



Citizens for  
Global Solutions

MINNESOTA

www.globalsolutionsmn.org

Newsletter  
January 2011

#### OUR VISION:

*We envision a future in which countries work together to abolish war, protect our rights and freedoms, and solve the problems facing humanity that no country can solve alone. This vision requires effective democratic global institutions that will apply the rule of law while respecting the diversity and autonomy of national and local communities.*

#### OUR MISSION:

*We are a membership organization working to build political will in the United States to achieve our vision. We do this by educating Americans about our global interdependence, communicating global concerns to public officials, and developing proposals to create, reform and strengthen international institutions such as the United Nations.*

## Review of James T. Ranney WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW: RE-THINKING AN OLD THEORY Joe Schwartzberg

*N.b.* Although Jim Ranney's 104-page essay, reviewed below, has yet to be published, I believe the review will, nevertheless, be of interest to many of our readers. Those who wish to read Ranney's work in full may do so by requesting an Internet version from the author by e-mail to [jamestranney@comcast.net](mailto:jamestranney@comcast.net).

Well-researched, meticulously documented, insightful, judiciously balanced (within its limited purview) and engagingly written, Jim Ranney's *World Peace through Law* provides a detailed and fascinating review of modern attempts to address the problem of attaining an enduring world peace and suggests various ways by which the world can and might move ever closer toward that goal. Though Ranney would certainly not oppose the establishment of a democratic world government—whether or not federal in nature—he does not see a full-blown world government, or even a purely advisory World Parliamentary Assembly, as a necessary precursor of world peace. A lawful system, he argues, can exist without the existence of an overarching governmental authority. Rather, he subscribes to the reasoning of Nuremberg war crimes prosecutor, Ben Ferencz, who has asserted that the *sine qua non* for a peaceful world are the following: “laws to define what is permissible and impermissible, . . . courts to settle disputes amicably or to hold wrongdoers accountable . . . [and] a system of effective enforcement.”

Much of the pleasure in reading Ranney's up-beat and encouraging monograph lies in savoring the documentation of his arguments through the writings and speeches of prominent thinkers (including the skeptics) on the subject of world peace and in discovering aspects of their thought that have, in many instances, been all but forgotten. Take, for example, Teddy Roosevelt. Despite his having won a Nobel Peace Prize in 1905 for mediating an end to the Russo-Japanese War, TR is better remembered for his dictum, “Speak softly, but carry a big stick,” than as a would-be universal peacemaker. Yet in his Nobel acceptance speech (which Ranney quotes at length), he showed a profound understanding of what world peace would require.

Curiously, the trail of thought followed by Ranney begins only with the Englishman, Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and is totally Eurocentric (if one takes the position that American philosophical thought is essentially an extension of that of the Europe). The relevant teachings of Judaism, early Christianity and Islam are totally ignored and there is not a single mention of the thinking on peace under law deriving from the

religious traditions of India or from the Confucian cultural realm. One wonders whether Ranney is aware of the ancient Indian emperor, Ashoka, a convert to Buddhism, who not only foreswore war, but had rock edicts and engraved pillars placed throughout his vast realm to proclaim the *dharma* (Buddhist law), and who sent missionaries as far afield as Rome and what are now Mongolia and Indonesia to promote law and peace.

All in all, Ranney strikes an optimistic chord. I agree with most of his analysis. He believes that China, much of the Islamic world and other areas currently out of step with Western liberal political thought will, sooner than we think possible, come to recognize its value and join in future world peace initiatives. I also was pleased to note his emphasis on civic education, international exchanges and tourism as vehicles for creating a new cosmopolitan global ethos. One of his recommendations—with which I strongly concur—is that the world needs to establish a system of compulsory mediation or arbitration of international disputes before they escalate to the point of violence, and also to establish the means for enforcing appropriately made decisions.

That's a tall order, but, in my view, doable. Would that Ranney had said more about how it might come about.

Much of Ranney's argument focuses on the vexed questions of enforceability and trust, the absence of which were recognized as stumbling blocks in the thinking of most of the thinkers whose writings he analyzes. These questions have become especially salient in a nuclear age; and it is the prospect of a nuclear conflagration, World War III—quite possibly bringing about an end to civilization—which Ranney sees as the greatest threat to humankind. He lauds Tad Daley's persuasive arguments in *Apocalypse Never* in support of the necessity and actual possibility of complete nuclear disarmament and a reliable inspection regime; and he suggests that once that goal is achieved the global level of threat perception will be so greatly reduced that nations will, in due course, see fit to disarm to purely defensive levels. He implies, further, that they would also shift funding away from excessive military spending to more benign social ends. But he does not go into any details on how they might do so and does not touch on the needed institutional global mechanisms for promoting such a purpose.

While I am in agreement with Ranney's and Daley's views about the potential horrors of nuclear war and the unacceptable danger of even a single act of nuclear terrorism, my own inclination is to attach even greater importance to the pressing problems of global injustice: economic, social and political. Yes, we do face the existential threat of a future nuclear Armageddon, but that problem is not even on the radar screen of the more than two billion of the world's people still living below the poverty line (an income of less than two dollars per capita per day). Nor is it likely to be a primary concern of oppressed racial, ethnic or religious minorities, who also number well into the hundreds of millions (largely

overlapping the former cohort); or of untold others who happen to live under other forms of tyranny, including tyranny based primarily on gender. These marginalized groups must cope not with some possible nuclear mishap, but with the painful exigencies of the *present*. In many parts of the world, some choose to do so through resort to terrorism or other forms of violence. If there were somehow a way to pool the latent grievances of the world's downtrodden and marshal their collective frustration, the resulting threat to civilization would, at the least, be on a par with that of a limited nuclear war. When the Marxist rallying cry, "Workers of the world unite; you have nothing to lose but your chains," was initially proclaimed in 1848, it was seen as promoting a dangerous, though probably unachievable, goal. Today, with the universal spread of the Internet, some variant of that appeal could, conceivably, pose a substantially greater threat.

Let us think a bit about the tenability of Ranney's presumption that law is the key to peace? I would certainly agree that it usually helps and that the preconditions for *international* peace set forth by Ferencz are essentially correct. But unacceptably high levels of violence, including revolutions and civil wars, most often begin *within* nations, not between them. India, a country I know rather well, has enjoyed the rule of democratically enacted law for all but thirty months out of its 63 years of independence. For most of the past decade, it has enjoyed rates of economic growth on the order of 7-8% per annum. Its overwhelmingly urban middle class has burgeoned to perhaps 250 million. Yet, the gap between the rich and the poor has never been greater and perhaps a third of the country is now wracked by Maoist ("Naxalite" in the Indian lexicon), mainly agrarian, violence. Is this situation one of "peace under the rule of law"? Similar situations exist in many other parts of our planet. But one needn't look

abroad to find analogous situations. In virtually any large American city, there is also an economic chasm between the affluent and the under-class. Many of the former feel safe only in gated communities; many of the latter are effectively imprisoned in urban slums. The law sees to the protection of the former and expends much of society's scarce resources keeping the latter in their place rather than bettering their condition. Peace prevails! But is it the sort of peace we want for our planet?

So what's the bottom line? My answer, following H.L. Mencken, is this: **"If you want peace, work for justice."** Or, to quote Martin Luther King, **"Peace is not the absence of war, but the presence of justice."** An unjust world cannot remain a peaceful world. We must devise ways to give everyone a voice. We must create a system that provides people with hope for a brighter future, if not for themselves, then at least for their children. Otherwise, many will ask, what is to be lost by resorting to violence? And violence will, all-too-often, ensue.

And what does all this say about world government? It tells me that, important though it is, eliminating the nuclear threat is not nearly enough to establish or preserve world peace. It confirms my conviction about the need for a broad-based, coordinated assault on injustice (And I haven't even yet mentioned the mounting threat of environmental injustice.) Can one reasonably anticipate that fully sovereign nations, acting on their own, will be able to marshal the will, the material resources, the finance and the talent to do the job? I think not. Let me close by asking readers to recall an old World Federalist syllogism: "Peace requires justice; justice requires law; law [i.e., law to the extent needed to establish justice] requires government. Therefore, **world peace requires world government.**"

---

## THE EARTH GARDEN

Hank Stone

**Editor's Note:** A retired engineer living near Rochester, New York, Hank Stone is a world federalist and a prolific essayist. Although we have never met, his essays frequently reach me by e-mail. What follows is excerpted from an eight-page essay that I wish I could print in full. But, if you like what you read, contact Hank at [hstone@rochester.rr.com](mailto:hstone@rochester.rr.com) and ask for the full

essay. You may also request to be put on his list-serve. J.E.S.

We live in the PROGRESS Paradigm, of scientific progress, economic growth, population growth and the promise of more of everything – forever.

I propose an entirely different paradigm: EARTH GARDEN.

In this story humankind is a family tending a garden, What are we humans here on earth to do? Garden. (cont. on page 4)

# THIRD THURSDAY GLOBAL ISSUES FORUM

Free and open to the public. Come and bring a friend.

Where? Hennepin Avenue United Methodist Church,  
511 Groveland Avenue, Minneapolis (at Lyndale and Hennepin). Park in church lot.

January 20, 7:00-9:00 p.m.

## WHAT IS HAPPENING TO AMERICAN DEMOCRACY?

This talk will analyze the deepening crisis between the American left and the right in American politics and argue for a 21<sup>st</sup> century civic populism, a “We the People” campaign to improve interactions between candidates and voters. It will argue that the people created government neither as saviors nor enemies, but as their instrument and meeting ground and that a combination of deliberation and public work with deep roots in the American civic tradition has the potential to revive government as an “us,” not an alien “them.” It will view politics as a national “public narrative” in which “citizens are the agents of our democracy.”

**Presenter: Professor HARRY BOYTE.** Founder and co-director of the Center for Democracy and Citizenship at Augsburg College, Boyte is also a senior fellow and graduate faculty member of the Humphrey Institute at the University of Minnesota. His career as an activist and scholar dates back to the 1960s when he was a Field Secretary for Martin Luther King’s Southern Christian Leadership Conference. He was a national coordinator (1993-95) for New Citizenship, a confederation of professionals working with the White House Domestic Policy Council and in this and many other capacities has tried to bridge the gap between citizens and government. A prolific writer, Boyte has authored eight books and more than a hundred scholarly articles on democracy, citizenship and community organizing and has appeared frequently on CBS’s morning and evening news and on MPR.

February 17, 7:00-9:00 p.m.

## CAN THE TAX HAVENS BE SHUT DOWN?

President Obama campaigned against the corporate use of tax havens (countries or territories where taxes are levied at low rates or not at all) and the London G-20 in early 2009 announced a new drive to end their use for personal tax evasion. But neither conventional crackdowns on haven abuse by businesses nor greater transparency to thwart individual evaders will produce satisfactory results. Completely new instruments must be used. Among the possible remedies worthy of being considered are formula apportionment of the corporate income tax base and high withholding taxes on investments from suspect territories.

**Presenter: Professor ROBERT T. KUDRLE.** A Rhodes Scholar, Kudrle holds a doctorate from Harvard University and a master of philosophy degree from Oxford University. He is currently the Freeman Professor of International Trade and Investment Policy, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota and an adjunct faculty member of the University’s Law School and its Departments of Applied Economics and Political Science. He studies industrial organization, public business policy and international economic policy. His recent research has focused largely on economic relations among industrial countries. He has served as a consultant to many U.S. and foreign regulatory and development organizations; has been vice president of the International Studies Association; and is a past co-editor of *International Studies Quarterly*.

---

### WORLD SAVVY PANEL

## Perspectives on Food and Sustainability: From Local to Global

Thursday, January 20, 6-8 p.m.  
511 Kenwood Parkway, Minneapolis  
\$10 suggested donation  
Call 612-767-4438 for more information.

Featuring discussion with:  
Jenny Breen, Good Life Catering  
Glenn Ford, Praxis Marketplace  
Julia Olmstead, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy  
Julie Siple, Minnesota Public Radio

CGS MN is a co-sponsor of this event.

(Continued from page 2) We plan the garden, work the soil, plant the seeds, water, weed, protect the crops, harvest, prepare the food, and eat the food. We raise a family. Our children help in the garden, grow up, get married, and grow their own gardens. We can create a new society, better than the one we have now, without the present problems. We can preserve the best of present society, and prosper for the indefinite future. And we can live happily through the transition. But PROGRESS will not get us there.

#### COW PUW

We will not dwell on the global problems, about which much is known, but will name six big ones. It is our human nature to drift into denial. Denial is comfortable, but if we are asleep we are irrelevant to the human future.

C is for climate change.

O is for peak oil. World production of conventional oil has already peaked.

W is for fresh water scarcity, from snow melt failure and over pumping aquifers.

P is for world population, which has doubled twice in the last 100 years.

U is for unsustainable economics. Our debt-based Capitalism can only grow or collapse.

W is for the war system of dispute settlement. In the nuclear age, war itself is unsustainable.

Our way of life assumes continuous growth for the indefinite future: PROGRESS.

Continuous growth on a finite planet is, of course, absurd. So things WILL change.

If we are to control that change, we must in some way address COW PUW. . . .

Waking up from the American dream sounds drastic. Can't we make adjustments to the status quo to address COW PUW?

We know that big jobs can be divided up so they can be handled by ordinary people. That's bureaucracy. Corporations, governments and militaries routinely do this, and achieve large-scale objectives.

**Editor's Note:** *Sorry to cut this off; but let me summarize what follows. Hank next discusses why the bureaucratic approach—rooted in the PROGRESS paradigm—can't work. "Adjustments to the Progress story," he asserts, "are the progress story." Instead, he argues, we need to listen to "Cultural Stories," to learn from others, to treat the earth as a garden in which many diverse cultures can prosper; in which the principles of Sustainability, Cooperation, Efficiency and Beauty are followed; where Recycling takes the place of growth and leads to sustainability. In closing he advises us that while we work on creating the outer Earth Garden, we can simultaneously plant an Earth Garden inside ourselves.*

#### **Citizens for Global Solutions**

(formerly the World Federalist Association)

5492 Bald Eagle Blvd. E.

White Bear Lake, MN 55110

[www.globalsolutionsmn.org](http://www.globalsolutionsmn.org)

<http://globalsolutions.org>

Infinite growth of material consumption within a finite world is an impossibility. **E. F. Schumacher**