

Toward Democratic World Federation

Publication of the Democratic World Federalists

Vol. 14, No. 4

Autumn 2005

DEMOCRATIC WORLD FEDERALISTS REFINE PURPOSES & OBJECTIVES

During the past year members of the Board of Directors of Democratic World Federalists and its Advisory Board have worked to refine the objectives and purposes of our organization -- one not limited by national boundaries -- to reflect better the principles being promoted. We feel that there is a need not only to deal with global problems but also to bring the blessings of liberty to the people of the world.

common humanity of the people, to their role as sovereign citizens, and the necessity for an open federal system of constitutional government, in order to become a civilized society in the 21st Century and leave behind the current malaise of competing and warring nation-states (and related crimes against humanity, including terrorism).

Anyone anywhere on Earth who finds these principles worth promoting is invited to become a D.W.F. supporter. -- JOS

To achieve this, we move from an understanding of the

The Purposes and Objectives of Democratic World Federalists are:

A. To promote an understanding of the principles that:

- Common Humanity** The people of the world, as interconnected members of a common humanity, must recognize that the well-being and safety of anyone should be of concern to everyone.
- Global Problems & Benefits** The people are confronted by global problems, such as war and civil conflict, crimes against humanity and anarchy, large-scale poverty and disease, and degradation of the environment. These can be dealt with, and peace and the well-being of the people promoted, through enforce able world laws.
- Sovereignty & Citizenship** The people, as sovereign citizens, are inherently endowed with the authority and the duty to govern themselves, either directly or through elected representatives, on all levels of society and ultimately the world. As citizens, they should respect the rule of law, which their civic participation creates and legitimizes.
- Good Government** The government of all political units must be open, democratic, and accountable to the people and have effective legislative, executive, and judicial branches, with checks and balances.
- Federation** Planet Earth, with unity in its diversity, requires a democratic, federal system of government, where problems from local to global are dealt with by governments at the appropriate level.
- Constitution** A world constitution with a declaration of rights should be promoted by any means possible, e.g., restructuring and democratizing the United Nations, federating a number of regional unions, expanding a community of democracies, or building a new set of institutions of government through a world convention.

B. To develop an organization/movement without borders and spread its message throughout the world via contacts with other civil-society organizations, educational institutions, the media, lawmakers, and the general public.

WORLD SERVICE CORPS -- PREPARING FOR DISASTERS

by Dwayne Hunn of Mill Valley, California

Another Katrina will happen. So will another earthquake. With Mother Nature, stuff happens, that can't be avoided. However, you can competently and humanely temper the aftermath.

Another Iraq and Vietnam may happen. So may another extremist act. With politics and policies, stuff happens. However, a lot of stupid policies can be avoided from becoming disasters.

How? By making Americans and the world smarter.

How do we do that? Give Americans a visionary program in

which a significant number serve, share, understand, learn, and teach their young. From that, America could grow a supermajority of smarter citizens, which then votes America away from stupid mistakes that cost us dearly in blood and economy.

What is that vision? It's getting the citizen-initiated World Service Corps proposed and passed in Congress. If passed, this legislation could annually ramp up America's best resource until,

continued on page 7

TOWARD DEMOCRATIC WORLD FEDERATION

Vol. 14, No. 4 ISSN 1091-8965

Editor - John O. Sutter Associate Editor - Eric Schultz
Editor Emeritus - Keith Beggs

OFFICERS of the DEMOCRATIC WORLD FEDERALISTS

President - John O. Sutter Vice President - Fred Duperrault
Secretary - Mary E. Harris Board Chairman - Roger Kotila

DIRECTORS

James Adams, Phil Allen, Byron Belitsos, Urs Cipolat,
Esther Franklin, Bruce Kennedy, Robert Neumann,
Lyndon Storey, Charles Turk, Susan Zipp

STAFF

Executive Director Eric Schultz

Democratic World Federalists are affiliated with the
Coalition for Democratic World Government, and the World
Federalist Movement.

Views expressed in articles published in *TDWF* do not
necessarily represent those of Democratic World Federalists.

Readers' comments are welcome. Subscription: \$25 for 1 year.

The deadline for submissions for the next issue is:

31 January 2006

Mark Your Calendar!

DEMOCRATIC WORLD FEDERALISTS

Sunday, 15 January 2006: Winter Board Meeting.

12 Noon, Brown-bag lunch; 1P.M., Meeting starts;
Directors and other supporters interested in participating,
RSVP 1-415-227-4880 or dwfed@dwfed.org.
Latecomers, ring #225 at intercom by front door.

NOVEMBER EVENTS

WORLD FEDERALIST MOVEMENT

D.W.F. was represented by WFM Councillors Eric Schultz and John Sutter and DWF Board member Sue Zipp at the Annual Meeting of the W.F.M. Council, held in Brussels, 4--6 November, with facilities hosted by the **Union of European Federalists**. The subject of restructuring W.F.M. was broached, with a working paper by Keith Best, Chair of the Executive Committee.

Three new Councillors were co-opted, including **Jean-Paul Pougala** of Cameroon and the new **African Federalist Movement**. Prior to the Council meeting, along with Lucio Levi, he spoke on experiences of the European and African Unions as steps toward a united world.

INFORMAL DIALOGUE ON GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

The second I.D.G.G. was hosted by the American Movement for World Government and held at the home of **Paul Raynault** in Englewood, New Jersey, 17-19 November. With a working paper by **Troy Davis**, a number of world citizens, world federalists, and world governmentalists discussed how they could organize themselves more effectively. Among the participants were Eric Schultz and eight D.W.F. Supporters.

FROM THE PRESIDENT'S DESK

PARALLEL GLOBAL GOVERNANCE FOR PLANET EARTH?

After 13 American states became independent, they formed a **League of Friendship** and tried to operate under the Articles of Confederation, with each state possessing the veto. It didn't work. Fortunately our perceptive Founders held a Constitutional Convention and produced the **American Federation**, which gradually became more democratic, as it provided for new states to be admitted but without vetoes.

In Europe in the years after World War II all of the countries on the continent formed a **league** called the **Organization for Security and Cooperation** in Europe. It provided a place for states with different ideologies to discuss problems, but had no legislative, executive or judicial powers.

At the same time several democratic states in Europe began working together and eventually organized the **European Union**, which is in the process of becoming a democratic European federation -- promoted by the Union of European Federalists and Young European Federalists -- with legislative, executive, and judicial powers and no veto. Other states may qualify for admission if they fulfill certain conditions, including becoming democracies.

Why not have similar parallel structures for the world? The **United Nations** is a **league** operating under a treaty and encompasses most of the nation-states of the world. It serves as a forum to discuss problems but has virtually no legislative, executive, or judicial powers, and -- with its veto -- is undemocratic.

On the other hand, the Earth needs a **democratic world federation** composed of democratic states and open to others that become democracies, and, of course, without a veto.

Now what is lacking are men and women leaders with the global vision to create for the Earth what Washington, Madison, Hamilton, Wilson, Paine, et al. did for America and Monet, Schuman, Adenauer, Spinelli, et al. did for Europe.

*During more than 300 years of wars and mismanagement of human affairs on Earth, **treaty law** has proven impractical and disastrous as a method for the management of world affairs*

The several major defects of treaty law are well known:

- ♦ *Treaty law is not universally and equally applicable, but applies only to nations that ratify the particular treaty, however few or many, and varies in the application from one treaty to the next.*

- ♦ *Treaty law among nations applies only to international affairs or the conduct of affairs between or among nations, and is not applicable to individual citizens directly.*

- ♦ *Since most of the problems of global human society cannot be defined in terms simply of relations among sovereign nations, it is impossible for treaty law to solve most of the global or supranational problems of people living on Earth.*

- ♦ *Finally, any nation may withdraw unilaterally from a treaty.*

-- A selection from by Philip Isley found in *Toward Genuine Global Governance*, edited by Errol Harris & James Yunker.

SOUTH AMERICA -- THE HARD CHOICE BETWEEN BUSH AND ISOLATION

by Fernando A. Iglesias of Buenos Aires

On the back cover our Winter 2005 issue, we published an inspiring quotation taken from the Cuzco Declaration, which announced the formation of a South American Community of Nations: a federal union of South American nations, which aspires to institute governing mechanisms on the continental level in order to promote peace and well-being for its peoples. That, along with the continuing (though sporadic) development of the European Union and the emergence of the African Union (however feeble), should be encouraging to those who believe in the value of supra-national governance. These examples show that many political leaders recognize the merit in the idea of a democratic federation. However, as Mr. Iglesias reports, political ideals are often distant relatives to reality. Without strong leadership, political malaise, cynicism, and intrusive U.S. trade policies could chip away at South America's chances for creating a just, prosperous, and united future. --ES

The South American nations have the unique privilege of being born under the inspiration of continental unity. Indeed, both Simon Bolivar and Jose de San Martin, the Colombian and Argentine generals whose campaigns liberated the subcontinent from Spanish domination, accomplished their military goals on behalf of South American unity and not under nationalistic invocations. Bolivar in particular was convinced that the most reasonable means towards freedom and prosperity for South Americans was through a continental South American Republic. He worked for this goal, which he called the "Patria Grande," until the end of his days.

Unfortunately, the modern history of South America has not lived up to the promise expressed in its auspicious beginnings. Immediately following the expulsion of the colonial armies, South America started a process of Balkanization. Its 13 countries have spent much of their history either fighting for hegemony or withering in isolation. Consider, too, the Guerra de la Triple Alianza, at the end of the 19th Century (in which 80% of Paraguayan males were exterminated by the joint armies of Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay), or the wars in which Bolivia lost both its coasts and its hopes, or the absurd conflict between Ecuador and Peru at the end of the 20th Century.

We South Americans usually blame the British Foreign Office, or European colonialists in general, for our Balkanization and other related episodes. Might there also be evidence for an idiosyncrasy in our political character? What should we make of the fact that grand speeches on the Bolivarian "Patria Grande" put orators on the front page of the newspapers, while concrete action toward making that image a reality remains completely neglected?

Even if last year, in Cuzco (Peru), the meeting of South American presidents proclaimed the birth of the "South American Community of Nations," the awful truth is that we still are -- as usual -- in the field of big useless words. They claimed that South

America will be an economic, monetary, and political unity in fifteen years! In the meantime, there isn't any civil organization whose main goal is South American unity. Despite their ideological affinity (almost all of them claim to be "center-leftist" and "pro-continental"), the national parties and governments have been unable to promote -- beyond words -- continental unity.

At present, the Mercosur (a continental free-market among Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay and Paraguay) is crippled by the constant disputes between its main partners. As a result, it has been unable to either compete or negotiate with other large common markets like NAFTA or the E.U., nor has it been able to properly amalgamate with the Andean Community, which is nearly too poor and weak to survive as an entity on its own.

Despite the fact that South American center-leftist presidents asked Bush for a European model of integration of Americas (with both economic and political integration), the model that was actually built with Mercosur and the Andean Community is, instead, NAFTA-like in structure. There are no truly common political institutions; integration is relegated only to the economic dimension.

The SCAN also faces the problem of having a populist leader, Venezuelan president Hugo Chavez, as its most insistent advocator (while he spends 2 billion dollars a year on Russian submarines and other armaments). This further condemns the "South American Community of Nations" to international isolation.

In fact, the entire idea of the South American Community Nations seems to have become the curtain that hides two other very concrete projects: bilateral agreements with the U.S. and populist dreams of national sovereignty, autarchy, and power.

The recent Summit of Mar del Plata (Argentina) must be seen in this light. While mass media showed people demonstrating against Bush on the streets and Maradona wearing the "Stop-Bush" T-shirt, while the international press insisted on the impossibility of unanimously signing a declaration in favor of the ALCA (the Alaska-Tierra del Fuego free market, promoted by the U.S. administration), the less apparent facts supported a contrary observation. Only Venezuela (that is, Chavez) was against the ALCA proposal. The four Mercosur countries asked for reforms of the ALCA project and all the rest (almost 30 countries, including those in Central America) were in favor, which means that they will join the NAFTA through bilateral agreements.

In such a position, South Americans should be able to look to the Europe for help. Not only because most Latin Americans relate more readily to its traditions than to U.S. ones, but also because the European Union is known as a model for regional federation. However, Europe seems to have trouble seeing beyond its own troubles, which include their justified concern about the American hegemony. This leads not only to their overlooking South America, but also to their further consideration of creating a unified European Army. Such action could be the end

continued on page 6

OBJECTIONS TO WORLD GOVERNMENT CONSIDERED

by David Ray Griffin of Isla Vista, California



(Professor Griffin responds to the conventional wisdom that the creation of a global government is both undesirable and impossible.)

Some opponents of the concept of a global government feared that it would lead to world tyranny. Any government nowadays could be dangerous, but would the creation of a global government be *more or less* dangerous than continuing with the current anarchical lack of order among nation states? Einstein felt that the present system is more dangerous, for besides having the perpetual threat of war, it is more conducive to tyranny.

The objection that a central government would probably lead to tyranny had been raised by those opposed to the plan to create a federal government for the U.S.A.; and yet the framers of the Constitution did well in setting up a form of government that could avoid becoming tyrannical, especially when the Bill of Rights was added to the checks and balances built into the separation of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

Another reason for thinking global government undesirable was that it might conjure up the image of a bureaucratic nightmare. However, global government proponents speak of a strictly *limited* government whose jurisdiction would deal with matters of common concern to all nations, e.g., planetary ecology, a global economic system, and security from outside attack.

Moreover, only in a *federal* system of global government can real political and economic decentralization and autonomy be possible.

The main charge was that it is simply impossible to create a global government. Such believers insist that a *global society* with much more uniformity in terms of beliefs and values than we have today must *first* occur. Yet the required consensus among the peoples of the world on basic values arguably already exists. Dorothy V. Jones in "The Declaratory Tradition in Modern International Law" lists nine principles that have been widely accepted by the nations of the world. Even if not fully practiced, this is the kind of consensus on values needed for a global democratic government to work.

But isn't this putting the cart before the horse? Recall that people in the states of Virginia and Massachusetts could not have had any reverence for the U.S. Government prior to its existence. Accordingly, loyalty to the world federation must be developed after it has been established. Of course, we'd hope that persons with different religious and philosophical outlooks could reinterpret those traditions in ways that support of world unity -- which would be the greatest transformation of human civilization.

It's possible that the poorest countries (left out of most political decisions by the U.N. Security Council and economic policies made by the G-8 nations) might reject the proposal for global government as one more scheme by the rich to exploit them. This

could be forestalled by having the plans for global government worked out by representatives from nations all over the world. The global government envisaged would be democratic, having a popularly elected Parliament (similar to that in the E.U.), no nation with veto powers, and no inner circle with permanent membership.

What about the richer nations -- especially the United States -- that had final say in the U.N. Charter? How would they consider a global government that would restrict their right (privilege?) to go to war and commit them to overcoming the huge economic disparity between themselves and the poorest nations? Assuming that the United States would have to take the lead, might it realize that global government is necessary if human civilization is to survive, when faced with international terrorism and the possibility of its gaining a nuclear dimension, and the mounting risk of nuclear proliferation among nations; as well as the population explosion, the accelerating deterioration of the natural environment, including the resulting climate change, and the exhaustion of vital resources -- precursors to resource wars?

Despite some past negative consequences of the American sense of mission, might its positive side be emphasized of saving the world from the multiplicity of dangers by leading the movement toward global government?

Finally, a global government should be more accessible now than in the 18th Century, or after the first World War, or even after World War II, because of technological advances, including in the fields of communication -- especially television (and the Internet) -- and transportation. Modern technology has made a world government technically feasible. But even more so, because of the deleterious effects of some contemporary technology, world government is an indispensable necessity. What now is most needed is to change our inherited way of thinking about international relations.

-- *From Toward Genuine Global Governance, edited by Errol Harris & James Yunker (1999). Most recently, while starting to write on global democracy, Professor Griffin, who taught ethics at the Claremont School of Theology, was distracted by the events around the 11th of September 2001. This led to his perceptive book in 2004 entitled The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions about the Bush Administration and 9/11.*

Now at www.dwfed.org

BOOKS -- We've been busy updating the "Books" page on our website so that you can quickly and easily find the world federalist classics and important new titles that you've been looking for. Take a look by visiting www.dwfed.org/books.htm and remember, books make great gifts.

CREDIT CARD CONTRIBUTIONS -- You can now make contributions to DWF with your credit card on our website. Just click on any of the "Donate" buttons for instructions.

PEAK OIL AND WORLD GOVERNMENT

by Hank Stone of Ionia, New York

The world is being run like an upside-down life raft. The raft is stable, and the status quo is delivering benefits for rich and powerful people worldwide. But "We the people" are in the water, hanging on, with our planetary and social and ecological systems unsustainable and unprotected.

During the Cold War, the world government movement lost momentum, because global thinking was out of step with the climate of fear being sold to the world public.

After the Cold War, there was a time of fresh opportunity. But decades of being marginalized had taught the democratic world government community the difficulty of our quest. We failed to argue afresh for cleaning up nuclear weapons. And we failed to engage people on emerging threats of overpopulation, climate change, pollution, and extinctions.

Now we find ourselves in a new time, with new opportunities and challenges. The world is running out of cheap oil. This development is so significant for both the US and the world that we world government people need to figure out how to relate to it. If what we are offering does not address the peak oil question in some direct way, we will be giving up a historical chance to demonstrate the relevance of world government to the question of arranging a successful human future.

In the 1960's an oil geologist named M. King Hubbard figured out that the amount of oil the US could pump each year would peak around 1970, then decline. He was ridiculed by others in the oil industry, who saw in 1970 that the rate of US oil production was higher than it had ever been! A few years later, the industry was forced to admit that US oil production had fallen, and indeed has fallen ever since, just as Hubbard predicted.

Now the idea of peak oil is well understood, and is known to apply to geographic regions, the holdings of particular oil companies, and indeed to the whole world's oil production. But there has been controversy about when peak oil will occur. Geologists working for oil companies and governments are under pressure to report that peak oil is a long ways out -- perhaps 20 years away. OPEC countries, for example, get the right to pump more oil by overstating their oil reserves. Economists working for governments assume that all the oil required will be made available by the "invisible hand" of the market. Politicians are inclined to accept the economists' views -- why borrow trouble?

However, retired oil geologists are saying peak oil is upon us now -- in 2005, 2006, or in 2007. Furthermore, China is importing more and more oil, so an explosion of oil prices may occur even before the production peak itself.

Peak oil doesn't mean the world will have run out of oil, but does mean "The Party's Over" (title of a book by Richard Heinberg): the underpinnings of the extraordinary wealth of Western Civilization will fail. The loss will affect agriculture, which relies on fossil fuels for powering tractors, trucks, irrigation, fertilizers, and pesticides -- not to mention food transport, processing, packaging, refrigeration, and retailing.

The argument is made that cheap oil is the reason the world's population was able to expand to the present 6.4 billion people. We are setting up a game of musical chairs for the survival of the human race. The comfortable way of life we have come to know depends on being able to drive our cars, have goods shipped and trucked from other places, heat our homes, and power industries to employ us and provide services.

Wind, solar, geothermal, tidal and new hydropower, though growing fast, now amount to less than 1% of total energy available to the U.S. Oil is 40%. All the fossil fuels (oil, coal, and natural gas) total 85% of energy.

With enough time to prepare, it's reasonable to think the U.S. can power down its economy, encourage a smaller population, develop a renewable energy industry, and adjust. But we are essentially out of time, and have an administration in Washington that sees access to oil as a military question.

Assuming we accept this grim peak oil assessment, what do we world government people have to contribute to the solution? I would argue that we are ahead of most people in that we have given some thought to our future needs. We do not want nuclear weapons to be used as part of rebalancing geopolitical power. We don't favor invasion and occupation of oil-rich countries. We want a plan to get to a balance between population and resources (including food, fresh water, and energy). We want both justice and order to be maintained, as we deal with the uncertainty of the future.

Knowing this, we should sponsor conferences that bring together the learned and the wise to work on pieces of a global get-well plan.

The life-raft is upside down. We are in the water. Peak oil is a giant wave, and we can see it coming. If we ignore it, it will do only harm. But if there is a way to position ourselves and the raft just so, the momentum of the wave could just turn the raft right side up.

Note: Professor Daniel Kammen, Director Renewable & Appropriate Energy Laboratory at the University of California -- Berkeley, spoke on related subjects before the the Marin County Chapter of the World Affairs Council of Northern California on 1 December. He noted that when natural petroleum has peaked and gradually been exhausted, it may account for some two trillion barrels of oil.

On the other hand, after visiting the tarsands region of northern Alberta, Kammen reported that those tarsands, along with the Orinoco tarsands in Venezuela, may contain as much as 15 trillion gallons of oil.

Nevertheless, it would take much more energy to extract oil from tarsands than, say, from under the sand of Arabia. One suggestion has been to "cook" out the hydrocarbons using nuclear fission on the ore deposits, but then one wonders about the effects on the environment.

IS THE U.S. GOVERNMENT BASED ON CHRISTIANITY?

In the United States, one often hears, especially from extremist clerics, that the country was founded on Judeo-Christianity. Nothing could be further from the truth. Instead of authoritarian societies ruled by monarchs and clerics who ascribed laws to ancient tracts considered sacred, the U.S. inherited democratic features from Athens in ancient Greece, and republican features from the Roman Republic. Its secular features resulted from the liberating ideas of the 18th Century Enlightenment.

The Founders of the United States in the 1770s and 1780s remembered only too well the bloody inter-Christian wars of Europe in the previous centuries. They insisted that our government would be secular, without any religious preferences (such as then existed in virtually every nation).

Although many of the early Americans were Christians (of differing denominations), the United States of America was formed with a secular government, and its Constitution made no reference to any deity. In fact, its Article V declared that a religion could never be made a qualification for any public office in the United States. Furthermore, its 1st Amendment declared that there could be no established religion [official religion financed by the citizen-taxpayer] or governmental restriction of one's religious (and, by extension, on one's non-religious) beliefs.

The text in the U.S. Bill of Rights banning any official religion was based partly on Virginia's Declaration of Rights in June 1776. In 1786 Virginia passed an implementing law drafted by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, in the face of Patrick Henry's insistence that the Church of England (now the Episcopal Church) remain the official religion, with its buildings and clergy paid for by the citizen-taxpayers. Within thirty years all of the original 13 states had given up their official religions.

Christian fundamentalists, including Baptists, some of whom are now clamoring for tearing down the wall separating church and state and even for assassinating foreign leaders, would have been a deprived minority if the principles of a secular government with separation of church and state had not been instituted at the founding of the U.S. federation.

The fact of no state religion was confirmed in the Treaty of Peace and Friendship between the United States of America and the Bey and Subjects of Tripoli of Barbary [present day Libya]. Negotiated in Tripoli by Consul General Joel Barlow in November 1796 at the end of George Washington's administration and ratified **unanimously** by the Senate during that of John Adams, it declares:

"Article 11. "As the government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion -- as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility of Musselmen [Muslims] -- and as the said states never have entered into any war or act of hostility against any Mahometan [Islamic] nation, it is declared by the parties, that no pretext arising from religious

opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries."

Some insist that the United States is a Christian nation and seek to establish a Christian theocracy here because its founders were Christian. However, a close examination of the facts would reveal that Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Benjamin Franklin, John Hancock, Alexander Hamilton, even Lafayette were not traditional Christians but Free Masons, Deists, or Unitarians. In fact, Adams wrote that the governments of the original states were "founded on the natural authority of the people alone, without a pretense of miracle or mystery."

Activists of all shades should take note. The future democratic world federation must have no official religion or religious laws but should allow peaceful proponents of religions, cults, ideologies and other beliefs to practice, so long as they are respectful of each other and of non-believers.--J.O.S.

"South America" continued from page 3

of the European dream of global peace and democracy through federal integration of the world.

Nowadays, nobody who counts in Europe seems to realize that steps towards the democratic unity of the planet that the E.U. represents must be globally extended or perish. Europeans don't seem to understand that economic and political agreements with Latin America and other countries are the best strategy to combat the growth of American hegemony. In fact, an extended and unarmed federation led by Europe may be the only way to peacefully prepare the way toward a democratic world federation.

Eroded by European indifference, American arrogance, and its own nationalism, the prognosis for South America, especially as it relates to the democratic integration of the world, is not good.

"Dekanawidah" continued from page 8

Benjamin Franklin, as one of the Founding Brothers at the Convention, previously in 1754 had proposed the *Albany Plan of Union* for the colonies. He had drawn inspiration from the Iroquois and was not hesitant in reminding his fellow colonists that:

"It would be a strange thing if Six Nations of ignorant savages should be capable of forming a scheme for such a union and be able to execute it in such a manner as that it has subsisted for ages and appears indissoluble, and yet that a like union should be impracticable for ten or a dozen English colonies, to whom it is more necessary and must be more advantageous, and who cannot be supposed to want an equal understanding of their interests."

Dekanawidah deserves the undying gratitude and the admiration of the American people, yet he is ignored in our schoolbooks and therefore is all but unknown to most Americans. We should reverse this neglect and put this man among the ranks of our great predecessors, alongside Pericles, Locke, Franklin, Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison and the others.

"World Service Corps" continued from page 1

in the sixth year, one million Americans, or 0.6 of 1% of those aged 18-60-plus, would voluntarily serve in their choice of the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps, Habitat for Humanity, Head Start, Doctors Without Borders, Red Cross, International Rescue Committee, OxFam, State Conservation Corps, etc.

Why would Americans volunteer for the WSC? Because they enjoy serving, like playing on great teams, and prefer building over wrecking. The proposed legislation would also offer simple, cost-effective federal financial incentives to volunteers.

Upon completing service, WSC members would receive tuition assistance for community or state college, equivalent educational loan pay off, or even an investment in Medical or IRA accounts, which would be transferable to relatives. This mini GI Educational Bill of Rights would give do-good governmental and non-governmental organizations the mix of enthusiastic, experienced, can-do Americans, that they need to make the world safer and better.

John Kennedy wanted the Peace Corps to put a million volunteers (PCVs) into the world. Then, he felt, it would become a significant force for bettering the world and America. Today, one of America's best and most cost effective programs has only about 177,000 returning PCVs. The proposed World Service Corps legislation calls for recruiting up to a million volunteers, That is a million of our most cost-effective resources (our citizens) dealing with and learning from world and domestic problems. It does so at an annual cost (stipend plus incentives) that is less than 1/10th of what it costs to maintain each of our military personnel, which is soaring past \$500,000 when supplemental and off-budget costs are added. What a huge, long-run savings in cost and blood!

Sure, a million WSC members would physically improve the

world, but more importantly, they'd do so by working shoulder-to-shoulder with people in all parts of the world. As a result, Americans would be directly exposed to the needs of the global village. Hopefully, they would then bring that enlightened perspective home to the world's superpower, whose actions can improve or destroy large parts of the world, .

Only about 15% of Americans have passports. Many of them have only corporate, or Club Med, world experiences. The WSC would expose more Americans to the classroom of world needs, so that their voting decisions are based on real life experiences, rather than on forgettable TV commercials designed for couch potatoes.

Imagine if the WSC had been running for years. Its incentives would have inspired more states to start Conservation Corps. The day Katrina struck, thousands of those new and expanded state Conservation Corps, plus thousands of volunteers with the Red Cross, Americorps, Habitat, Doctors Without Borders, International Rescue Committee, etc., would have been moving into Mississippi and Louisiana.

We need peaceful, productive Special Forces to handle today's special needs, as well as to reduce terrorist recruitment.

The World Service Corps www.worldservicecorps.us needs your support. Before the next hurricane or earthquake, or terrorist act, citizens need to enlighten local, state, and federal politicians, so they will enact the WSC legislation to send a million can-do Americans into the world's classroom of needs.

Dwayne Hunn, former Peace Corps Volunteer in Bombay, India, is Executive Director of People's Lobby Inc. and sponsor of the World Service Corps. He encourages anyone interested in this idea to sign the petition at the website listed above. This article appeared in the Marin Independent Journal on 23 September.

This Holiday Season, Give the Gift of Peace

Help us share the knowledge that can lead to a just and sustainable world by supporting the Democratic World Federalists.

Yes, I'd like to:

- become a Supporter of D.W.F.;**
- renew my subscription to D.W.F.; and/or**
- make a gift enabling the following to become D.W.F. Supporters (provide info. below).**

GIFT SUBSCRIPTION INFO:

Name: _____ Address: _____ E-mail: _____

Our Supporters receive our publication, *Toward Democratic World Federation*, and (for those with e-mails) timely updates on news and policies relevant to the governing of our world. Remember, we also offer a free copy of *One World Democracy* to all Supporters anywhere in the world that make contributions of US\$100/Euro 85 and above.

I've enclosed a donation of: \$50; \$100; \$250; \$500; \$1,000; \$2,500; Other \$
(or Euro equivalent where US \$100 = Euro 85) -- All contributions are tax deductible to the extent allowed by law.

Mail checks or money orders payable to the **Democratic World Federalists** to
55 New Montgomery St., #225, San Francisco, CA 94105

MY INFORMATION:

Name: _____ Phone: (_____) _____

Address: _____ Fax: (_____) _____

_____ E-mail: _____

DEKANAWIDAH -- CREATIVE GENIUS OF THE IROQUOIS

by James Adams of San Francisco


The name "Iroquois" refers to a language. The indigenous peoples who spoke this language lived in the vicinity of the eastern Great Lakes. It was a spoken language only, never written down until after the English-speaking colonists arrived and put Roman letters to the sounds of Iroquois.

Like many tribes in America before the European invasion, the tribes who spoke Iroquois carried out incessant warfare among themselves. One man changed this. His name, spelled in Roman letters, was **Dekanawidah** (sometimes Deganawidah). This man conceived the idea of forming the Iroquois-speaking tribes into a federation, where no tribe would make war on the others.

He traveled from one tribe to another and in 1570 persuaded the leaders of the tribes -- five at first, then six -- to join together in a federation, the world's first. (Let's note here that an alliance is not the same thing as a **federation**. Alliances are formed either to initiate an aggressive attack or to defend against one. A federation is formed to stop internecine warfare between the federation's members.)

With the combined strength of the warriors from all the Iroquois tribes, there were none of the surrounding tribes who could match them. After achieving lasting peace among themselves, the Iroquois went on to form alliances with tribes in neighboring territories. When the English and French arrived,

they found much of what is now southeastern Canada and north-eastern United States, under the control of the Iroquois. At the same time, the Europeans found something else: the idea of federation. The English settlers adopted this idea, and after their successful revolt against the English monarchy, they incorporated federalism as their mode of organization. The 13 colonies became the United States of America, with a federal system of government.



The five figures on the Hiawatha Belt memorialize the Great Peace between the 5 original Iroquois Nations. (Who became the 6 Nations after receiving the Tuscarora into the League.)

The word "democracy" is a Greek word, and the colonists were familiar with the practice of voting, one that originated in Athens in the time of Pericles. They knew, too, that the Greek city-states, each of which practiced participant democracy and voting, had sunk from their height of power and glory because of incessant conflicts between the city-states. The Greeks failed to federate -- a move which could have brought them peace -- and proceeded instead with their own self-destruction through internecine wars.

The men at the U.S. Constitutional Convention, with the examples of voting from Greece, and federation from the Iroquois, put together a democratic federation, which became the world's first lasting democracy, one which -- despite a civil war -- became a model of democratic governance in the eyes of the world.

continued on page 6

Toward Democratic World Federation

"World Peace with Justice through Democratically Enacted & Enforceable World Law"

Vol. 14 No. 4
Autumn 2005

DEMOCRATIC WORLD FEDERALISTS

55 New Montgomery St., Suite 225
San Francisco, CA 94105-3421
Phone & Fax: 1-415-227-4880,
E-mail: dwfed@dwfed.org
URL: www.dwfed.org

Nonprofit Org.
U. S. Postage
PAID
San Francisco, CA
Permit No 11368

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

Table of Contents

DWF Refines Purposes & Objectives	1
World Service Corps	1
Parallel Global Governance	2
South America	3
Objections to World Government Considered	4
Peak Oil	5
U.S., a Christian Nation?	6

"Individual governments need laws creating a separation of corporations from state. Just as religion must be separated from government in order to have a free society, corporations must be separated from government in order to have an effective democracy." -- One World Democracy

