

# UK Chilcot Inquiry: “The Iraq War Was Unlawful”. Unanimous Legal Opinion of Foreign Office Lawyers

Cameron government is blocking publication of their “official” report

By [Carl Herman](#)

Global Research, January 04, 2013  
[Washington's Blog](#)

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [US NATO War](#)  
[Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [IRAQ REPORT](#)

The [UK Cameron government is blocking publication](#) of their “official” report on Iraq war until perhaps 2014 or later, according to the [UK’s most popular](#) newspaper website.

Perhaps this delay is in part because the Blair government was advised before the war by [all 27 attorneys in their Foreign Affairs Office that war on Iraq was unlawful](#). That would mean armed attack on Iraq would be an unlawful War of Aggression, with identical criminal implication on US armed attack on Iraq.

**Unlawful war [requires US military](#) to refuse all war orders and arrest those who issue them** (more documentation [here](#)).

Public understanding that current wars “on terror” are not even close to lawful would end these wars. [War law](#) forbids all armed attack unless under attack by another nation’s government.

As [I wrote in 2010](#):

All the lawyers in the UK’s Foreign Affairs Department concluded the US/UK invasion of Iraq was an unlawful War of Aggression. Their expert advice is the most qualified to make that legal determination; [all 27 of them were in agreement](#). This powerful judgment of unlawful war follows the [Dutch government’s recent unanimous report](#) and [UN Secretary General Kofi Annan’s clear statements](#).

This stunning information was disclosed at the UK Chilcot inquiry by the [testimony of Foreign Affairs leading legal advisor, Sir Michael Wood](#), who added that the reply from Prime Minister Tony Blair’s office to his legal department’s professional work was chastisement for putting their unanimous legal opinion in writing.

[Sir Michael testified](#) that Foreign Secretary Jack Straw preferred to take the legal position that the laws governing war were vague and open to broad interpretation: “He took the view that I was being very dogmatic and that international law was pretty vague and that he wasn’t used to people taking such a firm position.”

Mr. Straw’s opinion is an Orwellian lie of the [crystal-clear letter and spirit of the UN Charter that outlawed wars of choice](#) in 1945. The UN Charter forbids all use of force except when

explicitly authorized by the UN Security Council, or in a narrow definition of self-defense upon an armed attack by another nation's government. This is arguably the single most important and clear law on the planet, the victory of the generation who sacrificed during World War 2, and damning criminal testimony for anyone in government to claim that this law is vague.

Violation of the laws which prevent a War of Aggression and a Crime Against Peace, are also arguably to worst crime a nation can commit.

UK Attorney General Lord Goldsmith testified he "changed his mind" against the unanimous legal opinion of all 27 of the Foreign Office attorneys to agree with the US legal argument that UN Security Council Resolution [1441 authorized use of force at the discretion of any nation's choice](#). This testimony is also criminally damning: arguing that an individual nation has the right to choose war violates the purpose, letter and spirit of the UN Charter, as well as violates 1441 that reaffirms jurisdiction of the Security Council in governance of the issue. This Orwellian argument contradicts the express purpose of the Charter to prevent individual nations from engaging in wars. A two-minute video of his mincing testimony is below as he pretends that war is still a lawful foreign policy option.

Moreover, the US and UK "legal argument" is in further Orwellian opposition to their UN Ambassadors' statements when 1441 was passed that this *did not authorize* any use of force:

[John Negroponte](#), US Ambassador to the UN:

[T]his resolution contains no "hidden triggers" and no "automaticity" with respect to the use of force. If there is a further Iraqi breach, reported to the Council by UNMOVIC, the IAEA or a Member State, the matter will return to the Council for discussions as required in paragraph 12.

[Sir Jeremy Greenstock](#), UK Ambassador to the UN:

We heard loud and clear during the negotiations the concerns about "automaticity" and "hidden triggers" — the concern that on a decision so crucial we should not rush into military action; that on a decision so crucial any Iraqi violations should be discussed by the Council. Let me be equally clear in response... There is no "automaticity" in this resolution. If there is a further Iraqi breach of its disarmament obligations, the matter will return to the Council for discussion as required in paragraph 12.

The Chilcot inquiry was initiated from public outrage against UK participation in the Iraq War, with public opinion having to engage a second time to [force hearings to become public](#) rather than closed and secret. The hearings were not authorized to consider criminal charges, which is the next battle for UK public opinion.

[Concentrated US corporate media](#) will not report the Chilcot inquiry "emperor has no clothes" facts and conclusion that the current US wars are unlawful. The US Senate Church Committee revealed [CIA infiltration of US corporate media to disinform the American public](#) to support US political agendas.

The [cost of these unlawful wars](#) is over a million Iraqi lives above those expected to have

died in pre-war conditions and \$3-\$5 TRILLION in long-term US taxpayer costs (that's \$30,000 to \$50,000 per average US household of \$50,000 annual income; do the math to figure your family's share).

US Senate and House Committee investigation has shown through all disclosed evidence that all of the justifications for war with Iraq were [known to be lies at the time they were presented](#) to the public. You are an irresponsible citizen if you do not verify these easily-understood facts from the disclosed evidence. A colluding corporate media for unlawful wars is a lame excuse for inaction when the facts are in front of you now.

The original source of this article is [Washington's Blog](#)  
Copyright © [Carl Herman](#), [Washington's Blog](#), 2013

---

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Carl Herman](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)