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This essay examines the historical context that led to Pope John XXIII’s proposal for a global “public authority” in his April 11, 1963, encyclical letter, Pacem in Terris (Peace on Earth). The catalyst for this letter was the Cuban Missile Crisis that occurred between October 22 and October 29, 1962. Pope John offered to mediate that crisis, and President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev agreed and eventually came to an agreement not only to end the crisis but also to negotiate a limited nuclear test ban treaty. In the last year of his life, a time for him of “metanoia” (change of heart), President Kennedy attempted to end the Cold War and promote nuclear disarmament. That metanoia coincided with John XXIII’s prophetic vision, and it may have been the reason for President Kennedy’s assassination. This essay also explores the core principles of Pacem in Terris that lead to John’s call for a “public authority” as the most realistic strategy to end war itself and to secure peace for all nations. Finally, the essay briefly reflects on the European Union as a successful regional model that could help shape the global governance envisioned by John XXIII.

Introduction

“We knew the world would not be the same. A few people laughed; a few people cried. Most people were silent. I remembered the line from the Hindu scripture, the Bhagavad-Gita; Vishnu is trying to persuade the Prince that he should do his duty, and to impress him, takes on his multi-armed form and says, ‘Now, I am become Death, the destroyer of worlds.’ I suppose we all thought that, one way or another.’”

Robert Oppenheimer
After witnessing the first Atomic Bomb test in 1945.

Today, our home on planet Earth is in peril of a nuclear war, whether caused by intention, by mistake, or by accident. The reality is that we have come close to nuclear war many times since 1945, and this threat continues to this day.

The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists (www.thebulletin.org) has persistently cautioned us about the threat of nuclear war through its Doomsday Clock. In 1947, the Clock’s first reading was 7 minutes to midnight. In 1963, with the signing of the Limited Test Ban Treaty, the Clock read 12 minutes to midnight. The Clock’s furthest point from doomsday was 17 minutes to midnight in 1991 with the end of the Cold War. In 2023, with the advent of the war in Ukraine in 2022 and with the Israeli/Palestine war in 2023, the Clock now reads an astonishing 90 seconds to midnight. In short, we are closer to nuclear war today than at any time since the Clock was invented.

Nevertheless, there is a peaceful path open to us to end this madness. Pope John XXIII’s behind-the-scenes assistance in the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 and his fervent call for world peace through a global “public authority” in his 1963 encyclical Pacem in Terris both offer hope for a future based on international law and mutual respect.

To fully appreciate the importance of John's intention and call, we first need to understand the
threatening context of the Cuban Missile Crisis, in which John secretly played a key role and which led him to issue *Pacem in Terris*. To understand that threatening context, I will first summarize the story told in Norman Cousins, *The Improbable Triumvirate: John F. Kennedy, Pope John, and Nikita Khrushchev* (W.W. Norton, 1972), an important book strangely overlooked by many leading historians of the Cuban Missile Crisis.

We also need to understand the powerful forces resisting John's vision and how that resistance may have led to the assassination of U.S. President John F. Kennedy. For that story, I will next summarize claims made by James Douglas in his extensively documented book *JFK and the Un-speakable: Why He Died and Why it Matters*, (Orbis Books, 2008). (Establishment historians of the Kennedy assassination—many of whom accept the “lone gunman” theory--ignore this book.) After that, I will explain the three key principles for global governance that *Pacem in Terris* articulates and briefly discuss the European Union (EU) as a model that could be expanded to the global level.

**John XXIII's Work for Peace in Response to the Cuban Missile Crisis**

To understand the necessity for global governance in Pope John XXIII’s *Pacem in Terris*, it will be helpful to review the Cuban Missile Crisis that was foundational to its publication. Again, I draw here on Norman Cousins' first-person account of Pope John’s pivotal role as a secret mediator during the Cuban Missile Crisis, as found in his book, *The Improbable Triumvirate: John F. Kennedy, Pope John, and Nikita Khrushchev*.

On October 22, 1962, United States President John F. Kennedy made a nationally televised address in which he announced that the Soviet Union had stationed nuclear missiles on the island of Cuba, just ninety miles from the U.S. mainland. In response, President Kennedy announced a military blockade of Cuba and stated, “It shall be the policy of this nation to regard any nuclear missile launched from Cuba against any nation in the Western Hemisphere as an attack on the United States, requiring a full retaliatory response upon the Soviet Union.”

Both Kennedy and Khrushchev knew that if Russia were attacked with “a full retaliatory response” of nuclear weapons and the Soviets in response attacked with their nuclear weapons on the United States, over five hundred million people would be killed in twenty-four hours.

At the end of his speech, President Kennedy called for a meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations “to take action against this latest Soviet threat to world peace.” There was no call for diplomacy, or for mediation, or for arbitration. Even if the Soviet Union *did not bomb* the United States but let us say it bombed distant Peru, the United States would still annihilate the Soviet Union.

Paralyzing fear struck the hearts of millions of people not just in the Soviet Union and the United States but all over the world. Was there no other way to resolve this crisis than to threaten the murder of millions of children, women, men, and thousands of animal species? Was this the end of the world?

On the same day as President Kennedy's speech, Norman Cousins opened the third of a series of conferences he had arranged for Russian and American “academicians, writers, and scientists,” this time at Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts. Attending the conference was Felix
Morlion, O.P., a Dominican Catholic priest and papal adviser. Preparing a book about John XXIII’s vision of world peace, he had asked Cousins to invite him to the meeting.

Morlion arrived late, but he immediately asked, “whether a papal intervention in the Cuban crisis – if only in the form of an appeal for greater responsibility -- might not serve an important purpose.” With the encouragement of both the US and the USSR delegates, Morlion telephoned the Vatican. A few hours later, the answer came back. The pope wished to help but wanted to be sure it was acceptable to both sides. Morlion then asked, "Would a proposal to both nations be acceptable [for] a withdrawal of military shipping and the blockade?"

Cousins checked with the White House and received confirmation from Ted Sorenson that President Kennedy approved the idea. The Russian delegation also phoned Moscow and received word back that the Pope's proposal was "completely acceptable to Premier Khrushchev." Cousins then wrote: "The next day Pope John issued his call for moral responsibility in the Cuban crisis … [and] the Pope's appeal made headlines throughout the world, including the Soviet Union.

Several days later, after the Andover conference and at dinner for the delegates at Cousin’s house in New Canaan, Connecticut, a news report stated that "Premier Khrushchev was removing the missiles from Cuba and had written a long letter to President Kennedy expressing the hope that the lessons learned during this crisis could be profitably turned to the promotion of peace."

Cousins also tells us that "Morlion informally explored with some of the Soviet delegates the possibility of further communication between Rome and Moscow in the cause of a workable peace." In addition, Morlion recommended Cousins as an informal and secret intermediary. Soon, Cousins began a series of initiatives that established close dialogue between Moscow and Rome, and with links back to Washington.

On October 28, 1962—just six days after Kennedy’s speech and after extensive behind-the-scenes communications, Khrushchev announced that he would withdraw the Soviet missiles, and the Cuban Missile Crisis ended. (The United States also secretly agreed to withdraw missiles from Turkey that were quite close to the Soviet Union.) It is doubtful that there would have been such a peaceful result to the Cuban Missile Crisis without Pope John’s intervention.

Through Cousins, Kennedy, and Khrushchev continued to negotiate in the following months, and each responded enthusiastically to early drafts of Pacem in Terris that Pope John XXIII shared with them. These negotiations resulted in the historic Limited Test Ban Treaty signed on August 5, 1963, by the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom. This was truly a remarkable development for nations that just months earlier were on the path to World War III.

Again, Cousins shared the early drafts of Pacem in Terris with both Kennedy and Khrushchev. Pope John’s encyclical had a profound effect on both men and played a key role in their historic negotiations to begin the end of the Cold War. Kennedy’s speech to American University strongly mirrored several key paragraphs of Pacem in Terris. Meanwhile, Khrushchev deeply respected Pope John and saw to it that the entire encyclical was printed in Pravda, a major Soviet newspaper (in the United States, the New York Times published the entire encyclical).
We should note that nuclear war was also avoided during the Cuban Missile Crisis when a Soviet submarine officer, Vasili Arkhipov, courageously refused to launch a nuclear torpedo in Cuban waters because it was mistakenly assumed that the United States had begun its own attack starting war between the USSR and the USA. However, the consent of three officers on the submarine was needed to launch the nuclear weapon. Two agreed to launch and Arkhipov was the sole “no vote.” Had Arkhipov voted in the affirmative the result would have been World War III.

President Kennedy's Work for Disarmament and his Assassination
According to James Douglas in *JFK and the Unspeakable*, President Kennedy’s intentions during the Cuban Missile Crisis were far more conciliatory than found in his public rhetoric.

In 1961, Kennedy had been betrayed by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and its Director, Allen Dulles, during the Bay of Pigs incident in Cuba. Dulles knew that the “invasion” would fail, thus leaving the United States no choice but to bomb Cuba, including Havana with its entire civilian population. Kennedy fired Dulles and made a bitter enemy (ironically Dulles was appointed to the Warren Commission that investigated the Kennedy assassination).

Then, on Oct. 16, 1962, President Kennedy met with the Joint Chiefs of Staff (senior Generals and Admirals) at the White House in response to the new Cuban crisis. Predictably, the Joint Chiefs advised Kennedy to bomb Cuba. The Joint Chiefs (including General Curtis LeMay, who directed the murderous B-29 fire-bombing raids on Japanese civilians during WWII), held that Russia would not retaliate with an attack of its own on the U.S. mainland, even though Russian military personnel were sure to be killed in a U.S. attack on Cuba. Kennedy refused; he believed the Russians were sure to retaliate if the U.S. bombed Russian troops. The Joint Chiefs strongly disagreed and questioned Kennedy’s competence and even his loyalty.

According to Douglas, Kennedy’s refusal to follow the mandates of the CIA and senior military officers began the path that would lead to Kennedy’s assassination. He made sworn enemies of the U.S. national security state that included the CIA and the Defense Department’s generals and admirals. Kennedy was so angry at the CIA’s provocative performance in the Cuban Missile Crisis that he stated he wanted to “splinter the CIA into a thousand pieces and scatter it into the winds.”

In his historic speech at American University on June 10, 1963, President Kennedy issued a dramatic call for an entirely new view of peace between nations and for a “new effort to achieve world law.” He called upon the American people to reexamine their attitude “toward the possibilities of peace, toward the Soviet Union, toward the Cold War, and toward peace and freedom here at home.” There is abundant evidence of Pope John XXIII’s influence on Kennedy’s American University speech.

In the spirit of *Pacem in Terris* Kennedy strongly endorsed the United Nations:

> Meanwhile, we seek to strengthen the United Nations, to help solve its financial problems, to make it a more effective instrument for peace, to develop it into a genuine world security system—a system capable of resolving disputes based on law, of ensuring the security to the large and small, and of creating conditions under which arms can be abolished.

These sentiments further infuriated the military establishment, the Central Intelligence Agency, and many in government who wanted to use nuclear weapons to destroy Russia. Douglas argues that, with his American University speech, Kennedy’s fate was sealed. In his words from *JFK and
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*the Unspeakable*,

The deepening of the Kennedy-Khrushchev détente was the larger context of the unfolding plot to assassinate Kennedy. It had become clear to America’s power brokers that the president of their national security state was struggling with his Communist opponent not so much over who would win the Cold War as on how to end it. From a national security standpoint, the president had become a traitor. (p. 175)

Further, in his “Speech to the UN” on June 20, 1963, at the United Nations in New York City, President Kennedy reiterated much that was in the American University speech, but he also took another fatal step that sealed his doom. Kennedy made “discreet contact” with Cuba’s ambassador to the UN to ask Cuban leader Fidel Castro if he was interested in a dialogue. With Khrushchev’s encouragement, Castro sent a positive response.

The CIA was kept out of this communication but, unsurprisingly, they found out and knew that it meant not just positive relations with Cuba but also an end to the Cold War and peace with the Soviet Union. Kennedy concluded his UN speech by announcing that the US, the USSR, and the UK had agreed to immediately begin talks on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Not only was Kennedy willing to talk to a Communist, but he was also willing to end the Cold War with the Communists without firing a shot. Again, this was fuel to the fire for the President’s enemies in the Defense Department, the CIA, and the FBI. Many were convinced Kennedy was a Communist himself and had to go.

Kennedy repeated his strong support for the United Nations in his speeches at American University and the United Nations in his address to the Irish Parliament on June 28, 1963, when he stated, “The United Nations must be fully and fairly financed, its peace-keeping machinery must be strengthened, its institutions must be developed until someday, and perhaps some distant day, a world of law is achieved.”

Quite clearly, in the last year of his presidency, Kennedy had a *metanoia*, a “change of heart” on matters of war and peace, which led to his conviction that nuclear weapons must be banned from the face of the earth. Most notable in Kennedy’s *metanoia* was his conviction that the United Nations was the path to peace for all nations.

According to Douglas, President Kennedy’s change of heart precipitated the death sentence orchestrated by his political enemies on November 22, 1963. No US President since John F. Kennedy has ever challenged the Defense Department or the CIA. At this point, I strongly recommend that readers view several videos that depict the use of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It may seem counterintuitive in an essay on peace to recommend videos that vividly depict burned bodies, suffering children, and two cities turned into ashes in an instant. However, we simply must understand that to end war a visceral response is necessary as well as an intellectual conviction that war is evil. Some readers are going to have to force themselves to watch these films. But it is important to understand what war actually does to our fellow human beings and our environment if we are to have a personal metanoia on matters of war and peace. We must view war with our hearts as well as our minds. Of the many videos available, I recommend the classic “Hiroshima Nagasaki 1945” (1970), and Hiroshima: The Real Story (2015).
Pope John XXIII’s Call in Pacem in Terris for Global Governance

To appreciate the historical significance of Pope John XXXIII’s call to global governance in 1963, it will be helpful to understand *Pacem in Terris* within the theological context of teachings on war and peace. Elsewhere, I have identified four traditions on war and peace in Christian history. The oldest is (1) Nonviolence in the 1st century, followed by (2) Just War (limited war) in the 5th century, (3) Total War (absolute war) in the 11th century, and (4) World Community (global governance) in the 16th century. (For further reference, see Joseph J. Fahey (2018), “An Overview of Four Traditions on War and Peace in Christian History,” *The Journal of Social Encounters*: Vol. 2: Iss. 1, 7-21. See also, Joseph J. Fahey (2005) *War and the Christian Conscience: Where Do You Stand?* Orbis Book.)

Christianity evolved from a religion that was founded on love for enemies (Nonviolence); to one that “mournfully” allowed the killing of enemies (Just War); to one that enthusiastically embraced the killing of enemies (Total War); and, finally, to a religion that sought to reconcile enemies through international peace based on global governance (World Community).

Pope John had lived through the carnage of World War I as an army medic and World War II as a diplomat in countries that were devastated by the war. This made Pope John vigorously anti-war from his experiences in the trenches of World War I, and from his experience in World War II, he became a defender of Jews and others who were persecuted in various European countries. (For an excellent source in understanding *Pacem in Terris* see Joe Holland’s *Summary & Commentary for Pacem in Terris* (Pacem in Terris Press, 2012). See also Gerald and Patricia Mische’s classic book that examines the national security state and the necessity for a governed world: *Toward a Human World Order: Beyond the National Security Straitjacket* (Paulist Press, 1977).

During the months following the Cuban Missile Crisis, Pope John and his team of Vatican experts began the writing of the papal encyclical that would set the Catholic Church on a course of condemning war itself and seeking to ground global peace on the creation of a “public authority” that could guarantee peace between member states.

The view of human nature in *Pacem in Terris*, like much of Catholic Social Teaching (CST), is rooted in the philosophical tradition of Natural Law, which holds that human beings can understand the purpose of Creation through reason and scientific endeavor. (For an inspiring analysis on the centrality of love in Catholic Social Teaching see: “For a Civilization of Love” in the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*. (Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace (2004) *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, pp. 252-255)

In Catholic Social Teaching there is little discussion of Original Sin that dwells on the “innate depravity” of human nature or that is pessimistic about the prospect of world peace. Hence, global peace is possible since people are naturally morally good social animals who can work cooperatively to secure common goals, including world peace. All people, through human reason, can understand God’s loving design for the universe even if they have never heard of God or are atheists. Global peace is possible.

This quotation from *Pacem in Terris* beautifully illustrates the natural law foundation for global peace:
There is reason to hope, however, that by meeting and negotiating, human beings may come to discover better the bonds that unite them together, deriving from the human nature which they have in common; and that they may also come to discover that one of the most profound requirements of their common nature is this: that between them and their respective peoples it is not fear which should reign but love, a love which tends to express itself in a collaboration that is loyal, manifold inform, and productive of many benefits (Par. 129).

Please note the terse statement that “it is not fear which should reign but love.” There are three principles in *Pacem in Terris* that are foundational to Pope John’s conviction that global governance is a necessity for global peace.

1. **Global Disarmament**
   Justice, then, right reason and consideration for human dignity and life urgently demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and finally that all come to an agreement on a fitting program of disarmament, employing mutual and effective controls (Par. 112).

2. **Global Public Authority is Necessary**
   Today the universal common good poses problems of worldwide dimensions, which cannot be adequately tackled or solved except by the efforts of public authority endowed with a wideness of powers, structure, and means of the same proportions: that is, of public authority which is in a position to operate in an effective manner on a worldwide basis. The moral order itself demands that such a form of public authority be established (Par. 137).

3. **The United Nations is the Path to Global Governance**
   It is therefore our ardent desire that the United Nations organization—in its structure and in its means—may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and may the time come as quickly as possible when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person and which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable rights. This is more to be hoped for since all human beings, as they take an ever more active part in the public life of their own country, are showing an increasing interest in the affairs of all peoples and are becoming more consciously aware that they are living members of the whole human family (Par. 145).

It is quite clear that for Pope John, the only realistic path to end the global arms race and to pursue global justice for all is through the creation of a global “public authority,” and the path to that is through the United Nations. In the end, nations are not going to disarm unless they are assured the security that will come from legal sanctions being imposed on any national leader who violates a mutually agreed pact to disarm and to renounce the use of war as a method of dispute settlement. Families all over the world deserve to live in a state of security and many are coming to understand that the security that is promised by ever larger armies and ever more powerful weapons actually is making their lives dramatically less secure. True national security can only be secured through
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an international system of laws that protect people everywhere.

The hugely profitable capitalist armament industry that fuels the national security state will, of course, resist any attempt to disarm and make the false claim that more and more weapons are a time-honored form of defense. Hence, a massive international program of “economic conversion” is necessary that will create an alternative economy to capitalism that will provide jobs for workers in environmental stewardship, mediation and arbitration, social services, education, the arts, and many other areas that will benefit from the cessation of arms production and research. (On economic conversion see Seymour Melman’s classic *Pentagon Capitalism* (McGraw Hill, 1970) and Lloyd Jeff Dumas’s *Making Peace Possible: The Promise of Economic Conversion* (Oxford, Pergamon Press, 1989). To understand the role of the United States alone in weapons production for relentless war, see David Vine’s book *The United States of War: A Global History of America’s Endless Conflicts, from Columbus to the Islamic State* (University of California Press, 2020).

It is important to note that Pope John believed that the “public authority” must possess “a wideness of powers, structure, and means of the same proportions … to operate in an effective manner on a worldwide basis.” Pope John quite realistically advocated a global union with sufficient power through elected bodies and global courts as the only sure path to the abolition of war. The use of governmental power involves coercion and legal sanctions since people have, at times, to be forced to do what is morally right. Coercion of necessity will involve the use of police and legal tribunals that will administer justice in a nonviolent fashion.

As presently constituted, the United Nations does not have “a wideness of powers” to outlaw war and arms production. But it can be reformed. Therefore, the beginning of what John called a global public authority can become a reformed United Nations, an organization that has existed since 1945.

The United Nations (www.un.org) and the 5,451 United-Nations-affiliated Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs: www.un.org/ecosoc/en/ngo#) labor daily to ensure that our global village promotes international peace and works to make economic life serve the universal common good. Further, a careful examination of the United Nations Charter and the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights will help us understand why UN agencies and UN NGOs work toward abolishing war and promoting economic and political rights for all.

In addition, the reader will benefit from consulting the World Federalist Movement/Institute for Global Policy (www.wfm-ipg.org) for strategies that can achieve world governance. A particularly practical proposal for UN reform is suggested by “A United Nations Parliamentary Assembly” (www.unpacampaign.org). This organization bases its proposals on existing parliamentary assemblies in many multilateral intergovernmental agencies such as the Council of Europe, NATO, and the African Union. A global parliamentary assembly that can abolish war is possible.

In summary, there are five essential principles that are found in *Pacem in Terris*:
1. Nations have a moral obligation to end the arms race, to abolish nuclear weapons, and to disarm.
2. The universal common good demands that international problems be solved without violence through a global “public authority.”
3. The global public authority must be freely chosen by the world’s nations.
4. The global public authority must respect the rights of individual member states and the civil rights of their citizens.
5. The United Nations, with its Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), is “an important step on the path towards the juridical-political organization of all peoples of the world.”

Lastly, it is important to note that Pope John turned neither to the Nonviolent tradition nor to the Just War tradition in Christian history to solve the problem of global war. Neither one of those traditions has as its goal the creation of an international institution with both the juridical power and structure necessary to outlaw the national security state, which has an insatiable appetite for military spending and for wars that will justify that spending.

While Nonviolence and Just War have important roles to play in nonviolent civilian defense and in the limitation of the atrocities in war, these traditions are not designed to promote global governance; hence, the necessity for the transformative mission of the World Community tradition.

**European Union as a Model for Global Governance**

Finally, we should take heart from the dramatic success of the European Union (EU - https://european-union.europa.eu), which, in an expanded version, could serve as a model for global governance. When Winston Churchill first used the term “A United States of Europe” in 1946, he was greeted with ridicule and derision. In my many visits to Europe in the 1970s and into the 1980s, I often encountered skepticism and even hostility to a European Union. But an amazing phenomenon happened: the European Union was created in 1993, just forty-eight years after WWII. At last, Immanuel Kant’s 1795 vision in *Perpetual Peace* of a “federation of free states” in Europe became a reality.

Miraculously, the EU borders encompassed historically warring states; a common currency, the Euro, was created; and the European Court of Justice now resolves disputes between the EU’s 27 member states without recourse to war. Also, smaller member states like Ireland and Iceland thrive as never before, and EU members travel freely to seek employment throughout a Europe that, less than a century ago, was torn apart by war.

A war between the Soviet Union and Ukraine simply could not happen if both nations belonged to the EU since leaders of any member state that invaded another would be subject to the European Court of Justice. Indeed, if both Russia and Ukraine were invited to join the EU, we could well see an end to the war and the rebuilding of peaceful relations between these states.

The European Union was formed in part due to the tragedy of World Wars I and II, but it was also very much created because the people of the EU member states realized that lasting prosperity and security could only be found through the formation of an international body ruled by law and respect for human rights. Today, similar movements like the European Union are happening on every continent and these international alliances are reducing the likelihood of war, especially nuclear war. Eventually – I hope within the next one hundred years – we shall see these regional alliances join to form an international “public authority” that will outlaw war and disarm the world of its suicidal weapons systems.
Consequently, we do not have to invent global and regional institutions to end war and promote universal peace. They already exist. We have the United Nations, which can be reformed, and its many agencies and affiliated NGOs that already promote peace and a healthy environment. We also already have the European Union, the African Union, and similar multinational organizations around the world that can one day evolve into a Global Union. Thus, we have an end and a means to it. A Global Union may be much closer than we think.

Conclusion
In this essay, we have examined one of the darkest moments in human history, in which our wonderful planet would have been turned into ashes if not for the intervention of Pope John XXIII and the prudent turn to sanity and moral conscience exhibited by John F. Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev. In the Cuban Missile Crisis, two world leaders faced the abyss and courageously chose the path to peace that began with a ban on the limited testing of nuclear weapons and the goal of eliminating them entirely. Pope John inspired President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev to choose the life-giving path of cooperation and understanding instead of the deadly path of hatred and mistrust.

Dear friends, we can, we must, build a global community based on justice and love for our people, our animals, our trees, our oceans, and – especially -- our future. Let the children of tomorrow look back on the 21st century as the turning point in human history that not only abolished war but created a Global Union that produced a secure and lasting peace for generations to come. Let us look to the future with hope, joy, and love in our hearts.

*With all my heart I believe this world’s present system of sovereign nations can only lead to barbarism, war, and inhumanity. Mankind’s desire for peace can be realized only by the creation of a world government.*
Albert Einstein, 1945

*Nothing else in the world...not all the armies... is so powerful as an idea whose time has come.*
Victor Hugo

*Blessed are the peacemakers for they will be called children of God.*
Jesus of Nazareth

---
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