
Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 22:24:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NodbuggerI didn't think someone this stupid could exist.

You're here. I'm just as surprised as you are.

Quote:1. Tell me where the UN has said it is illegal, not where you say it is. The UN. Where have they said it?

Lets see here... where in the UN does it say that invading another member state without authorization is illegal? Lets see... OH! The charter you never read!

The Charter of the United Nations, Chapter VII, Article 39:

"The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Looks to me that the Security Council decides the measures that will be taken. Not the United States.

Article 41:

"The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations."

And Article 42:

"Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations."

Looks to me that Article 41 & 42 give the power of authorization to the Security Council! Not the United States!

Article 43:

"All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities,

including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

This one says that you need to pass vital data through the Security Council through a "special agreement". Then the Security Council decides how many forces are to be deployed... and where! Then these agreements are negotiated between the Security Council and the Member States. Hmm... Maybe there is a typo, but I don't see "You may invade a member nation on pre-emptive circumstances without the authorization of the Security Council."

I really like this one: Article 46

"Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee."

Pretty self explanatory. Application of armed force is made by the security council, not the United States.

Article 48

"The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

Such decisions shall be carried out by the Members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members."

This one says that the Security Council makes a decision, and the member states are the ones who carry it out. I don't know about the rest of society, but I sure as hell don't remember the Security Council saying "Iraq is to be invaded."

Oh, I like this one the most:

"HAVE RESOLVED TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS TO ACCOMPLISH THESE AIMS
Accordingly, our respective Governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations."

Now lets take a look at Resolution 1441, shall we?

"Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, Kuwait, and the neighbouring States,"

Do you remember a resolution before March 19th, 2003 saying that this commitment may be disregarded? I don't. And likely neither will any other sane person.

Now lets look at what happened, shall we? In fact, lets jump to March 17th, 2003.

The President gives a speech announcing that Saddam Hussein must leave Iraq in 48 hours or a military conflict will break out. Your president states:

"For the last four and a half months, the United States and our allies have worked within the Security Council to enforce that council's longstanding demands. Yet some permanent members of the Security Council have publicly announced that they will veto any resolution that compels the disarmament of Iraq."

This resolution was debated on two days after this speech.
The results of this debate can be viewed here:

Results of the resolution debate on March 19th, 2003 in terms of the Iraqi-Kuwait situation

Note that debate wasn't on whether the US is allowed to invade or not. It was a debate on the resolution to allow any invasion into Iraq. The resolution failed. The vote on it was objected to by MANY member states:

Lets see... I'm not going to paste the entire statement from each nation mentioned that objected to the war, but I'll paste the name of the nation and give you the URL to the file so you can read it yourself. Even though I know you won't:

JOSCHKA FISCHER, Deputy Chancellor and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany.

DOMINIQUE DE VILLEPIN, Minister for Foreign Affairs of France

IGOR S. IVANOV, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation

FAROUK AL-SHARA', Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Syria

MUNIR AKRAM (Pakistan)

ADOLFO AGUILAR ZINSER (Mexico)

WANG YINGFAN (China)

MOHAMMED ALDOURI (Iraq)

The Press conference may be viewed here.

The Meeting Record may be viewed here.

At the end of the Press Release:

"Secretary-General KOFI ANNAN fully shared the regrets expressed by many Council members at the fact that it had not been possible to reach a common position. "Whatever our differing views on this complex issue, we must all feel that this is a sad day for the United Nations and the

disappointment, and were deeply alarmed by the prospect of imminent war. He paid tribute to the United Nations staff, both international and Iraqi, who had worked so hard in Iraq up to the last possible moment. That included the inspectors, whose work had now sadly been suspended."

At no point does it give the United States authorization to go into Iraq. At NO point in those documents does it say "You may act upon the warning issued in Resolution 1441". And at NO point does it say "You may act on the cease-fire from resolution 687". The very fact that the United States DID act despite their lack of authorization proves that it was ILLEGAL.

Quote:2. The speeches say we are going to liberate and Free the Iraqi people.

Those speeches say that America is going to Iraq to disarm the WMD that were thought to be there. At no point does it say "we are going to Iraq for the reason to liberate the people".

In fact, if Bush DID say that, then the war would still be illegal. Resolution 1441 says:

"Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, Kuwait, and the neighbouring States,"

Liberation would therefore be illegal since it was not authorized by the UN, and this commitment was never suspended.

Quote:He says he wants yo liberate the Iraqi people

Actually, he says: (This is when he begins to address the issue of liberation as a repercussion of invading Iraq)

"As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free."

That VERY word: "AS". That word implies that Liberation is a side-effect. "As this is happening, this will happen". NOT a reason. You've perverted literacy, now cut it out.

Quote:3. You are a hypocrite and need to shut up.

WARNING: IRONY

Remember kid, you were the one who said he wouldn't be arguing anymore. Twice now. And twice, you've replied in argument.

Quote:you say the way we did it was bad.

Anything that is against the law is inherently wrong. Ever hear the saying: "The road to hell is paved with good intention"?

Quote:Well Mr. I know everything...how do you suggest we would do it?

I would trust the UN to deal with the situation as they have been. The Quarterly report I posted a while back was evidence that Saddam's weapons were being destroyed. In fact, they were reported to be disarming up to March 18th, 2003, when the inspectors were whisked out of the nation for their own safety. I know you didn't read that report, otherwise you wouldn't be arguing this. I certainly wouldn't have sent thousands of fathers, mothers, and children to war on the SHAKEY PRETENSE that Saddam had stockpiles of weapons. Which, by the way, turned out to be false. Whoops!

I completely agree with the Russian Federation's resolve to the issue. You can find it in the links I've provided.

Quote:4. The UN did not vote and at this moment in time they are not saying it is illegal. Only people who are not the UN are saying it was illegal. If the UN won't say it then it isn't. Simple as that.

Ho boy, where do I begin with THIS one. After I stop laughing at your total ignorance, I suggest you read those links I've provided. There was a debate on the issue of Iraq, and the vote was inconclusive. THAT DOES NOT EQUATE TO "YOU MAY INVADE IRAQ".

And another thing: Are you trying to say "It's not illegal if you don't get caught"? Because that's what I got from that statement.

Quote:5. Congress can go around what ever they want. the UN does not rule the US. Like I said before, the US does not need a permission slip to defend itself.

Congress can do whatever they want legally within the United States. They have no authority in international dealing with invasion of a member state of the United Nations. You gave up that "freedom" when your country signed the Charter of the United Nations. Don't like it? Get out.

[quote]6.I do not care what documents say.[/url]

LOL. I think that summed up your credibility.

Quote:They never said it was illegal so it isn't illegal.

Well, after reading the charter and the resolutions, it is.

Quote:7.Well you are an idiot for not doing anything. Some people can;t wait for the police. Every time you see on TV about someone that stopped a murder or robbery. You are against people acting by themselves. you are an idiot if you believe.

Who said I would do nothing? I surely didn't. You, on the other hand, have put words in my mouth again. They're misconstrued and you don't know what they mean. I don't want them in my mouth.

I still think you don't understand what vigilante justice is. It is ILLEGAL. It still has a good outcome in many cases, but it is nonetheless ILLEGAL.

Quote:Stay in Canada. Man I can;t wait for Canada to blow up. You are a bunch of idiots up there.

Keep this kind of talk up, and I'll personally see to your banning from these forums.

Quote:8. The result of the war was the reason to go to war.

The result of this war is that the Iraqi people are free from Saddam, who is now in custody, and that no weapons of mass destruction have been found. That is not the same thing as a reason. Read the definitions again.

Quote:If it was not a fucking reason why did he mention it so many times?

Are you forgetting that he said that the Iraqi people can see the text in Iraq? He mentions the repercussion of their war being the freedom of the Iraqi people. That is not a reason.

Quote:If it was not a reason why is so much energy focused on it?

You're just being stupid again, right? Did you even see the pictures of Iraq after the Shock and Awe campaign? Can you imagine the turmoil the United States would be in if they just left Iraq the way it was?

Quote:Ya, jackass. He was not elected. He was a successor. now go die.

Go look up the definition of consensus. Oh, you're still wrong.

Quote:10. I am totally correct about the constitution. If Crimson wanted to ban you she could. If you were babbling outside a store the owner can force you to leave. a private citizen can stop another private citizens free speech. The government cannot.

Your government does not have the "right" to impress the constitution, or the rights and freedoms of your constitution on people that are not American citizens. If it does, please, point it out to me.

Quote: Have you ever even talked to American soldier, do me a favor...never talk on their behalf again.

I've talked to Kirby on a regular basis. From what I gather with him, he doesn't agree with this war. That's all I need to know. I for one, support the troops who are risking their lives for their country. I do not support the man sending them away illegally. This is something you seem to have confused.

Quote:12. No Bush is not a terrorist. Saddam is a terrorist. Osama is a terrorist. You are a jackass for even attempting to compare them.

I think Viper said it best, but I'll add to it:

"What would you call someone who unlawfully goes into someone else's country and blows stuff up?"

Quote:13. the means...congress voted. We kept our own sovereignty and Iraq is free. The UN isn't complaining only jackasses like you. I don't see where I am wrong.

Iraq lost its sovereignty when Saddam was captured. That in itself is a violation of Resolution 1441. I don't understand where you're supposed to be going with this point.

Quote:14. Where does it say we cannot start up the cease-fire?

I have a better question: Where does it say you CAN start up the cease-fire. Seems to me that charter says you can't, though.

Quote:5. I don't watch CNN.

Good. Now stop watching FOXnews. That's far worse.

Quote:I listen to people that have actually been to Iraq.

I listen to the people making the decisions. I also listen to the law.

Quote:The people who have suffered. The people are happy. The Iraqis that are very Happy about this.

WARNING: MORALITY VERSUS LEGALITY CONFLICT

Guess what champ, you can't always legally do what you think is right.
