

Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai

From the Selected Works of Hippu Salk Kristle Nathan

2012

World Government – Why and How

Hippu Salk Kristle Nathan, *National Institute of Advanced Studies*



Available at: <https://works.bepress.com/hippu/35/>



WORLD GOVT: WHY AND HOW

Dr. Hippu Salk Kristle Nathan

1998, Mechanical Engg.

Post Doctoral Associate, NIAS, Bangalore

(When I was asked to send an article for the Alumni Souvenir, I prompted to write this piece. The idea of World Government dominated my thoughts during my graduation days. Even today, after 14 years this idea is least talked about and always brushed under the carpet with the alibi of a utopian concept. I, on the contrary, believe this to be most practical idea and dedicate this article to my alma-mater, UCE, Burla.)

When human civilization started every human being was left to himself/herself. Each person was responsible for his or her own life. Arranging daily foods was an individual affair. So was security. Over the time, family life evolved. Inside a family, people shared their responsibility; cared for each other. There was division of labor. During this process of evolution, human beings realized that there are certain issues, which require common attention. In other words, these issues can be better addressed at community level than at family or individual level. With this need, community life developed. Security, transportation, communication, and knowledge sharing are some of the areas, which were taken care at community level by a common agency. The individuals in the community empowered this common agency to solve any matter of conflicts among themselves. We must take note that in designing this common setup, people had to do some compromise at individual level to attain the larger objective. They had to submit their fist right (i.e. muscle power) and sovereignty to create a more powerful common third-party structure, which would ensure harmonious and peaceful coexistence. The society we experience today is the result of such approach and process. In political terminology, the common agency built to take care of all the members of our society is called *Government*, and the society is called *State*.

Let us be assured that we have not created Government for luxury, rather for our necessity. Government is there to take care of our common problems, resolve conflicts among individual elements, and also for our security and holistic development. In this endeavor we as individuals have sacrificed our personal liberty and preferences to some extent. For instance, even if someone is an *Ambani* or any corporate tycoon, he has to use the common road as used by a *Ramu chaiwala*. One may have his own designed house or one may stay in personal preferred hotel, but all government and public places one uses, he needs to use in the same way just like another citizen. Depending on one's income someone may have to pay a huge tax while some other may be exempted. But none can argue 'why it is so' and label the same as 'injustice'. The argument for differential tax structure is a person with high income makes use of more public resources because of his greater economic activities, hence is liable to pay more tax. So, it is likely, a rich fellow may not prefer to be a part of this common governmental structure. The rich may perceive that they are capable to look after their problems and if left to themselves they wish to be out of this structure. Hence, individually, the rich avails minimal service from the government; like they avoid mass transit communication system, and send their children to sophisticated private school. However, in situations like paying tax etc, a rich man is forced to discharge his social responsibility. So, in a sense, governmental structure may

appear as a compulsion to the rich, not their willful sacrifice. But government prevails for the greater good.

This concept of *government* and *state*, within few thousand years, has successfully materialized up to country level. Let us consider our own country, India. India has both rich and poor states. But to successfully function as a nation state rich states like Goa or Maharashtra have to sacrifice for poor states like Odisha or Bihar. Under an imaginary situation, if Goa is given an option it may prefer for a separate country having a GDP per capita two and half times that of India. But in principle, it will not happen as it goes against the normal trend in shaping of civilization. Otherwise, we can then assume a part of Goa will then secede from mainland Goa to become an independent political entity and this sequence of secession can go up to individual level to reach the stage of stone age in which people live in absolutely independent way. So even if some individuals do not like, some community do not prefer, some states do not opt, Indians are into a political structure in which they are united. They are a country and they will stay under a common government. This does not mean India will never undergo any kind of accession or secession of political entities, but the overall country level political structure is likely to remain.

Here, I would like to bring in the topic of 'state/country' and 'nation'. A political entity i.e. state (or country) becomes a *nation* when the people of that entity feel the greatest belongingness to it. In other words, they arrange their loyalty order in such a way that they feel the citizen of the country first, then anything else. For instance, in case of India, if people call themselves an Indian first, then a Bengali or an Indian first, then a Marathi or Punjabi; and this kind of attitude prevails in general then we become a nation. Since secessionist force are still active in India and all the people in general do not arrange the loyalty order in the above fashion, India is called, at times, *a nation in making*. So in this nation making transition, those who do not arrange their loyalty order in the desired fashion, they are forced to do so by the political authorities. For instance, if a person says he is a Hindu or Muslim first then an Indian, or a *Tamilian* first and then an Indian or a *Gorkha* tribe first and last (not at all an Indian), then the *state* will discourage such view and try to enforce the loyalty order through the political structure. We have often come across a term like *European Nation*. This essentially represents peoples' feeling of European first then, say, a German or French. This is evident from the facts that Europeans have gone for common currency, common defense network, common communication (satellite) system and the commonality in trade and business. This is the outcome European Union's evolution as a political concept in the last fifty years. The basics of the concept of *nation* are political in nature and it comes naturally with time and sometimes it is forced upon before time to expedite.

Now the question is can we think of a situation in which we call ourselves a world citizen first, then an Indian or a world citizen first then an American, or English, or a Pakistani and so on. For this, we of course need global outlook or 'globe in mind' attitude and strong political will. However, I do not propose here that we need to wait till all the people of world to have the same outlook and then go for the unified world political structure. We can have it in the midway and make people to learn the loyalty order with time. World government is nothing but extending the political structure at the country level to the world level, and cultivate a loyalty order where we feel ourselves as world citizen first, and then anything else. We require the world government to address the worldwide issues of international injustices, poverty, climate, terrorism, international border conflicts, and disproportionate defense expenses. Without world government, these issues will be handled half-hazardly and as per the vested interest of the individual countries, which are conflicting in nature. World government is the most workable ideal to have perpetual peace. Sooner, or later, we are going to have it.

To me, the world government is not a distant dream. Why? To answer this, let us go into the history of our country, India. Before the English came, Indians were divided into many states with their Maharajas and Maharanis. All of these are monarchies fighting for land and supremacy. In those days, the belongingness to the land or the order of loyalty, which I talked about in the previous paragraphs, were like a *marahatta* first and last (i.e. under Marahatta ruler), a *hyderabadi* first and last (i.e. under Hyderabad nawab). So people belonged to this village, that *nawab*, this sultan, that king etc. Nobody imagined any significant change in the political course. But it happened. With English, Indians got exposed to such a political framework that monarchy soon changed to democracy. And innumerable kingdoms became a single political entity i.e. Indian nation state. So, my question is, was not today's form of democracy was a distant dream for the Indians of the 18th century? Yes, it was never a dream. How many common men have dreamed of a system in which they would be equaled with kings? Or how many kings would have thought in their wildest imagination that they would be equaled to their *prajas*? But under the political structure everything fell into line. This is the power of political system. So once the structure of *world government* gets evolved, the countries will get aligned with the system.

I understand, the idea of world government will not be in accordance with the agenda of powerful countries. But this is quite expected from the rich and powerful. They are apathetic towards any kind of government as they need to sacrifice more for greater good. So if under present US political system, an ordinary American is equaled with Bill Gates; under World Government US has to stay equal to Mexico, India has to stay equal to Maldives equal to Pakistan. Also, under such system US has to pay more fund for its higher income, India may pay more funds than Bangladesh or any Sub-Saharan African countries. But rich countries irrespective of their economic or business strength have to have equivalent voice like any other poor country. The nitty-gritty of power share can be worked out. These mechanisms are not *alien* to us, rather it is a one-step enhancement of political principle from country to world level.

I think it is high time we must do away with 'sovereignty' (which means infinite power) of nation states. Countries cannot be left to behave in a way that suits its interests. Such a thing has resulted in the present chaos—many secret pacts, defense deals, illegal trafficking, oil monopoly, business monopoly, non abeyance of environment protocols and so on. It is not the will of few powerful countries that decide the future it is the will of the entire humanity. Don't we feel in this age of climate, terrorism, nuclear bombs, insecurities it is high time to think beyond national selfish interests? Or if we can't feel then we should have a system of World Government, which will force us to think like that.

World government can facilitate and strengthen institutions like International Court of Justice and Interpol to solve international disputes. Standing armies can be abolished (we must note, we don't have border security force across different states of India, as all the states are part of the union government). This way, the military expenses can be brought down, and the money, resources, technology and mind can be put to solve poverty, illiteracy, lack of water, health, and electricity facility, and other progressive developmental use.

(Dr Hippu Salk Kristle Nathan is an M Tech from IIT Delhi, and PhD from IGIDR, Mumbai. Currently, he is a Post Doctoral Associate at National Institute of Advanced Studies, IISc Campus, Bangalore)

q q q