-54.
42 Ibid p. 254.
poorest ones have 0.25% to think that someone’s life is going to change dramatically if a
transfer of resources take place, in such a way that everyone should be provided with food
and water, sounds vastly exaggerated.\textsuperscript{43}

In the same way as Tannsjo, Nielsen believes that a sovereign political power of the
world, as it would have a control over all the resources, could conduct the necessary transfer
and would do so in the fairest possible way.

\textbf{Globalization}

Globalization is a process that is also of big importance to our discussion on the world
government. Nielsen defines globalization, in general, as a:

“\textsc{P}rocess whereby many social relations increasingly acquire relatively
distanceless and borderless qualities so that human lives are more played
out in the world as a single place”.\textsuperscript{44}

The interactions between people are transcending boarders of nation states and there
is a general notion of “planetary unity”. The lives of people are not longer confine to their
communities and national states, their lives are not passively excluded from what is going on
in the world that is becoming more and more a single “playground” where decisions on one
side can very well influence the lives of people on the other side.

And while globalization as defined previously could provide support in favor for a
world state, Nielsen is mostly interested in what he calls \textit{capitalist globalization}, and this \textit{kind}
of globalization is something that he is strongly against. The process of \textit{capitalist
globalization} in Nielsen’s view is a threat both to democracy and to nation state. Putting aside
the general question and opinion about capitalism, per se, the mobility of capital has
“changed things for governments and their ability to make policy and most particularly
macroeconomic policy”.\textsuperscript{45} With the possibility of capital moving away to a different country
hands of national governments are very much tied with regards to many issues. Governments
have little room to make decision independently of business interests.

What kind of sovereignty nation-states has, Nielsen asks, if they cannot make decision
regarding policies on health, taxation, investment, trade, banking, employment, and the
like?\textsuperscript{46} The result of the capitalist globalization as an un-democratic process Nielsen sees in
the fact that:

\begin{itemize}
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\end{itemize}
The mass of people, even with the standard democratic mechanisms (parties, elections, majority voting, referenda) can no longer control their state. [...] The governments they elect to run the ship of state do not and perhaps cannot (even if they had the will to do) resist the imperatives of giant multiteritorial corporations.47

It is not unreasonable to believe that nation states very soon will no longer have power to provide “the conditions of life where we can flourish and live in a social order which is self-determining”.48 What is needed is a different international system that could have a better control of capitalistic globalization, and provide that rights of workers and citizens have to be put in front any other interests, especially the interest of making profit.

But what is very important to point out to is that Nielsen thinks that a world government and a world state only have instrumental values. One political system is only more valuable to the other if it can “answer more adequately and more equitably to human needs”.49 If a system of independent democratic states could provide security and justice, we would not have to form a world government. But in Nielsen’s opinion the answer what system is better one is an open question that cannot be answered in advanced. In the ideal theory there would at least be no arguments to reject the idea of world government in itself.

Summary

A sovereign democratic world government, should provide peace and global justice, and be the ‘court of last appeal’ in a federation of world cantons. With the sole monopoly of power it could provide instruments for implementation of decisions necessary for obtaining these two goals. As democratic nation states are losing their power, with globalization at hand, an additional argument is put in favor of a world government that has the power over the globe and beyond nation boundaries.

I would just like to add one more thing about Nielsen’s proposal. Even though he was talking about an ideal approach to the question he did answer to the objection that a world government could turn into a global tyranny. He acknowledges the fact that a world federation, with big differences between cantons would eventually lead either to the collapse of the world state or to a repressive government trying to keep all these fractions in one place. Interestingly Nielsen does not take this objection as a great disadvantage for his position.
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In fact I think as bad as it would be, even an authoritarian and oppressive world state, unless (as highly unlikely) on a world scale it became like the Nazis, would still be the lesser evil to the evil of the world order we have now.\textsuperscript{50}

As long as such a government could provide peace and minimal living conditions to everyone, even being oppressive, in some way, would still be better that the situation in which threats of nuclear distraction and starvation are present.

\textbf{Held - Shared Sovereignty}

British political scientist David Held acknowledging many points on the problems of establishing world peace, global justice and democratization of the world, as the two previous theorists, offered a different political framework for a new international world order. He does not see a ‘one world state’ and a ‘one world government’ as desirable political goals, but he advocates for a complex system of shared sovereignty between a global and regional parliament as well as nation states. However, we will see that many institutional solutions he proposes are not very different from the ones we previously encountered.

\textbf{Globalization and Democracy}

Previously we saw how Nielsen believes that globalization is a threat to a nation state and democracy, Held in general shares this opinion. The range of decisions individual countries, their governments and consequently people in these countries have, is constantly being diminished.

The idea of a community which rightly governs itself and determines its own future, an idea at the very heart of the democratic policy itself is today deeply problematic.\textsuperscript{51}

Decisions in one state can make a difference in the lives of people far away, without their own consensus. The main claim is that a democratic political order within a political community requires a democratic order in the international sphere as well.\textsuperscript{52} On one side we have an influence from one nation state to the other(s), while on the other we also have different international organizations that are diminishing the range of options available to the people in a state. “Some duties and functions of the state […] must be performed at and across different political levels - local, national, regional and international.”\textsuperscript{53} If we are committed to the idea that people should have a vote and a say about their lives and future
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than they must be presented with an opportunity to control all sources of power that are influencing them and not only the ones present in their own country. What is needed is a whole range of transnational political bodies that could be controlled and governed by the people, while also a democratization of non-governmental international agents. With transnational political bodies nation states would no longer be the “sole centers of legitimate power within their own borders” but would not be ‘completely robbed’ of their sovereignty like in Tannsjo’s proposal. As noted before Held’s opinion is that we should take a path between the situation we have presently have with ‘sovereign’ nation states and the idea of a world state and government. Before I go into arguments that Held gives against global government, I would first like to go more into details on Held’s view what should be done to secure a democratic world order.

Held’s proposal for new global institutions

Even though we should not have an absolutely sovereign world parliament and a world government we should still have global institutions. What has to be done so that people would have a vote and a say in these global assemblies? First what is needed is “an authoritative assembly of all democratic states and agencies”. This requires a reform of the General Assembly of UN. Currently, in Held’s opinion, the United Nations are basically being controlled by big political powers, and are not a good representative of peoples and movements of the world. Very similarly to the proposal Tannsjo gave, Held proposes an independent assembly that would be directly elected. The question in which way should the voting be done is not something that will be solved easily. Countries with big population would definitely oppose to the idea that their vote is the same as of a much less populated country. A middle ground would have to be found that would respect the number of citizens in states while still protecting smaller countries as well. The assembly would at first be a complement to the UN, hopefully over time replacing the current General Assembly. This would not like with Tannsjo’s framework become the only sovereign political body, still it would be the body dealing with global problems similar to ones we talked before, like food supply and distribution to third world countries, environmental problems, question on reducing the risk of nuclear or chemical warfare, and similar.

54 Institutions like the IMF or WTO would have to be more influenced by the smaller countries, and not just by big economical powers.
56 Ibid. p. 273.
57 Ibid. p. 274. Held refers here to the electoral process for the European parliament as possibly an adequate option.
A whole number of regional parliaments has to be established, while keeping national parliaments in place as well, and making even smaller governmental bodies in nation states. Referendums national, regional and even global ones would have to be made possible on different issues, where constituency would be determined by the “nature and scope of the problem”.58 This is what was criticized by Tannsjø, the idea that in advance we should now which decision should be taken on what level. As we remember Tannsjø’s proposal was that the world government should decide in every case to what level should the question be address, still being the highest authority, resolving any possible disputes, or as Nielsen said “the court of last appeal”. This is the core difference between the idea of shared sovereignty and world government.

Shared sovereignty

The main principle that is in the background of proposal of shared sovereignty is that “decisions about public affairs should rest with those significantly affected by them”.59 That is why we have to allow people decide about their future on local level as well as on national, regional and global one. People would not accept the possibility of all decision-making capacity going to higher levels and to avoid this “principles governing appropriate levels need to be clarified and kept firmly in view”.60 Held offers a test how to decide on which level should the decision be taken and implemented. There are three questions that have to be answered. First we have extensiveness, the range of people affected; second intensity, how much would a group be affected by the policy, and how serious is the problem; and third comparative efficiency, a comparison of different consequences a policy would have on different applied on different levels.61 Held accepts the objection that this is quite vague and that there would often be disputes over appropriate jurisdiction, making it necessary to institute a whole number of forums and courts dealing with these questions.62

Some “core issues” would be laws independent of any further negotiations and would be applied everywhere. These core issues are what Held calls democratic rights. These rights are necessary for having a capacity for self-determination and involvement in democratic decision making.63 “Certain standards are specified for the treatment of all, which no political

58 Ibid. p. 273.
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62 Held proposes juridical bodies that would be composed of people who are “statistically representatives”. See Ibid. p. 237, and p. 206 ft.6.
63 Ibid. p. 275. There are seven of these rights categories and without them no one could equally and freely participate in democratic decision making.
regime or association can legitimately violate.” While on the other hand most of the policies would require further discussion on how to be best implemented (or maybe even not implemented) in particular settings giving concern to cultural values or economic conditions.

If we recall one of the arguments put forward ‘why we need a world government’ was the question of implementing decisions. Held is of course aware that laws without a coercive power to put them in practice would not have any “teeth”. He suggests that every nation station would give a proportion, rising to a more than half, of their national military troops to a global arm force, under the command of reformed UN. Over time a permanent independent force should be formed, by volunteers from all over the world. It is not only that a coercive power is needed to implement decision but more general to protect the democratic order. The use of troops “must remain a collective option of last resort in the face of clear attacks to eradicate cosmopolitan democratic law”.

Let me just in a few words give an overview of the whole framework we previously described. At the end of the day, we would have a global assembly elected directly by the people of world, dealing only with global questions and with the control of the global military force. There would be different regional parliaments, national, and local ones overlapping each other. A general legal framework would be put in place but all these political bodies would have sovereignty, and “law-making” would take place on different levels given the scope of the problem. There would be a wide network of courts, regional and international ones that would have to determine jurisdiction in disputes.

Against World government

Held agrees with the arguments Kant offered against the word government concerning tyranny, and adds more arguments against the concept of single world state and government. First, Held points our attention to the fact that in recent times a desire to establish, regain or maintain sovereignty by nation states and nationalist movements has not diminished. The nation states even with the globalization are still recognized as able in principle “to determine the most fundamental aspect of people’s life-chances”. It is unlikely that states will agree to completely surrender their sovereignty. When not knowing on what issues they, or to say people in with them, will be involved in decision making people would not be prepared to give up their power of self-government to a centralize world parliament. On the other hand, with nation states still present and shared sovereignty on different levels,
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people would have an opportunity to see their decisions respected and put into practice, while being able to control more easily the elected officials.

Besides a world government would, in Held’s opinion, suffer from the same problems as a ‘bureaucratic command government’: “acting presumptuously as if it knew what people should do and how they should behave in diverse settings”.\(^{67}\) It would, also, be very exposed to inefficiency from an information overload that would have to happen given the size and the number of problems it would be dealing with.\(^{68}\)

**Summary**

Held concludes that to suppose that in the future practice of democracy will be centered only on global domain would be a false interpretation of globalization. It is because “groups find themselves buffeted by global forces” that autonomy on local and regional level is needed, arguably this world of individual nation-state confederation with many transnational government bodies could be unstable, would still provide a possibility of a more direct and participatory democratic involvement of citizens. There would have to be a legal framework that would provide citizens with actual capacities to be included in political decision making.

Held also gives a list of short-term and long-term objectives. Most of these aims would start with a reconstruction of the United Nations. As we previously said a new Assembly of the UN with a coercive power in hand, would over time make possible demilitarization of nation states, interconnected global legal system, basic income for all adults in the world and other steps in direction of a true democratic world order. The road to achieve this, in the similar way as proponents of world government believe about their project, is a long one. Still if we recognize these goals as something worth of striving for and with a commitment to them they are not unreachable.

**Summary of the three approaches**

The ideas of Tannsjo and Nielsen are, in a way, very similar. Both of them believe that a democratic sovereign world government is needed as a solution to global problems. Nielsen as we remember recognizes the problem of security and global justice as the ones that we would need a global government to resolve, while Tannsjo adds solving
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environmental problems as the third task. They both thinks that a sovereign world
government with monopoly on coercive power could provide peace and real strength and
effectiveness to international law and other decisions taken by the government. In addition to
this, they do recognize that local autonomy has to be given to communities, making them
able to cherish their different values and identities. This autonomy would not be sovereignty
and the world would not be a confederation of states. The range of autonomy of local
political assemblies would be determined *exclusively* by the government. As I said in
Nielsen’s case there could be some room for interpretation, and I will come back to this
point, in the last chapter. The world government would in both of these proposals serve as a
final authority in any dispute.

While Nielsen thinks about this idea as theoretical and idealistic, Tannsjo believes a
democratic world government is a practically achievable goal. Starting with the
reconstruction of the General Assembly of United Nations, in a way that it is directly elected
in proportional electoral system, representing the true will of the people of the world, the
Assembly would over time take full sovereignty and military control.

Held believes that nation state, even though still not obsolete, has limited functions
and capacities for making people *self-governed*. A more complex system of world
governance is necessary if we want political participation of the people on question that are
influencing their lives. He also sees the reconstruction of General Assembly, in a similar way
as to Tannsjo’s, as necessary for this process. But, he does not think that all sovereignty
should pass to the hands of this new world parliament. He suggests shared sovereignty where
decisions are being made on different levels, from global to local, and with national states
still holding *some* power. The General Assembly should be provided with a military force
under its own command, but unlike Nielsen and Tannsjo, Held allows national armies, as
well.
Democracy

So far, I have been analyzing, the questions and arguments regarding a change in current international order. In the proceeding chapter I take a different turn and concentrate to an additional question. All three approaches to idea of world government and governance, from the previous chapter, are also related to the question of “democracy”. If we recall, Tannsjo claims that a world government has to be realistic and efficient in solving global problems, and both of these features could only be possible if the government is democratic. Nielsen, in his final remark on possible tyranny of global government was prepared to accept this “inconvenience”, but was very skeptical that this would occur, and in the ideal theory he saw the world government as democratic. Held is no exception to the view that global democracy is something worth striving for. The whole framework of world governance, he proposed, is constructed for the reason to protect the democratic way of governing.

Proposing a democratic political framework for governing the whole world, presupposes that democracy has some values that are beneficial for everyone in the world, and that is the best possible way of governing. On the other hand we have already encountered some objections against the world government on basis that it would be (come) totalitarian and undemocratic.

For these reasons we have to look more into depth and answer several questions about democracy. First, it is necessary to give at least a working definition of democracy, and what democracy presupposes. Second, “What are the reasons for having democracy, and why?” And the last question “if democracy is a suitable (political) option for all cultures and communities in the world?”; “is it a universal value accepted on the whole globe?”

Answers to these questions will be important for an assessment if the previous approaches to world government and world governance are desirable and possible in a way that their authors have presented them.

What is democracy?

Democracy comes from two words in Ancient Greek, δῆμος (dêmos) "people" and κράτος (krátos) "power", so democracy is “the power of the people”. However it is far from easy to answer what is precisely meant by this. As editors of Encyclopedia of Democratic Though have deduced: “democracy has many meanings, and even within the realm of scholarly thought there is no consensus on its usage.”69 On the other hand David Beetham
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does not think that there is a conceptual disagreement on how to define democracy. He takes democracy to be “a mode of decision-making about collectively binding rules and policies over which the people exercise control […]”.  

Democracy should properly be conceptualized as lying at one end of spectrum, the other end of which is a system of rule where the people are totally excluded from decision-making process and any control over it. Disputes about the meaning of democracy which purport to be conceptual disagreement are really disputes about how much democracy is either desirable or practicable […] 

As our interest here is not in democracy as a general decision making mode but as a mode of political decision making and governance, accepting the previous definition I will proceed to analyze democracy in political terms.

The disputes on how much democracy should be put into practice have at least two levels. First this leads to questions “on what matters the people should have the control of?” What institutions in the state should be controlled in a democratic way? And the second question “how should people be in control?” On this second line of questions, David Held notices that in the whole history of political theory there is:

[A] deeply rooted conflict about whether a democracy should mean some kind of popular power (a form of politics in which citizens are engaged in self-government and self-regulation) or an aid to decision-making (a means of conferring authority on those periodically voted into office). 

The idea of democracy in the political realm is related to self-determination and self-government by the people in a community. The differences between theories are related to the question “how self-government is best achieved?” Held distinguished three main models of democracy that are all rooted in the conflict previously quoted. The first model is direct democracy, the second representative, and third the one-party model, that is questionably democratic in its essence.

But there are more questions to be answered. First we have to define who are “the people” that are supposed to have the power of decision making. It is important to emphasize that the idea of moral equality was always deeply rooted in democratic procedure and collective rule. What has changed through the history of ethics and democracy is the concept of moral status. For instance, while women of Ancient Athens were not seen as full persons and consequently did not have full moral status and political rights, every Athenian male regardless of his social status and wealth was as valuable as any other, and had the same
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share of power in decision making regarding public affairs. In modern times the concept of 
*moral status* has spread to include more than just male humans, consequently expending 
*moral equality*.

Because each individual life is an end in itself, collective decisions ought to recognize, respect, and benefit individuals’ interests and values equally, insofar as possible. This moral intuition is central to democracy, and makes the concept morally compelling, apart from any institutional embodiments.\(^73\)

In the previous chapter we have encountered the concept of *citizenship*, defined as a status that individuals have, granting them equal political rights and liberties in a political community. Citizenship of course is not the same as moral status, and only refers to the equal political status and not moral ones. Though individuals are not excluded on the basis of gender, or race, there are *boundaries* on who should be included in the decision making process within a community. Citizenship and consequently, the right to be included in decision making, is usually given only to those who are born, or have lived substantial number of years, in a country. This boundary is thus territorial.

While we were describing Held’s position on world governance we already encountered problems with what should count as “people”. With the globalization the territorial boundaries are sometimes no longer regarded as sufficient.

More recently it has become clear that boundaries may be based on issues, as they increasingly are under doctrines of subsidiarity (the notion that political units should match the scale of problems with which they deal), and in emerging global institutions and forums.\(^74\)

In this case “the people” should be defined differently according to the scope of the problem. The principle of (political) equality should than be as such that “every individual potentially affected by a collective decision should have an equal opportunity to influence the decisions proportionally [to] his or her stake in the outcome.”\(^75\)

Related to the *equality* there is one more principle “at the center of all contemporary conceptions of democracy, and it is at the root of the claim of democratic political decisions to be regarded as worthy or legitimate”.\(^76\) It is the principle of “majority rule”. If every individual that has a right to participate in the collective decision making is equal to the other, than every individual “carries one vote”. The “majority rule” principle says that at the
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end of the decision making process the decision that was preferred by most, should be accepted and put into practice.

To define democracy only in terms of decision making as a collective electoral process is understood as “thin” concept of democracy.\(^{77}\) Even those who do see democracy primarily as related to electoral process, agree that there are more conditions that have to be met before the election that we would call elections democratic. Protection of liberties and freedoms, a guarantee of free political discussion and uncensored distribution of news, are all important. The people (i.e. citizens) have to be guaranteed, at least to a reasonable degree, to “have adequate and equal opportunities to form their preferences, to place questions on the public agenda, and to express reasons for affirming one outcome rather than the other.”\(^{78}\) For them to make a choice it has to be possible to attain information about what would serve their interests best. The formal equality of votes would be worthless if there is no previous equality in these matters.

Furthermore, although democracy is about decision making and elections, there are other scopes of democracy that have to be taken into account. After the elections are over there have to be mechanisms for holding elected officials responsible for their actions, checking if they are doing a good job in implementing decisions that were made ultimately by people. In previous chapters we talked about monopoly on violence by the government and the state. Decision, laws and policies, made by the government (a global or a nation one) would be impossible to implement without some coercive power.

Democratic states and governments do not differ in this way from other types of governments, like authoritarian ones. The difference it this sense between what we call democratic societies and non-democratic (authoritative or totalitarian) is that there are rules how this power can be legitimately used. And democracy is closely related to ideas of constitution and the rule of law. There are of course many different theories on these two concepts, but in general:

The standard purpose of a constitution has been to avoid the arbitrary, willful and tyrannous use of power, a goal traditionally encapsulated in the phrase, ‘the rule of law not men’.\(^{79}\)

When people give the power to the government this power has to be entrenched in certain rules. It is not just the pure use of violence that is at stake, but a broader idea that those who are representing the people are not “above” the people. They have to be
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accountable for their actions and the constitution as the highest legislative act has to define their duties and responsibilities.

Parliaments do have the legislative power to enact laws but this power is also not absolute. Laws have to be under the general legal framework defined by the constitution. The constitution is what is commonly described as democratic and only then the laws, elections and the government of a state. A democratic constitution has to define and guarantee equalities that we previously talked about, protection individual liberties and insure that the “majority rule” does not become the “tyranny of majority”. The constitution itself also has to be available for public scrutiny and review. Of course one of the biggest tests for a democratic state is that there are institutional capacities to make those in office bound by the constitution.\(^{80}\)

**Summary**

I have interpreted democracy here in a broader manner, as something that is usually called liberal democracy, relating this to political decision making. Accepting that democracy is in general a decision making mode, with the principles of equality and majority rule in its center, there are previous conditions that have to be satisfied if we want to define democracy as the power of the people. Political freedoms, access to free information are all in the center of making people “self-governed”. Furthermore, I pointed out that the concept of constitution is an essential part of seeing a state as democratic. Entrenchments on those who the power is transferred to and a general democratic legal framework are necessary for insuring that the “majority rule” doesn’t become “tyranny of majority”.

**Why Democracy?**

Democracy has gained such a strong emotive meaning that it is rarely questioned as the best form of governance. In the 20\(^{th}\) century is has become one of the beliefs:

[...] that seem to command respect as a kind of general rule - like a ‘default’ setting in a computer program. While democracy is not yet universally practiced nor indeed uniformly accepted, in the general climate or world opinion, democratic governance has now achieved the status of being taken to be generally right.\(^{81}\)

---

\(^{80}\) I have simplified things regarding the constitution at this point as constitution also defines duties and obligations of citizens, and not only those who are in power. But this is not so important for the assessment of world government, I wish to make in the next chapter.

\(^{81}\) Sen 1999, p. 5.
The high value that democracy has in political discourse is not without any bases. On the country we can clearly observe that people living in democratic societies enjoy higher living standard. They live longer, have more opportunities to develop and consequently have “better lives”. Of course, this is not only the result of democratic institutions and practices, but they also play an important part.

Still I think that we should pose a question that even if it is empirically evident that there is some appeal in democratic societies why this is so. Why did the democratic societies become “better” that the other ones?

Justification of democracy can be roughly divided between arguments that refer to the outcomes of this kind of political decision making comparing them to other possible methods; and arguments that refer to intrinsic values of democratic decision making. In practice very few theorist ever denied that consequences of political decision making should not be taken into account when valuing them. But some have in addition, claimed that there are “some forms of decision making that are morally desirable independent of the consequences of having them”. I follow, in this discussion, Amartya Sen who has distinguished three, what he calls, “different ways in which democracy enriches the lives of citizens”. There is an instrumental, constructive and intrinsic value of democracy.

Instrumental value of democratic governance lies in the fact that democratic states have been more successful in providing good living conditions to their citizens. This is especially true in situations when a crisis happen. Sen famously claims: “that in the terrible history of famines in the world, no substantial famine has ever occurred in any independent and democratic country with a relatively free press.” In his opinion famines, even as a result of natural disasters are usually easy to prevent. Democratic governments who are facing elections and criticism make a bigger effort to do their best in preventing them. On the other hand, countries in which there is no opposition to the government, no free press and no multiparty elections, were unable to stop starvation of their citizens. The policies that the governments of these countries take and put in to action, even with best wishes, are sometimes ineffective and without any criticism it takes far too long to change them, resulting in doing more harm than good. The example of famine is an extreme and a

---

82 Christiano, 2006.
83 Ibid.
84 Sen 1999, p. 10.
85 Ibid. pp. 7-8.
86 The example that Sen refers to is the famine in China, from 1958 to 1961, when 30 million people died, “while faulty governmental policies remained uncorrected for three full years”, Sen 1999, p. 8.
forceful argument in favor of democracy, but the positive role of free political discussion and the possibility to change and hold responsible the officials in power is beneficial in less drastic situations as well. Still the instrumental value of democracy does become obvious when things go bad.

When things go fine and everything is routinely good, this instrumental role of democracy may not be particularly missed. It is when things get fouled up, for one reason or another, that the political incentives provided by democratic governance acquire great practical value.\(^87\)

The \textit{constructive} value of democracy is, again, understood under a broader view. Political rights, especially those that are related to open, free discussion and criticism, are not only important for making informed choices and decisions, but additionally they are beneficial that people can form \textit{new values} and understand their needs in a better way. Without knowing which goals are feasible and which are not people cannot fully form their opinions on what they should regard as valuable. Only through an open debate it is possible to form, change and make priorities among thing that we hold valuable. In the terms of governance this would entail that people could understand what they can reasonably expect from the government. Which of the values and needs are possible to fulfill, and how should they be prioritized.\(^88\)

\textit{Intrinsic} value of democracy for human well-being is the most complex of the three values and I will relate this with David Held’s view on autonomy. The basic claim is that democracy, as political freedom and equality in decision making, is “a part of human freedom in general”\(^89\), and that deprivation of this freedom is a major deficiency in human’s well-being. Through democratic governance people are respected equally and regardless of the, for example consequences on their material well being, this freedom is a (moral) value in itself. Furthermore, democracy as self-determination and self-government of the citizens in a political community implies that the citizens are those who define the conception of what is their “political good”.\(^90\) It is “the people” who decide what their interests are, and there is no “good life project” independent from their own opinion. The principle of autonomy understood as “the capacity of human beings to reason self-consciously, to be self reflective

\(^87\) Ibid. pp. 8-9.
\(^88\) Sen gives a nice example on this point. Some of us may value immortality, and even if some of us think that this is \textit{not completely} impossible to achieve, still we do not put this high on our political agenda and ask this to be achieved by the government. See: Sen 1999, p. 10.
\(^89\) Ibid. p. 10.
and to be self-determining”\textsuperscript{91} involving the “ability to deliberate, judge, choose and act upon different possible courses of action”\textsuperscript{92} is at the center of seeing democracy as an \textit{intrinsically} valuable.

The principle of autonomy expresses two main ideas in political terms: that people should be self-determining and that democratic government should have limited power.\textsuperscript{93} Allowing people to be involved in decision making over the issues that are influencing their lives is respecting and promoting their autonomy. On the other hand restrictions to individual freedom in modern democracies are usually defined by the well known ‘harm principle’ specified by Mill. Interference with individual liberty, by the state or the society, can only be justified if the actions taken by the individual “harm” others.\textsuperscript{94} In public matters individuals have to be constrained so that their own autonomy does not interfere and violate other people’s autonomy, as much as it is possible.

I said that it is not enough that citizens should be granted \textit{a formal right} to equal membership and participation in democratic decision making, what is necessary is that people are provided with an opportunity to demonstrate their autonomy. If we relate the democratic state to the principle of autonomy, than a democratic government would have a responsibility to ensure that:

Citizens would have the actual capacity (the health, education, skills and resources) to take advantage of the opportunities before them. Such a constitution and bill of rights would radically enhance the ability of citizens to take actions against the state to redress unreasonable encroachment on liberties. It would help tip the balance from the state to parliament and from parliament to citizens […]\textsuperscript{95}

\textbf{Summary}

This “thick” understanding of democracy that I accepted, following Sen’s view, showed that there are three main reasons why democracy should be regarded as valuable. First it has an instrumental value, as it has better results for the well being of citizens. Second, the constructive role in forming and changing opinions and values, helping to define our own goals and needs in a better way, making these goals as political goals of the community. And finally, democratic procedures respecting equality and giving people the opportunity to be self-governed are at the center or respecting human autonomy, making the democratic mode governance morally appealing regardless of other consequences.

\textsuperscript{91}Held 1995, p. 146.
\textsuperscript{92}Ibid. p. 146.
\textsuperscript{93}Ibid. p. 147.
\textsuperscript{94}Held 2006, p. 80.
\textsuperscript{95}Ibid. p. 278.
Universality of Democracy

The third question about democracy that I want to answer here is “if democracy is a universal (political) value?” As both Tannsjo and Held agree even though not all values has to be shared among all the people of the world, both of their global political frameworks presuppose a common adherence to democracy.\(^\text{96}\)

[W]hat is clearly […] required is a ‘commitment’ to democracy, for without this there can be no sustained public deliberation, democracy cannot function as a decision-making mechanism, and divergent political aspirations and identities are unlikely to reach an accommodation\(^\text{97}\).

Amartya Sen is once again very helpful to first understand what we mean by “universal value”. If by this we presuppose that it is universally accepted, than it obvious that democracy is not such a value. However, as Sen asks, is there at least one value that has never been objected to? Surely there is not. Even in democratic societies there are people who question democratic procedure and object to them. What we should understand by universal value is not the empirical fact if people everywhere accept it or not, but “that people anywhere may have a reason to see it as valuable”.\(^\text{98}\)

The idea of democracy has been questioned on the lines that there are cultural and religious values that are not in accordance with democracy. There are two main examples usually presented in this context. The first one relates to so-called “Asian values”, while the other one is concerning Islam. It has been claimed that Asians traditionally value discipline and obedience to the family and the state, consequently not being that much interested in “self-governance” and democratic procedure, leaving personal autonomy in the background. The second example used in this context depicts Islam as intolerant and not opened to individual freedoms.\(^\text{99}\)

Both of these claims are empirical statements and both of them seem to be wrong. There is no evidence that people in Asia or Muslim countries do not hold personal autonomy valuable, or that they have not done so in the past. It is true that there are different values present in all the societies of the world, and through history different values have changed their place in the societies. Sometimes autonomy and personal freedom went into background while some other values took their place in the foreground. But to think that democracy, autonomy and equality are only values of the Western-European world would be grossly


\(^{97}\) Held 1995, p. 282.

\(^{98}\) Sen 1999, p. 12.

\(^{99}\) Ibid.
inaccurate. In the same way as there was no democracy in (Christian) Europe for centuries, democracy was present in Middle East, India and other parts of Asia, as well as through Muslim world, for centuries.\textsuperscript{100} If no one is claiming that there were no democratic values in Europe, in the times when there was no democracy, why would then some presume that these values are completely absent in societies that do not have democracy now? It is much more probable that the vast majority of values that are related to the concept of democracy are shared through the world but that their place in the society is not the same, all the time.

Even though the democracy at this point is not practiced everywhere, there are no reason to believe that this will not happen in the future. Furthermore, if we are right in this point there would no reasons to think that democratic world governance will be rejected by some cultures. It will take time for establishing democratic world order, especially in a peaceful and not, to say, a colonial way. But it is hard to find empirical evidence showing that the idea of democracy, and other principles that surround it, would harshly interfere with some communal values. We still have to be careful on implementation of democracy in the world, but we should not think that some people “in Asia” do not have at least general interests in human and political rights, and do not care for about their autonomy.

\textbf{Summary of the chapter}

I have tried in this chapter to provide a foundation for the next part of discussion. With identifying what democracy is, and what it presupposes in governing nation states, we can proceed and analyze if this is possible on the whole globe. I accepted the general definition of democracy as a decision making mode in which people have the power of control and have an equal say in the process. I also said what democracy means in a broader sense, with respecting and promoting human autonomy. I pointed out that one of the main differences between democratic states and governments, and authoritative ones, is that the first one are bound by a general legal framework, \textit{the constitution} that entrenches the power of the officials and the government. I gave an overview what are the reasons why we should think about democracy as appealing, with instrumental, constructive and intrinsic values, as well as the question of democracy as universal value.

\textsuperscript{100} We usually take Ancient Greece as a birthplace of democracy, but historically this is inaccurate. At the same time, and even before, democracy, similar to one in Ancient Athens, existed in city-states of Mesopotamia and India. See: Sen 1999 p. 1 and 14; Held 1993, p 16.
Democracy and World Order

In the last two chapters my goal was to give a fair description of three views on world governments and world governance and at least in general terms say something on what is democracy, and why we should look favorable to idea of democracy. My main task in this chapter is to evaluate the previous three views, and show how they stand in accordance with democracy. I hope to show in more details in how Tansjo’s and Held’s approaches exactly differ and which one should be preferred in regards of providing global democracy and a possible solution to global problems.

I would like to point out that my arguments presuppose a certain concept of democracy that I previously analyzed. And the further discussion has to be understood in those limits. First, I accept arguments from the last chapter, in favor of democracy and its values. Democracy in these terms should be understood in a broader way than just an electoral process with a majority rule in its center. Second, I also take that democracy is a universal value that even though is not present in all the societies in the world, is more of a meta-political project, where political goals, are defined by people themselves and not by some value from outside. Of course this presupposes that the argument presented by San is correct and that basically the principle of autonomy is accepted everywhere, at least to a degree. But by saying this I also want to point out that we have to be aware that acceptance of democracy and its values has to come from within a society, and should not be enforced from outside. So, my second presumption is that global democracy is a valid political and moral goal. Third, I also do not go into details on the question if citizenship is something that can or cannot be a matter of the whole globe, nor if this is necessary for solving global justice, or other global problems. I accept the basic assumption of all the three previous theorists that close unity of people is not needed to such an extent as communitarians think it is.

Under the previous constraints and understanding of democracy I hold that democracy is the best possible mode of decision making and mode of government, for human beings and their capacity of autonomy, has to be the mode of governing over the globe. If we are making a world government for all humans, that his government has to be democratic regardless of anything else.

101 I also take into consideration some of the arguments presented by Nielsen, but I mainly consider Tansjo’s argumentation.
World Government and Global Constitution

I will turn now to some objections toward Tannsjo’s proposal of world government. I believe that Tannsjo was not clear on some questions regarding the democratic character on the world government. Most importantly in my opinion his description of the word state misses one important part, a *democratic global constitution*.

According to Tannsjo a world government already presupposes democracy. A world government has to be democratic, if it is to be *realistic* and *efficient*. To form such a government would only be possible if it is a democratic one. In Tannsjo’s view the global parliament has to be formed in such a way that it represents the *true will* of people.\(^{102}\) The decisions being made in this global assembly would be decided by the principle of majority rule.\(^{103}\) If the parliament is a *true* representation of the world whatever it decides, the decision would basically be the same as if at least 50 percent of the population was involved in voting for the proposal. Global problems are clearly affecting the majority of the population of the world, in such a drastic way that, we can be optimistic that some kind of a decision on global equality and on laws regulating environment will soon be made by them.

But the problem as I see it is in the question how to provide reasonable expectation that the majority does not become “tyranny of majority”. Tannsjo tries to reassure us that chances that one group and chances that one interests group have the majority are much bigger in national parliament, than it would ever be possible in a global one. I do not think that this is the problem. This does not have to be some drastic violation of their rights, but they can still feel threatened by the government. Especially if a group hold values that are often in conflict with proposal for solving global problems.

Even if the world government would confine itself on solving only global problems, we can basically only speculate what will be the reach of these decisions in the future. The argument Tannsjo presented on problems regarding environmental issues exactly shows this uncertainty, as he says that the government will reach a compromising solution that would be accepted by every reasonable person in the world.\(^{104}\) This compromising solution, even if it could be reaechd by the majority could still be such that some groups are strongly against it,

---

102 Here, I talk about the situation in which the Lower House of the UN Assembly has taken over the *whole* power and is the only sovereign of the world.

103 If there is not such a majority, and that votes are equally divided, a chairman, or a similar official, could in principle make a ruling on which option should be accepted. In Tannsjo’s opinion this would not impair the democratic decision making, as the votes were divided equally. Tannsjo 2008, pp. 69-70.

104 Page 9 of this paper.
as they believe that these decisions are influencing their lifestyle in an unacceptable way. For example, it is in some sort of conflict with their religious views.  

At one point I think that democracy and solving global problems would have to come to some sort of a conflict, as described by Tannsjo. Here I am using democracy in broader sense that Tannsjo of course. I am talking about the possibility that sometimes some values surrounding individual autonomy and rights will be in conflict with solution for the global problems made by the government, in majority. Once again I am stressing the fact that this does not have to lead to a complete tyranny. Nor do I presuppose that every value has to be respected by the world government. But I do presume is that under a democratic regime those who are left in minority are provided with good reason why another decision has been taken. Through open dialog democracy with the constructive value of democracy that I talked about, should, not persuade, but give reasons so that the other side can better understand the reasons of the other side. And also in the other way around. Certainly the government will sometimes make wrong decisions. If the majority rule is the governing principle of the world parliament the question I would like to pose if there are (or if there should be) boundaries on what the government can do, even if it is representing the majority of the world.

Tannsjo does not say anything on the question if there should be a global constitution by I am certain that he would accept this idea at least to some extent. I have said in previous chapter that in democracies even though the government is sovereign, there are entrenchment for the government and its power defined by the constitution. People do know what rights they have, what kind of decisions the government can and cannot make, what kind of laws it can legislate, and at least in general they know what kind of questions will be taken on local levels. It is essential that they know all this in advance, as they have to know what powers they are giving to the government before they go to elections.

Presumable the same situation would apply to Tannsjo’s proposal at least to a degree, where for instance there could be a two third majority for a constitutional change, and not a simple majority. But this global constitution in my opinion would have to define, at least to a degree, what decision will be left for local authorities as well, but this is something Tannsjo strongly rejects.

According to Tannsjo not all political decision will be made by the government and in principle the government would confine itself to provide solutions for global problems. Other

---

105 Things could be much more complicated if for example there is a majority in the parliament that decides to make abortion illegal in the world, or something similar to that. It is very hard to make an assumption what will be the will of the people on this issue or some similar issues in the parliament.

106 I am mean in the sense of instrumentally wrong choices, not normative one.
questions would be delegated to lower levels of decision making, giving people a chance to decide on their own. What question should be delegated to a national or local level, in Tannsjo’s opinion cannot be known in advanced.

I can only speculate, as Tannsjo is unclear on this point, but there could be three possible options implied by this. First that this delegation of questions to lower levels could mean that these local and national assemblies could enact laws and policies which are limited to those issues that the government has defined and limited to that territory. Second, it could mean that laws in the world state would only be legislated by the world government but some laws would not have to be put into practice everywhere, and that there would be some local autonomy on these question. Or, a third option, that the laws, in the future world state, will all be global. We definitely know that laws regulating questions surrounding global problems will be global, but in other cases the situation is not clear.

I do not know why Tannsjo reject the idea that in principle under the world government there could be a constitution that defines on what level the decision should be made, thus protecting values of communities in a clearer way. Giving people the benefit to be more directly included in decision making, and with the world government keeping the sole command of military forces it would still keep the stability, and be the “court of last appeal”. It seems that Nielsen in his ideal theory was very close to this idea. The loose federation of cantons suggests that there would not be many laws on the federation level. In this view we have a democratic constitution that guarantees social basic rights, global government with monopoly on legitimate means of violence, that serves a constitutional court, and make rulings on disputes between cantons. But this is if we recall an idealistic approach.

If Tannsjo is right and if sovereign nation states of today do accept his reasons and proposal for forming a world government, this government being the only sovereign, could give back some sovereignty to the previous nation states without any military power. The stability of the system would be the same with a final authority on the top, but prospects for democracy, to say, in my opinion would be bigger.

Shared sovereignty

---

107 As I said in the last paragraph it is by no means easy to understand Tannsjo’s view if the laws of the world should all be global or not.
I will turn now to examination of *shared sovereignty*. First I will argue in favor of shared sovereignty in general and then I will examine shared sovereignty in Held’s framework.

When talking about shared sovereignty the principle of “subsidiarity” is at the center of the discussion. The principle was defined within the EU “wishing to ensure that decisions are taken as closely as possible to the citizens of the Union”. When decisions are being made in areas that do not exclusively fall in competence of the European Community, then they should be left to the lowest level of political authority unless the objective cannot be achieved, and has to be taken to a higher level. Held has proposed a test for determining on what level a policy should be taken, given the extensiveness, intensity and comparative efficiency, and this is in a similar way used in the EU.109

The idea of subsidiarity is by no means a new one. The 10th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States ratified in 1791, as a part of Bill of Right, expresses the same idea. The United States are good example of a federation of states with shared sovereignty defined by the Constitution. The US Constitution gives power to the National Government as well as to States and local governments while the 10th Amendment expresses the idea *that all is retained which has not been surrendered*. If there is a decision that should be made that is neither delegated to the Government nor prohibited to the State, then the decision should be taken on the lowest possible level. In any dispute the Supreme Court is the one who makes rulings, in accordance to the constitution.

In both cases, in EU and US, there is a constitution that defines the powers of the all places of decision making, and a principle that every other decision should be brought closest to the people as it is possible, given practical circumstances of achieving the desirable goal.

The idea behind this kind of thinking is to make those who are affected by the political decisions the ones who can exercise best control and be involved in decision making as much as possible. If the decision on what is the political goal should be left to the people, the definition on who are the people has to take into account the scope of those affected by the outcome of the decision. People have the opportunity not just to elect their representatives but being basically physically closer to the places of decision making to be reassured that their voice is heard and that those political questions that are closest to their everyday life are

---


109 For details see: Protocol 30.

110 [http://www.usconstitution.net/const.pdf](http://www.usconstitution.net/const.pdf), for the Amendment, see page 14.

111 Tannsjo would call this *confederation* not *federation*. 
under their control. And while Tannsjo believes that all these principles cannot effectively work in practice they usually do, at least in nation states, while EU gives support that it can work on the international level, as well.

Shared sovereignty as presented by Held, in the international realm, is a more complex system that it is in a national federation. A whole network of parliaments, courts and assemblies have to be put into practice from the global to local levels. The problems arising with this system is that there would be a great number of overlapping between all these institutions. There could be cases that over the same territory there are laws and policies contradicting each other, and while the democratic constitution is a very general framework, courts would have difficulties in making any rulings in possible disputes. Another question would be if in this framework new constituencies have to be formed all the time given the fact that new questions would have usually different range of people affecting. This would make things even more complicated.

Held did acknowledge the fact that there has to be some coercive power under the command of the global assembly, while he believes that nation states would not be prepared to give all of their military forces. So even when a decision in made by one of the international courts implementation of the decisions could take time as one of the states could refuse the rulings, and with nation army present, the interventions by the UN would be made only in extreme situations.

On one hand democracy would have a better perspective in a international system of shared sovereignty, especially as with nation armies present global parliament cannot turn into a complete tyrant, while on the other hand the whole system, as pointed out by Tannsjo, would be unstable as states would still be able to ignore decisions made on higher level.

**Stability and Monopoly on violence**

The question is if the monopoly on violence by world governments described by Tannsjo and Nielsen provide stability to the world state, in a way that it is not possible in Held’s framework. Stability here could only mean in terms of not letting anyone to “leave” the world state, and keeping the state in place. Otherwise I do not think that the world parliament and government would be any more stable in political terms than a confederation of world states. The same conflicts of interests and ideas on what should be done and how should it be done will be present within the world government. The monopoly of violence provides an opportunity to implement decisions without any opposition. Still decisions will
not be easy to make given the differences between the people of the world. If Tannsjo thinks that “the crucial thing is that a unique will of the people has to prevail”\textsuperscript{112} the process of coming to this unique will and reaching any decision will not be that easy, on many issues. Without the balance between the effort to negotiate and have as big majority in the world parliament as possible and imposing decisions of the majority, the world state will soon become oppressive.

On the other hand, are there any reasons to believe that even without this coercive power nation states would accept decisions and rulings even if they are not satisfied by them? There could be a good reason. As long as the overall benefits are bigger than the disadvantaged the nation states and its citizens would have a good reason to obey even those decisions that they are not completely satisfied with. If we recall the Held introduced the idea of shared sovereignty was presented as with the globalization citizens in a nation state did not have the real opportunity to be involved in decisions that are influencing their lives. The nation state was not enough to provide citizens with the opportunity to be self-governing in the full sense. For the nation state to “leave” the confederation would be getting back to the previous position. If citizens of one state are not always in the minority, in regional and global parliament, they would still have a good reason to stay under this framework, as it would provide them with better opportunities to govern their lives. But without some sort of a high court that would serve as the ‘court of last’ appeal even though the system will not collapse, it is still a question how long it will take to have any decision finally accepted and put into practice.

**Summary**

I started this chapter with a claim that a world government has to be established in a way that it is a democracy. And under democracy I understand all the characteristics from the previous chapter with its intrinsic, instrumental and constructive value, and essential relation with promoting and securing human autonomy.

I argued that Tannsjo’s position on some matters that are important for understanding democracy in this way, are somewhat not clear, as he takes democracy mainly in terms of decision making and principle of majority rule. Thus in my opinion opening a door for the tyranny of majority. The idea of shared sovereignty in general, with powers previously defined and delegated by the constitution between the central government and lower levels of decision making, is in my view a better framework for upholding democracy. I did not

\textsuperscript{112} Tannsjo 2008, p.72.
exclude the possibility that these two views cannot go together. On the contrary it seems to me that Nielsen’s ideal theory is very saying something close this.

My proposal would be that when nation states surrender their sovereignty to the global assembly, as explained by Tannsjo, than the assembly should formulate the global constitution with separation of power between itself and the former nation states, with some version of principle of “subsidiarity” also present. Thus forming a world federation with monopoly on use of violence within the world government. If nation states would be prepared to accept Tannsjo’s proposal than they would even have less objection to this proposal. It would still be possible for this government to turn into tyranny as it has the military forces on its side, still the other, Held’s option, with nation states keeping part of their military force even though providing security, that this will not happen, add instability in the sense that nation states could easier oppose to accepting decision from the higher political level.

So the main question now is if both of these proposals are possible which one should be preferred. On one side we have better opportunities for solving global problems with effective international law with coercive option, with possible tyranny of some sort possible. On the other we have a system in which nation states have some military power making international law less effective and easier for the state to leave the system, while giving more security that tyranny will not take over. If both of these proposals are realistic, and realistic to the same degree, than I would not have an answer.

113 I come back to this in the conclusion.
Conclusion

I started with an analysis of world government and solution to global problems. Even though much could be said on the matter if the world government is capable, as Tannsjo and Nielsen believe, to provide global peace, global justice and good environment I do presume that if it is a democratic government it will manage to find some solutions to these problems, if there is a solution at all possible.

I agreed with, my interpretation of, Nielsen’s approach that ideally a world government with monopoly on violence in a cantonal federation, with a constitution regulating shared sovereignty between national government and the cantons and a high court would be the best solution for a world order. It would promote democracy and autonomy to the fullest degree while being able to work efficiently on solutions to global problems, in terms of imposing solutions to individual nation stated. But there is no certainty and the mere possibility of tyranny is still frightful.

On the other hand Held’s solution even though democratic is unstable and could, as Tannsjo’s also says, push the whole thing back to where we started. The problem as I see it is still in the fact that the formation of world government is highly unlikable. I did not say much on this, but Tannsjo opinion on how would this road be possible is in my view quite naïve, as it is based on pure speculations on the supremacy of US.114

I do not have the final conclusion to the question what road should be taken. As I said in the previous chapter, both of these approaches agree, at least, in one thing that a reconstruction of the UN Global assembly is a necessity. Currently the world is being run by small number of big and powerful countries. So I conclude with agreeing with both Tannsjo and Held that what is needed is getting personally involved in finding solutions to these global problems. With democratization our own societies and governments, first, against interests groups that do not represent the interests and will of the people we can hope that a global democratic order is possible and that a solution to global is possible as well, has to come from individuals and their involvement not only in governmental decisions buy also in their involvement in international nongovernmental organizations and their work to make a pressure to individual nation governments to accept that there has to be a change in current world order.

114 Please see page 9 of this paper.
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