



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.

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.

2. 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 The principle that 'every nation has the right to defend itself' would, under SHIELD, be progressively superseded by the principle that 'every nation has a right to be defended'.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 percent 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