

# POSITION PAPER 1978 - U.N. vs. World Government

## The United Nations vs. The World Government

*Never before has it been so important to find a solution to the problem of substituting law for force in international affairs. It is almost a cliché to say that our very existence depends on finding a solution and finding it soon - but if this is a cliché it is also a frightening truth. - U Thant, Secretary General, United Nations, 1963*

*Note: The page numbers have been left in this text for reference purposes.*

### 1. Historical Background

The author fought with the Allies in World War II from the ruins and idealism of which came the present United Nations. His right to take an active role in the personal issue of world peace may be said to be categorical and sovereign. The same may be said of all combatants from whichever "side." To have been intimately involved with world war and not to play a dynamic part in world peace is to have fought in vain. Worse, it is a betrayal of one's brothers who died in battle and of the wives, mothers, sons and daughters whose deaths testify to the totality of 20th century war.

Two years after the atom bombings of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, the author came to realize that the United Nations, as originally and presently constituted, could not fulfill its avowed mission of world peace. Based on the principle of collective security of exclusive nation-states, which defect led to the collapse of the League of Nations and World War II, it lacked the sovereign legislative, administrative, judicial and enforcement ability, democratically controlled, to govern the world community wherein war would be outlawed.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposal of the Four Powers, the United States, Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union, condemned in advance the San Francisco Conference to a sterile exercise of national diplomacy which continues to this day. No nation proposed-- in recognition of our being one world in time and space-- to make us world citizens under a representative government dealing directly with people everywhere. Only China and Columbia expressed a willingness to delegate sovereignty to the organization while France and Venezuela paid passing tribute to a federal system. It must be added that a world legislature was proposed by Ecuador, the Philippines and Venezuela while more power for the General Assembly was proposed by Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Egypt, France, Greece, Guatemala, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway and Uruguay.

As to the veto of the Security Council, seventeen nations opposed it as completely contrary to the doctrine of the sovereign equality of states while Ecuador maintained flatly that it represented anarchy and the Australian delegate pointed out that if five states of the

original United States had enjoyed a veto, the ten amendments to the Constitution would never have been adopted.

As one at least equally concerned with world peace as any United Nations delegate, in May, 1948, after becoming stateless by virtue of Section 401(f) of the U.S. Nationality Act of 1940, the author claimed the status of world citizenship. By so doing, he was fulfilling his  
P. 116

international civic obligations implied by the Nurnberg Charter under Article 6(a)(b) and (c) which defines "crimes coming within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal for which there shall be individual responsibility."\*

The right to assume individual civic responsibility in a given community is the essence of course of the democratic principle and the true meaning of sovereignty. This has been subsequently confirmed by Arts. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 15(2), 18, 19 and 29 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The author's direct relationship with the United Nations itself began on 11 September 1948 when he was ordered by ministerial decision to leave France. Returning to the "international territory" of the U.N., about to hold its 3rd General Assembly at the Palais de Chaillot in Paris, he requested global political asylum as a World Citizen in a petition to then Secretary-General Trygve Lie. This petition specifically called for a review conference, according to Article 109 of the U.N. Charter to convoke a world constitutional convention to draft a world constitution for the governance of the world community. At the request of the Secretariat, he was summarily expelled from the "international territory" by the French police under orders from the Ministry of the Interior.

Once again he "petitioned" the General Assembly, this time from the balcony of the Palais de Chaillot the 22nd of November 1948, interrupting a session with the aid of friends and fellow World Citizens, calling for a world constitutional convention. Again, he was summarily ex-

---

\*II. Jurisdiction and General Principles, Article 6, para. 2. The U.N. Secretary-General, in his Supplementary Report to the General Assembly of 24 October 1946 stated that "In the interest of peace, and in order to protect mankind against future wars, it will be of decisive significance to have the principles which were implied in the Nurnberg trials, and according to which the German war criminals were sentenced, made a permanent part of the body of international law as quickly as possible. From now on the instigators of new wars must know that there exist both law and punishment for their crimes. Here we have a high inspiration to go forward and begin the task of working toward a revitalized system of international law." On 15 November 1946, the U.S. delegation introduced a proposal to the U.N. "...to initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codifications "...and reaffirmed ...the principle of international law recognized by the Charter of the Nurnberg Tribunal and the judgment of the tribunal." U.N. General Assembly Resolution 488.48(v) 1950, "Nuremberg Trials," entered the principles to

international law.

P. 117

pelled, this time by U.N. security guards. Increasing public support however coalesced into a worldwide movement for peace through world citizenship.

Dr. Herbert Evatt, then-President of the General Assembly, granted the author a personal hearing agreeing to distribute the petitions endorsed by a public meeting at the Salle Pleyel to all delegations. On 3 December 1948, at a public meeting at the Velodrome d'Hiver, Dr. Evatt's personal response was read. In substance, he wrote that the United Nations was not constituted to make peace between the "Big Powers" but only "to maintain it once made."

From this public acknowledgment of its President that the United Nations was inherently unable to "make peace" between "Big Powers"-- a situation which prevails today 30 years later-- which required world law and its sovereign institutions, we the people of the world, understood that world peace depended on each of us, not as exclusive nationals but as world citizens. We understood that we had to become identified as a "world people" before we could claim our right to determine our own political, economic, social and cultural destiny.

Coincident with these historical events, the General Assembly on 10 December 1948 proclaimed the UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS "...as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations..." endorsing the principle of a world democratic legal order+.

Both the concept of world citizenship as well as the eventual World Government of World Citizens was thereby mandated by this United Nations document to which all Member States became subject upon signing the Charter itself (Ref. arts. 55, 56).

Needless to say, despite article 109(3) which provides for a review conference after ten years of the U.N.'s existence, no such conference has yet been held, every member of the Security Council with veto power being on record as in opposition.\*

In the five years following the above events, literally millions of

---

+Preamble, para 4 and Article 28.

\*U.N. General Assembly Resolution 375(IV), 6 December 1949. "Declaration on Rights and Duties of States", Art. 14 states: "Every State has the duty to conduct its relations with other States in accordance with international law and with the principle that the sovereignty of each State is subject to the supremacy of international law."

P. 118

ordinary citizens throughout the world actively endorsed world citizenship with more than 750,000 actually registering at the

International Registry of World Citizens in Paris which the author founded with friends in January, 1949.

Given this popular mandate, and invoking both the highest moral principles and the imperative need of humankind in toto and each human being to survive, the author declared the World Government of World Citizens on 4 September, 1953 at Ellsworth, Maine, U.S.A.+

The administrative and executive agency of the new government was founded at New York City, January, 1954 under the name, World Service Authority.\*

The first official World Government document, the World Passport, was printed and issued beginning in June, 1954. It was based on Art. 13(2), UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

Sample copies were addressed to all national governments\*, to the High Commissioner for Refugees, to the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, to the Security Division, United Nations Secretariat, and to the International Federation of Travel Agents. Thirty-six governments acknowledged receipt of the sample passport, Ecuador, Laos, Cambodia, and Yemen accorded it de facto recognition and certain other governments indicated they would take advantage of the document when the occasion presented itself. No national government returned or rejected the document.

The 2nd edition of the world Passport was printed in November, 1971 and sample copies sent to all national governments.+ The third edition of the World Passport was printed in June, 1975 with samples again addressed to national governments.\*\*

The World Service Authority central office is in Basel, Switzerland. It is organized as a non-profit association under Swiss Civil Code 60 ss. World Service Authority District II has offices in London and World Service Authority District III in Washington, D.C. The latter is organized as a non-profit corporation in the District of Columbia.

---

+See "Ellsworth Declaration" (excerpted) appended.

\*\*Purpose: 1) To realize fundamental human rights as outlined in U.D.H.R.: 2) To promote technical, and global coordination of organizations, specialized agencies, etc. working for general good; 3) Provide documentation service for world citizenry corresponding to the articles of U.D.H.R.

\*Accompanying letter appended.

P. 119

## 2. The United Nations - An Analysis vis-a-vis the World government of World Citizens

The present U.N. Secretary-General, Dr. Kurt Waldheim, is not unaware of the Organization's defects. In his 1977 Annual Report, in noting "increasing frustration and disappointment at the failure to protect and promote human rights in various parts of the world..." he reminds us that "...it must be remembered that the existing machinery such as the Commission on Human Rights is

intergovernment and intergovernmental bodies of course reflect the position of Member-States."\* Unfortunately his conclusions are vividly and tragically known to millions of victims of war, deprivation and torture: "Thus we continue to have a conflict between the individual asserted principles of national sovereignty and the broad commitment to human rights."\*\*

His own concern for this lethal duality-- reflected also by his predecessors-- is apparent when he maintains that "For the work of the United Nations to be effective in the field of human rights, we need the active commitment, cooperation and political will of the international community."+

Exclusive nation-states however cannot exercise "political will" internationally which implies a political framework. What they can and do exercise is their "power will" backed either by economic clout or by armies. "Political will" outside the national constitutional framework presumes people acting civically in the world community. From this civic commitment evolves inevitably a corollary sovereign institution, divorced from nations, to which such individuals turn for help, giving it their primary loyalty, which becomes thereby capable of protecting human rights from violations by nations.

When the individual politically bypasses the nation-state in a unilateral exercise of his/her innate sovereignty, s/he is acting ipso facto as a citizen of the world. Further, s/he is incorporating the universal and unitive principles of world government just as the local and/or national citizen incorporates the principles of his/her locality and/or nation.

---

\*Section V, para. 5

\*\*Ibid.

\*Section V, para. 7

P. 120

The failure of the United Nations is nowhere more nakedly revealed than in the problem of disarmament. Since General Assembly Resolution 41(1) of 14 December 1946 to Resolution 31/72 of 10 December 1976, spanning 32 years of lip-service to the problem, general world disarmament has been grotesquely and disastrously mocked by 94 international wars, over \$6 trillion of the world's taxpayers' money spent on destruction, over 50 million killed and many more crippled, made homeless and refugeed, a 1977 global armament budget of over \$300 billion-- almost 8% of the world's gross national product when endemic poverty is the daily grim condition of hundreds of millions-- and an overkill capacity hundreds of times over. "Stocks of nuclear weapons," writes Dr. Waldheim, "have already been sufficient to destroy the world many times over, and yet the number of warheads has increased five-fold in the past eight years." Not only does the Secretary-General recognize the universality of the problem-- "...In a period where a new form of world society symbolized by the United Nations, is emerging, (disarmament is) a problem which vitally affects them all (the majority of the medium and small Powers)"-- but that all nations "should play an important part in a comprehensive approach to disarmament aimed at real disarmament in the context of

world order." (Emphasis added.)+

Though his appeal for "world order" is understandably addressed only to national powers-- which inadvertently exposes the fundamental contradiction of the underlying premise of the United Nations itself-- he can only mean the political reality of a world sovereign, i.e. legal power which can only derive from the true sovereigns, humankind and its fundamental integer, the human person.\*\*

Since the nation-state is by definition incapable of extending itself politically beyond its own sovereignty, the aware individual must recognize his/her sovereignty as already directly allied to that of humankind itself on a de facto or actual as well as moral basis. The Founding Fathers of the United States of America, to take but one example, recognized both a de facto and morally-based common citizenship between 1778 and 1887 yet politically disunited. They remedied the situation with the U.S. Constitution. That common world citizenship is the dynamic conceptual and actual fact of the 20th

---

\*Section IV, para. 3, 1977 Annual Report

\*Section IV, para. 8 " " "

\*\*Appended are statements from Heads of State advocating the rule of law as indispensable to world peace.

P. 121

century rendered by contrast startling apparent by the totality of nuclear war-- paling into virtual insignificance all lesser problems-- as well as by related global crises such as pollution, gross economic injustice, depletion of the planet's resources and the like.

The institutionalization of our common world citizenship, as we have pointed out, has already begun. Thus the complementing of the international penal code of the Nurnberg Decisions by the World Government of World Citizens removes the fundamental cause of war, i.e. the absolute sovereignty of nation-states. Only by so doing can nations disarm in security and world peace eventually ensue as trust and cooperation become reinforced by just world law.

In his Report, the U.N. Secretary-General overtly sanctions the extension of individual sovereignty-- as already codified by the Nurnberg Decisions-- beyond one's national allegiance. In discussing the administration of the U.N.\*, he maintains that the Charter "...is very clear on the exclusive international loyalty of the Secretariat...."+

Moreover, every Member-State is obligated "to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary-General and the staff...."\*

The primary political allegiance then of Dr. Kurt Waldheim and every member of his staff is to an organization-- not a government to which an individual can affiliate civically-- which he admits publicly as the highest civil servant of that organization is constitutionally powerless to sanction and protect fundamental human rights, the first of which is the right to live. This paradoxical

political allegiance is duly sanctioned by the U.N. Charter, the binding international instrument of all Member-States. It follows that the sovereign right of all humans to identify themselves politically as world citizens allied to its governmental counterpart by a simple pledge is likewise condoned implicitly by the United Nations Charter. Not only Article 15(2), UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, sanctions the right of the individual to choose his/her government, but the U.N. Charter itself as well as the INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS

---

\*Section X, Para. 2

+Article 100(1): "In the performance of their duties, the Secretary General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any authority external to the Organization."

\*Article 100(2), U.N. Charter  
P. 122

ON HUMAN RIGHTS+ recognize the right of self-determination of peoples and that the States Parties to these Covenants "shall promote the realization of the right of self-determination and shall respect that right in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations."

Furthermore, the United Nations by definition and by Article 20(1), U.D.H.R., recognizes the right of association. Notwithstanding the first three words of its Charter: "We, the People...", it does not however admit membership by individuals. It cannot therefore disapprove the founding by individuals unrepresented democratically by its mandate of a governmental institution to which they can associate as sovereign citizens thereby fulfilling their determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war...reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, etc...."\*

Again, the Secretary-General condones this position in his remarks concerning the helplessness of the Commission on Human Rights+ when he writes, "...in the present circumstances of international affairs, I feel that my actions must be governed by one overriding criterion, . namely, what approach will best serve the welfare of the individual concerned."\*\*

This humane "approach" is clearly and unequivocally spelled out in the Preamble of the UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS itself: "Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by a regime of law...." And Art. 28 confirms the character of this "regime of

---

+ The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, opened for signature on 19 December 1966, entered into force for the following States on 23 March 1976: Barbados, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritius, Mongolia, Norway, Romania, Rwanda, Surinam, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Ukrainian SSR, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United Republic of

Tanzania, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Spain, Panama, Poland.

\*\*Part I, art. 1(3)

\*Preamble, U.N. Charter

+General Assembly Resolution 728 (XXVIII): "The Economic and Social Council approves the statement that the Commission on Human Rights recognizes that it has no power to take any action in regard to any complaints concerning human rights."

\*\*Section V, Para. 6, 1977 Annual Report

P. 123

law": "Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized."

The oppressed individual must therefore avail himself of the most effective "approach" to secure protection of his fundamental rights and freedoms "in the context of world order."

The WORLD GOVERNMENT OF WORLD CITIZENS then represents the genuine political genesis of that world order which already has myriad other manifestations far advanced such as communications, technology, commerce, medicine, travel, etc., and represented in some measure by the specialized agencies.

The Secretary-General defined in his 1977 Report our very World Citizen allegiance: "The United Nations is also...the symbol of a higher and more ambitious political and social aim, the evolution of an international community with interests, aspiration and loyalties of a far more wide-ranging kind."\* (Emphasis added.) He concedes that the U.N. "is in search of its identity and its true role..." which again is to say that it has not found either yet, and that "...It tends to react rather than to foresee, to deal with effects of a crisis rather than anticipate and forestall that crisis." As a result, he adds, "its problems sometimes seem insurmountable and its frustrations intolerable."+

The United Nations therefore, as presently constituted, based on exclusive national sovereignty, represents world disorder or, to put it boldly, international anarchy. It is thus per se an institution of discord and conflict. Its Secretary-General however tells us that "We are, I believe, beginning to see the birth of such a community (international).\*\*

We World Citizens allied wilfully to World Government are in common accord with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on this point. But we would go further. Neither the world community nor humankind are abstractions. Both are dynamic facts of the 20th

---

\*Section I, Para. II, 1977 Annual Report

+Section X, para. 6, " " " . His predecessor, U Thant,

in discussing the obligations of the S.G. stated: "The Secretary-General operates under the Charter in a world of independent sovereign states, where national interests remain dominant despite ideological, technological and scientific changes, and despite the obvious dangers of unbridled nationalism.... The truth is of course,

that the United Nations, and the S.G., have none of the attributes of sovereignty, and no independent power...."

\*\*Section I, para. II, 1977 Annual Report

P. 124

century, of the Space Age. And to imagine that humankind and the world community can endure in an 18th century political system of separate, exclusive nation-states armed with nuclear weapons is not only utopic but suicidal.

In the light of the total crisis facing our human race, the exercise of individual world sovereignty becomes not only legitimate by virtue of the highest conceptual values taught by humanity's sages from time immemorial, by the total interdependence of each and all to a common eco-system as well as to common social needs, and by the entire plethora of "international instruments" aforementioned mandating and sanctioning the new planetary role of the individual, but it is the very price of human survival.

No less than Dr. Waldheim himself on 20 May 1974 admonished us to accept individual responsibility for world affairs with these words:

"The choice is in our hands. No nation and no individual can be a bystander at this critical moment in the history of the world. There are occasions when the magnitude and complexity of the tasks we face make a sensitive and responsible individual feel dispirited and helpless. But as the record of the last 30 years shows us, there is nothing beyond our capacity if we act collectively. That is why it is so important that every one of you recognize your responsibility not only as a citizen of your own country, but as a citizen of the world-- and above all, an active one."

We, the WORLD CITIZENS of WORLD GOVERNMENT, have approved and acted upon the United Nations' Secretary-General's endorsement of that willful and legitimate civic role.

P. 125