

The fact is that the two traditions in some ways start from diametrically opposed viewpoints. The just-war theory, for all its restriction, remains essentially a theory regarding the **justice of war** and the sovereignty of nations, whereas the anti-war tradition, from the very necessity of effectiveness, starts from an implicit assumption of the **injustice of war** and the interdependence of nations.

(viii) **The difficulty with the humanitarian anti-war tradition has always been that it does not take *realpolitik* seriously enough.** The focus on saving lives and exclusively humanitarian intervention in conflict is noble and prophetic, but the logic of war dictates that the humanitarian intervener will become a pawn in the war game, seen by either side as a means to the end, which is victory. The difficulty with the Just War tradition has always been that it invites "sovereigns" to become both judges and executioners in their own cause.

(ix) **The United Nations in its theory and practice over the past fifty years has incorporated both conflicting traditions.** The Security Council was in its foundation essentially in the just war tradition. It was an alliance of the victorious powers to enforce the world's peace. For the first time in history there was to be an undisputed legitimate authority for enforcement action. There was due process for identifying and judging criminal states, and a joint military command for restraining them by force if necessary. All this was enshrined in Chapter 7 of the UN Charter, under the heading of enforcement action.

(x) In fact, the Security Council as world peacekeeper was stillborn. The Cold War split it down the middle, and the opposing sides divided the Security Council. The opposing sides had a much deeper commitment to their ideology than to enforcing global justice through the United Nations. What did emerge, from the General Assembly rather than from the Security Council, was a complex array of peacekeeping initiatives which depended entirely on the consent of the conflicting parties, on the principle of non-intervention, mediation and on humanitarian relief. **All this activity was very much in line with the non-violent tradition, and bypassed both the just war theory and the original concept and purpose of the Security Council.**