Subject: Ridicules in your mind not mine...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 01:27:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"We can't have a reasonable dialogue if you insist on tieing 9/11 to Iraq. Thats rediculous and you know it."No I don't. Iraq has a lot to do with terrorists. Why are we fighting them there then? Are we just fighting nice civilians that don't want us in their country? Are these the people that are cutting off Americans heads? Why did the terrorist bomb the train in Spain? Why did they bomb the subway in London? Why would they want us out of Iraq if they have nothing to do with Iraq? "This is the Oil cartel headed by Bush/Cheney appropriating the oil for the U.S. If that is admitted than maybe some real discussion can take place."Why would I admit to something so ludicrous? If it was about oil why didn't we take it during the first Gulf War? Why aren't we taking it now? "That aspect of Bush's policy at least makes sense. The oil reserves in the world are becoming depleted at an ever faster rate and the explosion of need from the far east will accelerate that eventuality. Sending troops into the oil producing region in order to secure our ability to acquire oil and the means to guard our interests is the real reason we are there. That is not open to debate. It's the means by which we accomplished this and the needless deaths resulting from this assbackwards policy that concerns most of the civilised world."Not open to debate in your mind. But lets say the above is true. Ask yourself why are we so dependant on foreign oil? Could it be because the liberals won't allow a nuclear plant to be built anywhere in the US? Could it be because the liberals won't let us drill for oil anywhere? Hmm? Iraq has what 2% of the worlds oil supply? Why don't we go after Saudi Arabia where there is more oil if that's what we are after? None of what you are saying makes sense. Yes we have oil interests in the area. No it has little to do with this war. Why did the Democrats in congress vote for the war if it was about oil?"The argument is why the administration has overridden all reasonable approaches to negotiating from a position of strength by throwing the military into the field prematurely and proving how precarious our military options are."After 18 broken resolutions, I would say we gave him all resonable appoaches of negotiation. More than 18 broken resolutions would be unreasonable. "Throwing the military into the field prematurely"?? Are you serious? How long did Saddam have to comply? Please. This one statement right here is the reason the Democrats have lost control of congress and the presidency. It's proof that Democrats have no ties to reality. IMO we gave Saddam way too many chances. IMO when he broke the first resolution that would have been it. After 18 broken resolutions and years of sanctions, you say lets give him another chance. Give negotiations a try. Surely this is self delusion.So I noticed you dodged my question. Let me repeat it for you. What would you do? Sanctions didn't work. More sanctions? He wasn't complying. He wasn't going to. The sanctions were starving the innocent people of Iraq. What would you do?