

authorization of military force, as the French, Russians and Chinese had sought.

The Resolution also had clear language supporting the French, Russian and Chinese position. Paragraph 4 declaring that any failure by Iraq to comply with the Resolution will constitute a “material breach” also requires that such a breach “will be reported to the Council for assessment in accordance with paragraph 11 and 12” of the Resolution. Those paragraphs require the Chairman of the Inspection Team to report to the Security Council which will itself convene “immediately” to consider the situation and decide what to do. It seems clear from the Resolution that no member state should be able to use any violation by Iraq, whether very minor and technical or more serious, as legal justification to attack Iraq. The U.S. position led to the absurd conclusion that any mistake by Iraq would justify U.S. military action, a conclusion at odds with common sense, international opinion and the U.N. Charter. The Resolution required the Security Council to meet immediately and decide what to do about an Iraqi violation — a requirement inconsistent with member states taking their own, unilateral

“The U.S. position led to the absurd conclusion that any mistake by Iraq would justify U.S. military action, a conclusion at odds with common sense, international opinion and the U.N. Charter”

action. Indeed, France, Russia and China, which provided the critical votes to pass the Resolution, issued a statement upon its enactment that “Resolution 1441. . .excludes any automaticity in the use of force” and that only the Security Council had the ability to respond to a misstep by Iraq.

The U.N. Security Council and international law temporarily slowed the Bush Administration’s mad rush to invade Iraq. Resolution 1441 reflected U.S. coercion and heavy-handedness, but also the enormous international and domestic opposition to the Bush Administration’s plan to invade Iraq. Resolution 1441 alone did not resolve the issues. That resolution and the U.N. Charter provided a framework for peacefully

resolving the conflict with Iraq. The military action against Iraq is illegal; it did not constitute self-defense, and it was not authorized by the Security Council.

The National Lawyers Guild strongly condemns the Bush Administration’s violation of international law and the U.N. Charter and supports an immediate end to the U.S. occupation of Iraq within the parameters set forth by the Charter.

This fact sheet was written by:

Marjorie Cohn
President, NLG
Professor of Law, Thomas Jefferson School of Law
Libertad48@san.rr.com

Jeanne Mirer
Co-Chair, NLG International Committee
mirerfam@earthlink.net

John Quigley
Professor of Law, Ohio State University
quigley.2@osu.edu

Jules Lobel
Professor of Law, University of Pittsburgh
lobel@law.pitt.edu

**PRODUCED BY THE
NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD
Joint Anti-War Working Group**

**132 Nassau Street, Ste. 922
New York, NY 10038
212-679-5100
www.nlg.org**



National Lawyers Guild Iraq Fact Sheet:

THE WAR—IT’S NOT A MISTAKE, IT’S ILLEGAL

Article 2(4) of the U.N. Charter states that nations “shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state . . .” The Charter was signed by President Truman and, with the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate, was ratified by the United States in 1945. Under Article VI, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, the Charter is therefore part of “the supreme Law of the Land.”

The Charter contains only two exceptions to the prohibition on the use of force: when such force is employed in self-defense or when it is authorized by the U.N. Security Council. The U.S.-U.K. invasion of Iraq was not carried out in self-defense. The Security Council, reflecting the widespread international sentiment against war with Iraq, refused to authorize a U.S. attack against Iraq. The unilateral U.S.-U.K. invasion of Iraq was illegal under international law. It is a war of aggression, which the Nuremberg Tribunal called a “crime against peace.”

The National Lawyers Guild, in solidarity with the rest of the world, opposed the U.S./British invasion and occupation of Iraq. Today increasing numbers of American citizens are demanding an end to the occupation, but many still believe that it was right for the U.S. to invade and that the problems are with the handling of the occupation and the alleged failure of the Iraqi government to carry out its responsibilities. In truth, the invasion was not only wrong, but grossly illegal and criminal. The Guild has a particular responsibility to explain the illegality of the war and, to that end, we present this brief fact sheet. For a more complete exposition, see “Cowboy Republic: Six Ways the Bush Gang Has Defied the Law” by NLG President Marjorie Cohn, PollPoint Press (2007).

Self-Defense

Article 51 of the Charter sets forth the exception for self-defense. A nation can employ self-defense only “if an armed attack occurs,” or, as a number of authorities have argued, in response to an imminent attack. The need for self-defense must be “instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation.” (*The Caroline Case*) None of the reasons given by the Bush Administration for attacking Iraq, including destruction of claimed weapons of mass destruction or overthrowing Saddam Hussein, constituted self-defense under the U.N. Charter. Iraq did not pose an imminent threat of attack against the U.S. or any other U.N. member country. Even if the United States had properly acted

in self-defense, that license would have ended once the Security Council took up the matter.

In a speech to the West Point graduating class in the summer of 2001, George W. Bush set forth a doctrine that rejected this critical legal principle that force can only be used in self-defense. He built on that idea in his State of the Union address in 2002 where he warned the “axis of evil” nations that the United States would not wait “while dangers gather,” and then articulated the doctrine of pre-emptive strikes. In this radically new approach Bush proclaimed that the

United States can use military force against any state the administration perceives to be hostile. **This new U.S. position, obviously aimed at justifying an attack on Iraq, is a public renunciation of the U.N. Charter’s limitation on the use of force.**

Pre-emptive strikes are different from an earlier doctrine that was labeled “anticipatory self-defense” under which the United States and some other countries argued that they had the right under the U.N. Charter to attack a country that was planning an armed attack. This latter doctrine at least gave lip service to the restrictions on the use of force embodied in the Charter, i.e., that force could

only be used in self-defense or as authorized by the Security Council under Article 42. Past administrations viewed pre-emptive strikes on other nations as illegal, as evidenced by the Reagan administration’s vote in the Security Council that unanimously condemned Israel’s pre-emptive strike on Iraq’s nuclear facility in 1981. The doctrine of pre-emptive strikes moves beyond the restrictions of the Charter by stating that force will be used even if there is no immediate threat. It may well take the world back to a period prior to World War I when the employment of force had no legal restraints; countries could use force when and where they wanted. The creation of the U.N. Charter made the world safer; pre-emptive strikes have made it more dangerous.

The administration and the Congress abandoned the U.N. Charter’s core legal restraints in favor of a system in which the United States unilaterally decides which regimes warrant replacement by force. By at least rhetorically supporting the heart of the U.N. system over the past 62 years, the United States has supported its continuance. The doctrine of pre-emptive strikes wounds the U.N. system irrevocably. The consequences of this new doctrine are

“The administration and the Congress abandoned the U.N. Charter’s core legal restraints in favor of a system in which the United States unilaterally decides which regimes warrant replacement by force.”

frightening and have resulted in the exercise of unabashed imperial power. This path has led to more terror against the peoples of the world and the people of the United States.

U.N. Authorization

The United States has for more than a decade claimed that it did not need a new Security Council resolution authorizing force against Iraq. The U.S. claim is that Iraq materially breached Resolution 687, the cease fire resolution that ended the 1991 Gulf War. This material breach, according to the United States, resurrected Resolution 678 which authorized U.N. members to use force “to oust Iraq from Kuwait and so restore international peace and security in the area.”

A majority of the permanent members of the Security Council - France, Russia and China - have consistently rejected this U.S. position. During the crisis with Iraq over inspections in 1998, a majority of all the Security Council members disagreed with the U.S. position and argued that no existing Security Council resolution authorized the U.S., Britain or any other member state to enforce Iraq’s disarmament obligations imposed by Resolution 687. France, Russia, China and other nations argued that only a new, explicit Security Council resolution authorizing force against Iraq could provide a legal basis for such U.S./British action.

On November 8, 2002, after almost eight weeks of negotiation and tremendous pressure by the United States, the United Nations unanimously adopted Resolution 1441 which set a new timetable and a new regime of inspections for Iraq. What it did not do, no matter what the United States claimed about the resolution, was to authorize any country to use force against Iraq. The United States was still required as a matter of law go back to the U.N. Security Council for authority to use force. Its claim that it did not need to do so was not law; it was an exercise of sheer power.

Resolution 1441 represented a compromise between the French/Russian/Chinese view and the American/British perspective. The Council acquiesced to the United States by deciding that Iraq “was and remains” in “material breach” of prior resolutions, including Resolution 687. It also decided that any future “false statements or omissions...and failure by Iraq at any time to comply with, and cooperate fully in the implementation of, this resolution shall constitute a further material breach.” Finally, paragraph 13 of the Resolution recalls that the Council has repeatedly warned Iraq that it will face “serious consequences” as a result of its continued violation of its obligations. The “material breach” and “serious consequences” language was used by the United States to argue that the Security Council had essentially allowed it to use force in response to any Iraqi non-compliance. Moreover, the United States also argued that the Resolution did not explicitly require another Council vote on

“What [Resolution 1441] did not do, no matter what the United States claimed about the resolution, was to authorize any country to use force against Iraq.”