

---

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 03:36:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I've already stated that the international law that was created, signed, and ratified by all these nations including the United States was utterly powerless.

You're contending that that nullifies it's validity as a law. And it simply does not for the reason that your nation already AGREED to it being a law.

Yes, it is true that your own national laws often conflict with what the international law says you can and can't do, but that doesn't matter. National laws (as stated by the U.N. themselves) are all good and fine as long as they do not violate a given set of rules. That is the international law you agreed to. It ALSO says that your national laws do not hold legality when applied to other nations unless sanctioned by the international "Congress" if you were. You AGREED to this. The argument from this point, as you have already been a part of many times, is the fine combing of those damn resolutions. If you want to go into this again, fine. I'm game for it. But I predict we'll be right back at this argument again when you cannot rebuttal counter-evidence.

The existentialist reasoning here would support your argument saying that no such law that can be enforced is valid. But I'm not, nor would put much faith into that reasoning... ever. I could go through hundreds, THOUSANDS of analogies and logistics as to why this is a poor RATIONAL way of thinking, but I trust that you're smart enough to figure that out yourself.

What it dumbs down to is, you say you'll do somethings, and won't do some other things. Then you did some of those things you said you wouldn't do. In context, this is why the validation on anything EXCEPT a moral ground is flawed.

---