

---

Subject: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 01:52:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Link

Thoughts?

---

---

Subject: Re: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?  
Posted by [Aurora](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 01:53:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

MINTY.

---

---

Subject: Re: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 01:59:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I also heard they use a mixture of potassium nitrate, sulfur, and carbon. How dare they?????

---

---

Subject: Re: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 02:05:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Are restaurants using a dangerous chemical to season their foods? This "seasoning" uses a mixture of sodium, a highly explosive metal, and chlorine, a green toxic gas, to create this agent they claim adds flavor to food. Should this be allowed? Your thoughts?

---

---

Subject: Re: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 02:09:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

hmm.. sounds like sarcasm.

Perhaps if chemicals are allowed to be used in food, perhaps Saddam should be allowed to use them on people as well.

---

---

Subject: Re: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 02:14:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

How about that this is simply an incendiary device to clear out an area? Sure, it has side effects, but it's war. It's not a weapon meant to kill (many) people. Instead, it's to clear out an area. The insurgents were going to die by gunfire anyways, so death is a little bit heavier of a side effect than it burning the skin.

---

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 02:19:40 GMT

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

---

If it's not such a big deal, then why the hype with the military stressing that it "has not been used as a weapon", and alligations of an unknown number of iraqi women and children dying from phosphorus burns during the hostilities?

---

---

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 02:24:36 GMT

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

---

Because the media takes things out of context like this and turns it into negative as soon and as harshly as it can? Do you wonder why we never hear anything positive about the war? Not because there is no positive, but rather because the media chooses not to discuss the good progressions of it.

---

---

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 02:33:38 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Wed, 16 November 2005 21:19If it's not such a big deal, then why the hype with the military stressing that it "has not been used as a weapon", and alligations of an unknown number of iraqi women and children dying from phosphorus burns during the hostilities?

Good question, I really want to know how a news organization can get away with writing something like this:

Quote:An unknown number of Iraqi women and children died of phosphorus burns during the hostilities, Italian documentary makers covering the battle for Fallujah have claimed.

This means just about anything someone wants it to mean. It could mean no one was even hurt, or it could mean hundreds or thousands were murdered. It doesn't even state if anyone has actual evidence this happened. Taken at face value, it says no one knows if anyone was hurt. It's a useless statement, but seems to be used to hype up a story that doesn't deserve the bytes wasted to store it. Reporters should be reporting facts, not making up new ways to say nothing.

This kind of crap drives me crazy.

---

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 04:13:22 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Wed, 16 November 2005 19:24 Because the media takes things out of context like this and turns it into negative as soon and as harshly as it can? Do you wonder why we never hear anything positive about the war? Not because there is no positive, but rather because the media chooses not to discuss the good progressions of it.

Meh. Just passing the news along. However white phosphorus has been used, and it is a chemical compound that burns skin to the bone. Used against insurgents or not, I'm sure that America would be up in arms (no pun intended) if the insurgents were to use mustard gas.

---

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

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 07:17:37 GMT

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

---

White Phosphorous works as a weapon because of simple combustion. WP+Oxygen=fire. Chunks of WP, when they strike a person, do have a nasty tendency to burn straight through the skin and any other flammable matter between it and the ground, but that's all it does- it burns. The end result is quite similar to what would happen if you used a cutting torch on, say, your arm or leg.

Yes, it's nasty stuff, but it does not affect the human body in the same way that, say, a nerve or blister agent would. Chemical weapons generally have far more specific and targeted effects on the human body- a nerve agent, such as sarin for example, attacks the central nervous system, disrupting and shutting down signals sent from the brain to various body parts (incapacitating, then killing the target person). Blister agents, such as mustard agent, adversely accept surface tissues which they are exposed to- which is why it is such a bad thing to inhale them, as they will completely wreck your lungs in very short order.

Phosphorous is a simple incendiary device. It burns. It burns, and continues to burn very hot for an extended period, while giving off a bright, intense light- which is why WP and RP have been used in signal and illumination flares for centuries (...and the rockets' red glare...). It is not a chemical weapon any more than gunpowder, C4, napalm, or TNT. Chemical weapons have specific, targeted effects on specific bodily functions and tissues; WP just burns anything that gets in its way. Phosphorous ordinance is not specifically designed to destroy human flesh; it just happens to do that pretty damn well in addition to everything else it is good for (lighting things on fire, illuminating an area, alerting a rescue chopper to the location of a downed pilot, etc).

WP is not a chemical weapon, it is conventional, and this is stupid- next thing you know, people will be bitching about bullets being chemical weapons because they might have lead in them. Just another case of somebody trying to demonize the US by attacking some weapon that your average person really doesn't have a clue about the inner workings of.

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 14:58:56 GMT

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

---

meh, it was brought up in the news, being portraied badly, by the military no less, that it was something that finally had to be admitted to. The Ambassador even comparing the use of white phosphorus to the use of napalm.

I could care less about its use, I know it's used regularly with non-lethal intent. As I said, just passing on the news. (And providing a counterpoint since no one else seems to be doing it)

---

---

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

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 17 Nov 2005 17:55:34 GMT

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

---

I don't think the point is as much that it was being used as it was REPORTED that it wasn't being used offensively, which turned out to be false.

---

---

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

Posted by [runewood](#) on Fri, 18 Nov 2005 22:12:10 GMT

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

---

The worst thing to ever happen to America is the media. They are buyest, lieing jerks. If its not Fox its News Week. You were right, the media only shows negative news on the war. This sells. Like at the Spanish American War. If you know your history you will know wtf im talkign about. The people who are most for this war are the soldiers on the ground. Why? because they see the good they do every day, the people they help. Where is the media there?

The UN doesnt consider them Chemical Weapons. So there ya go.

---

---

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 19 Nov 2005 00:21:04 GMT

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

---

Javafx wrote on Thu, 17 November 2005 12:55| I don't think the point is as much that it was being used as it was REPORTED that it wasn't being used offensively, which turned out to be false. And whose fault is that, the U.S. government's, or the media's?

This is just conjecture, but the reason the military didn't tell the public it was using white phosphorous probably is because the public isn't widely educated about the use of white phosphorous as a conventional weapon, so it would be easy for the media to spin the story, making it look like the United States is using chemical weapons. In response, Congress restricts the military from using white phosphorous, thus depriving the military from a useful conventional weapon.

Plus, the public doesn't need to know everything the military does and everything it uses to fight our enemies. Should we be afraid we aren't giving the enemy a fair fight? Of course not. This is war; the military exists to win wars and kill our enemies. The more we tie the military's hands, the harder it is for it to win our wars.

And before the Geneva Convention comes up, wasn't it created in the first place with the idea that both sides would adhere to its rules so both sides' POWs would be treated humanely? Even if the terrorists were addressed in some article of the Convention, they have already violated many provisions of it, from torturing prisoners to beheading hostages. They're not following the same rules of war that we are, so it is useless to say that we'll only make them more mad if we break a few GC rules. They won't stop beheading hostages even if we let all the detainees in Guantanamo Bay go. They're out to win this war at any cost, and they'll fight dirty if they have to. Our refusal to meet them likewise is only a weakness that will seriously hinder our ability to win.

---

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 19 Nov 2005 00:36:42 GMT

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

---

"All's fair in love and war."

---

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 19 Nov 2005 02:28:22 GMT

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

---

Hydra wrote on Fri, 18 November 2005 19:21 Javaxcx wrote on Thu, 17 November 2005 12:55 I don't think the point is as much that it was being used as it was REPORTED that it wasn't being used offensively, which turned out to be false.

And whose fault is that, the U.S. government's, or the media's?

The media's. That's why I emphasized the word "reported".

---

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

Posted by [Chronojam](#) on Mon, 21 Nov 2005 10:28:32 GMT

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

---

I hear the US military is outfitting many of its soldiers with weapons that fire a dense compound that has been shown to cause brain damage, especially in the young (clearly targetting Iraq's youth and thus impeding its future generations). I don't know why the media hasn't pounced on this the way they pounce on depleted uranium, because it's clearly the next hot topic.

I mean, come on; if you wouldn't let lead be in your gas or in your paint, would you dare let the government use it in bullets? Damn chemical warfare.

---

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

Posted by [runewood](#) on Tue, 22 Nov 2005 19:34:16 GMT

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

---

We dont use lead bullets, we use mettal bullets.

---

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

Posted by [sterps](#) on Wed, 23 Nov 2005 21:18:45 GMT

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

---

I've used white Phosphorous in chemistry lab a number of times, its fun, and i THINK it burns brightly

---

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

Posted by [Chronojam](#) on Mon, 28 Nov 2005 07:40:57 GMT

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

---

runewood wrote on Tue, 22 November 2005 14:34We dont use lead bullets, we use mettal bullets.

Do you realize what you just said?

---

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Thu, 01 Dec 2005 18:00:17 GMT

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

---

j\_ball430 wrote on Wed, 16 November 2005 21:05Are restaurants using a dangerous chemical to season their foods? This "seasoning" uses a mixture of sodium, a highly explosive metal, and chlorine, a green toxic gas, to create this agent they claim adds flavor to food. Should this be allowed? Your thoughts?

Just to take this topic up with my limited knowledge of chemistry.

First off, sodium does start to smolder and catch on fire when exposed to air. It explodes in water. Chlorine is also highly toxic, used in mustard gas.

Now, here's the problem with this sarcastic post, if you didn't know, NaCl is a compound that has reacted. The Alkali metals have one "extra" electron, giving it another shell. The Halogen, Chlorine, is "missing" an electron. However, putting these two together results in the sodium attempting to get rid of the electron, but the chlorine attempting to keep it. Now, since they can't just break apart like that, they get stuck together, and they both kind of have their way, like the noble gases, and aren't as volatile unless seperated back to being just sodium and chlorine. Now, I have little to no knowledge on this, so I'll just go along with this until someone explains this to me more.

Anyways, salt = not dangerous.

White phosphorus = dangerous.

Phosphorus is something extremely dangerous in civilian environments. You can't just say "BLAME CARBOMBS" or "I don't care it kills terrorists and the terrorists kill innocents." Firing white phosphorus into a civilian area results in civilian deaths, and since white phosphorus is a powder it can be whipped around the streets of Fallujah.

War isn't what everyone seems to think it is. From the people I've talked to, they think White Phosphorus is just like any other weapon. It isn't. Bullets and bombs explode but can be protected against. White phosphorus, however, just burns. According to a US Soldier who fought in Fallujah (Source: Fallujah: The Hidden Massacre) white phosphorus will burn through gas masks. It's not easy to protect yourself from something in a typical Iraq city, open windows, etc. Fallujah wasn't just some hostile target, it had civilians in it. I read the CBC Opinion section, and I saw people that said "Get rid of terrorist's property" and even "When the Islamic terrorists stop blowing up innocent Iraqis at markets and schools perhaps then I'll care if the terrorists get incinerated with WP."

They're missing the point: Not everyone in Fallujah is a terrorist. Civilians and terrorists both died because of the use of this weapon. Maybe you don't care, because you care about your soldiers more than Iraq's citizens. We'll never know the true story, because with embedded journalism, the military can show you the good things, but not the bad things. If anyone knows anything about the Highway of Death, where the US opened fire on a highway of escaping civilians and military personnel, then you'll know what I mean. The news showed the tanks and fighters, but not the civilian cars, the dead civilians.

There's also speculation that the Mk-77 napalm bomb was used.

If I made any mistakes with my FACTS, not my opinions, please correct me.

---

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 01 Dec 2005 18:06:32 GMT

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

---

how do you protect yourself from a bomb? By chemical weapon, I think what is implied is Toxin, seeing as how everything is made up of one compound or another.

---

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Thu, 01 Dec 2005 18:15:19 GMT

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

BOMB! OH EM GEE TAKE TEH COVER!

DEY R SHOOTIN TERRORIZTZ PLZ HIDE KTHX!



Possibly, Gbull, =\

White phosphorus, however, goes OMG BURNIGN! AHH WIND R BLOWIN ROUND TEH CORNAR! WUT TEH FUX HAX!

---

---

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 13:20:05 GMT

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

---

glyde51, what you still don't realize is that WP has a very limited effective area. If they put a grenade in the same area, it would cause more damage. WP when used in the air has enough time to cool down and not cause harm once it gets to the ground, but if it is used near the ground it will explode, and basically burn everything in a 5-10m radius, not a very big blast zone.

If it was ever used as a killing weapon, it was used inside a building where insurgents were.

---

---

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 13:42:26 GMT

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

---

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article10907.htm>

=\ Watch

---

---

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 14:03:28 GMT

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

---

People die and get disfigured in war glyde. Do we try to prevent this from happening to civilians? Yes. However you cannot be 100% all the time. Say we bombed the building instead, those people would not have been alive.

---

---

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 22:11:42 GMT

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

---

So, you'd knowingly bomb a building with civilians in Iraq? LIBERATE IRAQIS! YOU = DEAD = TEH LIBERATED!

The point is the same with napalm: They're both weapons that disfigure with fire and chemical reactions.

---

---



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

Posted by [Sniper\\_De7](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 22:27:40 GMT

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

---

In war there's always civilian casualties. If someone attacked the US on their soil you'd bet your ass there'd be lots of civies dying. no one wants civilians to die (Well; except Saddam, but that's another case) We all know war is hell.

---

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 22:30:15 GMT

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

---

But you can AVOID them, and using white phosphorus or Mk-77 isn't avoiding civilian casualties, is it? You're just saying "Oh well, what's a few more civilian deaths!"

---

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

Posted by [Sniper\\_De7](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 22:37:24 GMT

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

---

so if you had bombed an area that had 20 enemies and one civilian and they all died, this is wrong compared to 20 enemies and say 6 of your men dying? I'll have to say that most won't agree with that sentiment. I mean it's not like they're going house to house and killing them on purpose. It doesn't make it right to do these things. but considering the alternative. How many innocent civilians were killed by their own people? by explosives? Oh well that's so much different right? Let's just jump on the bandwagon hey?

---

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 22:49:04 GMT

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

---

You're pointing out the fact that now, TERRORISTS are "they're own people," or rather, the terrorists are killing "they're own people." Terrorists and civilians aren't the same, terrorists don't kill they're own people, because a terrorist's only other "person" is another terrorist. They don't live for keeping civilians safe, or we'd have gave them the country.

You're forgetting that you started the war, if there were twenty targets standing around and maybe five civilians, it's worth the risk, but since, it's one, I might wait till they're safe or if it's an important battle, fire. If it's just a patrol and there's a civilian to be saved, I'd wait.

The last few sentences you just wrote practically scream "I ADVOCATE KILLING CIVILIANS!" That's the problem, people who don't care because they're not there. If a foreign country was saying "lol wutevr" and the US was being attacked like that, you'd scream about some sort of international treaty.

---

---

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

Posted by [Sniper\\_De7](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 23:01:49 GMT

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

---

what i meant was that they were from the same country. My point was that, in war, people have to do awful things. The very fact that sometimes we do think of their civilians even if it means greater risk for the soldiers fighting(which is generally always the case). While "people who live in their own country" (if that works better for you) have no such regard for the civilians. See the blantant difference? why you would rather attack US instead of them is way beyond me to even understand. The fact that you would first go to criticizing us shows enough to me what you really think. I mean why not criticize the people who try and prevent civilian deaths sometimes compared to "people in their own country" knowing full well that civilians will die and do them anyways without any regard, right? right...

---

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 23:20:17 GMT

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

---

I critize YOU because you went into this war, and you are not a nation that has extremist terrorist cells. There's not point in going OMG TERRORIST CELLS GHEY! LOL! Everyone knows that, but the US is a country that should, as a superpower, know better than to go "bibi cives lol."

Unfortunatley, not everyone thinks that way. "Y R U CRITIZING UZ WER ONLE TEH SMRTR GROUP!!1oneoen!11!"

---

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

Posted by [Sniper\\_De7](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 23:28:43 GMT

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

---

Just a question: Do you think Iraq will be better after this is all said and done? Just wondering

---

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 23:44:42 GMT

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

---

Will it? Depends what you mean by "said and done."

It will take MANY more years to stabilize Iraq.

---

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 23:45:42 GMT

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

---

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.

---

---

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 02 Dec 2005 23:48:01 GMT

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

---

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.

---

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 00:28:16 GMT

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

---

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.

---

---

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 00:36:23 GMT

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

---

Nodbugger 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?

---

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

Posted by [PhantomScope](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 00:53:40 GMT

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

---

Hm 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 guirilla 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.

---

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 00:55:08 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 19:28 Really, 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.

---

---

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 guirilla 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 possesions, 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.

---

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 02:14:23 GMT

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

The use of White phosphorus as a weapon is not what is in question, it's the effects it has. Bombs kill civvies just as easily as WP. What my question is: how fast does WP burn? Depending on the speed of the burn the person may die instantly, which is the same as a normal bomb blast.

I tried to look it up, but thanks to the obnoxiousness of the media, all I got was reprints of the same article posted at the beginning of this thread

---

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 02:49:36 GMT

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

Please go to google and find Fallujah: The Hidden Massacre

It explains a LOT.

---

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 04:20:51 GMT

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

All around the Logical Bush  
The hippie chases the war hawk  
The hippie thinks the war was in vain



Pop! goes the war hawk

---

---

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 04:43:36 GMT

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

---

Hydra wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 23:20All around the Logical Bush

The hippie chases the war hawk

The hippie thinks the war was in vain

Pop! goes the war hawk

It's nice that you can rhyme, but since this isn't a logical argument you are a failure until you post one. kthx.

---

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 09:23:13 GMT

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

---

NeoSaber wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 17:55warranto 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.

The invasion was a long time ago. Since then the UN and members have agreed to a cease-fire. Note that it is the UN that was involved in the cease=fire, and NOT the United States.

As far as my research has suggested, Saddam was firing at Troops from America, correct; however, America was acting a representative of the UN at the time, therefore they were actually considered UN forces before American forces. As such, Saddam was firing at the UN forces during the cease-fire, and only the UN had the power to act on it. Of course, America doing what Iraq did to them did not help things either. This being the cruise missile attack after the assassination attempt on Bush.

9/11 would have happened regardless. Perhaps not when it did, and perhaps not in the form it did, but a 9/11-type attack would have happened. But yes, the involvement in the Middle East did not

help that.

---

---

Subject: Re: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?  
Posted by [PhantomScope](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 11:32:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ok Glyde, Tell me that this is [<http://digilander.libero.it/ak47web/AKS-74U..A%5B1%5D.jpg>] Now, remove the clip, Also keep in mind that most middle eastern civilians and insurgents alike wear rather baggy robes. You now have a concealed automatic weapon that can be locked and loaded in under 15 seconds. Get shit through that thick skull of yours that Concealing a weapon can be relatively easy. And it's true the AK-47 is widely use but I highly doubt they are restricted to just that. that link was an assault carbine weighted at most likely 5-7 pounds, not much. Ammunition clips can be pouched on a belt under said garments unnoticed. I know people who can hide 16 inch knives and still move naturally in public. Also keep in mind a little think called suicide bombing, those are just walking shrapnel and they also try to get them infected with AIDS to assure death.

And like I goddamn said, I don't advocate the killing of civilians but in war it's likely to happen, also tell me this, what good is a home if your dead? I know they don't have much but come now, if someone invades your home town are you going to

A: Pick up a weapon and defend your home [Technically making you an insurgent if you fire upon Geneva Convention confined groups.]

B: Stay in your home at the risk of becoming collateral damage and casualty

or C: Leave the bulk of your possessions, take what you need and return once things get better. Remember, items can be replaced and walls repaired but losing family or limbs for possessions is just foolish

Oh and for your information I'm against killing civilians, but I'm also a firm believer in darwinism. Your acting awful childish, people die in wars, it's what happens. Should we try to reduce casualties? Yes. Is it completely unavoidable? No.

Unless you experience this crap yourself first hand I wouldn't talk shit All you know is what media has told you you dillusional little fuck. Start getting your own opinion and learn something for christ's sake.

---

---

Subject: Re: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 15:03:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NeoSaber wrote on Fri, 02 December 2005 19:55

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.

The big problem here is that this is simply not accurate, but the general public takes it as truth. We went through this argument ages ago, and it was concretely proven that while American soldiers did act in the Kuwait campaign, they were working under U.N. orders and as such (and affirmed by the UN itself) ought to be considered a UN army; acting under UN law and its peripherals. This is especially important, seeing how America's army wasn't the only one IN Kuwait.

That being said, the Gulf War I was not between America and Iraq, it was between The United Nations (United States, Saudi Arabia, Great Britain, France, The Netherlands, Egypt, Syria, Oman, Qatar, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Israel, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Canada, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Honduras, Italy, Niger, Romania, South Korea) and Iraq. This goes further to say that a cease-fire was never made between America and Iraq, it was made between the UN and Iraq. Thus, \*only\* the UN has jurisdiction to nullify the cease-fire in the event Iraq does; not the members acting independently of both UN rulings and universally ratified international law.

---

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 17:20:09 GMT

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

---

PhantomScope wrote on Sat, 03 December 2005 06:32Ok Glyde, Tell me that this is [http://digilander.libero.it/ak47web/AKS-74U..A%5B1%5D.jpg] Now, remove the clip, Also keep in mind that most middle eastern civilians and insurgents alike wear rather baggy robes. You now have a concealed automatic weapon that can be locked and loaded in under 15 seconds. Get shit through that thick skull of yours that Concealing a weapon can be relatively easy. And it's true the AK-47 is widely use but I highly doubt they are restricted to just that. that link was an assault carbine weighted at most likely 5-7 pounds, not much. Ammunition clips can be pouched on a belt under said garments unnoticed. I know people who can hide 16 inch knives and still move naturally in public. Also keep in mind a little think called suicide bombing, those are just walking shrapnel and they also try to get them infected with AIDS to assure death.

And like I goddamn said, I don't advocate the killing of civilians but in war it's likely to happen, also tell me this, what good is a home if your dead? I know they don't have much but come now, if someone invades your home town are you going to

A: Pick up a weapon and defend your home [Technically making you an insurgent if you fire upon Geneva Convention confined groups.]

B: Stay in your home at the risk of becoming collateral damage and casualty

or C: Leave the bulk of your possessions, take what you need and return once things get better.

Remember, items can be replaced and walls repaired but losing family or limbs for possessions is just foolish

Oh and for your information I'm against killing civilians, but I'm also a firm believer in darwinism. Your acting awful childish, people die in wars, it's what happens. Should we try to reduce casualties? Yes. Is it completely unavoidable? No.

Unless you experience this crap yourself first hand I wouldn't talk shit All you know is what media has told you you dillusional little fuck. Start getting your own opinion and learn something for christs sake.

Now you're just DEFENDING the killing of civilians by accident, and possibly encouraging, since anyone can be a big scary insurgent.

As I said before, they are in a poor country. This isn't your all holy America where you can find a bank that will likely give you money to live off of, or you have your magical Mastercard. All your possessions and stuff at that place is what you have. You can't just suddenly go OMGWTFBBQ RUN AWAY WAR IS HERE! If all your money, family, friends, everything is in that one city, then how can you just get up and say "lol, bibi2u."

Acting childish is defending something that is obviously wrong. You still have failed to criticize your own country for it's mistakes, haven't you? What about Mk-77?

I, as a "dillusional little fuck," have developed my own opinions. You, as a "mentally challenged jackass," are nothing more than an advocate for war, the most extreme option for accomplishing anything.

---

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 20:08:27 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Sat, 03 December 2005 04:239/11 would have happened regardless. Perhaps not when it did, and perhaps not in the form it did, but a 9/11-type attack would have happened. But yes, the involvement in the Middle East did not help that.

I mentioned 9/11 since when asked "After all this time, why attack Saddam now?", the answer people usually give is along the lines of: "9/11 changed the world and threats like Saddam can't be tolerated any more." So, I'm really just saying if 9/11 happened differently and/or at a later time, we likely wouldn't be in Iraq right at this moment.

Javaxcx wrote on Sat, 03 December 2005 10:03The big problem here is that this is simply not accurate, but the general public takes it as truth. We went through this argument ages ago, and it was concretely proven that while American soldiers did act in the Kuwait campaign, they were working under U.N. orders and as such (and affirmed by the UN itself) ought to be considered a UN army; acting under UN law and its periferals. This is especially important, seeing how America's army wasn't the only one IN Kuwait.

That being said, the Gulf War I was not between America and Iraq, it was between The United Nations (United States, Saudi Arabia, Great Britain, France, The Netherlands, Egypt, Syria, Oman, Qatar, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Israel, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Canada, Belgium,

Czechoslovakia, Germany, Honduras, Italy, Niger, Romania, South Korea) and Iraq. This goes further to say that a cease-fire was never made between America and Iraq, it was made between the UN and Iraq. Thus, \*only\* the UN has jurisdiction to nullify the cease-fire in the event Iraq does; not the members acting independently of both UN rulings and universally ratified international law.

I must be forgetting that argument. Can you point me to a link? I'd like to read it. Seriously, I'm not trying to be a jerk here, I would like to read over it.

That said, the UN doesn't say in its resolutions that it is at war with Iraq. UN Resolution 687, the "ceasefire" resolution, says:

Resolution 687. Declares that, upon official notification by Iraq to the Secretary-General and to the Security Council of its acceptance of the provisions above, a formal cease-fire is effective between Iraq and Kuwait and the Member States cooperating with Kuwait in accordance with resolution 678 (1990);

The ceasefire is between Iraq on one side and Kuwait and its allies on the other side. The US was the controlling power of those allies. When the first President Bush ordered a ceasefire, the shooting stopped because the US was in charge. Actually now that I think about it, that resolution could be taken to mean there were three sides in the conflict: Iraq, Kuwait, and the Coalition.

Since it mentions resolution 678, I'll bring up the part that "authorized" the Coalition:

Resolution 678. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait, unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necessary means to uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

I think it is clear that the UN considered this a conflict between Iraq and Kuwait's allies, not between Iraq and the UN. It mentions the Member States cooperating with Kuwait, not all the Member States of the UN. If Iraq was at war with the UN, all the members of the UN would be in a state of war with Iraq. I don't think this was the case.

The US was the leader of Kuwait's allies. Saddam violated the ceasefire, in part, by shooting at the US repeatedly. I don't see why the UN is the one who had to declare the ceasefire breached if it's own resolution declares the UN was not involved in the war. The principle parties involved were Iraq, Kuwait, and the US (as leader of the Coalition).

---

Subject: Re: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?  
Posted by [PhantomScope](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 20:29:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I never said It was OK to kill Civilians dipshit, I was just making a point that it will happen. Also consider the fact that many people have rebuilt what was lost. There are various organizations that gather funds to help families who lost everything to get back on their feet. But As I said if your stupid enough to stick around in the wrong places then shit to you. There are people stupid

enough to stick around but there are rules and measure taken to keep them out of the line of fire, but again I stress that getting caught in or near a fire fight will likely get you killed. Think about the main tactics that are used in wars to soften hard targets. Explosives, Artillery or a massive spray of bullets. Again, Darwinism, natural selection. Besides I doubt starving in your home is better than living in a red cross or other humanitarian aid refugee camp.

I also criticize my own nation enough without explaining myself to you, I fucking hate bush, he's a total dumbass and I know 6th graders who likely have a bigger library of terms than he will ever have. Bush was a jackass who was basically pampered but was a failure at life, but also had the political and financial backing of his family and family friends. By all means I hate him but Your damn right I'm going to support the troops that have to make the sacrifices, not the blood stained hands of white collars. I also hate the other Bush because he could have ended this over a decade ago, but didn't, we had Saddam surrounded, but left him, which was a big mistake because immasculating someone in that region is a big ass slap to the face of their beliefs. [Such as any Japanese who was capture was dishonored because of their belief in the warriors spirit.-ww2 Era but valid as comparison]

Asfor munitions such as the mk77 Keep in mind that these are soldiers and they take commands, so they do exactly as ordered unless they see a better method which most suggest before the plan is set in motion, and they are more dedicated to helping out their own guys. As a firebomb I'll say it is too extreme a method but keep in mind that nearly all weapons can be inhumane. I don't think the thing should be used but in the most dire of situations for combat support.

So I do support my armed forces, but I don't approve of my current government head. I have my own quarrels about my country that have nothing to do with this subject, so I'm staying on subject. You can keep your opinion of my country as you like, it's fine with me, just make sure you put your blame on the right people, not just stereotype of the nation because of the main shit you see on the teli. You can even judge me if you want just make sure you have the right list of names, unlike the washed down intelligence of the CIA.

---

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 22:24:42 GMT

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

---

As I said, they have nothing, and before, they didn't have anything. This is completely new to them, and people like you can only think about what we give them because you can see a large part of the picture, but they see a small part of the picture in greater detail. They aren't "starving" either.

There was a point in the Kuwait wars where the Iraqi civilians tried to escape, they went on the same highway as the Iraqi military. The US, being the all great humanitarian people they are, fired on the RETREATING Iraqi military AND civilians, killing both. Way2go.

Supporting the troops is important, but you need to get your military under control because what they're doing is unacceptable.

Of course, whenever I say "US" or the likes, I'm not saying "lol u al sux," I'm saying in general, like the military in general, the administration in general, etc.

---

---



Subject: Re: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?  
Posted by [PhantomScope](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 22:51:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

And like I said, mistakes are made, they wanted to completely dismantle the Iraqi army in the gulf war. Those civilians were just at the right place at the wrong time. But your wrong as that region is always in times of conflict, war is not new to them. not to say all of them have participated but there are just too many conflicts over there to say they have no idea of whats going on. The military is under control just under some who is out of control, I personally compair Bush to a Hitler that has yet to commit his holocost in his own country.[My country and any other US resident.] Either way we here need to deal with an idiot for 2 more years unless he is assassinated, in which case it's still bad because Cheney takes over so the puppet master happens to get authority anyway. Either way, this war in my opinion has been pointless as it's like looking for a needle in a heystack accept the needle happens to prick you and recede. Hunting down "terrorists" is like trying to eliminate racism in my opinion, it can't be done unless you can get everyone to believe on religion which is also near impossible.

All in all the "chemicals" use are not defined as chemical weapons but incedidary devices. The one issue is that some people choose to stay at the wrong times weather they are militiants or not won't be possible to confirm as the common practice is they carry off the dead outside of cities and urban practicies have yet to be confirmed as knowledge of their tactics are limited at best. So lets try to leave this in a good note

Killing civilians is wrong and globally is atleast attempted to avoid it, but it can't always be prevented and it's typically misinformation or accidental. Some of the weapons used should not be used but are as a result of arms issued and orders givin to use them. And last but not least, idiots in power with shadowy figures pulling the strings results in bad leadership and bad wraps.

I'm not sure of the accuracy of this site but at the least it could be in the area of give or take <http://www.defendamerica.mil/iraq/mar2004/tni-1yr0318042.htm> | Of coarse this is the UN and not the US so at least it shows cooperation is still present

---

---

Subject: Re: United States using chemical weapons in Iraq?  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 03 Dec 2005 23:00:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:The ceasefire is between Iraq on one side and Kuwait and its allies on the other side. The US was the controlling power of those allies. When the first President Bush ordered a ceasefire, the shooting stopped because the US was in charge. Actually now that I think about it, that resolution could be taken to mean there were three sides in the conflict: Iraq, Kuwait, and the Coalition.

Notice that the Resolution says "Member States". Meaning that at that point in time they were being represented as the UN members involved in the war, and not the individual countries themselves. This is why, ultimately, the UN has/had the controlling factor in what to do with Iraq, and not the individual countries.

---

---



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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 04 Dec 2005 00:26:48 GMT

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

---

PhantomScope wrote on Sat, 03 December 2005 17:51 I'm not sure of the accuracy of this site but at the least it could be in the area of give or take

<http://www.defendamerica.mil/iraq/mar2004/tni-1yr0318042.htm> I

About Us Keeping the Public in Touch

DefendAmerica, an official Defense Department website, was launched just weeks after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks to keep the public informed about efforts by the United States and its coalition partners to combat global terrorism.

The site offers the latest news, photographs, transcripts and other information about the U.S.-led war on terrorism. It highlights the words and activities of key U.S. , Defense Department and coalition officials related to terrorism.

But DefendAmerica also offers something not so readily available in the mainstream media: daily news reports and photographs by U.S. military photojournalists on the frontlines as well as in supporting units.

The site reports on the roles all branches of the military play in the war on terror: Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard, those on active duty as well as in the National Guard and Reserve. It covers contributions by coalition partners who have joined the United States in the war on terror. And DefendAmerica highlights a critical but often overlooked partner in the terror war: the American public that stands by to support the troops as they take a stand against the forces of terrorism.

Seems credible enough to me.

---

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 04 Dec 2005 00:54:44 GMT

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

---

warranto wrote on Sat, 03 December 2005 18:00 Notice that the Resolution says "Member States". Meaning that at that point in time they were being represented as the UN members involved in the war, and not the individual countries themselves. This is why, ultimately, the UN has/had the controlling factor in what to do with Iraq, and not the individual countries.

It doesn't just say Member States. It says Member States cooperating with Kuwait. That part of the resolution is referring to the countries that were involved in the conflict that also happened to be members of the UN as well. It would have said "all states", or "all member states" if the UN itself was party to the conflict. There are points in the resolution where the phrase "all States" is used. For example:

Resolution 68724. Decides that, in accordance with resolution 661 (1990) and subsequent related resolutions and until a further decision is taken by the Security Council, all States shall continue to prevent the sale or supply, or the promotion or facilitation of such sale or supply, to Iraq by their nationals, or from their territories or using their flag vessels or aircraft

(Note: I snipped out the specifics of what sales were outlawed)

Here the UN agreed all countries have to comply with an embargo on Iraq. Even though it says "all states" had to comply with this, it never says "all states" were involved in the hostilities. The UN itself probably isn't even a part of this provision, as it is not a state unto itself. As I quoted before, at the end of the resolution it says Iraq, Kuwait, and Kuwait's allies are the parties of the conflict.

In the original "use of force" authorization it had this to say about all other states:

Resolution 6783. Requests all States to provide appropriate support for the actions undertaken in pursuance of paragraph 2 of the present resolution;

The UN made a request that everyone support the countries who were authorized to attack Iraq. This is separate though from the actual use of force by those involved countries. Paragraph 2 would have authorized all members to use force, or the UN itself to use force, if the UN was a party to the conflict. All the authorization really did was say that Kuwait's allies were free from UN obligations as of a certain date. The UN never authorized itself to attack Iraq, it agreed that using force was justified. The resolution essentially says the UN "washed its hands of the situation" and let the involved parties do what they wanted to.

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 04 Dec 2005 02:54:24 GMT

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

Quote:It doesn't just say Member States. It says Member States cooperating with Kuwait. That part of the resolution is referring to the countries that were involved in the conflict that also happened to be members of the UN as well.

That's exactly what I said.... not once did I say "all states", had I implied that, I would have placed "All" in front of "Member States".

"Appropriate support" does not mean "do as you wish, whenever you wish, however you wish".

Paragraph 2 only states that "unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements the resolutions regarding it" that they can use all necessary means to ensure it. That date has come and gone, and Iraq had, at that time implemented what they had to (without checking, I believe it refers to the dismantling of its WMD's). If those conditions were met, then the paragraph 2 that you refer to does not possess any strength. They were met.

---

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 04 Dec 2005 03:31:51 GMT

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

I think we're getting a little mixed up here. The date that resolution referred to was for the first Gulf

War. Iraq had to withdraw from Kuwait to comply with that deadline as far as I'm aware. I was going to mention something about the UN's declaration that Iraq breached the ceasefire for the first Gulf War, but I cut it out, since I figured it wasn't really part of the discussion yet...

I took your reference to "Member States" to mean that the UN was in charge because members of the UN were involved in the war. I'm saying that the UN organization itself wasn't involved in the war at all, regardless if some of its members participated in the conflict. The resolutions make distinctions between the UN itself and the countries that participated in the fighting. The ceasefire applied to the combatants, which the UN itself is not listed to be among. The UN took on some responsibilities as part of the ceasefire, but that didn't make it the authority on it.

The way I read it is that "All States" is basically a reference to the UN body as a whole, whereas "Member States" are countries that although are part of the UN, are not acting on its behalf. Iraq was a member state too, but it certainly wasn't acting on behalf of the UN.

A judge has to settle a dispute between two parties. When he does, that doesn't make him a part of the dispute, just the arbiter of it. The UN played a similar role in the first Gulf War. That didn't make them the victorious side of the conflict, just a mediator of it. That left the ceasefire agreement between Iraq, Kuwait and the US. The UN wasn't part of it. Although they agreed to supervise some parts, that doesn't give them the authority to nullify the ceasefire.

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 04 Dec 2005 16:59:00 GMT

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

---

Ah, I see. That's where the mix up was.

You're partially correct then. I did mean that the UN is in charge, as the governing body of the resolution at least, however, the only parties affected by the resolution were those who took part in the war.

In short the Resolution was between the UN Member States involved in the war (with the UN as the body that governs them), Iraq, and Kuwait. It was a UN resolution, and only the UN has the power to say when it has been broken.

You compared the UN to judges, and that is an adequate comparison. However, your inference of what the UN did (as judges) was a little off. The UN did settle the dispute, by setting out a Resolution (or, to keep the comparison the same, a judgment). A judgment can be effected by the winning side, but it can not be acted on by the winning side if the benefiting party feels that the other side is not abiding by the judgment. If a dispute arises out of one side not abiding by the terms of the judgment, the party that wishes to act on that must first return to someone for instructions. In the legal system, this would simply be a lawyer/collection agency. With UN Resolutions, the only place to go is back to the UN for assistance with enforcing the judgment/resolution.

A Judge can only make the ruling/mediation. But the individuals do not have any authority in dealing with someone who does not adhere to the ruling without involving the system that gave

said ruling.

---

---

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 04 Dec 2005 18:56:12 GMT

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

---

I use the judge analogy a little loosely though, since a judge can turn to the executive branch of the government to enforce a judgment, and the UN doesn't really have a force to turn to that enforces its resolutions. Enforcement is basically left to the involved parties.

Ok, for the sake of argument, let's say you're right in that the ceasefire resolution was ultimately under the authority of the UN. The UN later passed resolution 1441, part of which stated:

Resolution 1441. Decides that Iraq has been and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant resolutions, including resolution 687 (1991), in particular through Iraq's failure to cooperate with United Nations inspectors and the IAEA, and to complete the actions required under paragraphs 8 to 13 of resolution 687 (1991);

The UN did declare Iraq to have breached the ceasefire agreement (resolution 687). So Saddam breached UN resolutions by invading and occupying Kuwait, and then he breached them again in violating the ceasefire agreement. The UN declared both these things, which leaves Saddam at fault for the current situation. The only way the US would be at fault is if the UN passed a resolution declaring the US in breach of the ceasefire for invading Iraq in response to Saddam's breach of the ceasefire. I'm unaware of such a resolution being passed, or even if such a resolution is possible. Wouldn't a resolution like that require the approval of the five permanent members of the security council (America, Britain, China, France and Russia)? If that's the case, the five permanent members are essentially "above the law" when it comes to UN resolutions.

---

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 04 Dec 2005 20:47:57 GMT

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

---

Whose authority it was aside for now, the UN did declare that parts of the cease-fire were breached, BUT had also given Iraq a "last" chance to fix the breach.

Quote: 2. Decides, while acknowledging paragraph 1 above, to afford Iraq, by this resolution, a final opportunity to comply with its disarmament obligations under relevant resolutions of the Council; and accordingly decides to set up an enhanced inspection regime with the aim of bringing to full and verified completion the disarmament process established by resolution 687 (1991) and subsequent resolutions of the Council;

Despite that there was a breach in the cease-fire, the UN forgave it.

---

---

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 04 Dec 2005 21:37:24 GMT

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

---

Iraq was still in breach though, even if the UN was going to let it slide one last time. The origin of our disagreement here is who was at fault for the present situation, Saddam or America. The UN only said Iraq had breached the resolutions, even if given one last chance. The US was never declared in breach as far as I'm aware. So technically/legally the US is not at fault for what happened, since the UN has yet to pass a resolution declaring the US at fault for breaching paragraph 2 of resolution 1441.

To the letter of the law then, Iraq was declared in breach of several resolutions and the US wasn't. Therefore, Saddam is at fault and not the US. That could change if the UN ever passes a resolution saying the US breached 1441 (by taking away Iraq's "Final Chance"), or 687 (by firing on Iraqi forces), or whatever, but so far it hasn't. Officially/technically/legally Saddam is at fault. The US didn't breach any resolution if the UN doesn't say it did.

That may be using the letter of the law to defeat the spirit of the law, but the "spirit" was lost long before when Iraq started firing on US forces repeatedly for years. Hard to call it a ceasefire when the sides weren't ceasing to fire, regardless of who fired first.

---

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 05 Dec 2005 00:57:55 GMT

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

---

heh, the so-called (by me anyways) "Renegade ideals" - This being that it may be "against the law", so to speak, but no one is going to bother to say anything because the ultimate good was accomplished. But I do see your point.

---

---

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

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Sun, 11 Dec 2005 06:56:16 GMT

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

---

I don't know this for sure, but isn't WP primarily used to create a diversion or cover?

---