

# Why *Isonomia Quarterly*?

Brandon Christensen

*Posted to the World Orders Forum: 27 March 2024*

Brandon Christensen serves as the editor of *Isonomia Quarterly*.

---

There is a new quarterly in town, and it has a prominent space dedicated to advancing and discussing world government. Its title is *Isonomia Quarterly*, and I want you to submit your calls for world government to it. The quarterly is aimed at the reading and thinking public. It is not an academic endeavor. It's a public one. Here is the link: <https://isonomiaquarterly.com/>.

## **Motivations**

The time for advancing boldly a new call for world government is now. The “balance of power” is making a comeback, and we all know that this is a bad thing. We all know that the balance of power leads to more wars, more chauvinism (ethnic, religious, and otherwise), and more poverty. We are all witnessing, in real time, autocrats throughout the world celebrating its return.

Times are bad. Let me start from the beginning. I am a libertarian. I was attracted to this ideology by Ron Paul, an isolationist U.S. congressman from Texas. His isolationism – a form of antiwar nationalism - is what *attracted* me to libertarianism. It pulled me in. There was nothing out there advancing a type of world government that a young opponent of American wars could latch on to. In the public sphere of ideas, there is no alternative to imperialism and war except various forms of nationalism that rely on the balance of power for an intellectual crutch. World government, in the public sphere, is a boogeyman at best and is dismissed as utopian at its worst.

And why shouldn't it be? The only place you can find good discussions and ideas about world government is in academic tomes, and the only way you are going to find these good discussions is with academic training and academic resources. *Isonomia Quarterly* is an antidote to this very real problem.

## **Background**

As I dove into libertarianism head first, a single point of contention continued to tug at me as a big red flag (don't judge me). It's a point that, ironically enough, libertarians of all stripes seem

to agree upon: for all their talk of secession and of allowing people to voluntarily leave to form new, smaller polities, libertarians today are absolutely mum on the idea of allowing people to voluntarily federate and form new, larger polities. It's a huge black hole within postwar libertarian thought, and very few people in those circles are ready to talk about it.

I was taken in by F.A. Hayek's calls for global federalism in his work that is popularly supposed to be about postwar conservatism. The two – postwar conservatism and global federalism - didn't match up. In the U.S., Hayek's calls for global federalism have been ignored. You'll never see or hear, for example, Tyler Cowen call for a Hayekian global federation (unless he's being Straussian about it). Hayek's mentor, Ludwig von Mises, who is often considered to be much more of a hardcore liberal, called for a single world state - an uberstate - rather than a world in which a hundred thousand nations bloom.

In Europe, Hayek's calls for global federalism have been “put into context,” and reimagined as a call for European federation. Some have even deigned to suggest that Hayek “really” called for a balance of power! But make no mistake, Hayek wistfully yearned for “the ideal of almost all liberal thinkers of the nineteenth century,” one where federation as a foreign policy was embraced and where “federal organization remained the ever recurring hope of a next great step in advancing civilization.” That's global federalism, not European federalism and certainly not American isolationism.

This phenomenon, of classical liberals and libertarians ignoring the calls for world government by their leading lights, has only been accentuated by the fact that classical liberals have replaced calls for federal world government with an illiberal notion of splendid isolation or, more theoretically, a world of sovereign, decentralized individuals who would have no government to utilize while trying to bargain via constitutional rule structures.

Current events necessitate a change of attitude in liberal circles. Given the dearth of public calls for world government in other circles, I'd say the same is true elsewhere as well.

### **Goals and scope**

*Isonomia Quarterly* is thus a journal that is dedicated to opening up this space, for liberals and others, to hash out the details of what a world state should look like and how it could be implemented. It is a coherent call for world government; one that is interdisciplinary and interideological. *Isonomia Quarterly* is a long-term conversation about ideas.

The journal needs to be able to reach the public as well. Its essays must be clear, cogent, and directed at non-specialists.

It must also take the idea of world government seriously. This means discussing “politics without the romance.” Take the American taxpayer, for example. Does your essay keep him or her in mind? What about the conservative? Does your call for a world republic address his or her

concerns? Your essays don't have to explicitly address the concerns of factions that you find distasteful or tangential to your own arguments, but these factions are a part of the daily fabric of our world. They compose a significant portion of the reading and thinking public. If world government is to be embraced, or at least to become a part of the cultural milieu of the reading and thinking public, it needs to be respectful of slogans like "No taxation without representation," and of people who vociferously call for a return to a world where power is balanced among enemies rather than domesticated among factions.

How do your public essays address the evidence for free markets as liberating hammers that have broken the chains of feudalism and socialism? How does your call for global democratic justice treat the objections of a conservative engineering professor who was born and raised in Budapest or Cairo? If you're not trying to at least influence the thoughts of our adversaries, you're doing world government wrong, and this is detrimental to the ignorant kid who is looking for answers on how to promote peace throughout the world he or she lives in.

### **Types of essays writtens so far**

*Isonomia Quarterly* is not just dedicated to world government. It is also dedicated to...isonomia, or equality under the law. I happen to think the two – isonomia and world government - go together like peas and carrots.

The quarterly is therefore organized in a unique manner. There is a space dedicated to discussions on world government, under the rubric of "security." There are also three spaces dedicated to discussing equality under the law: faith, technology, and order.

Finally, there is a space for fictional short stories and non-fictional memoirs, called "yarn." Each issue of *Isonomia Quarterly* ends with stories, because stories are essential to who we are as humans. They are the glue that binds us together.

Essays so far have covered the rise of the illiberal Right (written by a VP at the Cato Institute), the problems associated with federation as a foreign policy, and, in the most recent issue, an essay by Daniel Deudney and one of his graduate students on the problem of artificial super intelligence and how constitutional republicanism can contribute to its resolution.

The quarterly is interideological. It's not an echo chamber. One of its major aims is to promote the cause of world government among the reading and thinking public, and this means doing the hard work of bringing together people who sometimes don't like each other. James Madison and Alexander Hamilton turned against each other soon after the compound republic was ratified. You and I can do the same, but only if we must.

I thank Dr James Thompson for his generous invitation, and for all the work he does in the name of world government. I want you and need you to write public essays that advocate for world government. Send those essays [here](#), and put "Isonomia submission" in the subject line.