

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 21:53:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JavaxcxNot quite. You're right about the lack thereof to govern other nations, because nations are ASKED (or warned) not told to comply with resolutions. You're also right about being free to make your own choices. However, should those choices be in violation of the law agreed to by the Member States in 1945 and onward, then at the end of the day, the act was still illegal. Illegal, of course, in terms of the international law that Member AGREED to. In 1945, quite a few people said "yeah, we'll play by these rules". Those rules are the United Nations Charter.

All of these rules can be found here: <http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/>

I trust you to have more sense than Nodbugger and read them before commenting on them.

As for the United States government superceding the United Nations. Heh. I can't agree with that. Sure, you've got the biggest guns, but you've locked the ball'n'chain around yourselves when you signed that 'contract'. The fact of the matter is, Resolution 1441 was violated by both Iraq and the United States (and in essence, all nations in the Coalition of the Willing). If the U.S. is going to call Iraq's actions against resolutions illegal, then do the same thing, but claim it not to be illegal. Well, there is a problem there.

So I'm going to ask you:

Resolution 1441 says this: "Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, Kuwait, and the neighbouring States,"

That statement runs back all the way to Resolution 686 in 1990 in terms of Iraq.

Was this commitment (you can find it in the Charter in article 2 I believe) at the end of the day upheld and implemented by the United States and the CoW as per their authority of Resolution 678? If not, then this war is illegal. If so, prove it.

You're absolutely right. I was aghast when I read that the Security Council didn't condemn this attack despite its obvious violation of 1441 and previous resolutions. It's suspicious.

Bypassing all of the ridiculous flaming...

Yes, there are rules nations are expected to follow as members of the UN. However, I think you'll find that there aren't any nations that are willing to give up authority for any decision to anyone other than their own government. Not the US, not France, nor Russia, Great Britain, China, Germany, etc. The UN is NOT a government. Any time a nation decides that the UN is not acting in their best interests, you can be damned sure they can and will look after themselves with or without support. As far as the US government is concerned, this country's interests come BEFORE those of the UN. The US constitution and the laws supporting it supercede any resolution the UN puts forth. I am far beyond certain that if you looked deep enough, you would find that your own country has the same policy.

That is the reason why the US became a member of the UN, and not the League of Nations before it- the League had the authority to tell its members whether or not they could go to war, the UN can not do that.

There is a very interesting controversy surrounding the International Court that goes along the same lines. That is not something for this thread, as it has gone off topic enough already, but I think you would find it a juicy hot topic- if you don't know about it already.

Quote:You're absolutely right. I was aghast when I read that the Security Council didn't condemn this attack despite its obvious violation of 1441 and previous resolutions. It's suspicious.

Not exactly what I was referring to. I was talking about the illegal sale of weapons to Iraq between 1991 and 2003. It's not too shocking to find out that the countries profiting from deals with Saddam were the very same ones that opposed this war.

Please understand that I don't like how the US government basically gave the UN the cold shoulder, but also understand that I am-and always will be- loyal to my own country before the UN. There probably were better ways to go about getting rid of Saddam, but it is clear(to me, at least) that the UN was never going to do a damn thing about him- especially since several members of the security council(and it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out which ones) would have profited from Saddam staying in power.

Gizbotvas~do you think we are safer now than before the war in Iraq?

~do you think there are FEWER terrorists now that we occupy Iraq?

~do you think that occupying Iraq will slow/stop Al Qaeda?

~why do YOU think we went to war, I think it was to find weapons of mass destruction, but the reasons change so often, why do YOU think we went to war in Iraq?

1. Yes. Absolutely. Why is a different issue, and it would have been the same no matter which country was invaded.

2. No. In fact, I think their numbers will only increase. However, their target priorities have changed.

3. Stop? No. But it has given some of their supporters a change of heart...several state sponsors of terror have...well, stopped sponsoring.

4. Several reasons. If you think WMD's or any moral cause was the only reason, you are sadly misinformed. Certainly, both were issues, but not the main ones- just the ones that got the most attention. The war was intended to send a message, a big fat boldface warning to anyone who would threaten the US(Bad guys beware- you could be next!). It also serves as a distraction- as long as terrorists are fighting our all-volunteer military overseas, they aren't attacking civilian targets inside the US.

---