

---

Subject: Litmus test for liberals

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 19 Aug 2004 19:37:39 GMT

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

---

Nukelt15Actually, 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.

A little off topic, but these same "weapons of terror" (however those "experts" want to define it) are probably what kept the United States and Russia from blasting each other. It pertains no relevance to Saddam, but condemning the same weapons (or at least having that kind of connotation) that probably saved all of our lives seems a bit strange.

Quote: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.

I'm curious, could you get some proof about those MRBMs? It's not that I don't believe you, it's just I would prefer to have some confirmation.

As for the illegal weapons, it's true. He does/did have weapons deemed "illegal" by the United Nations. Read this, the 13th Quarterly Report from UNMOVIC. It should tell you exactly what Saddam still had in terms of illegal weapons reported to the UNMOVIC. But don't forget, these same people watching Saddam disarm were the same people that had to evacuate the country while doing their job only a day (I believe) before the S&A campaign. If you were in the same place as Iraq, would you keep disarming after and during a full scale invasion?

Quote: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?

Heh, no one said anything about stopping the search. The United States and their allies went into Iraq for the reason to disarm those weapons. It's bad enough they by all definitions and semantics violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq from March 19th 2003 onwards, but they can't simply pack up and go. It would be hypocritical and morally wrong to leave that society in more shambles than it was when Saddam was in power.

Quote: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?

Well, it's equally arguable to say the same thing to the intelligence communities that screwed up, right?

Quote: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.

I sincerely hope you haven't concluded that France and opposers to the war were in it for personal gain only. If you have, then I'm sorry to say but you are wrong. It might surprise you, but other

people have principles as well, and they don't always revolve around money. Canada did not send their troops to Iraq, but we thus far have given over \$300,000,000 to the Iraqi people for humanitarian reasons since this war began. We gain nothing from Saddam being in power, and risk quite a lot by not supporting one of our closest allies in their unlawful invasion.

Quote: 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.

You said "at the time". With Saddam out of power, and any influx of funds going to France because of Saddam (as so many people seem to believe) stopped, why aren't the French, in full force assisting in Iraq now (I'm NOT referring to the humanitarian efforts of the United Nations, btw)? Why isn't Canada? Why isn't Russia?

---