



## **It would have been inconceivable two hundred...**

..... that Britain would come to the aid of France to repel an aggressive invader; that, as we neared the start of the 20 th Century for America to come to the aid of sovereign states in Europe engaged in warfare.

The modern concept of the United Nations, would have been unthinkable, not only then, but also in the nineteen thirties. The League of Nations , to which America did not belong, was a start. A start that was vital, but, it did not stop tens of millions of deaths through global war. The horrors of war which saw 130,000 civilians killed in fourteen hours in the fire bombing of Dresden and 70,000 civilians killed in milliseconds in the atomic bombing of Hiroshima , concentrated the mind of civilised, non aggressive, non conquering man and the United Nations was born.

There is world peace ..... and yet millions of people are still killed in war. Often wars of greed or ego, perpetrated by a tyrant who suppresses his own people and seeks to conquer others to suppress.

The World has changed greatly since the late nineteen forties and there is much conjecture on whether or not it is a safer place following the break up of the Soviet Union and the improved East West situation. America now acts as, “World Policeman” and has done so very successfully to the benefit of all mankind. To date the American homeland has not been threatened by this role and the American people have accepted the arrival home of body bags, albeit in small numbers in military terms, where there have been economic benefits to America and her people. Would the situation be as acceptable to the American people if Los Angeles or New York , or Kentucky or Boston were the subject of reprisals; if there were no economic benefit to the people of America or, worse still, an economic disadvantage? The internal political problems of Vietnam to America , were, in my opinion, a mere rehearsal for what would happen today. There is an increasing reluctance amongst the people to seeing American ground troops engaged with the inevitable flow of body bags back home. A sacrifice which appears to have no benefit to the homeland.

Where economic interests are threatened, as with Kuwait , redress will be at hand. Where it is not, as with Iran and Iraq , it is not.

The concept of the UN, as with it’s predecessor, the League of Nations, was founded on the concept of collective security; ridiculed by some as unworkable, good in theory but too difficult to administer; the practical problems would prevent the concept working, some said.

But, although history shows us that collective security is more than uncertain when called upon to work, the World has been a safer, more peaceful place because of it.

But, even if **fully** implemented, does collective security achieve the results we desire? This century has twice seen collective security go to the aid of small countries being attacked in Europe and in each case a World War was the result. Authorised by a UN resolution,

America went to the aid of Kuwait . The object was achieved, but upwards of 50,000 lives were lost. Clearly, we must abandon traditional thinking based on being able to win UN approved wars and concentrate on the prevention of war. The total elimination of war. To achieve this the UN must empower itself to enact international law binding of all nations.

The law would be simple: no nation may invade another sovereign nation. The result equally simple: strikes against the invader nation by Shield forces, which are not under political control but in the hands of a Council of Monitors obliged to strike in the way that the Chief Constable is obliged to investigate when a crime is committed and not wait for a committee to authorise it.

Suppose .... when Nazi Germany attacked Poland , that the American Government had announced that its scientists and Defence Department had developed nuclear warheads with yields in the megaton range, along with a delivery system operating from US Navy submarines. And suppose that the US Government made it clear beyond all doubt that if the Nazis attacked Poland several US Navy submarines in the North Sea would, after extended warnings had been given to the targeted areas to minimise civilian casualties, progressively destroy Germany 's industrial capacity until the Nazis withdrew their armies from Poland .

The US made it clear that this ultimatum also applied to any nation committing an act of aggression against another nation. With this hypothetical scenario:

1. Would the Nazis have called off their attack on Poland ?
2. Would Britain and France as guarantors of Poland 's sovereignty, have welcomed the ultimatum, or would they have informed America that they would prefer to go to war with Germany using conventional weapons?
3. Would nations of good intent have welcomed the unconditional guarantee of their sovereignty given by the US , or would they have felt open to future threats from such a powerful nation?
4. And if some nations did feel so threatened, would they have felt relief when America subsequently indicated that it wished to hand control of its missile equipped submarine fleet to a supranational Council, to be made up from delegates originating from all World nations?

Evolution will never stop, the world order will constantly be changing. Perhaps at some future date those who criticise America in her role as the world's superpower now, will look back and wish she was still the world's superpower .....

It was inconceivable that .....