
Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 00:22:26 GMT

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

You posted a link with Putins statement? I must have missed it... perhaps you could quote the post again?

Did I glance over your post? nope.. this is what it said.

Quote:Japan did not need wmd to attack us. To assume the only why to attack is is wmd is just stupid.

I never stated anything similar to this, as I mentioned in my previous post.

Exactly, you said that in order for the attack to be done in self defence, America had to be in real and imminant danger (so absolute proof an attack will take place, not an assumption that some time in the future something may happen).

You had no proof of WMD's as I said, regardless of if they existed or not, regardless of if they could have been hid or not, there was no proof. Therefor using it as a delf-defence clause does not work. What did I say about using this as a defence now? Oh yes, it's pointless, but you decided to use it anyways.

Did You ever mention that "Japan did not need wmd to attack us". Never, at least until you pulled it out of thin air trying to destroy my credibility. So not knowing what you yourself writes is pretty bad in itself.

Quote: If you knew pearl harbor was going to happen would you say we couldn't attack Japan until they attack us? HELL NO! nobody is that fucking stupid to wait until they get hit to strike.

Any mention of WMD's? nope

so I said;

Quote:Sure, you have the right to defend yourself from danger, however there was no threat of danger. You yourself said there was no real proof for or against the existance of WMD's, so that excuse is not valid as "self defence".

Any reference to Japan having WMD's there? Nope, once again, no mention of that.

Then you respond;

Quote:Japan did not need wmd to attack us. To assume the only why to attack is is wmd is just stupid.

Making up something about me saying Japan needed WMD's to attack, when no sort of implication was there.
