

HOW TO LEGITIMIZE HUMANITY

10 March 1987

INTRODUCTION

I am delighted to be here. It is an honor and a pleasure, though I have to add, somewhat ironic. For, as a stateless World Citizen, my personal experience with so-called international law has been less than satisfactory. I say “so-called” because international law by definition is an adjunct and derivative of national law and not a body of law in and of itself. There exists no international legislative, executive, judicial or enforcement body operating independently of the nation-state system having “international Law” as its basis of jurisdiction. With due respect, the term “international law,” it would seem, is therefore a non-sequitur.

Alvin Toffler, in his seminal book, The Third Wave, is even more critical. He writes:

“All the political parties in the industrial world, all our congresses, parliaments an supreme soviets, our presidencies and prime ministerships, our courts, and our regulatory agencies and our layer upon geographical layer of governmental bureaucracy - in short, all the tools we use to make and enforce collective decisions - are obsolete and about to be transformed. A third wave civilization cannot operate with a second wave political structure.”

He concludes that:

“Just as the revolutionaries who created the industrial age could not govern the leftover apparatus of feudalism, so today we are faced once more with the need to invent new political tools.”

As I see it your dilemma as international law students, is that the subject itself derives from erroneous or even fraudulent premises: the so-called legitimacy of the nation-state system itself. The real question facing you as law students, it seems to me, is not whether international law is or is not dependent on national law, but whether the national system is relevant to human survival in our nuclear age.

Given this frontal attack on your doorstep, as it were, I am also keenly aware that it may be presumptuous on my part to claim any expertise on the subject of law itself. Having no standing in the legal profession, no law degree, no formal legal training, I can invoke no professional authority here. But contrarily, with no official reputation to defend, I have nothing to lose by speaking the plain truth about law as I know and experience it. I take comfort that Tom Paine could claim no university pedigree either, nor any of the prophets, nor indeed George Washington, your first president.

MY “CRIMINAL” EXPERIENCE

I do have some practical experience with criminal law having appeared as a defendant in twenty-two court cases in six countries since 1948. I have been incarcerated 32 in sixteen countries since i began my crusade for world peace in 1948. My “crime” in most of these actions was either possessing no identity papers or false ones. So I am what you might call a “jailhouse” lawyer. I have also prepared several briefs. One, a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court in August, 1981, then a petition for rehearing to the high court on December 22 of the same year - both denied - and finally a petition to the International Court of Justice at the Hague in March, 1985 wherein I cited President Reagan and First Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev as war criminals under the Nuremberg Decisions. this too was denied. These briefs are available in booklet form.

So what precisely am I doing here, you may well ask. The theme I want to talk about drives, you might say, from the “fourth” dimension of law: the flipside of the coin of revelation, that is, a holistic legitimate acceptance of the world of nature on our planet and its dominant species, humankind, as such. A striking symbol of that global mindset appeared on February 23 when we humans observed a supernova which exploded 170,00 years ago.

THREE PROPOSITIONS

Though our subject this evening is virtually limitless, our time is not. I can, therefore, only bare the outline of our theme in the hope that it provokes discussion and further inquiry on your part.

In the next hour or so I will attempt to advance three major propositions:

1. The nation-state system is not only anachronistic and fictional but inherently illegal.
2. The human race as a whole and the world of nature are inherently legitimate.
3. World law and government, both natural and positive, are already operative.

MY PERSONAL LEGAL POSITION

First I must define my personal legal position here before you as it is relevant to my three propositions. It has two sides: national and global.

First the national: in 1948 I legally expatriated myself from the United States according to the Nationality Act of 1940; therefore, as of 25 May 1948 vis-a-vis all nations and the historical and legal system itself I became “stateless.” I add in parenthesis, that in so doing I allied myself directly and dynamically with humanity itself which is also stateless.

THE RIGHT OF EXPATRIATION

Mind you, expatriation since 1868, has been deemed an inalienable right by U.S. law. The Act of Congress of 27 July 1868 proclaimed:

“...the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensable to the enjoyment of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness...any declaration, instruction, opinion, order or decision of any officers of this government which denies, restrict, impairs or questions the right of expatriation, is hereby declare inconsistent with the fundamental principles of this government.”

What the Fortieth Congress was affirming here - or tacitly reaffirming - was not only the inalienable right of the individual to renounce his national status but equally to choose his own political allegiance.

THE STATE LEGALLY CONDONES LAWLESSNESS

By renouncing nationality, I was exercising personal sovereignty in choosing not to continue in the nation-state system itself. I was permitted

legally by the state itself to deny its sovereign character. As the aforementioned Act of Congress pointed out, if expatriation is indispensable to the enjoyment of “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,” as the Act claimed and if the founding of the United States was to protect those very same rights, then by what legal means were they to be protected for the expatriate? We will come to the obvious answer to this basic question in a moment.

Did not this denial of exclusive state sovereignty and affirmation of personal sovereignty emulate the history of the founding fathers in 1787 who opted out of exclusive allegiance to their particular states in founding the higher allegiance to the United States they then created?

In other words, does not the exercise of personal sovereignty precede and provide the founding element of the new aggregate social contract we call government?

This is no new revelation. The Haudenosaunee, or the Six Nation Iroquois Confederacy, was perhaps the oldest government in the western hemisphere if not in the world to incorporate the principle of individual sovereignty as indispensable to free government. Its great sage and peacemaker, Hiawatha was undoubtedly the first political general systems scientist since he rejected a hierarchical structure - which dominated the tribal government - for an organic feedback system where each tribal member had input to the governing system.

MY LEGAL STANDING IN THE U.S.

What then is my present legal standing in the United States? The legal position of the United States government today in my regard is that I am inadmissible to its constitutional jurisdiction. In 1977, when I returned from a trip abroad, the Immigration and Naturalization Service classified me an “excludable alien.” This classification was subsequently upheld by the First District Court, the District Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court.

So where do I reside legally? The answer is to be found in *Ling Yee Suey v. Spar*, 1945, in which the court determined that

“A person brought into the United States by the authorities and then released on bond is considered as having never entered the United States and as being in a position analogous to one who stopped at the border and kept there.”

According to the U.S. Code therefore, though not “brought into the United States by the authorities” and not “released on bond,” I am legally residing on the frontier line separating the United States of America from the rest of the world. Strangely enough, this unique legal position has been forced on most nations by the expanding refugee and stateless persons population. Literally millions of individuals throughout the world - mainly victims of international wars - have been forced in the same anomalous legal position. Many are in detention or in despicable refugee camps.

WORLD CITIZENSHIP

I said my legal position has two sides; the other side is global. De facto or actual citizenship is obviously the beginning of government, the seminal political identity from which government evolves. In national constitutions, it is described as the “sovereignty of the people.”

At the time of my renunciation of nationality I declared myself a world citizen. That was my inalienable right to choose my own political allegiance. Many others since, in the hundreds of thousands, have claimed world citizenship. In 1953, therefore, on September 4 from the City Hall of Ellsworth, Maine I declared a government to administer to this global constituency: the World Government of World Citizens.

This declaration of overt world government, however, was essentially the legitimate recognition of the natural and spiritual “world government” already operating on planet earth to which all humans as every other species are already bound.

So I stand before you, not legally in the United States, confined by U.S. law to a territory defined as the “frontier” by all nations, as a sovereign World Citizen represented by a sovereign government of declared World Citizens.

Why the Nation is Illegal

From the holistic perspective, the nation-state is dependent for its exclusive legal existence on a condition of world anarchy. But that very condition in turn is the breeding-ground of international war. The very evolution of the nation-state itself was designed to eliminate the condition of anarchy among lesser socio-political units. Thus, like the lizard which stings itself to death entrapped in a circle of fire, the nation-state system contains the seeds of its own destruction.

Indeed, if war is the driving social and political force of all nation-states - and no serious student of political science can doubt this proposition - then not only its leaders but the system itself is guilty of international crimes defined by the Nuremberg Principles.

Moreover, given the genocidal character of nuclear weapons, the leaders of the nation-states which possess them are indictable under articles II, III and IV of the Convention of the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

Unfortunately, however, omnicide cannot be tried after the fact.

My first proposition that the nation-state is illegal may now be viewed in the light of its legal inability to protect its citizenry from inter-national war, the antithesis of law and order.

In brief, the concept of citizenship connotes just law protecting basic human rights, the principal one being the right to live. The concept of nation connotes an exclusive political fiction existing in a lawless or anarchic world community where conflict is the driving political and social force.

In other words, “national” and “citizenship” have become mutually exclusive in today’s world where war has been replaced by holocaust, the annihilation of human society itself.

The Fictional Nation-State Contract

When the Founding Fathers contracted with each other and individuals of thirteen states to form a “more perfect union,” it was to protect inalienable rights “Life, Liberty, Pursuit of Happiness,” etc.

But that new social contract was made in the political vacuum “beyond” the legitimacy of the separate and then sovereign states. The Articles of Confederation had to be rejected to create the political “vacuum” into which the Constitution could be placed.

Now, almost 200 years later, after four major world revolutions: technological, electronic, nuclear and spatial, the national contract has turned into a collective suicide pact. Not only national but world society is being held hostage by its inherent contradictions:

1. “National security” has become a euphemism for war.

2. War dominates society to the detriment of the “common welfare.”
3. Environmental pollution and degradation are built-in to a system breakdown.
4. When state “security” dominates governmental programs, violence becomes endemic internally and externally. Society literally goes mad, Presidents become open criminals, liars, dualistic, threatening all life. Business, unions, workers collude with violent-oriented commerce. TV, movies, media condone violence daily. Family, communal (tribal) regional groups are subject to moral and social disintegration.
5. Illegal usurpation of planetary space for national aggression.

As for the final point, national law, contracting between national citizens, obviously cannot extend beyond limits determined by its constitution. The very exclusivity of the nation precludes its claim to space “ownership” which is inclusive. In other words, national limits cannot, by definition, encompass spacial limitlessness. Thus exclusive national law cannot define the inclusive legitimacy of space.

Space is common to all humans on planet earth. Just as oceans are the “common heritage” of humanity, so obviously is space.

Just as only a World Citizen government can define the legitimate parameters of the world territory for all humanity, so only it can represent space surrounding humanity’s home planet.

Statelessness: The Key To World Peace

If you view the world only from your national citizenship allegiance, then a world government appears a chimera or utopian. It depends on nations “giving up” sovereignty. Worse, it renders you, the human concerned, impotent.

But let’s examine more closely this modern social phenomenon called “statelessness.” For, if indeed the nation-state as a war-making institution is thereby anachronistic, then perhaps statelessness is the breakthrough to a peaceful world.

I have already said that the US Congress in 1868 in July 28, established expatriation as an inalienable human right. By so doing, inadvertently

perhaps, statelessness acquired a legal status according to US law, the national law permitted and permits what appears to be lawlessness or a condition where positive law is absent. A national or state citizen choosing expatriation by definition enters a state of natural law with his or her fellow humans.

In 1963, a Convention on Statelessness, formulated by nations through the UN, defined the rights of stateless persons, Ironically, this was a confirmation by supposedly sovereign nations of the legal status of statelessness. Implicit in that recognition is again both the sovereign character of the individual and the limitation of sovereignty of the nation-state. For if a stateless person can enjoy a legitimacy “outside” the civic constitutional jurisdiction of the nation, then that legitimacy is of a sovereign character recognized by the so-called sovereign state.

Moreover, according to its provisions, the stateless Convention cannot apply to anyone having committed “international crimes” defined by “international instruments,” i.e., Nuremberg. And since Nuremberg is part of international law, a stateless person therefore has been considered an “international” citizen by the states themselves.

The Frontier Line Between States Is Legitimate Territory

All states are today obliged to deal legally with this growing world population of stateless persons while still denying them access to civic constitutional jurisdiction. but where are they placed legally> That’s right, on the line dividing them!

Then what are the underlying legal implications of this decision? First, national law is admitting that a “border” legally exists. That seems self-evident yet the implications are profound. Because what is not self-evident is that, by definition, that border is not part of the national jurisdiction. That is, in order to serve its function as a neutral dividing-line, it must be independent of the nation.

Second, if the nation has no jurisdiction on a border line, yet an individual can be confined there by national law, is not that law recognizing a legitimate “territory” outside its constitutional framework?

Thirdly, what is the law governing this neutral territory? And since it already has a population, what is its government?

Lastly, does not the nation depend for its very exclusive sovereign character on that neutral frontier line separating it from other equally sovereign states?

Ironically, therefore the frontier “line” has become the particular legal territory or “land” created by states for individuals “outside” the state jurisdiction. This extra-territorial “land” which divides all nations from each other, has become implicitly their “country.”

If a state has an ocean as border, that “land” merges with the ocean itself, a “common heritage of humanity.”

Furthermore, the legality of the dividing line or “frontier” is per se sanctioned implicitly by all states since **their** sovereign legitimacy depends on **its** existence.

But whereas each states claims sovereignty , the sovereignty of the dividing-line is universal, that is, single and worldwide covering the planetary community. It is not only actual but legal world territory. Furthermore, it could be argued that as it encompasses the oceans as well, it is the largest “country.”

The subject of national frontiers can be expanded almost as infinitum. For instance, though they delimit the nation’s sovereignty, they are crossed continually. Humans, commerce, micro-waves, voices, birds, cows, cockroaches, airplanes, etc. National frontiers are defended, fought over, killed over. They are continually changed but never foregone. They become sacred, almost divine, separating the godly from the ungodly. Space and space travel, of course, reveals all national frontiers as false, arbitrary, and in terms of human need and now survival, illegitimate.

Take them away - as the Haudenosaunis did between the warring six tribes, the Mohawks, Senecas, Onondagas, Oneidas, Cayugas and Tuscaroras - and the world becomes one country....which in natural fact, it is!

It could be said that the national frontiers represent the entire surface of the planet which is actual world territory. The essential lesson then to be drawn from the events of 1787 in Philadelphia is that the political dividing-lines between the several states were removed by the United States Constitution.

I hope you are beginning to perceive the fictional character of the nation-state system itself, dependent on physical dividing-lines which are at once independent, planet-wide and legitimate in their own right.

What Constitute a “People”

That leads us to another aspect of so-called international law. What legally determines a “people?” The General Assembly of the UN (Res. 2625, 1970) defines the form which self-determination may take:

*“The establishment of a sovereign and independent state, the free association with an independent state or the emergence into any other political status **freely determined by a people** constitute modes of implementing the right of self-determination of that people.”* (Emphasis added).

In other words, a “people” determines itself legally.

Having no national status yet possessing the inalienable right of free choice as to political allegiance, certain stateless persons and “refugees” residing as the legitimate “land” between states have “freely determined” themselves a “people” called “World Citizens.”

This self-determining “people” have pledged their allegiance to a declared government of their own choice, the World Government of World Citizens.

This sovereign government functions independently and “outside” of the nation=state framework. Yet, due to its functional “world land,” without which states could exist, it claims a superseding sovereignty over the nation-state by virtue of its global interdependence. So-called “foreign policies” of states vis-a-vis each other encroach upon and violate the sovereign character and unity of the World Government’s “territory.”

The Contractual Right

For you to accept the legitimacy of this new global government, we have to examine the precise elements by which governments come into being.

First, the right to make a contract is the seminal right enjoyed by all members of a given community.

The social contract is implicit in that right.

But that right is in turn dependent on the sovereign character of the individual within the social framework of a given community.

The question of sovereignty for a person living alone on a desert island obviously does not arise for there is no one to make a contract with.

The sovereign right arises with two or more individuals in the same social context.

The fact of two in a single social framework implies an exercise of sovereignty by both. Each must choose whether and how to live together or apart.

The aggregate decisions form a social matrix. The community itself then becomes sovereign along with the individuals comprising it.

As individuals are born or enter the social matrix, they contract not only with each and every other citizen but with the group itself as a whole. The relationship is known as dualism monism: or the principle of dynamic balance. The geodialectical formula is “One for all and all for one.”

This is called “government.”

“Citizen” Is Code Word For Social Contract

Of course the code word for the social contract is “citizen.” It implies the sovereign power of individual decision-making whether local, regional, national or global.

When two or more stateless persons, in recognizing their inalienable right to civic and political choice, contract socially to act peaceably toward each other, such a contract is legitimate within the legal code.

The contract, however, is global in concept and actuality. For it is both legally and operationally “outside” the national framework. It has a “meta” or independent sovereign character of its own.

The World Civic Contract

Besides the natural or biological “contracts” which link us dynamically one to another, “meta” or worldly contracts already tacitly exist between literally all members of the human race:

1. Postal service;
2. Telecommunication service;
3. Highway codes;
4. Common criminal codes;
5. International Travel by air codes, etc.

Human Rights Are Legitimate

I have talked about the legitimacy of the sovereign choice of the individual to make a social contract.

But what about the legitimacy of human rights themselves?

It is almost a banality to state that the exercise of the human right of political/social choice has resulted in many present-day governments.

Indeed, the Declaration of Independence reveals precisely how the inalienable rights of “Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness...” among others are to be protected:

“...That to secure these Rights, Government are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed...”

The term “human rights” implies, however, transnational or global boundaries. Humanity is not limited by national frontiers.

But if human rights are legitimate per se, then their protection by law is as legitimate. This is confirmed in the Preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human rights:

“Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by a regime of law...”

Then the exercise of the same human right of political/social choice by certain individuals who are by legal definition “outside” the nation of a world citizenship is as legitimate if not more so.

Here the global civic contract between sovereign individuals becomes the seminal act of legitimate protection of fundamental human rights.

Is Humanity Legitimate

If we accept that the individual right to live is legitimate, then the legitimate right of humanity itself to live cannot be questioned. For if humanity is destroyed, then each human being has been denied that basic right.

Furthermore, every national constitution refers to the “sovereignty of the people” as its very mandate for government.

“The People” as a whole is simple the human species itself.

That our species is dynamically linked to the whole of nature goes without saying.

We can then claim categorically that Nature itself is “legitimate,” in that natural laws are immutable and already “enacted” by their Creator.

Any violations of these laws are “crimes” against humanity and each and all humans.

World Government Is Operational

I have already mentioned in recounting my personal history that a world government was declared September 4, 1953 from the City Hall of Ellsworth, Maine.

While it represents humanity as such, it also services individuals who seek the overt identity of world citizenship in their particular social and political environment. It has registered over 250,000 individuals throughout the world as its citizens. Half of this new constituency are refugees and stateless persons like me.

Time does not permit me to detail all its various programs and plans. My book World Government, Ready Or Not! contains both its philosophy and down-to-earth operations.

World-Class Leaders Needed

In their 1977 message to the world, "Basic Call To Consciousness," delivered in Geneva at the Palais des Nations, the Elders of the Haudenosaunee wrote that:

"The people who are living on this planet need to break with the narrow concept of human liberation, and begin to see liberation as something which needs to be extended to the whole of the Natural World."

and that

"Spiritualism is the highest form of political consciousness."

You who are about to inherit the power reins of our desperate world need to think profoundly on your responsibilities to human survival in the nuclear age.

General Douglas MacArthur asked in 1955,

"When will some great figure in power have sufficient imagination and moral courage to translate this universal wish for peace - which is rapidly becoming a necessity - into actuality? It is the leaders who are the laggards. The disease of power seems to confuse and bewilder them. Never do they dare to state the bald truth that the next great advance in the evolution of civilization cannot take place until war is abolished."

The Rev. Henry Ward Beecher once claimed that *"The worst thing in this world, next to an anarchy, is government."*

If true, then world government, however expedient, is better than world anarchy. Moreover, with a crisis of total proportions facing us, a governed world is no longer a utopia but an imperative necessity.

World-class problems require world-class solutions. And only world-class leaders know that world law is the key to human survival.

And the revelation of our century unlike all previous centuries is that world law is already manifest in you as it is in humankind itself.

Thank you.

WORLD PEACE THROUGH WORLD GOVERNMENT

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE

MIDDLEBURY, VT

JANUARY 19, 1987

Reverend Walsh, members of the Armadillos, the Environmental Quality Club, the International Students Organization, students and faculty, honored guests, also, co-citizens of planet earth, fellow members of an endangered species, our human family

I am delighted and honored to be among you.

To speak to you in this beautiful chapel is both inspiring and humbling. For me, it symbolizes all of God's earthly houses be they churches, synagogues, temples, mosques, or whatever place of worship throughout the world where we humans gather to contemplate the oneness and wholeness of the divine order and our place in it.

The setting indeed provides the appropriate background for our topic this evening: world peace through world government.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

How appropriate too is the date, January 19, commemorating Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s life and work.

Only when rereading his speeches last week did I realize what constituted one of Dr. King's principal strengths. Besides acknowledging

God and love and non-violence in all his words and actions, there was another affirmation which began to slowly reveal itself to me and which seemed to become stronger as he approached his tragic and untimely death.

LOVE FOR HUMANITY

Like all great teachers, he finally allied himself with love not only for his single fellowman but love for humanity itself, not as an abstraction or a romantic fiction, but as a dynamic reality, as an entity distinct in itself, a whole greater than its parts...and a humanity in mortal danger.

For instance, in speaking of the things he wanted others to say at his funeral in a sermon at the Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, February 4, 1968, two months before his assassination, he told the congregation, "I want you to say that I tried to love and serve humanity."

And when accepting the Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo on December 10, 1964, he reaffirmed his belief "that one day mankind will bow before the altars of God and be crowned triumphant over war and bloodshed..."

In that acceptance and love of humanity, Dr. King was a true citizen of the world and a role model which we can only humbly emulate.

HOW TO SAVE THE WORLD COURSE

Now in preparing for this talk, following my usual custom, I carefully checked out your college curriculum to find the course on how to save the world. Imagine my surprise when I found it not. With all due respect to the planners of your academic education, I find this a grave if common omission.

Happily, I am here to at least partially rectify this deficiency.

Besides, though I possess no formal academic degree, I do have unique credentials for this task. Besides being an active World Citizen for almost 40 years, I have recently been appointed dean of a school of world law of the East-West University founded by Guru Nitya Chaitanya Yati of Travancore, South India. As such, I will consider your attendance at this lecture as a partial credit when and if you matriculate at the new school...to be founded.

So please consider this World Government 1. There will be no written exam after this lecture.

A CONTROVERSIAL SUBJECT, WORLD PEACE

We are dealing here, of course, with a grave and momentous subject, that of world peace...and highly controversial. Because it is a subject which involves everyone on earth. You can appreciate that in the short time allotted me tonight, I can only introduce the main elements and no doubt raise many questions and certainly controversy. That's to be expected and I welcome it. I understand a short period will be allotted for questions.

FOUR PARTS

Let us break the subject down into four parts: first, the idea of world government. How is it normally and wrongfully conceived and a new and radical definition; second, given the new concept, its actual founding in 1953 and what led up to it; third, the actual practice of world government on a daily basis; and fourth, its future and your part with it.

MOON TRIP WITH E.T.

But first, to get in the mood, let's take an imaginary trip to the first moon landing with Buzz Aldrin and Neil Armstrong. While joyfully practicing super high jumps over the dunes, let us pretend they notice a mild-looking alien waddling toward them. Having seen the movie "E.T.," they would not be overly surprised.

E.T. would ask them - by means, of course, of his intergalactic Language Synthesizer - "Hey, where do you weird-looking creatures hail from?"

Well, Aldrin was born in Montclair, New Jersey, and Armstrong in Watakoneta, Ohio. But that information wouldn't have meant very much to E.T. Given the circumstances, their answer would have to meet the new parameters posed by E.T.'s off-planet-earth existence.

"Well, that's home." Aldrin would have to say pointing to the small blue globe on the horizon.

"Nice. Nice. A beautiful sight." E.T. would reply. "You guys are lucky. I haven't seen that much H₂O in many star systems. I think I'll drop in, or rather on, while I'm in the neighborhood. Please, where is your world's capital city? And who is your leader?"

And that would be that. No more conversation. Because if the two astronauts ever revealed that they came from a race that not only had no central government but was contrarily preparing to blow itself up, they would be confessing their own insanity as well as that of their species.

Further, they would be admitting that the human race in its social idiocy yet technical prowess was a deadly menace to other species not only on the planet they shared but potentially to those inhabiting other star systems.

From E.T.'s viewpoint, the human race would be like a plague to be quarantined by the Inter-Galactic Federation Space Patrol.

IS THE HUMAN RACE A PLAGUE?

Well, is the human race a plague? Let me answer that in my own way.

If I were elected the first president of the World Government, say in the year 2000, and obliged to deliver a "State of the World" address to the newly elected world parliament and to my fellow citizens of the world, I would recall that since 1900, nations had fought 207 wars in which 79 million people were killed, a 500 percent increase over the 19th century, that the first major event signaling the breakdown of the nation state system - a carryover from the 18th century - was in 1914 when the first world war broke out, the second in 1939 with WWII, then 75 wars, big and small, continuing from that ominous date.

THE WAR GAME CONTINUES WHILE HUMANS STARVE

I would point out that in 1987, over 50,000 nuclear weapons, over 16,000 million tons of explosive power - measured in TNT - appropriately called "overkill," were available to the two largest nations, the United States and the Soviet Union, that the lead-time between launch and target had been reduced to about 15 minutes and that 42 national governments were spending over \$900 billion in weapons while 24,000 humans, many of them children, died of starvation daily, 500 million faced famine and over half the human race went to bed hungry every night.

TERRORISM IS NATIONAL FOREIGN POLICY

I would recall the nationalistic foreign policy credo of that day: deterrence, or mutual assured destruction, that coincident with the nuclear age beginning in 1945, international terrorism was thereby institutionalized by the governing system. Humanity itself became its innocent victim.

I would remind the world citizenry that in that same year 40 major and minor conflicts were raging involving 45 of the world's 164 nations, that 4 million soldiers were directly engaged, and that the refugee population from wars numbered over 20 million and was growing exponentially.

WORLD ECONOMY IN VIRTUAL COLLAPSE

Further, I would review the catastrophic economic world scene of that era with over a hundred currencies vying for recognition, each one in competition with all the others, with 15 per cent worldwide inflation where the poorest 30 per cent of the human population owned 3 percent of the income while the top 20 per cent owned 66 per cent, where giant and flagrant disparities between wealth and poverty existed, where the homeless were increasing geometrically and where many had turned to terrorism in their despair.

I would mention the increase in drug use, especially among the young, always a symptom of a sick, even dying social environment.

ECOLOGICAL DISASTER

I would talk of the increasing deforestation and desertification of vast once-fertile lands of that near-past, the yearly destruction of vast rain forests the size of Switzerland, of water, soil and air pollution due to toxic wastes and of the increase of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, and acid rain from industrial poisoning the world's lakes and killing precious trees along with the depletion of the ozone layer in the biosphere and the mortal radioactive pollution of plutonium which became and still is a major problem for hundreds of future generations.

NATIONAL POLITICIANS STUCK

And lastly, I would recall the deadly myopia and reluctance of the national political world to consider the formation of a world government in spite of the almost imminent possibility of nuclear holocaust.

WORLD CITIZENS REBEL

But then I would recount how desperate and angry citizens everywhere began to rebel against the insanity of the nation state system, how they finally awakened to the fundamental unity and wholeness of their human community, how we finally realized that an injustice against one was an injustice against all, that freedom and hunger were allies, that humanity

itself was no longer a myth but a reality to which we all belonged intimately, but a reality in deadly danger.

WORLD CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

I would cite the world constitutional convention of 1995 where elected world delegates gathered to hammer out the world constitution by which we are now governed. How war was thus outlawed by laws enacted by the world parliament and disarmament became a reality under the surveillance of the Sovereign Order of World Guards, a corps of retired generals and admirals. How the world's resources and the scientists, engineers, technicians and tool designers were gradually transferred from the insanity of weaponry to the business of livingry, as Buckminster Fuller put it.

In short, how world peace finally came to humanity and to all humans.

That would be my answer as to whether the human race is a plague. By taking thought and acting on it, we had eliminated the disease of disunity, whose latest outbreak was nationalism.

The year 2000 is only thirteen years away. Can this prophecy become a reality? That depends strictly on you and me.

PART 1: THE IDEA OF WORLD GOVERNMENT

Let's now consider part 1. The idea of World Government.

ALBERT EINSTEIN

Albert Einstein, in 1946, wrote that "a new type of thinking is essential if mankind is to survive and move to higher levels...Today the atomic bomb has altered profoundly the nature of the world as we know it, and the human race consequently finds itself in a new habitat to which it must adapt its thinking...In the light of new knowledge, a world authority and an eventual world state are not just desirable in the name of brotherhood, they are necessary for survival...This must be the central fact in all our considerations in international affairs: otherwise, we face certain disaster."

"Our defense," he concludes, "is in law and order."

THE THIRD WAVE

Alvin Toffler, in his seminal best-seller, The Third Wave, writes that *"all the political parties of the industrial world, all our congresses, parliaments and supreme soviets, our presidents and prime ministerships, our courts and our regulatory agencies, and our layer upon geological layer of governmental bureaucracy - in short all the tools we use to make and enforce collective decisions - are obsolete and about to be transformed."* He claims that *"Just as the revolutionaries who created the industrial age couldn't govern with the leftover apparatus of feudalism, so today we are faced once more with the need to invent new political tools."*

PEACE IS STRUCTURE

What Einstein, Toffler, Emery Reves, who wrote The Anatomy of Peace, Mahatma Gandhi, Douglas MacArthur, Rosika Schwimmer, E.B. White, and all others advocating world government imply is that peace is the result of established order, political structure and not simply a word standing alone.

So what's the problem? What prevents its immediate establishment?

WORLD GOVERNMENT QUICK FIX

It has often been said that the quick fix to world government would be if our planet earth were invaded by E.T.s from outer space.

The hot line between the Soviet Union and the United States would not only be permanently busy but the entire world's communication facilities as well as all its resources would be harnessed for the common defense to help repel the invaders.

A sort of provisional world government would be formed literally overnight by the nation states.

It would be a world government, however, based on fear and its ally, exclusive self-interest rather than on wisdom and enlightened cooperation.

Once the enemy was repelled, the *raison d'etre* for the world government would no longer prevail. The former national animosities would reassert themselves perhaps more virulently than before.

ALIENS ALREADY HERE: NATIONALISTS

Well, we don't need an invasion from outer space to realize world government here on the home planet. There is a much simpler and direct way which I will explain in a moment. Besides, we have already been invaded...from within. The aliens are already amongst us. They are called nationalists. And they are the true enemies of humanity.

NATION-STATE ETERNAL, ABSOLUTE, IRREPLACEABLE

This may seem simplistic at first sight but we are taught, almost from the cradle, that the nation-state is the highest political organization form of which the human mind is capable. Just think. Don't you believe that America is eternal, absolute, and irreplaceable? Well, so does the Englishman, the Frenchman, the Russian, the Indian and so on about their nations. So did the Babylonians and Carthaginians.

Of course, the very opposite is starkly revealed not only in the history books but in every daily newspaper; that the nation-state system is surreal, fictional, impermanent, anachronistic and, in today's nuclear age, suicidal.

NATION-STATE BREAKING DOWN

Furthermore, the nation is breaking up into smaller and smaller social units. In 1945 when the United Nations was formed, only 55 nations existed. Today, a short 42 years later, 164 exist - not including the micro-states - each claiming full sovereignty over the humans born on their part of the planetary turf. Myriad ethnic groups throughout the world are clamoring and rebelling against the nation which they claim strangles them. Their illusory cry for independence and freedom is in reality a sign of the break-up of the nation-state system itself.

WORLD GOVERNMENT, EXTENSION OF NATION-STATE

You have often heard it said, for instance, that nation-states must give up sovereignty to a world government for it to be formed, that the price of world order is national sovereignty. In other words, world government has normally been thought of as an extension of the nation-state. That is a totally wrong interpretation of government itself and its founding. National sovereignty is merely a fiction of the past that we, in our ignorance, cling to as children cling to their old toys. It is totally dependent on our exclusive allegiance to it.

The ultimate sovereign on planet earth is humanity itself...We, the People.

THE TRUTH IS, NATIONS-STATES HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH EITHER THE FOUNDING OF WORLD GOVERNMENT OR INDEED ITS FUNCTIONING.

WE RESIST AND OPPOSE WG

But since we credit nation-states as being both the impediment and the initiators of world government, and since nation-states are per se in competition with each other, we, in our almost hypnotic allegiance to the national system, permanently resist and even oppose the notion of world government's establishment. This in spite of our fear of a nuclear holocaust caused ironically by national competition itself in an anarchic world.

FEAR OF "BIG BROTHER"

Added to that national veto on world government is the popular fear of a supra-national government which would centralize and monopolize violence in the name of the common good. Where could we go in case of global tyranny? asks the sceptic. What happens to freedom if a world government takes over? This "Big Brother" fear further closes the mind to reason permitting rejection of the very concept of a just and democratic global authority.

Ask 100 people who claim to want peace if at the same time they desire a world government and 99 will say no. Ask an active pacifist what his politics are and 9 times out of 10, he will clam to be an anarchist.

US AND USSR COLLUDE

In the Security Council of the U.N. both the Soviet Union and the United States collude in preventing any change whatsoever in the Charter which would negate their veto privileges or their war option.

In other words, both nations condone and perpetuate world anarchy.

At Reyjavik, President Reagan and First Secretary Gorbachev tacitly agreed not to discuss the elimination of war through world law but only the reduction of a few nuclear weapons. All heads of state in political fact collude in the war option as an integral part of their foreign policy. Globally speaking, they are all anarchists. If the Nuremberg Principles are accepted, they are all war criminals.

On the other hand, we must ask ourselves, if world government is the key to human survival on planet earth, if so many important persons, sages, philosophers, religious leaders, moralists, scientists, artists, statesmen, even politicians and just plain folk like us agree, what then prevents its immediate establishment before we all get blown away?

INDIVIDUALS CREATE GOVERNMENTS

I have already intimated the answer: governments can't create higher government. Only individuals can create governments, whether local or global. Yet in all the speeches about world government, in all the immense literature on the subject, nowhere will you find a reference to the single individual's role in its formation. Check it out in your library tomorrow. The omission is flagrant and revealing.

AND YET WE ARE STILL TAUGHT IN ALL OUR CLASSES OF POLITICAL SCIENCE OR HEAR AD NAUSEAM AT ALL POLITICAL RALLIES THAT ONLY THE INDIVIDUAL HAS THE POWER OF POLITICAL CHOICE.

But when it comes to global government, the red stop sign lights up. So insidious is the national conditioning that even to consider you or me as having a dynamic part to play in its formation is to risk the charge of crackpot, utopian or even crazy.

But, given our desperate need, that no longer matters. As U.S. citizens, the only question you must ask yourself today is whether the United States can protect you against World War III. If the answer is no, then you must help create the new political entity which can.

I am here to reaffirm tonight- and mind you, I'm in pretty good historic company - that government, in its essence, always begins with the individual.

In other words, world peace is our business and ours alone.

NEW GOVERNMENT BEGINS OUTSIDE EXISTING LEGITIMACY

Now, here's another important but little realized fact about government-forming. By definition, all new government begins OUTSIDE the parameters of the existing legitimacy, in a sort of political vacuum.

The Articles of Confederation - a mere treaty arrangement between the separate sovereign states - had to be jettisoned to find political space for the United States Constitution. The same process occurred, albeit not without bloodshed, in the October 1917, Russian revolution, the French revolution of 189 and many others since including the recent Cuban, Filipino and Haitian revolutions.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS & UNITED NATIONS NOT GOVERNMENTS

Though the global political vacuum was overwhelmingly apparent after World Wars I and II, and still is, neither the League of Nations nor the United Nations filled it by defining and setting up a new government. On the contrary, they both reaffirmed the exclusive sovereignty of each of their member-states. In so doing, they not only perpetuated but institutionalized world anarchy. The most incisive expose of the stillbirth of the United Nations was E.B. White's The Wild Flag. I recommend it highly.

This illusion of political authority betrayed and denied humanity's oneness and wholeness. As Emery Reves wrote in The Anatomy of Peace, "*Just as you cannot jump a chasm in two leaps, there is no 'first step' to the establishment of government. Government is the 'first step.'*"

INDIVIDUAL SOVEREIGNTY CODIFIED

Now individual sovereignty, as you know by our American history course, has been codified in numerous constitutions and declarations.

A year after the Declaration of Independence proclaimed that "All men are created equal..." the Vermont Constitution of 1777 in Chapter 1, Art. 1, stated that "All men are born equally free and independent, and have certain natural, inherent, and unalienable rights, amongst which are the enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring and possessing and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety...."

Certain individuals in 1787 whom we revere as the "founding fathers" decided they needed a new government OVER the separate sovereign states. So they boldly declared themselves its citizens or "Americans." That identification was an exercise of their inalienable right of political choice, the essential, seminal step to the formal United States of America.

THE NINTH AMENDMENT

The U.S. Constitution of 1787 in the Ninth Amendment - and I can't help but wonder how many here know the Ninth Amendment - even provides for you, the citizen, to emulate the founding fathers on the global level. It states:

"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparate other rights retained by the people."

The founding fathers were affirming again that the people are sovereign even to defining their own rights. That's a powerful message to you ringing down the corridors of history from Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, Washington, Adams and their fellow revolutionaries.

In other words, by exercising their inalienable rights, they structured a new political tool, new decision-making machinery of a higher order based on the innate sovereignty of the people in order to deal with the new industrial age then replacing feudalism.

The very same rational process must now be repeated on the global level before it is too late.

ALL NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONS AFFIRM SOVEREIGNTY OF PEOPLE

In fact, there is not one national constitution in this world today which does not claim to derive from the people, to claim that we, the people, are sovereign, the real arbiters of our fate. And yet, ironically, there is not one national constitution today - including the U.S. Constitution - which can protect we, the people, from World War III.

Why? Simply because national constitutions have war built into their very structure. The euphemism for war is "national defense." You have often heard it said. "In times of peace, prepare for war." This is the insane dictum of all nations.

"Peace is our business," is the motto of the U.S. Navy, and the "Peacemaker" became the Orwellian name of a U.S. nuclear ballistic missile capable of eliminating ten cities.

TRUE PEACE

True peace, on the other hand, is always allied with justice, with law, with civic agreements solemnly arrived at by common democratic accord.

THE ESSENCE OF GOVERNMENT THEN IS INDIVIDUALS FREELY CONTRACTING SOCIALLY WITH THEIR NEIGHBORS TO LIVE IN A PRESCRIBED CIVILIZED WAY WITH EACH OTHER.

In today's "global village," we are all neighbors. No one disputes this anymore. Despite cultural, national, religious, ethnic, economic, linguistic and other relative differences, our fundamental humanity is a recognized fact. What I am saying is that the process of forming government is always organic, spontaneous and, in its structural aspect, revolutionary.

And it always begins with aware and concerned individuals exercising inalienable rights. We hear this word "inalienable" repeatedly in these days of the Bicentennial. But few of us appreciate its true meaning and profound significance in resolving our own problems.

INALIENABLE RIGHTS

Inalienable rights are rights you possess by simply being human. They can neither be taken away nor can you renounce them. It is self-evident that they are anterior to government. Sometimes they are called "natural rights." They are the political side of the spiritual coin of individual godhood taught by all humanity's wisdom sages from time immemorial.

The writers of the Vermont Constitution and the U.S. Constitution translated that wisdom heritage into political doctrine.

HUMANITY, THE ULTIMATE PEACEMAKER

And that brings us to another and profound realization, unique to our times alone. In today's interdependent world, there is an added dimension to peacemaking which is rarely realized. Consider if you will that the ultimate peacemaker is, after all, humanity itself.

This may be a strange thought. But if we accept the reality of humanity and not a sentimental fiction, then we must accept its independent right and even desire to live. Consider this: If humanity itself dies, each one of us dies. But if one of us dies, humanity still lives on. It must, therefore, exist as an entity in itself.

THEN, BEING A WHOLE, IT CANNOT WAR AGAINST ITSELF.
THAT'S WHAT THE HUMAN FAMILY REALLY MEANS.

And once this truth is fully realized and accepted, it allies each of us dynamically not only with one another, but with humanity itself, not theoretically, not philosophically, not mystically, but actually.

All our relative differences fade into insignificance in the light of this awesome truth.

A true peacemaker in today's world then - like the man whose holiday this is - always represents humanity itself without frontiers, moral, social, religious, biological and certainly political.

WORLD CITIZENSHIP CLAIM LEGITIMATE

My claim and yours as world citizens, therefore, is perfectly legitimate since it is grounded in our inalienable right to choose our own political allegiance, an allegiance dynamically allied with humanity's survival.

It then becomes a new, valid social contract between us transcending the nation-state system itself and indeed, already sanctioned by it.

I am aware that given our nationalistic conditioning, this is a difficult concept to grasp or realize. An example, however, to which we can all relate is the local post office. Entering a post office is in reality entering a global communication system. The stamps you buy are simply proof of the contract the postal service makes with you, the individual concerned, to provide global service.

UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION

The Universal Postal Union was first established in 1875. Do you know where it is headquartered today? Do you know the name of its Secretary General? Whether it's a man or a woman, white or black, Jewish, Christian, Moslem or agnostic? Did you elect him or her? Do you care what his or her race or religion is? Or how much salary he or she makes? No, these questions are all irrelevant to that service contract. All you are concerned with is that YOUR letter gets to the person at the address YOU put on the envelope.

In short, you are the sovereign operating unit of the global system.

The scientific name for the UPU is a "meta-system." Our world is full of them: the telephone, the television, satellite weather, etc.

THIS THEN IS THE NEW MEANING OF WORLD GOVERNMENT, A PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE GLOBAL SOCIO/POLITICAL SERVICE CONTRACT; A POLITICAL META-SYSTEM.

Now, as Tom Paine said, is the seed-time of union.

PART 2: THE FOUNDING OF WORLD GOVERNMENT

Now we arrive at Part 2: The founding for world government.

I must first apologize for the personal nature of this part of my talk.

WORLD PEACE BEGINS WITH ME

In 1945, after my return from World War II as a B-17 bomber pilot, and a lot of thought about my part in that immense puzzle called world peace, I concluded that world government, being an entirely new and sovereign institution had nothing to do with nations as such and everything to do with us, ordinary human beings, and especially we veterans who had just been professional killers in World War II.

Nations, I reasoned, cannot extend their sovereignty beyond their constitutional mandates. Besides, there is nothing in any national constitution either sanctioning a world government or, contrarily, prohibiting its establishment. I decided I had to act with the sovereignty I innately possessed as one single human being.

I SECEDE FROM THE NATION-STATE SYSTEM.

First, I divorced myself entirely from the nation. That was my first act of personal sovereignty. My family, my friends and many others considered it a crazy or irrational thing to do. But actually I was exercising my inalienable right to choose my own political allegiance...or in the case of expatriation, to not choose the nation-state system, to re-enter that state of natural rights which pertained at birth.

INTO THE WORLD COMMUNITY

In renouncing nationality, I actually seceded into the entire world community of all humans. By so doing, I proved to myself, at least, that

the sovereignty of the nation was neither absolute nor eternal. And by withdrawing my personal sovereignty from it, it had one less human to support its exclusivity. Conversely, the world community gained a directly-related human.

I DECLARE MYSELF A WORLD CITIZEN

It was a community with no common citizenship and, therefore, no government. So, for protection, at the same time of my expatriation, I declared myself a world citizen, in other words, a citizen of a non-existent world government. If this sounds crazy, please keep in mind that I have been imprisoned 32 times by national officials for simply not fitting into their rule book. Millions of our fellow humans suffer the same fate.

TO PROTECT THE PART, PROTECT THE WHOLE

Many people considered my renunciation both unpatriotic and un-American. It was neither. To protect America or any country, the whole world must now be protected. Patriotism or love for one's country is totally dependent on love for one's planetary community. How can the part survive without the whole?

FRENCH GOVERNMENT SAYS GET OUT

The French government didn't buy my world citizen status. It ordered me to leave. But I was then without a passport, the 20th century symbol of the national frontier world. Luckily, the United Nations General Assembly came to town bringing its fictional international territory with it. I claimed asylum there on September 11, 1948. The U.N. threw me off with the aid of the French police. Those events were well publicized so people around the world heard of world citizenship, perhaps for the first time.

OTHERS DECLARE THEMSELVES WORLD CITIZENS

Others followed that sovereign choice. Together we were forging a peaceful world constituency. Each declared world citizen was making a new civic contract with his fellowman.

WORLD GOVERNMENT DECLARED

Then, five years later, by our having claimed world citizenship in the hundreds of thousands, our worldly government eventually, inevitably and legitimately came into being in 1953...in microcosm. In the name of over

750,000 registered World Citizens, I declared our global government existent from the City Hall of Ellsworth, Maine, on September 4th of that year.

THE MASTER PLAN

We then devised a master plan in four phases. The first phase would be building or identifying our world constituency. We needed an administration agency for that which we called the World Service Authority. It began operations in January, 1954, from New York City.

The second phase would be the politicization of the new world constituency by means of a new political party transcending the nation-state while also fielding candidates on all municipal and national levels. Included in the platform of this world citizen party would be a restructuring of the economic environment to democratize wealth-producing capital.

The third phase would be one of consolidation: convening a world constitutional convention from which would come a world parliament and the additional organs of government, the establishment of a world bank and introduction of a world monetary unit, the actual dismantling of nuclear and conventional armaments as the economy regeared to peacetime activities.

The fourth and final phase would be one of fulfillment, a fully functioning world government integrated with national and local units, total elimination of armaments, protection of the environment and the planet on which our life depends.

PART 3: THE ACTUAL DAILY OPERATION OF THE WORLD GOVERNMENT

Now for Part 3, the actual daily operation of the World Government.

UDHR WORKING CONSTITUTION

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights the General Assembly of the United Nations had proclaimed in 1948, became our working constitution.

Since freedom of travel was defined by article 13(2), and since the frontier system of nations with its passports and visas militated against that right, our first document of identity was a World Passport. The first 1,000 came off the press in June, 1954.

To prove its workability, as much to myself as to other world citizens, in 1956 I traveled to India and back with it, after spending six months studying deductive psychology as applied to human events or the science of geodialectics with a South Indian guru or wisdom teacher.

WSA IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

The World Service Authority today operates from offices in downtown Washington, D.C. Legally, it is a District of Columbia non-profit corporation. It issues all World Government documents. The World Passport has gone through seven editions, is now in seven languages. Over 250,000 have been issued worldwide. It has been recognized by over 100 nations on a case-by-case basis. Six nations have given it de jure recognition.

Besides the World Passport, the WSA issues World Identity Cards, World Birth Certificates, the World Citizen Registration Card, the World Marriage Certificate, and the World Political Asylum Card.

Each document represents a human right defined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Thus they are powerful global civic tools vis-a-vis national bureaucratic abuses and violation of fundamental human rights.

WORLD COORDINATORS OF WORLD COMMISSIONS

In order to key in to the operating structure experts in various fields who are likewise committed to humanity's cause, I have called upon certain individuals to become world coordinators of commissions of the World Government.

So far, twelve coordinators have been appointed to head commissions. They are Syd Cassyd for Communications, Stafford Beer for Cybernetics, Yehudi Menuhin and Katherine Dunham for Culture, William Perk for Design-Science, Louis Kelso for Economics, Guru Nitya Chaitanya Yati for Education, Badi Lenz for Forestry, Michio Kushi for Health, Theodore Welles for Oceans, Isaac Asimov and Carol Sue Rosin for Space, Georgia Lloyd for Women, and John Steinbruck for World Political Asylum.

THE WORLD COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

The statute for our World Government judicial system, the World Court of Human Rights, was written in 1972 by the Commission for International

Due Process of Law. It awaits a world judicial commission and then the appointment of 15 world judges and proper funding to begin its imperative role of defending the individual against human rights violations.

250,000 REGISTERED WORLD CITIZENS

The registered citizenry of the World Government today numbers over 250,000. Two hundred and fifty thousands individuals throughout the world have established a legitimate global civic contract between them to act peaceably toward each other. That choice is also yours now. As Americans, the mandate of political choice was given to you over two hundred years ago. But that exclusive political choice has now run its historic course. It can no longer serve you. Your national citizenship has become a collective suicide pact. You must now renew that precious mandate on the sovereign ground of humanity where you actually reside.

Today, we're a mere quarter of a million. Tomorrow, with modern means of communication, with the desperate need for world law and order, with a 15-minute lead time to total destruction, we can and must number in the hundreds of millions as rapidly as possible.

THE 100TH MONKEY PRINCIPLE

Maybe you've heard of the "100th monkey" principle. At a certain mathematical point where a number of any group responds collectively to a crisis facing that group, a quantum leap in consciousness occurs throughout the entire group or species and it becomes transformed or metamorphasizes. I firmly believe we, the human race, are rapidly approaching that awesome moment here on the planet.

PART 4: THE FUTURE OF THE WORLD GOVERNMENT.

Now Let's talk about the future of the World Government..

MONDIALIZATION

Many cities and even states have recognized this new level of politics. Declaring a city worldly is called "mondialization" from the French word, "monde." It began with Cahors, a city of 50,000 in France in 1949 and has spread throughout the world. Minneapolis was the first U.S. town to "mondialize" in March, 1968. It was followed by St. Paul, San Pedro, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Kansas City, MO, Richfield, Ohio, Princetown Township, Akron, Oberlin, Eugene, Oregon, Racine, Wisconsin and many

others. Did you know that the states of Iowa, Minnesota and Illinois have made declarations of world citizenship? The wording is of the Minnesota Declaration is both explicit and historic:

"WHEREAS, in recognition of the greatly increased interdependence of the world in this age of nuclear power, pollution, hunger, and

"WHEREAS, realizing that the common interests of man can only be met through world cooperation, and

"WHEREAS, seeking to free mankind from the curse of war and to harness all available sources of energy and knowledge to the service of man's needs, and

"WHEREAS, aware that we can best serve our city, county, state and nation when we also think and act as world citizens

"NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the Governor and Legislative Leaders of Minnesota, recognize the sovereign right of our citizens to declare that their citizenship responsibilities extend beyond our state and nation. We hereby joint with other concerned people of the world in a declaration that we share in this world responsibility and that our citizens are in this sense citizens of the world. We pledge our efforts as world citizens to the establishment of permanent peace based on just world law and to the use of world resources in the service of man and not for his destruction...."

The signature was Wendell Anderson's and the date was March 26, 1971.

Innumerable colleges and universities followed suit: University of Missouri, Ottawa University, L.A. Harbor College, L.a. Valley College, Grinnel College, William Patterson College, University of Wisconsin, etc.

THE WORLD CITIZEN PARTY.

The time has come for these initiatives and aspirations as well as those of the general world peace movement to be translated into down-to-earth political reality.

In short, world citizens must now enter the local political arena.

For this to happen realistically, we need our own world political party. A party of human rights. A party for world peace through law. A party of humanity.

We have the voters now. We have the candidates. Many congresspersons and parliamentarians already have organized into a transnational coalition for world order. But they cannot move without us, the grass-roots, the people of the world.

MAYORALTY CAMPAIGN

I myself ran for mayor of Washington, D.C. in the recent election as an independent on a World Citizen platform.

It was the first time in the District's history that the global dimension of politics was introduced into a local campaign.

I campaigned on the basis of world law, that it alone was able to protect the targetted city and trapped citizens of Washington.

I received 585 votes.

But all America is targetted as is the Soviet Union.

As is humanity.

WORLD LEADERS FOR NATIONAL OFFICE

Only world leaders, therefore, can qualify for national office since the major problems facing the national voter are global.

No presidential candidate from either of the two major parties, Democratic or Republican, can address the question of world war or world peace. Their mandate stops at the national frontier. Only a World Citizen candidate allied with the World Government can truly represent you as voters.

Although President Reagan has called himself a "citizen of the world," and First Secretary Gorbachev has called for an "international legal order," both are opposed to any relinquishment of sovereign power to such an order.

That is why, in the U.S. campaign for president in '88, we are obliged to field our own candidate.

MY CANDIDACY FOR U.S. PRESIDENT

And to start the process, as a committed world citizen since 1948, born in Bar Harbor, Maine, thereby a natural-born citizen, I am today announcing my candidacy for U.S. president in the upcoming election.

MY PLATFORM

My platform will include:

- the denunciation of the arms race as illegal as well as insane; to which denunciation, I add all national programs involving the weaponization of space surrounding our planet such as the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative;

- the legal recognition of and protection for the de facto world citizenship enjoyed by every member of the human race by virtue of the physical reality of one world and one humankind;

- the immediate calling of a world constitutional convention to elaborate a constitution for the World Government;

- the "mondialization" of all United States villages, towns, cities and states and a call to governors and mayors throughout the world to officially declare their municipalities, counties and states integral and dynamic parts of the total world community;

- by a constitutional amendment, the registration of all United States citizens as World Citizens with the World Government in conformity with the Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution reserving sovereign rights to the people, and a call to all national citizens to so register through the World Service Authority;

- the registration of all U.S. newborns with the World Government in accordance with the accepted legal principles jus soli and jus sanguinis and the issuance of World Birth Certificates to them via the world Service Authority. This will begin human, therefore world legitimacy at birth where it belongs;

- the call to all heads of state for a world truce so that humans conscripted as national soldiers will cease killing fellow humans and that such killing be designated as criminal under revised Nuremberg Principles;

- the call to all elected officials, mayors, governors, national legislators and executive officers to promote world government through legislative action, political platforms and education of their specific citizenry;

- the establishment of a world peace corps as an option to national military service in conformity with article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: *"All human beings 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;"*

- a call to retired military men, particularly generals and admirals, to form a command unit to be called the Sovereign Order for World Guards to supervise this world peace corps. As the Nuremberg Decisions outlawed war and its preparations, no longer can fellow man kill fellow man without the charge of criminality;

- the call to all religious leaders to unite under the banner of one world, God's creation. For men of religion to kill others of a different religion is to blaspheme the Creator of the Universe. Religious leaders must condemn such practice;

- a call especially to the women of the world, the mothers, from whom humanity comes, who constitute half the human race, to support the world government to the fullest of their immense and sovereign power.

- the establishment of a World Bank one of whose missions would be to issue a stable world monetary unit gradually to replace the volatile national currencies;

- the revision of the U.S. budget with de-emphasis on armaments and emphasis on basic civic needs and services;

- the further implementation of the economic strategy of democratizing equity ownership of the tools of production through E.S.O.P.s (Employee Stock Ownership Plans), G.S.O.P.s (General Stock Ownership Plans), and C.S.O.P.s (consumer Stock Ownership Plans).

- settlement of Third World debts through establishing a World Park as a life support system for the tropical rain forests - a common heritage of humanity - offsetting the paper value of such monetary debts;

- a call to the myriad peace movements from every clime and of every inclination to unite under the all-encompassing manner of our common world citizenship.

THE CAMPAIGN BEGINS AT ZERO

I begin this campaign with no committees, no pledges and empty pockets. Everything is to do. It is your world I am trying to represent. Can I count on your support?

THE FINAL CHOICE

Immanuel Kant has written that *"When those who do the fighting have the right to choose between war and peace, history will no longer be written in blood."*

We, who not only do the fighting but the dying, now have that right and we must choose: world peace through world government or annihilation through nuclear holocaust.

For as Dr. Martin Luther King has warned us, *"...all the people of the world will have to discover a way to live together in peace, and thereby transform this pending cosmic elegy into a creative psalm of brotherhood."*

The Universe itself awaits our response.

Thank you.

WORLD PEACE IS (Y)OUR BUSINESS
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia
November 7, 1987

*"Man is a prisoner of his own way of thinking
and his own stereotype of himself.
His machine for thinking
the brain
has been programmed to deal with a vanished world."*
Stafford Beer, PLATFORM FOR CHANGE, Wiley, 1975

Since 1900, nation-states have fought 207 wars. Seventy-five million people - mostly the poor fighting the poor - have been killed. Forty-five wars, big and small, are being fought as I write. One hundred forty-two governments are spending more than \$1 trillion a year on their military while millions starve, hundreds of millions go to bed hungry, the homeless proliferate and ecological disasters threatening humanity along with all species survival go unchecked.

The current situation in the Persian Gulf exposes in frightening detail the "vanished world" to which Stafford Beer, one of the world's leading general system scientists, refers.

Just what is the real spectacle we are witnessing here?

The content of the problem assails us in daily headlines and nightly newscasts. But what is The Problem itself?

"The world of divided states..is out of control," wrote James Reston in the New York Times on December 20, 1979.

Like ancient Rome, Carthage, Babylonia, the Egyptian dynasties, Mesopotamia, Mycenea, the more modern Constantinople and all the eras of relative political reigns, we are witnessing the collapse of what Alvin Toffler calls "The Second Wave" or the nation-state system itself which replaced feudalism.

Both President Reagan's and General Secretary Gorbachev's problems along with those of all their fellow heads of state derive from obsolete decision-making machinery totally inadequate to handle the "proliferating complexity" of the industrial/electronic/ nuclear/space age.

In short, today's 20th century world is far and away too complex for leaders of the 18th century nation-state world to even understand much less structure or systematize.

Even such a professional politician as former Senator Charles McMathias, after four terms in the U.S., declared to the Washington Post in a recent interview that "the system doesn't work."

To put it in its simplest terms, the national governing system has broken down: it doesn't work anymore.

Hence, it continues the bankrupt and clinically insane "foreign policy" of the war option as a final "solution" to conflict resolution.

But most of us, hypnotized by the content of the problem dramatically exposed by the daily news totally overlook The Problem itself: the imperative need for fundamental global STRUCTURAL change; i.e., the world public order.

The American people and indeed the people of the world looked upon the recent White House Irangate spectacle with varied emotions: glee, sadness, contempt and anger, others with disdain and disgust and many with fear that such immoral and irrational officials control the apparatus of war and particularly nuclear war. But amidst all the recriminations and revelations, not one criticism of the National System itself. No mention of the anarchy which divides nations permitting and condoning such reprehensible public conduct.

Amid the current consternation with volatile stock market fluctuations worldwide, while some commentators reveal the startling news that the economy is "global," no linkage of that self-evident fact with the political anarchy which sanctions the monstrous monetary chaos attempting grotesquely and with total disdain for the poor who own no equity, to regulate the world marketplace.

At the outset of the nuclear age, Einstein reminded us that "everything has changed except our ways of thinking."

At the same time, Emery Reves in Anatomy of Peace wrote that we think "nation-centrally" rather than "globally."

The "vanished world" of the nation-state, that surrogate institution which still dominates the exclusive domain of politics due only to our allegiance to it, must now be transcended by structuring a higher allegiance to humanity and our common world community itself.

An even more startling revelation is that humanity itself IS already the "meta-system" or actual global infrastructure - a species bound by immutable spiritual, cosmic, social and biological laws.

Obviously, the "tool" for handling world complexity is WORLD organization. The multinational corporation, for better or for worse, already understands and operates this maxim full well...and at a profit.

But even while many who know the underlying problem as structural, while accepting with banality every technical innovation, refuse to consider a political structural change which is always revolutionary. They attempt only to modify the existing national rulebook. These include the U.N. supporters, world federalists, the "pocket" revolutionaries within nations, and of course, nationalists of every ilk.

My New Year's message of 1980 stated *"Though the time for nation-states is fast running out, the era of humanity's fulfillment, long prophesied, has begun."* I predicted that the 80's would reveal World Government as a dynamic political/moral reality.

Only two more years to go!

The upcoming U.S. presidential election is the next major media blitz.

My run for mayor of Washington, D.C. in the midterm election of '86 on a "world citizen" platform was to illustrate the dynamic linkage of that city - as all major cities - with world structural problems.

Five hundred eighty-four United States citizens voted for a World Citizen to be mayor of the U.S. capital! I consider that news, a significant harbinger for the future.

Given the desperate need to reach the widest possible public with the message of not just one moral and biological world but one

STRUCTURED world, given the apathy yet anguish of a vast majority of the voting public in the present anarchic situation, and given the abject ignorance or worse, duplicity of Republican and Democratic party leaders and followers, along with their Soviet counterparts, as to the revolutionary requirements for coping with our common problems, I have entered my candidacy for U.S. President on January 19, 1987, at Middlebury College, Vermont.

A vote for an activist World Citizen would be an actual "world vote," a power vote, a world peace vote. It would challenge all candidates as well as voters to consider world politics intimately allied to their local and national problems.

In conclusion, world peace is the business of those who stand to gain by its structuring: US. And that structuring can only come about by the recognition and then manifesting of our inalienable world citizenship and our intimate relationship to Mother Earth, that incredible, living "space ship" spinning majestically in the living universe.

One world or none is the christening ultimatum of the Nuclear Age.

Thank you.

DREAMING THE NEW GEO-POLITICAL DREAM

Sun Valley Symposium

Sun Valley, Idaho

November 1, 1987

My Fellow Earthians, Brothers and Sisters of our Human Family -

I am grateful for the opportunity to address this important group and to share this podium with an extraordinary array of distinguished world citizens.

In looking into my speaker's lifetime library to find out if October 30th had any historical significance, I discovered that forty-nine years ago today, millions of American had tuned their radio only to hear the dreadful news of an invasion of earth from Mars. There was literally panic in the Streets. Though President Roosevelt probably didn't call Stalin to find out how many tanks "Uncle Joe" had to help repel the alien attack, many thought he should have. But it turned out to be only Orson Welles doing his weekly thing.

I even read that when Reagan met with Gorbachev at Reykjavik, the U.S. President mentioned somewhat wistfully how an attack from outer space would immediately dissolve Soviet and U.S. differences in our defense against a common enemy. The story didn't reveal the Soviet General Secretary's reply. Maybe Reagan's somewhat broad hint suffered in the translation.

The theme, of course, is not new. As an avid science fiction buff, I have been dealing with earth invasion from space monsters ever since I can remember. Pretty stale stuff. Why even in "The Journey Home," Captain Kirk, Spock, Bones, Scotty and the rest of the Enterprise crew you will recall had to return to the 20th century from the future to save earth from that monster steel whale looking for its ancient water cousin.

Judging from our human history of wars in the past 49 years, a real invasion from Mars or outer space in 1938 at least would have saved the human race a lot of homegrown misery.

So I had the strange thought that maybe we here during this symposium can insist to our national leaders and a skeptical public that we are the invaders from outer space not to destroy the human race but to pull it together before it blows itself apart.

Or better yet, maybe we, who have already accepted the oneness of the world and our place in it as world citizens, can take the lead ourselves.

This was my idea when, on May 25, 1948, I renounced my national citizenship at the U.S. Embassy in Paris and declared myself a world citizen.

You see, I was concerned with my personal part in world saving back in the immediate aftermath of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I had just finished a bit of killing myself in the cockpit of a B-17 flying over Europe, oh not with those brand new atom bombs which my buddies had in their B-29s in Okinawa. But just little old incendiary bombs; if you had enough of them - and we did - you could do a fairly decent job on a city. Just ask the survivors of Hannover, Berlin, Dresden, Coventry or Tokyo.

What really troubled me after the war was that no one seemed to know how to stop the whole shooting match altogether. Because, what with the new bombs, I figured war itself had become obsolete. But the game only got bigger. And deadlier. Now it was my nation against the USSR. Or so people said. But I had the crazy feeling it was all the nations put together against humanity...and of course against me. President Eisenhower warned us in the '50s against the "military-industrial complex." To me that complex was pervasive, worldwide, and built in solidly to the nation-state system itself. In his seminal book, The Third Wave, Alvin Toffler condemned the "Second Wave" or national politics as being an anachronism in the 20th century:

"As nations are torn apart and restructured, as instabilities and threats of war erupt, we shall be called upon to invent wholly new political forms or 'containers' to bring a semblance of order to the world - a world in which the nation-state has become, for many purposes, a dangerous anachronism."

Einstein, at the outset of the nuclear age, had already warned us that:

"Everything has changed except our way of thinking."

While, according to Stafford Beer, the revered general systems cyberneticist,

"Man is a prisoner of his own way of thinking and his own stereotype of himself. His machine for thinking, the brain, has been programmed to deal with a vanished world."

(Platform for Change, John Wiley & Sons, 1975)

So I was desperate for action, action that would confront that system directly. But nobody I talked to or read about had the foggiest notion about how the individual could help make world peace.

The problem was in the word "world." When you put that in front of "peace," a psych-out seemed to occur in the brain. I soon discovered why. People just didn't think of themselves politically in a global sense. They could telephone to Aunt Lizzie in Hong Kong, watch the 7 o'clock world news every night and post a letter to POB 140 in Timbucktoo, even admire the moons of Saturn on the front page of the New York Times, but to act out world citizenship as an antidote to exclusive nationalism was a no-no.

Emery Reves in Anatomy of Peace bluntly explained that we think "nation-centrally" rather than "globally." As to the causes of war, he had written that:

"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."

In other words, he advocated world government as the single and unique solution to wars between nations. Then he made the startling observation that

"There is no first step to world government; world government is the first step."

Here was the crushing response to all incrementalists.

It was that transfer of sovereign power that intrigued me. Judging from the United Nations setup, the nations themselves didn't seem capable of doing it. National sovereignty, especially among the super powers, had to

be maintained at all costs. So the U.N. was designed deliberately for nations to retain their sovereign power. What was left? As ludicrous as it may sound, I figured that the MAKING of world peace through world government had to be the business only of the already sovereign individual. You...and me.

And so, I took what little sovereignty I possessed as a human being, legally divorced myself from the war-making institution, the nation-state, and invested it in a new allegiance: world citizenship.

Then the fun began. It's a long, sometimes painful, sometimes hilarious but always revealing story of one man's odyssey against the establishment. This is not the forum to tell it. Suffice it to say, I found myself continually outside the state looking in as it were. And without what the national bureaucrats called a "valid" passport, that criminal omission led to a lot of accommodations in national prisons, thirty-four to be exact.

I also discovered I wasn't alone in my advocacy of world citizenship. There were millions who, being in the same predicament, especially the stateless, were of the same mind. So we set up a registry of world citizens in 1949 and started counting heads. When we got to 750,000, in order merely to defend our new global status, we had to create a new government based on our fundamental human rights. Happily, these had already been identified in a universal declaration by a special commission of the moribund United Nations and proclaimed on December 10, 1948. One of them - article 28 - even mandated a world "order" so that "the rights enumerated in this Declaration can be fully realized." We were on pretty solid "official" ground.

Our world governmental declaration took place on September 4, 1954, from the City Hall of Ellsworth, Maine. You'll find that declaration and full information on this unique and historic development in our material available here at the symposium.

Personal world-saving was still my idea when, on January 19th of this year, at Middlebury College, Vermont, I announced my candidacy as a world citizen for United States President.

Because, you see, in between the establishment of the World Citizen Registry in 1949 and the announcement of my candidacy for the Presidency in 1987, a span of almost forty years, the world of nation-states has fought 75 wars, 44 of which are going on as I talk, spent over \$3 trillion on armaments, killed over 20 million individuals, mostly civilians, made

untold millions homeless and refugeed, stockpiled enough nuclear, chemical and biological weapons to wipe out life on earth many times over, polluted the atmosphere, the oceans, the soil with toxic wastes and radioactive poisons, and generally sustained an aura of fear, threat, tension and stress virtually everywhere resulting in societal ills of all kinds, the most insidious being alcoholism and drug use.

In short, our world peace efforts during this time have seemingly come to nought. The crises are still with us and greater than ever.

What in the world is wrong?

Unfortunately, the "vanished world" that Beer wrote about, the "second wave" politics which Toffler condemned, the "nation-centric" thinking that Emery Reves exposed, the "military-industrial complex" that Eisenhower warned us about, still holds sway over our political minds and emotions. It is the carry-over 18th century horse-and-buggy institution which still dominates the 20th century - the nation-state.

The question immediately comes to mind then, why in the world should a world citizen become a candidate for a national presidency? The answer is quite simple: a national president almost by definition can precipitate a world war, but he can't make world peace. A world citizen in the White House can at least help prevent a world war while setting in motion the structural conditions for world peace. My program spells this out in outline.

In sum, WORLD peace is obviously the result of world law and its institutions. This is a self-evident truth, enshrined in the Declaration of Independence. In order to protect inalienable human rights, you remember the rest..."*governments are created among men with the consent of the governed.*"

Our founding fathers had to create a new civic allegiance beyond that of their individual states in order to make peace between them after the Revolutionary War. "Novus Ordo Seclorum," a new order of the ages. We are the fortunate inheritors of that process, and that mandate.

In historical fact, the Haudanosaunee or Iroquois Confederacy was the role model for that union although some essential principles were unhappily left out of the U.S. Constitution such as the choice of the governors only by the women and the protection of the community unto the seventh generation. The recognition of this first principle would doubtless have

eliminated the warriors from presidential races whereas the last commonsense principle would have related the American citizens dynamically and intimately with protection of the environment. It would also have recognized the native Americans as brothers and sisters in humankind.

My candidacy for U.S. President as an activist world citizen then is meant to expose the nation-state for what it is: a surrogate system totally out of sync with the real-time world of the 20th century and, therefore, dangerous to the point of being a threat to human survival itself.

Today's economic headlines are bringing the point dramatically home. As the world's stock markets piggy-back on one another's plunge or ascent as the earth turns, all intertwined by satellite communication, commentators in some awe reach the banal conclusion that the economy is already global. But still the money system is hopelessly national. So dollars follow yen follow pounds follow deutschmarks follow francs follow dollars ad nauseam. Neither national economists nor politicians can envisage much less create a single global currency desperately needed to stabilize the global market.

So I stand here before you in two guises. One is as the world coordinator of a new government declared on September 4, 1953, based on fundamental human rights, and the second as a declared candidate for the highest national political office.

Let's talk for a moment about that upcoming presidential election. If Toffler, Einstein, Beer, Reves and a whole host of others are right that the nation-state is obsolete, why all the fuss about who is national president? Isn't a presidential election in reality a farce? An Alice-in-Wonderland politics? Wall Street is now crying for "leadership" from the White House. but what if the White House is literally empty of leadership? That no such commodity exists anymore on the national scale? Certainly the recent Iran-Contra debacle revealed once and for all that the emperor has no clothes. And if the last presidential election is any indication, only about half of us will even bother to vote anyway. The 49 percent of the U.S. electorate not voting in the last presidential election was in many instances a blanket vote AGAINST THE SYSTEM ITSELF. They were agreeing with Senator Charles McMathias, who, after four terms in the U.S. Senate, claimed that "the system doesn't work." No vote is in large part a protest vote. It says that the power of the president is no longer relevant to the voter's problems. And they are right.

Well, if you accept the system as real, just and representative, we independent or even small party candidates haven't a prayer. But suppose you are aware as I am that THE ENTIRE SYSTEM IS UNREAL, surrogate, a "vanished world" trying to manage a society gone global, a society saddled with an obsolete decision-making apparatus okay for the horse-and-buggy world, but totally inadequate to cope with a technological/electronic/nuclear/space age world of almost limitless data, then given this perspective, my global candidacy begins to make some sense.

What it means in political terms is that since the entire system is unable to represent the major issues facing us, the citizen voters, the principle one being war itself, we must elect someone WHO HAS ALREADY TRANSCENDED THE SYSTEM. And one with a track record of helping create and operate a new system based on global unity.

If you have followed me to this point, consider for a moment the present economic disasters in Wall Street, Tokyo, Hong Kong, London and other stock markets throughout the world, the global arms budget while millions starve, the situation in the Gulf, in Afghanistan, the nuclear proliferation in Pakistan, India, South Africa, Israel, and China, the carbon dioxide infiltration of our common atmosphere with the "greenhouse effect" threatening the warming of the polar caps, the ozone layer retreat threatening skin cancers worldwide, the deliberate and thoughtless destruction of rain forests without which humanity loses a large percentage of its oxygen, the acid rains destroying other forests and killing off lakes and the list goes on, all pointing to a total breakdown of "the second wave" decision-making machinery of the 18th century origin which replaced feudalism.

Given these major problems, I now ask you to mentally re-examine the policies of the major Democratic and Republican candidates. Being grounded in the system itself, none can obviously propose a solution beyond it. Therefore, NO CANDIDATE OF THE TWO MAJOR PARTIES CAN EFFECTIVELY DEAL WITH ANY MAJOR WORLD PROBLEM - WHICH ARE ALSO OUR INDIVIDUAL PROBLEMS.

My candidacy alone fulfills that imperative need. For I am the only entry with an ongoing program for world peace. Since they are part of the war system, no Democratic or Republican candidate can even discuss much less act on a program for world peace.

Whereas, as a world citizen, I am ALREADY part of the growing world peace system.

But that's not all. The U.S.A. is not the only country with a presidential candidate running on a world citizen ticket!

I am privileged and happy to announce today the candidacy for president of France a fellow world citizen, Monsieur Francois LaCroix, who is holding a press conference at this precise moment in Paris for this purpose. Our program is the same. A democratic world government based on the oneness of humanity and of our common home, Mother Earth. Together, we are launching an appeal to candidates for national office around the world, in Haiti, in Korea, and elsewhere to subscribe to our global program for the security, well-being and happiness of our fellow world citizens.

We invite as well all national presidential candidates to become citizens of our new global government, as role models for their own national constituencies.

The advantage of this multinational system to the national voter is obvious. Since other candidates transnationally have the same coordinated program, he or she is not only voting for a particular candidate in a particular nation, but for the other candidates as well. A "world citizen" vote is, therefore, a power vote, a compounded vote, a world peace and human rights vote instead of the single, narrow, stopping-at-the-border vote. I call this latter "a suicide" vote, one that only confirms the existing deadly politics-as-usual war game. You have only to examine the foreign policy positions of the leading party candidates to confirm this statement.

Before I conclude, a brief world on the rather incredible economic advantages of a peaceful world. Most of us are aware that this year's world military budget is about a trillion dollars. We all know of the worldwide debt crisis. Of the shaky banking structure with its electronic money transfer system. Of the volatility of all national currencies. Today, the United States has a public debt of over \$2 trillion. Its deficit this year is \$148 billion. President Reagan is meeting now with Congressional leaders to discuss how to reduce the deficit. Yet while the U.S. economy in the past seven days has revealed a shattering truth - that the entire global economic system can collapse literally overnight, neither the President nor any Congressperson is talking about ELIMINATING the defense budget or Reagan's personal paranoid fantasy, "Star Wars" - which now has a \$5.7 billion research budget - by installing a system of world order.

The more astonishing fact is that no world order thinker to my knowledge has made a cost analysis of a fully developed world government versus the present anarchic national system. Such an analysis would reveal conclusively that world government is the cheapest way out of our present economic morass.

The almost miraculous economic well being for us all when world peace arrives was spelled out in microcosm in a recent talk by the Reverend William Sloane Coffin, senior minister of the Riverside Church in New York, at the 1987 yearly meeting of the Religious Society of Friends in Philadelphia:

"A Trident submarine costs \$1,7 billion, but that's only one submarine. Let's talk a trillion. For one trillion dollars you could build a \$75,000 house, place it on \$5,000 worth of land, furnish it with \$10,000 worth of furniture, put a \$10,000 car in the garage and give this to each and every family in Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Colorado and Iowa. Having done this, you would still have enough left to build a \$10 million hospital and a \$10 million library for each of the 250 cities and towns throughout the six-state region. After having done all that, you would still have enough money left to build 500 schools at \$10 million each for the communities in the region and after having done all that, you would still have enough left out of the trillion to put aside at 10% annual interest a sum of money that would pay a salary of \$25,000 per year for an army of 10,000 nurses, the same salary for an army of teachers and an annual cash allowance of \$5,000 for each and every family throughout the six-state region, not for just one year, but forever. And that's only one trillion dollars or about one-half of what we now have in the pipeline prepared to spend over the next four years. And I haven't even mentioned trying to get pure drinking water for the thirsty people in the third world."

And that is only a glimmer of the incredible benefits which will accrue to humanity should we go from weaponry to "livingry" as Buckminster Fuller suggested.

Bucky went further in his thinking about our earthly mission. In his masterful book, UTOPIA OR OBLIVION, he wrote 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 as a world man - fails to comprehend and cope logically with the birth of Universe Man."

I find this a profound and startling insight. In that our world has turned into a "global village" in the 20th century, we can certainly understand "world man." But what did that profound thinker 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.

Who can deny that humanity has been programmed not only to arrive at our present stage of moral and mental development but to achieve a quantum leap in consciousness enabling us to metamorphosize from what we call the tribal or national status to the global, the human and beyond?

In that sense, we earthians face perhaps THE major challenge all primitive species face as a universal test of their intelligence - the recognition and organization of our fundamental unity AS A SPECIES. For without that reasoned global awareness, we cannot justify either our present or future existence in the cosmic scheme. And we will prove it by destroying ourselves along with our environment, not to mention the other species who share our planetary home.

In conclusion, the government of Gaia exists.

This human has claimed its sovereign protection.

He invites you to join with him and our co-world citizens to complete the task of refashioning the human world in partnership with nature for the security, the well being and the freedom of one and all.

And in doing so we will echo Tom Paine's great call to arms:

"WE HAVE IT IN OURSELVES TO BEGIN THE WORLD AGAIN."

Thank you.

WORLD CITIZENSHIP & HUMAN RIGHTS

**LEO GROSS SOCIETY FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW
Fletcher School of International Law and Diplomacy
Medford, MA**

April 26, 1988

I am deeply honored and pleased by this invitation to address this society. My lack of formal credentials while seemingly a disadvantage for you could, of course, turn into a distinct advantage for me. With no academic standing to defend, I can be more or less unrestrained and even bold in my remarks. Moreover, the subject matter is of such a vital concern that academic niceties must be renounced for plain speaking if we are to add to our mutual understanding of common problems and potential solutions.

I do nonetheless possess two kinds of unconventional credentials. First, I have recently been appointed dean of a school of world law by a South Indian guru. His name is Nitya Chaitanya Yati and he founded the East-West University of Brahma Vidya in Fernhill in the Nilgiris. Like his guru, Nataraja of Travancore, he possesses both Eastern and Western academic degrees, is the author of numerous books and papers and has lectured at a number of Western universities. So his credentials at least are impeccable.

But the irony of that appointment is that while there are numerous schools of international law, there is no actual school of world law. I reminded the guru of this fact. His reply was typical of the advaitic or non-dualistic method of teaching: "There is one now," he said.

So, according to this sage, you are looking at the School of World Law of the East-West University of South India.

I will endeavor before this prestigious gathering to live up to the trust placed in me by guru Nitya.

Second, perhaps my chief credential or asset in the field of world law as opposed to international law is that the position of statelessness in which I placed myself some 40 years ago - and I will go into this later on in some detail - has forced me to think about world law, not only as a theory but as a personally operative system since no other law has properly applied to me since that May day in 1948 and incidentally to millions also in my legal situation.

So to plunge full force into the subject, I think the overriding question we must ask ourselves is whether exclusive national citizenship, in the interdependent world, a world which Marshall McLuhan called a "global village," is any longer able to protect absolute, natural or inalienable rights such as are described in the U.S. Declaration of Independence, namely, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," among others.

As you may know, eleven years prior to that proclamation, the great jurist, William Blackstone of England, laid the cornerstone for the legal protection of what he called "absolute rights" in his Commentaries of 1765. He wrote that the principle aim of society

"... is to protect individuals in the enjoyment of those absolute rights, which were vested in them by the immutable laws of nature; but which could not be preserved in peace without that mutual assistance and intercourse, which is gained by the institution of friendly and social communities. Hence it follows, that the first and primary end of human laws is to maintain and regulate these absolute rights of individuals."

When the individual enters into society, Blackstone claims that he

"...gives up a part of his natural liberty, as a price so valuable a purchase; and in consideration of receiving the advantages of mutual commerce, obliges himself to conform to those laws which the community has thought proper to establish."

It has become increasingly apparent since 1914 that not only can exclusive national citizenship not protect absolute, natural or inalienable rights such as "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," but contrarily is their greatest enemy and the instrument of their inevitable destruction.

First of all, some supporting facts. Since 1900, nations have fought 207 wars. Over 70 millions humans have been killed - a 500% increase over the 19th century - and many more wounded and made homeless. Today's

refugee population is 15 million. Forty-four wars, big and small, are raging as I talk involving some 50 nations. Some 10 million humans are in national armies.

Almost a trillion dollars will be spent next year on weapons of destruction. Since 1981 preparations for nuclear war have cost \$427 billion. Preparations for conventional war in Europe have cost \$736 billion. Preparations for conventional war in Asia and the Persian Gulf have cost \$588 billion.

International debt totals over \$2.4 trillion with developing countries owing \$900 billion and industrialized countries, \$1,500 billion.

Yet today, tens of thousands of humans, mostly children, will starve to death, and millions will go to bed hungry.

Nations freely trade armaments with each other. Wars in the Third World are fought with weapons overtly and covertly supplied by the industrialized nations.

Over 50,000 nuclear weapons now exist with a megatonnage of over 16,000, enough to eliminate every vestige of life on earth for thousands of years. The total megatonnage dropped in World War II was 3.

Spy systems play their infantile games in every nation draining vast resources from social purposes.

Armies of men stand on national frontiers controlling entry and exit from these political fictions while other armies issue passports, visas and other so-called official documents designed to control the world citizenry.

The poorest 30% of humanity receive only 3% of the world's total income while the top 20% owns 66%.

Ecological disasters threaten our very life-support system. Radioactive pollution, spearheaded by deadly plutonium, a man-made substance with a half life of 250,000 years, is the 20th century Sword of Damocles. National armies are the biggest polluters of the environment.

I could go on ad nauseam.

The late Emery Reves, in his masterful Anatomy of Peace, published in 1945, three months before the Hiroshima/Nakasaki bombings, minces no words about the anachronism of the nation-state:

"The first step toward ending the present chaos is to overcome the tremendous emotional obstacle which prevents us from realizing and admitting that the ideal of sovereign nation-states, with all its great record of success during the nineteenth century, is today the cause of all the immeasurable suffering and misery of this world. We are living in complete anarchy, because in a small world, interrelated in every other aspect, there are seventy or eighty separate sources of law - seventy or eighty sovereignties...Our present system of national sovereignty is in absolute contradiction to the original conception of sovereignty, which meant - and still means - sovereignty of the community."

Somewhat later, Buckminster Fuller in Operating Manual for Spaceship Earth, explained the nation-state system another way:

"Spaceship Earth now has 150 admirals. The five admirals in the staterooms immediately above the ship's fuel tanks claim that they own the oil. The admirals with staterooms surrounding the ship's kitchen, dining rooms, and food refrigerators claim they own all the food. Those with a stateroom next to the lifeboat claim they own the lifeboat, and so forth. They then have an on board game called balance of trade. Very shortly, the majority of admirals have a deficit balance. All the while the starboard side admirals are secretly planning to list the boat to port far enough to drown the portside admirals, while the portside admirals are secretly trying to list the ship to the starboard far enough to drown the starboard admirals. Nobody is paying attention to operating the ship or steering it to some port. They run out of food and fuel. They discover that they can no longer reach a port of supply. Finis."

If, in the 18th century, nations were created to protect "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," among other inalienable rights, in the 20th century those same nations have become the instrument of their destruction.

We must face the grim fact: national citizenship, in our nuclear-triggered world, has become a collective suicide pact.

What to do?

According to Stafford Beer, president of the World Association of General Systems and Cybernetics

"Man is a prisoner of his own thinking and his own stereotype of himself. His machine for thinking, the brain, has been programmed to deal with a vanished world."

Our political thinking is national, a "vanished world," rendered irrelevant by four major world revolutions: industrial, electronic, nuclear and now spacial. It was an exclusive national citizen. In the second world war, I was flying a B-17 over Europe for the 8th Air Force in order to bomb German cities, towns and even villages. But in 1948 the "enemy" was the Soviet Union. Now the bombs were nuclear which meant, for all practical purposes, total. Wasn't I then colluding in the war game still played by nations? I asked myself, if I had been a part of World War II, didn't I have an obligation to help prevent World War III? In plain fact, did I have a choice?

As you have no doubt studied, the Nazis had been indicted, tried, convicted and punished, some with death, by a new set of rules called the Nuremburg Decisions which defined crimes outside the national framework. Wasn't I also now subject to those new rules?

These questions pounded at me personally in the late 40's especially after Nagasaki and Hiroshima bombings in 1945.

So three years after World War II, I took advantage of a little known United States law first enunciated in 1868 by an Act of Congress.

Permit me a little historical footnote. This period following the Civil War was one of great expansion for the United States. Abraham Lincoln, in part to motivate Europeans to emigrate to this relative new and vast country, introduced the Homestead Act in 1862.

In a largely agricultural world, the promise of proprietorship of 160 acres - after clearing the forest and if need be disposing of the Indians - in the vast region beyond the Mississippi, was a rallying cry to the European serf, still subsisting under feudal lords and kings.

But the question of nationality arose. When becoming naturalized citizens would the immigrants still be Germans, French or British? Or,

according to U.S. law, could they renounce those former nationalities? The question was not only theoretical but substantive. It implicitly involved the very subject of sovereignty itself. For if one could willfully choose another nationality, that choice implied invoking a fundamental inalienable right: That of choosing political allegiance.

After all, those millions of immigrants flooding into the United States in the mid 1800's were doing so of their own free will, not under any compulsion of the nations they were abandoning. Nationality for them had to be considered, not an automatic grant by the U.S. government, but the sovereign choice of an individual. It followed that if the individual could choose his or her nationality or government, then reciprocally, he or she could give it up. And so the Law of Expatriation was passed by Congress in 1868.

In the almost poetic words of the Act,

"...the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensable to the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;...any declaration, instruction, opinion, order, or decision of any officers of this government which denies, restrict, impairs, or questions the right of expatriation, is hereby declared inconsistent with the fundamental principles of this government."

Then at the 1930 Hague Conference for the Codification of International Law, the United States delegation made an even stronger plea for the incorporation of the principle of involuntary expatriation:

"For a century past, it has been the policy of my country that the right of expatriation is an inherent and natural right of all persons. It is true that allegiance is a duty, but it is not a chain that holds a person in bondage and that he carries with him to a new life in a new land..."

This principle is not a small matter. It is not a question of language or of formulae, or of phrases. It is a principle of the rights of man and the LIBERTY OF THE HUMAN RACE."

But that inalienable right raised the giant question of legitimacy.

For if indeed, the renunciation of the nation-state was "indispensable to the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," as the U.S. law

claimed, by what government then were these rights to be protected? Certainly the anarchic condition existing between the states was anything but protection. Today's refugee camps are pervasive witness to that fact. The expatriate, therefore, after exercising his right of renunciation of nationality, thus found himself in a legal dilemma...and a legal vacuum.

His act of expatriation was legitimate yet he found his fundamental rights unprotected by any positive law.

He became, therefore, by necessity and by virtue of his own innate sovereignty his own self-government. In other words, his inalienable or human rights could only be protected by a citizenship he himself claimed and activated.

It became clear to me when I left the U.S. Embassy on May 25, 1948, a stateless person - that is, a human not allied politically to any nation-state - that only a worldly citizenship could protect my inalienable rights. The same was true, of course, for any and all of my fellow humans.

And so, we arrive irrevocably at the subject of my talk: "World Citizenship and Human Rights."

I did not realize it at the time, but I came to recognize since that there is a subtle contradiction when adding "citizenship," and "rights" to "world" and "human."

"World" is a unitive word connoting wholeness, whereas "citizen" defines confining social and political rights and duties within a circumscribed human community. It is a word of sovereign earthy power while "world" opens out to the cosmos itself thereby adding a philosophical and even moral content.

By the same reasoning, placing "human" before "rights," betrays the same subtle contradiction, "human" connoting at once spiritual, social and biological levels, whereas "rights" again refers to a constraining political framework.

"Citizen" and "rights," in sum, are inhibiting words, relative and limited to one's neighbors' equal civic rights while "world" and "human" are both universal and unitive.

In spite of this contradiction, after legally expatriating myself in Paris in 1948, I chose world citizenship as my primary political allegiance almost forty years ago.

I was seconded in this choice by over 750,000 fellow citizens between the years 1949 and 1951 who registered as world citizens in the first global electoral machinery I founded on January 1, 1949, called the International Registry of World Citizen.

According to Prigogine, the Nobel Prize winner in chemistry in 1977, any organized system exists in dynamic tension between entropy and negentropy, that is, between chaos and information. But our human world is so information-rich or coherent, he claims, that it is almost certain to collapse into even higher coherence, not into chaos and self-destruction. In other words, he supports McLuhan's intuition that many seeming symptoms of breakdown are actually harbingers of breakthrough.

World citizenship is the legal breakthrough to higher political coherence.

Thus, ironically, in the 20th century, when exclusive nationality had become, as Einstein claimed, the "measles of humanity," when nations, after 1945 with the advent of the Nuclear Age, developed into doomsday machines threatening humanity itself, the right of expatriation took on an entirely different character. Rather than the loss of the right to have rights, as Chief Justice Earl Warren described statelessness in *TROP V. DULLES*, it was the right to "individual secession into the world community" itself, as described by Rufus King.

Returning to Blackstone's formula, and seconded by the Declaration of Independence, if no government exists to protect one's absolute or inalienable rights, obviously one must be created.

But the question naturally arises: If WORLD government is the sine qua non of WORLD peace and if the sovereign states by definition cannot relinquish any of their sovereignty, then from where does the sovereignty come to start a world government?

As one of your own courses asks: What is the source of legitimacy?

The answer is self-evident. But like so much that is self-evident, it completely escapes most of us.

It comes from "We, the people of the world."

Not to put too fine point on it, "We, the world's people" is simply humanity, the penultimate sovereign.

And humanity, claim the cyberneticists and general system scientists, is already a "governed" system just as is the human body. So, incidentally, do the Gaiaists or those who consider the Earth itself as a living system.

It follows that only human beings can represent humanity.

The mental and emotional leap from national to world government may be too much for most of us. Nonetheless, the idea of world government enjoys much credible support.

For instance, in 1945 Emery Reves had written that

"World government is not an 'ultimate goal' but an immediate necessity. In fact, it has been overdue since 1914."

For those who considered world government a far-away goal, he wrote that *"There is no first step to world government. World government is the first step."*

Einstein had echoed this sentiment. As far back as 1935 he had written that

"We must work toward creating a public sentiment to outlaw war..."

Then in 1946, no doubt tormented by the devastation at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, he wrote

"I believe that the establishment of a supranational government constitutes the deepest hope for mankind...With all my heart I believe that the world's present system of sovereign nations can lead only to barbarism, war, and inhumanity, and that only world law can assure progress towards a civilized peaceful humanity."

In an open letter to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1947 he made a further plea for world government. The Soviet reaction came a month later in a letter signed by four leading Russian scientists opposing Einstein's advocacy. After praising him, they castigated world government

as a "flamboyant signboard for the world supremacy of the capitalists monopolies."

In an ironic twist of history, only last week the New York Times reported that Soviet scientists, after 40 years of opposition to world government, in an article in the Moscow New Times, decided to publish for the first time Einstein's response to the Soviet physicists who ridiculed his call for world government 40 years ago because his ideas (and I quote) "*wonderfully correspond to the needs of the present times.*"

So much for the opposition to world government of reactionary critics in the U.S. who hide behind the now false assumption that the Soviets are opposed to world law.

Even such a conservative as Supreme Court Justice Owens J. Roberts called for world government in 1946. At the annual Associated Press luncheon on April 22 of that year he said that

"...Unless I misread everything that is written the world over, it is the universal opinion that regulation of conduct of men of every race and clime, by just rules justly enforced, namely government of a sort, is the only answer to the problems of peace. I don't have to tell you that history teaches that while nation states of sovereign and independent will exist in the world, and are recognized, agreements between those nation states, treaties and leagues, will not ensure peace, and I think that history equally teaches that in any society, however large and whatever its units, the road to world order is the road of government and law and the enforcement of law upon the individual."

In my naive, almost simplistic way of reasoning, I decided to take my destiny out of the deadly clutches of the nation-state war system which obviously could no longer represent my natural rights.

On May 25, 1948, as I stood before Vice-Consul Agnes Schneider in the United States Embassy in Paris and took the Oath of Expatriation deriving from that Congressional act of July 27, 1868, in political terms I was exercising my personal sovereignty to choose my own government.

In my own way I was fulfilling the historic promise made by the Founding Fathers in 1787 when they too transcended their exclusive state allegiance by creating a higher government to replace the obsolete treaty

arrangement hastily pasted together by the separate states while under British colonial domination: the Articles of Confederation.

And just as Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin or John Adams could not define "Americans" within the limited confines of the states of Virginia, Pennsylvania or Massachusetts but only as humans exercising their inalienable right of free political choice, so I could not define world citizenship within the exclusive legal confines of nationalism.

But equally important, by legally permitting me to make that choice, the nation-state, the United States, was recognizing the sovereign character of the human person.

From that ultimate political truth comes the real "bottom line" exposure of the illegitimacy of the nation-state system itself. For if it is only by virtue of the anarchic condition existing between nations that their exclusive existence is justified, then, in tacitly condoning a condition of anarchy between them thus sanctioning war, all nations are per se illegal.

This is affirmed by the wars being fought by nations today and being prepared for tomorrow. When we add nuclear to the conventional weaponry, we have the added monstrous crime for omnicide.

It is too often forgotten that governments are only the creatures of constitutions, written or oral. And no national constitution by definition can provide legal protection for humanity itself.

So to return to our brief history, with my own need for legal protection of my natural rights along with the sovereign mandate of the new world citizen constituency, motivated by sheer necessity and absolute morality. I declared in 1953, from the City Hall of Ellsworth, Maine, yet "outside" the nation-state system, a political entity for their legitimate protection called the "World Government of World Citizens."

Alvin Toffler, in THE THIRD WAVE, confirmed this obvious solution to a peaceful world:

"As nations are torn apart and restructured, as instabilities and threats of war erupt, we shall be called upon to invent wholly new political forms or 'containers' to bring a semblance of order to the world - a world in which the nation-state has become, for many purposes, a dangerous anachronism."

And that brings me to my candidacy in the 1988 presidential campaign which I announced on January 19, 1987, at Middlebury College, Vermont.

Here in the U.S., the frenzy of our presidential races totally obscures the fact that the system itself is anachronistic, a carry-over from the 18th century superimposed on a 20th century, totally interdependent world.

The historical equivalent of a national presidential election in a world of anarchy would be if George Washington and the other founding fathers, instead of meeting in the Constitutional Convention in 1787 to join the people of the then disunited states in a new legal order, had run for office in their respective state legislatures leaving the anarchy - institutionalized by the Articles of Confederation, akin to the United Nations Charter - intact.

We have only to examine the platforms of the major political parties to realize their total irrelevance to any major problem involving the survival of the individual voter or the total human species. There can be no direct address to any issue outside the national framework, and especially to the question of war itself which would expose the nation itself as powerless, by a strictly national party or candidate. Small wonder that almost half the electorate failed to show up at the 1984 presidential election. The public seems to know instinctively that while every national leader can provoke world war, no national leader can make world peace.

I do not intend to use this occasion as a political platform, but I will simply say that I am the only presidential candidate with an active peace platform. And that is the absolutely imperative requirement of the next president of the world's greatest modern-day Caesar.

We should elect no one to public office, according to Emery Reves,

"...who has not pledged himself in advance to work wholeheartedly to prevent the next war by the establishment of peace through law and government."

But what about international law? you ask. After all, that's what we're here for. Isn't it relevant to the problem of world peace?

I quite appreciate that here at Fletcher, as at other great international law schools throughout the world, the progression of so-called international law beginning with the great Dutch jurist, Huig von Groot, more commonly known as Hugo Grotius, is a subject of major importance and scrutiny.

We ordinary citizens, however, have the right to wonder why it is that we can place men on the moon, telephone instantaneously around the world, mail a letter worldwide, view the rings of Saturn on the front pages of our local newspapers, and yet remain in an 18th century legalistic morass which condemns us to destruction.

We must ask respectfully if today's international law schools are relevant to human survival.

After all, the growth of international law from Grotius' era to now has dealt mainly with relationships between states rather than with people. For instance, in his famous Three Books on the Laws of War and Peace, written in 1625, he argued that the only way for weak nations to prevail against more powerful ones was for them to unite in creating laws and institutions that could enforce justice. That formula, however, still condoning national division, unfortunately denied the age-old wisdom that peace and justice are both indivisible and universal.

Then, as you know, a great debate rages among jurists as to whether individuals are subjects of international law. Though the statute of the International Court of Justice at The Hague does not assign individuals any standing before the court, still the Nuremberg Decisions seemed to provide the needed breakthrough for individual accountability for crimes transcending national law. If true, then most nation-state leaders should be indicted and tried as war criminals - as I tried to do in a petition of March, 1985, to the ICJ - since preparing for and threatening war is a war crime according to these principles. That they are not again exposes the inherent contradiction of the so-called international law.

In short, it is revealed as not law at all but merely a system of multi-lateral treaties between equally sovereign states.

Certain revered jurists like Myres Macdougall of Yale, however, categorically deny exclusivity of international law to states alone. In his massive, comprehensive work, Human Rights and World Public Order, co-authored with Lasswell and Chen, he writes:

"The notion that states are the only appropriate 'subjects' of international law is belied by all the contemporary facts...about participation in the global processes of effective power and authoritative decision. This notion, unknown to the founding fathers and deriving from certain parochial misconceptions of the late nineteenth century, lingers on to impede the protection

of human rights merely because it sometimes serves the power purposes of the state elites...Historically, the greatest difficulty concerning participation in the world constitutive process has been the exaggeration of the role of the nation-state as the principal subject of international law. Because of the overwhelming emphasis of the 'sovereignty' of nation-states, there has been great reluctance to recognize other participants in world social process as in fact active subjects of international law."

Since humankind itself was threatened by the advent of the nuclear age in 1945, even national jurisprudence was obliged to adopt a more wholesale character. We read in today's journals, for instance, that Damjanjak is condemned to death by an Israeli court after having been charged with "crimes against humanity," crimes not found in the Israel criminal code but part of the Nuremberg Principles. The Eichmann case preceded this latest nod to "international" law. The French government likewise has indicted, tried and convicted Klaus Barbie under the same global criminal code.

Then the word "genocide" was coined to describe species annihilation. "Omnicide" later defined the crime of genocide. but where was the GLOBAL criminal court to try those individuals threatening humanity with this final crime? Where was the enforcement agency, the GLOBAL police force? Indeed, where was humanity's legislative body? And the world executive?

As Norman Cousins asked, Who speaks for Man?

On December 10, 1948, six months after my declaration of world citizenship, the revolution for legalizing human rights which had begun in the 18th century took on at least a semblance of official global dimension.

The General Assembly of the United Nations then sitting in Paris proclaimed to the world the UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

Here at last was a blueprint for the new way of thinking Einstein had called for; the operating manual Bucky Fuller demanded for spaceship earth. Here was the terra firma for a new social contract between passengers on that spaceship; but more than that, it was the pragmatic and unequivocal sanction for immediate personal action from principle on the global level, a world citizen code book to claim inalienable social and

political rights in the recognition that "We, the People" meant each one of us and humanity itself.

Here was the legitimate link between world citizenship and human rights.

Article 28 provides that *"Everyone is entitled to a social and political order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized."* As to the derivation of government itself, article 21(3) put it succinctly: *"The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government..."* And article 15 further defines the right of choice of government itself: *"Everyone has the right to a nationality and everyone has the right to change his nationality. "*

We, as World Citizens, are today claiming these rights from every corner of the world community.

And how do we put them into practice? Let me give you one concrete example. Here is a World Government passport. It represents article 13(2) of the UDHR:

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

It is being issued daily on demand from the World Service Authority, our global government's administrative and executive agency in Washington, D.C., to individuals throughout the world. Many are refugees and stateless persons like me. We who carry it are claiming our unity with our fellow humans and the world itself.

In conclusion, World Government is in operation NOW representing both the human being and sovereign humanity. I enjoin you further inquiry and active support.

Because, in this prophetic age, whether humanity survives or not depends on us, you and me.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, in the famous case, PEREZ v. BROWNELL, wrote:

"Citizenship is man's basic right, for it is nothing less than the right to have rights."

If Justice Earl Warren was right, then world citizenship is the right to have world rights such as the right to live peacefully on and with our home planet, Mother Earth.

Thank you.

WHY I AM A CANDIDATE FOR U.S. PRESIDENT

University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Student Activities Committee Third Party Series

World Citizen Party Candidate

Garry Davis

May 10, 1988

Fellow Earthlings:

I want you to know from the outset that I am a Leo with Gemini rising and the moon in Aries.

I don't want to begin this address on a negative note nor do I intend to shock you at the outset, but I must say that due to circumstances beyond my control, I may not win this election.

In the frenzy of the major political party race, we independent candidates hardly ever get a chance to explain why we are crazy enough to run for this lofty if unreachable office. So you are to be congratulated - or maybe condemned - for giving us this important platform. Speaking for my fellow gadfly candidates, I wholeheartedly thank the sponsors of this series and you, the audience.

Independent candidates have a unique advantage over the major party honchos. With nothing much to lose, we can speak the truth without fear of the consequences. We can address the real issues and not care about offending anyone. We do not have to cater to special interest groups in order to gain votes. The system is rigged against us anyway. We are not in a popularity contest or a picture parade. Also having little or no funds, we can speak for the dispossessed, the downtrodden, the persecuted, the forgotten, and the silent without embarrassment or apology. Because that's where we are also. We don't have to convince voters they are somebody. The citizens we address are already the sovereigns. And praise God, we don't have to please the right or the left or even the middle. Having nowhere to go but up, we can start right at the top, above the divisions.

In short, we can emulate the words of that master revolutionary, Tom Paine, who wrote:

"Independence is my happiness and I view things as they are without regard to place or person. The world is my country and all men are my brothers."

I intend to blast away "without regard to place or person." Our daily and global crises demand not only national but world leadership. That is the only politics which makes sense. As a human being, a world citizen and a father of four, that is the only politics I am interested in.

I am here to tell you that you as voters and I as a candidate in our American electoral system today have an all-important date with destiny...world destiny.

The person you choose to lead this great country in the next four or eight years will have more responsibility - not only for ourselves but for the whole human community - than anyone who has ever held power in all the sweep of past history. He may well be responsible for guiding mankind through the narrow pass between extinction and survival.

This is of course the imperative quest for peace. As Emery Reves wrote years ago, in his Anatomy of Peace,

"We should elect no one to public office who has not pledged himself in advance to work wholeheartedly to prevent the next war by the establishment of peace through law and government."

In judging me as a candidate you may first fairly ask where I am coming from, as compared to the background and motives of my esteemed opponents.

To begin with, we know that candidates Dukakis and Bush are both job-holders in the existing nation-state establishment. Or, in terms of the world community, their jobs and their commitments are local.

I have a job too, but mine is outside the national framework. It is global. Four decades ago I discovered a unique American way to stand for peace by transcending the nation-state war system. I renounced my U.S. citizenship to choose membership in the world community - world citizenship - as my highest political allegiance. (And incidentally, that was

the law-given right of U.S. citizens at that time. The language of our nineteenth century nationality laws, since greatly changed, was practically poetic in affirming the inalienable right of every human being to expatriate himself from one sovereign and transfer his allegiance to another.)

I was seconded in this choice by over 750,000 fellow citizens between the years 1949 to 1951 who registered as world citizens in the first global electoral machinery I founded on January 1, 1949, called the International Registry of World Citizens.

The one allegiance no one can renounce or transfer out of is his or her membership in the world community, and that is what I have been trying to express and honor ever since.

But there was no structure for this - individual world citizenship - so with support and inspiration from many sources over the years I created one and gave myself a job: today I am a volunteer World Coordinator of the World Government of World Citizens.

This sovereign government, declared over 35 years ago, actually operates today out of our global city hall in Washington, D.C., based on the inalienable human right to choose one's personal political allegiance.

This is government of, by and for the people of the world, what Alvin Toffler has called "third wave politics." Thus it represents humanity. Its sovereignty has been recognized innumerable times, by the acceptance of the documentation we issue, our World Passport, for instance, by national authorities at international frontiers.

So you see I am far from unemployed. And I am not at odds with my native land either. (I couldn't be in this race if I hadn't been born a good Maine Down-Easter.) Our great Declaration of Independence is itself an affirmation of every man's right to make personal political choices.

One could say that Governor Dukakis and Vice President Bush have made their careers from "inside" the national cocoon looking out at the rest of the world. Their universe revolves around Washington, D.C. just as the universe of General Secretary Gorbachev centers in Moscow. and that is the case with all national leaders.

But today this limited national perspective is not only a distortion of the real world, but an exceedingly dangerous distortion.

The reason is obvious: first, it perverts and denies the reality of our one world and one humanity, and second, it condones a condition of anarchy between nations.

And don't be misled by the so-called nuclear threat. I helped wipe out Dusseldorf, Brandenburg and Hannover with mere fire incendiary bombs.

And my brother was killed at Salerno by a plain old conventional bomb just as 21-year-olds are being killed today by conventional weaponry.

Emery Reves, in Anatomy of Peace, minces no words about the anachronism of nation-state. He writes:

"The first step toward ending the present chaos is to overcome the tremendous emotional obstacle which prevents us from realizing and admitting that the ideal of sovereign nation-states, with all its great record of success during the nineteenth century, is today the cause of all the immeasurable suffering and misery of this world. We are living in complete anarchy, because in a small world, interrelated in every other aspect, there are seventy or eighty separate sources of law - seventy or eighty sovereignties...Our present system of national sovereignty is in absolute contradiction to the original conception of sovereignty, which meant - and still means - sovereignty of the community."

My perspective is from the sovereignty of the world community, the external, global and incidentally, real-time viewpoint, outside looking in at the United States as part of the entire nation-state system (and make no mistake, I am appreciative of all our past virtues and accomplishments, and our very freedom to be meeting here together, as anyone could be). But this holistic perception naturally and spontaneously accepts the planet as one whole, and humanity as a coherent and systemic species - a human family...and dependent on Mother Earth herself for survival. Therefore, it is not blind to duties, responsibilities, and obligations extending throughout the entire family.

Contrarily, the political horizons of my opponents are exclusive, terminating at the national frontier. Beyond, they view only anarchy and chaos. Their policies, therefore, are reactive, acting on short views, immediate and external events and promising knee-jerk leadership. If you doubt this myopic perspective, look at the most important and terrible decision of our times, the commitment of the United States to World War

II - and remember that it was not made in Washington at all, but by leaders in Tokyo and Berlin, leaders who owed us absolutely nothing.

According to Ilya Prigogine, the Nobel Prize winner in chemistry in 1977, any organized system exists in dynamic tension between entropy and negentropy, that is, between chaos and coherence. But our human world is so information-rich or coherent, he claims, that it is almost certain to collapse into even higher coherence, not into chaos and self-destruction. In other words, he supports McLuhan's intuition that many seeming symptoms of breakdown are actually harbingers of breakthrough.

The legal breakthrough leading to higher political coherence is world citizenship.

As a World Citizen candidate, I already accept the world as given, an organic community of 5 billion human beings, all under nuclear threat and all awaiting leadership with at least some global vision, leadership questing for a rational way to get through the perilous years ahead together.

Do you see or hear that in Michael Dukakis or George Bush? Do they promise to represent you in a determined effort to preserve peace and order in the world community - in a word, to survive?

It would be immodest, which I am not, to stand here and claim that I am the only, or necessarily anywhere near the best qualified and available spokesperson for the message I am trying to bring to this campaign. But it is not arrogant to point out that I am standing alone in the field. Without me, voters and concerned citizens would have no focal point, not even a symbolic one, for views and feelings I think are nearly universal among us today.

My principal opponents have been an effective state governor, and a phenomenally loyal vice president (if blind loyalty to an aimable buffoon can be reckoned a virtue). But that does not mean they would make worthy presidents. Rather the opposite. Mere managerial skills and tunnel vision loyalty are not what is needed. The next incumbent must be possessed of world-sized determination and virtues, and must view America in her role as a global partner with unprecedented global responsibilities.

A president is one who inspires with wise counsel, one who envisions a positive future, not only for his people but for all people. Moreover, it requires an inner, disciplined self-confidence, a comprehensive view of the

world, and a sure knowledge of American's place in the interdependent scheme of the world community.

As we approach the 21st century, the U.S. president must represent, not only America itself, but American's global mission. And in that vision, he speaks for the world public as well. Fortunately, that global vision is implicit in the Constitution itself. And although the world community is totally interdependent in actual terms, it is still without a constitution.

Now does the U.S. president have a role to play in providing one? I say not only may he play that role, but he is mandated by his oath of office to do so. Because without a world constitution, he cannot define the inalienable human rights of his own constituents.

As the swearing in is the first duty of the U.S. president, the call for a constitutional convention will be my second duty as your president.

Because to my way of thinking, it has become increasingly apparent since 1914 that not only can exclusive national citizenship not protect absolute, natural or inalienable rights, but contrarily is their greatest enemy.

Hear these appalling facts. Since 1900, nations have fought 207 wars. Over 70 million humans have been killed - a 500% increase over the 19th century - and many more wounded and made homeless. Today's refugee population is 15 million. Forty-four wars, big and small, are raging as I talk involving some 50 nations. Some 10 million humans are in national armies.

Almost a trillion dollars will be spent next year on weapons of destruction . Since 1981 preparations for nuclear war have cost \$427 billion.

Yet today, tens of thousands of humans, mostly children, will starve to death, and millions will go to bed hungry.

Nations freely trade armaments with each other. Wars in the Third World are fought with weapons overtly and covertly supplied by the industrialized nations.

Over 50,000 nuclear weapons now exist with a megatonnage of over 16,000, enough to eliminate every vestige of life on earth for thousands of years. The total megatonnage dropped in World War II was 3.

Spy systems play their infantile games in every nation draining vast resources from social purposes.

Armies of men stand on national frontiers controlling entry and exit from these political fictions while other armies issue passports, visas and other so-called official documents designed to control the world citizenry.

The poorest 30% of humanity receive only 3% of the world's total income while the top 20% owns 66%.

Ecological disasters threaten our very life-support system. Radioactive pollution, spearheaded by deadly plutonium, a man-made substance with a half life of 250,000 years, is the 20th century Sword of Damocles. National armies are the biggest polluters of the environment.

I could go on ad nauseum.

The nation-state system breakdown is obviously far beyond the point of no return.

Since 1914, we have already had a full stomach of system dysfunction. Recently, it burst out during the Vietnam war administration. Then during Nixon's Watergate scandal. It exposed itself in the Iran/contra debacle during this administration with North, Poindexter, McFarlane and company playing the heavies. Currently it is revealed in the absurd SDI or "Star Wars" program where the Reagan administration, its paranoia in full display, presumes to own the space above all our heads and wants to fill it with destruction. And it is happening on the streets of America and throughout the world where the homeless wander in desperation, drug addicts proliferate, small children haven nightmares of nuclear holocaust and the general public becomes numbed over impending nuclear winter.

In Toffler's The Third Wave, he blows the whistle on the entire system:

"All the political parties of the industrial world, all our congresses, parliaments, and supreme soviets, our presidencies and prime ministerships, our courts, and our regulatory agencies, and our layer upon geographical layer of governmental bureaucracy - in short, all the tools we use to make and enforce collective decisions - are obsolete and about to be transformed. A third wave civilization cannot operate with a second wave political structure."

Historically, we have come full cycle...or full spiral. Just as the Virginia House of Burgess was rendered subservient to the federal code in 1789, so the national decision-making apparatus must be rendered subservient to a global legal code.

That is the vital message I am bringing to this campaign.

Both Michael Dukakis and George Bush still accept war as an option for resolving conflicts. It is built-in to their national framework. Both would maintain the military budget at its present level or higher. In one of his speeches, the governor pointed out that the USA and the Soviet Union have 50,000 nuclear weapons between them. the he added, "More than a dozen nations have joined - or soon may join the nuclear club, increasing the balance of terror. Ever since Hiroshima, nations have been trying to win the arms race. But the truth is that an arms race cannot be won; it can only be lost."

You might conclude from this statement that Governor Dukakis would have realized what was missing in this anarchic nationalistic war game was global government to outlaw war. But no, it's as if the Governor doesn't even realize the problem. He insisted that "What we need are defenses that really defend us - instead of weapons systems that bankrupt and destroy us all."

Is that the kind of deadly thinking you want in your next president?

Bush follows Reagan's paranoid lead in military thinking. He cast the deciding vote when the appropriation for "Star Wars" came up in the Senate.

Have you ever heard Dukakis or Bush mention the need for a world public order or government to outlaw war? Have you heard them refer to themselves as world citizens?

It is ironic that Roosevelt, Kennedy, Carter and Reagan all called themselves world citizens once they were elected.

So, my candidacy as a world citizen changes the dimension of the national political climate. I believe that a large portion of the American public has no illusions about the impotence of the present political system itself to solve their problems. After all, almost a majority in the last election rejected the voting process itself. Already many Americans are

turned off to the politics-as-usual game. As one political pundit put it, "The skim milk is rising to the top."

The Founding Fathers rejected political exclusivity in 1787. They eliminated the anarchy between the exclusive states by creating a higher government with its own set of laws above the warring states. They placed themselves outside the state system mentally and politically first before they could define the new social code called the Constitution of the United States.

They made peace among the thirteen sovereign states.

And we Americans have inherited and now profit from the process.

Now international war is the major problem. The same process must be repeated, this time on the global level.

Another major issue in this campaign is that of experience in so-called foreign policy. Bush claims he has more experience in foreign policy than Dukakis, therefore, is more qualified to be president. Dukakis replies that Bush's foreign policy experience was at the funerals of deceased heads of state and as head of the CIA. That he can deal more effectively with Gorbachev as a trained lawyer than Bush.

The entire argument is misleading, even false. A smokescreen hiding the real issue of anarchy vs law. The very phrase "foreign policy" identifies a past era, an era contradicted by the telephone, the television, instant transmission of information, the space age, and the totality of war. "foreign policy" is an 18th century politics artificially superimposed on the 20th century.

If visitors from outer space ever visited our planet, then perhaps a "foreign policy" would be valid but it would have to emanate from a world government, not from a particular nation.

But if experience in worldly events is a criteria for presidential calibre, then I am obviously the only valid choice. I am the only candidate who has claimed to be world citizen at age 26, who has opened the door for millions of your fellow humans also to claim that citizenship and who has declared a government for that citizenship which operates here and now from the center of Washington, D.C. identifying that global constituency.

My experience as a world citizen, founder and administrator of actual global institutions relevant to immediate public needs, which are operating now, is unique among the candidates.

But there are other major global problems as well to be tackled. Pollution of the atmosphere, the oceans, the soil; deforestation and desertification expanding exponentially in once-fertile lands; endemic poverty and starvation and illness throughout the human community. And deadly nuclear proliferation throughout the national world and a fragile international house-of-cards economy with debt proliferating everywhere.

I have read Dukakis' and Bush's so-called stump speeches. There is nothing in them about these problems, nor about the environment, toxic waste, water, soil and air pollution, acid rain, radioactivity, especially plutonium, carbon dioxide in the atmosphere threatening the "greenhouse effect," the disappearing ozone layer. There is nothing about the destruction of the primeval rain forests to graze cattle for McDonald's hamburgers or the elimination of innocent species which co-inhabit the planet.

Why?

Maybe the Democratic and Republican candidates already know the U.S. president is virtually powerless to cope with these problems. Moreover, maybe they realize that even his political clout is close to zero. Can he stop the Iran-Iraq war or indeed any of the 44 wars going on today? Can he save the millions in Africa from starving? Can he release the refugees from despicable camps? Does he control Botha in South Africa? Or Qadhafi in Libya or Khomeini in Iran? Can he prevent Japan's or South Korea's or Taiwan's or Singapore's growing economic power? Can he obtain the release of the over 5,000 Americans in foreign jails for drug abuse crimes? Or even the nine American hostages still being held in Lebanon?

America is not the world, after all. And we Americans are only six percent of the world's population.

What I am really saying is that in the real world, the president of the United States is actually powerless to truly represent the U.S. public. The same is true of course for the Soviet General Secretary. Or for any nation state leader.

The bottom line is that this presidential election is in reality a giant charade, a sort of Alice-in-Wonderland politics in an archaic system in historic disarray and breakdown.

So why am I running for president, you ask? Because unfortunately the U.S. President can still make war. That's why the next president must slow down that giant momentum toward global holocaust and immediately begin the process for building world peace.

My program alone is designed for that very purpose.

Both Dukakis and Bush will be focusing on issues like employment, trade, drugs, crime and other important subjects. But they will cop out totally on THE important subject: world peace. Yet if we don't solve that problem, there will obviously be no others.

And it goes without saying that cutting out the national arms budget would instantly free measureless talent and resources to tackle all these real problems facing us all.

My candidacy then is really a desperate effort to case one vote, my own, a vote for one world and one humanity. A vote for sanity.

Please join me and add your vote and your voice to mine.

This is the purest form of democracy in action.

Thank you.