
Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 10 Jun 2004 18:51:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.michaelmoorehatesamerica.com>

http://www.michaelmoorehatesamerica.com/video/newTrailer_lrg.wmv

And he has a way of not telling the whole story... *shock*

<http://www.startribune.com/stories/587/4810977.html>

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 10 Jun 2004 19:06:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sigh.

NEVER give a camera interview without a witness to verify your statements.

K9, remember when they issued that order not to speak about the Iraq war (#1) because leftists were deleting parts and making it look like the military was unhappy with president Bush?

Grr..

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 10 Jun 2004 20:03:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yup.

I got in trouble once for telling a reporter on camera to, "Get the fuck out of my face before you get hurt". My CO wasn't impressed. It may be what prevented me from hitting E-6

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 11 Jun 2004 02:48:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I like <http://www.bowlingfortruth.com> -- I spent a good part of the day reading up on what a fuckhead Michael Moore is.

I can't bend my head around his logic.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sat, 12 Jun 2004 03:36:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And I supposed your never spent a part of your day listening to what he says because... Well, because.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 12 Jun 2004 19:07:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because I instead spent it on a site that shows all his lies. Now if I ever hear what that idiot has to say I can just laugh at the presentation.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sat, 12 Jun 2004 20:19:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And how can you tell if they're lies or not? Simple, because like the majority of Americans, you don't know.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 12 Jun 2004 20:45:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AprimeAnd how can you tell if they're lies or not? Simple, because like the majority of Americans, you don't know.

And you are the all knowing Canadian God?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [liberator](#) on Sat, 12 Jun 2004 22:12:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The problem is he passes his crap off as fact when in truth it is opinion dressed in out of context statements to make it look like fact.

Michael Moore does not make Documentaries. Documentaries are films that tell of actual events. Mr. Moore's film have a very divisive political bent to them along the lines of "America's Sucks, I hate it, and here's why you should too".

Next to true documentary makers he's a joke.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [bigejoe14](#) on Sun, 13 Jun 2004 00:20:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.campchaos.com/show.php?iID=856>

More Michael Moore humor.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sun, 13 Jun 2004 01:23:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Alright, after two days of looking at Micheal's stuff and the so called "anti-Micheal Moore" stuff, I can tell that some of the stuff he says his infact true, but the rest is not, it's impossible to agree with everything both sides say.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Cebt](#) on Sun, 13 Jun 2004 01:58:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CrimsonBecause I instead spent it on a site that shows all his lies. Now if I ever hear what that idiot has to say I can just laugh at the presentation.

the same lies as bush and powell told UN about their socalled "proof" that iraq had weapons of mass destruction? and that was prooved by a examination of their prociedures(cant remeber the correct spelling) before the war and was shown in 60 minutes, for once the aluminum cylinders that was supposed to be used for nuclear weapons could never have been used for any type of mass destruction's weapon only for normal iraqi missiles

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 13 Jun 2004 02:17:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CebtCrimsonBecause I instead spent it on a site that shows all his lies. Now if I ever hear what that idiot has to say I can just laugh at the presentation.

the same lies as bush and powell told UN about their socalled "proof" that iraq had weapons of mass destruction? and that was prooved by a examination of their prociedures(cant remeber the correct spelling) before the war and was shown in 60 minutes, for once the aluminum cylinders that was supposed to be used for nuclear weapons could never have been used for any type of mass destruction's weapon only for normal iraqi missiles

<http://ap.tbo.com/ap/breaking/MGB3C459AVD.html>
http://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/breaking_1.html

You didn't hear about them? Oh ya, that is the liberal media for ya!

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Sun, 13 Jun 2004 08:57:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So they found remnants of stuff that could be used to make WMD's, but might as well not...the articles doesn't say how old those engine parts were, btw, I'd like to know that.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 13 Jun 2004 21:46:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How do I know who's telling the truth? Because the anti-Michael Moore sites have factual information. If Michael Moore conveniently edits a speech, the anti-MM site digs up a transcript of the speech and you can clearly see where he eliminated most of the speech to change its intended meaning. And that's just one example. It's not that I 'believe' the anti-MM site... they present the facts logically.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 02:22:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nodbugger
<http://ap.tbo.com/ap/breaking/MGB3C459AVD.html>
http://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/breaking_1.html

I've said it before, and I'll say it again:
WARNING: SCRAP METAL ALERT.

One site says Saddam COULD have shipped out WMD components, the other says he did for certain. Since the latter hasn't shown any conclusive proof outside saying:

"The United Nations has determined that Saddam Hussein shipped weapons of mass destruction components as well as medium-range ballistic missiles before, during and after the U.S.-led war against Iraq in 2003."

and

"The briefing contained satellite photographs that demonstrated the speed with which Saddam dismantled his missile and WMD sites before and during the war."

I could very easily spam this kind of information online to justify my war, too. I don't know if the World Tribune is Republican or not, but if it is, I'm not surprised.

The former site says:

"UNITED NATIONS (AP) - U.N. weapons experts have found 20 engines used in banned Iraqi missiles in a Jordan scrapyard along with other equipment which could be used to make weapons of mass destruction, an official said Wednesday."

If they're going to pull the hypothetical card, I'm going to say that he might NOT have made weapons of mass destruction too.

Please note that I'm not condoning Saddam Hussien. I'm approaching this war extremely objectively.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [liberator](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 03:35:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't actually dislike Mr. Moore, I don't like him either but that is beside the point. His method of attracting attention to himself for his self aggrandizement is pathetic. He is nothing but a tool for the Left in America and Abroad.

It makes sense when you think about it.

The Left considers America to be the focus of evil in the modern world, no matter what it is, it's America's fault.

The Ozone Hole in Antartica?

The Left: It the dirty American's fault. They drive SUVs and pollute.

In actuality, as science is proving, the hole in the ozone layer is a natural effect and is part of the cyclical nature of the Earth's atmosphere.

Global Warming?

The Left: It the dirty American's fault. They drive SUVs and pollute.

In actuality, as science is proving, the hole in the ozone layer is a natural effect and is part of the cyclical nature of the Earth's biosphere.

The War in Iraq?

The Left: It's America's fault! Hussein is as pure as the wind driven snow.

In truth, as an American, I can say(with a degree of sadness) that Bush may have mislead us when he claimed WMDs in Iraq. But, I look at it like this.

1. We(The USA) are finishing what we should have finished a decade ago in the Gulf War.
2. He(Bush) was made aware of something that precipitated the war and cannot tell the Public without either A) endangering a larger segment of the population or B)would embarrass one of our

allies.(the Food for Oil scandal at the UN anyone?)

3. It's part of a longer term operation to eliminate Islamic Theocracies in the middle east and thus remove a large portion of the support for international Terror Groups and eventually create a more permanent peace.

The governance of a free nation must be secular to fulfill its obligations to its citizens equally. However, Leaders of said governances must have a strong foundation in ethics and morality that comes from religion to lead well.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 06:52:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxNodbugger
<http://ap.tbo.com/ap/breaking/MGB3C459AVD.html>
http://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/breaking_1.html

I've said it before, and I'll say it again:
WARNING: SCRAP METAL ALERT.

One site says Saddam COULD have shipped out WMD components, the other says he did for certain. Since the latter hasn't shown any conclusive proof outside saying:

"The United Nations has determined that Saddam Hussein shipped weapons of mass destruction components as well as medium-range ballistic missiles before, during and after the U.S.-led war against Iraq in 2003."

and

"The briefing contained satellite photographs that demonstrated the speed with which Saddam dismantled his missile and WMD sites before and during the war."

I could very easily spam this kind of information online to justify my war, too. I don't know if the World Tribune is Republican or not, but if it is, I'm not surprised.

The former site says:

"UNITED NATIONS (AP) - U.N. weapons experts have found 20 engines used in banned Iraqi missiles in a Jordan scrapyards along with other equipment which could be used to make weapons of mass destruction, an official said Wednesday."

If they're going to pull the hypothetical card, I'm going to say that he might NOT have made weapons of mass destruction too.

Please note that I'm not condoning Saddam Hussein. I'm approaching this war extremely

objectively.

You are not approaching it objectively. If you were you would say..."Saddam is dirty bad motherfucker who needs his ass kicked."

Oh, and the ' could'. He is not going to make toasters with these parts. What the fuck do you think he will do with rocket engines and metal peices that were used in missiles?

If you took apart a minute man ICBM and threw it in the back of a truck not many people would know what it was. So a hunk of metal scraps can end up as a dangerous weapon.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 07:27:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Given the nature of this madman Saddam I would assume the worst instead of being a bleeding heart and assume less.

We underestimated the capabilities of Al Qaeda and lost 3000+ lives on 9/11... why make the same mistake again?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 12:10:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CrimsonWe underestimated the capabilities of Al Qaeda and lost 3000+ lives on 9/11... why make the same mistake again?

Apart from whether or not I agree with this, it's this kind of comments that make people believe Saddam had ties with Al-Qaeda.

liberatorI don't actually dislike Mr. Moore, I don't like him either but that is beside the point. His method of attracting attention to himself for his self aggrandizement is pathetic. He is nothing but a tool for the Left in America and Abroad.

Not all the left supports Moore. I do not consider him objective or anything.

liberatorIt makes sense when you think about it.

The Left considers America to be the focus of evil in the modern world, no matter what it is, it's America's fault.

Sure, whatever.

liberatorThe Ozone Hole in Antarctica?

The Left: It the dirty American's fault. They drive SUVs and pollute.

In actuality, as science is proving, the hole in the ozone layer is a natural effect and is part of the cyclical nature of the Earth's atmosphere.

Over the years, certain chemicals and other stuff used in fridges (CFC's) have been banned from use, which could very well explain the closing of the gap. Depletion of ozone is not as much caused by cars as it is by aforementioned fridges, spray propellers and other industrial uses.

liberatorGlobal Warming?

The Left: It the dirty American's fault. They drive SUVs and pollute.

In actuality, as science is proving, the hole in the ozone layer is a natural effect and is part of the cyclical nature of the Earth's biosphere.

It has not by far been proven to what extent human activity affects the current climatological change, but that it has at least some effect is quite clear.

liberatorThe War in Iraq?

The Left: It's America's fault! Hussein is as pure as the wind driven snow.

This only deserves a :rolleyes:

liberatorIn truth, as an American, I can say(with a degree of sadness) that Bush may have misled us when he claimed WMDs in Iraq. But, I look at it like this.

1. We(The USA) are finishing what we should have finished a decade ago in the Gulf War.
2. He(Bush) was made aware of something that precipitated the war and cannot tell the Public without either A) endangering a larger segment of the population or B)would embarrass one of our allies.(the Food for Oil scandal at the UN anyone?)
3. It's part of a longer term operation to eliminate Islamic Theocracies in the middle east and thus remove a large portion of the support for international Terror Groups and eventually create a more permanent peace.

Yes, we can clearly see the peace in the middle east. Tensions are higher than ever with little sign of recovery and support for groups like Al-Qaeda is skyrocketing.

liberator The governance of a free nation must be secular to fulfill it's obligations to it's citizens equally. However, Leaders of said governances must have a strong foundation in ethics and morality that comes from religion to lead well.

Iraq was a very secular nation. And I fail to see why morals must come from religion.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 19:04:38 GMT

CrimsonI like <http://www.bowlingfortruth.com> -- I spent a good part of the day reading up on what a fuckhead Michael Moore is.
I can't bend my head around his logic.

..Because I instead spent it on a site that shows all his lies. Now if I ever hear what that idiot has to say I can just laugh at the presentation

Such hostility. Michael Moore has successfully refuted most of the "damning evidence" from your site, and he did it here:
<http://www.michaelmoore.com/words/wackoattacko/>

I'm sure you've read his responses to the criticism you've read as you wouldn't want to be one-sided, and you wouldn't want to selectively present evidence just to make your point now would you? Cause that would be ironic all right...

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 21:21:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nodbugger

You are not approaching it objectively. If you were you would say..."Saddam is dirty bad motherfucker who needs his ass kicked."

ob-jec-tive (P) Pronunciation Key (b-jktv)
adj.

Uninfluenced by emotions or personal prejudices

While I'm not perfect, I'm trying to attack this war as objectively as possible.

Quote:Oh, and the ' could'. He is not going to make toasters with these parts.

Thats the beauty of the hypothetical card, friend. He could potentially make an army of toasters.

Quote:What the fuck do you think he will do with rocket engines and metal peices that were used in missiles?

What I see here are some piles of scrap metal being labelled Saddam's personal missle arsonal. For starters, there is no proof outside saying "Iraq has shipped out scrap metal, therefore this scrap is automatically Iraq's", when in reality, (while it's unlikely, but not impossible), that might not necessarily have come from Iraq.

Quote:If you took apart a minute man ICBM and threw it in the back of a truck not many people would know what it was. So a hunk of metal scraps can end up as a dangerous weapon.

Well, I could also throw a can a potassium and a can of nitrate into the back of a truck too. That doesn't mean I'm going to make gun powder.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 21:36:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxNodbugger

You are not approaching it objectively. If you were you would say..."Saddam is dirty bad motherfucker who needs his ass kicked."

ob-jec-tive (P) Pronunciation Key (b-jktv)
adj.

Uninfluenced by emotions or personal prejudices

While I'm not perfect, I'm trying to attack this war as objectively as possible.

Quote:Oh, and the ' could'. He is not going to make toasters with these parts.

Thats the beauty of the hypothetical card, friend. He could potentially make an army of toasters.

Quote:What the fuck do you think he will do with rocket engines and metal peices that were used in missiles?

What I see here are some piles of scrap metal being labelled Saddam's personal missle arsonal. For starters, there is no proof outside saying "Iraq has shipped out scrap metal, therefore this scrap is automatically Iraq's", when in reality, (while it's unlikely, but not impossible), that might not necessarily have come from Iraq.

Quote:If you took apart a minute man ICBM and threw it in the back of a truck not many people would know what it was. So a hunk of metal scraps can end up as a dangerous weapon.

Well, I could also throw a can a potassium and a can of nitrate into the back of a truck too. That doesn't mean I'm going to make gun powder.

This is why you are an idiot.

This is Saddam we are talking about. Mass murderer? Torturer? Invaded two countries and killed millions?

I would not trust him with a butter knife.

And the fact you do makes me feel very unsafe knowing people as stupid as you exist..

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 21:41:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sorry buddy, but I didn't say I trust him, nor did I say that I condone his actions.

Stop taking everything at face value. The news isn't always the real story. I'd be curious to know what the news in Iraq is right now. I'm sure you'd be just as surprised as I would.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 21:48:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxSorry buddy, but I didn't say I trust him, nor did I say that I condone his actions.

Stop taking everything at face value. The news isn't always the real story. I'd be curious to know what the news in Iraq is right now. I'm sure you'd be just as surprised as I would.

So then don't say anything in his defense. Which is exactly what you did. You are just trying to save your ass after yelling that Iraq did not have wmd.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 21:51:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

To date, Iraq does not have WMD. No WMDs have been found, and no amount of whining over materials that could POTENTIALLY make one will change that.

Remember, if I had potassium and I had nitrate, that doesn't mean I'll make gunpowder. Having metal doesn't mean you're going to make bombs. If that were true, then I'll tell your country that your computer has the potential to be made into a weapon of mass destruction.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 22:04:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxTo date, Iraq does not have WMD. No WMDs have been found, and no amount of whining over materials that could POTENTIALLY make one will change that.

Remember, if I had potassium and I had nitrate, that doesn't mean I'll make gunpowder. Having metal doesn't mean you're going to make bombs. If that were true, then I'll tell your country that your computer has the potential to be made into a weapon of mass destruction.

You just don't get it...

I am not Saddam and neither are you.

But Saddam has used them in the past, he has made them, and according to human nature he will do it again.

Just like people that do drugs. They do drugs go to jail, they get out and 3 weeks later they are back in jail for doing the same dumb shit.

Like I said in my last post. I would not trust Saddam with a butter knife.

And with you giving Saddam the benefit of the doubt.....that is one of the most stupid things in the world.

It is like trusting Michael Jackson with a group of 8 year old boys.

You are not going to get the expected results.

Saddam is not the type of person who should be allowed to run a country.

oh, and just because we have not found a cure for cancer does not mean there isn't one.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 22:07:41 GMT

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

After the Gulf war, to my knowledge, Saddam had a steady flow of UN inspectors go through his country and found nothing. In fact, they found no evidence to show he was making WMDs. Again, only to my knowledge. Kirby or K9 would probably know in better detail then I could ever explain anyway.

I'm not defending Saddam. He was an awful person. I'm trying to help you understand that what your local news tells you isn't necessarily the truth. THAT isn't new news.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2004 23:58:39 GMT

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

Sorry for the double post, but there are some issues I want you to address specifically from this.

NodbuggerBut Saddam has used them in the past, he has made them, and according to human nature he will do it again.

I'm not debating whether or not Saddam *might* try and obtain WMDs again. I'm telling you that there are no WMDs found in Iraq at this point. How does this justify the war on Iraq? Calling it a "War on Terror" doesn't justify invading a nation on shaky pretenses. Also, claiming to be

"finishing" what the Gulf War started is ridiculous (not necessarily said by you, but the principle applies). I suggest you read this and find out why this is so.

Quote:Just like people that do drugs. They do drugs go to jail, they get out and 3 weeks later they are back in jail for doing the same dumb shit.

This is utterly circumstantial and a terrible analogy.

Quote:Like I said in my last post. I would not trust Saddam with a butter knife. And with you giving Saddam the benefit of the doubt.....that is one of the most stupid things in the world.

Don't put words in my mouth. I've said nothing of this sort, in fact, I've said the opposite. I'm questioning the justification for the United States taking it upon themselves to "liberate" Iraq, not supporting Saddam.

Quote:Saddam is not the type of person who should be allowed to run a country.

I couldn't agree more with you. But I ask you, what gives YOU the right to go and remove his power? Your own morals? Propaganda? :rolleyes:

Quote:oh, and just because we have not found a cure for cancer does not mean there isn't one.

I don't mean to sound pessimistic, but it doesn't mean there IS a cure, either.

I suggest you read the UN's UNMOVIC Thirteenth Quarterly Report on Iraq. Dated in 30 May, 2003.

<http://www.un.org/Depts/unmovic/documents/S-2003-580.pdf>

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 15 Jun 2004 05:21:53 GMT

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

http://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/breaking_1.html

How much more does the UN need to find before it's enough? Of all people I never imagined that you would jump on the bandwagon of the stupid.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Tue, 15 Jun 2004 08:52:11 GMT

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

That article was posted here already. It doesn't do much more than make vague assumptions about scrap metal.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 15 Jun 2004 11:06:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimsonhttp://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/breaking_1.html

How much more does the UN need to find before it's enough? Of all people I never imagined that you would jump on the bandwagon of the stupid.

Read the quarterly report. It says that Iraq has been dismantling the SA-2 missiles, but there some that still remain.

"As of 17 March 2003, two thirds of the Al Samoud 2 missiles declared by Iraq to have been deployed had been destroyed, as well as one third of the associated logistics and support equipment."

That seems awfully close to the war to me. I don't know about you, but once bombs start flying at my country despite my non-proliferation, all bets are off.

But I'm not the Iraqi military. How do you know those scrap engines aren't the remainder of the arsenal being sold for much needed money?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Tue, 15 Jun 2004 12:31:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If by "vague" you mean that UN monitoring equipment was found still attached to weapons that weren't supposed to have anything done with them without UN supervision.

I highly doubt that the warheads are in the scrap yard, so....

Where do you think they might be?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Tue, 15 Jun 2004 12:35:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Javaxcxas well as one third of the associated logistics and support equipment."

This is the most worrisome of all the statements. Two thirds is missing. The ability to create more of this crap now moves into third world countries. Unmonitored, and under the control of morons who think killing kids is pleasing to thier God.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 15 Jun 2004 19:33:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I understand where you're coming from, but keep in mind the date of the inspection, and the date the Shock and Awe strikes launched.

They were still (according to the UN) dismantling their caches when the bombs started flying.

Hypothetically speaking, if you were in the Iraqi government at the time, and were dismantling your munitions, would you continue to dismantle while being under seige? Supposedly, the Shock and Awe was targetted at Military sites; how do we know the sites used to dismantle the warheads and propulsion systems weren't destroyed even, only if by accident? Ultimately, how can you (not necessarily you, Kirby) conclude that Iraq was still proliferating or transferring "scrap metal" when they were consciously disarming when the bombs were flying?

Remember people (you know who you are), I'm not supporting Saddam. I'm questioning the justification for this war. The conclusions to date are bittersweet, IMO. Saddam has been captured, which in itself is a good thing. But I'm questioning whether or not the ends justify the means, and I believe they do not, and have YET to see proof that justifies this war outside the POSSIBILITY Saddam might have had weapons of mass destruction.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 15 Jun 2004 21:39:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

By acting on circumstantial information, such as the components that COULD be used to make WMD's, without actually being assembled, is dangerous in a political sense. It's a large gamble for anyone to make assumptions without proof. "oh but he has the components to make the weapons", well I have components to make weapons sitting in my kitchen or garage right now. That being fertilizer and other everyday chemicals that when combined right would make a bomb. More on the legal aspect, if the US were to do something based on this circumstantial stuff and take Saddam to the World Court over this, the evidence just isn't there for something to happen. To relate it with an common local aspect, a known drug lord, despite having the means to do whatever, can not be charged with something unless it's absolutely certain that what he has, is infact illigal substances. This is why sting operations are set up, and no one acts until after the crime has been committed. This being the Criminal will 'walk', because the crime he was accused of had not occured.

In short, until Iraq is found with complete missles in usable condition, not much could really happen. Complete WMD's being found that have rusted through and are unusable is not the same as usable ones though..

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 05:29:03 GMT

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

Saddam was a bad person: yes or no?

Saddam's regime supported Islamic terrorism: yes it did or no it didn't?

Saddam's regime set up torture chambers and rape rooms and established a secret police to snatch "political dissenters" from their homes at night, rounded them up and slaughtered them: did happen or didn't happen?

Saddam has used weapons of mass destruction in the past: true or false?

The weapons of mass destruction he was forced to hand over to the UN in accordance with the Gulf War Treaty and UN Resolutions 678, 687, and 1441 are still unaccounted for: true or false?

Saddam played cat-and-mouse games with the UN weapons inspectors and even kicked them out in 1998 and had five years to hide or smuggle the weapons out of his country: true or false?

These reasons aren't enough for Saddam's removal from power: yes they are or no they aren't?

Had Coalition forces not removed Saddam's regime all of this would still be going on: true or false?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 06:56:59 GMT

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

The entire basis of the war-

Saddam has WMD's yes or no

I'm not against the war, what I'm against is the official reason for going to war. Regardless the point I was trying to make was the official reason, Saddam having WMD's, and the subsequent "look at these engines! We were right!" idiocy is redundant as it in no way proves they are WMD's.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 14:05:13 GMT

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

warrantoThe entire basis of the war-

Saddam has WMD's yes or noNo.

Quote:I'm not against the war, what I'm against is the official reason for going to war. Regardless the point I was trying to make was the official reason, Saddam having WMD's, and the subsequent "look at these engines! We were right!" idiocy is redundant as it in no way proves they are WMD's.

Weapons of mass destruction were only a third of the official reasons; the other two thirds were the gross human rights violations he comitted and the support to terrorism he was giving. Just as much emphasis was placed on these two other reasons as was the failure to fully disclose his weapons of mass destruction programs.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 14:25:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hydra1945 the support to terrorism he was giving

<http://www.cnn.com/2004/ALLPOLITICS/06/16/911.commission/index.html>

Purely speculative I'm afraid. Our own government now says there wasn't a connection that was viable.

"Figuring things out for yourself is the only real freedom anyone has."

Starship troopers

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 14:44:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This guy Begs to differ.

Here is a news report about the training camp he talks about. It talks about a Boeing 707 just sitting out in the middle of nowhere. Wasn't it a pair of 707s that were hijacked and flown into the Twin Towers?

Remember Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the terrorist who cut off Nick Berg's head? He's been with al-Qaeda for a long time. He's also been sheltered by Saddam before. He even received medical treatment from him.

EDIT: Bah, changed the link to the news story instead of having the interview twice.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 15:06:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hydra1945This guy Begs to differ.

Here is a news report about the training camp he talks about. It may not have been the 9-11 terrorists it was training, but there sure as hell were terrorists trained there.

Granted. I am a veteran, and I know the reality.

I served three tours of duty in the Persian gulf shooting at Sadam's forces, but the claim that Iraq was a sponsor of multinational terrorism is unfounded. This looks like a way to hit back at the U.S. by training special forces in specwar stuff. We do the same types of training by the way.

After the first Gulf war he lost control of pretty much everything in the no-fly zones which were

VERY restrictive to his genocidal policies. There was no way to hit back other than special forces, and his pathetic targeting of U.S. planes by SAM sites in the NFZ.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 16:53:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hydra1945warrantoThe entire basis of the war-
Saddam has WMD's yes or noNo.

Quote:I'm not against the war, what I'm against is the official reason for going to war. Regardless the point I was trying to make was the official reason, Saddam having WMD's, and the subsequent "look at these engines! We were right!" idiocy is redundant as it in no way proves they are WMD's.

Weapons of mass destruction were only a third of the official reasons; the other two thirds were the gross human rights violations he comitted and the support to terrorism he was giving. Just as much emphasis was placed on these two other reasons as was the failure to fully disclose his weapons of mass destruction programs.

Correct me if I'm worng, but the entire press about the war (at the beginning) was that Saddam had WMD's. Later when it was discovered that he didn't, was the reason for going officially changed to humainitarian reasons.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 17:18:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warrantohydra1945warrantoThe entire basis of the war-
Saddam has WMD's yes or noNo.

Quote:I'm not against the war, what I'm against is the official reason for going to war. Regardless the point I was trying to make was the official reason, Saddam having WMD's, and the subsequent "look at these engines! We were right!" idiocy is redundant as it in no way proves they are WMD's.

Weapons of mass destruction were only a third of the official reasons; the other two thirds were the gross human rights violations he comitted and the support to terrorism he was giving. Just as much emphasis was placed on these two other reasons as was the failure to fully disclose his weapons of mass destruction programs.

Correct me if I'm worng, but the entire press about the war (at the beginning) was that Saddam had WMD's. Later when it was discovered that he didn't, was the reason for going officially changed to humainitarian reasons.

That is all you heard.

If you look at Bushes first speech about Iraq, wmd was on the list of many things. It has always been humanitarian reasons.

Oh, there is no proof saying there are not wmd in Iraq.

Iraq has a lot of places to hide things. Go to plot out an acre of land. Hide 10 ball point pens any where you want in that area. Then see how long it takes a friend to find them.

You can even take the pens apart and hide them in separate places. And since everyone knows half a missile doesn't count as a weapon, a pen cap won't count as a full pen.

That will give you a good idea on what we have to deal with.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Javalcx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 19:32:55 GMT

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

NodbuggerOh, there is no proof saying there are not wmd in Iraq.

And this suddenly justifies the war? I hate to break it to you, but there is no conclusive proof saying there ARE WMD in Iraq.

Furthermore, the humanitarian card doesn't justify enforcing a democratic government in Iraq. Nor does it justify the United States administration to go AROUND the UN to invade Iraq.

I'll say it again: The ends does NOT justify the means. You STILL have yet to prove this otherwise.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 20:20:50 GMT

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

The entire structure of the middle east breeds and fosters terrorism. It has to be rebuilt. Everyone said Reagan couldn't topple the Soviet Union and he did... how is this any different?

And warranto, why would you listen to what the press said were the reasons? They want Bush to fail. Anything that's bad news for the US is great news for the Democrats.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 20:57:37 GMT

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

JavalcxNodbuggerOh, there is no proof saying there are not wmd in Iraq.

And this suddenly justifies the war? I hate to break it to you, but there is no conclusive proof saying there ARE WMD in Iraq.

Furthermore, the humanitarian card doesn't justify enforcing a democratic government in Iraq. Nor does it justify the United States administration to go AROUND the UN to invade Iraq.

I'll say it again: The ends does NOT justify the means. You STILL have yet to prove this otherwise.

What means? there was nothing wrong with the means. I guess the ends didn't justify the means with world war 2? You know how stupid you logic is?

Oh, ya just a few years ago your boy(and his man 'Hillary') was saying the complete opposite.

Along with the UN and the inspectors.

<http://www.cnn.com/US/9812/16/clinton.iraq.speech/>

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 21:19:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CrimsonAnd warranto, why would you listen to what the press said were the reasons? They want Bush to fail. Anything that's bad news for the US is great news for the Democrats.

Actually that's not true.

The PEW Charitable Trust Foundation released non-partisan research which stated clearly that the media "favors" Bush, with almost 75% of his network television coverage being favorable towards the administration.

The myth that the Media, comprised of the world's largest corporations, is somehow LIBERAL is sort of comical. Liberals do not control the wealth and power in this country, but will always influence it's cultural reform as that is done by the youth in this country which is almost always Liberal.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 21:24:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The means include the United States' invasion into Iraq. The ends are Saddam's capture, and the toppling of the Iraqi government.

The United States invaded Iraq on the ASSUMPTION, and let me say again, ASSUMPTION of

finding WMD, and to date, there have been none found. This means your ends are not justified.

I don't understand how comparing this to World War 2. Germany invaded all sorts of countries. Iraq has invaded none since Kuwait and the Gulf War, thereafter, UN inspectors monitored non-proliferation. I suggest you read that quarterly report I posted, instead of assuming it's drivel and ignoring it. That report disputes anything that CNN news can tell you, because it is dated a good 5 years later, and clearly shows that Iraq is non-proliferating.

I also suggest you stop blast out your rampant ad hominem. It makes you look a lot stupider than you probably are.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 21:33:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxThe means include the United States' invasion into Iraq. The ends are Saddam's capture, and the toppling of the Iraqi government.

The United States invaded Iraq on the ASSUMPTION, and let me say again, ASSUMPTION of finding WMD, and to date, there have been none found. This means your ends are not justified.

I don't understand how comparing this to World War 2. Germany invaded all sorts of countries. Iraq has invaded none since Kuwait and the Gulf War, thereafter, UN inspectors monitored non-proliferation. I suggest you read that quarterly report I posted, instead of assuming it's drivel and ignoring it. That report disputes anything that CNN news can tell you, because it is dated a good 5 years later, and clearly shows that Iraq is non-proliferating.

I also suggest you stop blast out your rampant ad hominem. It makes you look a lot stupider than you probably are.

What are the means? How are the means worse than the ends?

Oh ya they aren't. We haven't killed millions of people. A deadly virus was not let loose on the world. There was no easier way to do this. There is nothing wrong with the way we did this.

I do not know what the fuck you are trying to spew out there. We didn't do anything wrong as far as the means go.

We did not make an assumption. We went with what every leader of the free world said. Including the UN. the UN right now is more corrupt than Enron was. They are a bunch of fucking retards now and would not listen to them worth a shit.

and yes, comparing this to world war 2 is accurate. We went to war to get rid of Hitler. We went to war to get rid of Saddam. Those are means and the ends.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 21:46:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Your ignorance never ceases to amaze me. Go and learn what happened in World War 2, then you can make a credible argument.

I never said the means are worse than the ends. I said the ends don't justify the means, and they do not. Stop beating around the issue and give some credible proof that says "Iraq has WMD" with pictures of the warheads, because you're CONTINUING to justify yourself only by saying: "OFMGGGGGG THEAR IS WMD I DUNO 4 SHUR BUT I NO!! I DO!!!" and launching a dispicable Shock and Awe compaign.

Saying that Iraq has WMD does not make it so. You ASSUME they have them. Just as the UN, the "world leaders" and countless others did. Assuming something does NOT justify a war. I could assume that you have WMDs on the assumption that you're a raving war monger. But that probably isn't true, now is it?

You don't need to kill millions of people to justify a war. It takes ONE innocent life lost to a United States bomb, or ONE United States bullet to make this war unjust. It's JUST that technical. I guaruntee you this has happened, and if you say otherwise, you're an idiot.

Furthermore, the UN has, and would have continued to send inspectors to Iraq to inspect their arms. Check the damn report instead of working around it. The inspection on the AS2 missiles and their destruction was dated March 17th, 2003. That means the UN was STILL watching Iraq non-proliferate. It's like telling someone not to do something, and kicking them anyway.

Of course, if you want to live in your media-inspired world, where you guys are the knights in shining armour, go right ahead. I'll be sitting up here in the north laughing at you while you think the world is your oyster to do whatever you want with.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 22:02:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxYour ignorance never ceases to amaze me. Go and learn what happened in World War 2, then you can make a credible argument.

I never said the means are worse than the ends. I said the ends don't justify the means, and they do not. Stop beating around the issue and give some credible proof that says "Iraq has WMD" with pictures of the warheads, because you're CONTINUING to justify yourself only by saying: "OFMGGGGGG THEAR IS WMD I DUNO 4 SHUR BUT I NO!! I DO!!!" and launching a dispicable Shock and Awe compaign.

Saying that Iraq has WMD does not make it so. You ASSUME they have them. Just as the UN, the "world leaders" and countless others did. Assuming something does NOT justify a war. I could assume that you have WMDs on the assumption that you're a raving war monger. But that

probably isn't true, now is it?

You don't need to kill millions of people to justify a war. It takes ONE innocent life lost to a United States bomb, or ONE United States bullet to make this war unjust. It's JUST that technical. I guarantee you this has happened, and if you say otherwise, you're an idiot.

Furthermore, the UN has, and would have continued to send inspectors to Iraq to inspect their arms. Check the damn report instead of working around it. The inspection on the AS2 missiles and their destruction was dated March 17th, 2003. That means the UN was STILL watching Iraq non-proliferate. It's like telling someone not to do something, and kicking them anyway.

Of course, if you want to live in your media-inspired world, where you guys are the knights in shining armour, go right ahead. I'll be sitting up here in the north laughing at you while you think the world is your oyster to do whatever you want with.

I'm tired of you shit and you biased lies. I am going to ask you one question.

Would you have lived in Iraq while Saddam was in charge of it?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 22:13:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The last resort of a beaten fool, the "OMG U DUNNO WAT UR TAWKIN BOUT" card.

I don't live in Iraq, and likely never will, so that question is irrelevant to me.

I would however, like to have seen the United States administration show some maturity and patience before taking it upon themselves to do something. It goes against your own Bill of Rights, and you're too blantly stupid to see that.

Now before you start rambling on with "OMG BUT PPL WUD HAEV DIED IF WE W8ED 4 PERMISHIN!!!!", know that I agree with you fully. But the fact of the matter remains that innocent people died before the attack, during the attack, and are still dying in Iraq. Innocent people would have died in any circumstance, friend.

Just wait until after this campaign is over. You might finally see past the shroud that FOXNEWS has placed conveniently in front of you.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 22:39:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxThe last resort of a beaten fool, the "OMG U DUNNO WAT UR TAWKIN BOUT" card.

I don't live in Iraq, and likely never will, so that question is irrelevant to me.

I would however, like to have seen the United States administration show some maturity and patience before taking it upon themselves to do something. It goes against your own Bill of Rights, and you're too blantly stupid to see that.

Now before you start rambling on with "OMG BUT PPL WUD HAEV DIED IF WE W8ED 4 PERMISHIN!!!!", know that I agree with you fully. But the fact of the matter remains that innocent people died before the attack, during the attack, and are still dying in Iraq. Innocent people would have died in any circumstance, friend.

Just wait until after this campaign is over. You might finally see past the shroud that FOXNEWS has placed conviently in front of you.

Totally skip the fucking question.

You are a fucking loser.

How can you expect to let others live under him if you will not live under him?

Fucking self centered prick.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 22:43:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Consider yourself owned. Hypothetical situations and questions are utterly irrelevant. Learn how to debate. Go back to school, kid.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 22:51:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxConsider yourself owned. Hypothetical situations and questions are utterly irrelevant. Learn how to debate. Go back to school, kid.

Consider yourself a worthless prick.

It is to show you are a stupid fuck who does not deserve everything he has.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 22:54:49 GMT

Javaxcx Your ignorance never ceases to amaze me. Go and learn what happened in World War 2, then you can make a credible argument.

I never said the means are worse than the ends. I said the ends don't justify the means, and they do not. Stop beating around the issue and give some credible proof that says "Iraq has WMD" with pictures of the warheads, because you're CONTINUING to justify yourself only by saying: "OFMGGGGGGG THEAR IS WMD I DUNO 4 SHUR BUT I NO!! I DO!!!" and launching a dispicable Shock and Awe campaign.

Saying that Iraq has WMD does not make it so. You ASSUME they have them. Just as the UN, the "world leaders" and countless others did. Assuming something does NOT justify a war. I could assume that you have WMDs on the assumption that you're a raving war monger. But that probably isn't true, now is it?

You don't need to kill millions of people to justify a war. It takes ONE innocent life lost to a United States bomb, or ONE United States bullet to make this war unjust. It's JUST that technical. I guaruntee you this has happened, and if you say otherwise, you're an idiot.

Furthermore, the UN has, and would have continued to send inspectors to Iraq to inspect their arms. Check the damn report instead of working around it. The inspection on the AS2 missiles and their destruction was dated March 17th, 2003. That means the UN was STILL watching Iraq non-proliferate. It's like telling someone not to do something, and kicking them anyway.

Of course, if you want to live in your media-inspired world, where you guys are the knights in shining armour, go right ahead. I'll be sitting up here in the north laughing at you while you think the world is your oyster to do whatever you want with.

Every war in the history of man is unjust with your logic.

Yes that includes world war 2. How many civilians were killed in that war?

UN weapons inspectors could not have known what Iraq had for sure because they had not been there since 1998.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 22:56:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Throwing out random insults in a vain attempt to make you seem like a smarter or better person fail. Especially with you.

I still urge you to read that Quarterly report, it might shed some ACTUAL proof to you that this war is not justified. Of course, you don't have to. Ignorance is bliss.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 22:59:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavafxThrowing out random insults in a vain attempt to make you seem like a smarter or better person fail. Especially with you.

I still urge you to read that Quarterly report, it might shed some ACTUAL proof to you that this war is not justified. Of course, you don't have to. Ignorance is bliss.

Then answer the god damned question.

If you wouldn't live under Saddam what makes you think the people of Iraq liked it?

So then why subject the people of Iraq to countless more years of Saddam?

Why do they deserve a horrible life?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 23:01:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NodbuggerYes that includes world war 2. How many civilians were killed in that war?

This war deals with "Liberating Iraq" under the pretense of finding weapons of mass destruction and ridding Saddam of his reign. World War 2 wasn't exclusively about liberating Poland, and certainly not Germany. It was about stopping Hitler before he took over the entire eastern hemisphere. I didn't see Saddam doing anything but toiling in his desert alone after the Gulf War.

Quote:UN weapons inspectors could not have known what Iraq had for sure because they had not been there since 1998.

Read the report. They were in Iraq in March, 2003.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 23:05:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nodbugger

If you wouldn't live under Saddam what makes you think the people of Iraq liked it?

I never said they liked it. Nor did I imply it. Try reading my posts before posting irrelevant things like this, or putting words in my mouth.

Here's a good example that maybe you can wrap your head around. Remember in Renegade,

mission #2? Havoc, against orders, takes off and attacks the beach head. The US did this with the UN. In fact, after Havoc got back to base, he was thrown in jail. His ends did not justify his means, otherwise he wouldn't have been put in temporary confinement.

While only an analogy, it should be clear enough for even YOU to understand.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 23:06:02 GMT

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

JavacxNodbuggerYes that includes world war 2. How many civilians were killed in that war?

This war deals with "Liberating Iraq" under the pretense of finding weapons of mass destruction and ridding Saddam of his reign. World War 2 wasn't exclusively about liberating Poland, and certainly not Germany. It was about stopping Hitler before he took over the entire eastern hemisphere. I didn't see Saddam doing anything but toiling in his desert alone after the Gulf War.

Quote:UN weapons inspectors could not have known what Iraq had for sure because they had not been there since 1998.

Read the report. They were in Iraq in March, 2003.

Ya and? If they couldn't come a conclusion(Iraq was not cooperating) from 1991 to 1998. what makes you think a few weeks was going to make a difference?

And you said 1 innocent dying unjustified a war. In world War 2 Russia lost 16 million civilians. According to you that is 16 million reasons to make a war unjust.

BTW...you cannot answer the question.

Just like this anti-war idiot.

http://komo1000news.com/audio/kvi_aircheck_031003.mp3

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 23:07:33 GMT

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

JavacxNodbugger

If you wouldn't live under Saddam what makes you think the people of Iraq liked it?

I never said they liked it. Nor did I imply it. Try reading my posts before posting irrelevant things like this, or putting words in my mouth.

Here's a good example that maybe you can wrap your head around. Remember in Renegade, mission #2? Havoc, against orders, takes off and attacks the beach head. The US did this with the UN. In fact, after Havoc got back to base, he was thrown in jail. His ends did not justify his means, otherwise he wouldn't have been put in temporary confinement.

While only an analogy, it should be clear enough for even YOU to understand.

Gulf War never ended. The Cease fire said the coalition or the UN could resume the war.

Well The US, England , and Australia were the main forces in both wars.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 23:12:18 GMT

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

Nodbugger

Ya and? If they couldn't come a conclusion(Iraq was not cooperating) from 1991 to 1998. what makes you think a few weeks was going to make a difference?

Try a few years. Go and find out what the UNMOVIC is.

You realize, you're arguing through ignorance. You obviously didn't read the report, so can you make these conclusion when you refuse to see the proof PROVING otherwise. You haven't shown any proof outside a cnn.com report from 1998, which, by the way, has NOTHING to do with Iraq in 2003.

Quote:And you said 1 innocent dying unjustified a war. In world War 2 Russia lost 16 million civilians. According to you that is 16 million reasons to make a war unjust.

Smooth move, champ. Who killed those civilians? The bad guys, did. Remember? The ones who went to war for no reason. Hitler's excuses for going to war were unjust. Clue in.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 23:13:27 GMT

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

The Gulf War ended for the United States when Kuwait was liberated. Again, go and read my posts from two pages ago. This has been already addressed.

Stop arguing in circles.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 23:17:19 GMT

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

JavaxcxNodbugger

Ya and? If they couldn't come a conclusion(Iraq was not cooperating) from 1991 to 1998. what makes you think a few weeks was going to make a difference?

Try a few years. Go and find out what the UNMOVIC is.

You realize, you're arguing through ignorance. You obviously didn't read the report, so can you make these conclusion when you refuse to see the proof PROVING otherwise. You haven't shown any proof outside a cnn.com report from 1998, which, by the way, has NOTHING to do with Iraq in 2003.

Quote:And you said 1 innocent dying unjustified a war. In world War 2 Russia lost 16 million civilians. According to you that is 16 million reasons to make a war unjust.

Smooth move, champ. Who killed those civilians? The bad guys, did. Remember? The ones who went to war for no reason. Hitler's excuses for going to war were unjust. Clue in.

Well who are we to stop Hitler from going on a rampage? according to you Hitler had is sovereignty and we were going to ruin the Germans culture! then we were going to steal all their BMW's and sell them for our own gain. After that we left the country in ruins because we didn't attack Germany to free people!

When the UN weapons inspectors entered Iraq it was the first time they had been there since 1998.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 23:19:42 GMT

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

JavaxcxThe Gulf War ended for the United States when Kuwait was liberated. Again, go and read my posts from two pages ago. This has been already addressed.

Stop arguing in circles.

The Gulf War never ended.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 23:21:35 GMT

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

America's allies asked for assistance in World War 2 because they were under attack. American didn't decide to actually HELP until after Pearl Harbour. Remember?

Iraq isn't attacking America. Iraq is doing absolutely nothing outside festering in their desert. I fail

to see how you comparing Hitler is actually helping your argument.

I'll have something for you about the UNMOVIC inspections in a second.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 23:32:15 GMT

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

JavaxcxAmerica's allies asked for assistance in World War 2 because they were under attack. American didn't decide to actually HELP until after Pearl Harbour. Remember?

Iraq isn't attacking America. Iraq is doing absolutely nothing outside festering in their desert. I fail to see how you comparing Hitler is actually helping your argument.

I'll have something for you about the UNMOVIC inspections in a second.

Kuwait? They were under attack, but we decided to not go all the way in. Do you think it was smart to do that? I know we didn't do that with Hitler.

Ever hear of the lend lease act? Ya we were giving billions out to Europe and Russia.

So Saddam killing his own people is none of business? :rolleyes:

The stupid keeps flowing.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 23:35:22 GMT

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

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/gulf/cron/>
The Gulf war is over.

Now for the inspections:

"20 Nov 1997

Following intensive diplomatic action, Iraq accedes to an agreement with the Russian Federation providing for UNSCOM and its full complement of staff to resume work in Iraq. The commission's personnel return to Iraq on 21 November and resume their inspections the following day."

This worked until:

"13 Jan 1998

UNSCOM chief Richard Butler reports to the Council that during the first day of an inspection, Iraq announced it was withdrawing its cooperation with the inspection team, claiming that the

inspection team had too many individuals of US or UK nationality"

"Early Feb 1998

A group of international experts and UNSCOM inspectors conduct two technical evaluation meetings (TEM) in Baghdad, reviewing Iraq's VX and missile warhead programs. The report submitted to the Security Council states the group's unanimous conclusion that Iraq has still not provided sufficient information for the commission to conclude that Iraq had undertaken all the disarmament steps required of it in these areas. The commission's experts brief the Council on the outcome of these two TEMs in March 1998. "

This is an inspection. The brief period Iraq chose not to cooperate seemed to have only lasted for roughly 17 or 18 days, give or take. During which time, I'd like for you to note that Iraq was STILL being watched, although to their own terms of non-cooperation:

"22 Jan 1998

Following a visit to Iraq, Richard Butler reports to the Security Council that despite the council's statement insisting on unrestricted access to all sites, Iraq would not permit access to eight so-called presidential sites"

Thats an awfully small gap. Seeing how Iraq was still being watched, WMD transport (if any) would've been detected.

So again, how does this have anything to do with the events of the Quarterly Report of May 2003? That report states nicely that Iraq is disarming. Hell, there were resolutions written that Iraq agreed fully to:

"20-23 Feb 1998

Annan visits Iraq. As a result of his meetings, the United Nations and Iraq agree to terms of a memorandum of understanding (MoU), which is signed on 23 February 1998. Annan secures Iraq's pledge that it accepts all relevant Security Council resolutions, and will cooperate fully with UNSCOM and the IAEA. The MoU obligates Iraq to provide UNSCOM and the IAEA immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access for their inspections. The United Nations reiterates the commitment of all member states to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq"

And whats this? That last line? That was conviently ignored in March 2003, don't you think?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 16 Jun 2004 23:46:16 GMT

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

NodbuggerKuwait? They were under attack, but we decided to not go all the way in. Do you think it was smart to do that?

I seriously can't believe you. I mean, wow. It's just mind boggling. The objective was not to go farther, as the threat had been suppressed. In fact, there were repercussions to ENSURE the threat would remain suppressed, and until March 2003, there was no threat.

Since you're obviously inept to find this yourself, go here:
<http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/offdocs/b920330.htm>

Quote:I know we didn't do that with Hitler.

Of course the Allies didn't do that with Hitler. Hitler attacked THEM, not the other way around.

Quote:Ever hear of the lend lease act? Ya we were giving billions out to Europe and Russia.

Note how the United States did not send a single unit or squadron over to the east until after Pearl Harbour. Canada has been supplying the war on Iraq too, but not with manpower.

Quote:So Saddam killing his own people is none of business?

It's the UN's business. Not the United States'.

Quote:The stupid keeps flowing.

Then close your mouth.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 17 Jun 2004 00:24:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxNodbuggerKuwait? They were under attack, but we decided to not go all the way in. Do you think it was smart to do that?

I seriously can't believe you. I mean, wow. It's just mind boggling. The objective was not to go farther, as the threat had been suppressed. In fact, there were repercussions to ENSURE the threat would remain suppressed, and until March 2003, there was no threat.

Since you're obviously inept to find this yourself, go here:
<http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/offdocs/b920330.htm>

Quote:I know we didn't do that with Hitler.

Of course the Allies didn't do that with Hitler. Hitler attacked THEM, not the other way around.

Quote:Ever hear of the lend lease act? Ya we were giving billions out to Europe and Russia.

Note how the United States did not send a single unit or squadron over to the east until after Pearl Harbour. Canada has been supplying the war on Iraq too, but not with manpower.

Quote:So Saddam killing his own people is none of business?

It's the UN's business. Not the United States'.

Quote:The stupid keeps flowing.

Then close your mouth.

The Gulf War never ended. A cease fire does not mean it ended.

As for the Iraq sovereignty thing. Fuck that. Saddam fucked up now we got rid of him. Stop bitching about a good thing.

We were prepared to go all the way to Baghdad.

Saddam was a threat to the Iraqi people. Get it through your thick skull. Selfish asshole.

Hitler attacked an ally, as did Saddam. we just prolonged getting rid of him.

We send tons of pilots to fight in Britain. We didn't concern ourselves with it because it was just another European war. We got dragged into world war 1 and look what that got us!

Canada has not provided anything for the war except an anti-war stance.

The UN is the United States. It is our business to bring things to the attention of the UN. It is our business to keep us safe. It is our business. If you UN won't fucking do it we will.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 17 Jun 2004 01:05:09 GMT

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

Nodbugger

The Gulf War never ended. A cease fire does not mean it ended.

I'll tell you what. Wait until Kirby posts. He'll tell you that war is over. I don't know how that will make a difference to you though. I mean, your own President at the time said it was over too (as stated in that link), but I guess you chose to ignore that. Figures, eh?

Quote:As for the Iraq sovereignty thing. Fuck that. Saddam fucked up now we got rid of him. Stop bitching about a good thing.

Saying "fuck that" doesn't justify your war. You are still beating around the bush, kid. Furthermore, I didn't say capturing Saddam was a bad thing, I said the opposite. Learn to read.

Quote:We were prepared to go all the way to Baghdad.

Correction, you were not prepared at the time the Gulf War ended. The man power and the resources were not present to take Baghdad without Vietnam-like casualty counts. Furthermore,

your President said that you would NOT be going to Baghdad as your "enemy was defeated". Stop disregarding my proof because you're afraid that you might just be wrong.

Quote:Saddam was a threat to the Iraqi people.

Agreed. I don't know how many more times I need to tell this to you before it sinks into YOUR thick skull.

Quote:Hitler attacked an ally, as did Saddam. we just prolonged getting rid of him.

You removed him from Kuwait, and the UN set restrictions and enforcement through UN investigations on non-proliferation. There is no prolonging, as the US campaign was finished. Get it? DONE.

Quote:We send tons of pilots to fight in Britain. We didn't concern ourselves with it because it was just another European war.

I never said that America didn't send supplies. I said the opposite, and yet AGAIN, you fail to read the whole post. There were no American Squadrons in the Battle of Britain.

<http://www.battle-of-britain.com/>

Quote:Canada has not provided anything for the war except an anti-war stance.

Idiot. Canadian Role in Iraq

"Canada has committed \$300 million Cdn to the effort and is currently training Iraqi police in Jordan. It's also forgiving \$750 million in Iraqi debts."

That is support.

Quote:The UN is the United States.

Lady's and Gentlemen, the most ignorant statement of the day!

Quote:It is our business to bring things to the attention of the UN. It is our business to keep us safe. It is our business. If you UN won't fucking do it we will.

You're forgetting that the United States also made a commitment to the UN. Going around that commitment to fight a "War on Terror" hardly justifies the resolve.

It is NOT your business to independantly take it upon yourself to "rid the world of evil" and instill your beloved democracies where ever you see fit. It's against your own laws, and it's against international law.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 17 Jun 2004 17:01:34 GMT

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

There are a great many things wrong with your statements NodBugger.

I am not even going to touch the tip of the iceberg on them.

Remember what America is about. Not international policing, but freedom. Our country is heading towards financial Imperialism irregardless of Democratic or Republican administration.

I beleive GW is a good man. I believe he thinks what he is doing is right. I support him because he has strength of resolve, and more charachter than anyone since Ronnie. I believe that in the end he will have proven himself vindicated, but I don't have to agree with everything he does.

America is losing what has made it special for so long, and is becoming like every other Global power that couldn't make the cut.

We need to restore what we have lost, not distort the truth, ruin public trust, deal in secret meeting, and circumvent Global organizations WE instituted to prevent the very things we are now doing.

You clearly need to study. Take time to read material on both sides of the issue, and find resources that were printed when the events happened. Then you will start to see the scope of what's at stake, and what merits action, and what doesn't.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 17 Jun 2004 19:24:56 GMT

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

KIRBY098I beleive GW is a good man. I believe he thinks what he is doing is right. I support him because he has strength of resolve, and more charachter than anyone since Ronnie. I believe that in the end he will have proven himself vindicated, but I don't have to agree with everything he does.

I've tried to steer away from targetting Bush exclusively in terms of the War in Iraq. For reasons very similar to this. I agree with you in saying that he has the best of intentions in mind. But remember that quote, "the road to hell is paved with good intentions". He's a strong leader who has the ability to obviously empower nationalism, but I don't agree with his resolve. That doesn't make him a bad leader per se, but it does leave a lot of room for debate.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 17 Jun 2004 23:54:11 GMT

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

Here's something interesting. A little hare just informed me that there is absolutely no proof (and this is direct from the OHS) that there has been any sponsership of terrorism in Iraq, and that

there is no proof of any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Coming from an American working for the guys up top.

Kirby knows what I'm talking about.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 17 Jun 2004 23:55:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GizbotvasCrimsonAnd warranto, why would you listen to what the press said were the reasons? They want Bush to fail. Anything that's bad news for the US is great news for the Democrats.

Actually that's not true.

The PEW Charitable Trust Foundation released non-partisan research which stated clearly that the media "favors" Bush, with almost 75% of his network television coverage being favorable towards the administration.

The myth that the Media, comprised of the world's largest corporations, is somehow LIBERAL is sort of comical. Liberals do not control the wealth and power in this country, but will always influence it's cultural reform as that is done by the youth in this country which is almost always Liberal.

The most compelling evidence to the contrary lies in this poll they did:
<http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=29>

Mind you, this is in reference to the Bush/Gore campaign, but it clearly shows that people perceive the media as "pulling for Gore".

This recent poll:
<http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=214>

Seems to be the one you were referencing. It shows that many people feel that the media is "too easy" on Bush. That's not the same as the media favoring him. Of course if you're referring to a different survey, please use the links I provided here to find the poll yourself, because I'm sure you read the interpretation on some liberal website instead of finding the actual poll results and methodology.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 01:43:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CrimsonAnd warranto, why would you listen to what the press said were the reasons? They want Bush to fail. Anything that's bad news for the US is great news for the Democrats.

It's not just the press I had heard it from, it's every discussion I've ever heard about the reason for

going to Iraq. Hence the reason I included the "correct me if I'm wrong" statement.

Though the "Humanitarian" reasons also bring up the question (and this is intended more for nodbugger), if the people of Iraq were suffering so much, and helping them out is so important, why did the US wait so long to act on it?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 02:15:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto(and this is intended more for nodbugger), if the people of Iraq were suffering so much, and helping them out is so important, why did the US wait so long to act on it?

The US goes through power changes. Clinton would have liked to, but he was advised not to. So we didn't until Bush became president.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 02:53:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Bush was elected in January, he had 8 months to do something about Iraq prior to september 11th when priorities changed from whatever they were to Afgansitan and Al-Queda.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 03:44:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warrantoBush was elected in January, he had 8 months to do something about Iraq prior to september 11th when priorities changed from whatever they were to Afgansitan and Al-Queda.

I don't think someone could become president and get into the attacking countries mood that fast.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 05:23:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So your saying that the people were suffering then, and he had no intention of helping them? Or he just wasn't in the mood to help them? Considering I'm sure he knew about the conditions of the people prior to his swearing in... more so because his father had just left the position prior to Clinton comming in.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 06:41:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warrantoSo your saying that the people were suffering then, and he had no intention of helping them? Or he just wasn't in the mood to help them? Considering I'm sure he knew about the conditions of the people prior to his swearing in... more so because his father had just left the position prior to Clinton coming in.

What are you trying to prove?

This has been on the top of peoples to do list for many years. Bush was just the only one to act on anything.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 15:11:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxKIRBY098I beleive GW is a good man. I believe he thinks what he is doing is right. I support him because he has strength of resolve, and more character than anyone since Ronnie. I believe that in the end he will have proven himself vindicated, but I don't have to agree with everything he does.

I've tried to steer away from targetting Bush exclusively in terms of the War in Iraq. For reasons very similar to this. I agree with you in saying that he has the best of intentions in mind. But remember that quote, "the road to hell is paved with good intentions". He's a strong leader who has the ability to obviously empower nationalism, but I don't agree with his resolve. That doesn't make him a bad leader per se, but it does leave a lot of room for debate.

<http://reuters.com/newsArticle.jhtml?type=worldNews&storyID=5458352>

He has, irregardless of methods, been proven correct in North Korea, and Iran. Both have active nuke programs, and could care less about UN mandates. I take it on credit that GW is right about Iraq too. Someday we will find that he was. It's already starting to bear out as true somewhat, as stated by one of our detractors.

<http://www.cnn.com/2004/WORLD/europe/06/18/russia.warning/index.html>

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 15:31:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Again, I know where you're coming from, and I don't doubt your proof, but Warranto said it best: "Going to war on an assumption is a dangerous gambit" (paraphrased). He was right 2/3 times, but that doesn't mean he's right again, and thats just simply the bottom line.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 16:13:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What about this? Russia WARNED the US that Iraq was infact planning attacks WITHIN the US.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,123051,00.html>

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 16:22:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I see his point, I was just voicing why I support GW.

If I had been president, I wouldn't have issued the war order. Special ops could have solved all my problems for me.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 17:28:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

K9TrooperWhat about this? Russia WARNED the US that Iraq was infact planning attacks WITHIN the US.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,123051,00.html>

I told Kirby I didn't doubt his proof. But I ask you, hypothetically, of course, if Iraq collaborted with the Al Qaeda, therefore "supporting terrorism", why isn't the US invading France for these reasons?

In essence, those supporting the so called supporters of terrorism.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 17:43:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because we haven't tried to resolve the issues of France with diplomacy yet. Saddam had 12 years.

I do not agree with the humanitarian reasons. That was a side benefit, but not the main goal. The Middle East fosters terrorism and those born there are taught to hate Americans. Iraq is a key player in the Middle East theater and therefore is a starting point for rebuilding them into the type of people who exist in the 21st century -- people who solve problems with words, deals, and diplomacy, not death and destruction.

Liberating the Iraqis was something we knew we'd obviously accomplish but it wasn't the main focus.

Overall, I'd say that since we haven't had an attack on US mainland soil that Bush is doing the right thing and he's doing a good job.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [setstyle](#) on Fri, 25 Jun 2004 23:35:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

K9TrooperWhat about this? Russia WARNED the US that Iraq was infact planning attacks WITHIN the US.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,123051,00.html>

"Putin said Russia didn't have any information that Saddam's regime was actually behind any terrorist acts." Doesn't that negate the validity of any information given to the U.S.?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Sat, 26 Jun 2004 06:44:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

setstyleK9TrooperWhat about this? Russia WARNED the US that Iraq was infact planning attacks WITHIN the US.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,123051,00.html>

"Putin said Russia didn't have any information that Saddam's regime was actually behind any terrorist acts." Doesn't that negate the validity of any information given to the U.S.?

Read the story again. Bush never said Iraq was responsible for the 9-11 attacks. What the story said is the Russia warned the US AFTER 9-11 that Iraq was planning something.

PutinPutin said Russia didn't have any information that Saddam's regime was actually behind any terrorist acts.

"After Sept. 11, 2001, and before the start of the military operation in Iraq, the Russian special services, the intelligence service, received information that officials from Saddam's regime were preparing terrorist attacks in the United States and outside it against the U.S. military and other interests," Putin said.

See when you read the entire story you would understand. Don't go fishing for bits and pieces to spin.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [setstyle](#) on Sat, 26 Jun 2004 18:51:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

K9TroopersetstyleK9TrooperWhat about this? Russia WARNED the US that Iraq was infact planning attacks WITHIN the US.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,123051,00.html>

"Putin said Russia didn't have any information that Saddam's regime was actually behind any terrorist acts." Doesn't that negate the validity of any information given to the U.S.?

Read the story again. Bush never said Iraq was responsible for the 9-11 attacks. What the story said is the Russia warned the US AFTER 9-11 that Iraq was planning something.

PutinPutin said Russia didn't have any information that Saddam's regime was actually behind any terrorist acts.

"After Sept. 11, 2001, and before the start of the military operation in Iraq, the Russian special services, the intelligence service, received information that officials from Saddam's regime were preparing terrorist attacks in the United States and outside it against the U.S. military and other interests," Putin said.

See when you read the entire story you would understand. Don't go fishing for bits and pieces to spin.

With only those two paragraphs above, Putin would contradict himself. If there even were links between Saddam and Al-Queda (as mentioned in the rest of the article), that would not mean Saddam was in any way behind the 9/11 attacks. It's all speculation at this point.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 28 Jun 2004 02:43:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No one has said there was a link between Saddam and 9/11. This war isn't about 9/11. It's about preventing it from happening again. The only possible link between Saddam and 9/11 is that it's been reported that Mohammed Atta met with an Iraqi government official in Czechoslovakia. This isn't confirmed and is not being used to formulate a tie. However there are plenty of documented incidents of Osama/Al Qaeda and Iraq having ties.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Renardin6](#) on Sat, 03 Jul 2004 16:38:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

well, about Mr. Moore

In europe, a lot of people like his work.

He won the european oscar festival @ Cannes in France.

This man is not stupid, far from it.

Just compare Europe and USA.

USA : Almost every one has a gun at home.

Europe : No guns at home !!!

And about the news it's the same :

USA : The news make all american scared.

Europe : The news are about something else than danger and death... We don't have a 'COPS TV show' because we don't have enough pursuit in a year to make a single 30 min tv show with it...

I don't tell he is right about all, but on some points, come on ! face the truth !

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [U927](#) on Sat, 03 Jul 2004 19:54:14 GMT

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

Renardin6Just compare Europe and USA.

USA : Almost every one has a gun at home.

Europe : No guns at home !!!

USA : The news make all american scared.

Europe : The news are about something else than danger and death... We don't have a 'COPS TV show' because we don't have enough pursuit in a year to make a single 30 min tv show with it...

Now you are being a stereotypical bastard.

Almost everyone has a gun? That would mean that 80% or higher of a population of 255 million people has a gun in their home. Please, show me where you got this information, and I will cede to your point.

If you are going to ramble bullshit like that, at least make it SOMEWHAT believable.

Also, the news does not scare us. We don't board up our doors and windows when we hear someone was killed 50 miles away. And don't go saying that Europe doesn't have problems with crime. In most pursuit shows, about a quarter of the show displays high-speed chases and arrests in Britain, France, Germany, and Spain.

Don't go around waving your flag. Although the US may have more problems than Europe does, you face the same problems we do.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [NeoX](#) on Sat, 03 Jul 2004 20:52:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

He tells 99.9% of the truth. Its just true warm blood americans cant face it and/or are Bush supporters and are out raged.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 03 Jul 2004 22:34:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NeoXHe tells 99.9% of the truth. It just true warm blood americans can face it and/or are Bush supporters and are out raged.

If you believe Moore told the truth 99.9% of the time, you have no idea what truth is.

Umbral255 million
Closer to 300 million, actually.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 05 Jul 2004 19:12:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hydra - have you actually seen Fahrenheit 9/11?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [liberator](#) on Mon, 05 Jul 2004 19:44:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[quote="Umbral_DelaFlare"]Renardin6Almost everyone has a gun? That would mean that 80% or higher of a population of 255 million people has a gun in their home. Please, show me where you got this information, and I will cede to your point.

Well, here's the interesting part, aside from myself, I know very few people who don't own a gun and keep it in their home. There is even a gun in my parents house, it's unloaded and not well maintained, but if anything I'd say 80% is a little low.

The 2nd amendment guarantee's Americans the right to own and bear arms as the final line of defense against the Government should they leave control of the people and to defend against foreign invaders should the need arise. Thank heaven that the latter has never occurred and the former hasn't happened in over 150 years.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 05 Jul 2004 22:03:50 GMT

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

Yeah, the 2nd amendment has two parts, the second of which the NRA doesn't want you to know about. I believe this is correct, except for a few misplaced words:

The Second Amendment:

- 1) The right to bear arms
- 2) to be used in a well-formed militia

The second amendment isn't there to make sure hillbillies can sit in their neck of the woods and unload on wild animals with automatic rifles. It's there to make sure citizens can always have a form of protecting themselves without the help of the government.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [Renardin6](#) on Tue, 13 Jul 2004 13:05:46 GMT

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

...In europe, nobody has weapons...

...so nobody has problems...

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Tue, 13 Jul 2004 13:18:15 GMT

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

Really? Then what were they using to shoot at us when I was over there?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 13 Jul 2004 14:30:02 GMT

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

Um...which European country had a beef with the U.S. Navy?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Tue, 13 Jul 2004 14:48:37 GMT

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

All of them.

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Tue, 13 Jul 2004 19:43:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Renardin6...In europe, nobody has weapons...

...so nobody has problems...

That is the stupidest thing I ever read. LOL, where do you get your information from... The Polish, German, Russian or Italian mob?

Subject: Michael Moore Has Competition.
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Wed, 14 Jul 2004 02:12:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Renardin6...In europe, nobody has weapons...

...so nobody has problems...

STD Rate of Denmark: 6.7%
Source: <http://www.avert.org/stdstatisticsworldwide.htm>

List of terrorist groups:
<http://www.nationmaster.com/encyclopedia/List-of-terrorist-groups>

News on Gun Crimes:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/2640817.stm
<http://www.bcwf.bc.ca/s=122/bcw1069915015293/>

<http://reason.com/0211/fe.jm.gun.shtml>
<http://johnrlott.tripod.com/op-eds/IBDGunConFailure.html>

I reccomend you also visit <http://keepandbeararms.com/> and <http://www.a-human-right.com/>.
