

Chapter 1: The point of no return

It is about "the incident" which took place approximately 1 year ago, on the night of 13 to 14 April 2018. My country, with 2 others, fired dozens of missiles at Syria, which has Russia as its ally. Are we really aware of what happened? Some voices have denounced an attempt to start a third world war. I don't know if you heard about it, but the First World War was started with a knife. The blood called the blood and the alliances have unleashed a gigantic massacre of human lives, on a global scale. Let us rejoice that this act of pure madness did not cause blood. In 1918 there were nearly 20 million deaths. 27 years later, we were putting the cover back on with 60 million deaths. If every 27 years we triple the number of deaths, we would fall on 180 million deaths in 1972, 540 million deaths in 1999 and apocatyliptically, 1.62 billion deaths in 2026. Do you think that is not possible? If the electricity is no longer operational, how long will you last? Everything is dependent on this energy. And if an atomic bomb explodes in the upper atmosphere, it generates gigantic electromagnetic fields. These then destroy all electrical systems and all electronic systems. It is not only a circuit breaker that will jump but the infrastructure and equipments will be pulverized ... except for military equipments designed to withstand this type of field. So the only thing we can do is send back more bombs. Did you know that the atomic bombs went from the equivalent of 18 kilotons of TNT (it is dynamite) to 57,000 kilotons during only the first 16 years of manufacture, that is to say more than 3000 times more powerful. How many are we today? Probably at a threshold such as the nuclear winter for the whole Earth is guaranteed. Do you know the Z machine? This machine achieves unimaginable temperatures: several billion degrees. Some physicists speak of 50 billion degrees (kelvins). By way of comparison, the temperature on the surface of the sun is 5,000 Kelvin and at its center where nuclear fusion reactions take place, the temperature is estimated at 20 million Kelvin. What can be triggered as a reaction with 50 billion Kelvin? A super nova? Who knows? Perhaps we should consider that our power is sufficient to make an additional asteroid belt with the fragments of Earth that we would explode. We also now have bacteriological weapons, genetic engineering that could disrupt our sources of life and also probably weapons, working with artificial intelligence, which are interconnected. Everything would be destroyed automatically! We must also be aware that there are still other terrifying weapons that the military keep secret. Remember also that each world war saw the creation of new and ever more destructive weapons: chemical weapons, atomic weapons. What are we going to invent next time?

You can argue that it does not matter because we have responsible decision makers who will not put these plagues of humanity at stake, that it is only deterrence. Well I do not agree and proof has been provided with this "incident" in Syria. And we will

see throughout this book, that our civilization is not at all reasonable, stable and logical.

It is time for responsibilities to be clearly recognized and assumed. The engineer and the scientist who develop these destruction tools are as responsible as the one who orders to use them. If weapons of mass destruction did not exist, policymakers could not destroy Earth or kill large numbers of humans. The soldier who uses them also has their responsibility. Accepting to act without involving your conscience is giving up your responsibility, but it is also potentially giving it to someone else who is not wise. It is therefore advisable to make sure that he is wise, if you do not, it is irresponsible. If one of the three groups understands its responsibility, then it has the power to stop this madness. But can it? does it want it? I find it hard to conceive of technology providers, brought up in the myth of scientific progress, realizing that it is of the utmost necessity to leave their jobs, their passion and their wages.

Fortunately, there are a few. In this regard, I would like to salute and thank Google employees who have resigned from the company in 2018 to oppose and alert about the provision of high technology for their company for military fields. May others follow. I think the situation is more or less the same for the military who are the users of technology. They are trained and paid to obey, whatever the order. And for the politician, in most cases he reached his position at the price of a fierce power struggle. Can it function other than through power relations? However, the opportunity for change lies in the fact that not all politicians do this. Indeed, it can happen that a man comes to power by convictions and / or an impetus for change in a country and that he embodies this change. It only takes one.

But there is a fourth actor: the people. He can act and must do it because his survival is at stake. Faced with the massacres of the natives by the army of his country, Henry David Thoreau, acted and defined the concept of civil disobedience by refusing to pay his taxes which financed these horrors. He ended up in prison but free in conscience. This did not prevent the massacres, since he was alone. If a minority had followed, that would have been enough to stop everything. But at least, he planted a seed and inspired Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, among others and possibly others in the future. Like Thoreau, we must act, but not alone, and we will see in the rest of the book how to do so, with our means and our qualities, in order to succeed.

“If weapons exist it is to use them”

This sentence does not seem real because it is so terrifying when we talk about nuclear weapons. But when you think about it, you have to face the obvious. This sentence is a reality. We are being sold the strategy of deterrence. But this strategy only makes sense if the response is real, so that we will use massively destructive weapons in the event of an attack. Why did you build them, if even in the case of an attack, you really think they're never going to be used. But you know that fear is not deterred without weapons. So, we build them because we risk using them. And if we use them, it will be a disaster. What I want you to admit in this book is that sooner or

later the threat, or the feeling of threat, will be reached for the use of these annihilating weapons.

I remind you that France and other nuclear powers have already fired missiles at an ally of Russia where Russian troops were stationed. The match did not light the powder keg this time, but other occasions will occur and inevitably will arrive the day when there will be answers which will involve others and all will ignite. You think this incident was under control. However, during the French firing, missiles failed. Is it impossible that they deviated from their trajectory and reached a city or Russian troops? As French, do we know if we “control” our over-armed allies? Do we know all their plans, do they obey us? Can we have absolute confidence in them? Do they respect us to the highest degree? Are they reliable and predictable? It is unreasonable to believe that France is in control or in command of the situation. Yet we shot, and first. Also, do you know that Russian military doctrine is not to use nuclear force first? But does that mean that they will only reply with the atomic weapon if they are attacked with the atomic weapon? So we could attack them without limit with conventional weapons without them reacting violently? No, do not tell ourself stories to comfort us, if the country is attacked, it will feel entitled to retaliate with the weapons at its disposal, and the most powerful if it feels threatened, it is the principle of deterrence. And I still insist that France fired first. We have exposed ourselves to Russian nuclear fire.

I hope you understand that if the situation requires it, apocalyptic weapons will be used by people in a position to do so. So these people should have the least dangerous weapons possible so that they do as little damage as possible. What has happened since this incident? The arms limitation treaties are repealed. The European Union, which is sold to the peoples as an instrument of peace, collects billions to launch research and development programs for new military technologies. We finance and use our creativity for our destruction. Excuse me for insisting, but we have already gone too far on the wrong slope and we are not backtracking. In addition we always manufacture new weapons, now with more and more automation. There is less and less need for human intervention to massacre. It becomes less and less necessary to convince people of the need to kill and massacre.

You should also know that the arms industry is a business. To justify a new generation of weapons, it is necessary to show its superiority over the previous one. A war is an ideal means for this. New weapons are then sold to every country living in fear of being dominated. Another country is designated, especially if it rebels against this principle, to show again that there are weapons much more effective than what has just been bought. Libya and Iraq have borne the brunt of it. In this way, more of them are sold and the development of the next generation is financed.

But if countries are such a threat that they must be attacked, why are we selling them arms? This is morally absurd and increasingly dangerous as technologies develop. It takes fewer and fewer people to kill more and more people. We can see it as a mercantile interest: large funds allow us to sell weapons, pay mercenaries to use these weapons and then finance reconstruction and debt ad vitam eternam the

targeted country. However, we are still being sold a moral necessity to go and wage these wars. And when profit hides behind morality, it's really unhealthy.

But then, what is the right posture to adopt?

Our civilization has reached the end of the arms race rationale. Countries trying to emancipate themselves are attacked by the mighty ones. And a mighty one who would be attacked by another mighty one would cause massive destruction to at least one and probably to both of them. It is necessary to realize that even limiting oneself to defending oneself involves gigantic destruction. It is more reasonable to say: "I still prefer to be dominated than to sow at home and my opponent desolation, destruction and death or even total annihilation. We must hope that one day the dominant will understand that being ready to destroy everything does not give him superiority over the one who had the wisdom to withdraw from a destruction race. Even if the country which capitulated marks its refusal to be dominated, it should reassure the dominator on its nonaggression towards him. It is certain that the dominant is aware that his act is reprehensible and that in place of his adversary, he would have a lot of resentment. He will therefore try to protect himself from the lucid opponent by depriving him of all freedom of action lest he harm him. It is difficult to bear but this attitude is more reasonable than the destruction of one, the other or both parties. A long way begins to teach the brute his non-superiority. But life can go on, the dominated is led to develop unsuspected resources to free himself. He develops his inner greatness. The dominating country is confronted with other opponents in the same mindset as its own. Little by little, it understands the weakness of its position by not finding solutions in the face of permanent conflict situations. But, by constantly searching for solutions, it can find advice and resources from the dominated but more evolved people. Little by little he understands that the one who stooped down is greater than he is. Lasting peace can take hold. The position to adopt is therefore that of the mother before King Solomon who, so as not to see her child die, leaves it to the one who steals it from her. Justice will then be restored.