Over and over again, 'interests' are used as justification for offensive acts from personal indignities to military atrocities.

'National interests', are said to justify subjecting other peoples to our will: invading their countries, terrorizing, slaughtering their populace, imposing our ethics, morals, governmental procedures on them and consuming their resources, for our own sakes.

A mugger approaches you on the street. Although his interests are served by robbing you, or worse, it is unacceptable in 'civilized' society for his interests to supersede yours; others' interests stop where your person begins. Similarly a thug's, rapist's, cheat's, charlatan's or scoundrel's 'interests' may well be served by their physical, fiscal or emotional assault upon your being or person. Yet at the individual level that assault is an unacceptable act. Why then are such assaults supposed legitimate and acceptable among nations, when between individuals they generally are not?

When individuals' 'interests' are in conflict, how is it decided whose shall prevail? In 'civilized' societies, police, the courts and clerical mediators assist in attempting to arrive at 'fair', just or equitable resolutions: something for everyone. An individual cannot disregard the police or courts without becoming an outlaw.

Between states, the United Nations or the World Court provide means for obtaining solutions respectful of the competing 'interests' of individual countries. But necessary to the effectiveness of such agencies is the condition that nations work cooperatively within these agencies' framework toward a resolution. When a nation or its military, defying the UN or the World Court, contemptuously acts pre-emptively regardless of the 'interests' of other nations, is that not also the behavior of an outlaw state? Might makes, not right but, a mockery of fairness or justice!

What has become of our country and the founding principles for which it was once so widely admired?
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