



Background

Those in power tend to reject the concept out of hand, those who formerly held power tend to support debating the concept as you will see from the quotations. Those who reject debate tend to say it is impractical, those who support it tend to say it is nothing more than the situation which would be achieved if NATO were to be ultimately enlarged to include every nation of the world!

Under the Shield concept those who breach the enforceable international law of the United Nations would not do so without encountering the full might of an able United Nations, not the present animal. We have so far not taken a high profile as we have been gathering quiet support for the concept to be debated. As you will see from the brochure, we have now achieved that from some notable folk. It is essential when considering the concept to cast aside all thoughts of the way United Nations operates today.

The concept of Shield does require vision, but that is how this country evolved. In being misrepresented, it is often **wrongly** linked to world government - it has **nothing** to do with world government.

Without doubt the events of 11 th September 2001 demonstrate clearly the need for the world, having addressed the immediate issue, to look afresh at the way the world is policed. I make reference later to our three year old survey on America 's role as "world policeman", but had the United Nations adopted the concept of Shield in 1945, the environment in which extremists can wrongly cite the USA as the enemy of their culture, would not exist. Writing on the concept of Shield in 1996, Lord Callaghan said, "When the Charter of the United Nations was agreed, those who designed it looked forward to such a possibility, but any progress was pushed into the background by the Cold War."

Shield is the proposed re-organisation of the United Nations to make good the failure of the UN to prevent war between sovereign states and enable the UN to swiftly deal with humanitarian issues and civil war. Why has the UN failed? Simply because the ultimate use of force currently depends on collective security, which in turn depends not on international law, but self interest. I could argue that self-interest is preventing the debate on Shield .

Shield is based on the principle of democratic law and its enforcement, something which the people of this and many other countries not only accept and abide by, but demand in their national environment. Furthermore, although the concept of Shield is aimed at sovereign

warfare, it would create a United Nations with teeth and authority, able to act, if the General Assembly so authorised, in situations involving both civil war and terrorism. Indeed, it would remove from fundamentalists the target of hatred, which is so essential to their cause.

Although at present there is resistance in the corridors of power to the concept of Shield , it is largely based on an unwillingness to understand what Shield really means or how it works. At the same time we are repeatedly seeing on a situation by situation basis, of which Kosovo and Iraq are prime examples, the underlining principle of Shield used in managing conflict throughout the world. However, it is worthy of note that whilst current world leaders wish to retain the present system, and thus their power, former world leaders, from Lord Callaghan to ex Presidents Carter and Gorbachev, advocate debate and consideration of Shield.

Shield is not a formal pressure group, peace group or even lobby group! Indeed, at the heart of Shield is the very deterrence, which maintained global stability during the cold war, **but in support of international law.** Shield represents the theory of Defence Diplomacy in action and removes from any single government the fear that its sovereign troops could find themselves engaged in activities that it did not agree with or support, or that its electorate did not support. I repeat, that whilst the concept only addresses the issue of sovereign war, its adoption by the United Nations would mean that, subject to the direction of the General Assembly, the UN would also have the ability to act in situations of civil war or terrorism. Albeit the objective is to deter to such acts. The concept was conceived by the late Paul Stonor, and we have no external funding and it is not an organisation that anyone can join. >

Frankly, the criticism of Shield is based on nothing more than an emotional inability to accept change, or the concept simply being inconceivable. For example, opponents express fear about the power to use nuclear weapons being vested in people elected to a UN body but accept an American President having such power in an operational situation approved by the UN! Furthermore following the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington , countries across the world are coming together in an American lead coalition to hunt down terrorism, in the knowledge that America has said that she will go ahead without them anyway.

Shield involves no loss of sovereignty, nor does it remove from any nation the right to defend itself.

Even before 11 th September 2001 , we would in particular have drawn your attention to the American survey results and question 18, the private thoughts of those responding, three years ago. Now we shall see, but the test is not the coming weeks, months or even years, but decades.