

افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نباشد تن من مباد بدین بوم و بر زنده یک تن مباد
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

www.afgazad.com

afgazad@gmail.com

European Languages

زبانهای اروپایی

[By Jan Oberg](#)

04.04.2019

NATO at 70: An unlawful organisation with serious psychological problems

By *JO* on April 2, 2019 *No Comment*



April 3, 2019

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, [NATO](#), celebrated its 70th Anniversary on April 4, 2019. Some of us don't see anything worth celebrating about an incredibly expensive, dangerous and harmful alliance which should have been closed down exactly 30 years ago.

Why 30 years ago? Because in 1989, the First Cold War in the Western sphere – Europe – between the Warsaw Pact and NATO came to an end thanks to the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact.

When that happened and the Berlin Wall came down, NATO too should have been dissolved.

Its *raison d'être* until then had always and unambiguously been the very existence of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact (which, by the way, was established 6 years *after* NATO, in May 1955) and its socialist/communist ideology.

But NATO instead continued to expand – today 29 countries of which 10 former Warsaw Pact members – against all promises about the opposite given to the last Soviet President, *Mikhail Gorbachev*. And it has caused much harm even in peacetime.

Let's look at some dimensions that will remain untold at this Anniversary.

How is NATO unlawful?

If – like this author – you believe that it is wrong and even unlawful for an organisation to ignore and violate its own treaty/statutes/laws, NATO is an [unlawful](#) alliance which systematically violates its both its preamble and treaty provisions.

I'm pretty sure that most people – including those in politics and media – have never even glanced through the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation's [treaty text](#). Since most people have also never read the [United Nations Charter](#) either, about 99% of humanity has no idea of how close the two legal documents are to each other at least when it comes to stated purposes.

Neither do they have a clue about NATO's full commitment to adhere to the UN Charter provisions. And those provisions aim at abolishing war and make peace by peaceful means and only use – UN-organised – military means as a last resort (Chapter 7) when everything civilian has been tried and found to be in vain.

Are you surprised? Then read *the NATO Treaty Preamble (my italics)*:

“The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of *the Charter of the United Nations* and their desire to live in *peace with all peoples* and all governments. They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of their peoples, founded on the principles of *democracy*, individual *liberty* and the *rule of law*.”

Article

1:

“The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved *by peaceful means* in such a manner that international *peace and security and justice* are not endangered, and to *refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force* in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.”

Article

5:

“The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in *Europe or North America* shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective *self-defence* recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations...”