

THE MILITARY AND THE THREAT OF FORCE: WHAT IS THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE MILITARY WITHIN AND BETWEEN STATES

Tan Sri Ghazali Shafie

I remember a little incident in 1945 as a field security officer in the Allied Forces. I confronted a Japanese Officer immediately after the Japanese surrender. I asked him as to why the Japanese soldiers were so cruel and, even inhuman in their behaviour during the war; now after their defeat they had become very meek and even polite. His reply was simply, 'War is not for humans'. Since then, I had been wondering whether there was wisdom or a message in the statement. I thought of the behaviour of humans from the Kesusul Ambia and the Old Testament about the two brothers quarrelling or and one became the victim by the other who used a piece of stone. But that was not war, only two humans one with etreme jealousy, greed and super selfishness. War was something different. It had to have a collection of men. It has to be a clash of forces as occurring during the palaeolithic age when groups of men under a leadership using crude implements fighting for turf, food or women. Later, I reflected on what Machiavelli had said on hatred and dissensions. Then, I saw humans improving their weapons and the science of war but war was always theirs with a cause such as migration or conquest of lands.

Then war had come to mean conflicts for domination of one ruler and his tribes on others. The Romans, the Greeks and the Persians and later the Europeans and Americans were of this category. The Egyptians and the Assyrians introduced order, organisation and discipline into military affairs on and off battlefields, as if war was a kind of human sports. An additional cause appeared. It was the trade route between the Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean. Mesopotamia with its rich agricultural valley became a military prize. Therefore economics and logistical considerations became parts of the reasons for war. Sun Tzu in his 'The Art of War' showed a great understanding of the fundamental science and philosophies of war and military leadership. That book has become also a text book for modern business management which I reckon is quite sinister since it indicated through the studies of war strategy that business or commerce could incline towards espionage and other wiles of warfare.

Weapons of war used by military men were ones to shock and there were missiles. The prehistoric clubs were used as shock weapons while the hurling of rocks on enemies were the missiles. There were leather-reinforced metal armours used as protective equipments. I saw in my mind's eyes elephants, horses and

chariots as aids in warfare for victory and conquest. Since then warships, planes and intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) with atomic warheads, came into prominence with perfected digital instruments, financial and administrative systems in aid of the military. Terror and psychological warfare were also included as a calculated device to defeat the enemy.

The shock weapons and missiles in the form of the tanks and atom bombs were seen in the last Pacific war. To a lesser degree shock weapons and missiles were also used during the Iraq War. The Iraq War was also subjected to terror tactics and the populace in Iraq and Kuwait until today bear the scars of terrorism.

The Hindu epics of classical literature spoke of military exploits and war chariots. In China, I saw the terracottas of the army of Shih Huang Tee in Xian and observed how organised they were including scribes to record military exploits. And I wondered as to what the Japanese Officer said that war was not meant for humans. The military history from the beginning of time revealed that war was carried out between groups of men for reasons of economics, domination, logistics, imposition of cultural values or whatever. The last world war was no different as also the various conflicts on the West Bank, in Africa, Bosnia Herzegovina or Chechnya. Of course there had been wars without weapons except fangs and talons between monkeys and other wild beasts and birds including frogs as once reported in Kedah but we are not talking about them.

Perhaps the Japanese officer was expressing his own disgust. Perhaps in his view that Japanese were regarded by Europeans and Americans as subhuman shorty Nips and justified being killed like pests. The two atom bombs which were exploded on the old and the young of Japan mercilessly and inhumanly pummelled to smithereens; senselessly, since most men of fighting age were on the war fronts. He probably wanted me to know that the use of atomic bombs were weapons of mass destruction, more inhuman than the cruel activities of his soldiers. The effect of the bombs, both physically and psychologically is still with the Japanese people today.

Is it possible for humans not to think of war since war is created in the minds of men? The United Nations made a feeble attempt to eradicate or at least humanise war but war was 'justified' by the UN and International Law in certain circumstances on the basis of some causistic arguments. It could not obliterate "war" or its threat altogether in the minds of men. UN and the Atlantic Community appeared to have felt hopelessly helpless through the various failed attempts in Bosnia Herzegovina and Africa by organising UNPROFOR, IFOR, Peacekeeping Forces etc. as if war was inevitable and that war was a part of human sociological behaviour. The UN apparently has come to accept there was no way that war could

be humanised in the sense that there should be one ethical standard because war would defy ethics. The Bosnian conflict had shown that Dayton Agreement was hopeless in trying to humanise war by punishing war criminals. Even if that could be done, can humans avoid group conflicts altogether where all is fair including weapons of mass destruction in war? The answer is in the positive if, and a very big IF, humans are educated from infancy to imbibe certain universal ethics including that war as an extension of policy whatever may be the excuse or justification is bad and the thought of war whatever weapons used is yekky!.

A start by someone or a group has to be made and others may follow to rub off the idea of war and the threat of militarism. Two cars on a straight road at night blazing away in opposite directions with their lights full blast against the other would need one driver to dip his light first to seek the cooperation of the oncoming car driver to dip his light to avoid a collision. Sociology had proven that humans could be conditioned to anti-war or any state of mind. War heroes in the circumstances would no longer be adulated and toy weapons would be removed from toy shops. Education for all in the world should include the sociological and ethological studies of human behaviour so that his emotions and desires could be understood and disciplined and group conflicts would be abhoned. In other words, education should include Ethical Armament. Ad hocing for disarmament or arms control regimes are only showing up the weakness of humans. Peace loving quality should be reflected in the thoughts and actions of world leaders and politicians.

If the Japanese Officer had wanted to tell me that a war using weapons of mass destruction was not a war for humans, I think he was just being cynical like those who later believed that possession of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems had served as deterrents. But they did not stop wars, conflicts and military threats. Please ask the survivors of post 1945 conflicts and those African refugees, if they preferred wars using only clubs, bows and arrows or point three three rifles.

The problem is not weaponry be they stones or spears or atom bombs but the wrong unethical relationships between men which do not take into account various needs and the different cultural background and beliefs. There could be no single yard stick to measure ethical behaviour. But ethics will always be recognised by all as good values. There is a common denominator, 'mutual respect', which should be in the forefront as an imperative of ethics. Abel and Cain fought each other but Hilary and Tengsing of two worlds apart, because they mutually respected each other, tied themselves to each other with a rope and scaled the biggest rock in the world, Mt. Everest. A very small rock could be a missile to kill another human but Mt. Everest could be surmounted. The small rock was a problem but Mt. Everest was a surmountable difficulty. The two examples are relationships between two individuals. Casus belli had always pointed to an individual alienating another and

arousing his pack of military men to fight a war against the aggrieved party who is supported by his pack of military personnel.

The concept of Ethical Amament is germane to your current Conference.

Now you ask me as to what is the future role of the military within and between states. I think the role would be very different if we took a leaf from the lessons of ASEAN.

Malaysia recognises that she has five countries bordering her namely Indonesia, Thailand, Singapore, the Philippines and Brunei with the potentials for border conflicts. The first step taken was to form ASEAN which declared inter alia, 'conscious that in an increasingly interdependent world, the cherished ideals of peace, freedom, social justice and economic well-being are best attained by fostering good understanding, good neighbourliness and meaningful cooperation among countries of the region already bound together by ties of history and culture'.

ASEAN shares a primary responsibility for strengthening the economic and social stability without which no development could take effect. ASEAN is also determined to ensure stability and security from external interferences. ASEAN is committed to provide regional peace and stability through abiding respect for justice and the rule of law in their relationship on the basis of the United Nations Charter. ASEAN is open to all states in the South East region of ASIA hence one sees a former enemy, Vietnam, a member and soon Cambodia and Laos and through constructive engagement and cooperation, Myanmar.

ASEAN was declared in 1967. Hopefully the dream of the founding fathers will become a reality in 1997 as a collective will of the present ASEAN to admit every country in South East Asia subscribing to the aims, principles and purposes. Anyone not agreeing to this move is myopic and will only regret later. One of the principles of ASEAN is peace and determination to ensure the conditions of peace and stability, to ensure success to their economic and social wellbeing. And all members would be committed to broaden the areas of cooperation.

ASEAN is committed to the settlement of disputes by peaceful means and the renunciation of the THREAT or USE OF FORCE; ASEAN even provides a mechanism for Pacific settlement of disputes under the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation. I am sure they are ethical and not at all bad commitments. Hence, we do not have festering disputes in ASEAN which might endanger peace and stability. In September last year (1996), an incident took place where there was a clash between Malaysian and Indonesian navy personnel. There were a few casualties and nobody made a big public hoo-ha about it. The incident passed unnoticed. The media reported the incident after a meeting of the Malindo General Border Committee (GBC) in December 1996. Let us imagine if there was no spirit of

ASEAN and "mutual respect", the September incident would have been blown out of proportion and it would have been difficult for General Tanjung, the Indonesian Armed Forces Chief - a co-chairman of the Malindo GBC, to say that the settlement of the incident would exclude threats and the use of force.

Being co-chairman of Border Committees with Indonesia and Thailand for more than seven years, I had found that the role of the military was better deployed to foster deeper understanding with each other and the populace while the police was to keep the public order situation since they have the civilian power of arrest. In this regard, the Malaysian police always exchange notes with its counterparts in Thailand, Indonesia and Singapore and the intelligence community of ASEAN meet regularly. The military aiding police were always involved in emergency situations and also made to participate in community developments. In a nutshell the military and police still have their roles but different from the threat of force and the intimidating role of terror, and their activities will always be guided by the ASEAN spirit of cooperation and collaboration.

The thought of the use of force could now be regarded as archaic, at least in ASEAN between members although within states some ASEAN members still practise the old ways, yet the practice is becoming less and less acceptable. World opinion as seen in the Belgrade Crisis is openly inclining against military options or the use of force. Unless humans are equally imbibed into their minds the same ethical values through an education movement of Ethical Armament, I fear the element of greed as opposed to need would continue to influence group decisions.

So long as ASEAN still produces raw materials for the industries of the industrial world ASEAN would be in their good books. However, the paradigm is changing. ASEAN too is industrialising and this means a threat to the markets of the industrialised world. Should the threat of the market grow to a certain dangerous degree for them threatening their economic wellbeing and standard of living, ASEAN or some countries in ASEAN would no longer be regarded as good boys. The last WTO Ministerial Meeting in Singapore demonstrated the division between the industrialised world and the developing and least developed peoples. Some groups were quick to dangerously conclude, erroneously of course, that the dichotomy was between the rich and poor communities.

The thought of globalisation is being flogged and some peoples are beginning to nod in agreement with the concept. In the late summer of 1944, economists and financial politicians met at Bretton Woods. Hitler's Germany has just been defeated while in Asia, Tojo's Japan had to be dealt with. The economic turbulence caused by the war required immediate attention if the global peace was to be ensured. The objective of Bretton Woods was the creation of a global and unified economy so that trade and investments could flourish.

There was success though limited only to the free-market world. This was tied to the US economy and therefore by definition tied to the question of security as defined by the US. In Asia, it was related to the Pacific Defence in the face of communist challenges as espoused by the Soviet Union or China. Strangely enough, the US perceived only the armed but not the ideological challenge which required a response different from the armed challenge. Many now in hindsight have come to realise that the US policymakers then were terribly wrong.

The success of the then concept of globalism was manifest with the emergence of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and GATT and the Marshall Plan for the reconstruction of Europe. The UN is the product of parallel thinking in Danburton Oaks. All major currencies by the beginning of 1960 had become convertible. Japan, the vanquished, was beginning, like a phoenix from the ashes of the Pacific War, to rise as an economic power and by the middle of 60s had joined the OECD. By that Japan had come of age in the industrialised world of the free-market system. However, this success did not include the other half of humans which were in the centrally-controlled economies or those outside the free-market system of the industrialised world.

Investments flowed out to Asia in search of higher profit margin derived from cheap labour and cost-affective production. Free-market Asia began to prosper. This was confined to Japan, South Korea, ASEAN and Taiwan which meant that it was limited to those areas which adhered to the Free Market system and more particularly to those tied to the US security arrangement.

If one had taken a look at the economic situation then, one could not have escaped to notice its proximity to the question of Pacific Security. There was the Japan-US Security Agreement, US-led UN in Korea, SEATO, Five Power Defence Arrangement, ANZUS, and US actions in Vietnam and other communist-led insurgencies and subversions in Indo-China. Therefore it could be concluded that the economic globalisation as espoused by Bretton Woods was very much related to the security and the culture of free-market, with the US providing their definition as bulwarks against the anti-Free Market System elements. The Free Market System world became the spokes to the US HUB.

The success of globalisation of Free Market World flourished in the ambience of the Cold War between the US-led Free Market World and the centrally-controlled Soviet Union, China and their satellites who were the communist system promoters in the Pacific region. Security and economics were webbed. The priority of the US during the Cold War with Soviet Union was to make as many as possible friends, allies and anti-communist peoples even at the expense of American economy. Competitive market was not an issue so long as more and

more peoples were adhering to the culture of the free marketeers. The communist World led by the demised Soviet Union and China must be isolated. However, after the demise of the Soviet Union this is no longer a priority. The new priority is in the competition for the world market.

The reality now is that the prosperity of the US is being threatened by the competitive products of Asia. Already the system of fixed exchange rates and convertibility of dollars into gold had been destroyed which wakened the Bretton Woods system of one world of the free market. However, the floating-rate remains which helps to cushion the stress brought about by the oil shocks, the West Asian troubles and the breaking of the Berlin Wall. Bretton Woods nevertheless could not bring back the kind of discipline as envisioned in 1944 pertaining to a single global system.

It seems there is an effort to make the US government-controlled cybernetic hub as the only nucleus backbone ring thus retaining the dominance of the US role in the world system of security and market. This system has its genesis in the US Local Area Network and Coordinated US-wide system through secure telephone lines linking all Local Area Network via bridges to a single host. This network includes all US military assets and resources including satellites and all are subordinated to the central host which rendered easier management and coordination for defence purposes during the Cold War. Its usefulness in the Cold War would include intelligence gathering as well as information or disinformation dissemination or digitally controlled cyberwar offence or defence systems.

Now that the Cold War between Washington and Moscow is over, the system including its Host is offered as the hub firstly to all US business and then to others, again on the cultural and ideological basis of the Free Market System world as a one world to be the world standard Internet Protocol between remotes in different countries. In other words the former military host is now being operated as the hub for the spokes and the hub now has the potential role of controlling both military and commercial information technology in the world connected to it, on an efficient and centralised basis.

This is intrusion and could weaken adversaries, commercial or military. If a nation is entirely dependent on one hub alone it is extremely comfortable in an ambience of amiability and likemindedness but is otherwise highly dangerous. Whatever the word is used or arguments tossed the dependency on the sole information structure or a single hub controlled only by one power is undemocratic and extremely undesirable and should be avoided unless there is a universal acceptability of a jointly-controlled single hub. An International Advisory Panel will not serve the purpose of democracy unless the advice is mandatorily accepted. The hub under a single-power control is the Orwellian big brother, if you will and

all the spokes of the hub by definition become dependent on its information disseminates. That is the meaning of globalisation in this context.

Since speed is the essence of today's economic and commercial activities, there is no way the information Technology (IT) challenges could be faced or responded in the old fashioned way. It is no longer possible to separate the Foreign Policy of a country from its Economic Policy. Hence, there is a great need for speedy multimedia corridor, for speedy communication and adaptability which only the IT could efficiently and efficaciously provide. And to be active in world industry and trade there is no alternative to IT without which the industrialised world would always have an edge over the struggling developing peoples and the least developed countries (LDC). The LDC or even a large community in a developing country could be marginalised by the speed of modernisation with the danger of their becoming barbarians like the Mongols who ransacked Baghdad and destroyed valuable books because they did not understand what books and knowledge were all about.

It must be fully realised that there is no desire on the part of the developing world and the LDCs to be the political, cultural and economic minions of the single power controlled hub. If we were linked solely to this so-called global hub because we believe that there is only one world and one hub, then we shall be entirely at the mercy of the central hub. Should we begin to be out of favour economically, politically or otherwise. we may find our IT frozen or a computer virus running amok for a few days; and all our economic activities will come to a grinding halt. To accept the theory of a single world with an undemocratically controlled single hub is to put our necks in that kind of a noose.

For the moment, there does not appear to be any protection system other than to create Information Loops making us free from being hooked on only to a single hub. In other words, it is to get out of the potential hegemonic clutches of the single hub. Let us not forget that information is knowledge and knowledge power now controlled by a single great power. What dire consequences would emerge should that power forget the POWER that made it great and all ethics flown to the winds. Therefore a system has to be devised (if not as yet done) and this could only be achieved if we did something ourselves instead of relying on something we might get from the market.

For each ASEAN member, it is not economically feasible to have a loop solely for one country only. But developing countries in the EAEC region including South Asia (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Bhuttan and the Maldives), could get together in a Mutual Information Communication System (MICS - for want of an agreed name) with the aim of creating an Asian Loop. There is already

an effort by China and some parties in Japan to think about this problem as witnessed in a conference which took place recently in Tokyo in November 1996 attended by the President and CEO of S&T (Message Transmission Services Co Ltd) and the president and CEO of CTS Telecom which is one of the 15 VSAT Telecom companies in China and perhaps the only VSAT Telecom network hub which could handle international connection or allowed to do so from China. This Conference might have been regarded by some as a cybermaverick move and should be looked upon with disfavour. And certainly we should likewise do so if the control of the Asian hub was to be in the hands of one power only.

MICS should be run on a democratic grouping with a shared power system. In other words, the management should be in the hands of all participants devoid of hegemonism. Independent operators within the region should serve on a technical consultative body and they are among equals. There should be a MICS mixed personnel to staff the secretariat and attached to it is a body of research and development (R&D) personnel of the highest calibre and qualification to fuel a quantum leap in the techtronic endeavours. Thus there would be no single power to control the Asian MICS.

When globalisation is examined in this context it becomes clear that the siren call of one world is a make-belief that the dependency on a single hub is inevitable. The new world of the post Washington-Moscow Cold War is not as yet a single world. Many peoples still believe in the centrally-controlled economy and many still practise it as many have become disillusioned with the promises of the free-market system. Some have found that the free-market system also brings with it all the scourges and stresses of the system with which they are in no position to grapple.

There is a very strenuous effort targeting Cuba or China or Myanmar and some other countries with the hope of changing the peoples there to accept the culture of the industrialised world and of the Free Marketeers with all its exploitative ugliness. Prime Minister Dr Mahathir is always seeking a democratic World culture making the next millennium as the era of a united world not just only of Asia or Europe or America. As against that, one could detect that there are forces who espouse the one world culture but undemocratically defined. They even foretell that there would be a clash or war between cultures and civilisations. Some say that there would be a clash of values between the West and the East. There may be clashes of values and cultures but between the individualistic culture stressing on "I" of the developed countries and that of the developing and LDC whose main emphasis is communitarianism or "we".

In its final analysis there is no global village which pre-supposes shared values but a cluster of villages with their own respective cultural beliefs, ethics and ways.

The world is still fragmented in regionalism transcending borders created by imperialism. The only activity which way be regarded as global had been in trade even at the time when some people still thought of the world as flat. The acrimony was over trade routes rather than trade itself. There was one world of trade even if it had its share of modern unethical prejudices and practices of Persian market haggling and anti-Semitism as exemplified in Shakespeare's "The Merchant of Venice". There were silk and spice routes. International power game was once played by emperors and despots and the prizes were booties, control of trade routes dominion over land and sea and slavery. For that the instruments of conquest were the swords and guns which drove fear in the hearts of men. Now the prize is market and in this cyberage the instrument is the IT to capture hearts and minds and to intimidate them if and when necessary. There are now conditionalities to trade and labour and they may be issues in the future for threats and use of cyberwar if the edges of conflict were not blunted by ethical principles.

It may not be possible to escape entirely from the singly controlled power hub but at least MICS would maintain independence and protection by providing system alternatives and a buffer, a way to mitigate cybercongestion which may result in blackouts and disappearance of data into the cybervoid. And above all the MICS would not be a single government-controlled but shared among its members.

Regional MICS should be set up in Asia with the Pacific Island countries, Africa and South America and then link themselves up in a web of collaborative network using friendly satellites and then link it to the US hub to bring about the one world approach to trade without any odium of political or cultural hegemony. And if the concept of MICS is unacceptable or impractical and no protection system is available then I shudder to think of the alternatives. I could only hazard a guess, that it would be either a complete submission to the will of the single hub or to glorify our own cyberpunks, hackers and virus designers as cyberwarriors so that the world will be forewarned that we have the capacity to retaliate if our freedom, dignity or sovereignty is in any way undermined. Such moves would certainly run counter to ethics. In a cyberwar the role of the military is minimal not at all like the charge of the Light Brigade.

As if en passant I mention cybercongestion. The reality of the situation is that this year will double the approximately 40 million net users of last year. The people or power or the government who control the central hub must know its capacity and will take preventive and remedial measures against cyberfatigue. These measures may take the form of a very expensive research and development and invention which could transmit data at the rate of billion bits per second or to create an economic model with a new calculus to reduce users by classifying

"priority" transmissions at high categorised prices. In any case there will be an increase in the usage pricing which may be unreachable to developing and LDCs. That could be a cause for friction and a *cassus belli*. However, what is the role of the military in this situation? None, I should say. The only possible role of the military in any country is when the marginalised community might turn barbaric. The question is will the government of that country use the military to quell the boiling heat of the populace. I don't so other peoples would look askance at the government which should be aware that through its own fit of absentmindedness this unsatisfactory situation has emerged.

Let us at this juncture understand the concept of globalisation not in the context of a single-power control of the globe. Globalism as espoused by the single power which controlled the global hub could never eradicate war. The selfishness of such a globalism would only create dissensions and strifes. Globalism should be meaningfully democratic based on collaborative ethical ideals of humans sharing power, fate and destiny, where through Ethical Armament Education there would no longer be threats of use of force and acts of terror thus altering the roles of the military and the police. At least for now, the ASEAN way would eradicate the warlike and terroristic roles of the military. Is there a proper response to the challenge of hegemonism or its threat using cyberweaponry? Is there also an appropriate arrangement for a section of the people in a country not to be marginalised or alienated from the mainstream of modernisation by a small cybernetically educated group? To both questions, the only appropriate response in my view is a global ethical armament. WITHER MILITARY?

Tan Sri Ghazali Shafie, a former Foreign Affairs Minister, is a Distinguished Fellow of the Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS), Malaysia, a fellow of the University of Wales, United Kingdom, a Fellow of the National Institute of Public Administration (INTAN), Malaysia and Honorary Fellow of Akademi Filem Malaysia (AFM). Opinions and views expressed are entirely his own.