

Introduction

In 1927 H M Warner of Warner Bros dismissed developments aimed at providing talking pictures saying, “Who the hell wants to hear Actors talk”.

In 1911 Marshal Foch, the revered French General of the First World War said, “Airplanes are interesting toys but of no military value”.

These two gentlemen were undoubtedly experts but their mind-sets deprived them of vision ... that rare ability to envisage what might be, what could be.

The accompanying literature outlines a rationale, which has become known as Shield, a rationale with a long track record of challenging established mind-sets. Shield argues a profoundly logical case for a fundamental change in the charter of the United Nations, a charter deprived of teeth when drafted in 1945 due to the deteriorating relationships between the Allies, which lead to the Cold War.

In defining the UN’s role as Keeper of the Peace the existing charter places the same reliance on collective security as did the discredited League of Nations. As a consequence nations are left free during an international crisis to act according to their own economic and political self-interests, as we are currently witnessing.

An amended UN charter incorporating the Shield principle would establish enforceable international law enacted and applied subject to the same proven principles of law operating within Democratic nations. No longer would national self-interest and vetoes block or delay immediate and decisive action against an Aggressor. This would remove military aggression as an option open to military dictatorships.

When you read the Shield literature please focus on the World Order which would result from the UN operating under the Shield principles – not, repeat not, on the problems of implementation. All giant steps taken by Mankind have faced problems of implementation but, in the words of a great Englishman, “let the differences argue for themselves.” The difficulties would be no more daunting than those which arose in the creation of NATO or the organisation which has become the European Union.

Finally, imagine you had been involved in 1945 in the drafting of a charter for the United Nations Organisation. In respect of its peace keeping role two widely diverging charters are being put to the vote, one incorporating the Shield principles of enforceable international law and the other incorporating the concept of collective security and vetoes. Would you have voted for the draft charter based on collective security or would you have voted for the one based on the Shield principles of enforceable international law?

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 11th 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 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 11th 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.

Summary

1. SHIELD is not proposing that a powerful military law enforcement arm should be created and placed under the control of the UN General Assembly. On the contrary, the proposal is that the enforcement arm should be under the control of an independently elected Council which is not representative of any nation or economic interest.
2. The UN would enact a law stating that unauthorised military violation of a nation's sovereignty is an international crime of the first degree and SHIELD would be empowered and obliged to act autonomously to uphold the UN law.

The relationship between SHIELD and the UN would be identical with the relationship which exists between a nation's Government and its courts and police. Governments enact law but do not interfere with its case by case application by the courts and police.

Being stateless and without towns or populations to defend, SHIELD would enjoy an 'immunity to reciprocal devastation'. Consequently, it would project the absolute certainty that non-negotiable retribution would fall upon any nation committing a material act of military aggression. Not only would such deterrence eliminate acts of aggression, it would also eliminate the emergence of military dictatorships in the first place. There would be no point in amassing arms and armed forces which if used aggressively would trigger progressive destruction of the national economy.

3. The implementation of SHIELD would not require nations to surrender one iota of their sovereignty other than the right, if right it be, to commit acts of military aggression.
4. Under SHIELD, each nation would decide if and when it would start to reduce its own national defences.
5. The personnel for SHIELD's armed forces would be recruited on a strictly voluntary basis, open to the populations of all UN member nations. Governments would therefore be relieved of any political responsibility for the risks and rewards to which their citizens, who volunteer, would be subject, by their own choice and decision. It would be advantageous if the serving members were to take on the supra-nationality of SHIELD for the period of their service contracts. It is envisaged that SHIELD would require a substantial force well equipped with a limited number of volunteers from any one nation.
6. The principle that 'every nation has the right to defend itself' would, under SHIELD, be progressively superseded by the principle that 'every nation has a right to be defended'. BUT no nation would be prevented from defending itself if attacked.
7. Obtaining the acceptance of SHIELD's principles by the International Community is frequently put forward as an insurmountable hurdle. However, no cogent reasons are advanced why a majority of the UN's member nations would vote against the adoption of SHIELD.

Many nations accept an unconditional guarantee given by America that their sovereignty would be defended by American military power, but others do not. Recent events have called into question in the minds of some more than at any time in history the wisdom of having one nation giving such a guarantee. For those happy to accept the American guarantee, what is fundamentally different between a nation having its sovereignty defended by SHIELD forces rather than American forces?

Surely those who do not accept the American guarantee have much to gain.

There have been some who would have dismissed SHIELD on the grounds that it would be highly dangerous to place overwhelming military power in the hands of five hundred members of a supra-national Council, drawn from one hundred and eighty nations. They fail to explain, however, why it is a safer arrangement to leave such overwhelming military power in the hands of America, even now after the divergence of opinion on American Foreign Policy in 9/11. America is a nation state and its decisions are taken by its nationals based on national interest, something clearly demonstrated by the aftermath of 9/11. It is simply not possible for a one hundred and eighty nation Council to arrive at a sixty six per cent majority vote in favour of an undesirable national objective.

8. The United Nations was created to "make war impossible", but, in this one respect has been a lamentable failure. Politicians throughout history have always been more concerned with today; it is today on which the electorate judges them and passes sentence tomorrow. How politicians litter history who wish they had looked beyond today, to have won victory tomorrow. With a visionary courage maybe what SHIELD now proposes would have become enshrined in the original UN charter.

Certainly with so much horror in the mind of the world's population the futile arguments about implementation would not have raged as they do now. Maybe those who dismiss SHIELD as an irrelevance might care to consider what their position would be today if, back in 1945, the United Nations had been given a charter and constitution which embraced the SHIELD rationale. Would they now welcome a move to have the procedures of enforceable international law removed from the UN Charter, so bringing it into line with the actual Charter with which the UN is currently burdened? I rather doubt it; they'd be too scared of the reaction of the electorate to change.

"New ideas are always resisted by the establishment, based on the perceived problems of implementation and the unfounded fear that the electorate may resist change, even when they clearly desire it." Anon, 1927

"The voice of intellect is a soft one, but it does not rest until it has gained a hearing." Freud, 1927

"Vision is the art of seeing the invisible." Swift, 1711.

"One should always be a little improbable" Oscar Wilde, 1894.

"Where there is no vision the people perish" Proverbs, Chapter 29, verse 18.

Quotes

"My Lords, is my noble friend aware that I believe the support given to this document by a former president of the United States, Jimmy Carter, is unconditional as is the support given by a former president of the Soviet Union, Mr Gorbachev?" - Lord Jenkins of Putney, speaking in the House of Lords

"It is an interesting proposal that deserves to be discussed and debated." - Sir Malcolm Rifkind, Former Foreign Secretary

"Shield is a visionary idea, with a lot to commend it, though I have to add that in the present international political and financial climate it will not be easy to make it a reality." - Dame Margaret Anstee - former Under Secretary General of the United Nations

"Shield is a project that certainly deserves a large and detailed debate. The realisation of such a project could indeed be vital for our World in transition." - Alfred Cahen, Secretary General, Atlantic Treaty Association.

"After the tragedies we have witnessed in recent years, there can be no doubt that the world would be a safer and more secure place if the nations could one day reach agreement on a world system of international law. If it were to be effective, it would need to be acceptable to all and enforceable. 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. In truth, whatever the circumstances, there are several problems in defining its range.....very practical problems that must be faced, but despite them, nothing but good will come from people thinking about and debating these issues, and Mr Stonor makes a very useful contribution to the discussion" - Rt Hon Lord Callaghan of Cardiff KG

"I wholly agree that the Rule of Law should prevail on a global scale, and this will be possible only if effective military action is available at the disposal of a global authority."
- The Rt Hon The Lord Archer of Sandwell

"It does sound a most feasible concept" - Lord Grade of Elstree

"I wish you every success with your interesting project." - J-M Veranneman de Watervliet, Charge d'Affaires a.i., Belgium Embassy, London

"Preventative diplomacy is indeed a necessity in today's world and Switzerland is very much in favour of it." - Francois Nordmann, The Ambassador of Switzerland to London.

"Fundamentally, an American President has to run with such a proposal. It will not come from the bottom up, in my judgement, but the top down." - Lord Owen

"I am very interested and favourably disposed to the concept. It seems to me that in the long run peace in the world and disarmament will only be secured if there is an international security arrangement with a degree of automaticity. I do see enforceable international law as the way ahead." - The Rt Hon Lord Lamont

"This is a very interesting and imaginative scheme and very well set out." - The Rt Hon Lord Jenkins of Hillhead

"It looks most interesting ..." - The Rt Hon Lord Steel

"I would like to wish you luck in gaining recognition for the concept of "Shield"". - Menzies Campbell, MP

"I am most sympathetic to the concept of Shield ..." - Sir David Knox

"It is clear, an interesting concept" - The Rt Hon Alan Clark, MP

"It is all extremely relevant and I believe will eventually happen" - Peter Temple-Morris, MP

"...you are certainly correct in pointing to the desperate need to have an organised international response to the sort of emergencies which are occurring around the world."
- David Harris, MP

"It is, as you say, an interesting concept but not easy to sell." - The Rt Hon Lord Tebbit

"... an idea well worthy of the most serious consideration." - Sir Patrick Cormack, MP

"As ever ... the subject of a 'quick response unit' came up. Such a body was intended in the UN Charter, but has never been implemented." - Lord Ramsbotham GCB CBE

"The existence of a non-national law enforcement body answerable to the United Nations might indeed be useful ..." - Paul von Maltzahn, Minister Counsellor, German Embassy, London.

"Shield raised some interesting points." - John Humphrys, BBC Today Programme

"May I wish you every success in increasing the exposure and support for the principles that Shield promotes." - David Chidgey, MP

"I am sure that your work will add to the important developments in the post-Cold War world." - Francis Maude, MP

"I wish you every success with your work." - Simon Hughes, MP

"I agree that the role of NATO, the UN and the EU in both defence and international law will need to change in the coming decades and informed debate is necessary." - Richard Livsey, MP

"Of course I do accept that something must be done because I personally was appalled at the events over Iraq where the Americans and the British seem to have taken on a role as world policeman without authority." "I have to say that I think there is a great deal to be said for having some kind of international force or committed national force under the control of the United Nations and certainly this would be a great deal more sensible than the proposed European army which is a further indication of the obsession of the EU in establishing a single state without democracy." - Sir Teddy Taylor, MP

"I certainly think that you are moving in exactly the right direction. It is good to see that you have got such a broad-based group of supporters and I wish you well with your initiative." - Professor the Lord Alton of Liverpool

"I was most interested to read about the work of Shield. Shield is an imaginative idea, and it raises some very pertinent questions regarding the concept of a body of international law acceptable to all, interpreted in the same way by all and enforceable by all. I am firmly in favour of a high level of discussion on the issues which are addressed by Shield, in particular those which concern the key debate of the effective role of the United Nations in preventative diplomacy as we approach the 21st Century." - Lord Moynihan, Opposition Spokesman for Foreign Affairs, House of Lords.

"... I think you make some very interesting points in your letter about global stability and the UN needing an enforcement arm." - Rt Hon Lord Renton of Mount Harry

"I share your views about Shield but regret I cannot manage a meeting with you and Paul in the near future." - Rt Hon Lord Healey of Riddlesden

"..... I believe this is a very important initiative." - Julian Brazier, TD, MP

"This looks like an excellent initiative." - Nirj Deva, MEP

"I think your proposals are admirable and certainly worth further debate." - Caroline Jackson, MEP

"There is much to be said for the proposition that if the UN is to carry out the peace-keeping role envisaged by the Charter it needs, in today's world, a very different world from that at the time the Charter was formulated, to possess its own military capability." "I am further inclined to believe that this should consist of mercenary forces, rather than forces subscribed by the member states...." - Rt Hon The Lord Lawson

"Obviously, in view of the current debate about the role of the UN, the ideas encompassed within Shield are particularly relevant." - Gary Titley, MEP

United Nations Founding Philosophy

"We must make certain by your work here today that another war will be impossible." - President Truman speaking by phone to the Opera House in San Francisco, 25th April 1945

"It provides for peace with teeth; for the uniting of peace loving peoples against future aggressors; for a united front amongst the greatest powers, backed by the forces of the smaller powers as well." - General Smuts, President of South Africa and elder statesman

"If we had had this Charter a few years ago and the will to use it - millions dead would still be alive. If we should falter in the future in our will to use it, millions now living will surely die." - President Truman on the formation of the United Nations, 26th June 1945

Statement by Lord Callahan

Could not download

Quote by Jean Pictet

Interviewed in The Guardian by Peter Capella on 12th August 1999, Jean Pictet, the Red Cross lawyer who drew up the humanitarian military code, said:

"Governments are never terribly enthusiastic to be bound by convention, there really has to be popular pressure and that's why we need the support of the small countries too – the big powers have to be pushed a little." "I am a great-grandfather of two days. I think my great-grandson will see an organised world, with a judicial force backed by military strength that outstrips any other. I don't think there's any other solution."

Bullet point Summary

* The United Nations would enact a law stating that unauthorised military violation of a nation's sovereignty is an international crime

- *Shield would be obliged and empowered to act autonomously to uphold the UN law - Defence Diplomacy in action
- *Shield would be a non-national law enforcement body, answerable to but not controlled by the UN
- * The relationship between Shield and the UN would be identical to the relationship that exists between a nation's Government and its courts and police force
- * Being stateless and without towns and populations to defend, Shield would enjoy immunity to reciprocal devastation
- * The personnel for Shield's armed forces would be recruited on a strictly voluntary basis, open to the populations of all UN member nations, thus removing from a nation's government the fear that its sovereign troops were engaging in activities that it did not agree with
- * Individual governments would be relieved of any political responsibility resulting from the upholding of the law
- * Under Shield each nation would decide if and when it would start to reduce its own national defences
- * Shield involves no loss of sovereignty, nor does it remove from any nation the right to defend itself

Extract from RUSI Paper

Unable to copy here

It would have been inconceivable etc.

“It would have been inconceivable two hundred years ago that Britain would come to the aid of France to repel an aggressive invader; that, as we neared the start of the 20th 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 its 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:

Would the Nazis have called off their attack on Poland ?

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?

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?

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

The House Magazine

Too garbled to copy

Lord Callaghan – Comments following etc.

http://www.un-shield.com/answers_lc.htm

Comments following the article in The House Magazine, and his questions answered

1. Lord Callaghan asks, “In what circumstances would intervention in the affairs of another country be justified” and, “should intervention be justified only on a breach of the peace grounds or should it be extended to breaches of human rights or on humanitarian grounds”. Answer: The circumstances in which the Shield Council would act autonomously would be strictly limited by the mandate imposed on it by the UN. The Council would only be empowered - and obliged - to act autonomously when two or more nations are in a state of armed conflict.

Unless authorised and directed by a specific resolution of the UN General Assembly. Shield would not be permitted to interfere in the internal affairs of a sovereign nation. The most likely events which would cause the UN to order an intervention by Shield in a nation’s internal affairs would be civil war or a blatant disregard for human rights. Under such circumstances the Shield Council would act as commanded by the UN whereas when confronted with armed conflict between sovereign nations Shield would act autonomously to uphold UN law, subject to the mandatory rules of engagement.

2. Lord Callaghan also asks, “Who would exercise authority over an international force, whether armed or not?”

Answer : The Shield Council would be the authority to which the military enforcement arm of Shield would be subject. The enforcement arm would be armed, heavily armed.

The constitution of the Shield Council has been described earlier in this Review and it would be answerable to the UN. However, the UN would have empowered the Council to take autonomous decisions to uphold the UN law forbidding unauthorised military violation by one nation of another nation’s sovereignty.

The relationship between the Shield Council and the UN would be identical in principle to that of a democratic government’s relationship with its police force and courts. Police and courts are answerable to the parliament of the nation but they are autonomous in their case by case actions to uphold the law enacted by parliament.

Shield is essentially about establishing enforceable international law and it is a reasonable assumption that the process of international law must be based on the well proven principles which govern international law. There are, however, two aspects of procedure (rather than principle) which diverge from national law.

Firstly, unlike a national police force, the military enforcement arm of Shield would not be empowered to initiate any action against an aggressor nation unless prior authorisation had been given by a 66% majority resolution of the Shield Council. These resolutions may be regarded as the equivalent to a court order which authorises the police to take action normally forbidden them. There would be no circumstances in which the enforcement arm of Shield would be permitted to initiate action without the prior authorisation of the Council.

The second aspect in which there is a divergence from national law relates to the identification of the law breaker. Within a nation a criminal takes the risk of breaking the law in the hope, all too often justified, that the police will be unable to establish his identity or whereabouts. By contrast, the identity and whereabouts of a nation committing the international crime of aggression would be known before, during and after its unlawful act. When this aspect is coupled with Shield 's autonomy of action, a potential aggressor could be

in no doubt whatsoever that retribution would inevitably fall upon his nation should he decide to break the UN law.

It will be clear from the foregoing, that the Shield Council should be regarded as a near equivalent of a criminal court within a nation. If, however, one nation has an unresolved grievance against another nation it must approach the existing International Court of Justice to seek arbitration on the issue. The plaintiff nation, however just its cause, would be forcibly opposed by Shield if it took the law into its own hands and used military force in pursuit of its objective.

This procedure under law is equivalent to a civil action brought by an aggrieved citizen. The citizen is also under restraint that he must not take the law into his own hands.

Governments insist that their citizens accept both the rule of law and the decisions of the courts as regards the interpretation of the law. Under the proposed rationale of Shield, governments would be required to emulate their citizen's commitment to the rule of law, but in an international setting.

The House Magazine – Shield moves forward

Not available to copy

The Parliament Magazine

Not available to copy

Exchanges in the House of Lords Chambers

Thursday, 19th March 1998: Column 811
International Peace Police: Proposal 3.16 p.m.

Lord Jenkins of Putney asked Her Majesty's Government: Whether they will examine the possibility that the time is ripe for the establishment of an international peace police under the jurisdiction of the United Nations with duties to include the verification and enforcement of the conventions banning chemical and biological weapons and the observance of agreements relating to nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction.

Thursday, 19th March 1998: Column 811

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean): My Lords, the Government see no need for a police force of that nature under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. The verification of compliance with existing treaties and conventions on weapons of mass destruction should be carried out in accordance with the provisions contained in the relevant treaty or convention.

Lord Jenkins of Putney: My Lords, will my noble friend bear in mind what the situation would be in any country--for example, this one--if there were no police force to ensure that the law is observed as a matter of course, and nothing between the population as a whole and the military? So long as the present position remains, and enforcement is exclusively the task of the military, is not the danger always present--as has been seen recently in the Gulf--of a war developing, possibly even ending in a third world war?

What are the methods to which she referred just now which are currently in place?

30 Apr 1998: Column 383

"Shield Council" Defence Proposal 3.14 p.m.

Lord Jenkins of Putney asked Her Majesty's Government: What is their position on the proposals for the elimination of war between sovereign states set down in the Army Quarterly Defense Journal, Vol. 127, No. 1.

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean): My Lords, we do not support the proposal for a so-called "shield" organisation; a supranational council with a standing military force and nuclear weapons. Such an organisation would not be effective, accountable or politically acceptable. The UK is working to improve the ability of the international community to prevent and manage conflict. The United Nations is central to this effort. Collective defence through NATO will remain the cornerstone of the United Kingdom's national security.

Lord Jenkins of Putney: My Lords, is my noble friend aware that I believe the support given to this document by a former president of the United States, Jimmy Carter, is unconditional, as is the support given by a former president of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gorbachev? I do not know what the position is as regards a former premier of France, M. Rocard, who has also added his name. But as regards my noble friend Lord Callaghan, the fourth very distinguished international person to have put his name to the document, his support is qualified and he made that very clear in a foreword which he supplied to the article printed in the Army Quarterly Defense Journal, which of itself is a document supported by distinguished military people. In those circumstances, although I do not expect the Minister to say that the Government support this, does she feel able to say, as my noble friend Lord Callaghan said, that the document is well worth consideration and discussion?

Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean: My Lords, my noble friend has been very encouraging in trying to tempt me into saying that we would consider the document. But I must be clear both to my noble friend and the House that the Government do not believe that the document could command that degree of interest or consideration. It involves the creation of another nuclear power and would be in breach of our nuclear proliferation treaties. The so-called "Shield Council" would be independent of states and the UN Security Council. Its members would have to forswear their national allegiances. Her Majesty's Government are most concerned about the accountability of such a council in those circumstances.

30 Apr 1998: Column 384

Lord Monkswell: My Lords, while the Government may have reservations about individual aspects of this article's contribution to the consideration of international armed forces, nevertheless will they recognise that articles such as these do make a contribution to the developing debate about how we can obtain international security around the globe? Bearing in mind the current perception by a number of nations that international peacekeeping efforts appear to be dominated by the United States, does the Minister agree that every effort to ensure that international peacekeeping efforts are perceived and realised to be on behalf of the international community as a whole should be welcomed?

Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean: My Lords, I would be very concerned indeed if anything I said in your Lordships' House in any way detracted from the two answers that I have already given about the attitude of Her Majesty's Government to this particular document. As my noble friend raises other issues as well, I say to the House that Her Majesty's Government believe that the United Nations matters. For all its problems it is an indispensable institution. It is the only one we have at the moment which is capable of giving

any real legitimacy to decisions taken by the international community. The Government rest on that position.

Lord Jenkins of Putney: My Lords

Noble Lords: Next Question!

Lord Jenkins of Putney: My Lords, there is plenty of time left. May I briefly say—

Noble Lords: No!

Lord Jenkins of Putney: My Lords, may I briefly ask my noble friend to say that at least she agrees that this matter should be taken further? I hope that noble Lords will agree that this afternoon's discussion is only a preliminary stage. I hope that in future my noble friend Lord Callaghan of Cardiff will participate. Is my noble friend the Minister aware that I shall make it my business to ensure that an opportunity to do so is afforded to him?

30 Apr 1998 : Column 385

Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean: My Lords, my noble friend Lord Callaghan will know how much he relishes that opportunity--or not. I hope that I have been clear and unequivocal on this point. I cannot encourage my noble friend to believe that Her Majesty's Government will consider the document further. None the less, the Government are, of course, always willing to listen to my noble friend's interesting point of view and I am sure that we shall have the opportunity to do so on this matter in future.

Lord Callaghan of Cardiff: My Lords, is my noble friend on the Front Bench aware that having listened first to my noble friend Lord Jenkins and then to her replies, I am not sure yet which side I am on? However, I shall certainly go away and see what it was I signed. I shall then be very happy to take part in any discussions that may ensue.

1997 Surveys

Not able to copy

Final Comments

Shield is a radical concept and will challenge a number of fixed ideas or so called mind-sets. Those gripped by mind-sets will not debate Shield - they will dismiss it: they will smother it with an avalanche of peripheral difficulties and threshold problems, none of which bears on Shield's essential principles. History is littered with the unseemly reactions of orthodoxy to radical ideas.

Why would a well-intentioned nation not welcome Shield with open arms? It is not being asked to give up any of its sovereignty – just the reverse, it is having its sovereignty guaranteed. It is not being asked to reduce its current levels of defence, it remains free to reduce them when it feels secure under the guarantee of Shield.

The logic underlying Shield will take I, and you, just so far but no further. Its final consummation will need resolve, statesmanship and vision - and the greatest of these is vision.

Frequently Asked Questions

1. Would Shield's Supra-national Council be free from nationalism and other biasing factors which would distort the objectivity of the Council's resolutions?

Firstly, a brief description of the proposed constitution for the Council.

- a. Each one of the 186 member nations of the UN would be eligible to put forward, say, ten of its nationals, from which three would be elected by the General Assembly of the UN to serve on the Shield Council. The UN would have previously issued a demanding specification of the personal qualities and track record required of any person being put forward for election. The specification would stipulate a nil record of political, ideological or religious extremism. It would also require evidence to be available of the intellectual ability and past public service which would include military service.
- b. A Council member would not in any way be a representative of his or her nation's government and would swear to uphold UN law regardless of national or sectional interests and in accordance with a mandate issued by the UN. A similar oath vowing neither to seek nor to take instruction from any government or body' is taken by the Commissioners of the European Community.
- c. The eventual composition of the elected Council would be restricted to a maximum of 66.66% of-male or female members.
- d. Council members who are nationals of nations approaching a state of war or are already at war would be held incommunicado and would take no part in the relevant debates. A voting exclusion would apply to those nations deemed to be closely allied with the belligerent nations.
- e. The remuneration—offered to each elected Council member must reflect the awesome responsibility that he or she must bear. It is proposed that not less than US \$400,000 per annum, free from all taxes, should be paid to each member. The annual cost, therefore, of the 558 members' salaries would be \$223m, a sum equal to the cost of five warplanes.

Will the proposed constitution of the Council with the safeguards mentioned ensure that it would achieve 66% majority decisions which are free from the taint of nationalism or other biasing influences including even gross corruption?

Suppose it is known that, say, India or Pakistan is making preparations which indicate an attack by one on the other. The Council meet to discuss the situation but its members who are nationals of India or Pakistan are held incommunicado. The nationals of, say, eight other nations which are judged to be close allies of one or other of the potential belligerents are deprived of their vote but not excluded from the meeting. This would leave Council members from 176 of the 186 UN member nations to arrive at a 66% majority decision.

Would such decisions be objective or is it probable that they would be blocked by national bias and other subjective factors? A number of Shield's critics claim (but fail to support their claim with argument) that such distortions are inevitable.

But what possible grounds can be adduced for thinking that Council members, who happen to be nationals of, say, Norway, of Spain, of Ecuador - or anywhere - would, due to their national origins, feel compelled to vote in support of the nationalistic aims of India or Pakistan rather than voting in accordance with the spirit of the mandate they have sworn to uphold? In any case, why should the votes of those Council members who may be subjectively biased always favour, say, Pakistan rather than being evenly supportive of both parties? With an even distribution the biased votes would be self-cancelling so far as being able to block an otherwise 66 % majority vote.

The members elected to Shield's Council have not been taken at random off the street. They have been subjected to a most rigorous pre-selection examination. To focus the discussion, let it be assumed that you, the reader, are serving on the Council. Could you see yourself breaking your sworn oath in order to support Pakistan - for no reasons other than you were born in the UK or America or wherever? Or could you see yourself supporting India because you had been corrupted by an offer of a substantial sum to do so?

Even to pose these questions is to insult you. Why, then, are you unwilling to grant that the vast majority, if not all, of the carefully selected Council members would also embrace your own impeccable standard of integrity and rectitude?

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, how would a potential aggressor assess the Council's unswerving dedication to the enforcement of UN law? Could he rely on at least-a-third of the Council's members jettisoning their oaths and voting against a resolution to oppose the aggression with Shield's overwhelming military power - simply because of their national prejudices or because the aggressor anticipates corrupting delinquent Council members with clandestine inducements?

These questions have already been raised and answered and it can be assumed that an Aggressor would have no doubt whatsoever that retribution would fall upon his nation at the first aggressive move - and consequently that first move would not be undertaken.

Absolute deterrence arising from the certainty of Shield's response to aggression is central to its entire rationale and there are no grounds for thinking that the Council's collective behaviour under the stress of events would endanger the certainty and integrity of that response.

It is essential that the autonomy of action accorded to Shield cannot be over-ridden by the veto of a single nation. It would be open for consideration, however, whether or not the constitution of the Shield Council should allow for a 75% majority vote taken in the UN General Assembly to have the power to restrain the Shield Council from proceeding with a mandated course of action. One can visualise exceptional circumstances in which it might be undesirable for the Shield Council to proceed strictly in accordance with its mandated obligations.

2. If you accept that power corrupts would it be an unwarranted risk to create a massive military force under the sole control of a supra-national Council, however carefully its members may have been screened?

This frequently voiced objection is a bizarre extension of the previous criticism. It appears to suggest that the Council members and those in charge of Shield's military forces are likely to break their sworn oaths and all conspire together to seek imperialistic conquest or to interfere in the internal affairs of nations.

I have yet to hear a cogent explanation of what might cause over five hundred high calibre men and women to sink to the criminal level of behaviour suggested. In any case, what conceivable ideological or religious objectives could unite members of originating from cultures based on Islam and Christianity, on autocracy and democracy; and on a dozen other national diversities?

The only credible objective which would unite the Council members would be the one they have sworn to pursue - the elimination of war.

This particular criticism must be regarded as originating from “gut feeling” and, as such, is not susceptible to rational rebuttal. Inexplicably, those who urge this objection are unconcerned that even greater military and nuclear power is already in the hands of one nation – the USA.

3. Would the difficulties involved with creating an effective military force with volunteers from a variety of nations be insuperable due to language differences and the incompatibility of weapon systems?

The problems mentioned in the criticism are acknowledged as existing but are certainly not insuperable. This is confirmed by the existence of NATO and the successful deployment of personnel from a variety of backgrounds during the 1939/45 War. Nevertheless volunteers offering their services to Shield, may, at all levels, be required to be fluent in at least one of the five major languages.

The criticism does not relate to the core principles of Shield’s rationale, it is no more than an overstatement of an obvious implementation problem.

During the debate involving Shield it is usual to be heavily challenged with a flood of implementational problems or to be given a series of finely drawn instances in which the application of Shield’s broad principles of action may become uncertain or blurred.

For all such instances set against Shield I believe I could give matching incongruities in the principles and practice of our legal system and of our democracy. But thank heavens; law and democracy continue to preserve the society in which we live!

4. The Shield Military Enforcement Arm would be equipped with an extensive fleet of Trident type submarines equipped with missiles armed with nuclear warheads.

Would this be contrary to the efforts being made to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in existence? And in what possible circumstances would Shield be justified in launching its nuclear weapons?

The possession by Shield of nuclear weapons would be universally known. It would also be realised that the one-time Cold War principle of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) could not be applied to Shield as it would not possess towns, territory or a civilian population to protect. Consequently, Shield would have immunity to reciprocal destruction in the event of launching its nuclear weapons against an aggressor also possessing nuclear weapons. This immunity would make Shield’s final ultimatum to an aggressor non-negotiable as the aggressor’s nuclear weapons would not pose a reciprocal threat. Consequently Shield’s absolute command of the nuclear chessboard would make the possession of nuclear weapons for defence unnecessary thus facilitating a rapid reduction of the nuclear weapons held by nuclear powers. Additionally, it would reduce, even eliminate the clandestine efforts by a number of nations to acquire nuclear weapons.

The criticism includes the question: what possible circumstances would justify Shield using its nuclear weapons?

It would be open to debate and- expert guidance how Shield’s Rules of Engagement should be written to regulate its response to an act of aggression. Hawks would no doubt argue that if it is known that Shield will use nuclear weapons as an immediate response to aggression the deterrent effect would ensure no acts of aggression took place.

The less hawkish approach would prefer to see a proportional and incremental response starting with the use of conventional weapons only escalating to the use of -nuclear weapons as a last resort.

The hawks would use the argument that in 1945 two atom bombs caused Japan to surrender in order to prevent the progressive destruction of its core economy. It would be reasonable to assume, the hawks would claim, that if the US alone had possessed atom bombs prior to Pearl Harbour, Japan would not have gone to war in the first place. Hawks would also point out that the number of deaths arising from the use of the atom bombs on Japan was a fraction of the deaths which would have occurred if an American invasion of the mainland had been attempted using “acceptable” conventional weapons.

A reasonable compromise would be for Shield’s access to conventional forces and weapons to be extensive and to include seaborne airpower to facilitate high precision bombing of civil targets such as electrical generator stations, bridges and government administrative centres. If eventually nuclear weapons had to be used, due warning would be given to allow evacuation of the targeted areas. If Hiroshima and Nagasaki had been given forty eight hours prior warning of the destruction to follow, the casualties could well have been reduced to several hundred.

5. Would the additional cost of contributing to the maintenance of Shield be unacceptable to many nations which already find their defence budgets and payments to the UN unduly onerous?

The global amount currently spent by nations on defence and armaments totals approximately US \$680,000,000,000 per annum (US \$680 billion). If each nation contributed to the annual running costs of Shield a sum equal to 2 % of its current defence budget. The total contributed would be US \$13.6 billion. This would meet the annual costs of the Council at US \$1 billion and the annual running costs of the Trident type submarine fleet at US\$5 billion, which includes a provision for a ten year amortisation of the vessels. The remaining balance of US \$7.6 billion would meet the costs of a high command structure and rapid reaction land, air and sea combat units involving between 50,000 and 60,000 personnel. These highly mobile forces would be used for active intervention in smaller scale incidents.

The reader is reminded that in larger incidents Shield’s strategy would be, and would be known to be, the progressive destruction of an aggressor nation’s economy and infrastructure until it stops its aggressive actions. Nevertheless, the following proposal would, at little extra cost, provide Shield with an enormously powerful backup to its rapid reaction forces if an unusual set of circumstances required an aggressor’s armed forces to be resisted with conventional forces.

Nations which proposed to maintain significant armed forces after Shield was up and running would give an irrevocable undertaking that a specified number and type of their combat units, such as a tank regiment, a squadron of war planes, an aircraft carrier, would be instantly and unreservedly available for service under Shield’s High Command should Shield requisition them. An arrangement similar to this proposal was included in the UN Charter in 1945, but with little subsequent effect.

The less hawkish approach would prefer to see a proportional and incremental response starting with the use of conventional weapons only escalating to the use of -nuclear weapons as a -last resort.

The hawks would use the argument that in 1945 two atom bombs caused Japan to surrender in order to prevent the progressive destruction of its core economy. It would be reasonable to assume, the hawks would claim, that if the US alone had possessed atom bombs prior to Pearl Harbour, Japan would not have gone to war in the first place. Hawks would also point out that the number of deaths arising from the use of the atom bombs on Japan was a fraction of the deaths which would have occurred if an American invasion of the mainland had been attempted using “acceptable” conventional weapons.

A reasonable compromise would be for Shield’s access to conventional forces and weapons to be extensive and to include seaborne airpower to facilitate high precision bombing of civil targets such as electrical generator stations, bridges and government administrative centres. If eventually nuclear weapons had to be used, due warning would be given to allow evacuation of the targeted areas. If Hiroshima and Nagasaki had been given forty eight hours prior warning of the destruction to follow, the casualties could well have been reduced to several hundred.

Obituary

Not possible to copy

Index

Nothing to Print

Contacts

Ian Raitt

A Public and Government Relations consultant specializing in trade, inward investment and tourism promotion. Working through PR companies he founded in Kenya and then London, the successors to which still operate today, he has advised clients in these areas. He is a Vice Chairman of the Conservative Foreign & Commonwealth Council and an Honorary Member of the Middle East Association. A graduate of St Johns College, Cambridge he is a member of the Royal United Services Institute and the Royal African Society.”

Ian Hazeel

“A qualified Company Secretary, he worked for many years in the City of London in corporate finance and investment management. Subsequently a director of a property finance company and consultant to a venture capital group as an interim manager, he is now a partner in a small consultancy boutique specialising in the analysis and presentation of investment opportunities.”

David Selves

“A 15 year old school leaver who by 23 had qualified as a banker and was running his own businesses at 27, which, together with writing thrillers - one on Shield itself -, he has done ever since. A former Conservative Local Councillor and Parliamentary Candidate with a wealth of small and medium business and lending experience he has many other interests, including charity work, is a Deputy Chairman of the London Press Club and has been working on Shield since Paul Stonor invited him to do so with John Cockcroft in 1996.
www.davidselves.com

SHIELD | PO Box 38441, London, SE16 4WN | mail@un-shield.com

Contact US-Shield, PO Box 38441, London, SE16 4WN
mail@un-shield.com

Ian Raitt
20 Clayton Avenue, Hassocks, BN6 8HD
Phone + 44 1273 842030
Fax + 44 1273 842037
Email ir@un-shield.com

Ian Hazeel
41 Sussex Street, London SW1V 4RJ
Phone 020 7834 2386
Fax 020 7828 8026
Email ih@un-shield.com

David Selves
2G River View Heights,
Bermondsey Wall West, London SE16 4TN
Phone 07074.735837
Fax 07000.782523
Email ds@un-shield.com

Speak not of the difficulties...