Subject: To my ManualBlock..
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 12:26:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Just to clarify something from our discussion below. I said the US imports about 2% of it's oil from Iraq.You said:"Iraq holds the second largest oil reserves in the world; little more than 2% I would say"First off oil reserves and actual exports are different but in any case. See the link below for the facts. Take particular note of the line graph showing how much oil the US imports from the entire Persian Gulf for the period between 1972-2003. This includes Saudi Arabia the largest exporter by far. Still think the war was about oil? I ask my question again. If the war is about oil why pick on a country that we barely get oil from? But just to be clear I do understand we have some oil interest in Iraq. Hardly enough to go to war for wouldn't you say?
http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/pgulf.html

Subject: Re: To my ManualBlock..
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 13:21:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So.. where did we get all that oil? Maybe from brokers; who got it from the mid-east?I appreciate you educating me with websites; but you must be aware that for every site you can access I can get a competeing site that says the opposite. Thats why I don't do dueling websites.These discussions boil down to pretty simple concepts and results. If something works and is fair it is good and if it does harm and does not accomplish any good then it is bad.I delve into those perceptions that tell me how someone can believe that this administration is behaving in a way that persues the common good for all Americans. To me the concept is so ludicrous that I am driven to seek the reasoning behind supporting such obviously self-serving policies.Thats what holds the interest for me in these discussions."I care not whether a man is good or evil; all that I care,Is whether he is a Wise man or a fool. Put off Holiness and put on intellect." William Blake.

Subject: Come on ManualBlock...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 14:06:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

This isn't a propaganda website. It's a site that is simply reporting what the exports of oil are in the Persian Gulf. If you can show me a site that says otherwise please do. I like to have my facts striaght and would appreciate the input. If you can't then you are wrong. We get very little of our oil in the US from Iraq. This is the crux of your argument. If you can't refute this one simple point then you are wrong. So go ahead and do it. I am man enough to say I'm wrong if that is the case. Are you man enough to admit when you are wrong? But here is the problem you have. If in fact we get very little of our oil from Iraq (in fact we get less than 20% of our oil from the entire Persian Gulf)

then your hypothesis that the war is about oil completely falls apart doesn't it?

Subject: Re: Come on ManualBlock...
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 14:20:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Mr V you need to read your own website offering a little more closely. Iraq was at war during the last of the data sub-sets and as a result the oil fields initially were unavailable. However prior to sanctions and currently look at the totals. Second I know I said they have the second highest reserves of oil in the world. Check your website because I'll be damned if it doesn't seem to say the same thing.The problem with this site is it reports the data unconnected to geopolitical events. While the Saudi's increased production to meet demand much of the Irqi oil that did get above ground was ferried through phanthom delivery systems brokered by international business consortiums.Believe that oil got sold because it did; just not reported. Thats the problem with trying to promote your point with a website, it just leaves too much out to be of any use.And your points would hold more weight if you could refrain from the sales pitch for the Republican party every time you make a point.Anyone out there who thinks the Republican party is the second coming of Athenien Democracy; raise your hands.

Subject: If anyone really wants to know why we're in Iraq
Posted by wunhuanglo on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 15:57:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You can find out at the link below.During Clinton's adminstration, Cheney, Wolfowitz, Pearle, Rumsfeld - all the name you know and admire, formed the Project for a New American Century.You can read their detailed plan to preserve the "pax americana" as they called it.You can read about how they advocated the need for a "transformational laboratory" and then you'll understand why we're fighting in Iraq the way we are/were - few troops, rapid advance, etc...- You can read how 9/11 was used to get the project going once they were in power again - they were waiting for it - "Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbor." (page 51)You can see how everybody's role was planned out 8 years before Bush took office - the details ensuring the American world-wide hegemony.They've taken down a lot of their document recently, but the document below is the detailed plan they devised and published just before assuming power.
PNAC - where it all began

Subject: It quotes the exports of oil to the US for the period 1973-2003...

Posted by Mr. Vinyl on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 16:24:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That should be sufficient I would think.We weren't talking about reserves now were we? We were talking about oil from Iraq imported into the US. So spare me the BS. Obviously you are wrong about the war being about oil and your not willing to admit it. Still haven't seen your answer regarding what you would have done. Also haven't seen your web site showing me wrong regarding the 2% figure I gave regarding imports of oil to the US from Iraq. Why or why are you answering these important questions.

Subject: Let me explain the "my" in the title of my post above...
Posted by Mr. Vinyl on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 16:36:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I had originally titled my post "To my friend ManualBlock". I thought that might sound condescending so I tried to change it to "To ManualBlock'. I forgot and left the "my" in by mistake. So if the title looks weird that's why. Looking at it the way it appears looks condescending and I didn't mean that. Sorry about that.

Subject: Re: Let me explain the "my" in the title of my post above...
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 17:08:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Are you kidding me? We are friends; otherwise how could we argue like this and remain on speaking terms. At least thats the way I see it.By now I know you are good guy who happens to disagree with me; thats all there is too it.But that don't mean I go easy on ya'

Subject: Re: Let me explain the "my" in the title of my post above...
Posted by Mr. Vinyl on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 17:15:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Just trying to keep the debate on nice terms that's all. In any case I really am growing tired of this this one. I think I will drop it for now. Unless I read something that really gets me going again.Have a good weekend.

Subject: Re: It quotes the exports of oil to the US for the period 1973-2003...
Posted by Manualblock on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 18:52:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well I guess that makes us even regarding refusal to address issues. I actually obtained the figures for oil imports from a govt site and those were corroberated by your site you offered. I can't see where you fail to interpret this correctly. Sales are sales, no oil is directly imported anywhere; it's done by brokers all over the world.I say again; read your site carefully; all the info is there. And why persist in badgering me for solutions to major world problems and you can't even address where the insurgency gets its support; because hey; that kinda destroys pretty much most of your argument so I understand why you dodge that question.

Subject: Ok, maybe I'm dense...
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 20:17:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Help me out. The site I gave you says that the total export of oil from Iraq is 5%. That's the total to the world from Iraq. Doesn't matter where it goes from there. So please explain to me how this information means that the US gets most or even a substantial amount of oil from Iraq?I addressed where the insurgency gets it support. Read below. It gets it's support from Syria and Iran. But I disagree that it's some vast support system. Now how about you answer my question. What would you have us do?

Subject: On the count of three.....
Posted by colinhester on Sat, 27 Aug 2005 20:47:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Both answer each other's question. One, two.....

Subject: I have answered the question. Still waiting.....(Nt)
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Sun, 28 Aug 2005 01:30:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

NT

Subject: Re: I have answered the question. Still waiting.....(Nt)
Posted by Manualblock on Sun, 28 Aug 2005 01:55:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The site says Iraq holds the second largest reserves of light crude in the world. Oil goes on the world market. Breakdown the percentages for the five yrs since 2000. Then add what is being bought through the world market as a percentage of total oil acquisitions divided by the percentage provided on the world market by Iraqi reserves. There you go.What is hard about that. Now your reply that the insurgency requires little in the way of internal support is not acceptable. It requires tremendous amounts of popular support and that is admitted in the latest military analysis as per our high command. That is their real problem; stopping any influx of aid from Syria and Iran has already been accomplished. That was all those manuevers on the western border for the last year.Without an acknowledgement that popular support is what fuels the insurgency we are living in fantasy land and cannot have a rational dialogue.The question you have for me is way too broad in scope. What would I do concerning what aspect of mid-east politics particularly in Iraq needs to be defined a little more specifically. It's like asking how would you handle relations with the EU and the economic dynamics of currency stabilisation. That would take a couple hundred pages. So since I ask you a simple question of who supports this massive insurgency I will answere a simple and direct question dealing with a specific aspect of Iraqi policy gladly. So shoot; whats the specific question you would like to know?

Subject: Re: I have answered the question. Still waiting.....(Nt)
Posted by Manualblock on Sun, 28 Aug 2005 12:02:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm Still Waiting...

Subject: Re: I have answered the question. Still waiting.....(Nt)
Posted by Mr Vinyl on Mon, 29 Aug 2005 11:16:43 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You say>>>"The site says Iraq holds the second largest reserves of light crude in the world. Oil goes on the world market. Breakdown the percentages for the five yrs since 2000. Then add what is being bought through the world market as a percentage of total oil acquisitions divided by the percentage provided on the world market by Iraqi reserves. There you go."This is total gobbledygook. You do it. Show me where it says any of this. This is a non answer. You have been caught with your facts down. I made a point. I proved my point with the information on the web site provided. Now you prove your point that the is US importing any more that 2% of it's oil from Iraq. I'm not going to spend all this time to prove you wrong again only so you can come up with the next totally unsubstantiated conspiracy theory. So prove what you are saying.You Say..."Now your reply that the insurgency requires little in the way of internal support is not acceptable. It requires

tremendous amounts of popular support and that is admitted in the latest military analysis as per our high command. That is their real problem; stopping any influx of aid from Syria and Iran has already been accomplished. That was all those manuevers on the western border for the last year." Again you argue on a totally ridicules theory. That is that the insurgents need some vast kind of popular support. They don't. Do the terrorists that bombed the WTC in New York enjoy a vast popular internal support in New York. Did the terrorists that flew plans into the WTC have vast popular support here? Your premise is wrong so debating it with you is a waste of time. Again why should I have to prove your points. You prove that the terrorists have vast popular support in Iraq? Now I'm dropping this subject. Unless of course you actually come up with something of merit. You have shown your true colors.
