
Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 20:44:28 GMT

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

hydra: Didn't even think of the amount of space any biological or chemical agents take up- nice one.

I might take this opportunity to point out that the smallest operational nuclear warhead fits in a suitcase or backpack, and both the US and Russia have weapons of that size. Since Russia is known for selling weapons on the black market, is it not possible that everyone's favorite dictator could have acquired one? Note that this is just speculation now, not factual evidence- just something to get the 'ol mental gears turning. If you could hide those 20-someodd fighters under the desert, how easy would it be to hide a single suitcase or backpack (building on hydra's anthrax example)?

Remember to keep your minds open- I know the possibility exists that we may never find a biological or nuclear weapon in Iraq (chemical is another story, since we've already found thousands of gallons of stuff that could be used in those)...anyone else should remember that Iraq is still a big place, with plenty of sand to bury things under, and you really can't say "it isn't there" until the entire country has been thoroughly searched- and that could take years, I'm sorry to say; instant results are not guaranteed by looking through established military sites. This is not a simple matter of walking up to an Iraqi official and asking for the keys to the WMD cabinet.

HERE IS THE IMPORTANT PART:

As far as I'm concerned, if Saddam refused to allow inspection of his country by UN officials, he had to have been hiding something big- if he were dismantling it, there would be no reason to keep that information secret, since it could have only benefited him.

Whenever any weapon of mass destruction is dismantled, it **MUST** be observed, or it has not been dismantled at all. If no one can see it happen, then it cannot be confirmed. Papers do not serve as acceptable proof; any document can be forged, and any photograph can be doctored and edited(yes, I DO realize this goes both ways). An eyewitness or some other form of visual observation that is **NOT** under the control of the weapon's owner must be available to prove that the destruction was indeed carried out. Saddam never provided solid evidence, only paper.

Take the US and Russia for example- you may not be aware, but when either one dismantles a weapon, it is done in front of UN observers. Aerial reconnaissance and satellites confirm the destruction of such things as nuclear-capable bombers, ICBM silos, mobile launchers, and even ballistic missile submarines. Both nations have dismantled their Chemical and Biological warfare programs, and did that under inspection as well.
