

# Letter to World Citizens

1/3, July '77

July, 1977

"Because of the importance and novelty of the issue, I believe that the legal question is one that could be accepted by the Supreme Court of the United States."

The words were written to me May 23 in a letter summarizing the status of my case with the United States Government. The letter was written by David Carliner, one of Washington's most eminent civil liberties lawyers, a general counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union, a board member of the International League for Human Rights, a member of the Advisory Board of Amnesty International, an attorney who has been dealing with immigration issues for more than 25 years.

The specific issue to be decided is whether a native-born American who has renounced his U.S. citizenship, has declared himself a world citizen, has founded a government to sanction that citizenship, has been issued a passport by that government, should be allowed to enter the U.S. That's what I tried to do May 13th at Dulles International Airport. I tried to come home.

The U. S. says I can't - not because of anything I have done, or said or advocated. The U.S., it seems, has no official objection to **me**. Its objection is that I failed to produce a piece of paper that meets the Immigration and Naturalization Service's precisely defined requirements.

But there is, or course, more at stake than the question of whether one native son can be excluded because the travel document he carries does not meet the bureaucratic standard of the moment. The underlying issue concerns the legitimacy of the nation-state itself as the ultimate governing institution of human society in the nuclear age. The key question joining the narrow question of passports with the broad issue of the absolute sovereignty of the nation is whether allegiance to World Government is compatible or in conflict with allegiance to the Constitution of the United States of America.

The issue involves the security of every American. Is the individual legally justified in choosing a sovereign status beyond the limits of his or her nation-state? Precedents abound. U.N. personnel, international civil servants, the "blue caskets" of the U.N., etc. Some jurists even contend that since the Nuremberg Decision, everyone enjoys international civic character. If the U. S. courts decide that I am a citizen of World Government by virtue of the right of the individual to choose a political status - a choice recognized whenever an immigrant is granted U. S. citizenship and conversely by a section of the Nationality Act of 1940 recognizing the right to renounce U.S. citizenship - the implications are staggering.

Rival national citizenries breed dissent, animosity and finally war. A unifying citizenship eliminates animosity and deadly rivalry. Would Israelis and Jordanians consider each other enemies if both were citizens of World Government? (For "Israeli" and "Jordanian" read any other rival national citizenry.)

The lesson of America itself is precisely this. "E Pluribus Unum". The Founding Fathers founded a union from many parts. Now we intend to test the very principle of union in a legal confrontation with a nation whose political philosophy is grounded in it. We intend to prove that no national constitution in a nuclear-interdependent world - even that of so-called super-powers - can preserve its people from the holocaust of world war. We will point out that the 9th and 10th amendments to the U.S. Constitution were designed to provide extension of civic commitment to newly-created institutions which by definition superceded that of the individual states. We will claim that the Founding Fathers foresaw this day when the American people would be totally threatened and when the Constitution itself which delegated powers to protect their lives and well-being would be inadequate, even impotent to this task.

I am a self-declared citizen of World Government. I hope you are too. It is our inalienable right to choose our own political status. The World Government issued me its passport, the same kind it issues daily to hundreds of fellow world citizens. This passport represents the right of all humans to travel freely on their planet earth - which they did less than 50 years ago. This right has been codified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The U. S. President himself advocates the implementation of this Declaration as an obligation of all members-states of the United Nations.

Those are the reasons why the U.S. courts should finally decide to accept my status as a world citizen and uphold my right to travel on the passport issued by the World Government.

But suppose the Supreme Court refuses to review the case, or after review, upholds the contention of the U.S. Government that I not be admitted. What then? Back to England via Pan American, to Heathrow Airport where I embarked on May 13?

What position would the British government take? I would still be identified only by the World Government passport. Would Her Majesty's government be obligated to accept my claim of world citizen status which the U.S. government had just refused? Obviously not.

In fact, on July 23, 1953, after arbitrarily detaining me in Brixton Prison for nine weeks, the Home Office deported me to the U.S. as an "undesirable alien". At that time, the U.S. Immigration authorities accepted me quite literally with open arms. When I refused to disembark from the Queen Mary at New York, they forced me off the ship onto U.S. soil with the aid of two New York City policemen.

So we can't lose. The process may take two years or more to run its course. But in the end, either the U.S. courts will accept the validity of world citizenship thereby opening the way for all Americans to extend their citizenship rights and responsibilities in conformity with the 9th and 10th amendments, or the British government will, or the U.S. will be obliged to accept a native son who is forcefully repatriated by another sovereign state.

In any event the impotence of the sovereign nation-state and the absurdity of the system that places more value on rubber stamps than it does on humans will be thoroughly exposed.