

From Holocaust to the High Road: A Call to Witnesses

By Michael Diamond © 2012

This work may be freely shared, provided that authorship is attributed as above noted.

Behind the history books we wrote to make us appear wise when we were not, behind the puffery of our media, and behind the platitudes of American political leaders, there's a truth we dare no longer evade; we have done harm to ourselves and to the world on an unimaginable scale. Our actions have caused what should best be described as the great destruction, a holocaust of immense proportions.

It was set in motion in the spring of 1945 and continues to this day. Unless stopped, the devastation will worsen. Within the United States, the great destruction brought increases in diseases and disabilities. It has caused widespread declines in mental acuity. On a global level, the great destruction is fast making Earth an uninhabitable planet marked by privation and war.

To most people, the year 1945 is too far back to matter. I disagree. That year, we began forging the surplus of our productivity into the steel of weaponry. That year, the dream of planetary governance was subverted. That year we started delivering our children into a world that we allowed corporate America to make toxic. Only by turning our attention to that year can we see exactly where we erred and how to make the necessary course corrections.

The framers of the United States Constitution created a civil emergency provision for us to use in just this situation. That little-known provision is the domestic violence clause in Article IV, Section 4. They would have us use it now to wrest control from corporate hands, make peace and justice the norm, bring healing to the people, and environmental stability to the Earth.

The purpose of this writing is to show how the domestic violence clause can be used to get us off the low road to further destruction and onto the high road that leads to health, peace, freedom, and sustainability. A pivotal role will be played by our eyewitnesses to the great destruction, those of us who were born during or before the 1930s.

General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the supreme commander of all Allied Forces in Europe in the Second World War, ordered that the horrors of the Nazi concentration camps be photographed and statements be taken of witnesses and survivors. He understood that meticulous documenting would be necessary for Americans to comprehend what had happened. And he knew that the Nazi Holocaust, without such evidence, could be challenged and even denied as being unbelievable.

In our time, the harms that we've done to ourselves in the great destruction are near unbelievable, and the denial is massive, active, and commercially fueled. Little, if any, progress can be made without our eyewitnesses coming forward. They remember American public health before it was traded for corporate profits.

The Great Destruction Globally

The great destruction, globally, was launched by Harry S. Truman, President of the United States from 1945 to 1953. Until he became President upon the death of Franklin Roosevelt, Truman's focus had been on narrow projects with easily measured parameters. In the U.S. Senate, he was known for careful scrutiny of military contracts. Before that, as an administrator in Jackson County, Missouri, his focus had been mainly on modernizing roads and overseeing the construction of public buildings.

By contrast, there were leaders in both major political parties who had given critical thought to complex global issues. Wendell Wilkie, the Republican candidate for President in 1940, was one. His book, *One World*, was a call for giving respect to the people of all nations, no matter their color, their religion, their economic system, or their form of government. The public response to *One World* was overwhelming. Simon and Schuster published the book in April of 1943 without giving it prepublication advertising. Within eighteen months, they reported, over three million copies had been sold and *One World* had been "translated into virtually every foreign language."

Another such figure was Henry A. Wallace, Franklin Roosevelt's third term vice-president. World War II ended in the summer of 1945. Military analysts agree that the defeat of Nazi Germany had been made possible by the incredible resistance of the Soviet Union. Some twenty million Russians died in that war effort, and the USSR was left economically devastated. Nevertheless, fear that other countries might choose socialism or communism drove some Americans to call for war against the Soviet Union. Henry Wallace stood up against that call to war. "Criminal" and "un-American" is how, in a speech on September 13, 1945, he described, those who instigated for war against Russia. Choosing belligerency against the Soviet Union instead of accord, he said to a cheering audience at Madison Square Garden in New York City on September 12, 1946, will not determine whether we live in one world or in two worlds. The issue will then become "whether we live at all."

President Roosevelt died in the afternoon of April 12, 1945. Harry Truman was sworn in as President that evening. Roosevelt had never spoken to Truman about his four years of direct, personal communications with Joseph Stalin. Roosevelt never cautioned Truman about the myopic anti-Soviet bias in the State Department. On taking office, Truman knew nothing about the atomic bomb and the Manhattan Project. In fact, the two men had hardly spoken. The new owner of a candy store would have been given more

direction on running the store from the old owner than Franklin gave to Harry before his taking over, in wartime, the presidency of the United States.

Truman rebuffed advisors who urged him to consider views similar to those of Wendell Wilkie and Henry Wallace. Instead of allowing other nations to freely choose between capitalism, socialism, and communism, Truman falsely charged the Soviet Union with attempting to spread communism by force throughout the world. In the words of Frank Roberts, a British *charge d'affaires* assigned to Moscow in 1946, Harry Truman shunned the high road of allowing countries to decide for themselves what type of political and economic systems they favored. Instead, he took the low road by misrepresenting the Soviets as a military threat to the world, a threat that the United States had to meet with force.

In fact, except for the Soviet Union itself and countries along its borders, Joseph Stalin allowed capitalists to exert near total control in the rest of the world. Just as he had acquiesced in the 1927 Shanghai massacre of communists by General Chiang Kai-shek, so did Stalin refuse, in the late 1940s, to help Greek communists when they were decimated by superior arms and air power supplied to a fascist Greek government by England and the United States.

The false pretense of a Soviet military threat, said Prof. Arnold Offner (Lafayette College), in the concluding paragraph of *Another Such Victory*, 2002, became the “modus operandi of successive administrations and the United States for the next two generations.”

The beneficiaries of Truman’s anticommunism were large American corporations that wanted control of natural resources wherever they existed around the world. Democratic governments that resisted, like those in Guatemala, Iran, the Congo, and Chile, were labeled as communistic and were overthrown. (Guatemala for bananas, Iran for oil, the Congo for diamonds and minerals, Chile for copper) Dictators who went along with American corporate hegemony were supported. Our dictator allies included Mobutu, Laurent Kabila, Raphael Trujillo, Francois Duvalier, Suharto, Idi Amin, Sani Abacha, Anastasio Somoza, Augusto Pinochet, and the Shah of Iran.

The great destruction brought death to tens of millions of people and suffering to many times that number around the world. Survivors remember the duplicity of the United States in causing the harms. Most Americans know nothing of such matters. Our government operated mostly in secret. On occasion, some small bit of information about our nefariousness surfaces. That kernel of significant information, however, is erased daily by a media, beholden to the major economic interests, that constantly iterates only current happenings in troubled places, leaving out the historical context.

Koreans remember, even if we do not, that their nation was senselessly divided at the 38th parallel in 1945 by a military order of President Truman, who incorrectly assumed that the Russians were intending to lay claim to that country in the closing days of World War II. The division of Korea and the Korean War need not have happened.

The Viet Nam War was fought following our refusal to allow scheduled free elections in that country. Central Africa was destabilized (and remains destabilized to this day) by our murder of Patrice Lumumba, the first democratically elected Prime Minister of the Republic of the Congo. The list is long. Arming Muslims to fight Russians in Afghanistan was idiocy that changed the character and dynamics of Islamic leadership. Destroying the democratic government of Iran and sending its secular Prime Minister, Mohammed Mossadegh, into exile was a wicked act that the Iranians will long remember.

We need to return, clear-eyed, to the time when President Truman took that low road in 1945. We are inheritors of the animosities his errors have spawned. Justice requires that we understand the resulting grievances against us. And survival requires that we take steps to build an international order based upon guaranteeing freedom and justice to all.

One of President Truman's most thoughtless decisions was the stifling of the newly formed United Nations. Before 1945, a world government was optional; after the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it was an urgent necessity. At the end of World War II, only the United States possessed atomic weapons. There was *never* a better time to entrust the world body with controlling the use of nuclear material. Instead, President Truman welcomed an arms race, proclaiming that America would always be ahead. Deprived of responsibility at that critical moment, the United Nations was denied the opportunity to mature. The dream of peace was lost.

Without a world government there was no judge to whom one could go to contest falsehoods that were the bases for aggressions. There was no army that could defend against improper use of force. Nuclear arms proliferated, and radioactive fallout from thousands of atmospheric atomic tests blanketed the Earth. Wars, genocides, and dislocations have been continuous since 1945. The Soviet Union collapsed in 1991. Now, we war endlessly against terrorism, an enemy we create with every flawed foreign policy decision and every illegal drone strike around the world.

Without a world government to interdict the trade, massive resources, having a value in the tens of trillions of dollars, have been devoted to weaponry around the globe. At the same time, the vast majority of the world's population now live in privation. Without a world government to create and enforce environmental standards, global climate changes and degradation by pollution worsen. Without international planning, the scramble for diminishing resources on a planet with an expanding population portends to be gruesome. The Worldwatch Institute Report of 1987 (at page 213) described this moment in history as unique and pivotal. No previous generation has ever been "faced with decisions that will determine whether the earth our children inherit will be inhabitable."

The corporate interests that drove the great destruction benefited enormously. In fact, compared to what they had been in 1945, corporations have become major powers. The largest of them dwarf the majority of nations.

Without a world government to regulate their activities, the imperatives of those enterprises will continue to prevail. Corporate imperatives, by law, are based upon maximizing profits to shareholders. The connection between maximizing profits and conduct appropriate to assure justice, sustainability, and survival is minimal. Only through the workings of a fully empowered world government driven by the needs of the people can there be planning for the benefit of all.

The Great Destruction Internally

The chemical industry in the United States emerged from the First World War with a mission to remake the natural world. Undertaking that task was delayed by the Great Depression and by World War II. Beginning in 1945, the industry was ready to have us all live better through chemistry.

Products made from cotton and wool were largely replaced by synthetic chemical fibers. Soap flakes and washing soda disappeared. In their place came detergents. Natural fertilizers were replaced by synthetics made from artificially produced nitrogen. Time-honored ways of dealing with insects were shelved. In their place came pesticides made of neurotoxic chemicals. Dyes from plant sources were replaced by colorings made from coal. An array of chemicals were used to enhance the taste, appearance, smell, and shelf life of foods. Plastics won out over wood, glass, and metal. Natural oils and waxes disappeared. In their place came chemicals with artificial coloring agents, preservatives, and aromas.

Were these changes universally accepted as beneficial? They were not. Some people urged caution. A few predicted that the careless use of chemicals could be calamitous. At the very least, some level of governmental oversight was appropriate. President Truman, however, in the words of Professor Offner, “lacked insight into the history unfolding around him.” (Arnold Offner, *Another Such Victory*, 2002, concluding paragraph)

Instead of scrutinizing industry as a public health responsibility of the federal government, President Truman made oversight by government near impossible. He did this by enlisting American science and technology as warriors in his global fight against communism. The drumbeat against communism, begun in 1945, rose in intensity through his first three years in office. By the time of Truman’s campaign for the presidency in 1948, Americans had been conditioned to believe that communism both abroad and at home, was a loathsome enemy.

The President’s inaugural address on January 20, 1949 was, essentially, a declaration of war. It was constructed out of half-truths, oversimplifications, and a false identification of communism with the crimes of Joseph Stalin. Out of those reckless

assumptions, came a call to oppose communism and socialism whenever and wherever they existed.

Forgetting that communism was an understandable reaction (one of many) to the destructive excesses of European capitalism in the 19th century, Truman referred to it as simply “that false philosophy.” Its overriding propensity, he said, without supplying evidence, was “attack” and “aggression.” Its purpose in the world, he said without reference to history, was to deprive people in “free countries” of their “human dignity and the right to believe in and worship God.”

“Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace,” he said. The United States must “help the free peoples of the world...to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens.” To do that would require “a wider and more vigorous application of modern science and technical knowledge.” The United States, President Truman proclaimed, is “pre-eminent among nations in the development of industrial and scientific techniques” and should use its “store of technical knowledge” in a “worldwide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom.”

Industry was thus knighted by the President to perform essential services in a holy war against communism. One would not think of needing to subject such an avatar of hope to governmental scrutiny for purposes of assuring public health.

The outpouring of chemicals into the environment was unprecedented. Some seventy thousand new ones were created every year, many of which were far beyond the genetic experience of humans. We, who were designed to deal with road dust and bee stings, were inundated with such things as plutonium, PCBs, and dioxins.

By the 1970s, over a million new chemicals had been created. The bulk of them had the capacity to diminish health and impair human functioning. They would interact with one another and cause damage in unforeseen ways. From the late 1940s, the barrage was constant.

The effects of chemical exposures became observable in the 1970s. Rates of cancer in children took an upturn. Birth defects doubled. Neurological impairments increased. Cases of asthma, especially in children living in the cities, increased. There were dramatic declines in educational skills. The declines occurred, not only among disadvantaged students, but also with “our best educated and most talented young people.” (E.D. Hirsch, Jr., *Cultural Literacy*, 1988, page 5) All of this was happening to the children of parents who had been born after 1945.

In 1986, the National Assessment of Educational Progress reported that students at all levels were more deficient than students used to be at higher-order thinking skills, abstract reasoning, and problem solving. That loss of mental acuity persists to this day.

Health was better for people who had completed their early maturation phases before 1945. Those who were born before 1940 recall few cases among their peers of cancer in children. They never heard of autism. School lunchrooms always had a table with peanut butter and jelly. No one that old recalls a single allergic reaction to peanut butter. Most people born before 1940 don't remember seeing many young people with asthma. They don't remember cases of Alzheimer's Disease. Without exception, puberty arrived at about thirteen years-of-age. Everyone recalls the occasional schoolyard fight. It was usually over with quickly and soon forgotten.

Now, there are last-wish organizations for children with cancer. Hospitals have pediatric oncology wards. Autism used to occur once in every ten thousand births. At present, autism occurs more frequently than once in every one hundred births. And there has been a similar rise in bipolar disorder since the 1950s. Alzheimer's Disease and related disorders are showing up in people in their forties and fifties. Teachers are now trained to help children survive asthmatic attacks and life-threatening reactions to peanut butter. Children, as a result of exposures to growth hormones fed to livestock and poultry, are experiencing puberty as early as five years-of-age. Early onset of puberty confounds emotional and intellectual development. Schoolyard disputes, beginning in the 1970s, started escalating into murder. Road rage and "going postal" has become common. Mass murders, once crimes of the century, are now occurring almost monthly.

The connection between chemical exposures and mental acuity is obvious. In order for the human brain to properly develop, it must undergo, from the earliest fetal stages, a series of exquisitely complex steps. Correct sequencing and exact timing are crucial. During this process, toxins even in minute quantities can interfere with that development.

The prefrontal cortex of the human brain is especially vulnerable to chemical exposures. Neuroscience writer, John D. MacArthur, describes the prefrontal cortex as the place where empathy and reasoning reign. The prefrontal cortex emerged late in human evolution and is more easily damaged by toxic exposures than the older underlying structures. When damaged, selfish and antisocial urges generated in the primitive underlying structures of the brain proceed with less than adequate regulation. That's what happens when the brain's "thinking cap," as MacArthur calls the prefrontal cortex, is compromised by toxicity.

By the 1970s, a major health crisis was upon us. The federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the various state environmental departments were created. They were run, however, by engineers and lawyers who dealt with pollution in a superficial manner. EPA and the state environmental departments needed, from the start, to be staffed and led by microbiologists. Health was rapidly unraveling at a cellular level. If microbiologists had been put in charge, they would have noticed the connection between exposures and the doubling of birth defects, the plummeting of scores on standard educational tests, and the growing functional illiteracy in the workplace and in the general population.

A new focus of environmental health research has recently surfaced. It's called developmental immunotoxicology (DIT). DIT researchers are proving the connection between chemical exposures during the in utero period and health impairments, both emotional and physical. We are never stronger than our weakest link, Dr. Grandjean and the others are saying. Put another way, all of us are critically vulnerable in those first days, weeks, and months of life. A tiny exposure at those moments and hours is all that's needed to hamper us for the remainder of our lives. As Grandjean and others are saying: it's not the dose that makes the poison, it's the timing.

The fact that DIT research is only now surfacing is a matter of consternation. Fetal vulnerability is more a truth that had been avoided than a truth recently discovered. If President Truman had not put industry beyond scrutiny, DIT research is likely to have come to light in time to have ameliorated the worst effects of the great destruction.

The great destruction at home was predicted by the renowned microbiologist, Rene Dubos. In a 1971 essay entitled "The Limits of Adaptability," he said that diseases would certainly result from chemical exposures. Worse, however, would be declines in mental abilities and "distortions of mental and emotional attributes." Continuing failure to use environmental standards that take into account our genetic limitations and sensitivities, said Dubos, could bring about development of "a form of life that will retain little of true humanness."

Historian, Barbara Tuchman, in "A Nation in Decline," (*New York Times Magazine*, August 20, 1987) recorded these telling observations: Americans are showing "deteriorating ethics, poor performance, poor thinking, and lawlessness...It does seem that the knowledge of a difference between right and wrong [the classic definition of insanity] is absent from our society, as if it had floated away on a shadowy night after the last World War."

The Domestic Violence Clause

I have looked carefully at the domestic violence clause in Article IV, Section 4 of the United States Constitution and believe that its use, by the people, is our only hope for stopping the great destruction.

Article IV, Section 4, in its entirety, reads as follows: "*The United States shall guarantee to every state in this union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and upon application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.*"

The following version clarifies that "legislature" means the state legislature. Because applications are likely to come from numerous legislatures, I have made that noun plural and placed it in bold type. Action by state governors alone is not likely. Finally, I have replaced reference to "the states" with the words "the people." The 1868

United States Supreme Court case of *Texas v. White* held that it's the people, not the states that are owed the duty of protection against domestic violence.

The clause thus reads, staying with the words in bold: **“On application of the [state] legislature[s], or the executive when (when the legislature cannot be convened) the United States shall protect the states [meaning *the people* per *Texas v. White*] against domestic violence.”** (Emphasis added)

The framers of the Constitution were clear about the meaning of “domestic violence” in Article IV, Section 4. Domestic violence was, to them, harm that the people might do to one another, harm that would be beyond the police power of the states to handle. In the eighteenth century, domestic violence took the form of insurrections. Injuries from those events mostly came from muskets.

If the framers were here today, they wouldn't hesitate to say that the chemical assaults we inflict upon each other are virulent forms of domestic violence under Article IV, Section 4. Conceptually, they would plead, there's no difference between lead projected out of a musket during a rebellion and lead from a smelter, laced with mercury, that enters a child's body and impairs her developing immune system. In fact, they would say, the terrible array of degenerative diseases caused by toxic exposures are many orders of magnitude greater than the few casualties that resulted from Shays' Rebellion (1786-1787) and the Whiskey Rebellion (1794-1795).

The crux of the domestic violence clause is overwhelming federal power, all the power necessary to halt the violence and safeguard the victims. The source of that overwhelming power is superior governmental authority, Constitutional authority granted to deal with dire emergencies. Emergency Constitutional authority overrides rights that are based in law. Emergency Constitutional authority overrides rights found elsewhere in the Constitution and overrides rights stemming from trade treaties that result in untoward environmental exposures. In essence, the domestic violence clause contains war powers to be used in peacetime for as long as there are extraordinary challenges to American health and survival.

Who determines when a condition of domestic violence exists and what shall be done about it? The Supreme Court answered those questions in 1946. Justice Frankfurter's opinion in *Colegrove v. Green* makes it clear that the courts will neither hear nor determine such matters. Those are political questions to be decided upon by the people acting through their governmental representatives.

What must the federal government do, using the domestic violence clause, to stop the violence and bring healing? In short, the government must reconfigure our activities and our institutions, gearing them to our healing and our survival. Competing interests that are based on property and corporate rights must be subsumed. A wartime analogy is appropriate.

On December 7, 1941, Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. As a result, the United States was in a war with two fronts, Europe and the Pacific. Our survival was at stake. The federal government had to mandate activities that were geared to winning World War II. Competing property and corporate rights were subsumed. For example, the American auto industry was forbidden to make passenger cars. During the war years, they were required to manufacture such things as military trucks, armored vehicles, and airplane engines.

That same federal power, under the domestic violence clause, must be used now so that all the resources of the nation become available to confront our present emergency. Below is a partial list of institutional imperatives that require reconfiguring, using the power of the domestic violence clause.

Agriculture. There needs to be a large-scale return to small family farms that produce truly organic foods by using natural methods of pest control, crop rotation, and integration of animal wastes for soil renewal. Current large corporate practices favor monocropping, with its attendant over reliance on chemical pesticides, genetically modified foods, and concentrated feedlots for livestock and dairy production. All such practices are resulting in vectors of harm and have to be stopped. Resources (financial, educational, and human) will have to be put into reclaiming the land for safe and sane farming. Large corporations cannot accomplish family farming, and only families can bring back the small towns and the cultures of cooperation that corporations displaced.

Energy. The major American corporations that pump, mine, and sell fossil fuels have to be nationalized. Their conduct for the last twenty years has been scandalous. At the same time that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has been issuing warnings, the American fossil fuel companies have funded information campaigns denying global warming and its connection to fossil fuels. At the same time, and knowing that global warming caused by the use of fossil fuels was occurring, they used their political influence to obtain favor and funding for projects that would allow the continued use of coal and oil. Big coal has the government investing in carbon capture and sequestration. Coal would continue to be burned, but the resulting carbon dioxide would be buried in pits, both on land and under the ocean floor. Big oil has us drilling through shale and fracking to obtain natural gas. Both techniques involve risks to public health, and both undermine the economic viability of the use of renewable energy sources. At this late date, any trust placed in our fossil fuel corporations is misplaced.

Health. Getting Americans back to health will require a huge governmental effort. A corps of highly trained people will have to work cooperatively, availing themselves of all existing analytical and curative disciplines. They will reduce exposures, work to prevent the onset of harm, and treat all of us when morbidity manifests. Our present health care industry cannot operate preventatively and generously in that manner. Known as allopathic medicine, it is a system that relies on profits from patentable drugs and treating end-stage diseases with expensive modalities like surgery and radiation. The Rockefeller interests interceded in the early 1900s to have laws passed in every state giving allopaths a monopoly on diagnosing illness and prescribing treatments. Since then,

allopathic medicine has abused that power by derailing and criminalizing efforts by herbalists, homeopaths, chiropractors, and individuals who tried to bring us safer and gentler ways to prevent and treat illnesses. The list of such people made into pariahs is long. Royal Raymond Rife was one. He was derailed after he cured cancer in the 1930s using safe and inexpensive light frequencies. Recently, Dr. Stanislaw Burzynski has been forced to fend off criminal prosecutions and delicensing efforts. He cured brain cancers in children without the destructive side effects of chemotherapy and radiation, just by supplying a protein that his patients required. “Amazing, impressive, and unbelievable” are the adjectives used by Dr. Nicholas Patronas, a neuroradiologist to describe Burzynski’s work. (Transcript, May 24, 1993, Texas State Board of Medical Examiners, In the Matter of the Complaint Against Stanislaw R. Burzynski, Administrative Hearing Docket #503-92-529, page 122, lines 4 to 11) A system dominated by greed of that magnitude and functioning only after diseases, disabilities, and impairments occur cannot possibly serve us in our present circumstances. In like manner, health insurance will only operate as a drag on necessary progress.

Education. Chemical exposures have been diminishing the mental acuity of Americans for the last three generations. Deficits in higher-order thinking skills are quite manifest at this time, when we must deal effectively with the urgent imperatives of our civil emergency. An educational effort like none other in history, that includes vigilant actions to stop the exposures, needs to be put in place immediately. If we fail to do that, we will—all too soon—reach near the endpoint that Rene Dubos feared most, our becoming “a form of life that will retain little of true humanness.” How close are we? How much time do we have left before our “thinking cap,” as John D. MacArthur says, becomes too compromised by toxicity to have us function at required levels? Barbara Tuchman, a wise historian and thoughtful observer, noted in 1987 that we were already showing clear signs of having difficulty understanding the difference between right and wrong. (All three authors are cited above.) I cannot emphasize enough the necessity of an educational effort for us all that helps us suspend judgments, weigh evidence, hold several competing thoughts in mind at the same time, come to conclusions, and begin the process again when and if necessary.

Public health and survival initiatives that deal with our present civil emergency will be expensive. Wasteful spending is no longer acceptable. War is no longer affordable. All available resources, both human and financial, need to be deployed in this endeavor. Alexander Hamilton, in *The Federalist Papers*, No. 31, wrote about the all-out efforts required by a condition of domestic violence. Spending for such an emergency, he said, “ought to know no other bounds than the exigencies of the nation and the resources of the community.”

Available resources in the United States will be immense the very moment that we turn away from war. The present war against terrorism is best fought by supporting a United Nations strong enough to curtail the conditions that lead to terrorism. Acts of terror, when and if they occur, can then be treated as crimes and tried in the International Criminal Court.

And available resources in the United States will be immense the very moment that pork is stripped from legislation, the moment that all lobbying is made immediately public, the day the health care field operates preventively, and when the economy is redirected to deal with needs first. We can ill-afford the current economic model that's based on the creation of desire, the encouragement of debt, slavish reliance on the agendas of large corporations, and an out of control financial system that has become little more than legalized casino gambling paid for by working people.

Well, where does one start? I suggest we begin by looking again at Article IV, Section 4 of the United States Constitution. After distilling the words and removing the chaff, we are left with the following procedural directive: **“On application of the [state] legislature[s], the United States shall protect the people against domestic violence.”** So, activating the federal obligation to protect us under the domestic violence clause begins with contacting legislators in all the states.

Their duties under Article IV, Section 4 are limited to learning about the harms and determining whether a condition of domestic violence exists. If they are convinced that a condition of domestic violence exists, they are to petition the federal government to act upon the guarantee of protection due to the people. The states are not required to spend funds for the protections due to the people. Nor are they required to produce programs carrying out those protections. Their only duty is to hear the case and report on their findings.

What's the best way to make the case to the state legislators in all fifty states? I suggest that it be done by calling upon eyewitnesses to the destruction. Eyewitnesses are Americans who were born before January 1, 1940. I am one of them. We have vivid memories of conditions in the United States in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. We remember, in detail, the state of American health before the great destruction began taking its awful toll.

We, the witness generation, born between 1910 and 1940, need to stand as a buttress against denial that's likely to be fueled by powerful economic interests that will, no doubt, resist change. I suggest you use our testimonies, live and recorded, in the same way that survivors of the Nazi Holocaust in Europe keep alive memories of brutality that should never be forgotten.

You see, we remember a time when autism was unknown. We remember back to when cancer was relatively rare in adults and hardly ever struck children. We remember eating peanut butter in every school cafeteria, and none of us ever went into anaphylactic shock. None of us remember Alzheimer's Disease being so prevalent and taking memory from people even in their middle years.

Those of us who were teachers recall that students back then had longer attention spans and were capable of assimilating complex ideas earlier. Behaviorally, they were less disruptive and less cruel to one another. Having to medicate students to control behavior and enhance performance was unheard of before the great destruction.

Aside from race-based brutality, we remember few mass murders. Now they are occurring in places like schools, offices, movie theaters, and shopping malls with sad frequency.

Our eyewitness affidavits need to be taken before more of us are not available to state the necessary truths. They should be sent to state legislators in all fifty states. In addition, they should be shared with families who have been sorely affected by the great destruction. Those families need to know that the illnesses and incapacities that they are struggling with are not matters of bad luck, bad genes, bad habits, or God's will. No, they are the result of our having inundated ourselves with chemical exposures that are wildly beyond human genetic experience.

In addition, we the witness generation have unique historical perspectives that include World War II, the Korean War, and the Viet Nam War. We experienced the civil rights and the woman's rights movements. Many of us have time and sufficient personal resources to assist in an educational campaign aimed at state legislators. It won't be easy. Bringing about change has been made difficult because of drastic reductions in personal liberties. And power has become entrenched as never before, owing to unbridled political fund raising by corporations and the wealthy. Freedom of thought itself is being eclipsed. For example, responsible citizenship requires that the circumstances surrounding the events of 9/11 be discussed. The improbability of three large buildings coming down in free fall on the one and only day that air defenses seem to have been ordered to stand down is significant and requires inquiry. Yet, the vast majority of Americans fear to think about or express doubts and concerns regarding 9/11, one of the most pivotal events in all of American and world history.

Fighting for the lives and futures of our children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren is the highest duty that we can undertake. We can and will come forward, bear witness, and convince our state legislators that a condition of domestic violence exists which requires them to call upon the federal government to use the civil emergency provision in Article IV, Section 4 in order to safeguard the future.

And if there is resistance on their part, we know how to organize to replace them. In doing so, we will retool the political parties from the bottom to the top so that they finally serve the needs of the people. Remember always that the great destruction occurred on their watch, and every American now lives in the shadow of illnesses and disabilities brought on by that great destruction. It's unthinkable that we, the elders, together with the vast majority of Americans, will not unite and fight for the lives of our families, our neighbors, and all on-board this fragile, wondrous planet.

The changes to be made must, of course, reach the United Nations. A significant shift in power has taken place since the administration of President Truman. In 1945, nation-states were dominant. Now, nation-states have been eclipsed by the wealth, power, and reach of multi-national corporations. In most of the world, they are free to pollute

and to misuse people and resources. Vast stretches of the Earth are now being spoiled. International governance for the benefit of the people is a paramount necessity.

The domestic violence clause can be the fulcrum for the building of a movement stronger than any that preceded it in American history. It will be stronger than the Populist Movement of the 1890s, stronger than the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, and stronger than the Anti-War Movement of the 1970s. The reason such a political avalanche is now possible is that we are all endangered by the current threat. All of us are endangered, rich and poor, from every background, and no matter what our political philosophy might be. Disease, disability, ignorance, and loss of impulse control are bringing a suffering never before experienced in human populations to a planet that we're fast making uninhabitable.

The majority of other nations have shown a readiness to consider the granting of authority to the United Nations. The United States is adamantly opposed and will not ever join the International Criminal Court. Perhaps an understanding of the history behind the writing of the domestic violence clause can be instructive as a rationale for the United States to join with the majority of nations.

Delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 were acutely aware that survival of the United States was in doubt. There had been violence the year before in Massachusetts. A series of events known as Shays' Rebellion was beyond the ability of the State of Massachusetts to control. The federal government at that time had been a powerless body, more like a debating society than a central government. European nations—for that reason—predicted the downfall of the American experiment. (*Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 Reported by James Madison*, Ohio University Press, entry for Tuesday, May 29)

Powerlessness of the federal government was the theme that Edmund Randolph invoked on that first business day of the Convention, May 29th, 1787. The truth of that assertion was painfully obvious. As a result, the gentlemen then closed all sessions of the Convention to the public. The representatives from thirteen independent and sovereign states knew they had to go well beyond instructions given to them. They had to reduce the power and independence of the very states that had sent them. Necessity required that power and authority be ceded over to a newly created federal government. Only by doing so, could the people be made safe from threats of violence, both domestic and foreign.

Circumstances today are exactly the same. The American government, acting alone, cannot protect us from environmental harms. Neither can any nation acting alone. The climate deteriorates as natural habitats decline. Toxicity spreads on winds, across waters, and in tainted products from every part of the world. War and greed stalk the planet. Just as representatives of the American colonial states ceded authority to the United States, now the United States must give authority to the United Nations. For survival.

This is the time to correct the misstep of President Truman when he disregarded the need for effective planetary government. Such governance is the only way to protect the generations that are following ours. The President took many wrong turns back in 1945. We dare not do the same. We're better than that.