

THE ELLSWORTH DECLARATION

Garry Davis

4 September, 1953

“There is no first step to world government. World government is the first step.”

Emery Reves *Anatomy of Peace*

“As long as there are sovereign nations possessing great power, war is inevitable. There is no salvation for civilization, or even the human race, other than the creation of a world government.”

Albert Einstein

(Delivered at the City Hall, Ellsworth, Maine, U.S.A.)

Good Evening, dear friends:

This meeting has its origin about five years ago in Paris when I walked out of the United States Embassy as a sort of political nonentity, or stateless person. My story, that is, what led to that action, what happened afterwards, and where I find myself today have become matters of public interest, if only because anyone who has the audacity to deal with nationstates directly as if he were equal or even superior in sovereignty, whether he is considered a fool or a sage, is at least an object of curiosity.

It is my experience however that much misunderstanding and even misrepresentation has occurred in the public mind concerning me. This is, to a great extent, my own fault. I have found myself unable many times to explain clearly and concisely the basic reasons for my actions. Perhaps I shouldn't have tried. Actions speak for themselves, and so-called reasons often confuse as much as clarify. But also, the general press often print but half the story or sensationalize what is ordinarily quite a commonplace happening to entice the buying public. Flashy headlines replace objective and full coverage. This in turn gives rise to the cry of publicity seeker and the man stands condemned whatever his motives or sincerity. Mostly however I think that the subject itself is confusing and lacking in precedent, the subject being the wholeness of individual man, or his inherent total sovereignty with full authority and rights contrasted today against the

seeming absolutism of the sovereign state expressed in nationalism. . .and his inherent cooperative urge as contrasted with a fiercely competitive economy. . .how he can reassert himself in modern terms, what techniques he can use, what philosophy he can call upon, what moral fibre he can evoke in the face of giant immoral pressures and fears, what historical precedents he has, and finally what human support he can command around him, both individually and institutionally. The subject in short is unlimited man's revolt against a limited society and demands full command of every ounce of an individual's spiritual, intellectual, and physical stature. In the light of this problem, my personal limitations become glaringly obvious .

But once more I find it necessary to speak in public knowing full well the dangers just mentioned. I may confuse as much as clarify; the press may mock or cry publicity-seekers, or merely ignore; and again I may reveal my limitations in not embracing the full subject. But it is necessary first of all because I find myself in my homeland, America, and in fact in the very seat of my birth, Hancock County, in very unusual circumstances, and I want those about me, my fellow Americans, to know what I am about; exactly what these circumstances are, and what I intend to do about them; and secondly, I feel a duty and responsibility to my many friends in Europe and throughout the world who have supported me in the past and shown me their hearts and minds with openness and deep conviction, a duty which I have not always fulfilled and a responsibility which I have not always accepted, but which tonight I will try to fulfill and accept to the full measure of my ability.

To introduce my subject, let me say that though you and I here are friends and from the same soil, we are separated by as wide a gulf as man has ever artificially created. I was a bomber pilot during the last war, and I first discovered this artificial gulf between men when flying over Germany bombing German civilians and cities. Till then I hadn't thought much about my fellowman, or myself as a member of a world community. I had been too busy growing up, having fun and trying to earn a living. But in that starkly realistic situation, behind all the emotion and hysteria, I was literally forced to consider, for the first time I might add, the seeming foolishness of one group of human beings dropping bombs on another group, all members of the same human family. Certainly like them I had good reasons for my participation in the fight. Fascism was a public menace, a social disease, a cancerous scourge, and had to be wiped out at all costs. . .even at the cost of my death and that of my buddies-in-arms. But even so, I had to wonder what was wrong with the organization of our human community when a social disease like Fascism was allowed to become so plague-like that only an opposing plague, no matter how justified, could halt its advance. I

confess my political naivete while flying that engine of destruction, but I couldn't really understand why our leaders had let things get that far.

I wasn't alone in this wondering of course. Millions of young people were rudely shocked into the naked awareness that the social plague called war was a real part of their life. If nothing else, we were forced to start thinking about our responsibilities in this regard.

After the war I returned to my profession in the theatre. But the wondering continued underneath. Though we had a supranational organization called the United Nations supposedly to solve the problems of war and peace, poverty and plenty, the still absolute sovereign states, after a flurry of postwar disarmament, continued more hysterically than ever their superarmament race, especially my own and Russia, developing superbombs and super methods of killing off human beings. Taxes were increasing on individual citizens, relief budgets were cut as defense budgets were increased—though eminent scientists kept telling us that there was no defense against the absolute weapons now developed—more and more people went hungry, or were illclothed, or illhoused, refugees were dealt with apathetically or begrudgingly, the world's children were neglected, and general fear and insecurity were becoming commonplace.

Was it possible, I asked myself, that once again I was to be uprooted from my everyday life, this time to become a part of an even greater plague called World War III? Hadn't we learned anything from the last war, or the one before that, or the multitude of wars stretching back throughout man's bloody history? Does each generation have to go through this superfoolishness? Are we all so bankrupt of reason and moral fibre that we can't live in peace and cooperation with one another in one physical world? These questions and many more pounded at me with increasing urgency during the years of '46 and '47. What should I do? I kept asking myself. Where could the common man like me, the man-in-the-street, the fundamental integer without which there is no society, register his protest against this insanity? Where could I vote against war and poverty, and for peace and wellbeing? Who represented me, not only in the United States, but in the world community as well? In the U.S., there is law and order, government, a central control or brain, direct representatives of the people therein, if only in a political sense. Outside there is chaos and anarchy, a jungle world wherein raw force is the deciding factor, where individuals are helpless, and where only armies move in sinister and secret patterns. There is no World Parliament, no world constitution, no world law, or world economy, in short, no world brain or government. Instead on our one planet, there are about 80 separate and fully-sovereign political and

economic units, all attempting to govern and provide security for their individual citizens. Some are rich, some poor: some are large, some small. But all are absolute in their political power over their citizens, just as the original 13 American colonies or States were in 1780.

It's as if your body had 80 or so separate, and uncoordinated compartments, each with its individual command posts or brain, and each acting at crosspurposes and giving opposing orders to the various organs. What would be the result? Well obviously, we call such an uncoordinated man an idiot, and because we know he can't provide for himself, but eventually will either starve or be destroyed in some way, we put him into an institution for his and the public good.

But an objective observer on Mars, or indeed even on Earth, might very well apply the same idiocy to the organism we call humanity and of which we are all integral parts or cells whether we like it or not. He would see quite clearly that it lacks a unified coordinating center, or world brain. .
.or government.

But what about the United Nations? Isn't that set up to do the coordinating job, to be the brain of humanity? The answer of course, divorced of sentiment and ideals, is implicit in the actions of the very nations which are members of the U.N. Behind the inspiring ideals, the noble convictions, and imposing facade, and discounting the paralyzed specialized agencies set up to deal with real human problems, or the educational aspects, the United Nations is merely a meetingplace for the representatives of some, not all of the nationstates to try to win world public opinion for their particular interests. As such, it is an effective smokescreen behind which the most powerful nations carry on their absolute nationalistic policies. In short, it is neither united, nor is it inclusive.

I am aware in making these remarks of the high regard that the UN as such is held by many here in the US, but it is vitally necessary to divorce ourselves from false sentiment and vain idealism so that the naked reality of the world's condition can be faced if just and reasonable solutions to human problems are to be found. Certainly the United Nations is of immense value to me, the utterly neutral man, for by it I can see in startling clarity just what we lack and need. I might add that my experience indicates that there are few within the UN itself who are not being made increasingly aware of this lack and need.

After I became aware of the world's basic anarchic condition, which was certainly a spiritual as well as a political and economic anarchy, I like millions of others, was faced with the personal problem of what was my responsibility to the total world community? How could I relate myself directly and realistically with my fellowman, spiritually, socially and physically, not only as a protest, but as a practical way to fill in the vacuous area of world anarchy? I was truly an American, by birth, by upbringing, by forefathers, by conviction and by ideals, but I wanted no part of nationalism. But could the two be separated? And if so, what then was the position of the individual who managed such an unprecedented separation? In other words, how could he make an effective protest against a nationalism turned violent which thwarted and perverted humanitarian tendencies till men turned into mobs killing each other mercilessly and at the same time build his life on the constructive principle of social cooperation rather than on the jungle competition for bare necessities he saw all around him?

I wanted a corporate or federal or unitive world government to resolve the social organizational problem which in turn would resolve the economic problem with a world unitive economy; but first of all, I wanted a spiritual kinship, an awareness of a community of men derived from the same source, one human Organism, One Total Man, or more popularly, a world religion or universal church based on brotherhood, truth and love. From this, I knew and felt, would flow the other worldly institutions. Naive and oversimplified perhaps, but nonetheless sincere and heartfelt.

In personal revolt against nationalism to which I no longer wanted to contribute, and against raw competition with my fellowmen which I didn't understand and wasn't trained for, I went to Paris in May of 1948, and on the 25th of that month, before a U. S. Vice-Consul in the Embassy on the Champs Elysee, I took the formal oath of renunciation of my national citizenship, which is allowed by the Nationality Act of 1940. I did not deny being an American, which was an inherent part of me anyway, but I declared what I truly was in a larger worldly sense. . . .I claimed to a world citizen.

This of course was no new declaration, no original thought. Socrates made it, Tom Paine made it. Most philosophers, sages, and spiritual leaders have affirmed its principles of unity in one way or another. But there is no monopoly on such a universal truth. An so, now a common man had made it. To me, world citizenship expressed positively and clearly man's individual wholeness or completeness, his personal uniqueness and

individuality, plus his fundamental unity with all other men, spiritually as well as physically.

The general press however, mockingly referred to me as "the self-styled world citizen". It is a fitting commentary on our present-day political institutions when an ordinary citizen must style himself that which they presume to represent, but cannot, and then be mocked for it in the nation's press.

Here in America, where national citizenship is idealized and sentimentalized beyond all reason, I was publicly ridiculed. Many called me simply a crackpot with a hairbrained idea; others thought I was merely one more publicity seeker of which America apparently had hundreds of thousands, though this was a pretty desperate way merely to get publicity. Others, less emotional and more objective, called me simply unrealistic, or impractical, or ahead of the times, though at the same time they usually were obliged to add that the world was in pretty much of a mess and **something** should be done. But generally, I was considered merely one more symbol of youthful confusion, and a sort of international orphan. . .or world waif. . .and very unAmerican.

I argued that to be an American meant infinitely more than just to be a United States citizen. Americans, I said, held fast to principles of liberty, democracy, public welfare, and world peace, principles for which my forefathers suffered persecution, worked and died and upon which the nation was founded. Who was the true American, I asked, the man who stood for the above principles, or the chauvinistic nationalistic or warprofiteer? But my voice was drowned out in derision.

I must add here that I did not ask others to follow or even not to follow my particular action. I merely said that it was my way, and that if others were concerned about the same problems, they must find their particular way of renouncing absolutist nationalism and extending their loyalty to the total world community since at that time there was no one central and neutral organization to which all could belong as universal as humanity itself.

But even so, my birthplace hadn't changed, nor my upbringing, nor my ancestors. Also when I dropped my hand no longer a US citizen, I was no wiser, no more industrious, no more patient. The sun still shone on me, and the rain still fell on me; I still had to eat, breathe and work; I still liked music and dancing and the theatre; I could still laugh and cry, or be serious or tell a joke; my friends were still my friends, and people who didn't like

me anyway, still didn't like me anyway. In short, I was still very much me, despite my loss of national citizenship, and still very much a part of the total human community, and in fact, now a more direct part. In the real things, I hadn't changed a whit.

But like the pebble dropping on the surface of the water, I did make a ripple. . . on the surface. And to many people here in America especially, failing to distinguish the surface from the actual body of water, or the illusion of reality from the Real Itself, here in this dualistic society, I had dared to call into question the fundamental, the essential, and so, the secure. To these, US citizenship was absolute security, despite A-bombs, and two world wars. Also I had renounced "the American way of life," meaning principally the security of physical comforts and even luxuries. And so I was considered an outcast and a heretic on two counts, politically and physically. Morally, few in America, questioned my motives or actions. Needless to say, I was a great trial to my family and friends during this period.

Well, what happens to a man who finds himself plumb in the middle of the world anarchy, where there are no political representatives at any level of government, where no authority is prepared to accept or identify you, where you have no stable home and no legal right to live, where you have no influence because you have no political status and so where friends are either afraid or reluctant to come to your aid, where human rights are laughed at, and one is mocked for presuming to affirm even that he or she is a human being, where every petty official becomes your master before whom you must bow and scrape if you find yourself obliged to ask for some meager necessity till you are screaming inside and ready either to kill, or ask God's help, torn between the two, where indignity is mixed with contempt and pity, where life is a series of waiting-in-line at a window marked "alien", or "Stranger" behind which sits an indifferent clerk with only rubber stamps in front of him which determine your very existence, where the human spirit is crushed out of all shape and recognition until it withers of its own accord, where finally apathy and resignation nibble dumbly at the mind and heart till hope is gone.

Is this an exaggeration, coming purely from my imagination? Is the situation so bad? Ask the over 15,000,000 refugees in Germany, many living in made over concentration camps. Ask the hundreds of thousands of stateless people in France and England who are allowed to live there but legally not allowed to work. Ask the North and South Koreans made homeless by a "foreign" power's war. Ask the stateless people of Africa and Asia whose very homes, miserable hovels that they are, are owned by

colonial masters, and whose rights as human beings are ridiculed and scorned till they seethe in indignation and revolt and are ready to accept any tyrant who promises them freedom and more bread.

Ask me even.

Directly after my renunciation, my learning about these things began. The little clerk at the French police station had fifteen stamps in front of her, and nowhere to use them when I presented myself at her desk. She couldn't handle an ex-U.S. citizen who called himself a world citizen, born in America, yet residing in France, and without papers of any kind. **That** situation was in no lawbook or regulations manual she knew of. Legally I was outside the framework of the sovereign state of France. But physically I was inside. I had committed no crime or harmed anyone. My interests were purely humanitarian, positive, and outgoing, yet, being outside the law, I was considered a criminal for merely existing and subject to imprisonment. Such is the extraordinary position of a man caught in the lawless area outside of national sovereignty. Such also is the position that each powerful nation finds itself in in regard to other nations. It becomes suspect by another nation simply because there is no legal control of its actions by the other nation. By stepping outside the control of any nation-state, I discovered gradually that I had actually become sovereign in much the same way. And so I was suspect by that frustrated civil servant and by every government official I came up against thereafter. Finally in some desperation to keep me from jail, she stamped the back of a letter I had from the American Embassy in receipt of my passport. This gave me three pseudo-legal months to live in France. I asked her what I should do after three months. She shrugged and waved me out. After all, it wasn't her affair.

Just before the three months were up, the United Nations took over the Palais de Chaillot in Paris declaring that property international territory in a symbolic ceremony between Robert Shumann and Trygve Lie. Facing jail in France if I remained there, and jail in any other country I went to, I was literally forced to seek political sanctuary at the headquarters of this highest political authority in the world. It was the world organization after all; I would be privileged to present it with its first real citizen.

I remained on the steps of one of the U.N. Buildings for 6 days and nights. During this time, the curious but kind people of Paris supplied me with bread, cheese, fruit, and vin ordinaire. During that period I wrote a petition to the delegates through Mr. Lie asking for simple recognition of world citizenship. On the seventh day, I received my answer. I was expelled

forcibly. The U.N. Secretariat, not having any police, requested the French Ministry of the Interior to please "invade" their so-called international territory and remove this piece of international flotsam. So on Sept. 17th about 50 French policemen wearing their sternest looks, came in, took me against my will and deposited me in France again, a distance of about 10 yards.

The U.N. could have done the job of course, but it might have looked a bit foolish for a squad of U.S. or Russian marines carrying-out such a nonmilitary objective .

This somewhat ludicrous removal was the U.N.,s way of saying to me, "We don't represent you, so how can you expect us to recognize world citizenship? But further, we **can't** represent you because you're a stateless person, and we're composed only of states. As such, we, the United Nations, represent division and fear, and eventual war, whereas you, a neutral human being, obviously represent unity and peace. You have a sort of human sovereignty inherent in you, whereas we have only state sovereignty to link us, but contrarily we have private or vested interests to protect at all costs; you don't, because you have nothing to lose. You are able to take our ideals, aspirations and hopes and apply them directly in human affairs. We are unable to do so because they conflict with our sovereign statehood. Now you can see why we must get rid of you even to calling in a national police force and facing ridicule for doing so. Your naive but natural request for recognition of world citizenship exposes our limitations, and that we can't afford.,,

This is the major lesson I have learned. The world's greatest statesmen, the ablest politicians, the national policy makers, the Presidents, Kings, Congressmen, Parliamentarians, and all lesser state servants, can only mark time until we, on the very bottom of the pile, the so-called man-in-the-street, the John and Jane Does of the world, the simple human being with nothing to lose but his fears, make a concerted, cooperative, and determined effort to move into world peace and prosperity. By "into" I mean we must actually declare freedom and security an inherent part of our essential humanity, and then apply it scientifically, technically and spiritually in our daily lives. Until that is done, the statesman remains trapped between principle and practice; he has nothing to lead or govern except that which exists, and we all remain chained to our insecurities, poverties, and fears.

That concerted and cooperative one world movement until now has been undefined and unorganized. But it has been generating in parts.

Hundreds of nongovernmental international organizations reflecting every facet of man's interests including innumerable peace and welfare organizations are ready for a coordinated, cooperative, corporate one world organization. Millions of ordinary people everywhere are certainly ready to recognize their essential kinship, to cooperate in harmony, share their labor and services, pool their resources, both intellectual and physical, and benefit each other individually and mutually. Many small nations even are ready to relinquish a part of their sovereignty to such a supranational authority having provisions in their constitutions for such.

I myself quite by circumstance became a focal point for such a common and neutral meeting-ground in Europe in 1948-49 and '50.

After my formal ejection from the U.N. territory, and from subsequent events such as an organized interruption from the U.N. balcony on Nov. 22nd wherein with friends I asked that humanity be given a representative in the affairs directly affecting us, and after two large meetings in Paris which were attended to overflowing, a spontaneous one world and world citizenship popular movement came into being which was genuinely planet-wide.

I was flooded with hundreds of thousands of letters from all corners of the globe, and from peoples of all nations, colors, sects, races, occupations, and origins. Only the Americans and Russians were cool to or skeptical of the idea, not because of the American or Russian people themselves, but because their leaders were too busy fearing, insulting and arming against each other to pay much attention to such an unrealistic third force as one world and world citizenship, especially if it began in the giant middle world between the two opposing forces. "Not economically practical," said the American businessman; "Not politically practical," said the Russian communist.

I was personally attacked from Pravda and the U.S. press alike, one with vitriol and personal character assassination, the other with patronizing spankings or veiled suggestions of mental derangement. Pravda called me a U.S. bought dupe, exporting American world government along with detective stories and powdered eggs. The U.S. press inferred that I was naively and unwittingly playing into the hands of the Communists by creating a giant peace movement in the West, and why didn't I go to Russia to begin my movement there, or if not, then come home and go into a defense plant. . .while I was being psychoanalyzed.

But to the rest of mankind, caught in the middle of this two dimensional dialectic between two mighty physical forces, the reality of one world was overwhelming and the fact of world citizenship was grounded in truth.

But even if there were millions of one worlders and world citizens, very few agreed on general one world strategy and practically no one agreed on world citizenship tactics.

From the podium of the General Assembly of the United Nations on Dec. 10, 1948, came an appeal for help, which contained both one world strategy and world citizenship tactics. It came in the form of a document called *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. In effect, it was the greatest mandate to organize ourselves rationally ever given to mankind as a corporate body. On the other hand, it implied with uncompromising clarity that the United Nations as such is not that rational organization. The mandate was given to everyone on the planet. No one was excluded. When declared, it was hailed as a milestone in man's collective efforts to achieve freedom and security. But so far, five years later, it has not achieved freedom and security. So far, it's just another piece of paper with stirring words on it. Why is this? Why didn't men and women take this document, affirm the rights therein, and oblige their leaders to have them properly secured in a world organization? The reason is simple. But it may be a hard one to accept. Human rights apply only to humans, and until you and I throughout the world declare ourselves as such and organize that declaration so that wise and practical leaders can represent us as human beings, we can only expect less than human treatment in world affairs from our present leaders.

The very first article is a tool of mighty power cutting through prejudice, dogma, artificial beliefs, and general ignorance like a giant scythe cuts through weeds. For it is the expression of the Prime Law of Unity which binds all men as brothers both spiritually and naturally. All the other articles flow from it. It throws into bold relief all those who divide men artificially. It says: *All men are born free and equal in dignity and rights; they are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.*

Here is no sectarianism, nor chauvinism. First of all here is the affirmation of the spiritual truth that all men are directly connected with their divine source or origin through individual conscience. This is the ontological approach to religion, that is, that each and every human being is immediately and intimately related to the Spirit or Deity, and can perceive

that relationship intuitively without outside intervention. In other words, it reaffirms Christ's words, "*the kingdom of God is within you,*" or Socrates' admonition to "*Know thyself,*" or the Hindu Bhagavad Gita's constant references to the All Self in every man.

Then this article affirms that all men are endowed with reason, or the ability to think and solve problems of physical survival and social relationships. What is this but a clear go-ahead to organize in a reasonable manner the affairs of our common social community? But how much reason is applied today in the political circles of the world? How reasonable is this foolish national pride, this organized manufacture of lies and half-truths and artificially created hates between tribes of humans in the world community, this hypocrisy called diplomacy which any child could expose, and which wouldn't last a minute in a town meeting? How much reason is there to areas of surplus food rotting on wharfs and railroad sidings and other areas of pitiful and unnecessary starvation, or periods when millions are unemployed, yet factories lay idle because it doesn't pay to produce? It is needless to go on. The facts are unlimited to demonstrate that not reason but utter foolishness actually governs our world community despite our most fervent aspirations and lip-service to ideals.

But if men are reasonable and guided by conscience, it is clear that men in general have no representatives in the world area. No one yet speaks for humanity in toto. We, as a world's people, are inarticulate, inchoate even, because we are unorganized. The *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* recognizes this for it gives us the green light to organize a world electorate to elect such world representatives from our midst. Article 21 (3) says; *The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.*

There is no mention of what people. . . just the people. That only means all the people there are. Do you begin to see, however, how this One People is denied in the very council chambers of this so-called world organization? That the reality of human community includes not only all those nations and peoples of the UN but also Germans, Italians, Africans, Ceylonese, Japanese, Chinese, Rumanians, Bulgarians, and of course all stateless people and those under colonial domination? In short, everybody?

We all belong to this One People whether we like it or not and despite our external differences. Though I am an American, technically I am a stateless person, so I fit into the World's People category directly,

with no intervening citizenship. This is by no means a unique situation, but in fact quite common. And that, while it might seem to be a sign of utter chaos and despair, actually is a condition of great hope. In other words, there are millions like me **with nothing to lose**.

But what about our collective will. Is there such a thing? This is the most difficult thing I have experienced to make people believe. . .that in fact everyone wants just about the same things. These are expressed usually by slogans such as world peace, universal wellbeing, and personal freedom. But slogans like this have hidden other things. So people have become skeptical and cynical and bitter. It is the disease of our generation. But nonetheless, the collective will for such things exists and in greater quantity and power than any single man dreams.

If this is true, how then is it to be gathered, proclaimed, manifested, and secured? The Universal Declaration in Article 28 gives us a clue. It says that: *"Everyone is entitled to the **social and international order** in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration can be fully realized"* In other words, social and international **order**, not anarchy, are conditions under which rights pertaining to all human beings alone can be secured. Order of course means law and government. International order means international law and government.

Obviously, there is no such thing today.

Human rights and freedoms apply only to a select few today. Yet Article 2 states that: *"**Everyone** is entitled to the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration, without distinctions of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other state."* This only affirms what any reasonable man and every mother knows from time immemorial, that all men and women are indeed members of the same human community, and that subsequently there are no second-class world citizens.

No second-class world citizens! Do you realize what that means? It means that as well as being Greek, French, German, Russian, Indian, Chinese, Brazilian, Yugoslavian, Swedish, Italian, Malayan, Japanese, American or any other group, as well as being white, brown, black, red or yellow, as well as being an artisan or a craftsman, a merchant or a technician, a common worker or a king, a housewife or a queen, a national citizen or a stateless person, a man or a woman, a democrat or a republican, a Catholic or a Protestant, or Hindu, or Buddhist, or Moslem or Taoist or

Jew, we are all united in world citizenship because we're all united in freedoms and human rights, as yet uncoded in world law.

There are other rights defined. But these few mentioned are enough to go ahead full steam with the actual organization of our one humanity.

If you agree with me up to this point—and I have really said nothing very extraordinary, nothing new certainly, perhaps even things which are so obvious and simple that they don't bear repeating—but if we are agreed at least in principle, let us be convinced as I am, from bitter and sometimes humiliating experience, that we must now help ourselves. No one will hand us freedom and security on a silver platter. No one can. Who can exercise your reason or conscience for you? Who can put them to work but you? Each man and woman here is absolutely and solely responsible for his or her thoughts and actions regarding his or her personal welfare. Let us first then secure ourselves deep within our own reason and conscience for only then will we be able to find a practical way to the wide glorious world of sovereign humanity.

In short, we must personally, each one of us, recognize ourselves as **individually sovereign**, that is, a world unto ourselves, an authority, sure, capable, selfmotivated, self-contained, and self-governed, a full awareness of that part of us which is conscience and its servant reason. Let us realize fully that each one of us throughout the world, endowed with this very same conscience which links us all to the same Spirit or Origin, and reason, which links us all to each other, is in real fact then a **world** sovereign, and as such stands whole and free in the one community of men, above nations, sectional prides, narrow prejudices and jealousies, a World Patriot.

This is what I wish to affirm here tonight, world sovereignty. As human beings, we are all world sovereigns, the social and physical popular expression being world citizens, and no nation or power is able to deny that sovereignty or to deprive us of one iota of it.

This alone is democracy, for it includes all.

I have gone through five years of intense personal and public experience since my renunciation in Paris, and my affirmation of world sovereignty here tonight has been reached therefore after most careful and serious consideration. It is not a gesture of childish impulse or maudlin sentiment; it is not abstract idealism or fanatical necessity. It is a simple and obvious fact recognized now by peoples and governments alike. Further world sovereignty linked with world citizenship is at last that undefined

concept which relates spiritual, social and physical fact together to make a totality of man.

I said that it is grounded on sound spiritual, social, and physical fact. What are these facts or Prime Laws which are recognized universally by peoples and institutions alike? Well, I have already stated them here in many ways, but in brief they may be expressed as follows:

1. There is but One Deity or Ideal, Goal, Vision, Absolute, Origin, Source, Mind, Spirit, Reality, Understanding, Wisdom, Truth, and so on, unitively conceived and intuitively, that is, by conscience, perceived, of which I am a living and integral part, as is all mankind; and

2. There is but one world, which is ideologically or intellectually understood, as my and mankind's natural home despite social groupings such as tribal, communal, regional, geographical, cultural, historical, ancestral, lingual, or professional and which constitutes my total social environment or community; and

3. There is but one physical human family, which is instinctively felt by common fundamental needs and wants, despite color, race, sex, birth, property, economic or other physical status, and thus one common citizenship.

Further, I am convinced that the full recognition of these three fundamental or Prime Laws constitute a spiritual, social, and physical trinity, in that the first represents personal or individual freedom, the second, social or communal justice or fairness, and the third, physical security and well-being, upon which the rational organization of human society must be based for the increased happiness of all.

It is on these three laws that you and I and the rest of our fellow men and women can move together out of the foolish, wasteful, chaotic, poverty-stricken circumstances we find ourselves in today into the prosperity and happiness of a new world of complete and joyous humanity.

I have said tonight that we must help ourselves to peace, security and well-being. I have said that our leaders were stuck and needed our help. I have affirmed world sovereignty and world citizenship as a spiritual, social, and physical fact; I have given the trinity of Prime Laws in confirmation of this fact. I have shown that people everywhere are ready for peace and prosperity, that the world is in dire need of these two. Then I have shown that only an international authority, a world brain, a supranational

government can coordinate the immense diversity which is humanity, and make it live and breathe as it must if we, its coordinate parts, are to live and evolve. Further I have shown that the nations themselves, through the United Nations, have given We, the People, the mandate to create this world government through the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* .

Here in this Town Hall in Ellsworth, Maine, in the sovereign United States of America, I, a world citizen, exist in a world anarchy. I am no longer able to tolerate such a condition. By the authority vested in me as a world sovereign, it is my duty and my responsibility to myself and to my humanity to hereby proclaim for myself a world government with full legal powers and prerogatives based on the 3 Prime Laws of One God, One World, and one Mankind. This government for the moment exists only in my person, but since all men are world citizens with full world sovereignty based on a full recognition of the 3 Prime Laws if they but affirm them, the proclamation of world government is everyman's right, privilege, and responsibility.

Presumptuous undertaking? Not at all, for nothing less will serve us, and we must risk being called presumptuous by narrow minds and closed hearts. I will answer that all new-borns are presumptuous in their demands for sustenance and attention and I am no exception. The world is certainly filled with wiser and better men, and I am the first to admit personal failings. But that confession doesn't alter my need. A world government is here born and if there are wiser and better men, let them come forward challenged by its obvious failings and helplessness. Let humanity have their services by all means. Let the spiritual leaders and Gurus, the World Teachers come from their ashrams, their meditative retreats and monastic centers in this grave hour of our common need, and give us their moral council and guidance. Let them breathe into this newly born government, given life by one insignificant man-in-the-street, the spiritual substance it must have if it is to prosper and serve men wisely.

It must have material sustenance as well if it is to grow in health, substantial physical nourishment. In fact, ideally, it must have all the resources of our common Mother Earth if it is to benefit all the citizens thereon, and a world government by definition excludes no one from its benefits. Materially speaking, our planet and our human community is like a giant factory supplying all the material needs to all who live at once on it and in it. And the sooner we short circuit the road that is travelled by millions daily to satisfy the world's material needs, the sooner we will all have more leisure and means for recreation, whether social, intellectual, artistic, or physical. Obviously the less effort we give to the means of life,

the more time and energy we have to enjoy the ends of life, according to our individual interpretation. So our scientists and technicians carry the banner of progress for the human race, as they lighten the means and increase our opportunity to enjoy the ends.

Thus to solve the problem of managing our common factory for the mutual benefit of all, the most able scientists, technicians, managers, and administrators must come forward to give us their services.

Without this scientific management on the physical level of human activity, gross and criminal waste, inefficiency, giant unrests between workers leading to class struggles, bitter divisions between management and labour, and finally, when the national politicians can no longer govern the two opposed factions, the explosion of international war in the anarchic areas, leading to all the plagues of the uncoordinated or idiot man referred to earlier. In short, no sane business man would or could run his organization for a minute the way our world factory is run without going bankrupt.

Already many cooperative communities and industries exist, as well as large corporations in which complete coordination or cooperation plus scientific management is the guiding principle. The higher the degree of coordination by scientific management, the more successful the business. These understand fully the tremendous benefits which accrue to each member of a corporate or cooperative body. Full material protection within the corporate body is guaranteed. The largest corporate body of course, though still utterly uncoordinated, is the human species itself, and like the human body, only thrives in health and happiness when its various component parts are coordinated and working in harmony with its brain and spirit.

Therefore the third Prime Law of One physical human family must equate integrally with the first and second unitive laws. One for all and all for one must be the prime basis for a World Citizen's economy. This economy must evolve without disturbing one present law, but in fact utilizing certain economic laws now existent in every country for its prerogatives. Thus a World Citizen's Corporation must come into being which has as its purpose the complete integration and coordination of all the physical resources, means of production, and labor of the entire planet, for the direct benefit of all the consumers thereon, which excludes no one. Such a one world consumer's cooperative, linked to no politics or private interests because of its very inclusive nature, would allow each and every working world citizen to benefit directly from his or her labor and the labor

of his or her neighbor throughout the total world community. But further, it would at last give complete material security to those who were unable to work due either to age or physical disability. It would eventually link up all existent cooperative and corporate endeavors, all specialized nongovernmental world agencies now paralyzed due to national and competitive tensions, to one scientifically but democratically-elected World Parliament or Corporate Congress whose sole duty would be to run our world factory efficiently and harmoniously for the benefit of all the producers and consumers therein.

The World Government here proclaimed and open to all, will undertake to initiate such a World Citizen's Corporation as its proper corollary on the physical or economic level of human activity.

For moral and physical support of this endeavor, it calls upon the mothers of the world, who are so intimately connected with the physical continuance and well-being of the human race. If men be in fact World Citizens, so every mother is a World Mother since her child is born first into the Family of Man itself. And so, they are the great heart of humanity, the well of infinite compassion, love and pity that nurtures us from our very birth. They are the breast of plenty, and without their blessing and heartfelt support, we will remain in the realm of idle words and vain idealism.

Then we call to the common citizenry from which we have come, to our brothers in the world community. We call them in all comers of the globe, in every marketplace, in every secluded retreat, and from all walks of life. We call to the reason and conscience which we know to be a part of every man. In the name of Humanity of which he is an integral and valuable unit, we ask him to identify himself, not only as a citizen of his own hearth, his local community, his region, and his nation, but also as a citizen of the entire world as his natural and fundamental right as well as duty. Until we do this and begin to work together, we will continue to deserve the slaveries, both spiritual and economic we today endure. In short, we dare to proclaim mankind's total existence as the highest allegiance and the most noble and elevating duty of its separate component parts or individuals.

And in Humanity's name, in which any reasonable man may speak without fear, I, a World Sovereign, hereby claim the territory of the entire earth as the proper home and the rightful possession of all mankind. As an actual symbol of that ownership, and for the now existent World Government, I claim here in the soil of my birth, the dot of land on which I

now stand, as World Territory. Let it be henceforth known as World Citizen's Point, and marked only as 68°25'30" Longitude, 44°32'30" Latitude.

Let all World Citizens accept this point as a territorial symbol of their highest allegiance, whereas this World Citizen claims it as the only legal territory within the continental limits of the United States of America whereon he can reside.

As I stand before you here, no national law covers my very existence. Since that day when I was brought back into France from the United Nations, I have lived in five fully sovereign nations, yet not one of those nations was able to represent me legally. But further, merely to handle me physically, they were all obliged to violate their own national laws. The most recent violation occurred when the U.S. immigration authorities admitted me to this country last July 27th, frankly confessing to me at the time that no law covered my entry since I was not a U.S. citizen, not an immigrant, not a returning resident alien, and not a visitor, which four categories are the only lawful means of entering and residing in the United States.

According to the laws of this land, therefore, I am non-existent, a political and legal non-entity. Yet here I stand, in the City Hall of Ellsworth, a respectable community, in a conservative stronghold of the United States of America, the strongest power in the entire world, and though my very existence here calls into fundamental question that sovereign government, I remain untouched and unharmed. Just as the Immigration authorities were unable to refuse me though legally they were obliged to, so the law officer standing in the rear of this hall though legally obliged to arrest me because technically I am an illegal person, is unable to do so because my authority as a sovereign entity unto myself is manifestly greater than his as a representative of the sovereign nation. This does not mean that I must not obey reasonable laws of conduct, and that if I disobey them, I will not be arrested by this same officer. It means only that the State as such is the servant of the sovereign individual, which is the basic principle of democracy, and when the individual, according to his reason and conscience, secedes from the State because he considers it no longer able to protect him and yet give him the freedom he requires, the State must follow him as his very shadow, because eventually his fellow human beings and neighbors, also individually sovereign and democratic, as well as the servants of the State itself, will recognize him as the fundamental integer upon which a greater and more inclusive State **must** be built if the whole community is to thrive.

Thus as the territorial cornerstone of that Greater State, this dot I claim as the only piece of legal land on which I am now able to reside.

A point has no dimensions however, and therefore no physical existence, so neither can I actually live here, nor can the United States government claim it as national territory. Further, it having no physical existence, my claim needs no confirmation on the part of the national authorities as such, but only recognition from citizens throughout the world.

As a world sovereign, existing legally only in a worldly sense, I am able to give this point a legal existence based on the three Prime Laws of Mankind. So be it. Now every national citizen throughout the world is able to make a valid extension of his loyalty to the world community through this legal world territory without at the same time renouncing any humanitarian local or national responsibilities which are a part of the Whole. World citizenship is not incompatible with lower levels of citizenship so long as the duties and responsibilities of those citizenships reflect that of the greater.

At this moment this is the only neutral but inclusive government in existence. It has no foreign policy, no political parties, indeed no politics even. no army, navy or air force, though civil armies, navies and air forces can perform many humanitarian duties once the threat of war is removed, no axes to grind, no special interests to protect, and no private profits to make. Its door is open to all and will be closed to none. With the firm guidance of a representative council of the World's Teachers and the World's Mothers, this government will be able to command the services of the most capable and farsighted men in order that humanity might be best served, and that positions of public responsibility not be usurped by lesser men. Methods of just selection can easily be incorporated into a World Constitution or Charter whereby humanity's real leaders may rise to the top without fear and without hindrance. Thus would evolve a World Parliament or Corporate Congress gradually to replace in the public mind the absolute nationalistic sovereignties of today. Through a World Citizen's Corporation, problems of food, shelter, clothing, health, education, labor, production, distribution, management and the like will be dealt with as a whole, scientifically and cooperatively. A unified world currency will evolve in due course based no doubt on a labor value rather than the unrealistic gathering and stockpiling of inert metal by separate nation-states.

The completing of mankind, so long talked about by philosophers and spiritual leaders, so long dreamed of by the persecuted down the ages,

is at hand. It is started here tonight. A world government exists . . . if only in one common man and having but one dot of territory. No longer need we collectively hesitate. No longer need we argue about how long it will take, or whether the neighbor will come in. This neighbor is in, and it but remains for everyone to recognize and apply his own inness, or oneness.

The remaining task therefore is but a cleaning up one, a simple duplication. The main job is over, that of completing the microcosm. Each microcosm completed brings the macrocosm that much nearer completion. Borrow if you wish this global vision and determination. But do not be indifferent to your own survival and happiness. Examine these ideas and words with the searing blade of you own conscience and reason. They will stand even then. And do not hesitate for lack of experience. This work is unprecedented in these modern terms. Thus we are all youths in this task. But experience can only be gained by living our goal from the outset, by **being** members of the world community. And if we stumble, falter, even fall, there are others to carry on, for the reality of Man's Unity is a truth that cannot die.

I am a world sovereign. . .a forefather of the Human Race. Its government is here proclaimed.

Brothers and sisters, fellow World Citizens, join me in this glorious destiny.

GARRY DAVIS TALK

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

2 April, 1979

I am delighted and honored to be invited to address this meeting, especially under the format of international week.

As I was wondering how to go about addressing this meeting I was thinking of all the speakers who address students throughout the country and especially at commencement exercises and probably ever since the bomb exploded at Hiroshima and Nagasaki back in 1945 - which is a little bit before your time,- and how they would weary the students with the ideas of the crises which face all of us in the 20th century.

Then, of course, they invariably tell you to go out into the world, that world which they have loaded up with crises, with wisdom and courage and then they sit down rather smugly as if they had settled all your problems.

Well, I'm not going to do that, I am not going to follow that line. On the contrary, what I am going to do is point out our common enemy, enemy number one, yours, mine and that big word, human-kind's, and then I am going to tell you what to do and how to cope with that enemy in down-to-earth terms. Well, that's a rather presumptuous undertaking, I realize. But, the times don't permit double-talk any more and they don't permit double-think as George Orwell pointed out in "1984."

As I talk, of course, you are all aware of radioactive gasses, iodine gasses spewing out of a nuclear center near Harrisburg. This is happening now. This is a symbol, a very potent, dramatic symbol of the urgency of the message I am here to give you today. This is a symptom of an age which began in 1945, which is known generally as the nuclear age. The same reactor which is near Harrisburg near Three Mile Island is in a Trident submarine, in many Trident submarines, and if these ever follow the same course, or the melting of the core in these Trident submarines, they would sink to the bottom of the ocean. They would pollute with radioactivity hundreds of miles and they would be there for 250,000 years.

Another way of pinpointing the urgency, in 1945 the United States government spent eight and a half billion dollars on armaments; that's about 918,00 dollars an hour. But in 1979 the U.S. will spend about one

hundred, twenty six billion dollars on armaments which raise the ante to about 1.5 million dollars every hour. The total world military budget is about four hundred billion dollars; that adds up to 4.5 million dollars every hour. So, in the hour that I've been allotted to speak to you about world peace, the nation-state world will have moved four point five million dollars closer to world holocaust, and every hour you can tick it off like clockwork is another five million dollars closer to the end of the human story. We have no time to waste.

For today, I want to tell you about a new beginning for world peace, and a beginning that does not start and cannot start with nations, but with you and me. You see, when peace is discussed, it seems to have nothing to do with you and me, and it's discussed all the time from podiums, from lecture platforms, from pulpits; but it's always peace **between** nation states, peace **between** the USSR and the USA, peace **between** Vietnam and China, peace **between** Israel and the Arab states, peace **between, between, between** the nation-states, ad nauseam. But peace between equally sovereign nation-states so long as the **right** to wage war is not outlawed by a higher government once and for all is an illusion, and a travesty. It's merely a momentary absence of overt hostilities, as the hostility seethes underneath.

There was a voice in the past whose centennial we are celebrating this year, who ushered in the nuclear age with that famous equation which changed our world: $E=MC^2$. I am speaking, of course, of Albert Einstein. He wrote in his later years:

"As long as there are sovereign states possessing great power, war is inevitable. There is no salvation for civilization or even the human race other than the creation of a world government."

Then the former Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, who had a bird's eye view of what was going on in the entire system of the United Nations, wrote in 1963,

"Never before has it been so important to find a solution to the problem of substituting law for force in international affairs."

When Buzz Aldrin stepped out onto the moon's surface, took his little Minolta camera and pointed it back at his home planet, he took that magnificent picture, the earthscape, while we were all there. U Thant later commented on that. He said:

"Last year for the first time man could see our planet from the moon. They show no borders, no nations, no races, no ideologies and no political systems. They show vast oceans and seas, a few great land masses, precious atmosphere of air and clouds without which there would be no life on earth."

Then in direct contrast, when writing of the obligations of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, he said,

"The Secretary-General operates under the charter in a world of independent, sovereign state, where national interest remain dominant despite ideological, technological and scientific changes, and despite the obvious dangers of unbridled nationalism. He works within the paradox that as these sovereign states, in fact, become increasingly interdependent, the forces of nationalism often lead them to assert more and more stridently their rivalries with each other."

Then we move up to the present. Nothing changes, the present Secretary-General, Kurt Waldheim, writes in his 1978 report that in the present political circumstances the United Nations is seldom, if ever, in a position to enforce its decisions and has little means of making them effective in the face of determined opposition. Then we wonder, does the present Secretary-General Dr. Waldheim know what is required? Well, it would appear so because in the same report he says,

"Even the most casual consideration of the daily developments in our world provides clear evidence that global organization and global order, however imperfect and sometimes ineffective they may be at present are an increasingly indispensable necessity."

So, once more, world government is advocated; now by the U.N.'s top civil servant.

What does Jimmy Carter think of all this? What does he think is required for world peace, the leader of the world's mightiest military force who promised to decrease military spending if he were elected? Is he ignorant of the necessity of world government as a condition for world peace?

Well, I was in London on January 21, 1977 and I picked up the London Times and read the following:

"I have chosen the occasion of my inauguration as president to speak not only to my countrymen which is traditional, but also to you , citizens of the world. I want to assure you that the relations of the United States with the other countries and peoples of the world will be guided during our administration by our desire to shape a world that is more responsive to human aspiration. The United States will meet its obligations to help create a stable, just and peaceful world order."

You never heard that, you never read that, because it never got back to the United States. It came through the Voice of America a day late, so it was cold news. It never came back.

Now 53 cents out of every budget dollar today, as you probably know, goes for past, present, future wars. I am talking about the U.S. budget. Later on Jimmy Carter said up at the United Nations on April 29th, last year our national security in this complicated age requires more than military might. The choice is not which superpower will dominate the world; none can and none will. The choice instead is between a world of anarchy and a world of law. This is incredible; it goes on and on. I could read statements of dozens and dozens of national leaders, from Winston Churchill on, who talk about the necessity of world law for world peace. On paper, they are all for world law, even the generals.

Well, back in 1948, after I had fought in World War II as a bomber pilot, I discovered to my amazement the horrifying truth that the national official world, all the officials in the nations, including all the diplomats - and the diplomats of course are used to mouthing very glorious phrases about unity and brotherhood and so forth - are in fact unable to move beyond the very same murderous institution of the nation-state which gives them sustenance.

Their idea of defense is like a man who puts bombs in his own cellar and then has a system of controls by his bed in order to ward off burglars. Of course, when the bombs become nuclear, which has given rise to the phrase of "overkill" then the madness is complete. So I realized in 1947 that my relationship, and this goes for every one of us if you are a national citizen, with the nation-state, with the U.S.A. in particular, was no longer the social contract of the textbooks but it was actually a suicide pact with my fellow citizens. True, I was spared in WWII and I deeply regret and mourn the fact that my own brother was not, but not only would I not be spared in World War III but neither would my species.

I read a marvelous book published in 1945 by Emery Reves called The Anatomy of Peace in which Reves opened my eyes as to how I was thinking about the world. He pointed out that we thought and we were taught to think nation-centrally rather like in the Ptolemaic era when everybody thought that the sun revolved around the earth. Along came Copernicus and said "It ain't so" and Copernicus was considered a heretic. Everybody thinks about the world as if it's revolving around its own nation; if you are an American citizen it revolves around Washington, D.C., if you are a Soviet citizen the world revolves around Moscow, etc., if you are a Frenchman, Paris, an Englishman, London.

We do not think globally and we are not taught to think globally. This gives you the dawning realization that you are living, really, in an Alice-in-Wonderland political situation where you are governed by an institution which grew up in an age when the horse and buggy were the fastest means of transportation, when hand tools, and gun powder prevailed, when agriculture was the main occupation, when distances between people were measured in terms of weeks and localities and distances between countries, of course were measured in months. I remember reading once when George Washington turned to his Secretary of State, I think it was Jefferson, and said, "We have to get in touch with Ben Franklin," - who was their ambassador to France - "We haven't heard from him in a couple of months; we have to write him a letter." It was very slow in the days when the nation-state was founded.

Then, along comes the 20th century, along comes the car, the railroad, the airplane in 1907, and it was even before that the radio was developed. Suddenly we had an implosion of time and distance; suddenly the world collapsed in on itself. There were no frontiers in terms of communication and you were in a new ballgame. At that point we should have realized that if we were to survive and continue we had to reorder our thinking about politics, that politics had to meet the new conditions of the one communicative world which was now a dynamic fact in the twentieth century.

Well, this did not happen, as we all know. The nation remained; the nation fought its wars; the nation maintained its frontiers. Nationalism was a very strong force in the world and for me it was a shock to realize back in 1947 that the entire frame-work, the governing framework, in terms of world peace, was obsolete.

Then the great question remained: what do you do, how do you think; if your nation is not interested in your survival, who is? Well, then it comes

down to yourself, and that is the real shocker because then you realize that world peace depends on you. That it is your responsibility and it is your choice and that everything that is going on revolves down upon the individual making some very hard decisions about his/her immediate survival, in immediate and historic terms. Now this may be a startling thought to you, but the reasoning is unassailable. It all hangs on one word; the word is "sovereignty."

A nation claims to be sovereign and this, my friends, is a wholecloth lie. A nation is not sovereign. The original conception of the meaning of sovereignty is the sovereignty of the individual and then the community in which the individual lived, ethnically. Now "sovereignty" is a very easy word to define; it simply means choice. But nations have no choice anymore. Nations are glued, locked into a system where they can't budge and one of the greatest proofs of it is Vietnam where the United States could not launch any of its missiles, any of its nuclear weapons and had to move out. The same thing with the Soviet Union. These are two giants locked in a titanic rigor mortis with each other, in what we call a geodialectical situation, unable to move.

Iran is a perfect example where Jimmy Carter had no control over what happened. In Iran, the Shah was so-called propped up. Eight billion dollars worth of weapons went into Iran with another 9 or 10 billion on top of that described, and that is all down the drain.

Nations cannot act any more in terms of service to their individuals, to their citizens. And yet we give our sovereign, complete loyalty as human beings to particular nations in this century of instant communication and one world with no frontiers. So the exercise of **our** sovereignty becomes the key to world peace, and **only you and I can exercise sovereignty**. Only you and I can choose.

Now this is the essence of democracy, in fact, in a spiritual sense, this is the truth that will set you free. You choose your own spiritual identity; **you** choose it; it is not imposed on you at birth. This is the knowledge that gives power, etc. You can say it any way you want. In fact, this is the essential human right: to choose your own political identity, to choose your own status, in a sense. This is choice, sovereignty, keep that in mind. This is the essence of world citizenship.

Well, I discovered this back in 1948; I don't know why it was me. I was influenced I think when I was your age by an article or essay of Emerson, called Self Reliance - probably some of you have read it - and one sentence stood out, which I have never forgotten,

"The world is made for the education of each man."

Somehow in those days, with no major problems, I kind of accepted that as a motto. On another level, on a spiritual level, I was influenced by one phrase in the Lord's Prayer, that a lot of us say every Sunday, and that phrase was

"Thy will be done on Earth, as it is in Heaven."

Though I not religious in an orthodox sense at all, that phrase struck me as being a very powerful evidence of the link-up between that which was beyond me and my ability to exercise that power. It was a mandate; that's what I am saying.

So, back in '48 during the Berlin airlift - a very dramatic event - the media was pushing the idea of a "causa bella" if the U.S. pushed an armored column into East Germany to help the people in Berlin. In my sensitive mood at that time I was very excited about this and thought this was going to be the end of the world. The bombs were getting bigger, they were now nuclear, etc., and I was in the reserves in the Air Corps and didn't want to find myself flying over Moscow in a B-57 or whatever dropping nuclear bombs on my fellow citizens over there. So I was in a very sensitive state for this idea, for world citizenship, and I knew that my survival now depended upon my sovereign, self-identification with every other single human being on the planet. This is the way I was thinking and I still think this way. The reason for that was that we were all indissolubly bound to one another. They were saying back in 1945 after the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs that war has now become total. War changed its dimension at that point and at that time many of the people and the intellectuals and the scientists were saying, "OK, that's it. We can't afford war anymore because it's total. There are no winners so we can't afford it. We've got to rise out of that," and so forth.

Out of the ashes of that came the stillborn, sterile United Nations, which was merely an extension of the League of Nations - which was not a government - based on collective security, equally sovereign nations still maintaining the right to wage war.

So, if war was total, obviously peace was total. That's what Einstein was saying, and that's what Schweitzer was saying, and that's what Gandhi was saying. Then Wendell Willkie wrote a book, One World or None, and then, of course, in later years along came Bucky Fuller and Operating Manual for Spaceship Earth, and then there was Utopia or Oblivion and so forth. Now it has become rather standard. Every politician gets up and

talks about the inter-dependent world economic order, but back in those days I actually opted for that, for One World. My action was very simple. I simply chose a new identity: World Citizen.

I walked into the Embassy in Paris and raised my right hand and said, *"OK. count me out. I can't be an exclusive national citizen any longer."* After I dropped my right hand after taking what they called the "Oath of Renunciation" nothing had really changed. I was still the same person. I thought to myself, so much for the myth of national sovereignty.

Now of course from all the practical standpoints this was a very irrational act. To go from United States citizen to stateless was considered crackpot and some people called me even things a little less complimentary. My father cabled me and said, "You've done the worst thing you could do; you can't travel anymore." Of course I **was** one passport lighter. That was the only change; I did not weigh as much.

The U.S. Consul there in Paris considered me just one more ex-G.I. weirdo with a new bag. He asked me, *"Why are you doing this?"* I replied, *"Well, the United States can't protect me anymore."* I'll never forget, he looked at me and said, *"Well, I'm new here, maybe you're right."* Anyway at that point I did not know how to act. How does one act as a world citizen? I found out I didn't have to act at all; I just made the statement and then started to react.

The first thing that happened was the French Government came to me and said *"Get out!"* They told me to leave; I said where shall I go and they said, *"Anywhere you like; just don't annoy us."* Then I said, *"I haven't got a passport,"* and they said *"That's not our problem, just go!"* Here was a real Catch-22 situation. That is a situation which faces literally millions of people of today.

Rather miraculously for me the "Dead Sea" opened and the United Nations came to the rescue. Well, at least not the United Nations but a little planetary soil, "international territory" which was the site upon which the U.N. in Paris was situated. It was land surrounding the Palais de Chaillot. Of course I did not have anyplace else to go, prison was behind me. So, I got my sack and went up to the United Nations site which they called "international territory," and that began what might be called the "World Citizenship Movement."

The image of one little guy claiming global political asylum to this United Nations, the assembled might of the world, seemed to appeal to the French public if not to the French government. Of course, the U.N.

Secretariat was even more annoyed than the French Government, especially since I had some World Citizen Identity Cards printed at that time. I was going to present them to the delegates as they came in. They did not like that at all; they had to get rid of me because that was too embarrassing to have delegates of nation-states identified as world citizens.

So after six days of living in that open air apartment, as it were, at the request of the U.N. Secretariat the French government came into this little "international country," picked me up by the scruff of the neck and reimported back into France - a distance of about ten feet. This was exposing the ridiculousness of frontiers actually. The French press, plus the press of the world was there and, literally, an idea was launched by virtue of this almost accidental happenstance where I was caught in the right position at the right time.

I wasn't alone anymore; post-war Europe then was experiencing an identity crisis. After the war there is an immense sigh of relief and a willingness to forget it and go back to normal living. There was a tremendous reservoir of good will which was lying around waiting to be expressed.

World-citizenship - bang - came in and hit that core, that point in history where there was fertile soil ready for an idea to take root. So, in the next six months literally hundreds of thousands of people wrote to me in Paris saying "*Wonderful idea. I want to be a world citizen, too. Sign me up!*"

These details, incidentally, are spelled out in a book that I wrote called, My Country is the World which is available. The first result was an institution called The International Registry of World Citizens which we founded in 1949; this registry was actually the beginning of a global electoral machine. Our whole political program - we did not have anything more than this, we did not want anything more - was to elect one delegate per million population. This delegate would be mandated to be a member of a World Constitutional Convention. In fact, this is what we spelled out at the U.N. on November 22, 1948, in an interruption from the balcony. We called the U.N. "*an illusion of political authority.*"

Five years later, after we had more than 750,000 people registered as world citizens which represent more than the population of twenty sovereign nations in the United Nations, after I had been taken from Brixton Prison in London where I spent nine weeks, then brought to New York, I was forced into the United States against my will. I saw a very important civil rights lawyer who said, "*Well, you've registered all these citizens, and you call yourself a world citizen, now is the time to put this*

into a form which has to be recognized by governments. In other words you have enough mandate to declare your own government."

So on September 4, 1953, from the city hall of Ellsworth, Maine, we made the declaration of World Government. Now this declaration was the beginning of a new initiative for world peace! As embryonic as it was, as ridiculous as it was, as irrational and, in many terms, as impractical, still it was a nucleus. It was an embryonic beginning which allowed others then to come to the framework which was universal.

It had another significance. Historically it was redeeming the pledge of the founding fathers of the United States who, in the tenth amendment of the Constitution referred sovereign decision-making power back to the people. I sometimes talk to international law students and I ask them what the tenth amendment says. Nobody knows. Very few Americans have read the Constitution much less the Bill of Rights. Much less do they know the tenth amendment which is called the "Sleeping Giant." Even constitutional lawyers don't know why it's there; but it's ticking away to be used only in times of crisis. It simply provides that all powers not delegated to the Constitution nor prohibited to it by the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

This is a very extraordinary amendment, because it is saying first of all that the Constitution itself is limited. It is not a Bible; it's not a document which takes into consideration every single problem which is going to come down the time track for all time. For their descendents, it's saying, "You're going to have problems," and this is the insight of the founding fathers. I think it was probably Tom Jefferson himself who insisted on this - who is saying *"You're going to have problems which this Constitution is not going to take care of so we are going to provide a constitutional escape-hatch so that you, as a sovereign people, the source, the inheritors of the sovereignty, the pristine sovereignty which began this government, you can act constitutionally."*

So my declaration of World Government actually was redeeming the pledge of the founding fathers who allowed this constitutional escape hatch. This is the only constitution in the world that does so, which is why you have really an extraordinary opportunity as U.S. citizens to do in fact what the founding fathers themselves did although they had no benefit of constitution.

So what then did they actually do? They created a higher citizenship out of thin air to which they then gave their sovereign allegiance and in so

doing they protected their own local or state citizenships; Virginian, Pennsylvanian, Kentuckian, etc. Jefferson, in fact, wrote in 1790:

"Every man possesses the right of self-government. Individuals exercise it by their single will."

Here again is a confirmation of what I am talking about, the sovereignty of the individual, the essence of the democratic principle.

This is newly stated now, these things are brought up to date, Article 15, section 2, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights takes this idea of sovereignty, puts it into a framework of 1948, and allows the individual, in other mandates, to choose his or her own government.

Does anybody know what Article 15, section 2, of the UDHR is? All right, it says:

"No one shall be denied the...right to change his nationality."

It is rather extraordinary. Years and years ago, a couple hundred years ago you were "born" into a religion; you were a Jew, a Catholic, you were Protestant, you were a Moslem because you were "born" a Jew, a Catholic, a Protestant. Now we say no, the individual can choose his religion. But, choosing your own government? Changing your own nationality? This is new, but it makes as much sense as choosing your own religion. If a government does not please you, you choose another government.

A government is supposed to provide service, it is supposed to protect you. Suppose it does not provide a service; suppose it does not protect you? Must you remain under the aegis of that government? This is not citizenship, this is serfdom; this is to be a subject. But, the declaration of world government was even more than this; it was essentially a declaration of world peace. You see, by renouncing my exclusive national citizenship I had literally disarmed myself from the nation-state system. In other words, no national leader could speak for me, no national leader can speak for me now. Yes, they can put me in prison as they have done twenty seven times. In fact, if I go back to France I go to prison for two years and if I go back to Switzerland there is an order of arrest out for me....not because I have done anything wrong, but because I am doing something right.

I gave up my killing when I took off my uniform as a bomber pilot. But when I became completely harmless and put into institutional form what I was doing, I was blowing the whistle on the state that maintains the **right** to be violent. You see, a government is a monopoly of violence and a

man who insists that he will not fight, that he will not be used, in any way, not as an object of fear of another person, not as a threat to another person, becomes a threat to the **state** and he must be controlled. I was declaring myself a microcosmic world peace. This is what you can do. This is fulfilling an ancient prophecy - "Turning Swords into Plowshares" -which Jimmy Carter, Mr. Begin, Mr. Sadat were quoting last Tuesday on the White House lawn and which people continue to quote *ad nauseam*.. Then **up** go the military budgets. But how do you turn swords into plowshares? If in fact you go and read the Isaiah quote, as I did a couple nights ago, it is not **nations** turning swords into plowshares, it is **individuals** turning swords into plowshare. Go back and read it as it is very interesting. It's how I got this idea. When you become a citizen of World Government, you are personally taking the sword and breaking it or remaking it into a plowshare.

You are making world peace! What happens if millions of us do the same thing? What is going to happen to 129 congressmen up there on the hill who are in a committee for "World Peace through Law?" What is going to happen to parliamentarians all over the world who are also for world law? They are going to say: "Hey, some new politics to get on to." These guys are pros, these people are professional politicians who are not going to move until there is a constituency. A constituency is you and me, that is what we are building: a world, a global civic constituency now. So, I was fulfilling that prophecy I had discovered almost accidentally. I give myself no credit for this, I just happened to be there, happened to stumble onto it.

I had discovered the key to turn moral principle into dynamic political action in the 20th century. The door is open. Now the World Government is growing; we've got 50,000 citizens who are all over the world. There is no president; I am not the president. I am a coordinator, that's all. We have no elections yet because we haven't got enough people yet...That's down the track. You are invited to join this new and peaceful government.

What you're doing is simply adding a higher civic commitment to that which you already possess. You're not asked to give up any thing, the founding fathers did not give up anything. They just added a higher loyalty. They verticalized citizenship and by doing so, as I said, they protected what they already had.

Our administrative agency issues all our documents. This document, this passport actually is mandated by Article 13, Section 2, of the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights. This is the Declaration that Jimmy Carter keeps talking about to get Soviet Jews out of Russia. This is the article:

"Everyone has the right to leave every country, including his own, and to return to his country. "

It's a document which is recognized by an increasing number of nations. We don't get as much feedback as we want, but we have evidence of over a hundred countries who have visaed this document on a case-by-case basis. Six countries have given us letters saying they recognize it on a *de jure* basis.

This is how law builds up: citizens doing things. We have ID cards, we have birth certificates. Many people are asking us for our birth certificates now. Why? What is a birth certificate? It's the first social document; the first official document. When we are first born we receive a rubber stamp on our backside saying we are American, or Ghanian, or Rhodesian, or what have you. This locks us into the nation-state system. But nobody decided where he was going to be born; nobody decided the color of his skin. We are born from a female womb and we are born into the world community. So, we should have a human birth certificate and from that human birth certificate all our identity documents should flow.

You see how they get us with documents? I've been a victim of documents, nationalistic documents. In fact, in many countries this document is very difficult to get, that is, a national passport. In certain countries it costs an arm and a leg. In Ghana, for instance, you have to have 300 dollars up front before you can have the application form. In Turkey it costs about \$750 to get a Turkish passport; in other countries the national passport does not mean anything anyway. On a Rhodesian passport you can go from Rhodesia to South Africa, or Switzerland and the Swiss don't let you out except to return to Rhodesia because nobody recognizes Rhodesia.

In certain countries, you better not go with a U.S. passport. Because you are a U.S. citizen you are responsible for everything Nixon did, for Watergate, etc. It's built in, you see.

The editor of the Wall Street Journal in London would not leave England without his WSA passport because when he goes to Africa on an assignment he does not take out his British passport in Khartoum. Why? Because they are liable to put him away, I mean this is the week that Numieri is not seeing eye to eye with Prime Minister Callahan. So, every British citizen that comes off the plane gets put away.

This is the document game. I'm not for passports at all; I hate passports, I think they are ridiculous. But I gave my own up and for five years I was bouncing from jail to jail. Everybody knew who I was but they said, we've got to control you, you've got no documents and if you've got no document then we have nothing we can put our little rubber stamp on. If we can't use our rubber stamp then how do you expect us to get paid at the end of the month? So when you go up to the frontier and this man in uniform says, "Passport," you let him function. You present to him a passport which is really not so much a passport as an anti-passport. This again is based upon the idea of sovereignty, it's your document, it's your passport.

O.K. for the refugee, of course, the identity crisis is really horrendous. We deal with many, many refugees throughout the world. This document will cost you thirty-two dollars, but it does not cost the refugee anything because he does not have \$32. We deliver half our documents free and we have identified refugees from all over the world, literally. From Djibouti, Laos, Vietnam, Sudan, Mozambique, Angola, you name it! Whenever there is a surge of refugees, we know it, because we get hundreds and hundreds of letters from these refugees saying, *"Please send us these documents because we are without any papers whatsoever and that is being a non-person."*

We have had cases where people come up after they have been thrown out of the Horn of Africa in this war of Somalia and Ethiopia, where they have lost everything, their possessions, their farms. They finally get to Djibouti - a former French colony; it's a basket case. It's a little sovereign state now 80% unemployed with one town and a desert. The town is a kind of ghost town because the first thing the Somali's did is cut the railroad from Addis Ababa to Djibouti and that's all the work they had. But when these refugees get there, they need everything, of course, including water and food and the rest of it. The first thing the guy on the frontier asks them is, "Papers!" "There's nothing behind me but war, what do you want? My name is Ahmil Abdul Mohamad Aziz." He responds, "I don't know that, I don't know who you are. You say you are that," and so forth. The refugee says everybody knows me in my village and the guard says, "Papers." The refugee is in rags but because he cannot present a paper they put him in a camp and he writes to us in desperation and says he wants a world passport. He becomes a world citizen and he goes immediately from the bottom of the social heap to the top.

Anyway, I am taking too much time: Wind-up! ...I just want to mention two other things. There is one other article in the Universal

Declaration which is a mandated for an election. It's Article 21, section 3, which says,

"The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will should be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal vote."

Well, this is a mandate to hold an election for a World parliament. Actually, it has been sitting there on the shelf now for 31 years and nobody has used it. Five years ago Willie Brandt, who was the former Chancellor of West Germany, the former head of the Social Democrat Party, and a Nobel Peace Prize laureate, makes a statement saying he was a candidate for the European Parliament. Everybody was shocked, has he gone mad? There is no European Parliament. Willie Brandt tosses his hat into a political ring which does not exist - no machinery for it. It implies that citizens can vote beyond their nation? Heresy! This is upsetting the whole business of national sovereignty and this is Willie Brandt saying it! This June all the citizens of the Common Market will vote for direct representatives to the European Parliament. I say that history books will show Willie Brandt's courage in stepping out and saying I am a candidate for something that does not exist, but I am a candidate because we need it, signaling a political milestone which finally lead to the creation of a European Parliament.

Well, my friends, I am a candidate, too. I am a candidate for World Parliament. Why? First of all, I have no government except the World Government, which is empirical, so I am asking for your vote.

According to this mandate now you have the right to vote, because you have the right in this article. *"The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government.."* We've printed World Ballots. Unfortunately I did not bring any with me but you can write the World Services Authority in Washington, D. C. and we will send you a ballot. You don't have to vote for me. I am a candidate but you can draft Doug here; anybody can be candidate for World office.

Here is a World Ballot which simply says that as a citizen of the world I hereby perform my fundamental civic right and duty outlined above by voting for a direct World Representative to represent me in matters of common concern for the general good.

Now you can be a U.S. citizen and still do this. Nothing in your citizenship precludes this; in fact, again, going back to the tenth amendment it mandates it. You see these are new ideas which are standard, which can

be done, which are not impractical. All we have to do is do them, right from where we sit.

Now, the last thing I want to talk about is economics which is very important. Article 17 of the UDHR says that "*Everyone has the right to own property.*" To own property alone as well as in association with others and nobody shall arbitrarily be deprived of his property. Property is a very important part of a free society. Our forefathers understood that the ownership of property was essential to a free society; the reason was very simple, because power follows property. When you monopolize property, as we do today, you monopolize power. The ownership of property means the individual is economically independent and politically free. A citizen as opposed to being a serf or a subject. So that economic justice - this is part of our program - is very much part of world citizenship. It implies the democratisation of capital or that which produces wealth. Now since the writings of Karl Marx, economic justice has been recognized as vital to a free society. So you've got societies now which claim to be devoted exclusively to the so-called "planned" societies; you've got "free enterprise" societies which also have a primitive claim to economic justice based upon the free play of market forces. The truth, however, is that economic power, in both free and planned societies, is highly concentrated and both are totally comprised by the nationalistic political world which spend about 90% of the world's gross national product on armaments.

The concentration of wealth here in the United States is very well known. Six percent of the population owns about 50% of the wealth producing capital; ten percent owns 80%. Well, this is tremendous gross imbalance. In Russia it is about the same if you replace capital, monopolistic capitalists with the Communist Party which represents about one percent of the population which owns the entire means of production. Now, it's only by considering economics globally that you begin to see a light through this haze. Only by viewing the world as an economic situation, one situation, can the principle of economic justice be really applied. For one thing, the horrendous waste of the nation-state system itself would be gradually eliminated. This means armaments, embassies, consulates, frontiers, the diplomatic corps, the spy systems, the whole paraphernalia of the nation-state. I know this sounds terribly utopian but still it is anachronistic and does not add anything to your pocketbooks, in fact, it takes it away.

The choice is ours: World citizenship or world chaos!

Thank you for your attention.

WORLD GOVERNMENT OR WORLD WAR

EDUCATION FOR SURVIVAL

International Association of Educators for World Peace
Georgetown University
25 November 1982

May I express my pleasure at having the opportunity of addressing this important conference. Its theme, **Education for Survival**, bespeaks the total crisis facing our human race on planet earth. Total crisis calls for total solutions no matter how disagreeable these may appear to some. The time for theory about world peace is past. Bombs are ready to fall on our collective heads. Economic collapse is imminent; millions starve daily. Pollution, including radioactive, encroaches on our bio-system; bold and global action is required.

I consider my purpose my purpose here then to address squarely our common crisis as well as to propose a workable solution already in operation.

In sum, I intend to advance four propositions:

1. The cause of war is a state of anarchy between exclusive sovereign social units.
2. The sovereignty of these social units depends in turn on the exclusive allegiance given them by single human beings possessing, whether they know it or not, inalienable rights to choose their own political identity.
3. As one sovereign human being, owing no allegiance to any nation-state, I claim, as now do many others, to be a citizen of a global government as legitimate, if not more so, than any and all nation-states.
4. The evolution of this global government is the *sine qua non* of world peace.

Specifically, given the totality of war between sovereign nation-states, I maintain that exclusive nationality, being the civic condition which

perpetuates anarchy between nations, is not only immoral and irrational but illegitimate; and secondly, both world citizenship and world government are not practical realities but possess their own legitimacy and are the only method to achieve world peace.

To better illustrate the first point, in the nation-state world, no matter how you may regard each other personally or organizationally, every one in this room is designated an "alien" by billions of his or her fellow humans. That is, as exclusive national citizens, every human outside your particular nation is labeled "alien" by your own nation. Furthermore, many of you are also labeled, "enemy" by millions more no matter what other contacts you have or what your religious beliefs are.

Now, like you, I have several legal labels. If you are a United States citizen, for instance, I am for you an "excludable alien." I am also "stateless." These labels are the result of Justice Department and judicial determinations in the civil courts.

If you are a citizen of another nation, I am simply an "alien." If, on the other hand, you are a refugee or a stateless person, I am a fellow human legally outside the civic paradigms of the nation-state.

But there is another legal label for those who are already declared world citizens and registered with our global government. For you, I am legally your fellow world citizen. More of this process later.

Now the nations to which most of you belong claim that war is legitimate and their sovereign right, each an every one. Though half-hearted attempts have been made by national delegates since the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 to outlaw war, none have obviously been successful.

The first question we must then ask is, are delegates of nation-states capable of eliminating war between them? Another way of asking the same question: can sovereign nations in deadly competition with each other give up the one quality which justifies that sovereignty: the right to wage war or in its euphemistic terms, "defend" itself?

Obviously, the essential condition for the elimination of war-making between equally sovereign units would be to deprive those units of that so-called legitimate right. And here is the Catch-22. The answer as to whether they can do it themselves is evidenced by the one hundred and twenty eight wars since 1900 with today's so-called superpowers deadlocked in a suicidal arms race.

Emery Reves in "Anatomy of Peace" wrote in 1945:

"The real cause of wars has always been the same. They have occurred with a mathematical regularity of a natural law at clearly determined moments as a result of clearly definable conditions. 1. Wars between groups of men forming social units always taken place when these units - tribe, dynasties, churches, cities, nations - exercise unrestricted sovereign power. 2. Wars between social units cease the moment sovereign power is transferred from them to larger or higher unit...In other words, wars always ceased when a higher unit is established its own sovereignty, absorbing the sovereignty of the conflicting smaller units."

Applying that formula to the nation-state system, an outside or higher sovereignty would be required in order to outlaw war between equally sovereign social and political units. In virtual confirmation of this largely unrealized fact, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Dr. Perez de Cuellar claimed yesterday that though all U.N. members have signed the Charter, they *"have conveniently forgotten that it binds them to settle their disputes through negotiation."*

Reves, writing while the San Francisco Charter was being designed, reminds us that:

"Throughout the entire history of all known civilizations, only one method has ever succeeded in creating a social order within which men had security from murder, larceny, cheating and other crimes, and had freedom to think, to speak and to worship. That method is law."

"In short, peace among men and a civilized society - which are one and the same thing - are imaginable only within a legal order equipped with institutions to give effect to principles and norms in the form of law, with adequate power to apply those laws and to enforce them with equal vigor against all who violate them."

Now thirty eight years , 75 wars later and some four trillion dollars spent on armaments, we know the truth of that statement.

But if nations cannot eliminate war against them and it requires a higher authority, the question remains, from what source can this higher authority derive?

Here is the first mental and emotional barrier to overcome. Does it involve you and me? My friends, if world war involves you and me, then conversely world peace must involve you and me...and intimately.

That is the bullet we must bite if we are serious about world peace. However, If I am to be involved in this process of establishing an outside or higher sovereignty, it is irrelevant that I call myself a monotheist or a human being, a father, a world educator for peace or that you call yourself Christian, Jew, Moslem, Buddhist, Quaker, black or white, male or female, father or mother. Because what alone is relevant in this context is your and my legal participation in war-making or your and my legal participation in peace-making.

To arrive at this realization may not be easy for most of us because it means a reexamination of the loyalties which now bind us. We fear to lose them. Better the devil we know than the devil we don't. However, as I began, total crisis implies total solution. Nothing less will suffice than total commitment to world law.

The obfuscation surrounding the question of peace comes from all directions: moral, social, economic, biological, educational. And while I admit that peripherally moral, ethical, social, economic, educational and biological factors all play their role, still, when it is a question of the sheer survival of the species, the bottom of the line is the legal right either to wage war or to make peace.

If this is true, then, as I indicated, the problem of peace is neither moral, educational or technical but legal. If you doubt this let us examine its premise more closely.

Legally, we are living in a geocentric world of nation-states. We look upon economic, social and political problems as "national" problems. No matter in which country we live, the center of our political universe is our own nation. In our outlook, the immovable point around which all other nations, all the problems and events outside our nation, the rest of the world, supposed revolve, is - our nation. Unfortunately, our attachment to our particular is not only legal but pervasively emotional.

But when nations deal with other nations, the individual citizen is forgotten. The civic communication is cut between individual and head of state. He speaks for the "nation" not for the individual citizens. You have no input to such decisions supposedly taken in your name.

Yet such is the duality of the nation that even though it claims to be the legitimate representative of its people, a closer examination will reveal that it has relinquished its legitimate right to wage war both by its own laws and by binding international common law.

I will give only three examples of proof though there are a myriad more. Though the first declaration of legitimacy of war-making and even war preparing was the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, it was the Nuremberg Decisions formulated in 1945 to try the Nazi leaders which actually defined an international penal code.

These principles explicitly state that "any person who commits an act which constitutes a crime under international law is responsible therefore and liable to punishment." (Principle I); secondly, that "crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity are punishable as crimes under international law." (Principle VI); and thirdly, that "complicity in the commission of these crimes is itself a crime under international law." (Principle VII). As to the responsibility of the national citizen acting on orders from his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him."

The United Nations General Assembly accepted the Nuremberg Principles in 1950 as part of international law. We have to conclude therefore - with the International Commission of Jurists - that "the Principles of Nuremberg are today fully accepted as a part of international law."

These Principles constitute the first international penal code which superseded national obligations.

But what are "crimes against peace"? They are defined as:

1. Planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances;
2. Participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any acts mentioned under 1.

But, you will ask, aren't these all acts of sovereign nations, especially violating international treaties, agreement or assurances? Isn't that the game of diplomacy totally outside popular control? Then how can the Nuremberg Principles hold the individual citizen responsible? Well there is one citizen who possesses the legitimate right to speak for the state. That is the president or prime minister or secretary-general of the controlling party. If the Nuremberg Principles applies only to state leaders, then with minor exceptions, all are war criminals for all are either "Planning, preparing, initiating, or waging a war of aggression" though such inhuman activities are always couched in the sacred name of "national defense."

None the less, the Nuremberg Principles, in spite of no enforcement process, at least in principle, declare war outlawed.

The second proof of the illegitimacy of war , this time pertaining directly to the nation itself begins with the 1947 Showa Constitution of Japan, Chapter 11, entitled, "Renunciation of War."

Article 9 states "Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes. In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph,land, sea and air forces,as well as all other war potential ,will never be maintained. the right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized."

The extraordinary and precedent-shattering implication of Article 9 is that the concept of state sovereignty no longer has any validity.

After a trial of 30 months beginning on 3 May 1946 in Tokyo, the International Military Tribunal for the Far East gave down the "Tokyo Judgement." It pronounce sentence on twenty five accused war criminals. Part of the Judgement dealt with the alleged right of self defense of a nation. It stated:

"The right of self defense involves the right of the State threatened with impending attack to judge for itself in the first instance whether it is justified in resorting to force. Under the most liberal interpretations of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the right of self defense does does not confer on the State resorting to war the authority to make a final determination upon the justification for its action."

The implications of this judgement have largely been ignored by both the succeeding national leaders and the general public. It confirmed and universalized the concept of Article 9 in two ways. First, it introduced into the concept of command responsibility an arbitrary element of chance which effectively denied the state the right to impose such a risk on any individual. Second, by a radical interpretation of the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 which condemned "recourse to war for solution of international controversies..." and renounced it "as an instrument of national policy..." the judgement removes the sovereign right of self-defense.

The renunciation of the right of belligerency contained within A-9 was therefor given international legal standing by the Tokyo Judgement.

My last example of the illegitimacy of war-making by nations is contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Certain argue that the Declaration is not law. Yet eighteen nations today have incorporated it into their own constitutions. Many more refer to it in the Preamble. But the crucial fact about human rights is not their universality but their legitimacy. Consider firstly that that war-making is a function of sovereignty. Yet all national constitutions without exception claim to derive from the sovereign people. In other words, the exercise of fundamental human rights in the first place gave rise to all national constitutions. It follows that the legitimacy of human rights themselves is categorical.

Then by elementary reasoning, if the people are sovereign and innately legitimate, as stated in all constitutions and reaffirmed in such documents as the U.S. Bill of Rights, particularly in the 9th and 10th amendments, then we are sovereign and legitimate not as "Americans," "Indians," "Soviets," "French," or "Nigerians," but as humans.

It follows that the world's people, that is, humankind as such, is the ultimate and largest sovereignty on planet earth.

This humankind, of which each of us is a dynamic part, is innately and inalienably legitimate and in contra-distinction to that of the so-called sovereign state. Otherwise human rights themselves are not legitimate.

The United Nations Charter, in Article 56, obliges each Member-State to "observe and respect fundamental human rights" as a very condition for its membership. In so doing, it negates its sovereign character.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is explicit concerning our sovereign rights. Article 1 states that:

"Everyone is born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood."

For the protection of our fundamental rights, Article 28 states:

"Everyone is entitled to a social and international order so that the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration can be fully realized."

We have at last arrived at the genesis of world government by first exposing that exclusive national sovereignty is no longer legitimate and secondly that human sovereignty in terms of fundamental human rights is legitimate.

Thomas Paine has some illuminating thoughts on how government begins:

"It has been thought a considerable advance towards establishing the principle of freedom to say that government is a compact between those who govern and those who are governed; but this cannot be true, because it is putting the effect before the cause; for as men must have existed before government existed, there once was a time when government did not exist, and consequently there originally exist no governors to form such a compact with. The fact therefore must be that the individuals themselves, each in his own personal and sovereign right, entered into a compact with each other to produce a government..."

This "entering into a compact" is the social actualization of our innate and inalienable legitimacy.

Therefore world peace, as a result of a new global compact with fellow humans which legitimizes each partner in a partnership, a veritable horizontal network of sovereign individuals, in turn the aggregate - the "citizenry" or "people" - which creates the new institution of government, no longer appears either idealistic or utopian but eminently realizable in the here and now since it depends essentially on the sovereign will and **discretionary** decision of each individual concerned.

To conclude, for world government to come into being, humans must first identify themselves legally **beyond** the nations paradigms. This is no

feat since simply to recognize oneself as human is already to transcend the nation-state. But human law is evidently not exclusive national law. Therefore, each individual must identify himself or herself as a world citizen. **This becomes the first social communication or compact essential to the evolution of world government.**

But I must warn you, while to sign this Pledge of Allegiance to World Government is a perfectly legal act and the exercise of you inalienable right, it is also a revolutionary act. For it means that you are declaring your own sovereignty as against that of the state. You are taking your destiny into your own hands and declaring your worldly independence and freedom. You are crossing the razor's edge from the theory of world peace to its reality in microcosm.

E. B. White has written:

"World government is an appalling prospect. Many people have not comprehended it or distinguished it from world organization. Many others, who have comprehended it, find it preposterous or unattainable in a turbulent and illiterate world where nations and economics conflict daily in many ways. Certainly the world is not ready for government on planetary scale. In our opinion, it will never be ready. The test is whether the people will chance it anyway like children who hear the familiar cry, 'Coming, ready or not!'"

Educators for world peace, I enjoin you to educate by your world peace-making action...ready or not.

Thank you.

WORLD GOVERNMENT and YOU

Macrobiotic World Congress

Becket, Massachusetts

31 August 1984

I first want to express my appreciation and delight at having been invited to this podium to share with you some thoughts about peace. Frankly, I am in some awe at being here.

Michio Kushi's advocacy of peace through world government dates approximately from my own. When I read in Aveline Kushi's preface to Natural Healing Through Macrobiotics that George Oshawa had christened Michio "number one ambassador of world government," as far back as 1950 I knew our destinies were intrinsically linked. It has taken thirty four years for our paths to join, shall I say, organizationally. I know they have already been joined in our joint acceptance of what Michio calls, "The Principles of the Order of the Universe." Now, we move together in our noble crusade for humanity's emancipation and well-being. That is good news, indeed.

"Peace" is a word venerated throughout the world and, indeed, through all of human history. But what does it mean? There are many definitions of peace.

There is the personal and mystical "peace which passeth understanding," the intellectual peace of the fulfillment of a creative task, the emotional peace we call "love" expressed first in the family unit then to the neighbors and to God, the social peace of a community and the political peace of larger human societies such as the nation.

So what peace are concerned with here today? In a nuclear-triggered world, we are suddenly impelled not only to define but to practice a new kind of peace: "world peace."

The alternative is not only personal annihilation but racial suicide...at least on planet earth. All past revolutions, therefore, were merely prologues

compared to the one facing each one of us. If our crisis is total it follows our response to it must also be total. Viewed, however, from a national perspective only, world peace is impossible, a chimera, a fantasy. Anyone who seeks world peace is condemned as a dreamer, a utopist or a crackpot.

Just the monstrous amounts nations today spend on armaments underlines this fact. This year's global nationalistic military budget is over \$650 billion. In all of World War II - in which I was a United States bomber pilot - three megatons, or three million tons, of explosives were used. Today the combined nuclear powers possess over 16,000 megatons of explosive power available for immediate use against us.

We must draw the proper conclusion. All our previous definitions of peace must be urgently re-examined from the most intimate to the most universal.

I would put the first question to you: Is there then an essential characteristic, a common denominator linking all the various definitions of peace?

Having studied and lived the principles of macrobiotics, you are thoroughly familiar with it. You apply it in your food choices and in your very lifestyles. You know of it as the principle of dualistic monism; I apply the same principle in my political life as a world citizen. It is, of course, the principle of dynamic balance, maintaining a balance between opposites, yin and yang, or in psychological terms, bipolarities; in political terms, making peace between seeming opponents. It is this dynamic balance principle which is often forgotten when discussing the word "peace" which otherwise seems to be static or passive. Socrates called the process "dialectical," or the method of recognizing the bipolarities of a seemingly conflict situation under a superseding unity.

The new Webster Encyclopedic Dictionary states that the root of "peace" is the Latin, "pax" and "paxis." Now the root of "pac" means to agree, hence the word "pact." For there to be agreement or a pact, of course, there must first be two or more parties. But prior to this, the parties seeking agreement must have cognition or awareness of themselves as capable of such discernment. For most of seeking world peace, this recognition of personal capability is, I have found, a blind spot. We are conditioned into believing that world peace begins only with nations and the individual has no part to play in the process. Exactly the opposite is true as Michio teaches us daily. The entire peace process, whether local, global or cosmic

must begin with ourselves as individuals. I know you appreciate this personal decision-making quality in our present lifestyle.

Once realized, this discernment must then be communicated which introduces another factor. Peace cannot be achieved without a common language. There is no peace in the jungle: a rattlesnake just can't communicate with a lion. There is constant war between them. The modern national Tower of Babel continually frustrates those trying to establish peaceful communication across frontiers. That was the reason for such secondary and neutral languages as Esperanto, to serve as a communicative tool for the establishment of world peace. Let us peacemakers continue this noble attempt to bridge the communication gap.

These pacts we call "laws." We formulate them on family levels, local levels, state or country levels and on national levels. On all these levels your personal agreement is necessary for these pacts or laws to be maintained. They represent a many-sided equals sign between all citizens in a given community.

What social word defines an individual involved in that lawmaking process? "Citizenship." But Webster's Dictionary surprisingly doesn't link citizenship and peace together. In fact, it doesn't even mention law with peace, yet ironically, it defines "peace" as a "freedom from war," and a "cessation of hostilities." But it doesn't define the one basic characteristic essential to arrive at that freedom: common citizenship.

You can see quite clearly that the 1917 Treaty of Versailles ending the First World War was not a "peace pact;" it did not bring about a common citizenship between the antagonists. On the contrary, it maintained the very political bipolar conditions which led to the war in the first place. It was a treaty between nation-states and had nothing to do with humans as such.

So, between 1917 and 1939, there was no peace but merely an interlude between war...between national warriors. The cessation of hostilities in 1945, likewise, did not lead to a common world citizenship, though many nations at the San Francisco conference were willing to give the United Nations General Assembly real legislative power. This was rejected, incidentally, by United States delegate while the Soviet delegate completely acquiesced. So the very same war conditions prevail in the world of states today.

Taking a leaf from American history, it is easy to understand why the founding fathers insisted on a common citizenship above and separate from

state citizenships for peace to come about throughout the whole American community. You can also immediately see why there is no peace "between" the Soviet Union and the United States, nor can there be. There is no common citizenship between the humans in these countries or any other two countries, no political equal sign. This, in turn, leads to two startling conclusions: first, there can be no lasting peace between two exclusive sovereign nations; second, your national citizenry has become, in the twentieth century, a collective suicide pact. There is only one way out of this dilemma. **A common citizenship between all humans becomes by definition a world citizenship.**

This brings me to the underlying concept directly connected with any citizenship, whether local or global. It is probably the most debated concept in the English language. Because on its definition and utilization hangs the issue of world war and world peace. It is "sovereignty" or, in the terms already mentioned, the freedom to exercise balance. The same Webster's Dictionary defines "sovereign" as "supreme in power," or "the person having the highest power or authority in a state, as a king, queen, emperor, etc." Thus, "sovereignty" is "the state of being sovereign."

If you or I, as individual humans, have the inalienable right to choose our own political allegiance, as the founding fathers of the United States did, then we are sovereigns or the "supreme power," each one of us. If that is so, then we are, each one of us, supreme arbiters of that value known as freedom of choice. This is the discernment I spoke of earlier. We can choose politically to become the balance, or equal sign or law between the seeming opponents.

If we seek world peace, do we personally have to make a pact with every single other human living on planet earth? That seems impossible, on the face of it, but is it? We know the process by which the civic pact was achieved on the national, state and local levels and we certainly didn't know everyone with whom we made the pact even locally. That process is called, simply, "government." We should not be afraid of the word. It is simply housekeeping or the legislative, administrative, executive and judicial consequence of the original contract or agreement between humans. A world government then would be their collective recognition that if inalienable rights, such as life, freedom, security and, the famous, pursuit of happiness, are to be protected for one and all, the laws guaranteeing such rights must be duly legislated, executed, adjudicated and enforced for the good of each human and all humans identified as a species.

Let's now break down the peace process into realizable steps. The first step is to realize ourselves as individually capable of discernment or decision, that is, as sovereigns. The second step is to accept the fact that we must make a new pact or civic agreement with fellow humans living in the same geographical area. If it is world peace we seek, the geographical area is necessarily the world itself. The third step is to identify both ourselves and this pact in civic terms. Thus, we identify ourselves as world citizens exercising our inalienable right to relate to others who so define themselves in a worldly agreement.

Already many models of such common agreements exist, starting as far back as the Decalogue. The most recent is the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights** which was proclaimed by the nations themselves in 1948 as a "common standard of achievement."

The fourth step is the logical consequence of these now multilateral agreements: their evolving into an embryonic government representing both the sovereign individual and sovereign humanity.

The fifth step is to energize or activate this government thus spreading its influence, its capabilities and its services. These five steps are practical, concrete and perfectly legitimate. Beside, many of us have already taken them.

I made my personal declaration of world citizenship over 38 years ago. Hundreds of thousands throughout the world made the same declaration in the next few years. The concept of world citizenship was broad enough to encompass many seemingly divergent notions from spiritual to economic.

The next evolution took place in 1953 when the actual government of world citizens was declared on September 4th in Ellsworth, Maine. You may read this declaration at your leisure, for it is available here.

In January of 1954, a provisional administrative agency was founded for the new government in order to identify the newly declared world citizens. Thus, the World Service Authority was born. We now had our own "city hall" based on our fundamental human rights.

Many concrete identification symbols already exist to give legitimate evidence to this citizenship and government. The World Passport is one, a document representing the right of freedom of travel on planet earth. Already over two hundred thousand individuals hold this document and are using it. Six nations have recognized on a *de jure* basis and over 70 on a

case-by-case basis. Then, there is the World Birth Certificate, the World Identification Card, the World Marriage Certificate and, of course, the World Citizen Card, itself. These are powerful identification tools because they represent the sovereign individual and his or her inalienable human rights as outlined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Recently, I have declared my candidacy for election to world public office as a world citizen; that office is world president of our government. The World Service Authority, acting under the mandate of article 21(3) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which mandates such global elections, had these World Ballots printed for registered world citizens. What has the current national political process to say about all this? Does it even address the issue of world peace or world war? Does it mention world citizenship, world law or world government?

Maybe we should start right here in the United States since we have just been treated to two national party conventions and their alleged platforms. The first tip-off is in the Republican platform statement about human rights. Only one sentence is given to this vital subject and I quote,

"The American people believe that United States foreign policy should be animated by the cause of human rights for all the world's people."

Now, the phrase "human rights" itself implies transnational or global boundaries. The phrase "all the world's people" likewise identifies human rights as universal and bypassing frontiers, yet the political power being sought by the Republican party is, and can only be, national. Hence whatever policies deal with concepts beyond the nation must be classified as "foreign policy" which implies anarchy, the very antithesis of law. Yet without law, human rights have no social or political protection as the Preamble to the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights** states. So the plank referring to human right is fraudulent. Here in one succinct example is the Orwellian doublethink and doublespeak of national politics.

As to the foreign policy of the Republicans - which incidentally is mirrored by the Democrats - here is what Mr. Reagan and company say: "

We shall keep the peace by keeping our country stronger than any political adversary."

The Democrats merely echo this might over right philosophy with the statement:

"There is no higher goal for the Democratic Party than assuring the national security of the United States. This means a strong national defense..."

Both these statements are a denial of the very constitutional process which brought peace to this country two hundred years ago. Both are a denial of every teaching of every moral leader who ever lived on our planet who defined killing as a moral crime. This reliance on brute power is a reversion to jungle law, to the machismo of the caveman, a denial of the very concept of law and order which alone has brought the human race to its present day. But further, the man or men who promulgate might over right, according to the Nuremberg Principles, are legally war criminals and subject to indictment, prosecution and conviction.

The Republican platform continues its Machiavellian doublethink:

"Stable and peaceful relations with the Soviet Union are possible and desirable, but they depend upon the credibility of American strength and determination."

Just what does this really mean, "...the credibility of American strengthen and determination."? It implies nothing more than the willingness of the U.S. government to strike the Soviet Union first with nuclear weapons since should the Soviet Union strike the United States first, the possibility of retaliation would be lessened, if not eliminated, given what is now called the "electromagnetic pulse."

The dilemma is that, although both the USA and the USSR governments now realize that nuclear war will destroy both, no matter who strikes first, one or the other super-powers must strike first in order to avoid total or near total annihilation by the other. This is a formula for nuclear holocaust.

But not satisfied with provoking nuclear holocaust on earth, the Republicans promise to carry the nationalistic wars into space. I quote: "

We enthusiastically support the development of non-nuclear, space-based defensive systems to protect the United States by destroying incoming missiles."

Here the insanity and treason is fully exposed, insanity because inherent in such a proposal is paranoia carried to its limits. Paralyzed by fear, the proponents of such a "space wars" proposal cannot consider any solution to the anarchy dominating the world community but a suicidal policy in the

guise of protection; treason because the United States does not "own" the space surrounding the planet; national law does not cover it; national officials have no constitutional mandate to consider it within their legitimate domain. Finally, such a policy encroaches directly on the sovereignty of each human and the human race itself which has seminal rights as to what is to happen in its outer space.

The Democrats, while claiming to want to "move the world back from the brink of nuclear war" via a negotiated nuclear freeze, have no proposals for a government beyond the nations to supervise such a withdrawal from war.

In neither the Republican nor Democratic platform is mention of world law, world government or world citizenship. Neither platform addresses the question of war or peace. Neither platform addresses the question of world poverty or environmental pollution including radioactive. Neither platform, of course, blows the whistle on the nation-state itself as an irrelevant, feudalistic, anachronistic carry-over institution from the 18th century imposed on the 20th century of instant communication and instant destruction.

I claimed that Ronald Reagan is, according to the Nuremberg Principles, a war criminal. These principles were used to indict, prosecute, convict and punish, some by death, the Nazi leaders. In the simplest terms, if a man points a gun at you on the street he is threatening your life. If he pulls the trigger, he has murdered you. Both are penal offenses. Ronald Reagan, not to mention his fellow heads of state, is pointing a gun at me, Garry Davis. It is both a conventional and a nuclear gun. If "nuclear" means "total," then no matter where it goes off I will be dead. A dead man cannot file a suit against his murderer. Moreover, omnicide cannot be tried after the fact. But the Nuremberg Principles clearly state that "Crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity are punishable as crimes under international law."

Legally, I am a stateless person; no nation represents me. I am "outside," as it were, the entire nation-state framework. Mind you, I am not alone; there are millions in my same non-legal position. However, according to Nuremberg, international law still pertains to me. Principle I states that

"Any person who commits an act which constitutes a crime under international law is responsible, therefore, and liable to punishment."

In brief, I am preparing, as a stateless world citizen, to sue Ronald Reagan in the International Court at The Hague as a war criminal under the Nuremberg Principles. The suit is to be filed in October; such a suit could, with equal reason, be filed against Chairman Chernenko and all other heads of state.

Buckminster Fuller wrote in "Utopia or Oblivion" that

"It is not surprising that man, burdened with obsolete 'knowledge' - his spontaneous reflexing conditioned only by past experience, and as yet unable to realize himself already a world man - fails to comprehend and cope logically with the birth of Universe Man."

This is a profound and startling statement. We can certainly begin to understand "world man" what with our world having turned into a "village" in the twentieth century, but what did Bucky mean by "Universe Man?"

We claim to be on the threshold of the "space age;" but there is overwhelming evidence, including many Biblical references, that the so-called space age came to our planet aeons ago. I refer you to Erich von Daniken's books, among others, for confirmation of this exciting subject. There is no substantial reason to believe we humans, living on this tiny planet of a minor sun in a solar system on the very edge of a galaxy counting over four billion stars, most far brighter and larger than our own sun, in a universe composed of billions of galaxies, have been programmed ages ago by super intelligences not only to arrive at our present stage of moral and mental development but to achieve a quantum leap in consciousness enabling us to metamorphose from what we call the tribal or national status to the global and human.

In conclusion, we Earthians face perhaps **THE** major challenge all primitive species face as a universal test of their intelligence: the recognition and organization of our unity as a species. For without this, we cannot justify either our present existence or our future in the cosmic scheme and will prove it by destroying ourselves and our environment. The reward for achieving world peace is incalculable. The very stars await that very event.

In eastern terms, the karma of each individual and the karma of human-kind itself must now be recognized as dynamically joined and the key to survival. The balance between you and me as individuals and humanity,

expressed as world citizenship and world government, is the definition of world peace.

Friends, fellow humans, residents of planet earth, as part of this cosmic revolution, you are enjoined by humanity itself to recognize your innate and inalienable world citizenship, thus to become world peacemakers in these prophetic latter days which, in the words of Tom Paine, "try men's souls."

Thank you.

WORLD GOVERNMENT,
READY OR NOT
WHOLE LIFE EXPOSITION
Symposium on World Peace

1 September 1984

I feel highly honored to be able to share with you some brief thought about world peace. In five days, there will be a world holiday; no I am not referring to Labor Day. We world citizens will be celebrating the thirty-first anniversary of the founding of a world citizens' government. It was declared by your speaker on 4 September 1953 from the city hall of Ellsworth, Maine, twelve miles from my birthplace, Bar Harbor. It was then and still is the only government on this planet which represents me and many others who are equally stateless, politically.

The full declaration, known as the Ellsworth Declaration, is available here at the exposition along other world government literature.

When I received this invitation to address this important gathering, I had just announced my candidacy for world president to this global government. This moment presented a good opportunity, I thought, to further explain just what this candidacy meant and how you could support it if you so desired.

But this presents a problem. For many of you in this audience certainly do not accept the idea or the practicality of a world government on any terms. Like Thoreau and Lao-Tse, you may agree with the philosophy that the best government is that which governs least. In fact, that is also my philosophy, but more of that later. It would be foolish for me, therefore, to use this opportunity as a campaign platform for a nonexistent world office to this embryonic government without first at least preparing the conceptual ground for my mission. After that, I will just have to take my chances on your comprehension and generosity.

So, with your permission, I will indulge in a sort of mind setting and perhaps fanciful opening.

Fellow Citizens of Planet Earth,

As your World President, I have grave news. Our planet has been invaded by an alien race. They call themselves "*nationalists*." Their principal strategy is the age-old divide and conquer. Their master plan, now in its final stages, is to separate our world community into what they call "nations" and our common humanity into what they call "nationalities." They use every subtle trick and educational device to condition us to accept ourselves and each other as "nationalists" rather than world citizens. They have even made a religion of it, claiming falsely that the deity "protects" each separate nation.

Furthermore, they cleverly maintain that the particular law of any nation is absolute and eternal; some even use the deity to justify that absurd claim while others claim, ironically, that the state itself is God.

Further - and here is the ultimate danger - they have used our common technology and planetary resources to construct weapons of such power that their use would cause global destruction and possible elimination of our species itself. But even with this prospect in immediate view, their national strategy, continues to threaten each other with these nuclear weapons. Our common humanity itself therefore is, for the first time, in mortal danger.

We cannot divine the ultimate purpose of this alien race, the nationalists, for it would appear that their strategy would eliminate themselves as well as us. Could it be that they are sacrificing themselves for another race waiting to take over the planet itself once the radioactivity reached a tolerable level?

Fellow citizens of the world, we have been too complacent until now about humanity's future; we did not even consider it could be in danger. We must now unite our forces against this monstrous and treacherous invasion. We must claim our rightful ownership of our home planet or we are doomed.

One might open a speech from a World Citizen president on 31 August 1984 addressing a planetary audience.

If you think my imagery is too far out, even treasonable, please consider these facts.

-item: there are 35 national wars going on as I talk.

-item: the nationalistic military budget for 1984/85 is over \$650 billion. This is \$1,780 million per day or over \$74 million per minute.

-item: in all of World War II 3 megatons of explosives were used. Today, over 16,000 megatons of explosives are available to the nuclear superpowers.

-item: there is a six minute lead time from the launching of nuclear missiles to target going East or West.

-item: a nuclear exchange will result in a "nuclear winter" over the northern hemisphere reducing the temperature for six months to -40 degrees; furthermore, there is the likelihood the ozone layer will be eliminated by the rapid production of nitrous oxide resulting in deadly exposure to cosmic and ultraviolet radiation.

-item: there are over 5,000,000 young men in national armies.

-item: there are over 16,000,000 refugees throughout the world, victims of national conflicts; over half are women and children; starvation and near starvation is rampant among millions of them.

-item: the national economies are tottering on the verge of collapse; whole nations are so debt-ridden their very survival is questionable; the national debt of the United States is over \$1.05 trillion. Third world debt is now over \$500 billion.

-item: industrial pollution is becoming endemic; over 5 metric tons of plutonium now exist with a half life of 25,000 years. Less than one millionth of a gram causes cancer; twenty eight nations have nuclear reactors producing plutonium; the emission of sulphur into the atmosphere causing "acid rain" is 75 to 100 million tons per year.

-item: the world's forests are disappearing at the rate of 18 to 20 million hectares a year; by the year 2000, 40% of the remaining forest covering the less developed countries will be gone.

-item: increased population will cause water requirements to double in nearly half the world; extreme deforestation will make water supplies increasingly erratic.

-item: soil erosion is increasing exponentially worldwide; an area approximately the size of Maine is becoming barren wasteland each year.

-item: extinction of plant and animal species is increasing dramatically as their habitats vanish, especially in tropical forests.

-item: atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide and ozone depleting chemicals are significantly effecting the world's climate and upper atmosphere.

-item: the world population projected for the year 2000 is 6.35 billion; 90% if this increase will occur in the poorest countries.

The list goes on and on.

Our crisis is both individual and worldwide. That's why I call it a "planetary invasion." It may be useful to recall how we came to this dreadful if foolish predicament. The late Marshall McLuhan developed the theory that the extent of communication determines the limits of social organization. That makes sense because you can't organize society without communication.

If we take a quick look at human history starting with say 2000 B.C. until the present day and extrapolate to 2000 A.D., in comparing the rate of speed of transportation which determines communication, we arrive at a startling conclusion.

We can see that from 2000 B.C. clear through the birth of Christ up until latter 19th century communication was largely determined by the speed of the horse. From there, we see a rapid increase in a tight span of one hundred years until speed of transportation and, thus, communication goes out of sight.

But note what also happened during that short period. Four major revolutions took place: industrial, electronic, nuclear and space. Inventions of global import proliferated. First, goods and services crossed oceans and continents. Technology became a global phenomenon. Then the radio eliminated distance between people, likewise the telephone. After that came electronics and suddenly the world became a village in terms of communication. Now, with a gridwork of 4,000 satellites, television sets and computer becoming indispensable even in the home, our world community has become interlinked and interdependent. The world community for the first time to our knowledge has a "nervous feedback system." But in 1945 we entered the "nuclear age." Physical power crossed from relative to absolute. In 1957 man launched the first space satellite. According to McLuhan, global society can now be rationally organized.

But where are our politics, the very science of of social organization? Back in the 18th century...the horse and buggy era. Pre-industrial, pre-

electronic, pre-nuclear and pre-space. In other words, nationalistic. Whereas every other human endeavor has become global, politics remains parochial, feudalistic and thus suicidal. It becomes clear that, if we are all to survive, politics must also go global.

That means some hard decisions for us all. Decisions which will determine whether the human race will continue or go the way of the dinosaur and the Dodo bird. I realized in 1947 that as a so called national citizen, I had no input to the question of world peace whereas I had definitely been a part of world war as a bomber pilot in the 8th Air Force.

After returning to my profession in the theater in 1946, after the explosions over Nagasaki and Hiroshima, I started to think seriously about whether national citizenship could protect me from war any longer. If it couldn't, then it wasn't really citizenship but a kind of modern serfdom or even worse, given the new dimensions of war. It was a collective suicide pact. In other words, if i didn't have any control over my very life as a national citizen, then why should I give my human allegiance to the nation? But this thinking led to the major question: to what should I give my allegiance?

The more I thought about it the more I realized that national citizenship in the twentieth century is a contradiction in terms. After all, the first duty of any government is to protect its citizens. But no government can prevent war **between** nations. Quite the contrary, all national governments consider war as a part of their legitimate right. I finally realized that, in a nuclear age, that is formula for global holocaust.

The only valid citizenship able to protect you and me is common world citizenship since that was the only citizenship which linked up all humans on planet earth in a common agreement or social contract. That led to my public claim of world citizenship in Paris on 25 May 1948. Why not? Who was to deny it? Besides, was there any law against it? Does the U.S. Constitution prohibit it? Does any national constitution? Quite the opposite. They all claim that the people are sovereign, that they really are the ultimate power, not as citizens, mind you, but as humans. All governments are funded by humans.

It was not as a Virginian that Thomas Jefferson claimed to be an American, nor was it as a Bostonian that John Adams did the same. They both exercised human rights to claim a new political allegiance along with their fellow co-founders.

Besides there were both moral laws and penal code implicitly supporting my new citizenship: Thou shalt not kill or murder as a civic crime. Six months after I had staked my claim to world citizenship, a new declaration of human rights which the General Assembly of the United Nations proclaimed in 1948 actually sanctioned that citizenship. Article 21(3) states that "The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government..." Article 28 states that "Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized." These articles certainly confirmed the fact that we, the people, are indeed sovereign.

But let's examine this word "sovereignty" a little closer because it's a key issue. Every nation claims to be sovereign, but then, as I said, all national constitutions claim the people are sovereign. There seems to be basic contradiction here. If we, the people are sovereign then the ultimate sovereign is humanity itself. If that is true, then the claim to national sovereignty is a myth and a deadly one at that.

First of all, is sovereignty determined by quantity? The number of persons under a given government? Let's have a quick glance at comparative populations of equally sovereign states. We see by the headline of our chart the fallacy that population has anything to do with sovereignty. Seventeen cities with populations over five million surpass 70 sovereign states: Mexico City, Tokyo, Shanghai, Buenos Aires, New York, Peking, Paris, Sao Paulo, Calcutta, Moscow, Manila, Bombay, Seoul, Los Angeles, Chicago, London and Cairo. Sovereignty obviously has nothing to do with numbers of people.

But does this have something to do with political power and political choice? For instance, I legally renounced my national citizenship in 1948 in Paris. That was actually a sovereign act performed by a national citizen. But did I renounce my sovereignty as a human being at the same time? No, I couldn't have, because sovereignty - or freedom of choice - is inalienable. That's the essence of democracy and of human rights, their inalienability. In other words we have rights **because** we are human, not because some state says we do. One of the most basic human rights which was clearly stated in the Declaration of Independence was the right to choose one's political allegiance. That is precisely what the founding fathers did; they exercised their inalienable sovereignty and created the United States of America.

So what is stopping us from choosing a higher political allegiance than that of a suicidal nation? Is it fear? Is it ignorance of why or how to do it? World citizenship is ours to claim and then to use. It is the key to our

survival. It is the only way to protect what we already hold dear. For only by protecting the whole can we protect the parts. Do not be misled by the arguments of the nationalists; nations are not really enemies of each other. They continually protect each other's alleged sovereignty. Witness the United Nations Charter itself. Secretly all nations agree with each other that their most deadly common enemy is humanity and the sovereign human.

To illustrate, let's go on to our second chart. This chart reveals a total human communication process. For purpose of simplicity, I have indicated only four levels, though there are no doubt many intermediate levels. These four levels of communication are "dynamic" in character since each involves continual feedback to the individual.

The first dynamic identification is one to one, the most intimate relationship we have with our spiritual nature. Call it God, call it the Higher Self, Truth, Wisdom or whatever, still it is personal, subjective and the source of our entire conceptual value system. Our whole life is spent identifying with and identifying this first dynamic.

The second dynamic identification is with the family, the first social and even political unit. As we pass through life the family takes various forms: biological, legal, social, and spiritual. But it is the most intimate group identification where we first apply our value system outwardly, first to test our strength and expose our weaknesses.

The third dynamic identification is that which we personally desire or accept beyond the family. Here is immense variety. Here we have major and minor identifications. Two of the major ones are our particular nation and our religion. Being personal the dynamic is still partial or relative; its institutions are both exclusive and competitive. While it stimulates internal cooperation and sharing, it breeds aggressiveness, distrust and fear outside its closed circle. Often its philosophy and attitudes totally contradict the first and second dynamic identifications which are based on moral and human values. It pits human against fellow human. Economically it promotes scarcity thinking and unjust patterns of ownership of property. Being essentially derisive it leads finally to warlike attitudes and to war itself.

From the third dynamic identification comes alliance, treaties, charters between equally so-called sovereign states and the accumulated debris of wartime history. Here we find the mortal contradictions partial exposed by our first chart. For in terms of communication of information we live in a

"global village," yet in political terms we live in exclusive "villages" called nation-states. Here precisely is where communication between citizen and government has broken down. Let's face it squarely, no exclusive national citizen has any say in his or her survival.

The legitimacy of national exclusivity was denounced at Nuremberg after World War II where German government officials were accused of crimes against humanity and of war crimes which transcended their national allegiance. Doesn't it follow then that all national leaders today, under these same Nuremberg Principles, are likewise war criminals in that they are willfully and deliberately preparing for World War II?

This brings us to the fourth dynamic. Only on this level do we recognize the essential unity of the human race and the planet as our common house. Only here can be seen and possibly prosecuted crimes against humanity. Before the ages of technology and electronic breakthrough fourth dynamic identification was left to the sages, prophets, philosophers, artists, poets and pirates who were no doubt the first empiricists of this level, the first practical citizens of the world though no moral code guided their actions.

Throughout our short human history from the Decalogue to the Helsinki Accords men and women have defined holistic and fourth dimension identification values. Invariably they relate the individual to his or her humanity and humane values put under pressure by exclusive third dynamic regimes. Here on this dynamic world law, human rights, world citizenship and world government find their natural and rightful place. It is on this level that I am seeking political office.

On the national level we are witnessing the obsolete political charade in the United States of the two presidential candidates vying with each other as to who is more patriotic to national interests. But both are in essential agreement that outside the United States, might makes right.

To take merely two examples: Mr. Reagan, in his acceptance speech, declared that "We shall keep the peace by keeping our country stronger than any potential adversary." In last Saturday's New York Times, in a speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, he is quoted as saying that "it would be indefensible and immoral to allow military strength to continue deteriorating as it was..."

Both Mr. Reagan and Mr. Mondale deny the very constitutional process which brought peace to this country two hundred years ago. Both deny every precept and teaching moral crime. This reliance on brute power is a

reversion to jungle law, to the cave, a denial of the very concept of law and order which alone has brought the human race to its present. But further, now both are war criminals according to the Nuremberg principles.

As a candidate for world president, and a fellow human being, I hereby challenge both presidential candidates as well as all candidates for national office and all present heads of state to present to us, the world's people, their program for the elimination of war itself from our community. If they do not have such a program, then they betray the trust they demand of the people they presume to lead. I seek public office, on the other hand, as a world peace candidate. My program is world peace through law and its institutions. Government of, by and for the world's people.

Buckminster Fuller wrote in "Utopia or Oblivion" that "It is not surprising that man, burdened with obsolete 'knowledge' - his spontaneous reflexing conditioned only by past experience, and as yet unable to realize himself already a world man - fails to comprehend and cope logically with the birth of Universe Man."

This is a profound and startling statement. We can certainly appreciate and accept "world man" since our world, in the twentieth century has been transformed into a "global village," but what did Bucky mean by "Universe Man?"

We claim to be on the threshold of the "Space Age." But there is not overwhelming evidence that the so-called Space Age came to our planet eons ago? Are we so arrogant on this cosmic grain of sand to think ourselves literally alone as sentient species in the vast universe? I don't believe so.

There is substantial reason to believe, many Biblical references even - I refer you to Daniken's books among others - that we humans living on this tiny planet of a minor sun in a solar system on the very fringe of a galaxy composed of billions far larger suns, in a universe of billions of galaxies, have actually been programmed ages ago by super intelligences. This universal programming not only has permitted us to arrive at our present state of moral and mental development, no doubt aided from time to time by superior beings amongst us but to achieve a quantum leap in consciousness - of which this very congress is a prime example, along with many, many other manifestations throughout the world - enabling us to metamorphose from what we now call the tribal or national to the global or human status. Maybe we will not know the truth of this statement until we do reach maturity.

In conclusion, we earthians undoubtedly face THE major challenge all primitive species face as a universal test of their intelligence: the recognition and organization of their unity as a species. For without this, we cannot justify our present existence or our future in the cosmic scheme and will prove it by destroying ourselves and our environment.

My dear friends, fellow humans, residents of the planet earth, as part of this cosmic revolution, you are enjoined by humanities need to survive to recognize your inalienable world citizenship, thus activating world peacemaking, in these latter prophetic days which, in Tom Paine's words, "Try men's souls."

Thank You.

GLOBAL UPDATE 1985
Macrobiotic Summer Camp
Becket, MA
August 31, 1985

Aveline, Michio, co-citizens of planet earth, fellow members of an endangered species, dear brothers and sisters,

I am delighted once more to have the honor and pleasure to be with you and share this magnificent setting, this aura of well-being and happiness. I am also grateful that I have been allowed two precious hours of your time. It's both a challenge and a joy. A challenge because of the complexity of my subject and my intense desire to make it simple, appealing and impelling, and a joy because, as students, even disciples of Michio and Evaline Kushi, and therefore already committed to a lifestyle of harmony, you can understand and appreciate my commitment to world peace more than most, and, therefore, I feel a kinship with you which can only be further reaffirmed and reinforced.

Since I last stood on this podium, we have, of course, moved one year closer either to Armageddon or to the Millennium.

What does the global scoreboard tell us about progress in these two opposite directions?

In admittedly broad strokes, let's begin with the first. It is not an encouraging picture. First, no weapons were destroyed in the name of world peace. On the contrary, enough new weapons were produced during this year alone to wipe out our endangered species many times over. The United States now possesses over 13,000 nuclear weapons. President Reagan plans to spend \$222 billion in the next six years to add 17,000 new nuclear weapons to the U.S. arsenal.

The Soviet Union today has over 9,000 nuclear weapons. The total megatonnage of explosive power available to both countries is about 16,000. The entire megatonnage dropped in World War II was 3.

Nations spent over \$850 billion dollars this year on our collective destruction while millions starved, and needless to say, are still starving at the rate of 35,000 daily. Many of these are women and children.

National wars proliferated and forty are still being fought as I talk, involving 45 of the world's 164 nations. Five are conventional wars between nations and 35 are internal guerilla struggles and civil wars. Over 4 million national soldiers are directly engaged in combat while another 15 million are under arms. The U.S. is currently a major arms supplier to 20 of the nations at war.

Both the Soviet Union and the United States military commands are preparing for a preemptive nuclear strike against each other. I refer you to a recent book, *The Button*, by Adrian Ford, which fully details and buttresses this statement. Also, the *Defense Monitor* from which I derive most of my military facts. Each side is also preparing chemical and biological agents for use in an all-out war. The pretense of negotiations is exposed daily by charge and countercharge of both sides like schoolboys in a yard defying each other to cross that line. Industrialized nations compete with each other to sell the latest weapons to poverty-stricken nations which then allows them to fight each other or suppress their own citizens. If the '84 trends are continued, military arms delivered to Third World countries this year will surpass \$30 billion.

The environment becomes increasingly polluted. The level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is reaching deadly levels. The amount of plutonium now existent is enough to contaminate our very planet, not to mention all living species dependent on it, for more than 25,000 years. And every nuclear reactor produces more daily. Deserts are proliferating while forests are being cut down or destroyed by acid rain. Water shortages are critical and widespread.

Poverty is endemic throughout the world while a national economic system - or more accurately chaos - is on the verge of total collapse. South American countries owe billions of dollars to major U.S. banks which are on the border of bankruptcy themselves, lacking liquidity. National currencies are floating against each other only bouyed by public trust. Third World countries owe billions to a few industrialized nations and the International Monetary Fund. Even Communist countries owe billions to free enterprise countries and banks. The largest creditor nation, the United States, has over a trillion dollars of public debt with projections of annual \$200 billion deficits for the coming years and a trade balance deficit this year alone of over \$150 billion.

The United Nations remains totally impotent to cope with national or international war or human rights violations. The International Court of

Justice is a mockery and smokescreen behind which nations continue the war game. But more about this Court later.

There is as yet no worldwide movement for law and order. No wholesale peace initiative that in any way matches the deadly momentum toward war. Children everywhere are having nightmares of that war and demand of us tearfully and angrily how we, their parents, can be so abysmally stupid as to allow human society to drift swiftly to annihilation. They feel and are betrayed.

The list of negatives is seemingly needless. Dictatorships abound. Minorities, such as in South Africa, oppressively rule majorities. People everywhere are fearful, threatened, intimidated and feel helpless. So-called leaders admit their impotence to cope with any major problems. Drugs and alcoholism is on the rise. The refugee population has grown to over 20,000,000.

A visitor from another planet might well judge our race to be made and worthy only of the trashheap of history and the cosmos.

But what does the world scoreboard reveal on the opposite side?

A fundamental insight was reinforced by the world public this year: that the dimensions of power of nuclear weapons erased the classical definition of war. TV and movies such as "The Day After" and documentaries on Hiroshima and Nagasaki depicted the awful totality of nuclear explosions. Dynamic speakers such as Dr. Helen Caldicott and Carl Sagan focused the public mind on the horror of total war. We have been forced, often against our will and experience, to think in wholesale terms when considering nuclear weapons. The word, "holocaust," appears more and more frequently speaking of them. The word, "win," no longer applies to a nuclear exchange.

The first major reaction to the threat of nuclear holocaust was fear and revulsion without thinking through the real problem: how to eliminate war itself from the human community. This in turn led to the "Freeze Movement." But this proved short-lived with no positive political program to back it up. This year, the movement is all but dead. It also spawned rebellions against governmental authority itself in the name of this or that movement. It led to a resurgence in escapist fundamentalist religion whether Christian, Jewish, Moslem or exotic cults, all in the name of the same deity.

That none of these fear reactions denied or attacked the greatest cult of all, nationalism, but to the contrary, embraced it either tacitly or overtly as their primary power base, was damning testament to their partiality and, therefore, unconscious collusion with the anarchic war system of nation-states.

But nevertheless, the world public, linked by television satellites and flooded with a proliferation of data literally worldwide, was slowly--almost unconsciously crossing a vital threshold of awareness, the time-honored awareness of its essential oneness and dynamic connection with the earth and even the cosmos.

The famine in Africa gave rise to global media events by rock stars singing "We Are the World" while contributing millions to relief.

A major part of that new awareness came from the more active role many women began to play in the political process. A politics of relatedness or nurturing began slowly to infiltrate the male-oriented and dominated nationalistic we-and-they traditional attitudes.

Also bio or environmental politics, given form by the Green parties, groups such as Greenpeace, Save the Whales and others, began to play a role in political thinking.

Then space flights accompanied by dramatic pictures from space accelerated public awareness of the earth's wholeness and oneness. Exclusive and aggressive national policies appear increasingly myopic and foolish. And suicidal.

My general assessment would be that a momentous political quantum leap is about to take place in the public resulting in a global coalition of peace forces.

But what do I mean by "peace?"

In my talk last year, if you remember, I attempted to define the word, "peace," in a global context. I claimed that the principle behind all definitions of peace is the same you apply in your food choices: dynamic balance. You call it "dualistic monism."

I pointed out that in political terms, peace signifies the recognition of a common social environment between seeming opponents.

But even before this recognition, the key requirement for peace to result between two or more humans is first for each human to recognize fully his

or her inalienable or natural ability and right to make a positive choice. This choice is the essence of sovereignty. All national constitutions refer to the "sovereignty" of the people. "The people" break down to you and me.

It follows that it is your choice and your choice alone as to whether you will have world peace or world Armageddon.

Have you made that conscious choice yet? Or have you yet to realize that you have that choice to make? I note in passing that not many who heard me last year, to my knowledge, made that choice according to my definition. I pointed out that the key word connoting the choice for social peace to eliminate social conflict was "citizenship." Think of it. Your world is about to blow up. Your WORLD! Not your country or nation. The humanity to which you belong, into which you have been born, is about to be exterminated. Have you declared your civic allegiance to it yet? Have you claimed your citizenship to your world community? Forget the relative differences. Forget nationalism, religion, parochialism, sex, parentage, color, origins. Forget divisions, frontiers, barriers, mental, emotional or physical. Your humanity is at stake! To save yourself, therefore, you must save humanity. There is no other choice available. That's what both nuclear and Space Age means.

Whether you realize it or not, you are already involved on a daily basis in a myriad ways with both humanity and the world community. I am not talking of the humanity which flows through us all. I am talking about meta-systems, to use a cybernetic word. Cybernetics, as you know, is the science of organization. I find it an extremely useful discipline in explaining both what our world lacks and what it needs.

Let us take a prosaic example. Have you ever considered the true significance of entering a post office and buying a stamp? for a few cents or dollars, you are furnished with a worldwide delivery system involving ocean-going boats, planes, carriers delivering to every city, village, hamlet and post office boxes literally everywhere. We must admit, it is an extraordinary bargain.

You are operating in a "meta-system."

A meta-system has two general characteristics. First, it recognizes a given community as such, that is, as a whole. Second, it recognizes each individual in that whole as a sovereign, that is, the sole decision-maker to use the system and be served by it. No votes, no political parties, no nations, no bureaucrats, no committees, no unions, just you and you alone.

Now the Universal Postal Union was founded in 1875 in the horse-and-buggy days. I daresay no one in this hall nor indeed in the rest of the United States, other than perhaps top postal officials, knows who the Secretary General of the UPU is or what his nationality is or how much money makes. Moreover, no one cares. Nor do we know or care where its headquarters is. These facts are simply irrelevant to our being served by it.

You see, the SG of the UPU is a global civil engineer and administrator. He does not rule; he serves the world public as does every employee of the system.

Another characteristic of a meta-system is that you are solely responsible for your use of or action within the system. The man who sells you the stamp or delivers your letter is not responsible for its contents. Again, you're the sovereign.

Let's take another example. Everyone today uses the telephone. Another global meta-system. Punch a few buttons and you are talking to a friend in Hong Kong. You have bypassed all national frontiers, the KGB, the CIA and all the other spy systems, the national armies, politicians and bureaucrats. And you made the choice to call and what to say. Again, individual sovereignty.

The International Telecommunications Union was founded in Paris, 1865. Does anyone here know or care who its Secretary General is, or what his nationality or salary is? The question answers itself.

My third and last example of a meta-system is even more banal and self-evident. You are driving your car along a city street and come to a traffic light. As it is red, you stop. You agree to the restriction as do all your fellow drivers. A city is full of such restrictions, all regulated by commonly accepted laws. It is obviously to each driver's benefit as well as to the population as a whole that such laws exist and prevail.

Then you come to a ramp marked "I-95." You have the choice to go up the ramp or not, as you wish. If you do, however, you may drive for 3,000 or more and never encounter a traffic light. Another meta-system. Who does it belong to? Who made it? Who governs it? We are not really concerned so long as it is available to us individually and everybody together.

And just as the post office and the telephone, the interstate highway system services on a meta or wholesale level all the lower level communities, establishments and individuals.

But let's examine somewhat closer what actually happens when a meta-system is created. First of all, it verticalizes a particular service, that is, it goes outside of or beyond the local. It eliminates exclusivity. It establishes a general agreement or contract BETWEEN ALL USERS OF THE SERVICE. You do not perhaps realize that when you buy a stamp or post a letter that you are already in a tacit but nonetheless real contractual agreement with your fellow mailers throughout the world. For how else can the system work? The very act of entering the post office and seeking its service is a sovereign decision made by each and every individual in total agreement with each and every other individual engaging in the same common service.

But even more significant is the civic "cross fertilization" process taking place right under the noses of national politicians, frontier guards, spy systems and all the rest who maintain a rigid hierarchical oligarchy which predates and ironically POLITICALLY DENIES the very meta-systems being daily used by the citizens of the world.

In other words, you and I are already, in myriad ways and with utter self-confidence, acting as world citizens in our global village. Airplanes, television, international trade, now computer networking and numerous other examples of global meta-systems are presently available to one and all in the name of service, not power politics.

The last stereotype to be replaced by a global meta-system is the archaic and suicidal nation-state. This directly and intimately involves you and me. Here again is the real peace-making principle and process at work.

When I declared myself a world citizen in 1948, it was as if I turned onto a political ramp called "Inter-world 1," got to the top and there was nothing there. The political meta-system had not yet been built. And so I fell off, back into the "lower-level" political nation-state system. As I no longer fit into that system, I was harassed, persecuted and imprisoned. I was not alone.

Gradually over the years, as others went up the same political "ramp"--many falling back as I did--we, as sovereign individuals, began to build the political meta-system BECAUSE WE NEEDED IT. We eventually called it the World Government of World Citizens. The organizational linking instrument for that construction, or our global "City Hall," we called the World Service Authority. Today it operates ironically out of Washington, D.C.

Now I come to the crux of my talk here today. You are vitally important in the building of that new system. For without you, it has no reason to exist. Just as the post office, the telephone and the interstate highway system exist because you exist, so the global political meta-system depends on your existence alone and not on nations.

It works now and you may today avail yourself of it.

But without it, national leaders must consider not only each other potential enemies, but worse, identify you as potential enemies to our fellow humans beyond the stereotyped national frontiers. Given the anarchy between or lack of a global political meta-system "above" nations, they have no other choice. The arms race continues. Your national money goes into war-preparing and war-making. Reagan's "Star Wars"--as foolhardy and extravagant as it is--continues while Gorbachev slavishly follows suit, not because they are evil humans, not because the Pentagon and the Kremlin want to wipe each other and the rest of us knowing full well that nuclear is total, but because we, you and I, have not exercised our individual inalienable right first to claim the imperative need of a global political meta-system and second, actually to help build it with our sovereignty of choice.

It sounds too easy but believe me, it is as simple as changing gears in a car. As an exclusive national citizen, you are merely a subject, helpless in the grip of an anachronistic, deadly power unit. As a declared world citizen, you become once again the power broker, one of the sovereign people. I am the living proof of this truth.

The fear some of you may feel in considering that choice is artificially and insidiously created, carefully nurtured, and designed to perpetuate the stereotypical thinking and action. As Gene LaRoque writes in the Defense Monitor, Vol. XII, No. 1, "Nationalism remains the most powerful force in the international system."

The desire to survive and to have humanity itself survive must overcome that fear and dominate your choice.

I am here today not only as a world citizen of over 35 years standing and founder of the world government of world citizen but as a declared candidate for world president. This candidacy is also a vital part of the construction of our global meta-system. It implies both legitimate coordinating offices of the system and your active participation in choosing the officers. Just as you "vote" for the UPU every time you buy a stamp, and the ITU every time you dial an overseas number, so I am now asking

for your political vote as willful and active world citizens, indeed citizens of our new government.

Your right to this global franchise is sanctioned implicitly by every national constitution which recognizes the people as sovereign. The U.S. Constitution in the Ninth Amendment even refers to rights retained by the people without spelling them out.

It is sanctioned as well by the General Assembly of the United Nations through Article 21(3) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This states that

"The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Seventeen national constitutions refer to this Declaration as being the "law of the land."

And what is my platform? It is a world government of, by and for the people of the world. World peace through just and democratic law. The global legitimization of human rights and freedoms. An economy of abundance rather than scarcity, now totally feasible. The outlawry of war and gradual disarmament of all nations down to police level. Protection of our common environment. The human right to breathe pure air, drink pure water and eat food grown in healthy soil. Protection of ethnic minorities and cultures, languages and customs. Promotion of a common language as secondary to one's native tongue.

Institutionally, a Parliament of humankind, elected by universal franchise to enact world laws; an executive office for their administration, a judiciary for their legality, a world constabulary to enforce them and punish offenders.

A vote for a world president--which is your right--is a vote for world peace. The co-relation of voter and candidate is one of the major building blocks of any political system. It requires nothing more than the awareness of that sovereign choice of each individual to determine his or her own destiny.

I have a personal reason for seeking your world vote. As I stand here, I am not legally in any nation. In 1977, the Immigration and Naturalization

Service of the United States refused me entry into the United States. It classified me as an "excludable alien." I petitioned the U.S. courts. They upheld the INS' decision that I be excluded from the country of my birth.

I then appealed to the Supreme Court. It also denied my petitions. You may find these petitions in my recently published book, **WORLD GOVERNMENT, READY OR NOT!**

Then on March 15th of this year, I petitioned the International Court of Justice at The Hague. This time, however, in conformity with international law, I based my appeal on the Nuremburg Decisions. After exposing as best I could the illegality of war itself and that the threat of nuclear weapons is to threaten humanity with genocide, I cited both Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev as war criminals under the Nuremberg Principles.

On July 22 last, the Registrar of the Court, Mr. Bernandez, informed me that my petition has been rejected. The reason? In his words "...neither the court nor its Members may consider applications from private individuals or groups, provide them with legal advice, or assist them in their relations with the authorities of any country."

In rejecting my petition, it reveals its total impotence to address juridically the primordial question facing the individual as well as humanity, that is, the surcease from war between nations. In other words, it exposes its pretense of being the legal arbiter between aggressive and/or warring sovereign states. Also, the World Court has effectively repudiated its allegiance to that part of international law which is defined by the Nuremberg Principles.

The individual thus finds himself in a legal vacuum in a matter involving his very survival.

In other words, if you have a grievance against a state, say that it is threatening you with nuclear war, you cannot ask the highest Court on our planet for a redress of grievances. And yet the Nazis and the Japanese war generals were indicted, convicted and condemned personally for war crimes and crimes against peace defined by the Nuremburg Principles.

Just where does that leave us legally? Even though war has been declared illegal by Nuremberg, the very Court that seemingly would have jurisdiction against the criminals of war cannot even entertain a petition citing them as such. And yet the fifteen sitting judges of the Court take an oath of office to adjudicate so-called international law for a term of nine years.

They are amply remunerated out of taxpayers' funds.

We must ask what is the definition of fraud?

Are they not then fraudulently collecting their salaries? If only the criminals, that is, the states themselves have access to their Court, are not these fifteen judges merely acting as a judicial smokescreen behind which the criminals ply their deadly trade? And against whom? Against us, the world's people?

The irony is underlined when on May 22, 1985, I received a letter from a United Nations Special Assistant of the Under Secretary General for Disarmament Affairs who informed me, in his words, that "we have taken note of your considerable initiative with the International Court of Justice, and we hope that you will keep us informed of any ruling which might be forthcoming from them."

Apparently, the United Nations Disarmament Affairs office is as frustrated with its own Court as I am!

Now where does that leave me? And you? For Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev are pointing the nuclear gun at you too.

Since there is obviously no existent legal remedy or Court to which we can appeal to resolve the most pressing problem ever faced by our human race: world war and since President Reagan calls himself a "citizen of the world," and no doubt Mikhail Gorbachev considers himself one too, as their fellow world citizen, all bound together by the same international law of Nuremberg, in the absence of any other judicial remedy, I am preparing to make a "world citizen arrest" myself of these two war criminals. How and when and by whom this can be done is presently under study.

In conclusion, it is self-evident that if we want to be saved, we must save ourselves. This requires bold thinking and bold action some of which I have outlined today. It is our world and our humanity. We must assume a new legality, a global legitimacy which can deal finally with the question of war. And it is our moral and legal right and duty to do so. The tools are at hand; the need is categorically imperative. The global political meta-system is each individual's responsibility.

It is embryonically operating here and now.

The rest is up to you.

I am open to your questions.

Thank you.

WORLD GOVERNMENT OR WORLD WAR?

HUMANIST SOCIETY of METROPOLITAN NEW YORK

**777 United Nations Plaza
New York, New York 10017
21 October 1985**

Mr. President, Dr. Manson, fellow terrestrials, ladies and gentlemen, brother and sister humanists:

I approach this podium with mixed feeling. I am, of course, highly conscious of the honor bestowed upon me in addressing this distinguished forum. But I am concerned that, under the constrictions of time, I must fail to do justice to my subject - possibly the most controversial of our century: how to make world peace.

Also, there is the delicate question of my credentials. No university diploma adorns my wall citing me as a doctor of world dissidence. The pecuniary awards of that dubious profession, judging by my current account, are meager indeed. Of course, I am a former actor. While that may qualify me to be president of the United States does it justify my present title of "World Coordinator" or my presence here before you?

Another source of trepidation is that my subject is, in many ways, already your own very credo. I mean, talking to declared humanist about how to make peace is rather like telling Pete Rose how to hold his bat.

Nevertheless, in the name of over 250,000 fellow humans throughout the world who have made peace between themselves by declaring their primal allegiance to humanity as world citizens, I am delighted to greet you and thank you for this opportunity to share a few thoughts.

In a somewhat more mundane vein, I must confess another cause for trepidation. When Jesse Gordon asked me whether I would address you this evening I replied I would be happy to and what was the honorarium.

After recovering from his initial shock, Jesse said to me, "oh, we don't pay our speakers. We have no money; we even lose on the dinner."

"But my fee for a hour's talk is \$1,250 minimum, " I told him.

"You only have to talk for a half hour," he replied, "but we still can't pay you." I considered the importance of the occasion, "All right," I told him. "I'll do it under two conditions...one, that I get a vegetarian meal, and two, that I don't have to be polite."

"You got it. We'll only give you vegetables and you can say what you want."

"Oh, no," I told him. "Rice and vegetables."

"I'll see what I can do," he said. I must have looked disappointed because he added, "maybe you'll sell a few books."

So here I am, a \$1250 speaker for a rice vegetable dinner and no holds barred. Who knows, maybe as your president suggests I'll sell a few books. You appreciate, however that under these draconian circumstances, in keeping with the subject and the agreed upon second condition, I am obliged to propose to you a concrete act of economic humanism.

I have brought with me 2% of the entire treasury of the World Government, that is ,one hundred bills of ten World Dollars each. I am offering each of you the exchange of your ten dollar bills of nationalist war currency for our first edition \$10 bills of world peace currency. Now before you rush up to the podium to take advantage of their unprecedented offer, let me explain its true significance. First, this is real, honest to god money, it is not counterfeit.

We could just as well have used shark's teeth, round stones with square holes, or even gold dust - which is literally useless for any normal human purpose - for a global medium of exchange. But we took the easy way out and used paper just like any other government. It is good for all but between citizens of our world government, which, as I said, number over two hundred and fifty thousand. What backs it, you ask. Well, world trust for starters. Also, the World Government Treasury Department Account is open at the national Bank in Washington. This account is maintained at 50% liquidity which is a lot healthier than Citibank, Chase and Bank of America. It will reimburse all incoming World Dollars at par value for U.S. dollars minus 1% for exchange.

Why is this exchange a concrete act of economic humanism? Because this is the only world peace currency issued from a declared government.

Since it is above or beyond all national currency, in cybernetic language, it is meta-money. More on that later. It cannot be used for war preparations or war fighting. So when you exchange World Dollars for national dollars, francs, rubles, kroner, mark, yen, rupees or whatever, you are taking money from a war economy and placing it in a peace or world law economy, in other word a human economy. You are also accepting a peace currency which cannot be taxed by any national government for war purposes. Because for the moment no national government can or will recognize it as money.

Now I am not claiming that you can walk into a New York Delicatessen and buy a pastrami sandwich with these World Dollars, at least not yet. Your landlord, grocery clerk or stock broker might insist on green bills with George Washington or Ben Franklin's picture on them instead of blue bills with a mere human figure on them. Surely your bank at present might not credit them to your account. If they ever got to David Rockefeller's desk, however, he just might pocket them to show his Trilateral Commission buddies later who their real competition was.

But I will be frank with you, just like the first federal dollars, which to many people in 1787 seemed as worthless and as absurd as these bills may seem to you, this offering is to help finance our World Government. Keep in mind, this first run number only five thousand bills. Each bill is numbered ; they are dry-sealed with the World Government seal and finally , each bill is laminated so as to preserve its form and as a security measure. When subsequent bills are issued by the World Government, these first will appreciate in value. Though you may not be able to buy an IBM share with them today, I will prophecy that in ten years, if the human world is still here, which means that the World Government will be fully functioning - you may be even be able to pass the acid test for money convertibility: buying blue chips at the Last Hurrah in Atlantic City with them. Please, only five to a member.

There is, of course, another less humorous, even grim, aspect to this whole economic question. Nation, big and small, West or East, North or South, Communist or Capitalist, white or black, are debt ridden, some to the point of total bankruptcy. Chile, Brazil, Mexico together owe \$150 billion to outside banks. The entire foreign debt of capital importing, that is, developing countries, according to the International Monetary Fund, is eight hundred sixty-five billion dollars for 1985. No figures exist, to my knowledge, of the total national debt, but we can safely say that, with the United States added, it is in the many trillions, an incomprehensible sum. The business world suffers daily from the lack of a stable currency unit

with which to make contracts on a global basis. The international money market is floating on a sea of inconsistency and therefore uncertainty. The major New York, London, Zurich and other world banks are dangerously near illiquidity. If major investors, or indeed the general public, make a "run" on these banks today - the nightmare of all governments - they would have to close for lack of ready cash. In brief, the national economic world is ready for total collapse. As our forbearers discovered in 1787, a higher government over the lower debt ridden governments is not only the cheapest but the only way out.

Survival would not be the only benefit. As Buckminster Fuller pointed out in Utopia or Oblivion, "It is scientifically clear that we have the ability to make all of humanity physically successful."

In Jesse's letter of invitation I am enjoined to talk on a government of world citizens and how it is to come into existence. This is misleading. In 1947, after recognizing that my exclusive national citizenship was inadequate to protect me from war, I naively looked high and low for a world government to give my allegiance to, but couldn't find it any where. The very notion of world government was considered utopian, crackpot or subversive. Only dreamers like Einstein, Ghandi, E.B. White, Buckie Fuller, Willkie and Harold Stassen were touting it. The organizations working for it - like the world federalists - were pitifully inadequate both in concept, commitment and numbers. Indeed, they still are.

They all assume, incorrectly, that war as an institution, is subordinate to the social system it is believed to serve. What few understood then or even now is that war itself is the basic social system of the nation and that the elimination of war implied the inevitable elimination of national sovereignty and the traditional nation-state. Looking back throughout history, we could say that war is the system which has governed most human societies of record.

A daily and topical example of that misconception is taking place right now at the United Nations. Sixty heads of state will address the General Assembly this week. One hundred, sixty-eight national leaders have already spoken at this 40th anniversary. Not one has nor will address the question of war itself. Why? Because war is the governing political and social dynamic of their nations and nationalism.

A little known report, commissioned by the U.S. government, on the possibility and desirability of peace called Report from Iron Mountain, published in 1987 by Delta had some startling conclusion:

"Wars are not 'caused' by international conflicts of interest. Proper logical sequence would make it more often accurate to say that war making societies require - and thus bring about - such conflicts.

"The war system not only has been essential to the existence of nations as independent political entities, but has been equally indispensable to their stable internal political structure. Without it, no government has ever been able to obtain acquiescence in its 'legitimacy,' or right to rule its society. The possibility of war provide the sense of external necessity without which no government can long remain in power."

These are dire and shocking accusations. If true, Mr. Reagan Mr. Gorbachev and their fellow heads of state as well as all national parliamentarians and congresspersons are really allies in this monstrous game. Ask yourselves if any one of them, least of all the two superpower leaders, has ever advocated the elimination of war through a world government as a social imperative? The upcoming Geneva conference, for example, is scheduled to discuss the possible reduction of nuclear weapons. As such, it is a mere smokescreen behind which the US and USSR continue their war game...now directed against us.

I concluded that when peace organizations begin from within the national system to advocate a world public order, they are unwittingly colluding with and vitiated by the very system they seek to replace. I realized in late 1947 that no one still attached to the nation knew how to or could start a world government, least of all the United Nations' diplomats. No ghost of Tom Paine echoed in those sterile halls much less on Capitol Hill; and the Cold War was heating up fast.

Then I read Anatomy of Peace by Emery Reves. He wrote that we think "nation-centrally" whereas, if we want a peaceful world we must think and act globally. That was new and challenging. But how does one act globally? E.B. White finally clued me in. In The Wild Flag, he wrote,

"Whether we wish it or not, we may soon have to make a clear choice between the special nation to which we pledge our allegiance and the broad humanity of which we are born a part."

In 1948, therefore, figuring that if one hundred sixty-one years previously, Ben Franklin, Tom Jefferson, George Washington, John Adams

and company had declared their United States citizenship above their state allegiances, and by so doing created a new nation, faced with World War III, I had to declare a world citizenship over national allegiance. This citizenship alone would relate me socially and therefore peacefully to my fellow humans throughout my world. It was that simple.

Here was the missing element, I felt, of all so-called peace organizations. The positive affirmation of world sovereignty of and by the individual and his or her dynamic political connection with humanity, not as an abstract theory but as a pragmatic fact. But I first had to renounce my national allegiance which I now couldn't protect me anyway, being part of the world system itself. It hadn't protected those who died under my boots in World War II; it hadn't protected my brother Bud who died at Salerno. To put it bluntly, it was to me a suicide pact.

Well, many others, especially in Europe, followed suit between 1948 and '50. We registered over seven hundred fifty thousand demands for world citizenship in this period. Hiroshima and Nagasaki were fresh in people's minds, especially Europeans whose countries had become battlefields in World War II as in World War I.

But we self-proclaimed world citizens still had no government to call our own until 1953. By that time I had seen the inside of sixteen jails just because I didn't have a piece of paper saying who I was; I wasn't alone. There are still twenty million people out there with no identity documents. Nations call them refugees; I call them *de facto world citizens*.

On September fourth of that year, following the astute advice of Arthur Garfield Hayes, the great humanist civil rights lawyer, and mandated by my own need and that of my fellow world citizens, I declared at Ellsworth, Maine, a world government with full legal powers based on the three prime world laws: ethical, social and biological. The first defined our value system; the second, our interdependent world community; and the third, our indivisible human race.

My first book, My Country Is The World, recounts the history of that legitimate if primitive beginning. So you see, the world government has existed for over a quarter of a century and is functioning today. Since it is based on the proposition that humanity is indivisible and sovereign in itself while each human, also sovereign, is the microcosm of that microcosm, I call it political humanism.

Now what is the form of this embryonic world government and how does it function? It has no constitution, as yet. Its operational mandate is the Universal Declaration of Human rights. To implement the articles of this Declaration, it has set up an executive and administrative office, a global "city hall" in Washington, D.C. under the corporate name of the World Service Authority. The WSA registers throughout the world issuing to them a world citizen registration card. The office issues other world civic documents including world passports, world birth certificates, a world ID card. Each registered citizen is a functioning microcosmic world government; as such, we are all world peacemakers.

To represent key areas of interest affecting the world community, our government is evolving world commissions. Leading expert head these budding commissions: **Isaac Asimov** for Space, **Stafford Beer** for Cybernetics, **Syd Cassyd**, founder of the Employee Stock Ownership Plan, for Economics, **Michio Kushi**, founder of the Macrobiotic Movement, for health, **Badi Lenz**, founder of the World Tree Trust, for forestry, **Amory Lovins**, founder of the Rocky Mountain Institute, for energy conservation, **Yehudi Menuhin**, for culture, **Wm. Peck**, Buckminster Fuller's former associate, for Design Science, **John Steinbruck**, for global political asylum, Theodore **Wells**, founder of Oceanus, for oceans, **Guru Nitya Chaitanya Yati**, founder of the East-West University, for education.

Does our world government have territory? The answer is unequivocally yes! Where is it? Strangely enough, I am standing on it! Both actually and legally. In reality the entire planet is world territory. The original declaration of World Government claimed earth as its proper bailiwick. But incredibly, there is legal world territory outside of all nations, belonging to none, yet recognized by all! It is the physical line, a "no man's land," which separates them from each other! We call it the "frontier" or "border." But we conveniently forget that it is both actual and global. A strange phenomenon of our times is that literally of our fellow humans are living legally on that line, that "no man's land." Everyone not yet admitted to a particular nation, according to national law, is still legally outside it. But he or she is not in another nation. So "outside" must be the line separating two nations. Your speaker, incidentally, fits the novel prescription. Well those lines are continuous, traversing the world. They are actual **and** legal world territory. For how could nations exist without them? If a nation is legal then obviously the lines defining it are likewise legal. Our World Government then claims those lines which legally define all nations. If there are any international lawyers here, you might toy with this breakthrough in your spare time.

The World Passport issued by our World Government represents this actual and legal world territory. It is in seven languages as are all our documents. Over one hundred thousand have been issued to date. All nations have received samples of it; over eighty nations have recognized it. It is a concrete symbol of one frontierless world and our right to travel on it. Besides, being a **world** Passport, one shouldn't leave the planet without it.

Now for the key question: how does World Government work? I am aware at this point that when one adds "world" to "government," enormous misconceptions occur, both mentally and emotionally. One thinks fearfully of the final Big Brother scenario or a vast bureaucratic machine crushing all personal initiative and spirit.

But there is another way to think of government. A human service authority, or again, in cybernetics, a meta-system. I will give you a prosaic example. When you enter a post office to buy a stamp or mail a letter you do not think of yourself as being in the local office of a postal world government. Nevertheless, you are. Just think of the service you get for the few coins you pay: ships, airplanes, carriers going to every city, town, hamlet or post office box throughout the world. The Universal Postal Union was founded in 1875, the first global "meta-system." Or to get fancy, "The systemic organization of proliferating complexity for the sovereign individual."

The principles of any meta-system are two: universality and sovereignty of the unit to be served by it. In other words, the UPU recognizes the world community as a whole, a given, a priori. Only from that vantage point can it organize the complexity of that whole which is, by definition, beyond the scope of any one nation or group of nations.

Once organized the entire system then operates for the benefit of each and every individual **as a service** to be used as each individual freely decides. In other words, it accepts the individual as the fundamental operative unit.

I daresay no one in this room knows the name of the present Secretary-General of the Universal Postal Union. Most of us would not know where it is headquartered. Certainly his or her nationality or salary are matters of total indifference when you mail that card to Aunt Lizzie or receive your social security or dividend check. Yet the complexity of the meta-system was understood, controlled and made into a systemic organization by world

civic engineers for our benefit, both as individuals **and as a worldly people**. Their jobs depend only on their competence.

Many examples of global metasystems are available. When you pick up the telephone, you become a world citizen communicant. When you turn on the tube, you enter the world government meta-system of information. The same for the daily big business newspaper. When you network with another computer or fly in a plane or buy from a department or grocery store, you are operating a global meta-system which you take for granted. What about international sports competition? Or when you turn up the ramp marked "I-95" from a city full of traffic lights, you can drive 6,000 miles without hitting a light. Another example of a meta-system serving every city, town, hamlet and every driver. The little realized fact in the use of these meta-systems is that each of us is in a tacit global **contractual** agreement with all other equally served by and operating the same system. **They are all operative world human service "governments."** We are indeed the world!

So here is the definition of world government: a global political meta-system or organization designed scientifically to systemize the proliferating complexity brought about by structural changes in human society in the twentieth century and giving political sanction to all existing meta-systems for the benefit of humanity and each human.

Now contrast these already operating inclusive systems with your present political allegiance to your nation. But first realize that allegiance was proclaimed before all the present meta-systems were evolved, in the horse and buggy era of the 18th century. That allegiance was absurdly exclusive. It rejects both universality and you as the sovereign. Needless to say, it rejects your credo as humanists. The state claims absolute and eternal sovereignty; its very existence dominates and surpasses the law. It arrogates to itself the right to defend itself through war with other equally sovereign states. It uses our natural resources for this so called defense. The global national war budget for 1985 is estimated as nine hundred forty billion dollars, up from \$810 billion in 1984, roughly 10% of the world's gross national product. In a world where 1/3rd goes to bed hungry and millions starve, this is not only obscene it is insane. It uses our young as cannon fodder and our cities as battlegrounds. Ironically, it taxes you directly for your own national suicide. But world society itself is now nationalism's principal target. The greatest irony is that only our allegiance to the state perpetuates it because it is but a political fiction, a deadly surrogate for the real world.

Thomas Paine wrote in 1778 that "These are the times that try men's souls." He turned timid men into revolutionaries with his essay, "Common Sense." Our times try more than souls, they try our reason and our bodies as well. That our species itself is in mortal danger through nuclear holocaust is no longer in doubt. Since 1945, we have been bombarded with prophecies about Armageddon; its terror is lost in repetition. We all know the armament figures, how much megatonnage is available for war now. We know that the quantity far surpasses the amount required for humanities total destruction. We have the shocked dismay of "Nuclear Winter." But the most frightening truth is that should humanity perish, not only will each one of us perish also **but we will be individually responsible** for that terminal event. Whatever must be done to save humanity therefore, no matter the risk or sacrifice, must be done now before it is too late. It must be done by you and me.

Some hard questions, then, pose for humanists. With humanity itself in mortal danger, must not the humanist's credo be extended to the whole species as a truth to be denied or ignored at our **personal** peril? In other word, must not a true humanist today profess an allegiance to humanity itself, bypassing lesser allegiances? The answer it seems to me must be an unqualified yes. Herein lies the challenge and the solution.

The mindset required for allegiance to humanity, happily enough, is already highly developed. Technology, science, engineering, administration, communications, travel, commerce and in lesser degrees law all have transcended national boundaries and operate in the global arena. In recognizing your world citizenship, then, you simply affirm your sovereign allegiance to humanity; further, you declare politically all men and women your human cousins with whom you contract for a peaceful society; you individually make world peace. Can you afford anything else?

Before concluding, I must briefly touch on my case against Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev. War and its preparations have been declared illegal by the Nuremberg Decisions of 1945. This was not the first time, but these Decisions spelled out an international penal code which held individuals responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

Nuclear weapons have now added an absolute dimension to destructive power. Thus the use of nuclear weapons becomes, not war, but holocaust, genocide. The threat and preparation of genocide by these two national leaders is not only a crime against humanity, according to the Nuremberg Decisions, but an outrageous and intolerable abuse of political office

The crime of omnicide cannot be tried after the fact. As one human who will die if the nuclear trigger is pulled, as a stateless person, as a world citizen, as the founder of our only world government in our global village, as a father of four, on March 15th of this year I sued Reagan and Gorbachev in the International Court of Justice as war criminals according to the Nuremberg Decisions. The Court's registrar replied July 22nd that I could not petition the Court as an individual. Only nations had access to its jurisdiction according to its statute. But the same nations could claim the Court had no jurisdiction even if charged by other nations. That's like the Mafia families condemning drug running as a crime, claiming that only individuals committed the crime, then setting up their own court to which individuals are excluded and only families themselves are litigants all the while continuing to run drugs untroubled with legalities.

The crime of war, however, is still on the international law books and both President Reagan and President Gorbachev still have their fingers on the Big Trigger which is pointing at me. So now as an aggrieved individual I have exhausted all my legal remedies on planet earth. As absurd as it may sound, I must take the law into my own hands.

I have informed the respondent by registered letter of the Clerk's rejection on purely technical grounds; that the substantive issues the petition provide still prevail and that if they do not end the arms race and implement article 28 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights - which provides for an international and social order - by November 19th when they meet in Geneva, then I will issue a world citizen's warrant for their collective arrest. Please support this action by registering with the World Government and contributing to the World Citizen Legal Fund.

Again in The Wild Flag, the late and beloved E.B.White wrote:

"World government is an appalling prospect. Many people have not comprehended it or distinguished it from world organization. Many others, who have comprehended it, find it preposterous or unattainable in a turbulent and illiterate world where nations and economies conflict daily in many ways. Certainly the world is not ready for government on a planetary scale. In our opinion, it never will be ready. The test is whether people will chance it anyway like children who hear the familiar cry, 'Coming, ready or not.'"

Horace Mann said "Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity." Today, alone victory for humanity like victory for each

human is world peace through government of, by and for the people for the world

Let's claim it. Now.

Thank you.

WORLD GOVERNMENT: CATALYTIC META-AGENT

Presented to the Peace Development
& Global Competence Commission
of the International Society of
General Systems Research Conference
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia
27 May 1986

Fellow Earthlings,

Our conference this week has the opportunity to be accorded not a line, not a niche, but a chapter in history. Its organizers have brought together some of the finest systemic minds to work through a problem which has repeatedly and relentlessly plagued humanity. We have come together to find a door to world peace.

While some may seek to dismiss us as merely a small clique of concerned political idealists, I remind them of a similar clique of so called idealists who came together in this same town some one hundred and ninety-nine years ago. In the horse and buggy days of 1787, a diverse group of state citizens laid a then revolutionary foundation for government. Their ideas of inalienable or natural rights of the individual's sovereignty, and of the need to form a higher or "meta" government found expression in the United States of America.

They realized even then that their efforts were only an experiment. They carefully circumscribed their constitution; even included an extraordinary amendment reserving enumerated rights to the people. The day would come when their political descendents would have to carry the noble experiment one step further to the global level and today is that day.

This conference comes at a time of giant confrontation. We watch as civilizations collide; we wait as the nation-state is confronted by the one world era. Now we must act before it is too late.

Whether we are the facilitators of our destiny or its obstructors is up to us. We have a choice - sovereign action or tragic inaction, decision or sterile debate, revolutionary practice or benign theory.

I made my choice many years ago; after receiving my invitation from John Holmdahl, I decide to invite you, in fact challenge you to make yours.

My purpose today is three-fold: to stimulate and activate your global political will, to convince you of the legitimacy of World Government and, third, to bring the cyberneticists and world citizens together to create an even more powerful, more productive group than those who met here in 1787.

Almost forty years ago, after bombing cities and towns in World War II, after Hiroshima and Nagasaki turned war into holocaust, I realized the modern nation-state was the most insidious political con that ever had been perpetrated on our free intelligence. I opted out.

You perhaps already know the story. Becoming stateless was my bridge to world civic power. But being stateless is what we all are today in terms of protection of of inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness proclaim by the U.S. founding fathers.

If world peace is our goal, then you here are fully as stateless as I am in spite of you United States or other nationality. For obviously no nation can prevent war between nations. On the contrary, war is inbuilt to the nation-state system since its breeding ground is anarchy. For instance, in conferring discretionary powers on the U.S. President from the outset , even the U.S. Constitution vitiated its democratic principles when nation confronted nation. So we find ourselves insanely and literally on the brink of total annihilation as a species on the planet earth.

If we view the earth from a nationalistic perspective, it is absurd to contend that the national political world ruled by madmen and women? Is a threat against all humanity in the name of national security rational or insane? If so-called nuclear war is not winnable, as both Reagan and Gorbachev have repeatedly stated, is the threat of it possible for responsible leader?

Only world civic power can systemize that "proliferating complexity" which in your terms defines the crisis of our global era. But is world civic power legitimate or is it only a naive hope, a chimera? If it is to be

legitimate and, more importantly, if it to be successful, its institutional framework - the World Government - must first be proven to be legitimate.

The question of the legitimacy of World Government is two parted: Does World Government exist and is it lawful? Let's look at its elements. First, we have a "legitimate" world citizenry. In September 1954, a Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons was set for ratification by all nations of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In June, 1960, after thirty-five signatures it went into effect. According to that convention, the stateless person, ironically, became legal...according to the nation. He or she was recognized as a human being with clearly defined rights. Statelessness, therefore, enjoys its own legal status distinct from that of the state. But what the authors perhaps didn't realize was that status had a sovereign character in and by itself opening the way for the stateless person to become a legitimate world citizen! It only required him or her to declare that new or "meta" citizenship as an inalienable political right. That right had already been proclaimed by the Universal Declaration of Human rights in 1948.

I only realized that breakthrough after renouncing my own nationality in 1948 and being forced to defend my rights vis-a-vis all states with which I come in contact. I discovered to become stateless is not to relinquish inalienable human rights which, by definition, cannot be renounced. On the contrary, if divorced from the nation-state, the individual's rights become fully revealed, powered and thus operative. His or her access to humanity and the world community is direct, dynamic and decisive. The new world citizen status, as well, affirms the accepted right of "self determination of people." This right is codified in the United Nations Charter, the International Bill of Human rights and various protocols and conventions signed by the nation-states. But until the declaration of World Government in 1953 we stateless had no government to call our own.

Second, in addition to a natural citizenry World Government - unlike other governments in exile - has its own territory which is legally recognized by all nations. We all are familiar with the word "frontier." Every here has no doubt crossed many frontiers in his or her life, but have you ever truly analyzed them, figured them out? As you timidly presented your national passports, those shameful control devices issued by states to ensure your property status, to the frontier control guard to prove your innocence or rather complicity with the divisive system. Have you seen through them?

Indeed, it is over those vert "frontiers" that most national wars are fought. The "frontier" is vital to a nation, but then so is your acquiescence to it as exclusive national citizens. The frontier then is the most important aspect of any nation since it defines the physical, political, social, economic, often ethnic and even moral limits. today we have Jewish states, Christian states and Moslem states. Certainly without the frontier the nation wouldn't exist. But its most important task is legal; it defines the legal limits of a given nation.

Let's dig a little deeper into this "frontier" business applying geo-dialectical thinking. We just might discover a legal way out of the nation-state suicidal cauldron. If two national "frontiers" actually face one another, which divides them? In other words, what actually separates one nation from another? Simple reason tells us there must be a physical line, if only pencil thin, which serves this all-important function. But in that function - and herein lies the crucial fact - it actually serves a dual purpose. **The same line serves two nations!** So here we have a geo-dialectical equation: nation equals nation, the dividing line being the equal sign. The dividing line then is not incidental to all nations but contrarily essential to their legal existence. Without it **they** don't exist. Then itself must be legal otherwise nations themselves could not claim to be legitimate.

But let's carry this reasoning one step further. The same dividing line obvious continues unbroken wherever many nations exist. Therefore, it is actually inter-national territory. In fact, since all nations are defined by it, it is even world territory!

World Territory and World Citizens naturally co-exist. Yet while the product is World Government, the impetus, ironically, originates with national law itself. World Government is as a result made a "lawful" entity. A so-called alien physically entering a country yet not admitted legally is necessarily placed **legally** on the line dividing one nation from another or, in the case of a natural boundary such as an ocean, on the line separating that nation from the ocean territory.

It might surprise you to know that million of humans have been legally consigned to live on the dividing line between nations; I am one. Standing here on this platform, I am not yet legally admitted into the United States; my classification is "excludable alien." This title has also been conferred on Afghans, Cubans, Haitians, Salvadorans, Iranians, Iraqis, Ethiopians, Chinese and so on. This legal device is used by all nations to exclude unwanted "aliens," "refugees," and others considered undesirable to the national authorities. In the Soviet Union, this has been carried to extremes:

an individual simply applying to emigrate becomes "stateless" as far as Soviet citizenship is concerned while still residing in the USSR. The Soviet government has put a personal dividing line between the non-citizen and Soviet society.

Those confined to this unbroken world territory, however, are a de facto sovereign people. Whether they know it or not, they are actually world citizens living on "world" territory. Still retaining the inalienable right to choose their own political allegiance and consistent with the actual legality of the line they are forced to live on, many have declared themselves world citizens. Since it is the very same right used by the founders of the nations themselves, this declaration is per se valid and legal. Indeed, all national constitutions refer to the sovereignty of the people as their mandate. Therefore, the claim of world citizenship by this new "people" must be recognized by the very nations which have confined them to the dividing line between nations. It is essentially for this reason that the government by, of and for world citizens was declared.

On 4 September 1953, from the city hall of Ellsworth, Maine, in order to legally represent this new citizenry as well as humanity itself, your speaker declared the World Government of World Citizens. If citizens make governments, as Tom Paine was insistent to point out, world citizens make world government.

Among other mandates, moral, social and biological, I claimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as the political mandate for this new government, specifically Articles 21(3) which states "The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government..." and Article 28, which states that "everyone has the right to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms are set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized." The declared World Government then is the world power institution. So much for World Government's legitimacy.

Hopefully by now, you understand the basis of World Government. Hopefully you recognize the need for it and for your active involvement. I come now to my third and most important motive for being here today: inviting, nay, drafting you into the only government which represents the meta-level peace development about which you have been theorizing. The synthesis has already begun.

Bill Perk has already exploded into a fully metamorphosized global state as both a general systems expert and Coordinator of the Design-Science Commission of the World Government. He seems to be surviving the mix

well enough. Then another and impressive witness to the embryonic union between the world of organizational science and world politics is Stafford Beer, one of your former presidents, whom I recently appointed - and he accepted - the Coordinator of the World Cybernetic Commission of the World Government. Then our global city hall, the World Service Authority, received John's filled in Pledge of Allegiance last week. Bill, Stafford and John are now three of the 250,000 registered citizens of the World Government of World Citizens.

This encourages me to invite all conference participants to join the only global legal authority in our world town, the World government of World Citizens. Together, we have the chance or perhaps the obligation to change the world.

In summary, my claims this afternoon have been: 1) as individual humans, we possess a sovereign world power that translates politically into world citizenship, 2) world government is the instrument of application of that world civic power, and 3) world government is no longer a theory or pious ideal but a reality actually operating on a real-time basis dealing with immediate and pressing human problems. This world civic power, this "meta-power" alone can meet the total or meta-crisis facing you, me and the human race today. For, as Einstein put it, either we will eliminate war or war will eliminate us.

WORLD GOVERNMENT, CATALYTIC META-AGENT
International Society of General Systems Research

27-30 May, 1986

ABSTRACT

Given the proliferating data input of today's world, the inadequacy and even impotence of the present governing system, the nation-state - carried over from the 18th century - to organize systemically the world community for the well-being, peace and freedom of all the citizens therein, impels the recognition of the imperative need of a "meta-system," or, in political terms, a world government grounded in fundamental human rights.

The major purpose of the World Government - declared by the writer, September 4, 1953, at Ellsworth, Maine - therefore, is to provide a sovereign social/political vehicle for the individual to be identified as legitimate world citizen within an interdependent community, dynamically related to humanity as such as well as to its supporting ecosystem, the planet earth itself.

The new government operates pragmatically through the World Service Authority, its administrative agency, principally issuing global or "meta-documents" as proto-linguistic yet concrete symbols of those rights.

A synthesis of general systems science and the World Government augurs for its metamorphosis to full governance before a total world breakdown.

INTRODUCTION

While appreciating the honor of contributing to this Review, (SGSR) with no academic credentials or professional standing, I cannot presume to emulate or even relate to you as a cyberneticist or systems analyst. As I see it, my role, as an activist world citizen, is that of catalyst at your upcoming meeting in Philadelphia.

Our common objective, as I understand it, is to unify and systematize a now disjointed and rapidly disintegrating human world.

It is self-evident then that cyberneticists/systems analysts dedicated to "making the world work" need a real world model to work from while those operating that very model need the theoretical systems research input

to increase the model's effectiveness - in the face of giant oppositional forces - eventually metamorphosing it to full-scale governance before total (read: "nuclear") catastrophe.

Contemplate for a moment these stark facts: In the 20th century's first 85 years, 78 million people - mostly the poor fighting the poor - have been killed. That is a 500 percent increase over the 19th century. Since 1900, 207 international wars have been fought. In 1945, there were less than 50 sovereign nations; in 1986, there are 171, a 250+ percent increase with a corresponding increase in war potential. In 1960, 28 percent of independent Third World countries were military controlled; today 50 percent are. One hundred forty-two governments are spending more than \$900 billion a year on their military, over \$2 billion per day.

Nowhere is the chaos of present world conditions more apparent than in the fact that the poorest 30 percent of humanity has 3 percent of the income, while the top 20 percent has 66 percent. Death from starvation is commonplace. Seventeen million persons, mostly children under five, are currently dying each year from malnutrition. That's some 46,000 each day, 24 per minute.

Think back to the recent "Summit" conference or indeed to any so-called Summit Conference. Was the elimination of war or poverty ever discussed? Has any national leader ever proposed limiting national sovereignty to a world government? Reagan and Gorbachev - and even Qaddafi! - are blood allies in maintaining the "sovereign" nation-state system. They are all buddies-in-arms. legally, if international law, to which they constantly allude, exists, they are war criminals along with their fellow heads of state.

The history of nations is basically the history of war.

In the meantime, frail humanity desperately seeks its legitimization if only to call public and favorable attention to its miserable existence and will to survive as such.

for instance, as I write, Voyager 2, travelling 45,000 miles per hour, almost 2 billion miles from Earth, is sending back pictures of Uranus' five cratered moons, Miranda, Umbriel, Ariel, Titania and Oberon, pictures which took 2 hours, 45 minutes travelling at 186,000 mph to arrive at the home planet.

Contrarily, on the same home planet, the battleships and warplanes of the fictional United States of America, using much the same technology and science, are maneuvering in the Mediterranean playing nuclear footsie with fictional Libya's puny, yet stinging (thanks to the fictional Soviet Union) air force.

The two news stories - Uranus and Reagan/Qaddafi - symbolize the present human dilemma: man's awareness and application of natural laws to objective problems shared by one and all versus the dominant archetypal 18th century governing bodies in which systemic violence is not only condoned but totally integrated into the social and political infrastructure.

The former is real; the latter, surreal.

THE GLOBAL MINDSET

But analysis is easy. What to DO?

Emery Reves, in The Anatomy of Peace stated that we think "nation-centrally" but to survive must learn to think "globally." That's very, very difficult. Einstein wrote that, "Since the advent of the nuclear age, everything has changed except our way of thinking." Of course, Buckminster Fuller, Marshall McLuhan, and a plethora of lesser luminaries, have joined gleefully with this highly subversive notion of planetary oneness. We read now in your own Review Bulletin in Len Troncale's article titled "We Are One People" that

"...It would seem unnecessary to stress 'oneness' to a field devoted to 'holism.' Integration and synthesis are the most fundamental goals of our Society."

James Lovelock married this thinking with the "gaia" concept of a living planet to which we belong and contribute specieswise and from which we are individually and collectively nourished.

I have been happy and honored to add to this conceptual injunction of global thinking a corresponding "proto-language" involving personal action. I will explain.

With a minimum of theory - though we do invoke human rights sanctions - I "operate" a "Model T" world government chugging along a very bumpy new world road. Please do consider this in your evaluation of the following reflections: This world government is the only one I have to

represent me. The same is true for over half of the more than 250,000 of my co-world citizens.

ORIGINS

Briefly, here is how it happened.

In the aftermath of World War II, having realized that the exclusive nation-state was not only the perpetrator of world lawlessness BUT REQUIRED IT TO REMAIN "SOVEREIGN," I opted, albeit legitimately, out of that surreal system and declared for myself a new and OPERATIVE civic and political status: world citizenship.

I learned recently from one of your respected fellow cyberneticists, Stafford Beer, I had claimed a "meta-status."

My thinking between 1945-47 which led to this decision was unsophisticated to the point of childishness. A. The nation-state made war. B. I was an exclusive citizen of one. C. As such, I was colluding with war-making. D. To make peace (or be peaceful), I could n't remain allied to it, i.e., I had to expatriate myself. (The equivalent in spiritual terms of "renouncing society" and becoming a "truth-seeker" or "sannyasin.") E. Then, out of sheer necessity as well as moral principle, exercising my own sovereignty, I chose a new civic status of a global character, a world citizenship, thereby empowering its fictional counterpart, a world government, through and by which peace would be the result.

Logical, but it didn't work out quite as facile as I thought it would.

Others were touting world government at the time: Mahatma Gandhi, Wendell Willkie, Emery Reves, Albert Einstein and a bunch of good-willed yet ineffectual intellectuals who called themselves "world federalists" and wanted nations somehow to "get together." Of course, it didn't take a genius to know that world government WAS - and still is - the systemic answer to world chaos but that it wasn't going to be founded by nations.

"No nation state is going to vote a metasytem in place...It follows that the only international metasytem we shall ever have is, miraculously enough, is the one we already got! That is to say, the metasytem IS the population of all the world's citizens..."

(Managing Modern Complexity: Fifteen Years On, 1985, Stafford Beer, Futures Report Quarterly, The World Future Society)

Nobody, however, even the above-mentioned luminaries, had considered that such a potentially monstrous and complex organization as world government - despite the historical precedent of the origin of government - could begin with the defenseless and starry-eyed individual.

Tom Paine had explained the process in this way:

"It has been thought a considerable advance towards establishing the principle of freedom to say that government is a compact between those who govern and those who are governed; but this cannot be true, because it is putting the effect before the cause; for as men must have existed before governments existed, there once was a time when governments did not exist, and consequently there could originally exist no governors to form such a compact with. The fact therefore must be that individuals themselves, each in his own personal and sovereign right, entered into a compact WITH EACH OTHER to produce such a government..."(Emphasis added).

In brief, for world government to "happen," its personal adoption by the sovereign individual in the proto-linguistic or meta-language of world citizenship was required. But simply stating it wasn't enough; one had to become it, incorporate it, then act it out! Aye, there's the rub! What did you have to give up to become an operational world government citizen? Even an illusion can be comforting and the illusion of national security - except for the refugee- seems to impregnate every "national" pore. Better the devil you know...

But with the insanity of World War II behind me in which my paid bombing of villages, towns and cities earned me medals and nightmares, where my older brother was left on the sea's bottom along with his sunken destroyer, with the dead of Hiroshima and Nagasaki a constant emotional and moral hairshirt, with the craven and blatant hypocrisy of politicians continuing their obscene war games now with genocidal weapons filling me daily with fright and anger, with the embarrassed silence of my peers on the question of sheer survival disgusting me, and with the Berlin airlift supplying the political fuse, in desperation mixed with the elation of missionary zeal, I decided to become myself the "persona" or world citizen of a future world government.

Little did I realize that the moment I walked out of the American Embassy in Paris on May 25, 1948, minus a U.S. passport, no longer the "property" of the U.S.A., by sheer necessity, I had become an instant "authority" on the practice of global systems! Somewhat to my dismay, to the ubiquitousness of the world media and the almost instant and crushing support of the refugee and stateless population which, like me, had nowhere to go politically but "up," I learned quickly that once engaged, there was no turning back. The "meta-level" of political allegiance demanded total commitment - spirit, mind and body, whatever the cost.

Just as the fictitious United States of America in 1787 first needed its "citizen" declared from the largely antagonistic Continental Congress, so in 1948 the world government evidently needed its citizens declared from...anywhere on planet earth.

In Stafford Beer's words:

"Garry Davis had the steely nerve to declare himself a world citizen nearly forty years ago. He really was the first person to recognize the remarkable truth at the metasytem of world government was already there: in place, in being..." (Ibid)

I myself did not think at the time that the "metasytem of world government was already there..." In fact, I had never come across the word "Metasytem" until I read Beer's book, Platform for Change, last year. My thinking was rather more mystical:

"I must extend the little sovereignty I possess as a member of the world community, to the whole community, and to the international vacuum of its government - a vacuum into which the rest of the world must be drawn if it is to survive, for therein lies the only alternative to this final war."

(My statement of May 25, 1948)

Two significant events occurred shortly thereafter publicly recasting me from the "misguided crackpot weakening the defenses of the West..." as Time Magazine reported, to a "world figure" as The Atlantic Monthly claimed. On November 19th, at the 1948 Paris session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, from the balcony of the Palais de Chaillot, with friends I called for the U.N. to transform itself into a world government or we, the people, would do the job ourselves. We were abruptly removed from the premises by U.N. security police. Second came

the December 10th proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which we, the humans concerned, promptly adopted as our de facto world citizen "constitution."

STRUCTURE

Medard Gabel, in writing of the World Game in 1980, stated that "In designing anything it is best to start from scratch; to design the ideal system as if the existing system did not exist..."

With literally thousands of letters endorsing my world citizen stand, the first global organization I founded "from scratch" was the International Registry of World Citizens resulting from my invitation on January 1, 1949, for others to identify themselves as world citizens. In two tumultuous years, the IRWC registered over 750,000 individuals from over 150 countries.

With this global mandate, still stateless, 16 prisons (for not having "valid" papers) and five years later, again "from scratch," on September 4, 1953, from the City Hall of Ellsworth Maine, I proclaimed the founding of the World Government. (See "The Ellsworth Declaration", Chapter 1, World Government, Ready or Not!, Juniper Ledge Publishing Co., 1985).

I called for recognition from "the common world citizenry," and from "other governments" I asked for help from "the spiritual leaders and gurus, the World Teachers," from "the most able scientists, technicians, managers and administrators," and from the "mothers of the world."

The operative unit - the global "city hall" - of the new government was founded in 1954 in New York City: the World Service Authority. After having been situated in seven cities throughout the world - along with me - it is now headquartered in Washington, D.C.

The WSA issues all the Government's identity documents: the World Citizen Registration Card, the World Passport, the World Identity Card, the World Birth Certificate, the World Marriage License, and the World Political Asylum Card.

In other words, it is already identifying the world population as a "meta-constituency." Recognition of the WG's documents has been slow and grudging, but today, we count over 80 nations which, on an individual

basis, have stamped visas, resident permits, etc., on them. Five have accorded the World Passport official de juris recognition: Ecuador, Zambia, Mauritania, Togo and the People's Republic of China.

"If some people think of his lifetime's efforts to have properly recognized the World Government of World Citizens as quixotic, let them guess at the number of world passports (with subsidiary identification documents) that his organization has so far issued. I think I hear 250. Try another order of 250,000. That's quite a lot but WRONG AGAIN. The actual figure is a quarter of a million. HOW MANY MORE OF US WOULD IT TAKE TO REGISTER, AND MAKE THE POINT THAT NATION STATES ARE OBSOLETE? Worse yet: they are harbingers of universal death. Only a World Citizen could be expected to see that the two mighty powers, representing all that overkill, rattle their spears at each other in mere ritual. But each of us IS a world citizen. We know the risks. We know exactly where the profits are. WE HAVE NO VOICE UNTIL WORLD Government massively declares itself." (Emphasis added.)

("Managing Modern Complexity: Fifteen Years Along", 1985, Stafford Beer, Futures Report Quarterly, The World Future Society)

Twelve coordinators of world commissions have been announced over the years: Syd Cassyd (Communications), Stafford Beer, (Cybernetics), Yehudi Menuhin (Cultural), William Perk (Design-Science), Louis Kelso (Economics), Guru Nitya Chaitanya Yati (Education), Badi Lenz (Forestry), Michio Kushi (Health), Theodore Welles (Ocean), Isaac Asimov (Space), George Lloyd (Women), John Steinbruck (World Political Asylum).

Until two months ago, all advertising of our Government has been by word of mouth. Cast in the historic role of a "government in exile" since its inception, its main sustainers and champions (as well as martyrs) have been those already "exiled" from the nation state, the refugees and stateless of the world. Nowhere does the ancient injunction of "The first shall be last and the last first" apply more fittingly than in the first ranks of world citizens. Yet, Madison Avenue would be hard to devise an advertising campaign for the have-nots of a refugee camp. Talk about "grass roots" movements! I would suggest that system analysts begin their models with these highest motivated humans in mind!

ECONOMY

"It is scientifically clear that we have the ability to make all of the humanity physically successful. Industrialization itself relates to the resources of the entire earth, the entire universe. The industrial system is a comprehensive system and if reversingly fractionated will fail."

(Utopia or Oblivion, Buckminster Fuller, The Overlook Press, 1969, p. 242)

In recognizing the human race as a viable species, a drastic revision in economic thinking is imposed.

If mutual abundance - making "humanity physically successful" - or conversely, the elimination of poverty is a prime goal of humankind, the fundamental question: Who owns the world? must be answered by world economic planners worth the name. World citizens is the easy answer. However, present ownership patterns of wealth-producing technology - grossly monopolistic - obviously must be revised for the benefit of one and all. When five percent of the world's population own over 80 percent of the invested capital (equity), social upheaval with all its subsequent stresses and injustices is inevitable. If political democracy is an ideal to be espoused and implemented globally, then its corollary, economic democracy, must likewise be instituted. If true, the present exploitive, scarcity-oriented, war-infected, national economic house of cards is doomed.

In an article in *International Banking* of August 15, 1985, Christopher Hune points out the "Debt timebomb under the banks:

"...most of the leading American and British banks have lent far more than their capital to just four key Latin American debtors - Mexico, Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela. If all these countries simply refused to pay, all the banks whose lending exceeds their base capital would effectively be insolvent."

The national debt crisis is totalling almost \$3 trillion combined with the currency volatility in the unregulated global marketplace allied with increasing capital being sucked into war production and war-making is a sure formula for collapse in the short-term.

Furthermore, U.S. Deputy Treasurer Secretary, Richard G. Darman, no less, in a recent conference of leading economists held in Washington, frankly revealed the dynamic relationship between politics and economics:

"It seems to me that in thinking about a system that one would like to have in the world of the future, which presumably one would like to have on a stable basis for some period of time, it is absolutely essential that we address the question of the interrelationships between whatever is going to be the monetary system and the political system, the larger system, IN WHICH THE MONETARY SYSTEM MUST FUNCTION." (Emphasis added).

So to work. Five elements are required immediately to avoid a catastrophic breakdown. All are self-evident and exist already in part.

First, a new bank under the aegis of the World Government of World Citizens issuing a new global currency based on the original conception of money as a "Medium of exchange" between producers and consumers having no intrinsic value in itself. Already the "World Dollar (\$W) has recently been introduced by the World Government, with a par value of \$US1. The "World Government Treasury Account" is open at the National Bank of Washington for purposes of renegotiating the World Dollars. Five thousand numbered and laminated bills - "meta-money" - have been printed principally as a funding device for the founding of its own bank in due course. World dollars are obviously a peace currency, a human rights currency with, as one subscriber put it, "no blood on them."

Second, as mutual funds provide profits through a diverse portfolio of equity to members, so a democratically organized and controlled investment corporation of, for and by world citizens whereby they may cooperate and individually profit on the basis of economic justice in the purchase of approved securities of industries throughout the world; in turn, popular ownership of voting equity will lead inevitably to its legitimate protection on a global scale. (See World Government, Ready or Not!, "Who Owns the World?," p. 301: "The Economic World 'Ticket' & p. 302, "Second 'Plank:' World Public Order)

Third, a world citizen union based on two principles: 1) increased purchasing power through employee stock ownership plans (E.S.O.P.s) and 2) progressive decrease in the work/week due to full utilization of design science, automation, ephemeralization, robotics, and ecologically sound energy sources.

Fourth, a world institute of economic justice under the world government's aegis staffed by holistic-thinking economists: 1) to educate the world citizenry to the new global ownership philosophy and strategies, 2) to educate national and world leaders to the 'new look' in affluent economic thinking as opposed to obsolete scarcity-dominated economic thinking, 3) to education multinational and national management and personnel as to the economic, social, technical, ecological and moral advantages of adopting the new economic philosophy and strategies, and 4) to propose concrete solutions based on economic democracy for present and future corporate management and personnel.

Fifth, a concrete overall economic plan advanced by the above institute for reversing the nationalistic arms race without dislocation and embracing transferral and transforming strategies already detailed not only by the United Nations but by many reputable think tanks.

A FINAL OBSERVATION

Those intimately involved with the analysis and systems in retaining their exclusive national allegiance cannot but recognize their own complicity with the surrogate world of nations. As exclusive national citizens, do they not help perpetuate the very chaos, indeed what Stafford Beer prophetically refers to as "universal death," which the nation state today represents? Is n't national citizenship in reality a non-sequitur - a literal suicide pact in our nuclear-triggered world?

The dichotomy is found in the General Systems Bulletin (Fall, 1985) describing a program of your upcoming May meeting. Turn, if you will, to page 4 under "Applications in the Real World, M. Peace Development." First, I think you will agree that "peace development IS the key issue here, indeed of the whole SGS. For without it, none of us would remain. But, while other sections talk nobly of "holistic thinking" and "global dynamics" and "networking," here we find the old, relativistic, i.e., nationalistic blind spot:

"Peace development may be viewed as an effort to ASSIST THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD to become parts of an INTERNATIONAL system in which non-violent means can be used to obtain solutions and settle conflicts BETWEEN NATIONS...

"Peace-keeping has been referred to as a dissociative process of KEEPING WARRING FORCES APART..." (Emphasis added)

No mention of law, government, social contract, humanity, the sovereignty of the people, perennial moral codes, justice, courts, etc. Where does that leave you and me? That's right: helpless.

Why this blind spot among otherwise thoughtful analysts? Viewed objectively, all nations, bar none, have war BUILT IN as the main social and political dynamic. Eisenhower warned us of the "military/industrial complex." But the danger goes deeper. It is in reality a "military/industrial/NATIONAL complex." Being exclusive social and political units, yet existing in one geographical area - the world community - "sovereign" nations not only sustain conflict but NEED it in order to survive. Emery Reves, in Anatomy of Peace, put it succinctly:

"Wars between groups of men forming social units always take place when these units - tribes, dynasties, churches, cities, nations - exercise unrestricted sovereign power. Wars between these social units cease the moment sovereign power is transferred from them to a larger or higher unit."

To transfer "sovereign power...to a larger or higher unit" requires the individual exercising his/her inalienable right to CHOOSE a civic order beyond that which presently exists. And herein lies that insidious blind spot. True, the human being may be 95 percent programmed; but the remaining 5 percent either is active or reactive. Nationalism is political reactivism. World citizenship is political activism.

A hungry man is not interested in theories about growing food or why hunger is not good for him. Only actual bread will suffice. Likewise, yelling to a drowning man from the safety of the bank that he ought to think seriously about the consequences of getting that much water inside him is insufficient, to say the least.

To talk "metalinguistically" and not operate "metasystemically" will not save the world.

To OPERATE systemically on a global level, you must be "outside" THE ENTIRE NATIONAL SYSTEM.

Like Voyager 2.

Like you were at birth and will be at death.

Like humanity.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, given our common danger and human heritage, the plain fact is that only a "model" world government provides the operative "mode" of the solution you seek. If that frightens you, take heart. I've been on this holistic side of the political "line" for years as have millions of others. Believe me, it is only a mindset away. Besides, as I have appointed Stafford Beer Coordinator of the World Cybernetic Commission of the World Government of World Citizens, I have already included your discipline into the equation. In his acceptance of that post, he tacitly enjoins you to add your input to our evolving global meta-system.

And while all those stereotype mindsets in national uniforms from frontier guards to gilded thrones do get in the way occasionally - and even insist at times on a visit to their national goals, always an enlightening experience - as simple humans, we are right, and must prevail eventually...as must humanity.

In any case, the alternative is "universal death," so what's the choice?

Thank you.
