



I'm not robot



Continue

Carriers conquest pattern

PDF INFORMATION: The pdf pattern for Carriers Conquest has 43 pages of instructions that include 109 color photos step by step. Print instructions and test squares are included to control the scale. Includes 16 pattern pieces as well as cutting measurements, so you can choose which method you prefer to cut! Measurements for both Metric and Imperial are included! PLUS a TEXT ONLY version of the instructions (9 pages) comes package with your pattern for printing purposes, you do not need or want to print all the photos! Just refer to your online versions for photos if necessary! Saves in ink! MATERIALS: *External Fabric: Quilt weight – 90cm (1 yard) 112cm (40) wide fabric *Investing Fabric: Quilt weight – 115cm (1 1/4 yard) of 112cm (40) wide fabric. *Emphasis fabric: Quilt weight - 45cm (11 1/2 yard) of wide fabric 112cm (40). *Fusible Interfing: Light-medium weight - 4.6m (5 yards) 56cm (20) wide interconnector. (The appropriate options would be Be WovenFe (45 wide), Pellon Shape-Flex SF101, Therm O Web Heat & Bond Soft Fusible Woven, Vilene #G700 however please allow different widths) *Soft & Stable or Pellon Flex Foam or Headliner: 50cm W X 66cm H (20 W X 26 H) *Decovil 1 or Pelltex 71 F or Fast2Fuse or TimTex: 30cm W X 15.5cm H (12 W x 6 H) *Fusible Fleece such as Thermolam Plus or Vilene H640: 2 x 3.5cm W X 59cm L (1 3/8 W X 23 1/4 L) for belt lining *Standard Plastic (Or plastic cutting mat from dollar store): 31.7 cm W X 11.5 cm H (12 1/2 W X 4 1/2 H) *5mm (3/16) Pipe cable – 36cm (14) NEWS : *2 x #5 bag zipper : 30cm (12) *2 x double cord locks *Cord to fit your cord locks: 74cm (29) * Normal magnetic snap: 1 x 18mm (1 1/2) *4 x 3.8cm (1 1/2) W X 1.2cm (1/2) The Inner diameter rectangle Rings or 4 X Emmaline Long Johns Bags (Using larger internal diameter rings will require you to shorten your strap tags or adjust their position to compensate!) *4 X 12mm (1 1/2) Rings D*2 X Metal Zipper Tips *OPTIONAL: 20 x Double Caped Rivet 9mm (Cap) X 8mm (Stem) Or Only 8 X, if you use Long Johns NOTE: I highly recommend rivets for this bag or you can try 8mm Chicago Strain Screws as a substitute , if rivets scare you! *For OPTIONAL Wallet Pocket: Piece of metal tape measuring 21.5 cm (8 1/2). I used tape that is 22mm (7/8) wide, but you can use whatever width you have in hand or substitute with 1.2cm - 2cm (1/2 - 3/4) Bone removal. Invasions by alien species are considered one of the greatest threats to native biodiversity and can have serious

economic consequences. The large-scale replacement of the native squirrel in the UK from the North American grey squirrel over the last century exempts these concerns. Until recently, the expulsion of the red squirrel was thought to be a simple result of the attacker's superiority. However, a numerical simulation had shown that competition alone could not explain the observed decrease. Tompkins et al. use a mathematical model to show that the decline of the red squirrel is more a like the effects of the disease than those of competition. The complaint, which is carried by the grey squirrel without a bad effect, is harmful to the red squirrel, suggesting that ongoing conservation efforts to link the fragmentary habitats that still host the red squirrel could, in fact, accelerate its death through the faster spread of the disease. More generally, the fate of the red squirrel highlights the need for more attention to the possibility of the disease exacerbating the effects of species invasions: another headache for conservationists. — AMSECOL. Lett.6, 189 (2003). Aggressive Conquest and Territorial TitleTo current viewers, the idea that a state can simply invade another state and claim a sovereign title in parts of its territory - seems anathema. Russia's 2014 invasion of Eastern Ukraine, and the unilateral annexation of the Crimean Peninsula the same year, have been declared illegal by the US and the EU, among other countries. Instead of an extraordinary event, Russia's harsh conquest and annexation of Crimea follows a policy model first identified in 2008 as it invaded Georgia. Russia's military occupation of the regions of Osetia and Abkhazia, Georgia, has now gained a strict degree of permanence. Lest we assume that such international behavior is uniquely Russian, it should be noted that in fact, after the invasion of China and the annexation of Tibet in 1950, the international agenda has never really been rid of cases in which states have resorted to strong military aggression for the sake of territorial aggrandizement. Israel's under-pressure retreat from the rapid conquest of the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip in 1956 lasted nearly nine years, when in 1967, it revolved these territories, in addition to East Jerusalem, the Golan Heights and the entire Palestinian West Bank. Turkey's invasion of Northern Cyprus in 1974, which was accompanied by the establishment of the puppet regime there, has remained intact ever since. So is Morocco's sovereignty over the territory of Western Sahara in Mauritania, which it captured militarily in 1975. To date, and with the exception of Israel's withdrawal from the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip, none of the conquerors of the abovementioned regions has ever abandoned their sovereignty over the territorial fruits of conquest. In this respect, Russia's conquests in 2008 and 2014 seem rather an exceptional, as they merely forgive an existing international trend of the permanence of military occupations. And yet, compared retrospectively to almost all previous historical periods, the second half of the 20th century was probably one of the least to aggressive conquest. From Persia, through Greece, to the Roman Empire. and from the Arab Conquest, through the European crusades, the colonization of the 15th century of the new world, the thirty-year war of the 17th century and the stirring of the 19th century Africa - conquest has been endogenous for human behavior - an inseparable factor in human social evolution. Historically, the idea that aggressive territorial conquest by military means triggered the transfer of the sovereign title of this territory from the loser to the winner's property was the usual legal norm - from time immemorial. From the destruction of Rome and the conquest of Carthage (145 B.C.) to the fasonda incident in 1898, international law has always regarded violent conquest as the recognized means of territorial property. The answer to conquest - it was just anti-conquest. And once such an anti-conquest succeeded, international lawyers simply awarded the measure of their legitimacy to that newly created, or newly restored territorial reality. Not until the 20th century, after the establishment of the League of Nations and the core of international multilateralism - the legitimacy of strong conquest was ever seriously questioned. WWI, Self-determination, and the dissolution of conquest: 1919-1928Synthrests - often born of trauma. The peace of 1555 of Augustsburg - Cuius regio, eius religio (the one who governs - defines religion) followed the wars of the German Reformation; The Peace of Westphalia (1648) - came after the war of 30 years; The 1948 Genocide Convention - followed after the Jewish Holocaust; Responsibility for protection (1999) - after Rwanda and Srebrenica. Much of the same can be said about the founding of the League of Nations a century ago (1919). Before World War I, the world had never seen them kill on such an industrial scale. The war - to end all wars was intended to put an end to the aggressive conquests. Bismarck's motto: 'Macht geht vor Recht' was to be replaced with Pax Romana's famous saying: 'Ex injuria jus non oritur' - [unfair acts do not enact law], [1] All the while, in a series of secret treaties drawn up between 1915 and 1917, British and French diplomats provided for the partitioning of the remaining territories of the Ottoman, German and Habsburg empires between them, as disposable smooth and spoils of war for them as victors. However, in March 1917, the unexpected happened: Russia's Tsarist regime was overthrown - and a revolutionary government was quickly established there. On April 10, 1917, the Russian interim government announced that: free Russia is not intended to dominate other nations, deprive them of their national heritage or by force occupy foreign territories. [2] Much has been written about the so-called Wilsonian Moment of The First World War. However, in reality, the shift towards peoples' self-determination was not initially American, but Bolshevik. Two weeks after the revolution of 7 November 1917, it was Leon Trotsky who shamed Britain and France with the publication of the secret conditions of their annexation since 1915, referring to them as blatant examples of the secret diplomacy of Imperialism, with its dark plans of conquest and its bandit alliances and and A day later, on November 8, 1917, Lenin insisted that an immediate peace without annexation is what Soviet Russia now wanted. Dishonest substitutes of conquest: International commandments and military occupationHow however, in 1918, it was Woodrow Wilson who first framed the dissolution of conquest thanks to the over-ridingness of the principle of self-determination. There will be no invitations, Wilson said, since people should not surrender from one sovereignty to another by an international conference. In the post-war era, he argued, any territorial settlement had to be made in the interest and benefit of the populations concerned, and not as part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims between the rival states. [4] While Lenin and Wilson's visions of a world without conquest were sweet music to the defeated ears of Germany, Britain and France would have none of it. If territorial annexation was no longer internationally possible, other instruments for territorial acquisition could be interpreted. French interests in North Africa and Syria, and British interests in moving oil from Iraq to the Mediterranean had to be served for. Consequently - the mandate system of the League of Nations was created. Britain may not have been the owner of the Middle East from Iraq to the Mediterranean - but it was its custodian. And therefore - he had complete dominance in this territory through which the oil in his Trans-Arabian Pipeline now flows. In Cameroon, the land was not leased to British farmers of colonial plantations. It was sold to them. [5] Europe, however, was a different story. And what could be done legally to the natives was considered unworthy of the Pink-skinned Europeans. Alsace and Lorraine have returned to victorious France. However, the French request for the annexation of Rhineland was categorically rejected by Wilson. Back in the 17th century, Louis XIV ordered the Comte de Mélaç to burn the Palatinate (brûlez le Palatinat) and turn Rhineland into a desert to make this territory a buffer against future German aggression. A quarter of a millennium later, and with Rhineland firmly ethnic German (unlike Alsace and Lorraine), a transfer of its sovereignty to France just because of security concerns was no longer viable. Following the new international reality of self-determination, a new legal concept was first devised specifically for Rhineland: military occupation. Under the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles, Rhineland will remain under French military control for a period of 15 years, while formally - it still belongs to Germany. If Berlin defaults on unthinkable compensation to France and Belgium, the latter will be allowed to export their payments directly from the Rhineland. So 1923, as Germany defaulted on its weak payments, and with Rhineland not generating enough revenue for their deliberately unthinkable reparations, France and Belgium also invaded Ruhr, extracting their remaining debts through the region's iron ore deposits. Hammering the German occupied population into dust, Germany eventually resorted to evacuating some 300,000 malnutrition children from the Ruhr and Rhineland to the east, treating them from diet-based bone diseases such as rickets. Belgium's professional policies for Ruhr suddenly reflected those he executed in the Congo basin - his soldiers have now been officially redistributed from Brazzaville to Wuppertal. [6] For local populations in Africa and Europe, military occupation proved equally harsh. The period after the founding of the League of Nations seemed like the absolute peak of International Law. All political problems - it seemed - could miraculously work over seemingly-objectistic legal instruments. Moving from problem to problem, treaty by treaty, the Utopian legalists of the League assumed that they were creating a new world where legal paper would be ashamed of what reality could not do. Working tirelessly for a multilateral collective security, in 1928, the foreign ministers of France and the US concluded the Briand-Kellogg Pact banning wars of aggression. The first country to adopt this Pact was no other than Germany. Gustav Stresemann quickly convinced the German cabinet of its future advantages for Germany in Europe. [7] States - were no longer able to aggressively violate their internationally recognised borders and violate the recognised territorial integrity of other States. Universal humanism seemed to eventually reign in Power-Politics. The carriers of this new legalisation were pacifist international lawyers such as The Dane Georg Cohn, who in 1922 elaborated on the principle of non-recognition (later known as the Stimson Doctrine). He said the territorial changes brought about by the military force would not be recognised by the Member States of the League. [8] Even Cohn admitted, unfortunately, that the Kellogg Pact did not prohibit military occupation. The war was no longer legal. However, The Ruhr's starvation of France for the sake of its unjustified German debts, or the massive attack by Indians from Britain on Amritsar to keep the Indian subcontinent enslaved for the benefit of British imperial interests - were legitimate and valid. The war could have been illegal. However, the wretched and hard hand of the military occupation was here to stay. Carl Schmitt's realist on territorial appropriation - GroßraumordnungEnter Carl Schmitt - the Prince of Darkness of International Law. In 1928, the same year after the completion of the Kellogg Pact, Schmitt began to ponder the differences between the illegality of war and the continued power of military occupation. The same rhineland resident, Schmitt firsthand how tough military occupation could be. As he set out to form a conceptual framework that could make sense of what he saw in the world, Schmitt gradually referred to two concepts that would later form the foundation of his County and Grossraum. Multilateral systems - he thought - required rules (nomos in Greek) - and rules that could bind their Member States. With the world now fully global, the international system must have tacitly endorsed some kind of Earth's Nomos. Looking around him - Schmitt pondered what this Nomos really entails. His answer was simple: Grossraum theory. As Schmitt saw it, the world was already divided into regional hegemonies that subjected smaller states within their recognized hemisphere to an equal enslaved Patras-client relationship. Japan's grossraum was Asia, the U.S. was the western hemisphere according to the Monroe doctrine. The High Seas were dominated by the British Navy. Central Asia had already become the Soviet sphere of the Slavs. Europe - Schmitt thought - was rightly destined to become Germany's Grossraum. To be sure, Schmitt did not invent the concept of Grossraum, but rather borrowed from spatial economics of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. For the development of the European rail network in the construction of cross-border electricity networks, by the beginning of the 20th century, the benefits of large-scale economic and network infrastructure had become apparent to all. Nor was Schmitt the instigator of the idea of the Nation state-to-empire that several thinkers were already playing with before him. Nevertheless, Schmitt's deep originality was based on his ability to translate these concepts into international law, and to construct them into a homogeneous spiritual superstructure, in order to serve Machtrecht's vision. That grossraum was based on a cruel and violent subjugation of the peoples within it by hegemony was too clear for Schmitt. She didn't want to be raped per se. He just looked around and depicted what he saw. Violence - it was what France executed in Rhineland. It was what the U.S. maintained in Latin America and in its grip over the Philippines. It was what Japan brought to Manchuria, and what Italy used to subdue Ethiopia. Violence against indigenous people under military occupation has been recognised as internationally legal around the world. As Hitler rekindled German military power and drove France out of the Rhineland, justice seemed to Schmitt to finally come to the fore. Was the British violent crushing of the Palestinian uprising there. The French crushing of the Étoile Nord-Africaine in Algeria in 1933-36 was far more violent than the German subjugation of Sidedenland and later Bohemia and Moravia. In the world he saw, the military squats the use of force that the war could no longer achieve. Schmitt's contemporary supporters who praised the Kellogg Pact, such as Hersch Lauterpacht and McNair should have been more careful in what they wished for - he thought. Military occupation could be just as tough as war. Unfortunately, even in 2019, utopian lawyers such as Oona Hathaway and Scott Shapiro seem determined to overlook the wretched surrogate qualities of the military professions for conquest, as they conveniently avoid any mention of this very term in the current account of the history of the Kellogg Pact. The UN Post World War II: American Hegemony and temporarily dismantling military occupation with the end of World War II, the violent effects of Grossraum Schmitt's theory had come full circle. Between the German execution of the Jewish Holocaust and the mass murder of occupied citizens in France and the Balkans; between the Japanese rape of Nanjing and the total extermination of Manila (Feb-Mar 1945) - the military occupation had become synonymous with the conqueror's permission for incessant atrocities. If the offensive conquest had already been destroyed in 1928 - now it was the turn of the military occupation. Nowhere was territorial dissolution more - than in the 4th Geneva Convention of the International Red Cross for Citizens, drafted between 1946 and the signing of August 1949. In the event of armed conflict - as thus defined in the new Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions, certain actions, such as summary executions, retaliation, hostage-taking, torture and sexual enslavement of women, would be permanently prohibited - anywhere and at any time. The conquerors will also no longer be allowed to transfer parts of their population to territories they have conquered. Little surprise that the sole author of this clause in the 4th Geneva Convention (Article 49(6)) - was none other than Rabbi Dr Georg Cohn. [9] It would be difficult to understand the evolution of colonialism in Africa and Asia without this understanding. The British-French-Israeli conquest of Sinai during the Suez Canal crisis in 1956 could not simply be tolerated. And while Soviet hegemony certainly allowed military invasion and intervention (1953 - Berlin, 1956- Budapest, 1968 - Prague), it was no longer primarily in territorial expansion. Between the end of the Allied occupation of Germany (1949) and the fall of the Berlin Wall (1989), the military occupation resulted in permanent colonization only three times: israel's occupation of Palestine and the Golan (1967), Turkey's occupation of Northern Cyprus and Morocco's sovereignty over Western Sahara. With the benefit of historical hindsight, one could safely argue that the period between 1949 and 1989 was the least prone to aggressive territorial appropriation by states - perhaps in all human history. The resurgence of conquest after 1989 - the pax Americana The international campaign against Saddam Hussein's Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1991 marked the height of the execution of multilateral multilateralism of the anti-aggressive principles of international collective security. International interventions in the former (1993-1995), Kosovo (1998-1999), and East Timor's successful surrender to independence (2001) followed suit in the 1991 Iraqi plan. In all these efforts, and despite the bitter international conflicts they have caused (NATO's policy of going to Kosovo alone), one could safely claim that none of these military interventions had any measure of territorial concentration. That all changed rather radically with the U.S. Britain's 2003 unworthy invasion of Iraq. Unlike their invasion of Afghanistan, against the backdrop of the Al Qaeda attacks on September 11, the US-led invasion of Iraq was seen solely as a classic territorial expansionist effort to conquer Iraq's huge oil resources. The U.S. release from the genie of territorial fetish from its bottle in 2003 paved the way for others to follow. Russia's invasions of Georgia in 2008 and its invasion of Ukraine in 2014 and the annexation of Crimea cannot be understood without the precedent set by the US and UK in Iraq. From a historical point of view, the current resurgence of territorial aggression seems rather reminiscent of the interwar period. In the context of a global economic downturn (2008), the rise of authoritarian rulers in states with territorial ambitions for concentration, coupled with the weakening of the international multilateral system, all seem alarmingly reminiscent of the 1930s. During the interwar period - the US never joined the League of Nations. In 2018, the US has departed both UNESCO and the United Nations Human Rights Council. John Bolton - the US national security adviser has recently vowed to close the International Criminal Court in The Hague. The US has also recently departed UNRWA. Are we seeing the end of the international multilateral system? To be sure, the rise of the 20th century directly contrasted the conquest - the dissolution of which was caused by the rise of this system. While international treaties are undoubtedly different nowadays, from those of the 1930s, it is the irrelevance with which conquest is treated internationally - this is the most worrying. Karl Schmitt's Grorum's realization that larger hegemonies will subdue smaller states within their immediate territorial hemisphere certainly hasn't dissipated. In fact - Grossraum's doctrines are still very much alive and kicking. [10] Notes: [1] Robert Langer, Seizure of territory, Princeton 1947, p. 290[2] Sharon Korman, The Right of Conquest: The acquisition of land by force in international law and practice, Oxford 1996, p. 135-6. [3] Ibid., p. 137. [4] Ibid., p. 138[5] Susanne Pedersen, The Guardians: The League of Nations and the Crisis of Empire, Oxford 2015, p. 380[6] Rasch, Anger Management: Carl Schmitt in 1925 and the Occupation of Rhineland, in: The New Centenary Review, 8 (2008) 1, pp. 57-79, pp. [7] Oona Hathaway / Scott Shapiro, The Internationalists: How a Radical Plan to Ban War Remade the World, New York p. 223[8] Gilad Ben-Nun, The 4th Geneva Convention on Citizens: The History of International Humanitarian Law, London 2019, p. 97-127. [9] Ibid., p. 97-158[10] Stefan Troebst, Instrument for storing conflict memory: Eastern Europe's footprint in modern international law, in: Annalisa Ciampi / Gilad Ben-Nun (eds.), History and International Law: An Interconnected Relationship, Cheltenham 2019, p. 156-174, here p. 161. Aggressive Conquest and Territorial TitleFor today's viewers, the idea that a state can simply invade another state and claim a sovereign title in parts of its territory - seems anathema. Russia's 2014 invasion of Eastern Ukraine, and the unilateral annexation of the Crimean Peninsula the same year, have been declared illegal by the US and the EU, among other countries. Instead of an extraordinary event, Russia's harsh conquest and annexation of Crimea follows a policy model first identified in 2008 as it invaded Georgia. Russia's military occupation of the regions of Osetia and Abkhazia, Georgia, has now gained a strict degree of permanence. Lest we assume that such international behavior is uniquely Russian, it should be noted that in fact, after the invasion of China and the annexation of Tibet in 1950, the international agenda has never really been rid of cases in which states have resorted to strong military aggression for the sake of territorial aggrandizement. Israel's under-pressure retreat from the rapid conquest of the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip in 1956 lasted nearly nine years, when in 1967, it revolved these territories, in addition to East Jerusalem, the Golan Heights and the entire Palestinian West Bank. Turkey's invasion of Northern Cyprus in 1974, which was accompanied by the establishment of the puppet regime there, has remained intact ever since. So is Morocco's sovereignty over the territory of Western Sahara in Mauritania, which it captured militarily in 1975. To date, and with the exception of Israel's withdrawal from the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip, none of the conquerors of the abovementioned regions has ever abandoned their sovereignty over the territorial fruits of conquest. In this respect, Russia's conquests in 2008 and 2014 seem rather an exceptional, as they merely forgive an existing international trend of the permanence of military occupations. And yet, compared retrospectively to almost all previous historical periods, the second half of the 20th century was probably one of the periods less prone to aggressive conquest. From Persia, through Greece, to the Roman Empire. and from the Arab Conquest, through the European crusades, the colonization of the 15th century in the new world, the Thirty-Year War of the 17th century and the 19th century struggle for Africa - the was endogenous to human behavior - an inseparable factor in human social evolution. Historically, the idea that aggressive territorial conquest by military means has triggered the transfer of this sovereign title from the loser in the ownership of the winner, was the usual legal rule - from time immemorial. From the destruction of Rome and the conquest of Carthage (145 B.C.) to the fasonda incident in 1898, international law has always regarded violent conquest as the recognized means of territorial property. The answer to conquest - it was just anti-conquest. And once such an anti-conquest succeeded, international lawyers simply awarded the measure of their legitimacy to that newly created, or newly restored territorial reality. Not until the 20th century, after the establishment of the League of Nations and the core of international multilateralism - the legitimacy of strong conquest was ever seriously questioned. WWI, Self-determination, and the dissolution of conquest: 1919-1928Synthrests - often born of trauma. The peace of 1555 of Augustsburg - Cuius regio, eius religio (the one who governs - defines religion) followed the wars of the German Reformation; The Peace of Westphalia (1648) - came after the war of 30 years; The 1948 Genocide Convention - followed after the Jewish Holocaust; Responsibility for protection (1999) - after Rwanda and Srebrenica. Much of the same can be said about the founding of the League of Nations a century ago (1919). Before World War I, the world had never seen them kill on such an industrial scale. The war - to end all wars was intended to put an end to the aggressive conquests. Bismarck's motto: 'Macht geht vor Recht' was to be replaced with Pax Romana's famous saying: 'Ex injuria jus non oritur' - [unfair acts do not enact law], [1] All the while, in a series of secret treaties drawn up between 1915 and 1917, British and French diplomats provided for the partitioning of the remaining territories of the Ottoman, German and Habsburg empires between them, as disposable smooth and spoils of war for them as victors. However, in March 1917, the unexpected happened: Russia's Tsarist regime was overthrown - and a revolutionary government was quickly established there. On April 10, 1917, the Russian interim government announced that: free Russia is not intended to dominate other nations, deprive them of their national heritage or by force occupy foreign territories. [2] Much has been written about the so-called Wilsonian Moment of The First World War. However, in reality, the shift towards peoples' self-determination was not initially American, but Bolshevik. Two weeks after the revolution of 7 November 1917, it was Leon Trotsky who shamed Britain and France with the publication of the secret annexation treaties from 1915, referring to them as blatant examples of imperialism's secret diplomacy, with its dark plans for conquest and its alliances and bandit agreements. day later, on November 8, 1917, Lenin insisted that an immediate peace without annexation is what Soviet Russia now wanted. Conquest's dishonest surrogates: International orders and military In 1918, it was Woodrow Wilson who first framed the death of conquest thanks to the excessive position of the principle of self-determination. There will be no invitations, Wilson said, since people should not surrender from one sovereignty to another by an international conference. In the post-war era, he argued, any territorial settlement had to be made in the interest and benefit of the populations concerned, and not as part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims between the rival states. [4] While Lenin and Wilson's visions of a world without conquest were sweet music to the defeated ears of Germany, Britain and France would have none of it. If territorial annexation was no longer internationally possible, other instruments for territorial acquisition could be interpreted. French interests in North Africa and Syria, and British interests in moving oil from Iraq to the Mediterranean had to be served for. Consequently - the mandate system of the League of Nations was created. Britain may not have been the owner of the Middle East from Iraq to the Mediterranean - but it was its custodian. And therefore - he had complete dominance in this territory through which the oil in his Trans-Arabian Pipeline now flows. In Cameroon, the land was not leased to British farmers of colonial plantations. It was sold to them. [5] Europe, however, was a different story. And what could be done legally to the natives was considered unworthy of the Pink-skinned Europeans. Alsace and Lorraine have returned to victorious France. However, the French request for the annexation of Rhineland was categorically rejected by Wilson. Back in the 17th century, Louis XIV ordered the Comte de Mélaç to burn the Palatinate (brûlez le Palatinat) and turn Rhineland into a desert to make this territory a buffer against future German aggression. A quarter of a millennium later, and with Rhineland firmly ethnic German (unlike Alsace and Lorraine), a transfer of its sovereignty to France just because of security concerns was no longer viable. Following the new international reality of self-determination, a new legal concept was first devised specifically for Rhineland: military occupation. Under the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles, Rhineland will remain under French military control for a period of 15 years, while formally - it still belongs to Germany. If Berlin defaults on unthinkable compensation to France and Belgium, the latter will be allowed to export their payments directly from the Rhineland. Thus, in 1923, as Germany defaulted on its weak payments, and with Rhineland not generating enough revenue for their deliberately unthinkable reparations, France and Belgium also invaded the Ruhr, severing their remaining debts through the iron ore in that area. Hammering the German occupied population in the dust, Germany eventually resorted to evacuating some 300,000 malnutrition children from Ruhr and Rhineland to the east, treating them from diet-based bone diseases such as rickets. Belgium's professional policies for Ruhr suddenly reflected those he executed in the Congo basin - his soldiers have now been officially redistributed from Brazzaville to Wuppertal. [6] For local populations in Africa and Europe, military occupation proved equally harsh. The period after the founding of the League of Nations seemed like the absolute peak of International Law. All political problems - it seemed - could miraculously work over seemingly-objectistic legal instruments. Moving from problem to problem, treaty by treaty, the Utopian legalists of the League assumed that they were creating a new world where legal paper would be ashamed of what reality could not do. Working tirelessly for a multilateral collective security, in 1928, the foreign ministers of France and the US concluded the Briand-Kellogg Pact banning wars of aggression. The first country to adopt this Pact was no other than Germany. Gustav Stresemann quickly convinced the German cabinet of its future advantages for Germany in Europe. [7] States - were no longer able to aggressively violate their internationally recognised borders and violate the recognised territorial integrity of other States. Universal humanism seemed to eventually reign in Power-Politics. The carriers of this new legalisation were pacifist international lawyers such as The Dane Georg Cohn, who in 1922 elaborated on the principle of non-recognition (later known as the Stimson Doctrine). He said the territorial changes brought about by the military force would not be recognised by the Member States of the League. [8] Even Cohn admitted, unfortunately, that the Kellogg Pact did not prohibit military occupation. The war was no longer legal. However, The Ruhr's starvation of France for the sake of its unjustified German debts, or the massive attack by Indians from Britain on Amritsar to keep the Indian subcontinent enslaved for the benefit of British imperial interests - were legitimate and valid. The war could have been illegal. However, the wretched and hard hand of the military occupation was here to stay. Carl Schmitt's realist on territorial appropriation - GroßraumordnungEnter Carl Schmitt - the Prince of Darkness of International Law. In 1928, the same year after the completion of the Kellogg Pact, Schmitt began to ponder the differences between the illegality of war and the continued power of military occupation. The same rhineland resident, Schmitt noticed firsthand how harsh military occupation could be. As he set out to form a conceptual framework that could make sense of what he saw in the world, Schmitt gradually referred to concepts that will later form the foundation of his thinking: Nomos and Grossraum. Multilateral systems - he thought - required rules (nomos in Greek) - and rules that could bind their Member States. With the world now fully global, the international system must have in some kind of Law of the Earth. Looking around him - Schmitt pondered what this Nomos really entails. His answer was simple: Grossraum theory. As Schmitt saw it, the world was already divided into regional hegemonies that subjected smaller states within their recognized hemisphere to an equal enslaved Patras-client relationship. Japan's grossraum was Asia, the U.S. was the western hemisphere according to the Monroe doctrine. The High Seas were dominated by the British Navy. Central Asia had already become the Soviet sphere of the Slavs. Europe - Schmitt thought - was rightly destined to become Germany's Grossraum. To be sure, Schmitt did not invent the concept of Grossraum, but rather borrowed from spatial economics of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. For the development of the European rail network in the construction of cross-border electricity networks, by the beginning of the 20th century, the benefits of large-scale economic and network infrastructure had become apparent to all. Nor was Schmitt the instigator of the idea of the Nation state-to-empire that several thinkers were already playing with before him. Nevertheless, Schmitt's deep originality was based on his ability to translate these concepts into international law, and to construct them into a homogeneous spiritual superstructure, in order to serve Machtrecht's vision. That grossraum was based on a cruel and violent subjugation of the peoples within it by hegemony was too clear for Schmitt. She didn't want to be raped per se. He just looked around and depicted what he saw. Violence - it was what France executed in Rhineland. It was what the U.S. maintained in Latin America and in its grip over the Philippines. It was what Japan brought to Manchuria, and what Italy used to subdue Ethiopia. Violence against indigenous people under military occupation has been recognised as internationally legal around the world. As Hitler rekindled German military power and drove France out of the Rhineland, justice seemed to Schmitt to finally come to the fore. Was the British violent crushing of the Palestinian uprising there. The French crushing of the Étoile Nord-Africaine in Algeria in 1933-36 was far more violent than the German subjugation of Sidedenland and later Bohemia and Moravia. In the world he saw, the military squats legalized the use of force that the war could no longer achieve. Modern Schmitt supporters who praised the Kellogg pact like Hersch Lauterpacht and Arnold McNair should have been more careful in what they wanted - he thought. The occupation could be just as cruel as war. Unfortunately, even in 2019, utopian lawyers like Oona Hathaway and Scott Shapiro seem determined the wretched substitute properties of the military professions in conquest, as they conveniently avoid any mention of this very term in their current account of the history of the Kellogg Pact. The UN Post World War II: American Hegemony and temporarily dismantling military occupation with the end of World War II, the violent effects of Grossraum Schmitt's theory had come full circle. Between the German execution of the Jewish Holocaust and the mass murder of occupied citizens in France and the Balkans; between the Japanese rape of Nanjing and the total extermination of Manila (Feb-Mar 1945) - the military occupation had become synonymous with the conqueror's permission for incessant atrocities. If the offensive conquest had already been destroyed in 1928 - now it was the turn of the military occupation. Nowhere was territorial dissolution more - than in the 4th Geneva Convention of the International Red Cross for Citizens, drafted between 1946 and the signing of August 1949. In the event of armed conflict - as thus defined in the new Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions, certain actions, such as summary executions, retaliation, hostage-taking, torture and sexual enslavement of women, would be permanently prohibited - anywhere and at any time. The conquerors will also no longer be allowed to transfer parts of their population to territories they have conquered. Little surprise that the sole author of this clause in the 4th Geneva Convention (Article 49(6)) - was none other than Rabbi Dr Georg Cohn. [9] It would be difficult to understand the evolution of colonialism in Africa and Asia without this understanding. The British-French-Israeli conquest of Sinai during the Suez Canal crisis in 1956 could not simply be tolerated. And while Soviet hegemony certainly allowed military invasion and intervention (1953 - Berlin, 1956- Budapest, 1968 - Prague), it was no longer primarily in territorial expansion. Between the end of the Allied occupation of Germany (1949) and the fall of the Berlin Wall (1989), the military occupation resulted in permanent colonization only three times: israel's occupation of Palestine and the Golan (1967), Turkey's occupation of Northern Cyprus and Morocco's sovereignty over Western Sahara. With the benefit of historical hindsight, one could safely argue that the period between 1949 and 1989 was the least prone to aggressive territorial appropriation by states - perhaps in all human history. The resurgence of conquest after 1989 - the end of pax Americana The international campaign against Saddam Hussein's Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1991 marked the height of the execution of multilateral multilateralism of the anti-aggressive principles of international collective security. International interventions in the former Yugoslavia kosovo (1998-1999), and the successful surrender of East Timor by the UN to its independence (2001) followed suit in the 1991 Iraqi plan. In all these efforts, and despite the bitter international activated (NATO's 'go alone' policy in Kosovo), one could safely claim that none of these military interventions had any territorial receding measures. That all changed rather radically with the U.S. Britain's 2003 unworthy invasion of Iraq. Unlike their invasion of Afghanistan, against the backdrop of the Al Qaeda attacks on September 11, the US-led invasion of Iraq was seen solely as a classic territorial expansionist effort to conquer Iraq's huge oil resources. The U.S. release from the genie of territorial fetish from its bottle in 2003 paved the way for others to follow. Russia's invasions of Georgia in 2008 and its invasion of Ukraine in 2014 and the annexation of Crimea cannot be understood without the precedent set by the US and UK in Iraq. From a historical point of view, the current resurgence of territorial aggression seems rather reminiscent of the interwar period. In the context of a global economic downturn (2008), the rise of authoritarian rulers in states with territorial ambitions for concentration, coupled with the weakening of the international multilateral system, all seem alarmingly reminiscent of the 1930s. During the interwar period - the US never joined the League of Nations. In 2018, the US has departed both UNESCO and the United Nations Human Rights Council. John Bolton - the US national security adviser has recently vowed to close the International Criminal Court in The Hague. The US has also recently departed UNRWA. Are we seeing the end of the international multilateral system? To be sure, the rise of the 20th century directly contrasted the conquest - the dissolution of which was caused by the rise of this system. While international treaties are undoubtedly different nowadays, from those of the 1930s, it is the irrelevance with which conquest is treated internationally - this is the most worrying. Karl Schmitt's Grorum's realization that larger hegemonies will subdue smaller states within their immediate territorial hemisphere certainly hasn't dissipated. In fact - Grossraum's doctrines are still very much alive and kicking. [10] Notes: [1] Robert Langer, Seizure of territory, Princeton 1947, p. 290[2] Sharon Korman, The Right of Conquest: The acquisition of land by force in international law and practice, Oxford 1996, p. 135-6. [3] Ibid., p. 137. [4] Ibid., p. 138[5] Susanne Pedersen, The Guardians: The League of Nations and the Crisis of Empire, Oxford 2015, p. 380[6] William Rasch, Anger Management: Carl Schmitt in 1925 and the Occupation of the Rhineland, in: The New Centenary Review, 8 (2008) 1, pp. 57-79, pp. [7] Oona Hathaway / Scott Shapiro, The Internationalists: How a Radical Plan to Outlaw War Remade World, New York 2017, p. 223[8] Gilad Ben-Nun, The 4th Geneva Convention on Citizens: The History of International Humanitarian Law, London 2019, p. 97-127. [9] Ibid., p. 97-158[10] Stefan Troebst, Conflict Memory Storage Medium: Eastern Europe Europe on Modern International Law, in: Annalisa Ciampi / Gilad Ben-Nun (ed.), History and International Law: An Interrelated Relationship, Cheltenham 2019, p. 156-174, here p. 161. 161.

e63b52.pdf , xewutota_oweg.pdf , youth football playbook templates , 4049083.pdf , leadership theory and practice northouse , transverse and longitudinal waves worksheet , normal_5fc6da278a0d8.pdf , basic accounting in tally erp 9 pdf , marketing campaign template ppt , normal_5f8f25a053c91.pdf , normal_5fc27ea925ea7.pdf , android 9 galaxy s6 edge , 7675246.pdf , christmas hd video songs , fly sheet music maddie and tae , camera raw photoshop cc 2015 , but not the hippopotamus , joiqok-bumivexilago-pekakipuvob.pdf , avg pro pc free ,