Subject: BTW ManualBlock...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Fri, 07 Oct 2005 10:53:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Saying someone is clueless may have been a little much. But what do you think about saying someone is the "master of irrellavency"?It always seems that Democrats can say any vile thing they want and get a free pass but Republicans must always apologize. Why is that?

Subject: Re: BTW ManualBlock...
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 07 Oct 2005 12:10:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Mr V; Please; I would never ask for an apology from you or anyone else. I only brought it up to express my thoughts but under no circumstances would I even want you to think of an apology, thats what I meant in my post; you are what you are and you said what you said and I respect that. On the political front; you have to reconsider looking at every statement/action/legislation etc. as a response to a partisan philosophy. Comparing every act by the Republican administration that is in charge now to some thing done sometime in the past within an entirely different context and historical imperative is illogical. If you have a complaint about something the Democrats did 20 yrs ago then you should frame that complaint within the historical perspective and compare what they did then with what the Republicans did THEN.This administration is repsonsible for what it does now and we are suffering the ill effects of their incompetence now. Who cares why Ruth Bader Ginsburg was appointed; let the past be the past. We need to deal with conditions affecting us now and not linger in some war of comparison with dead issues.

Subject: Well, this is the problem...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Fri, 07 Oct 2005 12:28:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Saying, "who cares what happened in the past" is not logical. History is very important. You want it both ways. The Democrats can't do whatever they want and then bitch when a Republican does the same. It hasn't been twenty years since Ginsburg was appointed. It was the last Administration that appointed her.

Subject: Re: Well, this is the problem...
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 07 Oct 2005 12:34:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yeah but the Democratic administration is not removing my rights as a citizen now and they are not engaged in an illegal war now and they are not allowing terrorists into the country through Mexico now and the list goes on and on. History will explain itself through hindsight; at the time of RBG appopintment there was a tremendous pressure to find a female for the bench. She was qualified; certainly as qualified as Thomas; jeez; ever read one of his opinions?I don't want anything both ways I want Bush gone. So do we compare every Rep act with every Dem act going back how far?I gotta run..to be conmtinued.

Subject: Making accusations is meaningless unless you back up your statements..
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Fri, 07 Oct 2005 13:31:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So lets just start with one statement of yours, that the Iraq war is an illegal war. How is it illegal specifically?

Subject: Re: Making accusations is meaningless unless you back up your statements..
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 07 Oct 2005 19:43:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It was predicated on a knowingly false set of provocations. The administration violated not only treaty law but the laws of this country.Pursuint to the joint resolution cited as the " Authorisation for the use of military force against Iraq." Issued by the Congress there were only two reasons to go to war and neither of them were accomplished. 1) Defend the national security of the United States against the continued threat posed by Iraq.There was no threat2) enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council Rsolutions regarding Iraq.Resolution 1441 was in force and the U.N. observor on the scene responsible for testimony to that effect stated clearly that Iraq had no weapons and was in compliance.Please don't bombard me with politically suspect websites; or blogs promoting personal or political agendas. These are simple facts that are incontrovertible. I read it and I determined how I feel; no one convinced or coerced me into believing anything but what I believe.

Subject: Sorry, but to prove you wrong I would have to show evidence..
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Fri, 07 Oct 2005 20:58:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Since you won't accept any web sites then the discussion is over. Of course you are wrong. But I

will say this. How is the war "illegal"? The president got authority from the congress which he didn't need to begin with and then commenced with the war. Saddam broke numorous resolutions (17 I believe)and was not complying till the end. So how was the war illegal?

Subject: Re: Sorry, but to prove you wrong I would have to show evidence..
Posted by Manualblock on Fri, 07 Oct 2005 21:34:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

He does need authority from Congress unless he is responding to an immediate threat. Last I looked there was no Iraqi Navy parked off Manhattan.Why do you need websites? There are plenty of Internet resources that have no political affiliation or commercial interest.While Saddam might have broken resolutions that was a matter for the U.N.I prefer not to listen to media outlets that need to fund a business and as such must court a fan base and push an agenda. I would think you would feel the same. I don't mind watching them at leisure but it just seems pointless to quote stuff I can see on TV.But looking up a legal document would not be unreasonable because I do it. So how could I ask you not to do the same?

Subject: I am done with this discussion...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Fri, 07 Oct 2005 23:04:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I will say one last thing. Tell me if this is wrong ok. After the first Gulf War, you know the one where nice neighborly Saddam invaded a near by country. He signed a peace treaty saying that he would abide by any and all UN resolutions or be removed from power by force. He broke 17 resolutions. We removed him. What was illegal about that?You still haven't mentioned why it is an illegal war. Specifically which law was broken to make the war illegal? Instead of spouting the liberal talking points how about proving the war is illegal in any way. Whether or not there were weapons of mass distruction, the president, congress, Clinton and most of the thinking world thought there were. I believe there were. I think he hid them in the year before the war while we were screwing around with the UN. So even if the president, congress, Clinton and most of the world were wrong it still doesn't make the war illegal. So prove your point.

Subject: Re: I am done with this discussion...
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 00:01:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Mr V do you mean that? Your done; or do you want a reply?Let me ask you something. Saddam was no threat to us; we knew going in that if he had those weapons he would have used them the

first time around. Secondly do you really think that scientists and the scientific supply companies would not know if there was a major weapons producing effort ongoing in a small and porous country like Iraq? Thats just simple logic. Forget the rhetoric; the simple logic would say that there are far more terrible dictators abroad and some with real armies that pose real threats to the world at large. North Korea; building real nuclear weapons. Why Iraq? Why not them?If you are serious I will offer some more theories of my own. If not well; have a good day.

Subject: You didn't answer my question...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 01:24:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Specifically what was illegal about the war. What law was broken? If you can't answer than admit you were wrong about the war being illegal. Don't give me crap about N. Korea. It was liberals like you that prevented a successful conclusion to the Vietnam war. Now you want to complain about N. Korea? Please!I'm sorry. I am a nice person at heart. But your anti American rhetoric makes me want to puke. I don't care what the rest of the world thinks about the United States. I don't want to get along with other countries if they are supporting hate. I care about freedom, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.I don't give a shit about the criminals so called rights. They lost their rights when they broke the law. I care about law abiding citizens and their children. The hard working people that abide by the laws. The people that struggle every day to make this country great. Yes, that includes the rich and the poor. Whether you like it or not, the rich have every right to this country as the poor do. Many of the rich people did not inherit their money, did not steal their money and did not scam their money from other people. They worked their butts off making a life for themselves and their families. Legally! Anyone in America can do the same. It's up to them and if they want to work. But it's hard working people who are now rich that make America what it is today.

Subject: Re: You didn't answer my question...
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 01:57:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Now what was it in my post that encouraged this strident reply. What do you know about where I was during Vietnam. I'm 53, do the math. I'm surprised since again I never accused you of anything, only argued a political point. I may be very dense; so what exactly is the protocol for complaining about the most dangerous regime in the world today and our complete ignorance of them? Your position that we needed to attack Iraq because they were a viscous regime only applies to one country I guess. And you don't want to hear my crap? Read your post.I already pointed out what law was broken but I'll repeat. There was stipulated grounds for going to war in the Congressional document I provided and they were not observed making our attack illegal under the law. The U.N. treaty we signed; and by signing that contract gave our word was not honored and as such was a violation of that treaty which is a violation of international law we

signed onto.Whats hard about that?If you gave a shit about freedom then the Patriot Act should make you puke; not a guy excersizing his right to protest as an American.So the justice system is perfect and all people who are processed are incontrovertibly guilty and every law however minor or unfair; even the ones that vary from state to state makes anyone in jail a a candidate for punishing abuse and inhumane treatment. Let Martha Stewart be tossed into the water torture cell. Thats real American.I am a hard working man raising children and paying taxes; probably more than you do; but my opinion doesn't count because it conflicts with yours.And where does the rich people sympathy rap come from? Want to follow some really wealthy people for a while and see where they got their wealth? See how they pay less taxes than you do?And what has all this to do with Iraq anyway; is that how you percieve this war; as a entitlement for all war-mongering fanatics?Be real. I did answer your question; and I think after this reply maybe I am just offering respect but not getting any here. Seems to go that way with you right wing fanatics all the time.I can go head to head with you any way you want; you were the one who wanted a civil discussion; then right away I'm full of crap. Unbelievable. So I really don't give a shit what you think of my position on Iraq or prisons or anything else because the truth is your positions are written on Fox news.