

LETTERS TO WORLD CITIZENS

Garry Davis

Oct. 25, 1957, Paris

(Note: This newsletter is necessarily limited to world citizen and government press services, my facilities being what they are. As per my usual style, it will be personal and undoubtedly rambling. If the reader is familiar with my "Letters to Fellow World Citizens" printed in VALUES magazine, he will recognize a continuity in this initiative. Reprint permission is hereby given.)

WHY I "STOLE" FROM THE PARIS DEPARTMENT STORES

All actions have multitudinous explanations. Action itself is hardly understood. The Bhagavad Gita says: Wise is he who sees action in inaction and inaction in action. Telling the truth is one kind of action and making money through business is another. The poor man who has no papers to work and is hungry who "steals" a loaf from a chain store is engaging in a different kind of "action" from an armament manufacturer who makes a legitimate profit from the sale of his weapons. Socially the first is a "thief" and the second respectable and law-abiding.

A nation is an exclusive competitive political unit. Therefore it must have two sets of codes called laws; one for "inside" behavior; the other for "outside" behavior. The laws governing crime inside the nation are diametrically opposed to those governing armies outside. I only make this point to clarify the method of exposing this duality so that it can be neutralized.

As a stateless person - which title incidentally is merely the antithesis of the state citizen and therefor lacks any definition of itself - I have since 1948 been considered in that set of laws of states relating to those "outside" the constitutional framework or "foreigners." But when, as a self-claimed World Citizen, I also claimed the right to live, work, travel, etc. where I wanted and thus found myself confronting the other set of laws - for these rights can only be granted by the state to its citizens, generally speaking - the two sets of contradictory laws were both exposed as such and in my case, usually after short jail sentences, neutralized, that is, became inoperative.

In the past eight years I have been developing and refining techniques along this line based on humanitarian principles. My purpose was first to discover the principles in reality, that is, not just so many fine words, but in simple, down-to-earth axioms which could be publicly stated and acted upon and which conformed to the highest human values; and secondly, to practice them myself in precise situations which arose before me in order to have the personal experience of both their rightness and their efficacy.

My "action" in the Grand Magasins of Paris was directly in line with this development. That it had certain overtones may have been unfortunate. I am referring to the so-called scandal over the feminine lingerie, this being the precise item I chose to take. However even this must be viewed in proper perspective. Indeed it may have been the only possible thing to take under the circumstances, since first, I had deliberately "broken" the law for foreigners by entering France without papers and thus did not enjoy any legal protection whatsoever which left me utterly vulnerable vis-a-vis the government in which case, if the government thought me dangerous - and indeed why else would I be refused a visa since 1950? - I could suffer whatever penalty, legal or otherwise, it imposed, therefore the "theft" of lingerie served the purpose of creating the impression of frivolity, even adolescence; and secondly, considering the mammoth indifference the general press and public gives to world citizenship - I have some comments to make about this below - a "scandal" might have been the only way to procure news of the kind needed to neutralize possible fear-based action of government functionaries. Public opinion, after all, whether

good or bad, represents the major force in our world. Merely to be known therefore is to have power.

Paris is particularly susceptible or perhaps sensitive to news which hints of social aberration. In fact, the West itself, dominated by a dualistic moral code, is really more interested in its rebels than in its conformists since the former's rebellion is at least motivated by honesty while the latter accepts the two-faced code while secretly or subconsciously gnawed by doubt and indecision which in turn leads to lack of confidence and productive power.

As I explained in my recent communique - 2 October - the two sets of French law have been effectively neutralized in my case. Specifically, I was both ordered to leave France and to remain in France to await trial. When I asked for a clarification both from the Procureur de la Republique of the Department of Justice and from functionaries of the Ministry of the Interior, I was told by each they had nothing to do with the other's department and I must follow orders:

The net result is that since the orders are mutually contradictory, the issuing agency of such orders, i.e. the French government itself, has tacitly admitted it is unable to consider me either in the set of laws for strangers or in the set for citizens.

This can be the situation for anyone throughout the world who claims world citizenship and knows how to use its principles and axioms.

Many citizens of particular states today are rebelling against unjust regimes from the United States to the Soviet Union. In fact, all humanity is in revolt, either latent or overt, against both war-making and its dread allies, poverty and sickness. With each state 100% compromised in principle to seek the welfare of its citizens, the citizen must then utilize the theory and practice of world citizenship in any situation wherein the state denies in practice that principle. In other words, if a stateless World Citizen, treated as a "foreigner" by a state, can in one simple action, deprive that state of all power over him thus relegating sovereign where it belongs, to him, then the state World Citizen can, by the same principle, oblige the state to consider him also as a "foreigner" thus nullifying the restrictive law of the state.

If conscientious objectors, for instance claimed on the basis of their world citizenship not to be able to become national soldiers, but professed at the same time their willingness to become world policemen or world guards, their state could not prosecute them for disobeying state law. This sounds like wishful thinking. But consider it carefully. Any man or woman has the right to claim his or her rights. Today's claim however must be in today's terms if such rights are to be respected. And since it is only states which deny rights, that denial must be first exposed, then neutralized by a claim to a higher political status. That means world citizenship. Remember, there are no second-class World Citizens as all World Citizens "are equal in dignity and rights" as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights says. The C. O. claims a right above state law to which the state has already subscribed. How can the state then prosecute him?

The so-called White-Negro question in the United States and elsewhere can be treated likewise. First, let us realize that the titles "white" and "negro" are supposed to denote racial characteristics rather than color. We know immediately then that in itself, the issue is false. The color of a man's skin does not determine his intelligence or his character. Neither the soul nor the mind has color. And the heart is human. The issue then must be raised to the human level where alone it can be resolved. The man or woman deprived of rights by the state must simply claim them as a human being. But again that claim must be couched in terms the state can accept, that is, political, and the individual or individuals involved must claim sovereignty above and beyond the state's power to deny their rights.

Rights have bypassed national borders. The so-called Negro in the Southern United States is a world citizen anyway whether he knows it or not since he too is intimately affected by whatever happens in his world. Thus his claim to rights by the United States government is not considerate of his own status today beyond that of United States citizenship. A cursory reading of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights may bring this point home.

Then what about worker's strikes as we are today witnessing in France? Or those in Poland or Hungary? Or even in the United States? Will their wage demands, if met, resolve

their situation? Of course not. Prices go up proportionately. The world is in the grip of inflation. Living costs rise with wages. How can world citizenship help here? Let me say first that only world citizenship can help here. Only world citizenship - which implies world government - can remove frontiers, armies, armaments, and the incalculable expense to the human spirit, intelligence, energy and money which these entail. If, instead of an inflationary wage increase, the strikers struck as World Citizens, demanding a world economy, a world currency, and end to the waste of war and a beginning to an era of peace and prosperity, then their efforts would not be wasted. Perhaps a World Citizens Union of workers is one of our next steps.

In this brief NEWSLETTER I can't treat with the myriad situations wherein world citizenship alone can help. This will have to be dealt with in a later paper. Suffice it to say that there are indeed revolutionary forces loose in the world today and as always they can be a cause of immense harm or of untold good. I see little or no evidence that wither self-claimed World Citizens are ready, willing or able to spearhead these revolutionary forces. In fact, I have to report that I see exactly the opposite. I will deal with this directly below.

WHAT I HAVE SEEN IN PARIS

"You have compromised the 'movement'."

"We are thinking of changing the name of our journal 'Citizen du Monde'."

"You can no longer talk on the level as 'serious' men."

"You must make a public apology; otherwise we cannot go on. Then we talk of world citizenship now, the public laugh at us."

Such and the like were hurled at me by friends in Paris. One old-time friend from the Conseil de Solidarite asked me sadly, "Ah, Garry, what have you become?"

If that is the state of the 'movement' whatever that is, then we should all quietly fold our tents and creep shamefacedly into the night. I myself have never been in a 'movement'. I was, am, and will continue to be a World Citizen. Further I am ready to represent anyone else who claims to be in terms of a government and according to the principles of that government which have been publicly announced. Otherwise, "je ne marche pas," or count me out.

I have been many times at the International Registry of World Citizens at the Centre Mondialiste. I have talked with Mary Lloyd and Jacque Savary. There is no registry activity to speak of and the "Conseil Mondiale" is still looking for a way to hold elections for the FWC. I attended a meeting of the French Council for the FWC and discovered it was also looking for a way to hold elections. Everybody talks about "collective action" and therefore nobody acts. I visited the office of the Secretary-General of L'Union Federale Mondiale, was told by him that many "high personages" were "interested," and that future meetings were planned. The only person I saw who seems to be doing valid humanitarian work was L'Abbe Pierre. He therefore is crushed with overwork and responsibility. I am forced to conclude that the chasm between good intentions and good deeds is wide and deep. Robert Sarrazac seems to be in seclusion outside of Paris or so Jacque Savary tells me. And I am accused of "compromising the movement!" If it is true that one man in one day can compromise the movement after having been absent from the scene for almost eight years, it neither speaks well for the movement itself nor for those who claim to be in it.

WHAT ABOUT GERMANY?

My legal - or non-legal - situation in Germany is the same as in France. On September 4, German Judge Hurck at Granau declared me "outside of the law" when I was returned from Holland by Dutch passcontrolle police. At a press conference at Cologne, I revealed this to the ten journalists gathered in the living-room of Joachim Muller. I obtained a good press the next day in Cologne papers.