

# **Strategies for World Federal Government: The Early Debate Revisited**

Finn Laursen

Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

Email: [finn.laursen@dal.ca](mailto:finn.laursen@dal.ca)

[www.euce.dal.ca](http://www.euce.dal.ca)

[Preliminary draft]

Paper prepared for delivery at workshop “Present Futures and Future Presents - World State Scenarios for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” at Klitgaarden, Skagen, Denmark, 23-25 June, 2010

### **Abstract**

The World Movement for World Federal Government was formed in Montreux, Switzerland, in 1947. In the following years a wide-ranging debate took place inside this International Non-Governmental Organisation (INGO). Was UN Charter revision necessarily the best approach to world federal government? Or should a more radical approach be chosen, such as the calling of a Peoples' World Convention? How would regional federations fit in with a global federal structure? What contributions could come from World Citizens' movements? Part of the debate also concerned the powers of a future world federal authority. Minimalists wanted these powers limited to security issues; maximalists wanted a world federal government that could also deal with socio-economic issues.

The focus of this paper will be the debates that took place at the annual congresses of the WMWFG from the beginning to the 1953 Congress in Copenhagen, where the UN approach gained the upper hand. It will briefly sketch the developments after the mid 1950s, where for some years *World Peace through World Law* by Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn (Harvard University Press, 1958) dominated the thinking. The paper will also mention the contributions of World Federalist Youth in the 1960s and 1970s, when the author was actively involved. The conclusions will briefly refer to some IR and regional integration literature.

## **Introduction**

Ever since the Westphalian system took its roots in Europe after the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 there have been political philosophers who have dreamt of overcoming the international system of anarchy. Various peace plans that foresaw moving towards some kind of world government were produced. They often found inspiration in confederal or federal systems, allowing for a vertical division of power (Wynner and Lloyd 1949).

Movements for world federal government started emerging between the two World Wars in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. In Europe the resistance movements during World War II often prescribed some kind of international federalism to create peace after the war, frequently with emphasis on European federalism, but some movements emerging after the war worked in parallel for European and World Federation, and some also advocated a federation of democracies, basically an Atlantic federation.

A first international conference of federalist movements was called and took place in Luxembourg in 1946. The following year in Montreux, Switzerland, the World Movement for World Federal Government (WMWFG) and the European Union of Federalists (EUF) were formed within a week of each other. During the late 1940s there was a great overlap in leadership of the two organizations. But by 1951 many leading European federalists dropped out of the WMWFG because of what they felt was too much influence of the major American

federalist organization, United World Federalists (UWF), which was a minimalist UN oriented organization.

## The World Federalist Argument<sup>1</sup>

The argument of World Federalism is that a series of global problems - especially security problems - can be solved by a restructuring of the international society according to federalist principles.

Since the Westphalian system emerged in Europe it would be natural that international federalism emerged in prescriptive theory in Europe. We might mention the names of Pierre Dubois, King Podiebrand, Emeric Cruce, Sully (Henry IV), William Penn, Abbe de Saint-Pierre, Bentham, Kant, etc. (Laursen 1970).

Kant suggested in his essay *Zum Ewigen Frieden* that the only basis on which the international society can be built is the sovereignty of law. The problem is that of introducing legal rules among nations so that human society can pass from an anarchic society to a state of civilization. The states therefore must be bound by public laws and form a state of nations which should grow until it includes all peoples on earth. If you want to protect the freedom of the component parts while assuring the authority of the society in which they are united the answer is a federative system, the only form that can create effective international order. Kant said: "The law of nations (*Völkerrecht*) should be based upon a *federalism* of free states" (from English translation in Friedrich 1948, p. 254). We find in Kant's essay some of the legal arguments that later were to be so common in the world federalist debate. Kant's federalism, however, was more of the league or confederal type . As is well-known among International Relations scholars Kant also emphasized the importance of states being Republican, a proposition that is central in the so-called democratic peace theory.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century Emery Reves put the world federalist argument this way:

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is a voyage into an earlier part of my life. I joined the Danish organization *Een Verdens Ungdom* (One World Youth) at high school in the beginning of the 1960s. In 1965 at the Congress in San Francisco I was elected Vice-Chairman of the Youth and Student Division of the World Association of World Federalists (YSD/WAWF). Two years later at the WAWF Congress in Oslo I became Chairman of the YSD, which subsequently changed its name to World Federalist Youth (WFY) in 1968. Together with a group of young political scientists and peace researchers we developed a strategy which Hideo Sato (Japan) baptized 'Dynamics for Peace.' Later I was also involved in establishing an in-house think-tank called Institute for Global Policy Studies (IGPS). I have not been actively involved in the movement since the 1980s however, so I am not up-to-date on developments. The Movement is now called the World Federalist Movement. It has its headquarters in New York and its website is: <http://www.wfm-igp.org/site/wfm-home>.

1. Wars between groups of men forming social units always take place when these units - tribes, dynasties, churches, cities, nations - exercise unrestricted sovereign power.
2. Wars between these social units cease the moment sovereign power is transferred from them to a larger unit or higher unit (Reves 1946, 104).

Whether empirically correct or not, it was a powerful argument for many people, and world federalist movements emerged in North America, Western Europe, Japan and some third world countries. Especially after the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima in August 1945 the call for world government increased. Albert Einstein was one of the physicists who called for world federal government (Nathan and Norden 1960).<sup>2</sup>

Reves argued that we all have a wrong picture of the world we live in. He compared with developments within astronomy. It took long time before a Ptolemaic geocentric view was replaced by a Copernican heliocentric view:

We are living in a geocentric world of nation-states. We look upon economic, social and political problems as “national” problems. No matter in which country we live, the centre of our political universe is our own nation (Ibid., 22).

So, “Our political and social conceptions are Ptolemaic. The world in which we live is Copernican” (Ibid. 25). A revolution in our ways of seeing the world is needed. Neither arms nor disarmament will create peace:

... there is *one* way and one way only to achieve this end [of peace]. The integration of the scattered conflicting national sovereignties into one unified, higher sovereignty, capable of creating a legal order within which all peoples may enjoy equal security, equal obligations and equal rights under law (Ibid., 108).

How then go about creating this higher sovereignty? Here Reves was a radical utopian. He did not believe in governments. He referred to the United Nations as “the Unholy Alliance stillborn in San

---

<sup>2</sup> For correctness of the proposition the distinction found in Karl Deutsch’s integration theory between ‘amalgamation’ and ‘integration’ is of course relevant. Amalgamation does not necessarily produce a ‘security community.’ Such community can exist among sovereign units (see Deutsch 1954 and 1957).

Francisco" (Ibid, p. 236). He believed in appealing to reason. But would world government follow miraculously if everybody believed in the idea? He referred to the Philadelphia Convention. The American founding fathers had concluded that

...the Articles of Confederation (based on the same principles as the United Nations Organization) could not prevent war between the states, that amendment of these articles could not solve the problem, that the Articles of Confederation had to be discarded and a *new* constitution created and adopted, establishing an over-all federal government with power to legislate, apply and execute law on individuals in the United States. That was the only remedy then and it is the only remedy now (Ibid., 242).

Impatiently he said, "There is no 'first step' toward world government. World government *is* the first step" (Ibid., p. 243). Still it was not quite clear how that *first* step could be taken.

## **The Classical World Federalists Strategies**

In 1937 the first World Federalist Government organization, the Campaign for World Government, had been formed in the United States. Associated with this event were the names of Hungarian born Rosika Schwimmer, who had worked for world federation since 1914, and Lola Maverick Lloyd. Together they had worked out a peace plan in 1924 (Wynner 1954, 21-29). Other members of the Lloyd family and Hungarian born Edith Wynner also took part from the start. The strategy was twofold:

1. The governments must immediately call a World Constitutional Convention, or
2. 'Alternative non-governmental action if governments did not act promptly' should call a Peoples' World Convention.

In 1938 the organization Federal Union was created in the UK. It worked for both European and World Federation (Haegler 1972, 137). In 1939 an organization with the same name, Federal Union, was formed in the United States. Here the thoughts developed by Clarence Streit in his book *Union Now* dominated. His idea was that the so-called free and democratic countries around the

Atlantic should join in a nucleus federation which could gradually add new members. The model of course was the American Federation which had started with 13 states (Streit 1939).

Now the strategy debate could start. Rosika Schwimmer wrote a pamphlet in 1939 exposing the dangers in Streit's plan:

He does not seem to realize that to start with a power group of nations, labeled Union of Democracies, would provoke a Union of the rest of the World in hostile opposition ... his 'nucleus method' would not result in World Union but in catastrophe (Schwimmer 1939).

After World War II World Federalists met for the first time internationally in Luxembourg in 1946. The meeting was organized by J. Keith Killby, the Secretary of the British *Federal Union*, and Henri Koch (Luxembourg), who had lived in London during the war. About 75 people from 15 countries came. Among these were Dr. Max Habicht (Switzerland), Jean Larmeroux (France), André Voisin (France), Tom O. Griessemer (USA), Lt. Col. E.M. King (UK), James Avery Joyce (UK), Henry Usborn, MP (UK), Fred S. Carney (USA) and Georgia Lloyd (USA). The debate in Luxembourg focused upon 'Europe' versus 'the World.' Many Europeans advocated both European and World Federation. Most Americans present did not see the need for a European Federation (Laursen 1972, 2-9).<sup>3</sup>

A year later in August 1947 in Montreux, Switzerland, two organizations were formed: the World Movement for World Federal Government (WMWFG) and the European Union of Federalists (EUF). At the same time a student organization, World Student Federalists (WSF) was formed (Laursen 1968-69, 1972).

In the United States in 1947 five different organizations merged to form the United World Federalists (UWF), whose first president was Cord Meyer, the author of the book *Peace or Anarchy*. UWF became the main advocate of UN Charter revision. A changed Charter should give the UN real authority to deal with security questions (Wittner 1969, Baratta 2004, Vol. 1, Chapter 12). UWF found this limited, or minimalistic, plan sufficient in opposition to so-called maximalists, who also

---

<sup>3</sup> This and the following articles I will cite were based on access to the WMWFG archives. When the office of World Federalist Youth (WFY) closed down its secretariat in Copenhagen in the late 1970s I offered to take care of these archives. I am now on the outlook for a permanent place for these, which had moved from Amsterdam to Copenhagen when the World Association of World Federalist's Secretariat there was moved to Ottawa some years earlier. I also 'inherited' the archives of the Danish world federalist organization, *Een Verden* (One World), when it merged with the UN Association in the 1970s. Most of these have now been transferred to the Danish National Archives (*Rigsarkivet*) in Copenhagen.

wanted a federal authority to deal with economic and social problems. The question of the functional scope of a future federal authority became a new dimension of the federalist debate.<sup>4</sup>

About 300 delegates and observers from 24 countries came to Montreux for the founding Congress of the WMWFG. The main issue in the political discussions was UN Charter Revision versus a Peoples' World Convention. The British Plan in Outline for a Peoples' World Convention, worked out in 1947, was presented by Henry Osborne, MP and Rev. Gordon Lang, MP (UK). Speaking in favour of the UN Charter Revision approach was, among other, Professor Reginald Lang (USA). Some, including Alexandre Marc (France) and Jean Buchmann (Belgium), spoke in favour of accepting different 'modalities.'

In the declaration adopted at the end it was stated, inter alia:

We world federalists are convinced that the establishment of a world federal government is the crucial problem of our time. Until it is solved, all other issues, whether national or international, will remain unsettled. It is not between free enterprise or planned economy, nor between capitalism and communism that the choice lies, but between federalism and power politics. Federalism alone can assure the survival of man (Quoted in full in Laursen 1972, 30-31).

Concerning strategy two lines of action were mention in the Montreux Declaration:

1. The mobilization of peoples of the world to bring pressure on their governments and legislative assemblies to transform the United Nations Organisation into a world federal government, and by amending its Charter.
2. Unofficial and concerted action: in particular the preparation of a world constituent assembly.... This assembly, set up in collaboration with organized international groups, shall meet not later than 1950 for the purpose of drawing up a constitution for the world federal government. This plan shall be submitted for ratification, not only to the governments and parliaments but also to the peoples themselves, and every possible

---

<sup>4</sup> An example of a maximalist constitution was the one drafted by a group of scholars at the University of Chicago under the leadership of G.A. Borgese, an exile from Fascist Italy. They published their *Preliminary Draft of a World Constitution* in 1948. It was republished in 1965 with an introduction by Elisabeth Mann Borgese, daughter of Thomas Mann and the widow of G.A. Borgese (Borgese 1965). The group also published the journal *Common Cause*, the most academic of world federalist journals or magazines.

effort shall be made to get the world federal government established in the shortest possible time (Ibid.).

The second part of the strategy, a Peoples' World Convention, was now associated with UK MP Henry Osborne, and his *Crusade for World Government*.

Montreux elected Jean Larmeroux (France) as first president of the organization. Vice-Presidents were Henri Brugmans (Netherlands), Victor Collins, MP (UK), Ugo Damiani (Italy) and Edith Wynner (USA).

In 1948 the next Congress of the WMWFG took place in Luxembourg. Prior to that Congress the Executive Committee had discussed a third strategy, which was called the Parliamentary Approach. Jean Larmeroux now stated that under present political conditions there might not be time to carry out the "Osborne Plan" and bring together a Peoples' World Constituent Assembly. He therefore wanted a more direct method. He pointed out that it would be easier and faster to call together federalists of the various parliaments of the world to work out a constitution. To that end it would be necessary to create federalist committees in all parliaments. The new approach was accepted by the Executive Committee. This was subsequently criticized by Edith Wynner, who argued that such decision should be made at the level of the Congress (Laursen 1972, 35).

At the 1948 Luxembourg Congress there was again a confrontation of the strategies. The result was a multi-strategy compromise. The World Movement should work for

1. U.N. Charter Revision,
2. A Peoples' World Convention, and
3. The Parliamentary Approach.

As on earlier occasions there were those who spoke in favour of regional integration, too. In Luxembourg in 1948 this included Jean Larmeroux and Emery Reves. In the end the adopted Declaration also had a section of regional integration:

Integration at regional levels can be an approach to World Federal Government. The formation of regional federations may well hasten the establishment of World Federal Government provided:



- a) that they do not become ends in themselves;
- b) that they may be expected to diminish existing tensions and the existing disparity between great and small nations; and
- c) that they remain subordinated to the overriding objectives of establishing World Federal Government.

It should, however, be emphasized that regional federations cannot of themselves solve the problem of achieving enduring peace (Laursen 1972b).

Nothing was said about a possible Atlantic nucleus federation.

The 1948 Luxembourg Congress was attended by 330 delegates and observers. The biggest group of 84 came from the USA, followed by France with 42, Luxembourg with 39, the UK with 37, the Netherlands with 32, Italy with 21, Belgium with 15 and Germany with 13. The Congress elected Sir John Boyd Orr (UK) as President. He was mainly known internationally as FAO's first Director General. Abbé Pierre (France) became Chairman of the Executive Committee. Among those elected to the Council we could mention Stringfellow Barr (USA), Aage Bertelsen (Denmark), Lord Beveridge (UK), Elisabeth Mann Borgese (USA), Piet Hein (Denmark), James P. Warburg (USA) and Monica Wingate (UK) (Laursen 1972, 46-63).

The late 1940's also saw the emergence of the World Citizens' Movement and the idea of Mundialization. It was in April 1948 that the young Garry Davis abandoned his American citizenship and declared himself a World Citizen.<sup>5</sup> The mundialization movement gathered strength in France in 1949 under the leadership of Robert Sarrazac-Soulage who was also associated with the World Citizens' Movement. From this point on federalists possessed techniques of grass roots activities.

A functionalist approach to world order had been developed by Romanian-born, British-educated David Mitrany in the book *A Working Peace System*, published in London in 1943. Apart from world citizenship and mundialization the world federalist strategies of the late 1940's were predominantly constitutionalist and legalistic. Functionalism, on the other hand, instead of stressing a legal form, took its point of departure in functions and services supposed to be technical and non-political in nature. Functions determine which institutions are suitable. Functionalism emphasizes content, not form. Functionalism argues that by delegating more and more common

---

<sup>5</sup> For his own account, see Davis 1961.

tasks to specific functional organizations, the world's nations will gradually become integrated into a single community within which war will be impossible (Mitrany 1966).

World Student Federalists found inspiration in functionalism. They developed a strategy which they called functional federalism. In a declaration adopted at their Congress in Amsterdam in 1949 they said:

There is an increasing conviction that we shall not only strive towards the establishment of world government, but also contribute in every possible way to the development of that type of world community most conducive to the early creation and effective operation of a just world government.<sup>6</sup>

Real economic, social, and political problems were analyzed, and solutions were suggested (Laursen 1970c). The new President of the World Movement, Sir Boyd Orr, who by 1949 had become Lord Boyd Orr, was also clearly inspired by functionalism.

The 1949 Congress of the World Movement took place in Stockholm. About 350 delegates and observers took part in the meetings. The biggest national membership organization was United World Federalists, USA (27 votes) followed by Een Verden (One World) Denmark (19 votes), Weltstaat-Liga, Germany (17 votes), Federal Union, UK (14 votes), Union Fédérale, Belgium (13 votes), etc. Among the delegates were Prof. Brandt Rehberg (Denmark), Prof. G.A. Borgese (USA), and Dean Paul Shipman Andrews (USA). Lord Boyd Orr continued as President. Elisabeth Mann Borgese became chairman (sic) of the Executive Committee (Laursen 1972, 74-76).

The Stockholm Congress was very well documented. The greater part of the credit for that goes to Alexandre Marc<sup>7</sup> who, together with Clifford Dancer,<sup>8</sup> edited – and partly wrote – background papers on all the approaches being discussed at the time. The Congress worked in sub-committees. The one on UN Charter Revision was chaired by Dean Paul Andrews. Cord Meyer, Jr.

---

<sup>6</sup> For the Declaration of Amsterdam adopted in 1949 by World Student Federalists, see Laursen 1972, p. 144.

<sup>7</sup> Alexandre Marc was one of the leading French federalists. He found inspiration in Proudhon's federalism, supporting a general application of federalist principles within and among nations, referred to sometimes as integral federalism. I studied in 1966-67 at the *Institut Européen des Hautes Études Internationales*, which had been founded three years earlier by Alexandre Marc. He subsequently directed it for a number of years. I was invited back as an assistant for six months during the first part of 1975. Marc had also founded the *Collège Universitaire d'Études Fédéralistes* some years earlier in Aosta, Italy. I went there regularly from the mid 1980s and much of the 1990s to teach a political science course on "Le Fédéralisme comparé".

<sup>8</sup> Clifford Dancer worked with Stringfellow Barr at the Foundation for World Government in the USA. He was sent to Europe by the Foundation.

was rapporteur. The one on Peoples' World Convention was chaired by Henry Osborne, and Fyke Farmer (USA) was rapporteur. The sub-committee on the Parliamentary Approach was chaired by Baron Van de Bruggen (Germany) with Abbé Pierre was rapporteur. Monica Wingate chaired the Regional Approach committee with Gustavo Malan (Italy) as rapporteur. Sally Trope (USA) chaired the committee on World Citizenship with Ruth Allenbrook (USA) as rapporteur. Next there were committees on Atomic Energy, World Trade and Unemployment, The Colonial Problem, the Refugee Problem, and Food, Population and Functional Federalism. The latter was chaired by Stringfellow Barr and Scott Buchanan (USA) was rapporteur. Finally there was a committee on World Federal Constitution chaired by Mortimer Adler and with professor Borgese as rapporteur (Ibid., 79-100).

The movement now had a number of approaches and it was starting to deal with a number of the political problems at the time. The Congress in Stockholm also accepted an idea from World Student Federalists to start working toward relaxation of East-West tension.

The WMWFG President, Lord Boyd Orr received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1949. In his Nobel Lecture delivered in Oslo in December 1949 he said, among other things:

We are now physically, politically, and economically one world and nations so interdependent that the absolute national sovereignty of nations is no longer possible. However difficult it may be to bring it about, some form of world government with agreed international law, and means of enforcing the law, is inevitable (Boyd Orr, 1950).

He called for an "easing of the present political tension" and emphasized the importance of the work of the specialized agencies on the UN. He also mentioned the Stockholm Congress of the World Movement and said: "If the peoples of the world get together and with one united voice demand world unity and peace they will get it" (ibid.).

## **The Rise of the UN Approach**

1950 should have been the year of the Peoples' World Convention, composed of unofficially elected representatives of all the peoples of the world, one per million, from every country. The *Plan in Outline* had been published in 1947 by the British Parliamentary Committee under the leadership of Henry Osborne (Newcombe 1967, 13-14). But no unofficial elections took place, not

even with the help of the International Secretariat of the World Citizens in Paris or the Mundialized Communities which were supposed to take part in such elections. Thus the Convention which met the last days of 1950 in Geneva could only be a symbolic act.

The state of Tennessee had officially elected three delegates to the Peoples' World Convention in Geneva. They were State Senator Harwell, Representative Avery and lawyer Fyke Farmer, the latter being the prime mover of the action in Tennessee. Harwell and Farmer made it to Geneva where they met a third person, Professor Eyo Ita of Nigeria who claimed to have been chosen by individuals and chieftains of his people. After several days of consideration Professor Ita was recognized as a delegate (Laursen 1971a).

Apart from the delegates about 400 interested individuals came to Geneva as members of a Consultative Assembly. The meetings of that assembly clearly showed the lack of consensus as to how the future work for the PWC should be organized. The Danish professor Alf Ross sarcastically remarked later that the World State was not born of that occasion (Ross 1963, 256).

Just prior to the Geneva meeting Elisabeth Mann Borgese wrote in an article in *Common Cause* that the Osborne plan was logical, but she added: "The logic of the plan was, however, the logic of anarchical optimism. For if the people of the world could organize voluntarily, without government interference, and fulfill the most complex task political world history has ever seen, namely the convocation of a world constituent assembly, why and for what do the people need a government anyway" (Borgese 1950, 228).

At this time the World Movement was busy organizing its Rome Congress which met during the first week of April 1951. At the same time a Special Congress of Organizations sympathetic to the idea of world government took place.

Total participation in Rome was about 200 persons. Of these only 69 were official federalist delegates representing 28 organizations from 14 countries. This attendance was much smaller than at any of the three previous congresses. Some of the 54 organizations not affiliated with the World Movement which sent delegates or observers to the Conference were largely pacifist (Laursen 1971a).

The Council of the World Movement had invited the communist inspired Partisans of Peace to send observers. When United World Federalists realized this they cabled the World Movement:

If any and all invitations to the Partisans for Peace are not officially withdrawn prior to the convening of the Rome Congress, UWF will resign forthwith from membership and

all forms of participation in both the Rome Congress and the World Movement itself (quoted from Laursen 1971a, 12-13)

The World Movement revoked its invitation, the Council vote being 12 to 5. This led to the resignation of the Secretary General Pierre Hovelaque. The World Movement was now a Western Organization with which he disagreed. He thought it should be a Third Force between East and West. Abbé Pierre and Gustavo Malan resigned from the Executive Committee and Jean Didisheim (France) from the Council (ibid.)

Later Elliot Goodman wrote:

The incident of the Rome Congress crystallized the impasse that exists for the world federalist movement. Groups like the United World Federalists must face the fact that they are pursuing two incompatible goals. On the one hand, they claim to seek a *world* government, that is, a government that would include the Communists and necessarily accord them a conspicuous role. On the other hand, they dare not deal with Communists for fear of having a Red label pasted on them, a stigma that they know would promptly ruin the standing of their organization in the West. If it is held dangerous or impossible to deal with Communists, then it must be concluded that campaigning for a *world* government can no longer be a meaningful activity (Goodman 1969, 418).

The Rome Congress received financial support from the Italian Government, and foreign minister Count Sforza spoke at the inaugural meeting. He told the World Movement that its ideas were not new to the people of Italy, for, as he said, "Dante dedicated some of his writings to the union of all people of the world." He believed more in European than World Federalism, but admitted: "After all, history is only a series of Utopias" (Quoted from Laursen 1971a).

The different world federalist strategies were explained and discussed in Rome. Rev. Donald Harrington (USA) spoke on amending the UN Charter, Henry Usborne on elections to a Peoples' World Convention, Miss F. L. Josephy (UK) on regional federalism, James Avery Joyce on the functional approach, Alexandre Marc on integral federalism and Abbé Pierre on Parliamentary action (ibid.).

The Declaration of Rome proposed the creation of an “all-inclusive world federal government” with powers strictly limited to arms control. The wording was the same as that used by UWF earlier. As *World Government News* (Vol. 9, No. 98, May 1951) put it: “...for the first time in history, WMWFG has come under the influence of its minimalist faction.” The Declaration did however still mention the creation of a World Development Authority as part of the World Movement’s policy.

One event in Rome gave some encouragement to world federalists. Pope Pius XII gave a strong endorsement of the World Movement:

Your movement, Gentlemen, has the task of creating an effective political organization of the world. There is nothing more in keeping with the traditional doctrines of the Church....You, Gentlemen, are of the opinion that in order to be effective, this world political organization should be of a federal nature. If you mean by this that the organization should not be bound to the wheels of some mechanical unification, here again you are in harmony with the principles of political and social life so firmly laid down and sustained by the Church (Address by his Holiness, 1951).

From the Rome Congress in 1951 the World Movement clearly became dominated by the minimalist UN Charter reform approach of UWF. Nineteen of the 30 members elected to the Council were from the USA, Great Britain and Scandinavia. Eight of them, more than one fourth, were connected with UWF. The World Movement also got a new President in Rome. Lord Boyd Orr declined re-nomination because of ill-health. General Riiser-Larsen (Norway) was elected President by an overwhelming majority. He had been in command of the Norwegian Air Forces during the war and had previously been an Arctic explorer. Monica Wingate became Chairman of the Executive Committee (Laursen 1971b).

At this point it is important to mention that a World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government was formed at a conference in London organized by the British Parliamentary Group for World Government (McAllister 1952). A second London Parliamentary Conference in September 1952 discussed and adopted both a Plan A and a Plan B for UN Charter revision (McAllister 1953). The parliamentarians were now clearly focusing on the UN Charter revision approach. They looked forward to 1955 when Charter Revision would be on the UN agenda.

The World Movement did not have a Congress in 1952. A smaller study conference where the Movement's officials planned future activities took place at Ulenpas near Arnhem, the Netherlands. Over 20 federalists met for 10 days, discussing both theory and organization. John Pinder reported afterwards:

The most definite trend in the discussion was preference for U.N. reform as the target of immediate action on the world scale. Under Article 109 of the Charter, the subject of calling a U.N. conference to review the Charter must be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly in 1955 (Pinder 1952, 3).

Preferences for the UN approach were especially "marked among the Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavians, who at present comprise the larger part of the World Movement" (Ibid.). The year 1955 was now seen as the 'Year of Decision'.

The UN approach was consolidated by the Copenhagen Congress in 1953 (Laursen 1972c). It was preceded by a joint World Government Conference of the World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government and the WMWFG. The meetings took place in the Danish Parliament building, Christiansborg. The joint conference had 465 participants. The biggest groups came from the UK 103, Denmark 71, United States 61, France 41, Netherlands 39, Sweden 35, Japan 24, Germany 17, and Italy 15 (Laursen 1972c, 19).

The Joint Conference set up three commissions. The first commission, chaired by Max Habicht, discussed Plan A (substantial amendment). Gustav Fahlander, MP (Sweden) was rapporteur for the parliamentarians and Francis Gérard (France) for the World Movement. The second commission chaired by Arthur Henderson, MP (UK) discussed Plan B (Interim recommendations). US Congressman Charles Howel was rapporteur for the parliamentarians and Knud Nielsen (Denmark) for the World Movement. The third commission dealt with Freedom from Want. It was chaired by Joseph Lanet (France). Lord Birdwood and Dean Paul Andrews were rapporteurs. Much of the debate was about how much to hope for and to work for in 1955, when charter revision would be on the UN agenda. Knud Nielsen expressed a certain prudence: "We do not think we have the slightest chance of having a full and effective world government in 1955... we want to judge our chances and not try to take three steps at once when only one is possible." Professor Sohn, on the other hand spoke for radical suggestions: "It is very easy to talk about a little

step forward, but if you have a deep ditch in front of you full of danger, the only way to cross it is to take a large step” (quoted from Laursen 1972c, 22).

The Plan A adopted included the following:

- All states shall have the right to membership in the UN
- Complete, simultaneous, universal and enforceable disarmament
- UN inspectorate and UN police
- The International Court of Justice to be given compulsory jurisdiction
- A World Equity Tribunal to be created with jurisdiction to hear and report on all non-legal disputes
- The General Assembly to be replaced by two-house legislature, one chamber to be called the Council of States consisting of Senators appointed by the Member States, the other Chamber to be called the Council of Peoples and elected according to the numbers of the population of the member states – the World Legislature to have unlimited powers of debate, and power (a) to make recommendations on any matters within the scope of the Charter, (b) to raise revenue for UN purposes, (c) power to enact legislation strictly confined to matters concerned with and necessary for the preservation of peace, (d) power to elect and dismiss the Executive Council or any member thereof.
- The Security Council to be replaced by the election, from both Chambers of the World Legislature, of a World Executive Council responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security and charged with carrying out the directives of the Legislature (*Federal News*, No. 217, September/October 1953, p.4).

Plan B included an enlargement of the Security Council and abolishment of the right of veto. The Congress also recommended the creation of a World Development Authority. European Federalists were congratulated for the progress made in Europe thanks to the Schuman Plan leading to the European Coal and Steel Community: “A *Western European Federation* is to be welcomed by World Federalists as the solution to many of the problems of Europe, and above all as the end of much of the European anarchy which was the cause of two world wars” (Quoted from Laursen 1972c, 24).

The Congress also reaffirmed the Peoples’ World Convention is a possible approach to World Federal Government. The World Movement was asked to cooperate with the World Council for the Peoples’ World Convention which had been created in Geneva in January 1951. But no



specific activities were foreseen. Especially the Scandinavian delegates had been completely against the idea (Ibid.). By accepting the proposals of the joint Conference the World Movement had for the first time a detailed programme for UN Charter Revision. This was clearly the approach most on the mind of the main leaders of the World Movement and the main national organizations.

General Riiser-Larsen was reelected as President of the movement. Monica Wingate and Per Hækkerup were to share the responsibility for leadership of the Executive Committee.<sup>9</sup>

The adopted plan was minimalist in the sense that the World Legislature could only adopt legislation dealing with security issues. Other issues were not absent from the debate in Copenhagen. The plenary session also debated the problems of the under-developed territories and the 'cold war'. Afterwards *Federal News*, the monthly journal of UK *Federal Union* called Copenhagen "the largest and most successful conference of the World Federalists ever held" (*Federal News*, No. 217, September/October 1953).

## **Some Post-Copenhagen developments**

Copenhagen provided the World Movement with a plan. The focus was now on the UN. This was in line with the work of the American lawyer Grenville Clark. He had published a *Plan for Peace* in 1950 which was built on the idea of Charter revision (Clark 1950). His ideas were further developed with Harvard professor Louis B. Sohn. Together they published *Peace through Disarmament and Charter Revision* in 1953, and finally *World Peace through World Law* in 1958 (Clark and Sohn 1958). World federalists borrowed the title of the latter book as their slogan. They had got a blue-print of how it could be done. The introduction in particular was translated into several languages.

Even if 1955 passed as a year of non-decision, it long looked as if the Charter revision approach had gained permanently in the strategic battle. Connected with this approach was a feeling that federalists should be neutral and impartial, and not deal with 'political' issues. Federalists repeatedly asked for a better UN Charter which would create a world authority with powers in a limited field, namely that of war and peace narrowly defined. The fact that a UN member possessing veto power, the Soviet Union, was a declared opponent of touching the Charter in any way, received insufficient attention for many years. It was only in 1968 that the Youth and Student Division of what had become the World Association of World Federalists

---

<sup>9</sup> Hækkerup, who played a very active role at the time of the Copenhagen Congress was later to become Foreign Minister of Denmark. While he was Foreign Minister he published a book which was clearly inspired by world federalist thinking (Hækkerup 1965).

(WAWF) in 1956 organized a conference in Vienna on East-West Cooperation as a Step towards World Order, which had a few participants from Communist countries, through contacts established with the World Federation of Democratic Youth in Budapest. Later the senior wing of the Movement established contacts with the World Peace Council in Moscow.

### *The Contribution of World Federalist Youth*

The heyday of the legalism associated with the UN Charter revision approach lasted until 1965. At the San Francisco Congress of WAWF, its Youth and Student Division (YSD),<sup>10</sup> decided to explore a new field, that of economics. Professor Jan Tinbergen had provided an excellent basis for this in the book *Shaping the World Economy* (Tinbergen 1962). The topic was dealt with at three conferences in The Hague, San Francisco, and Tokyo, all in 1966. The contributions were published in book form as *World Peace through World Economy* (Youth and Student Division 1968). This title was slightly polemical. The juridical single factor explanation was criticized, but there was no wish to commit the opposite error of seeing all ills in the economic structure in a Marxian way.

The questioning of legalism continued at the Oslo Congress of WAWF in 1967. Here the YSD proposed some intermediate goals in a new Declaration of Principles. Apart from strengthening the UN, the Declaration called for increased East-West cooperation and improved development policies. Peace research should be supported. Its application in public policy was called for. In the introduction to the Declaration it was clearly stated that “any system of international security is worthless unless it guarantees a world community based on social justice for all nations.” This was the answer to the tendency to make security the goal for its own sake. The problem of which sort of security to aim for should not be evaded. It was made clear that “the conduct of governments must be based on a respect for fundamental human rights and the interest of the world community as a whole.” The Oslo Declaration was later revised and used widely by World Federalist Youth.<sup>11</sup>

The new approach that young world federalists started developing at Oslo was termed 'Dynamics for Peace' (Sato 1967; Laursen 1970d). It was felt that world federalists should deal with the major international issues and make suggestions as to how they might be solved. It was realized that one of the major factors blocking the road toward a federal world authority was the mutual distrust between East and West and the lack of consensus as to what such authority should be used for. A strong need for increased functional cooperation between East and West was therefore felt.

---

<sup>10</sup> World Student Federalists (WSF) changed the name to Young World Federalists (YWF) in 1953. In 1959 it merged with WAWF and became the Youth and Student Division of WAWF. In 1968 it sought greater autonomy again and became World Federalist Youth (WFY).

<sup>11</sup> See "Declaration of Principles," *Contact* No. 3 (1969), p. 16.

It was also suggested that the European reality, including the Oder-Neisse line and the existence of two German states, should be formally recognized by all European states. This was seen as a necessary first step toward normalization in Europe. The invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and four other Warsaw pact countries in August 1968 was condemned as a violation of international law. But it was felt that the policy of *détente* should be continued.

At the Council meeting in Vienna in 1968, the YSD/WAWF clearly demanded that the “United States and its allies must make immediate preparations for their military evacuation from the southern part of Vietnam.” It was argued that “the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam is a representative of the people of South Vietnam and must be formally recognized as such.” It was felt that “the Saigon regime was solely maintained by the massive United States military and economic intervention,” and that “the programmes of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam for social and economic development and the eventual unification of South Vietnam should be supported.” It was further recommended “that representatives of national and international agencies plan now with Vietnamese representatives the means of assistance to the Vietnamese people in the reconstruction and development of their country. Such preliminary work should lead directly to an international reconstruction and rehabilitation agency, which, while initially at the service of the Vietnamese people, would later be permanently available to any member of the world community.”<sup>12</sup>

The policy of 'Dynamics for Peace' reached a more developed expression at a meeting in The Netherlands in the summer of 1969. In the policy program adopted there a world federal authority was clearly seen as the ultimate response to the challenge of the anarchic international society and its problems. But, if the world was not ripe for such a revolutionary institutional change, it was possible to respond in several fields immediately. Under 'Immediate Response' no less than eleven intermediate goals were set up:

1. Securing Human Rights,
2. Strengthening international functional cooperation,
3. Reshaping the world economy,
4. Improving East-West relations,
5. Strengthening the United Nations,
6. Working for international arms control,
7. Supporting international voluntary service,
8. Internationalizing the high seas, the ocean floor, and outer space,
9. Preserving man's natural environment,

---

<sup>12</sup> "WYF Vietnam Policy," *Contact* No. 1-2 (1969-69), p. 9.

10. Supporting and applying peace research, and
11. Working for education of a more international character.

Specific measures were suggested under all these points. By contributing to global integration through these policies it was felt that the basis for better international institutions could gradually be laid. In return, the institutions could contribute to implementing the policies. WFY thus saw an interrelationship between function and structure. WFY opted for neither pure functionalism nor pure constitutionalism.

*Where did WAWF go?*

After the important policy and strategy changes in WFY, which I have outlined, WAWF started going into a more dynamic direction, too. However, it took some time. At first leading WAWF officers were very critical of the new WFY ideas. The author of the present article, who was elected chairman of YSD/WAWF at the Oslo Congress in 1967, had to fight for permission to read the Declaration of Principles, which had been adopted by the Youth Council, at the final closing session of the Congress. Gradually, however, WAWF came along. The chairman of WAWF's Policy Committee, Knud Nielsen, contributed much to that change. So did WAWF's representative at the UN at the time, Donald Keys, who felt the need in his work for relating directly to the issues on the UN agenda.

In the early 1970s the Ottawa office of WAWF issued a compendium of 'Policies of WAWF' which contained policies on

1. United Nations Reform,
2. Disarmament,
3. Development,
4. The Sea Bed,
5. Environment,
6. Human Rights,
7. Crisis Areas (Indochina and the Middle East and a few other issues).

In the following years WAWF became active in most of these and other areas. At most Congress and Council meetings policy resolutions and declarations were passed. <sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> The history of these developments still has to be written.

## Concluding Remarks

This paper has reviewed the developments of World Federalist thought from 1946 to 1953. In this period there was a rich debate about how to move toward a World Federal Government. Some wanted a 'big bang' in the form of a World Constitutional Convention, which would draft a constitution for the world, which would subsequently be ratified by governments and or peoples. Other believed in incremental change that would gradually move the world towards World Federal institutions. A possible strategy, which gradually gained influence during the period studied, was a revision of the UN Charter to turn the UN into a World Government or at least some kind of World Authority which effectively could deal with international security questions. Some functionalist-inspired federalists also wanted the UN to become a stronger organization in economic areas; in particular federalists often called for a World Development Authority.

The paper also looked briefly at developments in the 1960s and 1970s when the author was actively involved. This becomes a rather personal account. The focus, first in the youth wing of the movement, later also in the adult wing, gradually became the *process* that would take the world towards a *greater sense of community* which could help sustain more efficient global institutions. This meant actually looking at some of the conflicts that existed in the world and suggesting equitable solutions to the conflicts from a global perspective.

It is my personal belief that world order thinking can find inspiration in regional integration theory. The Monnet Strategy in Europe was influenced partly by functionalism and partly by federalism. By 'pooling' and 'delegating' sovereignty to common institutions, first in the European Communities in the 1950s, later in the European Union (EU) created by the Treaty of Maastricht, Europe has created a kind of 'credible commitments' that do not currently exist in other parts of the world. Sovereign states face 'collective action' problems. There is often a temptation to cheat or defect from agreements. And there are often difficult distribution problems to be solved. Supranational institutions can contribute to solving such problems and thereby creating 'credible commitments' (Moravcsik 1998). Some scholars argue that leadership can plan an important role in overcoming 'collective action' problems (Mattli 1999). A third group of scholars, sociological institutionalists, put emphasis on the creation of collective identities. The issue is not only efficiency but also legitimacy. In the European case, for instance, perceived problems of procedural legitimacy have led to the gradual empowerment of the European Parliament (Rittberger 2005).

Back at the time when I was actively involved in the World Federalist movement I found much inspiration in Amitai Etzioni's book, *The Hard Way to Peace* (1962). World Government gives a sense of direction. To prepare a strategy for World Order one needs a sense of direction. But the main problem is how to move in that direction. Regional integration can contribute to the process by decreasing the number of negotiating parties at the global level. I also believe that regional integration can contribute to lessen the problems of power asymmetries in the world that make it more difficult for the greater powers to accept stronger and more democratic institutional at the world level.

The language we use to discuss these issues has changed over time. At the beginning world federalists talked about World Government. Later they tended to talk more modestly about a world authority. Scholars in the 1980s started talking about international regimes. Then in the 1990s the terminology became Global Governance. But the issue remains the same: how can the world create common institutions that allow for efficient and equitable solutions to world problems.

Europe has moved beyond the Westphalian system, and become post-modern (Cooper 2003). Will other parts of the world gradually question absolute sovereignty and move towards a post-modern world?<sup>14</sup> And can Global Governance be improved along federalist lines? Federalism, I believe, offers the best techniques to also make those institutions more democratic.

## References

Address by his Holiness Pope Pius XII during an audience with delegates of the Fourth Congress of the World Movement for World Federal Government, 6 April 1951. In Rome Volume of WMWFG Archives (Author's collection).

Baratta, Joseph Preston (2004), *The Politics of World Federation*. 2 vols. Vol. 1: *United Nations, UN Reform, Atomic Control*; Vol. 2: *From World Federalism to Global Governance*. Westport, CN: Praeger.

Borgese, Elisabeth Mann (1950), "1950: World Movement at the Divide," *Common Cause*, Vol. 4, No. 5 (December), 225-232.

---

<sup>14</sup> For the author's most recent discussion of some of these issues of regional integration, see Laursen 2010.

Borgese, Elisabeth Mann (1965), *A constitution for the World*. Santa Barbara, CA.: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Boyd Orr of Brechin, Lord (1959), "Science and Peace," *Les Prix Nobel en 1949*. Stockholm.

Clark, Grenville (1950), *A Plan for Peace*. New York: Harper and Bros.

Clark, Grenville and Louis B. Sohn (1953), *Peace through Disarmament and Charter Revision: Detailed Proposal for Revision of the United Nations Charter*. Preliminary Print. Dublin, NH. July.

Clark, Grenville and Louis B. Sohn (1958), *World Peace through World Law*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cooper, Robert (2003), *The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Grove Press.

Cousins, Norman (1961), *In Place of Folly*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Davis, Garry (1961), *My Country is the World: The Adventure of a World Citizen*. London: Macdonald & Co.

Deutsch, Karl W. (1954), *Political Community at the International Level: Problems of Definition and Measurement*. New York: Doubleday and Co.

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

Etzioni, Amitai (1962), *The Hard Way to Peace: A New Strategy*. New York: Collier Books.

Friedrich, Carl J. (1948), *Inevitable Peace*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goodman, Elliot R. (1960), *The Soviet Design for a World State*. New York and London: Columbia University Press.

Haegler, Rolf Paul (1972), *Histoire et idéologie du mondialisme*. Zürich: Europa Verlag.

Hækkerup, Per (1965), *Danmarks Udenrigspolitik*. Copenhagen: AOF/Fremad.

Hart, Norman J., ed. (1949), *Basis of Federalism: A Symposium*. Paris: World Student Federalists.

Kant, Immanuel (1969), *Zum Ewigen Frieden*. Stuttgart: Reclam.

Killby, J. Keith (1951), "The Rome Congress, World Federalists pass another milestone," *Federal News*, No 193 (May), 1-3 and 6.

Larmeroux, Jean (1946), *Les États-Unis du Monde*. Paris : J. & R. Sennac Éditeurs.

Laursen, Finn (1968-69), "Youth and World Federalism. Part One: How it started," *Contact* (Copenhagen: World Federalist Youth), No. 5-6, pp. 3-9.

Laursen, Finn (1970), *Federalism and World Order*. Compendium I. Copenhagen: World Federalist Youth.

Laursen, Finn (1970b), "Youth and World Federalism. Part Two: Seeking an Approach," *Contact* (Copenhagen: World Federalist Youth), No. 2, pp. 19-25.

Laursen, Finn (1970c), "Youth and World Federalism. Part Three: The Rise of Functional Federalism," *Contact* (Copenhagen: World Federalist Youth), No. 5-6, pp. 84-88.

Laursen, Finn (1970d), "On WFY Policy," *Contact* (Copenhagen: World Federalist Youth), No. 5-6, pp. 63-66.

Laursen, Finn (1971a), "Youth and World Federalism. Part Four: Formulating Policies," *Contact* (Copenhagen: World Federalist Youth), No. 1, pp. 10-15.

Laursen, Finn (1971b), "Youth and World Federalism. Part Five: The Rise of the UN Charter Revision Approach," *Contact* (Copenhagen: World Federalist Youth), No. 3-4, pp. 30-33.

Laursen, Finn (1972), *Federalism and World Order*. Compendium II. Copenhagen: World Federalist Youth.

Laursen, Finn (1972b), "World Federalists Facing the Issue of Regional Federalism," *Contact* (Copenhagen: World Federalist Youth), July-August, pp. 13-21.

Laursen, Finn (1972c), "Youth and World Federalism. Part Six: The Consolidation of the UN Approach," *Contact* (Copenhagen: World Federalist Youth), April, pp. 17-24.

Laursen, Finn (1986), "Federalist Theory and World Order," *Occasional Papers* No. 4. Amsterdam: Institute for Global Policy Studies.

Laursen, Finn (1990), *Unity with Diversity: Federalist Essays (1972-1986)*. Amsterdam: Institute for Global Policy Studies.

Laursen, Finn (1995), "FN – mod en verdensmyndighed?" in Thorkild Møller and Henning Nielsen, eds., *FN, Europa og Rusland: Et festskrift I anledning af Hermod Lannungs 100 års dag*. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag, pp. 22-48.

Laursen, Finn, ed. (2010), *Comparative Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond*. Farnham: Ashgate.

McAllister, Gilbert, ed. (1952), *Report of the London Parliamentary Conference on World Government. September 24-29, 1951*. London: The Parliamentary Group for World Government.



McAllister, Gilbert, ed. (1953), *Report of the Second London Parliamentary Conference on World Government. September 20-26, 1952*. London: World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government.

McAllister, Gilbert, ed. (1955), *The Bomb: Challenge and Answer*. London: B.T. Batsford LTD.

Mattli, Walter (1999), *The Logic of Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meyer, Cord Jr. (1947), *Peace or Anarchy*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Mitrany, David (1966), *A Working Peace System*. Chicago: Quadrangle.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1998), *The Choice for Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Morgenthau, Hans J. (1973), *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: A. Knopf.

Nathan, Otto and Heinz Norden (1960), *Einstein on Peace*. New York: Schocken Books.

Newcombe, Hanna (1967), "Alternative Approaches to World Government," *Peace Research Reviews*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (February), pp. 1-84.

Pinder, John (1952), "Preparing for Copenhagen," *Federal News*, No. 208 (September/October), pp.3-4.

Reves, Emery (1946), *The Anatomy of Peace*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Reves, Emery (1963), *The Anatomy of Peace*. New York: The Viking Press.

Rittberger, Bertold (2005), *Building Europe's Parliament: Democratic Representation beyond the Nation-State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ross, Alf (1963), *De Forenede Nationer: Fred og Fremskridt*. Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk Forlag.

Sato, Hideo P. (1967), "Towards a Dynamic Approach to Peace," *Contact* (November), pp. 3-11.

Sarrazac, R. (No year – ca. 1958), *La mondialisation des communes et l'approche de la mondialité*. Nîmes: Conseil Français des Communes et Villes Mondialisées.

Schwimmer, Rosika (1939), *Union Now for Peace or War?* Illinois: The Campaign for World Government.

Streit, Clarence K. (1939), *Union Now: A Proposal for a Federal Union of the Leading Democracies*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Sørensen, Max (1955), *Bør FN's Pagt ændres?* Copenhagen: Forlaget Fremad.

Tinbergen, Jan (1962), *Shaping the World Economy*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund.

Wittner, Lawrence S (1969), *Rebels against War. The American Peace Movement 1941-1960*. New York and London: Columbia University Press.

World Council for Mundialization (1966), *Movement for Mundialization: Its Aim, Methods and Results*. Hiroshima City.

Wynner, Edith and Georgia Lloyd (1949), *Searchlight on Peace Plans: Chose your Road to World Government*. New and Enlarged Edition. New York: E.P. Dutton and Co.,

Wynner, Edith (1954), *World Federal Government: In Maximum Terms*. New York: Fedonat Press – Afton.

Youth and Student Division of the World Association of World Federalists 6th International Study Conference (1968), *World Peace through World Economy*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp.

#### **About the author:**

**Finn Laursen** finished his cand. scient. pol. degree at Aarhus University in 1974, much delayed thanks to his federalist activities. He subsequently became a more serious university student and received his PhD from the University of Pennsylvania in 1980. His dissertation dealt with US Ocean Policy. He now holds a Canada Research Chair (Tier 1) of EU Studies at Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada. In 2008 he has also received an *ad personam* Jean Monnet Chair and he directs the EU Centre of Excellence (EUCE) at Dalhousie University. Earlier positions include: Professor of International Politics, University of Southern Denmark 1999-2006 (where he directed the Centre for European Studies and held a Jean Monnet Chair); London School of Economics (1985-88), European Institute of Public Administration, Maastricht (1988-95); shorter periods at Tsukuba University, Japan, and at Fudan University, China. Edited books include: *Political Economy of European Integration* (Kluwer, 1995), *The Amsterdam Treaty* (Odense University Press, 2002), *Comparative Regional Integration: Theoretical Approaches* (Ashgate, 2003), *The Treaty of Nice* (Nijhoff, 2006), *The Rise and Fall of the EU's Constitutional Treaty* (Nijhoff, 2008), *The EU as a Foreign and Security Policy Actor* (Republic-of-Letters Publishing, Dordrecht, 2009), *The EU in the Global Political Economy* (P.I.E. Peter Lang, Brussels, 2009), and *Comparative Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond* (Ashgate, 2010).