

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 02:35:09 GMT

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

---

## Steps to becoming a GOOD Democrat

Virtually anyone can be a Democrat. Just simply quit thinking (about it) and vote that way. If you want to be a GOOD Democrat, however, there are some prerequisites you must have first. Compare them below and see how you rate...

1. You have to believe the AIDS virus is spread by a lack of Federal funding.
2. You have to believe that the same school system that can't teach 4th graders how to read is somehow the best qualified to teach those same kids all about sex.
3. You have to believe that guns, in the hands of law abiding Americans, are more of a threat than US nuclear weapons technology, in the hands of Chinese communists.
4. You have to believe that there was no art before Federal funding.
5. You have to believe that global temperatures are less affected by cyclical, documented changes in the earth's climate, and more affected by Americans driving SUVs!
6. You have to believe that gender roles are artificial but being homosexual is natural.
7. You have to be against capital punishment but support abortion on demand.
8. You have to believe that businesses create oppression and governments create prosperity.
9. You have to believe that hunters don't care about nature, but loony activists from Seattle do.
10. You have to believe that self-esteem is more important than actually doing something to earn it.
11. You have to believe that the US military starts wars--not evil tyrannical regimes.
12. You have to believe the NRA is bad, because it supports certain parts of the Constitution, while the ACLU is good, because it supports certain parts of the constitution.
13. You have to believe that taxes are too low, but ATM fees are too high.
14. You have to believe that Margaret Sanger and Gloria Steinem are more important to American history than Thomas Jefferson, General Robert E. Lee or Thomas Edison.
15. You have to believe that standardized tests are racist, but racial quotas and set-asides are not.

16. You have to believe Hillary Clinton is all about "progress" and not power. She just wants to help us out of the archaic system of governing that we've been subjected to since our founding.

17. You have to believe that the only reason socialism hasn't worked anywhere it's been tried, is because the right people haven't been in charge.

18. You have to believe Republicans telling the truth belong in jail, but a cheat, liar and sex offender belongs in the White House and you would vote him back in there in a New York minute (if you could).

19. You have to believe that homosexual parades displaying drag and transvestites should be constitutionally protected and manger scenes at Christmas should be illegal.

20. You have to believe that illegal Democrat Party funding by the Chinese is somehow in the best interest of the United States.

21. You have to believe that the vociferous minorities who protest against prayer and saluting the flag in school, the 10 commandments in court, have far more rights than the majority who believe in God and country and want these values to be instilled in our young children.

If you are locked in solidly to most of these beliefs - you're gonna be a big asset to John Kerry.

---

---

Subject: Re: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 02:40:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson  
If you are locked in solidly to most of these beliefs - you're gonna be a big asset to John Kerry.

John Kerry isn't Locked to anything.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 03:54:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson's copying and pasting skills are superb.

This is all retarded garbage.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

---

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 04:09:04 GMT

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

---

22. Girly men are homosexuals.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 07:04:52 GMT

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

---

SEALCrimson's copying and pasting skills are superb.

This is all retarded garbage.

I know the truth hurts...

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 07:27:58 GMT

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

---

I can do that.

President George W Bush is visiting an elementary school, and he visits one of the classes. They are in the middle of a discussion related to words and their meanings. The teacher asks the President if he would like to lead the class in the discussion of the word, "tragedy." So the illustrious leader asks the class for an example of a "tragedy."

One little boy stands up and offers, "If my best friend, who lives next door, is playing in the street and a car comes along and runs him over, that would be a tragedy."

"No," says Bush, "that would be an ACCIDENT."

A little girl raises her hand: "If a school bus carrying 50 children drove off a cliff, killing everyone involved, that would be a tragedy."

"I'm afraid not," explains Mr. President. "That's what we would call a GREAT LOSS."

The room goes silent. No other children volunteer. President Bush searches the room. "Isn't there someone here who can give me an example of a tragedy?"

Finally, way in the back of the room, a small boy raises his hand. In a quiet voice he says, "If Air Force One, carrying Mr. Bush, were struck by a missile and blown up to smithereens, by a terrorist like Osama bin Laden, that would be a tragedy."

"Fantastic," exclaims Bush, "that's right. And can you tell me WHY that would be a TRAGEDY?"

"Well," says the boy, "because it wouldn't be an accident, and it certainly wouldn't be a great loss."

---

---

Subject: ^^^^^^^^

Posted by [punkun21](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 10:48:00 GMT

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

---

NHJ I can do this...That was a load of crap

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 12:03:47 GMT

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

---

CrimsonSEALCrimson's copying and pasting skills are superb.

This is all retarded garbage.

I know the truth hurts...

Funny, I'm a Democrat. All that stuff is such bullshit. "Truth hurts" my ass. What WILL hurt for you is when Bush is kicked out of office.

---

Subject: Re: ^^^^^^^^

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 13:06:39 GMT

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

---

punkun21NHJ I can do this...That was a load of crap

So was Crimson's; that kind of was my point

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 14:53:01 GMT

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

---

Quote:11. You have to believe that the US military starts wars--not evil tyrannical regimes.

The one who throws the first proverbial punch is the one who starts the war. In terms of Iraq, it WAS America.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 18:00:05 GMT

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

---

I don't like Bush or Kerry, but c'mon. This was a JOKE.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Pak](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 18:21:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Especially When you have a Cash Cow Whore Wife, i.e. Teresa Heinz Kerry  
  
She was a Republican That Went Bad, Like Heinz Ketchup

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 18:51:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Shut up, you imbusiile. The fact that you would so rudely attack someone who really is not such a bad person, like Teresa, shows you have little comprehension of anything. Go be stupid somewhere else.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Pak](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 19:23:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Teresa Heinz Kerry is a Bitch Plain And Simple!  
  
As for Kerry He Isn't President Material, Hes a Flip Flop.  
  
Bush is More Straight Forth President You Know His Agenda.  
  
Bush is Better Than Kerry!

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 20:00:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

^ Looks like a European is trying to mock a Republican.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Pak](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 20:52:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm Canadian Eh?

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 20:53:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

PakTeresa Heinz Kerry is a Bitch Plain And Simple!

Why?

PakAs for Kerry He Isn't President Material, Hes a Flip Flop.

Tell me, why do you think John Kerry is a flip-flopper? Which bills did he flip-flop on?

PakBush is More Straight Forth President You Know His Agenda.

Lower taxes and screw the economy?

PakBush is Better Than Kerry!

Kerry is Better Than Bush!

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 22:04:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

PakI'm Canadian Eh?

Close enough.

SuperFlyingEngi, I told you once, and I'm going to tell you again. Buy "Whatever Happened to Justice" by Richard J. Maybury.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Fri, 06 Aug 2004 02:13:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiTell me, why do you think John Kerry is a flip-flopper? Which bills did he flip-flop on?

<http://www.georgewbush.com/kerrymediacycenter/read.aspx?ID=2439>

<http://slate.msn.com/id/2096540/>

Quote:Lower taxes and screw the economy?  
Lowering taxes screws the economy?

There are loads of sources for you to look at to try to understand how economics works. Try looking at some of it before commenting on it, or you may make another incorrect statement about it like you just did here.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Fri, 06 Aug 2004 06:26:54 GMT

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

---

If you do it right, lowering taxes can indeed help the economy. If you do it right...

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Fri, 06 Aug 2004 06:49:36 GMT

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

---

If you do it correctly, lowering taxes helps the economy, which is why George W. Bush lowered taxes correctly, which is why the economy is on the upswing.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 06 Aug 2004 14:24:59 GMT

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

---

Reagan lowered taxes too, but it screwed the economy rather badly, considering how his tax breaks went straight in to the national deficit. They say he made 3 trillion dollars of growth in the economy, but that's really a lie, because the deficit increased 3 trillion dollars. Thst's not a good tax cut.

George Bush lowered taxes, but at what expense? Cutting tons of funding for after-school programs, medicare, just about everything that helps people got cut so people can have their tax cuts. So, when everyone but the rich thinks that they have gotten some more money in their pockets, they end up spending more money to care for their children and themselves than if they hadn't gotten their tax cut. Whereas, the rich get to sit high and mighty.

Oh, and has everyone heard? The terror alert for the banking district was based on intelligence that was captured 3 years ago. 3 Years ago, they captured some drawings of the financial district, and sheets with time shifts on them from a suspected pakistani terrorist. So, they set off an alert a couple days ago. Doesn't make much sense to me, especially when each alert costs millions of dollars.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 06 Aug 2004 17:43:51 GMT

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

---

Oh you ARE a bright one, aren't you? I think you need to read up on that story a bit more. Even the media has retracted most of what they said about it. The information was 3 years old, then it was UPDATED recently, which is exactly the same thing that happened in the 9/11 attack. Apparently we captured someone with a LOT of knowledge about the communication methods of Al Qaeda and he's been quite a wealth of information for us.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 07 Aug 2004 15:00:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Disclaimer: the following statement is extremely biased, inflammatory, politically incorrect, and based entirely on the author's own opinions, which hopefully are not in the least bit like anyone else's.

Wow. I'm beginning to think that this country has almost completely outgrown its entire political system. It's time for a change- a really big one, and one that I'm sure will never be made because it would upset our precious status quo.

The problem is not that either party is any worse than the other- it's that few people can see past their own ridiculous party loyalty to actually sit down and think (yeah, that's right- a little logic, a little creativity, and some good old fashioned reason!) about what's actually best for America. That means (gasp!) looking at both sides of the issue- something which is rarer than a seaworthy russian submarine.

Even worse are the retards who vote for a particular candidate simply because they aren't the other guy- nevermind that they don't know a fucking thing about who they just gave their vote to! That particular brand of stupidity is showing its ugly face in this election- does anyone realize that Kerry and Bush are really not all that different in their private opinions on various controversial issues? The only difference is that one has already shown his hand and has to play it out- the other can straddle the issues all he pleases. If their positions were reversed, I'm not so sure the same damn thing wouldn't be happening.

I think I'll look for a third-party choice that actually supports the same things I do. Neither one of the major parties do that right now. And if such a candidate doesn't exist- well, there's always a write-in. The only way anything is ever going to change in this country is if people start voicing their own damn opinions, instead of someone else's.

[/OPINION]

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 07 Aug 2004 15:03:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

^

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [setstyle](#) on Sat, 07 Aug 2004 22:15:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Such sense I haven't read in a while. I disagree with Bush on too many issues to consider voting

for him, yet Kerry seems to me so vague I have no clue for what he stands. For those simple reasons I support Nader, if anyone, since he clearly communicates ideas I agree with. If people fear voting for third-party candidates and go with Kerry just to defeat Bush I don't feel they can stand for much of anything either.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Sat, 07 Aug 2004 23:20:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It's too bad Ron Paul decided not to run for president. Well, at least I have Badnarik.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Sun, 08 Aug 2004 07:48:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

In other words, the two-party system needs to go. This will allow candidates to appeal to more specific groups of people instead of doing everything possible to get the middle votes.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Sun, 08 Aug 2004 09:02:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That's right!

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Sun, 08 Aug 2004 13:24:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

MrBobThat's right!

I want to vote for him

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 09 Aug 2004 16:57:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I, too, disagree with the two-party system, and I don't think ANY law, amendment, or policy should EVER make reference to party affiliation. So few people would actually fall completely in line with a party's stance.

---

For example, I agree with Bush's stance on issues and except for a few youthful incidents, he's a stellar character. That's why I'm voting for him in November.

I not only don't know where Kerry stands on the issues, but he's basing his entire campaign on the 4 months he spent in Vietnam, then gets all pissy and combative when confronted with what he did in those 4 months.

I am not a Democrat. I do not believe in their ideals. I disagree with the Republicans on the gay marriage issue and I'm undecided on stem cell research, but everything else I can agree with.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 09 Aug 2004 19:56:36 GMT

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

---

The only thing I don't like about having more than two parties is that you will never get the majority.

One candidate can get 18% of the vote and still win the election, even though 82% of people don't want you as president.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 09 Aug 2004 21:22:34 GMT

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

---

That's why you need a minimum number of signatures/votes/whatever-the-hell-it-is-that-you-need to get onto the presidential ballot in most states. We could have literally hundreds of presidential candidates if just anyone who stood up and shouted "I WANNA BE PRESIDENT!!111!" got onto the ballot.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 09 Aug 2004 22:04:21 GMT

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

---

hydra1945That's why you need a minimum number of signatures/votes/whatever-the-hell-it-is-that-you-need to get onto the presidential ballot in most states. We could have literally hundreds of presidential candidates if just anyone who stood up and shouted "I WANNA BE PRESIDENT!!111!" got onto the ballot. Then why is there the blank for write ins?

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 09 Aug 2004 23:03:24 GMT

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

---

So that anyone can be voted for (which is fair) but saves room on the actual ballot...

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 09 Aug 2004 23:39:51 GMT

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

---

CrimsonSo that anyone can be voted for (which is fair) but saves room on the actual ballot...

Exactly, so it doesn't matter if someone gets on the ballot or not. If enough people want them as president they will write in their name.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 03:34:39 GMT

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

---

Maybe we should just have "Who do you want as president? \_\_\_\_\_" On the Ballots... Of course I'd imagine... it'd slow things down just a tad... Plus I mean We'd have scrolling on the bottom of the news:

Districts Reporting in : 110 148 139 58 29 13 4 1

Totals so far : Bush 24% Kerry 11% Nader 1% Fat Albert 3% Rick James Ghost 7% George Washington 3% Kirby Peawauket 2% Dave Chapelle 17% Hillary Clinton 0% Jim Nabors -1% Larry the Cable Guy 23% Colonel Sanders 7% Ash Ketchum 4%

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 06:13:30 GMT

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

---

I wonder how many people will actually write "Me" on the ballot

---

Subject: foolios

Posted by [ViperFUD](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 11:34:19 GMT

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

---

Have any of you actually heard of the electoral college?

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 12:01:49 GMT

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

---

Yes.

It creates a situation where one American's vote is worth more the another American's vote. It has the potential to create a situation where, nationally, more people will vote for President X, but President Y will win the election (ie. election 2000). Talk about fairness, eh?

There have been several attempts to get rid of the electoral system, but they have obviously failed.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 18:32:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DoitleLarry the Cable Guy 23%  
Git-r-done!!!!!!

SEALIt creates a situation where one American's vote is worth more the another American's vote. It has the potential to create a situation where, nationally, more people will vote for President X, but President Y will win the election (ie. election 2000). Talk about fairness, eh?  
Tell me, would it be more fair to people living in Arkansas, Wyoming, and other "fly-over" states if the elections were controlled by only those living in high-population areas? Some cities have a higher population than entire states, so what candidate is going to care about what the "rural rednecks" think about politics if there aren't any votes in it for them? They'd all be going after the votes in the urban areas and pander to their interests while the people living in rural areas get the shaft.

The electoral college gives the people living in low population areas a fair representation in the presidential election.

Quote:There have been several attempts to get rid of the electoral system, but they have obviously failed.  
Thank god they did, too.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 18:54:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You have a point, but that seems to be the only real advantage--one that is outweighed by several disadvantages. Besides, if all votes were equal, it would be in the candidates best interest to visit as many places as possible, and not just areas with high electoral points.

My vote is worth less than someone living, for example, in California. I don't see how that is fair. Period. If a state wins by literally 1 vote, than every vote for the losing candidate is an absolute waste. It is because of this that we end up with presidents whom the majority of Americans did not vote for, but are in office anyway.

A solution to both my side and your side of the argument would be to give electoral points proportionately to what percent the candidate won by, for every state. For example, if Bush wins in state X, which has 10 electoral points, by getting 60% of the vote, he will only get 6 points (60% of 10).

My 2 cents.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 21:02:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

PakAs for Kerry He Isn't President Material, Hes a Flip Flop.

Bush is More Straight Forth President You Know His Agenda.

I love when uninformed people speak their mind, they look so comically foolish. Why do you think Kerry is a flop-flop? Because the media has used that exact same phrase so many times, you are unable to create your own opinions. You're like a mina-bird. "Kerry is a flip-flop. CAW"

Bush is much more of a flip-flop than Kerry will ever be,

Bush said he would impose Steel Tarriffs even though they were illegal.  
~Bush repealed steel tarriffs because of Billions of dollars in sanctions leveled at the US.

Bush said Gay Marriage was a "State Issue" and would never pass policy on it.  
~Bush asks congress for a Constitutional Ammendment prohibiting gay marriage.

Bush says that he will not create a Secretary of Homeland Security as Democrats request, because it is "unnecessary"  
~Bush creates a Secretary of Homeland Security.

Bush promised to do away with "Nation Building", saying we have no business in doing that.  
~Bush asks for 150 Billion Dollars to rebuild Iraq.

Bush says he will not endorse a 9/11 commission.  
~Bush endorses the 9/11 commission.

Bush says he will not appear before the 9/11 commission.  
~Bush appears before the 9/11 commission.

Bush runs for election on fiscal responsibility and his ability to unite the country.  
~Bush establishes a RECORD HIGH national deficit from projected surplusses, and polarizes the country to Civil War levels.

Bush imposes an Executive order titled "Preservation of Open Competition and Government

Neutrality Towards Government Contractors' Labor Relations on Federal and Federally Funded Construction Projects "

~Bush awards no-bid contracts to his friends at Haliburton.

Oh I could go on and on, but you wouldn't understand as you dont actually think or form opinions from "information" or "news", you just regurgitate the latest catch-phrase from the TV and pretend to have an original thought.

If "flip-flopping" were really a problem for you, then you would be furious with GW Bush, but since you don't actually have a problem with "flip=flopping" you just want to attack Kerry, then nothing I say is going to make it through.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 21:24:27 GMT

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

---

And where did you get this information from?

The only one I know is true is when he said he did not like nation building.

But we are not really nation building, we are nation molding.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 21:43:14 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerBut we are not really nation building, we are nation molding.

...:rolleyes:

I can't make an educated statement on those "Bush flip flops" but I'm informed enough to know that's the stupidest sentence I've seen in a while.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 21:44:05 GMT

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

---

There is a difference.

We are giving them a leg up, not totally making them.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 21:48:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That argument got blasted on the pits, so it's gotta find new legs here I guess.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 21:53:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Flip flopping (Bush/Kerry?), or the electoral college?

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 23:10:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

CrimsonThat argument got blasted on the pits, so it's gotta find new legs here I guess.

Well, if it was inherently wrong enough to be blasted bad on the Pitts, then why don't you post what those people said here?

Oh, and did anyone see Bill O' Lielly get handed his head on Meet the Press by Paul Krugman? No, you won't be able to see the entire thing on Fox. I suggest reading the transcript, because whenever Krugman says something, Bill O' Dumbass starts screaming, and you often can't hear it.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 23:15:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Have you read what Krugman has said about O'Reilly?

If someone called you a liar who and a terrorist every chance they got you'd be pissed at them to..

The Krugman guy is a lieing asshole.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 10 Aug 2004 23:20:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

[http://www.boston.com/news/politics/president/articles/2004/08/10/kerry\\_says\\_hed\\_still\\_vote\\_to\\_authorize\\_iraq\\_war/](http://www.boston.com/news/politics/president/articles/2004/08/10/kerry_says_hed_still_vote_to_authorize_iraq_war/)

---

I voted for the war, then I voted against the funding, then I campaigned on the premise that the war was unnecessary and based on lies, then I said I would have voted for it anyway even if I knew there were no WMD stockpiles and the intelligence was faulty.

C'mon Senator... what kind of idiots do you think we are??

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 11 Aug 2004 00:18:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I spearheaded the entire 'go to war with Iraq' campaign...  
"...even if I knew there were no WMD stockpiles and the intelligence was faulty."

C'mon Mr. Bush... what kind of idiots do you think we are??

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 11 Aug 2004 01:23:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I don't understand what you're saying or trying to say. All I see is a pathetic attempt, even for you, to try and refute this.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 11 Aug 2004 02:45:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:I spearheaded the entire 'go to war with Iraq' campaign...  
"...even if I knew there were no WMD stockpiles and the intelligence was faulty."

C'mon Mr. Bush... what kind of idiots do you think we are??

lol what? Were talking about Kerry not Bush.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Wed, 11 Aug 2004 08:10:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Back to the electoral college. Can someone explain why this system does not favor high-population areas? States with more people do have more electoral college points, don't they?

Furthermore I agree with Seal when he said

Quote:A solution to both my side and your side of the argument would be to give electoral points proportionatly to what percent the candidate won by, for every state. For example, if Bush wins in state X, which has 10 electoral points, by getting 60% of the vote, he will only get 6 points (60% of 10).

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 11 Aug 2004 11:53:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You're right Crimson, that attempt was pretty pathetic.

What I was trying to say, is why do you blame someone who voted to go to war when there was faulty intelligence, and at the same time support the man in charge of the entire operation? Many Senator's votes were based on what Bush said in his speeches. If they knew that they were lies, people may have voted differently.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 11 Aug 2004 14:33:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Just for the record, and this is bi-partisen:

Don't make judgements based on whether "Mr X voted against blah", find out WHY they didn't vote on a perticular issue, or why they did. Most people aren't as heartless as the media and those campaign commericals make them out to be.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 11 Aug 2004 16:27:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NodbuggerHave you read what Krugman has said about OReilly?

If someone called you a liar who and a terrorist every chance they got you'd be pissed at them to..

The Krugman guy is a lieing asshole.

I take it you only watched the part of the interview on FOX where you can only hear O' Reilly putting words in Krugman's mouth? Read the transcript.

Krugman isn't a lieing asshole, he's on the Nobel Prize short list, whereas O'Lielly spews bullcrap all day long on his show. Although it was weird, because I actually watched his show the other day, and he was attacking the Swift Boat Veterans Against Kerry. Well, I suppose this makes sense, because I don't think many groups lie more than Swift Boat Veterans Against Kerry,

considering how their entire story is completely made up, and none of them ever served on his boat.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 11 Aug 2004 17:12:50 GMT

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

---

He has said if you can prove he lied he will admit it, but no one can prove him yet.

He is as objective as you will get on any show of this sort.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 11 Aug 2004 17:40:03 GMT

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

---

I hope you're not talking about O'Reilly. There couldn't be a less objective person.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 11 Aug 2004 17:48:34 GMT

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

---

First off, one of these guys was Kerry's commanding officer... so don't tell me that none of them served with him.

Furthermore, the Senate doesn't just sit on their asses all day and vote on stuff. There are committees there who review intelligence and oversee... well, lots of things. They don't sit around and vote based on what the president says... there are lobbyists and action groups who also give their senators information, and the oversight committee has access to exactly the same intelligence information that Bush has access to, and they came to the same conclusion.

Unfortunately for Bush and America, Dean hopped on this anti-war wagon and invited everyone to come aboard and re-write history and act like Bush acted unilaterally in this Iraq decision and lied to the Senate... when the Senate had the SAME intelligence data!

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 01:29:25 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngibecause I don't think many groups lie more than Swift Boat Veterans Against Kerry, considering how their entire story is completely made up, and none of them ever served on his boat.

If that's all you have to say about them, you can't be taken seriously anymore.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 08:16:21 GMT

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

---

CrimsonFirst off, one of these guys was Kerry's commanding officer... so don't tell me that none of them served with him.

Furthermore, the Senate doesn't just sit on their asses all day and vote on stuff. There are committees there who review intelligence and oversee... well, lots of things. They don't sit around and vote based on what the president says... there are lobbyists and action groups who also give their senators information, and the oversight committee has access to exactly the same intelligence information that Bush has access to, and they came to the same conclusion.

Unfortunately for Bush and America, Dean hopped on this anti-war wagon and invited everyone to come aboard and re-write history and act like Bush acted unilaterally in this Iraq decision and lied to the Senate... when the Senate had the SAME intelligence data!

But don't you think that if the president says that he's sure Iraq has WMD's, the Senate will tend to believe him? Did they know they had all the exact same data?

Furthermore I would appreciate if someone would answer my question about the electoral college system, I'm a bit confused about it.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 12:13:16 GMT

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

---

NHJ: I personally don't understand how the electoral college works at all...But, for a simplified look at it, here's How Stuff Works...

<http://people.howstuffworks.com/electoral-college.htm>

hydra1945If that's all you have to say about them, you can't be taken seriously anymore.

No, you have to in fact be an imbecile to believe what those people say...Yeah, one of them was his commanding officer, quite high up, however, so I doubt he actually served with him, and came out a couple days ago saying he didn't know what he was doing when he signed that petition, that he was making a big mistake, and that he's going to be in big trouble now...And then later that same day, like 6 hours later, he said, No, I was right all along, I should have signed this petition and I fully support Swift Boat Veterans Against Kerry.

Can you say large soft money donations from the Republican party? I know I can.

And people making such a big deal about whether or not he actually earned his purple hearts... If you get an open wound, you get a purple heart. It's not so much an award for taking home an injury as it is an award for facing combat and being injured in the process. Blood = Purple heart. There should be no discussion of whether he actually earned it, especially since there was

shrapnel in the wound for the one people seem most fixated on.

Here's what I believe is the official description of the Purple heart:

Awarded for wounds or death as result of an act of any opposing armed force, as a result of an international terrorist attack or as a result of military operations while serving as part of a peacekeeping force.

It's also our first medal, established in 1782.

The Bronze Star,

For heroic or meritorious achievement of service, not involving aerial flight in connection with operations against an opposing armed force.

A medal that shows particular valor or meritorious service.

Ah, yes, the Silver Star:

For distinguished gallantry in action against an enemy of the United States or while serving with friendly forces against an opposing enemy force.

Third highest combat medal awarded by the U.S. Armed Force designed solely for heroism in combat. Winning this one is definitely a big deal.

And to top that all of, numerous commendations from all of his commanders, except perhaps Mr. I-like-to-flip-flop-after-taking-large-soft-money-donations-from-the-Republican-party.

Trying to attack his war record is a retarded idea. Except it just keeps going and going and going. It's not like Kerry is championing his exemplary record at every speech he makes, nay, he's talking about how he plans to fix America. But the media keeps coming out and saying that "No one knows how John Kerry is." Even though a lot of people do, they eat up fake opinions with a spoon. If you listened, you would know John Kerry's agenda.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 15:23:51 GMT

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

---

Crimson[http://www.boston.com/news/politics/president/articles/2004/08/10/kerry\\_says\\_hed\\_still\\_vote\\_to\\_authorize\\_iraq\\_war/](http://www.boston.com/news/politics/president/articles/2004/08/10/kerry_says_hed_still_vote_to_authorize_iraq_war/)

I voted for the war, then I voted against the funding, then I campaigned on the premise that the war was unnecessary and based on lies, then I said I would have voted for it anyway even if I knew there were no WMD stockpiles and the intelligence was faulty.

C'mon Senator... what kind of idiots do you think we are??

Either you aren't reading the article that you yourself posted, you misunderstand the article, or you are misinterpreting it on purpose.

The article you quoted above never says Kerry would authorize the war, Kerry never says it, nobody listens anymore, nobody thinks anymore.

Kerry said the president should have the AUTHORITY to go to war. But that the authority was misused by Bush. In other words, he entrusted the president to have all options, and GW Bush fucked up.

From YOUR article:

Quote: Kerry said "Yes, I would have voted for the authority. I believe it was the right authority for a president to have." Kerry has said the decision to invade rested with the president.

The article you posted actually CONTRADICTS your theory claim that Kerry would have done the same thing.

CRIMMY- it isn't your fault that your opinions are based on lies and misinformation since you listen to Rush Limbaugh as a news source.

Quote: YOU SAID: I voted for the war, then I voted against the funding, then I campaigned on the premise that the war was unnecessary and based on lies, then I said I would have voted for it anyway even if I knew there were no WMD stockpiles and the intelligence was faulty.

First lie: he didn't vote for the war. Second lie: he didn't vote against the funding, he voted FOR the bill with a condition that tax cuts be suspended to PAY for it, when that was defeated by republicans

[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=108&session=1&vote=00373](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=108&session=1&vote=00373) he voted against the bill which was both fiscally responsible and remarkable insightful.

Third lie: "Then I would have voted for it". I have explained above why this is not true. Anyone who actually reads the newspaper knows this isn't true.

I am getting exhausted pointing out the flaws in your attacks on Kerry.

You claim above that my arguments were ineffective in the PITS FORUMS, and again I think you are blinded by your own jingoistic vitriol.

<http://renegade.the-pitts.net/index.php?s=87448dc29695950cbcc2691685e9f64b&act=ST&f=26&t=8020&st=0>

I think I made my point quite well in the Pits Forums, which is why maybe you came here to a forum board of younger, less informed folks to practice your propoganda on them.

Kerry is no more a "Flip-Flop" than GW Bush. To claim so is to ignore the nature of politics and to ask your politicians to be inflexible. A stance only the most ignorant people will hold onto.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 15:30:06 GMT

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

---

^ You know whats funny? Kerry would call you a liar.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 17:23:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That's not funny.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 17:35:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I didn't "come here". I own "here".

Kerry is obviously just pulling semantics here. You vote to authorize a war, you shouldn't be surprised when you get a war. And it still doesn't matter what Bush said to the Senate. They are adults, not children. They can think for themselves. They have nothing to lose from not doing what the president wants. That's the beauty of checks and balances. If these Senators are just going to do what the president wants (which they obviously don't considering Michael Moore's claim that Bush "had trouble getting legislation passed" when he first came into office... then these senators need to be disbanded and either elect more that will stand up for their beliefs or just eliminate that branch of the government.

But now we all know this can't possibly be the case, so don't make these senators out to be victims of these supposed "lies" when they were in a place to know what the intelligence said (the president knows nothing that the oversight committee doesn't know as far as that goes) and in a place to stop the war if it were so wrong.

Furthermore, I do not listen to Rush as a news source. First off, I don't listen to him at all, I read transcripts. But he's not a news show. He provides editorials/commentaries on the day's news. I use CNN as a news source.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 17:44:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

CrimsonI didn't "come here". I own "here".

You're right, sorry.

See, I knew if we talked long enough we'd agree on something.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 17:50:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

CrimsonKerry is obviously just pulling semantics here. You vote to authorize a war, you shouldn't be surprised when you get a war.

It is actually YOU using semantics here. Since the Senate never authorized the war, it authorized the president to use the military if and how he deemed necessary. Never mind that the vote was driven by erroneous information and fear, that isn't the point. The point is that Kerry never cast a vote in favor of war in Iraq and you say he did.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 18:16:52 GMT

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

---

GizbotvasCrimsonKerry is obviously just pulling semantics here. You vote to authorize a war, you shouldn't be surprised when you get a war.

It is actually YOU using semantics here. Since the Senate never authorized the war, it authorized the president to use the military if and how he deemed necessary. Never mind that the vote was driven by erroneous information and fear, that isn't the point. The point is that Kerry never cast a vote in favor of war in Iraq and you say he did.

I don't think you are receiving the point here.

Why would Kerry say, "You can use the military just don't use the military to fight"

If they authorize the use of the military don't you think that going to war is part of that use?

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 20:24:31 GMT

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

---

Now's around the time when I step in and throw some more gas on the fire...

Engi, are you aware that medals were thrown around rather freely in the Vietnam war? Whether Kerry 'earned' them or not is open to debate. For an example, there was one case of an officer getting a medal for knowing how to operate a radio (and in doing it, calling in an artillery strike on a friendly position)! Purple Hearts, in particular, were used as a way to get out of the war quickly, in much the same way as National Guard service served as a way to prevent being shipped overseas. Since neither you nor anyone else here was present when the events that got Kerry his medals took place, it is impossible to know exactly how deserving he was of them. "Because he got them" is not a good enough reason. A medal is only as good as the deeds that earned it.

Don't mistake that as an argument for Bush, though- I'll bash him just as readily as anyone. However, I think that should Kerry get into office, his supporters will wind up just as disappointed as his opponents.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 21:11:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I just don't understand... Bush says "Hey, look at this intelligence we are looking at. Iraq needs to be taken down and Saddam needs to be taken out of power. I am going to use some of our military to do so, ok?"

Congress says "We authorize you to use the military to deal with Iraq"

a year later... "We authorized you to use the military but we didn't know you would actually re-open the Gulf War! How could we have ever guessed you would take Saddam out of power mere months after you did the same thing to the Taliban! It's unthinkable!"

Give the Senate a little more credit, ok?

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 23:09:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JavaxcxJust for the record, and this is bi-partisen:

Don't make judgements based on whether "Mr X voted against blah", find out WHY they didn't vote on a particular issue, or why they did. Most people aren't as heartless as the media and those campaign commercials make them out to be.

And from what I understand about they way American politics works, bills are past almost in bulk. One can be attached to another, and if what it is attached to passes, so does the other.

If I'm wrong, someone please correct me.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 10:28:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm sure it's been done, but I don't know enough about the American legislation to say for certain.

Also: Both of you are using semantics. If what Kerry said is ambiguous, then everyone is going to be using semantics. Whee. I have no doubt in my mind that Kerry can be ambiguous when he talks. Bush is the exact same way.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [ViperFUD](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 11:32:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JavaxcxI'm sure it's been done, but I don't know enough about the American legislation to say for certain.

Also: Both of you are using semantics. If what Kerry said is ambiguous, then everyone is going to be using semantics. Whee. I have no doubt in my mind that Kerry can be ambiguous when he talks. Bush is the exact same way.

Although, Kerry is ambiguous because he changes his statement halfway through the sentence. Bush is ambiguous because he says things like "unambulgoutysnesstry."

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 12:13:28 GMT

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

---

Well, I was refering to his speeches such as his '48 hour warning'. Simpletons like Nodbugger construe information out of those speeches. Generally, when Bush says something, Nodbugger and many others interpret it in a totally different way.

It might just be because Nodbugger is an idiot, but he's definitely not the only one who thinks liberation was a 'reason' given on March 17th to go to war.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 13:28:54 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxWell, I was refering to his speeches such as his '48 hour warning'. Simpletons like Nodbugger construe information out of those speeches. Generally, when Bush says something, Nodbugger and many others interpret it in a totally different way.

It might just be because Nodbugger is an idiot, but he's definitely not the only one who thinks liberation was a 'reason' given on March 17th to go to war.

Not this argument again.

When did he mention it 10+ times if he did not intend to do it and it was was not an incentive for war.

The result can lead to the reason.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 13:32:45 GMT

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

---

Nope, and there is another thread regarding this argument. If you feel like you need to reply on

this issue again, please do it in the appropriate thread.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 14:23:26 GMT

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

---

Politics is the art of throwing big words into your speeches so that the general population won't know what the fuck you're really saying. Or maybe that was diplomacy?

Thing is, there's no such thing as a politician who takes office solely for the common good. It would be a wet dream come true if such a creature ever existed, but don't hold your breath waiting for one.

Want a working definition of an honest politician? Here you go: One that stays bought.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 19:41:23 GMT

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

---

The senate gave President Bush the authorization to use military force if he needed it, and he invaded Iraq against the wishes of many senators including Kerry.

I offer a metaphor: My daughter says she needs a cell phone in case of emergencies. I authorize it, I agree to pay for it. Later I get a phone bill showing she has made 300 local calls to her friends. What happened? Am I a "Flip-Flop" if I criticize her misuse of the authority I granted her? Is it my fault for trusting her with the phone, or is it her fault for misusing that trust? Can I not say that, given the chance to do it all over again, I would still give her the cell phone, but I wouldn't approve of the way she uses it?

To criticize Kerry for giving the president all the tools is ridiculous, the criticism lays in the way the president USES those tools, and President Bush has clearly misused the power he has been given. The war was a mistake, and the apologies have not been forthcoming.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 20:01:21 GMT

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

---

GizbotvasThe senate gave President Bush the authorization to use military force if he needed it, and he invaded Iraq against the wishes of many senators including Kerry.

I offer a metaphor: My daughter says she needs a cell phone in case of emergencies. I authorize it, I agree to pay for it. Later I get a phone bill showing she has made 300 local calls to her friends. What happened? Am I a "Flip-Flop" if I criticize her misuse of the authority I granted her? Is it my fault for trusting her with the phone, or is it her fault for misusing that trust? Can I

not say that, given the chance to do it all over again, I would still give her the cell phone, but I wouldn't approve of the way she uses it?

To criticize Kerry for giving the president all the tools is ridiculous, the criticism lays in the way the president USES those tools, and President Bush has clearly misused the power he has been given. The war was a mistake, and the apologies have not been forthcoming.

Fuck You

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [AlostSOul](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:04:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

If you are going to make yourself look like an ass on a politcs issue, then leave.

agreeing with javaxcx with this one. Nodbugger is making Bush look like he is on smokable crack. When bush gave his "48 hour" speech, he intended it to be a warning for Sadam Hussien to leave the country within "48 hours", not that we were going to war in 48 hours. In fact, Bush was lienyeint in his time and gave that dictator 56 hours before the first bomb fell on the country.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:14:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

They voted saying if Bush wanted to, he could attack Iraq.

For the months prior to this Bush was saying how he wanted to attack Iraq.

Would it be unreasonable to assume Bush would use the ability given to him by congress?

He in no way mis-used what congress said and they were in no way duped into thinking something different.

Bush asked if he could go to war, congress said yes, Bush went to war.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 14 Aug 2004 00:02:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I see that article is from October 2002.... and we started the war when? Oh yeah, March 2003... just about 6 months later. And yet he "rushed to war". LOL I am tearing up from laughter.

Your analogy is horrid and doesn't fit, mostly because they agreed at the time that Iraq was an

"emergency" and in fact Kerry along with several other senators urges Clinton to do the same thing back in his Administration.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 14 Aug 2004 00:12:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson

Your analogy is horrid and doesn't fit, mostly because they agreed at the time that Iraq was an "emergency" and in fact Kerry along with several other senators urges Clinton to do the same thing back in his Administration.

Quote:"[W]e urge you, after consulting with Congress, and consistent with the U.S. Constitution and laws, to take necessary actions (including, if appropriate, air and missile strikes on suspect Iraqi sites) to respond effectively to the threat posed by Iraq's refusal to end its weapons of mass destruction programs."

Letter to President Clinton, signed by Sens. Carl Levin, Tom Daschle, John Kerry, and others Oct. 9, 1998.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 20:12:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NodbuggerFuck You

Some of you little kids crack me up. You think you read the article, then you post it, and I read it, and see that your article actually makes my point for me.

Quote:In a major victory for the White House, the Senate early Friday voted 77-23 to authorize President Bush to attack Iraq if Saddam Hussein refuses to give up weapons of mass destruction as required by U.N. resolutions

We had weapons inspectors in Iraq saying there were no weapons of mass destruction. France, Germany, Russia, China, the United Nations, and people like me were urging the president to wait and see if there were actually weapons in Iraq before we used the military.

The letter you posted from 1998 is hilarious. For one thing, we DID bomb targets in Iraq that we thought to be weapons facilities and the Republicans freaked out calling for Clinton's resignation. Now suddenly it is the talking point for a Republican agenda. LOL. For whatever it's worth, not that I expect you to understand, but that letter DID generate activity through the IAEC and got weapons inspectors back into Iraq.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 20:13:59 GMT

---

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

---

Crimsonand we started the war when? Oh yeah, March 2003... just about 6 months later. And yet he "rushed to war". LOL

Your analogy is horrid and doesn't fit, mostly because they agreed at the time that Iraq was an "emergency"

Interesting that you first say there was no rush to war, and in the next breath you say it was an "emergency".

I think you are a Flip-Flop.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 20:16:55 GMT

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

---

GizbotvasNodbuggerFuck You

Some of you little kids crack me up. You think you read the article, then you post it, and I read it, and see that your article actually makes my point for me.

If you thought that would crack you up. Read this thread. ALL of it.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 21:42:12 GMT

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

---

GizbotvasNodbuggerFuck You

Some of you little kids crack me up. You think you read the article, then you post it, and I read it, and see that your article actually makes my point for me.

Quote:In a major victory for the White House, the Senate early Friday voted 77-23 to authorize President Bush to attack Iraq if Saddam Hussein refuses to give up weapons of mass destruction as required by U.N. resolutions

We had weapons inspectors in Iraq saying there were no weapons of mass destruction. France, Germany, Russia, China, the United Nations, and people like me were urging the president to wait and see if there were actually weapons in Iraq before we used the military.

The letter you posted from 1998 is hilarious. For one thing, we DID bomb targets in Iraq that we thought to be weapons facilities and the Republicans freaked out calling for Clinton's resignation. Now suddenly it is the talking point for a Republican agenda. LOL. For whatever it's worth, not that I expect you to understand, but that letter DID generate activity through the IAEC and got weapons inspectors back into Iraq.

No it doesn't.

They gave him authority to attack Iraq. End of story.  
He used it exactly how they wrote it and they have no excuse.

And neither do you for defending them.

There was nothing wrong with this war.

No matter what you people attempt to come up with Saddam was someone who we do need in this world.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 21:42:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JavaxcxGizbotvasNodbuggerFuck You

Some of you little kids crack me up. You think you read the article, then you post it, and I read it, and see that your article actually makes my point for me.

If you thought that would crack you up. Read this thread. ALL of it.

I was 100% correct in that thread. You never proved a single thing.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 22:03:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It was especially clever of you when you would quote a mile-long post and respond to one part of it.

NodbuggerThere was nothing wrong with this war.

Error: Too Stupid.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 22:12:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NodbuggerI was 100% correct in that thread. You never proved a single thing.

Except you couldn't prove anything relevant to your case, you didn't know the meanings of simple

---

words, you think that law is a suggested guideline that can legally be bent or broken to suit your personal needs... need I go on?

Oh, and guess what. Here's something funny for you:

"The Security Council, holding its first debate on Iraq since hostilities began on 19 March, was called on to end the illegal aggression and demand the immediate withdrawal of invading forces, by an overwhelming majority of this afternoon's 45 speakers."

<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2003/sc7705.doc.htm>

That link probably won't work. It's the March 28th Press Release. If you want, (even though you won't) you can read that and the actual meeting dialogue and the press release here:

<http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/scact2003.htm>

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [hareman](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 22:40:54 GMT

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

---

still on about this

<sigh>

need to get Vince McMahon to promote this one

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 00:44:29 GMT

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

---

Who gave Bush the authority?

Congress, or the UN?

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 01:57:30 GMT

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

---

I hate seeing people yak on and on about how the US defied the UN- they talk about the UN as if it had the authority to govern member nations. Nuh-uh. All member nations are still independent and free to make their own choices. The US constitution grants the authority to make war on the US government, not an outside organization (just because France or Russia doesn't want the US to go to war, the US can still go to war because the US government supercedes the authority of the UN).

H O W E V E R . . .

Member nations of the UN should at least try to work with each other, not against. If they feel the organization does not support their nation's best interests, they should withdraw from it. That goes for ALL member nations, not just one or two. At the beginning of the Iraq war, the simple fact is that nearly the entire security council was in violation of UN resolutions in one way or another. On that note, I feel that the UN has outlived its usefulness- it has neither the power to back up its resolutions nor the compliance of its member nations.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 02:25:45 GMT

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

---

Nukelt15l hate seeing people yak on and on about how the US defied the UN- they talk about the UN as if it had the authority to govern member nations. Nuh-uh. All member nations are still independent and free to make their own choices. The US constitution grants the authority to make war on the US government, not an outside organization (just because France or Russia doesn't want the US to go to war, the US can still go to war because the US government supercedes the authority of the UN).

Not quite. You're right about the lack thereof to govern other nations, because nations are ASKED (or warned) not told to comply with resolutions. You're also right about being free to make your own choices. However, should those choices be in violation of the law agreed to by the Member States in 1945 and onward, then at the end of the day, the act was still illegal. Illegal, of course, in terms of the international law that Member AGREED to. In 1945, quite a few people said "yeah, we'll play by these rules". Those rules are the United Nations Charter.

All of these rules can be found here: <http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/>

I trust you to have more sense than Nodbugger and read them before commenting on them.

As for the United States government superceding the United Nations. Heh. I can't agree with that. Sure, you've got the biggest guns, but you've locked the ball'n'chain around yourselves when you signed that 'contract'. The fact of the matter is, Resolution 1441 was violated by both Iraq and the United States (and in essence, all nations in the Coalition of the Willing). If the U.S. is going to call Iraq's actions against resolutions illegal, then do the same thing, but claim it not to be illegal. Well, there is a problem there.

So I'm going to ask you:

Resolution 1441 says this: "Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, Kuwait, and the neighbouring States,"

That statement runs back all the way to Resolution 686 in 1990 in terms of Iraq.

Was this commitment (you can find it in the Charter in article 2 I believe) at the end of the day upheld and implemented by the United States and the CoW as per their authority of Resolution 678? If not, then this war is illegal. If so, prove it.

Quote:At the beginning of the Iraq war, the simple fact is that nearly the entire security council was in violation of UN resolutions in one way or another.

You're absolutely right. I was aghast when I read that the Security Council didn't condemn this attack despite its obvious violation of 1441 and previous resolutions. It's suspicious.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 06:12:05 GMT

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

---

GizbotvasCrimsonand we started the war when? Oh yeah, March 2003... just about 6 months later. And yet he "rushed to war". LOL

Your analogy is horrid and doesn't fit, mostly because they agreed at the time that Iraq was an "emergency"

Interesting that you first say there was no rush to war, and in the next breath you say it was an "emergency".

I think you are a Flip-Flop.

I was using "emergency" in quotes to reference your cell phone analogy.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 13:46:51 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxNukelt15I hate seeing people yak on and on about how the US defied the UN- they talk about the UN as if it had the authority to govern member nations. Nuh-uh. All member nations are still independent and free to make their own choices. The US constitution grants the authority to make war on the US government, not an outside organization (just because France or Russia doesn't want the US to go to war, the US can still go to war because the US government supercedes the authority of the UN).

Not quite. You're right about the lack thereof to govern other nations, because nations are ASKED (or warned) not told to comply with resolutions. You're also right about being free to make your own choices. However, should those choices be in violation of the law agreed to by the Member States in 1945 and onward, then at the end of the day, the act was still illegal. Illegal, of course, in terms of the international law that Member AGREED to. In 1945, quite a few people said "yeah, we'll play by these rules". Those rules are the United Nations Charter.

All of these rules can be found here: <http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/>

I trust you to have more sense than Nodbugger and read them before commenting on them.

---

As for the United States government superceding the United Nations. Heh. I can't agree with that. Sure, you've got the biggest guns, but you've locked the ball'n'chain around yourselves when you signed that 'contract'. The fact of the matter is, Resolution 1441 was violated by both Iraq and the United States (and in essence, all nations in the Coalition of the Willing). If the U.S. is going to call Iraq's actions against resolutions illegal, then do the same thing, but claim it not to be illegal. Well, there is a problem there.

So I'm going to ask you:

Resolution 1441 says this: "Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, Kuwait, and the neighbouring States,"

That statement runs back all the way to Resolution 686 in 1990 in terms of Iraq.

Was this commitment (you can find it in the Charter in article 2 I believe) at the end of the day upheld and implimented by the United States and the CoW as per their authority of Resolution 678? If not, then this war is illegal. If so, prove it.

Quote:At the beginning of the Iraq war, the simple fact is that nearly the entire security council was in violation of UN resolutions in one way or another.

You're absolutely right. I was aghast when I read that the Security Council didn't condemn this attack despite its obvious violation of 1441 and previous resolutions. It's suspicious.

Shut the fuck up.

Why do you all you fuckers keep trying to make America the bad guy!

Are you really that fucking stupid? Saddam is the bad guy. Saddam is the one doing all the horrible shit. Stop protesting the US and go fucking protest Saddam. All you peace loving fuckers are a bunch of hypocrites. We did not do a single thing wrong. Saddam was the asshole killing people. We went there to stop that. If your stupid fucking head cannot agree with than sit down and shut the fuck up because we simply do not want to hear your stupid fucking logic. We do not fucking care.

I also don't fucking care how childish I may sound. I don't give a fuck. I don't care, if you guys are going to stay fucking retarded do it in Canada or where ever the fuck you are from.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 16:38:48 GMT

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

---

Quote:Shut the fuck up.

Why do you all you fuckers keep trying to make America the bad guy!

Sometimes we are the bad guy. Saddam Hussein was completely UNconnected to the 9/11





A FUK11!1 OMG WTF I DONT CAER IF U GUYS R GONG 2 STAY FUKNG R3TARDED DO IT IN CANADA OR WHERE EV3R TEH FUK U R FROM!1!111! OMG WTF LOL

I don't know, seal; I think nodbugger's post looked stupider. You're gonna hafta try harder to be as dumb as him. Try drinking some draino while eating paint chips.

And nodbugger ... as a Republican myself, I just have one simple request for you ...

SHUT THE FUCK UP.

You make the rest of us look like morons, and I don't appreciate that.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 19:02:35 GMT

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

---

Well tell me exactly what was wrong with what I said? I really don't fucking care.

Saddam was bad and we got rid of him, the Iraqis will soon have a democracy and all you can bitch about is how bad Bush is.

Well I'm tired of it. You are all just a bunch of cynical assholes and need a reality check.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 19:20:28 GMT

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

---

GizbotvasQuote:Shut the fuck up.

Why do you all you fuckers keep trying to make America the bad guy!

Sometimes we are the bad guy. Saddam Hussein was completely UNconnected to the 9/11 attacks. Al Queada attacked the US, a group formed in large part by the United States to combat Communists like me.

The Bush Administration scared the American Public, using constant references to 9/11, Al Queada, and terrorists, to push a long-held agenda to invade Iraq against all international law and common sense.

You can pretend America is correct all the time if you want to, but 3 Billion Muslims may disagree with you, and if you weren't so young and uninformed you would be forced to agree that some critical self-examination and policy review is warranted.

Remember that it was Legal to hang a Black man for touching a White woman not even sixty years ago here. We are not always right, we are not always the good guys, the important thing is to learn from our mistakes and get rid of GW Bush before he causes any more damage.

No we are almost never the bad guy as you put it. We have our reasons for doing everything we do.

Bush, nor has anyone ever connected Saddam to the 9/11 attacks. No one ever said that. That is just another lie. They said Saddam had connections with Al-Qaueda. Which has been proven to be true. Al-Queda was not formed to combat terrorists. Just because the people in Afghanistan 40 years ago were trained to fight communists does not in any way make them the same guys in Al-Queda. that is like saying the current German government is all Nazis. Saddam was a terrorist. He may not have been a terrorist who attacked us but he was still a terrorists. And we are fighting the war on Terror. Not just certain kinds of it, ALL of it and Saddam certainly fits into the category. 3 Billions Muslims will not disagree with me. Maybe a few million Canadians but not 3 billion Muslims. How is invading Iraq against common sense? Terrorists, bad guys who kill civilians on purpose. Saddam, bad guy who kills civilians on purpose.

It was never legal to hang a black man 60 years ago. It was just never reported. Because it happened in the South where 99% of people belonged to the KKK. If it happened in the North they would have gotten in a lot of trouble. BTW, many cases did go to trial (proving these acts were illegal) but because of the area the people who committed the acts were found not guilty.

And GW Bush has caused No Mistakes. And I am not following blindly as you are probably going to say. I have made up my mind and have come to reasonable conclusion. You how ever have not reasonable explanation for any of your conclusions. they are just extremists views that only a dumb fucker would choose.

BTW, Communism fucking sucks, It will never work unless you are the only person in the communist society.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 19:25:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warrantoNodbuggerShut the fuck up.

Why do you all you fuckers keep trying to make America the bad guy!

Are you really that fucking stupid? Saddam is the bad guy. Saddam is the one doing all the horrible shit. Stop protesting the US and go fucking protest Saddam. All you peace loving fuckers are a bunch of hypocrites. We did not do a single thing wrong. Saddam was the asshole killing people. We went there to stop that. If your stupid fucking head cannot agree with than sit down and shut the fuck up because we simply do not want to hear your stupid fucking logic. We do not fucking care.

I also don't fucking care how childish I may sound. I don't give a fuck. I don't care, if you guys are



Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 19:58:07 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerAnd GW Bush has caused No Mistakes.

...they are just extremists views that only a dumb fucker would choose.

Do you think it is reasonable, or extreme to say that GW Bush has made zero mistakes since taking office? When you say silly things like that, how do you think other people will view your opinions?

You are entitled to your own opinion, just make sure that it is your opinion, not one dictated to you by the latest calculated Conservative talking point.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 20:04:24 GMT

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

---

GizbotvasNodbuggerAnd GW Bush has caused No Mistakes.

...they are just extremists views that only a dumb fucker would choose.

Do you think it is reasonable, or extreme to say that GW Bush has made zero mistakes since taking office? When you say silly things like that, how do you think other people will view your opinions?

You are entitled to your own opinion, just make sure that it is your opinion, not one dictated to you by the latest calculated Conservative talking point.

Well name a an undeniable mistake. The only thing I can see being iffy is his immigration policy. But I think if you give it 15 years it will all straighten itself out anyways,

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 20:04:29 GMT

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

---

A few questions for the Bush fans here;

~do you think we are safer now than before the war in Iraq?

~do you think there are FEWER terrorists now that we occupy Iraq?

~do you think that occupying Iraq will slow/stop Al Queada?

~why do YOU think we went to war, I think it was to find weapons of mass destruction, but the reasons change so often, why do YOU think we went to war in Iraq?

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 20:09:59 GMT

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

---

GizbotvasA few questions for the Bush fans here;

- ~do you think we are safer now than before the war in Iraq?
- ~do you think there are FEWER terrorists now that we occupy Iraq?
- ~do you think that occupying Iraq will slow/stop Al Queada?
- ~why do YOU think we went to war, I think it was to find weapons of mass destruction, but the reasons change so often, why do YOU think we went to war in Iraq?

1. Safer in General? I would say yes. As you can see there hasn't bee another terrorist attack on US soil and all the people who would committing these attacks are taking on soldiers, who are equipped to fight these people. I would rather have American soldiers fighting the terrorists abroad than American civilians fighting them in the streets.

2. Of course there are fewer terrorists. Didn't kill about 300 the past weekend?

3. It will not stop it, but it will cause them to go to Iraq and if we show the cruel things they do more often people will be less inclined to join them. For an example. Now that Saddam is gone Iraqis are not able to watch television from outside of Iraq. They get tons more information than they used to and are now exposed to things going on in their own country and around the world. So now that people are car bombing the civilian population they will get really pissed off and more than likely help American and Iraqi security forces.

4. To get rid of Saddam. No matter what reason you heard. The main objective was to get rid of Saddam. As long as Saddam was no longer part of Iraq and they had a democracy I am happy. Weapons of Mass destruction are still an issue. Because they still cannot be proven either way.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 20:10:44 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerwarrantoNodbuggerShut the fuck up.

Why do you all you fuckers keep trying to make America the bad guy!

Are you really that fucking stupid? Saddam is the bad guy. Saddam is the one doing all the horrible shit. Stop protesting the US and go fucking protest Saddam. All you peace loving fuckers are a bunch of hypocrites. We did not do a single thing wrong. Saddam was the asshole killing people. We went there to stop that. If your stupid fucking head cannot agree with than sit down and shut the fuck up because we simply do not want to hear your stupid fucking logic. We do not fucking care.

I also don't fucking care how childish I may sound. I don't give a fuck. I don't care, if you guys are going to stay fucking retarded do it in Canada or where ever the fuck you are from.

Who said Saddam wasn't bad? NO ONE. WHO CARES if it is Saddam who is nuking the world, it DOES NOT give a member state the right to invade another member state without the approval of the United Nations. I could care less how noble it is, whether if in the end it is forgiven, or the leader of the country of the target invasion is the Devil himself, it does NOT make it any more legal.

NO ONE is disagreeing with you that saddam had to be stopped. IT DOESN'T MAKE IT ANY LESS ILLEGAL TO INVADE ANOTHER MEMBER STATE WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

SO THEN WHY THE FUCK ARE YOU SO AGAINST GETTING RID OF HIM? No anti-war person has ever answered this question. They always give some bullshit answer about oil or the war being illegal. Those are all shit for brains answer that are totally false. And only a dumb fuck with even bring those up.

The war was simply not illegal. And no matter how many UN resolutions or charters you pull up will make it illegal. The UN may have a few little pieces of paper with some writing on it, but when it comes to real world issues where pillows and candy don't count we couldn't give a fuck what the UN has written down. How many wars have there been without UN approval? How many people have been killed in genocides under UN Watch? WAY too many. The UN is obsolete. And we do not need to listen to them. We do not need a permission slip to defend the United States.

Nodbugger, reality check:

MORALLY RIGHT DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY EQUAL LEGALLY RIGHT. COMMON SENSE DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY EQUAL LEGALLY RUGHT.  
THE UNITED STATES WAS NOT AUTHORIZED TO ATTACK IRAQ, THEREFORE THE ATTACK WAS ILLEGAL AS IRAQ IS A UNITED NATIONS MEMBER STATE.

I am in NO way against getting rid of Saddam, I never said it, I never implied it.

IT DOES NOT MATTER HOW MANY WARS TOOK PLACE WITHOUT UN AUTHORIZATION, THEY WERE JUST AS ILLEGAL AS THIS.

THE UNITED STATES WAS NOT DEFENDING ITSELF AS IT WAS NEVER ATTACKED BY IRAQ. THE UNFOUNDED ALLIGATIONS OF A POTENTIAL FOR AN ATTACK DOES NOT EQUAL AN ATTACK.

If you don't like the UN, tell the American Government to pay off the member ship fees that they have NEVER bothered to pay, and LEAVE it. Until then, I could care less of it's "obsolete". I thas never been officially disbanded, therefore EVERY MEMBER STATE MUST FOLLOW THE RULES THE UN SETS FORTH.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 20:30:06 GMT

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

---

Well, I don't know about the rest of you, but I personally don't care what Nodbugger says any more.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 20:37:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

heh, neither do I, but commenting his sheer ignorance is too much fun to leave alone.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 21:10:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

How am I ignorant.

If the UN cannot enforce it laws there is no point to it, if they cannot stop the truly evil people in the world why should we listen to them on how we do things? They say it needs to be done yet they do nothing about it. We stood up and did something about. We don't care what the UN says anymore. It may be OK for you dumb asses to be UN pussies but I don't want to be.

And Putin warned of an attack by Iraq. Besides, that is stupid logic that we cannot defend against a possible attack. If you knew pearl harbor was going to happen would you say we couldn't attack Japan until they attack us? HELL NO! nobody is that fucking stupid to wait until they get hit to strike. It is not against US law to strike first in a fight. If you feel threatened and you believe you can stop a fight before one happens you have the right to prevent bodily harm to yourself.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 21:53:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JavaxcxNot quite. You're right about the lack thereof to govern other nations, because nations are ASKED (or warned) not told to comply with resolutions. You're also right about being free to make your own choices. However, should those choices be in violation of the law agreed to by the Member States in 1945 and onward, then at the end of the day, the act was still illegal. Illegal, of course, in terms of the international law that Member AGREED to. In 1945, quite a few people said "yeah, we'll play by these rules". Those rules are the United Nations Charter.

All of these rules can be found here: <http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/>  
I trust you to have more sense then Nodbugger and read them before commenting on them.

As for the United States government superceding the United Nations. Heh. I can't agree with that. Sure, you've got the biggest guns, but you've locked the ball'n'chain around yourselves when you signed that 'contract'. The fact of the matter is, Resolution 1441 was violated by both Iraq and the United States (and in essence, all nations in the Coalition of the Willing). If the U.S. is going to call Iraq's actions against resolutions illegal, then do the same thing, but claim it not to

be illegal. Well, there is a problem there.

So I'm going to ask you:

Resolution 1441 says this: "Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, Kuwait, and the neighbouring States,"

That statement runs back all the way to Resolution 686 in 1990 in terms of Iraq.

Was this commitment (you can find it in the Charter in article 2 I believe) at the end of the day upheld and implemented by the United States and the CoW as per their authority of Resolution 678? If not, then this war is illegal. If so, prove it.

You're absolutely right. I was aghast when I read that the Security Council didn't condemn this attack despite its obvious violation of 1441 and previous resolutions. It's suspicious.

Bypassing all of the ridiculous flaming...

Yes, there are rules nations are expected to follow as members of the UN. However, I think you'll find that there aren't any nations that are willing to give up authority for any decision to anyone other than their own government. Not the US, not France, nor Russia, Great Britain, China, Germany, etc. The UN is NOT a government. Any time a nation decides that the UN is not acting in their best interests, you can be damned sure they can and will look after themselves with or without support. As far as the US government is concerned, this country's interests come BEFORE those of the UN. The US constitution and the laws supporting it supercede any resolution the UN puts forth. I am far beyond certain that if you looked deep enough, you would find that your own country has the same policy.

That is the reason why the US became a member of the UN, and not the League of Nations before it- the League had the authority to tell its members whether or not they could go to war, the UN can not do that.

There is a very interesting controversy surrounding the International Court that goes along the same lines. That is not something for this thread, as it has gone off topic enough already, but I think you would find it a juicy hot topic- if you don't know about it already.

Quote:You're absolutely right. I was aghast when I read that the Security Council didn't condemn this attack despite its obvious violation of 1441 and previous resolutions. It's suspicious.

Not exactly what I was referring to. I was talking about the illegal sale of weapons to Iraq between 1991 and 2003. It's not too shocking to find out that the countries profiting from deals with Saddam were the very same ones that opposed this war.

Please understand that I don't like how the US government basically gave the UN the cold shoulder, but also understand that I am-and always will be- loyal to my own country before the UN. There probably were better ways to go about getting rid of Saddam, but it is clear(to me, at least) that the UN was never going to do a damn thing about him- especially since several

members of the security council(and it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out which ones) would have profited from Saddam staying in power.

Gizbotvas~do you think we are safer now than before the war in Iraq?

~do you think there are FEWER terrorists now that we occupy Iraq?

~do you think that occupying Iraq will slow/stop Al Queada?

~why do YOU think we went to war, I think it was to find weapons of mass destruction, but the reasons change so often, why do YOU think we went to war in Iraq?

1. Yes. Absolutely. Why is a different issue, and it would have been the same no matter which country was invaded.
2. No. In fact, I think their numbers will only increase. However, their target priorities have changed.
3. Stop? No. But it has given some of their supporters a change of heart...several state sponsors of terror have...well, stopped sponsoring.
4. Several reasons. If you think WMD's or any moral cause was the only reason, you are sadly misinformed. Certainly, both were issues, but not the main ones- just the ones that got the most attention. The war was intended to send a message, a big fat boldface warning to anyone who would threaten the US(Bad guys beware- you could be next!). It also serves as a distraction- as long as terrorists are fighting our all-volunteer military overseas, they aren't attacking civilian targets inside the US.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 22:29:46 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerHow am I ignorant.

If the UN cannot enforce it laws there is no point to it, if they cannot stop the truly evil people in the world why should we listen to them on how we do things? They say it needs to be done yet they do nothing about it. We stood up and did something about. We don't care what the UN says anymore. It may be OK for you dumb asses to be UN pussies but I don't want to be.

And Putin warned of an attack by Iraq. Besides, that is stupid logic that we cannot defend against a possible attack. If you knew pearl harbor was going to happen would you say we couldn't attack Japan until they attack us? HELL NO! nobody is that fucking stupid to wait until they get hit to strike. It is not against US law to strike first in a fight. If you feel threatened and you believe you can stop a fight before one happens you have the right to prevent bodily harm to yourself.

If the UN cannot enforce it is laws.. wait, your saying there are laws that prevented America from attacking? Well, thank you for proving my point that it was illegal!

Just because someone fails to uphold the law does not mean it's legal to break the law.

Sure, you have the right to defend yourself from danger, however there was no threat of danger. You yourself said there was no real proof for or against the existance of WMD's, so that excuse is not valid as "self defence". In order for it to be construed self-defence, one thing must be present. A real and imminent danger. So using this, please tell me the real and imminent danger that Iraq

posed to America. Remember, you yourself said there is no proof for or against the existence of WMD's, don't rely on that for a reason.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 22:56:18 GMT

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

---

warrantoNodbuggerHow am I ignorant.

If the UN cannot enforce its laws there is no point to it, if they cannot stop the truly evil people in the world why should we listen to them on how we do things? They say it needs to be done yet they do nothing about it. We stood up and did something about it. We don't care what the UN says anymore. It may be OK for you dumb asses to be UN pussies but I don't want to be.

And Putin warned of an attack by Iraq. Besides, that is stupid logic that we cannot defend against a possible attack. If you knew Pearl Harbor was going to happen would you say we couldn't attack Japan until they attack us? HELL NO! nobody is that fucking stupid to wait until they get hit to strike. It is not against US law to strike first in a fight. If you feel threatened and you believe you can stop a fight before one happens you have the right to prevent bodily harm to yourself.

If the UN cannot enforce its laws.. wait, your saying there are laws that prevented America from attacking? Well, thank you for proving my point that it was illegal!

Just because someone fails to uphold the law does not mean it's legal to break the law.

Sure, you have the right to defend yourself from danger, however there was no threat of danger. You yourself said there was no real proof for or against the existence of WMD's, so that excuse is not valid as "self defence". In order for it to be construed self-defence, one thing must be present. A real and imminent danger. So using this, please tell me the real and imminent danger that Iraq posed to America. Remember, you yourself said there is no proof for or against the existence of WMD's, don't rely on that for a reason.

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

Do you people really just have a one track mind?

And no, it was not illegal.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 23:03:06 GMT

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

---

Did I say Japan had WMD's? Where does Japan even fit into the war on Iraq?

As I said... the only legitimate way the United States could have attacked Iraq was by self defence. And as I said, in order for that to happen you need a real and imminent danger to be present. So

answer that.

One second question... do you even read what people post, or do you just glance over it and piece together random parts to suit your needs?

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 23:09:26 GMT

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

---

warrantoDid I say Japan had WMD's? Where does Japan even fit into the war on Iraq?

As I said... the only legitamate way the United States could of attacked Iraq was by self defence. And as I said, in order for that to happen you need a real and imminant danger to be present. So answer that.

One second question... do you even read what people post, or do you just glance over it and piece together random parts to suit your needs?

Are stupid or something? Do you just glance over my posts?

You said we needed to be in danger. You said that I said that wmd cannot be proven either way.

See if we didn't go into Iraq we would know nothing about the wmd. We would never have known. And don't say shit about the inspectors. If Saddam wanted to hide his wmd from the inspectors it wouldn't have been hard.

Now I said Japan did not need wmd to attack us. So if you had a brain you would make the connection that Iraq can attack us without using wmd.

I posted a link several times where Putin said Iraq had planned to attack America. Yet you guys just ignored it. We acted in self defense. We did not want to wait to get hit before we struck. When peoples lives are on the line you simply cannot wait for that. And for you to even suggest that proves your stupidity.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

\*\*\*

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

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

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

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

Any mention of WMD's? nope

so I said;

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

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

Then you respond;

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

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

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 00:33:55 GMT

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

---

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

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

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

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

\*\*\*

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

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

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

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

Any mention of WMD's? nope

so I said;

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

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

Then you respond;

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

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

I cannot believe you are this stupid.

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

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

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

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 00:57:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

Thank God. Everyone is tired of you retarded logic and immature attitude. Let's just hope that you mean it when you say it.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 02:04:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

Thank God. Everyone is tired of you retarded logic and immature attitude. Let's just hope that you mean it when you say it.

Yep thats it :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 02:51:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

warrantoWHO CARES if it is Saddam who is nuking the world, it DOES NOT give a member state the right to invade another member state without the approval of the United Nations.  
Four words: Oil-for-Food scandal

You're going to trust the UN?

I think it's about time that corrupt, spineless organization was disbanded. If two countries have a dispute, let them work it out. For example, why should Japan or Indonesia have a say in Israel's affairs? It's not going to affect them in any way if Israel builds a security barrier, it's none of their business, so why should they be able to tell Israel "We condemn you for building that wall!" if Israel didn't even ask their opinion?

The United Nations is not a world government even though that's what it's trying to be.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 02:56:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NodbuggerI cannot believe you are this stupid.

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

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

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

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

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

Quote:Sure, you have the right to defend yourself from danger, however there was no threat of danger. You yourself said there was no real proof for or against the existance of WMD's, so that excuse is not valid as "self defence". In order for it to be construed self-defence, one thing must be present. A real and imminent danger.

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

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

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

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

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

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 04:22:51 GMT

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

---

hydra1945warrantoWHO CARES if it is Saddam who is nuking the world, it DOES NOT give a member state the right to invade another member state without the approval of the United Nations.

Four words: Oil-for-Food scandal

You're going to trust the UN?

I think it's about time that corrupt, spineless organization was disbanded. If two countries have a dispute, let them work it out. For example, why should Japan or Indonesia have a say in Israel's affairs? It's not going to affect them in any way if Israel builds a security barrier, it's none of their business, so why should they be able to tell Israel "We condemn you for building that wall!" if Israel didn't even ask their opinion?

The United Nations is not a world government even though that's what it's trying to be.

Ordinarily you would be right. However in this instance, time and time again, the United Nations reaffirm Iraq's sovereignty and territorial integrity. This meaning no one had a right to violate it. Because of this, no other nation had the right to violate Iraq's territory, save one exception. Self-Defence. Now because as far as people were concerned Iraq was in the process of disarming, and America was under no threat of attack (of any type) from Iraq. Because of this, there was no reason for self-defence to be called.

Now with that said, if proof of a threat of attack had existed (meaning Iraq was going to send bombers over to America, or use other unconventional means) then self defence could be declared. Keep in mind, if proof is found after the war begins, it may justify the war, but it would make the war any less illegal, as the war was started under illegal pretences.

Regardless of the United Nations "World Government" intentions, it does have a charter that Member States have to adhere to. True, based on this charter, Iraq was also committing illegal offences, however as the saying goes, two wrongs do not make a right, and America had no right to violate Iraq's territory. Even if it had used Iraq's illegal activities as a reason.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 09:58:30 GMT

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

---

I'm glad that you made the only intelligent opposing post in this thread on the matter, Nukelt15.

Nukelt15 Yes, there are rules nations are expected to follow as members of the UN. However, I think you'll find that there aren't any nations that are willing to give up authority for any decision to anyone other than their own government. Not the US, not France, nor Russia, Great Britain, China, Germany, etc.

I would have to agree. It's pretty apparent after the attacks of 19 March 2003 that this idea is blatantly true. But you have to understand, and I don't mean to say this to be redundant, but the people that signed the Charter to come into the U.N. agreed to those terms. I'm not talking about "authority" or morality here. I'm talking strictly on the legal sense. In fact, I know exactly where you are coming from when you say the "U.S. supercedes the U.N.", and when I see that, I'm getting the distinct idea of two recognized international policies. However, even if it went through Congress "legally" as far as the United States goes, you have to admit that it did not go through the United Nations legally. Again, if it did, please prove it instead of pulling a Nodbugger and

throwing around misinformation and FOXNews generated "opinion".

Quote:The UN is NOT a government. Any time a nation decides that the UN is not acting in their best interests, you can be damned sure they can and will look after themselves with or without support. As far as the US government is concerned, this country's interests come BEFORE those of the UN. The US constitution and the laws supporting it supercede any resolution the UN puts forth. I am far beyond certain that if you looked deep enough, you would find that your own country has the same policy.

I would also agree that the United Nation isn't a government. It's an international organization. But, I am curious... Where in your constitution does it imply what you said? Not to disagree with you, but I would just like to see your view on the matter in better depth.

Quote:That is the reason why the US became a member of the UN, and not the League of Nations before it- the League had the authority to tell its members whether or not they could go to war, the UN can not do that.

Uh, I'm not sure about this one. The League of Nations was probably more blunt when they said it, but the United Nations does have the authority to "ask" its Member States to assist. Resolution 678 says:

"2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait, unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in paragraph 1 above, the above-mentioned resolutions, to use all necessary means to uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;"

Again, its not as blunt, but it does authorize Member States to go to war, if necessary. Note that resolution doesn't say that you can go to war unconditionally, Nodbugger.

Quote:Please understand that I don't like how the US governemnt basically gave the UN the cold shoulder, but also understand that I am-and always will be- loyal to my own country before the UN.

Oh, I would agree with you. The fact of the matter is though, if you're going to do something like that to such a widely recognized international organization, that SEVERE international criticism will follow. And it is totally warranted, and I think you can agree with me on that given the fact that the United States (and many others) chose to disregard policies that countries such as mine were abiding to.

Quote:There probably were better ways to go about getting rid of Saddam, but it is clear(to me, at least) that the UN was never going to do a damn thing about him-

I don't know about as far as usurping control of Iraq, but the United Nations WAS doing something about the abundance of weapons he had after the Gulf War. It is totally undeniable that Blix was actually doing something with UNMOVIC up to mere days before the Shock and Awe campaign. I posted a Quarterly Report on the matter in a previous thread, and if you want it, I'll get it again.

As far as getting Saddam out of power... Whether or not the United Nations would have done that,

I don't know. There were humanitarian resolutions on the matter which may or may not have led up to authorizing states to taking him from power. It's impossible to say what would have happened nowadays, though.

As for Nodbugger: I'm sorry that you feel that way. Your misinformed, disillusioned view of the world is the reason that people like Rush Limbaugh write articles on "hatred" for America. Guess what kid, you are wrong. It has been proven time and time again and you are simply too arrogant to acknowledge anything that opposes your tunnel-like vision of the world and your president.

You think you are doing the right thing by invoking, by all definitions, terrorism on Iraq, well, I hate to break it to you, but Usama Bin Laden thought that what he was doing was good, too.

Does that mean what he did wasn't illegal? I mean, according to you, laws are only guidelines. Attacking property on foreign soil, causing the deaths of innocent people, and all in the name of a "just cause".

That seems to me like it can be used interchangeably with what happened on March 19th, 2003. Oh well.

At any rate, I highly suggest you rethink your opinions. Any sane person, and every sane person here has disagreed with you on these matters. My God, REPUBLICANS in this thread have disagreed with you.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [ViperFUD](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 11:32:09 GMT

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

---

Here, nodbugger. I have an analogy for you.

I don't like you. You're an idiot. You are a danger to those around you, because you could infect them with your stupidity.

Therefore, I am going to kill you. I feel it is the right thing to do. And, after you're dead, warranto will probably tell me it was illegal. Now, i'm going to argue that it was the right thing to do, and therefore not illegal. And obviously, since the US couldn't stop me, either it WASN'T illegal, or the US is outdated. Also, the Japanese killed people once, so maybe you were going to kill me. It was self-defense.

Recognize this argument at all?

And if you don't understand what I'm saying, you've only proven my point that you're an idiot.

P.S. I'm not actually going to kill you. I know it's illegal, and wouldn't kill you even if it were legal. I feel the worst punishment that could be inflicted on you would be for you to have to live with your own stupidity.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 15:52:44 GMT

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

---

And you people call me an idiot?

I'd re read all of your posts.

1. Yo said there were no wmd, so there cannot be an imminent threat so you cannot say self defense. If you are going to say Bush was grammatically incorrect then you are grammatically incorrect.

2. Putin said Iraq was going to attack us. It is on every news source possible. but you only listen to obviously biased sources so you will never receive this information.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 16:19:32 GMT

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

---

Ok, I'm not exactly sure what the hell you just tried to get across there but I'll cope.

Article 51 says:

"Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Nothing in that statement says anything about being legally allowed to pre-empting an attack. It says you may act after the matter of fact, but not before. Sounds pretty stupid, don't you think? I would agree with you on that one. The Russian president saying that someone will attack doesn't validate this article, legally. Irregardless of United States law, if this Article isn't upheld, then the act is illegal in accordance with the international laws that your country agreed to.

I bet you, and a lot of individuals probably feel pretty stupid reading that after you get a warning from Putin. Oh, and before you go off on another of your little tirades, set aside your annoying off topic "morality" and look at this from strictly a legal aspect. That is, of course, if you've learned that laws aren't guidelines that only need to be upheld if you feel them just.

---

---

Subject: You 5.

Posted by [ViperFUD](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 16:48:42 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerAnd you people call me an idiot?

Yes, because you are. And this post of yours proves it.

NodbuggerI'd re read all of your posts.

I doubt it, but only because I doubt you can actually read. This is evidenced by the fact that as of today, you still have yet to understand a single thing that's been said to you.

Nodbugger1. Yo said there were no wmd, so there cannot be an imminent threat so you cannot say self defense. If you are going to say Bush was grammatically incorrect then you are grammatically incorrect.

Your first sentence is almost correct. It should read: "You said there were no WMD, so there was no 'imminent threat,' so Bush could not claim self-defense." This would be both logical and correct.

I have no fucking clue what the second sentence has to do with anything.

Nodbugger2. Putin said Iraq was going to attack us. It is on every news source possible. but you only listen to obviously biased sources so you will never receive this information.

Yes. Iraq was going to attack us. They were going to load up their donkeys, swim across the fucking atlantic, and somehow attack us.

WTF is this logic? How the hell, if they have no WMD's (and the missile chassis to carry them) are they going to attack us? I mean, ignoring the fact that they could sponsor terrorists, and kill maybe 3000 American's (ala Towers Attack), how can they visit any destruction on us that would do anything?

And besides, if they did that, we'd fucking pave their asses into the desert. Nothing like "operation Iraqi Freedom." It would be "Operation bomb-the-shit-out-of-Iraq." The difference? a zero survival rate.

Don't get me wrong. I love America (or at least, the idea of America). If anyone attacks us, I say kill them all. HOWEVER: Iraq did nothing of the sort. We were in the wrong, legally, and, IMO, morally.

THE ENDS DO NOT JUSTIFY THE MEANS.

fuck you and die.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 18:28:47 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerAnd you people call me an idiot?

I'd re read all of your posts.

1. Yo said there were no wmd, so there cannot be an imminent threat so you cannot say self defense. If you are going to say Bush was grammatically incorrect then you are grammatically incorrect.

2. Putin said Iraq was going to attack us. It is on every news source possible. but you only listen to obviously biased sources so you will never receive this information.

1. I said there were no WMD's, correct, I said therefor that they could not be used as a pretence of self defence. I DID NOT say they were the only means, I DID say that they could not be used as an excuse.

2. Putin said something? You mean like this?

Or perhaps this?

Or even this perhaps..

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 18:41:34 GMT

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

When the big dogs of the UN are deep in Saddam's back pocket for lots of money, their objectivity goes away. France and others had lots of money to lose if Saddam lost power and they voted for their own benefit because they don't give a flying fuck about America or Americans. They failed to act objectively and were selfish instead.

A law enforcement entity is only as good as its law enforcement capabilities. Unless all the other UN countries want to declare war on the US or capture Bush and try him for these "crimes" and put him in jail, then the UN itself is useless as a law making authority and hence worthless.

Overall, I would have done the same thing. Saddam blatantly violated all the resolutions for the cease fire agreement, therefore he needed to be taken care of. He had 12 fucking years to prove to the UN that he was disarmed. If he had truly disarmed, don't you think he would have shown the inspectors that instead of concealing his disarmament? Logically it makes sense that those weapons are somewhere if not in Iraq.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 18:47:56 GMT

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

And all of that is true.

It doesn't negate that it was still illegal. All the lack of action by the UN towards America does is dictate forgiveness. As well, the UN may be useless, but the law is still the law.

An example could be high-profile people. More often than not it seems as though they could get away with murder. It doesn't make the crime they've committed any less illegal, but because of their standing, no one is going to do anything about it.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 18:57:13 GMT

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

---

CrimsonA law enforcement entity is only as good as its law enforcement capabilities. Unless all the other UN countries want to declare war on the US or capture Bush and try him for these "crimes" and put him in jail, then the UN itself is useless as a law making authority and hence worthless.

I'm wondering the exact same thing. I doubt it would go as far as declaring war. I mean, if Bush is as intelligent as all you people seem to believe he is, then if he were asked to come to trial, and if he were innocent, then what does he have to lose?

I don't like the way the United Nations is run now. But I still have to abide to their laws. Just like I have to abide to the law that I can't assault someone who breaks into my home and threatens my family unless they touch me first. I don't like it, but I have to abide by it.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Gizbotvas](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 21:13:22 GMT

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

---

CrimsonWhen the big dogs of the UN are deep in Saddam's back pocket for lots of money, their objectivity goes away. France and others had lots of money to lose if Saddam lost power and they voted for their own benefit because they don't give a flying fuck about America or Americans. They failed to act objectively and were selfish instead.

Wow.

Saddam ran France? The way Haliburton runs the US?

France told us to wait, to not invade because they didn't think Iraq had nukes. They were right. Let me say that again- FRANCE WAS RIGHT and WE WERE WRONG. So go ahead and insult the French, eat your "Freedom Fries" and make Frog jokes. Whatever you do, DO NOT APOLOGIZE to them. Just because they were correct, and it turns out there was no immediate threat as the French told us, just because there were no WMDs as the French told us, just because Iraq had no capability of attacking the US as the French told us is no reason to back peddle now. No reason to embrace the French and admit we were wrong. We are never wrong.

And as your your ridiculous statement:

Quote: they (France)don't give a flying fuck about America or Americans

LOL, they did help us found the country. Remember a little something called the French-Indian War? America would not exist without the Financial, Political, and Military support of France. We wouldn't even be here today.

Bah, Fuck Em anyway, right?

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Wed, 18 Aug 2004 21:59:56 GMT

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

---

This is my problem with the common thought that France is in it only for the money, and nothing more:

You're making out the french to be capitalistic, soulless, and without rational thought for saying "don't go to war because we still think that UNMOVIC is working". Then you're saying that the French only said THAT because they were getting money from Saddam and implying that the French don't care for humanity at all. While it's arguable to say that, you have to understand that war was NOT the reason the United Nations came to be in the first place. And I quote:

"WE THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS DETERMINED

to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind..."

I agree that it is coincidental, and maybe even suspicious that most, if not all countries opposed to the war on March 19th 2003 would profit from Saddam being in power, however, that does not equate to the sole reason why those countries opposed this war. I suggest you read this and/or this to read what they actually said on the matter. After you're done that, if you do read it, please read this, this, this, and/or this to hear what the rest of the world had to say on the matter. I garuntee you that not every single country that spoke in those meetings was making money off Saddam.

Now, if you suggest that they are all lying (or passing on misinformation) when they talk, then I will call the United States and the United Kingdom on their faulty intelligence on the matter. Something, too, which can equate to misinformation being passed off as fact. Also something you can blame on the United States and the United Kingdom (not their leaders, per se, but their intelligence gathering institutions).

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 19 Aug 2004 02:36:53 GMT

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

---

GizbotvasFrance told us to wait, to not invade because they didn't think Iraq had nukes. They were right. Let me say that again- FRANCE WAS RIGHT and WE WERE WRONG.

Quote:just because there were no WMDs as the French told us  
Both of those statements about WMDs are untrue. Iraq DID have WMDs. Where do you think those insurgents got that sarin-filled mortar shell, and did those 10-20 sarin gas mortar shells the Polish found just pop out from nowhere? How about another cache of sarin gas the Marines found just a few weeks ago? Isn't sarin nerve gas a weapon of mass destruction?

Quote:LOL, they did help us found the country. Remember a little something called the French-Indian War? America would not exist without the Financial, Political, and Military support of France. We wouldn't even be here today.

You seem to be forgetting the hundreds of American merchant ships that were raided by French ships (French NAVY ships, not rogue pirates) during Adams's presidency. We kept telling them to stop, they kept replying with a middle finger. War was imminent, but the young nation wouldn't have been able to sustain a large-scale war with one of the world's superpowers of the time, so Adams sent over a peace delegation to France to straighten things out, averting a war that would have possibly destroyed the United States.

Yeah, the French are really noble and have always been our friends, haven't they? :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 19 Aug 2004 03:36:42 GMT

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

---

hydra1945Both of those statements about WMDs are untrue. Iraq DID have WMDs. Where do you think those insurgents got that sarin-filled mortar shell, and did those 10-20 sarin gas mortar shells the Polish found just pop out from nowhere? How about another cache of sarin gas the Marines found just a few weeks ago? Isn't sarin nerve gas a weapon of mass destruction?

I have a question: Not to say that you're wrong, because I too believe that Sarin gas was considered to be an illegal weapon. But "WMD" being as subjective as the next thing, has President Bush ever come blantly out and said "we have found WMD in Iraq in the form of Sarin gas"? I haven't been paying much attention to what he's actually said as of late, and you seem to be fairly versed on the matter, so the question stands.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Thu, 19 Aug 2004 07:16:53 GMT

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

---

Besides, you can kill more with regular explosives than with those 5 leftover Sarin shells. I doubt Saddam even knew about those, his whole military administration was a mess.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 19 Aug 2004 18:43:02 GMT

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

---

Actually, most of the "WMD" experts prefer to call them "Weapons of Mass Terror." They scare more people than they would ever be capable of killing. Chemical weapons are limited by how they are spread- if the wind goes in the wrong direction, or the river you plop it in gets filtered 50m downstream, the weapon is useless. Bio and Nuclear weapons are a different story, as both of those are capable of killing massive numbers of people. However, the same holds true- the fear factor of so-called "WMD's" far exceeds their actual combat value.

Oh, and sarin is not a gas. Liquid form, geniuses, it's not any more in gas form than the stuff that comes out of an aerosol hairspray can.

That said, Saddam was in possession of several weapon types that were forbidden to him, including several hidden long range interceptor aircraft and- surprise, surprise- mobile MRBM launchers(Russian-built ballistic missile systems more commonly known as SCUDs). He USED several of those missile launchers during the invasion.

Now, any half bright chimp could draw a logical conclusion from all this. Let's put together the facts:

- \* Ballistic missile launching systems
- \* Shells filled with chemical weapons(It does not matter how many- they were there, in Saddam's country, therefore he DID have them)
- \* Nuclear-capable long range fighters

Honestly, I do not understand how people can continue to argue that Saddam did not have such weapons or the means to deliver them. As for anything that has not yet been found, well, there's a couple thousand square miles of Iraq that still haven't been searched. Ok, so we have our madman, we have our "smoking gun"(or more accurately, smoking ballistic missile launchers), so why in the fuck are people trying to call off the search before finding the ammunition?

Looking at this from the "objective" point of view that you people seem to brag about so much, doesn't it make a whole lot more sense to finish the search before drawing conclusions?

As for the France thing- You're damn right they were in it for personal gain. They were looking after their nation's interests just the same as we were. Our interests conflicted, and that's all there is to it. Simple, huh? That doesn't make their decision a bad one(hell, even the US supported that bastard at one point, under a different administration)- not from their point of view. I highly doubt that the entire country of France was sitting there drinking wine and plotting the undoing of the US the night before they opposed us in the UN. The same goes for every country that opposed the US, and every country that went to war. Neither side did what they did because "it was the right thing to do", they did it because it was what (they thought) was best for their country at the time.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 19 Aug 2004 19:37:39 GMT

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

---

Nukelt15Actually, most of the "WMD" experts prefer to call them "Weapons of Mass Terror." They scare more people than they would ever be capable of killing.

A little off topic, but these same "weapons of terror" (however those "experts" want to define it) are probably what kept the United States and Russia from blasting each other. It pertains no relevance to Saddam, but condemning the same weapons (or at least having that kind of connotation) that probably saved all of our lives seems a bit strange.

Quote:That said, Saddam was in possession of several weapon types that were forbidden to him, including several hidden long range interceptor aircraft and- surprise, surprise- mobile MRBM launchers(Russian-built ballistic missile systems more commonly known as SCUDs). He USED several of those missile launchers during the invasion.

I'm curious, could you get some proof about those MRBMs? It's not that I don't believe you, it's just I would prefer to have some confirmation.

As for the illegal weapons, it's true. He does/did have weapons deemed "illegal" by the United Nations. Read this, the 13th Quarterly Report from UNMOVIC. It should tell you exactly what Saddam still had in terms of illegal weapons reported to the UNMOVIC. But don't forget, these same people watching Saddam disarm were the same people that had to evacuate the country while doing their job only a day (I believe) before the S&A campaign. If you were in the same place as Iraq, would you keep disarming after and during a full scale invasion?

Quote:Ok, so we have our madman, we have our "smoking gun"(or more accurately, smoking ballistic missile launchers), so why in the fuck are people trying to call off the search before finding the ammunition?

Heh, no one said anything about stopping the search. The United States and their allies went into Iraq for the reason to disarm those weapons. It's bad enough they by all definitions and semantics violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq from March 19th 2003 onwards, but they can't simply pack up and go. It would be hypocritical and morally wrong to leave that society in more shambles than it was when Saddam was in power.

Quote:Looking at this from the "objective" point of view that you people seem to brag about so much, doesn't it make a whole lot more sense to finish the search before drawing conclusions?

Well, it's equally arguable to say the same thing to the intelligence communities that screwed up, right?

Quote:As for the France thing- You're damn right they were in it for personal gain. They were looking after their nation's interests just the same as we were.

I sincerely hope you haven't concluded that France and opposers to the war were in it for personal gain only. If you have, then I'm sorry to say but you are wrong. It might surprise you, but other people have principles as well, and they don't always revolve around money. Canada did not send their troops to Iraq, but we thus far have given over \$300,000,000 to the Iraqi people for humanitarian reasons since this war began. We gain nothing from Saddam being in power, and risk quite a lot by not supporting one of our closest allies in their unlawful invasion.

Quote:Neither side did what they did because "it was the right thing to do", they did it because it was what (they thought) was best for their country at the time.

You said "at the time". With Saddam out of power, and any influx of funds going to France because of Saddam (as so many people seem to believe) stopped, why aren't the French, in full force assisting in Iraq now (I'm NOT referring to the humanitarian efforts of the United Nations, btw)? Why isn't Canada? Why isn't Russia?

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Phoenix - Aeon](#) on Thu, 19 Aug 2004 20:40:32 GMT

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

---

I love the argument about how Saddam was going to attack us all with WMDs. You do realise that an ICBM needs to have satellite targetting don't you? How many satellites do you think Saddam had? WMDs were never an issue to us, only to Kuwait, Iran and Saudi Arabia, all of whom happen to be about as much interest to the northern hemisphere as the oil they produce....

As for France, they slate England saying we were in the war for oil, personally I have no idea why we were in the war, I do however know something about where certain countries obtain most of their oil: England - North Sea; France Iraq. To top that off as soon as the war's over France demands a say in the "re-building" of the country, coincidence? Then again, they might just have been trying to piss us off, it's not as if we're not equal arseholes to them.

My thoughts; it's all fucked.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 19 Aug 2004 20:50:10 GMT

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

---

Ever see the movie 'True Lies' with Arnold Schwarzenegger?  
Terrorists got a hold of two tactical nukes, Russian ones of course.

They came in from the Florida keys. So there is no border guard and attempted to detonate one somewhere in Florida. This movie was made in 1994, even they knew it was a possibility 10 years ago.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 19 Aug 2004 23:36:06 GMT

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

---

Yeah, and Saddam could provide a terrorist with a flight to some remote island in the Carribean and some weapons? Or how about all that many he has? The 9/11 terrorists didn't need weapons, just money to get training and housing/board.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 20 Aug 2004 01:55:34 GMT

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

---

Nodbugger - don't get any political views from Fiction movies.

First, Saddam had nothing to do with 9/11. Ok, just clarifying.

Why would Saddam want to finance anything that would attack the United States? First, there was nothing showing that he was an imminent threat to the United States, and he would only conceive such a ridiculous idea out of severe insanity. He knew as well as we did that we could pound his country into the ground in about 5 minutes if he was involved in a major attack on our soil.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 20 Aug 2004 01:57:38 GMT

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

---

It may be fiction, but that doesn't mean it cannot happen.

And Putin told Bush Saddam planned to attack the US, if you were president would you just leave that alone?

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 20 Aug 2004 02:14:04 GMT

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

---

Quote:A little off topic, but these same "weapons of terror" (however those "experts" want to define it) are probably what kept the United States and Russia from blasting each other. It pertains no relevance to Saddam, but condemning the same weapons (or at least having that kind of connotation) that probably saved all of our lives seems a bit strange.

The fear of those weapons was what made them the most useful, I agree. Mutually assured destruction. However, there are enough of the damn things around already to wipe out all life on Earth several times over, and IMHO it is far better to have any existing weapons in the hands of countries which are not willing to use them(or lose them!).

Quote:I'm curious, could you get some proof about those MRBMs? It's not that I don't believe you, it's just I would prefer to have some confirmation.

I had been watching live news reports of the invasion when the SCUDs first came up- IIRC, Saddam's troops fired on Kuwait with them from well inside the Iraqi border. I'm pretty sure it was CNN I was watching- if I have the time tomorrow, I'll try to find a write-up of the story. In case you get around to looking before I do, the event took place within about 12-24 hours of the beginning of the invasion.

Quote:Well, it's equally arguable to say the same thing to the intelligence communities that

screwed up, right?

The intelligence community DID screw up. The director of the CIA lost his job over it- officially he resigned for "personal reasons," however it is well known that all government officials hand the President signed (but undated) resignation letters before taking office. They do that so the administration can fire any person at any time without looking bad for it.

Quote:I sincerely hope you haven't concluded that France and opposers to the war were in it for personal gain only. If you have, then I'm sorry to say but you are wrong. It might surprise you, but other people have principles as well, and they don't always revolve around money. Canada did not send their troops to Iraq, but we thus far have given over \$300,000,000 to the Iraqi people for humanitarian reasons since this war began. We gain nothing from Saddam being in power, and risk quite a lot by not supporting one of our closest allies in their unlawful invasion.

Sad as it may be, no country makes decisions of that significance without there being some gain in it for them. That includes France, the US, and everyone else as well. Morality may play some part, but it is the money and security that really drive such choices.

Quote:You said "at the time". With Saddam out of power, and any influx of funds going to France because of Saddam (as so many people seem to believe) stopped, why aren't the French, in full force assisting in Iraq now (I'm NOT referring to the humanitarian efforts of the United Nations, btw)? Why isn't Canada? Why isn't Russia?

Simple. With Saddam gone, there is no money to be made. Sending troops would do nothing to augment the country's income or security- and assisting the insurgents would only ruin the already shaky US-France or US-Russia alliances.

Quote:I love the argument about how Saddam was going to attack us all with WMDs. You do realise that an ICBM needs to have sattelite targetting don't you? How many sattelites do you think Saddam had? WMDs were never an issue to us, only to Kuwait, Iran and Saudi Arabia, all of whom happen to be about as much interest to the northern hemisphere as the oil they produce....

You, sir, need to read more. Or watch more TV. Or do something- your information is inadequate at best.

\*First-An ICBM does not \*need\* to be targeted at all- it could be purchased having already been configured by someone else. The missile guides itself, and needs no outside assistance once launched.

\*Second- We aren't talking about ICBM's(InterContinental Ballistic Missiles), we're talking about MRBM's(Medium Range Ballistic Missiles). Biiig difference. Most ICBM's go all thge way up into Earth orbit before hitting their targets, while an MRBM(such as a SCUD launcher) may only reach as high as the Stratosphere- around cruising altitude for commercial jetliners.

I won't even answer the part about oil, since this war never had anything to do with oil in the first place- a fact which has been established time and time again.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 20 Aug 2004 03:26:32 GMT

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

---

Since we (thankfully) agree on so much, I don't need to quote everything you wrote and attempt to refute it.

Quote:Sad as it may be, no country makes decisions of that significance without there being some gain in it for them. That includes France, the US, and everyone else as well. Morality may play some part, but it is the money and security that really drive such choices.

Well, you're right. Canada, for example gained nothing from Saddam, and would've gained nothing from attacking him. But we certainly did lose something for NOT attacking with the Coalition of the Willing. We've lost over \$300,000,000 as I've stated, in covering humanitarian relief, and our international relationship with the United States takes a beating. So whether or not that balances out, I don't know.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Phoenix - Aeon](#) on Fri, 20 Aug 2004 11:19:21 GMT

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

---

Need to read more, perhaps, I've never really read anything on ICBMs, I'll settle for the fact that I've had a look at their targetting systems. If you try to fire an ICBM without sattelite assistance chances are you'll miss by about 50 miles. The only system that can target itself is the Tomohawk targetting system, which happens to use cartography, useless unless you're only a few hundred metres above the land. As for not talking about them, people were at the time, they were talking about Saddam attacking Europe and America with WMDs. Or did you think they would do that with Scuds? As for the war not concerning Oil, that was an aspect, something that big can't not be an aspect. Even if oil wasn't a driv9ing issue it will certainly have shaped strategies, notice how careful they were to avoid hitting oilfields. You sir need to stop watching T.V and talk to someone who works with the hardware you claim to know so much about, your information is soefully inadequate.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [ViperFUD](#) on Fri, 20 Aug 2004 12:33:08 GMT

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

---

Phoenix - AeonNeed to read more, perhaps, I've never really read anything on ICBMs, I'll settle for the fact that I've had a look at their targetting systems. If you try to fire an ICBM without sattelite assistance chances are you'll miss by about 50 miles. The only system that can target itself is the Tomohawk targetting system, which happens to use cartography, useless unless you're only a few hundred metres above the land.

Again. They weren't talking about ICBM's. And if you're using biological warheads, 50 miles is a small distance to miss by. Close enough to count.

Phoenix - AeonAs for not talking about them, people were at the time, they were talking about Saddam attacking Europe and America with WMDs. Or did you think they would do that with Scuds?

Let's find out what he said:

Nukelt15... several weapon types that were forbidden to him, including several hidden long range interceptor aircraft and- surprise, surprise- mobile MRBM launchers...

...

\* Nuclear-capable long range fighters

...

Now, where do you see ICBM? Cause I don't. I see MRBM and long-range fighters.

Oh, and FYI ... long-range fighters could come to the US and bomb us. And they DON'T need sattelites to do it.

Phoenix - AeonAs for the war not concerning Oil, that was an aspect, something that big can't not be an aspect. Even if oil wasn't a driv9ing issue it will certainly have shaped strategies, notice how careful they were to avoid hitting oilfields. You sir need to stop watching T.V and talk to someone who works with the hardware you claim to know so much about, your information is soefully inadequate.

As far as oil fields go, let's think about this one: do we want to drop bombs on billions of gallons of oil? History flash: Saddam pulls out of Kuwait. The Iraqi's light the oil fields on fire. They burn for months.

It may have to do with wanting oil; I'm not going to debate that. But if you don't understand the hazards of terrain in warfare, well ... maybe you shouldn't be playing video games. I'll just let you run into the Tiberium to attack me, and we'll see how far you get ; ).

And as for knowing the hardware ... I'm just gonna call bullshit on this. You know shit about them that's not available on the internet.

Wr0d.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Fri, 20 Aug 2004 18:15:23 GMT

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

---

The reason we didn't attack the pipelines is because that is the backbone of the Iraqi economy. We wanted to remove Saddam not Iraq. Since we didn't want to totally screw over the country itself we left the pipelines. It's that simple...

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Fri, 20 Aug 2004 21:07:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It's funny; had we blown the oil fields, you'd probably be whining about destroying the oil that belongs to the Iraqi people, but since we didn't, you're just repeating the "OMG W4R 4 OIL!!111!!" bullshit argument.

Damned if you do and damned if you don't, I guess....

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 20 Aug 2004 23:46:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

hydra1945Damned if you do and damned if you don't, I guess....

That's probably because we shouldn't be there in the first place. Iraq's oil shouldn't be an issue at all for us.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 20 Aug 2004 23:49:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Not to mention all the pollution it causes. When Saddam burned the oil wells while exiting Kuwait he probably caused 300 years worth of pollution right there.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 21 Aug 2004 02:44:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SEALThat's probably because we shouldn't be there in the first place.  
Tell that to the man whose daughter was raped and tortured right before his eyes by Iraqi guards in a rape room.

Rape rooms don't exist anymore in Iraq. You know why? Because Saddam was removed.

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals  
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Sat, 21 Aug 2004 07:49:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

At the cost of how many thousands of lives, again?

---

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 21 Aug 2004 10:02:52 GMT

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

---

SEALThat's probably because we shouldn't be there in the first place.

Not necessarily. You shouldn't have gone in the way you did.

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Phoenix - Aeon](#) on Sat, 21 Aug 2004 15:29:41 GMT

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

---

Quote:Again. They weren't talking about ICBM's

Quote:Let's find out what he said:

Ehat he said was irrelavent, it was way after the war.I was reffering to comments mnade during the build-up to the war.

Quote:And as for knowing the hardware ... I'm just gonna call bullshit on this. You know shit about them that's not avaiable on the internet.

Not much I can really say about this one, since the only way I can refute it is by revealing stuff that's not on the internet, and there's a very good reason why it's not there. I'm not saying I know the hardware well, it's jut I know someone who works in military R&D and I've picked up a few things.

---