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In planning for security and a just and lasting peace after this war, it is best to start with the assumption that before any permanent planning is carried through some immediate planning shall be accomplished. During a short interim period to precede such permanent planning, such things as punishment of the members of the Axis nations guilty of the worst atrocities and crimes; disarmament of the Axis powers (industrially and scientifically, as well as militarily); the settlement of boundaries between the nations of Europe and various programs of restoration, reconstruction and rehabilitation of countries occupied by the Axis powers cannot wait for permanent post war planning. The United Nations have collaborated during the war, and they should be able to continue to collaborate during an interim period upon the solution of these immediate problems and thus give time for the working out of permanent world policies. This interim period, however, should be a short period, because it is quite questionable if the United Nations could long control the political and military policies and governmental activities of the Axis powers. As soon as possible this task should be turned over to some international organization. In this interim period the United Nations of the world might well also initiate any necessary steps for the establishment of some world organization, either by drafting a proposed constitution for the United Nations' adoption or by calling a convention of the peoples of all the nations of the world to draft such a constitution.

In planning for security and peace, it will be necessary, also to assume that the people of the United States and the world want a just and lasting peace and security. There is no doubt we are justified in making this assumption. Of course, there are still many Germans and Japanese who do not want peace. There may be a few people in the United States and the world

---

LL.B., LL.M., University of Minnesota; Professor of Law, Indiana University School of Law.
who still want war. There may be some others who think that it is impossible to get rid of war. But most people in the world are really tired of war and want permanent peace. After World War I, I. G. Farbenindustrie won the peace. The people of the world do not want this to happen again. They want to win both the war and the peace after this war. They are shocked with the horrors, brutalities and bestialities of war. They are disgusted that there are in the world human beings who can be guilty of such atrocities and inhumanities as the Germans and the Japanese have been guilty of. They are amazed that there still are military mad men who dream of world empires. They are alarmed at the new inventions and scientific discoveries which are now transforming the nature of warfare. They, at first, could not believe in the guilt of the Germans and the Japanese; but they at last have come to the conclusion that they must believe in it, and they have decided that they must get rid once and forever of such international gangsters and prevent the possibility of any nations' waging future wars.

In planning for world peace, the first postulate that must be made is that there is only one way to obtain peace, and that is to abolish war; and that war can be abolished. If it could not be abolished, there would be no use for any peace planning. This postulate should be self-evident. It is certainly a fundamental truth. However, most peace planners do not start with this postulate. Yet the fact remains that any peace plan which does not start with the abolition of war is not a peace plan. While there is only one road to peace, there are many roads to war. The peace plans about which we hear do not provide for the abolition of war but rely upon war either in part or altogether. This is true of isolationism, of neutrality, of imperialism, of alliances, of leagues, of concert of powers and balances of power. All of these schemes in the last analyses rely on war and sooner or later are sure to lead to war. People making these alliances and so forth may hope to avoid war, at least for a time, but they do so by the threat of military force; and they are planning so that they may win the war whenever they finally have to fight it. Preparedness and alliances are broken reeds on which to lean for the winning of the war. Germany was the best prepared of all the nations in the two last world wars. Yet she lost the first one and is going to lose the second. The Greeks
tried hundreds of alliances and leagues, but they all failed. The British empire has relied upon balance of power schemes, and these largely contributed to bringing about the two last world wars. A promise of an "international organization" generally means nothing more than some one of these war schemes. These are only weasel words to fool those who really want to have war abolished. Diplomacy, with its secrecy and intrigue and the false viewpoints of diplomats, is also one of the worst ways of trying to stop wars.

Yet make no mistake. War can be abolished. There is a way to abolish war. There is a real peace plan. It has existed for three thousand years, so there is no question about its existence.

In planning for world peace, a second postulate which must be made is that there is only one way to abolish war; and that is by substituting law for war. This is the way and the only way whereby war has been abolished for three thousand years, and this is proof that here is a method whereby war may be abolished. It is true there is only one way to abolish war, but since this plan will accomplish the abolition of war it is enough. Proof of this point will be given later.

In planning for world peace, a third postulate which must be made is that the only way that law can be substituted for war is by having a law and a government to create and enforce it which will (1) outlaw war (that is, make it illegal); (2) disarm the nations; (3) create a body of law to settle all those disputes where force has heretofore been used. This means for one thing that all three of these things must be accomplished. One of them alone will be absolutely futile. The outlawry of war alone, as was done in the Kellogg-Briand Pact, will not be enough. Disarmament alone, as in the Washington Limitations Armament Conference, will not be effective. If anything is to be accomplished these three things must be done together. This has always been the technique used and it must continue to be the technique used. For another thing this means, (4) that there must be a government not only to create all of this law but to have a police power of its own to enforce it and a military force of its own capable of defeating Germany if it should rearm, or any other nation either inside or outside of this government.

This government should be a democratic federation of the world. An empire will not do. Of course, the Romans, Ger-
mans and other people have dreamed of world peace by con-
quering the world. Such empires wage war to conquer the
world and history shows they obtain a peace which is only a
temporary peace, and that such empires will ultimately perish
by war. In addition to this objection, there is another objec-
tion to any empire, and that is its denial of the protection of the
great human democratic values of liberty, equality and common
good, which are almost as important as peace. These can only
be obtained by a democratic federation of the world. The
fundamentals of a democracy are (1) self-rule by the people;
(2) equality of opportunity, or freedom from discrimination;
(3) absolute liberty of thought, almost complete liberty of
expression and much liberty of action and (4) a homogeneous
culture for the common good of all. The establishment of a
world democracy would insure these fundamentals. Democra-
cies have historically been less likely to start wars than other
forms of government; and they also have proven themselves
best able to remove the causes of war. Since this is true it
probably would be wise not only to require a democratic form
of government for the internation government but also to re-
quire a democratic form of government for all those who are to
become members of the international government.

There is abundant proof that this kind of government and
law will be sufficient to abolish war.

The first situation where this technique for the abolition of
war was used was in connection with private warfare between
private individuals. Private warfare has been abolished by
various governments and systems of law, beginning three thou-
sand years ago and continuing down to the present time. Prob-
ably the plan is succeeding better today than it did in early
times, because in present times we are more careful in carrying
out each one of the three prerequisites. For all practical pur-
poses it can be said that today, in the United States for example,
private warfare has been completely abolished. It is true we
still have a few feuds in the Kentucky mountains, and once in
a while there is an individual who tries to take the law into his
own hands, but these exceptions do not disprove the rule or
statement which has been made.

The substitution of law for private warfare was a very
hard struggle. Those who were accustomed to private warfare
opposed the substitution by government of law for their private warfare, just as the people of the nations now oppose the substitution by government of law for public warfare. There was a time when vengeance and self-help, or private warfare, obtained in the relations between private individuals and small groups of individuals, just as now public warfare obtains between the larger groups of individuals found in the nations. At first, law could not be substituted for private warfare. All that could be done at first was the regulation of vengeance and self-help. The process whereby law was finally substituted for private warfare can be traced very easily in Hebrew law, Roman law and Anglo-American law and also in other systems of law. In Anglo-American history it was not possible to substitute law for private warfare until the time of Edward I in 1272. Yet throughout all Anglo-Saxon history and the first part of Norman history an effort was being made to do so. The first effort of the Anglo-Saxons to regulate vengeance and self-help took the form of preventing the avenger from making good his loss at the expense of innocent neighbors and this was accomplished by requiring him as a matter of custom to attempt to identify his wrong-doer and to follow the trail of the thief (with fresh pursuit and hue and cry), and that he resort to distress; and, finally, that he restrain his vengeance to the murderer or other wrong-doer and his kin. Later the right of sanctuary limited the vengeance of the avenger. About 600 A.D. wise men set down ninety dooms or tariffs or sums for acts of violence to be paid in lieu of vengeance. These were known as the dooms of Aethelbert. This work was continued by Ine of Wessex, Offa of Mercia and Alfred, until, finally, Edward the Confessor brought all of these forms of regulation together and developed the right of proof of innocence. This proof consisted first of the pronouncement of the doom by the elders; second, of the privilege of proof by oath helpers, and third, if the accused failed to clear himself, payment of *wer gild*. But there was no way of compelling this payment. The accused simply had the privilege of doing it, and if he did make the payment that ended the matter. If he did not make the payment the feud was revived and the wrong-doer was at the mercy of the avenger. The first of the Normans made an effort to substitute law for private warfare, and Henry II, with the es-
tablishment of the common law courts, almost succeeded in doing so; but he failed so that it was not until Edward I that this was done. In Magna Charta another effort was made to substitute law for private warfare between larger groups, or perhaps civil warfare, by the promise extorted from King John that "we will not set forth against him [free man], or send against him [i. e., by armed force] unless by the lawful judgment of his peers and by the law of the land."

Of course, the law substituted by Edward I for private warfare was not as complete and perfect as it became later on. However, the general effort from the time of 1272 to 1607, which was the great period of the common law, was, first, to outlaw private warfare; second, to disarm the people who had been accustomed to take their own vengeance and self-help; and, third, to create a body of law to take the place of war. In this period from 1272 to 1607, which has been called the strict period of Anglo-American law, the one concern of the law was the preservation of the peace [this finally became general security]; and the common law with reference to all of those matters of private interest where people had been in the habit and were likely to fight if they thought they had been wronged. These matters of interest related (1) to life and personal safety, (2) to the family, (3) to property and contract, (4) to freedom of locomotion, and (5) to reputation. The common law developed principles for the settlement of all questions involving these matters, and in doing so developed a body of law and a power of government so tough that it was enabled not only to control the conduct of private individuals, but even the conduct of kings. But the important thing to remember is that law succeeded in abolishing private warfare and it would have done it a lot sooner if there had not been so much unintelligible opposition to its doing so.

With all this experience with the abolition of private warfare it would be supposed that it would be very easy to substitute law for public warfare, but this effort has apparently met with just as much unthinking opposition as was met with in the case of the abolition of private warfare. For centuries now there have been efforts to regulate public warfare by prescribing the means according to which it must be conducted, but of course in World War II all of these means which have been
prescribed have been utterly and completely flouted, and public warfare has been conducted without regulation. Abortive efforts have been made even to go further than to regulate public warfare. The Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawed public warfare as an instrument of international policy. The Washington Disarmament Conference limited the arms of the nations although it did not completely disarm them. Both of these efforts were futile, because the only way to substitute law for any kind of warfare is to do the three things outlined above: first, to outlaw such warfare; second, to disarm the belligerents; and third, to create a body of law with a government behind it with power to settle any difficulties between the nations. Any other kind of law is not a substitute for war. However, we do have a perfect illustration of how public warfare may be abolished between states, and that is in the case of the forty-eight states composing the United States of America. Here public warfare has been abolished through outlawing warfare between the states and giving any war power to the Federal Government; by disarming the states and giving the power to maintain armies and navies to the National government, and by providing for the settlement of all disputes the states might have by a law provided either by the Supreme Court or the Congress of the United States, using power in the Federal Government not only to enforce its law, but to prevent any public warfare between the states. It is true that we have had one civil war, probably because the Federal Government had not as yet been made strong enough, but nobody expects us to have another civil war. This is proof that law can be substituted for public warfare just as well as for private warfare.

What has been done, in the case of private warfare between individuals and public warfare between the states of the United States, can be done in the case of the nations of the world. But if public warfare between the nations of the world is to be abolished we must here also provide for the outlawry of war as an instrument of international policy (as has already been done in the Kellogg-Briand Pact); we must disarm the nations; and we must substitute international law for international war. These three things can be done only by the establishment of a federation of the world. The plan proposed herein sets up such a federation of the world and gives it the power to do all of the
three things referred to. This plan should succeed in abolishing public warfare, between the nations, the same as the plan of the United States of America succeeded in abolishing it between the states of the United States. To obtain peace, then, (1) we must abolish public war; (2) we must substitute law (embodying the above principles) for war; because that is the only way to abolish war; (3) we must organize a democratic federation of the world, because that is the only way to obtain this law to substitute for war.

In planning for security and a just and lasting peace, there is a third assumption which should be made; and that is there should be a government for some other international interests besides peace. There are many other international interests which need protection, but which at the present time either have no protection at all or very inadequate protection, because the present governments of the world have jurisdiction to regulate only the very beginning or the very ending of the matter. There is at the present time no government for the high seas, the water under them and the air above them and the air over land areas now governed by national governments. There should be an international government with jurisdiction over this territory. There is at the present time no adequate regulation of international trade and transportation, the distribution of non-renewable raw materials of the world, or world labor standards, world finance, boundaries between the nations and immigration and emigration. There is no adequate government for backward countries. There is no government with jurisdiction to define citizenship for the world. Power to regulate these matters should be delegated to an international government. This international government should also be given power to remove the causes of war. Most of these causes of war are found in the matters already referred to. But this can be given as another reason for giving an international government its jurisdiction over them.

The plan of the writer for an international government will be set forth in the constitution hereafter printed. This constitution has been drafted on the basis of the assumptions heretofore set forth, and it embodies principles which will accomplish the goals of obtaining a just and lasting peace and protecting those important international interests which are in need of protec-
tion. It substitutes law for war by outlawing war, disarming the nations and providing for the creation of a body of law and the enforcement of that law by a federation of the world. It provides for the removal of the causes of the war.

It protects all of the values of democracy. It protects the fundamentals of self-rule by placing sovereignty, over all matters delegated to the federation of the world, in the people of the world as a whole, and by granting universal citizenship and suffrage to them. The fundamental of equality has been safeguarded by express limitations upon the powers of the government of the United Nations of the world and upon the powers of private corporations and by requiring the abolition of empires for all members of the United Nations. The empire system is one of the most flagrant violators of the principle of equality. The people of the United States fought the Revolutionary War over this issue. The colonists of other empires will not much longer endure the empire status. The principle is wrong and it should be no longer tolerated. The fundamental of liberty has been safeguarded by limitations on the powers of the government of the United Nations, upon the powers of the members of the United Nations and upon the powers of private corporations. A homogeneous culture for the common good of all has been safeguarded by giving the world parliament specific police powers, powers of taxation and the power of eminent domain. The homogeneous culture should be a resultant of the Greco-Hebraic-Chinese culture which has come to be that of western civilization.

It takes care of backward peoples. The problem of their care has never been satisfactorily solved before this. After World War I an attempt was made to solve this problem, by giving mandates to the various nations of the earth. The result of this effort turned out to be the making of all the backward peoples into colonists and their colonies a part of empire systems. The constitution drafted by the writer undertakes to solve this problem by making them mandatories of the federation of the world. This will avoid all the dangers of the former mandatory system. The federation of the world is limited so that it cannot become an empire and there is a further provision anticipating membership in the federation of the world for these mandatory people.
The writer in drafting a constitution for the United Nations has undertaken to set up a framework of government which will make the government of the United Nations one best calculated to accomplish all of the above purposes. The plan incorporated in this constitution is largely based upon the plan of the government of the United States (sovereignty, dual form of government, supremacy of the judiciary); but it has some features taken from the British form of government (legislative) and some features taken from the Swiss form of government (executive). The judicial branch of the United States form of government has been such a success that this feature has been incorporated in the government of the federation of the world. The dual form of government (or triple) is necessary for a federation. Sovereignty of the people as a whole is necessary, along with universal citizenship and suffrage, for the preservation of the fundamental of democracy of self-rule. The limitations copied from the United States Constitution are necessary for the protection of liberty, equality and the common good.

The United States' doctrine of separation of powers which has never worked too well and has been a cause of friction between the branches of government, and of inefficiency, and which is no longer needed for the protection of liberty, has been abandoned. Instead of the strong independent executive branch of government which the United States has there has been set up a branch subservient to the legislative branch like the British practice. For a world government one executive head would be too great an office for one human being. Hence, instead of this there has been set up an executive counsel somewhat on the Swiss model. Only one house of representatives is provided because it is better than two houses unless the solution of some other problem requires two houses, as in the case of the United States. A bicameral legislature, like a separation of powers, results in too much blocking by one house of the work of the other. Membership in the United Nations of the world is made open to all the present nations, or federations, of the world, provided they have a population of at least ten million, and they meet the other qualifications for membership prescribed by this constitution. But of course, if any nation does not have this population, all it has to do to qualify for membership, so far as concerns this point, is to federate with some other nation
or nations so that they altogether may have at least this minimum population. The Scandinavian countries might very well organize into such a federation. The Danubian and Balkan countries might also very well organize into either one or two federations. The small Central American countries might well join with Mexico. This minimum population of ten million people has been required in order to prevent the small nations ganging up and acquiring too much power in the world federation. In the same way that the small nations have been thus limited, the large nations have been limited in their voting power. This constitution provides that each nation or federation with a population of ten million shall have one representative and an additional representative for each twenty million of population in addition to the ten million, or a major fraction thereof; but that no nation shall have in excess of ten representatives. The total representation has been kept rather small in order to make the world parliament a small legislative body of about one hundred members. Experience has shown that a small legislative body is much more effective than a larger one. The United States House of Representatives has practically ceased to be a legislative body because of its size. If, in order to make the United States and Russia enter this federation, it would be necessary to give each of them immediately the maximum voting power of ten representatives, it might be wise to do so. What would be left of the British Empire after it was broken up would have a population most too small to extend this privilege to the British Commonwealth of Nations, and certainly not if Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand elected to come in as separate members instead of parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations (or federation). Of course, the French Empire and all other empires would have to be abandoned as a condition precedent to admission to membership in the United Nations, and then their population would be too low to have any special courtesy extended.

The author believes that he has set up the best possible plan for an international organization, but he wishes to emphasize that the framework of government is not fundamental. The details of representation and the organization of the branches of government and other like matters of detail might very well be changed, if the members of the United Nations
think that some other details would be better, or if it should turn out to be necessary to change them in order to make the plan for a federation acceptable to all. The abolition of war by the substitution for war of a law outlawing war, disarming the nations and making a body of principles to settle the disputes heretofore causing the use of force, through a federation of the world to establish and enforce this law; the abolition of empires; and the sovereignty of the people of the world as a whole are fundamental. There can be no compromise on matters of this sort. It is also almost fundamental that the federation of the world should have given to it also the powers referred to in the author's constitution.

The plan found in this constitution should be enough to insure security, a just and lasting peace, and a government for all other international interests which ought to have a government; and any other federation of the world which incorporated all of the fundamentals above referred to should accomplish the same things.

Yet it now begins to look as though the people of the world were not going to get any federation of the world, either such as the writer has planned or such as anyone else has planned. Instead of that, the peace that they are going to get will be either some alliance or some league. When it is known that peace cannot be obtained any of these ways but only by a federation of the world which will substitute law for war, it is apparent that we are going to lose the peace after this war just as we lost it after World War I.

The Dumbarton Oaks plan is now being urged as a peace plan. It is not a plan for a federation of the world but a plan for an alliance of the great powers. It does not outlaw war any more than did the League of Nations. Only the Kellogg-Briand Pact has as yet done this. The Dumbarton Oaks plan does not provide for the disarmament of the nations. It does not provide for any body of law to take the place of force in the settlement of disputes between the nations. It does not set up a government with any powers of its own or any military force of its own capable of conquering Germany if she should rearm or any other nation inside or outside that might want to start a war. Its assembly has been given no powers at all of its own, except to appoint part of the members of a Security Council which
has no powers of its own and which is not an agency of the assembly. The Economic and Social Council, provided for in the Dumbarton Oaks plan has, like the assembly, been given only the power to recommend to the nations which are called members of this international organization. The Security Council seems to have more authority, but in the last analysis, is found to have none. It is supposed to have a military staff and a mobile force, but so far as they are under its direction it can obtain and use them only by the consent of the nations. It has no tax power of its own to maintain these institutions even if it had them. But it would have to rely upon the nations for this maintenance. It is, therefore, apparent that the Security Council has not itself been set up as an international organization but is only an agency of the nations which are members of the council. This means the five permanent members of the council, for altogether there are eleven members. These five great powers will dominate and control the council. The fact that the security council is not an international organization is further proven by the fact that it cannot use any powers which may be delegated to it by the great powers against the latter but only against outsiders, that is, the small nations. This plan has been subtly worded perhaps to make people think it is a real international organization and a peace plan, but it is neither. It is really only another unholy alliance and a balance of power scheme between the great nations. The great powers could make this alliance and could create a Security Council as one of their agencies without any Dumbarton Oaks meeting. Why there is this pretence that the Dumbarton Oaks plan is something that it is not is hard to understand. Perhaps the purpose is to give a tone of respectability to this twentieth century "holy alliance" and to forestall possible opposition to it. Anyway, the Dumbarton Oaks plan should be called the Dumbarton Hoax.

This means that the people of the world are being sold down the river. This means that our soldiers are being betrayed. This means that mankind is being crucified on a cross of imperialism. This means that instead of planning for a just and lasting peace the leaders of the Allied powers are either planning for a third world war, or are planning a situation which is sure to drift into a third world war. They are not plan-
ning even to stop a third attempt by Germany to start another world war, when she probably would attack and defeat the United States first, before launching an attack against any other power. When the post war planning which our leaders are doing is given careful consideration, it appears so sordid, cowardly and monstrous that the people who are not participating in the planning are left almost stupefied and appalled at what their leaders are doing. The latter talk about permanent and lasting peace, about making this the last war, about planning so that our boys will never have to fight again, about saving civilization from utter annihilation which would occur to it if we should have a third world war. Yet, at the same time, they are saying this, they either know or should know that whatever they are doing is leading in the opposite direction.

What is the explanation for all this? There is no one explanation. There are probably a good many reasons for what is happening. So far as the Dumbarton Oaks hoax is concerned, probably the people who have been concerned with and working for the plan of the League of Nations have had too much influence. The League of Nations plan was a false plan, and the people concerned with its planning should have had nothing whatever to do with the present planning. The influence of a great many other groups in the United States has undoubtedly had influence upon our leaders. There are undoubtedly some people in the United States who still believe in war as an instrument of international policy. There are more people in the United States who have selfish interests of their own, or ideologies which they are not willing to give up as the price for peace. They do not want any change. We have always had war, and they think we can keep on having war. Among these there are the isolationists who honestly delude themselves into believing that we can live to ourselves alone when we have never done it in the past and we are now entering into an airplane world and a world where many non-renewable raw materials are being monopolized by a few nations. These people start out as isolationists, then they are liable to become imperialists, finally, fascists. Another group is our corporation magnates who tried to sell out their country to Germany before this war by favoring Germany over the United States in the matter of manganese, aluminum, tungsten-carbide, beryllium, synthetic rub-
There is a danger that these people would try to do the same thing again if they thought they could get some little selfish advantage. There are some senators who have been given a part of the treaty power who do not wish to give up this power. There are some members of Congress who have been given the war power who do not wish to give up this power. They say that to do so would violate our national sovereignty. The answer is, of course, it would not violate our national sovereignty because there is no national sovereignty. In the United States sovereignty resides in the people as a whole. Senators and congressmen are only agents of the people who have been given some powers by the people and who are liable to have those powers taken away from them anytime their principal desires to do so. The joining of a federation of the world would not be violating the sovereignty of our people but would be exercising it. In Great Britain those who are opposed to a federation of the world are those who believe in empires and balance of power schemes. They, of course, are the Tory class. In Russia there would likely be objection to a federation of the world by those who wish to continue their dictatorship. All of these countries would have to give up their armaments if they were to become members of a federation of the world with powers to abolish war. They will undoubtedly hesitate to do so. Yet if they should disarm Germany and Japan they would be no worse off themselves, if they disarm than they are now when they are armed. Many other influential people say and probably believe that peace is impossible. They are little men and are thinking in small ways but their influence cannot be forgotten.

The principal reason, however, why we are not getting a real peace plan is because our leaders and a majority of our people do not know how to get it. This confusion is shown by the calling of the Dumbarton Oaks a “world state” plan, by statements to the effect that we can “get peace without abolishing war,” by statements that we can have a “federation without giving any powers” to such an organization. There are a few people alive or dead who know or have known about the road to peace. Among these may be named Sir Frederick Pollock, Wendell L. Wilkie, Philander C. Knox, Henry A. Wallace, Clarence Streit, Grenville Clark, Harold Stassen, G. Bromley...
Sixty members of an Australian group for international reconstruction have signed a statement which shows that those who wrote it know this road to peace. There is a possibility that Chiang Kai-Shek and Joseph Stalin know the road to peace. Many people in the small nations and of course a great many other people in the United States and the other great nations know it, but there may not be more than a thousand or two thousand people in the whole world who really know this road. However many there are, there are not enough to afford the kind of leadership to make it easy to lead either one hundred and thirty million or two billion people on the road to peace. A majority of the people do not know the way. Yet undoubtedly a majority of the people are really lovers of peace and if they only knew the way we might get peace. It is because they do not know the way that we are not obtaining peace.

Our leaders not only share the confusion of the majority, but they lack the courage necessary for leadership. And they are giving us alliances instead of a federation. That is why they have been giving us war schemes and calling them peace schemes. That is why Franklin D. Roosevelt has been pursuing a policy of appeasement and not taking strong leadership in international affairs. That is why our State Department has been pursuing a spineless policy and washing its hands, Pilate like, while the Allies have been practicing imperialism and power politics. That is why our government apparently has been favoring every government on earth except democracies. That is why our foreign policy seems to be bankrupt of ideas. That is why Churchill has flouted the Atlantic Charter. That is why Stalin has been protecting himself and his country by himself; but if we are not to have a federation of the world, no one can blame him when all the other powers have been looking after themselves. Yet the solemn truth is that for a long time now we have not been getting one honest word for peace from any of the leaders from whom we should be expecting to get such words.

What constructive suggestion then should be made in the light of what has happened? What is wanted is a revival of the Atlantic Charter and a provision for a true, well-planned federation of the nations. If our leaders would use as much effort
to plan for peace as they have made to plan for alliances and empires and other selfish interests it would not be a difficult thing to obtain peace.

A few genuine, loyal federationists think that at the present time the best thing for true lovers of peace to do is to build on the foundation of the Dumbarton Oaks plan. In the opinion of the writer we might as well start all over again so far as the Dumbarton Oaks plan would help, but proposing to build on the foundation of the Dumbarton Oaks plan might obtain the support of a great many people who have committed themselves or are willing to commit themselves to this plan. But if any attempt were to be made to build on the Dumbarton Oaks plan, the Dumbarton Oaks plan would practically have to be made over. The Assembly set up in the Dumbarton Oaks plan could be retained, but it would have to be given the powers which have been discussed in this article instead of no powers which it has at the present time; and, if it really was to have powers of its own, of course, the scheme of representation would have to be thrown overboard. Costa Rica and Guatamala and other small nations like these could not possibly be given the same voting power as the United States, Russia and the British Commonwealth of Nations, China and France. The World Court of the Dumbarton Oaks plan could be used, only it would have to be given compulsory jurisdiction, and its decisions should be given binding force. All other agencies of the Dumbarton Oaks plan should be made agencies of the Assembly. The Security Council, for example, would have to be an agency of the Assembly instead of an agency of the great powers. The Dumbarton Oaks plan sets up a weak Assembly and a Council that is nominally strong, but actually hamstrung and weak. If there is to be any true federation of the world, the power to make great decisions must be placed in a larger representative body than the Security Council of the Dumbarton Oaks plan and this legislative body must have a well balanced plan of representation and must operate by a majority vote. The writer is not worried about the veto power of one-third of the United States Senate, because he believes that it is perfectly feasible to by pass the Senate and to have a constitution for the federation of the world adopted by the people of the United
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States as a whole in conventions, as was done in the case of the Constitution of the United States.

Even if alliances or leagues would otherwise accomplish good so long as they last—as they probably would not—there is no assurance that alliances or leagues can be made to hold together for any long period of time. The pressure of war may be enough to hold them together during the continuance of a war. After this experience they may be kept together for a short time after the war has been finished. But the chances are that after such a short time differences will begin to arise between the members of the alliances or the leagues, and when there are not sufficient pressures to keep them together the alliances or leagues are very likely to fall apart. This happened under the Articles of Confederation and under the League of Nations. It would be sure to happen again under any alliances or leagues of nations which might be formed after this war. Whenever this would happen an opportunity would be given again to Germany to rearm economically and militarily so as to start a third world war. Not only this but there would be a likelihood of a war starting between Great Britain and Russia and between the United States and Argentina. The Allies are already beginning to split over the question of what to do with Poland and also over the question of what to do in Greece. Hence, there is a paramount necessity of planning as soon as possible for a real federation of the world.

It has been suggested that the differences which have already arisen between the allies are evidence that there is no use of planning for a federation of the world. Instead of this being true these differences are evidence that a federation is needed. If we had had a federation before these differences arose, they probably would never have arisen. Without such a federation such differences are likely to continue to arise in the future; and the world will proceed hell-bent for another world war.

The situation today in the world closely parallels the situation which existed in the United States after the revolutionary war. Then there were conflicts over interstate commerce, as there are today over international commerce. Then there was danger of war between various states, as there is now between various nations. Then the states had experimented with a league, under the Articles of Confederation, as now the nations
have under the League of Nations. Then there was a sharp struggle between those who wanted a federation and those who wanted an alliance, or league, just as there is today, only then the federationists won whereas now the alliance men seem about to win. So bitter was the struggle then that many of the alliance men (e. g. Luther Martin) left the Convention and went home to stay and some others who remained refused to sign the new constitution (e. g. George Mason). The alliance men then used the same arguments which are being repeated today: that a federal government would destroy state sovereignty, that it would establish a monarchy, that it would destroy the lives, liberty and property of the people, that the boys of one state would be dragged all over the country to put down insurrections in other states, that the distances from one state to other states were so great and the racial strains and economic interests of the different states were so antagonistic that a federation would never succeed.

But there was a difference between then and now, in that then there were comparatively more leaders of vision and courage, who saw that the only way to obtain security and peace was through a federation of the United States, and who refused to compromise on this big issue and never gave up. These leaders were young men like James Madison and Alexander Hamilton. They had thought through the problems of government and knew that alliances would not solve them but only a real central, federal government. However, they were ably supported by such men of wisdom as Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson and George Washington. It was the latter who told the Convention: "It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God." Alexander Hamilton was perhaps responsible for the adoption of the constitution by New York; James Wilson for its adoption by Pennsylvania; and John Marshall for its adoption by Virginia. Oh that we had today men like these to lead us in the struggle for a federation of the United Nations!
Below is printed a Constitution for the United Nations, drafted by the author according to the principles set forth and discussed by him in the above article, and which he believes is necessary for the peace and security of the world.

**Constitution of the United Nations of the World**

*Preamble*

We, the people of the United Nations in order to form a more perfect international union, establish and insure justice and tranquility in international relations, provide for the abolition of war, and secure the blessings of international equality, liberty and peace, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United Nations.

**Article I: Membership**

Section 1. Membership in the United Nations shall be open to all the advanced nations or federations of the earth, which have at least ten million population; and, after the operation of Article XV is over, they shall become members by election to membership by a majority vote of the World Parliament. All advanced nations with less than ten million population may federate with other nations either with or without such population, and such new federation shall be eligible to membership provided it has a population of ten million.

Section 2. Backward nations, not as yet advanced enough for membership in the United Nations, and people inhabiting the small islands of the seas shall become territorial mandataries of the United Nations, and may be eligible for membership in the United Nations, whenever they can answer the population and civilization requirement.

Section 3. Before any nations or federations shall be admitted to membership in the federation of the world, a majority of the people of such nations or federations must vote to apply for admission, and if the World Parliament votes favorably on their applications, such combined action or ratification under Article XV, shall automatically have the effect of abolishing all treaties and diplomacy between the nations, all military establishments which the nations or federations may have and all empires or other non-democratic forms of government which
they may have. Any military equipment not converted to peace time uses within one year after the adoption of this constitution shall become the property of the United Nations.

**Article II: Sovereignty**

The sovereign power to establish international social control (law) according to this Constitution shall be vested in the people of the United Nations as a whole. All departments and organs of this government shall be mere agencies of the sovereign people, and they shall have only such powers as are delegated to them. This Constitution is of the people, for the people and by the people.

**Article III: Citizenship and Suffrage**

Section 1. All persons residing in any of the nations, which are members of the United Nations, shall be citizens of the United Nations and of the nation in which they reside.

Section 2. All citizens of the United Nations shall be entitled to vote in all elections for elective officials, of the Nations, or of the United Nations, except as the nations of the United Nations may prescribe reasonable intellectual or moral qualifications.

**Article IV: Dual Form of Government**

The government of the United Nations shall be a dual form of government as to all of its member nations, which do not already have a dual form of government, and as to them it shall be a triple form of government; and it shall have only those powers delegated to it expressly or by necessary implication. The powers not delegated to the United Nations by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the nations, are reserved to the nations respectively or to the people, until the Constitution shall be amended.

**Article V: Separation of Powers**

The government of the United Nations shall be divided into three branches: a legislative branch, an administrative branch and a judicial branch; and each may exercise only the powers herein granted to it.
Article VI: Legislative Department and its Powers

Section 1. All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a World Parliament of the United Nations.

Section 2. (1) The World Parliament shall be composed of members chosen every three years by the people of the several nations.

(2) No person shall be a member of the World Parliament who shall not at the time he enters upon his duties have attained to the age of 25 years, and, after the United Nations is 7 years old, been 7 years a citizen of the United Nations; and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that nation in which he shall be chosen.

(3) Members of the World Parliament shall be apportioned among the several nations, which may be included within this union, according to their respective numbers. The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the World Parliament of the United Nations, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as it shall by law direct. The number of members of the World Parliament shall be one for each nation or federation of nations, which is a member of the United Nations, and an extra member for each extra twenty million population above the ten million required for membership, or major fraction thereof, but not to exceed ten members for any nation or federation. Until the enumeration shall be made representation shall be based on the estimates of population in Table 2 of the League of Nations Statistical Yearbook.

(4) When vacancies happen in the representation from any nation, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

(5) The World Parliament shall choose its own officers.

(6) The World Parliament shall have the sole power of impeachment, but the World Court shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend beyond removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of honor, trust or profit under the United Na-

1 [optional clause]: The United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall each immediately be entitled to the maximum representation of ten.
tions, but such impeachment shall not prevent a regular criminal trial for any crime which may have been committed.

Section 3. The times, places and manner of holding elections for members of the World Parliament shall be prescribed in each nation by the legislature thereof, but the World Parliament may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.

Section 4. The World Parliament shall meet at least once every third year, and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in January, unless it shall by law appoint a different day.

Section 5. (1) The World Parliament shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members, and a majority shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may compel the attendance of absent members, in such manner and under such penalties as the World Parliament may provide.

(2) The World Parliament may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and with the concurrence of two-thirds expel a member.

(3) The World Parliament shall keep a journal of its proceedings, and, from time to time, publish the same, excepting such part as may in its judgment require secrecy; and the ayes and nays of the members of the World Parliament on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the journal.

(4) All bills passed by the World Parliament shall become law when signed by the chairman of the Executive Council, but the chairman of the Executive Council shall have no veto power.

Section 6. (1) The members of the World Parliament shall receive a compensation for their services to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the treasury of the United Nations.

(2) They shall in all cases, except treason, felony and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during the attendance at the sessions of the World Parliament, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in the World Parliament they shall not be questioned in any other place; but they shall not be immune from the service of process in a civil suit.

(3) No member of the World Parliament shall, during the times for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil
office under the authority of the United Nations, except that of membership in the Executive Council, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United Nations, except that of membership in the Executive Council, shall be a member of the World Parliament during his continuance in office.

Section 7. The World Parliament shall have

(1) the power to compel the outlawry of war, to substitute the law of the United Nations for war, and to enforce the disarmament of all the members of the United Nations;

(2) the power to declare war, to receive gifts of military equipment, to maintain an air force, and to provide for the government and use of such air force;

(3) the power to govern the high seas, the water underneath the surface of the high seas, the air above the high seas, and the air above land areas one thousand feet or more above the surface of the land; and the Panama Canal, Gibraltar, Suez Canal, Singapore, the Bosphorus, the Dardanelles, and the Kiel Canal.

(4) the power to protect the various members of the United Nations against invasion, and to guarantee to them a democratic, or republican, form of government;

(5) the power to settle any boundary disputes between any nations, not settled by them;

(6) the power to define citizenship for all the members of the United Nations;

(7) the power to provide uniform labor and health standards for all the member nations of the United Nations;

(8) the power to regulate international trade and transportation, the distribution of the non-renewable raw materials of the world; and to establish post-offices and post-roads:

(9) the power to regulate immigration and emigration to undeveloped territories of the United Nations;

(10) the power to regulate the value of money;

(11) the power to establish an administrative branch of government, to choose the members of an executive council, to provide for administrative commissions, and to delegate to them the power to ascertain facts, determine conditions, and to apply standards subject to Article VII of this Constitution;
(12) the power to select the judges for the World Court from the list of those nominated by the nations, to constitute judicial tribunals inferior to the World Court, and to regulate their jurisdiction and procedure so far as allowed by Article IX of this Constitution;

(13) the power to govern all mandataries, both small islands in the seas and backward countries in Africa, taken over by the United Nations as annexed territories after the conclusion of the World War II;

(14) the power to levy and collect taxes to pay all the expenses of the government of the United Nations;

(15) the power of eminent domain to acquire property for a seat of government and any other property necessary to carry into execution the powers of the United Nations, and to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over any such territory; the United Nations shall succeed to the ownership of all the property now owned by the League of Nations; and

(16) the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United Nations, or in any department or office thereof, including the power to prescribe criminal penalties.

Article VII: The Administrative Department and its Powers

Section 1. (1) All executive and administrative power herein granted shall be vested in seven executive departments, to be established by the World Parliament; in any executive commissions created by the World Parliament; and the secretariat to be created by the World Parliament by taking over the secretariat of the League of Nations;

(2) Each of the executive departments shall be presided over by a secretary, chosen by the World Parliament from its own members, but not more than one secretary shall be chosen from the same nation. These heads of executive departments shall together constitute an Executive Council. Election to

---

2 [optional clause]: For a period of fifty years The British Commonwealth of Nations, China, France, The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America shall all be ex officio members of the Executive Council and each entitled to designate a representative thereto, if not otherwise represented on it.
this Executive Council shall not affect membership in the World Parliament.

(3) Vacancies in the executive council shall be filled by the World Parliament if in session; if not in session by the executive council itself.

(4) A chairman and a vice-chairman shall be chosen by the Executive Council each to serve for one year, without the privilege of reelection, and the retiring chairman shall not be eligible to be chosen as vice-chairman for the next following year.

(5) The members of the Executive Council shall all be subject to reelection after every election of the World Parliament.

(6) The members of the executive council shall at stated times receive for their services a compensation, to be fixed by the World Parliament, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which they shall have been elected, and they shall not receive within that period any other emoluments from the United Nations or any of them.

(7) All other officers or clerks of the administrative branch of government shall be appointed by the Executive Council, subject to confirmation by the World Parliament where the salary exceeds $3000, under civil service rules, regulations and examinations which shall be promulgated and provided for by the Executive Council.

Section 2. Each member of the Executive Council shall be in charge of that executive branch of the United Nations to which he shall be elected secretary, under the rules, regulations and standards established by the World Parliament. But he shall render an account of his work to the Executive Council and all questions of executive and administrative policy shall be determined by a majority vote of the Executive Council. The Executive Council shall report and account to the World Parliament.

Section 3. The chairman of the Executive Council shall from time to time give to the World Parliament information on the state of the union of the United Nations, and recommend for its consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient. On extraordinary occasions he may convene special sessions of the World Parliament.
Section 4. The Executive Council shall take care that all the laws of the World Parliament be faithfully executed and that all officers of the United Nations are granted their commissions.

Section 5. The Executive Council and all other civil officers of the United Nations shall be removable from office on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Section 6. The Executive Council shall have the power, with the majority consent of the World Parliament, to make treaties and send ambassadors to any nations not members of the United Nations, until such time as such nations shall become members of the United Nations.

Article VIII: The Judicial Department and Its Powers

Section 1. The judicial power of the United Nations shall be vested in one World Court, and such inferior courts as the World Parliament may, from time to time, ordain and establish. The judges, both of the World Court and any inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior; and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation to be fixed by the World Parliament, which shall never be diminished during their continuance in office.

Section 2. The number of judges of the World Court shall be seven. The number of judges of any inferior courts shall be determined by the World Parliament. The judges of the World Court shall be selected by the World Parliament, from a list nominated by the executive heads of the various nations which are members of the United Nations, and the head of each nation shall have the power to nominate for the list of judges as many judges as his nation has representatives in the World Parliament. The method of selection of the judges for other courts shall be determined by the World Parliament.

Section 3. (1) The judicial power of the World Court shall extend to all jurisdictional questions; all constitutional questions involving the Constitution of the United Nations whether raised by a nation or by a private individual and all legal questions, concerning statutes of the World Parliament, or the liability and obligations of the United Nations or any of
them as against each other. The judicial power of all inferior courts shall be such as may be granted to them by the World Parliament. National Courts shall have no jurisdiction over United Nations' questions.

(2) The World Court shall have original jurisdiction in all cases, and shall have such appellate jurisdiction over inferior courts as the World Parliament shall provide. The World Court also shall have jurisdiction to create all rules of legal procedure for all the courts of the United Nations of the world.

Section 4. Treason against the United Nations shall consist only in levying war against it, or adhering to its enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court. The punishment for treason shall be declared by the World Parliament; but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attainted.

Article IX: Limitations on the Powers of the United Nations

Section 1. The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it, and then only by the World Parliament.

Section 2. No bill of attainder, bill of pains and penalties, or ex post facto criminal law shall be passed.

Section 3. No tax or duty shall be levied on articles exported from any nation.

Section 4. No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one nation over those of another; nor shall vessels or airplanes bound to, or from, one nation to another be obliged to enter, clear or pay duty.

Section 5. No money shall be drawn from the treasury except in consequence of appropriations made by law.

Section 6. No title of nobility shall be granted by the United Nations; and no person holding any office of profit or trust under it, shall, without the consent of the World Parliament, accept any present, emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever from any individual or any other government than that of the United Nations.
Section 7. The World Parliament shall make no law discriminating politically, economically or socially on account of race, sex, color, creed, ancestry, economic conditions or otherwise.

Section 8. The World Parliament shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise of religious or other beliefs; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, either by a censorship, or by imposing any liability for publications, except for slander or libel, or publications which have a clear and present danger to cause someone to commit a crime; or delimit any one’s freedom of action except by a proper exercise of the police power, or the power of taxation, or the power of eminent domain.

Section 9. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable search and seizures shall not be violated.

Section 10. No person shall be held to answer for a capital or other infamous crime unless on indictment by a grand jury, except in cases in the military forces; nor shall any person be subject to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb for the same indictable offense within the same jurisdiction; nor shall any person be compelled in any proceeding in which his testimony can be used in that or a later criminal case, to be a witness against himself; nor shall any person be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law as a matter of jurisdiction, or as a matter of procedure, including notice, an opportunity to be heard, an impartial tribunal and an orderly course of procedure.

Article X: Limitations on the Powers of the Various Nations

Section 1. No nation shall enter into any treaty, or grant any title of nobility, or maintain any army, navy or air military force, or engage in war unless actually invaded.

Section 2. No nation shall, without the consent of the World Parliament, lay any imposts or duties on exports to or imports from another nation.

Section 3. No nation shall, without the consent of the World Parliament, enter into any agreement or compact with another nation, except to settle boundary disputes or other local questions involving only such nations.
Section 4. No nation shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law as a matter of procedure, or as a matter of jurisdiction; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the protection of equal laws.

Section 5. Neither slavery nor colonialism, nor involuntary servitude except as a punishment for crime, whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall exist in any of the nations, which are members of the United Nations, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United Nations.

Section 6. No nation shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise of religious or other beliefs; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, either by a censorship, or by imposing any liability for publications, except for slander or libel, or publications which have a clear and present danger to cause someone to commit a crime; or delimit any one's freedom of action except by a proper exercise of the police power, or the power of taxation, or the power of eminent domain.

Article XI: Inter-Nation Relations

Section 1. Full faith and credit shall be given in each nation to the judgments and statutes of every other nation and the United Nations.

Section 2. Whatever civil rights, powers, privileges and immunities any nation may give its own citizens it shall give to the citizens of every other nation.

Section 3. A person charged in any nation with treason, felony or other crime, who shall flee from justice and be found in another nation, shall on demand of the executive authority of the nation from which he fled be delivered up, to be removed to the nation having jurisdiction of the crime.

Section 4. New nations may be admitted by the World Parliament into the union of the United Nations, but no new nation shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other nation, nor any nation formed by the union of two or more nations or parts of nations, without the consent of the legislatures of the nations concerned.

Section 5. The United Nations shall guarantee to every nation in this union a democratic or republican form of govern-
ment and shall protect each of them against invasion and on application of the legislature or of the executive, when the legislature cannot be convened, against domestic violence.

Article XII: Powers of Corporations, etc.

No private corporation or individual shall ever discriminate against anyone on account of race, sex, color, creed, ancestry, economic condition or otherwise; nor interfere in any way with the freedom of thought, freedom of expression, or freedom of action of others except in the exercise of their own lawful action. Both the United Nations and the several nations shall have concurrent power to enforce this prohibition each within its own jurisdiction.

Article XIII: Amendment

The World Parliament, whenever two-thirds of a quorum shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several nations, shall call a convention for proposing amendments; which, in either case, shall become a part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several nations, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be selected by the World Parliament.

Article XIV: United Nations Supremacy

Section 1. This Constitution, and all the laws of the United Nations made in pursuance thereof, shall be within their jurisdiction the supreme law of the world, and the judges in every nation shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of such nation to the contrary notwithstanding.

Section 2. Representatives in the World Parliament, members of the armed forces of the United Nations, judges and executive officers, and all other officers of the United Nations, and officers and judges of the several nations and members of the several national legislatures, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for office under the United Nations.
Article XV.

This Constitution shall go into effect upon its ratification in conventions by the United States of America, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Chinese Republic and six other nations or federations eligible for membership.