Tamir, in theoretical terms, advocates for and justifies the creation of a global state by deconstructing the current societal structure: the nation state. After revealing flaws in the premise of the nation state as well as disputing its efficacy, Tamir asserts that a global state is superior and desirable. Tamir successfully delineates and disproves the philosophy behind the creation of the nation state while disputing counter arguments (such as an “inevitable” tyrannical global government) to the creation of a global state. However, Tamir’s central thesis that the nation state is not legitimate or effective does not necessitate the need for a global state; it simply suggests it as an (albeit, better) alternative. To express the true need for a global state, we must recognize that nation states (more often than not, the most powerful ones) cause international problems that then create unjust realities for people of any nation. Only then does the need for a global state (and, to be extreme, the eradication of all remnants of the nation state) become clear.

Today, the world is in a vortex of regional conflicts that endangers global peace and prosperity, actualizing Samuel Huntington’s prediction that clashes among belligerent civilizations would be the center of global crisis. These clashes include rising Confucian China and its challenge against American-led post-Cold War unilateralism, the Middle East’s unending entanglements with Islamic fundamentalism (both internally and externally), Putin’s vociferous demonstration of aggression in former Soviet regions, and the most heavily armed demilitarized zone in the world: the Korean Peninsula. These clashes are forms of competition, expansionism, and self-interest: all symptoms of nationalism. Without the nation state, there is no motivation for economic domination or political control over other states or territories. Even fundamentalism and terrorism, according to Robert Pape, is increasingly becoming an expression of nationalism rather than of “religious fanaticism” as it might have been perceived in the past. The direct results of these clashes include physical warfare, displacement, and terrorism, but the indirect results include economic disparities, the exacerbation of environmental issues, state failure, exploitation of workers, etc.

To combat and mediate these clashes as well as attempt to deal with their effects in the most pronounced areas of the world, the United Nations was formed. Ironically, the United Nations is perhaps the most reflexive counter argument against the idea of the global state and a global government. However, the core of the UN’s failure in its disjoint nature. As Chandrakant

---

1 He does not speak of the logistics of bringing about the global state, and, to follow suit, I have to express my acknowledgement of the almost impossibility of creating such a state and note my concerns of literal problems that arise when transitioning from sovereign states to a global state (such as currencies, disparity between haves and have nots, rights to resources, etc.) However, like Tamir, I see the crucial value of the global state, especially in terms of where the world is headed now.


3 Pape, Robert 2003. *The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism.* The University of Chicago.
Yatnoor says in his *Challenges to the United Nations in the New World Order*, “the United Nations is an association of ‘divided nations’ who have little commitment for UN aims and objectives.”⁴ Even in Kant’s democratic peace theory and Doyle’s extrapolation of that (the Pacific Union among liberal democracies)⁵, the premise of peace is that it is among similar *nations* in agreement with one another. Here, the nation is still the basis of the agreement.

However, it is not enough to simply have this conglomerate of entities, though the concept of consent and shared ideology is beneficial. As long people associate the nation state as a part of their identity, their loyalty will lie there. As long as peoples’ loyalties are occupied in this manner, there is no way to achieve and maintain global peace for the benefit of all peoples indefinitely, because with loyalty to the state comes obligation to the state.⁶ Therefore, the dissolution of the nation state and people’s perceptions of loyalty to that state entirely is crucial to the creation of a global state. If this is possible, the global state is to be preferred because it eliminates the roots of direct and indirect problems we face. The reason why such a state is unobtainable is because people have already absorbed and retained identification with a nation, and, if not a nation, with an ethnic or cultural group. Nationalism is not dying (take Brexit or perhaps Trump’s prominence in the United States) and there are different facets of nationalism that mirror membership in a cultural group over political citizenship as is experienced in Hong Kong.⁷ Unless these parts of our identity can be completely erased—that is, if we no longer feel belonging to and a desire to defend or support a certain group—the global state (even if it can be technically created) is destined to fail.

---

⁵ Also mentioned by Tamir in *Who’s Afraid of a Global State?*
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