

# One world government assignment



'World government' refers to the idea of all humankind united under one common political authority. I believe it is logical to say that this delicate situation has yet to happen in this current world but it is arguable that it is slowly shifting from nations with hundreds of citizens to billions of citizens to unions of multiple nations to the eventual delusive one world government. In this paper, I will argue that even though one world government has its benefits, the pursuit of this may not result in happiness.

Proponents of world government argues that most of the social problems can be resolved if everyone falls under one common government. These problems include illegal nuclear activities, poverty, global warming and preventable wars. It is even mention in the bible that " Jesus was speaking of the coming world government of God to be established on the earth after His return. " Having one government is the only way to achieve anything resembling world peace because it would make the feeling of " patriotism" irrelevant because there's only one government to be patriotic to.

For an instance, The Taiping Rebellion that took place in the 18th century was the first major instance of anti-Manchu sentiment threatening the stability of the Qing dynasty, which significantly weakened the power of the corrupted and declining Qing Dynasty. The country was taken over by the Manchu, who originated from Russian Maritime Province, during the 16th century. The war was caused by the strong sense of patriotism from the Chinese (Han) to regain control over their nation.

During its fourteen-year course of war, approximately 20 million people died. This can be prevented if their loyalty was concentrated on a common

government. Similarly, the differences in loyalty may not be a problem anymore when the world unites under one common government. There may be an instance when people accept the fact that, even though they are different in terms of initial loyalty, they are under a common rule of one government so it will be positive sum game for everyone to achieve social stability.

Here you may question, even with a common government citizens may not feel obliged to be loyal to this coalition but in my opinion with the proper democracy system in place and also the right talent to prove the capabilities of the government, citizens will learn to embrace the new government. It would also be easier to eradicate extreme social inequalities by distributing the taxes from the rich and give to the poor. One way will be incur income tax for different salary group and distribute the taxes to place with absolute poverty.

A study by the World Institute for Development Economics Research at United Nations University reports that the richest 1% of adults alone owned 40% of global assets in the year 2000, and that the richest 10% of adults accounted for 85% of the world total. The bottom half of the world adult population owned barely 1% of global wealth. If part of the wealth from the top one percent can be distributed to the poorest people in the world, then we might not be far away from eradicating absolute poverty.

Assuming all citizens wants to actively change the world for the better, taxes may still result in the discontent from the richest 1% of the global citizen and may even reduce the effort to work harder to achieve higher revenue but

when one percent of the population is compared to half of the global population, the voice of discontent will be overwhelmed by the supporting masses. In the midst of all these potential benefits from magic power of the pixie dust; there still lie potential threats to be examined. There still lies the uphill task of having people of different race, ethnicity, and religion all loyal to one single system.

For an instance, . the difference in culture and practices can also be seemed as a potential threat. There are states that allow homosexual marriages and they are seen as legal couples however in other places these marriages may be seen as morally unacceptable and the marriage may not be recognised. Assuming nations do come together to form a one world government, and all borders are eradicated, does it mean that same sex couples who are legally married in one place will have to forgo their status and civil rights as a married couple when they move to a different place?

This may result in disagreements between the conservative nations and the nation who are more open to the idea. Potential solutions like the civil union may be a solution to the problem but it will still be a bitter pill to swallow for countries like Iran Mauritania, Saudi-Arabia and Sudan who put a death penalty on these marriages. Moreover, there is a need to create international laws to the suit different religious regulation for the new nation will be one of the paramount issues that need to be solved. For example, the Bible indicates the possibility of Jesus ruling the world as the king of the new world order.

That may suggest that there will be a significant amount of people who subscribe to this idea will push for a Christian-based government and special laws to be created to benefit the spreading of the religion. However, this will not go far in the presence of other religions in the world. There will be serious dispute over the degree of recognition given to the different beliefs. One of the best ways to examine the possible outcome of this proposition of forming one world government is through history when various people with different backgrounds and different ambitions try to force a common nationality onto them.

The first emperor of China, Qin Shi Huang, managed to unite the divided China into a common nation. Many may remember him for creating a clever division and micro-management of the nation and also a common measure of currency for the whole China. But I believe there are more people who remembered him for his later part of his ruling era for being that tyrant who tried to ban Confucianism and killed ten off thousands of scholars.

Even more remembered him as the ruler who spent his dying days neglecting politics while searching for the Elixir of life, creating more chaos than order in the country. Apart from the assassination by Jingke and Gao Jianli, there are others who want to overthrow him for all his tyranny and also to regain the status of their previous states. With all the evidence that the one common government brought economic benefits and prosperity for the masses, it is an irony that the assassins were seen as heroes by the descendents.

This may suggest that not only the people in that era went against the government but the same goes to the descendants who saw the need for the government to end. It has come to my attention that regardless of all that uprising and constant internal conflict, the modern China did unite as one nation but the social uprising stopped only after Chairman Mao came into power. He was seen as a national hero fighting against the Japanese during World War II. It was a unanimous agreement from most citizens in China to support him as their common leader.

However, this is extremely hard to come by and it is even harder for a man who is capable enough to gain the support for the majority of the world. Even if there is that one brilliant soul who managed to cater to the needs to all the citizens in the new world government, can he/she resist the temptation of being overpowered by human natures like greed or loathe? No one can guarantee that the 'king of the world' will not end up like Qin Shi Huang who diminished his good names with his ill-intention policies to maintain control over the people. This is a risk that some people may not be ready to take by giving the power of the state to someone or a group of politicians who they do not subscribe to. Ultimately, I do understand the rationale behind the push for One World Government, but if we have to overlook the possible racial and religious discrepancies in order for the system to make sense then maybe we should look for alternative solutions to our problems instead. History have told us that even with the states forcefully merged as one, without a common ground or reasonable solution to all our differences, it is almost impossible to maintain the government.