

# The Trojan Horse Plan for UN Reform (Part II)

Klaus Schlichtmann

*Posted to The World Orders Forum: 1 December 2024*

Dr. Klaus Schlichtmann is the liaison/legal advisor to the SA9 Campaign, i.e. 'Second' the 'Article-9-Motion.' He is the author of numerous scholarly articles and several books, including [Japan in the World. Shidehara Kijuro, Pacifism and the Abolition of War](#), and [A Peace History of India. From Ashoka Maurya to Mahatma Gandhi](#). As a world federalist and a member of the International Peace Research Association he has participated in many international conferences.

---

This essay was originally published by *Transcend Media Service* on 28 October 2024:  
<https://www.transcend.org/tms/2024/10/the-trojan-horse-plan-for-un-reform-part-ii/>

This essay is the second in a two-part series. Part I was originally published by *Transcend Media Service* on 21 October 2024 and republished by *The World Orders Forum* on 31 October 2024.

26 Oct 2024 – I can agree and am willing to believe that the “*Constitution for the Federation of Earth* provides the Earth (and humankind) with a brain” , that it “ends the war system in the world just as it ends the Injustice system and the environmental destruction system,” and that “peace is a direct consequence of institutionalising the unity in diversity of humanity,” and that “law needs to be both universal and planetary,” and that the “*Earth Constitution* actualizes our planetary community of unity in diversity,” as Glen Martin has written. But this I believe is likely to happen only through the United Nations and making use of the mechanisms prescribed in the UN Charter.

Indeed, “understanding the role of the *Earth Constitution* in human affairs requires seeing it within the context of several principles concerning our human situation that have emerged since the early 20th century. These include the principles of unity in diversity, of holism, and of the nature of constitutional law itself ... the *Earth Constitution* embodies the positive features of this paradigm-shift in human consciousness and ... can also function as a catalyst for further transformations that will solve our most basic human problems concerning war, social justice, human rights, and the destruction of nature.” (Glen Martin) No doubt, the “great transition” requires the Earth Constitution. <https://greattransition.org/gti-forum/earth-constitution-martin/>.

After the Second World War and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki the call for a global government and the international rule of law became ever more loud and clear. It had taken more than a century of preparation, among others with Benjamin Trueblood's 1899 publication *The Federation of the World* (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Co.). Professor Trueblood had translated Immanuel Kant's *Perpetual Peace*, served for 23 years as head of the American Peace Society and in 1913 was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. Then came the Hague Peace Conferences (1899 and 1907) already aiming to establish the international rule of law to help abolish war as an institution. The Greek Prime Minister Eleftherios Venizelos (1864-1936) advocated for a World Federation. Early on Victor Hugo's verdict in his famous speech in Paris at the International Peace Congress August 21, 1849: "A day will come when your arms will fall even from your hands!" also points in this direction. Supporting the *Hague Confederation* is German Walther Schücking's *The International Union of the Hague Conferences* (1918, translated from the German). More recently Albert Einstein, Bertrand Russell, Mahatma Gandhi, Norman Cousins and Léon Blum have called for a comprehensive system of a global dimension, a world federation. Léopold Senghor, Vaclav Havel, Andreas Papandreou and others have followed suit.

Albert Einstein had appealed to world leaders:

"The establishment of a supranational government constitutes the deepest hope of mankind ... in the long run, the creation of a supranational government with powers adequate to the responsibility of maintaining peace, is necessary ... Is this realistic? We believe nothing less is..."

The question I have already asked is: What consequences can we expect, if indeed a UN Member state decides to confer primary responsibility for the maintenance of International peace and security on the UN Security Council? If that happens, what will survive of the Earth Constitution and what will be accepted? The same goes for the UN Charter. To get out of the predicament UN Member states may want to come forward to sacrifice that part of national sovereignty that has allowed them to maintain a costly military to fight wars; they will be compelled to think more seriously about the future organisation of peace. Lawyers and politicians will scramble to use whatever means are at their disposal, foremost the Earth Constitution, which they will test to find out how it may help them get organised.

They will have to decide, whether they want to continue to operate "according to so called 'natural laws' of the market regardless of who gets hurt economically in terms of the property of vast sections of humanity and regardless of the consequences for our planet's biosphere." (Martin, p. 14) Let's visit how this plays out in reality!

"The theory stated that free competition among this (atomistic) multiplicity would result in the greatest efficiency and maximum production of goods and services necessary to human flourishing. Adam Smith termed this promised result 'the Invisible hand—many individuals competing in the marketplace out of pure self-interest would produce the

greatest good for the greatest number of persons. Self-interested individuals and corporations stood basically in external relationships to one another: strategically manoeuvring vis-à-vis one another and occasionally economically destroying one another in the competitive struggle (economic warfare).” (Martin, pp. 5-6)

Obviously, the war-prone “system of autonomous nation states operates on very similar assumptions to the economic system of autonomous individuals and corporations.” (Martin)

Let’s imagine a country like Mexico, for example, were to pass such a BILL as I have suggested in its national parliament, the Congress of the Union (Congreso General de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos), this would immediately create a sensation! Mexico would become a centre of international attention and speculation. How would the European nations react, whose constitutions provide for limiting national sovereignty in favour of the UN? France may react favourably and consider this as a (partial) fulfilment of the Constitution’s *condition of reciprocity*. Italy’s Constitution’s Article 11, considered a national treasure and an asset by the people, states:

“Italy renounces war as an instrument of offence to the liberty of other peoples or as a means of settlement in international disputes, and, on conditions of equality with other states, agrees to the limitations of her sovereignty necessary to an organisation which will ensure peace and justice among nations...” (See in Italian Luigi Bonanate, *Costituzione Italiana: articolo 11*, Roma 2018)

The Italians might also remember Gaetano Meale (‘UMANO’, 1858-1927, nominated for the 1908 Nobel Peace Prize), famous for his ninety-page pamphlet, “The End of Wars Through the Federation of the Peoples” (1889). (See the UmANO Foundation, <https://www.thomgambino.com/umano.html>)

Denmark may remember its engagement with the Interparliamentary Union (IPU) in 1952, out of which came this provision:

“Powers which according to this constitution rest with the authorities of the kingdom, can, through a bill, to a specifically defined extent, be transferred to international authorities, which are instituted by mutual agreement with other states to promote international legal order and cooperation.” (Art. 20, of June 5, 1953).

Limitations of national sovereignty, intended to benefit the international organisation of peace, were an issue at the IPU Conference in Switzerland in 1952. As a result, Denmark and Norway declared their willingness to adopt similar measures in their constitutions. The Conference pointed out that already

“many recent constitutions, such as the French Constitution of October 27, 1946, that of Italy of December 27, 1947, and that of Western Germany of May 8, 1949, have by constitutional provision decreed the subordination of internal public law to international

law, and have thus taken into consideration the possibility of limiting national sovereignty without its being necessary to have recourse to the procedure provided for the amendment of constitutional norms.”

Several constitutions provide for similar measures such as the **Japanese 1947 Constitution**, “forever renouncing war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as a means for settling international disputes,” and in Europe the **1971 Belgian Constitution** saying “powers may be conferred by a pact or law on institutions coming under international civil law” (Article 34), the **1973 Luxembourg Constitution** stating: “powers ... may be temporarily vested by treaty in institutions governed by international law,” the **1975 Greek Constitution** providing for “cooperation with other states” and for that purpose “authorities may be vested ... in agencies of an international organisation ... to limit the exercise of national sovereignty,” the **1976 Swedish Constitution** stating authority may be “transferred to a limited extent, to an international organisation for peaceful cooperation,” the **1976 Portuguese Constitution** commending “the abolition of all forms of imperialism, colonialism and aggression ... dissolution of political-military blocs and the establishment of a system of collective security, in order to create an international order capable of assuring peace and justice in relations among peoples,” the **1978 Spanish Constitution** stipulating that “authorization may be established for the conclusion of treaties which attribute to an international organisation or institution the exercise of competencies derived from the constitution ... to guarantee compliance with ... the international or supranational organisations who have been entitled by this cession,” the **1981 Austrian Constitution** stipulating “sovereign rights of the Bund [federation] can be transferred to intergovernmental institutions and their organs,” the **1983 Dutch Constitution** promising to “promote the development of the international rule of law” and saying that “legislative, executive and judicial powers may be conferred on international institutions by or pursuant to a treaty,” and the **Irish Constitution** providing for taking legislative action “for the purpose of international cooperation in matters of common concern.” These European countries would be inclined (or even compelled) to follow suit and pass similar Bills. However, In following up they may or may not want to mention or support/endorse the *Earth Constitution*. For them other issues and proposals might have precedence and be included in their own national BILL.

The Europeans might have forgotten their good intentions, but they basically knew and understood what they owed the rest of the world. In a speech before the IPU Assembly, the German delegate also addressed the “problem of limitation of national sovereignty,” aimed to realise “a universal parliamentary representation,” saying that “without a world government there is no future.” However, he cautioned: this “universal government” must be “elected by the people themselves.” The aim was to “make the United Nations universal and give it a universal parliamentary representation!” The man who uttered these words was Dr. Hermann L. Brill, a democratic socialist and anti-Nazi activist who as an inmate of the Buchenwald concentration camp had co-authored the famous *Buchenwald Manifesto*, which stated that militarism in

Germany must be “completely eradicated,” or else “there will be no rest and no peace for us or in the world.” Germany wanted to be admitted “with all due haste into the world organisation of peace and security.” Unfortunately, because of its controversial foreign policy after the war West Germany only joined the UN in 1973 and failed to implement its constitutional peace provisions, including submitting to the compulsory jurisdiction of the ICJ, stipulated in the 1949 post-war Constitution, which was mandatory.

Europe in general was criticised. The Indian delegate Arun Chandra Guha stated:

“The two world wars have taught Europe that national sovereign states could not be the last word in the evolution of human civilization ... What we require now is a world organisation which will be authorised with the rights surrendered by other states ... The civilised nations have failed in the case of the League of Nations, and I may not be quite wrong if I say the Locarno Pact was the first step leading to that failure. I have my own misgivings as to whether many of these European political organisations are not in a way neutralising the effectiveness of the United Nations.”

The Pakistani diplomat Ahmed E.H. Jaffer was of a similar disposition:

“The evils of the sovereign state and its incapacity to maintain peace are increasingly felt ... In my opinion time is ripe for beginning to plan and shape organisations which will ultimately form the nucleus of world federation... in connection with the question of limits to state sovereignty discussed at this conference it has been made amply clear that one of the greatest impediments to real political and economic cooperation between the states is the sovereignty of states and that the remedy for the sufferings of mankind lies in curtailing and limiting that sovereignty.”

Although international peace was high on the IPU agenda, skimming through the 860-page IPU document that had the proceedings of the 41st Conference (COMPTE RENDU DE LA XLIE CONFERENCE INTERPARLEMENTAIRE), I unfortunately found no mention of George Kennan’s “neutralisation plan” that wanted to prevent Germany from becoming a flashpoint for conflict between the East and West. Kennan’s “program A” of 1949 called for the complete withdrawal of the British, French, American and Soviet forces from Germany as a step towards German reunification. At the same time Joseph Stalin, aware of George Kennan’s “neutralisation plan” for Germany, made a similar proposal, promising a united, neutral state. The ‘Stalin Notes’ guaranteed “the rights of man and basic freedoms, including freedom of speech, press, religious persuasion, political conviction, and assembly.” If this had come to pass, it would have set the stage for Germany to take legislative action to embark on the transition toward genuine collective security and disarmament.

\*

In 1987 the *United Nations Conference on the Relationship between Development and Disarmament* invited non-governmental organisations to give them an opportunity to make

themselves heard. This was the time when NGOs had just begun to have a voice within the UN, granted them under Rule 45 of the provisional rules of procedure. Representing the German World Federalists (Weltföderalisten Deutschlands e.V.) I was able to present a Resolution, titled “Pooling Security Sovereignty with the United Nations.” Our Written Statement with the code A/CONF.130/NGO/41 was distributed to the UN Missions represented in New York.

The term ‘security sovereignty’ denotes that part of national sovereignty which, in a legal sense, makes the individual nation-state the sole guarantor for its subjects’ peace and security, not accepting any superior authority or rule of law in its external affairs. It is the sovereign nation-state, as subject under international law, that declares war and frequently spends up to 50 % of its annual budget on defence. Even in a democracy the original sovereign, the people, have no say in the matter; conscientious objectors to military service may not always be recognized. Individuals or groups are, strictly speaking, not subjects under international law. They are a mere means to an end, i.e. to serve the purpose of the state. Political structures worldwide do not allow them to participate in decision-making processes regarding national defence, military planning (such as on what kind of weapons or strategy money should be spent) etc. This is where our global system is stuck. A third world war seems inevitable, if we cannot find a way out of the present predicament.

H.G. Wells in his book ‘The Way to Peace’ (London and Aylesbury 1930) had already anticipated that “Pax is only to be attained by pooling sovereignty in relation to the main causes of stress between the originally separated communities” (p. 14). “Peace, in fact, has its price. The price of world peace is the abandonment of the idea ... of sovereign independence.” (p. 22) “We have to put world peace now before patriotism, and train ourselves to a new and wider loyalty” (p. 23).

During World War II the Polish Prime Minister in exile, General Wladislaw Sikorski, in an interview published in ‘Collier’s Magazine’ on 3 April 1943, expressed a similar sentiment:

“There must be, above and beyond ... (regional) federations, a world government, based on the present alliance of the United Nations. The United States, the British Commonwealth, Russia, China, the South American republics, the European confederations and the other nations of the world must pool their will-to-peace in this organisation. This world government must go beyond anything that has been tried before...”

This is precisely what WCPA and the Earth Constitution are aiming for. It is also what the UN Charter originally wanted to accomplish. The problem is that it has been unjustly and unduly criticised precisely by those nations who continue to understand “human life as composed of rationally self-interested individuals who, both individually and collectively through their businesses and corporations, compet[e] ... with one another for the accumulation of profit in the service of satisfaction of their ultimate desires.” (Martin, p. 5) Obviously it is not the veto power the five permanent members of the Security Council are wielding that causes the United Nations not to function effectively (as we have been told to believe), but the fact that Member states have

not agreed to limitations of their national sovereignty in favour of the UN. As Glen Martin points out: “The sovereign nation-state system integrated with monopoly capitalism leads to mayhem not only between countries but within countries,” (Martin p. 37) thus preventing governments from taking necessary political decisions to ensure their own as well as international peace and security. He quotes social scientist Christopher Chase-Dunn:

“This state and the interstate system are not separate from capitalism, but rather are the main institutional supports of capitalist production relations. The system of unequally powerful and competing nation states is part of the competitive struggle of capitalism, and thus wars and geopolitics are a systematic part of capitalist dynamics, not exogenous forces.” (Martin, p. 7)

Confronted with the BILL conferring primary responsibility for peace and security to the UN, countries will be made painfully aware of the disadvantages and dangers of the present system, a realisation to which the *Constitution for the Federation of Earth* will contribute and offer a solution. Let us remember that in 1945, when the UN Charter was introduced, it was anticipated that it “will be expanded and improved as time goes on,” and as many people and politicians around the world, including in the US, had hoped, this would lead to “its development into a world federation.” (House Concurrent Resolution 64)

\*

The Foreword to the Earth Constitution’s online numeric edition (2009) says it “has had quite an uphill climb. To date, thousands of individual citizens have ratified the Earth Constitution. However, the response from nations has been weak. After a half dozen occasions where national heads have agreed to the Earth Constitution, in each case there has been an early retraction, abandonment or change in head of state.” That is where the Trojan Horse plan comes in.

In his elaborate Introduction to the 2016 printed edition of *The Constitution for the Federation of Earth* Glen T. Martin writes:

“The 20th century produced what may well be the most important document for the 21st century and the future of human civilization: the *Constitution for the Federation of Earth* ... I hope to illuminate the truth of this statement and to show why a decent future, even a possible future, for humanity almost certainly involves ratification of the *Earth Constitution or some document very much like it.*” (p. 1, emphasis added)

Besides the known example of a world constitution, e.g. the *Preliminary Draft of a World Constitution* (University of Chicago, 1947), WCPA’s model is the only draft in existence, as the Wikipedia entry confirms, a draft that is relevant, comprehensive and conclusive.

No doubt: “Establishing and implementing a global constitution on a meaningful scale presents significant practical challenges, including political, legal, and logistical complexities ... The aim is to create a framework that promotes unity, justice, and sustainability on a global scale.”

(Wikipedia) To achieve this, Glen Martin points out: “The Constitution can serve as a practical, common sense guide to establishing a decent planetary civilization (for the first time in history) of peace, prosperity, justice, freedom, and sustainability.” (p. 1)

In his Conclusion Dr. Glen Martin writes:

“Throughout our model ... we have assumed the creative input of the human being with integrity, vision, and creative energy who must enliven the system outlined by the *Constitution* and the Parliament. The Earth Federation needs Parliamentarians, Judges, Administrators, Police, and Ombudsmen who are capable of cooperatively working as part of an open ended, democratic learning community informed by the dynamics of systems thinking and the principles of holism. We need dedicated people who are willing to begin living from the moment forward according to the ethical and legal principles embodied in the Earth Constitution.” (p. 63)

It makes sense that he doesn't want to completely eliminate all UN agencies.

“As people begin to understand the vision, there's a tremendous urgency that they also act on that vision with creativity, integrity, and energy. The *Constitution* must be ratified in a founding ratification convention according to the Protocols already developed by the Provisional World Parliament. It converts the present failed world system to peace, prosperity, justice, freedom, and sustainability. It replaces the U.N. Charter, with real democratic government keeping the valuable agencies of the U.N. as ministries of the Earth Federation. You are about to read the most important document produced by the 20th century—the document that will provide the foundation stone for the paradigm shift of the 21st century. *Nothing less than the fate of humanity and our precious planet Earth are at stake. We invite your participation. We invite you to a life of 'civil obedience'.*” (p. 65)

Watch Professor Glen T. Martin about Earth Constitution and World Parliament, with Tarik Günersel 2021 on YouTube: [https://youtu.be/v1Z6P6sr\\_Xc?si=ys9ZLF92WWEUASZ-](https://youtu.be/v1Z6P6sr_Xc?si=ys9ZLF92WWEUASZ-)

“Now is the time for collective action to address the big global problems, including nuclear threats and climate change. Now there is a way to force governments to act ... It's hard to believe we can be wrong about things we KNOW are true. We all have the sensation that our view of things is the objective TRUTH. But our beliefs can trick us. We do not think the 'unthinkable'. Global cooperation is required. New thinking now favours our survival ... Changing direction is unthinkable, but has become necessary. We need the humility to think the unthinkable, and believe the unbelievable. **We need new visions.** New traditions. New expectations. And hopeful new “stories” to live by.” (H. Stone)