

---

Subject: Re: After Downing Street

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 29 Jun 2005 20:52:05 GMT

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

---

gbull wrote on Wed, 29 June 2005 16:12 conceding what? its a public forum, get over yourself. fine, if you want me to, I will. We made loud noise made them go crazy and whatnot, thats much worse than sawing off someones head with a dull blade while their still alive.

Insurgents aren't Saddam's former government. And just because they do it doesn't make it ok for us to do it. Because we are carrying out torture so severe that people are dying from trauma-induced injuries. But I already said that, if you happened to miss it.

gbullalso, you still seem to be missing the point. Mr. Bush said we were to wage a war on TERRORISM. When in his speeches did he once say: "but we are limiting our aggression on those terrorists who have only just recently attacked or may be an immediate threat to us."

So why was Iraq such a hotspot for terrorists, as opposed to Iran, Syria, or Saudi Arabia? Well, I guess we should rule out the House of Saud because they're such close friends with President Bush.

gbulland to ask the question, does the end justify the means? Ask the Iraqis, they might be able to give you that answer.

As a general rule, your argument has flaws if you believe the ends justify the means.

"SFE"Hitler was an immediate threat to us, though, what with his being allied with Japan, Japan attacking us, and his attacking other countries in order to occupy them and kill non-Aryans. Saddam wasn't doing that.

gbullSadaam has never invaded a foriegn allied country, and hes certainly never committed genocide.

Remember what happened when he did do that? It's not like he was doing it again.

gbullFYI, Im sure the CIA makes a point not to follow uncorroborated reports with no proof.

Unless they're pursuing a political agenda. The CIA has a lot more problems than it used to, but that's a whole 'nother debate.

---