Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?
Posted by Hydra on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 01:22:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

SuperFlyingEngiNo, no, the U.S. sent the inspectors a notice to get out a few days before the invasion.
You're taking information we learned three days ago and applying it to a situation two years ago. We didn't know Saddam didn't have any weapons of mass destruction because he still wasn't letting weapons inspectors into his country.

Bush didn't lie since he didn't know the information we had learned three days ago (keyword: days) a year and a half ago (keyword: year).

warrantoOnly one thing wrong with the first part. International Law was broken. If you search, you can find mulitple threads where this was proven.
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Article 51 of the outdated UN Charter: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.

The world has changed since 1945 when the UN Charter was signed, and I have yet to see any amendments made to update it to the twenty-first century. The appeasement tactics of old do not work anymore (I don't they have ever worked, come to think of it).

Islamic terrorism is the threat, here, and there is no section in the UN charter to my knowledge that refers to an international threat such as this. Any nation that contributes to that threat is a threat as well and must be dealt with harshly, something the UN isn't prepared to do.

Quote:Regardless of the UNs inaction, it is not up to America to police (I took the liberty of correcting that for you) the world.
It is, however, up to the United States to protect itself from outside threats of which Iraq was apart.

Quote:The point I was tring to make is that future action, because they are not known, can not be used to explain the actions of someone. The ONLY way that something can be acted on before the act occurs is if actions are taken by the suspected to ensure the act is completed. According to the UN, Iraq was, albeit slowely, getting rid of the weapons it was told to get rid of.
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?

Common sense tells you that something just doesn't add up here.

Quote:I appologise.
Accepted.

JavaxcxSee, this is a neglectful problem on your part, and many pro-war types; especially on these forums. Warranto, AND myself have already stated that Iraq is in violation of international law. We have already conceded to the fact many times over many threads that Iraq is guilty of many charges. Since the majority of us here and around the world are probably in agreement on that issue as well, it really doesn't need to be brought up time and time again.
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? The UN has allowed the situation in Iraq to escalate and worsen for twelve years by using simple appeasement tactics, and 9/11 should have been a wake-up call to the world that says even the most powerful nation in the world can fall victim to a horrendous terrorist attack.

The tactics of appeasement are outdated in a post-9/11 world, and given the UN's inability to deal with Saddam firmly as it should have, it leads me to believe that the UN is outdated as well.

Quote:When people such as yourself turn the focus of an argument off the people in question (in this case, the coalition), and back onto Iraq with the "Well he started it!" theorm, it does nothing but weaken your stance because, well, it simply means you can't defend yourself with anything else.
I addressed this point earlier in this post. Moving on....

Quote:I'd expect Nodbugger and his ilk to do something like that, but not you.
I'm flattered you have such high expectations of me.

(j/k)

Quote:That is a very good point. Although, it does not deem the act legal. Especially when you have major figureheads of the U.N. (Like Kofi Annan) calling the war illegal.
So, the war was illegal, then. Do you want Saddam back in power?

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?

Quote:Let me be perfectly blunt: the U.N. is a farce.
Holy crap! We agree on something!

Quote:I can only suggest the coalition hasn't been repremended because it suits the U.N. to be on good terms with America and the United Kingdom.
Probably because it doesn't want to lose the majority of its funding.

Quote:There is one possible way to justify the war, however. The whole "self-defence" schpiel at the U.N.
That clause is a perfect example of how outdated the UN is. It basically says a country has to wait to be attacked before it can take the necessary action to prevent that attack. During a time when that attack can appear in the form of a mushroom cloud in Madison Square Garden at New Year's Eve, that clause has little to do with today's world.

With that aside, though, the United States was attacked not by a single country but by an international force that has the support of many other countries around the world and will stop at nothing to see the United States and its allies completely and utterly destroyed.

Such a force is not addressed in the UN Charter.

Quote:Pay the U.N. the fees you never bothered to pay for the last little while, and get out.
We have been providing more than 85% of the total funds the UN uses to operate and carry out its actions around the world. I agree with the latter point, though.

A little sidenote: I realize I got a bit too carried away in my earlier posts and came off as overly aggressive, and for that I apologize.
