

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 04 Dec 2005 16:59:00 GMT

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

---

Ah, I see. THAT's where the mix up was.

You're partially correct then. I did mean that the UN is in charge, as the governing body of the resolution at least, however, the only parties affected by the resolution were those who took part in the war.

In short the Resolution was between the UN Member States involved in the war (with the UN as the body that governs them), Iraq, and Kuwait. It was a UN resolution, and only the UN has the power to say when it has been broken.

You compared the UN to judges, and that is an adequate comparison. However, your inference of what the UN did (as judges) was a little off. The UN did settle the dispute, by setting out a Resolution (or, to keep the comparison the same, a judgment). A judgment can be effected by the winning side, but it can not be acted on by the winning side if the benefiting party feels that the other side is not abiding by the judgment. If a dispute arises out of one side not abiding by the terms of the judgment, the party that wishes to act on that must first return to someone for instructions. In the legal system, this would simply be a lawyer/collection agency. With UN Resolutions, the only place to go is back to the UN for assistance with enforcing the judgment/resolution.

A Judge can only make the ruling/mediation. But the individuals do not have any authority in dealing with someone who does not adhere to the ruling without involving the system that gave said ruling.

---