

Terrorism, Human Rights and the Case for World Government

My thesis is that both globalism with all its accompanying promises and problems plus cogent moral arguments for cosmopolitanism are moving us towards the need for greater international cooperation, based on enforceable international law. I argue that the best way to realize these globalist and moral goals is through the establishment of a World Government.

In the first chapter I describe the growing menace of non-state terrorism on people everywhere, from Baghdad where more civilians are being killed by suicide bombers than coalition forces, to Egypt and Istanbul, to Indonesia, to Madrid, London and New York. Terrorists attack our civilized way of life, rejecting democracy, secular law and human rights, especially the rights of women. I distinguish *Old-Style* from *New-Style* terrorism. *New-Style* raises the level of violence and rejects the distinction between combatants and civilians, so that it will blow up children receiving candy from a soldier. The hall mark of *New-Style* is the suicide bomber, epitomized in the attacks on the World Trade Center, who is willing to kill himself in order to spread death and chaos.

Chapter 2, The Case for World Government, first examines the virtues and vices of nationalism and then compares the results with the promises and problems of cosmopolitanism, concluding that something like soft nationalism is compatible with a form of democratic cosmopolitanism or limited world government. I show how globalism is bringing us closer together into a global village, so that we cannot separate ourselves from problems and forces occurring in other nations. For example, air and water pollution do not respect national boundaries and transnational corporations are taking on a life of their own. I then bolster the globalist tendencies to a centralized managerial institution with two moral arguments which would justify a preference for institutionalized cosmopolitanism over nationalism. In order to have enforceable international law, promote peace and curtail terrorism, we should be moving towards world government. I argue that *soft nationalism* is compatible with a republican form of world government. Finally, I defend my theory against several objections.

Chapter 3 deals with universal human rights. In Chapter 2, I mention but do not adequately defend the importance of universal human rights. Here I describe how they were formulated under the leadership of Eleanor Roosevelt. Then I meet objections against them, namely that they are ethnocentric product of Western culture and that they are relative, but not universally valid. Finally, I develop an overall justification of human rights, but one holding that they are correlative to moral duties.