

**THE DECLARATION OF HUMANITY: AN INCLUSIVE DEFINITION
AND ITS OPERATIONAL NECESSITY**

Joseph D. Kirchner
Independent Scholar
May 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
I. THE DECLARATION	5
Article I — The Definition of Humanity	5
Article II — The Universal Claim	5
Article III — The Purpose of Government	6
Article IV — The Fractal Obligation	7
Article V — The Foreclosure of Redescription	8
Article VI — The Deliberative Form	10
Article VII — The Reciprocal Obligation	11
Article VIII — The Foundational Character	12
II. THE NECESSITY	12
<i>A. The Structural Failure of Assertion-Form Universal Rights</i>	13
<i>B. The Pattern of Redescription in the Contemporary Order</i>	15
<i>C. The Existing Framework's Requirement for the Foundational Move</i>	16
III. THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT	18
<i>A. The Declaration of Independence (1776)</i>	19
<i>B. The Reconstruction Amendments (1868–1870)</i>	20
<i>C. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)</i>	21
<i>D. The Codified Order at the International Scale (1945–1984)</i>	21
<i>E. The Contemporary Pattern (1986–2026)</i>	22
<i>F. The Convergence</i>	24
IV. THE STRUCTURAL GROUNDING	24
<i>A. The Bodily-Jurisdiction Floor</i>	24
<i>B. The Laws of Supremacism and Egalitarianism</i>	25
<i>C. The Fractal Imperative</i>	26
<i>D. The Madisonian Diagnostic</i>	27
<i>E. The Rejection-of-Law Analysis</i>	27
V. THE OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS	28
<i>A. For the Ratification Protocol</i>	28
<i>B. For Domestic Constitutional Architecture</i>	29
<i>C. For International Engagement</i>	30
<i>D. For Citizen Action</i>	31

<i>E. For the State 2 Enforcement Mechanism</i>	32
<i>F. What the Framework Is Not</i>	33
VI. CONCLUSION: THE SINGLE WORD AND THE EIGHT BILLION.....	36
VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY	37
Constitutional and Founding Documents.....	37
Treaties and International Instruments.....	38
Companion Works	38

INTRODUCTION

This Declaration articulates a foundational definitional premise grounding the codified democratic order at every scale of human organization: humanity is every person, every family, every people, and every nation — without exception, without precondition, without diminution at any scale. The shift from the assertion-form articulation of universal rights ("all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights") to the definitional-form articulation ("humanity is the inclusive whole at every scale") is structurally consequential. Assertion-form articulations are vulnerable to *redescription* — the supremacist's denial that an excluded group falls within the asserted category. Every historical regime of organized exclusion has operated through this mechanism. Definitional-form articulations are invulnerable to redescription, because to deny any member's humanity is to deny the definition itself, placing the redescrber outside the framework rather than within it for a narrower interpretation.

Humanity, on the Declaration's foundational definition, is constitutive and not forfeitable. No party, by any conduct, can divest itself or any other party of membership in humanity. What violation does is forfeit the reciprocal cooperation other members extend, activate collective self-defense rights of those affected, and — where the violation constitutes a crime against humanity — activate the broader right of all members of humanity to defend humanity itself. The framework's enforcement is structural rather than coercive: coherent dialogue that forecloses argument in defense of violation; the alliance of members coordinating responses; per-situation national enforcement (always); collective self-defense rights and defense-of-humanity rights together constitute the operational mechanism. The doctrines of *jus cogens* obligations *erga omnes*, universal jurisdiction over atrocity crimes, and the Responsibility to Protect are downstream operational expressions of this foundation.

This Declaration completes what the Declaration of Independence (1776) began: carrying the universal premise from assertion into the definitional form the contemporary order requires.

I. THE DECLARATION

We the constituents of humanity — persons, families, peoples, and nations — declaring our foundational premise to the world; recognizing that every governance at every scale derives its purpose from the universal claim of humanity; affirming that no party at any scale may operate outside this Declaration without forfeiting standing within the framework of governance itself; do solemnly declare:

Article I — The Definition of Humanity

Humanity is every person, every family, every people, and every nation — without exception, without precondition, without diminution at any scale. Humanity is constituted of all who exist; nothing more is required for membership; nothing less is permitted in scope. The definition is foundational: it is the premise from which all governance derives and against which all governance is measured. The definition admits no exception.

Article II — The Universal Claim

Each member of humanity possesses, by the same foundational claim, the right to life, the right to liberty, and the right to pursue happiness in its own form. These rights are not granted by any government; they are not contingent on any institutional recognition; they are not conditional on any membership beyond membership in humanity itself; they are not alienable except by the bearer's own consent with respect to the bearer's own person.

The universal claim operates at every scale where humanity is constituted. The person bears the claim in its irreducible form — bodily sovereignty, the floor from which all higher-level authority is derivative. The family bears the claim as the associational right to constitute itself, raise children, hold property, pursue collective flourishing. The people bears the claim as the cultural right to maintain identity, language, religion, custom, and collective practice. The nation bears the claim as the political right to self-govern, choose its constitutive form, and pursue its conception of common good. At every scale, the right is the same right, expressed in scale-appropriate form: the right to exist, to act free from arbitrary constraint, to pursue one's own conception of flourishing.

Article III — The Purpose of Government

Governments — at every scale of social organization — are constituted among the members of humanity to secure these rights. The just powers of government derive from the consent of those governed at the scale at which government operates. No government, at any scale, possesses authority that is prior to or above the universal claim of humanity that constitutes its purpose.

The conventional view that treats individual rights as limits on a presumptive state authority is structurally inverted: the state's authority is granted by, and exists for, the universal claim of humanity. Every higher-level government — local, state, federal, international — is derivative of the foundational claim that constitutes its purpose. No level has authority prior to or above the claim that constitutes its purpose. Each level's authority is protective and derivative — granted to defend the universal claim against violations originating from any source, including violations by other levels of government.

Article IV — The Fractal Obligation

The framework of governance, at every scale, exists to operationalize the universal claim of humanity and to forbid its violation at any scale, by any party, on any pretext. The obligation extends through every scale of human organization:

- *At the individual scale*, the framework protects bodily sovereignty — the floor of constitutional authority from which all higher-level authority is derivative.

- *At the family scale*, the framework protects associational integrity — the right of families to constitute themselves and to pursue collective flourishing free from arbitrary state intrusion.

- *At the people / community scale*, the framework protects cultural integrity — the right of peoples to maintain identity, language, religion, and collective practice free from coerced assimilation.

- *At the civil society scale*, the framework establishes cooperative protection of persons and property within the polity, with deliberative mechanisms for the resolution of disagreement.

- *At the federation scale*, the framework binds member states to inter-state cooperation that secures the rights of all member-state constituents across the federation, with structural enforcement against unilateral exit.

- *At the international order scale*, the framework binds member nations to inter-national cooperation that secures the rights of all human members across borders, operating through codified principles, deliberative mechanisms, and reciprocal recognition.

The fractal structure preserves identity at every scale. The framework operates *through* identity, not against it: states retain their identity within the federation; nations retain their identity within the international order; peoples retain their cultural specificity within the broader

human community; families retain their associational integrity within civil society; persons retain their bodily sovereignty within all higher-level structures.

Article V — The Foreclosure of Redescription

Humanity is constitutive and not forfeitable. No party, by any conduct however violent or supremacist, can divest itself or any other party of membership in humanity. The violator remains a member of humanity throughout; the redescriber remains a member of humanity throughout; the supremacist remains a member of humanity throughout. What humanity *is* cannot be defeated by what some of its members *do*.

The supremacist claim — that some are more human than others, that some are less than fully human, that some categories of person bear diminished or contingent rights — cannot succeed in fact, but it can occur in operation. When it does, it triggers three structural consequences:

First, the violator forfeits reciprocal cooperation. The framework operates by mutual recognition and reciprocation. A party that operationally denies the universal claim of humanity for others cannot coherently demand its protections for itself. The framework's other members are not required to extend the cooperative benefits of membership — lowered defensive posture, trade preferences, recognition, treaty network access, institutional support — to a party operating in violation. The reciprocation requires operation consistent with the foundational definitional premise.

Second, the violator activates collective self-defense rights of those affected. When the universal claim is violated, the affected parties retain — and the framework's other members may exercise in coordination — the natural right of collective self-defense against the violating

conduct. The framework does not coerce or impose through supranational mechanism; enforcement of violations remains at the per-situation national level. What the framework adds is structural recognition that the violation has occurred, dialogue that forecloses coherent argument in its defense, and the alliance of members coordinating their responses.

Third, the violator activates the right of all members of humanity to defend humanity itself. Where the violation constitutes a crime against humanity — genocide, slavery, ethnic cleansing, systematic torture, mass atrocity, apartheid, or analogous violations that operate against humanity as such — every member of humanity has standing to defend humanity through coordinated action, regardless of direct injury to the member. The right to defend humanity is distinct from collective self-defense: collective self-defense requires direct injury to the defender; defense of humanity requires only that the violation be a crime against humanity, with standing grounded in membership in humanity as such.

The defense-of-humanity right is the structural foundation of doctrines already operative within the codified democratic order. *Jus cogens* obligations *erga omnes* — binding on all states, owed to all — encompass the prohibitions on genocide, slavery, torture, racial discrimination, and aggression. Universal jurisdiction over atrocity crimes (piracy, slavery, genocide, torture, war crimes, crimes against humanity) operates because the crimes injure humanity as such; any state may prosecute on humanity's behalf because every state is a member of humanity. The Responsibility to Protect doctrine, recognized in the 2005 UN World Summit Outcome Document, articulates the same principle: where a state manifestly fails to protect its population from atrocity crimes, the international community has the responsibility to act. These doctrines are downstream operational expressions of the Declaration's foundational definitional premise.

The prevention of atrocities is therefore not merely a moral aspiration; it is the operational expression of humanity's right to defend itself. Crimes against humanity are operational attempts to redescribe humanity to exclude the targeted population. The defense-of-humanity right is the right to resist that attempt — through the framework's structural mechanisms (dialogue, alliance, collective self-defense by affected parties, defense of humanity by all members) operating consistently across the four enforcement mechanisms the framework supplies.

The framework's enforcement against redescription is therefore not coercive; it is structural and reciprocal. Coherent dialogue makes redescription impossible to defend within the framework; the alliance of members coordinates responses; affected parties retain natural rights of collective self-defense; all members of humanity retain defense-of-humanity standing against atrocity crimes; per-situation national enforcement remains the operative legal mechanism throughout. The framework's operational power lies in the combination of these structural features — not in any supranational coercive apparatus the framework does not have and should not seek.

Article VI — The Deliberative Form

Disagreement with the framework's operational instantiations is internal to the framework. The framework supplies deliberative mechanisms — at every scale — for the expression of disagreement: legislative process at the national scale; treaty negotiation, judicial adjudication, and customary-law development at the international scale; popular sovereignty at every scale. Unilateral declaration of being unbound by the framework's binding character is rejection of the framework, not legitimate disagreement.

Legitimate disagreement engages the framework's deliberative process: a party files written submissions developing alternative interpretations, appears at oral hearings, proposes treaty amendments through the framework's amendment procedures, develops subsequent state practice and *opinio juris*, accepts the framework's adjudication while continuing to argue for revisions in subsequent cases. A party that engages these mechanisms remains a participant in the framework even when arguing against its specific outcomes. Rejection of Law, by contrast, refuses to engage the deliberative process and instead declares unilaterally that the framework does not apply. The procedural form of the rejection — formal withdrawal, "unsigned" of signed instruments, sanctions on the framework's enforcement infrastructure, characterization of the body as illegitimate — does not change the structural status. The party is, on the framework's diagnostic, in the same structural position as a party that has never recognized the framework — but with the rhetorical infrastructure of bound membership concealing the structural exit.

To preserve participation in the framework while disagreeing is to honor the framework; to declare unilaterally that the framework does not apply is to reject it.

Article VII — The Reciprocal Obligation

Every member of humanity owes to every other member the recognition of equal membership. The obligation operates symmetrically: the obligation to recognize others as fully human is the obligation to demand recognition as fully human; the obligation to honor others' rights is the obligation to expect others to honor one's own.

The framework's enforcement, in the uninstituted condition where coercive infrastructure does not operate at the international scale, depends on the universal reciprocity that the definition of humanity makes structurally required. Each member's adherence to the framework in its

dealings with other members reinforces every other member's commitment to the same adherence. The framework holds together through this reciprocation; defection from reciprocation is the operational mechanism by which the framework is dismantled.

Article VIII — The Foundational Character

This Declaration is foundational. It is not subject to amendment by any party, at any scale, through any procedural mechanism. It states the premise on which all governance is constituted; any government, framework, or institutional arrangement that operates against this Declaration operates outside the constitutive purpose of governance itself.

Restoration of integrity, for any party that has operated against the Declaration, requires return to the foundational premise. Departure from the premise is departure from the framework. The Declaration cannot be diminished; it can only be honored or rejected. The framework operates on its honoring; rejection is structurally untenable in the long run, because the laws of social organization predict — and history confirms — that systems operating on exclusivity generate the coalition of opposition that natural law guarantees will form against the exclusivist.

II. THE NECESSITY

This Declaration is necessary now for three structural reasons. Each is independent; each is sufficient on its own to require the foundational definitional move; together they make the Declaration not merely useful but operationally required for the codified democratic order's continued operation.

A. The Structural Failure of Assertion-Form Universal Rights

Universal-rights claims have been articulated repeatedly across constitutional and international history. The Declaration of Independence (1776) declared "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."¹ The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), Article 1, declared "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights."² The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) recognizes "the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family."³ The Convention Against Torture, the Genocide Convention, the Geneva Conventions, the various regional human-rights instruments — each articulates the universal-rights premise in some form.

Each of these articulations operates in assertion form. The assertion is that all humans have certain rights; the assertion can be denied at the level of application by claiming that the excluded group is not fully human. The Atlantic slave trade did not deny that humans have rights — it denied that enslaved persons were fully human. Indigenous dispossession did not deny universal rights — it denied that indigenous peoples were the proper subjects of those rights. Imperial conquest did not deny that civilization confers rights — it denied that colonized peoples had attained the level of civilization at which rights apply. The Nazi genocide did not deny universal rights — it explicitly redefined Jews and others as outside humanity. Apartheid did not deny that persons have rights — it declared that race constituted a basis for different rights. In every case, the operational move was redescription: not the denial of the principle but the denial that the principle applies to the excluded group.

1 The Declaration of Independence (1776).

2 Universal Declaration of Human Rights art. 1, G.A. Res. 217 (III) A, U.N. Doc. A/810 (Dec. 10, 1948).

3 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights pmb., Dec. 16, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171.

The assertion-form articulation is structurally vulnerable to this move because it permits the supremacist to claim consistency with the principle while operating against the excluded group. The supremacist says: "I accept that all human beings have rights; I deny that *they* are fully human (or that they bear the same rights, or that the principle's application to them is the same as its application to us)." The assertion is preserved; the operation is exclusionary. This is the structural failure of every universal-rights articulation that has operated in assertion form.

The definitional-form articulation is structurally invulnerable to this move. *Humanity is every person, every family, every people, and every nation* is not a claim about a property of humans; it is a definition that constitutes humanity as the inclusive whole. To deny any group's humanity is to deny the definition itself — which means standing outside the framework, not operating within it for a narrower interpretation. The supremacist who would exclude any group must either accept the definition (and thereby accept the inclusion) or reject the framework altogether (and thereby forfeit standing within it).

This is the Declaration's structural-logical contribution: the shift from assertion to definition forecloses the operational mechanism by which every historical exclusion has functioned. The shift is not a philosophical preference among contested views; it is a logical correction. Assertion-form claims permit redescription at the level of application; definitional-form claims do not. The Declaration is necessary because no existing instrument performs this definitional move with the structural force the framework requires.

B. The Pattern of Redescription in the Contemporary Order

The historical pattern is not merely historical. The contemporary international order continues to operate through redescription, in forms that the existing assertion-form instruments cannot foreclose.

Categorical counterterrorism predicates — the operational practice by which entire populations or political identities are characterized as "extremist" or "terrorist" without regard to specific conduct — operate by redescribing the targeted populations as outside the normal protections of law and policy. The 2026 *U.S. Counterterrorism Strategy*'s anti-Israel-extremism predicate, the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance Working Definition's adoption as a U.S. federal-policy instrument operating to characterize anti-Zionism as antisemitism, the broader Treasury sanctions regime targeting humanitarian and advocacy organizations operating in or in solidarity with Palestinian populations — each operates by redescribing political identity or advocacy as a national-security threat, thereby placing the redescribed subjects outside the protections that humanity entails.

Dehumanizing rhetoric in active conflicts continues to operate as the rhetorical infrastructure of organized violence. Statements characterizing Palestinians as "human animals," Israelis as deserving collective destruction, migrants as "invaders" rather than as human beings seeking safety, refugees as security threats rather than as members of humanity in displaced circumstance — each operates by redescription, with operational consequences ranging from policy decisions through individual violence to organized atrocity.

Exclusionary nationalism in domestic politics operates by drawing the boundary of full citizenship at categories that exclude some members of the polity. Anti-immigrant policy that operationalizes itself through dehumanizing rhetoric; "good immigrants vs. bad immigrants"

framings that condition humanity on assimilation; voter-suppression operations that redescribe minority voting as illegitimate or fraudulent; legislative attempts to redefine citizenship through birthright restriction — each is the operational descendant of the historical pattern.

International defection from the codified democratic order — the four-decade pattern documented in the companion research brief — operates by redescribing the rejected institution as illegitimate. EO 14203's declaration that the ICC has "no jurisdiction over the United States or Israel" operates by redescription: the institution that 125+ states have bound themselves to is characterized as lacking authority over the redescribing party. The Bolton unsigning of the Rome Statute (2002), the U.S. Article 63 declaration in *South Africa v. Israel* (2025), the 2026 sixty-six-organization memorandum — each operates by redescription. The institution does not lose its authority through the redescription, but the redescribing party operates as if it did, and the framework's diagnostic identifies the operation as USURPATION and the redescribing party as defecting from the framework's foundational premise.

The contemporary pattern of redescription cannot be foreclosed by existing assertion-form instruments because each operates by claiming consistency with universal-rights principles while denying their application to the redescribed subjects. The Declaration's definitional move forecloses the operational mechanism: humanity is the inclusive whole; redescription is denial of the definition; denial of the definition is rejection of the framework itself.

C. The Existing Framework's Requirement for the Foundational Move

The bodily-jurisdiction framework, the Madisonian Compliance Test, the Power Separation Vulnerability taxonomy, the three-level meta-violation diagnosis, the Laws of Supremacism and Egalitarianism — these supply diagnostic apparatus for identifying violations at every scale. The

diagnostic identifies USURPATION (a Position of Assigned Power exercising authority assigned to a different Position), ABDICATION (a Position failing to exercise mandatory authority), redescription as the operational form of supremacism, and the structural-indistinguishability of the disguised rejecter from the never-bound party.

But the diagnostic operates on violations *after* they have occurred. It does not foreclose, at the foundational level, the operational mechanism by which violation becomes possible. The supremacist who redescribes can be diagnosed as engaged in supremacist operation; until the definitional move is performed, the redescription cannot be foreclosed at the level of the framework's own premise. The Declaration completes the architecture: the bodily-jurisdiction floor articulates humanity at the individual scale; the fractal imperative recapitulates the universal claim at every scale; the Madisonian framework supplies the diagnostic; the Laws of S/E predict consequences of violation; the Rejection of Law analysis diagnoses defection. The Declaration supplies the foundational definitional premise from which all of these derive their force.

The requirement is operationally consequential because the codified democratic order at the global scale operates permanently in the uninstituted condition. No global sovereign with coercive enforcement infrastructure operates over the member states. The framework holds together only through the integrity of its members — the voluntary commitment to operate the framework's principles in dealings with other members. A member that defects cannot be coerced into compliance; the framework's recourse is the integrity of the other members. The framework's stability is a function of collective commitment to the foundational premise; its instability is a function of any individual member's defection.

In this condition, the foundational premise's structural form matters operationally. An assertion-form premise — "all human beings have rights" — is vulnerable to defection through redescription, as the historical and contemporary patterns demonstrate. A definitional-form premise — "humanity is the inclusive whole" — is invulnerable, because redescription is denial of the premise itself, not an interpretation within it. The definitional form makes integrity structurally robust: a member that operates outside the inclusive definition has placed itself outside the framework, and the framework's other members are structurally required to recognize the defection rather than absorb it as legitimate disagreement.

The Declaration is therefore not just useful but operationally required. The framework that operates only through member integrity must rest on a foundational premise that integrity can hold without becoming vulnerable to the supremacist's redescriptive move. The definitional form supplies that foundation; the Declaration articulates the form.

III. THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The Declaration is not a constitutional innovation. It is the modern declarative articulation of a premise that human moral and political thought has been articulating, in incomplete form, for centuries. The historical record shows the premise being repeatedly approached, partially articulated, partially operationalized, and partially recovered — but never articulated with the structural force that the contemporary order requires.

A. The Declaration of Independence (1776)

The Declaration of Independence is the proximate historical antecedent. Its second paragraph contains what is, in retrospect, the most consequential single sentence in the foundational documents of modern democratic government:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.⁴

The sentence operates as the foundational premise for the entire American constitutional project. It articulates four claims that, together, constitute the universal-rights premise: (1) the equality claim — all men are created equal; (2) the inalienability claim — the rights are unalienable, not contingent on government recognition; (3) the substantive claim — the rights include life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; (4) the source claim — the rights are endowed by the Creator, not granted by the state.

But the Declaration's operationalization in the United States Constitution (1789) was structurally particular. The Preamble articulates the Constitution's purpose: "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."⁵ The operative purpose-securing phrase is "to ourselves and our Posterity" — an American particularization of what the Declaration had declared universally.

The original Constitution operationalized the universal premise for white male property-holding American citizens. Enslaved persons were defined as 3/5 of a person for purposes of

⁴ The Declaration of Independence (1776).

⁵ U.S. Const. pmbl.

representation (Article I, Section 2);⁶ indigenous peoples were excluded from "We the People";⁷ women, the property-less, and others were excluded from the franchise. The founding articulated the premise and particularized the operation. The Declaration of Humanity completes what the Declaration of Independence began by articulating the inclusive premise in definitional rather than assertion form.

B. The Reconstruction Amendments (1868–1870)

The Reconstruction Amendments — the Thirteenth (abolition of slavery, 1865), the Fourteenth (citizenship and equal protection, 1868), and the Fifteenth (voting rights without race discrimination, 1870) — partially restored the universal-rights premise at the federal-state interface.⁸ The Fourteenth Amendment's "any person within its jurisdiction" is structurally significant: it carries the declared weight that the original Constitution's "ourselves and our Posterity" did not. The Fourteenth Amendment operates as the partial recovery of the Declaration's universal premise within the American constitutional structure.

The recovery was substantial but incomplete. The Reconstruction Amendments operationalized the universal premise within the United States, but the federal-international interface remained structurally particular. The United States continued — and continues — to operate the codified democratic order's protections particularistically: enforcing them domestically while rejecting external accountability through the four-decade defection pattern.

6 U.S. Const. art. I, § 2, cl. 3 (the Three-Fifths Clause, repealed by the Fourteenth Amendment, § 2).

7 U.S. Const. art. I, § 2, cl. 3 ("excluding Indians not taxed"); see also *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, 30 U.S. (5 Pet.) 1 (1831) (characterizing Cherokee Nation as "domestic dependent nation").

8 U.S. Const. amend. XIII (abolishing slavery, ratified 1865); U.S. Const. amend. XIV (establishing citizenship and equal protection, ratified 1868); U.S. Const. amend. XV (prohibiting denial of vote based on race, ratified 1870).

The Reconstruction Amendments' recovery applies fractally at the federal-state interface; the framework's project is to apply the same recovery at the federal-international interface.

C. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, articulated the universal-rights premise at the international scale.⁹ Its preamble recognizes "the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family" as "the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world."¹⁰ Article 1 declares: "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights."¹¹ The Declaration's thirty articles articulate civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights, applied universally.

The UDHR's articulation operates in assertion form. It claims that all human beings have certain rights; it does not perform the definitional move that constitutes humanity as the inclusive whole. The vulnerability of the assertion form has manifested operationally: in the decades since the UDHR's adoption, every major regime of organized exclusion has continued to operate through redescription — characterizing excluded groups as somehow outside the universal premise's application. The UDHR's foundational role in the codified democratic order is not in question; what is in question is whether its assertion-form articulation supplies the structural foundation that the contemporary framework requires.

D. The Codified Order at the International Scale (1945–1984)

The codified democratic order at the international scale has been articulated incrementally since 1945, through a network of treaties and instruments that together constitute the order's

9 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. Res. 217 (III) A, U.N. Doc. A/810 (Dec. 10, 1948).

10 Universal Declaration of Human Rights pmb., G.A. Res. 217 (III) A, U.N. Doc. A/810 (Dec. 10, 1948).

11 Universal Declaration of Human Rights art. 1, G.A. Res. 217 (III) A, U.N. Doc. A/810 (Dec. 10, 1948).

substantive content. The UN Charter (1945) establishes the basic framework. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) articulates the universal-rights premise. The Genocide Convention (1948) prohibits the destruction of national, ethnical, racial, or religious groups. The Geneva Conventions (1949) establish protections for non-combatants and prisoners of war. The Refugee Convention (1951) establishes protections for those fleeing persecution. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966) codify the UDHR's principles as treaty-law. The Convention Against Torture (1984) prohibits torture and mandates universal jurisdiction over its perpetrators.

Each of these instruments articulates the universal-rights premise in some form. Each operates in assertion form. The codified order is therefore vulnerable, at the foundational level, to redescription — and the contemporary defection pattern operationalizes that vulnerability. The Declaration's project is to articulate, with the structural force the order now requires, the foundational definitional premise that the codified order has been progressively but incompletely articulating since 1945.

E. The Contemporary Pattern (1986–2026)

The contemporary period has seen the operational form of redescription expand at multiple scales. At the international scale, the United States and Israel have systematically rejected the codified democratic order's enforcement infrastructure through six procedural mechanisms catalogued in the companion research brief: the 1986 ICJ withdrawal following the *Nicaragua* judgment; the 2005 withdrawal from the Vienna Convention Optional Protocol following *Avena*; the 2002 Bolton unsigning of the Rome Statute; the 2020 and 2025 ICC sanctions regimes (EO

13928, EO 14203); the U.S. Article 63 declaration in *South Africa v. Israel* (2025); the 2026 sixty-six-organization memorandum. Each operates by redescription: the targeted institution is characterized as illegitimate; its jurisdiction is declared null; the framework's protections are operationalized particularistically.

At the domestic scale, exclusionary politics have operated in parallel form. The 2026 *U.S. Counterterrorism Strategy*'s anti-Israel-extremism predicate, the IHRA framework's domestic policy adoption, anti-immigrant policy operationalized through dehumanizing rhetoric, the broader Treasury sanctions regime targeting humanitarian organizations — each operates by redescription at the domestic-policy scale.

At the operational scale in active conflicts, redescription continues to enable organized violence. Statements characterizing Palestinians as less than fully human have accompanied the conduct in Gaza; statements characterizing migrants as "invaders" have accompanied policies operationalizing dehumanizing detention conditions; statements characterizing political opposition as "enemies" have accompanied attempts to operationalize legal frameworks against the opposition.

The pattern at every scale is structurally identical: redescription is the operational mechanism; the assertion-form universal-rights premise cannot foreclose redescription; the framework's diagnostic identifies the redescription as supremacist operation; the framework's foundational definitional move is the logical-structural foreclosure of the operational mechanism. The Declaration is the contemporary articulation of that foreclosure at the scale the contemporary order requires.

F. The Convergence

The historical record reveals a convergent trajectory toward the definitional move without ever performing it. Each step has expanded the scope of the universal-rights premise — from the Declaration of Independence's "all men," through the Fourteenth Amendment's "any person within its jurisdiction," to the UDHR's "all human beings" — but each has remained in assertion form. The Declaration of Humanity completes the trajectory by articulating the universal premise in definitional form, applied fractally to every scale where humanity operates as a subject. The structural-logical apparatus required for the move — the bodily-jurisdiction floor, the Madisonian Compliance Test, the Laws of S/E (formally stated in first-order logic), the fractal imperative, the rejection-of-Law analysis — has only recently come together to make the contemporary articulation possible.

IV. THE STRUCTURAL GROUNDING

The Declaration is foundational to the framework that the companion works articulate. Each companion work supplies an operational component of the framework; the Declaration supplies the premise from which all components derive.

A. The Bodily-Jurisdiction Floor

The bodily-jurisdiction framework articulates *bodily jurisdiction at the individual human level* as the floor of constitutional authority — the primary sovereignty from which all higher-level authority is derivative. The floor is humanity at the individual scale: the irreducible expression of the universal claim that the Declaration articulates inclusively at every scale. The framework's diagnostic distinguishes direct floor violations (state action crossing into the bodily sphere),

indirect floor violations (state action removing the means necessary to preserve bodily integrity), and particularized-enforcement violations (state action operating external to the bodily sphere but effectively foreclosing internal decisions).

Under the Declaration, the floor is not merely the framework's irreducible minimum; it is the operational expression of humanity at the individual scale. The Declaration grounds the floor in the foundational definitional premise: every person bears the universal claim because every person is a member of humanity; the floor protects what humanity entails at the individual scale; the framework's diagnostic operates by reference to the foundational premise the Declaration articulates.

B. The Laws of Supremacism and Egalitarianism

The Laws of Supremacism and Egalitarianism state, axiomatically, that sustained conflict requires a supremacist claim somewhere in the system (the Law of Supremacism: $\forall S, \forall C \subset S, SC(C) \Rightarrow \exists P(E_x, E_y)$), and that systems of pairwise equal entities cannot sustain conflict (the Law of Egalitarianism: $\forall S, (\forall E_x, E_y \in S, Eq(E_x, E_y)) \Rightarrow \neg SC(C)$). The Laws supply the substrate predictions: exclusivity at any scale generates the coalition of opposition that natural law guarantees will form against the exclusivist; congruent inclusion at every scale precludes the conflict-generating dynamic.

The Declaration is the operational expression of the Laws' substrate. The definitional move forecloses the supremacist claim at the foundational level. By defining humanity as the inclusive whole, the Declaration places every member in the equal-entity condition the Law of Egalitarianism requires; the substrate's prediction operationalizes the Declaration's structural commitment to peace. The structural backing of eight billion members is the substrate's

operational expression: every member of humanity has the same definitional stake in the framework's integrity; defection from the definitional commitment generates the coalition the Law of Supremacism predicts will form.

C. The Fractal Imperative

The fractal imperative articulates that the social-contract object — cooperation between constituents to secure persons and property → collective survival — recapitulates at every scale of social organization. The template is identical at each level; only the constituents change. The Constitutional Convention and the Marshall Plan are structurally identical operations applied at different scales. The work is never done; it scales fractally with each new layer of social organization.

The Declaration is the foundational premise on which the fractal imperative operates. The universal claim is the same at every scale because humanity is the same inclusive whole at every scale where it is constituted. The fractal imperative's operational form — reciprocation among members + policy toward non-members — is the operational expression of the foundational reciprocity that the Declaration's Article VII requires. The framework's contraction (the contemporary US/Israeli pattern) is the structural opposite of the fractal imperative; the framework's expansion (the historical Marshall Plan-style operations) is its constructive operationalization. The Declaration grounds the imperative in the foundational definitional premise: the same humanity at every scale, the same right at every scale, the same reciprocal obligation at every scale.

D. The Madisonian Diagnostic

The Madisonian Compliance Test, the Power Separation Vulnerability taxonomy (USURPATION/ABDICATION), the process-challenge / violation-claim distinction, the Supremacy Clause "in Pursuance thereof" validity test, and the recovery of equitable standing for binary textual violations — together these supply the diagnostic apparatus for identifying when constitutional structure is violated at any scale. The diagnostic operates by structural-textual analysis, without subjective policy judgments; it tests whether claimed authority derives validly from constitutional grants.

Under the Declaration, the Madisonian diagnostic operates by reference to the foundational premise the Declaration articulates. The Position of Assigned Power is humanity (at the relevant scale) or its agents (governments at every level). USURPATION is the exercise of authority not assigned by humanity's constitutive purposes. ABDICATION is the failure to exercise mandatory authority that the universal claim requires. The diagnostic's structural force comes from its grounding in a foundational premise that admits no exception: the Declaration's definitional move makes the diagnostic universally applicable because the premise on which the diagnostic operates is universally inclusive.

E. The Rejection-of-Law Analysis

The Rejection of Law analysis articulates the constitutional case against unilateral executive treaty withdrawal at the federal-international interface, identifying four independent doctrinal grounds (Supremacy Clause, Inferior-Officer Exception, War-Powers, Structural-Fractal) and characterizing the contemporary defection pattern as paradigm USURPATION of the Senate's

assigned treaty power. The analysis grounds the defection pattern as structurally identical to the Confederate secession that the Civil War enforced Article IV § 4 against.

Under the Declaration, the Rejection of Law analysis operates as the diagnostic application of the foundational premise to the federal-international interface. The treaty-defection pattern is redescription operationalized at the inter-state scale: the rejecting party characterizes the international democratic deliberative bodies as illegitimate, thereby placing the bodies' constituents (members of humanity at the international scale) outside the protections the framework supplies. The Declaration grounds the analysis in the foundational definitional premise: the international order's protections operate on humanity at the international scale; defection from the protections is redescription of humanity; redescription is foreclosed at the foundational level.

V. THE OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The Declaration is foundational, but it is not merely theoretical. It has operational implications at every scale where the framework operates.

A. For the Ratification Protocol

The Declaration supplies the foundational article of the ratification protocol for nations entering — or restoring integrity to — the codified democratic order. A nation's ratification is, at its core, the affirmation of the Declaration: the nation affirms that humanity is the inclusive whole at every scale, that the universal claim attaches to every member of humanity, that the nation's governance is constituted to secure that claim, and that the nation will operate the framework's principles reciprocally with all other members.

The necessary constitutional features (the Guarantee Clause analog, the Supremacy Clause analog with treaty integration, the deliberative-concurrence requirement for binding international commitments, the anti-defection structural mechanism, the Article V analog, the deliberative war-powers, the independent judicial review with standing for structural violations, the floor protection, the officer-oath / independent constitutional duty, and the periodic elections) become the structural form by which the ratifying nation honors the Declaration's affirmation. A nation whose constitutive governance contains analogs to these features is structurally qualified for ratification; a nation that lacks them needs constitutional reform before ratification is structurally possible.

The ratification protocol's three operational variants — first ratification (by polities in transition or newly constituting); full-compliance ratification (by existing polities with integrity that have not formally articulated their ratification); restoration of integrity (by polities in systematic defection) — each operates on the foundation of the Declaration. The protocol's structural force comes from its grounding in the foundational definitional premise.

B. For Domestic Constitutional Architecture

The Declaration has implications for the domestic constitutional architecture of every polity that affirms it. The polity must enforce internally what it affirms externally: the universal claim of humanity must operate at every constituent scale within the polity. Internal exclusivity (denial of full membership to some persons within the polity) is structurally incompatible with affirmation of the Declaration at the external scale.

The American constitutional structure exemplifies the pattern. The Reconstruction Amendments operationalized the universal premise at the federal-state interface; the

Declaration's affirmation at the federal-international interface would require the United States to operate consistently at both interfaces. The contemporary defection pattern is structurally incompatible with the affirmation; restoration requires the polity to extend at the external scale what it has substantially achieved at the internal scale.

The same structural test applies to every polity. Polities that operate internal exclusivity (whether through caste, racial categorization, religious test, gender restriction, indigenous dispossession, or other historical or contemporary exclusionary structures) cannot consistently affirm the Declaration at the external scale; the affirmation requires the polity to operationalize the universal premise at every internal scale as well as at the international scale.

C. For International Engagement

The Declaration has implications for every form of international engagement. Treaty entry must operate on the Declaration's premise: the treaty's constituent commitments must be consistent with the universal claim at every scale. Treaty withdrawal must operate through the framework's deliberative mechanisms, not through unilateral declaration; the unilateral defection pattern is structurally foreclosed at the foundational level. Adjudication before international democratic deliberative bodies must be engaged with substantively; defection through redescription of the body as illegitimate is foreclosed.

Sanctions and other coercive measures must be calibrated to the foundational premise. Targeted sanctions against individuals responsible for specific violations of the framework are consistent with the Declaration; categorical sanctions targeting populations or political identities are inconsistent. Aid and policy toward non-members must operate the framework's principles consistently with the Declaration's universal premise; aid conditioned on internal compliance

with the framework's principles is consistent; aid conditioned on identity, ideology, or other supremacist criteria is inconsistent.

D. For Citizen Action

The Declaration has implications for citizen action at every scale. Every person, by virtue of membership in humanity, bears the same fundamental claim and the same reciprocal obligation. The framework's operational sustenance depends on citizen action at every scale: at the individual scale (recognition of others as fully human), at the family scale (constitution of families on the inclusive premise), at the people / community scale (recognition of equal cultural integrity for all peoples), at the political scale (advocacy and political action for the framework's principles).

Citizen action under the Declaration is not limited to formal political channels. Every interaction between persons is, at some level, an operation of the framework or against it. Recognition of others as fully human is the operational form of the Declaration's affirmation; redescription of others as less than fully human is the operational form of its rejection. The framework's State 2 enforcement depends on the universal reciprocation that citizen action constitutes.

For citizens of polities in systematic defection — the United States and Israel in the contemporary period — the operational implication is particular. The polity's defection is not the citizen's defection; the citizen bears the obligation to demand the polity's restoration of integrity to the framework. The recovered equitable-standing analysis (developed in the Madisonian foundation paper) supplies the procedural pathway by which citizens may enforce the constitutional structure against the polity's defection. The Declaration grounds the analysis in the

foundational definitional premise: the citizen's standing derives from membership in humanity; the polity's defection is structurally inconsistent with the citizen's stake in the framework; the citizen's enforcement action is the operational form of the framework's State 2 enforcement at the domestic-constitutional scale.

E. For the State 2 Enforcement Mechanism

The Declaration grounds the State 2 enforcement mechanism that the framework's uninstituted condition requires. The mechanism operates through reciprocation among members; the reciprocation's structural foundation is the universal-equal-membership the Declaration articulates definitionally; the framework's enforcement at the international scale is the operational expression of the foundational reciprocity the Declaration's Article VII requires.

When a member defects from the framework — through unilateral treaty withdrawal, through redescription of other members or populations, through asymmetric application of the framework's principles — the framework's other members are structurally required to recognize the defection rather than absorb it as legitimate disagreement. The structural-indistinguishability claim operates: the defecting member is, on the framework's diagnostic, in the same structural position as a party that has never recognized the framework — but with the rhetorical infrastructure of bound membership concealing the structural exit. The framework's enforcement consists in operationalizing the structural-indistinguishability: the defecting member's claim to the framework's protections is structurally foreclosed; the framework's other members are required, by the Declaration's reciprocal obligation, to operate the framework consistently with the structural diagnostic.

The State 2 enforcement does not require coercive infrastructure. It requires the integrity of the framework's other members to operate the framework's principles consistently — to refuse to absorb redescription as legitimate disagreement, to refuse to extend the framework's protections to those who would deny them to others, to refuse to participate in the defecting member's operational mechanisms. The Sumud article's diagnosis of the third-level meta-violation (deference-based non-execution of triggered jurisdictional warrants) identifies the operational form of the framework's enforcement failure: members holding triggered warrants fail to execute them while performing the rhetoric of compliance. The Declaration grounds the diagnostic: the failure is the failure of integrity; the framework's enforcement requires the operationalization of integrity by the members who hold the warrants.

F. What the Framework Is Not

The Declaration's project will be characterized by critics as an attempt to establish a "one-world government" — a global sovereign with supranational authority over nations, eroding sovereignty, homogenizing identity, displacing national constitutions. The characterization is structurally incorrect at every point. The framework is *non-coercive*, *non-supranational*, and *fractal*; identity is preserved at every scale; the only requirement for inclusion is the reciprocity already demanded at each level for the level's own internal operation.

Non-coercive. The framework has no enforcement infrastructure of its own and seeks none. Enforcement of legal violations remains at the per-situation national level, where it would be without the institution. The framework's operational mechanisms — coherent dialogue, the alliance of members, collective self-defense rights of those affected, and defense-of-humanity rights against atrocity crimes — operate structurally and reciprocally, never coercively. No

global police force; no global army; no global tribunal with power to compel compliance against the will of a member state. The framework explicitly forecloses all of these as structurally incompatible with its character.

Non-supranational. The framework does not stand above the member states. There is no global sovereign with authority to override national constitutions, no global legislature with power to legislate over national parliaments, no global executive with authority to direct national executives. Each member state retains complete sovereignty over its internal affairs, governed by its own constitutional process. The framework operates *among* states, not above them; its operational power is the structural recognition that members operating reciprocally generate, not authority that displaces national governance.

Fractal — identity preserved at every scale. The framework operates *through* identity, not against it. States retain their identity within the federation; nations retain their identity within the international order; peoples retain their cultural specificity within the broader human community; families retain their associational integrity within civil society; persons retain their bodily sovereignty within all higher-level structures (Article IV makes this explicit). The framework's fractal structure is the structural opposite of homogenization: each scale preserves what makes it distinct while operating the universal claim that humanity entails. The Declaration's affirmation does not erase national identity, cultural specificity, or constitutional particularity; it requires only that polities at each scale honor the same universal claim in dealings outside their scale that they honor in dealings within it.

Only the reciprocity already demanded at each level. This is the structural point that defeats the one-world-government characterization most thoroughly. The framework asks nothing of nations that nations do not already demand of their own constituent units. A federal

state already demands of its constituent states that they operate republican forms of government (Art. IV § 4 in the United States Constitution; analogous provisions in other federations). A nation already demands of its provinces or regions that they recognize the universal claim of humanity in some operational form. A polity already demands of its civil society that it secure persons and property within the polity. At every scale, polities already enforce the framework's principles internally; the Declaration asks only that they apply the same principles externally, in their dealings with other polities at the same scale.

The structural symmetry is what the rejection of the framework cannot coherently defend. A nation that demands its constituent states operate republican governance while rejecting the same principle at the international scale operates particularized enforcement — applying the principle downward while exempting itself upward. The Declaration's project is to restore the symmetric application of principles that polities already enforce internally. It does not ask polities to accept anything new; it asks them to accept, externally, what they already require internally. The "one-world government" characterization misunderstands the framework entirely: there is no new sovereign, no new enforcement, no new authority. There is only the symmetric application of what each polity already demands of its own constituents.

The framework's fractal architecture is therefore the precise opposite of the unitary world-state. A unitary world-state would centralize sovereignty, erode identity at every scale, and replace national constitutions with a single supranational order. The Declaration's framework decentralizes operationally (enforcement at the per-situation national level always), preserves identity at every scale (the fractal structure operates through, not against, identity), and preserves national constitutions as the operative legal mechanism within which the framework's principles

are honored. The characterization conflates two structurally opposite arrangements; the conflation cannot survive engagement with what the Declaration actually articulates.

VI. CONCLUSION: THE SINGLE WORD AND THE EIGHT BILLION

The Declaration's contribution is structural and logical, not philosophical. It articulates the logical structure of social contract itself — objective, invariant across time, place, and culture, applicable to any operative social arrangement at any scale — in definitional rather than assertion form. The foundational premise on which the codified democratic order's operation depends is not contestable opinion or culturally specific normative claim; it is the structurally necessary form of any social contract that operates universally over its constituents. The shift from assertion to definition is not rhetorical and not philosophical; it is a logical correction. Assertion-form articulations permit redescription at the level of application; definitional-form articulations do not. The assertion-form articulation of universal rights has been the foundational premise of constitutional and international democratic order for two and a half centuries, and has been vulnerable, at the foundational level, to the redescriptive move by which every historical exclusion has operated. The definitional-form articulation forecloses the redescriptive move at the foundational level.

The single word — *humanity* — properly defined, becomes insurmountable. To deny the definition is to stand outside the framework; to operate within the framework is to accept the definition. The framework's protections derive from membership in humanity; redescription of humanity to exclude any group is rejection of the framework, not interpretation within it. Every person, every family, every people, every nation has the same definitional stake in the framework's integrity. Defection from the foundational premise is defection from a framework

that has eight billion members; the cost of defection scales with the membership's reach; the framework's enforcement in the State 2 uninstituted condition operates through this reach.

The Declaration is the foundational article of the ratification protocol that the framework's project requires. A nation ratifying — or restoring integrity to — the codified democratic order affirms the Declaration. The affirmation is not procedural compliance with a contestable principle; it is the foundational commitment the framework's operation requires. The American founding required the same resolve at the constituent-states scale; the contemporary order requires the same resolve at the international scale; the resolve is the resolve to operationalize what the universal premise has been declaring, in incomplete form, for two and a half centuries.

This is the work. The American founding declared its first half. The Declaration of Humanity declares its second.

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Constitutional and Founding Documents

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE (U.S. 1776).

U.S. CONST.

U.S. CONST. amend. XIII.

U.S. CONST. amend. XIV.

U.S. CONST. amend. XV.

Treaties and International Instruments

CONVENTION AGAINST TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT, Dec. 10, 1984, 1465 U.N.T.S. 85.

CONVENTION ON THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF GENOCIDE, Dec. 9, 1948, 78 U.N.T.S. 277.

GENEVA CONVENTIONS, Aug. 12, 1949, 75 U.N.T.S. 31, 85, 135, 287.

INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS, Dec. 16, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171.

INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS, Dec. 16, 1966, 993 U.N.T.S. 3.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER, June 26, 1945, 1 U.N.T.S. XVI.

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, G.A. Res. 217 (III) A, U.N. Doc. A/810 (Dec. 10, 1948).

Companion Works

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *Applied Diagnostics: Structural Analysis of Active Conflicts Through the Bodily-Jurisdiction Framework* (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *Bodily Jurisdiction: The Floor of Constitutional Authority* (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *The Madisonian Separation of Powers Objective Compliance Test: Recovering Constitutional Structure Through Textual Analysis* (May 2026) (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *Means, Not Views: The Constitutional Distinction Between Radicalism and Extremism* (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *The Rejection of Law: Treaty Defection, State Secession, and the Fractal Constitution* (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *Torture in the Codified Democratic Order: The May 2026 Sumud Flotilla and the Three-Level Meta-Violation* (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *US and Israeli Rejection of International Adjudication: A Research Brief* (manuscript on file with author).