
Subject: Re: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 01:31:47 GMT

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

Nodbugger wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 18:45 glyde51, the US did not start this war, Saddam did.

As for civilian casualties, they happen. There is no way to avoid them when your enemy hides among them.

But as I have always said, if we left Saddam in power we would be guaranteed death.

You're STILL missing the point, you can reduce civilian casualties by not just saying "What's a few more" and using WP.

Nodbugger wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 18:48 glyde51 wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 18:44 Will it? Depends what you mean by "said and done."

It will take MANY more years to stabilize Iraq.

Have you ever been doing something and someone is looking over your shoulder complaining about what you are doing, you know you are doing it right, but you can't get it done because that other person won't shut the fuck up?

If people like you stopped acting like fucking retards and get positive about the situation it would have ended a while ago, if the people like you allowed the military to operate like it wanted to , it would have.

If Bush didn't have idiots like you harping over his shoulder complaining about every little thing, it would have been over a long time ago.

What do you mean if I got positive it would have ended? Am I really the WMD that started the war, the terrorist that keeps it going, or the politicians that used faulty intelligence? If so, come invade my house in Winnipeg, Manitoba. People in the West having bad attitudes towards your illegal war doesn't make it last longer.

warranto wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 19:28 Nodbugger wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 16:45 glyde51, the US did not start this war, Saddam did.

As for civilian casualties, they happen. There is no way to avoid them when your enemy hides among them.

But as I have always said, if we left Saddam in power we would be guaranteed death.

Really, now... last I heard, it was the USA who invaded Iraq based on now-admitted faulty intelligence.

I love you.

Javaxcx wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 19:36Nodbugger wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 18:48
If Bush didn't have idiots like you harping over his shoulder complaining about every little thing, it would have been over a long time ago.

Why would you want a leader who has a "mixed" (and admitted) record of successes and failures (by wholly American standards) operating free from critical analysis?

What are you, Saddam?

You too, for that matter.

PhantomScope wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 19:53Hm Lets think about a few things here. If your country is involved in a war and you know that forces are headed in your direction, will you stand around by the people who have guns? I sure as hell wouldn't I would rather try to become a refugee than chill out in a target clearing zone.

Next fact is that this is gurilla warfare so what seems like a "civilian casualty" could just be a troop in disguise and his buddies took his gear as the supplies are short. You would be suprized how many assault carbines can be purchased and concealed.

One more thing, I have yet to see remorse for civilians they've taken hostage. They intentionally kill civilians such as media representatives, or just someone in that country at the wrong time. The coalition isn't intentionally trying to kill any civilians not to mention propaganda fliers have been distributed in the past to warn civiliants of the dangers of remaining in the target area.

I'm not advocating the war but in times of war you should stand firmly behind your nation. One more thing, If you can provide me a historically documented war that had no civilian causalities, killed, wounded, missing, or otherwise, Then I will keep my mouth shut.

Oh, so you're saying people who won't flee they're only home, they're only possessions, in a poor country should all get up and run? When you have nothing else, your family lives there, your home is there, you don't just run. You stay it out, and hope. Your second point also sucks, most of the fighters have Ak-47s, and I know that if someone had an Ak down they're pants, I wouldn't think they're happy to see me. Besides, even if they did have an assault carbine in their pants, it'd be awfully hard to pull it out. For your third point, read my first point to this particular post. For your last, and final point, you're an asshat. Civilian casualties have been in every war, and they should be pervented. Don't using the bad parts of the past to justify the bad parts of the future is just being a jackass.

NeoSaber wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 19:55warranto wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 19:28Really, now... last I heard, it was the USA who invaded Iraq based on now-admitted faulty intelligence.

Last I heard, Saddam invaded another country thinking the world wouldn't care. America kicked him out, but didn't finish him off for political reasons. Then Saddam signed a cease fire agreement. After that he spent years shooting at American forces with little response. The US

finally finished the war Saddam started over a decade ago, citing WMD among other reasons.

I know people like hitting Nodbugger over the head with his own knee jerk reactions, but at least do it right. If Saddam hadn't invaded Kuwait, the US would probably never have gotten involved in the region, at least militarily. There would have been nothing to respond to. Now that I think about it, 9/11 might not have happened either since Bin Laden hates the US primarily for its involvement in protecting the Middle East from Saddam.

I ALMOST love you, but Osama is just a terrorist. Maybe you're partially right about Osama, though.
