

## Re: The debate

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.transcription/2004-10/0739.html>

---

**From:** djgordon (*danigordon\_at\_bellsouth.net*)

**Date:** 10/04/04

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 12:05:14 -0500

Now you're reading something I didn't say. Once again, for like the 100th time I will reiterate what I said. I never said the blood on his hand is not noteworthy (but are we supposed to condemn everyone who had to kill in wartime)—I SAID that you can't compare a soldier's blood from wartime killing to Bush's blood on his hands from sitting in his big oval office and sending our soldiers over there and killing the Iraqis.

Why keep going back to a point made a week ago, when I asked a valid question that still received no response? If you are so for trials and doing things lawfully, (and that's fine—I have no problem with that), why don't you believe that if we should try BL (and find a jury of his peers please) and let them decide his fate, why aren't you mad that they didn't do that for every soldier who has fallen in this war?

And once I went and reread your post, I have this to add. {sarcasm} Okay, fine, soldiers are being killed, innocent people are being killed, no biggie, it's wartime, they're not going to get a trial because that's what happens in a way.....well, DUH, then why can't we just kill BL and mark it up to wartime activities?

Dani

"Jeannie H Wilson" <jeanniehwilson@aol.comnonospam> wrote in message news:20041004120056.07554.00001480@mb-m18.aol.com...

> > *Why should he deserve any better than what our fallen soldiers have received? Did you see Iraq or anyone take our soldiers into custody, give them a trial, and then sentence them to death?*

>

> *So...if we cannot consider John Kerry's blood on his hands "noteworthy" since*

> *he received it during fighting for his country (in Viet Nam no less) then why*

> *can't we consider that our soldiers are being killed in the same fashion that*

> *Kerry and his men killed people in Viet Nam?*