
Subject: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [thrash300](#) on Mon, 24 Apr 2006 19:28:21 GMT

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

Is anybody going to attack Iran yet, I mean man, how long have they been trying to get those nukes! And we all just stand by watching, while a nation that wants all of us to die get a very destructive weapons, (there are worse weapons than the nuclear bomb) and our damn president is acting like a little lost boy in the White House pretending that he dosen't know squat about this issue. By the way have all of you been watching the news lately, the news is only about souther California, not 1 mile away from it, no world news, just celebrities buying new underwear and having sex. Thats it. What are all of you people going to do about it, you people need to wake up and smell the hate and anticipation!

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [bigjoe14](#) on Mon, 24 Apr 2006 19:40:59 GMT

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

lol

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Mon, 24 Apr 2006 19:47:22 GMT

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

I am smelling the hate and anticipation. I hate you and I am anticipating killing you.

Sorry, but I feel mean and you're the closest person to take it out on.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [csskiller](#) on Mon, 24 Apr 2006 23:31:53 GMT

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

The US (and Canada) seriously need to finish their job in Iraq / Afghanistan before this happens.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [FMhalo](#) on Tue, 25 Apr 2006 14:13:58 GMT

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

First they have to find those weapons of mass destruction before the terrorists can use them then they could go disarm Iran

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [thrash300](#) on Tue, 25 Apr 2006 14:51:53 GMT

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

They are obviously reaserching those weapons, they've been telling the whole world that!

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [Weirdo](#) on Tue, 25 Apr 2006 17:19:38 GMT

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

Quote:They are obviously reaserching those weapons, they've been telling the whole world that!
Big Grin

Last thing I heard, they told the whole world they were only making enriched uranium. Wich they use for nuclear power plants. This doesn't mean that they also make nuclear missles.

I would advise not to attack without first getting the help of the UN again. It's really not good for international politics, to try and speed up a war against a country with evidence that later appears to be false.

I don't see why you should be afraid of a country, Like Iran in the first place. They have nothing to gain with a war against the western world. A Frontal attack will only mean suicide.

My guess is they are just showing a bit of, with their nuclear projects as a bit of propaganda to their own people.

If you are really afraid of a nuclear war, you should focus more on North Korea than on Iran.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [Aprime](#) on Tue, 25 Apr 2006 18:51:56 GMT

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

csskiller wrote on Mon, 24 April 2006 19:31The US (and Canada) seriously need to finish their job

in Iraq / Afghanistan before this happens.

What the fuck is our job in Iraq? We aren't leaving Afghanistan though, I think the current (and preceding) government(s) made that clear enough.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [Homey](#) on Tue, 25 Apr 2006 20:55:56 GMT

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

Comrade wrote on Tue, 25 April 2006 14:51csskiller wrote on Mon, 24 April 2006 19:31The US (and Canada) seriously need to finish their job in Iraq / Afghanistan before this happens.

What the fuck is our job in Iraq? We aren't leaving Afghanistan though, I think the current (and preceding) government(s) made that clear enough.

I'm pretty sure he just is just talking about Canada in Afghanistan and America in both Afghanistan and Iraq.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [csskiller](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 02:04:44 GMT

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

Homey wrote on Tue, 25 April 2006 15:55!m pretty sure he just is just talking about Canada in Afghanistan and America in both Afghanistan and Iraq.

Yeah, sorry that's what I meant to say

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 06:35:45 GMT

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

csskiller wrote on Mon, 24 April 2006 19:31The US (and Canada) seriously need to finish their job in Iraq / Afghanistan before this happens.

Canada... HA!

Ok now to the matter at hand, yes Iran does need to be dealt with but the UN has a strangle hold on the situation and it will be impossible for the US to go over their heads again without some kind of consequences. We need to get Russia to stop supporting these bastards, even China is worried about Iran having nukes because they don't even want a war with Iran. China knows that if Iran goes to war they will not hesitate to use nuclear weapons. It is very scary when China gets worried because the most aloof "we don't give a shit what you do as long as it doesn't effect us." is getting involved.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 15:23:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yea, Iran needs to be dealt with, because it's a well known fact that Iran doesn't have the right to have nuclear weapons, when other minor world powers can. Hypocrisy par none. If they can't have nukes, why can we?

Don't get me wrong, I'm not advocating nuclear war, but if we want them to disarm, why don't we (We, referring to the United States)?

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [thrash300](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 19:48:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wierdo wrote on Tue, 25 April 2006 09:51 If you are really afraid of a nuclear war, you should focus more on North Korea than on Iran.

You are right, what ever happend to North Korea, it's like they just dissapeared. I know a person who's familiy works deeply in the goverment, like the IRS, and other services I won't list, he told me that they already have a nuclear bomb and a way to deliver it.

But I think that America absolutely has the power to occupy all of the threatning nation at once, I really do.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Toolstyle](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 20:16:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Do you just let rip the first brain fart that arrives in your head?

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 20:27:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

N. Korea has nukes already. How do we stop them when they already have them?

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Toolstyle](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 20:33:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

WE ATTACK THEM AND INVADE AND OCCUPY THEM AND KILL THEM AND STUFF!!!!!!!!!!!!11

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 22:05:38 GMT

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

For the record, attacking Iran is a bad idea.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [Appsh0t](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 22:11:46 GMT

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

US just wants to rule the world. thats all

they went in iraq and found what weapons of mass destruction
here in US there is millions of weapons of mass destruction.

Just becuz they have a weak army, US gets all crazy and goes nuts and says lets attack them
and makes up reasons

they r making uranium. so, they r going to use it for power plants, doenst US have nukes already.
so WTF is their problem

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 22:46:37 GMT

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

Because the United States has signed a non-proliferation treaty and has no intention of using their
warheads on another country in the foreseeable future, while Iran has neither of these qualities?

The US didn't attack Iraq "becuz they have a weak army." It was because we suspected that they
were secretly stockpiling biological and chemical weapons to use against Israel and Kuwait (and
Iran, but we didn't care so much about this). Or because George W. wanted to finish the job
George H.W. started in the Gulf War, which should have been done the first time.
(Just so you know, at the time of the Gulf War in 1991, Iraq had the 4th largest military in the
world.)

I hope you're not so naive to assume that Iran will not try to make nuclear weapons once they
have the ability to refine uranium. They have two reasons to do so: to have a bargaining chip in
diplomatic relations with the West (mainly over oil) and to threaten/attack their rivals in the Middle
East (Israel, Iraq, Saudi Arabia).

And what a stupid title for a thread. Sounds a lot like what's being chanted in Iran about America. But I guess if thrash300 says it, that makes it ok.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Homey](#) on Wed, 26 Apr 2006 23:21:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Wed, 26 April 2006 16:27N. Korea has nukes already. How do we stop them when they already have them?
Exactly, Iran doesn't have them yet, or as far as we know. If action is taken quickly it won't be a problem. If the US is going to deal with this problem, they should sooner rather than later.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 02:19:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I say let Israel deal with it. They surely will if nobody else does, and the US has plenty of unfinished work on the table right now. I'd bet good money they'll be extremely efficient about the whole affair, too.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 02:24:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Israel is having enough problems with Palestinian unrest as it is. The United States is having fewer internal problems and is therefore (theoretically) more fit to deploy troops overseas, especially since there are already troops in that area.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 02:56:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So, Iran can have nukes when it signs the non-proliferation treaty? Doubtful.

Why? Because Iran is not the U.S., nor is it any of the U.S.'s historical allies, therefore the U.S. will feel (Or pretend to feel in order to have a somewhat proper pretense for war) threatened by Iraq having nukes.

Russia has nukes, why aren't we worried about them? WHAT ABOUT THE RUSSIANS MAN?!
What about China? Canada? THEY HAVE NUKES! LETS GO KICK CANADA'S ASS!!

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 03:35:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Russia doesn't have money to put rocket fuel into their nukes. China would ruin their economy if the attacked the US. Canada doesn't have nukes and depend on us for defense primarily. I would like to say on the record that 90% of you have no credit in this area of the forum becuse your posts either come out your ass or you have no idea what you are talking about.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [xptek](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 03:37:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 26 April 2006 18:05For the record, attacking Iran is a bad idea.

Wow, there's the first and last thing we agree on.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 04:19:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Allow me to clerify then...

Dover wrote on Wed, 26 April 2006 19:56

//Begin Sarcasm

Russia has nukes, why aren't we worried about them? WHAT ABOUT THE RUSSIANS MAN?!
What about China? Canada? THEY HAVE NUKES! LETS GO KICK CANADA'S ASS!!

//End Sarcasm

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 04:20:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

By the way, DarkDemin, who the hell are you? Do I know you, and if not, why are you judging what kind of credit I have?

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 06:57:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm generalizing and I have been here a hell of a lot longer than you.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 15:04:36 GMT

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

I'm not quite sure the amount of time you've been a member of the forums really has anything to do with how competent you are in a particular subject. It gets depressing to see people waving it around like they've got something to prove.

Then again, a lot of people in this forum DO talk out of their asses. You must admit, though, it can get pretty funny to read through whole threads where nobody's got the faintest clue what they're saying.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 19:18:47 GMT

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

Yeah sometimes it is pretty funny, then we have superflyingfucktard who is always good for entertainment, Zunnie takes the cake, thrash is just a dumbshit.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 20:29:45 GMT

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

DarkDemin's just jealous because he doesn't know how to use facts.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 27 Apr 2006 22:02:40 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Thu, 27 April 2006 16:29DarkDemin's just jealous because he doesn't know how to use facts.

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [Jaspah](#) on Fri, 28 Apr 2006 01:16:24 GMT

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

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Fri, 28 Apr 2006 17:53:42 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Wed, 26 April 2006 22:56So, Iran can have nukes when it signs the non-proliferation treaty? Doubtful.

Why? Because Iran is not the U.S., nor is it any of the U.S.'s historical allies, therefore the U.S. will feel (Or pretend to feel in order to have a somewhat proper pretense for war) threatened by Iraq having nukes.

Russia has nukes, why aren't we worried about them? WHAT ABOUT THE RUSSIANS MAN?! What about China? Canada? THEY HAVE NUKES! LETS GO KICK CANADA'S ASS!!

By your first statement, it's obvious that you don't even know what non-proliferation means, or what the non-proliferation treaty states.

If they sign the treaty, it isn't doubtful that they will not get nuclear weapons; it would be a fact. See, that's what NON-proliferation means.. "we agree that nuclear weapons should NOT BE PROLIFERATED"

However, if they DO sign the treaty, they can join the 120 other countries that have agreed NOT TO PROLIFERATE NUCLEAR WEAPONS, but instead, share in peaceful nuclear technology (for things such as nuclear power) with safeguards to protect against PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

Remember when Russia said "hey, we'll enrich your uranium for you, and you can have all the nuclear power plants you want" and Iran said "fuck you, we're doing it in secret, under ground, in like a dozen sites you don't even know about"... Yea, that, along with the fact that they will NOT let the IEAA monitor their program as required by the NON PROLIFERATION TREATY, is a pretty good indication that their full of shit.

Get a clue. (and go look up the capitalized words..)

And that, my friend.. is what darkdemin meant when he said you were talking out your ass, or had no idea what you were talking about.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [thrash300](#) on Fri, 28 Apr 2006 19:06:50 GMT

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

DarkDemin wrote on Wed, 26 April 2006 22:35 Russia doesn't have money to put rocket fuel into their nukes. China would ruin their economy if the attacked the US. Canada doesn't have nukes and depend on us for defense primarily. I would like to say on the record that 90% of you have no credit in this area of the forum becuase your posts either come out your ass or you have no idea what you are talking about.

No No NO, you are wrong, Russia has some VERY SCARY MISSLES the R-7 Missle was produced during the Cold War, about 50 exist today, they have been in various places in Siberia, and I believe some in Ukraine, they have been and still are fueled and ready to go, each one of those missles can either be armed with 10 1 kiloton warheads, or 5 5 kiloton war heads, OR 1 50 MEGATON WARHEAD thats hundreds of times more destructive that the bombs droped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki COMBINED. The missle has a range of 10,000 kilometers and each of those warheads can be delivered to almost any point on the Earth.

--They Have Missles, Believe Me.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 28 Apr 2006 19:09:07 GMT

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

...As far as I know, Iran hasn't signed any such treaty. Why wouldn't they be allowed to have nukes?

Iran != Terrorists, agreed?

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Fri, 28 Apr 2006 19:36:13 GMT

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

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuclear_Non-Proliferation_Treaty

Iran has signed the treaty, according to the article here. The treaty only allows the US, the UK, France, Russia, and China to have nuclear weapons; in addition, the other signatories are not allowed to seek to obtain or develop nuclear weapons or nuclear weapon technology.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 28 Apr 2006 19:40:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Fri, 28 April 2006 15:09Iran != Terrorists, agreed?

No, they harbor terrorists and will not capture known terrorists in their country and turn them over to the U.S.

voanews.com Iran also harbors, trains, and supports many of the same terrorist groups as Syria. In addition, Iran provides substantial financial and military aid to Hezbollah, which has engaged in terrorism against Israelis, Lebanese, Americans, French, and Argentines, among others. Because of Syria and Iran's support for such terrorist groups, the U.S. has long designated both countries as state sponsors of terrorism.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [FMhalo](#) on Fri, 28 Apr 2006 20:17:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm lebanese and i could tell you Hezbollah has committed 1% of the conflicts Isreal created in Lebanon. If Hezbollah engaged in terroist activites in Lebanon i would hate to think what that would make of Isreal

That info you quoted was pure crap.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Appsh0t](#) on Sat, 29 Apr 2006 00:39:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

US= idiots agreed?

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 29 Apr 2006 00:54:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you don't like it leave, you 12 year old prick.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 29 Apr 2006 02:46:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SpyGuy246 wrote on Fri, 28 April 2006 12:36

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuclear_Non-Proliferation_Treaty

Iran has signed the treaty, according to the article here. The treaty only allows the US, the UK, France, Russia, and China to have nuclear weapons; in addition, the other signatories are not allowed to seek to obtain or develop nuclear weapons or nuclear weapon technology.

Fair enough. My bad.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Sat, 29 Apr 2006 02:52:36 GMT

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

No worries. I was a little surprised myself to see that they had actually signed it and on top of that had the audacity to blatantly break their promise set forth by signing without even withdrawing from it beforehand. What is the UN doing about it, I wonder?

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [thrash300](#) on Sat, 29 Apr 2006 03:41:57 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Fri, 28 April 2006 14:09...As far as I know, Iran hasn't signed any such treaty. Why wouldn't they be allowed to have nukes?

Iran != Terrorists, agreed?

I AGREE, But you do have to look through the enemy's eyes, and see why they do all of this (Or at least when the will) it gets complicated, but if you use your logical skills, and reason, I'm sure that all of you can figure it all out if you wanted to, and YOU SHOULD ALL DO FIGURE IT OUT! I'm only beginning to figure all of this out, and it has A LONG HISTORY TO IT.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sat, 29 Apr 2006 03:46:11 GMT

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

Trying to have your cake and eat it too?

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [thrash300](#) on Sat, 29 Apr 2006 03:46:22 GMT

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

SpyGuy246 wrote on Fri, 28 April 2006 19:52No worries. I was a little surprised myself to see that they had actually signed it and on top of that had the audacity to blatantly break their promise set forth by signing without even withdrawing from it beforehand. What is the UN doing about it, I wonder?

Tretys ,in most cases, are nothing more than fragile promises that are written on paper by two or more leaders with the world watching (Or Not) one day, and war can break out the next. All you have to do is look no farther than your History Book. And remember that not everything in those History Books are true or accurate! Do reaserch!

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 01 May 2006 15:19:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thrash300 wrote on Fri, 28 April 2006 20:41the enemys

Who?!

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Mon, 01 May 2006 16:15:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thrash300 wrote on Fri, 28 April 2006 20:41the enemys
Enemies. Spelling = Good

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 01 May 2006 16:42:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Appsh0t wrote on Fri, 28 April 2006 20:39US= idiots agreed?

Go to hell. Thanks.

Sincerely,
gbull

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 01 May 2006 17:27:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SpyGuy246 wrote on Mon, 01 May 2006 09:15thrash300 wrote on Fri, 28 April 2006 20:41the enemys
Enemies. Spelling = Good

I was asking who he was refering to.

Actually, he probably meant "Enemy's" anyways, although I can't be sure.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Mon, 01 May 2006 18:14:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh I know. I was just being anal.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [thrash300](#) on Tue, 02 May 2006 16:56:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SpyGuy246 wrote on Mon, 01 May 2006 11:15thrash300 wrote on Fri, 28 April 2006 20:41the enemys
Enemies. Spelling = Good

I was reffering to the people who want us dead.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 02 May 2006 18:27:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And these people are...?

Can you give me the name of a person, a group of people, an organization? I'm sure plenty of people on this forum want you dead, but I wouldn't call them "The Enemy".

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [thrash300](#) on Tue, 02 May 2006 18:53:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dumb Ass, I mean organizations like Alquada, Talaban, Hammas, as for people, like Ossamma Bin Laden, The President Of Iran, and Most Palistinian people, Im sure there are many others too.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Tue, 02 May 2006 21:18:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thrash300 wrote on Tue, 02 May 2006 19:53Dumb Ass, I mean organizations like Alquada, Talaban, Hammas, as for people, like Ossamma Bin Laden, The President Of Iran, and Most Palistinian people, Im sure there are many others too.

Dumbass*
Al-Qaeda*
Taliban*
Hamas*
Osama*
Palestinian*
I'm*

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [thrash300](#) on Thu, 04 May 2006 15:59:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DOVER is stupid.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [thrash300](#) on Thu, 04 May 2006 19:20:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gbull wrote on Mon, 01 May 2006 09:42Appsh0t wrote on Fri, 28 April 2006 20:39US= idiots agreed?

Go to hell. Thanks.

Sincerely,
gbull

America is not stupid, we now exactly what to do, the only problem is nobody wants to do anything, actually the minutemen are doing pretty good. But as far as Iran, Iraq, Afganistan, things aren't going so great.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 04 May 2006 22:08:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thrash, you're amongst the most biased, one-sided, uninformed people I know about.

Stop posting.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [thrash300](#) on Fri, 05 May 2006 18:50:54 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Thu, 04 May 2006 18:08

Stop posting.

Make Me.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 05 May 2006 18:54:00 GMT

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

I'm tempted to call banstick, but I don't think it's been warrented quite yet. Keep it up though, thrash300.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [sterps](#) on Mon, 08 May 2006 14:19:30 GMT

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

thrash300 wrote on Sat, 29 April 2006 05:06DarkDemin wrote on Wed, 26 April 2006 22:35Russia doesn't have money to put rocket fuel into their nukes. China would ruin their economy if the attacked the US. Canada doesn't have nukes and depend on us for defense primarily. I would like to say on the record that 90% of you have no credit in this area of the forum becuae your posts either come out your ass or you have no idea what you are talking about.

No No NO, you are wrong, Russia has some VERY SCARY MISSLES the R-7 Missle was produced during the Cold War, about 50 exist today, they have been in various places in Siberia, and I believe some in Ukraine, they have been and still are fueled and ready to go, each one of those missles can either be armed with 10 1 kiloton warheads, or 5 5 kiloton war heads, OR 1 50 MEGATON WARHEAD thats hundreds of times more destructive that the bombs droped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki COMBINED. The missle has a range of 10,000 kilometers and each of those warheads can be delivered to almost any point on the Earth.

--They Have Missles, Believe Me.

How old are you thrash? honestly.....

From the way you say things, i believe darkdenim and pain about you speaking out of your ass. For one, yes Russia has nukes. But why are you talking about Russia, they are not the problem, and are no where near the problem.

That 50Mgtonne nuke you were talking about, WAS called the Tsar Bomba, and i say WAS in capitals because it was detonated already. It was originally designed to be 100Mega tonne. But was too heavy so was reduced to a 50 Mega tonne, and was detonated back in 1961.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Mon, 08 May 2006 14:38:36 GMT

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

Even if Russia still has nukes, they don't have the money to launch them and they aren't stupid neather. The extremism has made place for corruption in Russia. Corruption stays iwthin the national borders most of the time.

Some other countries might be much more dangerous becauset hey actually believe they act like their God wants them to act and therefor would first launch, then think about consequences.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [thrash300](#) on Wed, 10 May 2006 21:52:20 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Mon, 08 May 2006 09:38Even if Russia still has nukes, they don't have the money to launch them and they aren't stupid neather.

You don't need money to launch a missle that has been readied to fire, all you do is press a button (well you do more than that like get the authirization, but you get the idea), by the way Russia has many ways of delivering nukes to their targets, like submarine launched nukes, HEY they might just happen to sneak in a few IBMs to Cuba and launch them at America, If America happens to be the target.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 10 May 2006 22:19:13 GMT

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

First of all, Russia has no interest in nuking America. Japan maybe. Not America. There's nothing in it for them except MAD (which is what kept them from launching missiles in the Cold War) and if we were still able to retaliate afterwards, there would be no way they could fight off an invasion.

Secondly, it is never as simple as pushing a button. You've been conditioned by Hollywood to think that there's a blinking red button saying DO NOT PUSH in every command bunker that launches a missile. Read http://www.everything2.com/index.pl?node_id=87441

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Titan_HQ](#) on Wed, 14 Jun 2006 12:41:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thrash300 wrote on Mon, 24 April 2006 20:28
damn president is acting like a little lost boy in the White House

pretending that he dosen't know squat about this issue. By the way

REALLY? the last i heard the US had a plan to use nuclear weapons if nesercarry*

*sorry about the spelling.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Wed, 14 Jun 2006 14:33:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jeez...so much retardation in this thread that it's not even worth arguing any further.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [OWA](#) on Wed, 14 Jun 2006 17:14:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thrash300 stated that...You don't need money to launch a missle that has been readied to fire, all you do is press a button (well you do more than that like get the authirization, but you get the idea), by the way Russia has many ways of delivering nukes to their targets, like submarine launched nukes, HEY they might just happen to sneak in a few IBMs to Cuba and launch them at America, If America happens to be the target.

I think Thrash has been playing a bit too much C&C Red Alert and Red Alert 2...

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 14 Jun 2006 17:22:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thrash300 wrote on Wed, 10 May 2006 17:52You don't need money to launch a missle that has been readied to fire, all you do is press a button (well you do more than that like get the authirization, but you get the idea), by the way Russia has many ways of delivering nukes to their targets, like submarine launched nukes, HEY they might just happen to sneak in a few IBMs to Cuba and launch them at America, If America happens to be the target.

President: NUKE RUSSA. KGO!
Commander: LOLK. PRES BUTAN!!
Soldier: LoL! K!!

I'm sure we all know that's how it works...

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 14 Jun 2006 17:25:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

thrash300 wrote on Wed, 10 May 2006 17:52 You don't need money to launch a missile that has been readied to fire, all you do is press a button (well you do more than that like get the authorization, but you get the idea), by the way Russia has many ways of delivering nukes to their targets, like submarine launched nukes, HEY they might just happen to sneak in a few IBMs to Cuba and launch them at America, If America happens to be the target.

Hmm, I know IBMs have that new shock proof technology but I don't think being hurled over a few 1000 miles that it will do any good.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 14 Jun 2006 18:06:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

holy shit we're all gonna die

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Homey](#) on Wed, 14 Jun 2006 20:28:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Wed, 14 June 2006 13:22 thrash300 wrote on Wed, 10 May 2006 17:52 You don't need money to launch a missile that has been readied to fire, all you do is press a button (well you do more than that like get the authorization, but you get the idea), by the way Russia has many ways of delivering nukes to their targets, like submarine launched nukes, HEY they might just happen to sneak in a few IBMs to Cuba and launch them at America, If America happens to be the target.

President: NUKE RUSSA. KGO!
Commander: LOLK. PRES BUTAN!!
Soldier: LoL! K!!

I'm sure we all know that's how it works...

Obviously that's how it's done. The soldier is also FPS Doug and would scream boom headshot. Thrash are you getting all this information? It's some serious shit and you gotta know about that big red button. You can even hack into the military and do it yourself!

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 14 Jun 2006 22:03:49 GMT

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

thrash300 wrote on Wed, 10 May 2006 15:52 HEY they might just happen to sneak in a few IBMs to Cuba and launch them at America, If America happens to be the target.

Well, as the saying goes:

If at first you don't succeed, try, try again.

Though I think with the current president, CMC 2 would be far more interesting than CMC 1.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN

Posted by [TheOne999](#) on Thu, 15 Jun 2006 00:35:30 GMT

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

OK first Thing NK has nukes enough said. I agree with most of The Real replies and Not with The Death to Iran lets get em ' now Thing. I feel Iran will try to get nukes for like it was posted before "bargaining" with The west and its rivals in the middle east. For The time being I don't Think they would just launching nukes if they get em, now terrorists (or who whatever you like to call em) in theory could get stuff from them under the table a little better than dirty bomb. Iran isn't as dumb as the media makes you think, yet we all know The history with them . US jumping in wouldn't be a great thing for us but yes the US does have enough to overkill em even with Iraq etc. Almost every War the US get involved in besides WW1 WW2 didn't go real good and made us look worse in the world, I not saying lets just stand here and do nothing but the Real way to stop these people is to have change from within there country. The whole world need to put 110% behind "world threats" be it from Nukes to hunger to disease. most countries just talk mostly including the US about wanting to do good but politics always seem to get in the way and nothing ever gets done right the first time (beside the polio thing back in the day). I don't have the answers to everything and dont claim i do but rushing in would be no greater than what we did in Iraq. besides The fact that most people in The US didn't mind going in but don't like being There for the long haul. e.g. Vietnam now Iraq blah blah blah . The answer to why doesn't Russia nuke us etc you should already know The word "MAD" which I guess also implies to other countries because of retaliation etc. If you don't know about M.A.D. google it sometime and find out what it means. I hope This has informed some and I know bored a few lol enjoy ! Thanks for listening to my view on things

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 15 Jun 2006 12:38:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sorry, couldnd't help it.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [OWA](#) on Thu, 15 Jun 2006 18:26:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

M.A.D = Mutually Assured Destruction (for those of you dont know what it means.)

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 19:40:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

one winged angel wrote on Thu, 15 June 2006 13:26M.A.D = Mutually Assured Destruction (for those of you dont know what it means.)

AKA: Brinkmanship, or 'bang for the buck.'

sigh The Cold War must have been awesome...

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 21:56:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, nothing beats living in fear. Everyone was pretty excited for that first nuclear strike, shame it never arrived.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 22:16:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I dunno, I kinda like the idea of a Russian invasion. Probably why I find Red Alert appealing.

But the whole "losing personal liberties/freedom" thing with the alternative of "steel-melting destruction" doesn't sound like a fair trade for a few years of amusement.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Wed, 28 Jun 2006 22:36:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hums Weird Al's, "Christmas at Ground-Zero."

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2006 01:00:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SpyGuy246 wrote on Wed, 28 June 2006 18:16l dunno, I kinda like the idea of a Russian invasion. Probably why I find Red Alert appealing.

But the whole "losing personal liberties/freedom" thing with the alternative of "steel-melting destruction" doesn't sound like a fair trade for a few years of amusement.

Go rent or buy the movie Red Dawn or Amerika(impossible to find). They are both about a Russian invasion of the United States.

Subject: Re: DEATH TO IRAN
Posted by [Berkut](#) on Thu, 29 Jun 2006 02:46:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, this topic's died down. Might as well post the lyrics...

Lyrics:

It's Christmas at Ground Zero
There's music in the air
The sleigh bells are ringin' and the carolers are singin'
While the air raid sirens blare

It's Christmas at Ground Zero
The button has been pressed
The radio just let us know
That this is not a test

Everywhere the atom bombs are droppin'
It's the end of all humanity
No more time for last minute shoppin'
It's time to face your final destiny

Well, it's Christmas at Ground Zero
There's panic in the crowd
We can dodge debris while we trim the tree

Underneath a mushroom cloud

(siren)

You might hear some reindeer on your rooftop
Or Jack Frost on your windowsill
But if someone's climbin' down your chimney
You better load your gun and shoot to kill

Oh, it's Christmas at Ground Zero
And if the radiation level's okay
I'll go out with you and see the all new
Mutations on New Year's Day

It's Christmas at Ground Zero
Just seconds left to go
I'll duck and cover with my yuletide lover
Underneath the mistletoe

It's Christmas at Ground Zero
Now the missiles are on their way
What a crazy fluke we're gonna get nuked
On this jolly holiday
What a crazy fluke we're gonna get nuked
On this jolly holiday

(siren)
