

Non-POM and Terrorism

Since it would be so dangerous for a nation's leaders to invade a non-POM nation, there might be those who would want to attack it via terrorism. This would not even require that the threat be coming from a national government. It could be done by almost anyone or any group no matter how small and radical. This leads to the conclusion that there would be terrorist efforts on the part of individuals or groups no matter how few people were motivated to perform such acts.

Now if there are enough attempts at terrorist acts and given the technology available for destructive acts there will be some "successful" acts of terrorism. But the number of such acts, the success rate of the attempts, and the recovery from such events will be better for a non-POM economy than for a POM economy.

There will be fewer attempts at terrorist acts because the international trade of a non-POM economy will be by barter. This is functional because a national economy has many products and services to offer and has many needs for goods and services to meet. Therefore the inherent win-win relationship of barter will promote amicable relations between the producers and consumers of the trading nations. This will avoid the colonial exploitation relationship that many industrial nations have experienced with third world nations.

Another reason for fewer attempts is that entry into a non-POM nation is much easier to control. That is, everyone who enters the nation will be identified to the accounts computer system. Unless the entrants expect to live on the charity of their hosts, they will be bringing money from their own nations. To be spent, these assets will have to be given to the non-POM nation in exchange for money in computer accounts. To have an account a person must be identifiable to the computer. That is, the computer must recognize their voice, fingerprints, retinal image, smell or some other measurable aspect of their person such that the computer system can transfer ownership of goods to them in the event they buy something. This means that every retail outlet can identify anyone who comes in. It also means that anyone that the computer does not know is automatically under suspicion. Therefore, there is almost no anonymity in a non-POM economy.

Next, the terrorist either must bring the destructive device(s) into the nation or must acquire the item once in the nation. Smuggling will not be done for profit because there is no tax on importing goods. But protecting the consumer from defective or dangerous merchandise would be paid. Therefore imported items would be examined. On the other hand, in a non-

POM society, weapons and other destructive devices are not likely to be given easily since the person who sells or gives any dangerous item will be held responsible for its use even after they have given it to someone else. Thus it would be difficult to acquire explosives, poisons, hardware, and other resources needed to create those items once in the nation. Now none of these actions will be *impossible*, just more difficult than in a POM economy and thus less likely.

Next we take up the success rate of attempts at terrorism. The current attitude of the vast majority of people in a POM economy is "that's not my job" or "it's none of my business" or "I don't want to get involved." This is a product of the POM simulation of a zero-sum game relationship. Contrast that with the non-POM attitude of "what can I do to help?" Since one can get paid for getting involved, since one can get paid for doing anything useful whether it is a part of one's job description or not, everything in public is everyone's business. In a POM economy such an attitude would be considered offensive since it would be seen as some act of nosiness or selfishness in curiosity or somehow taking advantage of someone else. But in a non-POM economy it would be recognized as being neighborly and those benevolent attentions, the actions of a friend or friend-to-be.

Therefore, anyone who appeared to be secretive, or not welcoming the attentions of others would look suspicious. If they were near some important equipment or in a crowd, they would be likely to be noticed and questioned. Those who enforce the law (police) would find this attitude on the part of the public to be quite helpful.

Some terrorist attacks would inevitably be successful, even as they are under a POM economy. When damage occurs or when people are injured, money is no object (that phrase has a literal meaning which is the one intended here) in the recovery. Whatever anyone can do to help will be paid. Unlike disasters in a POM economy, there is no delay while the decision is made as to who, if anyone, is going to "pick up the tab." This means that resources would be available for the recovery as quickly as word spread about what was needed. Those who spread the accurate, well-considered word would also be paid. In other words, the response would be optimized because *that* would generate the most pay. There is never a shortage of natural disasters to provide practice and lessons in emergency response and each time additional procedures and techniques would be learned, as they are now. However, in a non-POM economy these discoveries will be put into practice much more quickly than they currently are, since people will want to be paid for benefiting others by making these things possible.

Terrorist attacks can never be completely eliminated but the motivations for them as well as the opportunities for their implementation would be

greatly reduced, so the resultant damage, loss, and suffering from successful attempts can be minimized by a non-POM economy.

(See "non-POM Open-source"; for a related article that explains defense in the case of terrorist computer hacking.)