
Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 04:37:58 GMT

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

Since we are talking a lot about military history I'd suggest this site as a valid resource for historical info...

<http://www.fas.org>

Iran-Iraq War (1980-1988)

<http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/ops/war/iran-iraq.htm>

Security Council Resolutions on Iraq (1990-2000)

<http://www.fas.org/news/un/iraq/sres/index.html>

Confrontation With Iraq

<http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/ops/iraq.htm>

It's so entertaining that people try to make it seem that its JUST the USA+Britian and one or two other countries behind us when the reality is *drum roll* we currently have 35 countries supporting/involved in our actions.

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [Ren Sizzlefab](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 05:17:18 GMT

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

How many countries are in the UN again?

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 05:25:28 GMT

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

Ren SizzlefabHow many countries are in the UN again?

Doesn't matter. Not all of the countries are against or for the war. Some are neutral.

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 05:25:37 GMT

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

Ren SizzlefabHow many countries are in the UN again?

Good question...

<http://www.un.org/Overview/unmember.html>

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [Ren Sizzlefab](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 06:07:55 GMT

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

K9TrooperRen SizzlefabHow many countries are in the UN again?

Doesn't matter. Not all of the countries are against or for the war. Some are neutral.

It doesn't matter that only 35 out of 191 countries are involved in or support the war? It doesn't matter how many of the remainder are either neutral or against it, less than 20% are in support of the war. Hardly what I'd call overwhelming support.

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 06:22:05 GMT

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

Ren SizzlefabIt doesn't matter that only 35 out of 191 countries are involved in or support the war? It doesn't matter how many of the remainder are either neutral or against it, less than 20% are in support of the war. Hardly what I'd call overwhelming support.

35 countries are directly supporting the war in one form or another. Many others don't oppose it, they just aren't stepping forward to help.

Can someone put together a list of the countries that really do oppose a war? Then we can compare the differences in how many are for and against.

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 06:47:12 GMT

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

Ren Sizzlefab

Hardly what I'd call overwhelming support.

And I believe that would make you the first person in this forum to refer to 'overwhelming support'.

One ought never to turn one's back on a threatened danger and try to run away from it. If you do that, you will double the danger. But if you meet it promptly and without flinching, you will reduce the danger by half.

Sir Winston Churchill

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 08:10:41 GMT

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

Ren SizzlefabK9TrooperRen SizzlefabHow many countries are in the UN again?

Doesn't matter. Not all of the countries are against or for the war. Some are neutral.

It doesn't matter that only 35 out of 191 countries are involved in or support the war? It doesn't matter how many of the remainder are either neutral or against it, less than 20% are in support of the war. Hardly what I'd call overwhelming support.

Read my post. 164 countries do not oppose the war.

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 08:13:36 GMT

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

Jee I wonder why the whole anti-war crowd isn't DYING to jump in a fact based thread since as we all know us pro-war types are fucking barbaric sadist imperialst lying fucks.

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 12:36:53 GMT

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

Fact:

The US has not disclosed any truly creditable evidence of Saddam's "supposed" hidden weapons of mass destruction.

Most of their disclosed evidence is phone conversations. Not solid proof for the UN. I won't detail why as the reasons are hypothetical and not fact.

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 13:06:46 GMT

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

Commando no. 448Fact:

The US has not disclosed any truly creditable evidence of Saddam's "supposed" hidden weapons of mass destruction.

Most of their disclosed evidence is phone conversations. Not solid proof for the UN. I won't detail why as the reasons are hypothetical and not fact.

I suggest consulting my thread on a trip down memory lane w/the UN & our pal Saddam.

<http://www.n00bstories.com/renforums/viewtopic.php?t=683>

The idea that Saddam may not have weapons of mass destruction is a false-hood created by some in the anti-war movement...He's had them all this time and the UN is very aware of his devious attempt to conceal the facts.

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 15:16:00 GMT

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

Fact: Saadaam cannot provide evidence he destroyed the weapons declared he had after the gulf war. Where is all the VX, anthrax, etc.....?

Anyone? The U.N. can't find it, and Saadaam can't prove he destroyed it.

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [havocsnipe](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 17:00:34 GMT

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

US claims Iraq still has weapons of mass destructions.

Iraq claims it has not got any, The UN could not find any weapons like that and still wants to search. How can iraq now prove to the US it has no weapons.

How can anyone provide prove that you have not got, what you are looking for.

Why can't the US provide the international community any SOLID EVIDENCE that iraq has weapons of mass destruction.

If US can have thousands of nukes and has used them.

Is is very hypocritical for them to say other countries can't have them.

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 17:22:43 GMT

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

havocsnipeUS claims Iraq still has weapons of mass destructions.

Iraq claims it has not got any, The UN could not find any weapons like that and still wants to search. How can iraq now prove to the US it has no weapons.

How can anyone provide prove that you have not got, what you are looking for.

Why can't the US provide the international community any SOLID EVIDENCE that iraq has weapons of mass destruction.

If US can have thousands of nukes and has used them.

Is is very hypocritical for them to say other countries can't have them.

Like I've advised others. Brush up on your UN & Iraq relations at the link below which goes to my thread quoting NOTHING BUT UN DOCUMENTS.

A trip down memory lane w/Saddam courtesy of the U.N.

<http://www.n00bstories.com/renforums/viewtopic.php?t=683>

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2003 22:47:12 GMT

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

havocsnipelf US can have thousands of nukes and has used them.
Is is very hypocritical for them to say other countries can't have them.

The United States has never used a nuclear weapon on a target. The only nuclear weapon ever detonated by the United States was as a test on Bikini Atoll, it was the largest bomb ever detonated. There were many atom bomb detonations on Bikini Atoll, and in other test locations by the United States, plus the two detonated on you-know-who to end WW2.

The United States isn't saying other countries can't have them. We are saying that certain countries can't, those with leaders with itchy trigger fingers who wouldn't care about launching them. The reason why we won't/can't fire ours is because of the mutual destruction, we know that if we fire our nukes, the others will retaliate with theirs, nuking us.

Subject: Fact based thread.

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 13:30:48 GMT

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

Fact: Unless Bush' promises, Osama Bin Laden still has not been found.
