Submission to the Foreign Policy White Paper 2017

Australia and NATO

C.J. Hamer[1]
13 February 2017

Executive Summary

In a globalized world, one of Australia's primary interests is to work for international peace and prosperity, in order to assure peace and prosperity at home.

International peace can only be assured when there is established a binding system of international law, and an effective system of democratic global governance, such that we can guarantee that international disputes can be settled peacefully, without recourse to war.

The worldwide community of democratic nations should take the lead in constructing such a system. A suitable starting point could be a 'global NATO'.

Recommendation*. The White Paper should include a review of the concept of a 'global NATO' and the possibility of NATO evolving into a World Security Community of Democratic Nations. If a new Treaty to that effect was ratified, Australia should be among the first to consider applying to join as a full member of the new organization.*

Introduction

A major objective of Australia's foreign policy must be to support and extend the "rules-based international order", in order to assure peace and prosperity at home and abroad. In the long term, we must look to establish a binding system of international law, and a democratic system of international governance, or in short a global parliament. Only then will we succeed in *"saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war"*. This argument is presented in more detail in the submission from the World Citizens Association of Australia. It is not a new argument, and has been accepted by philosophers and statesmen for centuries.

The really difficult question is, how do we bring about this desirable state of affairs? The world federalist movement has concentrated its efforts on reform of the United Nations for the past seventy years, only to be stymied by the rigidity of the UN Charter. No meaningful reform of the Charter has ever been achieved.

The Europeans have shown the way for the rest of the world. They started from the Schuman Declaration of 1950, which declared the intention of building a European Federation in order to put an end to the catastrophic sequence of wars in Europe over several preceding centuries. Evolving in a step-by-step fashion by means of successive Treaties, they have built up the present European Union, which includes an elected European Parliament. With hindsight, the EU has made a number of mistakes, and it is going through a period of turbulence at the present time, but already there is a sufficient structure of governance in Europe so that one can assert with some confidence that there will never again be another major war within Europe.

Here we suggest that these tactics should be emulated by the worldwide community of democratic nations, leaving other nations to come on board later. In particular, there is an excellent opportunity at the moment to transform NATO into a global organisation, a world security community of democratic nations, which could indeed become the starting point for an eventual global parliament.

Section 03.   Australia is an influential player in regional and international organisations

Which regional and global organisations matter most to us? How should we support and shape them? How can we maximize our influence?

NATO

Australia has a proud record of promoting collective security in the global arena. Australians have been prominent in the foundation and operations of the United Nations, and we have always been a strong supporter of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Here it is suggested that Australia should support proposals for a *'global NATO',* to develop a global security organization based on the democracies. We see this as the next logical step in evolving a more effective structure of democratic global governance.

NATO is the linchpin of the Atlantic alliance. The organization lost its original purpose when the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, and has been slowly developing a new purpose as the security and peacekeeping arm of its members. It has overseen operations in Bosnia, Libya, and Afghanistan, and has thus become a security organization with global reach and responsibilities. There have been several suggestions that it should correspondingly invite new members, not just from the North Atlantic area, but from democracies around the globe [Aznar, 2006; Daalder and Goldgeier, 2006; Rasmussen, 2016],

Australia is currently an official Partner of NATO, and provided the largest contingent of troops in Afghanistan of any country not a full member of the alliance. It has also taken an important part in recent discussions at the NATO Summits.

Our recommendation is that Australia should officially endorse the concept of a 'global NATO', and lobby for reform of the organisation, to become a *World Security Community of Democratic Nations*. This is a very similar concept to the 'Concert of Democracies' advocated by a number of influential commentators in the United States [Daalder and Lindsay, 2007; Princeton Project, 2006].

A detailed discussion of this idea, including references, is given in the attached document, and will not be repeated here. In summary, the main recommendations are that Australia should support reforms:

- To open membership of NATO to stable democracies around the globe
- That NATO should guarantee explicitly never to undertake military operations in an external territory unless authorized to do so by the United Nations Security Council, in accordance with international law
- To introduce a qualified majority voting system into the councils of NATO
- To set up a Court to adjudicate any intractable disputes between NATO members on the basis of international law.

We argue that such an outcome would be a win-win result from virtually every point of view. Here we merely summarize a few of the principal arguments.

a. NATO needs reform in any case. The consensus decision-making process within NATO became extremely cumbersome with its expansion to 28 members. Military men within the organization complain bitterly about the process. General James Jones, formerly Supreme Allied Commander Europe, wrote: "Sooner or later, NATO will have to address whether you want 350 committees all acting on the rule of consensus. What's the logic of one or two countries being able to block action by the remaining 24 members? Why not have a system where they can just opt out?" [Jones, 2007]. A very senior group of former chiefs of staff in Germany, the US, Britain, France and the Netherlands wrote a detailed report, recommending that NATO should adopt a qualified majority voting scheme like that used in Europe [Naumann et al., 2007]. We support this idea, which by itself would transform NATO from a mere alliance to a community after the European pattern.

b. The new Community would provide a powerful new global security organization. NATO has already taken on a global role, as outlined above. It provides a virtually unchallengeable guarantee of security for its members. Working strictly in tandem with the UN, it could also provide a powerful right arm for the Security Council to maintain peace and security in the wider world.

c. Such ideas chime in with proposals from both sides of politics in the United States. The Republican leader John McCain called for a 'League of Democracies' during his Presidential campaign in 2007 [McCain, 2007] while several prominent figures on the Democratic side have called for a

'Concert of Democracies' [Daalder and Lindsay, 2007]. Thus a proposal of this sort has a very good chance of being implemented.

d. Australia would benefit in several ways. We rely primarily on our close alliance with the United States for our own security. A closer relationship with the other members of NATO could only enhance our security further. Australia already participates in yearly meetings of the 'Strategic Policy Planning Dialogue' (SPPD) along with a group of eight other major democracies from around the world. But the proposed changes would give us a regular seat at the top table of the Western community in discussing global security problems. Membership in a global security community, rather than a simple binary alliance, would also be a big step on the way towards an effective common security system for all nations.

These changes would require a new Treaty between the members of the alliance. Australia wields considerable influence as a middle-ranking Western power. Our support of a 'global NATO' would be of great importance in taking the next step towards a stronger system of global security and democratic world governance, and thus advancing world peace. A global NATO could indeed be the first step towards the desired global parliament.

We therefore recommend that the White Paper should include a review of the concept of a 'global NATO' and the possibility of NATO evolving into a World Security Community of Democratic Nations. An indication should be given that if a new Treaty to that effect was drawn up, Australia would be among the first to consider applying to join as a full member of the new organization.

A fuller discussion of this idea is given in the Attachment. The great unknown here is the attitude of the new President Trump in the US. He has referred to NATO as 'obsolete', and complained that other members of the alliance are not bearing enough of the financial burden. But the new community could certainly not be characterised as 'obsolete', and in fact other member states might be more willing to share the financial burden if they had a larger say in the decisions of the community.

Conclusions

Progress towards a global parliament has been stymied for seventy years by the rigidity of the UN Charter. In broad terms, everybody agrees that the UN needs reform, but no two nations agree on exactly what those reforms should be. Here we argue that an easier and more natural route towards a democratic global parliament could start with a smaller security community of democratic nations, based upon a reformed NATO. Here there is no Charter to stand in the way, and the new community could be established simply by a new Treaty between its members.

References

MCCain, 2007. John McCain. "McCain Remarks", Hoover Institution (speech, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, May 1, 2007), http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/McCain_05-01-07.pdf.

Daalder and Lindsay, 2007. Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay, ''Democracies of the World, Unite''', *The American Interest* 2, no. 3 (2007): 5-15,accessed April 28, 2011, http://www.theamerican-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=220.

Princeton Project, 2006. *"Forging a World of Liberty under Law: U.S. National Security in the 21st Century",* Final Paper of the Princeton Project on National Security (G. John Ikenberry and Ann-Marie Slaughter, Co-Directors) http://www.princeton.edu/~ppns/report/FinalReport.pdf

Jones, 2007. James Jones, "Stronger Political Structures for NATO", *Freedom and Union* 2, no.1 (2007):10-11.

Naumann et al., 2007. Klaus Naumann et al., *"Towards a Grand Strategy for an Uncertain World – Renewing Transatlantic Partnership",* 2007, http://www.worldsecuritynetwork.com/documents/3eproefGrandStrat(b).pdf

Aznar, 2006. Jose Maria Aznar, "*NATO: An Alliance for Freedom*", RUSI 151, no.4 (2006).

Rasmussen, 2016. Anders Fogh Rasmussen, "The Will to Lead: America's Indispensable Role in the Global Fight for Freedom" (Broadside Books, New York, 2016)

Daalder and Goldgeier, 2006. Ivo Daalder and James Goldgeier, "Global NATO", *Foreign Affairs* 85, 5,105 (2006)

Contributor

A/Prof Christopher John Hamer

Attachment

'Next Steps for NATO'

Next Steps for NATO

Chris Hamer

████████████████████████████████

████████████████████████████████████

Abstract

Since the fall of the Soviet Union, NATO has been taking on a global role as the security and peacekeeping arm of its members. We argue that NATO should now take further steps along this path, to become a world security community including democratic nations from around the globe. Such a community could work in tandem with the United Nations to maintain international security, and could eventually lead to a more effective system of democratic global governance, capable of ensuring world peace.

1. Introduction

With the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, NATO lost its original role as bulwark of Western Europe against a possible Soviet attack. Since then it has been slowly developing a new role, remaining as an umbrella organization for the defence of the Atlantic democracies, but now also acting as their "out of area" security and peacekeeping arm, first in Bosnia, then in Afghanistan and Libya. We will contend in this paper that this trend should be taken further, and that NATO should become a global organization, a *world security community of democratic nations*.

A number of Eastern European countries have recently joined NATO, which now has 28 members. This puts the old consensus model of decision-making under great strain. At his parting session with the Atlantic Council in 2007, General James Jones, the outgoing Supreme Allied Commander-Europe, called for a stronger political structure for NATO[1] : "Sooner or later, NATO will have to address whether you want 350 committees all acting on the rule of consensus," he said. "What's the logic of one or two countries being able to block action by the remaining 24 members? Why not have a system where they can just opt out?"

Shortly afterwards, a group of five very distinguished military men put forward a '*Grand Strategy*' for renewing NATO, echoing General Jones' call.[2] They were all former chiefs of staff in their respective countries (the US, Britain, France, Germany and Holland), headed by General John Shalikashvili of the US. Among many other suggestions, they demanded a shift in NATO decision-making from consensus to majority voting, and the abolition of national caveats in operational matters. This change alone would transform NATO from a mere alliance into a genuine Community.

Along with new members, many countries further afield have become NATO "Partners", including even Russia itself. It is therefore not a huge step to envision expanding NATO membership to democracies outside the traditional boundaries of Europe and North America. Former Spanish Prime Minister Aznar advocated just such an expansion[3]. Emphasizing the new threat of Islamist terrorism, he argued that NATO should develop a new dimension of homeland security to counter it, including integration of intelligence information and security services across all the democracies. He thus concluded that stable democracies such as Israel, Japan, and Australia should be invited to join.

At the same time, Stanley Sloan argued[4] for an expanded Atlantic Community – and a new Atlantic Community Treaty – to encourage cooperation among all NATO members on non-military aspects of their security. Tiziana Stella[5] summarized the proposals for reform of NATO which were on the table at that time, including

- reform of decision-making procedures;
- enhanced common funding;
- development of a common foreign policy;
- achieving a unified view on the global role of NATO;
- increased cooperation between Atlantic and global institutions.

Many of these changes have also been called for by the NATO Parliamentary Assembly (Resolution 337), as well as by former NATO commanders. Indeed, at the Lisbon Summit in 2010, NATO members adopted a new "*vision for the Alliance for the next decade: able to defend its members against the full range of threats; capable of managing even the most challenging crises; and better able to work with other organisations and nations to promote international stability*".[6]

In recent years, NATO has been recalled towards its original purpose by the revanchist behaviour of Russia under Vladimir Putin. Russia was alarmed and suspicious when its former Soviet satellites in the Baltic states and Eastern Europe elected to join NATO after the breakup of the Soviet Union. Russia's recent annexation of the Crimea, and destabilisation of the eastern Ukraine, has in turn alarmed the Baltic states and the Eastern Europeans, fearing that they may be the next Russian targets. They have called for more concrete support from NATO as insurance against such a possibility, and indeed NATO has responded to these requests. At the Warsaw summit in 2016, NATO members agreed on steps to *"reinforce our collective defence, enhance our capabilities and strengthen our resilience."*[7] Reinforcing this theme, the former Secretary-General of NATO, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, has published a book[8] offering a bold plan for an Alliance for Democracy, a "strengthened American and European alliance, joined by like-minded liberal democracies such as Japan and Australia, to create a military, political, and economic bulwark against the forces of tyranny."

There is an obvious need, in fact, for a community based on common security, a *world security community* of democracies. The US tried for a time recently to act as 'global policeman' on its own, and has had its fingers severely burnt in most cases. It led interventions in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and Syria which cost huge amounts of money and left chaos behind them, as witness the present maelstrom in the Middle East. It is now widely recognized that the US needs to work much more closely with its democratic friends and allies. Hence the formation of a security community made up of the democracies would be a natural next step. Such a community would provide a virtually unchallengeable guarantee of security for its members, and could also provide a strong right arm for the United Nations in security and peacekeeping missions in the wider world.

In the following we will discuss a detailed proposal of this type. It is proposed that NATO should be reconstituted as a new **World Community of Democratic Nations**[9], possibly including the OECD as a second arm also.

2. Proposal and Objectives

The proposal then consists of the following basic elements:

- Refocus NATO to give it a global mission, first to guarantee the security and freedom of all its members, and then to act as their security and peacekeeping arm in the wider world, under the aegis of the UN;
- Open membership to stable democracies outside North America and Europe, e.g. Japan, South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand. Eventually membership of the Community should be opened to any stable, democratic nation, subject to suitable criteria laid down by the existing member states. In the long run, it is envisaged that the organization will become universal, as democracy spreads to the rest of the globe;
- An explicit declaration should be made that the new community will only intervene forcibly in external states if authorized to do so by the UN Security Council, in accordance with international law;
- Alter the dysfunctional decision-making system within NATO, preferably at all levels, to a 'qualified-majority voting with opt-out' system, as advocated by senior military men.[1,2] To avoid indecision and deadlock, decisions on functional matters within the agreed competence of the organization should be made by some form of qualified-majority voting (perhaps with an opt-out clause) – unlike the consensus which is customarily required in NATO today. A theoretical voting system is known as the Penrose voting system or the 'Jagiellonian compromise'[10], which is very similar to the scheme used by the European Union under the Treaty of Nice.[11] This would transform the alliance into a '*security community*', which might be named the *World Community of Democratic Nations.*
- Channel funds to foster development in the more backward member states under the principle of "solidarity" established by the European Union. This would promote a feeling of community among the member states, and provide a strong incentive for new states to join in. This function could perhaps be

undertaken by adding in the OECD, which has a very similar membership, as a second arm of the community.

- Restructure the organization with prototype organs of democratic governance, following again the pattern established by the European Union:
    - A North Atlantic Council already exists, representing the member states. Instead of consensus decision-making, it should adopt a 'qualified majority' voting system, as used in the European Council of Ministers for instance.
    - A NATO Parliamentary Assembly already exists, as the prototype for a democratic chamber, but its official recognition is low;
    - A Court needs to be established, to settle differences over the interpretation of the founding treaty, and settle disputes between the member states on the basis of international law. This would form the embryo of an eventual legal system;
    - A bureaucracy in Brussels already exists, headed by the Secretary-General, and the regular budget of NATO is about $6 billion per annum – already larger than the UN core budget.

Much as for NATO and the OECD at present, the aims of the Community would include[12]

- to guarantee the security of each member state against external attack;
- to undertake security and peacekeeping operations for its members, under the aegis of the UN;
- to promote mutual economic development;
- to provide a framework which could be used for coordinated action on other common issues, such as global financial stability or global warming;
- More broadly, to serve the common global and diplomatic interests of its members.

Such an association would be much more flexible than the UN, able to change and grow through successive treaties, and could indeed form the nucleus for an eventual system of democratic global governance.

3. Advantages

Let us look at the advantages of this scheme from several different points of view.

a. NATO

Advantages of the scheme from the point of view of NATO members include

- It would provide a virtually ironclad guarantee against external attack for its members
- It would enable them to share the responsibility, and pool their resources, in carrying out peacekeeping and security operations

- It would cure the dysfunctional decision-making procedure within NATO at present
- It would provide a new legal framework for settling international disputes between members
- It would give NATO and the OECD an extended and hugely important mission for the future

c. UN

Acting in tandem with the UN, the new Community could bring crucial advantages

- Acting strictly at the behest of the Security Council, the Community would provide a powerful means of enforcement for the resolutions of the Council. It could play a role very like that originally envisaged for a standing security force under Article 47 of the UN Charter. It would only intervene in an external state if authorized to do so by the Council; but conversely, like its member states, it would be obliged to lend support to any security enforcement actions which were in fact mandated by the Security Council, under article 43 of the Charter. It would thus provide a strong right arm to back up any security actions of the UN.
- Furthermore, the new Community could quite easily set up rapid reaction units to carry out the role advocated for UNEPS, the proposed UN Emergency Peace Service. It could and should also set up mechanisms to reconstruct failed states after conflict, perhaps a Reconciliation and Reconstruction Commission, following the outstanding example of the Marshall Plan after World War II. This would give NATO a very positive role to play in healing the wounds created by armed conflict, something conspicuously absent after the recent overthrow of regimes in Iraq and Libya. President Obama himself has expressed regret at being unable to put "boots on the ground" to restore order and stable government after the overthrow of Muammar Gaddafi in Libya.[13] Such developments would be in full accord with the role of the new Peacebuilding Commission at the UN.

Thus the UN and the Community together would make up a vastly strengthened and more effective system of common security and international governance.

a. OECD

The OECD is now 50 years old. It began life as the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), established in 1947 to implement the Marshall Plan for the reconstruction of Europe after World War II. In 1961 it was reborn as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the US and Canada as members along with the Europeans. New entries have since raised the membership to 34 countries (see Table 1). Russia is now negotiating to become a member.

The current mission of the OECD is to promote policies to improve the economic and social well-being of its members and global society as a whole. It provides a forum where members can discuss common problems, and produces statistics, analyses and forecasts of trends in trade and investment, and recommends policies on the basis of these forecasts. Nevertheless, its importance has diminished since the glory days of the Marshall Plan.

By taking charge of structural adjustment funds being channelled to the less developed members of the Community, the OECD would gain a new function of major importance, very similar to its original role under the Marshall Plan.

d. USA

One of the Republican contenders for the U.S. Presidency in 2008, John McCain, caused quite a stir when he proposed the formation of a '*League of Democracies'* in order to build an enduring peace based on freedom.[14] "We Americans must be willing to listen to the collective will of our democratic allies," he said. On the Democratic side, Ivo Daalder, formerly the U.S. Permanent Representative on the Council of NATO, together with James Lindsay proposed a '*Concert of Democracies'* in order to form an "international institution capable of prompt and effective action both to prevent, and where necessary respond to threats to international security."[15]

The idea of a Concert of Democracies was also promoted in an authoritative, bipartisan report from the Princeton Project on National Security[16], *"Forging a World of Liberty under Law"* in 2006. So it seems there could be support for such ideas from both sides of politics in the U.S.[17] The Obama administration has been anxious to strengthen multilateral institutions and seek more cooperation with America's friends and allies.

Even in the later days of the Bush administration there were moves in this direction. "Unilateralism is out, effective multilateralism is in," said David Fried, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs.[18] "The hope is to see NATO as the core of a global security community," according to Victoria Nuland, U.S. Ambassador to NATO at the time.[19] The idea of a 'global NATO' was also advocated in a paper by Daalder and Goldgeier [20] in 2006. Noting its expanded global role, they declared that "NATOs next move must be to open its membership to any democratic state in the world". They argued that NATO "would become a more capable and legitimate adjunct to the UN by helping to implement and enforce its decisions".

Thus the main advantage for the US would be the opportunity to share with its partners the burden and responsibility of acting as 'global policeman', which no single nation has the right to assume in any case. In these times of financial stringency, the cost is a major consideration. In recent years, the astronomical cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, plus an expenditure on armaments about half that of the rest of the world put together, has taken a heavy toll on the US budget, so

that the national debt now stands around 100% of GDP. Action to cut costs needs to be taken urgently, and sharing more of the security burden would help enormously. A move towards shared responsibility and collective security is clearly the right thing to do in any case.

The fact that spokesmen on both sides of US politics have advocated similar ideas indicates that a scheme of this sort should have a good chance of acceptance in the US, and if the US leads the way, the other member states of NATO and the OECD are very likely to follow.

e. Europe

Europeans have already had long experience with transnational cooperation through the EU. The Chancellor of Germany, Angela Merkel, is very much in favour of multilateral cooperation, as is the President of France, Francois Hollande. An ex-Prime Minister of France, Edouard Balladur, has gone so far as to suggest a full union between the USA and Europe to deal with the full range of global foreign policy issues.[21] More recently, Anders Fogh Rasmussen has proposed an *'Alliance for Democracy'* with almost identical objectives to ours.[8]

Despite this, the Europeans were apparently very wary of the idea of a 'global NATO', being fearful of being dragged into neo-imperialist adventures under the dominance of the United States. Indeed, Daalder and Goldgeier had argued[20] that "If, as in the case of Kosovo in 1999, the UN is unwilling to authorize action against a threat to international peace and security, NATO might have to act anyway." This could be seen as contravening international law, and for these reasons the League/Concert idea was pronounced "dead in the water" at that time.[22]

These fears would be answered by an explicit declaration that the new Community would never use force to intervene in an external state unless authorized to do so by the Security Council, or else if it was itself under external attack. Furthermore, under a qualified majority voting scheme the US would have the largest voice, but by no means a dominant voice, in the councils of the Community. The introduction of qualified majority voting would give the Europeans a full voice in the decisions of the Community.

Very recently, debate has been revived in Europe as to whether a European army should be set up. Jean-Claude Juncker, the President of the European Commission, called for the EU to create a "common military force", including a command headquarters in Brussels. "We have to take responsibility for protecting ourselves and the European way of life", he said.[23] Britain has always been firmly opposed to this idea, but now that the Brexit vote has taken place, this impediment has been removed. The Eastern Europeans are also opposed, being more concerned that the Atlantic alliance, i.e. NATO, should reinforce its presence in the East as bulwark

against the perceived Russian threat. NATO has indeed agreed to station four battalions in the Baltic states and Eastern Poland.[24]

Establishment of the Community would probably settle this long-running debate as to whether Europe should build up its own armed forces for external defence, or rely on NATO. Europe would be able to rely on the strengthened Community for its external defence, and thereby save a considerable amount of money.

f. Russia and China

During the Cold War, the USSR looked on NATO with fear and suspicion, regarding it as a tool of the Western democracies and a threat to its very existence. Russia evidently continues to hold that viewpoint today. But if the new Community could only intervene militarily when authorized by the Security Council to do so, then Russia would effectively have a veto over Community operations in the outside world. This should allay any Russian fears, especially when combined with the promise that they could eventually earn entry into the Community themselves. The only remaining areas of contention would be the former satellites such as Ukraine, regarded by Russia as within their 'sphere of influence'. We can only hope that this issue can eventually be settled by peaceful means.

Similar remarks would apply to China, albeit to a lesser extent

g. Australia

Australia provides an example of a nation which might become a new member of such a global community. Australia's security is already guaranteed, effectively, by the ANZUS alliance with the US. Australian military leaders tend to recoil with horror at the suggestion that Australia should join NATO, presumably because of the dysfunctional decision-making system there. This would hopefully be cured by a qualified majority voting system.

Australia is already a NATO Partner in any case, and has contributed the largest non-NATO contingent of troops in Afghanistan. Full membership in the Community would give Australia a voice at the 'top table', and allow it to play a significant part in the emerging system of democratic international governance.

As with the Europeans, there are fears within Australia of being dragged into neo-imperialist adventures at the chariot wheels of the US. This is exemplified by the recent book *'Dangerous Allies'* from ex-prime minister Malcolm Fraser, which calls for Australia to pull back from the US alliance and take a more independent stance.[25] Adherence to the new Community would solve this problem, and allow Australia to participate in a more constructive and forward-looking system of collective security.

h. Atlanticists

In his book *Union Now*, Clarence Streit[26] advocated a full federal union of democracies in 1939 in order to combat the threat of fascism. The movement he began – originally called Federal Union, Inc., and later the Association to Unite the Democracies (AUD) – continued the campaign after WWII as a means to combat Communism. In 1949, an Atlantic Union Committee was set up to promote these ideas, including prominent figures such as Owen Roberts, a former Justice of the Supreme Court, and William Clayton, a former Under-Secretary of State and architect of the Marshall Plan. In the final postwar edition of Streit's book, he continued to advocate a union of democracies as a first step towards an eventual world federation:

"This Union would be designed

> a. To provide effective common government in our democratic world in those fields where such common government will clearly serve man's freedom better than separate governments,
> b. To maintain independent national governments in all other fields where such government will best serve man's freedom, and
> c. To create by its constitution a nucleus world government capable of growing into universal world government peacefully and as rapidly as such growth will best serve man's freedom."[26]

The Streit Council continues to advocate a union of democratic nations today.

Seventy years later, we are still waiting for Streit's dream to be accomplished. A full union of democracies including North America, Europe and possibly others is an enormous project, and it is not going to be achieved in a single giant bound.

 The Europeans, however, have meanwhile succeeded in their quest for a union of European nations. After World War II, European leaders such as Jean Monnet, Robert Schuman, Konrad Adenauer, Alcide De Gasperi and Paul-Henri Spaak, with their many collaborators, determined to put an end to the long series of terrible wars on that continent by integrating the nations. They proceeded in a step-by-step fashion, starting with the original 'Six', and proceeding through a series of treaties to build first the European Coal and Steel Community, then the European Economic Community, and finally the present European Union, which now embraces twenty-eight nation-states and nearly 500 million inhabitants. The EU is going through some severe trials and tribulations at the present time, but the great original objective is now secure. There will never again be a war between France and Germany.

This example shows us how a union of sovereign nations may indeed be accomplished, following a step-by-step, evolutionary process, and starting from a smaller core group of "progressive" nations. Hence we suggest that the first step towards a full union of democracies should be a looser *community* of democracies on the European model. A very similar notion was advocated many years ago by the distinguished political scientist Karl Deutsch and his collaborators in a well-known

book[27] *"Political Community and the North Atlantic Area"* (1957). More recently, James Huntley published an article[28] in *'Freedom and Union'* arguing for a Community of Democracies as a preliminary step towards a Union, along very similar lines to ours. There is no reason in today's world why the membership should be restricted to the Atlantic area, and the membership could include democracies from around the world, including, for example, Japan, South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand.

Creation of a world security community of democracies would be a sensible first step towards an eventual union of democracies, following the evolutionary strategy of the Europeans.

i. World Federalists

World federalists generally agree on the need for a global parliament, recognizing that global problems require global solutions. Issues such as world peace, climate change and preservation of the global environment, or the fight against poverty, disease and starvation in the Third World, can only be resolved by all nations acting together. Such issues demand a better system of global governance than we presently have, and ideally a global parliament.

The more difficult question is, again, how do we get there from here? World federalists have been grappling with this problem ever since World War II. Uniting seven billion people in two hundred countries – each jealous of its sovereignty – is an enormous task. Like climbing Mount Everest, it will not be achieved in a single giant bound. We will only get there gradually, through a series of base camps.

The realist Hans Morgenthau, for instance, wrote[29] in 1948 that: "The argument of the advocates of the world state is unanswerable. There can be no permanent international peace without a state coextensive with the confines of the political world." He argues, however, that such a world state is simply not feasible: "No society exists coextensive with the presumed range of a world state. The nation is the recipient of man's highest secular loyalties. Beyond it there are other nations, but no community for which man would be willing to act regardless of what he understands the interests of his own nation to be. In other words, the people of the world are not ready to accept world government, and their overriding loyalty to their own nation erects an insurmountable obstacle to its establishment." Times have changed since Morgenthau wrote these lines at the beginning of the Cold War, but nevertheless he correctly identifies the major roadblock to a world government.

The Europeans have shown that the obstacle of national sovereignty is not in fact insuperable, if one adopts an evolutionary strategy as outlined above. Similarly, at the world level, we could start with an association with strictly limited aims linking some of the more progressive nations – e.g., the democracies – and then build from

there, progressively expanding functions, developing institutions, and including more members, until a democratic global parliament is eventually achieved.

Many among the Atlantic movement do not accept the arguments for world federation, or believe that such a target is unachievable in today's world. But I would argue that the easiest route towards both objectives, a union of democracies on the one hand and/or a world federation on the other, lies through the same intermediate stage, a community of democracies. So both movements can support each other as "fellow travellers", at least as far as this stage in the process. They need not agree on what happens beyond that point.

4. Possible Problems

a. Polarization of the international community

Non-member states of the new Community may feel excluded, and suspicious of the motives behind it. If the Community interfered in their affairs, they would feel resentful, and would tend to regard the Community as an "enemy", creating a split between "us" and "them". Such a polarization of the international community should be avoided at all costs.

Thus it would be important to make overtures to non-members, as the far-seeing Harmel Report recommended for NATO many years ago. It should be emphasized that membership of the Community is open to all countries, provided only that they satisfy suitable criteria for democratic governance and peaceful relations with their neighbours.

Furthermore, the Community should guarantee never to undertake a military intervention in a non-member country, unless authorized to do so by the Security Council of the UN. That would even give Russia and China a veto over the external interventions of the Community. But in fact such a policy is obligatory under international law, as laid down in the UN Charter (Articles 2 & 42). It would also allay fears in Russia and China that the new Community was aimed against them.

This would be a somewhat contentious issue in some quarters in the US, for instance, because it would place restrictions on the role the Community could play in serving US interests. One of the arguments John McCain used in his proposal for a League of Democracies, for instance, was that "it could act where the UN fails to act".[14] But a large international organisation such as the proposed Community could not be seen to flout international law, and indeed it should do everything possible to strengthen and reinforce international law. Thus NATO was quite correct to refuse to play any role in the invasion of Iraq, for instance.

Finally, significant economic inducements should be offered to new members to join the Community. The European Union has shown the way to achieve this. Substantial amounts of 'structural adjustment' funds should be channelled through the OECD

arm of the Community towards the less developed member states, to bring their standard of living up to par with other members under the principle of *'solidarity'*. The non-member states would then be motivated to join up in order to access these funds.

b. Conflict with the role of the UN

A related problem is that the Community might be seen as competing with the role of the UN, in that both would be global security organizations. It will be vitally important to demonstrate that the Community would function in a manner complementary to the UN, rather than competing with it. Again, the Community should only intervene in a non-member state at the behest of the Security Council. The forces at the Community's disposal would then provide powerful reinforcement to the decisions of the Security Council. In fact, they would effectively supply the place of the standing armed forces originally envisaged for the UN under Article 47 of the Charter.

Another objection that might be raised is that these provisions leave NATO hamstrung and powerless to act in conflicts where the Security Council fails to authorize intervention (e.g. Vietnam or Syria), just like the United Nations itself. But that is simply a consequence of the imperfect state of international law at the present time. The gap would slowly be filled as more states qualify to join the new NATO themselves.

Furthermore, it would be no great step for the new Community to set up rapid reaction units to fill the role suggested for UNEPS, the United Nations Emergency Peace Service, which has been advocated by numerous NGOs for some time. The Community could quite easily fill this role in an effective manner. It might also set up a Reconstruction and Reconciliation Commission to help restore stable governance to failed states following a UN intervention, complementing the new Peacebuilding Commission recently established at the UN.

In summary, far from conflicting with the role of the UN, the new Community would fit in very neatly as the Security Council's strong right arm.

c. Forcing 'Western' values on other cultures

It might be charged that requiring democracy of new members is tantamount to forcing Western ideas of government onto what is meant to be a global community. But that is not a sustainable argument. Government "of the people, by the people, for the people" is a universal concept, not a purely Western one, and the thriving democracies in Japan and India are outstanding examples of this. As more non-Western members join the Community, these fears should quickly be allayed.

d. Mismatch between memberships of NATO & OECD

This problem would arise if the OECD were included as a second arm of the Community, as suggested above. It should not be a major difficulty.

The countries who are members of NATO and the OECD are compared in Table I. There is a large overlap between them: Some 22 countries are members of both organizations. There are 6 countries which are members of NATO but not the OECD, namely Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Romania. On the other hand, there are 12 countries which are members of the OECD but not NATO, namely Australia, Austria, Chile, Finland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Sweden and Switzerland.

If both organizations were linked together as components of a Community under a common Supreme Council, the question immediately arises whether all members of one organization should automatically become members of the other organization? A little thought shows otherwise.

Several members of the OECD are neutrals, including Austria, Ireland, Sweden, Finland and Switzerland. Japan has a well-known clause in its Constitution forbidding the formation of armed forces. These countries may well not want to join NATO - or on the other hand, they might be happy to join a new global security community guaranteeing the security of all in common. It appears that Sweden and Finland are even now considering whether to join NATO.[30]

Australia and New Zealand, by contrast, are not now members because they lie outside the North Atlantic area. They are Partner members of NATO, however, and have participated in recent NATO operations. Australia, for instance, supplied the largest contingent of non-NATO troops in the recent conflict in Afghanistan. They would be natural candidates to join the new 'globalized' NATO, and may well wish to do so.

Israel is a more contentious case. Since the Community would be guaranteeing the security of its member states, it would not want to be instantly embroiled in the middle-East conflict. It might be argued that Israel should settle the Palestinian question, in a manner which satisfies the reasonable aspirations of both Israelis and Palestinians, before it is allowed to join.

Thus it appears that new members of both NATO and the OECD should only be admitted on a case-by-case basis, as at present. If funds were channelled through the OECD for structural development of the less developed members, it would certainly be a strong incentive for all members to join the OECD, at least. As mentioned previously, it would also provide a strong inducement for new members to join the Community as a whole.

The further question then arises, how could the Supreme Council operate, if some members belong to NATO, for instance, and others do not? This could be handled easily enough. If the Supreme Council was discussing matters concerning NATO,

then non-member countries would simply not be given a vote on the matter at hand. They might be excluded from the discussions entirely, or else they might be present as observers, but would not be entitled to cast a vote on that specific matter. This might cause some bureaucratic difficulties – but that is what bureaucrats are for!

5. Conclusions

The new Community would bring many benefits. It would cure some of the major problems within the present NATO system. It would also produce a powerful new global security community, which acting in tandem with the Security Council would be a strong force for peace and freedom in the world.

Spokesmen on both sides of politics in the US have put forward similar schemes, so there is a good chance that a plan of this sort would be acceptable to the USA. The Europeans would most likely be happy to follow, and so the proposal should have a good chance of being implemented.

If the Community is open to new members, subject to suitable criteria of democracy and peaceful relations with their neighbours, then one can envisage many new members joining up, attracted by the prospect of new structural adjustment funds coming their way. The membership could soon include the majority of the world's nations, as more countries become democratic. Eventually, one may hope that membership in the Community would become universal. About two new countries became 'fully free' every year over a period from 1976 to 2003, according to Freedom House[31], although the number has stagnated since then. If this trend were to be resumed, we could look for all the world's nations to become democratic in about fifty years.

With the addition of a Court, and the adoption of qualified majority voting, the association would become a community on the European model. It would provide a convenient forum for discussion and the making of common policy on matters beyond the security sphere, including trade, finance and the environment. In time to come, one can envisage the Community evolving into a full-blown system of democratic global governance. It would be a natural first step towards an eventual global parliament.

In summary, a Community along these lines promises to be a beacon of hope for the future. It would represent a long step along the road towards a new system of democratic global governance, and a free, prosperous and peaceful world.

Acknowledgments

Table I. *A list of member countries belonging to NATO and the OECD. Membership is indicated by a cross.*

Country	NATO	OECD
Albania	X	
Australia		X
Austria	(neutral)	X
Belgium	X	X
Bulgaria	X	
Canada	X	X
Croatia	X	
Chile		X
Czech Republic	X	X
Denmark	X	X
Estonia	X	X
Finland	(neutral)	X
France	X	X
Germany	X	X
Greece	X	X
Hungary	X	X
Iceland	X	X
Ireland	(neutral)	X
Israel		X
Italy	X	X
Japan	(neutral)	X
Latvia	X	
Lithuania	X	
Korea		X
Luxembourg	X	X
Mexico		X
Netherlands	X	X
New Zealand		X
Norway	X	X
Poland	X	X
Portugal	X	X
Romania	X	
Slovak Republic	X	X
Slovenia	X	X
Spain	X	X
Sweden	(neutral)	X
Switzerland	(neutral)	X
Turkey	X	X
United Kingdom	X	X
United States	X	X
Totals	**28**	**34**

Notes and References

1. James Jones, "Stronger Political Structures for NATO", *Freedom and Union* 2, no.1 (2007):10-11.
2. Klaus Naumann et al., "Towards a Grand Strategy for an Uncertain World – Renewing Transatlantic Partnership", 2007, http://www.worldsecuritynetwork.com/documents/3eproefGrandStrat(b).pdf
3. Jose Maria Aznar, "NATO: An Alliance for Freedom", RUSI 151, no.4 (2006),
4. Stanley Sloan. "Taking the Atlantic Community beyond NATO Transformation." *Freedom and Union* 1, no.2 (2006): 6. http://www.rusi.org/go.php?structureID=articles_journal&ref=A44DCA72D99D0C. Stanley R. Sloan, "Permanent Alliance? NATO and the Transatlantic Bargain from Truman to Obama" (New York, Bloomberg Academic, 2010)
5. Tiziana Stella, "Global Threats, Atlantic Structures." *Freedom & Union* 1, no.2 (2006): 9-15.
6. Lisbon Summit Declaration (2010) http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_68828.htm
7. Warsaw Summit Communique (2016) http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_133169.htm
8. Anders Fogh Rasmussen, "The Will to Lead: America's Indispensable Role in the Global Fight for Freedom" (Broadside Books, New York, 2016)
9. A 'Community of Democracies' already exists, but its purpose is merely to promote the concept of democracy itself, and it does not fill the role we envisage here.
10. L.S. Penrose, 'The Elementary Statistics of Majority Voting', Journal of the Royal Statistical Society 109, 53 (1946); W. Slomczynski and K. Zyczkowski, 'Penrose Voting System and Optimal Quota', Acta Physica Polonica B37, 3133 (2006); 'Voting in the European Union: The Square Root System of Penrose and a Critical Point', Acta Physica Polonica B37, 3133 (2006).
11. Voting would no doubt be an evolutionary adaptation, as it was in the EU, with consensus remaining the usual *modus operandi* for years and voting used as a last resort when consensus seems unduly blocked. Experience from EU history shows that simply having this option legally in reserve, even if rarely used, serves to make it easier to reach prompt consensus decisions that have real substance; it puts obstructionists on notice that they could lose their chance to bargain for realistic compromises if they do not use it.
12. The first three of these goals are in the NATO Treaty, Articles II, IV, and V. The last three are permissible under the Treaty but not mandated. The fourth and fifth have been taken up gradually by NATO since 1991. The last in principle already exists, broadening NATO from a security alliance into a general purpose diplomatic community; it was embraced by NATO in the 1990s. NATO's limitations have never been for want of sufficient goals, but for want sometimes of sufficient instruments and procedures to carry them out. In the 1950s NATO appointed a committee of three 'Wise Men' to develop means of implementing its goals of closer political and economic cooperation. While their report was officially adopted by NATO

by consensus, only some portions of it were put into practice. The economic implementation was deliberately left to a separate organization, the OECD, Formed at the beginning of the 1960s as the successor to the implementing structures of the Marshall Plan; the OECD was able to include neutral European democracies, and bring in four Pacific allies: Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and South Korea. The Atlantic world thereby took on a dual, split-level identity: the Atlantic-only level and the Atlantic-Pacific level, or 'Atlanticism' and 'Trilateralism'.

13. BBC Documentary, "Obama: Eight Years in Power" (2016) http://www.sbs.com.au/ondemand/program/obama-eight-years-of-power#!

14. John McCain. "McCain Remarks", Hoover Institution (speech, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, May 1, 2007), accessed April 28, 2010, http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/McCain_05-01-07.pdf.

15. Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay, ''Democracies of the World, Unite''', *The American Interest* 2, no. 3 (2007): 5-15,accessed April 28, 2011, http://www.theamerican-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=220.

16. *"Forging a World of Liberty under Law: U.S. National Security in the 21st Century",* Final Paper of the Princeton Project on National Security (G. John Ikenberry and Ann-Marie Slaughter, Co-Directors) *http://www.princeton.edu/~ppns/report/FinalReport.pdf*

17. It might be thought that the U.S. Congress would be against voting in NATO as a threat to national sovereignty. However, this has not been the case. When approving the previous round of expansion of NATO membership, Congress adopted a resolution calling for exploration of moving away from consensus in NATO. The resolution was watered down to mere exploration, because the State Department opposed the resolution and felt the consensus system was working well. To be sure, there would undoubtedly be an opt out provision, so the issue is one of pooling only a small part of sovereignty -- probably less than the other members pool already in the NATO Integrated Command -- yet an important part of it, as it lies in the military and foreign policy sphere. Apparently Americans do not have the same hyper-sensitivity about loss of sovereignty when it comes to NATO, a grouping of fellow advanced democracies, as when it comes to UN-level institutions.

18. Quoted by Vince Crawley, "State's Fried Says NATO Not Counterweight' to United Nations,' *U.S. Department of State International Information Programs,* May 3, 2006. http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/news/2006/05/mil-060503-usia02.htm.

19. Quoted by Frederick Kempe, "NATO, Israel Draw Closer," *The Wall Street Journal*, February 14, 2006, accessed: April 29, 2011, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB113987680406772930.html?mod=world_news_featured_articles</a%3E.

20. Ivo Daalder and James Goldgeier, "Global NATO", *Foreign Affairs* 85, 5,105 (2006)

21. His main immediate proposal is to upgrade U.S.-EU summits into a U.S.-EU Council; at the same time he advocates reform of NATO and specification of rules for using NATO resources without consensus among

the allies. See: Edouard Balladur. "*Pour une Union occidentale entre l'Europe et les Etats-Unis"* (Paris: Fayard, 2007).

22. T.J. Piccone, "Democracies: In a League of their Own?", Brookings Institution Policy Paper Number 8, October 2008.

23. Jean-Claude Juncker, "We need a European army", 9 March 2016, http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-31796337

24. Jens Stoltenberg, announcement June 13, 2016. http://www.rferl.org/a/nato-baltics-poland-russia-ukraine-battalions/27795258.html

25. Cain Roberts and Malcolm Fraser, "Dangerous Allies" (Melbourne University Publishing, 2014)

26. Clarence K. Streit, "Union Now: A Proposal for an Atlantic Federal Union of the Free" (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1939). See also the postwar limited edition printed by Federal Union, Inc. (1949).

27. Karl Deutsch et al., "Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience" (Princeton University Press, 1957)

28. James Huntley, "The Democratic Peace," *Freedom and Union* 4, no.2 (2010): 11-19.

29. Hans Morgenthau, "Politics Among Nations" (5th edition) (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1973)

30. Reuters news report, June 16, 2016. http://www.reuters.com/article/us-nato-summit-nordics-idUSKCN0ZO1EO

31. '*Freedom in the World'*, annual report published by Freedom House, http://www.freedomhouse.org/reports