

506

Comments Prepared for Delivery
by
Representative James A. Leach
to
The Third Annual Peace Prize Forum
in cooperation with the Norwegian Nobel Institute

Luther College
Decorah, Iowa

February 23, 1991

We have now come to the end of the Third Nobel Peace Prize Forum. It is my charge in what has been described in the program as "A Call to Action" to send you home...with a message, or at least a perspective.

Before attempting such a daunting task, I would like to extend my personal appreciation for the comments, and more importantly the force of character, that previous speakers have brought to this podium. Seldom has such a distinguished group graced an Iowa college campus. I'm sure I speak for everyone assembled in expressing how appreciative and uplifted we are.

Normally concluding speakers in colloquiums of this nature summarize the views previously presented, but at the risk of presumption, I would like to present a somewhat divergent perspective and address my concerns principally to the students who have raised such thought-provoking questions this weekend and whose turn at the leadership wheel is so soon at hand.

It is my sense that in America today there is a crisis of perspective. Centuries hence historians may well write that there have been three great debates in our history. The first commenced with the founding of the Republic and the question of whether a nation-state could be established premised on the rights of man; the second symbolized by the Civil War and Suffragette movement of a century later centered on the question of definitions -- whether rights would be accorded individuals who were neither pale nor male; the third has just been engaged: the issue of whether society itself has rights and whether there is a right to peace.

In this context, we must recognize that conflict begins in the hearts and minds of individuals and it is in the hearts and minds of individuals that values must be instilled if society is to be preserved. We must also recognize that responsibility can't be ducked. To sin by silence, by inaction, is to induce moral amnesia, to deny accountability.

Several decades ago in one of the profoundest personal observations of the 20th century a German pastor, Martin Niemoeller, reflected on the dark night of the human soul we now call the Holocaust.

--First, Niemoeller said, the Nazis went after the Jews, but because he was not a Jew, he did not object.
--Then they went after the Catholics, but because he was not a Catholic, he did not object.
--Then they went after the trade unionists, but because he was not a trade unionist, he did not object.
--Then, he said, they came after me, and there was no one left to object.

How does all this relate to an understanding of events unfolding this very afternoon in the Persian Gulf?

Of profound relevance, it seems to me, is a dialogue which occurred between two theologians a week apart in the Spring of 1932 in a religious journal called The Christian Century. The theologians were brothers -- H. Richard Niebuhr, who was professor of Christian ethics at Yale Divinity School, and Reinhold Niebuhr, who held a similar chair at Union Theological Seminary. Richard Niebuhr was a pacifist; Reinhold was not.

Citing developments then occurring in the incipient stages of the Sino-Japanese conflict, Richard Niebuhr warned that righteous indignation was "a dangerous thing" and suggested that introspective self-analysis was preferable to judging a neighbor. Little constructive could be done by countries interfering in the affairs of other states, he suggested, but something very constructive could always be done by individuals preparing themselves for the future.

In a profoundly tortured rebuttal to the views of his brother, Reinhold Niebuhr concurred in the pacifist premise that "the business of true religion [is] to destroy man's moral conceit," but he nonetheless held that "no nation can ever be good enough to save another nation purely by the power of love." Accordingly, he suggested that "justice is probably the highest ideal toward which human groups can aspire."

From this line of reasoning over the centuries a just war doctrine has emerged. Briefly, it holds that for war to be considered just, it must be animated by a just cause and informed by righteous intention, that it be undertaken by a lawful political authority and only as a last resort, and that rectifying actions be proportionate to the wrongs committed.

I raise the just war issue, what might at first blush seem to be an esoteric concern, for two interrelated reasons. First, the issue of war involves the gravest of moral questions. Second, not merely the theory but the history of international relations since the First World War embodies the distinction between just and unjust causes of War. The Covenant of the League of Nations, the United Nations Charter, and The Charter of the Military Tribunal at Nuremberg all reject the 'realpolitik' doctrine of 'staatrason' -- the tyrannical notion that might makes right, that orders lacking moral base can be considered

legal.

Instead, modern world politics are founded upon a conception of international society analogous to the laws and customs of coercion in domestic societies, that resort to violence in international affairs must be regarded either as lawful police action or crime. In other words, resort to armed force in international society is legitimate only if it is used on behalf of or in service to the fundamental principles and purposes undergirding international law.

Thus the moral philosopher Michael Walzer observes that, "aggression is the name we give to the crime of war."

In post-war America diplomacy, the classic exposition of this principle was stated by President Truman in October 1945, when he declared that the fundamentals of American foreign policy would rest in part on the proposition "that the preservation of peace between nations requires a United Nations Organization composed of all the peace-loving nations of the world who are willing to use force if necessary to insure peace."

Perspective is always difficult to apply to events of the day, but it would appear that a watershed development in international relations is occurring. For the first time in modern history, a credible system of collective security -- predicated on the understanding that force may be required to keep the peace -- is on the threshold of being born.

If one American political party has been historically identified with advocacy of collective security and the multilateral diplomacy it implies, it is the Democratic Party. Collective security was the watchword of Woodrow Wilson, who literally drove himself to death defending this principle against strident critics. Franklin Roosevelt, arguably the greatest president of this century, insisted that collective security principles be espoused in the Atlantic Charter, in authoritative statements of American aims in World War II, and ultimately in the Charter of the United Nations itself.

Yet today it is a Republican President who, in opposition both to the isolationist and go-it-alone interventionist themes that have ambivalently marked much of this century's conservative tradition, is in the vanguard of credible collective security endeavors.

If force must be used to roll back the Iraqi conquest, it will be in the profoundest sense an act of law enforcement rather than an act of warfare. Our troops will be acting in concert with our allies and in conformity with a U.N. mandate as constables to enforce the law abroad, rather than as soldiers of nationalist whim.

Warfare is sometimes described as the scourge of nationalism, but in this instance the use of force is intended to be authorized to defend an international collective security system, to undercut rather than bolster narrow destructive nationalism.

From an historical perspective, observers of crises that involve aggression in this century frequently look to the European cities of Sarajevo and Munich for juxtaposed historical analogy: Sarajevo implying excessive rigidity in the international system, Munich implying not enough spine. In this case, Munich appears to be a more apt historical analogy. On the other hand, to the degree there is an historical parallel, perhaps the most relevant is an East African capital, Addis Ababa, where some 55 years ago, the League of Nations was faced with an analogous crisis.

In 1935, Fascist Italy, then considered a world class power, invaded and eventually subjugated Ethiopia. With great fanfare, the United Kingdom led 50 other members of the League in a decision to enforce the Covenant of the League by imposing economic sanctions against Rome. Mussolini declared that any sanctions which might affect his military capabilities, especially regarding oil, meant war. Confronted with this brute threat, Britain and her allies recoiled.

In The Gathering Storm Churchill later observed: "the measures passed with so great a parade were not real sanctions to paralyze the aggressor, but merely such half-hearted sanctions as the aggressor would tolerate . . . [British leadership had] led the League of Nations into an utter fiasco, most damaging if not fatally injurious to its effective life as an institution."

Likewise, at issue in the Kuwaiti crisis is less an outcome where individual nation-states may be winners or losers, but one in which the international system has an enormous stake.

From challenge springs opportunity and in this context the President is precisely right to suggest that a new international order is at issue. Hopefully, once the storm clouds have passed, the international community will be able to conclude that the United Nations has finally functioned as its founders intended. But if this conflict is not resolved in a manner which at least restores the status quo ante, then our current international structure -- and in particular the United Nations -- will be grievously jeopardized.

In this regard, as the prospect for a ground war escalates this afternoon, the danger of unintended martyrdom also rises. The United States must be careful to ensure its policies not turn a tin-horn Hitler into an Islamic Allende.

Hence, I would urge the Administration to make it clear to Saddam that at issue are international standards and that a Nuremberg-like tribunal is in the offing for those who torture or execute POWs or civilians or employ poison gas. In addition, the United States should take this opportunity to advance within the U.N. system the creation of an International Criminal Court to hold accountable individuals who violate international conventions, to complement the World Court which exclusively adjudicates disputes between states.

I raise the notion of creating a criminal court at this time because terrorist crimes, usually directed against individuals, small states or relatively small groups of people, challenge nonetheless the rule of law. There could be no more appropriate potential defendant to proceedings in such a court than Saddam Hussein for his brazen violation of civilized norms of behavior in his invasion of Kuwait, in his treatment of POWs, in his use of human shields, as well as poison gas, which has been outlawed by both the Geneva Convention of 1925 and the Biological Weapons Convention of 1972.

Americans must understand that Saddam is not only a menace to the region, but -- with his biochemical weapons capability, nascent nuclear weapons capability, and proven proclivity to use weapons of mass destruction against his own as well as foreign peoples -- his regime represents a broad threat to international law and order. If Saddam's brand of brigandage is rewarded, it will become a replicable model in other corners of the earth. Judgment about proportionality must include such considerations. Lives jeopardized today in the sands of Saudi Arabia may represent lives spared tomorrow, in other distant niches of the world's terrain.

We must have the resolve and courage to stand up to coercion so that the world does not again become vulnerable to Saddam-like blackmail.

At issue for Americans is whether engagement or disengagement represents the more moral policy, whether a policy of peacekeeping or keeping an unprincipled peace will best stand the test of time. Recognizing, in Niebuhrian terms, that there are elements of societal as well as individual moral conceit in an engagement policy, I am nonetheless convinced that a moral society cannot shirk its responsibility to advance justice.

Saddam Hussein has conducted two wars in the last ten years which resulted in a million casualties; he has made rape a daily instrument of coercive state policy; executions are of epidemic proportions, frequently with family members asked to witness and pay for the bullets.

When a country is not only being systematically pillaged, but a culture eviscerated, moral people have an obligation to do more than simply wring their hands and suggest that resolve be diluted by the sands of time.

Sanctifying the status quo in the Gulf with a sanctions only policy would have driven a stake into the heart of international law, for it would have rendered hapless the collective security system Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt worked so assiduously to create and American soldiers in the great wars of this century fought so courageously to make possible.

It would have left a fragile world order increasingly vulnerable to aggression and thus war.

The President's collective security approach, on the other hand, gives hope that an international order will be established based on the precept that aggression will not be rewarded; that peacekeeping is peace making; that potentates, whether petty or mighty, who through naked aggression attempt to take the world hostage will be held accountable to the rule of law.

The oldest paradigm in the Judeo-Christian tradition of governance is the moral imperative of a search for peace. Peace must be the goal of moral leadership. Yet peace, properly understood, cannot merely be defined as the absence of war. After all, if this were so, then a small nation suddenly subjugated and enslaved by a rapacious and unscrupulous neighbor might, after a spell, be considered at peace when in fact its citizens refuse to reconcile themselves to an unconsented fate.

We know from history that humankind does not accept enslavement with abject acquiescence. It goes without saying that peace within a society implies the existence of peace within the individuals who make up such a society. In this context, rights and liberties must be accorded nation-states no less than individuals. In the words of Churchill, true peace "is nothing less than the safety and welfare, the freedom and progress, of all the homes and families of all the men and women in all the lands."

That is why last night in response to a question about who I thought a fitting recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize for 1991 might be, I suggested none would be more fitting than the American G.I. Afterward, a thoughtful young woman told me she thought it was time we stop celebrating the warrior. This morning a former Nobel Laureate said she "puked" at my suggestion.

So that there is no misunderstanding, let me modify my proposal and suggest as strongly as I can that the Nobel Peace Prize for the 20th century should go to the American G.I.

Let me explain. In a geo-strategic sense there have been three defining events of the 20th century -- World War I, World War II, and World War III which was won without a shot being fired in 1988 and 1989 in Eastern Europe. The Gulf War may be a foot-note event, but nonetheless it is of defining significance. What the President is attempting to develop in his New World Order theme is that aggression will not be rewarded; that countries should be expected to follow precepts of international law just as individuals should be expected to adhere to domestic statute; that international institutions will be used to the maximum in developing collective security arrangements; and that countries distant from areas of conflict will be prepared to sacrifice to ensure that abstract principles be ensconced as world-wide norms.

If it weren't for the American G.I., there would be no collective

security. The only competition in the world today would be between totalitarianism of the Left and totalitarianism of the Right. Europe would be freedom's toxic dump. Either the Nazi or Soviet jackboot would be the symbol of order. The land mass that produced Montesquieu and Locke, Beethoven and Descartes, would find its libraries exclusively filled with the class conflict, hate ridden dogma of Das Kapital and Mein Kampf.

Without attempting to colonize or subjugate, the G.I. marched in Flanders' fields and landed at Omaha Beach to make possible the precept that aggression would not be rewarded. In so doing, he and she have laid the foundation for a collective security system that deprives nation states of the incentive to go to war.

Because of the G.I., the 21st century can be looked to with an understanding that what distinguishes this generation of citizens of the world from all others is that we are the first to have the capacity not just to wage war, but destroy civilization. As Einstein once noted, "The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking." If war is a constant of history, the greatest political science question of all time is how it can be made to be obsolete. The G.I. more than anyone else has made possible such a prospect.

The establishment of a New World Order demands we recognize mistakes of the past with an understanding that the most challenging assignment for civilization is to figure out how not to make the one mistake that can't be repeated: nuclear Armageddon.

Avoiding a nuclear exchange implies the need to pay greater attention to the causes of war, such as impoverishment, as well as to the development of instruments of war. Arms control on a global as well as regional basis is a self-evident societal imperative. The time is past due for fulfillment of the promises of START, for a regional nuclear free zone in the Middle East, and for a comprehensive test ban. If there is any lesson of the Gulf conflict, it is that the West and the North are responsible for the creation of the armed camp known as Iraq.

Any credible post-war scenario in the Middle East must include unprecedented restraints on the transfer of arms. The lesson of today is that countries of the world must demand an end to the arms race tomorrow.

Finally, a note about this century as it is beginning to unfold into the next. The 20th century, like those of all recorded history, has been hallmarked by war. For the first time, however, mankind has come seriously to contemplate reasons war should become obsolete and reasons such a prospect might become possible. The existence of weapons of mass destruction give unprecedented and compelling reason to work to insure they not be employed. The creation of international institutions, most importantly the United Nations, the expansion of international law, and the demonstrated will of the international

community to participate in collective security arrangements such as NATO, which has won an unfought war, and the alliance poised to engage an aggressor this afternoon in the Gulf, give hope that the next century will be hallmarked by the absence of cross-boundary conflict.

It is up to the youth today to think anew about war and its meaning. In providing new leadership and new ideals, however, care must be taken to recognize the importance of the sacrifice of your fathers and mothers and the foundation that decent, moral people have laid with their decisions to risk life, limb and fortune to enoble the precept of collective security and defend values identified with the American way of life.

Let me conclude this seminar on "Leadership in Peacemaking" by suggesting to the students assembled here that the inspirations of role models can never be underestimated. That is why so many of you gathered today with Vice President Mondale and Ambassador Ruppe to honor President Arias, Betty Williams and the other Nobel Laureates of this century.

Theirs is the kind of leadership that distinguishes life, the kind of glue that holds the fractious instincts of this fractured planet together.

Blessed are the peace makers, especially the American G.I. who has been called upon once again in this century to deter aggression . . . to keep the peace.