
Subject: eggmac the pacifist

Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Wed, 19 Mar 2003 23:50:55 GMT

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

Commando no. 448 We should condense this topic to point form and make a review with the counter arguments.

I.E. Kirby's claims:

Point
Counters

Point
Counters

That way we can keep track of it in a manner similar to that of a debate. If this isn't done when I go on the computer next I will do it myself.

Now back to my sniper shots at points.

Ok earlier in the topic I noticed that someone claimed Saddam support the French leader's party and thus France is no longer impartial. Yet Bush and less than impartial himself. His father went to war with Iraq and stopped before going into Baghdad and taking out Saddam. How do you know Bush isn't trying to "finish" his father's war? I find that anything but impartial in the matter. [list] his "father's war" was finished. bush senior did what he set out to do, push sadaam back and let the un disarm him. it was the un that did not finish what it started. gw bush is an independent man who rose to power because of his own ideals and accomplishments, not because he was a president's son. otherwise, we would have many presidents and sons filling the whitehouse. if anything, being bush's son hurt his chances rather than helped because of perceptions that bush senior was ineffectual as a leader (perceptions that i do not share) of course political connections gained by bush senior's years in the whitehouse helped gw gain the whitehouse, but those connections would have meant nothing if gw did not have the qualifications on his own. everyone who has gained the whitehouse since the beginning of the country has relied on their "connections" to help them get there but bottom line, it is the people who decide.
