

During correspondence with President Jimmy Carter in November 2011 , he sent us a hand written note stating “I believe that the goals of Shield and the Carter Center are quite compatible”.

The declared aim of the Carter Center is “The waging of Peace”. The declared aim of UN-Shield is “The prevention of conflict”.

WHAT IS SHIELD ?

Shield is a concept for the UN to have its own Permanent , Standing Military Intervention Force comprised of professional military personnel recruited directly from member nations in the same way as UN civilian staff. Such a force was envisaged in the original UN Charter but was never implemented, mainly due to the Cold War.

The current structure of UN peacekeeping whereby forces are often hurriedly, belatedly and sometimes unwillingly assembled from a melange of different nations is clearly no longer fit for purpose.

The difficulties in carrying out a rapid deployment in Mali by African Union /ECOWAS forces, combined with the increasing reluctance of major powers such as the USA to assume the role of World’s policeman, show that the time has surely come to create a permanent UN force capable of operating **rapidly**, globally and independent of **any** national, political or military control.

This type of force would remove the growing threat of reciprocal “revenge” attacks by terrorists against the nationals or property of countries supplying UN

contingents, such as resulted from the French intervention in Mali and the Ugandan troops in Somalia, because no single country would have provided a contingent.

LEGITIMACY

A key factor in the UN-Shield concept is that of legitimacy. No longer is world opinion likely to tolerate unilateral intervention by any super-state or alliance of states. With UN-Shield the legitimacy of an operation is guaranteed.

VISION.

Jean Pictet, the Red Cross lawyer who drafted the Rules of War said in an interview with The Guardian newspaper on 12 August 1999, “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 is any other solution.”

Jonathan Swift, the Irish Essayist, wrote “ Vision is the art of seeing the invisible”.

Earlier, in the Book of Proverbs, the words were written “Where there is no vision the people perish”.

NOW IS THE TIME TO CREATE THE UN PERMANENT FORCE

On April 25th 1945 , President Truman of the USA, speaking by phone to a formative meeting of the UN in the San Francisco Opera house, said “We must

make certain by your work here today that another war will be impossible.”

There has never been a more opportune time to commence forming the initial cadre of the UN Defence Force (UNDF). Growing numbers of professional military personnel are being made redundant from their own armed services due to budget cuts but many young men and women are seeking military careers, particularly at a time of high unemployment.

These personnel could serve for the whole or most of their careers with the UNDF which would be open to men and women from all UN member nations who would ultimately be fully integrated, irrespective of their original nationality, down to platoon strength.

A FORCE OF ALL ARMS.

The UNDF would be a force of all arms with air force and naval components. It would have the strategic heavy-lift air transport capability vital today for operations in continents such as Africa where 16 countries are totally landlocked and two, the Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo are virtually landlocked.

The UN naval Force would be deployed in areas of maritime conflict such as piracy in the Indian Ocean, the Straits of Malacca and the West African coast.

WHOSE IDEA IS IT?

Shield was conceived by one man, the late Paul Stonor who, as a boy in England in 1941, saw his home in Liverpool destroyed in an air raid and later that year saw his mother open a telegram announcing that

her eldest son had been killed in action in the Japanese attack on Hong Kong.

Devastated by the loss of his brother, whom he greatly admired, Paul Stonor vowed that if ever he became successful he would devote increasingly his time and money to furthering the cause of world peace and the prevention of conflict.

He did indeed become highly successful as a businessman and in the 1990s began to create and promote the idea of a permanent international military intervention force answerable to but not controlled by the UN.

He called this concept SHIELD

HOW WOULD UN-SHIELD BE STRUCTURED ?

The UN would be charged with the responsibility to establish an independent supranational Council. This in turn would be in sole command of an armed law enforcement body. Both would be answerable to, but not controlled by the UN

The Council would be similar to a Court of Justice in a nation state and the UNDF to a national police force. Therefore the UNDF would be empowered and required to take immediate action to prevent conflict in the same way as a national police force is empowered and required to take immediate action to maintain law and order.

Consequently the dangers of conflicts escalating while the UN deliberates on agreeing a mandate, such as have occurred

in the Near East and in Africa recently, will be avoided.

Thus aggressors, faced with certain instant and powerful intervention by the UNDF, will be doubly cautious before launching their attack

The Supranational Council, would be elected under UN supervision from each of the UN member nations via an agreed formula, for terms of between two to four years.

These elected members , who would be known as monitors, would be required to swear to uphold UN law regardless of sectional or national interests and in accordance with a UN mandate. The oath would be similar to that taken by European Commissioners who vow “neither to seek nor to take instruction from any government or body”.

These measures would be markedly different from the UN’s current multinational approach where members vote in accordance with their governments’ policies rather than pre-established law.

HOW LARGE WOULD UN-SHIELD BE ?

A study carried out by the Royal United Services Institute in 2008 concluded that a substantial force could be built up incrementally over a period of time starting with a UN Intervention Force of 10,000 . Military experts, in the light of events in Libya, Syria and several African countries have recently said that a starting figure of 50,000 personnel is now required. This force could expand rapidly as the effectiveness of its deployments became globally recognised and national

governments reduced their own defence expenditure.

The UN-Shield Force would be bound by Rules of Engagement issued by the UN which would lay down the appropriate response to any crisis.

The existence of UN-Shield would not involve a deadline for UN members to reduce or abandon their own security but its proven, global deterrent effect would enable nations to do so, confident that their sovereignty was safe.

BACKGROUND TO UN-SHIELD

As can be seen from this web-site the UN-Shield idea has evoked considerable positive comment from many notable opinion leaders worldwide. They have seen that , when assessing the viability of the concept, it is essential they cast aside all thoughts of the way the UN operates today in its conflict prevention and peacekeeping roles. It will mean the restructuring of the Security Council or its replacement by another body.

The events of 11th September 2001 have demonstrated clearly the need for the world to look afresh at the way peace throughout the globe can be ensured. Had the UN adopted the concept in 1945 for the prevention of conflict through a permanent UN military force the environment in which extremists cite the USA as the enemies of their culture would not have arisen.

As the President of South Africa and global statesman General Smuts said in 1945. “The UN provides for peace with teeth: for the uniting of peace-loving people against future aggressors”.

Writing on the UN-Shield concept in 1997 the former British Prime Minister, Lord Callaghan said, “When the charter of the UN was agreed, those who designed it looked forward to the world becoming a safer and more secure place if the nations could one day reach agreement on a world system of international law.”

However it should not be thought that Shield is synonymous to World Government. It is not. It is purely a concept for the prevention of conflict.

It is true that some people in power tend to reject the concept of Shield but it is noticeable that many more, who have previously held power but no longer do so, including Presidents Gorbachev and Carter, support the need for further study and discussion of Shield as they see the logic and the need for it.

While they were in power statesmen were often constrained by the accepted policies of their governments or organisations but freed from these pressures many have recognised that the age of military interventions by a single nation, however powerful, or by a coalition of nations such as NATO or a section of a regional grouping such as The African Union, is nearing its end.

The economic problems of an increasing number of nations mean that they no longer have the financial strength or the political will to carry out international peacekeeping deployments.

SHIELD IS NOT A PRESSURE GROUP

Shield is not a “peace” group or lobby group. It is a concept which represents the theory of Defence Diplomacy in action in support of international law. It removes from any single government the feat that its sovereign troops could find themselves engaged in military actions that it or its people did not agree with or support.

Whilst the concept originally addressed purely the issue of war between sovereign states it has adapted over the years to confront the growing dangers of civil conflict and asymmetric war. Thus the UNDF would have the military ability to act in recent and current conflicts such as those in Libya, Syria, Somalia, Afghanistan, The Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Mali.

“VISION IS THE ART OF SEEING THE INVISIBLE”,
Jonathan Swift.

Two hundred years ago, with the Napoleonic wars raging, it would have been inconceivable that in the 20th century Britain would have twice come to the aid of France to repel an aggressive invader.

Today the concept of Shield may, to some, be inconceivable. Every day brings further news of actual or threatened conflict but, concurrently, accelerated by the speed of modern internet and satellite communications, imaginative and creative minds are

trying to think forward to discover possible new solutions.

The League of Nations was a new, but flawed, solution. The United Nations was a new solution but it has not prevented millions dying in war since it was formed. One reason for this is that the structure of the UN has, in essence, not changed since it was formed nearly 70 years ago.

If the UN had created its own permanent armed intervention force, as originally envisaged in the Charter, millions who have died may have been alive today.

The world has changed momentarily since the late 1940s and there is much conjecture as to whether or not it is a safer place since the break-up of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War.

However one thing has become clear : since President Obama was elected for a second term the United States no longer has the political will or the economic and military power to fulfil the role that , to a great extent, it has carried out since the fall of the iron curtain - namely that of the world's policeman.

Yet, as a one time head of the American CIA , Admiral Wolsey said "there will always be a maverick nation."

Even when the United States was, in effect the world's policeman, the American led intervention in

Kuwait resulted in the loss of upwards of 50,000 lives . The second Gulf War provided proof that the age of interventions by one super-power was coming to an end and Afghanistan has shown that even coalitions of militarily well-equipped nations cannot bring speedy solutions to asymmetric conflict.

THE FUTURE

There is now a growing consensus among global leaders and experts in conflict prevention that the organisation of the United Nations, especially in the role and structure of the Security Council, needs urgent review.

Shield provides a solution which has been developed and honed over 20 years during which the rationale of its thesis and the feasibility of its implementation have never been effectively disproven . This despite the efforts of some who realise that its successful inception would lead to the end of their ability to continue their undemocratic and lawless activities.
