

Re: Ratch's evidence criterion revisited.

## Re: Ratch's evidence criterion revisited.

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Assembler/alt.lang.asm/2007-08/msg00166.html>

---

- *From:* "Ratch" <[watchit@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:watchit@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 4 Aug 2007 12:50:37 -0500
- 

"hutch--" <[hutch@xxxxxxxx](mailto:hutch@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1186245517.879028.70820@xx](mailto:news:1186245517.879028.70820@xx)

HAY RATCH !!!!

1. Bush lied to start a war.
2. Young Americans are dying in Iraq for no reason.
3. The US economy is on its knees funding two wars that are lost.
4. The security of the US has been compromised by its level of debt.

Sorry to be slow coming back but I did not find your post in the mess of other posts.

I was there and answered all your posts addressed to me.

Your following lines of argument are why I take no notice of you and only address your criterion of evidence.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030317-7.html>

Statement by G.W. Bush from above link.

"Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised. This regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbors and against Iraq's people."

(1) The expression "leaves no doubt" leaves no doubt as to the intent of the US president. He was deliberately lying as he has ruled out being mistaken.

You are really confused, Hutch. Back in 2003, he thought there was no doubt, and he did not know he was mistaken.

Re: Ratch's evidence criterion revisited.

(2) The expression "some of the most lethal weapons ever devised" leaves no doubt as to the intent of the US president. He was deliberately lying as he has ruled out being mistaken.

Yes, he intended to neutralize what he thought were the then present lethal weapons. As I said before, he ruled out being "mistaken" because he thought for sure that he was not. You seem to have a hard time understanding that point.

(3) When Colin Powell made the statement "These are not assertions" to the United Nations he excluded being mistaken. He was deliberately lying as he has ruled out being mistaken.

Same answer as above. Try to understand that they were so sure that they were right that they could not conceive such a possibility as being mistakenly wrong.

In the face of the statements being directly provably false, to deny that both Bush and Powell lied, you have to deny what they are recorded as saying.

One one denies what was recorded. You seem to have a hard time understanding that just because someone says something that proves later to be wrong does not make him/her a liar, unless they knew at the time it was wrong. That means proving intent, which relates to the state of mind, or other evidence that s/he knew the statement was untrue. Why are you having such a problem with this?

Invent yet another criterion of evidence that turns a lie into a mistake for G. W. Bush but not for Idi Amin, Hitler, Stalin or even poor old Saddam.

That has already be explained before. It relates to the saying, "Consider the source". Ratch

.

Re: Ratch's evidence criterion revisited.