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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 12 Oct 2004 04:28:28 GMT

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

No, I read that part. Only a portion has been credited for it, not all of it. Meaning that, yes, money paid towards the UN may be accredited could be in lieu of UN dues. The only thing is, is that it does not automatically mean EVERY due has some money attributed to it. Going again, towards what I said about an agreement being made.

This section of that paragraph explains it; important parts being bolded.

Quote: that if we spend money on an authorized U.N. peacekeeping activity that those monies that we have spent there are in lieu of dues; that is, they could replace dues. They only did that, though, with \$1.8 billion. There is about another \$17 billion that is still out there that we have received no credit for."

Now, yes that also implies there is \$17 billion not accounted for, but as it is, only a portion has been put towards UN dues. Something like this has the ability to continue in the future (expences being put towards dues), but unless an arrangement has been made, it doesn't HAVE to (of course, this won't prevent America from rightfully assuming it will).

In the case of a disagreement in that with America and the UN, there is always acourt to figure out the specifics.
