

THE JUST CAUSE OF THE WEST

If you are driving on a very congested road and an aggressive taxi driver attempts to overtake you by trying to squeeze in front of your motor car, leaving only a small clearance between your vehicle's front fender and his taxi's rear fender, what action should you take in the heat of the moment?

Should you fight the taxi driver by not yielding to his dangerous manoeuvres and, in the process, face the possibility of having your motor car damaged by the taxi driver's vehicle?

Or, should you permit the taxi to squeeze in front of your motor car by quickly reducing your speed, thus avoiding the possibility of being a party to an accident with the taxi, but, by so doing, invite the very real probability of being hit by the motor vehicle to your rear due to your required very rapid deceleration in order to avoid, being hit by the taxi?

Such situations happen only too frequently on many roads in many major cities, throughout the world.

As is obvious in the above hypothetical **TARGET** () scenario, the choices for a successful extrication from such situations may be correct ... or incorrect, depending, only too often, on luck.

President Barack Hussein Obama, the leader of the most-powerful, military country to which the world has ever been witnessed, as well as being the largest single economy on the face of the globe, is, today, faced with the conundrum not too dissimilar to the situation, described above.

The Obama Administration strongly wants to take military action against the Government of Syria and, in the process, hopefully, unseat President Bashar Hafez al-Assad and his henchmen.

President Barack Hussein Obama has stated that President Bashar Hafez al-Assad crossed that red line in the sand that states that no nation should use chemical weapons.

The Chemical Weapons Convention (the correct name is The Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction) is an international arms control agreement that outlaws the production, stockpiling, and use of chemical weapons and their precursors .

The roots of this Convention go back to June 17, 1925, when it was known as The Geneva Protocol of 1925.

The General Assembly of the United Nations has repeatedly condemned all actions, contrary to the principles and objectives of The Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare.

On Wednesday, August 21, 2013, it is generally held – and there are mountains of circumstantial evidence to add weight to the contention – that the Administration of President Bashar Hafez al-Assad used, inter alia, sarin, an extremely toxic chemical weapon that is used as a lethal nerve gas, to kill more than 1,429 innocent, Syrian civilians, of which number, 426 deaths were known to be children.

The Damascus Massacre, as, no doubt, this action will be dubbed in time, crossed the red line that President Obama had drawn in the sands of time and, today, he, as Commander-in-Chief, and members of his

Administration are trying to convince the people of the United States that a military attack on Syria is the noble thing to do in view of the despicable actions of the Syrian Regime in using chemical agents to slaughter innocent civilians.

Is one to assume, therefore, that, when the Syrian Regime was in the midst of slaughtering some 100,000 of its civilians by the use of conventional weapons, such as bullets, rockets, bombs and napalm, to name only some of the weaponry that is quite effective at maiming and killing adults and children, with more than two million Syrian civilians, running to neighbouring countries in order to avoid being killed, the Administration of President Obama did not think that that red line in the sand had been crossed?

Some people, today, are pondering the following conundrum:

Is the noble intellectual and emotional attitude of the Government of the United States of America in wanting to attack Syria due to its avowed belief that it would be the correct and appropriate response to President Bashar Hafez al-Assad's actions in violating The Chemical Weapons Convention?

Or, is the noble intellectual and emotional attitude of the Government of the United States of America in wanting to attack Syria due to its avowed belief that it would be the correct and appropriate action to take in order to protect the civilians of Syria?

If one accepts the second proposition – attack Syria in order to protect innocent civilians – for what reason did not the United States and/or other Western powers that made claims that they abhorred the situation in the country, take action more than two years ago?

Today, the Administration of President Obama has stated that it wants to punish the Government of President Bashar Hafez al-Assad for its violations in respect of The Chemical Weapons Convention – only.

No mention has been made, publicly, as to the known and proven ability of conventional weaponry, used by the Government of Syria in order to mutilate and to kill, just as horribly as The Damascus Massacre when sarin was used, and with the same impunity upon any member of the civilian population of the country.

On strictly humanitarian grounds, there are arguments for and against foreign military intervention in Syria, but warnings have been aired that if such military action is taken in Syria, for whatever reason, it could light a tinderbox throughout the Middle East.

Suggestions abound that the Lebanese-based, terrorist group, Hezbollah, and Islamic fundamentalistic Iran would side with President Bashar Hafez al-Assad's Administration and come to its aid.

Hezbollah fighters are already in Syria, fighting the ragtag, anti-Assad forces, and, recently, a delegation from Iran has flown to Damascus, obviously to assure President Bashar Hafez al-Assad's Administration that Iran stands shoulder to shoulder with the country and its leaders.

Lawful military force, imposed on one country by another, must be considered as a last resort when all else fails.

Unlawful military force, on the other hand, can only be condoned in exceptional circumstances.

It could be held, also, that the situation in Syria meets the '*exceptional circumstances*' criterion and, in fact, the prime facets of that criterion must have been met some two years ago.

If one accepts the basis of the definition of the '*exceptional circumstances*' criterion, it follows that the just cause of the West (if an international coalition is formed, as seems highly likely) is, more than likely, sufficient grounds for a military assault on Syria.

There is little reason in taking the line that the gas attack of August 21 is the *raison d'être* for the launch of what President Barrack Hussein Obama has called for a '*limited response*' – because there is a far-better and capacious determination that he can put forward to The Congress of the United States.

-- E N D --

*While TARGET makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published,
TARGET cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.*

*If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in
TARGET, please feel free to e-mail your views to editor@targetnewspapers.com. TARGET
does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the
laws of libel.*