

---

Subject: Patriotism

Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2003 07:45:36 GMT

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

---

Duke of NukesEDIT: this was directed at Blazer

we dont know of alternatives because we dont know all the information. I'll be the first to admit that there might not be another solution...other than never giving Saddam these weapons in the first place. I think you guys are forgetting a few things...Saddam was put into office by the USA...he was given chemical weapons from the USA. Bush had planned to go to war in Iraq since before he was even elected...perhaps Bush is doing the right thing...but for the wrong reasons.

you really should learn a bit about history before speaking about it.

sadaam was NOT put in office by the us. he started in power as the right hand man to the president of iraq in 1979. he then backstabbed his way into the presidency.

while we did provide some means to make chem/bio weapons, we were not the only ones supplying iraq. and, there was good reason... 1) they were fighting iran which was the greater of two evils. 2) we were in a cold war with the ussr and the mideast was one of the most important places to be. thus by helping iraq, we were bidding against the ussr for a very strategic partner. also, keep in mind that while we were courting saddam openly to his face, we were also providing help to the kurds in a bid to get rid of him because we knew he was a hitler wannabe and we would be better off without him.

al that aside, what was done in the past doesn't matter, what matters is what he has done since. just because we were once "friends"(term used loosly) doesn't mean we are obligated to bow down to this maniac now.

edit: forgot to mention, bush did not plan to go to war before he was elected. he did however campaign on the principle of putting an end to saddam's games. this is one of the many reasons i voted for him. we put up with saddam for long enough. it was time to shit or get off the pot!

---