

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 19 Aug 2004 18:43:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Actually, most of the "WMD" experts prefer to call them "Weapons of Mass Terror." They scare more people than they would ever be capable of killing. Chemical weapons are limited by how they are spread- if the wind goes in the wrong direction, or the river you plop it in gets filtered 50m downstream, the weapon is useless. Bio and Nuclear weapons are a different story, as both of those are capable of killing massive numbers of people. However, the same holds true- the fear factor of so-called "WMD's" far exceeds their actual combat value.

Oh, and sarin is not a gas. Liquid form, geniuses, it's not any more in gas form than the stuff that comes out of an aerosol hairspray can.

That said, Saddam was in possession of several weapon types that were forbidden to him, including several hidden long range interceptor aircraft and- surprise, surprise- mobile MRBM launchers(Russian-built ballistic missile systems more commonly known as SCUDs). He USED several of those missile launchers during the invasion.

Now, any half bright chimp could draw a logical conclusion from all this. Let's put together the facts:

- \* Ballistic missile launching systems
- \* Shells filled with chemical weapons(It does not matter how many- they were there, in Saddam's country, therefore he DID have them)
- \* Nuclear-capable long range fighters

Honestly, I do not understand how people can continue to argue that Saddam did not have such weapons or the means to deliver them. As for anything that has not yet been found, well, there's a couple thousand square miles of Iraq that still haven't been searched. Ok, so we have our madman, we have our "smoking gun"(or more accurately, smoking ballistic missile launchers), so why in the fuck are people trying to call off the search before finding the ammunition?

Looking at this from the "objective" point of view that you people seem to brag about so much, doesn't it make a whole lot more sense to finish the search before drawing conclusions?

As for the France thing- You're damn right they were in it for personal gain. They were looking after their nation's interests just the same as we were. Our interests conflicted, and that's all there is to it. Simple, huh? That doesn't make their decision a bad one(hell, even the US supported that bastard at one point, under a different administration)- not from their point of view. I highly doubt that the entire country of France was sitting there drinking wine and plotting the undoing of the US the night before they opposed us in the UN. The same goes for every country that opposed the US, and every country that went to war. Neither side did what they did because "it was the right thing to do", they did it because it was what (they thought) was best for their country at the time.

---