
Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 05:59:52 GMT

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

The stupidity in this thread (except for Dover) is incredible and almost unbelievable. But it is for real and that's why I have been forced to reply.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 14:00

Why the hell would they start massing missiles THAT far away from home and THAT close to American soil? I mean, without any intention for using them. Or at least using them to threaten the country.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 20:46 But let me ask you a question, if you are so smart: If what you say is true, what is the reason behind the USSR porting WMDs to Cuba in the first place?

My long reply below answers Razor's stupid questions in the two quotes above.

That's a typical "dumb civilian" question with lack of basic military knowledge and history. Learn on your own instead of listening to false information and garbage from school and TV. You want to know why?

Here's the short version:

-The Soviet Union placed missiles in Cuba because the United States placed missiles in Turkey (in 1961) that could reach Moscow in 16 minutes. Placing missiles in Cuba (in 1962) was the just and fair Soviet retaliation for American actions.

I just fucked up your previous argument(s). But for the sake of the other name-calling people here, the long version:

Remember that the Cuban Missile Crisis happened early in the Cold War (1962). Bombers, land-based nuclear missile platforms, and unworthy missile submarines were the order of the day. Nuclear missiles did not have such very advanced guidance systems and the probability of a missile failing was high. Their range was also limited. So, the closer the missiles were to your targets, the higher the chances of a successful strike.

And forget the "duck-and-cover" bullshit you learned in school, there were NO Soviet bombers capable of such a mass attack on the United States. The whole bullshit "Russians-have-a-million-bombers-and-they-can-nuke-America-anytime-in-one-big-fucking-bombing-raid" was a conjured up lie that was born during the days of McCarthy's paranoia and the Red Scare.

In 1962, the year of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the U.S. had almost 28,000 nuclear warheads. The Soviets had a mere 3,300+. These figures are true and confirmed by both nations and NATO. So, those who think the Soviets were going to start a war and wipe out humanity can go to hell.

The Soviet Union NEVER was equal to the United States when it came to the military. Throughout the Cold War, they were ALWAYS one step behind the United States in terms of evolution of

military warfare, tactics, technology, flexibility. They caught up rather impressively in the late 1980's but then did not last too long after that to see the "glory."

The Soviets made awesome strides in some areas of sea and land warfare but always lagged behind the U.S. in other aspects. Only the vast amounts of nuclear warheads, the later advanced missile capability, and their adoption and integration of advanced foreign electronics into their tanks/aircraft in the 1980's ensured that the USSR maintained a rough nuclear/conventional parity and therefore "equal" status with the United States.

So, in such a crucial period of military technological backwardness of the 1960's, the Soviet Union had no other choice than to deploy missiles in Cuba. No, they were not going to start a war but there was no other option on the table.

And Cuba, located close to the U.S., was the best and only option to even the tide.

My maps will explain for those who can't read/understand words:

Map 1: After the end of WWII, the Soviet Union was isolated. It's biggest allies were the Eastern Bloc nations. It also eventually gained the trust of Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Iraq (after the Colonists left them). Observe the nuclear symbols representing locations of nuclear weapons:

MAP 1

Do you people see any **IMBALANCE** in the first map? Is there something "uneven" about it? Sure...American nukes are **ASSRAMMED** right near Soviet controlled areas **POSING DIRECT THREAT TO MOSCOW** while not a single Soviet nuke is anywhere near the American mainland.

I don't expect a few people here to see this in a military perspective and understand but thank fuck I can.

A well-trained military force with the intelligent command hierarchy like that of the Soviet Union would, not surprisingly, be looking for an opportunity to fix this strategic imbalance.

And they did fix it when the Cuban Communists opened up their arms to Moscow in 1959. It was the most timely and perfect opportunity for the Soviet Union to get even when it came to the distributed deployment of nuclear weapons. (Refer to Map II below)

MAP 2:

So, now the Soviet's had evened the playing field but then you all know what happened.

Understand now? They were not going to start a war but were making a highly intelligent and strategic military maneuver in a Nuclear Age. The same kind of military strategy with which Americans had nukes assrammed in Europe and Turkey in the first place!

But Kennedy and then-Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev (two great men) agreed to a deal to have

the Soviet's remove the missiles from Cuba if Americans removed their missiles from Turkey. So, it was a sort of good ending that was achieved by two great men who did everything possible to solve the crisis peacefully.

There are people who say that the Soviets "putting missiles in Cuba" was not justified and see it as a provocation by the USSR to go to war. What fucking idiots! As explained above, the USSR was in no position to start a war; they were simply playing by the rules of the Cold War.

If it had been some other Latin-American country that befriended Moscow, then the Soviets would have deployed missiles there. So simple to understand.

By putting nukes in Cuba, the Soviet Union maximized its chances that it had of having a successful strike IN THE EVENT of war. Deploying nukes in Cuba was NOT a prelude to war but a necessary measure to be successful in case of war.

This is also where my next strong rebuttal takes place:

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 19:11 We know we can trust ourselves to not offensively fire a nuke without warning on another nation, but how can we be so sure that some other nation feels the same way? Call it paranoia if you will.

This is the stupidity that I find in some people (everywhere) and CANNOT agree with. Not only is this paranoia but also stupidity, arrogance and self-righteousness.

Did you know that the sole reason the Cold War never became a hot war? Not because you did all the the "good" shit but because Russians are not the animals you think they are. And they are not the animals you have brainwashed others into thinking they are.

Sure, the Russian government is not that clean and have committed atrocities in the past.

But remember that the Russians are a civilized race. They have made strides in all subjects and science and sent man into space. And they most understood the concept of "Mutual-Assured-Destruction" (MAD).

Stop classifying the Russians as animals and then maybe your attitude about them can change.

BTW, I am coming from the most peaceful and open nuclear-armed nation and I can speak on behalf of my politicians and my fellow countrymen that we understand the power of the nuclear weapon and are as trustworthy as you. The same goes for every other nuclear armed nation.

So, you can go eat your paranoia. I use my commonsense more often. I run on commonsense, not fear, blind emotions, and religion.

NOTE: To those who are asking pathetic questions like "where are you from" and "you need to go back to your country", I have a question for you:

Since when was thinking critically a crime worthy of deportation in the United States of America?
