STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

# PEACEKEEPING AND PDD 25: AN AMERICAN MORAL PRESCRIPTION

BY

CHAPLAIN (LTC) DAVID H. BRADFORD
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2002

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

20020429 158

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

# PEACEKEEPING AND PDD 25: AN AMERICAN MORAL PRESCRIPTION

by

David H. Bradford
United States Army

Chaplain (Col) Donald Rutherford
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

## ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: David H. Bradford

TITLE: Peacekeeping and PDD 25: An American Moral Prescription

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 09 April 2002 PAGES: 20 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Peacekeeping is an American value based on the virtues that have made us a great nation and a world super power. Perhaps the only hegemon for the next 20 to 30 years. In order to determine a viable and strategic policy for the United States of America in regards to peacekeeping efforts as a superpower, this research paper employed a critical analysis methodology. This study investigates the issue of peacekeeping and makes recommendations concerning America's involvement and reasons for being fully engaged in efforts to bring peace to a troubled world. The research sought to determine the various reasons for making peacekeeping a central American foreign policy and why historically America has sought peace for itself and the world.

Some reasons are: 1) American virtues; 2)America's historical interest in peace; 3)American role as only superpower; 4)America's religious beliefs and their role in shaping our national interests.

The key findings in this research project reveal the following. 1) America has always had an idealistic approach to its relationships with other countries in terms of America's central and key position in the world. 2) America has gone to war many times to restore and preserve freedom and bring peace to a troubled world. 3) America is now the only world superpower which brings certain obligations as well as rights. 4) America is a religious country with all of the values and virtues of a spiritual nation. These virtues and values lead our nation to want good for ourselves and for others.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ..... III

PEACEKEEPING AND PDD 25: AN AMERICAN MORAL PRESCRIPTION ..... 1

A MORAL IMPERATIVE ..... 1

BLUE FLAG ..... 4

NATION BUILDING ..... 5

BLESSED AR E THE PEACEMAKERS ..... 7

FAITH OF OUR FATHERS ..... 8

TERRORISM AND PEACEKEEPING ..... 10

CREATING OUR OWN GRAVITY ..... 11

POLICY RECOMMENDATION ..... 12

ENDNOTES ..... 15

BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 17

PEACEKEEPING AND PDD 25: AN AMERICAN MORAL PRESCRIPTION

> Peacekeeping is therefore the imposition of neutral and lightly armed interposition forces following a cessation of armed hostilities and with the permission of the state on whose territory these forces are deployed, in order to discourage a renewal of military conflict and promote an environment under which the underlying dispute can be resolved.[1]

The previous administration endorsed PDD 25, which carefully encourages[2] with certain limitations the United States to participate in peacekeeping missions. The term peace operations means anything from traditional peacekeeping to peace enforcement "aimed at defusing and resolving international conflicts."[3] My judgment is that the current administration should continue to follow the guidance of PDD 25 and enhance and expand its direction with more resources in order to make peacekeeping a more significant priority for the United States military.

As PDD 25 states;

> When our interests dictate, the US must be willing and able to fight and win wars...Circumstances will arise however, when multilateral action best serves US interests in preserving or restoring peace. In such cases, the UN can be an important instrument for collective action. UN peace operations can also provide a "force multiplier" in our efforts to promote peace and stability.
>
> During the Cold War, the United Nations could resort to multilateral peace operations only in the few cases when the interests of the Soviet Union and the West did not conflict. In the new strategic environment such operations can serve more often as a cost-effective tool to advance American as well as collective interests in maintaining peace in key regions and create global burden-sharing for peace.[4]

Peacekeeping, the art of separating and standing between two or more enemies, and peacemaking, the art of going to war to end hostilities, have a great deal in common. They are both very well suited to American values and virtues and abilities. They have both been important to mankind, and the World War II generation has literally saved the world by doing both at the expense of their lives and fortunes. Why? Why would they place themselves and their country in harms way for over 50 years? Why should we place ourselves and our country in harms way for peace?

**A MORAL IMPERATIVE**

In my judgment the why is answered by what Henry Kissinger calls "America's Moral Prescription." Being a realist, he may not have intended the term to be used in such an idealist appeal for the expansion of the Presidential Decision Directive from the Clinton Administration.

But I do think that the principle of what he says can apply to our leadership in furthering the goals and intent of PDD 25.

> Both schools of thought – of America as beacon and of America as crusader – envision as normal a global\international order based on democracy, free commerce, and international law. Since no such system has ever existed, its evocation often appears to other societies as utopian, if not naïve. Still, foreign skepticism never dimmed the idealism of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, or Ronald Reagan, or indeed of all other twentieth-century American presidents. If anything, it has spurred America's faith that history can be overcome and that if the world truly wants peace, it needs to apply America's moral prescriptions.[5]

The term "America's Moral Prescription" is a loaded term full of the richness of the American spirit and full of the pride and conviction of the American people that what we have as a nation is what the world needs and what many want. If the world doesn't recognize it, or want it, it may not matter. We are or should be convinced that we have the answer for a troubled world and the ability to provide assistance. The concept of "manifest destiny" indirectly speaks to peacekeeping. As we once believed it was our destiny to become the nation we have become, in my judgment the concept can and should apply to our efforts to bring peace to troubled peoples and nations. We, as a nation, can, and should use our great national resources, people, treasure, and vision, to bring hope and peace to our world.

Of course this "calling" is not without it's difficulties. As far back as 1919, when the League of Nations was being debated in the United States, Henry Cabot Lodge spoke against the League and the United States getting involved in what he considered an unwarranted involvement in the world's troubles that would threaten America's peace, way of life and prosperity.

> The United States is the world's best hope, but if you fetter her in the interest through quarrels of other nations, if you tangle her in the intrigues of Europe, you will destroy her powerful good, and endanger her very existence. Leave her to march freely through the centuries to come, as in the years that have gone. Strong, generous, and confident, she has nobly served mankind. Beware how you trifle with your marvelous inheritance—this great land of ordered liberty. For if we stumble and fall, freedom and civilization everywhere will go down in ruin.[6]

It is understandable why some Americans have been and are reluctant to be involved in the world's affairs. We have been so blessed and so lucky as a nation, it seems arrogant and careless to risk it for the benefit of others who may not be grateful for our interest in their well-being. It is too easy to hide our heads in the sand and hope that the world will take care of itself. This is I fear the temptation to avoid difficult and risky involvement in peacekeeping efforts. As

Henry Cabot Lodge himself said, "The United States is the world's best hope...". This should be our call to action and face head on the challenges and risks of being a peacekeeper. As the Commander, Canadian Land Forces Command, Lieutenant General M. Baril stated on 14 November 1996 at the United Nations:

> Action to relieve the suffering of the people is urgently needed, but the international community is still struggling to find a way to address the problem. What is needed is a force which can quickly deploy to assist the humanitarian organizations to regain access to the people who need their help. Canada is willing to contribute to a multi-national force and lead it. We have consulted with other members states and have been encouraged with the cooperation and sense of urgency expressed by many. Planning has commenced to organize and deploy a force, which, with the proper authority and international will, could deploy quickly. .... Action is needed now and we cannot wait for the perfect plan.[7]

"We cannot wait for the perfect plan", is perhaps the most cogent and relevant comment that we can repeat from General Baril's call for action. The United States should be ready to take measured steps in the cause of peace throughout the world, knowing that whatever we do will not be the perfect plan or perfect solution. It will be much needed help and worth giving if we believe in our nation's purpose and its obligation to the world for the many blessings we enjoy as a people.

What would a peacekeeping plan for the United States look like? It would by necessity be led by the United States in conjunction with the United Nations. But we would be the driving force as we call for a committed effort to peacekeeping efforts. We would offer the resources to make the effort viable to include leadership, troops, intelligence, and logistics. We hopefully would not be providing everything for each mission, but our willingness to lead would certainly give encouragement to our allies and give notice to the enemies of peace that their efforts will be challenged. If Canada can offer itself as the leader of a peacekeeping effort in Eastern Zaire, we should be able to do the same on a broader scale. According to Alvin and Heidi Toffler in their book War and Anti-War, a full one third of the nations of the earth have insurgents or governments in exile or some very real threat to its very existence.

These nations face a tremendous problem that many will not be able to handle by themselves. In testimony before the U. S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary of State Warren Christopher warned that "if we don't find some way that the different ethnic groups can live together in a country.... we'll have 5,000 countries rather than the 100 plus we have now".[8]

The necessity for action by a great power such as ours is by no means a new idea in the history of the nations of the world. It is precisely the fact that the United States is a great power,

which some might call a hegemon, that it is the only one who can provide the necessary leadership for peacekeeping in the 21st century. As John Fiske wrote in Harpers in 1885,

> The greatest work which the Romans performed in the world was to assume the aggressive against menacing barbarism, to subdue it, to tame it, and to enlist its brute force on the side of law and order. This was a murderous work, but it had to be done by someone before you could expect to have great and peaceful civilizations like our own. [9]

Peacekeeping may in fact be a "murderous work", meaning it may cost us our blood in addition to our money. But it needs to be done. There is an urgent need for realistic, practical and substantive measures to be taken by our nation and the international community. We should be prepared to lead and do what is possible.

**BLUE FLAG**

Beginning in 1989, there was an explosion in the number of what was called "peacekeeping". These can be described as operations involving many nations forces under the command or direction of the United Nations. There was a transformation from only rare use of the term, with very little military involvement from the world powers, to suddenly being almost a universal term. The term was also adopted by politicians as a useful tool to solve post cold war problems.

The first surge in 1989 sprang from the resolve of the Soviet Union and the United States to put the Cold War behind them and end several long-burning regional conflicts in which they had been supporting, directly or indirectly, rival parties engaged in large scale, violent struggles for power, particularly in Namibia, Angola, Mozambique, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Afghanistan, and Cambodia. In each instance the United Nations Security Council mandated and deployed peacekeeping forces numbering upwards of five thousand soldiers for the purpose of helping implement prior agreements to end the combat and secure the peace. There was a second surge which stated in 1991 and was inspired by the recent cooperation of the five permanent members in using the United Nations Security Council not only to help resolve smaller regional conflicts, but also to help defeat Iraq in the Persian Gulf. The United States, the Soviet Union, France, and Britain with Chinese acquiescence, agreed on a still more active, broader United Nations role in attempting to resolve large scale internal crisis in a number of terribly troubled states. An unprecedented meeting of the United Nations Security Council at the chief of state level was held on 31 January 1992, and endorsed the concept of "strengthening the capacity of the United Nations for preventive diplomacy, for peacemaking and for peacekeeping." The New World Order was at hand.[10]

While it may be true that not every peacekeeping mission led by the United Nations has been completely successful in every aspect, it should not be said that there have not been some significant accomplishments in maintaining peace in a number of troubled areas of the world. From the basic intent of the United Nations Security Council starting in 1989 to try and begin a new way of seeing the world and some of its problems, and in providing a new way of solving some of those problems, we have a framework in which to continue helping those who most desperately need help. While a "New World Order" may not be exactly what we need or want, it is not a totally worthless vision of what some have wanted and perhaps may one day be realized. The world has without a doubt seen a great deal of progress in a vast number of areas affecting many nations during the past 20 years, and the idea of some "New Order" for the future, of whatever scope, should not be ruled out. Of course, practical considerations have to be taken into account. We should not be too starry eyed about what we can accomplish. We need to carefully and thoughtfully weigh the costs and at the same time be willing to pay for the right solution. In other words, you get what you pay for, and the saying holds true in peacekeeping as it does in other types of military operations. While this may or may not relate to the late payment of United Nations dues, it should be taken into considerations when we think and ponder our options and interests.

> In United Nations field operations, as in life, you get what you pay for. A weak and divided international response to a conflict, such as the one in Bosnia and Herzegovina, is going to breed a cautious, self constrained field operation. It is unrealistic to expect that an operation like the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) could fill a void created by political disagreements among United Nations member states on how to maneuver the Bosnian parties toward a peace settlement. The operation was, and remains, a stopgap measure, not a solution to the conflicts of Bosnia and Herzegovina. [11]

**NATION BUILDING**

So what could we assume the solution to be? I argue that one solution will be a more thorough commitment by the United Nations Security Council to provide more resources, troops and money, to the problem. Which means the United States of America assuming our leadership role in leading the United Nations in a more thorough peacekeeping effort.

Having the will power to undertake a peacekeeping mission of any type and see it through to its successful accomplishment must be agreed upon before any force is sent into an unsettled area. In the case of Somalia, there was a great deal of hope and optimism that the United Nations effort would not only settle the many disputes within the country but help rebuild the nation, sometimes called "nation building".

The implied tasks of nation building are complex and difficult when attempted in a hostile environment. When you have a strategic goal such as nation building, there are a great many implied tasks that must be thought through if the mission is to have a chance. The risks may be great, but the rewards are worth the risk. The mandate given to the mission in Somalia gave it a great many implied tasks, which it found itself unable to accomplish.

> Opening up a secure environment for relief while keeping the warlords more or less sweet and somewhat off balance; maintaining and demonstrating military primacy without making a permanent adversary or national hero of any local actor; pushing the military factions towards a locally led political process while opening up that process to civilian elites, without advocating precise formulas, removing heavy weapons from areas of conflict while fostering the restoration of police and government functions – these are undertakings of the highest order or delicacy and complexity in a militarized and fragmented society such as Somalia's. These accomplishments in fact went far beyond the one line goal of creating a secure environment for humanitarian relief.[12]

It cannot be denied that the failure of the peacekeeping mission in Somalia will make any future attempts to do something like it in the future very difficult and complicated. The fact that the operation was over burdened with tasks and undermanned for what the force was supposed to do, only emphasizes the need for more thorough planning and adequate manning. It should not be seen as a sign that these types of missions should not be undertaken. Giving up on the prospects of assisting a troubled nation to rebuild would be as big a failure as failing to properly execute the mission in the first place.

> To continue its goal of nation building but without using any coercive means, the United Nations was forced to revise its mandate. In February 1994, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 897, which lowered the expectations for what the Somalia peacekeeping force and large military contingent could accomplish and placed more emphasis on traditional passive tasks that would "encourage and assist" the local parties to "achieve disarmament and to respect the cease-fire.[13]

Whatever the avenue of what might be called "nation building" takes, which I prefer to call a type of peacekeeping, the important decision is to take action. If it means that the United Nations is not the vehicle for such action, then we must be flexible enough to use the alliances that exist and have served our nation in the past. These regional alliances are a valid and perhaps somewhat less contentious avenue to funnel our forces and efforts.

> Military actions require extremely close coordination between intelligence gathering and operations, a smoothly functioning decision-making machine and forces with some experience of working together to perform dangerous and complex tasks. These things are more likely to be achieved through existing

national armed forces, alliances and military relationships, than they are within the United Nations command.[14]

**BLESSED ARE THE PEACEMAKERS**

There is, as I have mentioned earlier, a very strong value based reason to provide peacekeeping forces to the world, whether through the United Nations or other means, such as those mentioned by Adam Roberts in the above quote from The United Nations and International Security and Survival. This value is based on the religious virtues which have had a profound impact on the formation of our nation and its founding principles. While we may not always have the perfect answer or provide a perfect service to our fellow man, it is nevertheless important for us to endeavor to provide that service. The Bible provides us with a very good mandate to be as many things as we can be to as many people as possible. And a part of this "calling" involves peacekeeping.

> Though I am free and belong to no man, I make myself a slave to everyone, to win as many as possible. To the Jews, I became like a Jew, to win the Jews. To those under the law I became like one under the law (though I myself am not under the law), so as to win those under the law. To those not having the law I became like one not having the law (though I am not free from God's law but am under the law of Christ). To the weak I became weak, to win the weak. I have become all things to all men so that by all possible means I might save some.[15]

Of course the Apostle Paul doesn't expect our nation to assume the same kind of spiritual sacrifice that he showed to others. But I believe that he would expect us to take his example to heart and attempt to live our life as a community in the spirit of love for others. Love is not a luxury in this life, it is a necessity. And for the destitute and war ravaged, our assistance may make all the difference. Whatever our motive, we can take some encouragement that our creator will approve of our efforts to bring peace to others.

There are other inspirational passages from the Bible that I believe are important in our deliberations in what action to take in regard to providing peacekeeping forces to the world. The term "peacekeeping" is one used in the Bible and is found in one of the most famous passages. This passage is called the Sermon on the Mount.

> Now when he saw the crowds, he went up on a mountainside and sat down. His disciples came to him and he began to teach them saying: Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are those who mourn, for they will be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth. Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they will be filled. Blessed are the merciful, for they will be shown mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called the sons of God. Blessed are those who are persecuted because of

> righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you and falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of me. Rejoice and be glad, because great is your reward in heaven, for in the same way they persecuted the prophets who were before you. [16]

Without a doubt the spirit of this passage from the Bible calls us to step outside of our own small interests to see and act on a principle that the interests of others are just as important if not in some instances more important than our own.

**FAITH OF OUR FATHERS**

> "The preamble of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which proclaims that, since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace should be built, it is fundamentally a religious proposition."
>
> -Swami Ranganathanada

There is a tremendous amount of documentation that faith and certain religious beliefs were an integral part of the founding of our nation. The idea of separation of church and state was an idea that was expressed in a letter by Thomas Jefferson trying to explain what the first amendment meant in terms of religious liberty.

> The connection between American belief structure has been one of at least partial denial. Although separation of church and state has been one of our enduring political myths; in fact religious belief and religion have played a key context-establishing role since before the framing of the constitution. Religion has helped shape American values since the earliest days when Americans saw the United States as the "new Jerusalem," the city on the hill where people could work out their destinies free of old restraints—and as a beacon on the hill for others. Belief in a divine creator, if not in a state religion, suffused our political life-and still does despite the increasing 20th century secularization. In practical foreign policy terms, missionaries were engaging in their own forms of "diplomacy" before the United States even had a diplomatic service, and missionaries outnumbered American diplomats abroad until well into the 1950's.[17]

The significance of religion should be considered in formulating our foreign policy toward peacekeeping missions. It can be a part of the motivation and driving force to assist others who need our help. Religion is the stabilizing force in our sometimes wavering understanding of man's nature and what drives him to do what he does. Christianity in particular provides a lesson on realism and is instructive to our understanding of humanity. James H. Toner, Army War College Professor of Leadership and Ethics, states, in his work....

> ...any statecraft devoid of a sense of limitation is bound inevitable to fail, for politics is not theology; one's soul is not saved by the devices of economics and

> diplomacy. Prudent statecraft is a product of sober reflection on the theological insight and on the historical example of man's proclivity to sin. [18]

Toner's belief in the sinfulness of man is not unique. This view of man is found throughout the scriptures of both Judaism and Christianity as well as theologians of all ages. According to the German theologian Niebuhr, man has a unique way of viewing himself and acting out his conceit in sinful ways.

> Good and evil are not determined by some fixed structure of human existence. Man, according to the biblical view, may use his freedom to make himself falsely the center of existence; but this does not change the fact that love rather than self-love is the law of existence in the sense that man can only be healthy and his communities at peace if man is drawn out of himself and saved from the self-defeating consequences of self-love.[19]

This opinion of man's interest and seemingly unending determination to sin is not uniquely a Christian point of view. And while the founding fathers of our nation were instructed mostly by Christianity, much of Christianity was instructed by Judaism. With the Jewish experience with war and never ending search for peace and self sacrifice for peace, I believe the Jews and their faith have a great deal to teach us and our system of government about peace.

Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, a speaker at the Paris Peace Symposium in 1968, points out that the history of Israel is full of images of battle. He mentions a statement by George Holley Gilbert in The Battle and Universal Peace:

> The ancient Hebrews had a warlike career. They fought the battles of Yahweh for centuries. But when at last their national existence was no more, when they sat and sighed by the ruins of their holy city, or far from the nations, some among them dreamed of a new wondrous age that was yet to come. They thought of their past, glorified, indeed, in the far retrospect. But they did not long to have those ages returned unchanged. They dreamed of a future that should be far better than the best their fathers ever had known. And one constant element of that great future – one on which they dwelt with satisfaction – was peace. Out of the vision of a time when peace should flow as a river. By this vision the Hebrew prophets became leaders of the race toward a future kingdom whose realization is still among the treasures of hope.[20]

The lesson of the Jewish people in their quest for peace may not be entirely applicable to our current and complex problem of peacekeeping, yet it does give insight into human nature, the eternal aspirations of man for peace, and a spiritual and religious foundation for understanding the desire for peace. Out of the wisdom of the Jewish religion there are many expressions of this desire, need and requirement for peace. The Midrash, a Jewish commentary of religion and theology, states:

> The Torah(first five books of the Jewish Bible) does not command you to run after or to pursue the other commandments, but only to fulfill them upon the appropriate occasion. But peace you must seek in your own place and pursue it even to another place as well.[21]

The requirement for peace is a heavy burden for people of faith because it requires sacrifice. The sacrifice of pride and selfish interests, the turning of the other cheek, submission and a host of other behaviors that might be considered negative or destructive for a nation to engage in. It is therefore difficult to translate personal faith into action for a nation. In my judgment it is sometimes appropriate to practice a biblical faith as a nation and sometimes it is not. Knowing when it is appropriate requires a great deal of wisdom. And it is from faith and the leaders of our faiths that we receive a type of wisdom that should be considered. The Jewish scholar Dr. S. Schwarzchild, describes the radical concept of peace within Judaism:

> God, to the Jew is the radical of radicals, the 'Ikkar ha Ikkarim', the root of all roots. As Karl Marx reminds us in a famous passage, to be radical means to go to the root. Marx went on to claim that the root of man is man. Judaism, however, insists that the root of man is God. Consequently, when God, the radical, the root of all roots, demands that we seek peace, He demands radically that we radically seek peace. Hence, when He demands, "Seek peace and pursue it," He did not mean seek war, nor did he mean seek peace when it is prudent, popular, or conducive to one's selfish or national interests. Nor yet did He mean seek peace slowly, under certain and not under other conditions. Because the God of the religious Jew is the root of all radicalism, He is bound to be radical in every way, insisting on peace now and everywhere in the methods of operation as well as with respect to the goal.[22]

While peace may not be easy or cheap, it is from the religious perspective, essential and non-negotiable. How the nations fit this into their worldview is a question that only the politicians are able to determine, based on the values of its people.

**TERRORISM AND PEACEKEEPING**

Terrorism is without a doubt the opposite of peace, any kind of peace. Terror by its nature undermines and destroys not only the peace which may exist but also any prospects for peace. Terrorism has been defined as:

> ...a planned campaign of paramilitary types of action which is characterized by episodic violence against random targets in order to injure and terrify ordinary people for political purposes while seeking to avoid military confrontation with governmental forces.[23]

The obvious problem for nations interested in peace is how to resolve the issues that lead a group to engage in terror to highlight their complaints. Can we negotiate with a group that has

just killed five thousand of our citizens; women and children included? Are we able to talk with terrorists about their interests as we would a nation that is fighting our soldiers on the field of battle? Can there be a settlement with terrorists? A part of the answer to these questions is found in the discussion on whether terrorist's acts can be justified. If it is possible to justify an act of terrorism as it is possible to justify an act of war, then there might be ground to consider a negotiation or settlement.

> We might conclude that if war can be justified, then terrorist acts can be also, if they have certain characteristics. But if terrorism includes, not by definition but in fact, the unnecessary killing of the innocent, it is at least not more justified than war in doing so, though the scale may be smaller. And if comparable good results can be accomplished with far less killing, an alternative to war that would achieve these results through acts intrinsically no worse than those that occur in war would be justifiable...[24]

The fact that the terrorism that threatens our nation is religious based makes it even more difficult to deal with. At the same time we deny it's a religion and call it evil, while recognizing that the terrorists are in fundamental Muslims. It seems incomprehensible to us that a religion would foster such actions on the part of its adherents. And yet that is exactly what is happening. Denying that we are dealing with a religion is not going to help our policy makers cope with the situation. We must come to a full and appropriate acceptance of who and what we are facing if we are to resolve our dispute, or any dispute.

The complexities and nuances of the current terrorist threat need to be understood and not dismissed. At the moment our country is labeling the Muslim terrorists as evil. This simplistic mislabeling will not solve our national problem. The militant Muslims confronting our nation have religious grievances that they believe are justified by some of our nations actions in the Middle East. We must come to some comprehension of our enemy, an honest understanding, if we are going to address the underlying causes of the current terrorist threat. If the terrorists believe they are doing something holy and right, our bombs will not dissuade them that we are the evil in the world.

## CREATING OUR OWN GRAVITY

I do not want to seem too naïve or idealistic in calling for an improved, enhanced and more thorough peacekeeping effort in the world led by the United States. The world's record on peacekeeping is not exactly what one could be proud of. The hopes of this century have all but been dashed on the reality of our many failures in trying to keep peace by thinking only the best of others and failing to see the evil that exists. This unrealistic approach should not be repeated and does not need to be if we can heed the lessons of our peacekeeping history.

Charles Krauthammer, a writer for The New Republic and columnist for the Washington Post, wrote a very sobering article in November 1995 titled, "Peacekeeping is for Chumps". In it he lambastes the weak and ineffective peacekeeping efforts of the 20th Century. His criticisms are important for our deliberations if we are to avoid the pitfalls and blind spots that still exist within the counsels of the well-intentioned countries that would help form any future peacekeeping force.

> It is now the third time this century that we have come under the illusion of having found a new way to reorder the world. These illusions come in the immediate aftermath of a great war. And though we are hardly conscious of it, our time, marked by victory in the Cold War, is a classically postwar time... In the 1990's, we have been told, indeed by such ostensibly political realists as George Bush, that a New World Order is dawning, an order based on global community, international law, collective security, peacekeeping, the United Nations, and true multilateralism.[25]

In spite of skepticism, Americans have an inner strength that will allow us to continue to lead the world. This strength in part comes from the heart of our nation, the core of our society. The core of our society and the strength of our life is the democracy that has been handed down to our generation. Democracy is many things to many people, and that is one of the most important aspects of a free people, having a government that can accommodate a great many different ideas, beliefs and peoples who hold to these different beliefs. Democracy at its best is multi-sided. This multi-faceted nature to democracy is one thing fundamentalists hate about it.

"There is no one certain truth that guides the United States, and extremists hate openness and allowing options for the people to choose".[26] It is this extremism that will be difficult to fight without losing some of the openness that we love as Americans and losing that strength that makes our way of life the hope for the world.

**POLICY RECOMMENDATION**

Our national policy toward peacekeeping must be one of engagement. All of our resources should be brought to bear, including our moral strength based on our national virtues. We must utilize the avenues that are open, including the United Nations, NATO, and any coalition or regional alliances that might be useful. With the right mix of forces and with the right troops and with the right mandate, our peacekeeping efforts can be successful. This is asking a lot of ourselves and allies, but the possible gains are worth the effort.

We should also explore the formation of additional coalitions to cover areas of the world that might be overlooked by the traditional organizations we have worked with in the past. Subject matter experts must be used to help us understand the issues affecting a specific area of the

world where there is conflict. National arrogance and pride must take a back seat to the open mind and open hand of a world power interested in peace. We must be able to view others and ourselves through their eyes and not shrink from the unpleasant and unflattering images we may see. We will have to be open to have our minds changed about some notions we have held. All of this will require a more open approach, which while holding some risks, also holds a greater promise of peace. PDD25 of the Clinton Administration is a good beginning and should be continued in the current presidential administration.

**Word count 6042**

## ENDNOTES

[1] Paul Diehl, International Peacekeeping, (London: Warner Books, 1993),5.

[2] Professor Frank Jones, United States Army War College, Interview by author, 18 September 2001, Carlisle, PA.

[3] William J. Clinton, Presidential Decision Directive 25:Peacekeeping (Washington, D.C.:The White House, February 1996),3.

[4] Ibid.,4.

[5] Henry Kissinger, Diplomacy (New York, NY:Simon and Schuster, 1994),2.

[6] Henry Cabot Lodge, "Nations Forum: American Leadership Series," 1918-1920: Available from<http:www.Memory.loc.gov/cgibin/query/D?nfor:79:./temp/~ammem_PTID>;internet;access ed 25 September 2001.

[7] Lgen Baril, "Statement to UN HQ NY," Canadian Peacekeeping School document, 14 November 1996, 1.

[8] Alvin and Heidi Toffler, War and Anti-War (New York, NY:Warner Books,1993),288.

[9] John Fiske, "Manifest Destiny," Harper's Magazine, March 1885, 34.

[10] John Hillen, Bluehelmets, The Strategy of UN Military Operations, (Washington,D.C.:Brassey's,1998),11-12.

[11] Ibid.,182.

[12] Hirsch and Oakley, "Somalia and Operation Restore Hope", New York Times Magazine, September 1999. 10.

[13] UNSC Resolution 897, 4 February 1994.

[14] Adam Roberts, The United Nations and International Security and Survival, Vol 35, no.2. Summer 1993, 15.

[15] The Apostle Paul, 1st Corinthians 9.19-22.

[16] The Gospel of Matthew 5.1-12.

[17] John D. Stempel, Faith and Diplomacy in the International System, Patterson School of Diplomacy, March 2000, 17.

[18] James H. Toner, The Sword and the Cross: Reflections on Command and Conscience (New York, N.Y.:Praeger Publishers, 1992),9.

[19] Ronald Neibuhr, Christian Realism and Political Problems,(New York, N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953),130.

[20] Jack Homer, ed. World Religions and World Peace: The International Symposium on Peace, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), 43.

[21] Midrash, Jewish Sacred Writings, volume 22, section 4, paragraph 7.

[22] Jack Homer, ed. World.

[23] Wilfred L. Lacroix, War and International Ethics: Tradition and Today,(Maryland: University Press of America, 1988), 620.

[24] William S. Held, Violence, Terrorism and Moral Inquiry, New York, NY: Doubleday, 1997), 620.

[25] Charles Krauthammer, A False Vision, (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000), 44.

[26] Robert J. Lifton, "Ideology and Freedom", Bill Moyer Journal, January 2001,27.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


(Baril, Lgen. "Statement to UN HQ NY." Document from Canadian Peacekeeping School, Borden_Ontario, 14 November 1996. 1-2.

Clinton, William J. Presidential Decision Directive 25. Washington, D.C.: The White House, February 1996.

Diehl, Paul. International peacekeeping. London: Warner Books, 1993.

Fiske, John. "Manifest Destiny." Harpers Magazine, March 1885, 30-36.

Geyer, Georgie Anne. "Peacekeeping, War of the Future." The American Legion Magazine. September 2001, 81-83.

Held, William S. Violence, Terrorism and Moral Inquiry. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1997.

Hillen, John. Bluehelmets, The Strategy of UN Military Operations. Washington, DC: Brassey's, 1998.

Hirsch, James and Oakley, Charles. "Somalia and Operation Hope". New York Times Magazine. December 1998.

Homer, Jack. World Religions and World Peace. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.

Jones, Frank, Faculty Instructor. Interview by author, 18 September 2001, AWC, Seminar 3.

Kissinger, Henry. Diplomacy. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1994.

Krauthammer, Charles. A False Vision. Boston: Beacon Press, 2001.

LaCroix, Wilfred L. War and International Ethics. Maryland: University Press, 1988.

Lifton, Robert. " Ideology and Freedom", Bill Moyer Journal, January 2001.

Lodge, Henry Cabot. "Nations Forum: American Leadership Series." 1918-1920. Available from Http://www.memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?nfor:79:./temp/~ammem PTID. Internet. Accessed 25 September 2001.

Matthew, Apostle. Gospel of Matthew, New Testament.

Midrash, Jewish Sacred Writings

Neibuhr, Ronald. Christian Realism and Political Problems. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

Paul, Apostle. 1 Corinthians, New Testament.

Roberts, Adam. The United Nations and International Security and Survival. New York, NY: Scribners Press, 1997.

Stempel, John D. "Faith and Diplomacy in the International System", Patterson School of Diplomacy, March 2000.

Toffler, Alvin and Heidi. War and Anti-War. New York, NY: Warner Books, 1993.

Toner, James H. The Sword and the Cross-Reflections on Command and Conscience. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers, 1992.

UNSC Resolution 97. February 1994.