

**The Indian Institute of Culture**  
**Basavangudi, Bangalore**

Transaction No. 19

**PROPOSALS OF WORLD FEDERALISTS**  
**FOR UNITED NATIONS**  
**CHARTER REVISION**

By  
MAX HABICHT  
(Member of the Bar of Geneva, Switzerland,  
Formerly a Member of the Legal Section  
of the League of Nations Secretariat)

Publications Department  
1, North Public Square Road  
Basavangudi, Bangalore 4  
(India )

# THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF CULTURE

Transaction No. 19

## PREFACE

The Indian Institute of Culture, believing in the brotherhood of man and regarding a just and lasting peace as a natural expression of that relationship, shares with many in India as in other parts of the world a concern for bringing into being a World Government with powers adequate to insure peace and justice.

The Institute has been represented at several Conferences on World Government—the First and Second London Parliamentary Conferences and the important gathering at Copenhagen in August 1953, when the World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government and the World Movement for World Federal Government held joint sessions. There and at the more recent London Congresses of those two bodies were worked out the proposals for the revision of the United Nations Charter which Dr. Max Habicht presents and analyzes here.

Dr. Max Habicht was Chairman of the Commission constituted at the Copenhagen Conference to draft the Proposals for Charter Revision that he presents here in the form in which they were amended at the London Conference held last September.

Dr. Habicht, a member of the Bar of Geneva, Switzerland and a former member of the Legal Section of the League of Nations Secretariat, spoke at the Indian Institute of Culture in January 1954, urging fundamental changes of the structure of the United Nations. At the Institute's request, after participating in the recent London meetings on Charter revision, he prepared this paper, which was discussed at the United Nations Day Celebration of the Institute on October 24th, under the chairmanship of Shri D. H. Chandrasekhariah, Former Minister of Education in Mysore State.

The United Nations admittedly has not achieved all that was hoped for by the framers of its Charter. It has to its credit praiseworthy achievements in the localizing and stopping of wars, if not in their complete prevention. Some of its Specialized Agencies, moreover, have done excellent work. But that there are handicaps to the effectiveness of the United Nations as at present constituted seems beyond dispute and those handicaps must in many cases be ascribed to defects in the provisions of the Charter itself.

With all its shortcomings, the United Nations Charter offers a foundation on which it should be possible to build an effective World Government. Under the Charter itself, its revision will become possible next year in the light of experience with its working. This should be a matter of immediate concern to every nation and to every thoughtful individual. The time is short and the problem deserves more serious attention than it has been receiving from Governments and the world press.

The proposals presented here have had the disinterested consideration of many thoughtful men of many countries. They merit open-minded examination and intelligent support. It is in the hope of quickening interest in this vitally important problem that the Institute is publishing this paper.

# PROPOSALS OF WORLD FEDERALISTS FOR UNITED NATIONS CHARTER REVISION

BY  
DR. MAX HABICHT

Recently the World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government and the World Movement for World Federal Government, at their Congresses in London in September 1954, formulated an appeal for United Nations Charter reform and made concrete proposals for strengthening the United Nations.

They issued the following statements:—

## I.—THE LONDON MANIFESTO

We, members of Parliaments of 21 countries, have met in London to consider how nations can live and work together in peace, and have heard from scientists the facts of hydrogen and other nuclear weapons.

We warn the world, with all our united strength, that rival nations are now engaged in the most dangerous arms race of all time. In the past, an arms race has always ended in war, but a war fought with the nuclear weapons would annihilate whole countries, and indeed threaten the existence of human life.

A race in arms is inseparable from power politics. Power politics are now costing the world 40,000 millions a year in armaments, and even at this price we have not bought security.

If so much of the world's resources are diverted each year to the sterile, unproductive and inflationary purpose of armaments, the result, even without war, will be social revolt and economic exhaustion. If these new weapons are used, then it is the physical destruction of the world which faces us.

We call upon peoples and governments throughout the world to recognize that the choice is now between some form of world government or world ruin. It is a matter of the arms race or the human race.

We welcome a race—but let it be between economic systems and political ideas in the raising of the quality of living of the people for whom they are responsible. If even a part of the £40,000 millions now spent on arms were devoted to economic development and social welfare, then an entirely new meaning and dignity of life would open for hundreds of millions of our human fraternity.

Let us therefore give up the impossible attempt to achieve national security with national armaments. Let us accept the fact that absolute national sovereignty in the modern world is impossible.

With these facts before us, we call upon all governments to use the opportunity presented next year for the reform of the United Nations Charter and to strengthen that Organization so that it becomes representative of all the peoples of the world; is charged with the duty of ensuring world peace upon the basis of world law; is provided with an adequate world police force to enable it to discharge that duty; and that a portion of the sums of money now spent upon national armaments be devoted to the economic development of the planet upon which we live.

## II—Proposals for United Nations Charter Revision

TO BE SUBMITTED TO EVERY GOVERNMENT

The World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government and the World Movement for

World Federal Government after reviewing the activity of the United Nations and its Charter at their Conferences in Copenhagen in 1953 and in London in 1954, in the firm belief that the aim of the United Nations as stated in the preamble to its Charter: "TO SAVE SUCCEEDING GENERATIONS FROM THE SCOURGE OF WAR, "cannot be obtained by the present organization of the United Nations, recommend that every Government should forthwith instruct" its representatives at the United Nations to urge and to vote

- (a) that the United Nations proceed to a revision of its Charter, and
- (b ) that this revision should transform the United Nations into a World Federation in conformity with the following PROPOSALS.

These PROPOSALS represent the considered views of the two bodies as to the MINIMUM WORKABLE SCHEME necessary in their opinion to ensure peace and stability throughout the world.

The interim recommendations in the ANNEXE are intended, by extending the operation of the United Nations, to help in preparing the ground so that the United Nations evolve into the full World Federation detailed in the PROPOSALS.

## THE PROPOSALS

### *Proposal 1*

#### MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNITED NATIONS

1. All states shall have a right to membership in the United Nations, provided they accept the terms of the Charter.
2. Once a state has been admitted into membership, it shall have no right of secession.
3. The Charter shall define what a state is.
4. The World Legislature of the United Nations shall be competent to decide whether an applicant is eligible within the terms of the Charter. Its decision shall be subject to appeal to the International Court of Justice by either the aggrieved applicant or any member of the U.N.

### *Proposal 2*

#### DISARMAMENT

1. The Charter shall provide for complete, simultaneous, universal and enforceable disarmament, carried out by rapid stages. (Details of the disarmament plan should be set out in an annexe to the Charter.) Disarmament shall be subject to inspection and supervision by U.N. Inspectors and enforcement by U.N. Police.
2. Production of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction shall be prohibited, The possession of all existing such weapons shall be vested in the U. N. Atomic materials shall be placed under the control of the United Nations at all stages where energy from such materials might be applied for atomic weapons.

### *Proposal 3*

#### U.N. INSPECTORATE AND POLICE

The Charter shall provide for a U.N. Inspectorate to be charged with the supervision of the disarmament plan, and for a U.N. Police to enforce the provisions of the Charter, the laws enacted there under, and the decisions of the International Court of Justice and other organs of the U.N. ( Details of the composition and organization of the U.N. Inspectorate and Police should be set out in an annexe to the Charter.)

*Proposal 4*

## INTERNATIONAL COURTS

1. The International Court of Justice shall be given compulsory jurisdiction to decide legal disputes:

{a) between two or more member-states

(b) Between any parties, if the dispute concerns the interpretation and application of the Charter and laws enacted there under.

2. The Charter shall provide for the creation of lower courts of the U.N., empowered to decide on violations by individuals of the Charter and laws enacted there under. The International Court of Justice shall have appellate jurisdiction with respect to judgments of such lower courts. {The annexe to the present U.N. Charter relating to the International Court of Justice shall be amended accordingly.}

*Proposal 5*

## WORLD EQUITY TRIBUNAL

1. A World Equity Tribunal, which shall be a section of the International Court of Justice, shall be created with jurisdiction to hear and report on all non-legal disputes between states.

2. The decision of the World Equity Tribunal shall be advisory, unless the parties to the dispute have consented in advance to its being binding. (Details of the organization and powers of the World Equity Tribunal should be set out in an annexe to the Charter.)

*Proposal 6*

## WORLD LEGISLATURE

## Part I—Constitution

1. In place of the present General Assembly, a World Legislature shall be established.

2. The World Legislature shall consist of two Chambers.

3. One Chamber, to be called the Council of States, shall consist of Senators appointed by the member-states.

4. The other Chamber, to be called the Council of Peoples, shall consist of Deputies, the number of whom shall be determined for each member-state on the basis of population and other relevant factors.

5. All legislation shall be passed by both Chambers.

6. Safeguards shall be established to ensure that all legislation shall be passed only with the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators and two-thirds of the Deputies present and voting in each case.

## Part II—Powers

The World Legislature shall have:

1. Unlimited right to debate and to make recommendations on any matters within the scope of the Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the Charter, Power to enact legislation strictly confined to matters necessary for the maintenance or re-establishment of international peace. percentage of estimated world income to be so raised must be defined in the Charter, and should be levied proportionately to the national income of each member-state.

2. Power to elect and dismiss the World Executive Council or individual members thereof.

3. Power to enact legislation for raising revenue for such functions. The maximum

*Proposal 7*

WORLD EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

1. In place of the present Security Council a World Executive Council shall be established.
2. The two Chambers of the World Legislature, sitting together, shall appoint and may dismiss the Executive Council.
3. The Executive Council shall be responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security and for carrying out the directives of the World Legislature. The members of the Executive Council shall be elected for a fixed term, but shall be dismissible by the World Legislature.

*Proposal 8*

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

1. The Economic and Social Council shall be continued and strengthened by giving it increased responsibility for the activities of the Specialized Agencies and wider influence and ampler means for the development of less-developed areas. To this end a U.N. Fund for Economic Development shall be forthwith established and financed is the pooling of contributions from member- and non-member-states.
2. As and when effective disarmament progressively releases savings from war budgets to swell the resources available, a World Mutual Development Fund shall be created to be administered as a specialized agency of the United Nations, and to be financed by a percentage of such savings. The Fund shall be used for increasing the economic productivity of the less developed areas and for making it possible for those areas to raise their standard of living and to create a beneficent upward spiral of world-wide prosperity.

*Proposal 9*

U.N. CITIZENSHIP

1. To ensure that world law can be enforced by the means of the United Nations against individuals breaking the law, every citizen of a member-state shall be a citizen of the U.N., as well as of his own country. The Charter and the laws enacted there under shall bind each individual citizen of the U.N.
2. The United Nations shall ensure that citizens of non-member-states and stateless persons shall act in accordance with the Charter, so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of peace.

*Proposed 10 Human Rights*

A Bill of Rights shall safeguard all persons against violation by the United Nations of certain basic liberties. (The Bill of Rights should be set out in an annexe to the Charter.)

*Proposal 11 Trusteeship Council*

The present influence of the Trusteeship Council in Trust Territories shall be extended to all Colonies and Protectorates.

ANNEXE

INTERIM RECOMMENDATIONS

Pending the adoption of the above proposals in their entirety, the two bodies would support any change whether by amendment or otherwise designed to strengthen the United Nations in the following manner:

*Recommendation 1.* Making the United Nations universal.

*Recommendation 2.* Increasing self-denial in the exercise of sovereignty by the State necessary for the better working of the United Nations.

*Recommendation 3.* Measures bringing about weighted representation in the General Assembly.

*Recommendation 4.* Making the Security Council more representative.

*Recommendation 5.* Establishing any feasible plan towards disarmament and international control of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

*Recommendation 6.* Measures towards the creation of an International Police Force.

*Recommendation 7.* Extension of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, increased resort to it for advisory opinions, and wider use of the Permanent Court of Arbitration.

*Recommendation 8.* Creating a World Development Agency on the lines of the specialized Agencies of the U.N. for the purposes of achieving world-wide freedom from want, which shall have guarantees of substantial long-term financial assistance commensurate with the challenge of world poverty, hunger and disease.

### III—COMMENTARY

The two organizations of World Federalists sponsoring the above proposals were founded in Montreux, Switzerland, in 1947 (World Movement for World Federal Government)<sup>1</sup> and in London in 1951 (World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government.)<sup>2</sup> Their present combined membership of about 100,000 is scattered over half of the States of the World. Prominent members of parliaments in many countries support this movement.

World Federalists reject the often-asserted fallacy that the Charter of the United Nations is satisfactory and that, if only Governments would live up to the Charter, peace could be kept. The Charter provides, for instance, for the right of Member-States to prevent other Governments from joining the United Nations and, because of this, some twenty applications for membership have been refused. How can one pretend that Member-States do not live up to the Charter, when they use the rights explicitly provided for in the Charter in order to keep one-fourth of mankind outside the world peace organization? No one should be led into error by a vague statement that Governments act contrary to the Charter, when in effect they use rights explicitly guaranteed by the Charter. The Charter is defective. Unless it is changed, even the best-intentioned Government cannot obtain permanent peace through that instrument.

Another fallacy must also be rejected: Peace, it is often asserted, can be achieved through love and ethics; more love, it is argued, would lead to more peace. Do we enjoy peace in cities and states because fellow-citizens love each other? It is quite evident that the local and national peace which we enjoy is due, not to love, but to law. In other words, it is due to the fact that some one in our cities and nation-states formulates rules of behavior and enforces them upon us, independently of whether we love our neighbors or not. Nothing should be said against men and women of good-will who attempt to bring more love and better ethics into our life, except that they err, if they believe that love alone can bring peace.

The core of the proposals of World Federalists is the replacement of the United Nations Assembly by a World Parliament, because the United Nations has not done, and cannot do, what most people expected it to achieve: save us from the scourge of war.

In the present Assembly, each Member-State has one vote. Countries like India, with 360

million inhabitants, or the United States of America, with 166 million, naturally cannot permit an Assembly, in which Iceland with 140,000 inhabitants has equal representation, to vote for measures other than mere recommendations. They cannot submit to binding decisions by such an unrepresentative body. Before permitting it to impose important peace measures and enact world laws, the representation in the Assembly must be weighted according to the relative importance of Member-States.

World Federalists propose that big countries should have a greater number of representatives than small countries. Each Member -State might be permitted to send from one to eight Senators to an Upper Chamber of a World Legislature and to send Deputies to a Lower Chamber, the number of which would be determined by the size of population and other relevant factors. A two-thirds majority in the Senate and the House of Deputies then should be empowered to enact laws binding upon every individual residing in a Member-State. A United Nations machinery, now hampered by veto rights, would thus be replaced by a legislature which would function similarly to parliaments in nation-states.

No real progress in matters of disarmament appears to be possible, unless the rule of unanimous consent is replaced by majority decisions. The disarmament efforts of the League of Nations failed, as have all attempts for the international control of atomic weapons by the United Nations, not because all Member-States did not desire disarmament, but because it was never possible to reach agreement on specific measures by unanimous consent. Majority rule, on the contrary, would permit satisfactory progress. It is an illusion to think that the United Nations can ever bring about a world-wide disarmament agreement under its present set-up, in spite of the continuous efforts by several delegations in this direction. A world legislature is the preliminary condition for world disarmament and, without disarmament, there is no possibility of law enforcement upon individuals.

Another fundamental change proposed by World Federalists is the replacement of collective military action against a recalcitrant Member-State by police enforcement of United Nations laws upon individuals. The Charter now provides that "action by air, sea and land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security" (Art. 42) shall be undertaken. This means nothing less than war against the people of a recalcitrant Member-State. No peace can be built by organizing bigger and better wars. Korea has given a taste of what these provisions of the Charter mean.

World Federalists are opposed to the principle, at the present time so generally accepted, that collective security by military measures shall be made the foundation of peace. They do not believe that to possess and threaten with super-bombs is a contribution toward permanent peace. A balance of power only postpones war until the day that something fails out of balance, as has always happened in the past with countries engaged in rearmament.

World Federalists have declared solemnly in a London Resolution of 1951 that "war cannot be abolished so long as any nation claims as part of national sovereignty the right to prepare and wage war against other nations."

World Federalists are against United Nations wars.

. Mankind's problem in an age of thermonuclear bombs is not to know what wars shall be permitted but what enforcement machinery can be introduced to enforce law successfully without wars. The answer is police enforcement upon individuals.

Let us be conscious of the difference.

Collective security is an attempt to threaten a Member-State with war, in the hope of



keeping that Member-State from breaking the Charter. Result: United Nations wars such as the destruction brought about in North and South Korea.

Police enforcement is based on the age-old experience that, in every human society, there are law-breakers. It is unrealistic to expect that a United Nations Charter will not be broken. But if the individual law-breaker is arrested by police action, the peace is very little disturbed and, above all, no innocent children and civilians are massacred in the process. Day and night, police act in this manner in our cities and in our States. In places like Korea, why not arrest the individuals, however highly placed, who move tanks and break laws, instead of ruining the country by collective military measures?

This can, of course, be done only if peoples agree to set up a World Legislature that can make World Laws to be enforced on individuals. Permanent peace without World Government is an illusion.

World Federalists estimate that an international police force of about 750,000 men could thus enforce the peace and give the world better security than the present system of forcing 19,000,000 soldiers into uniform at a cost of over 100 billion dollars per year.

That brings us to the next proposal of World Federalists: to use a percentage from the savings by disarmament to create a World Mutual Development

Fund for increasing the economic productivity of the less-developed areas. It is estimated that 20% of the present war budget could suffice for such a purpose. The rest would lead to a massive reduction of general taxes. World Government would be much cheaper than the present co-existence of armed sovereign states.

Not only lower taxes would be the result of World Government, but also the freeing of millions of men from military service, the freeing of money for productive measures, and the raising of the low standards of living of half of mankind which now goes hungry some part of every year.

World Federalists have little criticism of the activities of the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and the Special Agencies of the United Nations. They propose to extend the influence and to increase the financial resources of these Agencies. But, if the international security problem cannot be solved through better machinery, all the other beneficial activities of the United Nations will be engulfed in the catastrophe of another world war.

The League of Nations died because it was not reformed in time. The friends of the United Nations are those who see this danger and remember the fate of the League of Nations.

World Federalists also propose an extension of the judiciary and a world bill of rights.

Government officials may abuse their powers. Indeed the history of mankind over the centuries shows the struggle of the citizens against arbitrary and unjust actions of their rulers.

Many countries have worked out bills of rights guaranteeing certain fundamental rights to every human being, the list of which varies from state to state.

After having conquered such rights and obtained protection against our own local and national governments, it is essential that World Government should not destroy these rights.

The idea of a bill of rights must be raised to the world level, and no World Government should be permitted to arrest an individual without the latter's right of appeal to a judge.

A bill of rights appended to the United Nations Charter would help to increase freedom in the world.

Speaking of freedom, which can pretend that individual freedom exists in a world in which most sovereign states now force millions of men to wear a uniform, to live away from their families and to spend some of the best years of their lives away from the occupations of their choice? The present Charter of the United Nations has not freed mankind from such servitudes. The abolition of conscription would be the consequence of disarmament through a World Parliament.

Numerous are the well-informed students of national and international affairs who are in favor of an evolution ultimately leading to World Federation. But their time-tables differ greatly.

World Federalists fear that the time is short and that, if World War III cannot be prevented through Charter Revision, conditions thereafter will be less propitious for a World Federation. World Government might come by conquest; and such conquest in the future would not merely destroy cities and millions of human lives but it would also destroy the art of democratic government on a federal basis.

Could World Conquerors afford to give to the world the instrument of a democratic World Constitution as proposed by World Federalists? A constitution under which all races, classes, religions, big and small nations could have a part in lawmaking and in controlling law enforcement under the guarantee of a bill of rights? Such a federal system could not be the outcome of conquest by one part of the world over the other. Woe to the vanquished of the next world war!

Those who contend that the world is not ripe for World Federal Government often assert that only like-minded citizens can join in one and the same state. They contend that peoples who do not speak the same language, which are not of the same religion, are of different races, are divided between literates and illiterates, or believe in different political and economic systems, could not work together in the same parliament.

The answer is that this is happening at this very moment! In the Swiss and many other parliaments, Communists and non-Communists sit on the same benches and vote by majority rule. In Canada, French- and English-speaking deputies carry on discussions in the same legislature. Literate and illiterate voters elect members of very different races and religions to the Indian Parliament. No diversities of the kinds mentioned above have prevented a federal system from coming into existence upon one condition—that people asked for it.

The world could have such world-wide federal machinery tomorrow, if a substantial majority of the people in every country would demand it—in spite of what certain Government officials may say and what some international lawyers may teach.

It is interesting to remember how existing federal states came into existence. An example is Switzerland:—in 1848, 22 cantons proceeded to a plebiscite of the male population on whether to transform their League of Sovereign Cantons into a Federation. The majority in 15\*1/2 cantons voted “Yes ” and in 6-1/2 cantons voted “No.” Eminent political leaders and learned lawyers contended, after that plebiscite, that federation needed unanimous consent and that one could not build a unified federal Switzerland contrary to the negative vote of 6-1/2 cantons. The plebiscite began on August 5, 1848 and, on September 12 of the same year; the Federation was a reality, because a substantial majority had insisted on the political evolution of Switzerland in spite of those who had said that this was impossible. Under their

system of alliances and leagues before 1848, the Swiss had had numerous wars among themselves. Since adopting a federal constitution a hundred years ago, wars among the Swiss have ceased; and the Swiss of today are, without exception, grateful to their forefathers for having imposed Federation upon a reluctant minority.

In the middle of the 20th century, no mere minority of 200 million could prevent 2 billion people of the world from imposing world federation—if they really wanted it.

Another imagined difficulty is the belief that any of the five big powers can veto the elaboration of a World Federal Constitution by the United Nations for submission to the Member-States for ratification.

In contrast to important decisions of the Security Council, which need at least the affirmative vote of all the Big Five (China, France, the United Kingdom, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.), a revised Charter can be voted upon in a Review Conference by a two-thirds vote of the Conference and therefore does not necessarily need the affirmative vote of any of the Big Five. It is true that amendments of the Charter cannot be imposed upon Member-States unless ratified by two-thirds of the Member-States, including the Big Five.

This revision procedure has a double advantage; First, the United Nations cannot be broken up legally unless an overwhelming majority of mankind consents to the change. Second!}, no Member of the United Nations can veto the holding of a Review Conference or the adoption by a two-thirds majority of any decision of that Conference.

The process of ratification will necessarily take several years ( at least five years). Only at the end of that period can it be known whether the amendments will enter into force or not.

No Government has to date indicated its intention to propose fundamental changes of the kind suggested by World Federalists. The reason is that no Prime Minister, no Minister of Foreign Affairs, no Parliament, can move in this direction unless supported by public opinion ; and public opinion has not yet been articulate on United Nations Charter Revision.

Whether the above proposals can be realized depends on the attitude of every man and woman and upon the articulation of the desire for World Government. None of us is too small to do his part in saying what he wants in matters of world peace.

When in the Orient, the writer collected statements by the first servants of new India on this very question :

Said Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of India, on December 28, 1953, in his address to the participants in the International Legal Conference in New Delhi:—

One sometimes wonders how the nations of the world are going to keep one another in order, unless there is a super-State which controls every State, big or small, just as an individual's life and activity are controlled by the State of which he is a citizen.

Mr. M. Patanjali Sastri, then Chief Justice of India, said on the same occasion:—

It is now generally recognized that the concept of absolute state-sovereignty is the greatest obstacle to the evolution of a new system of regulation of international relations....

The instinct of self-preservation against this new danger, the Moloch of atomic war, should induce the national groups to revise and modify the concept of absolute sovereignty which has become obsolete in the context of the present-day world and give their consent to the creation of a new international order....We believe that the emergence of a new world community motivated by these ideas is not far off.

Some time ago, the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement at the Chicago University Radio Round Table:—

I have no doubt in my mind that World Government must and will come, for there is no other remedy for the world's sickness. The machinery for it is not difficult to devise. It can be an extension of the Federal principle, a growth of the idea underlying the United Nations, giving each national unit freedom to fashion its destiny according to its genius, but subject to the basic covenant of the World Government.<sup>1</sup>

Would it be permitted to ask whether leadership in transforming the United Nations into a World Federation might come from new India?<sup>2</sup>

At present, the Delegation of India, in comparison to all other delegations at the United Nations, represents the greatest number of human beings and occupies a middle position between two blocs now engaged in a cold war. No delegation in the United Nations is better placed than the representatives of India to take the initiative in proposing a fundamental change of the United Nations Charter in order to “remedy the world's sickness.”

Could new India become the leader on the road to World Federation?

---

<sup>1</sup> Address:—Keizersgracht 309, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

<sup>2</sup> Address;—21 Hampstead Lane, Highgate Village, London N. 6, England.