

**ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT, DR. HUGH J. SCHONFIELD,
AT THE OPENING OF THE PARLIAMENT OF THE
MONDCIVITAN REPUBLIC,
IN THE TEMPLE OF PEACE AT CARDIFF, 26 AUGUST, 1963**

Seven years ago this week, in this noble hall of the Temple of Peace at Cardiff, capital city of the ancient Principality of Wales, a very young nation solemnly adopted its Constitution as an independent self-governing people.

Some of you who are here to-day, like my wife and myself, will have vivid recollections of that occasion, and will feel how appropriate it is after a sabbath of years that we should meet here again to renew our vision, examine our experiences and plan for the future.

I am deeply moved that it should be my privilege to be standing where I stood in August 1956, delivering the Opening Address as I did then in faith and hope, and now most thankful that I have been allowed to see so much of fulfilment. In 1956 we had our citizens in 32 countries. Now it is 60. We had not begun to come under our own Parliamentary government. Now it is our second Parliament which meets here, and our first Government created at Vienna in 1959 is giving an account of itself.

-We Mondcivitan are still a young nation. In these days it is no unusual circumstance that a people should gain its independence. But when we held our Constituent Assembly something happened which was unprecedented in human history. There was brought into being de facto not a territorial state but a Commonwealth of World Citizens. Here was a people with a world distribution, composed, of individuals of many lands and diverse races, which sought and achieved a national status in order to give concrete political expression, to the ideal of world unity, and to create an impartial agency for the service of all mankind.

The late Secretary-General of the United Nations once declared, "Still the nation remains the highest fully organised form for the life of peoples," We have given that truth a new dimension and significance. We chose nationhood, not for any selfish ends, not for our own security or prosperity, not to acquire and exercise power. We took the form and attributes of a nation to pioneer a way of evolution from state loyalty to world loyalty.

It was a bold, imaginative and far-reaching decision, which broke through the hard crust of traditional sectional nationalism even more profoundly than the organisation of the United Nations. It represented a design, formulated twenty-five years ago, seven years before the inception of the United Nations, which when carried fully into effect could help to release the soul of man from servitude to prejudice, hostility and self-interest, and liberate him to embark on developing an integrated and harmonious planetary society more worthy of human dignity and skill.

Our unique enterprise demonstrated the right of free men and women - free in spirit - to revolt into sanity, not by setting themselves in violent, or even non-violent, opposition to contemporary political authority, but by the labour of 'their own hands and minds building the prototype of a peaceful world community capable of inspiring international co-operation and goodwill.

Our calling was not to anarchy, nor to any kind of dictatorship, Neither was it to any bureaucratic interpretation of democracy. It was a call to a polity of persons, an organic association of partner-citizens. The Mondcivitan Republic, a republic of world citizens,

has parliamentary representation; but it has no political parties or a party line. We have moved on beyond the 'isms'.

Yet although our structure is in many respects novel, as it had to be for our distinctive purpose, our government is as real as any other which exists. And you, the Deputies to our Parliament, who have come here at material cost and sacrifice, in some instances from remote parts of the world, have been duly elected by your fellow Mondcivitans in your constituencies.

From the beginning we have proceeded in accordance with internationally recognised custom and usage. The terms we employ, republic, nation, parliament, government, ministers, citizens, do not have to be expressed in print by anyone between inverted commas, as if their authenticity was open to question. These terms are used by us validly and constitutionally, and no people on earth can use them with a better right. The only term to which we are not entitled, and which we never use, is that of state, since this would require that we functioned in a separate country of our own, which as world citizens we cannot do. In the words of our Constitution, "the earth is our homeland."

If it is said that we are in advance of our time, we acknowledge this, but not as an objection or a criticism. Some elements in every generation must be in advance of the time. Otherwise there would be no incentive to go forward. There would be stagnation and death. But change takes place rapidly nowadays, and the novel very quickly becomes the commonplace.

A major cause of the world's present distresses is that we are at a moment in history when there is required of us a more profound alteration in our relationships, in our attitudes towards the family of mankind, in the character of our social and political institutions, than at any previous period. Confronted with the imperative necessity to adapt ourselves, the more sentient and informed are aware how far we are behind the time in almost everything except scientific and technological development. The tools are in our hands; but shall we use them as aids to further evolution or as the means of self-destruction?

It is evident that mankind has progressed at different rates in different connections. In social and economic practice we are now seeking to apply a good deal that was advanced thinking nearly a hundred and fifty years ago. In political and international relations we are beginning to bring into operation what was proposed by men like Hugo Grotius more than three hundred years ago. But the greatest time-lag is in the ethical sphere, where we have not yet been able to attain to the standards defined upwards of two thousand five hundred years ago. What therefore should be chiefly concerning us is how best we may bring forward what is most in arrears, in order to avert an overwhelming catastrophe. It is of little consequence in this respect which nation first sets foot on the moon; but it may well tip the scales on the side of life instead of death that some nation should endeavour to give exemplary expression to principles of equity and nobility.

Here we are up against the difficulty inherent in the modern equation of nations with states. It is like the story of the rich young ruler in the Gospel, who had to turn sorrowfully from the path of service because he had great possessions. To an encouraging extent the specialised agencies of the United Nations have been giving a lead; but the identification of important member-states with particular ideologies, as well as with extensive territories, has slowed down further advance almost to a standstill. It is vital that a nation should arise able to surmount these obstacles, and to lend a hand in removing them and get things moving again. Otherwise friction and exasperation could

well come to such a pitch that to clear a path at all costs one or other of the contending parties would risk blowing everything up.

As one eminent statesman might put it; "When two heavy trucks are jammed side by side on a narrow road, so that neither can pass the other, the drivers will not only exchange jokes."

Certainly it is no joke that the trucks are loaded with the most lethal weapons ever contrived. No wonder uninvolved bystanders are alarmed! No wonder there are anxious peace and world government movements! No wonder there are demonstrating nuclear disarmers! No wonder youth to whom the future belongs as of right struggles against the threat of imminent death!

Yet panic is the worst counsellor, and impatience can produce no effective remedy. There is need for urgency; but what is to be done must be done with calm intelligence and insight, as if we had all the time in the world, and with a conviction which is swayed neither by intensity of emotion nor by unreasoning fear. We may remind ourselves of what was said by the prophet of old: "In quietness and confidence shall be your strength."

We should realise, to begin with, that the task confronting us is initially not one for great multitudes. Because to many of us it is so obviously right that war should be abolished we imagine that the vast majority of mankind not only must feel the same, but be ready to join with us in bringing this about. We hear talk of peace-loving nations. So we tend to be impressed by numbers, and commonly speak of winning the support of masses. Quite often, when I have been explaining about the Mondcivitan Republic, the first question put to me is, "How many of you are there?" As if the answer would make evident what value should be attached to our enterprise and whether it would be likely to succeed. Numerical strength is by no means to be despised, especially when it represents wholehearted devotion, but it is not in itself the test either of . worth or capacity.

If we are not to delude ourselves and invite frustration and despondency we shall recognise that a very substantial part of mankind is either in ignorance or near ignorance that a world crisis exists. There are millions for whom the very word World has almost no meaning. What matters to them supremely is the business of daily existence, to have paid employment, to obtain enough to eat, to suffer a little less.

Where better conditions prevail there is much heedlessness, perhaps because hope deferred maketh the heart sick, and because consciousness has as yet risen little above the level of personal and material concerns. The chief political influence is party and partisan propaganda, appealing to self-interest in the guise of national prosperity and prestige, and too often making capital out of prejudices and the instinct for self-preservation.

Most men are still fully prepared to kill others for causes which they deem sufficient, and which may or may not be glorified as patriotic, righteous, or simply inevitable. Somewhere in the world they are doing it all the time. The unease which is chiefly felt about war nowadays arises from consideration of the heavily diminished chances of survival, not merely for armies, but for whole populations, whole countries, whole civilizations. But even so, a large measure of tolerance of the new weapons of mass destruction has been procured by describing them as deterrents and a means of defence.

At this stage, therefore, we must not expect that the peoples of the world can be the active means of their own salvation. They are not educated for it. They are not organised

for it. They cannot even be reached on a substantial scale except by the consent of those who control the channels of communication.

For the most part the voices we hear are those of the few who wield authority in the name of the many. We attach great weight to the pronouncements of leading statesmen on international issues because their policies are able to commit whole peoples and their military and economic resources. The more powerful the state the more keenly we listen. A private individual may have something to urge far more constructive, far more consistent with the real interests of humanity; but he will be fortunate indeed if his words are allowed to reach more than a tiny fraction of the world's population. Unless he is known to have a large and influential following he will get little publicity.

The whole state structure of the world community is highly competitive and self-centred, riddled with suspicion and antagonism. The political atmosphere is very easily charged with emotion on the surface of the stream of events, while the political undercurrents are devious and highly dangerous for the unwary. The wiser statesmen, undoubtedly, do want a world living in amity and freed from the scourge of war. But they are unable to bring it about unaided, because all that is comprehended in considerations of state imposes restrictions on them.

The nearest they have been able to come in transcending these limitations is the organisation of the former League of Nations and the present United Nations, which have instituted agencies for a more universal approach to common needs and problems. These have worked advantageously in many fruitful fields, and made a notable contribution to a sense of corporate responsibility.

But the United Nations, as I stated in 1944, could not be expected to deal effectively with the graver issues of war and international conflict unless harmony between the Great Powers could be guaranteed. Without such harmony it was, in my opinion, the gravest error of judgment to build into the United Nations the principle of collective security, to conceive of it as the League of Nations with teeth in it. Whatever might involve the United Nations as an organisation in the power-political struggle could only hinder the growth of respect for world law, world institutions, and human rights.

So long as any of the Great Powers who are the permanent members of the Security Council, or indeed any state or combination of states, is able to follow its own devices in its external relations the term Collective Security has no substance.

This is clearly seen by the advocates of a World Federal Government, and by those who want the United Nations to be in supreme charge of the maintenance of world law and order. ' But they do not tell us how to induce the Great Powers in particular to subordinate themselves to a world authority. The trend at present is decidedly not towards a United States of the World, but towards the development of regional associations which may help to restrict the progress of the forest fire of ideological conflict and offer some hope of extinguishing it. We have attempts to formulate a Monroe Doctrine for the several continents,

Because many of us as individuals so long to hear a higher political voice speaking with calming power and compelling authority, and because a certain warrant is found in the status accorded to the organisation and some of its officials in the Charter, we incline to regard the United Nations as something which exists in its own right, detached from and independent of the states who are its members. This it is not. But to an extent our feeling is justified, because thanks to the great care, the dedication and breadth of vision

of those who have served as Secretary-General and in other key capacities, there has been emerging despite all setbacks the expression of a conciliatory supra-nationalism. In keeping with this there is favoured in some quarters the recognition of a United Nations citizenship.

The signs and portents are not all gloomy, but much effort is needed to swing the United Nations away from the concept of collective security, from all association with might in which misguided rulers have put their trust. Let the United Nations be totally free from the taint of militarism! Let it have nothing in common with war or the implements of war! Let there be no United Nations force, no so-called policemen! Let the members agree that the organisation shall be converted from an agency for peace-keeping to one of peacemaking.

We could have a United Nations which would be a kind of ombudsman for mankind, with emphasis on activities of reconciliation and positive peace-promotion. I would remind you here of what I said earlier, of the vital need in international relationships to bring forward what is most in arrears, the acceptance and exercise of ethical standards of conduct. It is in this respect that the United Nations stands to gain, indeed, all states of the world, all mankind, from the creation of the Mondcivitan Republic. Increasingly we are helping to make the prospect of equitable world institutions, functioning by a general desire and consent, come within the bounds of practical realisation.

On a miniature scale, but in a world-wide context, we have fashioned a united nation of individuals of East and West, of various races, faiths, cultures and occupations, prepared to commit themselves to the principles, obligations and responsibilities of world citizenship. We have established a commonwealth without territory, without armament, without any partisanship or motive of self-interest, devoted to duties of impartial service and mediation, furnishing an example to all nations.

To assist in putting our world affairs on an altogether more promising basis we are seeking to earn from the governments of the states a progressive recognition of our character and worth, not by trumpeting our virtues, but by quiet and helpful initiatives deserving intelligent consideration. We want them to feel that they are receiving from us encouragement to act with nobility and with courageous magnanimity, in accordance with a new universal interpretation of their highest duty.

When I was invited to be the first President of our Republic it was evident that what was chiefly expected of me was to do my utmost to get things moving in this direction. You could place no resources at my disposal. You could not pay for my time or work, or enable me to travel widely. These have been heavy handicaps; but to the best of my ability I have endeavoured not to betray your confidence. My office has kept me very busy both with internal and external matters essential to our progress, but I propose to confine my review to those activities which have a more direct bearing on the theme of this address.

Believing it to be vital in the state of international tension that opportunity should be given for a rational reappraisal of our world situation in view of the great changes which have taken place over the past half century, political, social, economic and scientific, and questing for the machinery to bring this about, I drafted in the summer of 1960 a proposal that a third Hague Peace Conference should be convened with the co-operation of the Specialised Agencies of the United Nations. The former Hague Conferences took place in 1899 and 1907. The proposal in booklet form was sent to the U.N. Secretariat and to the governments of all member-states. It was my hope that such a conference

might have been held this year, the fiftieth anniversary of the opening of the Hague Peace Palace, That hope has not been realised, in spite of the interest and approval of several states, and the support of various international organisations. But my initiative has inspired one of the governments which responded favourably, that of the Republic of Honduras, to bring to the United Nations a very fine resolution on the subject of Organising for Peace. This would have the effect of associating the U.N. much more definitely with the investigation of the causes of war and the positive promotion of peace, and builds upon much that was in the text of our Mondcivitan proposal.

I take this opportunity not only to welcome the Honduras resolution, but to commend again the convening of a third Hague Peace Conference to discuss constructively our major world problems, leaving aside particular disputes between states.

The dangers of radio-active fall out led me in 1961 to compose "An Urgent Call on Behalf of Humanity", in which I pointed out, and I quote, "that no government in the world has been invested with a mandate which permits it to exercise, or attempt to exercise, the power of life and death over any peoples not legitimately subject to its jurisdiction." This principle of international law excluded, among other things, "the testing of nuclear or other weapons which may be a danger to them or inflict injury upon them." Any government acting in a contrary manner was guilty of a crime against humanity.

The text of this Urgent Call was in the first instance transmitted on September 20 to the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and of the Warsaw Pact by our First Minister Donald Hanby, and later on October 9 to the United Nations Secretariat and to the Foreign Ministers of thirty-five unaligned or neutral states.

What was the result of this action? The first result later in October was that Canada, supported by twenty-four other countries, introduced a resolution, and you will note the wordings "The General Assembly of the United Nations declares that: Both concern for the future of mankind, and the fundamental principles of international law, impose a responsibility on all states concerning action which might have harmful biological consequences for the existing and future generations of peoples of other states, by increasing the levels of radio-active fall out." The resolution was adopted by a vote of 70 to 0, with 18 abstentions.

A further result was a resolution by twelve small states declaring that the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons is contrary to the laws of humanity and commits a crime against humanity. Before this resolution was debated in the General Assembly the First Secretary of the Russian Embassy called upon me at the request of Mr. Gromyko, the Soviet Foreign Minister, and subsequently on November 24 all the Warsaw Pact countries voted in favour of the resolution, which was passed, with most of the countries we had approached voting for it.

As regards particular situations, I may mention that in August 1961 impartial views towards a solution of the problem of Germany and Berlin were directed by me to the governments of the four Occupation Powers and later released to the Press. In Eastern and Western circles they were considered useful, and they would still appear to be the fairest and most constructive so far put forward.

The Cuban crisis of October 1962 was an exceptionally grave one. It seemed to me to require an approach that could be equally helpful to Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Krushchev, not attempting to deal with the actions of either side or to criticise them, but rather

strengthening their determination to reach a peaceful settlement. As your President I wrote to them in identical terms, and it was a great satisfaction that Mr. Krushchev, in his letter to Mr. Kennedy of October 28, used the argument of my communication in almost the same words. I also appreciated deeply the note expressing gratitude which I received from the White House.

What I have wished to illustrate in drawing more public attention to these interventions is not my personal services, but what has been made possible by the existence of the Mondcivitan Republic. If our character had not been what it is, that of a Servant-Nation, and had we not had a government able to have dealings with fellow-governments at the appropriate levels and in the manner prescribed by protocol, it is very doubtful whether our efforts would have met with the same reception and response, I hope we shall take this to heart, because it is important not so much to ourselves as to mankind that our Presidents, Ministers, Deputies and diplomatic personnel should be accorded the courtesies due to their offices. We are not place and title hunters, but sincere people, applying ourselves to the best of our competence to bring to any position with which we may be entrusted the qualities and the equipment which it demands.

Very few of us had previous experience or training, and I am not going to pretend that in our first four years under Parliamentary Government, and with all the novelty of our enterprise as a , commonwealth of world citizens, it has been easy to fulfil what was expected of us. Some offices were not sufficiently clear and defined, and we must not forget or fail to honour the fact, that all the individuals concerned laboured without payment, giving up in the cause of humanity much of the rest and relaxation to which they were entitled when their normal work was done.

In the name of our people everywhere I would express our very deep gratitude to our First Minister, Donald Hanby, for the magnificent way he has measured up to the responsibilities laid upon his youthful shoulders. He has not spared himself in any way in carrying the burden of our administration and giving me every possible support. Certain other ministers have greatly assisted by their zeal and conscientious devotion. If I may name two, I would pay tribute to Nguyen-Huu at Saigon and David Btresh at Buenos Aires. The former, exceptionally, has had to run his department under the most trying and even dangerous conditions, and has proved himself to be a man not only of outstanding ability and high integrity, but of great personal courage.

When the reports are laid before you, the Deputies of this second Parliament of the Mondcivitan Republic, it will be proper to think of where we have failed and how we may do better. But I would invite you at no time to let it be absent from your minds how very much has been accomplished with totally inadequate time and infinitesimal money. I can state here, and all who are listening to me may marvel, that putting together everything we have received throughout the past seven years since our Constitution, the combined sum does not amount to one tenth of the cost of a single long-range bomber or intercontinental missile. The largest contribution, a little less than £5000, has come to us only recently from the International Arbitration League, when this long-established and successful society founded by the Nobel Peace Prize winner Sir William Cremer, took the decision to become incorporated with us.

Of course it is quite disgraceful that terrific and astronomical finances should be spent on the weapons of war, and that it should be so hard to obtain even a fraction far the promotion of peace. But I am afraid it is typical of the false set of values which is the greatest evil of our time. And this is why we now live a life of fear under the shadow of

the magnadeath of the mushroom cloud.

Speaking from this Temple of Peace and Health, I wish to say that we citizens of the Mondcivitan Republic in sixty countries believe with all our hearts that evil can and must be overcome by good. We are pledged, individually and collectively, to stand for and work for the good, to seek and find it in others, to make it operative for the peace and well-being of all mankind.

We are not blind to the risks or to the obstacles, and we do not foolishly view the world through rose-tinted spectacles. But we are blessed not only with faith, but with clarity of purpose, with the realisation of exactly what we have to undertake and achieve. Already with small numbers and slender means we have made some impression on seemingly impregnable and unyielding attitudes. Through the efforts of this Parliament, through the efforts of all who shall join us, help us, and co-operate with us, we shall unbar and open wide the door of hope for all the children of men.
