AN OVERVIEW OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE 1648 WESTPHALIAN PEACE TREATY: SOVEREIGNTY, COLLECTIVE SECURITY, AND BALANCE OF POWER.

Mashud Layiwola Adelabu Salawu (Ph.D),
6, Adelabu Salawu Street, P.O. Box 1997,
Ipaja Post Office, Ipaja – Lagos.
Phone: 08037167539
Email: adesal2@yahoo.com

&

Emmanuel Olatunde Ojo (Ph.D),
Faculty of Arts, Obafemi Awolowo University,
Ile Ife, Osun State.
Phone:08034075383
Email: olatundeojo55@gmail.com

Abstract
In 1648, the Peace Treaty of Westphalia ended Europe's Thirty Years war, which was sometimes referred to as the last of the great wars of religion. Yet state actors, years after the Treaty, subsequently introduced those concepts of necessity - Aliance system, balance of power and collective security, as prerequisite for peace building. However, developments in the global system, though in line with the ideals of the Treaty, are faced by contradictions, with over-emphasis on the doctrine of sovereignty. The concept is being abused in the absence of a central government with coercive powers. This study uses secondary sources of data and the theory of an International Government, canvassed by Asirvatham and Misra, is invoked. This study reveals that the doctrine of national sovereignty is a great hindrance to the effective realization of a broadly based international policy, for good governance and checkmating physical, structural and psychological violence. The poor governance styles, especially in Africa, have heightened genocide and pervading electoral fraud, where dubious victories are often celebrated with impunity. Since the doctrine of sovereignty regards the rules of international law as the product of independent wills of sovereign states, no state is considered bound by any rule to which it has not given its prior consent. This paper, therefore, recommends the invocation of an International Government, such as the United Nations Organisation, which will be converted, into a genuine world federation, by the possession of coercive powers, over its constituent units.

Keywords: Balance of power, Collective Security, International Government, Sovereignty.

Introduction

The Peace Treaty of Westphalia and Osnabruck (1648), which established the legal basis of modern state-hood, and by implication, rules or constitution of modern politics has its pronounced consequences for International Relations. "But it was only in the twentieth century, as global empires collapsed, that sovereign statehood, and with it, national self-determination, finally acquired the status of universal organizing principles of world order" (Baylis, Smith and Owens 2017:23). When wars are fought, they have their underlying purposes. The Thirty Years war, 1618-1648, in Europe which was a confessional-political conflicts, between the Protestant and the Roman Catholic Leaders, witnessed very catastrophic consequences, in population losses and material destructions. Understandably, wars often lead to killings, famine and gnashing of teeth, as well as mass destructions, far beyond what could be adequately recorded, but what is usually germane, after the devastation, must be those lessons garnered there-after. In short, the germane question could be thus: what were the legacies or derivatives for both the combatants and their heirs, in a war that had wantonly, consumed generations? The legacy from the treaty, for the global society, is anchored on a major principle of Sovereignty of States. The eventual concepts of necessity, balance of power and collective security. These three principles, which have contradictory interpretations for International Relations, have been the focus of global politics since the seventeenth century, which this paper intends to examine. Essentially, how international relations is affected by these developments will be reviewed, but first, the angle which an International Relations' theory of "International Government, in a United World Society" poses, will first be examined.

Theoretical Discourse:

Scholars of International Relations have long been deeply interested in the interplay between the Great Powers and the reasons why even the most powerful have, in the end, disappeared from the stage of history. These reversals could be gleaned from what happened to the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian empires after the First World War, the European Colonial empires, after the second World War, and finally to the Soviet empire itself, between 1989 and 1991. But history also demonstrates that when empires fall, this is not always followed by stability and prosperity. The collapse of Soviet Communism, did not spare Russia from facing new challenges (Baylis, et al, 2017:71). If, after the formation of the United Nations Organization, the international community is still experiencing the symptoms of why there were First and Second

World Wars, it becomes imperative to tinker with a global hegemon, for a strong platform to situate global peace. On this terrain, the theory of an international government, as canvassed by Asirvatham and Misra (2013:575), becomes ideal.

From the Treaties of Westphalia in 1648 onwards, states have been regarded as, by far, the most powerful actors in the international system. They have been the universal standard of political legitimacy, with no higher authority to regulate their relations with each other (Baylis et al, 2017). On that platform, security issues are now the priority obligation of state governments, which make states assume their own protection, in what has become a self-help world. Sovereignty is a loaded concept. Under this regard, each state starts viewing the international system as a hostile arena and that the only avenue of protection open to a state, for its security, is only at the expense of its neighbors. Under such an atmosphere, as permanent peace becomes impossible, attempt at achieving a balance of power, becomes the alternative path. That is where international politics, full of intrigues, acrimony, as well as palliatives, could be discussed. For Neo-realist writers, such as Mearsheimer (1994), international politics may not be characterized by constant wars, but nevertheless, security competition takes place, with war always a possibility. Although, they accept that co-operation among states can, and does occur, but such co-operation has its limits. It is constrained by the dominating logic of security competition, which no amount of co-operation can eliminate.

As a panacea, and in further enhancing the necessity of an international government, in a United World Society, Asirvatham and Misra (2013), take us through a historical path, by tracing the advent of the rise of internationalism, beckoning to its gains and the likehood of its challenges. The scholars remind the global society that just as the nineteenth century was an epoch of triumphant nationalism, the twentieth century could be regarded as an epoch of new resurgent internationalism. However, in Laski's theoretical attempt, at elucidating the idea of an international government, he laments that

> the inadequacy of the sovereign nation-state has been demonstrated by the tragic occurrence of two world wars in a period of three decades. The emergence of the League of Nations, after the First World War and the establishment of the United Nations Organization, after the last war, are the

steps in a right direction of a world federation, based on complete abrogation of the sovereignty of nation-states, as the only remedy of the myriad ills, caused by the existing anarchy in international affairs (Asirvatham and Misra, 2013:574/575).

Reinforcing this view, and while wondering about the rot in the acrimonious interactions of nation-states, Laski argues that the emphatically territorial character of the sovereign nation-states, enables a small section of its members to utilize its power for their own ends, even against the interests of their fellow citizens. Against such a danger, international government represents the most solid protection we have" (Laski, 2008:234).

In his further disdain for sovereignty of a nation, Laski (2008), submits two observations to support his proposition of an international government. The first is that the state is, in daily administration, the government, and that the government may lie at the disposal of a special interest, and second, in order to enforce obligations upon it, an organized consultation with other groups is essential, if the 'will' realized is to represent a just compromise between competing 'wills'. Balancing his proposition, Laski enthusiastically avers that the territorial supremacy of government is made more sancrosanct, by making it work through functional organs. He insists that by adopting the practice of an international government, it enables us to make its "will" responsive, not merely to the political state but also to group interests, which, if the political states stand alone, may well receive inadequate recognition.

In a clear contrast to the adherents of sovereignty, on the possibility of the doctrine's easy detection and suppression of conflict, we are of the strong view that since conflict is a product of interaction, unless we can find the institutions which can make possible the abrogation of conflict, in the domestic life of a state, as it stands now, we shall not find them in the sphere of international affairs. Under this sphere, an international government is a good alternative.

The need for an international solidarity in a United World Society
Discussions on the future of International Relations have become expedient because of the cumulative events of over three centuries, since the proclaimed Westphalian Peace Treaty in 1648.Many of the reactions call for an overview of the concept of

sovereignty, for a better and a harmonious international world order. These concerns included, but not limited to wars, economic resources, border/ boundary conflicts, racial prejudice, suspicion, distrust, discrimination, as well as religion, and blatant electoral fraud, with impunity, on account of sovereignty, amongst many others.

David Mitrary (2017), a pioneer integration theorist, argues that transnational co-operation is required, in order to resolve common problems. World politics is no longer an exclusive arena for states, as it had been for the 300 years of the Westphalianstate system (Baylis, et el (2017)). Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye (1972) cast their lot for an international government, by submitting that the centrality of other actors, such as interest groups, transnational corporations, and international non-government organizations (INGOs), have to be taken into consideration. Here, the overriding image of international relations is that of a web of diverse actors, through multiple channels of interaction, that are capable of promoting global peace and concord. With that spirit in vogue, invocation of obstructive aggrandizement, citing sovereignty, will be eliminated.

Ake (1981), expresses optimism about the possibility of embracing the idea of an International Government, starting with economic integration. However, he sounds a note of caution, on account of the basic problem with the strategy of collective self-reliance, which requires a considerable degree of regional economic co-operation and integration. This caution is based on the fact that Africa has tried in the past to promote, political integration, with very limited successes. He cites some foreseeable difficulties, such as political differences, the fear of metropolitan powers, as well as the disparity of the size and economic development of members. Although, the main structural features of African formations are behind this inertia, the prospect of giving a working interpretation to the gains of an International Government, is actively at work. The idea was mooted by Dr. Kwame Nkrumah in 1963, but it was killed by acrimonious display of international politics. Revisiting the call for an International Government demands a review of the Westphalian constitution, which came to colonize the entire planet.

A Perusal of Westphalian Constitution
Constitutions are important documents because they establish the location of legitimate political authority, within a polity, as well as the rules that inform the exercise and limits of political powers.

In codifying and legitimating the principle of sovereign statehood, the Westphalian constitution created the "modern state system. It welded the idea of territoriality with the notion of legitimate sovereign rule. By extension, the 1648 Wesphalian proclamation situates the supreme legal and political authority within territorially delimited states. As strong as this intention assumes, the opposite is the case, particularly, with weak states in the developing nations of Africa. That idea is what informs Krasner (1999) to state that the Westphalian system has, for many states, been little more than a form of organized hypocrisy. Besides that, many schools argue that contemporary globalization presents a fundamental challenge to the Westphalian ideal of sovereign statehood, which, under a very close scrutiny, is transforming the world order, in its complexity. This notion is empirically discernible because the political and economic interactions between the developed and the developing nations, exemplify this development.

Castigating the concept of an absolute and independent sovereign state, which demands an unqualified allegiance to government, from it members, International Relations scholars see the practice as incompatible with the interests of humanity. "In a creative civilization, what is important is not the historical accident of separate states, but the scientific fact of world-interdependence. The real unit of allegiance is the world and that the real obligation of obedience is to the total interest of our fellow men" (Asirvatham and Misra 2013:575).Equally, a group of Realists, particularly Hedley (2002), emphasizes that the international system exists in a state of anarchy – a term that implies, not a complete or absence of structure and rules, but rather the lack of a central government that can enforce rules.

Sovereignty, constitutionally speaking, means that a government has the rights, in principles, to do whatever it wants, in its own territory. This, in principle, means that states are equal in status, if not in power. Sovereignty equally depicts that states must not interfere in the internal politics and decision processes, of other states. More controversially, some states assume that sovereignty gives them the right to treat their own people in any fashion, including such actions that other states call genocide (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2011). These, and many more adversarial applications of the use of sovereignty, represent the objections and why some people are emphasizing that only a world government can solve those problems of impunity and aggravated arrogance.

A Perusal of Sovereignty, Balance of Power and Collective Security.

The linkage between sovereignty, the major principle from the Treaty, and other eventual doctrines of necessity, balance of power and collective security, is very complex. Since the post-Westphalian era, the nature, evolution and pattern of interactions, in the global system tend towards a potentially problematic and obfuscating sense of international relations. The be-all-and-end-all of these concepts, result in a world of bewildering contradictions and are promoting global discontents because no nation can, on its own, challenge a neighbour, no matter the enormity of her actions within her borders. We start off by looking critically at the definition of sovereignty, defined as the power of the state to make laws and enforce them, with all the means of coercion it cares to employ. It is the distinctive mark of the state, distinguishing it alike from individuals and associations, within the state. It has two aspects, internal and external. Internally, it means the power which the state claims to make and enforce law, upon individuals and associations, within the area of its jundiction. Externally, it means independence of foreign control (Appadorai, 2004, Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2011).

As the definitions of sovereignty are many and varied, Bodin (1998) defines it as the supreme power over citizens and subjects, unrestrained by law. Yet, Duguit (2004), sees it as the commanding power of the state; it is the will of the nation, organized in the state; it is the right to give unconditional orders to all individuals in the territory of the state. Furthermore, Burgess (2004), describes sovereignty as original, absolute, unlimited power, over the individual subjects and over all associations of subjects. The Question is-if a group or an individual is so empowered, how can one prevent its misuse and how will it not generate conflict? This question and many more provoke Giddings (2013),to lament that in all the dictionaries, there is no other word that has more disastrously been conjured with, by metaphysical juggler, Jurists and political theorists as sovereignty had been. On that verbosity, it has lost sight of concrete fact, and has given people's minds to abstractions. Viewed from that account, sovereignty has become, for political science, a thing that never was on sea or land (Giddings, 2013).

In a rather scornful contribution, Soltau (2013), describes the concept of sovereignty as the exercise of a final legal coercive power by the state. In line with the views of philosophers, for every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction-(Isaac Newton). This array of definitions attracts various criticisms, which drew the attention of

Asirvatham and Misra (2013), to the views of the scholars in the school of Political Pluralism, who criticize the doctrine of sovereignty, as parochial. They aver that the concentration of power at a single central source results in a tyrannical social order. It is their views that the dispersion of power to peripheral points of the body politics, should be the basis of free societies. The pluralists further contend that the state should not monopolize power in society. Instead, power should be equitably shared with other groups and associations. In their further vituperation against sovereignty, the Pluralists suggest that instead of threatening force to secure the total acquiescence of all dissenting groups states should respect their reasonable autonomy and regard social diversity as the conclusive proof of a really healthy community. Barker (2013), a great critic of sovereignty, submits that no political common place has become more arid and unfruitful than the doctrine of the sovereign state. In a further reaction against the ills of sovereignty, another scholar, Krabbe, cited by Airvathanand Misra, pleads that the notion of sovereignty must be expunched from political theory. The submissions of these scholars, based on empiricism, are sufficient to assume that there must be grave reasons that motivate the reasoning of the pluralists, against the doctrine of state sovereignty.

Having discussed sovereignty, sparcely though, being the main focal principle derived from the 1648 Peace Treaty of Westphalia, the other two, which are doctrines of necessity; Balance of Power and Collective Security, must also be examined, to bring out those contradictions in them, and review those tentative ways for ameliorating their ill-effect on governance.

BALANCE OF POWER

What is power, what determines it, and how can it be balanced?
"Power is a central concept in international relations – the central one for realists – but it is surprisingly difficult to define or measure"(Michael and Duvall2005; David, 2002,cited by Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2011:45). Power, in the most general sense, is the ability of a political actor to achieve his or her goals. In the Realist approach, it is assumed that possession of capabilities will result in influence, and so, the single word 'power', is often used ambiguously to cover both(Baylis, et al, 2017). "Power is the ability to achieve one's purposes or goals. More specifically, it is the ability to affect others, to get the outcomes one wants. Another problem is determining which resources provide the best basis for power, in any particular context" (Nye, 2007:60-1). At this juncture, what are those determinants of power? State power is a mix of

many ingredients. Elements that an actor can draw on, over or long term include total GDP, population, territory, geography and natural resources. These attributes change only slowly. "Less tangible long term power resources include political culture, patriotism, education of the population and strength of the scientific and technological base. Not left behind among the elements of power for a state, are the credibility of its commitments, in terms of its reputation for keeping its words, otherwise called trust. This is equally a long-term power base, while at the same time, the ability of a state's culture and values, in consistently shaping the thinking of other states, often classified as being in possession of power of ideas, are also strong elements of power" (Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2011: 47).

However, the phenomenon of misuse of power, which has engulfed the global community, takes different forms. As for those scholars in the Realist school of thought, the main actors on the world stage are States, which are legally sovereign states. By a simple definition, sovereignty simply means that no actor in the global system can compel a sovereign state to act in specific ways, because all the states are equal and autonomous. With this system in vogue, conflict, which is a product of interaction and inevitable, could pose a danger to the society, where all proffer equality. Other actors in the international system, such as multinational corporations or International Organizations have to relate within the framework of interstate relations. If states propagate the doctrine of sovereignty, as expected under the sphere of international politics, Realists attribute it to a struggle for power, in each state's attempts at maximizing her national interest. In order to resolve any logjam envisaged, a mechanism, known as the balance of power, is often adopted, whereby states often struggle to prevent any one state from dominating. As international politics is all about conflict resolution, an adoption of techniques of bargaining, alliances, as well as diplomacy are often the key mechanisms for balancing various national interests.

Little wonder why Baylis, et al (2017: 529) submit that balance of power, in realist theory, "refers to an equilibrium between states; Yet, Historical Realists regard it as the product of diplomacy (contrived balance), but, Structural Realists regard the system as having a tendency towards a natural equilibrium (fortuitous balance). It is a doctrine and an arrangement whereby the power of one state (or group of states) is checked by the countervailing power of other states".

In the international system, there is no higher authority to counter the use of force, and that is the problem. Therefore, security can be obtained only through self-help. This means states often rely on internal mechanisms to achieve security. Evidently, while a state is gunning at her own security, she will, inevitably be propagating the insecurity of other states. When a situation, such as this emerges, it leads to a security dilemma. This leads to the assertion that one state's desire for security, is often the breeding ground for another state's sources of insecurity. When the state clamoring for security, and other states in the society, feeling threatened react, the tendency is there that the threatened states will be undertaking measures to equally enhance their own security too. In order to checkmatethe risk of a hegemon, alliances will be formed, to effect a balance against the power of threatening states. It must be known that since balance of power is not natural or inevitable, it must be constructed. On this terrain, this paper submits that although stateleaders and diplomatsplay a crucial role in maintaining the doctrine of balance of power, yet, in the anarchy of the international system, the most reliable foundation for enhancing the principle of 1648 Westphalian Peace Treaty is the development of an International Government, which will attract respect from global nations.

Collective Security: We need to have an idea of the invocation of doctrines of necessity, to checkmate the unevisaged adversarial impact of sovereignty. Woodrow Wilson concluded that the causes of the First World War were not only in the wickedness of German Leadership but in the European balance of power system as well.

In 1917, he attacked the reigning international order, which preceded the war, as a system of organized rivalries. He then raised some questions, upon which the global future peace and policy should traverse:

> Is the present war a struggle for a just and secure peace, or only for a new balance of power?... There must be, not a balance of power, but a community of power; not organized rivalries, but an organized common place.

What Wilson meant by community of power was an entirely new concept, that later became known as collective security. (Kissenger, 1994).

Collective Security is the formation of a broad alliance of most major actors in an international system, for the purpose of jointly opposing aggression by any actor; sometimes seen as pre-supposing the existence of a universal organization (such as the United Nations) to which both the aggressors and its opponents belong" (Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2011:502). Equally, Collective Security is a means of maintaining peace, in which a collection of states agree on an institutional framework and legal mechanisms, to prevent or suppress aggression. Two examples of collective security actions, under the auspices of the United Nations, were the Korean war and the Persian Gulf war (Nye, 2007:286).

Basically, "nations must agree to the principle that, in matters which touch more than one nation, they will be bound by the decision arrived at, by a common international body, in which all nations are, in some way, represented. Such matters are: territorial boundaries, international migration, armaments, tarrifs, privileges of national minorities, international communications, and foreign capital (Appadorai, 2004:147). These peace building ethos, against seeking self help on the aforementioned matters, demand that the external sovereignty, being claimed by nation-states, must be restricted in these matters, and there must be a commitment to the rule of law between nations, as there is between individuals, within each state.

Shaw (2003), in his own treatice, states that, international law, unlike mutual laws, derives, not from actions of a legislative branch or other central authority, but from tradition and agreements, signed by states. It also differs in the difficulty of enforcement, which depends, not on the power and authority of central government, but on reciprocity, collective action, and international norms. Although, there may be no central government to enforce them, but international institutions are put in place by consensus, to monitor developments. Any nation that refuses to obey an international law, and is declared a recalcitrant state, risks being declared a rogue state. Any nation so pronounced, as having no respect for international norms or agreements, will be decisively dealt with, through a coercive and collective action.

But if human-kind could learn from history, the experiences from the First and Second World Wars must have revealed that a system of national security is an impossibility for all nations, at the same time, even for a few, for all time. The coordination of the

United Nations, although needing an overhaul, reveals that might cannot be the basis of right. In line with the aforesaid necessity, and in conformity with a civilized way of International Relations, one tends to ask for an alternative, to the global anarchy, as a result of the perceived insecurity attached to national security of a state. Under an international government, the respect for a Central Administration, as an umpire, will significantly curtail global violence.

The Global Security Architecture, Since After The Second World War

This has been largely shaped, with some cosmetic modifications, in line with the ideas of the 1648 Peace Treaty of Westphalia. They have been predicated on the principles of sovereignty of each independent state and collective security, that was protected and reshaped by the Great Powers, with little or no regard to the contradictions inherent in the concepts of sovereignty and collective security, respectively.

It is the contradictions presented in International Relations that are of great concern to international relations' Scholars and Practitioners. These have to do with the misapplication of the concept of sovereignty by many world leaders, particularly in the Third World nations, where much harm could have been done before beaucracy allows an intervention. The global community will not forget the episodes of Rwanda, Sudan, Liberia and Sierra Leone in a jiffy. Nevertheless, the fundamental principle of collective security is that all Great Power States are encouraged to unite their policies and forces, against any aggressor state: translating to standing against the state which violates the boarders of another one. Yet, the principle of sovereignty implies that other states have no legal right to interfere into the internal affairs of any other state, at least without legal permission, by an authorized supranational organization, such as the United Nations Organization or any of its organs, so empowered.

However, where failed states exist, or genocide is threatened, some analysts believe outsiders should ignore sovereignty. In 2005, the United Nations High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Changes, endorsed the "norm that there is a collective international responsibility to protect civilians from the effects of war and human rights abuses." According to the UN panel, this responsibility is "exercisable by the Security Council, authorizing military intervention, as a last resort, in the event of genocide and other large – scale killing, ethnic cleansing or serious violations of humanitarian law, which sovereign Governments have proved powerless or unwilling

to prevent." (Nye, JR, 2007:161). The case of the NATO's aggression on Serbia and Montenegio in 1999, was a good preaching point, to put a stop to the flagrant violation of the principle of sovereignty.

While there are indeed, many observations in the concept of sovereignty, especially, as it concerns the principles for identifying legal independence and territorial integrity of each nation, there is an aspect of the above submissions that has an endless appeal for a redress in contemporary thinking. This has to do with the earlier referenced genocidal killings and maiming, which could occur before the basis for homogeneity has any success. Laconically, a revisit to the suggestion of a federal union of nations, is inevitable (Appadorai, 2004; Griffs, O'Callaghan and Roach, 2008)..

Sensing that blood-letting and acts of impunity, in the absence of an umpire, could be reduced or eliminated, Appadorai is of the view that the citizens of each member state will have to obey a government, other than their own government, in which, no doubt, they will have some, but not the sole voice, in determining policy. Federation, essentially, means a division of powers and double allegiance. It means in effect, nothing less than the surrender by the nation – state, of part of its sovereignty. The minimum federal subjects are defense, and foreign affairs; Other common affairs may or may not be transferred to the federal authority (Appadora; 2004:157).

Conclusion

This paper has examined the core principle generated by the Peace Treaty of Westphalia (1648), which is sovereignty, and the eventual concepts of necessity, balance of power and collective security. Equally, the consequences of these principles for International Relations, which are pronounced in their incompatible operations, were also highlighted.

First, the framers of the 1648 Westphalia Peace Treaty deserve a very high commendation, because over three centuries have lapsed, and besides peripheral adjustments, the Peace Treaty remains largely germane to the practice of International Relations, till date. However, what is of an urgent concern is the use to which sovereignty, as a concept, by each nation, is being subjected. Much as the United Nations Organization is trying to prevent bad governance and human rights abuse, individual states, have clandestinely clamped down on their citizens, basing their

action on sovereignty and non interference. Although, the United Nations Organization has gone ahead to make pronouncements on these abuses, major destructions, both human and material, would have occurred before any partial intervention. This paper is of the view that conceited actions by the privileged and first world nations are not in conformity with the tenets of sovereignty, and this will be checkmated by an international government. Yet, when violations, on the pretext of sovereignty, are especially egregious, and the states could be identified, collective action, by an "international government", could be taken. Hence, the call for an international government, where states' sovereignty will only be partially torched but with a federal government at the top of world affairs.

Since a common abuse of power, and a discredit to the application of balance of power and collective security, is electoral system, especially in the developing economies, institutionalizing an international government will promote sanity and sustainable development will follow.

Some of the prerequisites of an international government are that:

a. the nations of the world need to collaborate and accept the principle of co-eistence, in order to obviate the subsisting suspicions between and among the nations of the world, big or small;
b. sources of international friction, though inevitable, will be identified, for the promotion of racial harmony and equality among citizens of each nation;
c. there is a great need to reduce the deep rooted disparities in the economic sphere, between the developed and the under – developed countries, because economic inequalities are inimical to a peaceful co-existence;
d. while each state must retain the security outfits on ground, the setting up of global security outfit must be agreed upon, and an enforceable universal law, will be required;
e. it is disheartening that in this 21st century, there are nations where unrestrained kidnapping, armed banditry, slaughtering and beheading of human beings, are happening, with impunity, particularly in the developing nations. Where an international government is in vogue, such a head of government or state, could be made to account, as crimes being committed under sovereignty, will disappear or reduce drastically.

In order to compliment the United Nations Organization, and to check the excesses of
bad governance and human rights abuse in the global society, the idea of an
international Government must be given a trial. It will make international relations
less turbulent and will be a peaceful building block, for the global society.

References

Ake, C (2008),*A political Economy of Africa*, England: Longman

Appadorai, A (2004), *The Substance of Politics*, New Delhi: Oxford University
 Press

Asiruatham, E and Misra, K.K. (2013), *Political Theory*, New Delhi: Chand &
 Company PVT.Ltd

 BarkawiT. (2005), Globalization and War, Lanham, M.D: Rowman and Littlefield
 Barker, H (2013), "The Superstition of the state", in "*London Times
 literary supplement*", July 2013, P.329.*(https:// books.google.ng.com, cited
 26/05/2020)*

Baylis, J., Smith, S, & Owens, P. (2017), *The Globalization of World Politics,: An
 Introduction to International Realtions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bodin, B. (1998), *War and Society in Europe*, Stroud: Sutton Publishing Bodin, J.
(1973) *"Limitations on Sovereignty"* in George H Sabine & Thomas. Thorson, *A
History of Political Theory*, Oxford: Oxford & IBH Publishing co. PVT.
 Ltd.

Clauswitz, C. (1972) *von Kriege*, Bonn: Free press

Dennen, V.D (1995), The origins of war: The Evolution of a Male –Coalitional
 Reproductive Strategy, Groningen: Origin Press

Duguit L. (2004) "the Theory Sovereignty" In A. Appadorai (2004), *The
 Substance of Politics*, New Delhi: Oxford

For Michael, B. and Duvall, R., see Joshua, S. Goldstein and Jon C. Pevehouse,
 International relations, 2011:45, New York: Longman.

Giddings, F.H (2013), *The Responsible state: A Re-Examination of fundamental
 Political Doctrines in the Light of World War and The Menace of
 Anarchism*, Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goldstein, J.S &Pevehouse, J.C (2011), *International Relations, Wineth Edition,*
 New York: Longman

Griffiths,M, O'Callaghan, and Roach, S.C. (2008), International Relations, The key concepts, Second Edition, London & New York: Routledge.

Hedley, B. (2002), The Anarchial Society: A study of order in World Politics, Columbia: Columbia University Press

Keohane, R.O and Nye, J.S (1972), *Transactional Relations and World Politics; An Introduction*, Boston,: Little Brown

Krabbe, H. (1973) "The modern idea of the state", Translation by George H. Sabine and Walter J. Shepard (1973) New York and London: Oxford & IBH Publishing Co.PVT. LTD. (P.35).

Kissenger, H. (1994), *Diplomacy*, New York: Simon and Schumster Paper backs.

Krasner S.D (1999), *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Laski, H.J (2008) *Grammar of Politics*, Delhi: Surject Publications

Mearsheimer, J.(1994/5), "The False Promise of International Institutions", in the *Journal of International Security*, 19(3):5-49, Also, in John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mitrany, D.(1943), *A working Peace system*, London: RIIA

Michael, T (1976), *Anarchy and co-operation*, Michigan: Michigan University Press

Nye, J.S (2007), *Understanding International Conflicts, An introduction to Theory and History*, New York: Pearson/Longman

See Burgess, H. (2004), "On Sovereignty", in A .Appadorai (2004), *The substance of Politics*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press (Pp.145-146).

Shaw, M.N (200), International Law, 5th Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Soltan, R.H (2013), "On sovereignty", in Dr. Eddy Asirvatham & K.K. Misra, *Political Theory*, New Delhi: S. Chand & Company PVT Ltd.