

---

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 04 Dec 2005 18:56:12 GMT

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

---

I use the judge analogy a little loosely though, since a judge can turn to the executive branch of the government to enforce a judgment, and the UN doesn't really have a force to turn to that enforces its resolutions. Enforcement is basically left to the involved parties.

Ok, for the sake of argument, let's say you're right in that the ceasefire resolution was ultimately under the authority of the UN. The UN later passed resolution 1441, part of which stated:

Resolution 1441. Decides that Iraq has been and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant resolutions, including resolution 687 (1991), in particular through Iraq's failure to cooperate with United Nations inspectors and the IAEA, and to complete the actions required under paragraphs 8 to 13 of resolution 687 (1991);

The UN did declare Iraq to have breached the ceasefire agreement (resolution 687). So Saddam breached UN resolutions by invading and occupying Kuwait, and then he breached them again in violating the ceasefire agreement. The UN declared both these things, which leaves Saddam at fault for the current situation. The only way the US would be at fault is if the UN passed a resolution declaring the US in breach of the ceasefire for invading Iraq in response to Saddam's breach of the ceasefire. I'm unaware of such a resolution being passed, or even if such a resolution is possible. Wouldn't a resolution like that require the approval of the five permanent members of the security council (America, Britain, China, France and Russia)? If that's the case, the five permanent members are essentially "above the law" when it comes to UN resolutions.

---