

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 02:56:39 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerI cannot believe you are this stupid.

You said I cannot use the self defense reason because I cannot use wmd as something to defend against.

I simply pointed out Iraq did not need wmd to attack us. I gave an example. Which was Japan. Your lack of brains did not allow you to figure that out.

BTW, I'm not going to attempt to explain this to you again.

lol, and who's making up what stuff now? Trying, and I stress the trying part, to make me look like an idiot doesn't work when you have to pull things out of thin air like this.

I in no way EVER stated that Iraq NEEDED WMD's to attack someone with. I never even implied it. What was it that I said again? Oh yes..

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". In order for it to be construed self-defence, one thing must be present. A real and imminent danger.

Where in here did I say Iraq NEEDED to use WMD's? nowhere. Did I say Japan would use WMD's? Nope. Did I imply WMD's were the only reason someone could go to war? Nope. Did I imply that WMD's were a reason the United States used for going to war? Most certainly! Did I imply that using self-defence (as is the only legal way one Member state can attack someone) as a clause could work? Sure! Did I imply that the WMD's were not a valid reason for self-defence? Of course!

Did I imply that there were other reasons self-defence could be used as an excuse? Sure! Does that include WMD's? Yup. Does self-defence include traditional war that Japan used at Pearl Harbor? Of course!

Was there proof that Iraq was going to use traditional warfare to attack America? None!

And now the more important point I had made, that you completely missed. Is there WMD's that Iraq could use? Inconclusive. Therefore with no proof of a traditional attack, and an argument that America used to go to war including WMD's, I stated that WMD's could NOT be used as an excuse for self defence as it is inconclusive as to their existance.

What was so hard about this to understand that you had to go and make up things in an attempt to make me look bad? Are you THAT much of a sore loser?

---