

"To an extent, the problems of nuclear and conventional arms are reflections of weaknesses in the international system. It is weak because it lacks a significant structure of laws and norms of behavior which are accepted and observed by all states. The fact that nations arm and go to war reflects these weaknesses." ¹

In its report, the Palme Commission goes on to consider improvements to the U.N.'s ability to provide security, calling for a new "concordat among the permanent members of the Security Council to support collective security action, at least to the extent possible, of not voting against it." ² It also called for the creation of a new kind of U.N. peace-keeping force.

World federalists regard the Palme Commission report as a highly significant document for its approach to the problem of security and for its many creative recommendations. We commend it to the attention of the Special Joint Committee on Canada's Foreign Relations as a reference document. We shall attach sections of it as appendices to this paper (Appendix 2-1).

The Palme Commission report is an affirmation of the basic approach of world federalism. World federalism is a fuller elaboration of the tenets of common security presented in the report. The most essential addition world federalists would make is that the reliability of common security institutions depends on their procedures being binding on all parties.

The effect of all parties committing themselves to being bound by the legal processes of common international institutions would be to vest these institutions with a degree of political authority, or "sovereignty," in their sphere of competence. The litmus test of the extent to which states really intend these institutions to be binding is the extent to which they empower these institutions with the further authority (independent of the veto of any state) to act to enforce law. In the case of the United Nations, the final authority to enforce international laws against aggression is vested not with the institution, but with five states, namely the permanent members of the Security Council. Any one of these states may unilaterally, and without need to show cause, prevent the U.N. from taking collective security action.

This, indeed, points to a critical difference between collective security and common security. With collective security a group of sovereign states agree, on a case-by-case basis, to "gang up" on any aggressor. The U.N. serves collective security principally by providing a permanent vehicle by which states can coordinate themselves. With fully developed common security, as proposed by the world federalists, the institution *itself* is vested with the means to provide for security *on behalf of* its members.

This is the fuller conception of common security which is at the heart of what is meant by world federalism.

Recommendation 2-1: That Canada affirm the goal of common security and the evolution of a world federation to be the guiding vision and long-term objective of Canadian foreign policy.

² Ibid, p. 163