
Iraq wants withdrawal timetable

Posted by truthhurts - 2008/07/07 15:57

Well, well, well. It appears the Iraqi's now want a timetable for withdrawal.

BAGHDAD - Iraq's prime minister said Monday his country wants some type of timetable for a withdrawal of American troops included in the deal the two countries are negotiating.

It was the first time that Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki has explicitly and publicly called for a withdrawal timetable - an idea opposed by President Bush.

He offered no details. But his national security adviser, Mouwaffak al-Rubaie, told The Associated Press that the government is proposing a timetable conditioned on the ability of Iraqi forces to provide security.

Iraq wants withdrawal timetable

Now we can sit back and watch Bush and McCain scramble, because they have no intention of giving the Iraqi's a withdrawal timetable. They only want to give the Iraqi's control of their country back if they have the kind of government we want them to have, and agree to our terms, like control of airspace, bases, etc. Little things like that. It appears the Iraqi's are now marching to a different drummer, though.

Don't think for a minute that Maliki, or his Shiite allies, want the US forces to leave. But they are under a lot of pressure. First of all, they are under pressure from Iran, whose regime remains the chief ally of the ruling alliance of Shiites, including Maliki's Dawa party and the powerful Islamic Supreme Council of Iraq (ISCI), led by Abdel Aziz al-Hakim. Iran's goal is to neutralize Iraq as a possible threat to Iran, and Iran's leaders are pressuring Maliki and Hakim to loosen their reliance on the United States. Interestingly, Maliki reportedly told President Bush personally, in a video teleconference on Friday, that the United States cannot use Iraqi territory to attack Iran, and he added that "fomenting tension in the region and pushing for military action against Tehran could wreak havoc on the entire region, including Iraq."

Maliki is also under pressure from a broad coalition of Iraqi nationalists, from angry, disenfranchised Sunnis to Muqtada al-Sadr's movement.

But Maliki's statement is a big deal. At a minimum, it presents an enormous problem for Bush and John McCain, who are arguing for an indefinite US stay in Iraq til "victory," and who oppose a timetable. True, Maliki seems to be linking his timetable to Iraqi military success, which is not too different from the Bush-McCain formula. But inside Iraq, the pressure is building day by day for a US withdrawal, and Maliki is by no means in control of the process. The fact that both Iran and Sunni nationalists, who are on a collision course, agree that US forces need to leave Iraq, only means that pro- and anti-Iranian factions will settle their differences (either by peaceful diplomacy or by violence) once the United States is gone.

<http://www.thenation.com/blogs/dreyfuss/334991>

That last line in the article above, translated, means that there is yet a civil war to be fought in Iraq, between the Sunnis and Shiites, which is exactly what I, and others, have been saying all along. We just might be told to get the hell out so they can fight it. Won't that be interesting?

For those who are wondering, McCain will be the one running on the "We're not leaving, even if you want us to" platform. ;)

Re:Iraq wants withdrawal timetable

Posted by woody - 2008/07/07 16:22

truthhurts wrote:

Well, well, well. It appears the Iraqi's now want a timetable for withdrawal.

BAGHDAD - Iraq's prime minister said Monday his country wants some type of timetable for a withdrawal of American troops included in the deal the two countries are negotiating.

It was the first time that Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki has explicitly and publicly called for a withdrawal timetable - an idea opposed by President Bush.

He offered no details. But his national security adviser, Mouwaffak al-Rubaie, told The Associated Press that the

government is proposing a timetable conditioned on the ability of Iraqi forces to provide security.

Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Now we can sit back and watch Bush and McCain scramble, because they have no intention of giving the Iraqi's a withdrawl timetable. They only want to give the Iraqi's control of their country back if they have the kind of government we want them to have, and agree to our terms, like control of airspace, bases, etc. Little things like that. It appears the Iraqi's are now marching to a different drummer, though.

Don't think for a minute that Maliki, or his Shiite allies, want the US forces to leave. But they are under a lot of pressure. First of all, they are under pressure from Iran, whose regime remains the chief ally of the ruling alliance of Shiites, including Maliki's Dawa party and the powerful Islamic Supreme Council of Iraq (ISCI), led by Abdel Aziz al-Hakim. Iran's goal is to neutralize Iraq as a possible threat to Iran, and Iran's leaders are pressuring Maliki and Hakim to loosen their reliance on the United States. Interestingly, Maliki reportedly told President Bush personally, in a video teleconference on Friday, that the United States cannot use Iraqi territory to attack Iran, and he added that "fomenting tension in the region and pushing for military action against Tehran could wreak havoc on the entire region, including Iraq."

Maliki is also under pressure from a broad coalition of Iraqi nationalists, from angry, disenfranchised Sunnis to Muqtada al-Sadr's movement.

But Maliki's statement is a big deal. At a minimum, it presents an enormous problem for Bush and John McCain, who are arguing for an indefinite US stay in Iraq til "victory," and who oppose a timetable. True, Maliki seems to be linking his timetable to Iraqi military success, which is not too different from the Bush-McCain formula. But inside Iraq, the pressure is building day by day for a US withdrawal, and Maliki is by no means in control of the process. The fact that both Iran and Sunni nationalists, who are on a collision course, agree that US forces need to leave Iraq, only means that pro- and anti-Iranian factions will settle their differences (either by peaceful diplomacy or by violence) once the United States is gone.

<http://www.thenation.com/blogs/dreyfuss/334991>

That last line in the article above, translated, means that there is yet a civil war to be fought in Iraq, between the Sunnis and Shiites, which is exactly what I, and others, have been saying all along. We just might be told to get the hell out so they can fight it. Won't that be interesting?

For those who are wondering, McCain will be the one running on the "We're not leaving, even if you want us to" platform. :)

All your bla bla bla won't change the fact that you cannot help Barack Hussien win in November with this crap. He needs the poor black women in the big cities to get off the couch and history tells us they wont.

On the bright side for you liberals it looks like it will be just a one term for President McCain. Then you will have to beat out Mitt Romney for the job...

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by truthhurts - 2008/07/07 16:35

Same old woody. Always good for a laugh, and a delusion or two. :laugh:

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/07 16:37

woody wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

Well, well, well. It appears the Iraqi's now want a timetable for withdrawl.

BAGHDAD - Iraq's prime minister said Monday his country wants some type of timetable for a withdrawal of American troops included in the deal the two countries are negotiating.

It was the first time that Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki has explicitly and publicly called for a withdrawal timetable - an idea opposed by President Bush.

He offered no details. But his national security adviser, Mouwaffak al-Rubaie, told The Associated Press that the government is proposing a timetable conditioned on the ability of Iraqi forces to provide security.

Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Now we can sit back and watch Bush and McCain scramble, because they have no intention of giving the Iraqi's a withdrawl timetable. They only want to give the Iraqi's control of their country back if they have the kind of government we want them to have, and agree to our terms, like control of airspace, bases, etc. Little things like that. It appears the Iraqi's are now marching to a different drummer, though.

Don't think for a minute that Maliki, or his Shiite allies, want the US forces to leave. But they are under a lot of pressure. First of all, they are under pressure from Iran, whose regime remains the chief ally of the ruling alliance of Shiites, including Maliki's Dawa party and the powerful Islamic Supreme Council of Iraq (ISCI), led by Abdel Aziz al-Hakim. Iran's goal is to neutralize Iraq as a possible threat to Iran, and Iran's leaders are pressuring Maliki and Hakim to loosen their reliance on the United States. Interestingly, Maliki reportedly told President Bush personally, in a video teleconference on Friday, that the United States cannot use Iraqi territory to attack Iran, and he added that "fomenting tension in the region and pushing for military action against Tehran could wreak havoc on the entire region, including Iraq."

Maliki is also under pressure from a broad coalition of Iraqi nationalists, from angry, disenfranchised Sunnis to Muqtada al-Sadr's movement.

But Maliki's statement is a big deal. At a minimum, it presents an enormous problem for Bush and John McCain, who are arguing for an indefinite US stay in Iraq til "victory," and who oppose a timetable. True, Maliki seems to be linking his timetable to Iraqi military success, which is not too different from the Bush-McCain formula. But inside Iraq, the pressure is building day by day for a US withdrawal, and Maliki is by no means in control of the process. The fact that both Iran and Sunni nationalists, who are on a collision course, agree that US forces need to leave Iraq, only means that pro- and anti-Iranian factions will settle their differences (either by peaceful diplomacy or by violence) once the United States is gone.

<http://www.thenation.com/blogs/dreyfuss/334991>

That last line in the article above, translated, means that there is yet a civil war to be fought in Iraq, between the Sunnis and Shiites, which is exactly what I, and others, have been saying all along. We just might be told to get the hell out so they can fight it. Won't that be interesting?

For those who are wondering, McCain will be the one running on the "We're not leaving, even if you want us to" platform. ;)

All your bla bla bla won't change the fact that you cannot help Barack Hussien win in November with this crap. He needs the poor black women in the big cities to get off the couch and history tells us they wont.

On the bright side for you liberals it looks like it will be just a one term for President McCain. Then you will have to beat out Mitt Romney for the job...

Lordy Woody that was a good one! My sides are sore!! Tell me Woodman, where did you get your cute phrase about poor black women that you must have memorized by now? 4 years of McSame? Oh, oh there goes my side pains again!!!President Mitt Romney,stop it I can't take anymore! I will have to log off now and let my laughter subside!!

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/07 16:42

truthhurts wrote:

Well, well, well. It appears the Iraqi's now want a timetable for withdrawl.

BAGHDAD - Iraq's prime minister said Monday his country wants some type of timetable for a withdrawal of American troops included in the deal the two countries are negotiating.

It was the first time that Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki has explicitly and publicly called for a withdrawal timetable - an idea opposed by President Bush.

He offered no details. But his national security adviser, Mouwaffak al-Rubaie, told The Associated Press that the government is proposing a timetable conditioned on the ability of Iraqi forces to provide security.

Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Now we can sit back and watch Bush and McCain scramble, because they have no intention of giving the Iraqi's a withdrawl timetable. They only want to give the Iraqi's control of their country back if they have the kind of government we want them to have, and agree to our terms, like control of airspace, bases, etc. Little things like that. It appears the Iraqi's are now marching to a different drummer, though.

Don't think for a minute that Maliki, or his Shiite allies, want the US forces to leave. But they are under a lot of pressure. First of all, they are under pressure from Iran, whose regime remains the chief ally of the ruling alliance of Shiites, including Maliki's Dawa party and the powerful Islamic Supreme Council of Iraq (ISCI), led by Abdel Aziz al-Hakim. Iran's goal is to neutralize Iraq as a possible threat to Iran, and Iran's leaders are pressuring Maliki and Hakim to loosen their reliance on the United States. Interestingly, Maliki reportedly told President Bush personally, in a video teleconference on Friday, that the United States cannot use Iraqi territory to attack Iran, and he added that "fomenting tension in the region and pushing for military action against Tehran could wreak havoc on the entire region, including Iraq."

Maliki is also under pressure from a broad coalition of Iraqi nationalists, from angry, disenfranchised Sunnis to Muqtada al-Sadr's movement.

But Maliki's statement is a big deal. At a minimum, it presents an enormous problem for Bush and John McCain, who are arguing for an indefinite US stay in Iraq til "victory," and who oppose a timetable. True, Maliki seems to be linking his timetable to Iraqi military success, which is not too different from the Bush-McCain formula. But inside Iraq, the pressure is building day by day for a US withdrawal, and Maliki is by no means in control of the process. The fact that both Iran and Sunni nationalists, who are on a collision course, agree that US forces need to leave Iraq, only means that pro- and anti-Iranian factions will settle their differences (either by peaceful diplomacy or by violence) once the United States is gone.

<http://www.thenation.com/blogs/dreyfuss/334991>

That last line in the article above, translated, means that there is yet a civil war to be fought in Iraq, between the Sunnis and Shiites, which is exactly what I, and others, have been saying all along. We just might be told to get the hell out so they can fight it. Won't that be interesting?

For those who are wondering, McCain will be the one running on the "We're not leaving, even if you want us to" platform. ;)

Imagine that!

The country we have taken a pre-emptive war to which murdered 100s of thousands and demolished any signs of modern living wants us to leave?

I hope that catches on in Afganistan then maybe we can return to our country which has been ruined in the last +8 years of dictatorship and willful neglect by the voters.

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by woody - 2008/07/07 18:54

utocoman wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

Well, well, well. It appears the Iraqi's now want a timetable for withdrawl.

BAGHDAD - Iraq's prime minister said Monday his country wants some type of timetable for a withdrawal of American troops included in the deal the two countries are negotiating.

It was the first time that Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki has explicitly and publicly called for a withdrawal timetable - an idea opposed by President Bush.

He offered no details. But his national security adviser, Mouwaffak al-Rubaie, told The Associated Press that the government is proposing a timetable conditioned on the ability of Iraqi forces to provide security.

Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Now we can sit back and watch Bush and McCain scramble, because they have no intention of giving the Iraqi's a withdrawl timetable. They only want to give the Iraqi's control of their country back if they have the kind of government we want them to have, and agree to our terms, like control of airspace, bases, etc. Little things like that. It appears the Iraqi's are now marching to a different drummer, though.

Don't think for a minute that Maliki, or his Shiite allies, want the US forces to leave. But they are under a lot of pressure. First of all, they are under pressure from Iran, whose regime remains the chief ally of the ruling alliance of Shiites, including Maliki's Dawa party and the powerful Islamic Supreme Council of Iraq (ISCI), led by Abdel Aziz al-Hakim. Iran's goal is to neutralize Iraq as a possible threat to Iran, and Iran's leaders are pressuring Maliki and Hakim to loosen their reliance on the United States. Interestingly, Maliki reportedly told President Bush personally, in a video teleconference on Friday, that the United States cannot use Iraqi territory to attack Iran, and he added that "fomenting tension in the region and pushing for military action against Tehran could wreak havoc on the entire region, including Iraq."

Maliki is also under pressure from a broad coalition of Iraqi nationalists, from angry, disenfranchised Sunnis to Muqtada al-Sadr's movement.

But Maliki's statement is a big deal. At a minimum, it presents an enormous problem for Bush and John McCain, who are arguing for an indefinite US stay in Iraq til "victory," and who oppose a timetable. True, Maliki seems to be linking his timetable to Iraqi military success, which is not too different from the Bush-McCain formula. But inside Iraq, the pressure is building day by day for a US withdrawal, and Maliki is by no means in control of the process. The fact that both Iran and Sunni nationalists, who are on a collision course, agree that US forces need to leave Iraq, only means that pro- and anti-Iranian factions will settle their differences (either by peaceful diplomacy or by violence) once the United States is gone.

<http://www.thenation.com/blogs/dreyfuss/334991>

That last line in the article above, translated, means that there is yet a civil war to be fought in Iraq, between the Sunnis and Shiites, which is exactly what I, and others, have been saying all along. We just might be told to get the hell out so they can fight it. Won't that be interesting?

For those who are wondering, McCain will be the one running on the "We're not leaving, even if you want us to" platform. ;)

Imagine that!

The country we have taken a pre-emptive war to which murdered 100s of thousands and demolished any signs of modern living wants us to leave?

I hope that catches on in Afganistan then maybe we can return to our country which has been ruined in the last +8 years of dictatorship and willful neglect by the voters.

""""as a tear rolls down conmans face""""

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by Wren - 2008/07/08 04:09

Woody et al live in dreamland. We are going to lose to Obama because the GOP has allowed itself to be corrupted by the neo-cons and the social conservatives. We will be in the minority for the next eight to twelve years.

Yes, Iraq does want us out, and a solid minority of Iraqi Shi'ites want closer ties with Iran. The neocon invasion of Iraq was our greatest foreign policy blunder in U.S. history.

Oh, and Mitt for Pres? As if. Forty percent of America won't vote for any type of Mormon for President. That won't change four years from now.

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by Sir John the Apostate - 2008/07/08 08:17

Bush said back in May. That if Iraq ask us to leave. That our troops would leave Iraq. Sounds like they're asking us to get out. I wonder how Bush will weasel out of this one?

B)

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/08 08:50

Sir John,
You beat me to it! I wonder if Bush threatened the leadership to not publically announce it for years now but they know he is lower than pond scum and lamer than Tommy the one legged a\$\$ kicker so they are not afraid to become more vocal.

In any event, Bush and the Republican'ts have forgotten yet another promise he made and will act as if they never heard him say it.

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by woody - 2008/07/08 09:02

A little over one year ago:

Consumer confidence stood at a 2½ year high
Regular gasoline sold for \$2.19 a gallon
The unemployment rate was 4.5%
Since voting in a Democratic Congress in 2006 we have seen:

Consumer confidence plummet
The cost of regular gasoline soar to over \$3.50 a gallon
Unemployment is up to 5% (a 10% increase)
American households have seen \$2.3 trillion in equity value evaporate (stock and mutual fund losses)
Americans have seen their home equity drop by \$1.2 trillion dollars
1% of American homes are in foreclosure
America voted for change in 2006, and we got it!

Quote of the Day... 'My friends, we live in the greatest nation in the history of the world. I hope you'll join with me as we try to change it.' -- Barack Obama

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/08 09:05

Glad to see you have switched sides Woodman.

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by Wren - 2008/07/08 09:11

woody wrote:

A little over one year ago:

Consumer confidence stood at a 2½ year high
Regular gasoline sold for \$2.19 a gallon
The unemployment rate was 4.5%
Since voting in a Democratic Congress in 2006 we have seen:

Consumer confidence plummet
The cost of regular gasoline soar to over \$3.50 a gallon
Unemployment is up to 5% (a 10% increase)
American households have seen \$2.3 trillion in equity value evaporate (stock and mutual fund losses)
Americans have seen their home equity drop by \$1.2 trillion dollars
1% of American homes are in foreclosure
America voted for change in 2006, and we got it!

Quote of the Day... 'My friends, we live in the greatest nation in the history of the world. I hope you'll join with me as we try to change it.' -- Barack Obama

The above is a classic fallacy of the nonthinking person. Coincidence is not causation. In this case, the changes are solely because of the admin's failures since 2001.

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdraw timetable

Posted by Everybody Loves Raymond - 2008/07/08 12:30

a-Malaki better wake up and decide whose side he wants to be on, the Freedom of America or the Slavery of Iran. He cannot have it both ways. Can't he see that only when his military and our military have defeated the terrorists in his midsts that he will be free?

I think al-Malaki has been watching too much Communist News Network (CNN).

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdraw timetable

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2008/07/08 14:48

If they want us to leave, I say do as Bush promised and let's pack up and go home.

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdraw timetable

Posted by Sir John the Apostate - 2008/07/08 14:50

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:
a-Malaki better wake up and decide whose side he wants to be on, the Freedom of America or the Slavery of Iran. He cannot have it both ways. Can't he see that only when his military and our military have defeated the terrorists in his midsts that he will be free?

I think al-Malaki has been watching too much Communist News Network (CNN).

Ray I'll ask you the same question. That I ask before in this thread.

In May didn't Bush say that if Iraq ask us to leave, that we would leave Iraq?

Well they're asking us to leave.

What's Rush's spin on that one Ray?

<http://www.heraldextra.com/images/fbfiles/images/Spank-5ffd7cbc2900f1ad52347d98245c8d0e.gif>

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by Everybody Loves Raymond - 2008/07/08 15:16

unaffiliated_person wrote:

If they want us to leave, I say do as Bush promised and let's pack up and go home.

Yep, cut and run like all Defeatocrats. Turn back all the success we've had over there. Waste all the blood and treasure we've spent just so the Messiah Obama can say "I did it, I got us out there." Our surrender to the Islamists will only mean that the next attack will be in a St. Louis mall, Houston hospital or San Francisco park.

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/08 15:30

Too bad the Liar and Thief can not have at least one positive success during his rein such as "I removed our troops from Iraq" Nope not even that shred of decency during his terms.

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by Sir John the Apostate - 2008/07/08 15:37

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:

unaffiliated_person wrote:

If they want us to leave, I say do as Bush promised and let's pack up and go home.

Yep, cut and run like all Defeatocrats. Turn back all the success we've had over there. Waste all the blood and treasure we've spent just so the Messiah Obama can say "I did it, I got us out there." Our surrender to the Islamists will only mean that the next attack will be in a St. Louis mall, Houston hospital or San Francisco park.

So is that Rush's spin on it Ray?

<http://emoticons.msn-beta.com/big/100.gif>

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by ericmiami - 2008/07/10 05:44

Poor Raymond. Give her a break, Sir John. She's doing the best she can with what she's been given. (I still suspect Raymond is actually StupidReader).

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by Wren - 2008/07/10 07:40

That's possible.

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/10 09:22

Personally I think anyone who purposely deceives by creating a 2nd or 3rd moniker has no credibility. What do you think Wren?

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/13 22:39

I don't think you can say for certain what is going to happen next in Iran. Mosul, Sadr City and Basra's headlines are quite different than 6 months ago. The Iraqi people seem to be taking a different course. An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by truthhurts - 2008/07/14 05:56

ThomasK wrote:

I don't think you can say for certain what is going to happen next in Iran. Mosul, Sadr City and Basra's headlines are quite different than 6 months ago. The Iraqi people seem to be taking a different course. An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Really, Thomas? Why is it "for certain"? Have you been appointed some sort of military and political seer or something? Thomas the Seer?

Please post your evidence as to why it is certain. In that evidence, you should post proof that if we withdraw in 16 or 18 or whatever months, the Iraqi's will devolve into a worse situation than they are in now. You should also post proof that the timeline would not induce them to get their act together, especially since they sure seem to want some sort of timeline for us to get out anyway. You know, like how when a teacher sets a timeline for a test, it gets kids to study and prepare for said test. Well, the ones who want to pass the test, anyway.

You should also post proof that the Bush/McCain way will eventually (10 years, 20 years, 50 years, who knows) work to our satisfaction. Our satisfaction, of course, is apparently not an Iraq that can take care of itself, but an Iraq that can do that plus allow us to build bases and use those bases as launching pads for incursions into other areas of the middle east.

And while you are at it, post your proof that all the troops we have tied up in Iraq for all those years won't affect our ability to respond elsewhere if we need to on short notice.

So go ahead, Thomas. Post your proof of the "certainty" of these things. We'll all be waiting on pins and needles for your proof.

Oh, one more thing. No one has ever proposed an "unconditional" pullout in sixteen months that I am aware of. Certainly not Obama. Please present your proof of that as well. ;)

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/14 15:17

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

I don't think you can say for certain what is going to happen next in Iran. Mosul, Sadr City and Basra's headlines are quite different than 6 months ago. The Iraqi people seem to be taking a different course. An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Really, Thomas? Why is it "for certain"? Have you been appointed some sort of military and political seer or something? Thomas the Seer?

Please post your evidence as to why it is certain. In that evidence, you should post proof that if we withdraw in 16 or 18

or whatever months, the Iraqi's will devolve into a worse situation than they are in now. You should also post proof that the timeline would not induce them to get their act together, especially since they sure seem to want some sort of timeline for us to get out anyway. You know, like how when a teacher sets a timeline for a test, it gets kids to study and prepare for said test. Well, the ones who want to pass the test, anyway.

You should also post proof that the Bush/McCain way will eventually (10 years, 20 years, 50 years, who knows) work to our satisfaction. Our satisfaction, of course, is apparently not an Iraq that can take care of itself, but an Iraq that can do that plus allow us to build bases and use those bases as launching pads for incursions into other areas of the middle east.

And while you are at it, post your proof that all the troops we have tied up in Iraq for all those years won't affect our ability to respond elsewhere if we need to on short notice.

So go ahead, Thomas. Post your proof of the "certainty" of these things. We'll all be waiting on pins and needles for your proof.

Oh, one more thing. No one has ever proposed an "unconditional" pullout in sixteen months that I am aware of. Certainly not Obama. Please present your proof of that as well. ;)

Hold on there Kemo Sabe, before you blow a fuse. :kiss:

If you're going to drink Obama's kool aid, at least know what you are drinking. Here's a direct quote from his own website:

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010.

Now drink shug-a-lug, drink, drink, drink, drink.... :side:

Even the Iraqi government doesn't want us out for AT LEAST FIVES YEARS. Read the news, (and your own guys website) dimwit before you open your idiotic mouth. :P

Now let's see what else I can predict? You're going to wet yourself from all that kool aid you're drinking. :)

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/14 16:03

<http://icfsteel.com/images/koolaid1.JPG>

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/14 16:40

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

I don't think you can say for certain what is going to happen next in Iran. Mosul, Sadr City and Basra's headlines are quite different than 6 months ago. The Iraqi people seem to be taking a different course. An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Really, Thomas? Why is it "for certain"? Have you been appointed some sort of military and political seer or something? Thomas the Seer?

Please post your evidence as to why it is certain. In that evidence, you should post proof that if we withdraw in 16 or 18 or whatever months, the Iraqi's will devolve into a worse situation than they are in now. You should also post proof that the timeline would not induce them to get their act together, especially since they sure seem to want some sort of timeline for us to get out anyway. You know, like how when a teacher sets a timeline for a test, it gets kids to study and prepare for said test. Well, the ones who want to pass the test, anyway.

You should also post proof that the Bush/McCain way will eventually (10 years, 20 years, 50 years, who knows) work to

our satisfaction. Our satisfaction, of course, is apparently not an Iraq that can take care of itself, but an Iraq that can do that plus allow us to build bases and use those bases as launching pads for incursions into other areas of the middle east.

And while you are at it, post your proof that all the troops we have tied up in Iraq for all those years won't affect our ability to respond elsewhere if we need to on short notice.

So go ahead, Thomas. Post your proof of the "certainty" of these things. We'll all be waiting on pins and needles for your proof.

Oh, one more thing. No one has ever proposed an "unconditional" pullout in sixteen months that I am aware of. Certainly not Obama. Please present your proof of that as well. ;)

Hold on there Kemo Sabe, before you blow a fuse. :kiss:

If you're going to drink Obama's kool aid, at least know what you are drinking. Here's a direct quote from his own website:

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010.

Now drink shug-a-lug, drink, drink, drink, drink.... :side:

Even the Iraqi government doesn't want us out for AT LEAST FIVES YEARS. Read the news, (and your own guys website) dimwit before you open your idiotic mouth. :P

Now let's see what else I can predict? You're going to wet yourself from all that kool aid you're drinking. :)

Be a good ex mormon church leader and and let the spirit move you.....someplace else preferably!

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdraw timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/14 16:53

utocoman wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

I don't think you can say for certain what is going to happen next in Iran. Mosul, Sadr City and Basra's headlines are quite different than 6 months ago. The Iraqi people seem to be taking a different course. An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Really, Thomas? Why is it "for certain"? Have you been appointed some sort of military and political seer or something? Thomas the Seer?

Please post your evidence as to why it is certain. In that evidence, you should post proof that if we withdraw in 16 or 18 or whatever months, the Iraqi's will devolve into a worse situation than they are in now. You should also post proof that the timeline would not induce them to get their act together, especially since they sure seem to want some sort of timeline for us to get out anyway. You know, like how when a teacher sets a timeline for a test, it gets kids to study and prepare for said test. Well, the ones who want to pass the test, anyway.

You should also post proof that the Bush/McCain way will eventually (10 years, 20 years, 50 years, who knows) work to our satisfaction. Our satisfaction, of course, is apparently not an Iraq that can take care of itself, but an Iraq that can do that plus allow us to build bases and use those bases as launching pads for incursions into other areas of the middle east.

And while you are at it, post your proof that all the troops we have tied up in Iraq for all those years won't affect our ability to respond elsewhere if we need to on short notice.

So go ahead, Thomas. Post your proof of the "certainty" of these things. We'll all be waiting on pins and needles for your proof.

Oh, one more thing. No one has ever proposed an "unconditional" pullout in sixteen months that I am aware of. Certainly not Obama. Please present your proof of that as well. ;)

Hold on there Kemo Sabe, before you blow a fuse. :kiss:

If you're going to drink Obama's kool aid, at least know what you are drinking. Here's a direct quote from his own website:

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010.

Now drink shug-a-lug, drink, drink, drink, drink.... :side:

Even the Iraqi government doesn't want us out for AT LEAST FIVES YEARS. Read the news, (and your own guys website) dimwit before you open your idiotic mouth. :P

Now let's see what else I can predict? You're going to wet yourself from all that kool aid you're drinking. :)

Be a good ex mormon church leader and and let the spirit move you.....someplace else preferably!

Now let me see! Ahh yes, it's coming in loud and clear. You two remind me of:

http://mysite.verizon.net/mnm0711/comic_mutt&jeff_june_1960_vol_1_no118.jpg

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/14 16:58

Obamas plan to get out of Bush's wars.....

My Plan for Iraq
By BARACK OBAMA

http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/14/opinion/14obama.html?_r=2&oref=slogin&pagewanted=print&oref=slogin

Read it and smile Tommy boy! Unless of course you are enjoying the slaughter of our troops and Iraqi and Afganistan innocents?

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by JLD - 2008/07/14 17:15

utocoman wrote:
Obamas plan to get out of Bush's wars.....

My Plan for Iraq
By BARACK OBAMA

http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/14/opinion/14obama.html?_r=2&oref=slogin&pagewanted=print&oref=slogin

Read it and smile Tommy boy! Unless of course you are enjoying the slaughter of our troops and Iraqi and Afganistan innocents?

It is nice fluff, but there really isn't much to it, unless I'm missing something. Sure, it sounds good, and I'm all aboard provided he can make it work. I do have some misgivings though.

1) No permanent bases in Iraq. Obama has stated several times, and again here, that he has no interest in maintaining permanent bases in Iraq. My question then is this, where will he deploy our forces from inside the Middle East? There aren't a lot of countries that will allow the US to do this. I don't care if we do it from Iraq or not, as long as we don't pull our troops back and then find we can't deploy them when and where we need to because of logistical snafu.

2) Along the same thread above, he talks about not having a permanent base but talks of "a residual force in Iraq". How

will they be supported, resupplied, protected, etc. I'm under the impression that would require some kind of base, but not according to Obama. Someone who knows more please educate me.

3) Leaving any forces in Iraq that are not combat effective. Leaving a residual force in Iraq is scary. Ask anyone that has ever experienced being an "adviser". You are sorely outnumbered if the crap hits the fan. I think our "residual force" will be staring into the face of a very hostile host country. How can they maintain combat effectiveness under that condition? What type of residual force is this? How strong? What function does it serve? Will Iraq even allow this hit squad to operate in its territories once the occupation has ceased? Who will provide for this force's overall security?

4) A phased withdrawal. I'm not outright opposed to this prospect, but I think it needs to be carefully considered going into it. The moment you start pulling our soldiers from Iraq either their needs to be 1) less need for their presence or 2) someone to take their place. This means that either the violence must phase out as well, or Iraqis must step up. But what if they don't? Once you start pulling soldiers you run the risk of overburdening the ones left behind. You pull too fast but leave too many behind and you have a lot of combat ineffective troops sitting on their hands in the safe zone, unequipped to move outside of the safe zones and under-supplied and under-reinforced should they move and come under attack.

I don't have the answer to these questions, of course, but I think they do need to be addressed.

I will say that I think what happens in Iraq is going to happen regardless of who is elected at this point. Pressure from Iraq and its neighbors, political pressure from other countries and from the very people at home are going to push the government hard to get us out. An indefinite stay, like people think they will get from McCain is unlikely to happen. That is just my opinion.

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/14 17:38

utocoman wrote:

Obamas plan to get out of Bush's wars.....

My Plan for Iraq

By BARACK OBAMA

http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/14/opinion/14obama.html?_r=2&oref=slogin&pagewanted=print&oref=slogin

Read it and smile Tommy boy! Unless of course you are enjoying the slaughter of our troops and Iraqi and Afganistan innocents?

Why don't you get it directly from the horse's mouth, so-to-speak, Mutt. Or are you Jeff? You're both alike, it's hard to tell you apart.

obama.com

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010

Unconditional surrender, that's what your clown is going to do Mutt err Jeff.

And what he's going to do about Iran is a real treat. He's going to put on a Jimmie Carter/Mr Rogers sweater and have a chitchat. Just gives you goose bumps, doesn't it Mutt?

Secretary Rice has more spheroids than your guy ever will.

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/14 17:52

No answer is necessary, you have shown your stupidity already.

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/14 18:13

utocoman wrote:

No answer is necessary, you have shown your stupidity already.

Perhaps you have not fully recovered after your one legged a\$\$ kicking contest Truth gave you.

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by truthhurts - 2008/07/14 18:22

Thomask wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

Thomask wrote:

I don't think you can say for certain what is going to happen next in Iran. Mosul, Sadr City and Basra's headlines are quite different than 6 months ago. The Iraqi people seem to be taking a different course. An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Really, Thomas? Why is it "for certain"? Have you been appointed some sort of military and political seer or something? Thomas the Seer?

Please post your evidence as to why it is certain. In that evidence, you should post proof that if we withdraw in 16 or 18 or whatever months, the Iraqi's will devolve into a worse situation than they are in now. You should also post proof that the timeline would not induce them to get their act together, especially since they sure seem to want some sort of timeline for us to get out anyway. You know, like how when a teacher sets a timeline for a test, it gets kids to study and prepare for said test. Well, the ones who want to pass the test, anyway.

You should also post proof that the Bush/McCain way will eventually (10 years, 20 years, 50 years, who knows) work to our satisfaction. Our satisfaction, of course, is apparently not an Iraq that can take care of itself, but an Iraq that can do that plus allow us to build bases and use those bases as launching pads for incursions into other areas of the middle east.

And while you are at it, post your proof that all the troops we have tied up in Iraq for all those years won't affect our ability to respond elsewhere if we need to on short notice.

So go ahead, Thomas. Post your proof of the "certainty" of these things. We'll all be waiting on pins and needles for your proof.

Oh, one more thing. No one has ever proposed an "unconditional" pullout in sixteen months that I am aware of. Certainly not Obama. Please present your proof of that as well. :)

Hold on there Kemo Sabe, before you blow a fuse. :kiss:

If you're going to drink Obama's kool aid, at least know what you are drinking. Here's a direct quote from his own website:

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010.

Now drink shug-a-lug, drink, drink, drink, drink.... :side:

Even the Iraqi government doesn't want us out for AT LEAST FIVES YEARS. Read the news, (and your own guys website) dimwit before you open your idiotic mouth. :P

Now let's see what else I can predict? You're going to wet yourself from all that kool aid you're drinking. :) Let me make this short and succinct for you.

One. Here is what you said:

An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Two. You presented no proof, not even any evidence, that an unconditional pullout is not the answer. Your opinion is not proof or evidence.

Three. You presented no proof that Obama said anything in his proposal was "unconditional." Nothing in the part you posted above in bold says anything about it being "unconditional", and I challenge you to post a link to anything Obama has said that says his plan is "unconditional".

So much for Thomas the Seer. Hell, so much for Thomas the Lucid Human Being. :laugh:

Chug-a-lug, Tommy boy. ;)

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by JLD - 2008/07/14 18:26

utocoman wrote:

utocoman wrote:

No answer is necessary, you have shown your stupidity already.

Perhaps you have not fully recovered after your one legged a\$\$ kicking contest Truth gave you.

Oh yes. I'm sorry, we aren't allowed to have real discussion here. I'm sorry, I thought you could act like an adult - you know, discussion, that type of thing. I said in my statements that I didn't have the answer and specifically asked for explanations, corrections, etc.

I think Uto that you just don't have them. You are so ready to swallow anything your candidate says that you don't really listen to what it is. If I'm wrong, then go back and read my post again and feel free to comment on it.

I'm not looking for a fight, I don't care about your so-called ass-kicking contest. If you think that is what we should focus on then it is no wonder we are in the shape we are. If you want to continue down the path of the 12 year old you seem to be then fine, go right ahead and I'll keep assuming you don't know what the crap you are talking about.

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by Wren - 2008/07/14 18:30

ThomasK wrote:

utocoman wrote:

Obamas plan to get out of Bush's wars.....

My Plan for Iraq

By BARACK OBAMA

http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/14/opinion/14obama.html?_r=2&oref=slogin&pagewanted=print&oref=slogin

Read it and smile Tommy boy! Unless of course you are enjoying the slaughter of our troops and Iraqi and Afganistan innocents?

Why don't you get it directly from the horse's mouth, so-to-speak, Mutt. Or are you Jeff? You're both alike, it's hard to tell you apart.

obama.com

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010

Unconditional surrender, that's what your clown is going to do Mutt err Jeff.

And what he's going to do about Iran is a real treat. He's going to put on a Jimmie Carter/Mr Rogers sweater and have a

chitchat. Just gives you goose bumps, doesn't it Mutt?

Secretary Rice has more spheroids than your guy ever will.

ThomasK, we cannot maintain our troop strength beyond this year in Iraq. When our troop levels fall, and they will, the violence will "surge" once again.

Only the Iraqis can solve their problems.

Re:Iraq wants withdrawal timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/14 18:39

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

I don't think you can say for certain what is going to happen next in Iran. Mosul, Sadr City and Basra's headlines are quite different than 6 months ago. The Iraqi people seem to be taking a different course. An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Really, Thomas? Why is it "for certain"? Have you been appointed some sort of military and political seer or something? Thomas the Seer?

Please post your evidence as to why it is certain. In that evidence, you should post proof that if we withdraw in 16 or 18 or whatever months, the Iraqi's will devolve into a worse situation than they are in now. You should also post proof that the timeline would not induce them to get their act together, especially since they sure seem to want some sort of timeline for us to get out anyway. You know, like how when a teacher sets a timeline for a test, it gets kids to study and prepare for said test. Well, the ones who want to pass the test, anyway.

You should also post proof that the Bush/McCain way will eventually (10 years, 20 years, 50 years, who knows) work to our satisfaction. Our satisfaction, of course, is apparently not an Iraq that can take care of itself, but an Iraq that can do that plus allow us to build bases and use those bases as launching pads for incursions into other areas of the middle east.

And while you are at it, post your proof that all the troops we have tied up in Iraq for all those years won't affect our ability to respond elsewhere if we need to on short notice.

So go ahead, Thomas. Post your proof of the "certainty" of these things. We'll all be waiting on pins and needles for your proof.

Oh, one more thing. No one has ever proposed an "unconditional" pullout in sixteen months that I am aware of. Certainly not Obama. Please present your proof of that as well. :)

Hold on there Kemo Sabe, before you blow a fuse. :kiss:

If you're going to drink Obama's kool aid, at least know what you are drinking. Here's a direct quote from his own website:

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010.

Now drink shug-a-lug, drink, drink, drink, drink.... :side:

Even the Iraqi government doesn't want us out for AT LEAST FIVES YEARS. Read the news, (and your own guys website) dimwit before you open your idiotic mouth. :P

Now let's see what else I can predict? You're going to wet yourself from all that kool aid you're drinking. :) Let me make this short and succinct for you.

One. Here is what you said:

An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Two. You presented no proof, not even any evidence, that an unconditional pullout is not the answer. Your opinion is not proof or evidence.

Three. You presented no proof that Obama said anything in his proposal was "unconditional." Nothing in the part you posted above in bold says anything about it being "unconditional", and I challenge you to post a link to anything Obama has said that says his plan is "unconditional".

So much for Thomas the Seer. Hell, so much for Thomas the Lucid Human Being. :laugh:

Chug-a-lug, Tommy boy. :)

You're such a dweeb. Who shives a git what you think. You think unconditional surrender is the answer, go right ahead. Why don't you prove it. And if you think Obama's "plan" to pull out in 16 months by the summer of 2010, is going to make everything hunky dory in the Middle East, dream on kool aid kid. I challenge you to prove it.

Now go cool off with a nice glass of kool aid. You're getting your grundies in a heck of a bundle. :kiss: :kiss:

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/14 18:41

Wren wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

utocoman wrote:

Obamas plan to get out of Bush's wars.....

My Plan for Iraq

By BARACK OBAMA

http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/14/opinion/14obama.html?_r=2&oref=slogin&pagewanted=print&oref=slogin

Read it and smile Tommy boy! Unless of course you are enjoying the slaughter of our troops and Iraqi and Afganistan innocents?

Why don't you get it directly from the horse's mouth, so-to-speak, Mutt. Or are you Jeff? You're both alike, it's hard to tell you apart.

obama.com

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010

Unconditional surrender, that's what your clown is going to do Mutt err Jeff.

And what he's going to do about Iran is a real treat. He's going to put on a Jimmie Carter/Mr Rogers sweater and have a chitchat. Just gives you goose bumps, doesn't it Mutt?

Secretary Rice has more spheroids than your guy ever will.

ThomasK, we cannot maintain our troop strength beyond this year in Iraq. When our troop levels fall, and they will, the violence will "surge" once again.

Only the Iraqis can solve their problems.

I haven't a clue what will happen beyond this year. But I do know that you're right in saying the Iraqis have to solve their problems. This I agree with completely.

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/14 18:44

utocoman wrote:
utocoman wrote:
No answer is necessary, you have shown your stupidity already.

Perhaps you have not fully recovered after your one legged a\$\$ kicking contest Truth gave you.

Have you recovered from your kissing of Truths a\$\$? BROWN NOSE. :kiss:

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/14 18:46

http://images.google.com/url?q=http://www.whudat.com/news/images/barack-obama-and-jesse-jackson.jpg&usg=AFQjCNEOSCGcWGOs_DsQPnVffHLIC1yZow

These two make a cute couple.

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/14 19:08

JLD wrote:
utocoman wrote:
utocoman wrote:
No answer is necessary, you have shown your stupidity already.

Perhaps you have not fully recovered after your one legged a\$\$ kicking contest Truth gave you.

Oh yes. I'm sorry, we aren't allowed to have real discussion here. I'm sorry, I thought you could act like an adult - you know, discussion, that type of thing. I said in my statements that I didn't have the answer and specifically asked for explanations, corrections, etc.

I think Uto that you just don't have them. You are so ready to swallow anything your candidate says that you don't really listen to what it is. If I'm wrong, then go back and read my post again and feel free to comment on it.

I'm not looking for a fight, I don't care about your so-called ass-kicking contest. If you think that is what we should focus on then it is no wonder we are in the shape we are. If you want to continue down the path of the 12 year old you seem to be then fine, go right ahead and I'll keep assuming you don't know what the crap you are talking about.

The ASSumption was on your part JLD. I was replying to Tommy. I already read that you do not have a clue what to do except to not pull out and lose all we have won?

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by JLD - 2008/07/14 19:12

utocoman wrote:
JLD wrote:
utocoman wrote:
utocoman wrote:
No answer is necessary, you have shown your stupidity already.

Perhaps you have not fully recovered after your one legged a\$\$ kicking contest Truth gave you.

Oh yes. I'm sorry, we aren't allowed to have real discussion here. I'm sorry, I thought you could act like an adult - you know, discussion, that type of thing. I said in my statements that I didn't have the answer and specifically asked for explanations, corrections, etc.

I think Uto that you just don't have them. You are so ready to swallow anything your candidate says that you don't really listen to what it is. If I'm wrong, then go back and read my post again and feel free to comment on it.

I'm not looking for a fight, I don't care about your so-called ass-kicking contest. If you think that is what we should focus on then it is no wonder we are in the shape we are. If you want to continue down the path of the 12 year old you seem to be then fine, go right ahead and I'll keep assuming you don't know what the crap you are talking about.

The ASSumption was on your part JLD. I was replying to Tommy. I already read that you do not have a clue what to do except to not pull out and lose all we have won?

You never disappoint Uto. :P

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by truthhurts - 2008/07/14 19:24

Thomask wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

Thomask wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

Thomask wrote:

I don't think you can say for certain what is going to happen next in Iran. Mosul, Sadr City and Basra's headlines are quite different than 6 months ago. The Iraqi people seem to be taking a different course. An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Really, Thomas? Why is it "for certain"? Have you been appointed some sort of military and political seer or something? Thomas the Seer?

Please post your evidence as to why it is certain. In that evidence, you should post proof that if we withdraw in 16 or 18 or whatever months, the Iraqi's will devolve into a worse situation than they are in now. You should also post proof that the timeline would not induce them to get their act together, especially since they sure seem to want some sort of timeline for us to get out anyway. You know, like how when a teacher sets a timeline for a test, it gets kids to study and prepare for said test. Well, the ones who want to pass the test, anyway.

You should also post proof that the Bush/McCain way will eventually (10 years, 20 years, 50 years, who knows) work to our satisfaction. Our satisfaction, of course, is apparently not an Iraq that can take care of itself, but an Iraq that can do that plus allow us to build bases and use those bases as launching pads for incursions into other areas of the middle east.

And while you are at it, post your proof that all the troops we have tied up in Iraq for all those years won't affect our ability to respond elsewhere if we need to on short notice.

So go ahead, Thomas. Post your proof of the "certainty" of these things. We'll all be waiting on pins and needles for your proof.

Oh, one more thing. No one has ever proposed an "unconditional" pullout in sixteen months that I am aware of. Certainly not Obama. Please present your proof of that as well. ;)

Hold on there Kemo Sabe, before you blow a fuse. :kiss:

If you're going to drink Obama's kool aid, at least know what you are drinking. Here's a direct quote from his own website:

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010.

Now drink shug-a-lug, drink, drink, drink, drink.... :side:

Even the Iraqi government doesn't want us out for AT LEAST FIVES YEARS. Read the news, (and your own guys website) dimwit before you open your idiotic mouth. :P

Now let's see what else I can predict? You're going to wet yourself from all that kool aid you're drinking. :)
Let me make this short and succinct for you.

One. Here is what you said:

An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Two. You presented no proof, not even any evidence, that an unconditional pullout is not the answer. Your opinion is not proof or evidence.

Three. You presented no proof that Obama said anything in his proposal was "unconditional." Nothing in the part you posted above in bold says anything about it being "unconditional", and I challenge you to post a link to anything Obama has said that says his plan is "unconditional".

So much for Thomas the Seer. Hell, so much for Thomas the Lucid Human Being. :laugh:

Chug-a-lug, Tommy boy. ;)

You're such a dweeb. Who shives a git what you think. You think unconditional surrender is the answer, go right ahead. Why don't you prove it. And if you think Obama's "plan" to pull out in 16 months by the summer of 2010, is going to make everything hunky dory in the Middle East, dream on kool aid kid. I challenge you to prove it.

Now go cool off with a nice glass of kool aid. You're getting your grundies in a heck of a bundle. :kiss: :kiss:
Once again, no supporting material for your statements. You could have just said "I have no proof that Obama ever said his position was unconditional, and I have no proof that pulling out is not the answer." Then you would have been an honest man, Tommy.

Instead we got just a little "Tommy Tirade." :laugh:

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by truthhurts - 2008/07/14 19:26

utocoman wrote:

The ASSumption was on your part JLD. I was replying to Tommy.
When you reply to one, you are replying to the other. And vice versa. ;)

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by JLD - 2008/07/14 19:38

truthhurts wrote:

utocoman wrote:
The ASSumption was on your part JLD. I was replying to Tommy.
When you reply to one, you are replying to the other. And vice versa. ;)

LOL, so can I lump you in with Uto then? You'll make such a pretty couple. ;)

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by truthhurts - 2008/07/14 19:46

JLD wrote:

truthhurts wrote:
utocoman wrote:
The ASSumption was on your part JLD. I was replying to Tommy.
When you reply to one, you are replying to the other. And vice versa. ;)

LOL, so can I lump you in with Uto then? You'll make such a pretty couple. ;)

I like him, but we have totally different styles. But hey, if it makes you feel good, lump away. Republicans are good at

lumping things. :laugh:

You and Tommy, however, are two peas from the same pod. ;)

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdraw timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/14 19:48

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

I don't think you can say for certain what is going to happen next in Iran. Mosul, Sadr City and Basra's headlines are quite different than 6 months ago. The Iraqi people seem to be taking a different course. An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Really, Thomas? Why is it "for certain"? Have you been appointed some sort of military and political seer or something? Thomas the Seer?

Please post your evidence as to why it is certain. In that evidence, you should post proof that if we withdraw in 16 or 18 or whatever months, the Iraqi's will devolve into a worse situation than they are in now. You should also post proof that the timeline would not induce them to get their act together, especially since they sure seem to want some sort of timeline for us to get out anyway. You know, like how when a teacher sets a timeline for a test, it gets kids to study and prepare for said test. Well, the ones who want to pass the test, anyway.

You should also post proof that the Bush/McCain way will eventually (10 years, 20 years, 50 years, who knows) work to our satisfaction. Our satisfaction, of course, is apparently not an Iraq that can take care of itself, but an Iraq that can do that plus allow us to build bases and use those bases as launching pads for incursions into other areas of the middle east.

And while you are at it, post your proof that all the troops we have tied up in Iraq for all those years won't affect our ability to respond elsewhere if we need to on short notice.

So go ahead, Thomas. Post your proof of the "certainty" of these things. We'll all be waiting on pins and needles for your proof.

Oh, one more thing. No one has ever proposed an "unconditional" pullout in sixteen months that I am aware of. Certainly not Obama. Please present your proof of that as well. ;)

Hold on there Kemo Sabe, before you blow a fuse. :kiss:

If you're going to drink Obama's kool aid, at least know what you are drinking. Here's a direct quote from his own website:

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010.

Now drink shug-a-lug, drink, drink, drink, drink.... :side:

Even the Iraqi government doesn't want us out for AT LEAST FIVES YEARS. Read the news, (and your own guys website) dimwit before you open your idiotic mouth. :P

Now let's see what else I can predict? You're going to wet yourself from all that kool aid you're drinking. :) Let me make this short and succinct for you.

One. Here is what you said:

An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Two. You presented no proof, not even any evidence, that an unconditional pullout is not the answer. Your opinion is not proof or evidence.

Three. You presented no proof that Obama said anything in his proposal was "unconditional." Nothing in the part you posted above in bold says anything about it being "unconditional", and I challenge you to post a link to anything Obama has said that says his plan is "unconditional".

So much for Thomas the Seer. Hell, so much for Thomas the Lucid Human Being. :laugh:

Chug-a-lug, Tommy boy. ;)

You're such a dweeb. Who shives a git what you think. You think unconditional surrender is the answer, go right ahead. Why don't you prove it. And if you think Obama's "plan" to pull out in 16 months by the summer of 2010, is going to make everything hunky dory in the Middle East, dream on kool aid kid. I challenge you to prove it.

Now go cool off with a nice glass of kool aid. You're getting your grundies in a heck of a bundle. :kiss: :kiss:
Once again, no supporting material for your statements. You could have just said "I have no proof that Obama ever said his position was unconditional, and I have no proof that pulling out is not the answer." Then you would have been an honest man, Tommy.

Instead we got just a little "Tommy Tirade." :laugh:

What's a matter, haven't kicked your dog today? What kind of "conditions" do you think he can get by leaving Iraq in 16 months by the summer of 2010, as his own website states? Do you think the Iraqi's are going to be sooooo greatful we are gone that they will do his bidding? You've lost it. Not that you ever had it.

Take another drink.

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by JLD - 2008/07/14 19:50

Alright, enough fun, but I have to come clean. I am Thomask. Yup. You guessed. You are sooo "SMRT"!

But on a more serious note, it is obvious nothing is going to get accomplished by trying to have a conversation here. Uto is borderline crazy (judging from his other posts on the forum) and Truth is just an ass. Thomask is right about the Cool Aid. You are so butt-hurt by the current administration that anything anyone says contrary to it you embrace wholeheartedly - glub glub glub. Doesn't mean that what you embrace is wrong - just scary that you don't even question it. Lucky for you, Obama is a smart enough man to handle thinking for a couple more people. Frees you up for other things...

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by JLD - 2008/07/14 19:51

Thomask wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

Thomask wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

Thomask wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

Thomask wrote:

I don't think you can say for certain what is going to happen next in Iran. Mosul, Sadr City and Basra's headlines are quite different than 6 months ago. The Iraqi people seem to be taking a different course. An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Really, Thomas? Why is it "for certain"? Have you been appointed some sort of military and political seer or something? Thomas the Seer?

Please post your evidence as to why it is certain. In that evidence, you should post proof that if we withdraw in 16 or 18 or whatever months, the Iraqi's will devolve into a worse situation than they are in now. You should also post proof that the timeline would not induce them to get their act together, especially since they sure seem to want some sort of timeline for us to get out anyway. You know, like how when a teacher sets a timeline for a test, it gets kids to study and prepare for said test. Well, the ones who want to pass the test, anyway.

You should also post proof that the Bush/McCain way will eventually (10 years, 20 years, 50 years, who knows) work to our satisfaction. Our satisfaction, of course, is apparently not an Iraq that can take care of itself, but an Iraq that can do that plus allow us to build bases and use those bases as launching pads for incursions into other areas of the middle east.

And while you are at it, post your proof that all the troops we have tied up in Iraq for all those years won't affect our ability to respond elsewhere if we need to on short notice.

So go ahead, Thomas. Post your proof of the "certainty" of these things. We'll all be waiting on pins and needles for your proof.

Oh, one more thing. No one has ever proposed an "unconditional" pullout in sixteen months that I am aware of. Certainly not Obama. Please present your proof of that as well. ;)

Hold on there Kemo Sabe, before you blow a fuse. :kiss:

If you're going to drink Obama's kool aid, at least know what you are drinking. Here's a direct quote from his own website:

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010.

Now drink shug-a-lug, drink, drink, drink, drink.... :side:

Even the Iraqi government doesn't want us out for AT LEAST FIVES YEARS. Read the news, (and your own guys website) dimwit before you open your idiotic mouth. :P

Now let's see what else I can predict? You're going to wet yourself from all that kool aid you're drinking. :) Let me make this short and succinct for you.

One. Here is what you said:

An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Two. You presented no proof, not even any evidence, that an unconditional pullout is not the answer. Your opinion is not proof or evidence.

Three. You presented no proof that Obama said anything in his proposal was "unconditional." Nothing in the part you posted above in bold says anything about it being "unconditional", and I challenge you to post a link to anything Obama has said that says his plan is "unconditional".

So much for Thomas the Seer. Hell, so much for Thomas the Lucid Human Being. :laugh:

Chug-a-lug, Tommy boy. ;)

You're such a dweeb. Who shives a git what you think. You think unconditional surrender is the answer, go right ahead. Why don't you prove it. And if you think Obama's "plan" to pull out in 16 months by the summer of 2010, is going to make everything hunky dory in the Middle East, dream on kool aid kid. I challenge you to prove it.

Now go cool off with a nice glass of kool aid. You're getting your grundies in a heck of a bundle. :kiss: :kiss: Once again, no supporting material for your statements. You could have just said "I have no proof that Obama ever said his position was unconditional, and I have no proof that pulling out is not the answer." Then you would have been an honest man, Tommy.

Instead we got just a little "Tommy Tirade." :laugh:

What's a matter, haven't kicked your dog today? What kind of "conditions" do you think he can get by leaving Iraq in 16 months by the summer of 2010, as his own website states? Do you think the Iraqi's are going to be sooooo greatful we are gone that they will do his bidding? You've lost it. Not that you ever had it.

Take another drink.

Actually Uto agreed that they will hold hands and sing. Man, aren't you paying attention? ;)

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdraw timetable

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/14 19:52

Take heart Tommy, look what Bush did to Afganistan and Iraq in only a few short weeks. Obama can get us out quicker than McCain can change his Depends!

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdraw timetable

Posted by truthhurts - 2008/07/14 19:55

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

I don't think you can say for certain what is going to happen next in Iran. Mosul, Sadr City and Basra's headlines are quite different than 6 months ago. The Iraqi people seem to be taking a different course. An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Really, Thomas? Why is it "for certain"? Have you been appointed some sort of military and political seer or something? Thomas the Seer?

Please post your evidence as to why it is certain. In that evidence, you should post proof that if we withdraw in 16 or 18 or whatever months, the Iraqi's will devolve into a worse situation than they are in now. You should also post proof that the timeline would not induce them to get their act together, especially since they sure seem to want some sort of timeline for us to get out anyway. You know, like how when a teacher sets a timeline for a test, it gets kids to study and prepare for said test. Well, the ones who want to pass the test, anyway.

You should also post proof that the Bush/McCain way will eventually (10 years, 20 years, 50 years, who knows) work to our satisfaction. Our satisfaction, of course, is apparently not an Iraq that can take care of itself, but an Iraq that can do that plus allow us to build bases and use those bases as launching pads for incursions into other areas of the middle east.

And while you are at it, post your proof that all the troops we have tied up in Iraq for all those years won't affect our ability to respond elsewhere if we need to on short notice.

So go ahead, Thomas. Post your proof of the "certainty" of these things. We'll all be waiting on pins and needles for your proof.

Oh, one more thing. No one has ever proposed an "unconditional" pullout in sixteen months that I am aware of. Certainly not Obama. Please present your proof of that as well. ;)

Hold on there Kemo Sabe, before you blow a fuse. :kiss:

If you're going to drink Obama's kool aid, at least know what you are drinking. Here's a direct quote from his own website:

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010.

Now drink shug-a-lug, drink, drink, drink, drink.... :side:

Even the Iraqi government doesn't want us out for AT LEAST FIVES YEARS. Read the news, (and your own guys website) dimwit before you open your idiotic mouth. :P

Now let's see what else I can predict? You're going to wet yourself from all that kool aid you're drinking. :)
Let me make this short and succinct for you.

One. Here is what you said:

An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Two. You presented no proof, not even any evidence, that an unconditional pullout is not the answer. Your opinion is not proof or evidence.

Three. You presented no proof that Obama said anything in his proposal was "unconditional." Nothing in the part you posted above in bold says anything about it being "unconditional", and I challenge you to post a link to anything Obama has said that says his plan is "unconditional".

So much for Thomas the Seer. Hell, so much for Thomas the Lucid Human Being. :laugh:

Chug-a-lug, Tommy boy. ;)

You're such a dweeb. Who shives a git what you think. You think unconditional surrender is the answer, go right ahead. Why don't you prove it. And if you think Obama's "plan" to pull out in 16 months by the summer of 2010, is going to make everything hunky dory in the Middle East, dream on kool aid kid. I challenge you to prove it.

Now go cool off with a nice glass of kool aid. You're getting your grundies in a heck of a bundle. :kiss: :kiss:
Once again, no supporting material for your statements. You could have just said "I have no proof that Obama ever said his position was unconditional, and I have no proof that pulling out is not the answer." Then you would have been an honest man, Tommy.

Instead we got just a little "Tommy Tirade." :laugh:

What's a matter, haven't kicked your dog today? What kind of "conditions" do you think he can get by leaving Iraq in 16 months by the summer of 2010, as his own website states? Do you think the Iraqi's are going to be sooooo greatful we are gone that they will do his bidding? You've lost it. Not that you ever had it.

Take another drink.
Sigh. Once again, Tommy, here is what you said.

An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

You do admit to saying that, right. Well, right?

You made the statement, and the burden of proof is on you to support it with evidence. You did not say it was your opinion. You said it was "for certain." I asked you to prove it, and you have been flopping around the forum like a fish out of water ever since.

It is illogical (and dimwitted) to try to turn the tables on me and tell me to prove that it that leaving is the answer, because I never claimed that "it is for certain" that it is the answer. The truth is, there's a plethora of things that can go wrong in Iraq if we leave, and a plethora that can continue to go wrong if we stay. There is no certainty in this, either way. Any moron knows that...why are you having trouble with it?

Now why don't you just be a man and admit that you cannot support your statement above? Or do you want to flop around like a fish some more. :laugh:

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/14 20:07

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

I don't think you can say for certain what is going to happen next in Iran. Mosul, Sadr City and Basra's headlines are quite different than 6 months ago. The Iraqi people seem to be taking a different course. An unconditional pullout in 16

months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Really, Thomas? Why is it "for certain"? Have you been appointed some sort of military and political seer or something? Thomas the Seer?

Please post your evidence as to why it is certain. In that evidence, you should post proof that if we withdraw in 16 or 18 or whatever months, the Iraqi's will devolve into a worse situation than they are in now. You should also post proof that the timeline would not induce them to get their act together, especially since they sure seem to want some sort of timeline for us to get out anyway. You know, like how when a teacher sets a timeline for a test, it gets kids to study and prepare for said test. Well, the ones who want to pass the test, anyway.

You should also post proof that the Bush/McCain way will eventually (10 years, 20 years, 50 years, who knows) work to our satisfaction. Our satisfaction, of course, is apparently not an Iraq that can take care of itself, but an Iraq that can do that plus allow us to build bases and use those bases as launching pads for incursions into other areas of the middle east.

And while you are at it, post your proof that all the troops we have tied up in Iraq for all those years won't affect our ability to respond elsewhere if we need to on short notice.

So go ahead, Thomas. Post your proof of the "certainty" of these things. We'll all be waiting on pins and needles for your proof.

Oh, one more thing. No one has ever proposed an "unconditional" pullout in sixteen months that I am aware of. Certainly not Obama. Please present your proof of that as well. ;)

Hold on there Kemo Sabe, before you blow a fuse. :kiss:

If you're going to drink Obama's kool aid, at least know what you are drinking. Here's a direct quote from his own website:

redeploy combat brigades from Iraq at a pace of 1 to 2 brigades a month that would remove them in 16 months. That would be the summer of 2010.

Now drink shug-a-lug, drink, drink, drink, drink.... :side:

Even the Iraqi government doesn't want us out for AT LEAST FIVES YEARS. Read the news, (and your own guys website) dimwit before you open your idiotic mouth. :P

Now let's see what else I can predict? You're going to wet yourself from all that kool aid you're drinking. :) Let me make this short and succinct for you.

One. Here is what you said:

An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

Two. You presented no proof, not even any evidence, that an unconditional pullout is not the answer. Your opinion is not proof or evidence.

Three. You presented no proof that Obama said anything in his proposal was "unconditional." Nothing in the part you posted above in bold says anything about it being "unconditional", and I challenge you to post a link to anything Obama has said that says his plan is "unconditional".

So much for Thomas the Seer. Hell, so much for Thomas the Lucid Human Being. :laugh:

Chug-a-lug, Tommy boy. ;)

You're such a dweeb. Who shives a git what you think. You think unconditional surrender is the answer, go right ahead. Why don't you prove it. And if you think Obama's "plan" to pull out in 16 months by the summer of 2010, is going to make everything hunky dory in the Middle East, dream on kool aid kid. I challenge you to prove it.

Now go cool off with a nice glass of kool aid. You're getting your grundies in a heck of a bundle. :kiss: :kiss:
Once again, no supporting material for your statements. You could have just said "I have no proof that Obama ever said his position was unconditional, and I have no proof that pulling out is not the answer." Then you would have been an honest man, Tommy.

Instead we got just a little "Tommy Tirade." :laugh:

What's a matter, haven't kicked your dog today? What kind of "conditions" do you think he can get by leaving Iraq in 16 months by the summer of 2010, as his own website states? Do you think the Iraqi's are going to be sooooo greatful we are gone that they will do his bidding? You've lost it. Not that you ever had it.

Take another drink.
Sigh. Once again, Tommy, here is what you said.

An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

You do admit to saying that, right. Well, right?

You made the statement, and the burden of proof is on you to support it with evidence. You did not say it was your opinion. You said it was "for certain." I asked you to prove it, and you have been flopping around the forum like a fish out of water ever since.

It is illogical (and dimwitted) to try to turn the tables on me and tell me to prove that it that leaving is the answer, because I never claimed that "it is for certain" that it is the answer. The truth is, there's a plethora of things that can go wrong in Iraq if we leave, and a plethora that can continue to go wrong if we stay. There is no certainty in this, either way. Any moron knows that...why are you having trouble with it?

Now why don't you just be a man and admit that you cannot support your statement above? Or do you want to flop around like a fish some more. :laugh:

A plethora, I'm impressed. I agree there are a plethora of "things" that will happen. Maybe Obama needs to amend his website once in awhile. According to it, he's backed himself in another corner. Some change. He can't even figure out how to change his website and you think he's going to change the world!

DRINK, DRINK, DRINK.....

Re:Iraq wants withdrawl timetable

Posted by truthhurts - 2008/07/14 20:29

Thomask wrote:
truthhurts wrote:
Sigh. Once again, Tommy, here is what you said.

"An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain."

You do admit to saying that, right. Well, right?

You made the statement, and the burden of proof is on you to support it with evidence. You did not say it was your opinion. You said it was "for certain." I asked you to prove it, and you have been flopping around the forum like a fish out of water ever since.

It is illogical (and dimwitted) to try to turn the tables on me and tell me to prove that it that leaving is the answer, because I never claimed that "it is for certain" that it is the answer. The truth is, there's a plethora of things that can go wrong in Iraq if we leave, and a plethora that can continue to go wrong if we stay. There is no certainty in this, either way. Any moron knows that...why are you having trouble with it?

Now why don't you just be a man and admit that you cannot support your statement above? Or do you want to flop around like a fish some more.

A plethora, I'm impressed. I agree there are a plethora of "things" that will happen. Maybe Obama needs to amend his website once in awhile. According to it, he's backed himself in another corner. Some change. He can't even figure out how to change his website and you think he's going to change the world!

DRINK, DRINK, DRINK.....

You still fail to admit the obvious. You won't even admit that you said what you said. Is this another one of those loopy things of yours where you meant something other than what you said?

Once again, it's time for me to reel the flopping fish (that's you) back in. Can you support your statement above with actual evidence, or not? Can you provide evidence that withdrawing combat troops in not the answer, and can you

present proof that Obama has said his timetable was "unconditional"

Yes or No? If Yes, present the proof.

Or will be seeing more of those weak "DRINK, DRINK, DRINK" comments that only show the forum how pitiful your reasoning abilities are?

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdraw timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/14 20:35

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

You do admit to saying that, right. Well, right?

You made the statement, and the burden of proof is on you to support it with evidence. You did not say it was your opinion. You said it was "for certain." I asked you to prove it.

OK, OK, I am certain that was my opinion. Does that help your boner? If it doesn't, in 4 hours you should take appropriate steps. I wouldn't want you to be unable to get another hard on with one of my posts. B)

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdraw timetable

Posted by truthhurts - 2008/07/14 20:55

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

You do admit to saying that, right. Well, right?

You made the statement, and the burden of proof is on you to support it with evidence. You did not say it was your opinion. You said it was "for certain." I asked you to prove it.

OK, OK, I am certain that was my opinion.
I see. You are certain it was your opinion and unable to present any supporting evidence. Got it.

See, that wasn't so hard, was it? ;)

=====

Re:Iraq wants withdraw timetable

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/14 20:58

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

ThomasK wrote:

An unconditional pullout in 16 months is not the answer. That IS for certain.

You do admit to saying that, right. Well, right?

You made the statement, and the burden of proof is on you to support it with evidence. You did not say it was your

opinion. You said it was "for certain." I asked you to prove it.

OK, OK, I am certain that was my opinion.

I see. You are certain it was your opinion and unable to present any supporting evidence. Got it.

See, that wasn't so hard, was it? ;)

Well maybe for you it wasn't. :(

If you get my drift. :)

=====