

Organization Of Free Countries

The Need

With the plethora of existing international organizations, is there a need for another? The answer is that none of these established organizations have the structure, capabilities or resolve to address the global issues that present the greatest dangers to the civilized world.

Background

Each of the global organizations has shortcomings which limit their effectiveness in confronting the major dangers which the civilized world faces today: Items:

1. The UN

The Security Council is limited by the veto power of the five founding nations from taking meaningful actions. (Iran today).

It excludes from this council the two countries with the second and third largest economies in the world, Germany and Japan.

It is essentially a debating society which seeks to settle all conflicts through diplomacy, and has a forty year history of ineffective sanctions.

2. NATO

It has no permanent military force to enforce its decisions.

NATO was formed in December 1949 primarily as a response to the perceived threat from the Soviet Union. It has a direct relationship with the United Nations, and all members must reaffirm their commitment to the principals set forth in the UN Charter.

All members are required to contribute certain military assets, on call when authorized to meet a specific conflict). NATO. Russia is not a member but has a working relationship with the organization.

NATO generally restricts its activities its area of interest, namely Europe and North America. It has an excellent forty year record of protecting its 26 member nations, and has now expanded to encompass all of the countries in continental Europe (except Switzerland and Liechtenstein) and Turkey and is considering applications from several other regional states. However, in 2005 NATO authorized sending a military force to Afghanistan to take over peacekeeping activities.

3. ASEAN

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations was organized in 1967, not as an alliance to meet a potential military threat, but as a more benign forum for solving regional problems. Its members “adhere to the Principals of the United Nations

Charter”, but are in no way bound by strict commitments. Perhaps the major difference with NATO is that most of the nations in ASEAN are economically underdeveloped countries and have not the means to contribute much towards collective security.

The Solution

The optimum solution would be to create a new *exclusive*, not all inclusive, world organization. The group should be composed of countries that share our common values, namely freedom of speech, religion, press, and a freely elected government that can be periodically replaced, peacefully, by the consent and will of the people. Of course, not all countries have the same political systems, and vary by degree of freedom in civil rights and economic policies. But of the 191 countries that are now members of the UN, 35 appear to meet the standards for charter membership in the *Organization of Free Countries (OFC)*, as shown in Table A below. The organization will invite other countries to join as they meet the criteria established by its charter members.

However, once established, the effect of the new organization would not be to replace the UN, but to essentially assume the functions of the Security Council. At that point, there would be no reason for the US, or other members, to participate in the Security Council. There are many agencies of the UN that do perform very worthwhile services (e.g. UNICEF, etc.) and these should continue to be funded based upon their objectives and performance.

OFC Membership Criteria

The definition of a “Free Country” is a relative, not an absolute term. Our basic criteria for a free country is one that can and does change its government leadership periodically peacefully, generally through free elections. We envision the following nations are considered the “Core Group” as Founding Members of OFC:

OFC Founding Members
(alphabetical)

Table A

Australia	Austria	Belgium
-----------	---------	---------

Brazil	Canada	Chile
Czech Republic	Denmark	Finland
France	Germany	Greece
Hungary	Iceland	India
Ireland	Israel	Italy
Japan	South Korea	Mexico
Netherlands	New Zealand	Norway
Philippines	Portugal	Russian Federation
Spain	South Korea	Sweden
Switzerland	Taiwan	Turkey

There are also several countries (e.g. Bahamas) which meet the OFC criteria, but they are too small to have international impact. Perhaps they can be granted an Associate status.

Notably missing from this list is China (including Hong Kong) which is a major world power but with an authoritarian government not likely to change any time soon. However, a number of countries with authoritarian governments do share many Western values, and are likely allied with the cause of international peace for their own self protection. Singapore is a classic example. Also, Thailand and Vietnam have free market economies, and have developed strong commercial ties with the West.

Monarchies

A number of the countries on the list are “constitutional monarchies”, namely United Kingdom, Spain, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Also, most of the of the Arab countries are monarchies, notably Saudi Arabia and the seven Emirates in the UAE (particularly Dubai and Abu Dhabi), Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar and Morocco. Several of these nations are making small steps toward democratization, but all of these governments are firmly linked to the West economically.

Perhaps one day the royal family of Saudi Arabia may discern significant merit (e.g., a pending French-type revolution) and set up Mecca and Medina as “Vatican Cities” under the Islamic clergy. Following the English example, the “Royals” could establish a parliamentary government to run the country, and retire to the good life in their palaces and yachts in Marbella.

The Charter

The specific Articles will be worked out between a core group of the founding members, as was done by the EU, hopefully with less contention. Presumably funding will be based upon the relative sizes of the economies of the members. With the U.S. having the largest share, it will have significant influence on the charter of the OFC. The cost of the entire OFC organization could probably be paid for by diverting some funds from their present UN contributions.

Site Selection

For similar reasons, it appears that a new location in a country other than the U.S would be advantageous for the new world headquarters of OFC.

The site selection again will be the decision of a majority of the charter members, but some of the reasons for an non-U.S. site are (a) to create a image that it is not a U.S. operation; (b) to be closer to the scene of the problems (e.g. the Middle East) and the other member countries; and (c) much less expensive for all of the members than the capital cities of the developed world (e.g. New York and Brussels).

As a possible location, it appears that the area around Shannon, Ireland would meet these criteria. There is a large and underutilized airport, within easy range of all European cities and the United States. It is in a non-urban area, with ample room in adjacent areas to develop an entirely new headquarters complex for OFC. The development should be welcomed by the Irish people and government. As a final incentive, they make some great beer and some very good whiskeys. The Irish people are usually very friendly, and although they speak a weird dialect of the English language, it is slightly easier to understand and learn than Chinese.

The Mercenary Military

Perhaps most important, the ideal new organization would have its own permanent military forces in place to enforce the actions authorized by the majority of the members. To be effective, the CFC must have the means to legally enforce its decisions. The forces would be ready to deploy on short notice to answer any crisis as soon as such action is authorized.

The primary mission of the OFC military is to defend the member countries from all forms of aggression, including terrorist attacks.

In the 21st century, these attacks are more likely to be launched by groups directed by religious fanatics, as exemplified by Al-Qaeda and Hezbollah. This is truly an irregular form of war, and calls for revised tactics.

It may well be that the last engagement between two large armies in the field was the First Gulf War. The total destruction of the Iraqi forces by the American-led coalition was not lost on our enemies, who have revised their tactics accordingly. As vividly shown in Viet Nam and again in our present involvement in Iraq, a long drawn out guerilla war is the most effective way to defeat an occupying army. Suicide bombers are the weapon of choice of the Islamist leadership, and are chillingly effective against civilian targets.

The best defense against terrorist attacks is to destroy their leadership before they attack. This is not an easy task, but with modern weaponry and the requisite commitment, it can indeed be done, as shown in the case of Al-Zarkawi.

Thus, the proposed OFC military is not a large ground force, but a group of specialized combatants to gather intelligence, pinpoint leaders, and call in missile and air strikes until they run out of places to hide. In the process, they will likely loose a number of their closest

colleagues, as well as camp followers and, unfortunately, a number of innocent civilians as well. This is called collateral damage, which is an integral part of all warfare.

The creation of the CFC military force is not intended to replace the military forces of member countries; however, it should serve to augment and/or replace the forces of any single nation (e.g. the US) and thereby serve to disperse the antagonism of the world towards a perceived act of aggression by one country. It would dispel some of the criticism of the US as “Policeman of the World”.

The OFC military will be an entirely voluntary force, recruited from (or seconded to) the OFC from the services of member countries. A high, uniform pay structure with the best modern equipment should attract the most qualified personnel from all countries. It will be a war fighting, not peace-keeping unit. Member countries will be required to contribute to the permanent force, either in manpower or by proportional payments which will be used to hire mercenaries. For example, although the Japanese constitution prohibits government participation in military affairs, there are no doubt a number of their citizens who would join as individuals.

With good pay, excellent equipment and training, and the chance for advancement, the OFC military could develop into a world-class fighting force. The cost of creating, training and supporting a mercenary military, both in peace time and during combat deployments, if spread between the coalition of OFC members, would certainly be much less than the costs incurred by the U.S. when engaged in these activities alone (e.g. Iraq).

Part of the larger items of military equipment (e.g. aircraft & ships) could be obtained on a lend-lease basis, the creative financing technique developed by President Roosevelt in World War II. The balance of the equipment required would either be purchased directly or provided with the personnel assigned to OFC.

Writing in the *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings* in November 2005, Admiral Mike Mullen described the process of “Building a Global Maritime Network” and creating a 1,000 ship Navy. This idea involved the integration of the maritime forces of all of our allies in joint operations, thereby greatly expanding the capabilities and coverage of the U.S. Navy. The concept was met with significant enthusiasm, and is, in fact, being continually implemented through joint operational maneuvers. This coordination is an excellent example of how the forces under command of OFC could operate.

Just the presence of these forces – land, sea and air - should give potential opponents pause before incurring actions that would trigger their involvement. Such a committed deterrent would have been very useful in preventing many historic conflicts.

Implementation

Because the formation of OFC will require the consent of each of the participating governments, and each of the founding nations are democracies, the creation of the OFC will require the approval of each administration and a majority of the elected officials, presumably who reflect the will of their constituents. Accordingly, to create the organization will require both an

education program to gain general approval of these citizenries, and a massive lobbying effort to gain the support of their elected representatives. This is indeed a formidable task.

The usual way to proceed in such endeavors is to gain the support for the idea from a selected group of prominent individuals who have immediate name recognition, relevant credentials and optimally are held in high esteem. This initial group of supporters of the OFC concept will seek the financing required to implement the project. One objective of this paper is to ascertain the level of support from potential financial and political backers of the concept of the Organization of Free Countries.

VII.

CONCLUSION

In looking at the world situation today, it is obvious that globalization is here to stay, and the “Flattening” process described by Tom Friedman is accelerating. The great leaps in communication technology and the Internet make world events immediately known to a large percentage of the world. Growth in international trade increases annually, and isolation is impossible.

Yet most of the world’s population remains desperately poor and illiterate. These people are easy prey for the ruthless dictators who exploit the situation for their own aggrandizement and wealth, too often with the assistance of cynical governments and merchants from the developed world.

This paper acknowledges and welcomes the globalization and flattening process. Its principal recommendation is to create a new world organization composed entirely of countries that share the central ideals of Western societies, namely placing great value of the lives of all individuals, and their inalienable right to “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness”. These ideals have been embraced by the UK and most countries of the old British Empire, the European Union, Scandinavia, and the Baltic States, and in the Orient by Japan and Taiwan. These countries constitute the core of what is proposed as a new organization to promote world peace. This is called the “Organization of Free Countries”.

Regarding the proposed solutions, while the process of stating them is simple, accomplishing them is not. The implementation is extremely difficult. The UN and NATO are very well established, large bureaucracies, with powerful supporters, albeit with many detractors. The addition of an independent military which has the assets to perform all of the missions of NATO would be a multi-billion undertaking.

Thus, the problems involved in implementing OFC with these objectives, would be, in the short term, very expensive and highly unlikely. However, assuming more limited objectives, the anticipated difficulties do not appear insurmountable. The proposed implementation plan is set forth in a separate document.

In the end, I remain very confident that the Western civilization will eventually prevail over the restrictive Islamic theocratic governments. As a Burmese once told a visiting friend, “America must really be a great country”. When asked to elaborate he replied, “I have never heard of anyone trying to escape from there!”

Although we all have many criticisms of our country, for anyone who has traveled there is no doubt, with all its flaws, the United States is the greatest country in the world, a beacon for all who wish a better life. The challenge is to keep it that way.

Byron K. Varne
October 26, 2006

Organization of Free Countries

Proposed Charter Members

And other

World Organizations

BKV Visited	Country *	NATO	OFC	United Nations: General Security Assembl Council y	WTO Members	OPEC Members	Nuclear Weapons	G-8
	Afghanistan			X				
	Albania			X	X			
	Algeria			X		X		
	Andorra			X				
	Angola			X				
X	Antiqua and Barbuda			X	X			
	Argentina			X	X			
	Armenia			X	X			
X	Australia		X	X	X			
X	Austria		X	X	X			
	Azerbaijan			X				
X	Bahamas			X				
X	Bahrain			X	X			
	Bangladesh			X	X			
	Barbados			X	X			
X	Belgium	X	X	X	X			
	Belize			X	X			
	Benin			X	X			
	Bhutan			X				
	Bolivia			X	X			
	Bosnia and Herzegovina			X				
	Botswana			X	X			
	Brazil		X	X	X			
	Belarus			X				

	Cote d'Ivoire			X			X		
	Croatia			X			X		
	Cuba			X			X		
	Cyprus			X			X		
X	Czech Republic	X	X	X			X		
	Democratic Rep. Of Congo			X			X		
X	Denmark	X	X	X			X		
	Djibouti			X			X		
	Dominica			X			X		
	Dominican Republic			X					
X	Ecuador			X			X		
X	Egypt			X			X		
	El Salvador			X			X		
	Equatorial Guinea			X					
	Eritrea			X					
X	Estonia	X		X			X		
	Ethiopia			X					
	European Communities						X		
X	Fiji			X			X		
X	Finland		X	X			X		
X	France	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
X	Gabon			X			X		
	Gambia (The)			X			X		
	Georgia			X			X		
X	Germany (Federal Republic)	X	X	X			X		X
	Ghana			X			X		
	Grenada			X			X		
X	Greece	X	X	X			X		
	Guatemala			X			X		
	Guinea						X		
	Guinea-Bissau			X			X		
	Guyana			X			X		
	Haiti			X			X		
	Honduras			X			X		
X	Hong Kong		X				X		
X	Hungary	X	X	X			X		
	Iceland	X	X	X			X		
X	India		X	X			X	X	
	Indonesia			X			X	X	
X	Iran			X				X	Dev.
X	Iraq			X				X	
X	Ireland		X	X			X		
	Israel		X	X			X	X	

x	Italy	x	X	X	X		x
x	Jamaica			X	X		
x	Japan		X	X	X		x
	Jordan			X	X		
	Kazakhstan			X			
	Kenya			X	X		
	Kiribati			X			
	Korea (Republic- South)		X	X	X		
x	Kuwait			X	X	x	
	Kyrgyz Republic			X	X		
	Laos			X			
	Latvia	x		X	X		
x	Lebanon			X			
x	Liechtenstein			X			
	Lesotho			X	X		
	Liberia			X			
	Libya			X		x	
	Lithuania	x		X	X		
x	Luxembourg	x					
	Macao, China				X		
	Macedonia			X			
	Madagascar			X	X		
x	Malaysia			X			
	Malawi			X	X		
	Maldives			X	X		
	Mali			X	X		
	Malta			X	X		
	Marshall Islands			X			
	Mauritania				X		
	Mauritius			X	X		
x	Mexico		X	X	X		
	Micronesia (Federated States of)			X			
	Moldova			X	X		
	Mongolia			X	X		
x	Monaco			X			
	Morocco			X	X		
	Mozambique			X	X		
	Mauritania			X			
x	Myanmar (Burma)			X	X		
	Namibia			X	X		
x	Nepal			X			
	Nauru			X			
x	Netherlands	x	X	X	X		
x	New Zealand		X	X	X		

	Nicaragua			X		X			
	Niger			X		X			
	Nigeria			X		X	X		
	North Korea (Demo Peoples Rep)			X				Dev.	
X	Norway	X	X	X		X			
X	Oman			X		X	X		
X	Pakistan			X		X		X	
	Palau			X					
X	Panama			X		X			
	Papua New Guinea			X		X			
	Paraguay			X		X			
	Peru			X		X			
X	Philippines		X	X		X			
X	Poland	X	X	X		X			
X	Portugal	X	X	X		X			
X	Qatar			X		X	X		
	Romania	X		X		X			
X	Russian Federation		X	X	X			X	X
	Rwanda			X		X			
	Saint Kitts & Nevis			X		X			
	Saint Lucia			X		X			
	Saint Vincent & the Grenadines			X		X			
	Salomon Islands			X					
	Samoa			X					
	San Marino			X					
	Sao Tome & Principe			X					

x

X	Sweden	X	X	X
X	Switzerland	X	X	X
X	Taiwan	X	NO	NO
X	(Chinese Taipei)			X

X

- X
- X
- X
- X
- X
- X
- X
- X

X

Totals

62

* Blue type indicates proposed OFC charter members.