

## LETTER TO WORLD CITIZENS

5/8, Nov. 91

As we read of Presidents Bush and Gorbachev's rush to further nuclear disarmament, I ask myself three pertinent questions.

First, if the two leaders are willing to destroy nuclear weapons, why don't they rush to eliminate the scourge of war itself? In short, why not scrap the whole woeful plague? Isn't that the ultimate goal of disarmament? Why destroy a few arms and leave the cause untouched? A clue to The U.S. News & World Report starts its Oct. 14 report "Missions Implausible" by asserting that "Just because President Bush ordered the Navy to remove all nuclear weapons from its surface ships last week, don't think the Navy has stopped planning to fight World War III." "Fight World War III"? But wouldn't fighting World War III be to consider humanity itself as the enemy! One wonders whether as Commander-in-chief, President Bush has stopped planning "to fight World War III"? "Star Wars," B-2 Bombers, new carriers, F-22 fighters, 2 Seawolf nuclear submarines, etc. are all scheduled for production in the '90's. The U.S. military budget for 1992 is still over \$290 billion. Moreover President Gorbachev apparently still controls 20,000 plus nuclear warheads while France, England, Israel and China between them possess several hundred more. The same article states that "the U.S. military will maintain overwhelming numerical advantages in naval and air forces against all potential Third World adversaries." National leaders crying "peace" yet keeping their nuclear and conventional powder dry are like the butchers extolling life while sharpening their knives for the waiting cattle.

My second question is, why national armies in the first place? Who are the real "enemies" in today's world? The President of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis, wants the 200,000 Soviet soldier out of his newly-independent country. The Ukraine seeks to recall Ukranian soldiers now serving in the defunct Soviet Union in order to recruit them into a new Ukranian army. Then take Haiti as an example. Why does impoverished Haiti need an army? Armies are supposedly for fighting other states which become sometimes "enemies" sometimes "friends." Yet we know that popularly-elected President Bernard Aristide has been deposed by the army. Was Haiti's President and those who elected him then considered the "enemy" by the army dissidents? A nation has been defined as "a group of people with an enemy" but has the "enemy" ironically become the citizens of that very state? And like the viper That without armies, nations couldn't exist? In short, do nations **need** "enemies" to exist...internally or externally?

In states where control is centralized, armies and police are synonomous. The "enemy" for those governments are not so much external but internal...the people. That was Aristide's case. Elected popularly, he was obliged to protect himself from Haiti's own army which had no other enemy than the people of Haiti. He formed his own elite army or "palace guard" and apparently encouraged the people to take violent action against repression, in other words, against the rich. But that situation faces each and every national leader to more or less degrees. The **system** of nation-states, being exclusive, permits power centralization; in fact, assures it. Why? Because a national leader must contend with both external and internal problems, the first conditioned by anarchy between states, the second, by whatever legal order prevails. But the two are mutually incompatible. So when the internal legal order inevitably breaks down, the only disciplined force available to restore "order" is the army.

Haiti's present military junta now faces the same dilemma. It cannot tell the world who are its real enemies without betraying its own defunct role. To admit that the people are the enemy and not foreign foes would necessitate its stepping down and then disbanding. But more, it would require it to blow the whistle on the system itself which by definition, being part of the system, it cannot do. Neither can President Aristide. Check-mate. Or better, Catch-22.

My third question devolves from the first two: If these two leaders, Bush and Gorbachev are so willing to destroy property paid for by their respective taxpayers, why should said taxpayers - hurting as they are - continue to pay for more weapons? I mean those nuclear

missiles - as well as all conventional weaponry - are public property, aren't they?. Don't they "belong" to the citizens, after all? Then if the leaders are destroying war public property, why shouldn't the taxpayer citizen take his or her money - or at least that part of the tax allocated to armaments - and place it in a peace-making institution, i.e., a world government? Aren't the "leaders" really enjoining the people to "make peace" **between them**? And doesn't that mean raising the level of the social contract **above** the national? To the world level....where the war game resides? After all, the national tax people can't have it both ways: ask for money to clean the streets, tend the parks, provide for the young, sick and elderly and so forth and at the same time for blowing up the streets, destroying the parks and slaughtering the young, sick and elderly along with the rest of the population. What about "national security," you ask. The oxymoron of the century! The wholecloth lie exposed by over 200 international wars since the turn of the century, all fought in the name of "national security."

The self-evident answer to "national security" is that in the nuclear age world security via law is the price of national security.