

---

Subject: Ring of Evil

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 18 Feb 2005 18:40:11 GMT

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

---

AircraftkillerQuote:It doesn't matter if no one else follows the law, the law is still there. The ineffectiveness of it poses no relevance to it being there, and whether or not it is broken.

So what your argument now boils down to is that even if the law is useless, unable to be enforced, and not something you have to follow... Why is it a law, and why are you harping about it?

Again, your argument has no substance to it. If you don't enforce a law and make it useful, it won't be credible. It's the same logic behind copyright infringement.

And don't say "no one cares" because you obviously do. Our care, or lack thereof, of the "international law" you so diligently subscribe to shows that you're upset that we refuse to abide by something that can't be enforced. If the UN calls it illegal, then they'll do something about it. But until then I kindly invite both you and Java to shut the fuck up about it and actually argue a real point.

What we're trying to say is that if a law can't be enforced, it wouldn't matter anyway because there'd be no reason to have the law to begin with... EVEN IF we were fucking held to this "international law" you keep bitching about. But since we obviously aren't, you telling us about that is like SuperFlyingFungallInfection telling us that Germany can imprison Donald Rumsfeld for war crimes.

Does it matter if they can? Yes, and only if he goes to Germany. Does it matter if something "can" be done about the supposed violation of "international law"? Yes, and only if the nations that created it plan to do something about it. Otherwise it's invalid and holds no ground.

And yes, he contradicted himself. He tells someone not to whine, but whines anyway. That is a contradiction.

The law may be unenforced. useless, whatever. It doesn't matter. The law IS STILL there. A law not willing to be enforced does not automatically invalidate it. In order for a law to be "no more", it must be rescinded by the government body that brought it into existence.

Point in context: Supposedly In Oblong, Illinois, it's punishable by law to make love while hunting or fishing on your wedding day. I can't vouch for the validity of this, but the point is the same. If this is done, the law has been broken. It may not be enforced, but the law IS STILL there until the government removes it.

Nodbugger has it right. UN Laws = Jaywalking. But guess what? Jaywalking is still breaking the law even if it won't be enforced.

I AM NOT saying that America should/will/is going to be punished. All I am saying is that the law is there, and that law has been broken. That's it. That's where the point stops.

And no, a contradiction is expressing two opposing view points. NOT saying one thing is bad, then

doing it yourself as there is no discrepancy with the facts (It's still "bad", regardless of who does it). That's called hypocrisy, not a contradiction.

---