

Editorial

United Nations cannot impose law

Over the Aug. 4-5 weekend, Margaret Thatcher, with George Bush's enthusiastic support, enunciated a new legal doctrine. According to the British prime minister, a United Nations resolution against Iraq was binding on all nations of the world, and superseded decisions by the governing bodies of hitherto sovereign nation-states. This was echoed by George Bush in his speech on Aug. 8, when he said, "This resolution now has the force of international law."

Such a pronouncement is coherent with British aspirations to prevent another nation-state, a reunified Germany, from being a force for economic development. That Germans would again play the role that they did in the era of the American Revolution, led by the great republican poet Friedrich Schiller and the economist Friedrich List, is a fate which the Anglo-American oligarchs intend to avoid at all costs—even including a Third World War.

Thus they will seek by every means possible to bully the rest of the world into submission to their interpretation of the already abominable United Nations resolution, which essentially outlawed the Iraqi nation.

This is the same arrogant disregard for national sovereignty which is embodied in the infamous Thornburgh Doctrine, which says that the United States has assumed the right to take police action against the nationals of other nations, without regard to the law of those nations. Assassination of the political leaders of other nations falls under this category.

Another instance of this new interpretation of international law—overshadowed at the moment—is environmentalist law, which is also intended to override national sovereignty.

Now the irony, which has not escaped critics of the United States, is the fact that there were no sanctions against the United States under international law for its unprovoked invasion of the nation of Panama—not to speak of the kidnap of General Noriega. The comparison should perpetually be borne in mind.

A U.N. resolution, of course, does *not* have the force of international law. What is being asserted by Mrs. Thatcher and Mr. Bush is a pagan Roman notion

of international law, bearing no connection to Christian natural law. That the use of nuclear weapons against Iraq is now being mooted by the U.S. government, proves this. The Anglo-American willingness to consider the use of nuclear weapons against the Arabs is coherent with their otherwise openly expressed racist views against the "coloured" peoples of the world. It is also coherent with the pagan views of Britain's Prince Philip, who has stated that he places a value on animal life above that of humans.

True international law flows from natural law, as elaborated by Gottfried Leibniz in the past, or Lyndon LaRouche today. It is based upon the natural sovereignty of every man, woman, and child living today, and the rights of future humanity. It is based upon the political notion of a community of sovereign republican nations.

There are three conceptions of international law. First, there is customary law, which is based upon Locke. This is a flawed conception in comparison with a true, Leibnizian conception of international law defined by natural law; nonetheless it does not countenance lawlessness such as the American invasion of Panama, or the current Anglo-American show of force in the Middle East. What we are seeing today is a third conception, which is modeled upon the arbitrary power of the Roman Empire.

The establishment of a new Roman Empire, a third Roman Empire under the control of the Anglo-Saxons, in collaboration with an Eastern, Russian cosmopolitan faction, has been a project of the British over this whole century. One pathway which they are trying to use to accomplish this, is to turn the U.N. Security Council into an imperial council controlled by the Anglo-Americans. According to this, when the Security Council declares a law, everybody must obey, or else face the terror of Anglo-American power.

If Mr. Bush and Mrs. Thatcher continue to assert this kind of nonsense, they're going to find that the world says we'd better get rid of these Roman imperial powers, while we still can do it. The world will then welcome a great financial collapse of Britain and the United States.