
Subject: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 26 Sep 2005 22:59:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

One step closer to Zarqawi.
Eat lead, fucker.
Who says we're still losing?

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Tue, 27 Sep 2005 02:08:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Who says you WERE losing?

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 27 Sep 2005 03:37:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CNN, Ted Kennedy, Bill Clinton, Hillary Clinton, Tom Daschle, etc...

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [SuperMidget](#) on Tue, 27 Sep 2005 12:45:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Canada...

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 27 Sep 2005 13:53:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We said the States were losing the war? When did this occur?

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Tue, 27 Sep 2005 15:14:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperMidget wrote on Tue, 27 September 2005 08:45Canada...

I'm certain that no one in this nation with a shred of sense has seriously thought that the overkill that is Iraq is a losing front.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Tue, 27 Sep 2005 21:58:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's not really losing. It's slowly progressing. You can't occupy a war this long and say you're losing. Unless you look at the casualty count

At any rate, the war is, as I said, slowly progressing. I don't think we have said that we are losing, though I know sometimes the newgroups (CNN and CBC) have guests that say "The war is unwinnable." That's only if you consider the fact that extremists pop up on a daily basis. Ignore that and of course you're winning!

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Dreadlord](#) on Fri, 30 Sep 2005 11:43:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

damn, when your government will understand that Iraq War is endless?
only their wish to obtain Iraqi oil is the reason of that war, nothing of that so-called "democracy"...

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Fri, 30 Sep 2005 16:08:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It wasn't just oil.

- 1) Allies for military uses
 - 2) Oil
 - 3) Shooting at WMD-less people
 - 4) Ignoring intelligence officers
 - 5) Oil
-

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 30 Sep 2005 16:38:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You forgot #6: Pursuit of evil Republican agenda to take over the world, #7: Eat babies and laugh diabolically, #8: Rig the next election, and #9: Oil.

Come on, don't get careless now!

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 30 Sep 2005 16:53:38 GMT

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

glyde51 wrote on Fri, 30 September 2005 12:08It wasn't just oil.

- 1) Allies for military uses
- 2) Oil
- 3) Shooting at WMD-less people
- 4) Ignoring intelligence officers
- 5) Oil

When are you going to fucking realize that you have absolutely NO clue as to what you're talking about concerning the Iraq War... or most things for that matter. The Iraq War has NOTHING to do with oil. The CIA had information suggesting that Iraq was producing the chemical weapon VX. VX is extremely dangerous and powerful. I'm pretty damn sure that even YOU wouldn't want that weapon in the hands of terrorists. Obviously, we didn't find any VX, but that's not the only reason why we went to war. Saddam was known to associate with Osama and funded many terrorist groups. Saddam ruthlessly killed Kurds because he didn't like them. Let's not forget how ruthless Saddam was towards his own people, even loyalists. Granted, the war isn't exactly a "legal" war, but personally, I feel that morals are more important to uphold rather than laws if the two contradict (which, for the most part, they don't). This war is more of a moral war than anything, and I completely agree with it on the basis that we cannot let this extremely evil man hold any power and especially fund terrorist groups who more actively seek the free world's destruction. This not only puts America in danger, but Canada, England, etc... This affects you as well, so stop making it out to be that we're just doing it for America's gain and for all the wrong reasons. I, personally, don't want evil people to hold power, which is why I won't vote for Hitlerly if she runs for President.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 30 Sep 2005 22:07:08 GMT

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

It's a conspiracy!

American Scientists discover a way to control the weather. The Bush administration realized the potential of this, and invaded Iraq. The said scientists activate thier weather machine to create Katrina and Rita, thereby "forcing" Oil prices to spike. The Bush administration then turns to the newly-freed Iraq for "support" in supplying oil to reduce the prices. America gains gradual control over more oil as they now have a reduced price to pay, thanks to the "support" for the hurricane relief.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 01 Oct 2005 03:14:25 GMT

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

You're still forgetting the part about eating babies! Everyone knows that anyone who doesn't oppose the war eats babies!

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [prox](#) on Sun, 02 Oct 2005 23:15:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Whoever doesn't support the war is just braindead. One only has to watch Three Kings to realize that. Yeah, "it's just a movie," but still.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [SuperMidget](#) on Mon, 03 Oct 2005 15:38:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

They were losing because they were making absolutely no progress. Where I live, it's now old news.

Also what happened with the trial of Saddam? Everyone's forgotten about it already...

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [rm5248](#) on Mon, 03 Oct 2005 20:03:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's just like Vietnam... People come in to fight, there's no real front line, and it's mostly guerrilla attacks.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 04 Oct 2005 00:22:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperMidget wrote on Mon, 03 October 2005 11:38 Also what happened with the trial of Saddam? Everyone's forgotten about it already...

I can't wait until his trial takes place, because when he's convicted on all charges, the war will finally be validated, once and for all, and it will be known to the entire world, and all this debating about it can cease.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 04 Oct 2005 02:42:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I hate to be the one to break it to you, but the war cannot be validated unless you find what you originally went there for. Which, as you are undoubtedly in utter refusal to accept, was the original cause to create the "threat" that Iraq posed and that your Congress affirmed to go to war in the FIRST place.

It matters not what Saddam is convicted of, albeit hopefully everything. The Coalition gains very, and I mean VERY little from any judgment that comes as a result of his trial.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 04 Oct 2005 03:45:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Reasons for fighting a war mean nothing compared to the war itself. You can justify any action taken against any nation regardless of whether or not your initial reasoning changed.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Javacx](#) on Tue, 04 Oct 2005 17:58:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The moment you start playing the sophistry card is the same moment you shouldn't even need to respond.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 04 Oct 2005 20:38:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

http://counterterror.typepad.com/the_counterterrorism_blog/2005/09/abu_azzam_alira.html

Maybe not quite #2.

Sorry I've been gone from these forums for so long, but I was getting a little bored. I'll go back to that hurricane thread soon [probably] in case you all are still holding your breaths.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 01:44:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There is no fallacy in that argument. The war is the important subject in the entire "debate" (If one could call people bitching at each other a debate) we're in right now. I also distinctly recall there being more than one reason to invade Iraq, and it was more than WMD issues. That being said, even if there were no other reasons initially besides WMD, how does the validation of the war matter? It's already taking place, there's nothing you're going to do that will stop it, and your thinly

veiled (and poor) attempts at intellectual superiority through using that argument serves no purpose other than to be an arrogant asshole.

Thanks for playing.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 02:46:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I could have sworn on many, MANY occasions it has been affirmed that the reasons to going to war (the ones in question; circa 2003) was all but exclusively the supposition that Saddam had WMD and that he posed a "real threat" to the United States.

The problem you seem to have is (and while I do single you out here, this wholeheartedly applies to your ilk) that you see peripherals as themselves that which they are not. Your Congress is (thankfully) smart enough to know what is fully legal and what is fully illegal. Your "supplimentary" reasons for going to war are very much illegal in every single intelligible nation on the face of this planet. That's why the bill passed ALLOWING the war didn't mention anything save the alledged "threat" Iraq posed to the United States.

Since you, curiously enough, try and negate the other side of your argument by... deviating from the topic, I feel I ought to point out that the validation of the war matters insomuch that Hydra stated that it would be vindicated. I say otherwise. I am also fully capable to not only prove it, but squelch your redundant, self-validating, and at this point over 2 years later, seemingly random attempts at a rebuttal. Call it arrogance if you want to (as you undoubtably will continue you do), but I still invite you to prove me wrong. Something, by the way, you have yet to do.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 03:01:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I could care less if we had no reason for attacking and occupying Iraq. I always supported it because we've had every right to do so since 1991.

There is no "international law" that means anything to anyone. Should we decide to ignore or obey, it poses no consequence to us. Thus "international law" and "illegal", linked together, are just your ways of complaining about a war in an attempt to make yourself look more knowledgeable than you really are about the subject.

It's not easy to prove someone wrong when they will not change their opinion. You still believe "international law" applies even if it cannot be enforced. It's as if you would voluntarily restrain yourself from throwing trash on your lawn if your local home owner's association told you that you couldn't anymore, even though they hold no power whatsoever.

Even if the law exists, it has no power, thus it holds no credence for anyone and any nation that

has any self-respect. I would not adhere to laws that couldn't be enforced, and I seriously doubt you would either.

Of course, there's nothing I really can do to convince you that "international law" is null and that using it in an argument is pointless; short of being the members of the committee that make said "law" into inaction. More to the point, though, why would you expect the United States to follow "international law" when it isn't enforced for the nation we invaded because of the lack of enforcement?

I know you've said it was vigilante justice before, and that we shouldn't have done it. That's a great reason if the United Nations were doing their part in enforcing their own resolutions and laws. The Minutemen in the Southwest aren't supposed to be patrolling the border to spot out terrorist suspects and illegal aliens, but they still do it while even cooperating with the Border Patrol.

Then again, the UN didn't want to cooperate with the United States for being their Minutemen in this situation, and you know this. So my only conclusion is that you either support Iraq's pre-war dictatorship and corrupt UN deals with said government, or you're doing this just to annoy people. I wouldn't venture to say you are without morality or intelligence, since I know you well enough to tell you're a decent guy who disagrees with me on points; so I'm led to believe you're using this subject as a way to entertain yourself ala-FUD style by posting the most far-fetched and irritating theories you can in order to support anti-war sentiment.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 03:07:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ah, still on this "It's ok as long as it doesn't conflict with what we want" idea, huh?

Quote:

I always supported it because we've had every right to do so since 1991.

Interesting, considering this would only have a hope of holding true if it was international law that was violated. Yet...

Quote:Even if the law exists, it has no power, thus it holds no credence for anyone and any nation that has any self-respect. I would not adhere to laws that couldn't be enforced, and I seriously doubt you would either.

So, make up your mind. Either it DOES exist, in which perhaps your argument could hold some sort of water. Or, it doesn't exist, in which the whole idea of "we had every right" means absolutely nothing.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 03:12:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh, I very much support the morality of this war and am pleased with the universal objectives of the conflict. I'm also very much anti-ignorance. What Hydra was saying was ignorance, and as such, I corrected him. You're the same way, albeit from what I see on these forums, you do it for fun. I do it because... I happen to think that a world that exists through truth will be functional and more enjoyable to live in. And while it isn't much, I would much rather practice what I preach as opposed to not.

The argument regarding the validity of international law as its objective stature I could restate again and again, and it would still go unaddressed (as it has) as you still play the circle game. So, while I could (and will if need be), I'll save my breath and refer you to the dozens of topics which it has been extrapolated and restated... clearly on deaf ears as it would seem. Of course, if you wish for me to do it again I have no problem doing so, because as stated above, I'm all for anti-ignorance.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 03:19:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We had a cease fire in 1991. There is no "international law" about that. If hostilities are initiated again it's still fair game as the war is still going on.

I never said whether or not the law exists. I was questioning its power and why anyone should follow it. Even if it didn't exist, we've still had every right to attack since our rights are inherent in our system of government when Congress passed the declaration of war on Iraq. Whether or not the UN, you, I, or anyone else liked it is irrelevant.

Quote:The argument regarding the validity of international law as its objective stature I could restate again and again, and it would still go unaddressed (as it has) as you still play the circle game. So, while I could (and will if need be), I'll save my breath and refer you to the dozens of topics which it has been extrapolated and restated... clearly on deaf ears as it would seem. Of course, if you wish for me to do it again I have no problem doing so, because as stated above, I'm all for anti-ignorance.

It takes two people to continue a circular argument. If you're going to consistently deny that the law isn't powerless and that it has some sort of validity in this world, you're just as guilty of circular reasoning as I am.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust
Posted by [Javacx](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 03:36:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've already stated that the international law that was created, signed, and ratified by all these nations including the United States was utterly powerless.

You're contending that that nullifies it's validity as a law. And it simply does not for the reason that

your nation already AGREED to it being a law.

Yes, it is true that your own national laws often conflict with what the international law says you can and can't do, but that doesn't matter. National laws (as stated by the U.N. themselves) are all good and fine as long as they do not violate a given set of rules. That is the international law you agreed to. It ALSO says that your national laws do not hold legality when applied to other nations unless sanctioned by the international "Congress" if you were. You AGREED to this. The argument from this point, as you have already been a part of many times, is the fine combing of those damn resolutions. If you want to go into this again, fine. I'm game for it. But I predict we'll be right back at this argument again when you cannot rebuttal counter-evidence.

The existentialist reasoning here would support your argument saying that no such law that can be enforced is valid. But I'm not, nor would put much faith into that reasoning... ever. I could go through hundreds, THOUSANDS of analogies and logistics as to why this is a poor RATIONAL way of thinking, but I trust that you're smart enough to figure that out yourself.

What it dumbs down to is, you say you'll do somethings, and won't do some other things. Then you did some of those things you said you wouldn't do. In context, this is why the validation on anything EXCEPT a moral ground is flawed.

Subject: Re: Another One Bites the Dust

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 05 Oct 2005 14:42:30 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller wrote on Tue, 04 October 2005 23:19We had a cease fire in 1991. There is no "international law" about that. If hostilities are initiated again it's still fair game as the war is still going on.

I never said whether or not the law exists. I was questioning its power and why anyone should follow it. Even if it didn't exist, we've still had every right to attack since our rights are inherent in our system of government when Congress passed the declaration of war on Iraq. Whether or not the UN, you, I, or anyone else liked it is irrelevant.

It takes two people to continue a circular argument. If you're going to consistently deny that the law isn't powerless and that it has some sort of validity in this world, you're just as guilty of circular reasoning as I am.

One problem. International cease-fires are governed through international law. So, I ask again, does it exist, or doesn't it?

"Every right to attack" doesn't deal with the legality of the issue. It's just one country deciding what to do with another country. Heck, if Canada (for example) decided it wanted to declare war on the states, we could do so simply by the government saying so, and as far as we're concerned it would be ok. That still doesn't mean that it's legal or not.