



The WorldVoter

the newsletter of

Vote World Parliament

— democratic world parliament through a global referendum —

<https://voteworldparliament.org/>

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

<http://www.rescueplanforplanetearth.com/>

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

Issue #38, April, 2011

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

THE SCORE

As of April 16, 2011, 21,748 people have voted. So far, the votes are 95.4% in favor of creating a democratic world parliament.

* * *

Quotes of the month

We are living in the most critical stage of human history. I am proud and honored to work with you on one of the most critical ideas of our time: liberating democracy from the box of the nation-state. John Dale, VWP member

Of course the result from a successful global referendum would trump national law, but for an online global referendum there are problems with voter fraud that would have to be overcome. (paraphrased) The late Dr. Terrence P. Amerasinghe, professor of law and the former President of the World Constitution and Parliament Association

* * *

News in brief

New Board member

* * *

A warm welcome is extended to William Dudley Bass of Seattle, WA, USA. William has taken an interest in our initiative for a couple of years, and we are very pleased that he is

now on our Board. He is currently finishing the writing of his new book, *We the People of Earth: A Stand for Democratic World Government*. To see his photo and bio, please go to <https://voteworldparliament.org/about/who-we-are/> and scroll down.

* * *

New review of *Rescue Plan for Planet Earth*

“Very, very admirable is the way that Jim Stark has thought through a global referendum in concrete detail. He uses fact, figures, numbers, geography, tables and charts in an extremely thorough way. He is also extremely articulate and well-reasoned in terms of the need for and the useful methodology of computers, the Internet and social networking in the process of a global referendum. These are areas in which Stark’s thinking and book particularly shine.... Also very concrete and admirably practical is the organization, Vote World Parliament [formerly Vote World Government].” Rev. Dr. Karen A. Hamilton, General Secretary (Ex Officio), The Canadian Council of Churches and Executive Chair of the World Federalist Movement—Canada, from a review of *Rescue Plan for Planet Earth* in *The Federalist Debate*, March 2011 (edited by Dr. Lucio Levi) This quote is an excerpt. Full review posted at <http://www.rescueplanforplanetearth.com/reviews.html> or in the current issue of the The Federalist Debate website at... <http://www.federalist-debate.org/fdb/index.bfr> .

* * *

Slight change in ballot wording

The Board of Vote World Parliament has unanimously endorsed a proposal from Mr. Per Norbäck of Sweden to insert the word “transparent” right into the ballot proposition. The aspect of total transparency was emphasized strongly in the book *Rescue Plan for Planet Earth* (to confirm, go to <http://www.rescueplanforplanetearth.com/free3chapters.pdf> and scroll down until you find “Chapter 5”), so there is no substantive change in our proposal, nor is there any reason to start the vote count over at zero. The ballot wording now reads:

Do you support the creation of a directly-elected, representative, transparent, and democratic world parliament that is authorized to legislate on global issues?

Per Norbäck is trying to get a municipal referendum done in Vallentuna, Sweden, where he is a member of council as well as head of the Demoex (for “democracy experiment”) Party. He is also a high school teacher, so he asked his students to consider our initiative. There was a strong consensus that the global referendum could be dangerous because a world authority could degenerate into global tyranny. The only way Mr. Norbäck could bring his students around was to give them an iron-clad assurance that such a body would be *completely* transparent. We just cannot act for peace and accidentally set the stage for global tyranny. The only antidote to corruption is transparency, so if we want a guarantee of protection against corruption, we’ll need to have *total* transparency, now and forever, as the basic operating procedure of a world government or parliament.

Mr. Norbäck asked (in an email to me) why we hadn't included the word "transparent" in the list of adjectives in the ballot wording? Well, we thought of that and rejected the idea back in 2006. Now, it seems we should have done that from the beginning, that in fact we made a mistake in not including it. Now that mistake has been corrected. Our gratitude to Per Norbäck for bringing this matter to our attention.

PS Mr. Norbäck's first effort to get a municipal referendum failed, but he (and we at the HQ of VWP) have not given up by a long shot.

* * *

A Talk with [Dr. Giulio] Gallarotti: In Search of a World Parliament, Direct Democracy

NOTE: Giulio Gallarotti is a professor at the Wesleyan University, a liberal arts college in Middletown, Connecticut, USA and the author of *The Power Curse: Influence and Illusion in World Politics*. He is one of the 120+ published authors who support VWP's global referendum initiative, and he is supporting efforts to have a referendum for the university and another referendum for the city of Middletown.

Copyright © 2011 *The Wesleyan Argus* (<http://wesleyanargus.com/2011/02/25/a-talk-with-gallarotti-in-search-of-a-world-parliament-direct-democracy/>)

By Sam Korda, Assistant Features Editor (*The Wesleyan Argus*)

The Argus: When and how did you get involved with the Global Referendum for a Democratic World Parliament?

Giulio Gallarotti: I got an e-mail from Jim Stark [founder of NGO Vote World Parliament], and he said 'Look, you've written about some of these subjects, international organization and world politics, and I'm looking to get a bunch of people—authors, thinkers, and scholars—to support this initiative because I want it to be legit.' There are people who have thought about this and written about this, so I thought I would join the initiative.

A: What exactly are you trying to accomplish?

GG: I guess our organization is a way of trying to establish some kind of precedent. At this point, it may be nothing more than symbolic, but it's pretty powerful for those of us who look to the future and wonder what it will look like from an international perspective. I and many others who have thought about where we're going with governance and world problems foresee a day of greater political unification of the globe. We're seeing it happen in a lot of ways already—NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Association, has pulled together three major countries into one economic sphere. We saw a European economic community come into existence, something that's evolved into more of a political entity, a European Union.

I see us as kind of pioneers. With pioneers, they don't necessarily think what they're doing is going to get results, but they have to make a statement. It's kind of like when

Ralph Nader runs for president. He doesn't think he can win, but Nader believes in the future that people will choose people who want to work just for the people.

A: How can a major revisioning of international politics be perceived as legitimate?

GG: This is legitimate politically if we take existing international and domestic law seriously—domestic law recognizes constitutional changes if two-thirds of the people vote, and there are all kinds of statements in modern democratic constitutions that ultimately show that the power to decide resides in the people. This is recognized in international law and some of the most important political documents in world politics, like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations, which basically says that political authority resides in the people. If we take that for the truth, if we believe it and they stand behind it, then certainly some mass movement that suggests people want a world government would be legally binding. The only way to interpret this kind of language is to respect that authority of the people.

A: Is accounting for such a massive vote feasible?

GG: The tricky part is trying to figure what the threshold would be for such a vote to pass. Based on Stark's calculations it would take 66 percent of about two billion capable people. These are rough estimates, but they seem to be plausible. We'd like to get a lot of votes, but we probably won't get that many unless people start doing an American Idol type thing: just voting 90 gazillion times. But regardless, if we get many votes, it's still a statement. Before every change, you always need to have some sort of symbolic action, some long string of failures. I like to say that every great revolution starts with a bunch of misguided loonies. Maybe we're the loonies, but I don't think we're so misguided.

A: What is it about the current political climate that necessitates this revision of world politics?

GG: We don't have policies that are giving people what they want or need—the political bargain is breaking down and that's wrong. And so, we're trying to make a statement that global power is in the people, and that to move towards a more civilized world we have to take these toys away from little boys, take the ability to perpetrate violence and destruction from people who have not shown responsibility and the ability to use it in a humane way. Once that happens, we can move towards a world where things are truly voted on democratically. In the future we can do that with the technology available; people can make themselves heard.

A: Do you think this is part of a larger historical trajectory? Are there historical trends that the organization is drawing upon?

GG: There seems to be a pattern throughout history—small political structures grow into larger ones. We started with farming villages that grew into city-states, that grew into regional bodies, that grew into nation-states. Now we're seeing nation-states starting to

come together. I see this line in history, and I believe, that in the future, we will have some sort of world government.

A: How would you see this system working?

GG: People will have to use whatever the leading communication technology is. By the time something like this is taken seriously, we'll have the right communication technology for people to weigh in. Something with filters so that it's legitimate. And I suspect that, in this particular case, if these apps take off I think you're going to see more referendums in countries because more people can weigh in. I think you're going to see much more direct democracy. In the future, like anything else, it's going to have to be a representative system of some sort. You're going to have to elect people who can shepherd the policies and offer things that the people want.

A: Have you figured out what sorts of issues would be confronted?

GG: All sorts of issues. One important field is security: territorial disputes, ethnic problems, secular problems having to do with boundaries, countries wanting to secede from other countries. The kinds of issues that make people want to pick up guns and make countries and fight wars. Not just that but also issues of economic justice. Should poor countries get more transfers from richer countries? What would trade policies have to be like? Things about health and food supplies. Who gets all the AIDS medicine? How are we going to distribute vaccines and food supplies? Who's going to cut their carbon emissions? Every single important issue that is dealt with diplomatically would now be more of an internal thing, and people would eventually get to vote on that. It would still be a federated system, in that countries would maintain a lot of sovereignty. But if a ruling came down, such as, for example, the United States has to cut their carbon emissions by 10 percent, then it would be law and we would have to do it.

A: Has there been response from national government and politicians?

GG: Not really, we're just starting out. I'd be interested to see if we're getting any coverage in the news over time.

A: If you encountered anyone who would disagree with the plan, how would you persuade them otherwise?

GG: Well, I wouldn't. Don't forget this is a democracy, and everyone has a say. Bottom line, count them up and see what the majority wants. I'm not here to proselytize, I'm not trying to convert anyone. I just have my idea and I'm pushing it, and we'll see what happens.