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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 04 Dec 2005 00:54:44 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Sat, 03 December 2005 18:00 Notice that the Resolution says "Member States". Meaning that at that point in time they were being represented as the UN members involved in the war, and not the individual countries themselves. This is why, ultimately, the UN has/had the controlling factor in what to do with Iraq, and not the individual countries. It doesn't just say Member States. It says Member States cooperating with Kuwait. That part of the resolution is referring to the countries that were involved in the conflict that also happened to be members of the UN as well. It would have said "all states", or "all member states" if the UN itself was party to the conflict. There are points in the resolution where the phrase "all States" is used. For example:

Resolution 68724. Decides that, in accordance with resolution 661 (1990) and subsequent related resolutions and until a further decision is taken by the Security Council, all States shall continue to prevent the sale or supply, or the promotion or facilitation of such sale or supply, to Iraq by their nationals, or from their territories or using their flag vessels or aircraft
(Note: I snipped out the specifics of what sales were outlawed)

Here the UN agreed all countries have to comply with an embargo on Iraq. Even though it says "all states" had to comply with this, it never says "all states" were involved in the hostilities. The UN itself probably isn't even a part of this provision, as it is not a state unto itself. As I quoted before, at the end of the resolution it says Iraq, Kuwait, and Kuwait's allies are the parties of the conflict.

In the original "use of force" authorization it had this to say about all other states:

Resolution 6783. Requests all States to provide appropriate support for the actions undertaken in pursuance of paragraph 2 of the present resolution;

The UN made a request that everyone support the countries who were authorized to attack Iraq. This is separate though from the actual use of force by those involved countries. Paragraph 2 would have authorized all members to use force, or the UN itself to use force, if the UN was a party to the conflict. All the authorization really did was say that Kuwait's allies were free from UN obligations as of a certain date. The UN never authorized itself to attack Iraq, it agreed that using force was justified. The resolution essentially says the UN "washed its hands of the situation" and let the involved parties do what they wanted to.
