

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2003 05:57:32 GMT

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

---

When will America drop its next WMD?

What do you think will cause such an event to take place?

People dying is always bad but sometimes big ass bombs do lots of talking.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2003 07:12:01 GMT

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

---

depends on your definition of WMD. Do you mean a nuke? I don't see us dropping a nuke anywhere, unless the shit really hits the fan. NOBODY wants to use nukes, which is why its so silly for countries including us to have hundreds of them. Hell it only takes a handful of them to wipe out an entire continent.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2003 09:25:40 GMT

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

---

Countries shouldn't have nuclear weapons. They claim the the threat of MAD is the reason. But what would happen if so revolutionary party took power and didn't care about MAD in acheiving it's goals. Imagine the situation they would cause. You say that wouldn't happen in your country but it can. They can ride to power on some campain promises and if they slip in with majority and have their party all vote for a certain bill.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2003 12:28:58 GMT

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

---

Commando no. 448Countries shouldn't have nuclear weapons. They claim the the threat of MAD is the reason. But what would happen if so revolutionary party took power and didn't care about MAD in acheiving it's goals. Imagine the situation they would cause. You say that wouldn't happen in your country but it can. They can ride to power on some campain promises and if they slip in with majority and have their party all vote for a certain bill.

MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction) does keep all of the nuclear powers (like America, Russia, etc.) from blowing each other up. Both sides know that if they launch missiles our way, we'll launch ours at them. What keeps the smaller countries from attacking with nukes? The assurance that they will be completely wiped out by the powers if they do, and that most of them don't have weapons that could reach us.

"You say that wouldn't happen in your country but it can." Well, actually it can't happen in my country, because the President cannot declare war, that's Congress.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2003 13:53:35 GMT

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

---

"You say that wouldn't happen in your country but it can." Well, actually it can't happen in my country, because the President cannot declare war, that's Congress.[/quote]

Plus the President does not have complete control of the country. If the president isnt doing a good job we can get rid of him. The military won't listen to him and neither will congress or anyone else if he is bad. There is no way that can happen here.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2003 19:48:27 GMT

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

---

I said if a party took majority. What if the party's congress members stood united in their stance and declared the use of them. The controllers are trained to obey the order to launch if the order seems authentic. They don't have much say in the matter. Even if but 2 controllers in one facility deem the order valid and decide to go through with it then MAD is almost assured. Only 1 missile would have the world freaking out. Then when retaliatory strikes begin then the other controllers are pretty much forced to follow a MAD order.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 25 Apr 2003 21:10:16 GMT

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

---

Commando no. 448I said if a party took majority. What if the party's congress members stood united in their stance and declared the use of them. The controllers are trained to obey the order to launch if the order seems authentic. They don't have much say in the matter. Even if but 2 controllers in one facility deem the order valid and decide to go through with it then MAD is almost assured. Only 1 missile would have the world freaking out. Then when retaliatory strikes begin then the other controllers are pretty much forced to follow a MAD order.

Well someone who would do that wouldnt have been elected in the first place.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Sat, 26 Apr 2003 02:35:35 GMT

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

---

Commando no. 4481 said if a party took majority. What if the party's congress members stood united in their stance and declared the use of them. The controllers are trained to obey the order to launch if the order seems authentic. They don't have much say in the matter. Even if but 2 controllers in one facility deem the order valid and decide to go through with it then MAD is almost assured. Only 1 missile would have the world freaking out. Then when retaliatory strikes begin then the other controllers are pretty much forced to follow a MAD order.

Looks like someone has no clue what the hell they're talking about.

There are several people in completely different locations that have to authorize it before the two inside of the control room can launch the ICBM from a silo (which both have individual keys that have to be turned on opposite sides of the room)

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [-Tech-](#) on Thu, 01 May 2003 05:44:53 GMT

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

---

Actually, all it would involve is interrupting the periodic burst-transmissions that are sent to the Ohio-class Trident subs when they come close enough to the surface. If they don't receive that critical transmission, they dive, try one more time, then fire off half of the U.S. nuclear arsenal at whatever target they want.

Feel safe? :twisted:

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Thu, 01 May 2003 12:59:32 GMT

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

---

-Tech-Actually, all it would involve is interrupting the periodic burst-transmissions that are sent to the Ohio-class Trident subs when they come close enough to the surface. If they don't receive that critical transmission, they dive, try one more time, then fire off half of the U.S. nuclear arsenal at whatever target they want.

Feel safe? :twisted:

1. They wouldn't risk the end of the world like that, they wouldn't just launch their weapons if they didn't receive a radio signal every so often.
2. One sub doesn't carry "half of the U.S. nuclear arsenal". They carry about 20 or so nuclear missiles in their vertical tubes, and probably some more in storage or as torpedo launched cruise missiles.

(Even if you're talking about all of the U.S's subs collectively (somewhere around 10-15 or so), there isn't enough nuclear weapons there to come close to equaling half of the U.S's arsenal.)

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Thu, 01 May 2003 13:59:29 GMT

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

---

yeah...there was a report a while ago explaining how many nuclear weapons there are in the US. What was it...like enough to destroy the world 20 times over?

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Fri, 02 May 2003 16:33:48 GMT

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

---

Anything over once is excessive.....

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [anort893](#) on Sat, 03 May 2003 21:34:51 GMT

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

---

Well,

In development are new "battlefeild" nukes, small and concentrated enough to destroy a underground bunker without affecting the surface. You are right, larger weapons are not of much use now, and the ability to destroy the world 7 times over is not nessesary anymore.

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Mon, 05 May 2003 12:53:15 GMT

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

---

anort893Well,

In development are new "battlefeild" nukes, small and concentrated enough to destroy a underground bunker without affecting the surface. You are right, larger weapons are not of much use now, and the ability to destroy the world 7 times over is not nessesary anymore.

It never was.

And battlefield nukes already exist.

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Mon, 05 May 2003 15:56:06 GMT

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

---

KIRBY098anort893Well,

In development are new "battlefeild" nukes, small and concentrated enough to destroy a underground bunker without affecting the surface. You are right, larger weapons are not of much use now, and the ability to destroy the world 7 times over is not nessesary anymore.

It never was.

And battlefield nukes already exist.  
The proper name for them are "Tactical Nukes".

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD  
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Mon, 05 May 2003 16:34:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<http://www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb0206.htm>

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD  
Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Mon, 05 May 2003 21:29:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

anort893Well,

In development are new "battlefeild" nukes, small and concentrated enough to destroy a underground bunker without affecting the surface. You are right, larger weapons are not of much use now, and the ability to destroy the world 7 times over is not nessesary anymore.

You're about 20-30 years late. Small nuclear weapons have been around for quite some time.

And what do you mean 'anymore'? The ability to destroy the world any times over was never necessary.

And nuclear weapons of any size would effect the surface if detonated underground, the EMP sent out by the blast would damage electronics, and the radioactive crap would eventually make it's way to the surface.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD  
Posted by [Wild1](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 00:01:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The last time we used a WMD was to end probably the gretest war we will ever see. That was used against the Epire of Japan. I dobt we will ever see WWIII in our lifetime. Even then WMD's would be our last resort as was with WWII.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [anort893](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 00:36:51 GMT

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

---

The ability to destroy the world several times over was a necessity, because of the fear that about 90% of our nukes would get destroyed by the other side before they could get launched. The idea was that we could still launch a counterattack if most of our nukes got wiped out by a Soviet first strike.

Yes, battlefield nukes are not new, but 5- kiloton ones that can take out a bunker and leave most of the surface intact are. Current "battlefield" nukes are 20 kilotons, the size of the Hiroshima bomb, and in reality too large for tactical use. [/i]

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 06:33:57 GMT

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

---

Wild1The last time we used a WMD was to end probably the greatest war we will ever see. That was used against the Empire of Japan. I doubt we will ever see WWII in our lifetime. Even then WMD's would be our last resort as was with WWII.

bombing Hiroshima was not a "last resort" which is why it remains a controversial subject to this day. Japan was already near surrendering, not to mention the Red Army was gonna land in Japan a few days later and the US would have been a few months later.

I personally think we shouldn't have attacked Hiroshima which had a large civilian population...but it doesn't matter. The fact that we dropped the bomb was basically to show Russia that the US was a force to be reckoned with...and in doing so we probably saved thousands more lives by averting a war between the US and Russia...but despite all these things...it still wasn't a last resort...

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 12:44:26 GMT

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

---

Duke of NukesWild1The last time we used a WMD was to end probably the greatest war we will ever see. That was used against the Empire of Japan. I doubt we will ever see WWII in our lifetime. Even then WMD's would be our last resort as was with WWII.

bombing Hiroshima was not a "last resort" which is why it remains a controversial subject to this day. Japan was already near surrendering, not to mention the Red Army was gonna land in Japan a few days later and the US would have been a few months later.

I personally think we shouldn't have attacked Hiroshima which had a large civilian population...but it doesn't matter. The fact that we dropped the bomb was basically to show Russia that the US was a force to be reckoned with...and in doing so we probably saved thousands more lives by averting a war between the US and Russia...but despite all these things...it still wasn't a last resort...

---

There was two choices to end the war with Japan... Using a huge invasion force to invade Japan, or drop the bomb.

Invading Japan would have killed more then just dropping the bomb. If the Japanese fought so hard and viciously for Midway and Okanowa(sp?), what would they fight like to defend their home?

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 13:30:29 GMT

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

---

I'm not saying we shouldn't have dropped the bomb...I'm saying it wasn't a last resort. A last resort is when you have NO other choices...and since we could have invaded and maybe even lost less lives there, it's (it's pointless argueing what could have happened because neither of us knows how quickly Japan would have surrendered and how many civilians would have died)

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 13:56:25 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukes! I'm not saying we shouldn't have dropped the bomb...I'm saying it wasn't a last resort.

I'll agree with that because it wasn't meant as a last resort. It wasn't a matter of bomb or invasion. The invasion was coming anyway, the bombs were dropped as part of the war, it really wasn't expected to end it, so it couldn't be a last resort. The bombs did help end the war, which was a little unexpected. Japan didn't even realize what had happened to Hiroshima at first and the military said they would continue fighting anyway.

It was a cross between the bombs and the imminent invasion from the Soviet Union that made Japan surrender.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Tue, 06 May 2003 19:49:09 GMT

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

---

And there is still the point that you (US) could have used the bombs on military targets rather than civilian massed ones. Why not bomb one of their heavily fortified island bases? I am sure it still would have scared the crap out of them. We argued the same points about the bombing of Japan before in a topic titled eggmac the pacifist (which might I say was in all a disgusting witch hunt).

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [anort893](#) on Wed, 07 May 2003 00:35:10 GMT

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

---

Hirosima was as military target. It was one huge factory town dedicated to making war material. Same for Nagasaki. These were not innocent little residential targets, they were part of the Japanese war machine.

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Afromn96](#) on Wed, 07 May 2003 02:31:09 GMT

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

---

they had 2 drop that bomb if they would have made a ground invasion there would have benn just as much death but for americans instead of the japenese so they had 2 make that choice, it was either them or us. and we did expect that 2 win the war becuase we scared the crap out of them by saying we had another bomb ready 2 go but we didnt, so they surrendured

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Wed, 07 May 2003 02:48:05 GMT

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

---

Afromn96and we did expect that 2 win the war becuase we scared the crap out of them by saying we had another bomb ready 2 go but we didnt, so they surrendured

Excuse me, but we dropped TWO atomic bombs on Japan. One over Hiroshima ("Little Boy" Which was 12.5 kt), and the one over Nagasaki ("Fat Man" Which was 21kt).

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Wed, 07 May 2003 05:39:07 GMT

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

---

Duke of NukesWild1The last time we used a WMD was to end probably the gretest war we will ever see. That was used against the Epire of Japan. I dobt we will ever see WWIII in our lifetime. Even then WMD's would be our last resort as was with WWII. bombing Hiroshima was not a "last resort" which is why it remains a contraversial subject to this day. Japan was already near surrendering, not to mention the Red Army was gonna land in Japan a few days later and the US would have been a few months later.

they were so close to giving up we had to drop two of them..

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 15:21:21 GMT

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

---

anort893Hiroshima was as military target. It was one huge factory town dedicated to making war material. Same for Nagasaki. These were not innocent little residential targets, they were part of the Japanese war machine.

oh...ok...so how many civilians died because of one factory? Hiroshima was a huge city and I find it hard to justify slaughtering thousands of innocents because of one companies mistakes...if that were the case...how would you feel when your local Ford plant was nuked because they gave materials to Nazi Germany to build tanks during WWII?

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 15:23:43 GMT

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

---

[sgthe0ne]they were so close to giving up we had to drop two of them..

I believe I read somewhere actually that they surrendered after the first...but word took too long to get to America that the second bomb was dropped by then...we needed a longer buffer period...we just got impatient

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 15:29:29 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukes[sgthe0ne]they were so close to giving up we had to drop two of them..

I believe I read somewhere actually that they surrendered after the first...but word took too long to get to America that the second bomb was dropped by then...we needed a longer buffer period...we just got impatient

I sincerely doubt that, considering we were monitoring thier communications, and had cracked thier coding before the war ever began.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 15:37:47 GMT

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

---

perhaps not...I'm not really sure about that but it seems like I did read it somewhere. Anyways...I just think we should have attacked larger military targets at the least

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 15:53:13 GMT

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

---

I suspect that they were targeted mainly due to the fact that they were producing the parts to make the kamikaze planes, which at the time, were the only real threat to the largest armada ever assembled.

Kamikaze attacks were doing far more damage than the Japanese Navy ever could have incurred, and given the distance to get replacements in, and the impending invasion which would need them, I reason that the targets picked were plane factories, and the technicians used to build them.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD  
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 17:00:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Duke of Nukes I believe I read somewhere actually that they surrendered after the first...but word took too long to get to America that the second bomb was dropped by then...we needed a longer buffer period...we just got impatient

They didn't even want to surrender after the second, but the emperor decided enough was enough and called for surrender. Part of the military tried to overthrow the emperor to prevent the surrender, but the emperor was able to thwart the coup long enough to address the nation and tell the people to surrender.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD  
Posted by [anort893](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 22:49:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It wasn't that there was a factory in the town, it was that the town itself was a war factory, with the overwhelming majority of civilians producing vital Japanese war materials.

Also, the inhabitants of the city really weren't civilians, because they were armed by the Japanese government, and prepared to fight to repel an invasion.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD  
Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Fri, 09 May 2003 01:34:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Duke of Nukes anort893 Hiroshima was as military target. It was one huge factory town dedicated to making war material. Same for Nagasaki. These were not innocent little residential targets, they were part of the Japanese war machine.

oh...ok...so how many civilians died because of one factory? Hiroshima was a huge city and I find it hard to justify slaughtering thousands of innocents because of one company's mistakes...if that were the case...how would you feel when your local Ford plant was nuked because they gave

materials to Nazi Germany to build tanks during WWII?

I don't know if this was emphasized enough in the past replies to this thread, but HIROSHIMA WAS MAINLY A DAMN INDUSTRIAL TOWN DEDICATED TO MANUFACTURING WEAPONS AND SUCH FOR JAPAN'S WAR EFFORT. It wasn't just one factory you mentally challenged child.

Ford didn't manufacture tanks for Germany dumbass. And Ford wasn't an entire city who was manufacturing weapons and planes and whatever for our enemy.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Fri, 09 May 2003 06:56:27 GMT

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

---

Ford supplied parts for German tanks during WWII. A town dedicated to building weapons for Japans war efforts my ass. There were a few factories...the entire city wasn't just one big factory...that's like saying any major city is just a big paintball arena

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Fri, 09 May 2003 12:31:01 GMT

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

---

All of you really need to give supporting documents to backup your claims.

This source lends validity to some claims by both parties.

Do RESEARCH before spouting off people.....

<http://www.dannen.com/decision/index.html>

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Fri, 09 May 2003 15:20:32 GMT

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

---

<http://www-personal.umich.edu/~jimlup/hiroshima.95.html>

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Fri, 09 May 2003 15:35:50 GMT

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

---

NHJ BV<http://www-personal.umich.edu/~jimlup/hiroshima.95.html>

---

Interesting reading. Thank you.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Fri, 09 May 2003 15:36:22 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukesperhaps not...I'm not really sure about that but it seems like I did read it somewhere. Anyways...I just think we should have attacked larger military targets at the least

Japan did not surrender after the first bomb. Japan didn't even believe that one bomb could do that damage.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [anort893](#) on Sat, 10 May 2003 04:18:34 GMT

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

---

"Quote:The world will note that the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, a military base. That was because we wished in this first attack to avoid, insofar as possible, the killing of civilians. But that attack is only a warning of things to come. If Japan does not surrender, bombs will have to be dropped on her war industries and, unfortunately, thousands of civilian lives will be lost. I urge Japanese civilians to leave industrial cities immediately, and save themselves from destruction."

Source: Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Harry S. Truman, Containing the Public Messages, Speeches and Statements of the President April 12 to December 31, 1945 (Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1961) page 212. The full text also was published in the New York Times, August 10, 1945, page 12.

just thought that you all might want to hear the words from the mouth of Truman himself. Truman clearly states Hiroshima as a military base, and I agree with this assesment, as Hiroshima was one of the few remaining armorys for what was left of the Japanese war machine.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Sat, 10 May 2003 09:15:42 GMT

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

---

Man like 70% of Americans would truly agree with Bush if he said let's invade russia one of the last nuclear powers that can oppose us. Of course he would have to use his nice little propeganda.

You see you Americans need to start disagreeing with your president more. Because beleive it or not your president can act like an idiot.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD  
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sat, 10 May 2003 17:07:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Commando no. 448 You see you Americans need to start disagreeing with your president more. Because believe it or not your president can act like an idiot.

I'll disagree with Bush if I see reason to, but if he agrees with my point of view why should I? While I'm sure there's some lemmings out there that do whatever the president says (whoever the president is at the time), I'm not one of them. I've believed we needed to overthrow Saddam ever since I started thinking about stuff like that. That was 5 or 6 years ago. Bush did what I wanted him to do, I didn't just sit back and nod my head because he said so.

I really annoys me when I debate the war in Iraq and someone says I'm just blindly following the president. If anything, he's blindly following what I want him to do.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD  
Posted by [anort893](#) on Sat, 10 May 2003 18:39:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm with NeoSaber on this one. I am not blindly following the will of any President, but simply looking at their views and statements and deciding if I agree with them. I agree with Truman about the dropping of the bomb, and I agree with Bush about the invasion of Iraq. I do not blindly follow Bush, because I disagree with him on some other points, like his refusal to do anything about the flood of illegal immigrants flooding into the country and my home state of California.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD  
Posted by [Afromn96](#) on Sun, 11 May 2003 17:47:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I live in CALI 2 and i also agree with u, what part do u live in

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD  
Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Sun, 11 May 2003 19:20:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I meant the country as a whole. There are many that aren't like what you claim to be.

And I how can you disagree with something he hasn't done? You want him to stop the flood of immigrants as he hasn't. That isn't quite disagreeing.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

---

Posted by [anort893](#) on Sun, 11 May 2003 20:43:06 GMT

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

---

I disagree with Bush on his decision to not take action, as well as his decision to push an illegal immigrant "amnesty" program that would allow all illegals to apply for and get legal residence. It disturbs me that neither side of the aisle seems to care about this.

And afroman, i actually live in the Bay Area, close to SF but thankfully not in that city.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Tue, 13 May 2003 12:51:12 GMT

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

---

anort893I disagree with Bush on his decision to not take action, as well as his decision to push an illegal immigrant "amnesty" program that would allow all illegals to apply for and get legal residence. It disturbs me that neither side of the aisle seems to care about this.

And afroman, i actually live in the Bay Area, close to SF but thankfully not in that city.

What's the problem, really? You don't think other people not fortunate enough to have been born in America should be able to find a better life?

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [anort893](#) on Tue, 13 May 2003 22:54:04 GMT

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

---

No, i think that amnesty encourages immigrants to skip the part where they apply for legal residence, get tested for disease, etc before they are allowed in the country.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Wed, 14 May 2003 13:46:08 GMT

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

---

anort893I agree with Truman about the dropping of the bomb

stop bringing up WWII before everyone stops paying attention to you. Only someone with an IQ of 60 would say WWII is the same as the war in Iraq. They cannot be compared so dont act like they're the same thing.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Wed, 14 May 2003 14:26:39 GMT

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

---

Duke of NukesOnly someone with an IQ of 60 would say WWII is the same as the war in Iraq. They cannot be compared so dont act like they're the same thing.

They can be compared. There are plenty of parallels between Hitler and Saddam. I've found it strange how if you take what Hitler wanted to do, and change the word 'German' to 'Arab', you basically get what Saddam wanted to do. The main difference between the two of them is we were able to stop Saddam before he got very far in his mission to conquer his region of the world.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Wed, 14 May 2003 15:08:37 GMT

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

---

well then Bush can easily be compared to Hitler as well

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Wed, 14 May 2003 15:47:46 GMT

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

---

:rolleyes:

:rolleyes:

:rolleyes:

Now that is a stretch even for you.

Was Hitler ever held accountable to the people he governed?

I didn't think so.

Was Hitler elected? No.

Was Saadaam elected in a democratic way? No. He coerced through threats, and ballot stuffing to give him 100% of the vote. Do you know any other democratic country where any official gets 100% of the vote unopposed?

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Wed, 14 May 2003 16:11:07 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukeswell then Bush can easily be compared to Hitler as well

Well, I could compare you to Hitler too. It would make just as little sense as comparing Bush to Hitler. Saddam and Hitler have a lot in common. Their reasons for attacking other nations and committing genocide are nearly identical.

KIRBY098Was Hitler elected? No.

Actually he was. Hitler spent years campaigning, mostly trying to get the Nazis to be elected the majority party in Germany. Once they were, he got the government, now mostly under Nazi control, to elect him chancellor. He then immediately began to dismantle the democratic government of Germany, giving himself all the power.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Wed, 14 May 2003 16:35:10 GMT

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

---

You are, of course, correct.

What I should have specified was the fact that during the atrocities they committed, both had removed the democratic processes that elected them both.

In fact Hitler's brown shirt party was defeated in the initial run for election.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Wed, 14 May 2003 17:23:20 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukeswell then Bush can easily be compared to Hitler as well

This post shows that you have a third world education. You make a comment, yet you don't back it up. Give your comments some backbone. How in the world can you compare Bush to Hittler? I would really like to know where you came up with that one.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [anort893](#) on Wed, 14 May 2003 22:46:42 GMT

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

---

The reason that i talk about WW2 is that this post is about the WMD's owned by the U.S., and WW2 is the only war that saw a nuke used. It's not that far a stretch of the imagination.

By the way, Saddam's real inspiration for his police state came from Hitler and Stalin themselves. Diddn't know if you were aware of that.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Fri, 16 May 2003 13:39:08 GMT

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

---

K9TrooperDuke of Nukeswell then Bush can easily be compared to Hitler as well

This post shows that you have a third world education. You make a comment, yet you don't back it up. Give your comments some backbone. How in the world can you compare Bush to Hittler? I would really like to know where you came up with that one.

:rolleyes: I didn't need to explain because a smart person could figure it out for them selves, obviously NeoSaber got it

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Sat, 17 May 2003 12:29:10 GMT

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

---

Duke of NukesK9TrooperDuke of Nukeswell then Bush can easily be compared to Hitler as well

This post shows that you have a third world education. You make a comment, yet you don't back it up. Give your comments some backbone. How in the world can you compare Bush to Hittler? I would really like to know where you came up with that one.

:rolleyes: I didn't need to explain because a smart person could figure it out for them selves, obviously NeoSaber got it

Obviously you can't read...

NeoSaberWell, I could compare you to Hitler too. It would make just as little sense as comparing Bush to Hitler. Saddam and Hitler have a lot in common. Their reasons for attacking other nations and committing genocide are nearly identical.

You said in comparing Bush to Hitler, they're similar ("well then Bush can easily be compared to Hitler as well"), NeoSaber said that it doesn't make sense, and that they have nothing in common and they cannot be compared, no more then he can compare you with Saddam.

Both K9Trooper and NeoSaber said that it doesn't make sense.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Sat, 17 May 2003 21:45:18 GMT

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

---

Bush wants to govern the entire world, just like Hitler did. There's my fucking evidence

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [anort893](#) on Sun, 18 May 2003 00:25:35 GMT

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

---

Quote: Bush wants to govern the entire world, just like Hitler did. There's my fucking evidence

And what is your evidence of this? Did Bush call you up and tell you? Are you telepathic? Is there some kind of Bush "Mein Kampf" floating around that I do not know about? Please tell me.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [bigwig992](#) on Sun, 18 May 2003 06:28:06 GMT

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

---

Duke of NukesBush wants to govern the entire world, just like Hitler did. There's my fucking evidence

Haha. That's funny. It was interesting reading all your other post actually having decent opinions. But aww man, you ruined it there. One last ditch effort to hold strong in your "opinion" was shit. Hah. "bush wants to govern the world". Yeah, yeah he does, me and him talked about it over the phone back in January. Comeon, Bush isn't all evil. The way I see it now you can do either 1 of 3 things:

- 1) Move to America and maybe, just maybe you'll start to understand our evil ways.
  - 2) Go preach about America's wrong doing to your neighbors, start up a "revolt", and come over and attack us.
  - 3) Shut up.
- 

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Sun, 18 May 2003 15:16:14 GMT

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

---

Duke of NukesBush wants to govern the entire world, just like Hitler did. There's my fucking evidence

We could start an entire "Stupid Comments That Retards Make" site off of you. Human's have a right to be stupid once in a while, but you just abuse the privilege every chance you get.

Your ignorance and stupidity isn't evidence.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Afromn96](#) on Sun, 18 May 2003 19:20:30 GMT

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

---

Sir PhoenixxDuke of NukesBush wants to govern the entire world, just like Hitler did. There's my fucking evidence

We could start an entire "Stupid Comments That Retards Make" site off of you. Human's have a right to be stupid once in a while, but you just abuse the privilege every chance you get.

Your ignorance and stupidity isn't evidence.

---

True, True.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Mon, 19 May 2003 04:32:06 GMT

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

---

yeah, he just goes around, telling France, Germany, basically all his allies AND all his enemies what to do. You're right though, he's not trying to control any other country...he's only taken over 2 countries in the past 2 years...god...what was I thinking

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Mon, 19 May 2003 08:34:56 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukesyeah, he just goes around, telling France, Germany, basically all his allies AND all his enemies what to do. You're right though, he's not trying to control any other country...he's only taken over 2 countries in the past 2 years...god...what was I thinking  
you weren't thinking, that's the problem.

he doesn't tell any of his allies what to do. he asks them to do what he wants and sometimes tries to buy their vote. this is what all countries do. sometimes it works, sometimes not.

the 2 countries he "took over" were at war with us. taliban as rulers of afghanistan was only recognized by 1 country in the entire world. they supported and protected al queda. therefore, when al queda attacked, afghanistan was responsible.

iraq has been at war with us since they broke the ceasefire agreement(about 11 1/2 years ago)  
we finally had a president who wasn't gonna take saddam's crap anymore.

bush is using diplomacy where we can and force when necessary... a nice balance that i wish all presidents would use.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Mon, 19 May 2003 11:57:15 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukesyeah, he just goes around, telling France, Germany, basically all his allies AND all his enemies what to do. You're right though, he's not trying to control any other country...he's only taken over 2 countries in the past 2 years...god...what was I thinking

This might come as a surprise to you--since you have a sub 6th grade English/Reading level--but there is a difference between TELLING and REQUESTING. He can request and or persuade that the allies help us, he can request and or persuade our enemies to comply, but he can't really TELL our allies or enemies what to do.

Since when has taking out the government in two countries trying to take over the world? I can see how he's trying to "govern the world" by taking out the dangerous governments of 2 countries.

---

:rolleyes:

Oh, to answer your last question... What you are usually thinking, NOTHING AT ALL.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Tue, 20 May 2003 01:21:29 GMT

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

---

every single one of these threads you proceed to do nothing but pile insults on me. I did not honor either of your posts by reading them. if you want people to listen to you, dont make fun of them every chance you get.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [anort893](#) on Tue, 20 May 2003 01:28:57 GMT

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

---

Quote:every single one of these threads you proceed to do nothing but pile insults on me. I did not honor either of your posts by reading them. if you want people to listen to you, dont make fun of them every chance you get.

well if you want us to be nice, i reccomemd you be a little less caustic in your posts, and think about your posts for a few minutes before putting them up. The more calm and thoughtful your posts, the less insults get flung your way.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Afromn96](#) on Tue, 20 May 2003 22:51:19 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukes every single one of these threads you proceed to do nothing but pile insults on me. I did not honor either of your posts by reading them. if you want people to listen to you, dont make fun of them every chance you get.

u are the one calling our president Hitler.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Wed, 21 May 2003 02:26:07 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukes every single one of these threads you proceed to do nothing but pile insults on me. I did not honor either of your posts by reading them. if you want people to listen to you, dont make fun of them every chance you get.

---

Hmmm, maybe if you wouldn't act so damn stupid and at least try to back up your lame posts with even the slightest bit of fact, we wouldn't need to make fun of your obviously low intelligence.

I don't make fun of people every chance I get, only those special little children (Like you.) that throw insults this way FIRST and have nothing to back them up.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Wed, 21 May 2003 06:26:31 GMT

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

---

And everyone against the war...everyone that cares about humanity and hasn't had their soul burned out of them.

Afromn96Duke of Nukes every single one of these threads you proceed to do nothing but pile insults on me. I did not honor either of your posts by reading them. if you want people to listen to you, dont make fun of them every chance you get.

u are the one calling our president Hitler.

I never once called the president Hitler...I was making a comment about the idiocy of how people today compare absolutely everything to Nazi Germany. You used to constantly hear about the forum Nazis and the chat Nazis. Might as well call God a Nazi because he's not gonna save all religions...maybe he'll only allow Catholics in. He's against the Jews...or maybe he's against everyone else...so he must be a Nazi...right?

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Wed, 21 May 2003 11:20:10 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukes And everyone against the war...everyone that cares about humanity and hasn't had their soul burned out of them.

Not even close my mentally retarded little child. If said person has made stupid comments(Example: You), threw insults over here first (Example: You), can't back up their stupid comments (Example: You) than yes I would make fun of said person. But not everyone who is against the war is as stupid as you, so no, I don't make fun of everyone who is against the war. Your complete ignorance is quite humorous.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Thu, 22 May 2003 03:52:22 GMT

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

---

as is yours...considering your side of the arguement threw the first flame. I've backed up my arguements just as well as you have...you're just ignorant and arrogant enough to not pay any attention and assume I was shot down when you dont actually pay any attention to the other side of the arguement.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Thu, 22 May 2003 11:28:59 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukesas is yours...considering your side of the arguement threw the first flame. I've backed up my arguements just as well as you have...you're just ignorant and arrogant enough to not pay any attention and assume I was shot down when you dont actually pay any attention to the other side of the arguement.

Our side? Wait, who's the one who ignorantly said that our president is nothing more than Hitler? Without ANY form of evidence, fact, or anything else at all to back it up.

You haven't backed up your arguments at all, saying that our president is nothing more than Hitler because he's removed two dangerous governments and demands things from allies/enemies (which he can't, and doesn't, he can only recommend, request, persuade, etc.) isn't backing it up, all you are doing is providing stupid reasons that are completely irrevlavent to Bush being "Hitler".

Who are you trying to say is ignorant and arrogant? You are so ignorant that you don't even bother to actually look something up, to find the real facts, or to actually read the other side's post to make sure you aren't misunderstanding it. Arrogant? You think you are so high that you are completely correct, you're never wrong, but when proven wrong, and when everyone else knows you are wrong, you can't even admit that you are wrong about any part of a discussion even though you've been proven wrong.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Thu, 22 May 2003 17:52:44 GMT

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

---

bla bla bla. I explained my reasoning for saying he could be compared to Hitler dispite the fact that I shouldn't have had to to begin with. You can compare anyone to Hitler if you try hard enough...as the people of these boards have proven continously

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 22 May 2003 18:51:58 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukesbla bla bla. I explained my reasoning for saying he could be compared to Hitler dispite the fact that I shouldn't have had to to begin with. You can compare anyone to Hitler if you try hard enough...as the people of these boards have proven continously

Which was our point exactly, dumbass. If you try hard enough, you can compare someone to anyone. It doesn't mean the comparison is valid. Yours was not, and that's why no one agrees with you.

There is something more dense than a black hole, after all..... :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Thu, 22 May 2003 19:15:10 GMT

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

---

and my point is comparing Saddam to Hitler isn't valid either. Did Saddam set up detention camps where he killed thousands of people simply because he didn't like what religion they followed? Did he try a global conquest of Earth? Did he ever take over any country besides Kuwait?

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 22 May 2003 19:16:28 GMT

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

---

KIRBY098There is something more dense than a black hole, after all..... :rolleyes:

Kirby, you can't really mean that. A black hole retains what it takes in. Logic is repelled off of Duke. They are opposites.

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 22 May 2003 19:21:07 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukesand my point is comparing Saddam to Hitler isn't valid either. Did Saddam set up detention camps where he killed thousands of people simply because he didn't like what religion they followed? Did he try a global conquest of Earth? Did he ever take over any country besides Kuwait?

Ummmm, have you heard of the eight year Iran/ IRAQ war?

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 22 May 2003 19:22:59 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukes Did Saddam set up detention camps where he killed thousands of people simply because he didn't like what religion they followed?

<http://hrw.org/editorials/2003/iraq051603.htm>

Yes dumbass, he did.

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Thu, 22 May 2003 19:26:30 GMT

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

---

I could prove every single one of your posts wrong...but what would be the point? You'd just turn around and call me a name and discredit my source. Maybe I shall when you mature a little bit.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 22 May 2003 19:30:22 GMT

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

---

If you are so "adult" then it should be nothing to overcome my "childish" dicredidation of you pathetic sources.

Prove away, kid. :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Thu, 22 May 2003 19:58:58 GMT

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

---

Duke of Nukesand my point is comparing Saddam to Hitler isn't valid either. Did Saddam set up detention camps where he killed thousands of people simply because he didn't like what religion they followed? Did he try a global conquest of Earth? Did he ever take over any country besides Kuwait?

1. Hitler didn't kill thousands of people, he killed MILLIONS of people.
2. No, he skipped the middle man and killed them without putting them in concentration camps.
3. Yes he did murder ALOT of people because they were different, ever heard of the Kurds?
4. Niether tried a "global conquest of Earth". He tried to take over Europe, which--this may come as a surpise to you--isn't "global".

Let's recap. Both Hitler and Saddam were dangerous "dictators". Both Hitler and Saddam killed ALOT of people because they were different than them. Both tried to take out the countries surrounding it. The only difference? Saddam had enemies that were MUCH MORE powerful and technologically advanced to easily stop him before he could get more than Kuwait. (And Hitler had that stupid salute and mustache)

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [bigwig992](#) on Fri, 23 May 2003 03:00:28 GMT

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

---

Sir PhoenixxDuke of Nukesand my point is comparing Saddam to Hitler isn't valid either. Did Saddam set up detention camps where he killed thousands of people simply because he didn't like what religion they followed? Did he try a global conquest of Earth? Did he ever take over any country besides Kuwait?

1. Hitler didn't kill thousands of people, he killed MILLIONS of people.
2. No, he skipped the middle man and killed them without putting them in concentration camps.
3. Yes he did murder ALOT of people because they were different, ever heard of the Kurds?
4. Niether tried a "global conquest of Earth". He tried to take over Europe, which--this may come as a surprise to you--isn't "global".

Let's recap. Both Hitler and Saddam were dangerous "dictators". Both Hitler and Saddam killed ALOT of people because they were different than them. Both tried to take out the countries surrounding it. The only difference? Saddam had enemies that were MUCH MORE powerful and technologically advanced to easily stop him before he could get more than Kuwait. (And Hitler had that stupid salute and mustache)

Bravo.

---

---

Subject: Nukes

Posted by [thatguy](#) on Thu, 29 May 2003 13:12:33 GMT

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

---

North Korea is a country we should worry about, they are close to getting Nukes, and recently ran a test on one of the missile platforms, sending a dummy missile into the ocean near Japan, the are absolutely out of there gord over there and i believe if they feel threatened enough, they would use nuclear Missiles, we have to tread lightly over there, but by the same token keep a military presence in South Korea so they know we mean business.

TG

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Wed, 18 Jun 2003 23:01:30 GMT

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

---

Hitler didn't killed anyone , his army/secret police did, same as for Saddam.

Just my two cents .

\*you can always call them murderers for ordering their army and bla bla bla to kill people\*

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [thatguy](#) on Thu, 19 Jun 2003 00:07:16 GMT

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

---

those people were killing in the name of Hitler, he had all the power and killed those who opposed him, make no mistake hitler is the one who ordered all the killing, not the other way around.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Fri, 20 Jun 2003 14:57:16 GMT

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

---

AprimeHitler didn't killed anyone , his army/secret police did, same as for Saddam.

Just my two cents .

\*you can always call them murderers for ordering their army and bla bla bla to kill people\*

When you pay someone to murder another, you the conspirator can be charged for the murder.

With their money and orders to execute, Hitler and Saddam did murder millions of people.

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Epeyon](#) on Fri, 20 Jun 2003 21:14:39 GMT

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

---

Quote:Aprime wrote:

Hitler didn't killed anyone , his army/secret police did, same as for Saddam.

Just my two cents .

\*you can always call them murderers for ordering their army and bla bla bla to kill people\*

When you pay someone to murder another, you the conspirator can be charged for the murder.

With their money and orders to execute, Hitler and Saddam did murder millions of people.\

Hitler did kill someone himself and his wife. :rolleyes:

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Mon, 23 Jun 2003 19:25:02 GMT

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

---

Meh, nobody has a prove of it, they haven't found his body, he's maybe still alive you know.

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Mon, 23 Jun 2003 19:44:13 GMT

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

---

AprimeMeh, nobody has a prove of it, they haven't found his body, he's maybe still alive you know.

That would be nearly impossible. He was 56 when he committed suicide (or supposedly), in 1945, it is 2003, if he was alive today he would have to be over a hundred years old, nearing his 115th birthday.

---

---

Subject: AMERICA'S WMD

Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Sat, 06 Dec 2003 23:37:22 GMT

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

---

Quote:

depends on your definition of WMD. Do you mean a nuke? I don't see us dropping a nuke anywhere, unless the shit really hits the fan. NOBODY wants to use nukes, which is why its so silly for countries including us to have hundreds of them. Hell it only takes a handful of them to wipe out an entire continent.

Agreed.

---