

(apologies to Robert Browning)

Global Research, April 17, 2018

Theme: Law and Justice, Militarization and WMD, US NATO War Agenda

In-depth Report: [SYRIA](#)

As a healer for these past 50 years, I wish you and your cabinet to note this analysis. It is obvious to a child that your order to bomb three sites in Syria had no basis in 'international law', although that has been shredded by HMG and others. That the twittering psychopath Trump took the lead confirmed the absence of any law.

Law - one view, joined by others, ref “Customary International Law” - Dapo Akande, Professor of Public International Law, Oxford University

I reach the following conclusions:

1. Contrary to the position of the government, neither the UN charter nor customary international law permits military action on the basis of the doctrine of humanitarian intervention. There is very little support by states for such an exception to the prohibition of the use of force. The UK is one of very few states that advocates for such a legal principle but the vast majority of states have explicitly rejected it.
2. The legal position advanced by the government ignores the structure of the international law rules relating to the use of force, in particular, because a customary international law rule does not prevail over the rule in the United Nations charter prohibiting the use of force. To accept the position advocated by the government would be to undermine the supremacy of the UN charter.
3. Even if there was a doctrine of humanitarian intervention in international law, the strikes against Syria would not appear to meet the tests set out by the government. The action taken by the government was not directed at bringing "immediate and urgent relief" with regard to the specific evil it sought to prevent, and was taken before the inspectors from the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons were able to reach the affected area.
4. If the position taken by the government were to be accepted by states globally, it would allow for individual assessments of when force was necessary to achieve humanitarian ends, with the risk of abuse. It is because of the humanitarian suffering that will ensue from such abusive uses of force, that other states and many scholars have been reluctant to endorse

the doctrine of humanitarian action.

[Humanitarian intervention](#) as per Blair in Sierra Leone etc.

“As a pretext for deploying troops in Italian Somaliland and Italian Eritrea for an intended invasion of Ethiopia, Benito Mussolini thus claimed that he was attempting to both secure the Wal Wal border area where some Italian soldiers had been killed and abolish the local slave trade.[12] Similarly, Adolf Hitler justified his own forces’ occupation of the Sudetenland by suggesting that they were attempting to quash ethnic tensions in Czechoslovakia.[11]”

Join Mussolini and Hitler.

Humanitarian? A third, 4 million, of our dear children are poor. Two thirds of those poor children are in ‘working families.’ The planned destruction of OUR National Health Service. Imagine the distress – humanitarian? The vile treatment of our black sisters and brothers who came from the Caribbean 67 years ago – humanitarian? To be sent ‘home’ from the slave owners isle. Oligarchs and others crooks with money welcome. Off shore tax havens welcome. Dual nationality – easy if you are part Israeli citizen. Such vaunting hypocrisy.

National interest – quoting you PM.

A Britain to be adept only at lying and using explosive force? The other prominent psychopath and Bullingdon Boy, Mr Johnson, has spoken of ‘toppling Assad’ and used other very aggressive language. It is not national interest that drives you, it is the interests of Israel. This is obvious in very many ways, including GB’s ‘turning away’ (Amira Hass) from the genocide of the Palestinian people. Yes – genocide. The plan for Syria, and the decimation of ALL Arab entities was laid out by Oded Yinon in 1982 as translated by the good [Israel Shahak](#) – a humanitarian Israeli immigrant. This was reinforced by ‘Securing the Realm’ Perle et al, and the most evil Project of the New American Century, which GB was part of.

Your bombing of the 3 sites is all to do with a late attempt to ‘topple’ President Dr Assad.

Logic

You pretended to be erasing chemical weapon storage and production. The alleged attack was trumpeted by the ‘White Helmets’, trained terrorists from outside Syria, who you partly fund. In the propaganda video, they were not wearing protective clothing, masks etc and the child victims showed no obvious respiratory distress. As at Salisbury, you condemned the Syrian army before there was good evidence, and against the 900 years long tradition of British law. You disgusted millions by your violence and your lawlessness. What happens when you blow up chemical weapons? Would you blow up a Porton Down?

The Way Forward

This teetering country needs some healing and some truth. Give genuine help to the Syrian people in their recovery from all the efforts to destroy it. (You will know how many times Syria has been bombed by Israel for instance). And get to work on the schooling and nutrition of our children here.

All is aggression and so much lie.

For truth,

David Halpin, MB BS FRCS

David Halpin is a frequent contributor to Global Research

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Dr. David Halpin](#), Global Research, 2018

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Dr. David Halpin](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca