

There is tension between those in support of diplomatic solutions (i.e., dialogue with China and North Korea) and those favouring building defences (i.e., NMD).² It should be noted, in this context, that former President Clinton was on the verge of reaching an agreement with North Korea, putting a stop to its ballistic missile programme. The Bush administration, in turn, humiliated the South Korean President Kim Dae-jung, who has been trying to bring North Korea out of its isolation, during his visit to the U.S. In a similar vein, the new administration renamed the directorate dealing with non-proliferation as counter-proliferation. This change in terminology signals a shift in approach to proliferation issues from prevention to unilateral (possibly military) intervention. The former approach assumes that proliferation is preventable and being pro-active pays off. The latter sees proliferation as inevitable and aims at managing consequences *via* military instruments.³ Both of these developments – the treatment of President Kim Dae-jung and the shift to counter-proliferation, indicate that the balance in the White House is being tipped in favour of military defence, to the detriment of diplomatic solutions.

3. "Humanitarian" Intervention and Regional Conflicts

There is a disjuncture between the emerging U.S. interests and views on "humanitarian" intervention, on one hand, and the views of the international community, on the other.

The U.S. military needs to separate "humanitarian" operations from an outright war. When the U.S. goes on a mission, it has the whole war in mind. The military is prepared to use full force for two basic reasons: first, to perform and second, to avoid loss of (American) life. A point was made that while the military can stop fighting, it does not bring peace.

The demands on the U.S. military in the post Cold War era are unparalleled. They include:

- diversifying roles in complex "humanitarian" interventions
- meeting expectations of domestic actors as well as the international community
- defending interests of the U.S.
- performing to meet multiple and diverse expectations.

When determining the pace and the nature of response, humanitarian considerations come last. The U.S. military and the administration ask first of all, whether the problem abroad poses a security threat. Second, what are the political implications of (solving or not) the problem and last, are human rights (security) threatened?

² Although not implicitly stated, some would like to see NMD aimed at neutralising China, as well as "rogue states targets."

³ This debate is not new and generated controversy with allies in the early 1990's.