

Airstrike by UK, USA, and France on Syria

Student Name

Student ID

Date of submission

The airstrike that took place in Syria on the “14th April 2018” by the UK, USA, and France, was in response to a chemical weapons attack by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad in a Damascus suburb. The countries fired 110 missiles were at 4 pm Syrian time at the three destinations. The missiles were fired through plane and shops at three target locations which include the Damascus scientific research center, the storage house of chemical weapon positioned in the west of the Homes, and the command post and storage nearby it.

These missiles were forward for the international defense and the maintenance of international peace as the Syrian government has been involved in the chemical weapons since the civil war took place in the country in the year 2011. Nikki R Haley, the American ambassador at the United Nations (UN), has claimed that the country has been involved in the chemical weapons despite the banned on these and identification of this on the April 7th led to the missile attack.

The basic argument that prevails internationally is that these missile attacks made by the countries have violated the international law. The government of Syria along with the Russian government condemns the attacks based on this, however. However, if the international laws formed by the United Nations are studied it is found that the UN charter does prohibit the use of forces and power by one state on to the other. However, there are two exceptions to this international law. The first case in which states can attack and use its force is when the self-defense at the

individual as well as the collective level is at stake of an armed attack, illustrated in the Article 51 of Charter. Another condition is stated in Chapter VII of the UN Charter states that state can use its force against another when it is done for the sustainment and maintenance of the international peace and security, only if the non-forceful methods adopted failed.

If the UN Charter is studied it is found that are attacks were valid as first they were banned and their use on the civilians was a sign that they took take place in an international setting as well (Gray, 2018). The UK government used it in the supporting of the argument that force was used against Syria as a convincing amount of evidence was made available which confirmed their involvement and points towards the distress that can be posed upon with its use. In addition, there was no alternative available for condemning the use. Therefore, it was the only possible alternative available for saving billions of lives which were at stake (Teson, 2018). Furthermore, the force used against the chemical attack at Syria followed a studied proportion in which the humanitarian sufferings that could take place were accounted; this made the attack time-limited and proportionate.

The purpose of the attack was to eliminate all central activities and places forced and obliged for the chemical weapon production and the distress that followed it. The US government in its statement made it clear that these measures were adopted as the result of the activities were carried on and their dependence or

reoccurrence depends on its caring in the country. The United States seeks international peace and does not plan to seek an indefinite presence in the region of Syria.

The attacks were done on the basis of humanitarian reasons and were limited to the elimination of chemical use in the weapons which endorse the international norm banning their use.

References

Gray, C. (2018). *International law and the use of force*. Oxford University Press.

Teson, F. (2018). *A philosophy of international law*. Routledge.