

---

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 04:00:07 GMT

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

---

hydra1945If you're so worried about "international law," why aren't you as angry at Iraq for disobeying numerous U.N. resolutions and playing footsie with weapons inspectors for 12 years? You're willing to forget all the bad and illegal things Saddam's regime committed in an attempt to weaken the legitimacy of the Iraq war.

See, this is a neglectful problem on your part, and many pro-war types; especially on these forums. Warranto, AND myself have already stated that Iraq is in violation of international law. We have already conceded to the fact many times over many threads that Iraq is guilty of many charges. Since the majority of us here and around the world are probably in agreement on that issue as well, it really doesn't need to be brought up time and time again. When people such as yourself turn the focus of an argument off the people in question (in this case, the coalition), and back onto Iraq with the "Well he started it!" theorem, it does nothing but weaken your stance because, well, it simply means you can't defend yourself with anything else. I'd expect Nodbugger and his ilk to do something like that, but not you.

Quote:You're attempting to weaken the force that is trying to remove Saddam. Therefore, you're defending him.

Now here is another problem. It is not defending Saddam to say "You got him, good. You did it the wrong way, though." Remember chief, you can do the right thing the wrong way.

Quote:Something else to think about: If Saddam's removal was "illegal," then the U.N. has an obligation to place him back in power.

That is a very good point. Although, it does not deem the act legal. Especially when you have major figureheads of the U.N. (Like Kofi Annan) calling the war illegal. Let me be perfectly blunt: the U.N. is a farce. I can only suggest the coalition hasn't been reprimanded because it suits the U.N. to be on good terms with America and the United Kingdom. Again, and make sure you understand this: This does NOT deem the act legal.

Quote:America broke no law when it invaded Iraq as a protection of its own national security. Terrorism is a very real threat. Iraq has had a history of aiding terrorists.

For the first part of that: There are several threads in this forum discussing and proving that America had absolutely no authority to invade Iraq under any U.N. resolution. In fact, because of key statements in resolution 1441 and like like, the coalition's actions can be deemed illegal for violation of Article 2 of the charter, and the commitment to the sovereignty of Iraq which was violated and manipulated for a time.

There is one possible way to justify the war, however. The whole "self-defence" schpiel at the U.N. For some insight onto that clause, take a look at this.

Find some evidence that Iraq was indeed branded and considered an imminent threat, not simply a threat that can escalate to imminent-- because that logic would allow you to attack any one in

the world for any reason. It would also legally allow places like North Korea or Iraq (former) or Iran to blast the fuck out of the west because they figure America to be a threat that might become terminal.

If you cannot, then the self-defence clause may not be used, and that can only go further to appeal to the idea that you did the right thing the wrong way.

Quote:If anything, America was enforcing the law Saddam broke.

As long as you are a Member State, you do not have the legal authority to do that at your whims. Don't like it? Pay the U.N. the fees you never bothered to pay for the last little while, and get out.

---