

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 09:58:30 GMT

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

---

I'm glad that you made the only intelligent opposing post in this thread on the matter, Nukelt15.

Nukelt15Yes, 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.

I would have to agree. It's pretty apparent after the attacks of 19 March 2003 that this idea is blatantly true. But you have to understand, and I don't mean to say this to be redundant, but the people that signed the Charter to come into the U.N. agreed to those terms. I'm not talking about "authority" or morality here. I'm talking strictly on the legal sense. In fact, I know exactly where you are coming from when you say the "U.S. supercedes the U.N.", and when I see that, I'm getting the distinct idea of two recognized international policies. However, even if it went through Congress "legally" as far as the United States goes, you have to admit that it did not go through the United Nations legally. Again, if it did, please prove it instead of pulling a Nodbugger and throwing around misinformation and FOXNews generated "opinion".

Quote: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.

I would also agree that the United Nation isn't a government. It's an international organization. But, I am curious... Where in your constitution does it imply what you said? Not to disagree with you, but I would just like to see your view on the matter in better depth.

Quote: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.

Uh, I'm not sure about this one. The League of Nations was probably more blunt when they said it, but the United Nations does have the authority to "ask" its Member States to assist. Resolution 678 says:

"2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait, unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in paragraph 1 above, the above-mentioned resolutions, to use all necessary means to uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;"

Again, its not as blunt, but it does authorize Member States to go to war, if necessary. Note that resolution doesn't say that you can go to war unconditionally, Nodbugger.

Quote:Please understand that I don't like how the US governemnt 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.

Oh, I would agree with you. The fact of the matter is though, if you're going to do something like that to such a widely recognized international organization, that SEVERE international criticism will follow. And it is totally warranted, and I think you can agree with me on that given the fact that the United States (and many others) chose to disregard policies that countries such as mine were abiding to.

Quote: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-

I don't know about as far as usurping control of Iraq, but the United Nations WAS doing something about the abundance of weapons he had after the Gulf War. It is totally undeniable that Blix was actually doing something with UNMOVIC up to mere days before the Shock and Awe campaign. I posted a Quarterly Report on the matter in a previous thread, and if you want it, I'll get it again.

As far as getting Saddam out of power... Whether or not the United Nations would have done that, I don't know. There were humanitarian resolutions on the matter which may or may not have led up to authorizing states to taking him from power. It's impossible to say what would have happened nowadays, though.

As for Nodbugger: I'm sorry that you feel that way. Your misinformed, disillusioned view of the world is the reason that people like Rush Limbaugh write articles on "hatred" for America. Guess what kid, you are wrong. It has been proven time and time again and you are simply too arrogant to acknowledge anything that opposes your tunnel-like vision of the world and your president.

You think you are doing the right thing by invoking, by all definitions, terrorism on Iraq, well, I hate to break it to you, but Usama Bin Laden thought that what he was doing was good, too.

Does that mean what he did wasn't illegal? I mean, according to you, laws are only guidelines. Attacking proptery on foreign soil, causing the deaths of innocent people, and all in the name of a "just cause".

That seems to me like it can be used interchangeably with what happened on March 19th, 2003. Oh well.

At any rate, I highly suggest you rethink your opinions. Any sane person, and every sane person here has disagreed with you on these matters. My God, REPUBLICANS in this thread have disagreed with you.

---