

## 1: Is the U.S. Abandoning The World Order It Created?

*Abandoning the Liberal International Order for a Spheres-of-Influence World is a Trap for America and its Allies The liberal world order is under assault. Polls suggest an American ambivalence about upholding the rules-based global system.*

In addition, the resolution ignored initiatives that truly could have reduced maternal mortality, such as ensuring access to obstetric and post-natal services, medication, and nutrition. The developing world is ravaged by the catastrophe of maternal mortality, but even the United States suffers from a disproportionately poor maternal mortality rate. This should not be the case. We have what it takes to see mothers safely through pregnancy and the birth of their child. What we need is international commitment to implementation of basic lifesaving care—a task that is tragically mishandled by the U. Instead, the three-week Human Rights Council session devolved into the flagrant promotion of abortion, radical sexuality education for children, and other controversial issues. Help us champion truth, freedom, limited government and human dignity. The resolution, shepherded to passage by Burkina Faso and New Zealand, failed to take into account the positions of Russia, Egypt, and other countries that urged the document remain focused on maternal mortality. Russia, Egypt, and others called for reduced references to abortion and insisted on respecting state sovereignty on the matter. Prior to this resolution, all references to abortion in U. Nothing in international law infers a right to abortion, and countries that did not agree with this emphasis vowed to retain their sovereignty on this issue. But countries are under enormous pressure from the U. Abortion always has been a sticky subject at the U. Most Western countries maintain an extremely liberal stance, but much of the developing world continues to place heavy restrictions on abortion access, and some protect unborn life entirely. The United States represents an interesting case because of the fight to reclaim pro-life laws at the state and federal levels. But any country with abortion restrictions has a vested interest in ensuring the U. This remains a primary ploy of the pro-abortion agenda even though it has been disproven repeatedly by empirical evidence. There was considerable opposition expressed about this from the onset, but in the end, no country manifested the political will to challenge it via a vote. Does this signal the demise of the pro-life voice at the U. In fact, it points more to the increasing delegitimization of U. Genuine consensus, the fundamental principle upon which multilateral negotiations at the U. The idea of consensus is that any objection from any country, no matter how small, should be taken into account by the other countries and subsequently left out of the final negotiated resolution. This is intended to prevent the tyranny of the majority and allow every country to influence the discourse. But their resolution failed, This shows the inherent problems of handling these issues in this forum. Given its limited composition, voting results do not reflect the views of the full U. Moreover, the increasing prevalence of voting on controversial issues has discouraged countries from actively participating in negotiations, resulting in an oppressive climate of silence in the face of increasing affronts to state sovereignty, religious and ethical values, and cultural backgrounds. This is the official result of the session, but behind the scenes, it was evident that many countries, even powerful ones, repeatedly called for the national law qualifier and were clear after the vote they would not interpret the text as creating new human rights obligations other than those codified under existing international law. The lack of respect for this position is reflective of the sad state of affairs at the council today. Although far from ideal from a pro-life perspective, references to sovereignty are essential for the safeguarding of unborn life in countries that ban or restrict abortion access. The fact that sovereignty was disavowed in this resolution constitutes an enormous threat to the international order. It reveals the willingness of Western powers to engage in blatant abortion promotion even when the lives of women are at stake. Elyssa Koren is director of U.

## 2: What Happens if the Trustee Abandoned an Asset? | LegalZoom Legal Info

*Abandoning the Liberal International Order for a Spheres-of-Influence World is a Trap for America and its Allies.*

Polls suggest an American ambivalence about upholding the rules-based global system. Populists are besieging governing elites in the West while Russia works strategically to destabilize European and American governments through propaganda and proxies. A rising China wants to create a global system that is not U. If it holds, this trend could produce a spheres-of-influence world “ which many, including the current presidents of the United States, China, and Russia, find intuitively attractive. But were such an order to replace one based on global integration and American leadership in the geopolitical cockpits of Europe and Asia, it would only engender insecurity and conflict. In a spheres-of-influence world, great powers order their regions. The problem with this kind of order, however, is several-fold. Too many spheres overlap in ways that would generate conflict rather than clean lines of responsibility. Japan would oppose Chinese suzerainty in East Asia, including by developing nuclear weapons; India and China would compete vigorously in Southeast Asia; Russia and China would contest the resources and loyalties of Central Asia; Europe and Russia would clash over primacy of Central and Eastern Europe. The Middle East would be an even more likely arena for hot war between Saudi Arabia and Iran, and Turkey would contest regions also claimed by Russia, Europe, and possibly China. A spheres of influence world would also sharpen great power competition outside of each region. Regional hegemony is a springboard for global contestation. China would be more likely to challenge the United States out-of-area if it had subdued strategic competition in its own region. Russia, like the Soviet Empire before it, would keep pushing west until it met enough hard power to stop it. The fact that Russian troops marched through Paris during the Napoleonic Wars demonstrates that the limits of Russian power need not be confined to the former Warsaw Pact. Roosevelt and his generals well understood that the United States could not be safe if hostile powers controlled Europe and Asia, despite the wide oceans separating North America from both theaters. A spheres-of-influence world would also crack up the integrated global economy that underlies the miracle in human welfare that has lifted billions out of poverty in past decades. A real-world and real-time example of what happens when American power retreats in an effort to encourage regional powers to solve their own problems is the mess in Syria. It has produced the greatest refugee crisis since “ a stain on the consciousness of human civilization “ and has led many to conclude that the Middle Eastern order of states dating to the end of World War 1 is collapsing. President Obama pursued an express policy of retracting American military power from the Middle East, including withdrawing all troops from Iraq and refusing to intervene militarily when President Assad used chemical weapons against his own people, despite a red-line injunction from the United States not to do so. It leaves weaker states to become the victims of stronger or more aggressive ones, and it seeds insecurity by removing the reassuring variable of American military guarantees and presence. It emboldens American adversaries and leads American allies to take self-help measures that themselves may undercut American security interests. A spheres-of-influence world would also produce contestation of the open global commons that are the basis for the unprecedented prosperity produced by the liberal international economic order. The United States, because of its sheer power and resource base as well as its relative geographical isolation, might do OK in a spheres-of-influence world. Their weakening and insecurity would in turn render the United States weaker and more insecure “ since U. More broadly, such a transition would also likely lead to the kind of hot wars that reorder the international balance of power, including by incentivizing aggressive states to push out and assert regional dominion, knowing that America does not have the will or interest to oppose them. The fact that U. It would also be ironic if the United States were to back away from its historic commitment to shaping a world that is an idealized vision of America itself “ one ruled by laws, norms, institutions, markets, and peaceful settlement of disputes. This is an installment in a new Medium publication called Out of Order. Follow us for more analysis on the liberal international order and the forces challenging it.

### 3: Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal withdrawal Trump's first executive action Monday - CNNPolitics

*Donald Trump's "America First" is likely to mean a further denigration of international law and process, to the detriment of America's national security and long-term interests.*

To a remarkable extent, the Republican Party has thrown down the gauntlet on UN treaties: If the rest of the world agrees on something, even something modeled on US leadership, it is treated as suspect and even dangerous for the United States to join with those countries in a treaty, on the ostensible grounds that the treaty obligations would infringe US sovereignty. The list of global agreements in which the United States refuses to participate is long and growing. Another notable case is the Convention on the Rights of the Child, to prevent the abuse, exploitation, and capital punishment of children. This treaty was adopted by the UN in 1989 and came into force in 1990, after a sufficient number of countries had ratified it. The United States held out. Once again, US conservatives argue that the treaty would violate US sovereignty. In each case, one argument is that treaty membership would limit US sovereignty. Advertisement Other reasons are given as well. The US Senate, again largely on the Republican side, objected to the UN Law of the Sea on the grounds that it would limit American companies from earning profits from deep-sea mining. It objected to the Convention on Biological Diversity on the grounds that protecting endangered species would threaten the private property rights of US farmers and ranchers, especially in the large landholdings in the west. Hard-line senators objected to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty on the grounds that it was not verifiable, despite expert opinion to the contrary. The United States has stayed out of the land mine treaty not just because of Senate opposition but because the US military has continued to use land mines in the defense of South Korea. Bush formally notified the court that the US would not seek membership, expressing concern that US military personnel might be subjected to ICC charges. The list of unsigned or unratified treaties continues to grow, and the US increasingly stands almost alone in the world in remaining aloof from these UN agreements. Our disdain for globally shared and negotiated rules is clear for all the world to see. The logic of treaty-making should be clear enough. In principle, treaties involve areas where nation states can potentially do serious harm to other nation states pollution, arms races, arms trade, war or where vital global protection of vulnerable populations children, refugees is at stake. Countries give up their sovereignty reciprocally. On issues of interstate relations, each individual nation agrees to refrain from harmful actions against the other nations on the condition that the other nations agree to refrain from the same actions against the country in question. It is, of course, nothing more than the Golden Rule put into the framework of international law. Yet there is a reason why the foes of these treaties work so hard to prevent their ratification by the US Senate. They believe, and rightly, that if the United States actually ratifies an agreement, it is more likely to follow through on its implementation. To break a treaty, after all, is to incur a global reputation as a deal breaker and to risk not just a bad reputation but also a coalition of countries pressing for a return to compliance. In some cases, including violations of the rules of international trade under the World Trade Organization WTO , the treaty provides for specific enforcement terms. Moreover, the US government is typically very happy, even insistent, that other countries are living up to the terms of international agreements. Likewise, the United States had aimed to further many of the specific objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity while not being a signatory to the agreement. The Republican Party objection to international law has three underpinnings. The first is a historical image, essentially a founding myth, of America as untethered in its fate from the rest of the world. This attitude is expressed in a draft trade policy agenda released by the Trump administration: This principle remains true today. Accordingly, the Trump administration will aggressively defend American sovereignty over matters of trade policy. According to this view, the US has little interest in what other countries are doing. These beliefs are wrong. The United States needs to care profoundly what other countries do. We need to care about nuclear nonproliferation, pollution control, climate change, the movements of terrorists, the laundering of illicit funds, narcotics trafficking, human trafficking, tax administration, financial stability, and the countless other areas governed by treaties and other forms of international law. Nor could US military power alone begin to accomplish this task in the absence of international law. At the apex of US power after

World War II, when the United States constituted roughly 30 percent of global output, American leaders recognized the urgent need for a greatly expanded body of international law to guide an increasingly complex and interdependent world. From the s to the s, the US led the way in promoting UN-based treaty law. If the United States continues to turn inward, China will be more than happy to take up the slack. This year at Davos, Chinese President Xi Jinping offered a stirring defense of globalization and international responsibility. We should join hands and rise to the challenge. History is created by the brave. Let us boost confidence, take actions and march arm-in-arm toward a bright future.

## 4: Abandoned Cargo

*Contrary to popular belief, respecting the restraints of international law better serves the national interest than does an attitude, so prevalent since 9/11, that international law poses inconvenient obstacles on the path toward national security.*

This article is over 6 months old Play Video 1: He then signed an executive order reimposing sanctions on any foreign company that continues to do business with Iran. The order gives companies day or day grace periods to extract themselves from existing Iranian contacts or face punitive US measures. The deal, struck in Vienna after nearly two years of intensive talks, limited the Iranian programme, to reassure the rest of the world that it cannot develop nuclear weapons, in return for sanctions relief. Tehran also accepted extensive monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency IAEA , which has verified 10 times since the agreement, and as recently as February, that Tehran has complied with its terms. The nuclear deal is also enshrined in a UN security council resolution that incorporated it into international law. The 15 members of the council at the time unanimously endorsed the agreement. Thank you for your feedback. In a separate tweet, the French president Emmanuel Macron warned: The nuclear non-proliferation regime is at stake. In reintroducing sanctions, Trump referred to claims by Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu that Israel had documents detailing past Iranian work on nuclear weapons development. Both Trump and Netanyahu are under significant domestic pressure. Trump is under scrutiny for possible collusion with Russia during the presidential election campaign, and for paying hush money to a porn actor who claims to have had sex with him. The Israeli prime minister is the subject of several police corruption inquiries. The US Treasury issued a factsheet providing a timetable of restoration of sweeping sanctions against global companies trading or investing with Iran. Bolton said that the US would also cease to abide by the UN security council resolution that endorsed the July deal. The deal was endorsed by a UN security council resolution soon afterwards. Much will now depend on reaction in Tehran, where hardliners have campaigned against the agreement and pressed for Iran to revive a full range of nuclear activities and throw out UN inspectors. The other parties to the nuclear agreement with Iran have said they will try to keep the deal alive, but it is far from clear that will be possible in the face of the sanctions that Trump has reintroduced, targeting companies around the world for doing business with Iran. Their failure to sway Trump was a striking measure of how little influence Europe has on this White House, which has sided instead with Israel, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates on a major strategic decision. Iran also took down about 13, of its centrifuges, leaving just over 5, of its oldest-model machines in place. It ceased all enrichment at its underground facility at Fordow, which "like other Iranian nuclear sites - was put under continuous international monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency. The IAEA had repeatedly confirmed that that Iran was in compliance with the restriction it had agreed to in The Iran deal explained: He revealed that the secretary of state, Mike Pompeo, was on the way to Pyongyang, apparently to finalise arrangements.

### 5: How can abandonment of children by noncustodial parents be prevented?

*The high costs of abandoning international law Link Even before Donald Trump put America first, the Republican Party had largely walked away from international treaty law.*

Containers are abandoned for a number of reasons: But there are other issues, too. In the shipping industry, there can be more considerations than would be for a storage facility. Any container that is not moving is losing money so container shipping lines do not want containers sitting in storage for very long. Once a container has been discharged from the vessel and free time has expired, there is a set amount of time before they can treat the container as abandoned. Sometimes it is a matter of the shipper having a dispute with the shipping line or freight forwarder and by the time it is settled, the demurrage is so high that it makes more sense to abandon than to pay the fees. Other times, the consignee for the container just never picks it up. Either way, the shipping line must get rid of the container so they can get it moving again. Abandoned containers can be a burden to the shipping line since it will cost them storage fees so they tend to get rid of the contents quickly. Just as with the storage lockers, the shipping line will auction off the cargo as soon as possible so they can get their container moving again. Shipping companies have a number of options if the consignee fails to take delivery of a consignment under the terms and condition of the bill of lading issued for the subject shipment and under common law. The shipping company has a lien on the cargo by which it may recover the costs for storage, demurrage, freight, handling charges, etc. The process of law allow shipping companies to: If a shipment is unclaimed and delivery cannot be effected, the carrier will so notify the proper parties as shown on the Bill of Lading by telephone, mail or electronic communication. If notification is sent by mail, the notice will be considered to have been given the first business day after it was mailed. If no such instructions are received within 10 days after the date of notification, the carrier will dispose of the freight by public or private sale or discard in landfill or dumpsite with no further liability to the carrier in accordance with the Bill of Lading. Options for resolution of abandoned cargo: This includes returning the goods to the shipper named in the bill of lading or to some other overseas place. As the goods had not been entered into home consumption by way of an import declaration, the shipping company may lodge an Export Entry that the reported goods are leaving the country and to obtain an Export Consignment Number Sale to a New Owner: The shipping company may seek out a buyer for the goods. The negotiated price should, if possible, at least cover the costs incurred by the shipping company, be subject to the buyer accepting responsibility for lodgement of an Import Declaration and payment of all duty and GST. The new buyer can take delivery from the bonded warehouse. Due to environmental regulations and the requirements of the Customs Act, the shipping company must obtain prior permission to dispose of abandoned goods. Application for permission should be sent in writing. How big is the problem of abandoned containers? According to one major shipping line on the Asia-Europe run, the numbers have decreased considerably compared with three or four years ago "but still shipping lines and the ports they call at routinely end up with boxes full of contents that no one apparently wants. According to US Department of Transportation figures, more than , loaded containers are abandoned each year in the US alone "most of them ending up at ports. Worldwide, it is hard to determine a total.

### 6: The high costs of abandoning international law | Agora Dialogue

*abandonment, desertion, child, custody, divorce, separation, abandon, abandoned, noncustodial, custodial, parent, marital* How can CustodyZen Help divorced or separated parents raise happier children? [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com) is an amazing website that helps divorced parents communicate the important issues related to raising their children.

What are the effects of child custody abandonment? Abandonment is an act where someone leaves a family situation and the duties that come with it. Abandonment may be with or without "cause", and there are three different types abandonment that are important in family law. Marital abandonment Child custody abandonment We will address each of these types of abandonment, but the main focus of this article will be on the third type of abandonment, which is child custody abandonment by noncustodial parents after a divorce or separation. What is marital abandonment? In family law, marital abandonment describes the situation when a spouse leaves the marital domicile and does not return. When at-fault divorce laws existed, marital abandonment was one of the possible marital misconduct issues that would be grounds for divorce. Still, marital abandonment may potentially lead to an unfavorable outcome for the spouse who leaves. What are the two types of marital abandonment? Marital abandonment can be defined as either criminal or constructive. Defining the type of marital abandonment has occurred depends on whether or not the abandoning spouse has just cause. Criminal Abandonment Criminal abandonment is marital abandonment where the spouse who left the marriage did not have "just cause". Criminal abandonment does not mean that the person who abandons the other will be punished by jail or other criminal methods. Rather, criminal abandonment means the person may be held financially responsible for the other person after that person leaves the marriage. For example, assume a person has a spouse who is special needs and the other spouse decides to abandon the marriage, criminal abandonment has taken place. A family court will not force the couple to remain married; however, the person who abandoned the marriage might incur significant spousal support obligations because of the criminal abandonment that has taken place. Constructive abandonment Constructive abandonment, which may be a type of emotional marital abandonment, has to do with one spouse giving "just cause" to the other to leave the marriage. Withholding sex, abuse, adultery, or a lack of financial support are all possible causes that might lead their partner to abandon the marriage with "just cause". Even if the spouse can prove grounds for constructive abandonment, it likely will not matter, as most states have no-fault divorce laws. If either spouse wants a divorce, the courts are likely to grant it regardless of who is at fault. What is child abandonment? When a parent leaves a child without enough care, supervision, support, or parental contact for an excessive period of time it is also referred to as child abandonment. Committing child abandonment is a criminal offense. Note that child abandonment and child custody abandonment should not be confused; they are two entirely different situations. What is child custody abandonment? A different form of abandonment can take place in a child custody situation. This type of "child custody" abandonment might occur if the noncustodial parent avoids contact with his or her children and fails to pay support. Different states have different laws in place regarding how to handle this type of abandonment. Such abandonment can have a profoundly negative effect on the children, as they feel unwanted by one of their parents. What can cause child custody abandonment? Parents who become estranged from their children, do so for a variety of reasons, and the effects of this type of abandonment on a children can be incredibly difficult for children to deal with. Parental Alienation Parental alienation is any time on parent communicates something negative about the other parent where the children can hear it. If parental alienation is allowed to go on of r a significant period of time parental alienation syndrome PAS may occur. Low Self-Esteem When the noncustodial parent begins to feel as if their role as a parent is insignificant, this low self-esteem may lead that parent to abandon their relationship with their children. Children who feel abandoned by one parent often suffer depression because of it, and in fact, child custody abandonment can be more difficult for a child to contend with than the death of a parent.

### 7: Did Trump Break the Law? U.S. Leaves Iran Deal, Violates World Order and Risks War, Experts Say

*And Axiom says the cost of its space station will be at least an order of magnitude cheaper than what NASA spent to build the original ISS (i.e., if the ISS cost \$ billion, then an "Axiom).*

James Dobbins writes that Madeleine Albright once referred to America as the indispensable nation, by which she meant that by virtue of its size, wealth and power, the United States plays a unique role, acting as the keystone to a world order in a manner that no other state could replace. We may be about to test that proposition. The United States has benefited as well, but not as much as some, and America has also borne disproportionate costs for sustaining this order. European and Japanese growth rates eventually declined to or below American levels, but these were replaced by new challengers. Hundreds of millions of people have been lifted out of poverty. Democracy has spread from a few dozen countries on the North Atlantic to half the world. Free trade generally, and access to the American market specifically, has driven much of this growth. American security commitments in Europe and Asia have ensured the peace. But the United States spends more to defend these areas than the regional residents spend themselves. And the United States has also paid more in blood as well as treasure, suffering much higher casualties in Korea, Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan than most other members of the international coalitions that joined in these fights. The United States is not the only nation to have made a turn away from globalization. This populist reaction seems common to much of the Western world. But the United States may be the only nation without which the global order cannot persist. Madeleine Albright once referred to America as the indispensable nation, by which she meant that by virtue of its size, wealth and power, the United States plays a unique role, acting as the keystone to a world order in a manner that no other state could replace. Donald Trump is a deal-maker who prides himself on his negotiating skills. Rather, he seems likely to seek better deals. Are such to be had? Reopening agreements allows all sides to put forward new demands. Are there are win-win outcomes to some of these possible renegotiations. Perhaps the liberal global order that has brought so much security and prosperity to so many people can be updated, rather than jettisoned. But if so, there is likely to be a lot of hard bargaining on the way.

### 8: Bretton Woods system - Wikipedia

*If you want to abandon "lawful permanent resident" status, or if you want to rely on a treaty tie-breaker to claim nonresident status, you need to take some affirmative steps.*

By Richard Falk T Vernon Place, Washington D. The US Government has long adopted double standards when it comes to respecting international law, especially in the setting of national security issues. It promotes a generalized respect for the Rule of Law in world politics, is outraged by violations of international law by its enemies, and chooses selectively when to comply and when to violate. This pattern goes far back in American history, but it is convenient to take note of American violations of international law in the setting of the Vietnam War, as well as periodic interventions in Central and South America. It seems clear that the United States, and the American people, would have benefited over the years from a foreign policy carried out subject to the discipline of international law. If the US Government had abided by international law, the dreadful experience of the Vietnam War would not have occurred. More recently, an observation that will be discussed further below, upholding international law would have avoided the fiasco of the Iraq War. It is important to understand that the restraints of international law have been voluntarily developed by sovereign states to protect their interests and values. Their intent is practical. It reflects the wisdom of centuries of diplomacy. International law is of particular importance in relation to uses of force in the course of foreign policy, and more generally issues relating to security, especially war and peace. The Supreme Court has ruled that in the event of an unavoidable clash between these two sources of legal authority, the last in time should prevail. Let me make the general point more strongly. In a globalizing world of great complexity it is in the interest of all states, large and small, that their relations be reliably regulated by international law. This observation underpins the daily operations of the world economy and many other aspects of international behavior, including maritime safety, environmental protection, tourism, immigration, disease control. The stability of international life depends on a closely woven fabric of law as the basis for almost all activity beyond the borders of a sovereign state. What is a cause for deepest current worry is that the United States has seemed to abandon this understanding of the relevance of law to the establishment of world order. This concern is not entirely new. Even prior to the attacks, the foreign policy of the Bush administration disclosed its disdain for widely respected international treaties. The Bush White House contended that existing and pending treaties limited its military and political options. In the early months of the Bush presidency it announced its opposition to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons testing, its unwillingness to submit the Kyoto Protocol regulating greenhouse gas emissions, defiantly withdrawing its signature from the Rome Treaty seeking the establishment of the International Criminal Court, and its intention to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. Such a pattern of unilateralist hostility to international treaties and multilateral cooperation was unprecedented in American history. It led to a strong negative reaction at home and abroad. Normally friendly governments were clearly alarmed by this internationally disruptive behavior of the new American president. The repudiation of widely endorsed multilateral treaty arrangements that were generally viewed as important contributions to a peaceful world seemed contrary to common sense, as well as to the general wellbeing of the peoples of the world. These expressions of unilateralist approach did not involve violating existing international law, but rather expressed the ultra neoconservative attitude that multilateral cooperation in the security area was undesirable, limiting the capacity of America to take advantage of its status as the sole remaining superpower in the aftermath of the Cold War. Congress is also not exempt from blame on these counts. It was in Congress even before George W. Bush came to Washington that militarist pressures were brought to bear in such a way as to oppose beneficial multilateral treaty constraints on United States policy. What mainly distinguished the Bush approach to international law from that of its predecessors were two developments: It was this posture by the Bush leadership that frightened world public opinion. These rules include humane treatment of prisoners taken during armed combat, unconditional prohibitions on torture and assassination of political opponents, and the duty to protect civilians in any foreign territory under occupation. The most important of all these legal restrictions on foreign policy is the rule of

international law prohibiting non-defensive uses of force without a mandate from the UN Security Council. But it is precisely a permission slip that international law, and the UN Charter, requires. The Iraq War is a notorious example of a war of choice that violates this fundamental rule of international law. As such, according to the Nuremberg Principles embodied in general international law after the conviction of German leaders for their criminal conduct, constitutes a Crime Against Peace. The detrimental impact of such American lawlessness on the protection of human rights has been documented in great detail by such respected organizations as the American Civil Liberties Union, Amnesty International, and Human Rights Watch. To sustain a climate of acquiescence within the United States it has been necessary to rely upon a manipulative politics of fear that has largely led to a suspension of criticism, including from the US Congress. In this crucial respect, the Congress is failing in its constitutional duties by not seeking to exert pressure on the Executive to uphold the Rule of Law by insisting on compliance with international law. Perhaps, the public outrage associated with the derelictions of governmental duty in the setting of Hurricane Katrina have finally opened a space for challenging the legitimacy of the present government, and holding the leaders to account. But the neoconservatives in and around the White House seem unchastened. Despite the ongoing draining experience of the Iraq occupation, these foreign policy super-hawks are making belligerent noises that suggest the possibilities of further military adventures in the Middle East, targeting Syria first, and then menacing Iran. Boot writes as if there are no legal or moral inhibitions on such aggressive uses of force at the whim of American leaders. If other governments were to adopt such a logic the world would quickly become an inferno of violence and extremism. In a globalized world the extension of law to international activity is in the national interest. It keeps our leaders from embarking on geopolitical ventures that are not supported by the citizenry if fully informed. American failures to abide by international law gives others a reciprocal right to violate their legal obligations, including in relation to Americans detained abroad as prisoners. What we see instead during the Bush presidency is a refusal to uphold the most fundamental obligations of international law that are binding on all sovereign states. The readiness to plan the Iraq War as early as September 12, and the availability of the legislative draft that was to become the Patriot Act give every right for a vigilant citizenry to be suspicious. As suggested, in the aftermath of Katrina, and given the continuing ferocity of the Iraqi resistance to the American occupation, new political possibilities exist to challenge the Bush White House, and revamp American foreign and domestic policy, attending to the needs of the people, especially those who suffer in poverty while those around them wallow in obscene wealth. Finally, adherence to international law in matters of war and peace is in the interest of the American peoples and the peoples of the world. There may be humanitarian emergencies or dangerous threats of attack that might justify recourse to war as the UN Secretary General and the UN High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change both conclude, but recourse to war is only legally valid if it is authorized by the Security Council. He is currently visiting professor of global studies at UC Santa Barbara.

### 9: Western Nations Abandon Consensus to Push Abortion Agenda at UN | The Stream

OTTAWA — Foreign Affairs Minister Chrystia Freeland urged the United States to resist the temptation to abandon the rules-based international order and Western alliances for a "mano-a-mano."

Polls suggest an American ambivalence about upholding the rules-based global system. Populists are besieging governing elites in the West while Russia works strategically to destabilize European and American governments through propaganda and proxies. A rising China wants to create a global system that is not U. If it holds, this trend could produce a spheres-of-influence world — which many, including the current presidents of the United States, China, and Russia, find intuitively attractive. But were such an order to replace one based on global integration and American leadership in the geopolitical cockpits of Europe and Asia, it would only engender insecurity and conflict. In a spheres-of-influence world, great powers order their regions. The problem with this kind of order, however, is several-fold. Too many spheres overlap in ways that would generate conflict rather than clean lines of responsibility. Japan would oppose Chinese suzerainty in East Asia, including by developing nuclear weapons; India and China would compete vigorously in Southeast Asia; Russia and China would contest the resources and loyalties of Central Asia; Europe and Russia would clash over primacy of Central and Eastern Europe. The Middle East would be an even more likely arena for hot war between Saudi Arabia and Iran, and Turkey would contest regions also claimed by Russia, Europe, and possibly China. A spheres of influence world would also sharpen great power competition outside of each region. Regional hegemony is a springboard for global contestation. China would be more likely to challenge the United States out-of-area if it had subdued strategic competition in its own region. Russia, like the Soviet Empire before it, would keep pushing west until it met enough hard power to stop it. The fact that Russian troops marched through Paris during the Napoleonic Wars demonstrates that the limits of Russian power need not be confined to the former Warsaw Pact. Roosevelt and his generals well understood that the United States could not be safe if hostile powers controlled Europe and Asia, despite the wide oceans separating North America from both theaters. A spheres-of-influence world would also crack up the integrated global economy that underlies the miracle in human welfare that has lifted billions out of poverty in past decades. A real-world and real-time example of what happens when American power retreats in an effort to encourage regional powers to solve their own problems is the mess in Syria. It has produced the greatest refugee crisis since — a stain on the consciousness of human civilization — and has led many to conclude that the Middle Eastern order of states dating to the end of World War 1 is collapsing. President Obama pursued an express policy of retracting American military power from the Middle East, including withdrawing all troops from Iraq and refusing to intervene militarily when President Assad used chemical weapons against his own people, despite a red-line injunction from the United States not to do so. It leaves weaker states to become the victims of stronger or more aggressive ones, and it seeds insecurity by removing the reassuring variable of American military guarantees and presence. It emboldens American adversaries and leads American allies to take self-help measures that themselves may undercut American security interests. A spheres-of-influence world would also produce contestation of the open global commons that are the basis for the unprecedented prosperity produced by the liberal international economic order. The United States, because of its sheer power and resource base as well as its relative geographical isolation, might do OK in a spheres-of-influence world. Their weakening and insecurity would in turn render the United States weaker and more insecure — since U. More broadly, such a transition would also likely lead to the kind of hot wars that reorder the international balance of power, including by incentivizing aggressive states to push out and assert regional dominion, knowing that America does not have the will or interest to oppose them. The fact that U. It would also be ironic if the United States were to back away from its historic commitment to shaping a world that is an idealized vision of America itself — one ruled by laws, norms, institutions, markets, and peaceful settlement of disputes. Follow us for more analysis on the liberal international order and the forces challenging it. The views expressed in GMF publications and commentary are the views of the author alone.

Marketing project on jewellery An analytical framework for regional development policy Transcultural psychiatric research review Ing music guitar flash cards Liverpool, a capital of the long twentieth century What can we do? Remedies for reducing inequality Lisa M. Lynch. Totally Unauthorized Guide to Fx Fighter Ellen white sabbath school lesson notes Garmin colorado 400t manual Indias exports and export policies in the 1960s New sources of development finance 2000 ford mustang v6 repair manual Agriculture in urban planning World resources and energy Family Programs (YMCA Program Discovery Series) The Haunted Tracks Green buyer behaviour Reflections on the dialogue between Jew and non-Jew in the Bible and in rabbinic literature Tovia Ben-Cho 8.5 skills practice hyperbola algebra filetype A letter written from the right honorable the Earle of Bedford to a lord of the House of Peers, of all th Calling In The Soul Leadership for a changing church Albertas petroleum industry and the Conservation Board This is the ultimate fake book Eye wonder space book The Boys Life of Abraham Lincoln Blockbusting in Baltimore Contexts, Intertexts, and Hypertexts (Written Language (Written Language) Shadow of a gunman The lunatic still at large Civil Democratic Islam Hands on Mathematics, Numbers from 1-10 Art of Medical Consulting Little Polar Bear/Little ReindeerLE Caring from the heart Henry Fitzgeorge Strether. Curiosities of popular customs Biomarkers in cancer chemoprevention Commentary on the Gospel of S. John. Elementary and intermediate algebra book