
Subject: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 20 Jun 2006 19:55:40 GMT

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

<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/20/washington/20cnd-cong.html?ex=1308456000&en=09b84bc82f790b49&ei=5090&partn er=rssuserland&emc=rss>

The New York Times Earlier today, Republicans defeated a Democratic proposal for an investigation into waste and fraud in military contracts. The proposal, made by Senator Byron L. Dorgan of North Dakota, called for a panel like the one led by Harry Truman when he was a Senator, which uncovered many abuses in military spending during World War II. It failed by a 52-to-44 vote.

Republicans try hard to avoid accountability. It's almost like they've been profiting through the War In Iraq...

Various Scandals (Courtesy of Salon.com, through <http://www.ecolivingcenter.com/board/politics/messages/73.html>)

Halliburton: Pumping Up Prices

The scandal: In 2003, Halliburton overcharged the army for fuel in Iraq. Specifically, Halliburton's subsidiary Kellogg, Brown & Root hired a Kuwaiti company, Altanmia, to supply fuel at about twice the going rate, then added a markup, for an overcharge of at least \$61 million, according to a December 2003 Pentagon audit.

The problem: That's not the government's \$61 million, it's our \$61 million.

The outcome: The FBI is investigating.

Halliburton's Vanishing Iraq Money

The scandal: In mid-2004, Pentagon auditors determined that \$1.8 billion of Halliburton's charges to the government, about 40 percent of the total, had not been adequately documented.

The problem: That's not the government's \$1.8 billion, it's our \$1.8 billion.

The outcome: The Defense Contract Audit Agency has "strongly" asked the Army to withhold about \$60 million a month from its Halliburton payments until the documentation is provided.

Money Order: Afghanistan's Missing \$700 Million Turns Up in Iraq

The scandal: According to Bob Woodward's "Plan of Attack," the Bush administration diverted \$700 million in funds from the war in Afghanistan, among other places, to prepare for the Iraq invasion.

The problem: Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the U.S. Constitution specifically gives Congress the power "to raise and support armies." And the emergency spending bill passed after Sept. 11,

2001, requires the administration to notify Congress before changing war spending plans. That did not happen.

The outcome: Congress declined to investigate. The administration's main justification for its decision has been to claim the funds were still used for, one might say, Middle East anti-tyrant-related program activities.

Iraq: More Loose Change

The scandal: The inspector general of the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq released a series of reports in July 2004 finding that a significant portion of CPA assets had gone missing -- 34 percent of the materiel controlled by Kellogg, Brown & Root -- and that the CPA's method of disbursing \$600 million in Iraq reconstruction funds "did not establish effective controls and left accountability open to fraud, waste and abuse."

The problem: As much as \$50 million of that money was disbursed without proper receipts.

The outcome: The CPA has disbanded, but individual government investigations into the handling of Iraq's reconstruction continue.

Iraq: The Case for War

The scandal: Bush and many officials in his administration made false statements about Iraq's military capabilities, in the months before the United States' March 2003 invasion of the country.

The problem: For one thing, it is a crime to lie to Congress, although Bush backers claim the president did not knowingly make false assertions.

The outcome: A war spun out of control with unknowable long-term consequences. The Iraq Survey Group has stopped looking for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 20 Jun 2006 20:15:42 GMT

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

TOO LONG DIDN'T READ

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Wed, 21 Jun 2006 06:51:14 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 20 June 2006 22:15: TOO LONG DIDN'T READ

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 21 Jun 2006 12:52:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wasting time reading another liberal rant is just that... wasting my time.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 21 Jun 2006 16:50:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well then explain why the Republican Congress refuses to investigate any fraud in Iraq. You can't just ignore things you don't agree with. And I would hesitate to call my words "angry".

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 21 Jun 2006 17:50:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 02:51 Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 20 June 2006 22:15 TOO LONG DIDN'T READ

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 21 Jun 2006 18:34:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Some of that is true, there is alot of money going missing over there, when its meant to be used on building projects.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 21 Jun 2006 18:49:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

When you say some of it is true, you're implying that some isn't, and so I challenge you to identify what exactly is incorrect.

And ACK, if you're expecting me to pander to feigned idiocy, I shall not.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [OWA](#) on Wed, 21 Jun 2006 21:34:12 GMT

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

Iraq is not my problem. I dont want to get involved.

My problem - Must put kettle on.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 21 Jun 2006 21:36:55 GMT

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

Wasting money to find out who wasted money just to throw those people in prison just to waste more money is just that... a waste of money.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 21 Jun 2006 22:14:54 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 13:49When you say some of it is true, you're implying that some isn't, and so I challenge you to identify what exactly is incorrect.

And ACK, if you're expecting me to pander to feigned idiocy, I shall not.

Because he is in Congress and should know.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 21 Jun 2006 22:44:36 GMT

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

DarkDemin wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 17:36Wasting money to find out who wasted money just to throw those people in prison just to waste more money is just that... a waste of money.

So your position is that we shouldn't enforce laws in America? That's completely ridiculous. And the point isn't that people wasted money, it's that they stole it. When over a billion dollars in taxpayer money is even possibly stolen, it's always worth investigating. Because who's to stop it from continually occuring?

Even only taking into account which option is cheaper, which is stupid, investigating where this money went is definitely the better option. And since Congressional Republicans are so adamantly opposed to doing so, what does that tell you?

Honestly, that's a really doltish opinion you had there.

EDIT: Grammatical Errors

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 21 Jun 2006 22:54:11 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 18:44DarkDemin wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 17:36Wasting money to find out who wasted money just to throw those people in prison just to waste more money is just that... a waste of money.

So your position is that we shouldn't enforce laws in America? That's completely ridiculous. And the point isn't that people wasted money, it's that they stole it. When over a billion dollars in taxpayer money is even possibly stolen, it's always worth investigating. Because who's to stop it from continually occurring?

Even only taking into account which option is cheaper, which is stupid, investigating where this money went is definitely the better option. And since Congressional Republicans are so adamantly opposed to doing so, what does that tell you?

Honestly, that's a really doltish opinion you had there.

EDIT: Grammatical Errors

I was doing a John Madden impression. You know I care and all that the government is "stealing" money from the tax payers but what else is new. Seriously every administration has stolen money from us. You just find this oh so interesting because it has to do with the Bush administration and how many Conservatives are on this forum.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2006 00:25:06 GMT

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

Billions of dollars is not routine. Honestly I'm not entirely sure why you seem to be avoiding the point that this amazingly large sum of money was apparently stolen from the U.S. government and now such theft is apparently being covered up by the Republicans in Congress. And this theft occurring through a war that was justified and initiated based on lies and deceit by those same Republicans.

Your quotations are misguided. What is suggested by people such as the Pentagon auditors is outright theft. Not "stealing". Stealing. It's also important to note that this missing money is implied to have been transferred to individuals, not the government. As such, thieves in the U.S. are now driving their new luxury yacht with American tax dollars.

If you really have such an apathetic view on such incredible theft, then how can you have any political opinion? I mean, come on, what's worse than "massive stealing through fake war"? A 0.5% tax hike to fund city schools?

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2006 11:55:06 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi, I am going to make this as clear as possible. No one cares about what you post anymore.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2006 15:32:37 GMT

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

Either out of stupidity or lack of an aggressive response.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2006 16:21:14 GMT

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

Arguing with you about something when I will never change your mind is useless to me; therefore I don't waste my time.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2006 17:49:46 GMT

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

Don't forget that you're the one refusing to acknowledge obvious theft.

And since you haven't given me a reasoned point to change my mind to, I'm not entirely sure what action you want me to take. Your forfeiture of continued debate seems to be a bit premature.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2006 17:59:13 GMT

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

I'm basing my opinion that arguing with you is a waste of time based on past fact.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2006 18:02:57 GMT

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

Vague, amorphous "fact". The best kind.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2006 18:49:28 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 13:50
Goztow wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 02:51
Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 20 June 2006 22:15
TOO LONG DIDN'T READ

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [OWA](#) on Thu, 22 Jun 2006 19:18:32 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller wrote on Thu, 22 June 2006 19:49
Aircraftkiller wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 13:50
Goztow wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 02:51
Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 20 June 2006 22:15
TOO LONG DIDN'T READ

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [MadDave](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2006 00:18:59 GMT

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

The Bush administration is good at pulling shit and then covering it up. And for those of you who keep replying with "TOO LONG DIDN'T READ", no one cares if you read it or not.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2006 00:47:23 GMT

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

MadDave wrote on Thu, 22 June 2006 20:18
The Bush administration is good at pulling shit and then covering it up. And for those of you who keep replying with "TOO LONG DIDN'T READ", no one cares if you read it or not.

All administrations have done that. It's not just Bush. Bush just happens to be the current president who is being called on it.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2006 02:03:28 GMT

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

MadDave wrote on Thu, 22 June 2006 20:18
The Bush administration is good at pulling shit and

then covering it up. And for those of you who keep replying with "TOO LONG DIDN'T READ", no one cares if you read it or not.

Dave did you register just to post that? If so, die.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [OWA](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2006 18:52:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Welcome to the forums

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Fri, 23 Jun 2006 21:30:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

one winged angel wrote on Thu, 22 June 2006 12:18Aircraftkiller wrote on Thu, 22 June 2006 19:49
Aircraftkiller wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 13:50
Goztow wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 02:51
Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 20 June 2006 22:15
TOO LONG DIDN'T READ

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Aprime](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2006 00:32:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

vagina

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [MadDave](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2006 04:14:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Thu, 22 June 2006 19:47MadDave wrote on Thu, 22 June 2006 20:18The Bush administration is good at pulling shit and then covering it up. And for those of you who keep replying with "TOO LONG DIDN'T READ", no one cares if you read it or not. All administrations have done that. It's not just Bush. Bush just happens to be the current president who is being called on it.

That's true but like superflyingengi said, Billions of dollars is not routine. I know all administrations have done that but the Bush administration has a habit of doing it. If they did it like every other

administration then they wouldn't be called on it. You can't just ignore the fact that they did this either. If you let a criminal get off the hook after killing someone what's there to stop them from doing it again? Nothing. The next time Bush needs to fund something quick he can just do this again.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Sniper_De7](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2006 14:24:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If an administration did it before, the only reason why it's brought up among other countless things is for liberals to demean GW some more. It may not be right, but why would it suddenly stop for GW's administration if it happened in other administrations just before? So clearly we see why it's really brought out...

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2006 16:24:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Okay, somebody name something as bad as stealing through a fake war that a previous President did.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2006 16:56:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Stop calling it a fake war superflyingfucktard. People don't die in "fake" wars.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [OWA](#) on Sat, 24 Jun 2006 23:34:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here is something worse. Nuclear War leading to an irradiated world which isnt safe to live in. Otherwise I say Either WW1 or WW2. Nastier than stealing through a fake war..

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [MadDave](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2006 01:52:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Those possibilities are far fetched. What makes you think that if we didn't invade they would have attacked us, with Nuclear weapons even? It's amazing how people can defend a political party to this extent. It's like no matter what they do there's always a reason for it, if it was Kerry that did that you would probably wanna kill him (No I'm not a Kerry supporter, I'm just stating something). If the Bush Administration fucked a dog in the ass you people would probably make up more excuses to protect them.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2006 02:08:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We wouldn't be so apt to defend the Bush administration if Democrats weren't so willing to bash Bush at every opportunity. Sure, it's politics, but liberals have gone way past any line of sensible attacks. I mean, even to the extent of calling it a fake war. Like that's not liberal propaganda...

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [MadDave](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2006 02:56:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Bash him at every oppourtunity? It's far from that. When a president steals \$700 million dollars, he should be bashed. You don't see other presidents doing shit like that, and you know if they did they would be called on it too.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2006 03:21:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Honestly, I don't remember any of the previous presidents, so I can't say what they have or haven't been called on. Besides the obvious sex scandal for Clinton, of course.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Sun, 25 Jun 2006 05:05:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFungallInfection's posts are always fun to read...

Quote:And since Congressional Republicans are so adamantly opposed to doing so, what does that tell you?

That they're opposed to doing so; what does it tell you? Not wanting to investigate something doesn't mean that they are guilty; I thought you were supposed to be smart?

Quote:I'm not entirely sure why you seem to be avoiding the point that this amazingly large sum of money was apparently stolen from the U.S. government and now such theft is apparently being covered up by the Republicans in Congress.

Didn't your own articles say that the FBI was investigating it? Congress does not control the FBI.. so if a crime was comitted, they'll find it... So, how are the Republicans apparently covering up a crime that we're assuming took place?
I thought you were supposed to be smart?

Quote:Don't forget that you're the one refusing to acknowledge obvious theft

See above?

Quote:It's also important to note that this missing money is implied to have been transferred to individuals, not the government. As such, thieves in the U.S. are now driving their new luxury yacht with American tax dollars.

You acknowledge that there is a possibility that fraud ocured. You note that the FBI is currently investigating this possible crime. And yet you throw out an argument that thieves are right now, this second driving new luxury yachts with US tax payer dollars.

Your arguments are always so full of fallacies and obvious, emotional claims that it isn't actually even possible to have an educated argument with you.

It's always easier to simply point out the obvious when responding to you... You're a fucking retard, and an obvious liberal tool. It amazes me that to this day, you are still dumbfounded that no one will jump on your bandwagon.. Start discussing the subjects, leave out your typical repub-bashing comments and stop making absurd assumptions-as-fact statements and your "important issues" will be much better received.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [MadDave](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2006 00:18:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, msgtpain, if over a Billion dollars isn't where it's supposed to be and Congress lets it slide, what does that tell you? 1: They stole it or 2: They don't care about the money. Eithe way, the money was stolen and to prevent that from recurring the Congress should have investigated. Now, how about not looking over every one of superflyingengi's words for something you can manipulate, and if you're gonna talk about an educated arguement try not to be such a jerk.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2006 00:20:48 GMT

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

MadDave wrote on Sun, 25 June 2006 20:18 Well, msgtpain, if over a Billion dollars isn't where it's supposed to be and Congress lets it slide, what does that tell you? 1: They stole it or 2: They don't care about the money. Either way, the money was stolen and to prevent that from recurring the Congress should have investigated. Now, how about not looking over every one of superflyngengi's words for something you can manipulate, and if you're gonna talk about an educated argument try not to be such a jerk.

Because, as we all know, Congress cares about investigating especially if the FBI is supposedly investigating? Also, out of the Democrats in Congress, what's the percentage of them wishing to investigate all of this? I'm not convinced that Republicans are trying to hide something if the Democrats won't speak up.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2006 00:59:34 GMT

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

MadDave wrote on Fri, 23 June 2006 23:14 j_ball430 wrote on Thu, 22 June 2006 19:47 MadDave wrote on Thu, 22 June 2006 20:18 The Bush administration is good at pulling shit and then covering it up. And for those of you who keep replying with "TOO LONG DIDN'T READ", no one cares if you read it or not.

All administrations have done that. It's not just Bush. Bush just happens to be the current president who is being called on it.

That's true but like superflyngengi said, Billions of dollars is not routine. I know all administrations have done that but the Bush administration has a habit of doing it. If they did it like every other administration then they wouldn't be called on it. You can't just ignore the fact that they did this either. If you let a criminal get off the hook after killing someone what's there to stop them from doing it again? Nothing. The next time Bush needs to fund something quick he can just do this again.

So you agree that all administrations have done it. Then why are you applying all these claims to the Bush administration? Why not apply it to the presidency in general?

- "The Bush administration has a habit of doing it." It would be more accurate and helpful to say "the presidency has a habit of doing it."

- "If you let a criminal get off the hook... what's there to stop them from doing it again?" Well, we've apparently already had previous administrations stealing, so either no one has caught them ever and we're going to arbitrarily start with Bush or we have caught them and it hasn't done any good either way. Maybe you should think of reforms to the office itself instead of penalizing someone who holds it once...

- "If they did it like every other administration then they wouldn't be called on it." So are you suggesting that it's fine/normal for them to steal, as long as they don't get caught and we should

only punish Bush because he wasn't careful enough to avoid getting caught?

This is all assuming that there was actual wrongdoing that went on at all. If it is determined that there was none, then the whole thread is moot.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2006 01:24:48 GMT

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

MadDave wrote on Sun, 25 June 2006 20:18Well, msgtpain, if over a Billion dollars isn't where it's supposed to be and Congress lets it slide, what does that tell you? 1: They stole it or 2: They don't care about the money. Eithe way, the money was stolen and to prevent that from recurring the Congress should have investigated. Now, how about not looking over every one of superflyngengi's words for something you can manipulate, and if you're gonna talk about an educated arguement try not to be such a jerk.

It doesn't tell me anything.. The only thing that I can glean from this entire conversation is that you can read a statement and then (whether intentionally or through ignorance) make an assumption which is completely unsupported by the very text you presented us with.

In that whole original post, no where is there anything that even implies "stolen money" or "missing money"; those are simply your interpretations to try and support your completely fictitious opinion.

1. Halliburton allegedly overcharged \$61 million for gas. That is outrageous, and if they did it intentionally to line their own pockets, shame on them and I hope they are found guilty. However, this was halliburton, Not Congress, and not even Dick Cheney, even though liberaly sympathizers would really like to persuade us it was.

2. \$1.8 billion of Halliburton's charges to the government, about 40 percent of the total, had not been adequately documented. Did you read that? Care to read it again? had not been adequately documented. Last year, I struggled to find about \$15 thousand dollars in paper invoices for my own business, and I only did about 1.2 million in gross revenue. I knew how I had expensed the funds, it was all in QuickBooks, but my accountant wanted a paper trail. No where in that paragraph did it even imply that the money was improperly disbursed, or that it had been stolen (as you all are trying to claim), the auditing firm simply didn't think that there was adequate documentation for the funds. Now, you can assume all you want, but this is why it's such a shallow, bullshit stance to be trying to push on us as proof of "corruption". It's simply your own opinion, without even a fraction of the facts or knowledge you would actually need to make an educated opinion on the matter.

3. the Bush administration diverted \$700 million in funds from the war in Afghanistan, among other places, to prepare for the Iraq invasion. So the fuck what? We divert more than that every year from Social Security... Money is money. I can think of a thousand other ways that I'm pissed on a daily basis in regards to how the fucks in Washington spend my money. This isn't proof of corruption, or stealing, etc.

4. The problem: For one thing, it is a crime to lie to Congress, although Bush backers claim the president did not knowingly make false assertions. Wow, finally Democrats agree that this is not something we should look over with a blind eye. Funny that they don't think that about Clinton's little "lie" to congress. I'm not a die-hard Bush fanatic.. In fact, I would say that I probably agree with his 29% approval rating right now. If he did indeed lie to the American people about Iraq, then I hope he burns in hell. But again, that's only my opinion of what should happen if he outright lied. It is my opinion that he strongly believed in what he was doing, based on the information he had, and just made one huge, fucking, enormous mistake. But that just makes him dumb, not a corrupt bastard who is stealing from the American people.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [MadDave](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2006 07:07:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You do raise some good points o-o

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [OWA](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2006 12:43:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MadDave wrote on Sun, 25 June 2006 02:52If the Bush Administration fucked a dog in the ass you people would probably make up more excuses to protect them.

I dont support any of your American political administrations because I am British. I support the conservative/tory party. The Labour party needs to give way to new management. Tony Blair is past it now.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 26 Jun 2006 16:23:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DarkDemin wrote on Sat, 24 June 2006 12:56Stop calling it a fake war superflyingfucktard. People don't die in "fake" wars.

Yes they do, which is the point. This is a "fake" war because of a lack of reason in starting it.

msgtpain, you might warrant a response if you can talk more about actual issues than engaging in name-calling.

j_ball Besides the obvious sex scandal for Clinton, of course.

Which killed a lot of people.

j_ball We wouldn't be so apt to defend the Bush administration if Democrats weren't so willing to bash Bush at every opportunity. Sure, it's politics, but liberals have gone way past any line of sensible attacks. I mean, even to the extent of calling it a fake war. Like that's not liberal propaganda...

Would you prefer that this be ignored?

j_ball Because, as we all know, Congress cares about investigating especially if the FBI is supposedly investigating? Also, out of the Democrats in Congress, what's the percentage of them wishing to investigate all of this? I'm not convinced that Republicans are trying to hide something if the Democrats won't speak up.

Congressional Democrats are largely spineless, so I wouldn't use that as a valid measurement.

And I would like to call attention to Former Congressman Duke Cunningham, who was driving a yacht with, although not money diverted from Iraq, money earned somewhat unscrupulously through bribe money he was given in return for defense contracts.

wikipedia In 1997, Cunningham pushed the Pentagon into buying a \$20 million document-digitization system created by ADCS Inc., one of several defense companies owned by Wilkes. The Pentagon didn't want to buy the system. When it hadn't done so three years later, Cunningham angrily demanded the firing of Lou Kratz, an assistant undersecretary of defense he held responsible for the delays [10]. It later emerged that Wilkes reportedly gave Cunningham more than \$630,000 in cash and favors.[24]

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Randy_%22Duke%22_Cunningham#All_eggations_Arise

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2006 00:17:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Mon, 26 June 2006 11:23
j_ball Besides the obvious sex scandal for Clinton, of course.

Which killed a lot of people.

Like the Iraqis who got hit with the cruise missiles he launched to divert attention.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2006 00:35:58 GMT

Wow Superflyingengi... Msgtpain debunked your entire stance pretty much, yet you overlooked it because he zested you with a bastardization of your name?

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2006 00:51:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MadDave wrote on Mon, 26 June 2006 03:07 You do raise some good points o-o

Anyone that actually cares about issues such as this can easily discuss them with others (republican or democrat) and either agree with each others opinions or agree to disagree.

The problem with SFE and the text he quotes from sources like salon.com is that they are 100% anti-Republican, not anti-policy. They engage in such blatant smear campaigns that it boggles my mind how anyone can read the stuff they smear as news and not walk away simply rolling their eyes.

In their mind, if Bush did it, it was wrong. If republicans control congress, then they're just out to screw the American people and make their corporate buddies richer. Anything and everything that they can take hold of, they'll spin it up just a little and try to convince as many people they can as to why we should vote Democrat next time.

I don't disagree with a lot of the stuff that folks like SFE post. A lot of it does need to get out in the open, and if it's a scandal, lets uncover it and make it right. But it isn't a scandal just because a Republican was involved, which is what they would like you to believe, Dem's have their fair share too.

For someone to claim that we are not "discussing the issues" when they are so obviously one-sided and closed minded is so hypocritical it is beyond comprehension. Even if he agreed to my post above, and couldn't back up his side of the argument at all, he would simply walk away and wait until the next big thing he can post and try to bash Republicans or Bush again. He'll never admit that he's wrong, or jumped to conclusions, or took something out of context; so most of us are way beyond cordial conversations with him.

If these items originally posted are indeed true, have faith in the system.. it'll all come out in time; things have a way of working themselves out. I remember a conversation on my forums a few years back from another extreme liberal. They were ranting and raving about how all these big bankrupt executives were in bed with Bush, how corrupt Bush was, and that it was the Bush administrations fault that they were all getting off scott free. How many of them have now been found guilty and sent to prison? Shit takes time to make it through the system, and honestly, would you want it any other way? Innocent until proven guilty, we set it up that way for a reason. Assumptions based on hatred for a party are not proof of guilt.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2006 01:54:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Doitle wrote on Mon, 26 June 2006 17:35Wow Superflyingengi... Msgtpain debunked your entire stance pretty much, yet you overlooked it because he zested you with a bastardization of your name?

don't worry, that's his excuse to not respond.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 27 Jun 2006 16:20:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Doitle wrote on Mon, 26 June 2006 20:35Wow Superflyingengi... Msgtpain debunked your entire stance pretty much, yet you overlooked it because he zested you with a bastardization of your name?

He didn't prove it wrong, he proposed a less assumptive approach to discourse, while leaving out several key things. Some being:

The inspector general of the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq released a series of reports in July 2004 finding that a significant portion of CPA assets had gone missing -- 34 percent of the materiel controlled by Kellogg, Brown & Root -- and that the CPA's method of disbursing \$600 million in Iraq reconstruction funds "did not establish effective controls and left accountability open to fraud, waste and abuse."

The Defense Contract Audit Agency has "strongly" asked the Army to withhold about \$60 million a month from its Halliburton payments until the documentation is provided.

This, coupled with party line votes in the Senate blocking all investigation of waste in Iraq, creates more than a baseless assumption. While I certainly wouldn't convict someone on this, it is a base for my opinion, and I have yet to actually see any of it refuted.

Now, believe me, I didn't ignore msgtpain because I couldn't respond to his post... that level of name-calling is just ridiculous, and I don't feel obligated to respond to it.

Oh, and did anyone hear that Limbaugh got detained for trying to smuggle drugs into the country?

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 00:46:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFuckingRetard wrote on Tue, 27 June 2006 12:20

Oh, and did anyone hear that Limbaugh got detained for trying to smuggle drugs into the country?

You just can't seem to read an article and post the facts, can you?

I'm sure what you meant to state was that Rush was detained for having a bottle of viagra in his suitcase labeled with his doctors name, not his. His lawyer stated and the Dr confirmed that this was done as a favor, in an attempt to avoid any embarrassing media publicity.

But I do agree, "Smuggling Drugs" does sound like a much better way to smear a Republican you don't like.

"Strongly" asking the Army to withhold money until documentation is provided is quite a stretch away from "OMG those Republican thieves are riding around in Yachts they bought with that stolen money!!" Or, am I simply mistaken? Do you, or do you not agree that not a single article you have provided has used the word "Stolen" or "Thieves"? Isn't it true that those are simply your additions to the argument?

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 02:10:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Do you guys ever wonder how many times SFE runs his post through thesaurus, grammar, and spell check?

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 06:40:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No, why?

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 14:50:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

shrugs

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 16:43:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I substitute that with reading books, darkdemin.

msgtpain, I congratulate you on your ability to actually debunk something, and I stand corrected. However, you still can't seem to grasp not using insulting language, which honestly isn't that hard, and would quite frankly make your posts much more salubrious to read.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 18:53:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Maybe if you got your facts straight the first time around, didn't post in an overall condescending manner, and listened to reason and logic while arguing? I bet he'd lay off then... but that's probably asking too much.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 23:39:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 28 June 2006 12:43 which honestly isn't that hard, and would quite frankly make your posts much more salubrious to read.

You know what would make your posts better? If you'd stop trying to act so arrogant; especially like above... You shouldn't take the "word of the day" off your desktop calendar and attempt to use it, if you truly don't understand what it means.. Unless of course, you really do mean that you would like the act of reading my posts to promote good health, or provide some other type of well-being for you. But in that case, you should have stated "would, quite frankly, make reading your posts salubrious."

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2006 02:00:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I actually used that word correctly. But I appreciate the dictionary regurgitation. And yes, I knew what it meant and didn't go dictionary diving for some powerful new word.

As I recall, there were actual issues at hand.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2006 03:16:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 28 June 2006 22:00

As I recall, there were actual issues at hand.

Exactly, like why did you see fit to add words like stolen and thieves and "missing" money to the articles you were attempting to debate?

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2006 17:55:50 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 20 June 2006 16:15 I'M NOT ONLY LAZY, I LIKE TO SPAM!

It's not even really that long. If anyone here can't read that in under two minutes, kill yourself.

Interesting stuff, SFE. Although I think the last one is just a tad bit old.

Quote: Funny that they don't think that about Clinton's little "lie" to congress.

Remember kids: Clinton getting head killed thousands of American lives and cost the American people hundreds of billions of dollars.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2006 20:16:10 GMT

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

Remember kids, a lie isn't a bad thing as long as someone has committed a worse lie than you!

Also, mifabian, can you say, "innocent until proven guilty," or does that not just come into play because he's someone you hate?

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2006 05:15:21 GMT

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

mifabian wrote on Thu, 29 June 2006 10:55 It's not even really that long. If anyone here can't read that in under two minutes, kill yourself.

icedog90 wrote on Fri, 23 June 2006 14:30 one winged angel wrote on Thu, 22 June 2006

12:18 Aircraftkiller wrote on Thu, 22 June 2006 19:49

Aircraftkiller wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 13:50

Goztow wrote on Wed, 21 June 2006 02:51

Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 20 June 2006 22:15

TOO LONG DIDN'T READ

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2006 13:16:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Thu, 29 June 2006 16:16 Remember kids, a lie isn't a bad thing as long as someone has committed a worse lie than you!

Well... I wouldn't say that that's true. However, it certainly is a less serious lie. I don't think all lies are equally bad and it doesn't matter what it's about--context matters!

(at least we're both thinking of the children, right?)

Quote:Also, mfabian, can you say, "innocent until proven guilty," or does that not just come into play because he's someone you hate?

Hey now... I just said "interesting stuff." I'm not out to jump to conclusions simply because they are convenient to me.

icedog90 wrote(spam)
Thank you sir. Good to know this forum is full of 13 year olds.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Fri, 30 Jun 2006 15:53:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mfabianicedog90 wrote(spam)
Thank you sir. Good to know this forum is full of 13 year olds.

Quite alot of them, really. It's not an insult.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2006 06:45:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I guess you're not smart enough to see my age in my profile. congratulations.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2006 15:50:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

icedog90 wrote on Sat, 01 July 2006 02:45 I guess you're not smart enough to see my age in my

profile. congratulations.

Do I even really need to reply and say that it was implied that you were ACTING like a 13 year old, regardless of your age? I don't give a shit how old you are.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2006 16:23:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

icedog90 wrote on Sat, 01 July 2006 01:45 I guess you're not smart enough to see my age in my profile. congratulations.
What? No. I know you're the same age as me. I just meant that there are 13-year-olds on this forum, and didn't see it as an insult.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sat, 01 Jul 2006 16:46:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mjfabian wrote on Sat, 01 July 2006 08:50 icedog90 wrote on Sat, 01 July 2006 02:45 I guess you're not smart enough to see my age in my profile. congratulations.

Do I even really need to reply and say that it was implied that you were ACTING like a 13 year old, regardless of your age? I don't give a shit how old you are.

I love how you're one of those people that try to argue to the extreme and like to win. this is nothing, and look at how you're already beginning to throw shit at me.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [agent_CDE](#) on Fri, 07 Jul 2006 19:10:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

icedog90 wrote on Sat, 01 July 2006 12:46 (nested quotes go here)
I love how you're one of those people that try to argue to the extreme and like to win. this is nothing, and look at how you're already beginning to throw shit at me.

I love how you completely fail to justify your behavior and instead turn to ad hominem attacks to discredit your adversary. Totally brilliant tactic, there.

If anyone's flinging excrement, it's you. It was quite clear that he was implying you (and much of the forum) have the behavior and maturity of a 13 year old. I'm inclined to agree with him.

And in summation, a question: I could say I'm 42 years old in my profile. How old am I?

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 07 Jul 2006 21:25:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"YOU ACT LIKE A 13 YEAR OLD BUT THAT'S NOT AD HOMINEM ROFLLERS!!1"

STFU@YOU.COM

YOU'RE NOT CLEVER AND YOU'RE NOT FUNNY.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [agent_CDE](#) on Mon, 10 Jul 2006 19:27:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aircraftkiller wrote on Fri, 07 July 2006 17:25"YOU ACT LIKE A 13 YEAR OLD BUT THAT'S NOT AD HOMINEM ROFLLERS!!1"

STFU@YOU.COM

YOU'RE NOT CLEVER AND YOU'RE NOT FUNNY.

And you are? You use the same immature allcaps YOU@STUPID.COM or some derivative thereof in every thread you post in.

I'm not attacking the poster directly, I'm expressing an opinion about his actions. I'm not trying to say "You act like a 13 year old therefore your entire argument is null and void!", so no, it isn't an ad hominem.

But of course, we all know I'm actually here to entertain everyone I meet. Oh wait...

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 10 Jul 2006 20:20:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CORRECTION: I USE IT IN A FEW THREADS I POST IN. I'VE POSTED IN THOUSANDS OF THREADS, SO UNLESS YOU'RE IMPLYING THAT I'VE POSTED STFU@YOU.COM/YOURWRISTS SINCE 2001 YOU'RE COMPLETELY WRONG.

THAT'S NOT UNUSUAL THOUGH

YOU'RE ATTACKING THE POSTER DIRECTLY, YOU IDIOT. READ WHAT AD HOMINEM IS ALL ABOUT. I WOULDN'T EXPECT YOU TO DO IT WITHOUT BEING FORCED TO SO I'LL PASTE THE DEFINITION FOR YOUR IGNORANT SELF.

Appealing to personal considerations rather than to logic or reason: Debaters should avoid ad

hominem arguments that question their opponents' motives.

HEY GUESS WHAT? THAT SOUNDS JUST LIKE YOU

ROLF WAFFLES

IF YOU HAD NO INTEREST IN AD HOMINEM ATTACKS THEN YOU WOULDN'T POST THINGS LIKE "OMG UR THIRTEEN YEARS OLD!"

STFU@YOU.COM

WWW.OGMFGOOGLE.COM/YOURWRISTS

WWW.STFU.COM/YOURWRISTS

WWW.GETACLUE.COM/YOURWRISTS

ROLF.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Aprime](#) on Mon, 10 Jul 2006 20:35:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

STU UR JUS A BIG JAKAS

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [agent_CDE](#) on Tue, 11 Jul 2006 02:50:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pot. Kettle. Black.

I have never said anything referencing motives. I have never used my own opinions (despite my voicing them) in an attempt to justify my position.

But if you insist I'm a hypocrite, then YOU have done nothing but bare your holier-than-thou attitude for all to see. YOU constantly fire off immature attempts at "insults" with this web address gimmick - and I don't particularly care how recent it is or how delicately you assume you wield it. YOU continue to (incorrectly) assume what you say is automatically correct. YOU continue to act like a general troll and make an ass of yourself. The only reason you command anything vaguely resembling respect is that you happen to be able to make Renegade maps.

And I am not wasting my time with this shit any longer. I suggest you go back to making maps instead of proving yourself even more of an idiot.

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Tue, 11 Jul 2006 02:57:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 12 Jul 2006 04:45:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

agent_CDE wrote on Mon, 10 July 2006 22:50Pot. Kettle. Black.

I have never said anything referencing motives. I have never used my own opinions (despite my voicing them) in an attempt to justify my position.

But if you insist I'm a hypocrite, then YOU have done nothing but bare your holier-than-thou attitude for all to see. YOU constantly fire off immature attempts at "insults" with this web address gimmick - and I don't particularly care how recent it is or how delicately you assume you wield it. YOU continue to (incorrectly) assume what you say is automatically correct. YOU continue to act like a general troll and make an ass of yourself. The only reason you command anything vaguely resembling respect is that you happen to be able to make Renegade maps.

And I am not wasting my time with this shit any longer. I suggest you go back to making maps instead of proving yourself even more of an idiot.

WHAT DO I HAVE TO DO WITH THIS BESIDES HAVING POINTED OUT HOW YOU CONTRADICTED YOURSELF?

I'M SORRY YOU SEE ME AS HOLIER-THAN-THOU FOR SIMPLY POINTING OUT WHAT'S WRONG WITH YOU. I KNOW I'M PERFECT SO THERE'S NOTHING I'M WORRIED ABOUT WITH MYSELF.

IF YOU DIDN'T CARE ABOUT BEING TOLD TO STFU@YOU.COM/YOURWRISTS THEN YOU WOULDN'T EVER POST ABOUT IT. SO EITHER YOU'RE ANNOYED BY IT OR YOU JUST LIKE TO TALK ABOUT STUPID SHIT. I'M THINKING IT'S A MIXTURE OF BOTH, NOT SURE THOUGH.

I DON'T WANT YOUR RESPECT. YOU'RE PRETTY MEANINGLESS TO ME ONCE I VIEW ANOTHER LINK ON THIS FORUM. OMGZ ROFLS

SO DON'T WASTE YOUR TIME, ALTHOUGH I'D BE REALLY SURPRISED IF YOU COULD CONTROL YOURSELF LONG ENOUGH TO NOT RESPOND TO THIS STATEMENT.

ROLF@FORT-GEFUCKOFF.COM/YOURWRISTS

Subject: Re: Fraud In Iraq? Impossible.
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Fri, 14 Jul 2006 03:17:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 11 July 2006 23:45

...Sprachst Du Englisch
