

---

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

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 01:37:29 GMT

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

---

I'll let Warranto respond to the parts addressed to him.

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The tactics of appeasement are outdated in a post-9/11 world, and given the UN's inability to deal with Saddam firmly as it should have, it leads me to believe that the UN is outdated as well.

You're right, they are outdated tactics. They SHOULD be changed. But that doesn't mean that you can go around playing vigilante cop until that happens and call it "legal". Iraq should be punished for its violations of those UN resolutions, and believe me, I don't want to see Saddam back in power, but you have to understand that two wrongs do not make a right in any circumstance.

Quote:So, the war was illegal, then. Do you want Saddam back in power?

Of course not. I "want" all those in violation of the law to be punished. If Saddam is also in violation of that law, and if deemed necessary by the Security Council, he wouldn't be reinstated as president of Iraq and would be tried appropriately. But that doesn't mean that the aggressors are free of blame. Not by a long shot.

Look, you have to look at these legal situations as objectively as possible. You might not like the idea of that, but that is simply how the law works.

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?

Not if Saddam is also guilty of violation of the law.

Quote:That clause is a perfect example of how outdated the UN is.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.

Take a look at that article I posted.

Quote: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.

That's right. They were attacked by Al Qaeda, not Iraq. Therefore, under the very Charter of the

U.N. (however outdated that we can agree it is), you cannot do what you did legally in terms of their sovereignty.

---