

FROM PATRIOTISM TO HUMATRIOTISM

Ronald J. Glossop

(Sermon for 3 July 2016 at 1st Unitarian Church of St. Louis MO)

Tomorrow is this country's best known holiday, the 4th of July, Independence Day. Flags and slogans like "God Bless America" will be everywhere. Our country is celebrating its beginning. It is a day to celebrate our patriotism and our pride in our country and what it stands for: the rule of law, liberty for all, the protection of human rights, policies for the community determined by the majority but always with rights for minorities, regular and fair elections, and so on.

There are different dimensions of patriotism. Patriotism can refer to pride in one's country, in its accomplishments, in its ideals. Patriotism can refer to love of one's country, to a desire to preserve it and improve it. Patriotism can refer to loyalty to one's country, to a very high level of commitment to do whatever the national government requires.

In this last case of patriotism as loyalty to the government we need to consider the distinction between unthinking loyalty and critical loyalty. What if those in authority seem to be doing something we regard as very wrong? What if our national leaders are doing something that seems to be good for our country but is very harmful to those in other lands or to our planet as a whole? Should our concern be limited to what is good our own country? This difficult issue warrants further discussion.

In our U.S. federal system of government the issue of the locus of loyalty can even be one of loyalty to our state government versus loyalty to our national government. What should we do if the state government adopts a policy which seems to be good for our state but which is very detrimental to the welfare of the country as a whole? I think that in general people would agree that the welfare of the larger national community should take precedence over the welfare of the smaller state community, although in individual cases one needs to consider all the details.

Does the situation remain the same if we are balancing the welfare of our national community against that of the much larger world community? I think that in general people have said that the welfare of the smaller national community where our home is is more important than welfare of the larger more distant world community. Why is this latter situation different from the state versus nation issue? An important factor is that within our country there are common values and a common language. There is a collective unity and a sense of belonging within the national community which doesn't exist in the global community. Even more important is the existence of a national government that rules the national community and to which loyalty is expected while, at least so far, there is no world government to which loyalty is expected.

Nevertheless the question can be raised. Is patriotism (or nationalism) always a desirable thing? Yes, it can bring people together within the national community. Indeed that is exactly what leaders in some countries are trying to bring about, especially in newly independent countries. At the same time, patriotism can also be used to generate animosity toward outsiders. Patriotism is important in energizing citizens to fight wars to preserve the country against other countries with different values and contrary economic interests. Nevertheless, as Voltaire noted, a disappointing aspect of patriotism is that people often suppose that in order to be a good patriot they must be enemies to the rest of humanity.

A sophisticated public discussion of the limits of patriotism took place in reaction to Martha Nussbaum's 1994 essay "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism" published in the October/November issue of the BOSTON REVIEW. That essay and responses to it were collected by editor Joshua Cohen in the book *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism* published by Beacon Press in 1996. Professor Nussbaum argued vigorously for cosmopolitanism over patriotism in her essay and in her responses to those opposed to her view. The basic argument for cosmopolitanism is that no one chooses where to be born. Where we happen to be born is a

matter of chance outside of our control just as also is our gender, our race, our abilities or disabilities, and so on. A second argument is that almost everyone admires people whose loyalty to humanity overrides narrower loyalties such as to their own country or their own religion. A third argument is that we have moral obligations to other humans and there is no good reason why those moral obligations should cease at the national border.

"Cosmopolitanism" is a widely used term for what I am calling "humatriotism," that is, the view that loyalty to all of humanity is just as basic as loyalty to one's local community. I like that word "humatriotism" partly because it was invented by a friend, Professor Theodore Lentz of Washington University here in Saint Louis. He even used that word as the title for a book he edited published in 1976. The subtitle is "Human Interest in Peace and Survival." The second reason I like the word "humatriotism" is that, as Oxford Reference says, it is a word that "connects the campaigns against global warming, environmental pollution, world poverty, war, nuclear weapons, and social injustice." "Cosmopolitanism" refers to a theoretical viewpoint first put forth by the Cynic Diogenes and the Stoics before the time of Alexander the Great, and it still has that meaning of loyalty to the world community as a whole, but, as the Oxford Reference notes, the word "humatriotism" relates more specifically to our current reality where modern technology makes it possible for us to actually live in a real global community. A third reason for favoring the word "humatriotism" over "cosmopolitanism" is its clear contrast to the word "patriotism". I very much support Nussbaum's cosmopolitanism, but I think that her essay "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism" would have been better titled "Patriotism and Humatriotism," even though in her essay she evidently wanted to refer to that older Stoic ideal.

In our modern world humatriotism is in competition with the very strong forces of patriotism and nationalism. From the 15th to the 19th century the world was controlled by European national government in vigorous, often violent competition with each other. Partly as a result of two world wars and the spread of the industrial revolution to the whole world, in the 20th century a new kind of inter-nationalism was developed where the national governments tried to become a bit more cooperative with each other and a bit less imperialistic. They established inter-national organizations such as the League of Nations and the United Nations. Much but not quite all of the earlier colonialism has been abolished. Nevertheless for the most part these inter-national organizations are still controlled by and for the national governments, each one focused on its own interests and welfare. For one example, even though the Earth as a whole is facing the huge problem of too many people, about half of the national governments in the developed world have policies designed to encourage population growth in their own country. In the 21st century we need to transition from inter-nationalism to globalism. The Earth is one community.

Patriotism and nationalism are powerful forces in the world because the nation to which we belong is often a major part of our self-identification. What are you? "I am a Canadian" or "I am a German" or "I am an Egyptian," and so on. For most people the nation-state to which they belong is a more important aspect of their self-identity than any other group they happen to belong to, even their religious group or their occupational group or their family. In the 21st century, we need a new kind of self-identification "I am an Earthling" first and only secondarily a citizen of this or that country.

Another important matter for one's self-identification is one's national language. Language provides the tie for identifying with one's nation-state, and national governments usually use their political power to promote the national language. It often serves as a main instrument for uniting the country. Consider the situation in this country with regard to the use of English and the issue of whether another language such as Spanish should be allowed for public signs or official government business. In many societies, including the United States at present, a very controversial issue is what language should be used for instruction in the schools.

Because of modern technology our human situation is rapidly changing. As Bob Dylan told us in 1964, "The times, they are a-changing." We can travel to any part of the world in less than 24 hours, and the internet has made international communication virtually instantaneous. The photo of Earth from space as well as our own experiences persuade us that national borders are much less important than they were 25 years ago. Students regularly study in other countries, and many people are marrying mates from another country. Former colonies have become independent countries. Former less developed countries have rapidly industrialized. Many products of industry are produced in many different countries. We are living in a 21st century global community where national borders have become much less important and national governments can be major obstacles to a peaceful, prosperous, safe, and just world.

An April 16, 2016 BBC poll surveying the views of 20,000 people in 18 countries found that 51% of those asked see themselves "more as global citizens than national citizens." The proportion of those considering themselves to be primarily global citizens has increased to 56% in developing countries--73% in Nigeria, 71% in China, 70% in Peru, and 67% in India. It has declined in developed countries, probably due to refugees coming from poorer countries. In the USA 48% viewed themselves primarily as global citizens while the proportion for the world as a whole was 51%. The details can be found on the internet at "2016 Global Citizen poll."

In this 21st century I believe that it is time for all inhabitants of planet Earth to move beyond patriotism (loyalty to fatherland) to humatriotism (loyalty to all humanity). We are living at a time when this change must be made, just as in earlier history we humans made the transition from tribal identification and loyalty to urban identification and loyalty to national identification and loyalty. It is time to change from thinking primarily nationalistically--"I am a Canadian" or "I am a German" or "I am an Egyptian"--to thinking globally--"I am an Earthling."

In order to encourage this change we should make use of the same devices previously used to promote nationalism and patriotism. They now should be used to promote humatriotism.

One device used to promote patriotism is the pledge of allegiance to the nation-state. It is one of the first things taught children in school. Professor Lillian Genser of Wayne State University in Detroit has composed a new pledge of allegiance for this age of globalism. It goes:

I pledge allegiance to the world, To cherish every living thing,

To care for Earth and sea and air, With peace and justice everywhere.

This pledge or something like it needs to be used along with the national pledge of allegiance in elementary schools around the world, so that children come to realize that they are members of a global community too. Do you know of a local school where it might be used?

Another device typically used to promote patriotism which now needs to be used to promote humatriotism is a flag which stands for the global community. Just as we have national flags for the national communities, so we need a world flag which stands for the global community. It seems to me that the U.N. flag is very appropriate for this purpose. Since 1974 the U.N. flag has flown along with the national flag and the state flag at the center of the campus of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville where I previously taught to show that the university's commitment goes beyond the state and the nation to the whole world. One might also make use of the earth flag promoted by the environmentalists, but I myself prefer the U.N. flag since it represents the human global community which I think needs to be our focus.

Still another instrument now used to promote patriotism that should also be used to promote humatriotism is the celebration of holidays. Nationally we have holidays like Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, and Veterans Day all of which promote patriotism. Globally we should celebrate special days like U.N. Day, October 24, which according to a resolution passed by the U.N. General Assembly in 1971 is to be celebrated in all countries. Another holiday to be celebrated globally is Human Rights Day, December 10, the day in 1948 when the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights was adopted without dissent by the U.N. General Assembly. Such holidays celebrated by the whole world would greatly help to promote humatriotism.

To promote humatriotism in our schools we could also give as much emphasis to the study of world history as is currently given to the study of national history.

Still another device used by national governments that we could use to promote global community would be a world anthem. The music would probably not pose a huge problem, but what about the words? Which language would be used for the words? The European Union is facing this very problem with its European anthem. It can be translated into the various national languages, but how can it be sung in unison? The Esperantists have produced their nationality-neutral translation of the anthem, but will the national governments agree to use it?

I have already noted how important language is for identification with the larger community. We need a language for the world community, and not just for the world anthem. This language for the world community should not be any national language. That would be unjust to all other nations. The readily-learned language Esperanto was created just for this purpose by L. L. Zamenhof and published to the world 129 years ago. As a completely phonetic totally rule-guided designed language, it can be learned in one-fourth or less of the time it takes to learn national languages. If all children throughout the world learned Esperanto as a second language, they would be ready to be members of the global community, civitanoj de la Tero [citizens of the Earth]. Unfortunately, in 1921 a proposal in the Assembly of the League of Nations to do just that was stopped by the action of the French government on grounds that there already was a world language, namely, French.

Some people, following the same kind general viewpoint adopted by the French government and speakers of French in 1921, now believe that the English language should be the language of the global community. But less than six percent of the world uses English as its first language. If some national language were to be chosen to have such a privileged status, three have more native speakers than English, namely, Mandarin Chinese, Hindi, and Spanish. How would you like to have to learn Chinese in order to participate in global institutions? Furthermore, English is one of the least phonetic of Western languages and contains so many exceptions to the rules that even its native speakers have trouble learning to spell correctly and avoiding grammatical errors. As speakers of English, it seems to me that we have a special moral obligation to learn and use a nationality-neutral readily learned global language like Esperanto rather than expecting everyone else to use our illogical national language. As a result of learning and using Esperanto I have personal friends all over the world, and when communicating with them in a neutral language, I feel like a world citizen. Also, about 3% of my email is in Esperanto.

To complete the transition from patriotism to globalism, we will need to do more than just change personal attitudes, however. We will need to change global political institutions. That will be a major challenge. The inter-national United Nations will need to be converted into a democratic world federation which will have control over the world and national governments similar to the way that the U.S. federal government has control over this country and its state governments and the way that the European Union is integrating the countries of Europe and the way that the African Union is integrating the countries of Africa. Finally, loyalty to national governments and regional federations will need to be subordinated to loyalty to a democratic world federation, just as in our country loyalty to the state governments is subordinated to loyalty to the national government.

Even now, however, we as individuals can begin not only to think of ourselves as world citizens but also to act as world citizens. We can support international organizations such as the United Nations but also international non-governmental organizations such as the our own UU-UN Office, the UU Service Committee, the Coalition for the International Criminal Court, the United Nations Association of the U.S.A., Citizens for Global Solutions, Amnesty International,

Doctors without Borders, Human Rights Watch, CARE, the Universal Esperanto Association, and so on.

This is an exciting time to be alive. We can participate in this transition from patriotism and nationalism to humatriotism and globalism. Furthermore, we live in the country that should lead the way in this transition instead of being an obstacle to it as we sometimes have been. Let us use our energies to facilitate this transition and make it a peaceful one for us and our descendants.

Now let us join in singing hymn #121 "We'll Build a Land," but in line with the sermon let's always change that word "Land" to "World."