

# THE CANADIAN BAR REVIEW

---

---

VOL. XXII

May, 1944

No. 5

---

---

## BLUEPRINT OF WORLD ORDER

The passionate wish of mankind is for security, security from aggression from without, security from decay and destruction from within. "Freedom from fear and want" is the way it is put in the Atlantic Charter. Whether this aspiration of mankind is to be satisfied will depend on what is done in the near future to establish peace on an enduring basis. Internal and external security alike depend on the international settlement.

Before examining the possible bases for peace, it is desirable to consider what we mean by peace. Peace is more than the absence of war. It is a condition which results when human affairs proceed in harmony. This condition is more frequently attained under government than without it, though some governments appear to be incapable of producing the desired harmony.

Secondly, what is government? Government is a process which produces stability by means of change. It is an adjusting process. It gives legal sanction to those changes in rights and obligations which are required by the evolution of society, and so it keeps the ship on an even keel. The more dynamic the forces in society the greater the need for adjustment. If appropriate change is not made by peaceful means it is sought by force, as every major rebellion and revolution demonstrates.

What is true within the state is equally true between states. The absence of a workable process for the adjustment of international differences prepares the way for war. To-day the weight and velocity of the forces of trade, invention, organization and finance are creating marked national inequalities, and at a more rapid rate than ever before. These inequalities show themselves in trade balances, foreign exchange, living standards and the like. A depressed standard of living in one nation is of concern to all, for prosperity is indivisible. To establish peace on a world basis calls for more than control of arms and armaments. It calls for

an organ capable of dealing effectively with underlying economic and financial causes and processes.

Five main bases have been suggested for peace. Four of these have been tried in the past and have failed. They are Peace by Power, Peace by Balance of Power, Peace by Treaty, and Peace by League. The fifth holds out hope for mankind. It is Peace by Government.

*Peace by Power:*—Peace cannot be attained solely by the destruction of the armed forces of one group of nations or by the occupation of the territories of the defeated nations. Peace cannot be imposed on the world whether it be by one nation, or by four nations. Peace by force of arms alone will be as evanescent as was the pax romana.

*Balance of Power:*—No basis for permanent peace can be found in Balance of Power. This is obviously so in principle.

*Peace by Treaty:*—Nor does hope lie in Peace by Treaty or alliance. A Treaty is the most fragile of all restraints on a nation which dreams of conquests, or which dresses in shining armour. In a world of power politics a Treaty is as strong as the paper it is written on.

*Peace by League:*—Fourthly, there is the attempt of Peace by League. Many have the impression that peace can be established by a "strengthened" League. That is an illusion. No League can be devised which will do the job.

The history of Leagues is one of steady failure because of basic weaknesses, which no amount of tinkering can overcome. Committees can assist the League administratively, but structural weakness in the parent body is not cured by the appointment of Committees, even if they are described as functional or *ad hoc* bodies.

The 1919 League failed on a number of counts. It produced no satisfactory solution of the armaments problem. It was unable to devise a system of collective security. Its provisions against unprovoked aggression were a mockery.

This was bound to be the case, for the League enshrined the national principle. It left to national governments an international task which they were incompetent to perform. The blame rests both on the democracies and on the fascist governments. The leading democracies failed the League, and the leading fascist governments broke it up.

Equally fundamental was the failure of the League to provide workable machinery for peaceful change. The League

enshrined the principle of *status quo*. It was anachronism in a changing world.

Inequalities in living conditions actual or anticipated create mass dissatisfaction and prepare the way for war. Under the Canadian Constitution adjustment grants are made by the Federal authorities to Provinces whose standard of living is depressed. The same principle will have to be applied in world affairs. It is already being applied by Canada in its mutual aid gifts to allied nations. The post-war organization of peace will require the free supply of quantities of goods, services or money by the more wealthy to the less wealthy nations.

Under a League of Nations these sums must be financed by national governments. Even in times of prosperity a national budget will take precedence over an international budget in a national legislature. Does anyone believe that in a period of depression Congress or Parliament will continue to vote vast sums for U.N.R.R.A. or similar international bodies?

The moneys required for the continuous process of financing peace must be raised by an international taxing body from sources of revenue within its own control. This cannot be done by a League of Nations.

*Peace by Government:* Let us then turn to the fifth proposal, namely, peace by government. How does it differ from a League of Nations? A little history will make this plain.

In 1777, that is to say the year following the Declaration of Independence, the thirteen colonies formed a League of Nations. It was entered into by the execution of so-called "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union". There was a central authority appointed by the states. It was the creature of the state governments. It had no jurisdiction over any citizen. Its revenue consisted of grants to be made by the legislatures of the states. This arrangement worked badly, even while the struggle against the Mother Country lasted. Some states failed to contribute, others were dilatory. After the peace of 1783 it hardly worked at all. Currency problems throughout the union became acute; trade languished, insolvency became widespread, and there were armed revolts. The arrangement was, in fact, as Washington said, no better than anarchy.

The leaders of the colonists saw that a new departure must be made. Accordingly in 1787 a convention of delegates from the different states met at Philadelphia. They decided on bold measures; and in place of a treaty they drafted a Constitution.

This was a fundamental change; for a Constitution rests on the authority of the people.

The second major change was the creation of a federal state; that is to say, a state in which there were two classes of legislature; local legislatures having jurisdiction over matters of local concern, and a central legislature having jurisdiction over matters of common concern. The whole area of government was divided into two fields, one for the states, the other for the central government. The matters of common concern, confided to the central legislature, were foreign relations, war and peace, the army and navy, commerce, currency, and taxation for the foregoing purposes.

From the first the new constitution operated well. It brought prosperity. It released commerce from hampering restrictions. Trade, no longer a source of friction, became the vehicle of prosperity. But, more important, this new arrangement brought peace. Save for one interlude it made it possible for the thirteen states to carry peace from the Atlantic to the Pacific, while they expanded into a confederacy of forty-eight states. Under no other known political arrangement could this great and peaceful expansion have taken place.

A comparison of wars in Europe and the United States respectively, since the adoption of the United States constitution, is instructive. The areas are comparable, for Europe embraces 2,000,000 square miles, the continental United States 3,000,000 square miles. In Europe there have been eight wars or groups of wars; the Napoleonic wars from 1793—1815, the war between France and Austria in 1859, the war of Austria and Prussia against Denmark in 1864, the war between Prussia and Austria in 1866, the Franco-Prussian war from 1870—1871, the two Balkan wars from 1912—1913, the first great war from 1914—1918, and the second great war from 1939 to the present. In the United States there was one war, the Civil war, which lasted from 1861 to 1865. This record does not include wars waged with states beyond the confines of the areas mentioned such as the Crimean war, the South African war, the Mexican war or the Spanish-American war.

The wars within Europe constitute the unhappy experience of civilized peoples inhabiting a continent, who have not been organized on a continental basis. The score is 8 to 1 in favour of organization.

It is sometimes said that the peaceful expansion of the thirteen states and the similar expansion of the four Canadian

provinces, was due to their common ancestry and outlook. The facts are against any such conclusion. There were great differences in ancestry and outlook both in the thirteen states and in the four provinces, for the colonists were of English, Scotch Irish, French, Dutch and Spanish extraction.

Peace depends more on the instrument and operation of government than on common origin or outlook; a fact which is sometimes overlooked by persons who have no experience in the operation of constitutional documents. The fratricidal wars of the Greek states might have been avoided, and the civilization of Greece might have expanded across uncivilized Europe had the political thinkers and lawyers of those days been equal to the task of producing a scheme of government under which local autonomy could be reconciled with central control in matters of common concern.

The present task of those interested in peace is to devise the framework for permanent world order. The federal principle is applicable; but certain changes in design will be required. In the United States and in Canada the federal structure is a two-storey affair consisting of local and central legislatures. World government will require a four-storey structure consisting of local, national, continental or regional, and international legislatures.

The local legislatures such as those of Pennsylvania, Ontario, Alsace and Prussia will continue to exercise jurisdiction over matters of local concern. New local legislatures may even be set up, say, in Scotland and Wales.

Similarly, the national legislatures such as those of the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France and Germany should continue to have jurisdiction over matters of national as distinguished from international concern.

Continental or regional bodies are required to deal with continental or regional matters. In the Pan-American Union, and in the recently announced arrangement between Australia and New Zealand, we see the beginnings of such bodies. In Russia, China and India continental organizations are already established. Continental organizations are lacking in Africa and in Europe. The British Commonwealth is a world-wide association of nations of equal status under the Crown. Its members favour continental or regional arrangements designed to promote peace.

Finally, a central legislature with power to legislate in matters of world concern is required. Such matters can not be

dealt with by national legislatures any more than matters of national concern can be disposed of by local legislatures. Without such a central legislature world conditions are as chaotic as American conditions would be if the central government at Washington were dissolved and its powers over arms, tariffs and other matters vested in the legislatures of the 48 states. In any blueprint of a world order there must be a legislature at each level to deal with the problems of that level. The central legislature should have an exclusive jurisdiction to legislate on matters of world concern, such as war and peace, armed forces, currency, weights and measures, standards of labour and of living, intercontinental trade, health, and taxation for the foregoing purposes. To the central legislature might well be delegated exclusive control over the manufacture of arms, or alternatively, over those industries (*e.g.* the heavy industries and the chemical industry) on which the manufacture of arms depends. It is a matter of debate as to whether education is not also a matter of world concern.

Under the suggested arrangement peace would be established by power based on principle. Germany could no more arm against her neighbours than the Province of Ontario can arm against adjoining provinces; for the exclusive power to raise and maintain armed forces would rest with the central legislature. Were any attempt made by Germany to levy taxes for armaments the courts would be bound to declare the statute *ultra vires*. Instead of Germany being externally policed there would be that internal regulation which comes from the courts and the constitution.

The benefits flowing from such an organization are apparent. It abolishes the strife-creating distinction between victors and vanquished. It substitutes the ballot for the bullet. It converts trade into an instrument of peace. It extends law and order to the international jungle. It is the only system which will give the results desired, namely, prosperity and peace.

World organization cannot be developed immediately, but a decision must be made. We are at the cross-roads. Are we to move toward government, or are we to continue in anarchy? The allied statesmen have a great responsibility. Posterity will not forgive them if, for a second time, they fumble the ball which has been passed by young and heroic hands.

Peace must be organized, but to organize it requires the impulse of forces not yet harnessed to the task. One such force is the antipathy to war. This is a compelling urge, for unless

this generation organizes the world for peace, it will be placing the feet of its grandsons on the bleak path to World War No. 3. But there is a higher appeal not based on fear, or race or colour; it is no tribal or nationalistic conception; it contains no principle of exploitation; it is the ideal of service of humanity itself. Under such an impulse an era may be introduced of which it can be said that the meek inherit the earth.

LEWIS DUNCAN.

Toronto.