# SUPRANATIONAL FEDERALISM
# The World Citizens' Journal

**For a dialogue between peoples, nations and civilizations**





THE ALTIERO SPINELLI INSTITUTE

FOR FEDERALIST STUDIES

# SUPRANATIONAL FEDERALISM
# The World Citizens' Journal

## For a dialogue between peoples, nations and civilizations

"It's good to live where humanity reigns. Those who choose to reside in a place devoid of humanity lack wisdom. … Do not do to others what you would not want them to do to you." (Confucius, *The Analects*, 4.1; 15.24).

---

Nowadays young people wonder if they will have a future. A nuclear war between great powers can annihilate the population of entire continents. Moreover, all living organisms, including humanity, are threatened by an irreversible ecological crisis of the biosphere. The international political system created at the end of the Second World War is paralyzed by hostilities between large and small powers pursuing conflicting goals and interests. No world player proposes to stop the mad race towards a fatal international anarchy.

However, the federalists can act. About half of the world's population lives in federal states, but in these countries, federalism is conceived as a technique of administrative decentralization. On the contrary, in Europe, since the Schuman Declaration of 1950, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) has been conceived as "the first step towards the European Federation." European and world federalists can act together for a just and peaceful international order, founded on democratically legitimized supranational institutions.

International pacification is necessary to stop the environmental crisis, the arms race and war. The first step is to start a dialogue between all national peoples and civilizations on the future of the international order. The European Union, "by creating an area of freedom, security and justice," has established the European citizenship. Why not establish the same form of peaceful coexistence for the citizens of the world?

---

**Submissions** – The "Supranational Federalism" Journal is open to all citizens of the world who wish to develop arguments and observations on the international political process in the spirit indicated in the mission statement above. The contribution must be written in English. The Journal will be published every three months. Each contribution must not exceed the limit of 1,500 words and must be sent to the following address: supranational.federalism@gmail.com We encourage young people to submit articles. Submission must include a short biography and a photo of the author. Please do not include footnotes, endnotes, or references; instead provide hyperlinks for any references you think would be helpful. We reserve the right to make editorial changes before publication.

**Supranational Federalism,** No 5, September 2026.

**Editor:** Guido Montani, Honorary Member of the Union of European Federalists (UEF).

*The Global Ventotene* is published under the auspices of *The Altiero Spinelli Institute for Federalist Studies* – Municipio di Ventotene, 04020 Ventotene (Italy)

The opinions expressed in this "Journal" are those of the autor(s) alone and they do not reflect the views of the *Altiero Spinelli Institute for Federalist Studies*.

The figure on the front page - with twelve portraits that have been chosen as personalities who have indicated to future generations the founding values of a cosmopolitan civilization - is the work of the graphic designer Alice Lazzaro: alicelazzaroart@gmail.com

## Contents


Editorial
*Power Politics, Democracy and Federalism* p. 4

*The International Criminal Court.*
*The attack of the USA and reactions* " 7

- *State Department Launches Campaign to Dismantel International Criminal Court's Threat to American Sovereignty* " 7
- *UEF Press release* " 8
- *World Federalist Movement – IGP* " 9
- *Washington Working Group on the ICC* " 9
- *EU Parliamentarians call for the activation of the EU Blocking Statute* " 10
- *WFM of Japan* " 11

Daniel K White, *William Pace. Personification of Peace* " 13

Domenec Devesa, *Is the EU already a federation? Why theorising this matters for federalists?* " 15

Domenico Moro, *A Euro-African response to the Spanish-Moroccan dispute over immigration* " 17


---

**Ideas for the World's Citizens Corner**
Published at the Request of the Editor

---

**AFTER NATIONS, The Making and Unmaking of a World Order, by Rana Dasgupta**

## Power politics, democracy and federalism

The statement by the Secretary of the US State Department, Marco Rubio, to support the dismantling of the International Criminal Court, clearly reveals the US government's desire to favour the power politics of the United States also through the dismantling of the institutions created in the post-war period to defend human rights and democracy. This is a threat that must be taken seriously not only by federalists, who fought for the creation of the ICC, but by all democrats, whatever country they belong to, because history teaches us that the rise of authoritarian regimes in the last century undermined the foundations of the democratic state in Europe and in the world.

The MAGA policy, the ideology of the Trump administration, has already clearly shown its objectives of world domination both on the economic front, with punitive tariffs, and on the political front, with sudden military aggression by countries considered enemies, such as Venezuela and Iran. Now the attack to the ICC reveals long-term goals that show how democratic forces in all countries have become a target of the MAGA coalition.

Historian Marc Bloch wrote: "Ignorance of the past is not limited to damaging the understanding of the present; but it compromises, in the present, the action itself." The political scientist, John Keane, entitled the chapter dedicated to democracy in the years between the two world wars: "The European Graveyard" (*The Life and Death of Democracy*, Pocket Books, 2009). Mussolini and Hitler did not seize power with a coup d'état, but by eroding the democratic system from within, thanks to the inability of the democratic parties to understand the real intentions of the two dictators. A similar operation also took place in our century in Putin's Russia, after the disintegration of the USSR. Democracy must be actively defended, no clemency can be expected from its enemies.

Today, the erosion of democracy is visible in the United States and the European Union. A first sign in the US was the violence used to curb migration to expel numerous immigrants and the threats made to progressive universities. Also worrying is the continuous expansion of presidential powers, which the Court of Justice does not sufficiently curb, as in the case concerning threats against Governor Jerome Powell, while he was still chairman of the Federal Reserve System. According to *The Economist* (*Degradation in progress*, July 18th-24th 2026) "Less than halfway through his second term, Trump has turned the Department of Justice (DoJ) from an arm of the law into a muscular limb of the presidency. … Even if Americans elect a president who wants to restore the DoJ, the damage will be hard to reverse. … After Watergate, statesmanship and bipartisan effort were needed to create the modern DoJ. Today the stakes are as high, and the task is harder."

In the European Union, the influences of MAGA politics are even more dangerous, because they favour the growth of sovereigntist parties in many European states, particularly in Italy, Germany and France, and undermine European solidarity. In some cases, individual parties (such as the AfD in Germany) or governments, as was the case with the Italian government, seek to gain favors not only from the U.S. government but also from its wealthy supporters, such as Elon Musk and large IT companies. The future of the European Union is in danger, because the EU is not a state, it has no defense. NATO's armed forces are commanded by an American general. The only cohesive institution of the EU today is the Economic and Monetary Union, but in a world in which the great powers – the USA, Russia and China – could benefit substantially from its disintegration, as happened with the USSR, the forces of nationalism and anti-Europeanism are growing. They delude European citizens that full national sovereignty, without an overarching "European bureaucracy," would guarantee a bright future.

In this issue of "Supranational Federalism" we publish the statement of Secretary of State Rubio and numerous positions in defence of the ICC. We also publish a profile of the

WFM's action, led in those years by William Pace, which shows how the world and European federalists (in fact the support of Emma Bonino, then a member of the European Commission, was important) acted in agreement. United federalists can win crucial battles for a world that is more respectful of human rights, more democratic and peaceful.

The history of the dramatic crisis of democracy in the years between the two world wars spurs us to seek ways to counter the malign action of the overbearing and anti-democratic rulers of our time. In the search for this path, it must be borne in mind that political action must include the objectives of defending human rights, democracy and the pacification of international relations. These three goals are interdependent and crucial: if one of these three goals were forgotten, the other two would become impossible. Human rights are the basis of the formation of the modern state, just think of Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, the "Charter of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen" of the French Revolution and the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" approved by the UN in 1948. In the modern state, which has developed in the national dimension, human rights have been guaranteed by democratic institutions because, as Rousseau argued, sovereignty belongs to the people: it is the citizens who decide how to be governed, therefore the government must be democratic. The modern state was born as a nation state, because the societies of those years typically had this dimension; a dimension that has proved inadequate only with the development of modern industry and the globalization of the economy. The nascent democratic state had as its first objective to guarantee the security of its citizens and it did so, internally, by prohibiting armed conflicts between citizens, whose security was guaranteed by police forces. However, the international community of armed sovereign states has generated bloody wars, up to the recent development of nuclear weapons that can annihilate entire continents. For this reason, today, domestic and international security have become rival public goods: the security of citizens should be guaranteed by their national government, but if a government of a rival great power threatens to annihilate the weaker state, the lives and freedoms of its citizens are in danger.

The campaign organized in the years following the fall of the Berlin Wall, in an international situation in which it was still possible to have confidence in the ability of the United States and the other members of the United Nations Security Council to guarantee an – uncertain and inadequate – international stability, the creation of the ICC could be accepted as a missing piece of the UN. Today, the UN is paralyzed, the Security Council is composed of rival powers, whose primary objective is to create its own imperial area, as large as possible. Smaller, less armed countries can only decide which imperial area is convenient to belong to. Intermediate powers, such as Brazil, India, Australia, etc., attempted to increase their power by equipping themselves with nuclear weapons. Nuclear proliferation is unstoppable. The citizens of the world, whatever state they belong to, are more insecure than their grandparents and parents, because nuclear weapons today could unleash an atomic apocalypse.

European and world federalists must begin to discuss a common campaign to counter the claim of the great powers to decide the future of humanity by the force of arms. The future of humanity is also threatened by a climate crisis that national governments refuse to address with effective policies. That is why it is difficult today to organize a campaign with hopes of success to defend the ICC, which is only one piece within the framework of the United Nations. It is necessary to address the problem of a comprehensive reform of the United Nations in crisis. For example, why does the International Court of Justice not have the power to discuss, in the case of a dispute between nation states that could lead to war, the reasons put forward between rival governments to decide who is right and who is wrong and to pronounce a sentence, as civil courts do within nation states? Why do we have to accept an international monetary system based on a hegemonic currency, the dollar, when today the interdependence of the world economy would require a government of world currency, finance and trade in which all the countries of the world can participate? Why is the world's wealth, particularly financial wealth,

concentrated predominantly in a few rich countries, while a fairer management of the world's wealth would make it possible to reduce international poverty considerably?

It is certainly not possible to deal with all these problems here. The purpose of these reflections is only to stimulate a debate between European and world federalists on the future of international politics and its institutions, first and foremost the United Nations. Democratic reform of the United Nations could solve many pressing problems. Among the policies supported by WFM is "Democracy without Border," which advocates the creation of a World Parliament. This initiative is right, but it must be accompanied by other proposals to address all the problems – security, international justice, human rights and international democracy – that could unite democrats from all over the world in a common undertaking. Citizens and parties of every country and continent should join the federalists to save democracy everywhere, initiate international pacification among democratic countries, fight authoritarianism, and save the planet from the looming environmental crisis. The time has come to launch a campaign "For the democratic reform of the United Nations".

# The International Criminal Court

## The attack of the USA and reactions

July 13, 2026

**State Department Launches Campaign to Dismantel**
**International Criminal Court's Threat to American Sovereignty**

Today, Secretary of State Marco Rubio announced a sweeping campaign to dismantle the threat posed by the International Criminal Court to U.S. sovereignty. The campaign will feature a whole-of-government response to systematically disable the ICC's ability to operate, target American servicemen or officials, or otherwise threaten American sovereignty.

The ICC poses an intolerable threat to U.S. sovereignty – it claims the authority to prosecute and even imprison American servicemen and officials operating on behalf of America's national interest. Americans never signed up for this, and all American presidents since the ICC's ratification have maintained that the ICC does not have jurisdiction over Americans. The ICC previously opened an investigation into U.S. servicemen and intelligence officers and has since refused to close these cases.

The ICC now seeks to become the unaccountable global arbiter – positioning itself above and beyond the nation state as a supranational enforcement arm of a globalist bureaucracy empowered to persecute American servicemen and officials at will. No diplomatic option will be off-limits in the campaign to dismantle the threat posed by the ICC to Americans.

The campaign will feature a wide range of actions intended to ensure that the International Criminal Court is incapable of threatening U.S. sovereignty or targeting Americans.

Actions under consideration include:

- Diplomatic calls from the Secretary of State, Deputy Secretary, ambassadors, and other members of senior leadership to foreign nations highlighting the abuses of the ICC and the risks posed to Americans and other nations urging them to withdraw from the ICC
- Nations that partner with American law enforcement and the U.S. military or that enjoy the benefits of the U.S. security umbrella are called upon to reject the ICC's purported authority to prosecute American officials and servicemen
- Increased scrutiny of nations that refuse to reject the ICC's false authority while relying on U.S. assistance
- Diplomatic calls urging other nations that, like America, that are not party to the Rome Statute to leverage their diplomatic networks to take similar actions alongside us
- Visa revocations and travel bans for ICC personnel
- Increased sanctions against the ICC and affiliated organizations

---

**UEF PRESS RELEASE**

**UEF Calls for Immediate Action to Protect the ICC and Activate the EU Blocking Statute**

On this July 17, World Day for International Justice, the Union of European Federalists (UEF) reaffirms its support to the International Criminal Court (ICC), a unique jurisdiction in the world, which embodies one of the major achievements of international justice, promoting international law and victim's redress.

We strongly condemn the Trump Administration's ongoing interference and unjustified sanctions against ICC judges and prosecutors and in particular the recent statement by U.S. Secretary of State Marco Rubio announcing that Washington will work to "*systematically disable*" and "*dismantle the ICC, brick by brick, if necessary.*"

In fact, Marco Rubio accused the Court of "*waging a war against our country, not with bullets or missiles, but with the force of so-called international law,*" and described it as an institution "*backed and run by a powerful network of leftist nongovernmental organizations, smug globalists, and hostile Third World governments*." The State Department confirmed the campaign will expand sanctions, visa revocations, and travel bans against ICC judges, prosecutors, and affiliated organizations, while pressing allied governments, including EU Member States, to reject the Court's jurisdiction or risk losing U.S. security cooperation. This marks a sharp escalation from targeted sanctions to an explicit, government-wide effort to incapacitate the Court altogether.

The Union of European Federalists recalls that the European Union has been among the strongest supporters of the ICC and its mandate. The ICC exemplifies the belief that some crimes (genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, the crime of aggression) are so grave that they concern the whole of humanity.

In this context, we view the Trump administration actions as an unacceptable attack on international justice. The extraterritorial enforcement of these measures within the European Union is a clear violation of our legal and political sovereignty. It attempts to compel EU-based entities to participate in a blockade against an international judicial body that the Union itself is bound by treaty to support. The EU Blocking Statute was designed precisely for this scenario in 1996: to protect European operators from the unlawful application of foreign legislation.

The demand to shield the ICC is rooted in the clear, established mandate of the European Parliament. Throughout 2025 and into 2026, the Parliament has exerted intense and sustained pressure with several urgent Parliamentary questions on the European Commission to deploy this legal shield, echoing the demands of Member States like Slovenia, civil society organizations, and the ICC itself. In particular in its Resolution 2025/2528 adopted on 12 March 2025 the European Parliament expressed its "utmost concern about US sanctions against ICC, its prosecutors, judges and staff, which constitute a serious attack on the international justice system" and called upon "the Commission to urgently activate the Blocking Statute and on Member States to urgently increase their diplomatic efforts in order to protect and safeguard the ICC and the indispensable cornerstone of the international justice system".

However, despite these clear directives, and despite public statements by European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen and European Council President António Costa defending the ICC's independence from Washington's pressures, the executive is actively ignoring the repeated, explicit calls of the European Parliament.

The UEF is committed to promote International Justice, fight impunity and protect victims of human rights crimes. We firmly support the mobilization led by Eumans and No Peace Without Justice (NPWJ) and the campaign of the Coalitions for ICC and call for the immediate activation of the EU Blocking Statute to protect the ICC.

## World Federalist Movement - IGP

On July 13, U.S. Secretary of State Marco Rubio launched a campaign to dismantle the International Criminal Court. "*To accept the ICC is to surrender control of our national destiny,"* asserted Mr Rubio. *"It would mean the death of the U.S. as a sovereign and independent nation. Our decision and our people would be at the mercy of the ICC and its collaborators in the "international community… Using all the tools at our government's disposal, working beside every ally with whom we can make common cause, we will dismantle the ICC—brick by brick, if necessary.*"

The campaign adds new elements to the sanctions that the U.S. had already placed on the ICC, key ICC personnel and several NGOs involved in ICC actions relating to alleged atrocity crimes by the Israeli and U.S. military in territories under the jurisdiction of the ICC. The new elements include, in particular, a campaign of U.S. pressure on countries to withdraw from the ICC, especially allies of the U.S. and other countries that rely on U.S. assistance. Already, this appears to be having an impact with Venezuela announcing on July 24 that it would withdraw from the ICC (See US State Department notice on Venezuela's withdrawal).

WFM-IGP has joined hundreds of other organizations around the world in opposing the U.S. sanctions on, and its campaign to dismantle, the ICC. We endorsed two recent sign on letters including;

- The International Criminal Court is in Danger: A Call to Defenders of International Law (in French and English), which includes a call, in particular, on the EU to apply the Blocking Statute, whose activation would make it possible to neutralise, on European territory, the extraterritorial effects of American sanctions. This move has been requested by the ICC President and supported by members of the European Parliament;
- Support the ICC as a Vital Court of Last Resort for Victims of Grave International Crimes, a joint letter organized by the Washington Working Group on the ICC and endorsed by more than 100 U.S. based organizations and individuals.

---

Washington Working Group on the ICC

### SUPPORT THE ICC AS A VITAL COURT OF LAST RESORT FOR VICTIMS OF GRAVE INTERNATIONAL CRIMES

As of July 29, 2026, 125 organizations and individuals have joined the below statement. Additional signatories will be added on a rolling basis. To join the statement, kindly fill out the Google form: https://bit.ly/WICCstatement (please note this is intended for US/US-based organizations and individuals given our group's focus; we fully encourage others to join complementary actions).

As US organizations from across civil society—including legal, human rights, faith-based, humanitarian, academic, and democracy organizations—alongside advocates for victims and survivors of atrocity crimes, prominent scholars, legal practitioners, diplomats, and civil servants, we are alarmed by the US administration's announced campaign to "dismantle" and "systematically disable" the International Criminal Court (ICC), including reported threats of consequences for states that continue to support or cooperate with the Court.

As the country commemorates the 250th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, we are reminded that the American experiment rests on an enduring principle: that no one is above the law. An independent judiciary, the rule of law, and equal justice under law are values the United States has long championed both at home and abroad.

The United States played a defining role in the early development of international criminal justice. US Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson and Nuremberg prosecutor Benjamin B. Ferencz, a lifelong champion of international justice, including the ICC, and the promise of "Never Again," promoted the enduring principle that the gravest crimes must be met with accountability under the law. That commitment continued through US support on a bipartisan basis for accountability efforts before dedicated courts set up to address grave crimes committed in the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Sierra Leone. And it continued to support the work of the ICC in countries including Sudan and Ukraine.

The ICC is an independent and impartial judicial institution created by states to investigate and prosecute genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression, consistent with the principle that such crimes should not go unpunished. These are the only crimes within its jurisdiction. As a court of last resort, it reinforces—rather than replaces—the primary responsibility of states to investigate and prosecute these crimes. Efforts to intimidate, weaken, or dismantle the Court undermine confidence in the administration of justice and the international legal system itself. Most critically, they break a promise to victims and survivors that justice can prevail over impunity for crimes that shock the conscience of humanity and that no one is above the law.

We are concerned by any effort to pressure states for honoring the international legal commitments they have undertaken. The ICC has jurisdiction when a citizen of a non-state party commits crimes within its mandate on the territory of an ICC state party. US citizens who commit crimes abroad are subject to the jurisdiction of foreign courts. This is a well-established principle of international law.

We also express our solidarity with the judges, legal professionals, civil society organizations, and others who serve the cause of international justice with professionalism, independence, and fidelity to the law.

We urge the administration to withdraw this policy; refrain from actions that undermine the independence and functioning of the International Criminal Court or seek to discourage lawful cooperation with it; and reaffirm the longstanding commitment of the United States to justice, accountability, and the rule of law. July 17, International Justice Day, marks the adoption of the Rome Statute of the ICC. We reaffirm our commitment to accountability for atrocity crimes, to judicial independence, and the rule of law. We urge the US government to uphold that legacy.

---

**EU Parlamentarians call for activation of the EU Blocking Statute**

## Protect the International Criminal Court, defend the rule of law.

"We, Members of Parliament from across the European Union, Norway and Ukraine, discussed "The role of the EU and its Member States in supporting global accountability mechanisms, including universal jurisdiction, international courts and special tribunals" during an interparliamentary Committee meeting held on 6 May 2026 in the European Parliament, Brussels. Following this meeting, we reaffirm our commitment to the international legal order and to multilateral institutions mandated to report, gather evidence, investigate and prosecute the gravest crimes under international law, including the International Criminal Court (ICC).

We also condemn unilateral foreign coercive measures, notably those imposed by the United States under Executive Order 14203, against ICC officials and their partners working to gather and preserve evidence of international crimes. Such coercive measures are producing concrete effects

within the European Union. Individuals and entities targeted under the Executive Order — including European citizens — have faced the closure of their bank accounts, restrictions on financial transactions, loss of insurance and payment services, and denial of access to essential digital and technological services in Europe.

The extraterritorial application of foreign coercive measures within the European Union is illegal and seriously undermine the autonomy of the European legal order, the independence of judicial institutions, and the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms of all the Europeans. The Union and its Member States are committed to support international justice mechanisms and should use all existing legal instruments designed to precisely address such situations.

We therefore call on the President of the European Commission to urgently propose the inclusion of Executive Order 14203 in the Annex to Council Regulation (EC) No. 2271/96 (the EU Blocking Statute). Activating the Blocking Statute is necessary to protect persons and entities operating within the European Union from the extraterritorial effects of these coercive measures, to uphold the independence of international justice institutions, and to defend European sovereignty."

Members of the European Parliament's Subcommittee on Human Rights: Mounir Satouri (Chair); Maria Temido (First Vice-Chair); Francisco Assis; Sandra Gómez López; Bernard Guetta; Rima Hassan; Hannah Neumann; Chloé Ridel; Marco Tarquinio; Catarina Vieira. Members of national parliaments of EU Member States: Atidzhe Alieva-Veli (National Assembly, Bulgaria), Patryk Gabriel (Sejm, Poland), Raúl Díaz Marín (Congreso de los Diputados, Spain), Adam Gomoła (Sejm, Poland), Beáta Jurík (National Council, Slovak Republic), Nuna Menezes (Assembleia da República, Portugal)

---

## World Federalist Movement of Japan (WFM-J)

**Statement (28 August 2026)**

### Immediate Withdrawal of Unjustified Pressure on the International Criminal Court

The International Criminal Court (ICC) has issued arrest warrants for Russian President Vladimir Putin and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in connection with alleged international crimes, including war crimes. These actions demonstrate the principle that no one—not even a head of state—is above the law or immune from accountability for the gravest international crimes. As such, they represent an important affirmation of the rule of law and deserve strong recognition and support.

Russia, however, retaliated by placing ICC President Judge Tomoko Akane on its wanted list. The Trump administration has likewise designated President Akane and other ICC officials for sanctions pursuant to a presidential Executive Order and has even considered encouraging States Parties to withdraw from the ICC. Such actions constitute blatant interference with the independence of the Court and a serious assault on the rule of law. They are wholly unacceptable.

The World Federalist Movement of Japan has long advocated “World Peace Through World Law” and has worked toward a world in which disputes are resolved through law rather than force. To that end, we have consistently promoted the development of international law and the rule of law, as well as the reform and strengthening of international institutions.

The establishment of the ICC in 2002 represented an important realization of precisely these principles. When Japan moved toward accession to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, we played a leading role, in cooperation with many other NGOs, in supporting Japan’s participation in the Court. We therefore have a particularly strong commitment to the ICC and are

deeply outraged by the sanctions and other forms of pressure directed against President Tomoko Akane and other ICC officials.

When President Akane became the target of retaliatory measures by Russia, she made clear her determination to defend the rule of law even at personal risk, stating in substance that judges are replaceable even if one of them should lose their life. In response to the sanctions imposed by the Trump administration, she has also warned, in substance, that we must not allow this to become the beginning of the end of the rule of law.

When the Trump administration issued its Executive Order authorizing sanctions against ICC personnel, 79 countries issued a joint statement condemning the measure. Japan did not join that statement.

This was presumably due, at least in part, to considerations surrounding Japan's relationship with the United States. Friendship between nations, however, cannot mean accepting every action taken by a friend or ally. A true friend must be prepared to say clearly when a friend is wrong.

Nor should it be forgotten that U.S. Secretary of State Marco Rubio, who is now among the strongest critics of the ICC within the Trump administration, was himself a co-sponsor in 2022 of a U.S. Senate resolution supporting accountability for war crimes committed in Ukraine and encouraging international action, including through the ICC, to investigate such crimes. At that time, he supported the role of international justice and the rule of law in holding those responsible for grave international crimes accountable.

It is not too late.

The Government of Japan should call for the immediate withdrawal of these unjustified retaliatory measures, sanctions, and other forms of pressure directed against the ICC and its officials, and should make clear its full and unequivocal support for the Court.

Japan nominated Tomoko Akane for election as an ICC judge, and she now serves as President of the Court. Japan has also long been one of the Court's foremost financial supporters and has made the rule of law a central principle of its foreign policy. For these reasons, defending the independence and integrity of the ICC at this critical moment is not merely an option for Japan—it is a responsibility consistent with the principles Japan itself has long upheld.

---

# William Pace
# Personification of Peace

*by Daniel K White*

*By* Hailing from the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, William Pace grew up in the post WWII era that brought about an unprecedented economic boom in America and witnessed a dynamic change in civil society with the emergence of a counterculture when Pace graduated from the University of Denver. Like so many other young American's, Pace was faced with the possibility of being conscripted during the height of the Vietnam War. As his university's student body president, he opposed the war and secured conscientious objector classification. In his moral and intellectual struggle with war, Pace stumbled upon Albert Einstein's largely unknown but intriguing biography 'Einstein on Peace' and *his* struggle with "war" by Otto Nathan and Heinz Norden. Einstein's thoughts on peace resonated deeply with Pace and it would become one of Pace's greatest inspirations in pursuing a life devoted to protecting the environment, international justice, rule of law, human rights, and world peace.

Pace's discovery of Einstein's soul searching for world peace gave Pace the impetus to find out more about Einstein's significant involvement in the World Federalist Movement (WFM). The campaign for world federalism began in the 1930's in direct response of the failed attempt by the League of Nations to prevent the outbreak of another world war with the idea and concept becoming popularized in 1937 by two influential pacifists and feminists Rosika Schwimmer and Lola Maverick Lloyd.

After the movement gained momentum through the likes of Rosika Schwimmer, Lola Maverick Lloyd and others, similar groups with the same objectives aimed at preventing and abolishing war through peaceful means began to flourish. The movement for world federalism continued to grow with several publications such as 'The Anatomy of Peace' by Emery Reves in 1945 and early notable figures like Albert Einstein, Oscar Hammerstein II (Rodgers & Hammerstein) and Bette Davis were well known advocates for world federalism and instrumental in promulgating the movement.

The WFM founded in 1947 is today a non-profit, non-partisan organisation committed to the realisation of global peace and justice through the development of democratic institutions and the application of international and world law. The ongoing success of this historic movement can be attributed to many individuals, and owing to the foresight and initial efforts by Rosika Schwimmer and Lola Maverick Lloyd who envisioned world federalism, members of WFM-IGP today continue to gather from around the globe to collaborate and work effectively and tirelessly with one another in harmony towards preventing World War and establishing peace.

In 1983 the Institute for Global Policy (IGP) was implemented as an educational arm of the WFM and continues to this day to improve and better understand the United Nations (UN) and other international organizations. Its primary function is to research and form policy aimed at promoting human security, international justice, the prevention of armed conflict and protection of civilians. Given the gravity of work WFM-IGP is involved with, the movement has attracted influential and charismatic personalities even in contemporary times such as Martin Sheen and the late Sir Peter Ustinov who was well known for his humanitarian and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) efforts and served as International President of the WFM-IGP from 1994 – 2004. Pace gained extensive experience working for many years for peace and disarmament causes, as well as work for Amnesty International and for preparations for the UN Decade of International Law and the Earth Summit (UN Conference on Environment and Development). Pace became acting Secretary-General of WFM in 1988 and began full-time service at the UN office of the WFM in 1994. During Pace's tenure while he was Executive Director for the WFM-IGP (1994 – 2019)

and since then, Pace has had a propitious career and tangible success with international justice, rule of law, environmental law, and human rights.

It was a seminal moment in July 1998 for international law and justice when by a vote of 120 – 7, the world's governments adopted the Rome Statute for the International Criminal Court (ICC) and four years later, in July 2002, 66 nations ratified the treaty establishing the ICC (now 123 nations ratified). Pace and the Coalition for the ICC comprising 2500 organizations worldwide was organized and hosted by WFM-IGP and were widely recognized as fundamental to the creation of the ICC both being nominated numerous times for the Nobel Peace Prize. Pace and WFM-IGP were asked by the government of Canada to organize a global coalition for another major new norm – the Responsibility to Protect – endorsed by more than a hundred nations. Thus, 2 monumental achievements were implemented and continue to serve the international community in preventing and ceasing aggression, genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and ethnic cleansing. In acknowledgement of Pace's immeasurable contributions, he was awarded the William J Butler Human Rights Award 2002 from the Urban Morgan Institute for Human Rights and was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize for his work on the ICC.

Despite the hurdles and challenges presented globally by various governments from all corners around the world, Pace has consistently been unabated in his pursuit for global peace and even served as the Secretary-General of the Hague Appeal for Peace (1996 – 1999) and chaired what has been called the largest peace conference in history, marking the 100th anniversary of the first Hague Peace Conference that involved more than 8,000 nongovernmental organizations, international institutions, and government representatives. When reflecting on the efficacy and ongoing role of the United Nations, in an article published by Pace in 2016 he stated the following "Let me state that I believe it is highly likely that the UN has prevented WW III – that is a war between P5 governments (Permanent Members: China, France, Russia, USA, UK and other states) using nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction." Given Pace's expertise, he has been widely featured in The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, the BBC, CNN, Der Spiegel and while Pace's overall achievements may not be widely known, his actions speak volumes of what can be accomplished through a life pursuing peace.

Today, Pace continues to devote his time on numerous transnational committees and leads the Center for Development of International Law where Pace has served as President since 1989. His contribution to justice, law, the environment, and humanity over the past 30 years is nothing short of remarkable. The old peace movement (WFM-IGP) which Pace has been a pivotal member of has not only managed to keep with the zeitgeist of the times, it offers everyone to be a part of a worldwide community who share the same honorable ideals for justice, law, environmental protection and human rights and values.

With devastating natural disasters, wars, and civil conflict around the world today, Einstein could not have been more insightful and profound in his quote for peace. "Peace cannot be kept by force; it can only be achieved by understanding."

Pace is the embodiment and exemplification of what Einstein envisaged; long may he endure.

# Is the EU already a federation?
# Why theorising this matters for federalists?

**by Domenec Devesa**

Some scholars are arguing that the EU is already a federation (Robert Schütze, *European Union Law*, 3rd ed., Oxford University Press, 2021) or a state, albeit of a different nature from the traditional nation-state (Sylvain Khan, *L´Europe: un État qui s´ignore,* CNRS Éditions, Paris, 2026).

Schütze argues convincingly that standard German legal tradition fails to properly identify the nature of the EU since it only admits two categories of political entities: sovereign states (either unitary or federal) and international organisations. From this follows that the EU can only be an international organisation (which it clearly is not in view of its many distinctive features), or alternatively a "sui generis" organisation. This characterization of the EU in fact creates a "category of one", with therefore limited explanatory power. According to Schütze, there is at least a third category of political organisation: the "federation of states", something different from a federal state (unitary in origin before political decentralization, or otherwise with the central state exercising the "competency to establish competencies").

Thus, using the United States, as a federal union of states, as a metric, Schütze concludes that the EU is also a federation. Several features are common: creation by international treaty ratified by all Member States, specific attribution of competences to the Federation by the constitutional framework and dual sovereignty, joint legislation by an elected chamber representing the people and a chamber representing the states, and primacy of federal law.

Kahn, on the other hand, highlights the many "state attributes" that the EU already has and shows that the nation-state is just one type of state among many, including the imperial state, the local state, and indeed the "supranational state". According to this view, the EU is a supranational state, which is not founded on familiar state features such as military power, and blends federal and intergovernmental features. As such, it is in permanent evolution and is set to acquire more powers, particularly in defence. In the final page of the book, Kahn equates the latest stages of the "supranational" with the Kantian "federation of free states".

In my view, both authors provide interesting and complementary insights for constructing a useful theory of integration, and for the federal movement, albeit with some caveats. Schütze makes an important theoretical contribution by placing the EU on "federal ground", a term he also uses, but that must not necessarily be equated with "federation". While Schütze is right in rejecting the legal dualism state-international organisation, and in identifying key federal features of the EU, he overlooks other (quite fundamental) characteristics that also set it apart from the American tradition of federalism. The EU may therefore be better understood as an emerging or incomplete federation of states: already situated on federal ground, but not yet possessing all the essential attributes of a fully-fledged federation.

First, while the American federation was created with the consent of its constituent states, no individual state retains a veto over subsequent constitutional reform: under Article V of the US Constitution, amendments may enter into force upon ratification by three quarters of the states. In the EU, by contrast, although the European Parliament can initiate Treaty reform, the ultimate power to amend the Treaties remains with the Member States, all of which must agree to and ratify the amendments. Secondly, while the EU is sovereign in the fields of attributed competences, it lacks an autonomous general taxing power: it cannot determine the resources needed to finance its policies or the overall size of its budget without the unanimous approval of the Member States. Finally, unanimity remains the general rule in areas that constitute a typical external dimension of federal sovereignty: foreign policy and defence. The latter is particularly revealing since Article 42(2) TEU itself expressly envisages common defence as a possible future stage of integration.

Why does this theorisation matter? These two theoretical approaches largely coincide with the view that the EU has a federal vocation (based on the Schuman Declaration and its empirical evolution since 1950) and thus is at the very least a federalising project or federation-in-the-making (Sidjanski). This does not mean that this evolution is inevitable or that the speed of travel is adequate (certainly it is not): Member States need strong incentives or pressing conditions to share more sovereignty, and there are vocal opponents in European society, particularly the resurgent far right. This is why the role of the federalist movement is so important. With a clear understanding of the EU's nature, it can highlight what has been achieved, identify what remains to be achieved - and this is badly is needed to survive in a world of empires - and fight for it, thus steering the project closer and faster towards its end goal: a federation of states.

Theorisation about the EU has other practical implications for federalist activism. Purely intergovernmental or sui generis accounts risk obscuring both the federal features already observable in the Union and the remaining institutional asymmetries. Their normative consequence may be to naturalise as permanent features arrangements that are in fact contingent stages of European integration, thus preventing further federal evolution.

---



**Domenec Devesa** is the President of the Union of European Federalists. Former member of the European Parliament (MEP 2019-2024). Senior Researcher at CIDOB. Socialist Coordinator in AFCO and Rapporteur for the draft Electoral law of 3 May 2022.

---

# A Euro-African response to the Spanish-Moroccan dispute over immigration

**by Domenico Moro**

As we know, at the end of last July, the Spanish enclave of Ceuta – a city situated in the north of the African continent – experienced an exceptional influx of migrants. In terms of scale, it surpassed the similar event in 2021, when around 10,000 people poured into Ceuta. According to some estimates, by the end of July, the influx of migrants had involved over 80,000 people and resulted in a high number of casualties. Apart from its scale, however, this is not the only event of its kind, nor does it concern Morocco alone: over time, it has also affected Algeria, Libya and Tunisia.

The recent tragedy in Ceuta has highlighted at least two objective facts. The first is that African migration to Europe is a structural problem to which the EU must provide an equally structural response; the second is that, as demonstrated by the precedents of Turkey, Belarus, Libya and Morocco itself, migration is being used as a tool of hybrid warfare against the EU. These are two problems for which a solution is far from straightforward, and which make it increasingly urgent to launch a common European foreign policy towards the African continent.

As regards the first of the two objective facts just mentioned – namely, the solution to the problem of African migration – this can only take the form of a joint plan by the EU and the African Union (AU) for the continent's development, so as to tackle at its roots one of the main causes of emigration (the others being the endemic wars affecting the continent and climate change). This development plan should be accompanied by controlled Euro-African management of migrant flows, as Europe needs – for demographic reasons – legal migrants to integrate into the labour market. The launch of a joint Euro-African development plan is necessary, as it is unrealistic to expect the EU to resolve the migrant issue on its own. This is a perspective that Pope Francis, a figure of unquestionable moral stature, had already criticised in the past, describing it as a 'hypocritical' stance.

During a press conference held at the end of his visit to Bahrain in 2022, the Pope, responding to a question on the issue of immigration, stated: "And then I would like to mention another European responsibility: Africa. I think this was said by one of the great stateswomen we have had and have — Merkel. She said that the problem of migrants must be solved in Africa. But if we think of Africa with the motto: "Africa must be exploited", it is logical that migrants — people — flee from that exploitation. We have to, Europe must try to make development plans for Africa. To think that some countries in Africa are not masters of their own subsoil, that they still depend on colonialist powers! It is hypocrisy to want to solve the problem of migrants in Europe. No, let us solve it at home too […] If we want to solve the problem of migrants for good, let us solve Africa. The migrants who come from elsewhere are fewer. but let us turn to Africa. Let us help Africa. Let us move forward."

A European plan for Africa should, however, be preceded by a change in the way the EU's borders are managed. The EU should turn its borders into European borders rather than national ones, as is still the case today. Frontex should be the agency responsible for European borders and not, as is the case today, an agency that supports national border guards: it should rather be the other way round, with national structures supporting Frontex's activities. Obviously, the European institutions will have to ensure that Frontex no longer violates human rights and is no longer an unacceptable source of corruption (*'Frontex continues its mission in Greece, despite serious violations of migrants' rights*', Le Monde, 18 July 2026).

Equally complex is the issue of the use of immigration as a tool of hybrid warfare. Regarding the causes of the large influx of migrants into the enclave of Ceuta, various hypotheses have been put forward, some of which concern an alleged US plot aimed at weakening the Spanish government for having opposed the use of Spanish bases for intervention in Iran. The most widely accepted theory is that the influx was facilitated by the Moroccan government, which took advantage of a ruling by the Spanish Court of Justice stating that migrants arriving by sea could not be turned back; and, this may explain why the Sánchez government has not levelled specific accusations at the Moroccan government (*What Morocco was saying to Spain in Ceuta*, Foreign Policy, 11 August 2026).

The Moroccan government's policy of exerting pressure on the Spanish government by using immigration as a lever is not new and has several reasons behind it. The first is Morocco's demand for the return of the cities of Ceuta and Melilla. The second is Spain's stance on the future status of the former Spanish Sahara – now known as Western Sahara – which is seeking independence. Whilst this latter position is

supported by Algeria and Mauritania, a United Nations Security Council resolution, adopted at the end of October last year, supports the Spanish position instead.

There is little doubt that Ceuta and Melilla are the legacy of a European colonial policy towards Africa, just as there is little doubt that, Ceuta in particular, occupies a strategic position in that it allows control over Mediterranean maritime traffic. This is the very reason why Britain refuses to relinquish Gibraltar, even though it is, essentially, a rock on the border between the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. The strategic importance of the straits – it must be emphasised – has returned to the fore following the US's illegal intervention against Iran and the subsequent clash over control of the Strait of Hormuz.

Ceuta is a city that holds no obvious economic interest for Spain, but only strategic interest, and the same applies to Morocco. A solution to this conflict is unlikely to be found by emphasising the respective nationalist positions and by using immigration as a tool of hybrid warfare. One of the solutions that has long been under discussion is, in fact, the possibility of administering Ceuta (and Melilla) by establishing dual sovereignty over the two cities, modelled on Andorra, whose heads of state are the President of the French Republic and the Bishop of Urgell. Economic integration between Morocco and the EU makes it possible to envisage a shared solution.

Trade (imports plus exports) between the EU and Morocco in 2024 accounted for 54 per cent of Morocco's total trade with the rest of the world. Far behind came China with 7.7 per cent and the US with 6.9 per cent. But even more significant is the impact of trade with the EU on Morocco's GDP: in 2024, it stood at 41 per cent. This means that Morocco's long-term interests depend on the stability of its relations with Europe, rather than on its relations with China or the US. This fact makes the hypothesis of an alleged American plot against the EU even less plausible, even though the migration crisis at the end of July fuelled the MAGA ideology on immigration and bolstered the US policy of dividing the European continent (*Crise de Ceuta: l'impossible quête des origines de la rumeur d'une ouverture de la frontière*, Le Monde, 4 August 2026). Morocco's close integration with the European economy puts into question the notion that the future of Ceuta and Melilla is a matter solely concerning relations between Morocco and Spain: the latter would lack the necessary bargaining power, and the migration crises that occasionally occur to the detriment of the two cities demonstrate this. Only the EU can reasonably support a credible and lasting solution, but for it to be such, it must also involve the African Union. An agreement between the EU and the AU regarding Ceuta and Melilla would represent a response that transcends the nationalist politics pitting Morocco against Spain. The agreement could be reached at the intercontinental level and subsequently provide for the joint management of the two cities to be delegated to Morocco and Spain.

An agreement between the EU and the AU would have clear geostrategic implications and would also set an example for the rest of the world. The joint management of the two cities would also amount to joint management – albeit partial (given that it does not include the city of Gibraltar) – of the Strait of Gibraltar. This solution could remain in place until the ill-fated American venture against Iran raises the issue of control over the strategic straits affecting world trade in a new light – such as their management by a United Nations agency.

---



Member of the Board of the "Luciano Bolis" Foundation, of the Federal Committee of the European Federalist Movement, and of the European Movement. He has collaborated on issues of federalism and European defense with the Center for Studies on Federalism and with the journals Eurobull, Il federalista, Il Mulino, Italianieuropei, Pensiero Mazziniano, and Queste istituzioni. He has published "Toward European Defense" (Il Mulino, 2018) and, co-authored the volume "The Government of a Supranational Federal Economy and Its Institutions" (2014).

---

## AFTER NATIONS
## The Making and Unmaking of a World Order
## by Rana Dasgupta

Rana Dasgupta's book, *After Nations. The Making and Unmaking of a World Order* (London, William Collins, 2026, pp. 488) deserves to be taken into consideration by federalists for its in-depth and original analysis of the crisis of the post-Cold War international order, although its conclusions on possible remedies do not appear convincing for the reasons we will see. Those who set out to understand the causes of the crisis of the international order and the practicable ways to overcome it must explore without preconceptions all the well-argued analyses, because the future of humanity will depend on the negative or positive developments in international relations: it is enough to recall the possible recourse to nuclear weapons by the superpowers and the unstoppable ecological crisis that from year to year suffocates all continents with increasing heat waves. Today, many inhabitants of planet Earth, especially young people, are asking, "Will humanity have a future?"

Dasgupta's analysis is interesting because it analyses the international system from multiple points of view: culture, civilization, religion, political and economic institutions. It also examines the political consequences of great revolutions and the relations between small and great powers; the economy in its historical phases of development, information technologies and the environmental crisis. "In the late 1970s - Dasgupta says - there began a set of processes which restored the autonomy of financial capital, reset the purpose of politics, and generated a number of formidable new competitors to the nation-state. What these process were, and where they willl lead, forms the core of this book. Here we need only say that nearly five decades later, the nation-state is unable *even in theory* to manage reality as once it did. Its capacity to deliver progress and human welfare has been significantly undermined" (p. 5). The book is divided into four Parts and each part into chapters. The Parties are: 1. God-France; 2. Money-Britain; 3. Law-America; 4. Nature-China. Finally, there is a Conclusion in which some reforms of the international order in crisis are proposed.

The Part *God-France* It is mainly dedicated to the formation and development of the French state, as a model followed by all the other European and non-European states that have progressively become part of the society of nation-states, therefore an interdependent system of sovereign national governments, often fighting for supremacy or their independence. Here is how Dasgupta specifies the formation of this political paradigm: "Considering the comparative poverty and unproductivity of Europe, the Capetian conception of sovereignty generated a reasonably effective military and economic machine. But it also produced a religious paranoid kingdom obsessed with the control of inner life and fundamentally inimical to scientific progress, cosmopolitanism and banking. This was in marked contrast to the non-national polities at the European fringes, which were also inordinately richer. The Abbasid caliphate, the Ottoman empire, the Mamluk sultanate, the Iberian empire of al-Andalus – none of these required homogeneity of belif. Catholics and Jews enjoyed freedom of warship in Andalus, and frequently rose to high political office" (p. 29). This model of coexistence between political power, religious power, agricultural and urban society allowed the European continent to promote a decisive transition towards the era that we now consider modern: trade intensified between all European countries, productivity in agriculture increased, city-states were formed and then the first regional states, especially in Italy, and a little later the first great monarchies in France, Great Britain and Spain. These developments increasingly relegated religion to a marginal role. "In the modern cosmology, God does not intervene directly in the world. The prime mover of history is the state, which takes

over most of the coercive functions previously associated with God, and in which faith is non-negotiable. The divinity is pushed to the edge of the cosmos, a remote guarantor of state legitimacy ("God save America"). Individual citizens are free to imagine this divinity as they please, so long as it does not interfere with the primary allegiance to the 'mortal God'." (p. 43).

Part Two - *Money-Britain* – discusses the complex relationship between personal wealth, democracy and social justice. The subject of the study of this crucial historical process is Great Britain. "For centuries, England was distinguished from other European monarchies by the power of parliament, which acted to limit crown prerogative, principally by controlling access to taxation. … One advantage was a political system which excluded all interests save their own: only those in possession of significant estates could vote or serve in parliament" (p. 95). This power structure generated a continuous tension between the government and the ruling class. "Elizabeth I squandered much of crown wealth to the purchase of political support ... Her successor, James I, attempted a turnaround ... He created new excise duties on England's expanding trade" (p. 96). In the same years, England had to begin to compete with an ambitious neighbour. "In 1578, the Dutch Republic became the first large state to be ruled by the capitalist class. The result was a formidable engine: in a short century the world was taken over by the Dutch empire" (p. 99). Thus began the race of the European powers to conquer Asia and the Americas, the great European colonial empires were formed, which would resist until the second half of the twentieth century, and the first financial institutions of modern capitalism: the stock exchanges. In England, after the transitory phase of Cromwellian authoritarianism, relative political stability was achieved. "The 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688 saw the definitive takeover of English politics by interests of property, and the establishment of a 'fiscal-military' state committed to the expansion and defence of those interests at home and abroad" (p. 109).

In the second half of the seventeenth century, the English economy embarked on a profound transformation that would become overwhelming in the following century and that would extend from Europe to the whole world: the industrial revolution. Its relationship with the development of democracy is, however, problematic, partly contradictory. "The state could not *Afford* democracy. More than that, it did not *need* democracy. … Britain was no budding democracy. It was a successful and secure property despotism which, far from relaxing its exclusions, enforced them more brutally as the eighteenth century advanced. The British state did not represent 'the people', who saw it for what it was: a venial imposition. All but propertied men were excluded from the political system" (p. 113).

These crude observations do not concern only the social and political situation of those years. "Britan's eighteenth-century elites were open-minded radicals, who might have felt quite at home in today's Silicon Valley. They had no sentimentality about political order – cutting the head from one king, for instance, and sending another into exile. … they were, in fact, the 'founding fathers' of our own world – indeed, there mines and plantations would supply the capital for the Industrial Revolution" (p. 119).

An unforeseen consequence of the Industrial Revolution was the formation of a class of a large mass of working poor. "The 'Poor Law' of 1834, introduced as part of the process of labour rationalisation, instituted houses of forced labour for poor adults and children; the purpose was to convince them that charity was a more arduous and humiliating form of slavery than anything they might encounter through wage work. The law revolted paternalist conservatives such as Charles Dickens and John Ruskin, who retained a belief in the responsibilities of wealth towards unfortunate" (p- 134). The new phenomenon was the symptom of a deeper social transformation, it was not only a matter of facing the drama of poverty, but of the formation of a new social actor: the working class. Over the course of the century, workers' unions were organized and real political parties were formed to support their rights: thus a new political thought developed: socialism and communism. A further development of the social process connected with the industrial revolution was the conquest of universal suffrage. "As suffrge expanded, politicians also needed proletarian votes, and it became convenient to have the working classes massed into unions under identifiable

leadership. Worker 'combinations' moved gradually from the illegal fringes, therefore, to the centre. Unions were fully legalised in Britain in 1871, and the right to strike acknowledged." (p. 142). Workers not only gained the right to join unions and parties, but soon became a relevant political subject in national politics. "Universal male suffrage was conceded in Britain in February 1918. Female suffrage was finally added in 1928; this too had much to do with wartime experience, which had highlighted the essential role of women in industrial society" (pp. 147-8). In conclusion: "This was the high era of the Western nation-state: a time of great internal conflict, of course, but also of stupendous achievement" (p. 153).

The most recent developments in the international economic system since the fall of the Berlin Wall can be summarized as follows: globalization without government. Dasgupta states: "this revolution began in the banking centres of London and New York, and was extendet across the world. Though it spoke the language of markets, currencies and products, its target was states, taxes and laws. It was a political revolution ... globalisation was criminal" (p.157-61). In the most recent phase, globalization, which favours the adoption of powerful 'smart' technologies, is seriously jeopardizing democracy. Some AI ideologues, such as Peter Thiel, argue that "The notion of 'capitalist democracy' he believes 'has become an oxymoron' ... Thiel's investment in crypto currencies, like his founding vision at PayPal, aimed to foster a new kind of money 'free from all government control and dilution'" (p. 165). Dasgupta recalls: "*Foreign Affairs* observed in 2021 that 'states have been the primary actors in global affairs for nearly 400 years. That is starting to change, as a handful of large technology companies rival them for geopolitical influence. … The democracy heyday had already ended" (pp. 169-74).

Part Three is entitled: *Law-America*. In this Part Dasgupta intends to show how the United States of America has played a prominent role in the creation of the contemporary international order based on the rules of international law and on basically peaceful relations between nation states. Of course, this model of international politics dominated by a great power does not exclude wars, genocide and exploitation by rich countries of poor ones. The first pages are dedicated to a rapid reconstruction of the political thought that developed after the discovery of America and the relations between 'civilized' countries, the Europeans, and the 'barbarian' countries, the non-European ones. In this historical context, the Peace of Westphalia (1748) represented a decisive turning point. A system of sovereign states has been formed in perpetual search for possible dominance over other states and a necessary balance between powers. It is the dramatic alternative between balance and hegemony that the historian Ludwig Dehio (*Gleichgewicht oder Hegemonie,* 1948) describes in one of his classic works dedicated to international political history. Dasgupta cites some crucial authors: the philosopher Kant criticizes the system of states based on bare relations of power, covered by an ambiguous international law that allows the resolution of disputes through war. For Kant, perpetual peace can only be guaranteed by a world federal union of states. In the cosmopolitan federation, relations between states must be based on an international law that excludes recourse to war. A second philosopher and politician cited by Dasgupta is Marx who inaugurates the politics of the workers' internationals, which later developed as socialist and communist internationals. Finally, Dasgupta quotes Mazzini, who fought not only for Italian unification, as a nation state, but also for the political unification of European nations. This part of Dasgupta's work is useful for understanding contemporary problems.

Let us now consider the crucial role played by the United States in the construction of the contemporary international political order. Already during the First World War, Woodrow Wilson in one of his speeches (in 1916) observed that thanks to God's Providence "a continent had unused and waiting for a peaceful people who loved liberty and the rights of men more than they loved anything else, to come and set up an unselfish commonwealth" (p. 213). As is well known, at the Versailles Conference Wilson proposed the creation of the League of Nations which was supposed to make the world a 'safe place for democracy.' A second principle on which Wilson intended to base the new system of international relations was the self-determination of nations, a principle adopted by Lenin in the Communist International (1919). It soon became evident that the League of

Nations would not be able to guarantee peace between the most economically advanced countries or between them and those still subject to colonial rule, now able, thanks to the principle of self-determination, to demand respect for their national autonomy, or sovereignty.

In the 1920s, in Italy, fascism managed to conquer state power without resorting to a violent revolution, although the violent groups, the fascists, active in civil society, managed to obtain growing consensus from the ruling class. In the thirties, Mussolini's example was followed with determination and ferocity by Hitler who managed in 1933 to be appointed Chancellor of the Reich by President von Hindenburg. Democracy, in an international system, where armed violence is a 'last resort' remedy for growing political and social disorder, is condemned to give in to authoritarian forces. Dasgupta notes that Wilson had deluded himself into thinking that he was creating a kind of world parliament with the League of Nations, through which sovereign states could peacefully settle their disputes. Wilson, Dasgupta observes, "was no friend of the colonised, who came to realise that Lenin was a much more plausible icon for their struggle. The United States spent much of the second half of the twentieth century fighting the very group which had come to seek America's help in 1919 and had been turned away. He was himself, in this sense, fully responsible for the breakdown of the 'world parliament' he had so fervently set up" (p. 222).

Towards the end of the Second World War, the U.S. government, under F. D. Roosevelt, took the initiative to plan, in agreement with the USSR, the second great world power, the creation of new international institutions. "The conflagration moved America to position of capitalist superpower. … As the editor of *Fortunes* put it in 1942, 'America imperialism can afford to complete the work the British started ... American vision, self-government would be granted in the world's people, while simultaneously and contrarily, global institutions would insulate contracts and property rights from their control. This would be an empire of law ... the United States of America emerged from an English principle of property" (pp. 237-8). In fact, the first international institutions created were the economic ones: the Bretton Woods conference took place in 1944, where it was decided to create an international monetary system based on the dollar. In later times, institutions concerning international trade were founded. The UN was founded in San Francisco in 1945. "The American empire was constituted, most obviously, of a system of independent nation-states, each one symbolically represented by a seat in the General Assembly of the new 'United Nations'. In theory at least, all would be legally equivalent, and the protection of the 'Westphalian system, which had benefited only a handful of industrialized powers, would be extended to the world" (p. 247).

"This was no 'Westphalian' system: once again, a club of rich states enjoyed plenary sovereignty, while a second tier was vulnerable to significant outside infiltration, and for everyone else there were no rules at all. ... The much trumpeted Universal Declaration of Human Rights did not stand a chance. The United Nations, once again, was not a world parliament, and could not guarantee those rights, responsibility for enforcing the Declaration was therefore devolved to the highest authority in existence, which was national governments themselves" (pp. 252-3).

The fourth part – *Nature-China* - it is dedicated to the oldest existing empire (or state). China was official foundation in 221 ECB. "The network of farms and walled cities established along the Yellow and Yagtze rivers could properly and appropriately be called China, ... These early societies coordinated human beings, animals, plants and minerals into patterns which proved highly conductive to state-building. … It began to fail only when it came into contact with another, more energetic, formula – that of Europe's industrialized nation-states" (p. 304). It is certainly not possible here to summarize the history of China over the last two millennia. We must limit ourselves to underlining a political-cultural aspect of Chinese civilization that has some common traits with the European one. The first common aspect is the formation of the ancient state, thanks to the exploitation of natural resources and the development of agriculture. Dasgupta rightly draws attention to the formation of a surplus of agricultural products, which in those centuries allowed the birth of a political-economic function that today we call 'money'. This phenomenon is connected to the cultivation of wheat. "Grain represented *potential* consumption – which might be actualised far

away in space or time, even by remote foreigners or those not yet born. Since it could be stored ... grain could also dispense this value in standard units, and therefore function as a means of exchange. Tax, and therefore states, and therefore 'modern' politics, began with grain ... No longer did communities labour merely to sustain human life; now they had to sustain the life of states. Farmers produced more than was necessary for their own survival, in other words, and owed their surplus to state-appointed bureaucrats" (p. 308). The downside of these developments in the agricultural-political system was the catastrophic destruction of biodiversity. Archaeologists have been able to verify "the corresponding retreat of those so-called 'star' or 'umbrella' species – such as tigers and elephants – whose survival is most dependent on the forest hinterland" (p. 309).

Of the fascinating history of China it is now necessary, for obvious reasons of space, to examine only one political-cultural aspect of China, ancient and modern: its conception of the necessary unity and harmony among the different populations. Let us focus on two dynasties: Quin (221-206 ECB) and Han (200 ECB – 220 AD). "By the end of the Spring and Autumn period (476 ECB) the states of the feudal lords numbered little more than a hundred, of which only fourteen were important. Then under the Quin emperor (221 ECB) there was just one. We should note that China's 'monistic' cosmology was already well established long before political unification. During the 'Spring and Autumn' and 'Warring States' periods, the states of the Yellow River basin witnessed the philosophical efflorescence of the so-called 'Hundred Schools of Thought', which idealised unity and order in both the metaphysical and political domain. According to philosopher Mozi ... the Quin triumph was seen as the actualisation of the blessed unity; it was a theological event ... Unity was not just territorial. At the centre of Mozi's thought was the concept of *tianxia* – usually translated as 'all under Haven'. Historian normally treat this as a political concept, referring simply to 'the people living under Chinese imperial rule', but for Mozi it was also moral, ecological and metaphysical. Condemning the disorder of his own period, he hoped for return to the ideal of the past, when Shang and Zhou emperors unified the world as a harmonious whole.... Unity descended from Haven" (pp. 316-7).

Let us now make a very long leap in time and consider how the ancient conception of *tianxia* has found a new formulation in modern China, thanks to the political struggles that have developed during the 19th and 20th centuries, up to the present day. Over the years, economic relations between China and the European continent have never been interrupted. "A tense symbiosis emerged, which gave rise, not only a Sinocentric trading system, but ultimately a continental economic network whose effects were felt as far away as Baghdad, Costantinople, Venice and Bruges. … The international order represented by its tribute system seemed truly to embrace 'all under Haven' (*tianxia*). And yet, even as China attained its most spectacular glory, it began to collapse as a result of the unsustainable pressure on society and nature. At that point, it was definitively annihilated by another ecological alternative: industrial Europe." (p. 326-7).

"How might China absorb the lessons of the West – and so become modern and powerful – without being infected by the West's nationalism and *without losing the empire*? … *Tianxia* was ecological and cosmological, it was a 'regime of value', defined through opposition to the Westerners' anarchic and uncouth *guo*, or 'state'" (p. 360). "Social-democratic ideals failed to fit the Chinese reality ... The theological space would remain empty for decades. The answer to the question raised in the 1890s would arrive only later, and its name was Communism. Communism was the transitional 'total theology' that allowed two empires – Russia and China – to be preserved from collapse, even as several others broke up and surrendered to the national condition. The twentieth-century reincarnation of the Eurasian land empire was the 'People Republic' – which was emphatically not a democracy, but what Mao called a 'dictatorship of the people'" (p. 361).

"Chinese Communism absorbed the ancient charisma of 'all under Haven', allowing for the continuity of the political entity. Most significantly for our purposes, the Communist turn allowed China to cut off economic ties with the capitalist world for several decades and, so protected, to transition away from the biological energy regime it had always known. Isolated China would develop a modern industrial base on such a scale that, when the barriers were dropped, it could

resume the dominant global position anticipated for it by late-nineteenth-century reformers. … China would be the vehicle for a tradition of cosmopolitan thought – including the Western tradition of Kant – which was otherwise disappearing from international relations" (p. 362).

Dasgupta's essay on the crisis of the international order and the search for ways to a world based on justice, freedom and peace is very useful for those who intend to act. However, in his conclusions, Dasgupta firmly states that the creation of a peaceful world without wars is only a philosophical dream. "The idea we might replace nation-states with a world state is absurd. Beginning with the practicality: no agency on earth could accumulate the power required for such a takeover. The process would also be violent beyond imagination – and our quest, precisely, is to reduce violence. One of the problems with nation-states is that they destroy too much: a new politics must seek to preserve". This observation is historically correct: many, almost all, nation states were founded through wars between parties or between states at the end of which the victor obtained the power to dominate the subjugated populations. But the process of world peace must and can follow other paths. The construction of a universal peace between nation states does not require a world nation superstate, but a process of international pacification. Here I propose three critical observations to Dasgupta's analysis.

The first concerns the thought that Kant develops in his political essays in which he states that humanity must propose to put an end to wars between sovereign states through the creation of a world federation of states. Some interpreters argue that Kant sometimes defended the idea of a confederation (i.e., a diplomatic union between sovereign states) and not a federation. However, the most attentive scholars have ruled out this interpretation. In the Seventh Proposition of "Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim" (1785), Kant says: "The problem of establishing a perfect civil constitution is dependent on the problem of a lawful external relation between states and cannot be solved without the latter". This means that every state that belongs to the international order will have an imperfect constitution – the claim to supreme sovereignty over its citizens and other states – until the problem of the cosmopolitan constitution is solved. In this regard, Kant observes, "after many devastations, reversals and even thoroughgoing exhaustion of their powers, nature drives them [the nation states] to what reason could have told them even without much sad experience; namely to go beyond a lawless condition of savages and enter into a federation of nations, where every state, even the smallest, could expect its security and rights not from its own might, or its own juridical judgement, but only from this great federation of nations (*Foedus Amphictyonum*), from a united might and from the decision in accordance with laws of its united will."

Regarding Kant's hesitations, understandable in an era in which the system of nation states was chaotically forming, an important scholar of Kant's thought observes: "Whereas in the "Idea for a Universal History" (1784) Kant emphasizes the analogy between the two levels of the state of nature without restricting its applicability, in the 1790s he modifies this view. He still uses the analogy but now limits its applicability. The *Goals* is still to form an international federation with the power to enforce its laws, but there are important disanalogies as to *how this goal should be pursued*. Kant introduces the thought that this goal should be pursued via the establishment of a loose league of peoples, as a first step" (P. Kleingeld, *Kant and Cosmopolitanism*, CUP, 2012, pp. 47-8).

My second criticism of Dasgupta concerns the misunderstanding of federalist political thought in its dual aspects: as a federal state and as a political ideology. As for the most relevant aspect of the discovery, because it is a crucial innovation in the history of political thought, of the federal state, it is enough to recall an observation by Alexander Hamilton, one of the constituents of Philadelphia. In *The Federalist*, Hamilton addresses the argument that the 13 states that had fought for their independence could only have the choice between a complete division and a partial "confederacy", i.e. a diplomatic union. That the confederacy could ensure peace between the 13 states was a naïve illusion, Hamilton argues: "man are ambitious, vindicative and rapacious. To

look for a continuation of harmony between a number of independent, unconnected sovereignties in the same neighbourhood, would be to disregard the uniform course of human events, and to set at defiance the accumulated experience of ages" (*The Federalist*, No VI). United in a federation, the United States would be able to be completely independent of the hegemonic claims of the European powers. The federation represented an "enlargement of the orbit" of government (No IX), since local governments remain responsible for local affairs, while entrusting the central government with the necessary powers to manage common affairs: foreign policy, defence and the unity of the internal market. There is therefore a precise relationship between federation and pacification between member countries.

The third criticism concerns the lack of understanding of the process of European unification, unfortunately still incomplete if compared to what happened in the United States in 1787, at the Philadelphia Convention. The start of the process of European unification dates back to the Resistance against Nazi-fascism. In all European countries dominated by Hitler's troops, popular revolt movements were formed inspired by the ideal of European federal unity. These movements, at the end of the victorious war against Nazi-fascism, acted in civil society and national politics to claim the federal unification of Europe. Unfortunately, the two superpowers, at Yalta, decided that European countries should be divided into two different areas of influence: a Western sphere and an Eastern sphere. For this reason, the process of European unification could only begin in the western part, because Stalin was firmly opposed to the political unity of European countries. Political unification thus began through a gradual process, thanks to the creation of the ECSC, based on the *Schuman Declaration* (1950) in which it was stated that the ECSC was only a first step towards the European federation. In the *Statement* the relationship between the ECSC and pacification between European nations is clearly affirmed. "The solidarity in production thus established will make it plain that any war between France and Germany becomes not merely unthinkable, but materially impossible. The setting up of this powerful productive unit, open to all countries willing to take part and bound ultimately to provide all the members countries with the basic elements of industrial production on the same terms, will lay a true foundation for their economic unification." Today this process has reached the monetary unification of the internal market, with the euro, a supranational currency. The European Union is an economic power, but not a political one because it does not yet have a defence and a foreign policy. However, the process of unification is underway and European federalism is now recognized as a new political ideology, an ideology inspired by the Kantian idea of peace (on European federalism: M. Albertini, *Nationalism, Federalism and European Integration,* Rubbettino, 2017) therefore to a foreign policy of pacification among all the nations of the world through a process that could stop the disintegration of the United Nations. The European Union, if it is given the means to act as a federal state, will be able to form a coalition of states sufficiently authoritative to initiate a democratic reform of the United Nations.

Guido Montani