

Letter to World Citizens

Vol III/1, Jun/Jul 82

The U.S. Supreme Court denied both my petition for certiorari and petition for rehearing to be considered a legal world citizen in the United States.

The decision had proved my thesis that my right to identify myself as a world citizen is indeed **legal!**

How do I arrive at that seemingly extraordinary conclusion? First of all, since January 27, 1982, when the final court decision was published, the lower court's decision - that I am an "excludable alien" as well as "stateless" - prevail according to U.S. law. This in turn obliges the Immigration and Naturalization Service to "exclude " me from U.S. soil.

In that the same INS contends that I am "stateless" and therefore unexcludable, it has failed to obey that U.S. law at this present writing. (Other "excludable aliens," Haitians, Afghans, etc. remain in U.S. jails.)

This conclusion, that the U.S. code was inoperable in my case, was part of my argument to the Supreme Court.

What then is my **legal** status in the United States? In default of U.S. law assigning me a legitimate one, it can only be that what I myself claim.

Secondly, in both petitions, I claimed that the Ninth amendment — *"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage other rights retained by the people"* — sanctions the exercise of the **inalienable** right to claim a new and **higher** political allegiance along with the existing ones.

In denying my petitions, the high court in effect denied its jurisdiction in determining the nature of those rights "retained by the people" in that such rights, being **inalienable**, are this **anterior** to the formulation of the Constitution itself and the founding of the Court.

Thirdly, the Supreme Court upheld the long-standing principle that expatriation is a **human right** regardless of the consequences of statelessness.

That means, incidentally, that any Haitian, Iranian, Eritrean, Iraqi, Mexican, Ghanaian, Nigerian, Russian, Israeli, Burmese, Vietnamese, etc. who arrives on U.S. shores by whatever route or means can **unilaterally** renounce his or her nationality - a registered letter is sufficient - return all state documents and the U.S. A must in return respect that human right.

In fact, this right is actually spelled out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Art. 15(2): *"Everyone has the right to a nationality and everyone has the right to change his nationality."*

If we have the right to "change" our nationality, obviously we have the right to **choose our own government.**

That is one of the inalienable rights implied in the Ninth Amendment. The 1981 Human Rights Report of the U.S. State Department confirms this revolutionary notion categorically "*..individuals do not owe their humanity to the community, as earlier philosophies often argued; the community owes its whole **legitimacy to the individuals** whose existence is prior to it.*" (Emphasis added) (p. 3, col.2)

Now comes the political bombshell. If the expatriate — or the national citizen — wilfully chooses World Government as the object of his/her sovereign global allegiance **as many are today doing in lieu of any other government to represent them at this highest and newest civic level**, they have thus **legalized themselves** in a revolutionary yet non-violent and democratic way and in perfect conformity with both U.S. historical precedent and constitutional law. My case is proof.

Further, in the case of the expatriate, he has sought and found **global political asylum** through his affiliation to his new government.

In the case of the U.S. national draft resister or non-registrant, in pledging his allegiance to the World Government, he has effectively **eliminated** the very cause of the draft (or registration), that is, so-called defence of the nation. In short, he has become a microcosm of **legal** world peace. He has exposed the fundamental illegitimacy of the entire military philosophy and practice. In legal terms, he has found the one remedy to countervail the discretionary powers the U.S. Constitution confers on the President when speaking as head of state, powers obviously to wage war. (In my Petition for Rehearing, I challenge these powers as fundamentally illegitimate in a Nuclear Age is that nuclear war is not "winnable")

When enough of us have completed this absolutely legitimate process - sanctioned by the U.S Constitution not to mention every constitution endorsing basic human rights - peace in OUR CONSTITUENCY, i.e., the world community, will ensue.