

The End of Nationalism: A Call For a Declaration of Interdependence

... I suggest that breakdowns within a national society, leading to violent civil strife that draws in outside powers, constitutes the greatest danger of international war that the world faces in the foreseeable future.

Louis J. Halle

"In sane politics, therefore," writes McGeorge Bundy,¹ "there is no level of superiority which will make a strategic first strike between the two great states anything but an act of utter folly." Halle, in the essay from which the headnote is quoted,² explains very cogently how the theory of war is losing its legitimacy. He cites three reasons for his conclusion: (1) the instruments of war no longer have any political utility or feasibility; (2) the trend toward egalitarianism throughout the world; (3) there can be no more self-contained, geographically limited wars. Halle, therefore, concludes that since World War II there have been only three wars in the Middle East and one between China and India. He contends that there have been three civil wars—Greek, Korean and Vietnamese—since 1945, all of which had their origin in issues that remained unsolved at the end of World War II, or arose during the cold war period, 1947 to 1963. It is these civil wars which he fears may draw the great powers into military confrontations.

Now if Bundy's theory is correct and Halle's fears are based on a solid foundation, it would seem that the road ahead for sentient human beings the world over is very clear. Either the mature of the world recognizes that the "space-ship earth" that we are inhabiting is a finite system and that we all have a community of interest in existence, ecology and destiny, or we shall all be overwhelmed in our detritus and pollution, run out of energy sources and raw materials and find that food is in short supply. The individual states, in a complex and interdependent world, are no longer a viable entity. The problems facing the world in the last third of the 20th century cannot be solved on a national basis; only international cooperation and coordination will bring forth

*Member of the Boston, Massachusetts and American Bar Associations; Harvard Law School (1936), Harvard College (cum laude, 1933); Chairman, Board of Editors, *Commercial Law Journal*; President, Commercial Law League (1970-71).

¹*To Cap The Volcano*, 48 FOREIGN AFFAIRS 1, 9-10 (1968).

²*Does War Have a Future?* 52 FOREIGN AFFAIRS 20, 29 (1973).

a viable solution to innumerable problems and needs. In discussing the Arab oil boycott of the West, Defense Secretary James Schlesinger stated recently:

I think that one should not tempt fate by pushing the concept of national sovereignty too far . . . We should recognize that the independent powers of sovereign states should not be used in such a way as would cripple the larger mass of the industrialized world. That is running too high a risk and it is a source of danger.³

I would like to suggest five steps which, if implemented in good faith, will go a long way to solve the problems now threatening the developed world. The steps are as follows: (1) Carry forward the impetus of the partial test ban⁴ and non-proliferation treaties⁵ to cover underground testing and non-proliferation zones in Latin America and in Europe; (2) Work toward a more equitable distribution of the world's goods and resources; the obscene equation which allows the rich to get richer and the poor poorer must be ameliorated; (3) The world's inhabitants and the national entities must develop a feeling of solidarity and community: Man cannot, in this day, live by bread alone nor eat his bread alone—in this finite system we inhabit, we are going to have to share to survive; (4) A program of international education must be introduced which will incontestably prove that the fate of each is inextricably bound up with the fate of all others; if this is so, we will have to live within the context of that rubric; and (5) The nations of the world will have to agree to submit their controversies to the International Court of Justice. Let us examine these five propositions in more detail.

I. Nuclear Testing and Proliferation

The basis of world order is the elimination of the fear of destruction either by intentional or catalytic detonation of nuclear weapons. One of the best ways of alleviating this fear is to carve out more and more territory in which atomic weapons will be prohibited. The Antarctic Treaty⁶ was the first international agreement designed to "reserve exclusively for peaceful purposes" an area which had not been militarized. The Treaty on Outer Space⁷ followed in many particulars the Antarctic Treaty. The Space Treaty looks beyond the Antarctic

³Boston Globe, January 8, 1974.

⁴The Test Ban Treaty must be described as partial in application, since neither France nor the Peoples Republic of China has acceded to its terms. Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, Aug. 5, 1963, art. I, § I(b), (1963) 14 U.S.T. 1313, T.I.A.S. No. 5433, 480 U.N.T.S. 43 (effective Oct. 10, 1963).

⁵Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, July 1, 1969, art. X, 21 U.S.T. 483, T.I.A.S. No. 6839 (effective March 5, 1970).

⁶The Antarctic Treaty, Dec. 1, 1959, art. VII (1959) 12 U.S.T. 794, 402 U.N.T.S. 71 (effective June 23, 1961).

⁷Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, Jan. 27, 1967, art. IV, (1967) 18 U.S.T. 2410, T.I.A.S. No. 6347 (effective Oct. 10, 1967).

model in some respects and in some respects is more comprehensive.⁸ The seabeds beyond national jurisdiction is another area that should be demilitarized so that their exploration and exploitation for the benefit of all mankind may proceed. The resources in the seabed are much more easily available and the problems involved in the seabed are much more imminent and momentous than either the Antarctic or outer space. It may well be that man's inventiveness has proceeded far beyond the socialization process. Eric Fromm in his new book *The Anatomy of Human Destruction*⁹ believes that the most important determinant of a man's character is society. But "society" will not save us unless we individually take some responsibility and initiative. George A. Miller in an essay entitled "Some Psychological Perspectives on the Year 2000" writes:

If we invent thermonuclear weapons capable of destroying all life, we will find social constraints on their use. No automatic, biological principle will take over our destiny, for human intervention is possible and in emergencies, it can be rapid, massive, and effective. Our destiny is in our own hands.¹⁰

II. Distribution of Goods and Resources

Hundreds of millions of persons in Asia, Africa and Latin America still subsist on annual per capita of \$100 or less. On January 23, 1974, the U.S. Congress refused to appropriate \$1.5 billion as the American share of the latest replenishment of the International Development Association (IDA).¹¹ This organization is an adjunct of the World Bank; it makes interest-free loans for periods of 50 years with only one percent repayment for each of the first ten years and larger amounts over the balance of the loan. Funds are used for such basic projects as agriculture, electric power, transportation and water supply, along with commercially-oriented industrial and tourist enterprises. The continual domination of Third World countries by the industrial nations makes the former vulnerable to world market forces and puts them in a weak bargaining position; there is a need for basic social changes and freer trade policies. There are three universal goals sought after by people generally: life sustenance, esteem and freedom.¹² The basic difficulty in achieving them in the Third World is, as Gunnar Myrdal points out, the circular causation which brings benefits to those who already enjoy them and worsens the lot of those who began life in dire straits.

Paul Rosenstein Rodan, professor of economics at M.I.T., was one of the

⁸Marian H. McVitty, *Disarmament, THE UNITED NATIONS: THE NEXT TWENTY-FIVE YEARS, TWENTIETH REPORT OF THE COMMISSION TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION OF PEACE*, Oceana Publications, Inc. (Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.) 1970, p. 172.

⁹Holt, Rinehart and Winston (1973).

¹⁰DAEDALUS, Summer, 1967, p. 1974.

¹¹Boston Globe, January 25, 1974.

¹²DENIS GOULET, *THE CRUEL CHOICE*, Atheneum (New York) p. 91.

earliest in the profession to see and suggest the importance of "development economics" as a discipline. As early as 1944¹³ he contrasted the role played by the state in the developed countries in influencing the distribution of income toward greater equalization with the lack of any mechanism in the international system. He warned that underdevelopment had become a political as well as a moral problem because people will prefer to die fighting when they see no prospect for a better life—"The development of the economically backward areas of the world is, therefore, the most important task facing us in the making of peace."

There are other savants who recognize the clear and present danger of American predominance or hegemony. Helio Jaguaribe points out¹⁴ that the economic and institutional structures of the U.S. are based on private, strictly oligopolistic and cartelized forms. These forms, because they are so far-reaching, tend to transfer to the world plane the oligopolistic and cartel policies prevalent at home. Jaguaribe asserts that the American capitalist system is likely, by its very nature, to be incompatible with the existence of other autonomous centers of production and consumption. This fact compels the states that wish to maintain their own economies under the control of their own capital and agents to establish measures which will protect and stimulate the autonomy and self-sufficiency of their own economies.

III. World Community Solidarity

This conflict in philosophy between the developed and the developing world creates new obstacles to world order and new stimuli to the development of international hegemony by the United States. Here is where the third desiderata to which reference has been made to above comes to the fore—the necessity to establish a world community and solidarity therein. In the words of one ecologist: "the contents of the biosphere are those of a closed system. Until the 20th century, men and nations could act as if the system were infinite. But now that possibility is gone forever."¹⁵

If we are thus constrained to live together, how can we justify some of the recent actions of the U.S. on the world stage? Is there any question that the American credit blockade and the Pentagon military assistance, credits and advice to the Chilean military leaders, among other facts, brought about the coup and the fall of President Allende on September 11, 1973? Professor

¹³*The International Development of Economically Backward Areas* in *INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS* April, 1944, cited in JAGDISH BHAGWATI et als, *DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING*, MIT Press (Cambridge) 1973, p. 28.

¹⁴*World Order, Rationality and Socioeconomics* 95 *DAEDALUS*, 607, 617, (Spring, 1966).

¹⁵Lynton D. Coldwell, *An Ecological Approach To International Development: Problems of Policy and Administration* in JOHN P. MILTON, (ed.) (in press), cited in Goulet, *op cit* P. 273.

Oswaldo Sunkel, a leading Chilean economist not particularly known for his pro-Allende views, testified recently before a United Nations panel investigating the impact of multi-national corporations. He stated that the economic growth of his country was based on dependence on foreign investment for a century, first in mining and later in manufacturing, marketing and finance. The resulting social structure had an upper segment, a satisfied but alienated middle class and a vast majority of poor, miserable and depressed urban and rural workers. "The Government of President Allende," asserted Sunkel, "made an attempt in changing the structure of underdevelopment and dependence. It may have had many errors, but nobody can deny that it attempted to redress this economic and social structure by fundamentally democratic means."¹⁶

In a necessarily closely integrated world, should the U.S. embargo on selling non-military goods to Cuba be continued a decade after the missile crisis? Should not the economic verities of the situation be re-examined so that we recognize that, if we freely trade with Russia and China, the "economic denial" policy of 1964 toward Cuba makes no sense? Japan purchases one million tons of sugar annually from Cuba while the Cubans purchase a variety of items in exchange.¹⁷ All that happens is that American businessmen are prevented from selling their wares ninety miles from our coast while we go searching for customers (of the same political hue) thousands of miles away. However, some improvement is being made vis a vis Cuba. The Anti-High-Jacking agreement which was concluded early in 1973¹⁸ seems also to be effective: namely, the prohibition against organizing expeditions on the soil of either nation directed against the other. The most important part of the agreement, however, is the fact that it had been negotiated on the basis of absolute equality between the two countries. In the opinion of one Cuban official: "In all the history of Cuba and U.S., no such mutual respect for sovereignty was reflected in formal or informal relationships."

The Arab oil boycott is another example that the nations of the world must forget their selfish and parochial views. George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, urges¹⁹ that the United States offer to share its oil resources along with those of other principal consuming nations. He feels that these consuming nations should present a common front by letting none suffer greater hardship than the others, and deplors that the Netherlands should have been quite unfairly singled out for special punishment. Ball also requests that a coordinated program be developed to search out alternative sources of energy. Certainly, the experience and technology of Germany, Britain, Japan and other nations could be pooled to

¹⁶New York Times, September 14, 1973.

¹⁷James Higgins, Boston Globe, February 18, 1974.

¹⁸Feb. 15, 1973, Dept. of State Bulletin No. 35.

¹⁹New York Times, November 30, 1973.

solve the problems of the production of synthetic oil and gasification of coal and other sources of cheap power. Here again, a united front, in attempting to solve a mutual problem, is the best—and in this parlous state of the world—the only way to solve it in due time.

Covert operations conducted by the United States in foreign nations, whether in Vietnam, Chile or Cuba, are a substantial cause of a bitter resentment against us which persists in many parts of the world. In a recent article in *Foreign Affairs*,²⁰ Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, former Attorney General and Under-Secretary of State claims that the U.S. should abandon all such secret operations in foreign countries, except the gathering of intelligence. "Specifically," Katzenbach writes, "there should be no secret subsidies of police or counter-insurgency forces, no efforts to influence elections, no secret monetary subsidies."²¹ He points out that presidents become captives of public anti-communist sentiment and are carried away by this crusading ardor. They dare not lose any foreign territory and resort to unilateral action not authorized by the powers inherent in their office. Katzenbach points out that President Kennedy took public blame for the failure of the invasion of Cuba at the Bay of Pigs, not for the attempt.

In discussing the problem of Burma's search for identity, Lucian W. Pye discusses²² some of the problems facing a nation in transition from a rural to an industrial status. He points out that a certain degree of truth and confidence makes possible complex organizational life. Emotions of aggression can rarely serve socially productive purposes. He asserts that a lack of trust is a fundamental obstacle to modernizing society and the building of a secure nation state. No one has put the prime necessity for the building of a world community better than Harry Wheeler. In his volume *Democracy In a Revolutionary Era*²³ he states that mankind now has wagered all his stake on one civilization, one gamble for survival. Like it or not, this puts the whole world together in the same game of politics. It had better be an architectonic one, he asserts.

IV. International Education

The basic need to re-activate and re-orient the peoples of the world to a recognition of their mutuality of interest is of imminent concern. Edwin O. Reischauer, former U.S. Ambassador to Japan, doubts that the education our children are receiving will guarantee them their survival in the 21st century.

"If you are going to do it," Reischauer said in a recent interview,²⁴ "education

²⁰September, 1973.

²¹*Ibid.*, at 784.

²²POLITICS, PERSONALITY AND NATION BUILDING, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1963, p. 125.

²³Center For the Study of Democratic Institutions (Santa Barbara) 1970, p. 12.

²⁴Boston Globe, November 11, 1973. See also his TOWARD THE 21ST CENTURY: EDUCATION FOR A CHANGING WORLD Alfred A. Knopf 1973.

is going to have to play a large part. What you have to do is think of the subject matter of education as being, fundamentally, mankind,—the human experience. Your fundamental attitudes are really put into you early in life. Are we producing today the kind of people who can understand that the basic unit of human cooperation and, hence, survival is moving from the national to the global level?" Reischauer goes on to urge that a fundamentally different type of history be taught, not a history of the triumph of our particular group. We teach about wars and battles, the competition of civilization and that the one group that is great is the American. He feels that there is no better way of making one aware of things outside his own culture than to learn a foreign language, one of a very different sort from one's native tongue.²⁵

The recognition of this deficiency—a lack of *Weltanschauung*—is also apparent in other parts of the world. Japan recently pledged \$100 million as a step toward creating a U.N. sponsored education network of research organizations to operate as a "think tank" which would study world problems.²⁶ Both established and budding scholars from many countries would serve on temporary assignment conducting research in the problems of peace, environment and population control and, generally, in the improvement of the quality of life. It was hoped that liaison would be established with universities in the countries in which the research centers are located, so that faculties and students could become involved in the work of this U.N. university. Dr. Harold Taylor, spokesman for the U.N. committee helping to sponsor the university, stated that national universities have not reached a point at which their curricula, research studies and other potential contributions to world comprehension in the prevention of war and in the advancement of human welfare are even remotely adequate to the task the U.N. university proposes to undertake.

Erich Fromm is not at all optimistic about the future of mankind.²⁷ He believes that the U.S. has developed a necrophilous character and is overwhelmed by a passion for destructiveness. The trouble is unrestrained industrialism, moral torpor and an absence of shared ethical vision. If the citizens of the United States cannot participate in a mutually shared view of the world—with a common language, history and background—how can we expect disparate members of the world society to join in bringing forth the "Brave New World"? The threshold problem is to educate the world to the substantial

²⁵It is interesting to note, in this context, the concern of educators, especially language teachers, who are concerned over the steady decline in the number of U.S. students enrolled in foreign language courses. Many colleges have dropped their former entrance requirement of two or three years' foreign language instruction. This had resulted in the fact that more and more high school students take no foreign language at all. Boston Globe, March 24, 1974.

²⁶New York Times, November 25, 1973.

²⁷New York Times, December 15, 1973.

changes that have occurred in the economic sphere. Dr. R. Buckminster Fuller, at a symposium recently sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania to discuss "War Or Peace: 1976," claims that the world has evolved from the social system that dictated war as an economic necessity to one in which the means of production and distribution are available to satisfy all the basic needs of the world's population. This is the first time in history, he asserted, that the choice is not between war and starvation, rather that it is the conditioned reflex with which the nations of the world look at the problem. How else can one explain that \$200 trillion a year focused on Armageddon, the approximate current outlay for worldwide armaments and war preparation?²⁸

The social scientists tell us that the things that men hold in common bulk as large as things that separate them. The anthropologists, we are advised by Clyde Kluckhohn,²⁹ will hardly question that eventually there will be in some sense a world society. The sole argument will be over the question, how soon? After how much suffering and bloodshed? Let us now turn to the observance of law, which is the fifth of the areas of change through which a war-free world may possibly be achieved.

V. Law and Dispute Settlement

World order is not inevitable, writes Harry Wheeler, it is only necessary.³⁰ There are a number of reasons why states obey the law, asserts Abram Chayes: convenience, routine, the presence of expectation, the feeling that the values of the system outweigh the gain from violating a particular norm in a particular instance.³¹ This cost-benefit analysis which exercise states in a rational analysis of a particular problem indicates that national governments behave more or less like reasonable men. The United Nations Charter is a valuable part of the legal infrastructure that binds the world together. What happens when the legal arm of this world sinew, the International Court of Justice, is ignored by parties to a case brought before it?

In *United Kingdom v. Iceland*³² and *Federal Republic of Germany v. Iceland*³³ (the so-called Fishing Jurisdiction cases), the two plaintiffs complained that Iceland had purported to extend its exclusive fishing jurisdiction over its territorial waters to 50 miles. The Court's jurisdiction was based on an agreement to resort to the Court that Iceland had executed in 1961 at the time of the settlement of an earlier "cod war." In 1972, by a vote of 14 to 1, the Court

²⁸New York Times, November 14, 1973.

²⁹MIRROR FOR MAN, Fawcett World Library (1964), New York, p. 234, ff.

³⁰*Op cit*, note 26.

³¹*An Inquiry Into the Workings of Arms Control Agreements* 85 HARVARD LAW REVIEW 905, 907 (1970).

³²I.C.J. (1972) pp. 12, 17.

³³I.C.J. (1972) pp. 30, 35.

ordered the parties to keep the status quo, and requested Iceland to refrain from taking any measures to enforce the new regulations it had promulgated. Iceland, by telegram in July, 1973, denied the Court's jurisdiction on the ground that "the vital interests of the people of Iceland are involved. . ." It even refused to appoint an agent to argue its case.

In *Austria v. France*³⁴ and *New Zealand v. France*³⁵, cases filed before the International Court of Justice in May, 1973, protests were made against France carrying out atmospheric nuclear tests in the region of the South Pacific. It was claimed that the Plaintiffs' international rights were being violated by radioactive fallout and that further tests should be enjoined. The Court decided in June, 1973, by an 8 to 6 majority to give the plaintiffs the relief sought. France declined to yield to the jurisdiction of the Court, asserting that it was manifestly not competent "and that France could not accept its jurisdiction." France also refused to appoint an agent to argue its case.

In a case entitled *Pakistan v. India*³⁶ Pakistan sought to enjoin the transfer of certain prisoners of war to Bangladesh. India did not take part in the oral arguments concerning the Court's jurisdiction but did file a written brief against it. The Court decided by a vote of 8 to 4 that it would first decide the question of its jurisdiction, raised by the defendant, before it went on to the substantive question.

In these cases, one could argue that the defendants, by refusing to acknowledge the authority of the International Court of Justice, the U.N.'s principal judicial organ, are guilty of international contempt of court. If the practice of ignoring the Court and its rulings persists, writes one international legal savant,³⁷ this could destroy the Court and with it, much of what hope remains for third-party adjudication as a means of settlement of disputes among states. It is deeply to be deplored that it is three countries brought up in the tradition of Western culture and law which have taken this intransigent attitude. If the defendants contesting the jurisdiction of the International Court had been from developing areas of the world, smoldering at the precepts of an international law, which they had no hand in formulating, one could probably understand such an obscurantist attitude. But France? India? Iceland?

In summation, let us listen to Charles Frankel, Professor of Philosophy at Columbia, who at one time served as Under Secretary of State for International and Cultural Affairs. He writes:

No science can argue a man into having good will, and it is frightening when intelligence is applied in a moral void. The faith in objectivity and intelligence which

³⁴I.C.J. (1973).

³⁵I.C.J. (1973).

³⁶I.C.J. (1973).

³⁷Stephen Schwebel, *A Mixed Review For International Law* 9 VISTA 41 (October, 1973).

has characterized liberal societies has been based on the assumption that there existed in society a fund of good manners, good sense, and common decency which made it possible for men to understand one another and to negotiate their differences peacefully. In its larger aspect, the present resurgence of interest in philosophies of history is an attempt to find a fund of public values, or an element of shared purpose or common destiny, which might give men a basis for understanding and voluntary co-operation.³⁸

Unless man can find, and shortly, a feeling of shared purpose and common destiny, mankind is indeed doomed.

³⁸THE CASE FOR MODERN MAN, Beacon Press (Boston, 1955) p. 19.