
Subject: Re: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 20:08:27 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Sat, 03 December 2005 04:239/11 would have happened regardless. Perhaps not when it did, and perhaps not in the form it did, but a 9/11-type attack would have happened. But yes, the involvement in the Middle East did not help that.

I mentioned 9/11 since when asked "After all this time, why attack Saddam now?", the answer people usually give is along the lines of: "9/11 changed the world and threats like Saddam can't be tolerated any more." So, I'm really just saying if 9/11 happened differently and/or at a later time, we likely wouldn't be in Iraq right at this moment.

Javaxcx wrote on Sat, 03 December 2005 10:03The big problem here is that this is simply not accurate, but the general public takes it as truth. We went through this argument ages ago, and it was concretely proven that while American soldiers did act in the Kuwait campaign, they were working under U.N. orders and as such (and affirmed by the UN itself) ought to be considered a UN army; acting under UN law and its periferals. This is especially important, seeing how America's army wasn't the only one IN Kuwait.

That being said, the Gulf War I was not between America and Iraq, it was between The United Nations (United States, Saudi Arabia, Great Britain, France, The Netherlands, Egypt, Syria, Oman, Qatar, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Israel, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Canada, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Honduras, Italy, Niger, Romania, South Korea) and Iraq. This goes further to say that a cease-fire was never made between America and Iraq, it was made between the UN and Iraq. Thus, *only* the UN has juristicion to nullify the cease-fire in the event Iraq does; not the members acting independently of both UN rulings and universally ratified international law.

I must be forgetting that argument. Can you point me to a link? I'd like to read it. Seriously, I'm not trying to be a jerk here, I would like to read over it.

That said, the UN doesn't say in its resolutions that it is at war with Iraq. UN Resolution 687, the "ceasefire" resolution, says:

Resolution 68733. Declares that, upon official notification by Iraq to the Secretary-General and to the Security Council of its acceptance of the provisions above, a formal cease-fire is effective between Iraq and Kuwait and the Member States cooperating with Kuwait in accordance with resolution 678 (1990);

The ceasefire is between Iraq on one side and Kuwait and its allies on the other side. The US was the controlling power of those allies. When the first President Bush ordered a ceasefire, the shooting stopped because the US was in charge. Actually now that I think about it, that resolution could be taken to mean there were three sides in the conflict: Iraq, Kuwait, and the Coalition.

Since it mentions resolution 678, I'll bring up the part that "authorized" the Coalition:

Resolution 6782. 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 foregoing 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;

I think it is clear that the UN considered this a conflict between Iraq and Kuwait's allies, not between Iraq and the UN. It mentions the Member States cooperating with Kuwait, not all the Member States of the UN. If Iraq was at war with the UN, all the members of the UN would be in a state of war with Iraq. I don't think this was the case.

The US was the leader of Kuwait's allies. Saddam violated the ceasefire, in part, by shooting at the US repeatedly. I don't see why the UN is the one who had to declare the ceasefire breached if it's own resolution declares the UN was not involved in the war. The principle parties involved were Iraq, Kuwait, and the US (as leader of the Coalition).
