Subject: The WMD and terrorist ties that didn't exist...or did they? Posted by Javaxcx on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 02:26:53 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:It's becoming irrelevant as to whether or not it was vigilante justice.

Quote:I'll concede that what we did was "wrong" by "international law,"

Whether or not it is relevant isn't the point. It either was vigilante justice, or it wasn't. And if you conceded to the aforementioned, then you must agree that it was vigilante justice. And you're right, it does tie into that idea of "realism superheros", but it still doesn't change the fact that the law was broken to meet your agenda, no matter WHAT it was. But the difference here is that Superman never goes running around like a Nodbuggered moron screaming "IT WAS LEGAL FUK U ANTIWAR BIZTSCHX".

We've already agreed that it was the right thing to do, but we're firm in the fact that it was done the wrong way. It can be proven any number of ways, many of which have already been stated and restated in these, and on the Pitts.

Quote: The fact remains that no one was going to do anything about it except for the United States. Russia, France, and Germany all had some nice deals going with Hussien. Removing him would have voided them. That is the only reason they opposed removing him from power by invading Iraq and finishing what he started in 1991.

You have to be careful with this argument because it can come back and bite Bush, Cheney, or any other places that are making a sweet buck off this war. I probably don't need to explain it to you, so I won't bother unless you want me too.

Quote:but then again allowing Hussien to mutilate the Oil for Food program and bribe our allies into helping him does not really help your case either.

No one said anything about the allies being in the right either. If they are guilty of accepting bribes, then they too are in the wrong and should be punished.

Quote:I personally view this as the real world equivilant of Star Trek's Kobiashi Maru simulation program - a no win situation. Arguing over it is futile - it won't change anything at all.

I suppose it doesn't change anything of major importance, but it does clarify many fallacies that people like Nodbugger or Cm2Play pull out of this situation. As much as these people want to think it, America isn't on the holy high horse that they seem to elevate it to.

Quote: The problem with your type of thought is that you probably won't acknowledge a threat until it makes itself known in a belligerent fashion.

The problem with the "attack any threat" train of thought is that you can attack any country for any reason at any time and call it "self-defence". Neither train of thought sound very good at all, but the one right now that applies to the Member States is the idea that Warranto explained. Do I think it's a good call? Of course not. But is it the law? Yes.

Quote: Unfortunately that holds little water when human lives are at stake.

There is plenty of time after the matter of fact to suffer the consequences.