



# The WorldVoter

the newsletter of

## Vote World Parliament

— democratic world parliament through a global referendum —

[www.VoteWorldParliament.org](http://www.VoteWorldParliament.org)

Vote World Parliament's co-presidents are Ted Stalets and Jim Stark

[www.RescuePlanForPlanetEarth.com](http://www.RescuePlanForPlanetEarth.com)

This site, above, is for the VWP companion book, *Rescue Plan for Planet Earth*

### Issue #33, November, 2010

(This issue and all previous issues are posted at <http://voteworldparliament.org/about/newsletter/>)

#### **THE SCORE**

***As of November 13, 2010, 21,534 people have voted. So far, the votes are 95.4% in favor of creating a democratic world parliament.***

#### **Quote of the month**

**The world will not survive if it remains on the present course. Establishing a proper Earth government is my most important idea, an absolute necessity, and then most other ideas can be fulfilled.** Robert Muller died in September of 2010. He was a genuine visionary, and worked at the UN. He spelled out his “4,000 best ideas for a better world” (subscribe at [www.GoodMorningWorld.org](http://www.GoodMorningWorld.org)), and this one (above) was the greatest of all.

\* \* \*

#### **News in brief**

##### **Stark back in the saddle after heart attack**

On September 27, 2010, Vote World Parliament's founder Jim Stark had a heart attack. He has been recovering well, and has returned to a leadership role in VWP (he is now a co-president, along with Ted Stalets).

\* \* \*

## Add a TWIGG to your diet

Brian Coughlan (with Fred Brandi and Deon Barnard) interviewed Jim Stark on October 31, 2010 as Episode #13. TWIGG stands for “This Week in Global Governance,” the full name of the weekly podcast. *The WorldVoter* highly recommends TWIGG as a regular part of your listening diet, and VWP thanks Brian *et al* for adding the graphic link to our portable ballot (a “voting booth”) to the TWIGG page (<http://twigg.squarespace.com/>). All 14 TWIGG episode links are at: <http://twigg.squarespace.com/twigg-episode-archive>.

\*\*\*

### Robert Muller: a great man remembered

by Jim Stark

Dr. Robert Muller, who died in September of 2010, was a genuine visionary. He spelled out his “4,000 best ideas for a better world” (subscribe at [www.GoodMorningWorld.org](http://www.GoodMorningWorld.org)) as an enduring legacy for a world in great need of great ideas.

In 1979, I gave a speech at the UN under the auspices of an NGO called Pacem in Terris (meaning Peace on Earth). It was the very first time the idea of a global referendum had been presented at the UN. Dr. Muller was in attendance. At that time, he was the head of the eighteen agencies that made up the United Nations Social and Economic Council (the civil service of the UN), and as an international public servant, there were constraints on what he could say in public. However, after my speech (as faithfully reported in my 1991 book, *Cold War Blues*), Dr. Muller astonished everyone by calling the global referendum “historic and inevitable.” He later wrote me a letter in which he said: “Without hesitation I can say that a world referendum ... would be extremely useful — you can quote me at will.”

PS *Cold War Blues* is available free from <http://voteworldparliament.org/about/books/>.

\*\*\*

### Opinion

“Asinine nonsense”

Re: “Once a noble dream, the UN is now a joke,” was penned by Rex Murphy, Canada’s best-known grumpy old political pundit and printed in the *National Post* Sept. 25, 2010 (<http://fullcomment.nationalpost.com/2010/09/29/todays-letters-when-we-spoke-the-un-went-to-lunch/>). His article received this pithy analysis (below) from Larry Kazdan, VP of the Vancouver branch of the World Federalist Movement and a friend of VWP.

**“While the UN can certainly be improved, that organization has ended or prevented numerous wars thereby saving millions of lives, and has improved the lives of millions more with social and medical programs. Rex Murphy’s blinkered rant on the value of the United Nations from a western point of view demonstrates that Mahmoud Ahmadinejad certainly does not hold the monopoly for spouting asinine nonsense.”** Larry Kazdan

\* \* \*

## **Russian opinion leaders**

by John O. Sutter

John Sutter, President of the Democratic World Federalists ([www.dwfed.org](http://www.dwfed.org)), thanks Treasurer Bob Hanson for bringing this to our attention.

Back in 1992, Mikhail Gorbachev declared at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri: “On today’s agenda is not just a union of democratic states, but also a democratically organized world community.... An awareness of the need for some kind of global government is gaining ground, one in which all members of the world community would take part.” Is Gorbachev a closet world federalist or a world citizen?

In the century that started as the Bush/Cheney/neocon regime called for “full spectrum dominance” of the land, sea, air, and outer space leading to the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq and complicity in crimes against humanity, the U.S. policy was to thumb our nose at the United Nations, the International Criminal Court, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, *et al.*

Well, let’s see what four Russians have to say today. Do we have here more closet world federalists or world citizens?

### **Russian “Gang of 4” calls for a new disarmament plan**

“Nuclear disarmament is not a goal in itself but rather an important area, precondition and method for reorganising international life on more civilised principles,” say Yevgeny Primakov, Igor Ivanov, Evgeny Velikhov and Mikhail Moiseyev October, 22 2010. (Full story at [http://indrus.in/articles/2010/10/22/start\\_a\\_new\\_disarmament\\_plan04815.html](http://indrus.in/articles/2010/10/22/start_a_new_disarmament_plan04815.html) ... also reprinted below.)

*Yevgeny Primakov is Russia’s former Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs  
Igor Ivanov is a former Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs  
Evgeny Velikhov is President of the Russian Scientific Centre “Kurchatov Institute”  
Mikhail Moiseyev is a former Chief of the Russian General Staff*

#### **Full story:**

The year 2010 has seen important events in the sphere of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, with positive impact on global security. The presidents of Russia and the US have signed a new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty in Prague. If ratified by national parliaments, it will make strategic ties between the two nuclear powers more stable, transparent and predictable. A summit on nuclear security in Washington has passed resolutions to enhance the safety of nuclear materials worldwide. The 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) concluded with the signing of the final document on strengthening the treaty.

Useful as these steps are, they have not touched upon the strategic nuclear ideology of mutual deterrence. It is the paradox of nuclear deterrence that largely addresses the threats of the last century, while in the new global and multi-polar world, any major armed conflicts between great powers and their allies are highly unlikely.

At the same time, nuclear deterrence is not effective against the new threats of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, including the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and delivery systems, global terrorism, ethnic and

religious conflicts, and cross-border crime. Nuclear deterrence in some cases can provoke proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

To prevent the negative impact of nuclear deterrence on cooperation among global players, it is necessary to decrease arms levels through pacts based on the principle of minimum sufficiency, and also promote strategic stability to ensure equal security for all and exclude the possibility of the first nuclear attack or rocket launch due to technical error or erroneous interpretation of the other party's intentions or a lack of time for decision-making by the political leadership. The new START meets all these requirements, but much remains to be done.

The next stage of nuclear disarmament cannot be exclusively bilateral. It will require restrictions and confidence measures towards other nuclear countries. Unlike the US, Russia's geostrategic position makes it accessible to all nuclear countries, which has to be taken into account for deep disarmament.

The concept of nuclear deterrence has become an insurmountable obstacle on the path to global nuclear disarmament. It is no secret that there are not just supporters, but also opponents of nuclear disarmament in the US, Russia and other countries. Some are still guided by Cold War stereotypes, but many voice specific and justified concerns related to the process of disarmament. Their arguments cannot be simply ignored. For example, there is a widespread belief in Russia that the country's nuclear potential is a key element of Russia's great power status.

We are convinced that Russia's foreign image will be largely ensured by its economic modernisation, rising living standards, social and political rights and freedom and development of science and culture. However, as long as the threat of "power projection" is used in international relations, Russia will have to retain sufficient military, including nuclear, potential to protect itself, its allies and its lawful interests.

Thus, nuclear disarmament requires greater confidence among nations, along with greater international security and stability. The Obama administration has revised its global security agenda, shifting to a new, multilateral approach with focus on strengthening global security regulations and institutions, the use of diplomacy in dispute settlement, and equal partnership with Russia. It is important that these principles are reflected in the foreign policy of the US and its allies.

This applies to anti-ballistic missile defence, conventional weapons and strategic non-nuclear weapons, as well as space militarisation plans. Taking a long-term perspective, we came to the conclusion that the world without nuclear weapons is not our existing world minus nuclear weapons. We need an international system based on other principles and institutions. A nuclear-free world shall not become a world free of wars using other weapons of mass destruction, conventional arms, advanced non-nuclear weapons and systems based on new physical principles. It is not just about major wars, but about local conflicts as well. Today, small countries view nuclear weapons as a means to offset the huge advantage of great powers in terms of conventional weapons. It is this idea that provokes nuclear proliferation at the regional level, triggering the threat of nuclear terrorism. **To eliminate such threats, it is necessary to build reliable mechanism for peaceful settlement of major and local international and border conflicts.**

**Nuclear disarmament necessitates a thorough overhaul of the entire international system. This will also help solve other key problems of the 21<sup>st</sup> century related to global economy and finance, energy supplies, environment, climate, demography, epidemics, cross-border crime and religious and ethnic extremism. Nuclear disarmament is, therefore, not a goal in itself but rather an important area, precondition and method for reorganising international life on more civilised principles and according to the demands of the new century.**