

Why Fight?

An Essay on the Morality of Wars:

When to Start them, How to Fight them, and When Not to

by Michael Andregg, University of St. Thomas, for the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 2016 Ethics Symposium. Presented on April 20, 2016. mmandregg@stthomas.edu

Introduction

The United Nations and the body of international law that preceded and empowers it concluded that starting aggressive war is the ultimate crime, because embedded in that act are derivative crimes like murder, torture, abuse of captured combatants or civilians, and in the worst cases slavery and genocide.¹ The history of humankind has seen many worst cases, so thousands of groups of peoples that once existed do not anymore.² Just War Theory (JWT) is the most recognized and discussed root of such thinking, though it varies in versions and interpretation.³

The universally recognized legitimate reason for war is defense of the people or the state against attack by others. Since nation-states have written most of the modern rules, many are slanted toward the state and against rebellion. But war has been with us far longer than nation-states⁴ and corruption of governance is among the most important causes of the civil wars that predominate today, in the Third Millennium of the Common Era.⁵ So we will also pay some attention to the neglected area of when to rebel or at least when to disobey orders, because blind obedience can empower fascism, police-states and the universal crimes of genocide, etc.

I remind American military audiences that our country was born in rebellion against unjust rule. Our “founding fathers” were all considered traitors by corrupt elites in Britain. Britain gave up being “great” when it decided to sacrifice ordinary people’s freedom in pursuit of wealth, power

and enslavement of non-British people. I remind non-Americans that this problem is universal. The sins of imperialism go back thousands of years before nation-states, and still exist today.

A short essay cannot be comprehensive. The moral dilemmas encountered by professionals in the military and intelligence sectors are profound and complex. “Ethics for spies” is especially difficult and “situation dependent.” If you think hard about this, we think you will agree that even spies are better (and better off) if they have some moral foundation, lest they become agents of evil like employees of police-state institutions as exemplified by the Stasi of East Germany, the Nazis before them, the KGB of Stalin, Romania’s old Securitate, the security groups of North Korea, and the mukhabarat of some Islamic states who think that their mission in life is repressing dissent instead of protecting their peoples. When this condition prevails, such agents of evil crush their best and brightest citizens, parasitize the economy, and eventually cause the state to collapse as the men and women who were born to protect their peoples (a.k.a. warriors) pivot to help the rebellion instead of the corrupt government that often formerly employed them.

Professionals are not mere employees of bureaucracies.

So ethics for soldiers, even for spies, is essential. Wise ones agree; what you think is up to you.

Governments sometimes worry when people like me write like this. But people like me are a dime a dozen. They worry more when people like you start to whisper taboo thoughts, which is why they spend so much effort controlling what military and intelligence professionals learn and telling them what to think. So expect a little subversion here, because I too have sworn to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. And I am not happy with what we see today.

The Constitution is being ignored and abused by people obsessed with ‘terrorists’ and power. Of course real terrorists exist, and demand attention, but we face bigger security problems. Survival

of civilization itself is at risk to the confluence of WMDs with authoritarian leadership rising in countries where hundreds of millions of unemployed and very poorly educated teenaged males are maturing into desperate circumstances today. That is a formula for many disasters.

Civilization today is besieged by barbarians who don't care about nuances of governance or law. And all the bombs on earth cannot destroy them if the bombs create more enemies than they kill. So the circumstances for military success are transforming as we discuss the threat environment.

A hyper-complex "developing global crisis" is building on our horizon, like a line of high, dark clouds about to spawn tornadoes. We must spend a few paragraphs on that now, because it will dominate our future whatever you conclude about ethics of war. Before done, a few paragraphs on "community policing" will follow review of JWT, because that body of thought and doctrine provides a model for both the military and for intelligence professionals¹ who together face larger, darker problems with much heavier weapons than your average gang in the neighborhood.

The Developing Global Crisis: Main Dimensions and Causes

The "developing global crisis" (DGC henceforth) begins with population growth and resulting pressures on both the living system and on global economies that lead to derivative phenomena like failed states and endemic violence. Failed states become breeding grounds for terrorism, and crime. But the crisis has many other dimensions, like perfection of propaganda combined with modern computer technologies, corruption of governance worldwide, climate change, and

¹ This paper was written for two related, but different audiences: mid-level officers in the regular rotation at the US Army's Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth Kansas, and intelligence professionals from a number of countries and agencies who are all trying to cope with the special problems of what we call here the "Developing Global Crisis." Hence there are several references to professional ethics in both communities.

that confluence of WMDs with millions of teenaged men maturing in desperate circumstances. Against these forces of decay, good people work hard every day to protect the innocent, feed the hungry and heal the earth. One ideal role of military and intelligence personnel with global vision is to protect the good from the forces of decay and death, so the NGOs can do their work.

The DGC has been developing for a long time and it been studied by thousands of scientists over decades because it threatens human civilization, perhaps even survival of our species.⁶ It is very complicated and interdisciplinary. This makes it difficult to talk about even among professionals. Some of its causes are often taboo, which is especially problematic for people in bureaucracies. So this summary must be superficial, and it will be blunt about a few sensitive subjects.

1. Population Growth, Population Pressure and the “Population Bomb” (all different)

Population growth is absolute numbers and rates, such as that the world currently has about 7.3 billion people increasing at about 1.1% per year to add about 80 million per year. This would imply doubling in about 64 years if that rate were sustained. It will not be, because the living system of the earth cannot support so many people long term without vast changes. Death rates will likely rise instead. Nations will fall, for sure. The living system that supports us will rebel. Actually, it already is rebelling in forms like droughts in Syria and Iran that increase pressure. All of those effects have military consequences, but many differ from classical, interstate war.

Population pressure is more complicated because it depends on cultural, economic, technical and military factors that influence how much pressure there is on stressed populations to move along opportunity gradients, often generating conflicts in destination nations. The “Population Bomb”

is exploding all around you now, disguised by political and religious languages. The descent of Syria into bloody chaos is an excellent example if one has time to follow the causal links.⁷

Simply put, four years of drought caused millions of unemployed youth and others from rural areas to move into Syrian cities where opportunities were already rare and monopolized by friends of the Assad regime. Mostly peaceful demonstrations against corruption were repressed ever more violently until civil war erupted. A country that had a population growth rate of 2.4% before these events saw that turn negative as over 450,000 people were killed and millions fled to neighboring countries like Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey.⁸ Those countries were also stressed, and emergent evils like the death cult called ISIS, ISIL, Daesh or the “Islamic State” were born.

2. Global Warming (+desertification, extinctions, resource wars, mass migrations, etc.)

Global Warming is one result of all that growth and consumption of fossil fuels combined with wholesale destruction of forests and dead zones in oceans detailed in thousands of climate science reports.⁹ Propaganda from legacy energy industries caused the term “climate change” to replace the more accurate term “global warming” as part of a campaign to frustrate practical responses to this problem. That worked for 30 years. The ability of organized money to prevent solutions to problems cannot be overestimated. Its ability to corrupt politicians is also legendary.

3. Jobs, Income, and Opportunity Inequality

The need for jobs is obvious and everywhere, especially since about 80 million more people will join us each year with all the normal needs and wants. Less obvious, but at least as important for social stability, is the quality of jobs available and the general distribution of wealth within and

between nations. That has been getting less equal as technology and other factors known as “globalization” hits economies. Some inequality is natural and even essential. Too much kills.

4. Failed and Failing States Combined with Proliferation of WMDs and New Information Technologies

When the balance between natural resources and consuming populations is lost, societies fail.

When 90% of the wealth of a nation is controlled by 10% or less of the people, societies often fail. When states fail, people become poorer and more desperate as governments no longer provide even basic safety. So people spend scarce resources on weapons, and violence increases. When arms to rebel against unjust and often immoral elites include WMDs, everything under heaven is at risk. The internet is transforming such dynamics profoundly today. In the past, the dispossessed could be ignored or exterminated. That is neither moral nor practical now.

5. Corruption of Governance (more important than “terrorism,” which is a symptom, tactic and a label for opponents, not a primary cause of the developing global crisis).

Some degree of corruption of governance has always been with us and probably always will be, because it arises spontaneously in groups. A certain amount may even be necessary for efficient economies, according to some theorists. Governments often label their enemies “terrorists” or “criminals,” even though many are often mere critics. Real terrorists are genuine pests and require serious attention including killing sometimes, but do not be fooled about who the more powerful and dangerous are. Corrupt politicians do much more damage to civilizations today.

The DGC matters because most of its causes are not military, and many of its symptoms cannot be solved by military methods alone, yet it has many security consequences. Our people and our

nations must be protected against vast numbers of dispossessed, angry young men who emerge from the DGC, because there will be demagogues eager to recruit them to genuine terrorist groups if no one else offers better options. Some demagogues will be non-state actors, others psychopathic leaders of pathocracies.¹⁰ Both acquire power by coopting anger and focusing that on neighbors. The confluence of all those angry, hopeless young men with WMDs, computers and demagogues is transforming the strategic threat picture as we read, write, analyze and fight.

The Essence of Just War Theory (JWT)

Libraries of commentary have been written about JWT and its main principles. They are deeply reflected in both national and international laws of war. So there is no need for a detailed review here. But our main thesis is that the bewildering threat picture today, described as a developing global crisis (DGC) presents novel implications when seen through the lens of Just War Theory. So a very brief review of that is called for now.

First, JWT is classically divided into two parts that can be expressed as questions: 1) When is it just to initiate war? (*jus ad bellum*), and 2) How can wars be justly fought? (*jus in bello*).

These are very important questions for those who support a military profession, because they distinguish principled and disciplined professionals from mercenaries and terrorists who may kill anyone for mere employers, or even deliberately kill innocents to support ideological goals.

Second, despite those libraries of commentary, evidence is thin that political leaders actually contemplate fine points of philosophy before starting wars or authorizing tactics in wars. Immediate consequences for their nations seem to clearly predominate over theory, and crass

calculations about the effect of the war on the politicians' political future are so common there is a term for it (Simmel effect).¹¹ Bureaucracies also seldom consult philosophy, but often discuss rules and financial implications for their institutions. Money should be irrelevant in strict JWT, but only innocents think that money and politics never matters to those who start and wage wars.

Third, there are at least seven basic principles of JWT, but some scholars cite up to 11. So there is no firm consensus even on the theory, much less on how to apply it to real-world cases. Even more revealing, some scholars conclude that almost no wars can be just, especially in the modern world with WMDs and non-state actors. Others conclude that every war their country is engaged in must be just, by definition. So the nationality and even the personality of scholars, much less politicians, can strongly influence conclusions about JWT.

Those reservations noted, here are the most important principles of JWT to me. Rank is arbitrary because, in theory, every one of the at least seven conditions of JWT must apply for a war to be justly declared and fought.

- 1) There must be a JUST CAUSE, or reason for starting a war. The most obvious, and only universally recognized just cause is to defend against external armed threats. Internal armed threats should be dealt with only by police forces except in severe circumstances.
- 2) War must be declared by a LEGTIMATE authority. Lengthy pieces have been written by attorneys, philosophers and political scientists about the meanings of political legitimacy.
- 3) Response to external attack must be PROPORTIONAL to the evil caused by the attack. For example, it is very questionable whether North Korea was “justified” when they used cyber methods to injure SONY Corporation in 2014 when SONY created a movie that

insulted their leader Kim Jong Un. If the US had responded to that attack by destroying Kim's capitol Pyongyang with nuclear weapons, this would violate the "proportionality" principle of JWT. Instead we crippled their internet for several days.

- 4) Because nuclear weapons are extremely indiscriminate, that response would also be disallowed because nuclear weapons would kill every kid, cat and rat over many square miles. All to stop the evil behavior of one bad leader and his team of cyber warriors. Thus conduct in war is subject to a test of DISCRIMINATION between the innocent and real threats to a nation's security. Finer distinctions were very explicitly and carefully considered when creating the Geneva Conventions and the US Military Laws of War.¹²
- 5) LAST RESORT – Finally, resort to war is allowed in JWT only if all other avenues of conflict resolution have been tried and failed.

That is enough for here on principles of JWT. Others can explain esoterica like the principles of double effect, and right intention. Now for what these mean in the context of the current DGC.

When to Start Wars

Since the only universally recognized legitimate reason to wage war is defense against attack by others, an idealistic answer to this question is "never." In an ideal world, the US Army would only end wars, with victory over forces of evil that started them. In the very imperfect world we observe, many say the Army should be available to protect or even promote "national interests," a perniciously plastic concept. Some idealists (like Canadian diplomat Lloyd Axworthy) even

say that there is a larger “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P) innocents elsewhere from genocide or other major disasters caused by incompetent or immoral governments.

That is a very slippery slope. On one hand it was awful to watch the Rwandan genocide unfold when many western nations could have stopped it. On the other hand, experience of the last generation has shown that even the greatest Army ever built is much better at breaking enemy governments than at rebuilding functional governance from the ashes and rubble of the broken. This result has been seen despite the best efforts of millions of service men and women to create effective institutions in Iraq and Afghanistan and to ‘win the hearts and minds’ of populations to support them. It is also very likely that Paul Kigame was better at rebuilding Rwanda than any occupying army could be. So extreme caution should accompany ‘responsibility to protect’ calls.

America lost in Vietnam because our high command did not recognize that the Vietnamese were actually the ones fighting for freedom (from foreign domination). Our high command thought that America had to be ‘fighting for freedom’ because Communism was so bad and repressive that no one would prefer that to domination by us. But they were wrong, and so we lost.

British ethicist, chaplain and Col. Phillip McCormack observed at the Army Command and General Staff College Ethics Symposium of 2015 that there are really only two universal values that should orient military professionals in democracies. These are Survival and Liberty (or freedom). Never get on the wrong side of liberty, no matter what some politicians say, or you will likely lose, and in worst cases even our national survival may be put at risk.

According to U.S. General Daniel Bolger ¹³ we lost in Iraq and Afghanistan for similar reasons, although he also stresses the lack of significant planning for post-war rebuilding, and the lack of

100% commitment at home for the very long and extremely expensive task of rebuilding states once destroyed. Those situations are still fluid, but Iraq looks like it will never reintegrate and Afghanistan started out about a millennium behind Iraq in social and infrastructure development. We accomplished a lot of good in Afghanistan, but the cultural shifts we encouraged were vast (like education of women) so how much will endure remains uncertain.

Finally, there are always some who will argue for the morality of preemptive wars. They ask “Why wait?” if a declared enemy is building strength to attack. Such logic can be compelling, as when the Israelis launched their 1967 war against a host of gathering enemies. But if everyone launches wars against prospective enemies, what you will get is endless wars of each against all. In a world of WMDs, that means a very short half-life for human civilization itself.

Such reservations noted, one still must ask how America (or any state) should deal with old and emerging death cults like the Lord’s Resistance Army of central Africa, Boko Haram of Nigeria, or “ISIS” (ISIL, Islamic State, or Daesh … the name hardly matters)? Others ask whether any response to global problems without a strong military component is realistic. Many NGOs have found they cannot do their good works without security support lest they all be killed or captured for ransom and propaganda. History also shows that inaction when faced with growing, clear and present dangers presents great risks of its own. This is the prime dilemma that JWT addresses.

Integrating these elements of ethical thought and of the history of war during and before my lifetime leads to these practical conclusions to me.

1. Defense against unambiguous attacks is always allowed, as is proportional counterattack.

2. Preemption should not be allowed except under the most extreme, compelling, and unambiguous circumstances, which almost never occur.
3. If a death cult or terrorist state becomes so powerful that it threatens everything under heaven, then the Security Council of the United Nations should be able to recognize that and authorize an appropriate and international military response. Thus responsibility is shared, costs are shared, and the world is protected from the fevered minds of people who see enemies everywhere. As George Kennan once noted, some people “need enemies.” Nations should not go to war just to meet those people’s psychological needs.
4. Aggressive war is the supreme international crime, just as it says in the UN Charter, which the USA largely wrote and certainly ratified. So wars for wealth or mere “national interests” are not moral unless they are actually sanctioned by the UN Security Council as well as by the US Congress if America is involved.

How to Fight Wars

One thing the United States military does not need from me is advice on how to fight once engaged. It defeated the greatest evil in human history in World War II, while simultaneously defeating Japan in the Pacific theater. Later, it defeated a superpower armed with over 35,000 nuclear weapons during the long and frustrating Cold War which included many hot encounters, using radically different methods and strategy. In 1991 America’s military defeated the fourth largest army on earth in just 100 hours of actual combat. The U.S. military knows how to fight.

Today our Air Force can deliver lethal ordinance to any spot on earth if so ordered, and our Army and Navy Special Forces can send more discriminating and flexible teams almost anywhere as they did when they killed Osama bin Laden who was holed up near an army headquarters in Pakistan 40 miles from their capitol under protection of Pakistan's ISI.¹⁴

The big problem is achieving meaningful, long-term victories in the context of the Developing Global Crisis. Despite such awesome power, this is much harder than killing a particular enemy target or breaking Third World governments when dictators become unbearable. So political context is critical, and we are back to the vexing question of when to fight.

General Colin Powell, whose statue graces the U.S. Army's Command and General Staff College in Kansas, thought hard about these issues and offered this advice which is a good place to start. It is largely based on thinking by his former boss and Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger, but all of our work is built on foundations created by many others. The "Powell Doctrine" suggests that 8 questions must ALL be answered before military action should be taken by the United States, so it is much like the 7 main principles of Just War Theory. The questions are:

1. Is a vital national security interest threatened?
2. Do we have a clear, attainable objective?
3. Have the risks and costs been fully and frankly analyzed?
4. Have all other non-violent policy means been fully exhausted? (Note that this is parallel and quite consistent with the JWT principle of "last resort").
5. Is there a plausible exit strategy to avoid endless entanglement?
6. Have the consequences of our action been fully considered?
7. Is the action supported by the American people?

8. Do we have genuine, broad international support?

Let us assume that danger threatens, that all these questions have positive answers, and all the other constraints of JWT and international law have been satisfied. How should we then fight?

My answer is **ferociously**, with overwhelming force if possible, but “all in” regardless because the nation must be in genuine danger and it is our duty to respond whether victory is likely or not. When the children are in danger it is everyone’s responsibility to do what they can to help. The uniformed military are just the people who have chosen to prepare for this full-time. And of course, the ones who suffer first and most therefore. More on this soon in community policing. To fight without ferocity is to invite defeat, perhaps disaster. So clarity of purpose is essential.

Most of the caveats I have cited in this essay reflect the tragic truth that sometimes intelligence about danger is not correct, often “all consequences” and “exit strategies” have not been thoroughly considered, and sadly that forces of evil do exist on this earth who like to start wars for profit, to enable police-states, dictatorships, or theocracies, and for other very crass reasons that have nothing to do with the honorable virtues that should motivate military **professionals**.

Even when all the conditions of JWT and laws and Powell Doctrines have been obtained and we fight the forces of evil ferociously, we still need to consider the reservations that those principles identify. We need to discriminate between truly evil dangers and the many innocents around them. We need to be proportional in response, and we need to consider political context so that a better solution can eventually be found or created long-term. All wars have causes, some eternal, some triggers for each specific conflict. When the fighting is done, many of those causes will continue unless corrected. So unless you want perpetual war, considerable thought should be

devoted not just to exit strategy but to dealing with fundamental causes. Otherwise, in the very long term, use of big WMDs somewhere is almost inevitable. Once that Pandora's Box has been opened again, all of civilization is at risk, even human survival itself. Therefore it is mandatory that military **professionals** consider such issues. Along with a few other hard questions! Like ...

When to Rebel

Officers are taught from the day they walk in the door to obey orders from a hierarchy that peaks with a Commander in Chief, who is also the Chief of State in the USA and many other countries. So the idea of rebelling as a duty is virtually unheard of. But it is my duty to remind people about the very rare circumstances when that applies. Let us consider some obvious cases first.

Germany's Wehrmacht had a great reputation in 1939, for operational efficiency and for honor among the officer's corps. As the psychopathic madman Adolf Hitler changed laws, created the SS, suppressed dissent, invaded neighbors, then non-neighbors like France and Russia, and then started to murder millions even of his own country's men, women and children, the truly honorable among Germany's officers faced a profound moral dilemma. Did their loyalty to the state and its madman leader, sworn by oath, overwhelm a duty to protect the people of Germany?

As students of history know, some very senior officers began formulating plans to depose or even assassinate Mr. Hitler as early as 1939, with the most famous attempt occurring on July 20, 1944. All failed for various reasons, and that last attempt resulted in the arrest of over 7,000 Germans and execution of almost 5,000.¹⁵ The point is that military professionals are not mere

employees. Even though such circumstances are extremely rare, they do occur. So men or women who seek the honor of a military profession must contemplate and even study them.

On the other side of the world, the Japanese Admiral who is credited with creating the successful plan to attack Pearl Harbor, Isoroku Yamamoto, is alleged to have said shortly after that, “I fear all we have done is to awaken a sleeping giant, and filled him with a terrible resolve.”¹⁶ The Admiral obeyed his Emperor and General Staff to create an attack plan that mostly succeeded, short term. But if his reservations had been adopted, his country could have avoided being hit by two nuclear weapons that alone killed ~ 200,000 mostly innocent people, ending a war that killed over 2 million military and perhaps 3 million Japanese when civilians are included. Of course, many innocent Americans were also killed at Pearl Harbor and in the resulting war against Japan.

One could continue to list many other cases, like the dictator Pol Pot of Cambodia who murdered something like 2 million of his own 7 million people (a contender for world’s highest percentage of slaughtered innocents) or Mao Tse Tung of China who managed a long killing process called the “Cultural Revolution” that resulted in deaths of 18-30 million depending on who is counting. Estimates of such mass killings are always very approximate guesses. What matters is that the dictators ALWAYS depend on their uniformed military services to assist, and often to play leading roles in a total violation of the rules of the Commander of us ALL.¹⁷

A group of social science scholars including many psychiatrists and clinical psychologists in Poland survived first the Nazi occupation, then the Soviets. So they were very highly motivated to understand, a) how such evils could occur, and b) how otherwise decent men in uniform could be transformed into agents of evil willing to kill their own citizens, neighbors, even family. Their result is called “Political Ponerology”¹⁸ This is a difficult read, but worth it for scholars.

What should matter to military professionals is whether their duty stops with simply obeying commands by the state, or whether loyalty to their peoples should prevail under very severe circumstances. I say that protecting the people is a mission from God (however you discern that) and that this is a duty that cannot be erased by any law or any oath if you want to preserve the dignity of a noble profession. Men who will kill anyone for an employer are sadly common, and disgraceful to put that bluntly, especially when they slaughter innocents for profit as some do. The strategic challenge of our time is between civilization and barbarism.¹⁹ So how you decide this fundamental question has very large consequences for both civilization and for your soul.

Community Policing

The differences between military combat and police who keep the peace and preserve order at home are profound. So do not be misled that I am ignoring those differences. But both soldiers and ideal police have a common moral mission which is protecting the innocent against violence by others. Every profession has better (wiser) and worse practitioners. The best among police have been working on a concept called “Community Policing” since at least 1829. It expresses some very basic principles that everyone in the guardian professions should know.

Sir Robert Peel set out to reform the Metropolitan Police of London in 1829. A key part of that was creating a code called Peel’s Principles that became a cornerstone of what is now called Scotland Yard.²⁰ All nine are useful, but I will focus here on just two, lightly paraphrased.

#7. The police at all times should maintain a relationship with the public that recognizes the historic tradition that *the police are the public and the public are the police*; uniformed police

being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties *which are incumbent on every citizen in the intent of community welfare.*

#9. The test of police efficiency is the *absence of crime and disorder*, not the *visible evidence* of police action in dealing with them. (A parallel for Generals would be the absence of war.²¹)

Some modern management systems make a mess of this by insisting on “metrics” for success that ignore these deeper principles. For example, simply rewarding high arrest or incarceration rates can obscure the deeper reality that something else is fundamentally wrong if a society is plagued by chronic crime. A parallel example from the military side would be when General William Westmoreland kept declaring imminent victory in Vietnam, because we were killing such huge numbers of Vietnamese and winning every major battle ... on the way to losing the war. A better metric for him would have been decreasing recruitment for his enemies because they were assured that America would leave and let them determine their own destiny.

So here are some operational lessons I take away from community policing.

1. Never conclude that “the public” is your enemy. Violent individuals and groups may become enemies of peace and innocence anywhere, but if the general public or simple critics of the regime of the day become your enemy, then you, and it, are doomed.
2. Never assume that we are actually fighting for “freedom” if substantial parts of our public disagree. That’s like Powell’s item #7. Remember that politicians can be the masters of calling black “white.” It is a professional military officer’s **duty** to point out when they are wrong. If that means losing your commission or your pension, so what? To a real **professional** money is not an excuse for betraying the mission of protecting innocence.

3. Even if engaged overseas in life and death combat with armed barbarians, never forget that every one of them has a mother, father, other kin and often wives and children too.

In their minds, THEY are fighting for god and freedom, not you. You are an agent of evil to them. Occupying armies are never loved in the long term. So do not forget that the hearts and minds of populations, even adversaries, are always relevant strategically.

4. Finally, never forget that the strategic challenge of our time is between civilization and barbarism. Professionals should remind politicians when they forget that as some will.

Thus while overwhelming force for a quick victory is almost always the ideal strategy, and an early exit to return to family and protecting actual home lands is the noble goal, one must always take the greatest care to protect the innocent in your area of operations. Of course perfection is not possible; it is also not possible in police work. But enemy media will always focus on deaths to innocents as they see them, not as you do. So even the crassest calculator must learn how to minimize these to avoid recruiting for your enemies and sustain assistance from other countries. That is increasingly imperative for long term victory in our complex, modern world where active alliances are essential.

The Autoimmunity Metaphor

The challenge of Community Policing can be expressed by a metaphor centered on autoimmune diseases. When a body is healthy it is protected from external diseases and internal cancers by an immune system that circulates by every cell checking for foreign invaders (bacteria, viruses)

and internal mutations called cancers that may grow beyond their proper bounds to kill healthy cells and eventually the whole body if not suppressed by that healthy immune system.

If the immune system fails to recognize the essential differences between its healthy cells and true disease organisms, it begins to attack healthy cells resulting in diseases like multiple sclerosis (MS), Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease) or Huntington's Chorea. In such cases the nervous system is slowly destroyed and the body eventually dies.

If the internal security services of a state begin to confuse dissent or free thinking with treason, those services begin to attack the sources of progress and reform, who are the dissenters and free thinkers. These are the people who first see what is wrong or weak in a society, and agitate for change. Even within security services free thinking can be repressed, which dumbs them down.

Likewise if a person is attacked by an external enemy, he or she must respond with maximum speed, strength, precision, technique and fighting spirit. That is not possible if the body or mind are weakened by disease or internal conflicts. Martial artists master relevant skills by discipline and practice, which also increases speed and strength. Professional soldiers in any branch of service should be the philosophical and practical martial artists of their communities.

Thus if a master is attacked by a foolish or evil other, his or her body springs into action and the fool is disabled, dismantled or killed with extraordinary speed and technique, depending on how dangerous he was. There is no hesitation; no muscle pulls the wrong way because it is confused or weakened by autoimmune disease. The bones are strong, the eyes are clear, the mind is calm and focused, and one man (or woman!) can defeat five ordinary fighters or twenty thugs*.²²

The key is remembering mission, and that the mission begins with protecting innocence always.

The Caterpillar Metaphor

In these extraordinary times, the mission does not end with protecting innocence, or even with preserving the state that funds and authorizes an army or intelligence organization. If civilization is to survive the struggle with barbarism, and that developing global crisis we have mentioned briefly, then transformational change is called for. This places new and extraordinary burdens on the people who were born to be Guardians.

For those who do not know about metamorphosis of caterpillars, the essence is that caterpillars grow as fat as they can with energy and critical nutrients. Then they “pupate” creating a hard protective shell while the caterpillar’s innards turn into a kind of cellular soup and dramatically reorganize. After appropriate time, a beautiful and greatly changed butterfly or moth emerges, with new structures like wings and many other things depending on the species.

The point for military and intelligence professionals during this time of trials is that preserving the caterpillar from disease remains a real job for its immune system. But preserving the exact details of internal order definitely is not. On the contrary, if they do that, no butterflies can be. Apparent chaos yields an organism much better suited to survive the world it is about to enter.

Human civilization is being transformed today by vast forces, many working for good, some dedicated to evil outcomes of various kinds like the police-state. Some of those glacial forces are neither good nor evil intrinsically, just laws of nature such as that nations and the world can have high birth rates with high death rates, or low birth rates with low death rates, but not high birth rates and low death rates long-term, because equilibrium with the earth’s carrying capacity

for humans will be achieved one way or the other. This is an ‘iron law’ of biology. Guardians with global vision will be able to see the path to long-term safety and security, and help protect everyone through this challenging and risky process. Become one.

Virtue, Duty and Essential Differences between a “Professional” and an “Employee.”

Some people think that the word “professional” just means they are being paid to do things. That is a very primitive definition. Others observe that any true profession must have a code of ethics specific to their trade and responsibilities. Some “intelligence professionals” (a.k.a. spies) have been trying to develop such a code for a generation, but they have failed for reasons including the very difficult dilemmas that spies encounter in their work, and resistance by bureaucracies that frankly fear ethics.²³ But why America’s military has failed to develop a true professional ethic deeper than “obey orders and the law” or “do your job well” is a real mystery to me.²⁴

So I will simply declare here what I believe distinguishes a military or intelligence **professional** from terrorists, thugs, mercenaries, political police and other dark employees of police-states.

1. In my world, the **professional** man or woman of arms is distinguished by an intense commitment to protection of the innocent and the weak against the ruthless and strong (imagine babies being threatened by terrorists here). Whether these guardians are paid to act or not is quite irrelevant, because protecting the innocent is a duty of all citizens. But some people make this their full time avocation, and those are the best professionals.
2. Protecting a nation against external attack is a large case of that first principle. Millions of good men and women have agreed to make full time careers of this duty; Kudos to

you. But do not confuse the two. Protecting innocent people and ideals of freedom and liberty come first, not second. People and principles are more important than states, which can go bad. If governments become too corrupt, or leaders become too insane, they can become dangerous to both the people and the state that sustains them. This puts a big strain on professional guardians who are not mere employees of some bureaucracy.

3. Military professionals must be uncommonly courageous, because they have committed to run towards danger, not away from it. This too has nothing to do with money, and everything to do with commitment to protecting the innocent and our communities.

Finally I stress that all this resonates with something buried deeply in our souls that some call conscience. And conscience resonates with the Commander of us All. This is why mercenary forces almost always lose to defenders of innocence and liberty, in the long run.

These are my opinions on the topic of morality of war in the modern age of WMDs and Developing Global Crises.²⁵ Best wishes with your own struggle with the difficult dilemmas that every professional officer must face in their time of service to higher goals.

¹ William Slomanson, *Fundamental Perspectives on International Law* (Boston: Wadsworth, 2011); On specifics of United Nations views and policies see “Upholding International Law” at <http://www.un.org/en/sections/what-we-do/uphold-international-law/>, accessed May 2, 2015.

² Quincy Wright, *A Study of War*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942, 1965); R. Ernest Dupuy and Trevor N. Dupuy, *The Encyclopedia of Military History from 3500 B.C. to the Present*, second revised edition (New York: Harper and Row, 1986); Azar Gat, *War in Human Civilization* (London: Oxford University Press, 2006); Robert Lifton and Eric Markusen, *The Genocidal Mentality*, (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1991).

³ A classic source on Just War Theory is Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*, original 1976, latest edition (New York: Basic Books, 2006).

⁴ Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, London: Cambridge University Press, second edition, 1992).

⁵ Michael Andregg, *On the Causes of War* (esp. Ch. 14) (St. Paul, MN: Ground Zero Minnesota, 1997, 1999, 2001).

⁶ Michael Andregg, Bucharest, Romania, “Report for Cadets at the Romanian National Intelligence Academy” (*Mihai Viteazul*) October 21, 2013.

⁷ Krzysztof Walczak, “The Developing Global Crisis,” Section 3 on Conflicts, (St. Paul, MN: Bome Productions, 2015) a 32 minute educational video production accessible at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RLyMB3KGWck>.

⁸ At least 8 million Syrians are ‘internally displaced’ today and >5 million Syrian refugees fled to Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey, some of whom returned to help energize ISIS. About one million fled north into Europe during the summer and fall of 2015, sending similar pressures of destabilization into many other countries. Do not forget that refugees carry skills, dreams and positive things with them also; remember that such people built America. But too many, too fast for good assimilation, can also destroy a nation. Remember Genghis Khan and the Mongols too.

⁹ *The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fifth Assessment Report, 2014*, is an introduction to hundreds of other reports, because it is an 1140 page magnum opus compiled by the UN agencies WHO and UNEP. It can be purchased, or is accessible online at: <http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/>.

¹⁰ Andrew M. Lobaczewski, *Political Ponerology: A Science on the Nature of Evil Adjusted for Political Purposes*, (Edmonton Canada: Red Pill Press, 2008) based on a Polish original titled *Ponerologia Polityczna* published in 1984, translated into English in 1985 by Alexandra Cheiuk-Celt and corrected by the original author in 1998. “Pathocracy” is a term they use to describe nation-states coopted by and often ultimately destroyed by psychopathic leaders.

¹¹ “Simmel effect” is named after Austrian Georg Simmel who wrote about “scapegoating” and other demagogic tactics in “The Sociology of Conflict” in the *American Journal of Sociology*, IX, pgs. 490-525, 672-689, and 798-811, 1903-1904. Translated by Albion W. Small.

¹² A good reference for US Military Laws of War is the *Law of War Deskbook*, (243 pages) available at: http://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/pdf/LOW-Deskbook-2010.pdf, 2010.

¹³ Bolger, Dan. *Why We Lost: A General’s Inside Account of the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars* (New York, NY: Eamon Dolan/Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2014).

¹⁴ It should be noted that many parts of the intelligence world remain sceptics on many aspects of this story since zero actual evidence was publicly produced regarding the identity of the people killed in Abbottabad that night, even though decisive evidence about Bin Laden would have been extremely easy to obtain and reveal (see Seymour Hersh, “The Killing of Osama bin Laden” in the *London Review of Books*, Vol. 37, No. 10, May 21, 2015, at <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v37/n10/seymour-m-hersh/the-killing-of-osama-bin-laden>). Hersh believes it was indeed Bin Laden, but that many other elements of the official story are quite false. This fact, combined with the very persuasive but largely fraudulent data presented to the world about Iraqi WMDs prior to the second Gulf War in 2003, means that no one with a brain believes what the American government says anymore just because we say it. Sceptics demand evidence for legitimate reasons. About one trillion dollars and one million lives were spent on this “mistake” and Iraq may never recover as an integrated nation. This lack of trust presents a huge long-term cost to American security because it has damaged our relationships with many allied nations, not least among their intelligence communities. Liaison relations matter a lot for military affairs, especially in the current context.

The whole story of that episode of cooking the books on pre-war intelligence is far too complicated for a short essay like this. So it will be summarized by the head of Britain’s MI6 report to his Prime Minister on July 23, 2002. Sir Richard Dearlove reported then that U.S. intelligence was “being fixed around the policy” which means it was being distorted and politicized to justify a war that U.S. leaders had already decided to start regardless of evidence or Iraqi actions. It is sadly ironic that the messenger chosen to deliver this fraudulent information to the United Nations on Feb. 5, 2003 was the same General Colin Powell whose wisdom I cite elsewhere in this paper. Powell calls that speech his darkest hour now. When a U.S. Secretary of State and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with an exceptional reputation can be fooled by dark forces in the intelligence community and the White House on such a fundamental matter with such grave consequences for our troops whom he loves and for millions of people overseas, well, it should increase prudent caution among all Generals on this earth.

¹⁵ Kurtz, Harold, “July Plot” in *The Course of German History*, by A.J.P. Taylor (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974) p. 226.

¹⁶ Record, Jeffrey. *Japan’s Decision for War in 1941: Some Enduring Lessons*, Feb. 2009, accessible at: <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/summary.cfm?q=905>

¹⁷ Whether you have any religion or not is entirely up to you of course. But you deserve to know that I do because that matters for moral conclusions. In particular, the God I serve 1) does not want us to destroy the earth as some people claim, and 2) is not happy with how casually adults on earth kill each other’s children today over political arguments as we observe in so many ways during these difficult times.

¹⁸ Lobaczewski, Andrew, *Political Ponerology: A Science on the Nature of Evil Adjusted for Political Purposes*, ibid.

¹⁹ Michael Andregg, “Intelligence Ethics: A Key to Much Bigger Issues,” presented at the US Army Command and General Staff College Ethics Symposium, April 22, 2015, in press at: *InterAgency Journal*, (Leavenworth, KS, 2016).

²⁰ Sir Robert Peel's Principles of Law Enforcement, 1829, are itemized at: https://www.durham.police.uk/About-Us/Documents/Peels_Principles_Of_Law_Enforcement.pdf. There are many other summaries and lesson plans.

²¹ In his incomparable *Art of War*, written sometime in the fifth century B.C.E., Sun Tzu wrote:

“Generally, in war the best policy is to take a state intact; to ruin it is inferior to this. To capture the enemy's army is better than to destroy it; to take intact a battalion, a company or a five-man squad is better than to destroy them. For to win one hundred victories in one hundred battles is not the acme of skill. To subdue the enemy without fighting is the acme of skill.” 3:1-3.

“If not in the interests of the state, do not act. If you cannot succeed, do not use troops. If you are not in danger, do not fight. A sovereign cannot raise an army because he is enraged, nor can a general fight because he is resentful. For while an angered man may again be happy, and a resentful man again be pleased, a state that has perished cannot be restored, nor can the dead be brought back to life. Therefore, the enlightened ruler is prudent and the good general is warned against rash action. Thus the state is kept secure and the army preserved.” 12:17-19.

Sun Tzu's words have been republished for > 2500 years, long after the emperors he worked for were forgotten, because unlike most of his peers, Sun Tzu was wise as well as skilled. You can see above that he would encourage keeping the army strong and the state secure by preserving peace, much more than by prevailing in constant wars.

²² Or so some teachers of martial arts say. More practically, masters all know that any 8 year old with a gun can kill the most accomplished martial artist. Still training helps, and best practice schools are very concerned with the ethics of violence. An unpublished essay presented at an International Society for Comparative Study of Civilizations conference of June 6-9, 2012, goes a bit deeper on this topic, titled: “Clashes of Civilizations Gave Rise to Martial Arts, but Enlightened Martial Philosophies Reveal the Better Way,” by M. Andregg.

²³ Jan Goldman, “Ethics Phobia and the U.S. Intelligence Community: Just Say No,” pages 16-17 in Intelligence Ethics: The Definitive Work of 2007*, by the Ground Zero Minnesota Center for the Study of Intelligence and Wisdom, 2007. Also relevant: the entire Fall/Winter edition, Vol. 3, No. 2, of the *International Journal of Intelligence Ethics* which was devoted to the question of whether Dr. Goldman's thesis was in fact displayed by official intelligence agencies and bureaucracies, both in the USA and abroad.

²⁴ The lack of a formal code of ethics for the US military was also a mystery to Thomas Gibbons of the US Naval War College, another presenter at the CGSC Ethics Symposium of 2015, who pointed this out to this author. Of course each service has “core values” (invariably a short list of universal virtues) and there is the Magnum Opus of laws called the Uniform Code of Military Justice. But codes of ethics are typically in between these short and long types of prose, and are often considered a requirement that distinguishes professions from trades, occupations and hobbies. Hence my considerable emphasis on the word **profession** in much of this essay on its fundamentals for soldiers. Between when this paper was written and when it was published, the US Military has apparently published a formal code of ethics but it is hard to access.

²⁵ David Ignatius, “The U.S. can't fix it”: James Clapper on America's role in the Middle East” in the *Washington Post*, May 10, 2016. This interview with America's current Director of National Intelligence is noteworthy and welcome because it confirms and amplifies most of the major factors described as “The Developing Global Crisis” in this paper. Fully understood this has vast implications for the U.S. military because it shows why we could send endless troops and treasure to civil wars in that region, but still fail to create stability or build nations because the troops and treasure are mainly addressing symptoms instead of causes of the crises.