

# Chapter 11: The Peace Plan

Everything that has been said in this book so far is not new. Socrates, Victor Hugo, Gandhi, Patrick Mbéko and many others have already awoken on these subjects. Where this book now takes its specificity is to propose an implementation of peace based on the understanding of what is explained above. The previous chapters are a kind of reminder and synthesis. I hope that they will one day be perceived as obvious. But, now, it is necessary to concretize these beliefs so that they become a reality, then a knowledge. The necessary and sufficient conditions are in place to establish peace in the world. This is necessary because otherwise humanity will disappear. The conditions are sufficient because humanity is now greatly interconnected. Ideas and actions can be shared fairly quickly among all humans. And, I think we are in a situation where many humans are yearning for change.

As explained earlier, the basis of actions must be based on respecting the golden rule, namely, not to do to others what we don't want done to us. Thus, the main work is a work on yourself. The efforts that you impose on yourself are intended to improve yourself and to challenge your neighbor to understand your motivations. They must be clear. Finally, it is necessary to make the other person an ally. Everyone has to end up pushing in the same direction. We can't waste energy coercing and punishing the one who is wrong. The miracle happens when a person understands that he has made a mistake and decides to use all his will and energy to make it right.

In light of this preamble, here is a plan that will bring peace to the world. The general idea is to remove all weapons. Peace means no more fighting. If we no longer have the means to fight, peace, which is the goal, is achieved.

## **Step 1: make France a non-aggressive country.**

Some will ask why France? Some may say that there are more aggressive and impactful countries.

The first reason is that I am French, I cannot ask another country to do something that my country does not do. First of all, we have to work on ourselves and give an example.

Then, the question is not to make a ranking of aggressiveness or to know who is the worst or the most violent country. My feeling is that France has gone far beyond what is justifiable in the eyes of a fellow citizen, and in the eyes of an earthman. As a winner of the Second World War, we asked, or rather imposed, on our neighbor Germany to never be aggressive again and to have only a defensive army. Were we legitimate to impose this on our neighbor? Does having one's enemy militarily defeated make our demand legitimate? Were we morally superior to

Germany? Algerian friends recalled to me that on May 8, 1945, the date of the German surrender, Algerians demonstrated to remind France of its commitment to decolonize Algeria after the victory over Germany. France had been able to preserve a political and military façade thanks to Algeria in exchange for its collaboration. But the French army machine-gunned the Algerian demonstrators on May 8. All the successive powers passed under silence this event. Who can say that France had a moral superiority at that time? Agreeing never to start another war in order not to fall back into the horrors of the Second World War is moral progress. I think that Germany has progressed because it accepts willingly what has been imposed on it. It would be solidarity on the part of France to recognize the seriousness of what it has done in Libya and to make the decision not to provoke this kind of horror again. France would then be equal in peace with Germany. The golden rule would then be respected. Shouldn't we, the French, make this decision for our country? Brothers and sisters of the whole world, could you help us to do so? The Libyan people will receive a first relief in their ordeal: to obtain by an act the recognition that they have been attacked.

There is another point, both symbolic and important. Taking the decision to never again attack a country will bring us in line with our deepest intentions. We will stop lying to ourselves and to everyone else when we call our military system "Defense". We will simply be in conformity with this word.

The army should only be used to defend ourselves, on our land. It is essential not to retaliate on the land of an aggressor. If this possibility is left open, it could be used as a pretext for false flag operations. Malicious minds know how to organize terrorist attacks in the uniform of the country they want to attack, and then it could be explained to us that it is absolutely necessary to go and exterminate these terrorists who are preparing themselves abroad. And we will remain an aggressor.

This choice results in breaking alliances that could commit us outside our territory. The progress is to put forward the idea of avoiding all aggression. Solidarity in aggression is not progress. If solidarity is a very important value in the eyes of our allies, they can do as we do. We have experienced solidarity in unconsciousness in Libya, and we don't want that anymore.

Now comes a major point. The weapons. Some offensive weapons will have to be abandoned. And in particular atomic weapons. It is not possible to say "I won't attack anybody anymore but I keep my atomic weapons". That would mean that I would only explode the bombs on my country. It is sheer madness to consider detonating such weapons on one's own land. If an enemy invaded a part of the territory, throwing a bomb of mass destruction on it would make the affected area uninhabitable for a very long time. It would take less time to wait for the enemy to withdraw and there would be a chance of recovering something usable or liveable. So we have to face the fact that weapons of mass destruction are offensive weapons. We do not want them to explode on our territory, nor do we want them to strike a foreign population. Nor do we want to be responsible for a general conflagration that would affect the entire planet and all of humanity. We must abandon this burden.

The struggle is no longer only military. Interest groups are using finance to take control of politics, which has control of military affairs. It is necessary to limit the military action of predatory interests. They act wherever there is something profitable to acquire or control. And they do not limit themselves in quantity or in means. If humanity moves towards a confederation of exclusively defensive countries, it is to put limits to these forces of predation that have invaded our daily life and it is a good strategy to start containing them and make them understand that their appetite must be limited. This is a non-violent response to the trap of the free trade doctrine. If populations were able to live with sufficient moral values, without being exterminated or dominated by the military power of their neighbors, their prosperity and joy of living would be a flagrant denial of the superiority theories of free trade. That is why a proponent of free trade needs a powerful and offensive army, so that he will not be challenged by virtue. Virtue does not give freedom for economic plunder and corruption. Free trade should be negotiated with the minimum requirement that it be impossible to attack another country. For history teaches us that those who have refused economic plunder have been taken by force of arms.

Some might say that we must assist those who call on us. A person who is in control of his emotions would say that we don't have to do it militarily. To think that it is necessary to intervene militarily reveals a culture of violence and domination. Why does our civilization have the reflex to help militarily? Is it not a symptom that we have not yet tried to understand the root of conflicts? We have already gone too far down the road of violent aid to continue. On the other hand, in the parable of the Good Samaritan, Jesus teaches us another way. That of care and placing the attacked people in a safe place nearby that can accommodate them. It is also appropriate to take care of the arrangements so that the one who receives is not harmed. If you want to help, it is more reasonable to do this than to make the arms dealers prosper and put the victims in debt so that they can rebuild their country. You have no idea how many people you can feed with the cost of dropping a single bomb.

Finally, one last point is that my Christian and Gandhian aspirations make me think that the most effective path would be to demilitarize completely and unilaterally. I don't see which country is likely to invade us militarily. Switzerland and Germany are exclusively defensive countries. Our other neighbors, Belgium, Luxembourg, Italy and Spain, do not claim anything from France. We have many productive exchanges with them. Seas and oceans protect us. What navy should we fear if we disarm ourselves? Are we not also protected by our neighbors? They would have to invade them first before invading us. It is true, however, that we have behaved aggressively towards a number of countries in the not too distant past. I am thinking in particular of our former colonies and protectorates where the French power still tries to keep a certain hold. They might have some resentment from the past. They may still have some. But if we no longer had the power to defend what we call our interests, in their country, this feeling would disappear. We might consider having common interests so that their interest is to preserve us. We could hope to rely on them in times of

trouble. But my understanding of Islam is that not all people move at the same speed and that it may be appropriate to defend ourselves. It is likely that a significant part of the French do not consider it reasonable to lay down their arms. The step is perhaps a little high. I accept this idea. Peace can be achieved without unconditional and unilateral disarmament. It may be a better idea than my spiritual aspirations would suggest. And I am sure it will bring more French people together. It will be easier afterwards for other countries to imitate this approach of limiting themselves exclusively to defending their own territory.

Now, for the mutation towards a country that is only defensive, it is necessary that many French people share this idea and want it to be put in place. So we must make it known. We must count these people who affirm their commitment. A website has been created for this purpose. It is the first step towards a new era of peace. Those who register can do so with the greatest pride. They offer to posterity a world of peace that is conducive to evolving in brotherhood. They have the opportunity to say who they are, where they live, their commitment, their contributions and their wishes for posterity. They are a beacon of peace. In a speech quoting from the writings of Marianne Williamson, Nelson Mandela said, "And as we let our own light shine, we unconsciously give other people permission to do the same."

As we are liberated from our own fear, our presence automatically liberates others.". Posterity will be able to honor and remember each of the stars that were activated, for a long time to come. Thus we fulfill and complete the prayer of the music group OneRepublic in their song "Counting Stars":

**"I've been prayin' hard  
Said no more counting dollars  
We'll be counting stars  
Yeah, we'll be counting stars"**

This website is addressed to all the inhabitants of the earth. Initially, the goal is to have as many French people as possible asking for an exclusively defensive military position, limited to its territory. Other nationalities can also register to reassure, support and actively encourage the the French people. A first initiative could be to count the people offering to host in their homes French people who would have to flee France in case of a military conflict after France has committed itself not to attack anyone. This site will then evolve according to the needs of the actors.

For this transformation in France to be done in the best possible way, the aspiration of the French must be joined by the aspiration of their leader. This is how France has always been built. Our president, currently Emmanuel Macron, has this exceptional opportunity to do so. But I feel that this position is very difficult. A president in France does not come to power spontaneously. You need a lot of support. At least some of these supporters defend the interests of high finance and the military-industrial complex. These supporters did not give him their support without taking guarantees. The limitation of military power to defense is the first domino that can loosen the grip of high finance on society. It will not let itself be

released. The safeguards taken to ensure the president's loyalty will be used if he chooses the path of justice and the public interest. It is possible that the president will be very lonely among his advisers, whose true interests are unknown. Attempts to destabilize him will be made if he ventures to reach out to the people. One should not be fooled by the media, which has already succeeded in getting one of his close ministers to leave because they made a state scandal about the fact that he ate lobster at the expense of the state. And it was not the respect for animals that was blamed. One should not reject the hypothesis that presidents are kept in a cave within a cave to explain such damaging decisions for the country. However, if the president has done regrettable things, they should not be tolerated to buy our peace. We will have to hear him explain and see what he does to repair them. But be aware that most of these movements will take place behind the scenes and we will not know the president's intentions. The sooner he formulates them, the sooner he will have our encouragement to make them happen. We must also be aware that the savior of Rome, Aetius, was a hostage in his youth at the court of the Huns. Some have said that this allowed him to understand their strengths and weaknesses and ultimately make them give up the fight. Others have accused him of being a Romanized Hun. Our president has worked for high finance. He is in the position of Aetius in 430... whose destiny is to unite the peoples, confront the barbarians and suffer ingratitude. Who can have such shoulders? He can choose to manage day-to-day affairs and follow the general trend. He can also be a victim of events and press the button that will bring about the final destruction. It is up to him to choose his destiny. But we can awaken him to the gravity of sending missiles at Syria and its Russian ally in April 2018. Why was such a serious decision made so quickly? Perhaps, our president now has the distance to see that nothing is certain about the data that made him take this serious decision. Perhaps he can realize that Syria is undergoing the same accusers as Libya. The consideration of these accusers for the Libyan population was feigned and everyone can see that today, 8 years later, it is non-existent for the suffering Libya. Why do we want to continue to make a carnage with the same recipes? Our president was lucky enough not to cause irreparable damage. But he could have started a war with the Russians. His conscience must be awakened to this issue. What can we do to help him? Make him think about a neighboring issue, like Libya, where he was not involved. What would he have done? We must also make him aware of the consequences of a war between atomic powers. The idea I have to act, as an individual, is to broadcast Bob Marley's song "One Love". In this song Bob Marley asks the question directly to the people who have the capacity to destroy humanity:

**"Let them all pass all their dirty remarks  
There is one question I'd really love to ask  
Is there a place for the hopeless sinner,  
Who has hurt all mankind just to save his own beliefs ?"**

This beautiful song promotes the idea of unity and the love of humanity. Music can reach where words alone are powerless. If the presidents wonder why they hear

this song all the time, then someone will be able to answer them and they will be able to prepare their answer to Bob. I hope they will realize that this perspective and therefore their current place is unbearable for a soul. I hope they will come to unburden themselves; for them, for us, and for the next.

Then, journalists of big media, aware of having participated in making the public opinion accept useless wars, could offer a tribune to the Syrian president to give us his point of view on the events of April 2018 and the attitude of France and other countries towards his country. It would also be interesting to ask him what he knows about the plane bombings that have been attributed to Libya. Patrick Mbéko suggests that Syria knew of other suspects. It would be wise, with some distance now, to understand what we, or the previous generation, did to provoke such a violent reaction.

These are some examples of ideas for actions that can lead to the people being joined by their leader. For those who need hope, Emmanuel means "God is with us."

**Step 2: Restore credibility and usefulness to international dialogue and coordination structures**, such as the United Nations (UN).

When France succeeds in step 1, it will be a very big step forward. It will create a great wave of hope throughout the world. Some will want to follow the example and keep the hope of a world peace alive. But be careful not to get carried away. France will still be a very young child. It cannot yet explain to other countries what it is appropriate to do. And history reminds us of this. In 2003, our representatives explained to the UN the seriousness and the non-necessity of a war to invade Iraq. We failed to convince the warmongers to give up. But in 2011, we joined them. They were the ones who were able to convince us to go to war, so well that we even zealously put ourselves in the lead of the crusade against Libya. Worse, I believe that we have misled other countries that gave some credit to France's voice. It would be a step forward if we had the humility to recognize that we are not a member of the UN capable of making a permanent contribution to the security of nations. Yet we have one of the 5 permanent seats on the UN Security Council. Do the others get it? It would be interesting to have a secret vote to get the opinion of the other nations on the permanent members of the Security Council. However, what is certain is that the 5 permanent members of the Security Council have nuclear weapons and are probably the 5 nations that have the most. The ones who can destroy all of us are the ones in control of the UN Security Council! Can't we say: "The madmen have taken over the madhouse"?

Let's see how this organization behaves. In particular for Libya. On March 1, 2011, Libya was excluded from the UN Human Rights Council. Because of this decision the Security Council is seized to adopt the resolution 1970 of the UN. It is formulated in this resolution based on unverified accusations, sanctions of freezing assets of Libyan leaders and their families, their travel ban, an arms embargo and the seizure of the International Criminal Court. It is also demanded the abandonment of the respect of the sovereignty of the Libyan State on its territory so that can be



exercised the freedom of the media, the free distribution of medicines, the evacuation of foreigners and the work of humanitarian organizations. In short, it is a matter of claims that turned out to be false, in order to subdue an official regime under the pretext of humanist values.

To illustrate my point, I will give you some revealing extracts from this 1970 declaration. Let's start with the preamble in which we have the considerations of the Security Council, one of which is the following:

"  
Taking note of the letter to the President of the Security Council from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya dated 26 February 2011,  
"

I have not found this letter, but it seems that he is demanding that his leader Gaddafi to resign and leave. It is quite astonishing that the representative of a state, responsible for making requests in the form of a letter to the UN, the Security Council or the UN Secretary General, uses this open diplomatic form to address the one he represents. If he does not agree with what is being asked of him, he must tell him directly and eventually stop representing him. This is what a lawyer must do, for example. In his official statements, the representative changes sides from February 26, 2011, repeating unverified accusations, and now known to be false. He then goes from official representative to public accuser. And so, during all the deliberations of the Security Council, not a single voice comes to the defense of the Libyan regime.

Even if, for some, this regime is indefensible, that is not the issue. We are in a situation of application of the law, with sanctions. Elementary justice requires that the defendant be able to express his defense and give his contradictory point of view. Ancient Roman law already demanded this. This is the worst kind of denial of justice, where the lawyer in court asks his client to confess to the charges. This is more like theater than justice.

There is more in the preamble of the resolution:

"Welcoming the Human Rights Council resolution A/HRC/RES/S-15/1 of 25 February 2011, including the decision to urgently dispatch an independent international commission of inquiry to investigate all alleged violations"

It is therefore presented that the initiation of an investigation on alleged facts is the cause of the sanctions that will follow. This means that the UN Security Council is relying on the fact that Libya is presumed guilty.

What can we expect in this context? Let's look at the body of the resolution:

"[The Security Council] Demands an immediate end to the violence and calls for steps to fulfil the legitimate demands of the population;"

We see from the beginning of the resolution the demand for non-violence to others. In the chapter on non-violence, it is explained that having this demand is in no way a non-violent approach. It is a denial of self-defense. This strategy is used by those who do not believe in non-violence and want to fool those who try to believe in it without really understanding it. Moreover, in the following resolution 1973, the

Security Council claims for itself the use of violence. We have a Council that applies the adage "do as I say, but not as I do". This is far from the golden rule, far from the legacy of the wisdom of our different civilizations. The members defending this resolution even went on to show their deeply violent character by dropping thousands of bombs to force the leader to comply, outside the resolutions they were calling for. Then, why is it demanded that measures be taken to meet the demands of the people? The UN has no right to interfere in the internal affairs of a country. Secondly, do we know if there are not already mechanisms in place to take into account the demands of the Libyan population? Providing information to the authorities and taking decisions requested by a fraction of the population are two different things. But in both cases, the internal management of a country is not the responsibility of the UN.

A little further on in the resolution we find:

"ICC referral

[The Security Council]

4. Decides to refer the situation in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya since 15 February 2011 to the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court;

5. Decides that the Libyan authorities shall cooperate fully with and provide any necessary assistance to the Court and the Prosecutor pursuant to this resolution and, while recognizing that States not party to the Rome Statute have no obligation under the Statute, urges all States and concerned regional and other international organizations to cooperate fully with the Court and the Prosecutor;"

You will agree that this passage regarding the International Criminal Court (ICC) is not clear and reveals some contradictions. Here are a few things for you to understand. Libya has not ratified the Rome Statute which makes the International Criminal Court valid for that country and its citizens. Therefore, the law says that the ICC does not apply to Libya. Moreover, three of the five permanent members of the Security Council have not ratified the Rome Statute and do not want to be subject to the ICC. So they have to find a trick in the wording to get Libya to be subject without them and others being subject to it. The trick is to say that all states are concerned only with the Libyan case. Once again, we are witnessing a "do as I say, not as I do". This establishment of law is completely asymmetrical. Not only does Libya not agree with the ICC, but all those who do not agree decide that it is valid only for Libya, without asking its opinion. Can we talk about right and law under such conditions?

Yet in its preamble the Security Council recalls its humanist aspirations:

"Deploing the gross and systematic violation of human rights"

[The Security Council] Decides that the Libyan authorities shall cooperate fully with and assist the Court and the

You will agree that this passage regarding the International Criminal Court (ICC) is not clear and reveals some contradictions. Here are a few things for you to understand. Libya has not ratified the Rome Statute which makes the International Criminal Court valid for that country and its citizens. Therefore, the law says that the ICC does not apply to Libya. Moreover, three of the five permanent members of the Security Council have not ratified the Rome Statute and do not want to be subject to



the ICC. So we have to find a trick in the wording to get Libya to be subject without them and others being subject to it. The trick is to say that all states are concerned only with the Libyan case. Once again, we are witnessing a "do as I say, not as I do". This establishment of law is completely asymmetrical. Not only does Libya not agree with the ICC, but all those who do not agree decide that it is valid only for Libya, without asking its opinion. Can we talk about law under such conditions?

Yet in its preamble the Security Council recalls its humanist aspirations:

"Deeply regretting the gross and systematic violations of human rights,"

The lawyer who attacks the one he represents, the obligations for some and not others, the impossibility for the defendant to speak, the defendant is presumed guilty. With this resolution, the UN violates the rights of the people and their leaders. And with resolution 1973, which authorizes the use of violence, the fundamental human right to punish on the basis of a judgment based on the evidence provided by the investigation is violated. In this "international justice", the results of the investigation are not awaited before the deliberations. The deliberations result in a punishment and the executioners carry out a sentence different from the requested punishment and without control, without limits, without risking sanctions for themselves.

If there is such a need to trample on justice and truth to this extent, then there is a problem. And the problem is not limited to Gaddafi, a whole country is ravaged and many, many people have died. The people have also been victims of this denial of justice.

Thus the actions of the UN Security Council show that "the madmen have taken over the madhouse". Major dysfunctions are taking place. And it seems that the hysteria is contagious. A majority of countries in the Security Council voted in favor of the resolutions against Libya, with a few abstentions. None against. It seems that no one in the Security Council was in any doubt. However, the information that Gaddafi wanted to create an international currency not based on usury was known, at least by the French dissidence that I followed. The fact that it was a threat to some other currencies was already an obvious motive for this whole masquerade at the time. I find it hard to believe that none of the governments voting on the Security Council knew about the real motive. Why didn't they speak out? Why doesn't the International Criminal Court take advantage of Resolution 1970 to investigate and get the cooperation of all states? If it needs leads, I recommend Patrick Mbéko's book which gives very interesting elements on the exactions that were blamed on Gaddafi... but orchestrated from outside Libya. Is the ICC independent and can it do this job? What has it produced in the last 8 years? Why can some slander without risking anything? To understand what happened at the UN and to repair it so that international law can prevail again seems a colossal and necessary task. And the problem did not happen in 2011 with Libya. Here is a quote from Gaddafi in 2007: "[It is] normal that the weak resort to terrorism, since the superpowers have violated international legitimacy, international law and the United Nations, and have executed their decisions outside this framework."

It would seem, then, that Gaddafi had identified the problem and that in order to maintain control, the madmen had to get rid of a serious opponent.

If France succeeds in step 1 of the plan, it will no longer have nuclear weapons. It will then be "a madman" who has realized that he is so. We are at the beginning of the healing process, but it is unlikely that he will be able to heal the others in time. The task is far too delicate for France alone.

At this stage of the plan, I must keep the next part quiet for the moment. I leave it to the wisdom master Mikhaël Omraam Aïvanhov to explain:

"How many problems the coexistence of our two natures, superior and inferior, poses to us every day! This is why, when our higher nature encourages us to behave honestly, to make efforts, we must also make sure that the lower nature is not informed, so that it does not put up obstacles. It is a principle of strategy: generals who develop battle plans do not spread them out everywhere, because if the enemy knew about them he would prepare a retaliation. Similarly, when the higher nature makes plans, it must protect them from the schemes of the lower nature. But while the lower nature must be unaware of what the higher nature is doing, the higher nature must keep a watchful eye on the lower nature in order to thwart its traps, for it is constantly busy plotting shady affairs. It is therefore necessary to keep our higher nature constantly on the alert, so that it may observe what is going on and intervene, if necessary, to set things right."