

The compelling, but still unpersuasive, case for war on Syria

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

This is an opinion item.

Author(s) St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial board

Source St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Date May 9, 2013

URL http://www.stltoday.com/news/opinion/columns/the-platform/editorial-the-compelling-but-still-unpersuasive-case-for-war-on/article_b824bc4c-a269-5872-b7fc-b568751da7f0.html

Quote

“ The United Nations, in the wake of the Rwandan atrocities in 1994, adopted an international norm called “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P) that says nations have an obligation to intervene when another nation commits crimes against humanity. Even if Mr. Assad hasn't gassed his people — the U.N. isn't entirely sure of that — he qualifies on any number of other counts. But intervention would not be easy, nor cheap, nor predictable and not certain to wind up doing more good than harm. ”

Add or change this opinion item's references

This item argues against the position United States should intervene on the topic Syrian civil war.

Retrieved from

"https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=The_compelling,_but_still_unpersuasive,_case_for_war_on_Syria&oldid=16529"

This page was last edited on May 17, 2013, at 02:35.

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.