



CHAPTER 24 | World Peace

The only guarantee for lasting peace and security in the world is the realization of completely free world trade. If you create interdependence between people all over the world, it creates common interest. The European Union is a good example of this. The chance that the politicians of one member state can still find sources of conflict to start a war against another member state seems to have been reduced to a minimum. Free trade is trade between individuals (businesses) across a country's borders, without government intervention in the form of protectionist measures such as trade barriers or import and export tariffs. Free trade leads to the application of David Ricardo's economic law on comparative advantage. In short, this law means that every region of the world will produce those products and services where it is most advantageous on the basis of the available capital goods such as raw materials and labour. On the basis of this law, for example, it will no longer be tenable for products from Dutch greenhouse horticulture to compete with the same products from regions where the sun shines more often and the average temperature is warmer. Greenhouse horticulture in the Netherlands can only exist by the grace of government intervention through subsidies and protectionism. Free trade, world peace and prosperity go hand in hand. There is no peace in the world because there is no completely free world trade. The United States and the European Union are frontrunners when it comes to sealing off their domestic markets. The United States has been blocking the successful conclusion of the so-called Doha negotiations within the World Trade Organisation (WTO) for years. It is not prepared to reduce agricultural subsidies to American farmers. There is also no peace in the world because the same United States, with countries of the European Union in its wake, are still waging imperialist, i.e. aggressive, wars. Imperialism is about power and money. Although these are conducted under noble objectives such as 'protection of the free western world' (Korea, Vietnam) or 'the war against terrorism' (second war in Iraq and war in Afghanistan and the Middle East), they are in fact imperialist in nature. Especially 'The War on Terror' is a brilliant concept. The enemy are unknown and invisible terrorists, who not only reside in caves, but would be anywhere in the world, including among us, and could strike at any moment of the day anywhere in the world. A war against an invisible enemy can neither be won nor lost. This war is infinite. The 'War on Terror' is a hoax and only meant to keep us in constant fear. There is evidence that the 9 September 2001 attack was an 'inside job' of American government officials. The clues to this can be seen in the film *Zeitgeist* and in *Fahrenheit 9/11*, Michael Moore's documentary. How can it be that after ten years the most belligerent and best-equipped country in the Western world, the United States, has still failed to track down and capture a caveman named Osama Bin Laden? Is it because Osama Bin Laden is brilliant, the United States and all the other states involved are incompetent, or because he is not meant to be found? How real is the risk that a bunch of terrorists will take control of a country by their actions? That risk is negligible. A bunch of bombs and grenades won't get you very far. It



takes a whole army of people to do that. The 'War on Terror' gives politicians and governments all over the world the legitimacy to continue to allocate infinite amounts of money to the military-industrial complex, to make countless civilian casualties and to safeguard geopolitical interests (oil and other raw materials). In addition, it offers the opportunity to further restrict the civil rights and freedoms of people all over the world. It seems to be a deliberate attempt to change the world into a large totalitarian police state. A totalitarian state of the kind described by George Orwell in his book 1984. In the meantime, we can conclude that President Obama does not differ from all his predecessors in this respect. He's just more of the same. However, it has not to be like this. Man has a choice at any time of the day to think or act differently. The direction that could be taken is the following. The most important starting point is that threatening or exercising violence against others is forbidden. This principle should particularly apply to politicians, who want to make use of their armed forces. This armed force, also known as the defence apparatus, should only protect civilians who live within a country's borders against external aggression. Nothing justifies the use of the armed forces for the realisation of an imperialist political agenda beyond its borders. As such, this is also enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Aggression from one state towards another state is forbidden behavior. To deprive politicians of power on this point, the only and most effective solution would be to privatize the defence apparatus. Insurance companies may have a role to play. What obstacle is there to finance national security through insurance premiums? For example, the home insurance could be expanded with this module. After all, what is the likelihood that the Netherlands or the European Union will still be confronted with external aggression within its borders? This chance is nil. So what is the point of using a lot of taxpayers' money to maintain a fully prepared defence apparatus? A branch that nowadays is used for purposes other than the protection of civilians in their own country. What would be against protecting citizens against the threat of war by private parties on the basis of real risk? The free market, like no other, is capable of developing a tailor-made defence structure. And should, under these circumstances, a politician unexpectedly rise up abroad and intends to wage war against us, then for reasons of efficiency a good price will be put on this person's head, instead of letting it come to that. The development described above can be accelerated if young people decide from now on to give up a military career. Killing other people or endangering your own life for 'the good of society' is acting on the basis of political moral and power. It has nothing to do with living consciously from the heart. The world does not become a safer place by the use of violence. After all, everyone is free to defend themselves against aggression by someone else. So violence provokes violence. The hopeless missions in Iraq and Afghanistan are good examples of this. If you start shooting, they will be shooting back. Real peace between people and peoples is only achieved by the realization of economic interdependence, cohesion and by resisting politicians who want to wage war.