

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 18:29:56 GMT

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

---

The main point of that argument seems to be that the US shouldn't have to pay because it has been paid many times over through other costs.

That's nice, it doesn't matter though. Unless an agreement had been made that those costs could be paid in lieu of the dues, then yes, that speech would make a compelling argument. However, to my knowledge, no such agreement has been made. Therefore that speech is a pointless argument.

Quote:OK, so let me get this straight... we should let Saddam go, punish Russia, France, and Germany's leaders for being bribed... punish the US leaders as war criminals. Yes, I see that a much better solution.

Kind of like how the DC sniper had an indictment dismissed, simply because it did not reach the court in time? He was very much guilty, and should not have been able to get off. But the law is the law, regardless of who agrees with it or not. The Administrative law was not followed, therefore, despite the fact he was most likely guilty, the indictment was dismissed.

Link

The exact same thing applies here. If the law was not followed in the removal of Saddam, he could very well be let go. Of course, as I stated, if the UN so desired, he they could arrest him right away on other crimes.

---