

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 01:44:41 GMT

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

---

Quote:Nope, still no law broken.

Article 51 of the outdated UN Charter:

"Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations"

Members of a terrorist organization attacked the United States on September 11, 2001. That organization has been aided by Iraq in the past. Though it was not a direct attack, Iraq has still harbored and provided aid for known terrorists and terrorist organizations.

Nope, sorry. Iraq is not Al-Queda. Regardless of "past association", the only way this link could affect the legality of the war is if Saddam hired Al-Queda for that attack. Otherwise, that comment holds no strength whatsoever. Oh, and as an extra, to my knowledge that link wasn't announced as a reason for going to war, so it doesn't make a viable defence anyways.

Quote:It is, however, up to the United States to protect itself from outside threats of which Iraq was apart.

And we come full circle. Prove to me that Iraq was a real an imminent threat.

Quote:The UN quite frankly had no idea what Iraq was doing with its weapons of mass destruction. Saddam was and always has been playing cat-and-mouse games with the inspectors since before he kicked them out in 1998, and during the five years weapons inspectors were not present, no one had any idea what he was doing with them. He may have been dismantling them, but if he was, why wouldn't he have let anyone know about it? Why kick the inspectors out if you're doing what you're being told to do?

As you know, weapons inspectors must be present at any dismantling of any weapons of mass destruction in any country in the world. If the United States decides to dismantle a nuclear warhead, UN inspectors must be present to ensure that the weapon is dismantled properly and disposed of correctly.

Now, I ask you, if Saddam was indeed complying with the orders to dismantle his weapons of mass destruction after weapons inspectors were kicked out, why didn't he just let them back in to witness their dismantling?

Moot point. The UN released documents stating that Iraq was complying. They may have been fooled, yes, but thats the information that they presented as accurate, therefore America had no legal basis to act on it.

Quote:Wouldn't it be sort of a contradiction on your part to say you don't want Saddam put back into power even though he was removed as a result of an illegal war?

I'm not saying that I want this to happen, nor do I think that it would happen, but if it did, it would

be the proper thing to do, if not the best thing. This is exactly why Police officers have strict guidelines when arresting someone. If they are not adhered to, the person arrested could be let go. The same thing applies here. If the UN actually decided to investigate and rule on this matter (they won't, but just as an example), Saddam could be let go. Forcefully returned to power is another thing though.

Edit: to clarify, letting Saddam go would be the proper thing to do. It would NOT be the best thing to do. -just if there was any misconception in the wording-

Edit 2:

(19:46:52) Carbon-12: What if Saddam was also guilty of violation of those resolutions?

>warranto: that would be delt with seperatly. In regards to him being removed via the war, the administrative law part was done incorrectly.

(19:48:06) @warranto: it would probably be, America lets him go, and the UN arrests him right after

Hopefully that fixes the understanding.

Quote:Why, then, doesn't the world stand firmly when dealing with countries like Iraq who, as you say, is "guilty of many charges" and a threat to the world peace?

This can be explained by something I call hte "good guy-Bad guy" factor. When the publically viewed "Bad guy" does something bad it is expected of him, and therefor doesn't generate much public outcry (compared to what I'm going to explain next). The good guy, however, is expected to be good. So when the "good guy" does something bad, it is not expected of him, and the public outcry is extensive.

Remeber though, this does not express the belief of individual people, just the collective.

---