The Danish Peace Academy

ISSUES OF PEACE, SECURITY AND ECONOMICS, SEEN FROM A CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE

by *Edy Korthals Altes*

Peace and Security in the 21st Century

If there is one area in urgent need of new thinking and acting it is in the field of Peace and Security. We are actually living in an absurd world, wasting huge scarce resources on weaponry that to a large extent can never be used without risking the annihilation of the greater part of mankind. At the same time, there is no real willingness to deal adequately with major world problems like hunger, poverty and the progressive destruction of our natural environment. About one billion people are living under wretched circumstances. Many millions are dying every year because of lack of food, water and other basic necessities. Although technology and finance could prevent this immense suffering only a small fraction of the total military expenditures is being made available! Governments try to justify the priority given to armed forces by invoking the classic maxim: *If you want peace, prepare for war*. The sad fact is however that the spectacular increase in military power did not bring us a greater security but a much greater human insecurity!

The blindness for what is going on is - to put it mildly - surprising for a modern society, which claims to be 'enlightened'. Modern man is slumbering on a volcano, ignoring its rumbling! Part of this may be due to the fading of the nuclear nightmare at the end of the Cold War. The subsequent process of dismantling nuclear weapons and progress in arms reduction raised high hopes. Drastic cuts in bloated defence budgets were expected to bring a substantial 'peace dividend'. These lofty expectations were however not fulfilled. Soon, after an initial drop, military expenditures started to rise again. To such an extent even that they have now largely surpassed the all time height during the years of the greatest tension between the two superpowers. An abundant supply of arms intensified violent local conflicts. Though the global threat had receded our world did not become a safer place. New threats to peace and security emerged, notably a very dangerous form of terrorism aiming at mass killing. Atrocious terrorist attacks are raising worldwide fears of things to come.

We live indeed in a highly dangerous world in which human security - the basic right to life - is threatened in many ways. These threats are not just limited to terrorism and weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Millions of human beings are dying every year as a consequence of hunger, poverty and diseases. The conditions

of life are also directly endangered by the progressive destruction of the natural environment, climate change, pollution and a rapid decline in biodiversity. Moreover there is a growing risk of violent conflicts in the coming decades as a consequence of fierce competition between countries for scarce natural resources. All of these threats will have a direct or indirect effect on our basic security. In this Chapter we will sketch an outline for a new approach to peace and security. But before doing so we shall take a look at some formidable obstacles on this road.

A grim reality

We are actually living in the presence of a military apparatus, which has the potential to end the human adventure at short notice. The magnitude of this threat is often underestimated.[1] Although modern killing machines have reached a high degree of perfection, considerable efforts are going on in military Research and Development for ever more 'effective arms'. Even 16 years after the end of the cold war, more than $65 billion was spent in the USA on military R/D.[2] As long as this downpour of money continues there will be plenty of room for scientists to design and develop new arms and weapon-systems. Some of these are specially designed for inflicting multiple complicated wounds on as many people as possible, without killing them. The 'rationale' is simple: to increase the pressure on the adversary. Wounded people require more attention than dead bodies! Some of these weapons - causing only limited material damage - have the additional 'advantage' that they will greatly reduce the costs of reconstruction of conquered territory!

Special attention should also be given to a new category of arms: the 'directed energy weapons'. Even small quantities of electro-magnetic radiation and field concentration on parts of the human body, for example at the base of the brain, could alter appreciably the functions of living cells, resulting in abnormal behaviour. Ultrasonic waves may cause direct death or inflict incredible suffering during the rest of existence. All these new developments are surrounded with a veil of secrecy. Disinformation keeps the public ignorant, mostly putting the emphasis on the usefulness of a particular weapon without mentioning the more harmful or even disastrous collateral effects. Moral scruples do not play a role; it is 'effectiveness' that counts. Even nations, taking pride in being called civilised, are not immune for these inhuman practices.

Apparently, there are no limits to the perversion of the human mind. At this moment, many thousands of highly qualified scientists and managers are engaged

---

[1] For these major threats, see Chapter1.

[2] Military Research and Development in the USA, is projected to rise to $70 billion in fiscal year 2009. Before
2010 the Pentagon intends to spend more than $ 120 billion on the development of nano-technology. Future Combat Systems envisage the use of a 'GI, Robot' –a new generation of soldiers(not slowed down by human feelings).

in forging the new instruments of hell. All of these carry a heavy responsibility for the immense suffering which will in future be inflicted on millions of people. The same applies to those politicians who support decisions to produce certain types of arms or *fail* to take a stand![3] Shocking is also the passivity of large sections of public opinion, which is in sharp contrast to the violent protests and effective actions of our ancestors against the 'dum-dum bullet' in the beginning of the 20th century! Did we somehow forget that none of us can escape the existential question: *'Adam, where are you?'* Last but not least: do governments realize that - eventually - some of these 'perfected' weapons may fall into the hands of malicious elements?

Lack of transparency

The ugly effects of modern warfare are carefully hidden from the public. In part by means of manipulation of the media, partly through the use of veiled language. Great care is taken to avoid a critical public opinion such as occurred during the war in Vietnam. In presenting losses to the nation, attention is chiefly focussed on those killed and wounded 'on our side'. The picture of substantially greater losses on the other side remains mostly rather hazy. Scarce attention is also given to the great number of those, who are mentally or physically, maimed for life. Not to speak of the afflictions of the next of kin! Even a small number of victims will affect a much larger part of the population, either directly or indirectly. Another, often ignored aspect, is related to the anguish of countless soldiers who participated in the butchery of war. Especially among those who took part in actions inflicting suffering upon others. The vast majority of those called under arms are on the whole fine and decent people who would never consider doing harm to anybody. However, once called to fight they are under orders to eliminate other human beings. Although high-tech warfare makes it possible to kill vast numbers of people without direct physical contact with the enemy, feelings of remorse are bound to emerge eventually. Even the toughest military training will not succeed in suppressing the most basic human feelings! The aftermath of the Vietnam War has shown quite a number of tragic cases of soldiers suffering from permanent traumatic experiences. Are decision makers sufficiently aware of the destructive effects of war on the moral fabric of a society?

The arms-industry - a huge monster difficult to control

The military-industrial -scientific complex wields considerable power as it is well entrenched in political and administrative circles. Its position was in recent year

---

[33] A variety of new developments - ranging from electric magnetic weapons, spectacular sight improvement, blast energy to non-lethal weapons - is discussed by David Shukman in: *The sorcerer's challenge – Fears and hopes for the weapons of the next millenium*, Hodder and Stoughton, London 1995. See also Frank Barnaby, *The automated Battlefield,* Sidgwick and Jackson, London 1986. Also: *New Technologies and the Arms Race,* Edited by Scharf/Holden Reid and Carlton, Macmillan 1989.

greatly strengthened as a result of several important mergers also with sectors in the civil industry. Hence, the impact of the arms industry and weapons-laboratories upon the military budget and the so coveted defence orders! Weapon production and arms trade are often justified with the argument: '*arms do not fight, but people do*' or with the equally soothing slogan: '*Arms are only made to prevent wars, to deter aggressors*'. The flimsiness of this reasoning should be obvious to anyone familiar with the history of war and the statistics of casualties. There is a direct relation between arms and victims, which is difficult to ignore. Massive arms deliveries greatly facilitated and intensified violent conflicts in Africa and elsewhere. Furthermore, who could deny that the vast supply of landmines has caused - and still is causing - innumerable victims?

Occasionally a cry of alarm is raised after the exposure of great suffering of human beings in conflict areas, especially when it appears that there is a link with the profitable business in arms. This may even lead to a renewed insistence on restrictions on the export of arms. It is however rather naive to think that effective restrictions could be imposed by some well sounding agreements. The arms industry has its own dynamics and is not hampered by moral considerations. Whenever arms are produced, ways will be found to sell them. It is also obvious that the arms industry benefits more from armed conflicts than from a situation of peace with dwindling sales. This is a factor, which should not be overlooked when studying the origin of a particular conflict. Governments are often caught in an ambivalent position between the goal of promoting peace and the safeguarding of substantial economic interests in the arms industry. Most governments are therefore inclined to close an eye on the strict application of internationally agreed restrictions whenever their own military-industrial complex is involved. Powerful lobbies are never at a loss for convincing arguments to sell arms!

Excessive military expenditures

All of the above mentioned developments have been made possible by bloated defence budgets. World wide military spending exceeded $ 956.000.000.000 in the year 2003 (about half for the USA alone!) This is substantially more than the sky-high peak during the Cold War.[4] Particularly in the past few years' military expenditures have rapidly risen. The official justification for these excessive outlays was simple: 'our nation is at war'. It goes without saying that this trend is strongly promoted by a powerful military/industrial complex in which many thousands scientists and managers are earning an attractive income.

The imperative to overcome war

History has seen innumerable wars. Many people are therefore inclined to think that wars are inherent to human nature. A line of thinking, which has to change since the development of weapons of mass destruction! Humanity is from now on

---

[4] *Sipri Yearbook 2004*, Oxford University Press. After 11/9. US military expenditures accelerated dramatically. President Bush obtained in 2003 an increase of $ 48 billion. If other items like the 'off budget' expenditures for military purposes are included, the figure of $ 450 billion will be largely surpassed.

forced to develop new ways for conflict resolution.[5] This can be achieved, as war is a human institution. It could therefore be abolished just like slavery. Disaster looms if we continue along the present way of trying to solve conflicts primarily with the use of military means. The only practicable way in this high-tech epoch is along the *common* elaboration of a different, comprehensive approach towards security aiming at *the creation of the conditions for peace.* If we do not succeed in this 'mutation', we risk extinction. Not as result of a natural disaster but by our own scientific and technological achievements and incapacity to adjust our behaviour in time!

In his fascinating book *'History of warfare'*, John Keegan - a well-known war historian - demonstrates convincingly that the thesis of Clausewitz: ' *war is the continuation of policy by other means'*, no longer holds.[6] Indeed, in an age in which mass destruction has become a real possibility, war can no longer be considered as an effective extension of policy by other means. It represents *the bankruptcy of policy*!

The irrationality of war in modern times should be obvious. Modern war, with its own laws and dynamism, has a demoniacal character. Once the gigantic war machinery starts moving it is ruthless. Moral limits and human rights are subordinated to only one overriding objective: defeating the enemy in the most effective way. Warfare has changed radically over the past decades. Not only because of the spectacular increase in the destructive potential but also as a result of breakthrough in communication-, information- and space technologies. Nuclear powers, facing each other with distrust, are caught in a hair-trigger situation in which perceptions play a great role. They must constantly be on high alert, prepared to strike in order to prevent the first strike of the opponent.

A military conflict between major powers would risk the extinction of a great part of the world population! The prevailing security concept is therefore seriously flawed; it ignores the close linkage between four basic facts:
- Extreme vulnerability of modern society, even for the most powerful nation in the world. The idea of invulnerability has become obsolete.
- Apocalyptic destructive potential of modern arms. The danger of deliberate or inadvertent use.
- Modern terrorism with its wide-ranging potential to cause chaos,
- Greatly increased interdependence in a global world.

The first two elements make it imperative to look for other non-military ways to deal with conflicts. Warfare can no longer be seen as an effective way of dealing with conflicts. Only when all options are exhausted there should be = in very special cases in conformity with the just war tradition - a resort to military means within an international context. However it should be beyond all questions that a

---

[5] Illuminating on this point: Robert S.McNamara, *Blundering into Disaster*, Pantheon Books, New York 1986 also: George Kennan, *Around the Cragged Hill*, Norton, New York, 1993.

[6] Keegan, John, *The History of War,* Hutchinson; London, 1993.

major war between leading powers is no longer a realistic option. Even *limited conflicts* should be handled with much prudence in view of the risk of escalation and other harmful consequences. *There is simply no other way out, in our highly vulnerable modern world we are compelled to look for non-military means for solving conflicts.*

Modern terrorism - the third element - forms indeed a grave threat. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the fight against it will be conducted in the most effective way. This requires however - as we shall see later - more than military means. The heinous terrorists attacks on 11/9 opened the eyes of many people for the extreme vulnerability of modern society. However there is still not enough awareness of the full significance of *interdependence* in our world. People living in the 'North' can no longer ignore hunger, misery and despair. The security situation in the prosperous nations will be affected by poor conditions for human security in developing countries. There is therefore - apart from moral reasons - a real need to develop a global perspective and mechanism for resource allocation.[7] The close connection between all four factors *makes it imperative to apply political/economic justice together with solidarity, to all parts of the world!*

In spite of the radically changed circumstances most politicians persist on military solutions whenever a security threat is perceived. They fail to recognize that an effective security policy requires a radical reversal in priorities in the spending of scarce resources. The emphasis on military expenditures should be shifted towards a substantial increase in funds for meeting urgent world problems.
The present lack of foresight confronts us with an odd paradox: an unprecedented level of military expenditures not leading to more security but... a higher insecurity!

The greatest danger to our security lies therefore not at the crossroads of radicalism and technology but in ignoring the urgency of a well integrated common approach to tackle the major world problems![8] It would be a grave error to narrow down the security issue to threats, which can only be met by the use of military force.
The idea to deal first with the so-called 'hard issues' and later with the 'softer issues' is seriously flawed.[9] For political and moral reasons! It fails to perceive the urgency to meet those 'soft' threats to human security!

Prophetic voices

Not only churches, all religions are therefore confronted with a moral responsibility of the highest order. During the Cold War, churches launched strong protests against the nuclear arms and irresponsibility of the arms race.[10] The

---

[7] *Sipri Yearbook 2004*, page 309.

[8] This is the opposite of what President Bush states in his accompanying letter to the National Security Strategy of the USA.

[9] *From Empire to Community*, Amitai Etzioni, Palgrave Macmillan, 2004

[10] Paul Abricht/Ninan Koshy, *Before it is too late*, WCC, Geneva 1984. Also: *Catholics and Nuclear war- A commentary on The Challenge of Peace*, The U.S. Bishops Pastoral letter on War and Peace, Chapman, London 1983. For a survey see, *Ethik fur das Leben, 100 Jahre Okumenische Wirtschafts- und Sozialethik*; Stierle/ Werner/

Conciliary Process, initiated during the Vancouver Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983, opened the perspective on a new constructive approach to peace and human security. During this Assembly, churches in North and South, East and West, engaged in a commitment to work together for *Peace, Justice and Integrity of Creation.* Since the end of the Cold War, there has however been a notable slackening of activity. The peace issue stands in many churches at low ebb. This is also reflected in the low profile of major peace movements and even in some inter-religious organizations that have their origin in the promotion of peace. The present critical situation requires a renewed vigour. Religions and inter-religious movements should take up a much stronger position on the issue of peace and security than they do at present.[11] Needed is a massive counterforce of citizens against a development, which constitutes a mortal threat to humanity. New thinking about security and peace should be brought to the grass roots, local congregations and parishes. This could become an important building block for a vigorous peace movement in which religious people join hands with citizens sharing other convictions in life. A movement, inspired by the vision of a new concept for peace and security, offering a perspective for a more secure and peaceful world.

The foregoing does not mean that we should remain passive in the battle between good and evil. On the contrary, faith in God should inspire us to a strong commitment for justice, peace, security and solidarity in this world. This looking for a more effective and responsible way to achieve peace and security is definitely no pacifism! But in selecting the means, we are directly challenged: are these in harmony with our responsibility as human beings? The time for paying lip service to Psalm 85 is definitely over. The words '*justice and peace embrace each other'* are of particular relevance in our global world, demanding a much greater international effort towards the deprived countries. The poverty issue is no longer a mere matter of ethical concern but has become a matter of life and death. Even for the wealthy nations! Christians are permanently confronted with the question: *do we really try to act in the spirit of our faith in Jesus Christ?* Pope John XXIII called in his Encyclical letter: '*Pacem in Terris'* for a new attitude towards war and a living together on one planet. But acknowledging that all human beings have a right to live demands from those in power a disposition to share part of their wealth. Living together in a global world means also confronting together major threats, developing a sense of commonality.[12]

In spite of all the persistent warnings of authoritative experts and churches against nuclear arms, governments did not adapt their thinking and acting about security to the radically changed situation in our high-tech age. Nuclear weapons are still considered to be essential for security. Hence, the development of a new generation of nuclear arms and the recent adaptation of the strategy to enlarge the possibilities for actual use of the nuclear weapon!
Indicative for the different mood in wide circles of public opinion was that the Pugwash movement, which has since so many years voiced serious concern about nuclear arms, was awarded with the Nobel Prize for Peace!

Helder, Ernst Lange, Rothenburg.o.d. Tauber 1996.
[11] See Chapter 5.
[12] *From Empire to Community*, Amitai Etzioni, Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Beyond the just war tradition

Since many centuries Christian scholars and politicians have worked on rules to limit the disastrous effects of war. An effort was made to restrict the use of military force. Certain criteria had to be met before a war could be justified (*jus ad bellum*) and rules were laid down to 'humanize war'. The '*jus in bello*' prohibits warring nations to refrain from barbaric practices. Although the 'just war tradition' has succeeded in a number of cases to tame the voracious appetite of nations it cannot be denied that it repeatedly has been invoked to justify war. Not only in the distant past but also recently as we have seen in Iraq!

The just war tradition is at present subject to considerable pressure. Modern warfare makes compliance with just war criteria highly unlikely. This applies in particular to the principle of proportionality and respect for the distinction between combatants and non-combatants. During the last fifty years the number of innocent civilians during armed conflicts has risen dramatically as a result of 'collateral damage'. Precision weapons are not always hitting their military targets! Basic conditions for a *just war* are also undermined by the perverse nature of newly developed arms like the daisy cutter, cluster bomb or directed energy weapons.

Even more fundamental is that no appeal on the just war tradition could ever justify the resort to military means in case of a conflict between major powers or military alliances. The apocalyptic potential of destruction and the perspective of a holocaust, destroying many millions of human beings and large regions of the planet, should ban any thought of 'a great war'. For the first time in history is humanity confronted with the imperative to develop other ways of conflict resolution!

This definitely does not mean passivity or absolute pacifism in case of serious threats to human security. On the contrary, substantial efforts will be required for conflict-prevention, peace-enforcement, peacekeeping and peace building. And, if all these efforts fail, there may be even *the necessity* to employ military force during inter- and intra-state conflicts *of a more limited character*. There are certainly cases wherein governments will be under obligation to defend their people. The Charter of the UN explicitly authorizes the use of force in case of defence. Wars however for aggrandizement, expansion of influence and economic goals are prohibited. Specifically are also excluded holy wars or the imposition of an ideology. The tendency to shift from the use of military force - in case of limited conflicts - towards the exercise of the international police functions should be reinforced. But this resort to military power – when all other options are exhausted - should be subject to strict limits within an international context. Against this background it could be said that there is need for a further refinement of the just-war tradition. In particular with regard to constraints on the kind of weapons which are in conflict with letter and spirit of the Geneva Conventions!

Mankind has finally arrived at a stage in history in which it has to move beyond

the just war tradition. The emphasis should henceforth be put on creating the conditions for peace instead of focussing on the rules of war. Peace is in our interdependent world more than the absence of war, it is the fruit of a right ordering of things through the values of justice, truth, freedom and love [13] Peace, should therefore be based on a common confrontation of the major threats to human security. The fundamental question should therefore be raised whether the just war tradition still holds a promise for a more peaceful world or whether a different line of approach has to be developed which places the just war doctrine in a wider context.

Moving towards a new comprehensive security concept

Developments since the Second World War compel nations to move beyond the just war doctrine. For centuries attention was focussed on threats to *state-security* and the military means needed for defending it. During the Cold War we became familiar with the concept of collective security, which meant a system in which States pledge that aggression against one is aggression against all, obliging to react collectively. In recent years it became clear that the classic borderline between internal and external security was rapidly fading. Our modern world is in need for a much wider concept of security as new threats to security, transcending national borders have emerged. Threats, which no longer can be met with military means. It was this development, which prompted the Secretary General of the United Nations to appoint a High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. The authoritative Report mentions three major reasons for a new approach to collective security: today's threats recognize no national boundaries, are connected and must be addressed at the global, regional and national level. No state, no matter how powerful, can by its own efforts alone make itself invulnerable to today's threats.[14]

The Panel defines six clusters of threats we will be facing in the decades ahead:
- Economic and social threats, including poverty, infectious diseases and environmental degradation
- Inter-state conflict
- Internal conflict, including civil war, genocide and other large scale atrocities
- Nuclear, radiological, chemical and biological weapons
- Terrorism
- Trans-national organized crime

All these threats are interconnected, requiring a comprehensive approach and a framework for preventive action. Hence, the importance of development. The Panel rightly sees this as the indispensable foundation for a system of collective security. It could significantly contribute to combat the actual threat to human security for many millions of people. Another, noteworthy feature of the new look at collective security is that the primary role is no longer assigned to military power but to

---

[13] *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response.* 1983 by the United States Catholic Conference, Inc.
[14] High- level Panel Report, UN General Assembly 2 December 2004; A/59/565.

political, economic, cultural, religious and other non-military means. Military force should be relegated to a subordinate role within a truly international context and only be employed in last resort within the context of the UN or regional security organizations. The new comprehensive approach towards peace and security entails therefore a radical revision of priorities in dealing with major global threats.

To bring about peace in our interdependent world we must completely revise our priorities from 'defence' towards establishing a just and sustainable world order.

Implementation of the concept of collective security

The following steps could enhance human security in a global world:
1- A substantial shift from military expenditures to programmes dealing with the major global threats to human security.[15] This reallocation of scarce resources could make a significant contribution to eliminate potential causes of conflicts. It could be effectuated by means of a planned gradual reduction of excessive military budgets - say 5% yearly – over a period of 10 years. Reduction of military outlays should be combined with a scheme for the conversion of war industries.
2- A deliberate shift from the present fixation upon military solutions towards a non-military approach in case of a threat to peace. The possibility for an effective use of soft power through well-coordinated international actions is considerably increased as a result of spectacular progress in information and communications technology. This is of particular relevance for the relations with China, which should not be dominated by mutual fear and distrust. Neither a ring of military bases around China nor a renewed arms race will enhance security. A genuine effort to incorporate this rapidly emerging power in a global network of cooperation would be a more promising approach!
3- A new impulse to disarmament efforts in particular with regard to weapons of mass destruction. Consequently, full support of the Middle Powers Initiative and the New Agenda Coalition aiming to overcome the deep divisions between the nuclear and the Non-Aligned Movement.[16] A crucial element is here the adherence to obligation of article VI of the Non- Proliferation Treaty. This implies naturally a complete revision of present security strategies ultimately leading to a radical reduction of the strategic role of nuclear arms.[17]
4- Substantial reduction of funds for Research and Development of new arms. Strict compliance of letter and spirit of the Geneva conventions on the avoidance of unnecessary human suffering.
5- A halt to the weaponization of Space. Unequivocal international commitment to the peaceful use of outer space.
6- Acknowledgment of the implications of interdependence. Hence the need for the prosperous nations to take a critical look at existing trade- and agricultural policies, affecting countries in need of development. Putting solidarity in practice by a

[15] High- level Panel Report, UN General Assembly 2 December 2004; A/59/565.
[16] See interesting Report of Atlanta Consultation II: *On the future of the Non Proliferation Treaty*, Jan, 2005, Global Security Institute: www.gsinstitute.org.
[17] See: ElBaradei Proposal for multinational control over operations for producing nuclear material in Nobel lecture 10 December 2005.

readiness to revise agreements harmful to the legitimate interests of the poor nations. Developing a sense of global belonging: *Commonality*.[18]

7- Strengthening of a multi-polar, multi-cultural world founded on a *set of fundamental principles*. Nations need each other in a global world: *internationalism instead of unilateralism*! Therefore a definite 'No' to hegemonic aspirations and preventive wars. Avoidance of a deadly competition for scarce natural resources. Adjustment of the UN to the profound changes since it was founded. Without effective global and regional institutions there is little hope for a just and peaceful world order. This requires the active participation of the USA, putting its full weight behind efforts to construct a viable world order. Not as an Imperial power but as a major partner!

8- Strong government support for initiatives of Conflict Prevention and Peace- building. This could avoid far costlier armed conflicts. *'Prevention is better than cure'*. Application of non-violent methods (Satyagraha) and the establishment of a non-violent civilian Peace Corps as proposed by the European Parliament. Promotion of extensive peace-education at all didactic levels.

The abovementioned suggestions represent a fundamental change in thinking about security and peace. Unfortunately even highly developed countries still continue to formulate policies based on an outdated security concept. A noteworthy example we find in the *National Security Strategy of the United States of America.* As the fate of our world in coming decades will be largely determined by the policies of the USA, we will give special attention to this Document, incorporating the 'Bush doctrine'.

The Bush doctrine on pre-emption

The events of the 11th of September had an electrifying impact on American society. All of a sudden, Americans, convinced of the invulnerability of their country, woke up to the dangers of modern terrorism. A galvanised nation immediately adopted a range of draconic security measures. War was declared on terrorism and the 'axis of evil'. All states suspected to support terrorists were to be held accountable. The war was presented in black and white terms such as: 'Those who do not support us are against us' and 'We, the righteous, are fighting a Holy Crusade against evil in the name of God, if necessary with the use of nuclear arms. In this fervid climate, the already huge military budget could be smoothly raised to nearly $500 billion.

In the *National Security Strategy* presented by President George W. Bush to Congress in September 2002, much attention is given to the war against terrorism and rogue states.[19] In this Document, which puts the emphasis on military means, two lines come together: a deep sense of insecurity - even genuine fear – is meeting with a strong awareness of unprecedented power. Exclusive trust is placed in American strength as the United Nations was deemed to be unable to deal with the actual threats. Henceforth this organization was assigned a marginal role. The claim of the United States for world hegemony was laid down with little consideration for the sensitivity of other nations. From now on, the United States

---

[18] Amitai Etzioni, *From Empire to Community*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. See also Chapter7.
[19] *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, Washington D.C. September 2002

alone will lead the world on the path of peace, freedom, democracy and free markets. American leadership would prevail, if possible together with a coalition of the willing, but if necessary alone, supported by overwhelming military power. A 'Pax Americana', had to be established, based on unparalleled military strength and a preponderant economic/political influence!

The Bush doctrine on pre-emption constitutes a radical break with post-war efforts to build a world order based on the principles of the United Nations. It seriously undermines the UN, the only international body holding a promise for a viable world order. This is most unfortunate, as the growing interdependence of nations demands a deliberate effort to reform and reinforce this institution. Here, the USA - with its dominant position in world affairs - could and should play a constructive role! However, in criticizing the effectiveness of the UN it should be kept in mind that its members - including some major players – have systematically opposed proposals to adjust its structure to the radically changed power-relations since its founding.

In a certain sense it could be said that the White House Document codifies the tendency towards unilateralism which was already manifest over the past few years. A tendency, which was strongly reinforced by the sense of power emanating from the huge military build-up. The depressing list includes: repudiation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, rejection of the Kyoto Protocol, dropping out of the global effort to strengthen the Bio-War Treaty, refusal to accept the International Criminal Court and the pursuit of the militarization of Space.

A clear indication about future policy provides also *Vision 2020,* a Document of the United States Space Command, released in the year 2000.[20] This Report clearly states that *"Full Spectrum Dominance"* is essential for the protection of American interests and investments. Already at an earlier phase, influential conservatives had launched the Project for a New American Century (PNAC). Their prime concern was to maintain the American way of life in a turbulent world in which the gap between rich and poor is widening. A global '*Pax Americana*' was considered to be essential for safeguarding national security and economic interests (oil!). The PNAC Report makes a strong case for an aggressive grand strategy, based on a military posture, which would be impossible to challenge.
Justification

Several political and even theological arguments were used to justify the present policy:
- Need for self-defence.
- Ineffective decision-making process of the UN, its incapacity to enforce resolutions.
- Conviction that only the unparalleled power of the US could meet present challenges.
- Promotion of political and economic interests.
- Sense of calling: 'God's own country' has to participate in the struggle between good and evil, if necessary with all disposable means! For the Crusade against evil exists a moral mandate, it should be seen as a Holy Endeavour, carrying out the Will of God!
- Fulfilling God's mission in bringing freedom and democracy to all corners of the earth. Only a *Pax Americana*, based on overwhelming power, is supposed to bring about a

---

[20] *Vision for 2020,* United States Space Command; www.spacecom.af.mil/usspace

secure world order.

A brief political comment - a dream turning into a nightmare

There can be no doubt that the threat of terrorism has to be taken seriously. The danger of weapons of mass destruction falling into wrong hands is real. It should also be recognized that this new threat couldn't be met by the classical concepts of deterrence and containment. Appropriate instruments and effective policy measures have therefore to be put in place.[21] In addition to special security measures, there will certainly be the need for a limited use of military force to eliminate terrorist networks. However, great care should be taken that the use of military force does not undermine efforts to overcome terrorism. Counterproductive actions - such as the war in Iraq - should therefore be avoided. The breeding ground for terrorism should definitely not be enlarged! Putting the emphasis on the large-scale employment of military force cannot eliminate the complex phenomenon of terrorism. A much more subtle approach is required in which the *limited* employment of military means - *within an international context* - represents only one element of a much wider range of measures. Europeans, having learned from many sad experiences with warfare and terrorism, tend to be more cautious on this point.

That is why they are insisting to give much greater attention to the causes of terrorism. Bismarck - a statesman who left his mark on European history in the 19th century - used to say: *"Politics should not seek revenge for what has happened, but take care that this will never occur again"*. Wise words, highly relevant in these days.

Europeans do not stand alone in their criticism of the present foreign policy. Even a hardliner like Brzezinski has been pleading to focus on *the political roots of terrorism*. Unfortunately, the security document is rather skimpy in this aspect. It limits itself to the observation that poverty does not make poor people into terrorists even though it recognizes that poverty, ineffective institutions and corruption make weak states vulnerable to terrorist's networks. Of particular importance in the fight against terrorism is to avoid the destruction of precious values, which constitute the essence of a civilized society. It should never be forgotten that democracy, freedom and human rights were only achieved after many hard struggles over long centuries.

Great doubts exist about the wisdom of the Bush doctrine. Is this really the best way to handle present challenges to security or could it lead to even greater problems? This applies in particular to the concept that the USA is prepared to impose its will through the use of military power, *whenever this is considered to be necessary for the defence or the protection of its interests*. Pre-emption and counter-proliferation as strategies are bound to increase international instability and stimulate an arms race, particularly among countries that feel threatened. Indeed, if one nation sets the example others will be tempted to follow, claiming a similar

---

[21] Interesting information about the 'Global Antiterrorism Coalition' in: *From Empire to Community*, Amitai Etzioni, and Palgrave Macmillan, 2004, p.103-112.

right to interfere. Instead of re-enforcing the international security regime, we risk to fall back into an international jungle. An ominous indication of what the doctrine on pre-emption holds in store is provided by the Iraq war. Overwhelming military force led to an early breakdown of the criminal Saddam regime. Sophisticated arms however did not succeed in pacifying the country. Winning the peace proves to be infinitely more difficult than winning the war. It also became abundantly clear that democracy could not be imposed on a country if it does not dispose over the basic conditions.

The readiness to resort to unilateral preventive military action is causing great concern. Particularly in Muslim countries it is leading to an explosion of violent anti-Americanism and hatred against the West. Moreover, it weakens the position of moderates in regimes still willing to cooperate in the war against terrorism. Unilateralism - now presented as American Internationalism - is also causing deep irritation, yes stubborn resistance, particularly from nations with a proud history (France) and rising powers like China. A strong wave of anti-Americanism has engulfed European countries in recent years, even in nations, which have cultivated long ties of friendship. This most unfortunate estrangement of traditional allies comes at a time in which there is an urgent need for effective international coalitions in order to confront together the staggering world problems. A need, also clearly recognized in the Strategy document when it affirms: *"There is little of lasting consequence that the USA can accomplish in the world without the sustained cooperation of its allies and friends in Canada and Europe"*. Could there be a more striking contrast with actual policies?

Another reason for concern about the Bush doctrine is related to the nature of modern warfare. Pre-emptive action requires an element of surprise. The decision to engage in a preventive war has to be taken under great pressure on the assessment of presumed threats, in a situation where intelligence information could be manipulated. A risky undertaking as we have seen during the disastrous war in Iraq.

Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay, two experts in international relations, gave a clear verdict about the present security policy. In their authoritative book *"America Unbound "*, they reach the following conclusion: *"The fundamental premise of the Bush revolution - that America's security rested on an America unbound - was mistaken."* [22]

The USA is in these days tempted to rule the world on basis of unparalleled strength. With its overwhelming military power it is capable of eradicating every nation on this planet. Its political will can be imposed anytime, anywhere. But in this interdependent world wherein no nation can hope to stand alone we need coalitions. These however cannot be built on strained relations and an antagonized worldwide public opinion. Force alone will never succeed in conquering minds and hearts.

Imperial leadership is an anachronism in a highly interdependent world.

---

[22] *America Unbound*, Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C., 2003

Unilateralism and arrogance of power do not enhance security. But wise restraint and moderation would on the other hand facilitate the loyal cooperation of nations in the struggle against terrorism. Security in the 21st century cannot be built on the insecurity of others; it requires a multi-polar order supported by effective international institutions based upon principles of justice and sustainability. Although the Strategy document mentions some of the important changes in the international arena over the past decennia, it fails to put the security strategy in a worldwide context. A serious mistake as even the greatest superpower of all times cannot hope to ensure security for its citizens when a large part of humanity has to bear the burden of a miserable existence. Trying to keep control of the world while striving to maintain a morally and politically unacceptable social and economic situation inevitably leads to violence. The new National Security Strategy – with its threat of preventive war - has greatly increased the likelihood of the use of military force. It will therefore not enhance security but endanger world stability!

A true sense of global responsibility must be translated into an effective approach towards the major problems of our world. Loyal allies should for that reason speak out frankly and not hide their misgivings out of fear to hurt their big brother. This applies in particular to Europe, owing so much to the great American nation, which came twice to its rescue during two world wars. But genuine solidarity does not imply a meek endorsement of a line of action, which will lead to a destabilization of international relations and to an inadequate approach to pressing world problems. Besides these serious political objections against the Bush doctrine there is also the moral aspect: it is reprehensible. Therefore much weight should be given to the *personal attitude* of American citizens. As Christians are playing a conspicuous role in American society we will now turn our attention to the relation between Christian faith and the Bush doctrine.

Christian Faith and the Bush doctrine

The relation between Christian faith and policies related to peace and security is in the actual circumstances of the greatest relevance. The Christian community in the USA is unfortunately strongly divided on the question of what should be the most responsible way of dealing with challenges to security. The Iraq crisis has brought to light a fundamental split about the justification of war. On the one hand those in favour of following a tough approach using military force. On the other side those who warned insistently against war, in line with: the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, the World Council of Churches, the Pope and Catholic bishops all over the world. This split between Christians - sharing the same Communion and reading the same Gospel - is not only sending a wrong signal to the outside world but constitutes also a serious threat to durable peace and security. There is therefore a real urgency for an inner-Christian dialogue on this subject. Not a non-committal exchange of ideas about texts and general principles but a genuine existential dialogue based on a living faith in Jesus Christ. I therefore hope that the following reflections may stimulate a *common* search for a new creative approach.

The Name of God should not be idly used!

The Bible warns emphatically against the idle use of God's name and the temptation to make an image of God. All our words about God are based on *human* notions. Christians should for that reason always speak in a spirit of reverence about God, who is infinitely transcending all our thoughts. It was this profound sense of awe and deep respect, which made Israel to forbid the idle use of the Name of God. Hence, the obligation to refrain from using His Name whenever we seek to justify our policies and acts. The Bible reminds us that humankind is created in God's image and likeness and not the other way around.[23] Human beings should therefore not try to mould God in their image and their likeness! All religious people - Christians as well as members of other religions - should be keenly aware of the looming danger of the abuse of God's Name! It is this deep conviction, which brought Muslim leaders to a strong condemnation of terrorists who invoked their faith in Allah before committing their atrocious acts on the 11th of September.

Europeans have taken a long time before they discovered that there are compelling reasons against the use of God's Name in order to justify their policies. Only recently, insight broke through that God's Name should never be abused in order to serve our goals. Many wars have been fought in the past under the banner of 'Gott mit uns'. In this respect it is significant to note that in contrast to the Crusades, which were blessed by the Popes, the war against Iraq was strongly condemned by John Paul 2nd. He was keenly aware of the danger of a clash of religions in a highly militarised world. A clash, which would be fully in line with Bin Laden's strategy to demonstrate to the Islamic community that the West - especially the U.S.A. - is starting a global war against the Muslim world. On this issue, we would be well advised to heed the warning of Samuel Huntington against Western armed interventions in other cultures. Raising our banner in the Name of God is indeed a fatal error, which could have disastrous consequences![24]

Christians, standing under the Principal Commandment, should openly recognize that they have fallen short in true love to God and fellowmen. Did we really practice Biblical justice in our relations with other human beings? Did we show compassion with those in distress? What about trade and agricultural policies having a negative effect on the population of the poor countries? Should we not be filled with shame if we compare the immense need of a great part of humanity with the comfortable standard of living in our prosperous North? Is there not a lack of determination to deal effectively with major world problems such as poverty, hunger, health and environmental destruction? How could we ever justify present priorities of excessive military spending and the modest efforts in solving the basic needs of a large part of the world population? Can we - in all honesty - stick to a simple black and white approach, claiming that *we* represent the good people? Can we truthfully claim that there is no evil in us, are we without sin? Is it not true that vested interests are playing a significant role in our policies? Would it therefore not be appropriate for all of us to reflect in a spirit of contrition upon the full portent of the Great Commandment?

---

[23] Genesis 1; 26.
[24] Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1996. p.312.

If we really want to understand God's will for us today, we should look upon Jesus Christ, who has revealed in his life and words the will of the Father.[25] In his message of love and compassion there is nothing, which could ever justify our fixation on military solutions. Nothing also, to consent to the present neglect of the hungry, the poor and destruction of our natural environment: God's creation! The life of Jesus was focussed on unity with God and unity with the people he met. Recognizing all of them as God's children, never exclusive but always inclusive.[26] It is this message of love and commitment to unity, which is of the highest relevance in a split and suffering world! Through Christ we learn what it means to love our neighbour, including our enemies! It is in this intimate spirit that the split among Christians on the vital issue of war and peace may be healed.

It is in this spirit, that we should start a common search of how to translate Christ's message of peace and justice in the actual situation.
It is in this spirit, that Christians have to unite their efforts in striving for a more humane, just, secure and sustainable world.
It is also in this spirit, that Christians have to reject in principle the resort to war in a conflict situation.
It is in this spirit, that Christians should exercise the greatest caution before consenting to use limited military means in exceptional circumstances.

The temptation of power

The old truth about the correlation between rising power and growing weakness seems to be forgotten. This is particularly relevant for the USA, which since it reached the pinnacle of power, is more vulnerable than ever before. Modern society has many weak spots. Already a technical or intentional breakdown of essential services - electricity, water, transport or even a computer virus - can cause great havoc and paralyse the social order. Another reason for vulnerability is the critical dependence on other nations for the preservation of its incomparable prosperity. In particular, because of the immense needs for energy (oil), other natural resources, capital and the financing of its colossal double deficits! The paradox between rising strength and growing weakness is reminding us of the huge statue in the dream of King Nebuchadnezzar. A statue of extraordinary strength and brilliance but with its feet and toes partly of iron, partly of clay. Then, all of a sudden, a stone struck the feet and broke the statue in pieces and …its fall was great![27] Another relevant Biblical story speaks about the temptation of Jesus in the desert. When the devil took Jesus to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendour, he said to him:
'All these I will give you, if you will fall down and worship me.'
Jesus said to him, away with you, Satan! For it is written,
'Worship the Lord your God, and serve only him.'

Are Christians sufficiently aware of the implications of this diabolic temptation?

---

[25] '*Whoever has seen me has seen the Father'*, John 14, 9.
[26] See for this section the Epilogue.
[27] Daniel: 2.31-45.

How to deal with present challenges to peace and security?

Although the document on the *Security Strategy of the United States* reflects a different spirit, it contains one little phrase, which offers hope for a new constructive approach. President Bush wrote in his accompanying letter to the document: "*Today, the international community has the best chance since the rise of the nation-state in the seventeenth century to build a world where great powers compete in peace instead of continually prepare for war.*" In view of the facts and present policies, this pertinent statement will raise eyebrows. Particularly when we look at the truly monstrous proportions of the military potential and the colossal - still expanding - military budget. While the military expenditures of the USA are in the order of nearly $500 billion, only a small fraction is made available for official development aid. Even the recent increase of this minimal amount with 50% does not change much in the perception that the USA - giving less than 0,2 % of its Gross National Product for official development aid - is lagging way behind the UN objective of 0,7%! It is quite obvious that 'Competing for Peace' would require a radical shift in priorities!

Still it would be a grave mistake to dismiss this constructive opening for a new line of thinking. The pertinent challenge of President Bush to 'compete in peace' should be taken up, certainly by the European partners. If this would lead to a joint American-European endeavour, it could even be highly beneficial for an improvement of the battered transatlantic relations.[28] Of crucial importance would be the recognition that a fresh look has to be taken at the major threats to human security for us and for our world. These threats – as we have seen earlier - are not just limited to Weapons of Mass Destruction and terrorism. They comprise other urgent world problems as well, such as: poverty, hunger, spreading of disease and the alarming rate of environmental destruction. All are threatening human security!

Those, still clinging to the old concept of security, ignore the simple truth that meeting the basic needs - providing human security - is an essential condition for living in peace. Indeed, there will be no peace without justice and solidarity with the millions now living in abject poverty! The same could be said for the urgent need to stop the progressive rate of destruction of our natural environment. In the present critical world situation, it is of paramount importance to develop a common strategy addressing the key problems. All nations should become conscious of the fact that we are seated in the same boat heading for treacherous waters. Particularly the Atlantic partners, who are economically speaking highly developed, could chart a new course towards a more peaceful and sustainable world. This could be prepared by creating a High Level Group for a joint reflection upon the appropriate way to handle major world problems. Such a joint consultation of the USA and the EU might focus on the following pertinent questions:

---

[28] See Chapter 10.

- What are the six major global threats to security?[29]
- How do we actually deal with these pressing world problems? Do current policies facilitate effective solutions? What are actual priorities in spending?
- What should be done in order to compete effectively in peace? To what extent should policies be readjusted?

If the United States of America would be prepared to act in this direction - in conjunction with the European Union – this great nation could render a much more superior contribution to world peace and security than it could ever hope to achieve with all their costly efforts to bolster an already awe-inspiring military power.

Conclusion

Governments are still in the ban of the outdated security concept: *if you want peace prepare for war.* This concept automatically entails excessive military outlays and a dynamic development of new and ever more costlier arms systems. Instead of greater security it leads to a growing insecurity! Not only as a consequence of the inherent danger of a huge destructive potential in a highly vulnerable society but also because of the neglect of major threats to human security.

Our highly interdependent world is in urgent need of a new comprehensive concept based on the insight that if you want to avoid war, you have to pursue actively policies leading to a just and durable peace. There can be no doubt that this radical shift in approach – leading to a drastic cut in military orders - will provoke fierce resistance from the military-, industrial- and scientific establishment. Given the fact that these vested interests are well entrenched in the political constituency there is a need for a strong countervailing power. This could be found in an active public opinion, deeply convinced that a new approach is urgently needed. This presupposes however a widespread awakening to the imminent dangers of a pursuance of the present course.

Humanity stands before the choice of *Awake or perish*! In making this choice the inner motivation of people plays a great role. For this reason I have dwelt at length on the relevance of a spiritual renewal. It is my firm conviction that Religions - together with all those who share a profound awareness of the unique value of life - could greatly contribute to this process of awakening.

---

[29] The Report of the UN High Level Panel lists six categories, covering many problems. It may be easier to arrive at a consensus on a new approach if a start could be made with six of the most crucial issues.