

---

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 UN's inaction, it is not up to America to produce the world.

As for the stuff that's "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 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.

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.

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

---