

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 22 Mar 2004 21:39:47 GMT

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

---

Quote:Actually, from what I can remember, Clinton bombed a nuclear power plant Iraq had set up.

And there wasn't incorrect evidence that the CIA was currently telling him was a forgery, either.

No, but your information source is incorrect...ISRAEL bombed the power plant, not the US. Clinton hit a few SAM sites and ignored anything more serious. It's interesting to note that Clinton's administration recieved the same type of intelligence that Bush did regarding Iraq- to quote Slick Willy himself:

Quote:One way or the other, we are determined to deny Iraq the capacity to develop weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver them. That is our bottom line.-(Feb. 4, 1998)

And his Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright:

Quote:Hussein has...chosen to spend his money on building weapons of mass destruction and palaces for his cronies.-(Nov. 10, 1999)

Sound familiar? This wasn't cooked up by Bush in an attempt to grab publicity, it was valid intelligence that was available to the previous administration (and the one before that, as well). Oh wait, but there's more...much more. In case you missed it, that letter Crimson posted was signed by Presidential hopeful and bleeding heart "I was duped by Bush" anti-war campaigner John Kerry. Fool him once, shame on him. Fool him twice, shame on Bush? I don't think so.

This was very, very close to the end of Clinton's eight year double term. How likely do you think it is that Saddam, having numerous banned weapons reported by intelligence(which, by all logic, MUST be valid, since it wasn't collected under Bush :rolleyes: ), would have disarmed the moment Bush entered office? Or even when he published his "report" of what had been disarmed?

I don't need to remind you that paper is no substitute for visual evidence; if it would not be accepted at a trial in court, it should not be accepted by the world- if Saddam truly disarmed, why in the name of all things unholy would he have hidden the evidence of his compliance? Please, PLEASE don't tell me you're that naive. It doesn't take a four digit IQ to figure out that he was hiding something...key word here is HIDING! As in, NOT MEANT TO BE FOUND! Given the vast area he had to hide whatever he had in, and the possible size of the hidden weapons, it could take decades to turn anything up...yet people like you are willing to say there's no possibility of anything being found after only ONE year. How long did it take to find Saddam himself, hiding in that little hole? And he was right under our damn noses, too! If you have 100% absolute, rock-solid, factual evidence, with no room for doubt, that says there is nowhere left to hide something in Iraq, please present it now. Otherwise, it is logical to assume that something still might be found. After all, it wouldn't be a search if we knew where to look, would it?

Just a follow-up on WMD's made from legal substances, sometimes probable cause can be more than enough to justify the seizure of those materials. Say a man who lives in the suburbs purchases a van, six barrels' worth of fertilizer, 100' of fuse, and a zippo lighter. He puts all of the

above in the back of said van. Now, this may be perfectly legal to own, but what in the name of bloody hell do you THINK he's gonna do with it, when he has no farmland and no practical use for fuse? That may be exaggerated, but the same applies in Iraq- if you find multiple 50-gallon drums of chemicals(which they HAVE found...imagine what they HAVEN'T), mostly pesticides that are deadly nerve agents, for use on crops, in an area with almost no viable farmland, few types of insects that eat those crops, and a dictator who thinks he should rule the entire region, do you REALLY think those chemicals will be used to kill insects?

I truly wish people would use their logic for once...

---