
Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 06 Oct 2004 20:14:14 GMT

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

<http://www.cnsnews.com//ViewSpecialReports.asp?Page=\SpecialReports\archive\200410\SPE20041004a.html>

I wonder, if and when these documents are proven to be authentic, the "OMG THERE WAS NO WMD OR TIES TO AL-QAEDA BEFORE 9/11" folks will eat crow

cnsnews.com

Exclusive: Saddam Possessed WMD, Had Extensive Terror Ties

By Scott Wheeler

CNSNews.com Staff Writer

October 04, 2004

(CNSNews.com) - Iraqi intelligence documents, confiscated by U.S. forces and obtained by CNSNews.com, show numerous efforts by Saddam Hussein's regime to work with some of the world's most notorious terror organizations, including al Qaeda, to target Americans. They demonstrate that Saddam's government possessed mustard gas and anthrax, both considered weapons of mass destruction, in the summer of 2000, during the period in which United Nations weapons inspectors were not present in Iraq. And the papers show that Iraq trained dozens of terrorists inside its borders.

One of the Iraqi memos contains an order from Saddam for his intelligence service to support terrorist attacks against Americans in Somalia. The memo was written nine months before U.S. Army Rangers were ambushed in Mogadishu by forces loyal to a warlord with alleged ties to al Qaeda.

Other memos provide a list of terrorist groups with whom Iraq had relationships and considered available for terror operations against the United States.

Among the organizations mentioned are those affiliated with Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and Ayman al-Zawahiri, two of the world's most wanted terrorists. Zarqawi is believed responsible for the kidnapping and beheading of several American civilians in Iraq and claimed responsibility for a series of deadly bombings in Iraq Sept. 30. Al-Zawahiri is the top lieutenant of al Qaeda chief Osama bin Laden, allegedly helped plan the Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist strikes on the U.S., and is believed to be the voice on an audio tape broadcast by Al-Jazeera television Oct. 1, calling for attacks on U.S. and British interests everywhere.

The source of the documents

A senior government official who is not a political appointee provided CNSNews.com with copies of the 42 pages of Iraqi Intelligence Service documents. The originals, some of which were hand-written and others typed, are in Arabic. CNSNews.com had the papers translated into English by two individuals separately and independent of each other.

There are no hand-writing samples to which the documents can be compared for forensic analysis and authentication. However, three other experts - a former weapons inspector with the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM), a retired CIA counter-terrorism official with vast experience dealing with Iraq, and a former advisor to then-presidential candidate Bill Clinton on Iraq - were asked to analyze the documents. All said they comport with the format, style and content of other Iraqi documents from that era known to be genuine.

Laurie Mylroie, who authored the book, "Study of Revenge: Saddam Hussein's Unfinished War against America," and advised Clinton on Iraq during the 1992 presidential campaign, told CNSNews.com that the papers represent "the most complete set of documents relating Iraq to terrorism, including Islamic terrorism" against the U.S.

Mylroie has long maintained that Iraq was a state sponsor of terrorism against the United States. The documents obtained by CNSNews.com, she said, include "correspondence back and forth between Saddam's office and Iraqi Mukhabarat (intelligence agency). They make sense. This is what one would think Saddam was doing at the time."

Bruce Tefft, a retired CIA official who specialized in counter-terrorism and had extensive experience dealing with Iraq, said that "based on available, unclassified and open source information, the details in these documents are accurate ..."

The former UNSCOM inspector zeroed in on the signatures on the documents and "the names of some of the people who sign off on these things.

"This is fairly typical of that time era. [The Iraqis] were meticulous record keepers," added the former U.N. official, who spoke with CNSNews.com on the condition of anonymity.

The senior government official, who furnished the documents to CNSNews.com, said the papers answer "whether or not Iraq was a state sponsor of Islamic terrorism against the United States. It also answers whether or not Iraq had an ongoing biological warfare project continuing through the period when the UNSCOM inspections ended."

Presidential campaign focused on Iraq

The presidential campaign is currently dominated by debate over whether Saddam procured weapons of mass destruction and/or whether his government sponsored terrorism aimed at Americans before the U.S. invaded Iraq last year. Democratic nominee Sen. John Kerry has repeatedly rejected that possibility and criticized President Bush for needlessly invading Iraq.

"[Bush's] two main rationales - weapons of mass destruction and the al Qaeda/September 11 (2001) connection - have been proved false ... by the president's own weapons inspectors ... and by the 9/11 Commission," Kerry told an audience at New York University on Sept. 20.

The Senate Intelligence Committee's probe of the 9/11 intelligence failures also could not produce any definitive links between Saddam's government and 9/11. And United Nations as well as U.S. weapons inspectors in Iraq have been unable to find the biological and chemical weapons Saddam was suspected of possessing.

But the documents obtained by CNSNews.com shed new light on the controversy.

They detail the Iraqi regime's purchase of five kilograms of mustard gas on Aug. 21, 2000 and three vials of malignant pustule, another term for anthrax, on Sept. 6, 2000. The purchase order for the mustard gas includes gas masks, filters and rubber gloves. The order for the anthrax includes sterilization and decontamination equipment. (See Saddam's Possession of Mustard Gas)

The documents show that Iraqi intelligence received the mustard gas and anthrax from "Saddam's company," which Tefft said was probably a reference to Saddam General Establishment, "a complex of factories involved with, amongst other things, precision optics, missile, and artillery fabrication."

"Sa'ad's general company" is listed on the Iraqi documents as the supplier of the sterilization and decontamination equipment that accompanied the anthrax vials. Tefft believes this is a reference to the Salah Al-Din State Establishment, also involved in missile construction. (See Saddam's Possession of Anthrax)

The Jaber Ibn Hayan General Company is listed as the supplier of the safety equipment that accompanied the mustard gas order. Tefft described the company as "a 'turn-key' project built by Romania, designed to produce protective CW (conventional warfare) and BW (biological warfare) equipment (gas masks and protective clothing)."

"Iraq had an ongoing biological warfare project continuing through the period when the UNSCOM inspections ended," the senior government official and source of the documents said. "This should cause us to redouble our efforts to find the Iraqi weapons of mass destruction programs."

'Hunt the Americans'

The first of the 42 pages of Iraqi documents is dated Jan. 18, 1993, approximately two years after American troops defeated Saddam's army in the first Persian Gulf War. The memo includes Saddam's directive that "the party should move to hunt the Americans who are on Arabian land, especially in Somalia, by using Arabian elements ..."

On Oct. 3, 1993, less than nine months after that Iraqi memo was written, American soldiers were ambushed in Mogadishu, Somalia by forces loyal to Somali warlord Mohammed Farah Aidid, an alleged associate of Osama bin Laden. Eighteen Americans were killed and 84 wounded during a 17-hour firefight that followed the ambush in which Aidid's followers used civilians as decoys. (See Saddam's Connections to al Qaeda)

An 11-page Iraqi memo, dated Jan. 25, 1993, lists Palestinian, Sudanese and Asian terrorist organizations and the relationships Iraq had with each of them. Of particular importance, Tefft said, are the relationships Iraq had already developed or was in the process of developing with groups and individuals affiliated with al Qaeda, such as Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and Ayman al-Zawahiri. The U.S. currently is offering rewards of up to \$25 million for each man's capture.

The documents describe Al-Jehad wa'l Tajdeed as "a secret Palestinian organization" founded

after the first Persian Gulf War that "believes in armed struggle against U.S. and western interests." The leaders of the group, according to the Iraqi memo, were stationed in Jordan in 1993, and when one of those leaders visited Iraq in November 1992, he "showed the readiness of his organization to execute operations against U.S. interests at any time." (See More Saddam Connections to al Qaeda)

Tefft believes the Tajdeed group likely included al-Zarqawi, whom Tefft described as "our current terrorist nemesis" in Iraq, "a Palestinian on a Jordanian passport who was with al Qaeda and bin Laden in Afghanistan prior to this period (1993)."

Tajdeed, which means Islamic Renewal, currently "has a website that posts Zarqawi's speeches, messages, claims of assassinations and beheading videos," Tefft told CNSNews.com. "The apparent linkages are too close to be accidental" and might "be one of the first operational contacts between an al Qaeda group and Iraq," he added.

Tefft said the documents, all of which the Iraqi Intelligence Service labeled "Top secret, personal and urgent" show several links between Saddam's government and terror groups dedicated not only to targeting America but also U.S. allies like Egypt and Israel.

The same 11-page memo refers to the "re-opening of the relationship" with Al-Jehad al-Islamy, which is described as "the most violent in Egypt," responsible for the 1981 assassination of Egyptian President Anwar Sadat. The documents go on to describe a Dec. 14, 1990 meeting between Iraqi intelligence officials and a representative of Al-Jehad al-Islamy, that ended in an agreement "to move against [the] Egyptian regime by doing martyr operations on conditions that we should secure the finance, training and equipments." (See More Saddam Connections to al Qaeda)

Al-Zawahiri was one of the leaders of Jihad al-Islamy, which is also known as the Egyptian Islamic Group, and participated in the assassination of Sadat, Tefft said. "Iraq's contact with the Egyptian Islamic Group is another operational contact between Iraq and al Qaeda," he added.

One of the Asian groups listed on the Iraqi intelligence memo is J.U.I., also known as the Islamic Clerks Society. The group is currently led by Mawlana Fadhel al-Rahman, whom Tefft said is "an al Qaeda member and co-signed Osama bin Laden's 1998 fatwa (religious ruling) to kill Americans." The Iraqi memo from 1993 states that J.U.I.'s secretary general "has a good relationship with our system since 1981 and he is ready for any mission." Tefft said the memo shows "another direct Iraq link to an al Qaeda group."

Iraq had also maintained a relationship with the Afghani Islamist party since 1989, according to the memo. The "relationship was improved and became directly between the leader, Hekmatyar and Iraq," it states, referring to Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, an Afghani warlord who fought against the Soviet Union and current al Qaeda ally, according to Tefft.

Last year, American authorities in Afghanistan ranked Hekmatyar third on their most wanted list, behind only bin Laden and former Taliban leader Mullah Omar. Hekmatyar represents "another Iraqi link to an al Qaeda group," Tefft said. (See More Saddam Connections to al Qaeda)

The Iraqi intelligence documents also refer to terrorist groups previously believed to have had

links with Saddam Hussein. They include the Palestine Liberation Front, a group dedicated to attacking Israel, and according to the Iraqi memo, one with "an office in Baghdad."

The Abu Nidal group, suspected by the CIA of having acted as surrogates for Iraqi terrorist attacks, is also mentioned.

"The movement believes in political violence and assassinations," the 1993 Iraqi memo states in reference to the Abu Nidal organization. "We have relationships with them since 1973. Currently, they have a representative in the country. Monthly helps are given to them -- 20 thousand dinars - in addition to other supports," the memo explains. (See Saddam's Connections to Palestinian Terror Groups)

Iraq not only built and maintained relationships with terrorist groups, the documents show it appears to have trained terrorists as well. Ninety-two individuals from various Middle Eastern countries are listed on the papers.

Many are described as having "finished the course at M14," a reference to an Iraqi intelligence agency, and to having "participated in Umm El-Ma'arek," the Iraqi response to the U.S. invasion in 1991. The author of the list notes that approximately half of the individuals "all got trained inside the 'martyr act camp' that belonged to our directorate."

The former UNSCOM weapons inspector who was asked to analyze the documents believes it's clear that the Iraqis "were training people there in assassination and suicide bombing techniques ... including non-Iraqis."

Bush administration likely unaware of documents' existence

The senior government official and source of the Iraqi intelligence memos, explained that the reason the documents have not been made public before now is that the government has "thousands and thousands of documents waiting to be translated.

"It is unlikely they even know this exists," the source added.

The government official also explained that the motivation for leaking the documents, "is strictly national security and helping with the war on terrorism by focusing this country's attention on facts and away from political posturing.

"This is too important to let it get caught up in the political process," the source told CNSNews.com.

To protect against the Iraqi intelligence documents being altered or misrepresented elsewhere on the Internet, CNSNews.com has decided to publish only the first of the 42 pages in Arabic, along with the English translation. Portions of some of the other memos in translated form are also being published to accompany this report. Credentialed journalists and counter-terrorism experts seeking to view the 42 pages of Arabic documents or to challenge their authenticity may make arrangements to do so at CNSNews.com headquarters in Alexandria, Va.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 06 Oct 2004 20:16:02 GMT

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

<http://www.cnsnews.com/ViewNation.asp?Page=\Nation\archive\200410\NAT20041004b.html>

cnsnews.com

Journalistic Methodology Used to Report Details of Saddam's Terror Ties

By David Thibault

CNSNews.com Information Services

October 04, 2004

Forty-two pages of photocopied official Iraqi Intelligence Service documents, some hand-written and some typed in 1993, serve as the basis for Scott Wheeler's article, entitled, "Saddam Possessed WMD, Had Extensive Terror Ties." The memos reflect communication between the Iraqi Intelligence Service and Saddam Hussein, by way of his top assistant, the secretary to the president. Tables indicating the Iraqi regime's possession of mustard gas and anthrax in the summer of 2000 are included in the documents, as is a list of 92 individuals believed to have been trained inside Iraq for terrorism operations.

-- Wheeler obtained documents from a longstanding, reliable source who had provided unassailed information for articles previously published. The source is a senior U.S. government official, but not a political appointee and demanded anonymity before furnishing the documents and speaking with CNSNews.com about their importance. At no time in the investigation for this article were the Bush administration, the Bush re-election campaign, the Republican National Committee, the campaign of Democratic presidential nominee John Kerry or the Democratic National Committee consulted.

-- Two translators, working separately and independently of each other, translated the Arabic documents into English for CNSNews.com.

-- There are no hand-writing samples to which the documents can be compared for forensic analysis and authentication. However, three additional experts, a former weapons inspector with the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) who demanded anonymity before speaking with CNSNews.com; Bruce Tefft, a retired CIA counter-terrorism official with heavy experience dealing with Iraq; and Laurie Mylroie, Iraq expert and advisor to then-1992 presidential candidate Bill Clinton on the subject, were asked to evaluate the Iraqi intelligence documents in a double-blind manner. All said the documents comport with the format, style and content of other Iraqi documents from that era known to be genuine. Each of the experts concluded that the documents represent strong evidence that Saddam Hussein maintained extensive ties to terrorist groups including al Qaeda and that he possessed weapons of mass destruction (mustard gas and anthrax).

-- To protect against the Iraqi intelligence documents being altered or misrepresented on the Internet, CNSNews.com has published only the first of the 42 pages in Arabic, along with the English translation. Credentialed journalists and counter-terrorism experts seeking to view the Iraqi Intelligence Service documents and their English translations may make an appointment to visit CNSNews.com headquarters in Alexandria, Va. by first telephoning Managing Editor David Thibault at 703-683-9733.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 06 Oct 2004 20:17:53 GMT

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

(English Translation)

In the name of Allah the compassionate the kind

(The Eagle/Iraqi slogan)

Top secret, personal & urgent

Republic of Iraq

The bureau of presidency

The secretary

Issue # 425/ K

Date: Jan.18th.1993

Rajab 25th.1413 Hijri

Esquire Comrade Ali Al-Reeh Al-Sheikh/ a member of
The Arabian Bureau-Ba'ath party leadership.

Subject: instruction

In a continuity with our former book#7184/K on Dec.20th.1992, its decided that the party should move to hunt the Americans who are on Arabian land, especially in Somalia, by using Arabian elements, or Asian (Muslims) or friends.

Take the necessary steps

Stay well for struggle

Signature of the president's secretary

Jan.18th.1993

Copy to:

The General Director of the intelligence system/

The same purpose mentioned above that concerned your duties

(Not clear writing) The two gentlemen; the deputy and ... M4 to study the ways to executive the instructions

Inform me in person ASAP

Another (different) not clear signature

Jan.18th

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2004 00:31:24 GMT

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

Ah yes, good 'ole cybercast news service. Before they publish the documents, I don't care what they say the documents say. This story means nothing if they won't release those papers.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2004 08:49:46 GMT

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

"To protect against the Iraqi intelligence documents being altered or misrepresented elsewhere on the Internet, CNSNews.com has decided to publish only the first of the 42 pages in Arabic, along with the English translation. Portions of some of the other memos in translated form are also being published to accompany this report. Credentialed journalists and counter-terrorism experts seeking to view the 42 pages of Arabic documents or to challenge their authenticity may make arrangements to do so at CNSNews.com headquarters in Alexandria, Va"

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Renardin6](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2004 12:53:47 GMT

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

Quote:They demonstrate that Saddam's government possessed mustard gas and anthrax, both considered weapons of mass destruction

Is that serious ?

In 1914, germany had already mass destruction weapons so...

Anthrax ? Hmmm, just use email and forget US postal.

Mass destruction weapons are atomic missiles... not stupid old chemical stuff.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [liberator](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2004 14:07:34 GMT

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

tell that to the millions that have died from various nerve agents.

Quote:Mass destruction weapons are atomic missiles... not stupid old chemical stuff.

That's the dumbest thing I've ever heard. Sure atomic/nuclear weapons are flashy and awe-inspiring, but compared to a barrage of chemical artillery shells, the kill count isn't that

different, they just die faster. Chemical weapons also have the major advantage of being highly controlable, they either disperse through natural breakdown or can be neutralized with the appropriate counter-agent which are also deliverable by artillery shell/bomb.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2004 14:55:06 GMT

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

Renardin6

Mass destruction weapons are atomic missiles... not stupid old chemical stuff.

Uhh.. ok. Atomic weapons may have massive destruction capabilities, but WMD simply means the death/injury toll has the potential to be large. Chemical and Biological weapons fit into this category.

I will have to admit though, I have never heard of this news source prior to Crimson posting this in the pitts forum. Hence I am taking this as an unreliable (not necessarily meaning inept or false) source until something is printed as a known news agency.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Phoenix - Aeon](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2004 15:22:35 GMT

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

Hmmm, Iraq had WMDs, I think not, the headline in today's Guardian:

Quote:1,625 UN and US inspectors spent more than two years searching hundreds of sites at a cost of over \$1bn. Yesterday they delivered their verdict:

There were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq

Full article

The article also contains links to the primary dossiers and reports on the situation in Iraq, it makes an interesting read.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2004 17:34:10 GMT

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

Like searching a place the size of California, if they didn't want you to find it, would turn up anything They had plenty of time to hide the WMD or move them out, most likely to Syria

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2004 19:34:11 GMT

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

SETI will never lose hope either. It is impossible to convince people concretely either way on the issue of WMDs. Either they exist and you can't find them and will keep looking until something comes up, or they don't and you can't prove it.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2004 20:22:58 GMT

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

BlazerLike searching a place the size of California, if they didn't want you to find it, would turn up anything They had plenty of time to hide the WMD or move them out, most likely to Syria

2 years and a billion dollars can find almost anything. And just because CNS says they won't release any more of the documents in no way means that they have them. If they don't post the documents, it means nothing.

EDIT: Instead of that, how about reading a real report, like the Dolfer report, for instance? It clearly shows that the most relation Saddam had with WMDs were daydreams.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2004 21:41:20 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiBlazerLike searching a place the size of California, if they didn't want you to find it, would turn up anything They had plenty of time to hide the WMD or move them out, most likely to Syria

2 years and a billion dollars can find almost anything. And just because CNS says they won't release any more of the documents in no way means that they have them. If they don't post the documents, it means nothing.

EDIT: Instead of that, how about reading a real report, like the Dolfer report, for instance? It clearly shows that the most relation Saddam had with WMDs were daydreams.

It said he planned on getting them, and it also Said France, China, and Russia had illegal dealings with Iraq.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 07 Oct 2004 22:14:04 GMT

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

Planned on, but had no capacity to, get WMDs.

Especially with the whole world looking over his shoulder

Especially with the UN sanctions

Saddam didn't have WMDs and wasn't about to have them any time soon. If he started to get WMDs, the world would know. The WMD case for war is now completely unjustified.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 08 Oct 2004 01:10:17 GMT

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

WMDs:

- Nuclear (EX: duh!)
- Chemical (EX: Anthrax)
- Biological (considered the worst kind. EX: smallpox)

those are all categories of WMDs

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 08 Oct 2004 02:11:21 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiPlanned on, but had no capacity to, get WMDs.

Especially with the whole world looking over his shoulder

Especially with the UN sanctions

Saddam didn't have WMDs and wasn't about to have them any time soon. If he started to get WMDs, the world would know. The WMD case for war is now completely unjustified.

Well no.

No one was looking over his shoulder.

The UN sanctions were set to run out.

He wanted them ASAP and could have had them in a matter of months. They had the plans for Nuclear weapons. they could easily get the parts. Did that article I post mean nothing to you?

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Phoenix - Aeon](#) on Fri, 08 Oct 2004 12:59:50 GMT

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

Did the one I posted mean nothing to you? Or how about the reports from official sources, face it

Nodbugger, even the CIA has said there were no WMDs in Iraq.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 08 Oct 2004 20:34:10 GMT

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

Phoenix - AeonDid the one I posted mean nothing to you? Or how about the reports from official sources, face it Nodbugger, even the CIA has said there were no WMDs in Iraq.

I don't care that there weren't.

We accomplished our goal. Iraq does not have wmd, and they never will.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 08 Oct 2004 22:01:42 GMT

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

So you don't care that George Bush himself lied to you over and over?

Even if we took a country that really was no threat to anyone, and made it a festering pool of everything bad?

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 08 Oct 2004 22:10:54 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiSo you don't care that George Bush himself lied to you over and over?

Even if we took a country that really was no threat to anyone, and made it a festering pool of everything bad?

no one lied. Iraq was a threat, and it is not a festering pool of everything bad.

Quit lying to yourself.

For every 1 soldier that supports Kerry there are 4 that support Bush. For every bad thing that happens in Iraq there are 1 million good things. The media refuses to report on it and they tricked you and you are stupid enough to believe them.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 08 Oct 2004 22:38:54 GMT

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

Dear Lord,

Thank you that Nodbugger is not old enough to vote. Please strike him dead with lightning when he turns 18.

Amen.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 08 Oct 2004 22:54:42 GMT

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

ACTUALLY, the only people who 'lied' (and even that is loosely based) is the CIA on the initial information. The president acting on that misinformation (unless he actually KNEW about it, something that can never be proven) is not technically his fault. HOWEVER: It IS his responsibility to deal with, and suffer the consequences of acting on misinformation.

It's not very fair, but isn't that kind of axiom part of the conservative mandate anyway?

As for Iraq being a threat: lol, yeah. If Iraq was a threat to America, then America is a threat to Iran and North Korea, and therefore, it would (at least according to the recurring pro-war logic that you people tend to spew out) legally justify them launching a pre-emptive attack on America. They'd fail, obviously, but it couldn't be called terrorism if what America did to Iraq's sovereignty isn't.

Thing is, Nodbugger, Iraq was not, and never was even considered an imminent threat. There was absolutely NO evidence saying that Iraq would attack America March 20th, 2003, or frankly, any time in the foreseeable future. And now you're in a mess that America can't get out of any time soon. Sure, there are some pretty good things, IMO, that have happened in Iraq. There are also a great deal of pretty bad things too. The problem with you is, you're living in a happy little bubble where you can brush the bad and hypocritical aside while focusing on the happy and glamorous. I'm sure glad that the soldiers on the floor don't have YOU watching their backs.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 00:36:04 GMT

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

You tend to forget my dad was there and hundreds of soldiers that I have met have been there/are there/ are going there.

http://www.usatoday.com/news/politicselections/nation/president/2004-10-03-bush-troops_x.htm

American Soldiers back Bush over Kerry 4-1.

Are they lying too? You know those people fighting and dieing for the mission. When 80% of them

support the person that put them there, those are not opinions you can refute...ever.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 02:41:58 GMT

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

So?

Someone's opinion means absolutely nothing when it comes to the truth.

The truth is: Iraq was currently not a threat. Iraq MAY have become a threat sometime in the future, but that does not mean someone could act on that assumption prior to the fact.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 03:09:23 GMT

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

warrantoSo?

Someone's opinion means absolutely nothing when it comes to the truth.

The truth is: Iraq was currently not a threat. Iraq MAY have become a threat sometime in the future, but that does not mean someone could act on that assumption prior to the fact.

Better safe than sorry.

You simply cannot discredit the soldiers opinions. you are an idiot for doing so.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 03:10:30 GMT

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

The truth is that Iraq was a threat and could have become an even greater threat had he been left alone for an even longer period of time.

Nodbugger is absolutely right in this regard.

Saddam has assisted terrorist organizations in the past. Terrorist organizations are the threat. He was aiding the threat. Therefore, he was a threat.

He had the resources, connections and the desire to hurt America. Diplomacy had failed with him for twelve years.

SADDAM HUSSEIN

WAS

A
THREAT.

The world is safer now that he is out of power.

I don't know why you people would have been happier to see him stay in power instead of seeing him removed. Why do you all continue to defend this brutal dictator?!?

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 03:39:51 GMT

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

NodbuggerwarrantoSo?

Someone's opinion means absolutely nothing when it comes to the truth.

The truth is: Iraq was currently not a threat. Iraq MAY have become a threat sometime in the future, but that does not mean someone could act on that assumption prior to the fact.

Better safe than sorry.

You simply cannot discredit the soldiers opinions. you are an idiot for doing so.

Wow... how, unpatriotic of you. You're actually sanctioning other countries to attack America simply because someone "may" come into power that would use all those nukes you own? After all, better safe than sorry, right?

Quote:I don't know why you people would have been happier to see him stay in power instead of seeing him removed. Why do you all continue to defend this brutal dictator?!?

Who here is defending Saddam? I'm not, I don't think Javaxcx is. Infact, I don't think anyone wanted him to remain in power.

It still doesn't make it right to do so through illegal means.

Quote:SADDAM HUSSEIN

WAS

A

THREAT.

America is a threat to people right now. You and Nodbugger are amazing. I mean, all this talk about sanctioning an attack against America is not going to go over well you know.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 04:16:52 GMT

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

You are an idiot, it is that simple.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 04:30:34 GMT

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

hydurr34827349034

SADDAM HUSSEIN

WAS

A

THREAT

TO

MY

MOTHER.

The neighborhood is safer now that he is out of power.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 05:17:10 GMT

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

NodbuggerYou are an idiot, it is that simple.

If he's an idiot, then you are nothing but a mindless pawn.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 06:57:34 GMT

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

warrantoWho here is defending Saddam? I'm not, I don't think Javaxcx is. Infact, I don't think anyone wanted him to remain in power.

It still doesn't make it right to do so through illegal means.

If you're so worried about "international law," why aren't you as angry at Iraq for disobeying numerous U.N. resolutions and playing footsie with weapons inspectors for 12 years? You're willing to forget all the bad and illegal things Saddam's regime committed in an attempt to weaken the legitimacy of the Iraq war.

You're attempting to weaken the force that is trying to remove Saddam. Therefore, you're defending him.

Something else to think about: If Saddam's removal was "illegal," then the U.N. has an obligation to place him back in power.

Do you really want that?

Quote:America is a threat to people right now.
If you mean terrorists when you say people, you're right.

Quote:You and Nodbugger are amazing.
I'll take that as a compliment.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 14:46:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hydra1945If you're so worried about "international law," why aren't you as angry at Iraq for disobeying numerous U.N. resolutions and playing footsie with weapons inspectors for 12 years?

Playing "footsie" as in letting them go wherever they wanted, and making the offer to the UN of doubling the number of weapons inspectors? Besides, how "footsie" could he be playing if there was nothing there, since 1992 or so?

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 18:09:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngiPlaying "footsie" as in letting them go wherever they wanted, and making the offer to the UN of doubling the number of weapons inspectors? Besides, how "footsie" could he be playing if there was nothing there, since 1992 or so?
I thought you were smarter than this, SuperFlyingCommunist.

When did the Duelfer report come out, SuperFlyingEngi? Two fucking days ago!!! When did Saddam let the inspectors back in? A few days before the invasion!!! He kept inspectors out for FIVE YEARS before then!!!!

Jesus, I have never met someone as dense as you.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 19:29:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hydra1945warrantoWho here is defending Saddam? I'm not, I don't think Javaxcx is. Infact, I don't think anyone wanted him to remain in power.

It still doesn't make it right to do so through illegal means.
If you're so worried about "international law," why aren't you as angry at Iraq for disobeying numerous U.N. resolutions and playing footsie with weapons inspectors for 12 years? You're

willing to forget all the bad and illegal things Saddam's regime committed in an attempt to weaken the legitimacy of the Iraq war.

You're attempting to weaken the force that is trying to remove Saddam. Therefore, you're defending him.

Something else to think about: If Saddam's removal was "illegal," then the U.N. has an obligation to place him back in power.

Do you really want that?

Quote:America is a threat to people right now.
If you mean terrorists when you say people, you're right.

Quote:You and Nodbugger are amazing.
I'll take that as a compliment.

I never ONCE stated that I wasn't "angry" at Iraq for breaking the law themselves. However, that is a moot point, and only shows a desperate attempt by you to avoid the topic at hand. It was NOT America's responsibility to police the world, regardless of the UN's ineptness to do its job. Iraq broke the law as well, yes. I never once stated otherwise. However, America broke the law as well, and no amount of "Look, he did it too!" is going to change that.

I am NOT trying to "weaken the force that removed him", however as I continuously state, that DOES NOT mean America didn't break any laws as well.

No the UN does not have an obligation to put Saddam back into power. What they would have an obligation, if any, to do would be to discipline America for its actions; but you know as well as I do that the UN won't do anything.

...wow. I can't believe you think everyone that is not an American is a terrorist. You did say that after all...

Quote:Quote:America is a threat to people right now.
If you mean terrorists when you say people, you're right.

After all, America has the potential to launch massive nuclear strikes at every country in the world, so they are a threat to everyone in the world. What is more amazing, however, is that YOU actually think everyone in the world is a terrorist. We can only hope you're never in charge, because I'm sure you would be that person that DID launch the WMD's America possesses.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 19:52:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You are fucking retarded.

America is only a threat to those who hate the US. We will never attack a friendly nation.

We will never use these weapons unless they are used against us. Is it that hard to understand?

Saddam was a threat to the world. And we took him out because no one else would.

Now stop bitching about it and help the situation.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 20:14:28 GMT

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

Where is your proof that sometime in the future, there will never be someone in power who has the desire to use those weapons?

If you can provide that, then I will retract that point.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 21:14:59 GMT

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

warranto never ONCE stated that I wasn't "angry" at Iraq for breaking the law themselves. However, that is a moot point, and only shows a desperate attempt by you to avoid the topic at hand. It was NOT America's responsibility to police the world, regardless of the UNs ineptness to do its job. Iraq broke the law as well, yes. I never once stated otherwise. However, America broke the law as well, and no amount of "Look, he did it too!" is going to change that. America broke no law when it invaded Iraq as a protection of its own national security. Terrorism is a very real threat. Iraq has had a history of aiding terrorists.

If anything, America was enforcing the law Saddam broke.

Quote:I am NOT trying to "weaken the force that removed him", however as I continuously state, that DOES NOT mean America didn't break any laws as well. You're attacking the reasons for invading Iraq and removing Saddam. You are trying to remove the force that is finally getting rid of that brutal dictator.

Again, I state, America broke no international law.

Quote:No the UN does not have an obligation to put Saddam back into power. What they would have an obligation, if any, to do would to discipline America for its actions. If it was indeed found to be unlawful for America to invade Iraq for the reasons it did, then the U.N. would have not only an obligation to discipline America for its wrongdoings but to rectify the damage done to Iraq. What was the "damage" done? The removal of Saddam's regime.

Quote:but you know as well as I do that the UN won't do anything.

Right, because the U.N. would most likely lose the 85% of funds America provides for its operation.

Quote:...wow. I can't believe you think everyone that is not an American is a terrorist.

Quote:You did say that after all...

Quote:Quote:America is a threat to people right now.

If you mean terrorists when you say people, you're right.

...Wow, I can't believe you got THAT out of what I said.

You're smart enough to know I did not mean "you're a terrorist if you're not American!" in that statement. I shouldn't even have to explain it to you.

Quote:After all, America has the potential to launch massive nuclear strikes at ever country in the world, so they are a threat to everyone in the world. So does China, Russia, Israel, Great Britain, Pakistan, and India (the former states of the Soviet Union and Russia more than anyone else). I guess they would be threats to the rest of the world, too, going by that definition.

Quote:What is more amazing, however, is that YOU actually think everyone in the world is a terrorist.

You're smart enough to know I did not mean that.

C'mon, Warranto, that's not like you.

Quote:We can only hope you're never in charge, because I'm sure you would be that person that DID launch the WMD's America possesses.

Now what the hell gave you that idea?

NodbuggerYou are fucking retarded.

Nodbugger, though the rest of your post is correct, Warranto is anything but retarded.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 21:56:02 GMT

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

hydra1945SuperFlyingEngiPlaying "footsie" as in letting them go wherever they wanted, and making the offer to the UN of doubling the number of weapons inspectors? Besides, how "footsie" could he be playing if there was nothing there, since 1992 or so?

I thought you were smarter than this, SuperFlyingCommunist.

When did the Duelfer report come out, SuperFlyingEngi? Two fucking days ago!!! When did Saddam let the inspectors back in? A few days before the invasion!!! He kept inspectors out for FIVE YEARS before then!!!!

Jesus, I have never met someone as dense as you.

No, no, the U.S. sent the inspectors a notice to get out a few days before the invasion.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 01:26:14 GMT

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

hydra1945Everything in your last post; just to save space

Only one thing wrong with the first part. International Law was broken. If you search, you can find multiple threads where this was proven.

In the event that the reason of America enforcing the law, that as well is just as bad. Regardless of the UNs inaction, it is not up to America to produce the world.

As for the stuff thats "not like me", I'm well aware of that, but I was trying to prove a point, and through those other threads that I mentioned above, this type of posting was a last resort in explaining it.

The point I was tring to make is that future action, because they are not known, can not be used to explain the actions of someone. The ONLY way that something can be acted on before the act occurs is if actions are taken by the suspected to ensure the act is completed. According to the UN, Iraq was, albeit slowly, getting rid of the weapons it was told to get rid of.

In the event that what Blazer posted was true, until they actually made attempts to follow through with those acts, (ex. Building up its weapons again) nothing could 'legally' be done. Anything prior to that is conspiracy, and is a lesser charge.

In keeping with this out-of-character point, that definition of a threat, and it involving China, Israel, Canada, in fact every nation in the world could be a potential threat. This is exactly the point I was trying to make about future actions not being able to be considered. It turns into ludicrous reasoning such as this.

Anf that "You being in charge comment" was a bit out of line, but I was getting frusterated in trying to get my point across. I appologise.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 04:00:07 GMT

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

hydra1945If you're so worried about "international law," why aren't you as angry at Iraq for disobeying numerous U.N. resolutions and playing footsie with weapons inspectors for 12 years? You're willing to forget all the bad and illegal things Saddam's regime committed in an attempt to weaken the legitimacy of the Iraq war.

See, this is a neglectful problem on your part, and many pro-war types; especially on these forums. Warranto, AND myself have already stated that Iraq is in violation of international law. We have already conceded to the fact many times over many threads that Iraq is guilty of many charges. Since the majority of us here and around the world are probably in agreement on that issue as well, it really doesn't need to be brought up time and time again. When people such as

yourself turn the focus of an argument off the people in question (in this case, the coalition), and back onto Iraq with the "Well he started it!" theorem, it does nothing but weaken your stance because, well, it simply means you can't defend yourself with anything else. I'd expect Nodbugger and his ilk to do something like that, but not you.

Quote:You're attempting to weaken the force that is trying to remove Saddam. Therefore, you're defending him.

Now here is another problem. It is not defending Saddam to say "You got him, good. You did it the wrong way, though." Remember chief, you can do the right thing the wrong way.

Quote:Something else to think about: If Saddam's removal was "illegal," then the U.N. has an obligation to place him back in power.

That is a very good point. Although, it does not deem the act legal. Especially when you have major figureheads of the U.N. (Like Kofi Annan) calling the war illegal. Let me be perfectly blunt: the U.N. is a farce. I can only suggest the coalition hasn't been reprimanded because it suits the U.N. to be on good terms with America and the United Kingdom. Again, and make sure you understand this: This does NOT deem the act legal.

Quote:America broke no law when it invaded Iraq as a protection of its own national security. Terrorism is a very real threat. Iraq has had a history of aiding terrorists.

For the first part of that: There are several threads in this forum discussing and proving that America had absolutely no authority to invade Iraq under any U.N. resolution. In fact, because of key statements in resolution 1441 and like like, the coalition's actions can be deemed illegal for violation of Article 2 of the charter, and the commitment to the sovereignty of Iraq which was violated and manipulated for a time.

There is one possible way to justify the war, however. The whole "self-defence" schpiel at the U.N. For some insight onto that clause, take a look at this.

Find some evidence that Iraq was indeed branded and considered an imminent threat, not simply a threat that can escalate to imminent-- because that logic would allow you to attack any one in the world for any reason. It would also legally allow places like North Korea or Iraq (former) or Iran to blast the fuck out of the west because they figure America to be a threat that might become terminal.

If you cannot, then the self-defence clause may not be used, and that can only go further to appeal to the idea that you did the right thing the wrong way.

Quote:If anything, America was enforcing the law Saddam broke.

As long as you are a Member State, you do not have the legal authority to do that at your whims. Don't like it? Pay the U.N. the fees you never bothered to pay for the last little while, and get out.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 05:10:39 GMT

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

Who the fuck cares. The UN sucks so we told them to go fuck themselves for the time being.

The UN will go nowhere as long as Kofi is around.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 05:26:12 GMT

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

You're a goof.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 06:36:29 GMT

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

Nah, both are.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [xptek](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 23:44:10 GMT

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

NodbuggerYou are fucking retarded.

/me sounds irony alarm.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Panther](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 00:00:27 GMT

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

ScampNodbuggerYou are fucking retarded.

/me sounds irony alarm.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 01:22:35 GMT

SuperFlyingEngiNo, no, the U.S. sent the inspectors a notice to get out a few days before the invasion.

You're taking information we learned three days ago and applying it to a situation two years ago. We didn't know Saddam didn't have any weapons of mass destruction because he still wasn't letting weapons inspectors into his country.

Bush didn't lie since he didn't know the information we had learned three days ago (keyword: days) a year and a half ago (keyword: year).

warrantoOnly one thing wrong with the first part. International Law was broken. If you search, you can find multiple threads where this was proven.

Nope, still no law broken.

Article 51 of the outdated UN Charter:

"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"

Members of a terrorist organization attacked the United States on September 11, 2001. That organization has been aided by Iraq in the past. Though it was not a direct attack, Iraq has still harbored and provided aid for known terrorists and terrorist organizations.

The world has changed since 1945 when the UN Charter was signed, and I have yet to see any amendments made to update it to the twenty-first century. The appeasement tactics of old do not work anymore (I don't they have ever worked, come to think of it).

Islamic terrorism is the threat, here, and there is no section in the UN charter to my knowledge that refers to an international threat such as this. Any nation that contributes to that threat is a threat as well and must be dealt with harshly, something the UN isn't prepared to do.

Quote:Regardless of the UNs inaction, it is not up to America to police (I took the liberty of correcting that for you) the world.

It is, however, up to the United States to protect itself from outside threats of which Iraq was apart.

Quote:The point I was trying to make is that future action, because they are not known, can not be used to explain the actions of someone. The ONLY way that something can be acted on before the act occurs is if actions are taken by the suspected to ensure the act is completed. According to the UN, Iraq was, albeit slowly, getting rid of the weapons it was told to get rid of.

The UN quite frankly had no idea what Iraq was doing with its weapons of mass destruction. Saddam was and always has been playing cat-and-mouse games with the inspectors since before he kicked them out in 1998, and during the five years weapons inspectors were not present, no one had any idea what he was doing with them. He may have been dismantling them, but if he was, why wouldn't he have let anyone know about it? Why kick the inspectors out if you're doing what you're being told to do?

As you know, weapons inspectors must be present at any dismantling of any weapons of mass destruction in any country in the world. If the United States decides to dismantle a nuclear warhead, UN inspectors must be present to ensure that the weapon is dismantled properly and

disposed of correctly.

Now, I ask you, if Saddam was indeed complying with the orders to dismantle his weapons of mass destruction after weapons inspectors were kicked out, why didn't he just let them back in to witness their dismantling?

Common sense tells you that something just doesn't add up here.

Quote:I appologise.
Accepted.

JavaxcxSee, this is a neglectful problem on your part, and many pro-war types; especially on these forums. Warranto, AND myself have already stated that Iraq is in violation of international law. We have already conceded to the fact many times over many threads that Iraq is guilty of many charges. Since the majority of us here and around the world are probably in agreement on that issue as well, it really doesn't need to be brought up time and time again.

Why, then, doesn't the world stand firmly when dealing with countries like Iraq who, as you say, is "guilty of many charges" and a threat to the world peace? The UN has allowed the situation in Iraq to escalate and worsen for twelve years by using simple appeasement tactics, and 9/11 should have been a wake-up call to the world that says even the most powerful nation in the world can fall victim to a horrendous terrorist attack.

The tactics of appeasement are outdated in a post-9/11 world, and given the UN's inability to deal with Saddam firmly as it should have, it leads me to believe that the UN is outdated as well.

Quote:When people such as yourself turn the focus of an argument off the people in question (in this case, the coalition), and back onto Iraq with the "Well he started it!" theorem, it does nothing but weaken your stance because, well, it simply means you can't defend yourself with anything else.

I addressed this point earlier in this post. Moving on....

Quote:I'd expect Nodbugger and his ilk to do something like that, but not you.
I'm flattered you have such high expectations of me.

(j/k)

Quote:That is a very good point. Although, it does not deem the act legal. Especially when you have major figureheads of the U.N. (Like Kofi Annan) calling the war illegal.
So, the war was illegal, then. Do you want Saddam back in power?

Wouldn't it be sort of a contradiction on your part to say you don't want Saddam put back into power even though he was removed as a result of an illegal war?

Quote:Let me be perfectly blunt: the U.N. is a farce.
Holy crap! We agree on something!

Quote:I can only suggest the coalition hasn't been reprimanded because it suits the U.N. to be on good terms with America and the United Kingdom.

Probably because it doesn't want to lose the majority of its funding.

Quote:There is one possible way to justify the war, however. The whole "self-defence" schpiel at the U.N.

That clause is a perfect example of how outdated the UN is. It basically says a country has to wait to be attacked before it can take the necessary action to prevent that attack. During a time when that attack can appear in the form of a mushroom cloud in Madison Square Garden at New Year's Eve, that clause has little to do with today's world.

With that aside, though, the United States was attacked not by a single country but by an international force that has the support of many other countries around the world and will stop at nothing to see the United States and its allies completely and utterly destroyed.

Such a force is not addressed in the UN Charter.

Quote:Pay the U.N. the fees you never bothered to pay for the last little while, and get out. We have been providing more than 85% of the total funds the UN uses to operate and carry out its actions around the world. I agree with the latter point, though.

A little sidenote: I realize I got a bit too carried away in my earlier posts and came off as overly aggressive, and for that I apologize.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 01:37:29 GMT

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

I'll let Warranto respond to the parts addressed to him.

Quote:Why, then, doesn't the world stand firmly when dealing with countries like Iraq who, as you say, is "guilty of many charges" and a threat to the world peace? The UN has allowed the situation in Iraq to escalate and worsen for twelve years by using simple appeasement tactics, and 9/11 should have been a wake-up call to the world that says even the most powerful nation in the world can fall victim to a horrendous terrorist attack.

The tactics of appeasement are outdated in a post-9/11 world, and given the UN's inability to deal with Saddam firmly as it should have, it leads me to believe that the UN is outdated as well.

You're right, they are outdated tactics. They SHOULD be changed. But that doesn't mean that you can go around playing vigilante cop until that happens and call it "legal". Iraq should be punished for its violations of those UN resolutions, and believe me, I don't want to see Saddam back in power, but you have to understand that two wrongs do not make a right in any circumstance.

Quote:So, the war was illegal, then. Do you want Saddam back in power?

Of course not. I "want" all those in violation of the law to be punished. If Saddam is also in

violation of that law, and if deemed necessary by the Security Council, he wouldn't be reinstated as president of Iraq and would be tried appropriately. But that doesn't mean that the aggressors are free of blame. Not by a long shot.

Look, you have to look at these legal situations as objectively as possible. You might not like the idea of that, but that is simply how the law works.

Quote:Wouldn't it be sort of a contradiction on your part to say you don't want Saddam put back into power even though he was removed as a result of an illegal war?

Not if Saddam is also guilty of violation of the law.

Quote:That clause is a perfect example of how outdated the UN is. It basically says a country has to wait to be attacked before it can take the necessary action to prevent that attack. During a time when that attack can appear in the form of a mushroom cloud in Madison Square Garden at New Year's Eve, that clause has little to do with today's world.

Take a look at that article I posted.

Quote:With that aside, though, the United States was attacked not by a single country but by an international force that has the support of many other countries around the world and will stop at nothing to see the United States and its allies completely and utterly destroyed.

That's right. They were attacked by Al Qaeda, not Iraq. Therefore, under the very Charter of the U.N. (however outdated that we can agree it is), you cannot do what you did legally in terms of their sovereignty.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 01:44:41 GMT

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

Quote:Nope, still no law broken.

Article 51 of the outdated UN Charter:

"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"

Members of a terrorist organization attacked the United States on September 11, 2001. That organization has been aided by Iraq in the past. Though it was not a direct attack, Iraq has still harbored and provided aid for known terrorists and terrorist organizations.

Nope, sorry. Iraq is not Al-Queda. Regardless of "past association", the only way this link could affect the legality of the war is if Saddam hired Al-Queda for that attack. Otherwise, that comment holds no strength whatsoever. Oh, and as an extra, to my knowledge that link wasn't announced as a reason for going to war, so it doesn't make a viable defence anyways.

Quote:It is, however, up to the United States to protect itself from outside threats of which Iraq

was apart.

And we come full circle. Prove to me that Iraq was a real an imminent threat.

Quote:The UN quite frankly had no idea what Iraq was doing with its weapons of mass destruction. Saddam was and always has been playing cat-and-mouse games with the inspectors since before he kicked them out in 1998, and during the five years weapons inspectors were not present, no one had any idea what he was doing with them. He may have been dismantling them, but if he was, why wouldn't he have let anyone know about it? Why kick the inspectors out if you're doing what you're being told to do?

As you know, weapons inspectors must be present at any dismantling of any weapons of mass destruction in any country in the world. If the United States decides to dismantle a nuclear warhead, UN inspectors must be present to ensure that the weapon is dismantled properly and disposed of correctly.

Now, I ask you, if Saddam was indeed complying with the orders to dismantle his weapons of mass destruction after weapons inspectors were kicked out, why didn't he just let them back in to witness their dismantling?

Moot point. The UN released documents stating that Iraq was complying. They may have been fooled, yes, but that's the information that they presented as accurate, therefore America had no legal basis to act on it.

Quote:Wouldn't it be sort of a contradiction on your part to say you don't want Saddam put back into power even though he was removed as a result of an illegal war?

I'm not saying that I want this to happen, nor do I think that it would happen, but if it did, it would be the proper thing to do, if not the best thing. This is exactly why Police officers have strict guidelines when arresting someone. If they are not adhered to, the person arrested could be let go. The same thing applies here. If the UN actually decided to investigate and rule on this matter (they won't, but just as an example), Saddam could be let go. Forcefully returned to power is another thing though.

Edit: to clarify, letting Saddam go would be the proper thing to do. It would NOT be the best thing to do. -just if there was any misconception in the wording-

Edit 2:

(19:46:52) Carbon-12: What if Saddam was also guilty of violation of those resolutions?

>warranto: that would be dealt with separately. In regards to him being removed via the war, the administrative law part was done incorrectly.

(19:48:06) @warranto: it would probably be, America lets him go, and the UN arrests him right after

Hopefully that fixes the understanding.

Quote:Why, then, doesn't the world stand firmly when dealing with countries like Iraq who, as you say, is "guilty of many charges" and a threat to the world peace?

This can be explained by something I call the "good guy-Bad guy" factor. When the publically viewed "Bad guy" does something bad it is expected of him, and therefore doesn't generate much public outcry (compared to what I'm going to explain next). The good guy, however, is expected to be good. So when the "good guy" does something bad, it is not expected of him, and the public outcry is extensive.

Remember though, this does not express the belief of individual people, just the collective.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 01:54:12 GMT

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

Quote:You're right, they are outdated tactics. They SHOULD be changed. But that doesn't mean that you can go around playing vigilante cop until that happens and call it "legal". Iraq should be punished for its violations of those UN resolutions, and believe me, I don't want to see Saddam back in power, but you have to understand that two wrongs do not make a right in any circumstance.

It's becoming irrelevant as to whether or not it was vigilante justice. The fact remains that no one was going to do anything about it except for the United States. Russia, France, and Germany all had some nice deals going with Hussein. Removing him would have voided them. That is the only reason they opposed removing him from power by invading Iraq and finishing what he started in 1991.

This reminds me of those "realism superhero" comics. A mega villain attacks, destroys a lot of people and property, and someone like Superman comes along and stops them. After the fight is through, someone calls them a vigilante, and they get hunted down. Nevermind the fact that they saved the populace from further destruction, or the fact that they were the only ones willing or able to do anything about it.

I'll concede that what we did was "wrong" by "international law," but then again allowing Hussein to mutilate the Oil for Food program and bribe our allies into helping him does not really help your case either.

I personally view this as the real world equivalent of Star Trek's Kobiashi Maru simulation program - a no win situation. Arguing over it is futile - it won't change anything at all.

Quote:And we come full circle. Prove to me that Iraq was a real and imminent threat.

The problem with your type of thought is that you probably won't acknowledge a threat until it makes itself known in a belligerent fashion.

Quote:That's right. They were attacked by Al Qaeda, not Iraq. Therefore, under the very Charter of the U.N. (however outdated that we can agree it is), you cannot do what you did legally in terms of their sovereignty.

Unfortunately that holds little water when human lives are at stake. I care little for international

law, as I've said before, because it always ends up being self-serving tripe for Europeans to try and "counteract US hegemony in the world" as a sign of defiance, that they're not as weak as they really are. I suppose losing every major point of influence over the past 400 years really hurts European pride, only to get one-upped by a former British colony.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 02:26:53 GMT

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

Quote:It's becoming irrelevant as to whether or not it was vigilante justice.

Quote:I'll concede that what we did was "wrong" by "international law,"

Whether or not it is relevant isn't the point. It either was vigilante justice, or it wasn't. And if you conceded to the aforementioned, then you must agree that it was vigilante justice. And you're right, it does tie into that idea of "realism superheros", but it still doesn't change the fact that the law was broken to meet your agenda, no matter WHAT it was. But the difference here is that Superman never goes running around like a Nodbuggered moron screaming "IT WAS LEGAL FUK U ANTIWAR BIZTSCHX".

We've already agreed that it was the right thing to do, but we're firm in the fact that it was done the wrong way. It can be proven any number of ways, many of which have already been stated and restated in these, and on the Pitts.

Quote:The fact remains that no one was going to do anything about it except for the United States. Russia, France, and Germany all had some nice deals going with Hussien. Removing him would have voided them. That is the only reason they opposed removing him from power by invading Iraq and finishing what he started in 1991.

You have to be careful with this argument because it can come back and bite Bush, Cheney, or any other places that are making a sweet buck off this war. I probably don't need to explain it to you, so I won't bother unless you want me too.

Quote:but then again allowing Hussien to mutilate the Oil for Food program and bribe our allies into helping him does not really help your case either.

No one said anything about the allies being in the right either. If they are guilty of accepting bribes, then they too are in the wrong and should be punished.

Quote:I personally view this as the real world equivalent of Star Trek's Kobiashi Maru simulation program - a no win situation. Arguing over it is futile - it won't change anything at all.

I suppose it doesn't change anything of major importance, but it does clarify many fallacies that people like Nodbugger or Cm2Play pull out of this situation. As much as these people want to think it, America isn't on the holy high horse that they seem to elevate it to.

Quote:The problem with your type of thought is that you probably won't acknowledge a threat until

it makes itself known in a belligerent fashion.

The problem with the "attack any threat" train of thought is that you can attack any country for any reason at any time and call it "self-defence". Neither train of thought sound very good at all, but the one right now that applies to the Member States is the idea that Warranto explained. Do I think it's a good call? Of course not. But is it the law? Yes.

Quote:Unfortunately that holds little water when human lives are at stake.

There is plenty of time after the matter of fact to suffer the consequences.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 03:13:02 GMT

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

As the victors it's our right to make money off the war. I personally think we should take their oil and annex the sections of Iraq with it for all the trouble that nation has caused us.

The difference with the bribery is that I only see you focus on the US, and how you can incriminate us. How about playing fair and focusing equally on the others responsible for this mess?

I don't care if it was the law or not. The problem with the "law" was that it was flawed. Generally, when laws are antiquated or not good, you'll try to get them changed. We did, if I remember correctly. It's hard to change the laws when the people who don't want it changed are the ones being bribed.

At that point it doesn't become law, it becomes a chokehold on doing what it is that you need to do in order to protect your nation.

As for consequences, the only consequences we should face are ones involving us pulling out of the UN and withdrawing all funding, along with removing our soldiers from every overseas location except for war spots including Afghanistan and Iraq.

Other than that, they should face the consequences for being an inept world body that only exists to serve itself, not humanity as a whole.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 04:10:59 GMT

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

OK, so let me get this straight... we should let Saddam go, punish Russia, France, and Germany's leaders for being bribed... punish the US leaders as war criminals. Yes, I see that a much better solution. :rolleyes:

And what is this crap about unpaid dues? From the best of my knowledge, the USA is the largest funder of all the UN's humanitarian projects. If we were so "in debt" to the UN then why wouldn't they take the first opportunity to bring us to "justice"... and how can they bring us to "justice" if Bush refused to make us a part of the International Criminal Court in the Hague?

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 05:16:02 GMT

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

AircraftkillerAs the victors it's our right to make money off the war. I personally think we should take their oil and annex the sections of Iraq with it for all the trouble that nation has caused us.

That wasn't what I was talking about.

Quote:The difference with the bribery is that I only see you focus on the US, and how you can incriminate us. How about playing fair and focusing equally on the others responsible for this mess?

In all "fairness": France, Germany, and Russia didn't cause the deaths of hundreds of innocent people while leaving just as many homeless. Sure, that's what comes with conventional war nowadays, but it doesn't change the fact that innocent people died under your attacks. Read my post again chief: if they're in the wrong, they need to be punished as well.

Quote:I don't care if it was the law or not. The problem with the "law" was that it was flawed. Generally, when laws are antiquated or not good, you'll try to get them changed. We did, if I remember correctly. It's hard to change the laws when the people who don't want it changed are the ones being bribed.

If this is what you (and possibly millions of Americans) believe, then why is it that you are still in the U.N.?

Quote:OK, so let me get this straight... we should let Saddam go, punish Russia, France, and Germany's leaders for being bribed... punish the US leaders as war criminals. Yes, I see that a much better solution.

Stop being so one dimensional. Now understand this, because you and many others are having a seemingly difficult time comprehending: "NO BODY IS ABOVE THE LAW". Conservative or not, you're all (supposed) to be equal when it comes to the law. If you ask Bush if you go to his final debate on Wednesday, he will tell you the same thing. If you are going to punish Saddam the way you have done so by eviscerating him from his sovereignty, and go as far as to criticize the French, Germans, and Russians for their illegal deals which you suspect are the reasons they would not support you, how in God's name can you possibly ignore the rampant hypocrisy of your own nation? If you can even fathom condemning any of those nations under a legal pretense without looking ever so closely at yourself, then maybe I was right all along: Maybe you are living in a bubble.

As for your dues, I've only looked for a few minutes, but:

Quote:Jan. 2003. The United States, the world's richest nation, is currently the biggest single defaulter owing more than 800 million dollars to the world body.

<http://www.worldrevolution.org/article/241>

But yet, all these poorer nations can afford to pay their debts.

Quote:and how can they bring us to "justice" if Bush refused to make us a part of the International Criminal Court in the Hague?

So wait a second here, are you trying to imply that you had no legal right to do dick all in the first Gulf War because the ICC wasn't even invented yet? How is it that the U.N. can beat on Saddam Hussein back then or enforce resolutions on him with legal pretense before, and AFTER the creation of the ICC but all of a sudden, you consider yourself absolved from it here and now? Sorry Crimson, not being part of the ICC doesn't absolve you from the obligations to the law when you signed the charter. It obviously didn't for Saddam. Nice try, though.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 06:52:08 GMT

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

<http://www.globalpolicy.org/finance/docs00/bartlett.htm>

I think this is a VERY persuasive argument towards the whole UN dues issue.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 18:29:56 GMT

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

The main point of that argument seems to be that the US shouldn't have to pay because it has been paid many times over through other costs.

That's nice, it doesn't matter though. Unless an agreement had been made that those costs could be paid in lieu of the dues, then yes, that speech would make a compelling argument. However, to my knowledge, no such agreement has been made. Therefore that speech is a pointless argument.

Quote:OK, so let me get this straight... we should let Saddam go, punish Russia, France, and Germany's leaders for being bribed... punish the US leaders as war criminals. Yes, I see that a much better solution.

Kind of like how the DC sniper had an indictment dismissed, simply because it did not reach the court in time? He was very much guilty, and should not have been able to get off. But the law is the law, regardless of who agrees with it or not. The Administrative law was not followed, therefore,

despite the fact he was most likely guilty, the indictment was dismissed.

Link

The exact same thing applies here. If the law was not followed in the removal of Saddam, he could very well be let go. Of course, as I stated, if the UN so desired, he they could arrest him right away on other crimes.

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 23:56:34 GMT

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

Apparently you didn't read the entire speech.

"They have all reached essentially the same conclusions, that we have spent about \$19 billion on peacekeeping activities since 1992. Now, we have been credited with \$1.8 billion of that against U.N. dues, so a precedent has already been made, that if we spend money on an authorized U.N. peacekeeping activity that those monies that we have spent there are in lieu of dues; that is, they could replace dues. They only did that, though, with \$1.8 billion. There is about another \$17 billion that is still out there that we have received no credit for."

Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they?

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 12 Oct 2004 04:28:28 GMT

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

No, I read that part. Only a portion has been credited for it, not all of it. Meaning that, yes, money paid towards the UN may be accredited could be in lieu of UN dues. The only thing is, is that it does not automatically mean EVERY due has some money attributed to it. Going again, towards what I said about an agreement being made.

This section of that paragraph explains it; important parts being bolded.

Quote: that if we spend money on an authorized U.N. peacekeeping activity that those monies that we have spent there are in lieu of dues; that is, they could replace dues. They only did that, though, with \$1.8 billion. There is about another \$17 billion that is still out there that we have received no credit for."

Now, yes that also implies there is \$17 billion not accounted for, but as it is, only a portion has been put towards UN dues. Something like this has the ability to continue in the future (expenses being put towards dues), but unless an arrangement has been made, it doesn't HAVE to (of course, this won't prevent America from rightfully assuming it will).

In the case of a disagreement in that with America and the UN, there is always a court to figure out the specifics.
