

---

Subject: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 03:25:00 GMT

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

---

Wingdingo on the Reborn forums wrote:Here is one of my many rants. Enjoy.

(this line does not refer to you.)

Too many of you can't think of this war in a logical sense. Yes it's tragic that our soldiers are dying for what is a "wrong cause" yet, you fail to see that those men and women VOLUNTEERED, to serve our country. They knew the risks when they signed up, yet they still wanted to lend a hand and serve their nation, serve their brothers and sisters.

I'll admit, the US has taken on the role of "world police" but I highly doubt we are "bullies." I'm not proud that the US has done so, but lo and behold, who else is stepping up to do the task? The rest of the world certainly doesn't give a damn. If you wish the US would just stay out of everybodys business so be it. But what would have happened during WWI and WWII had the US not been involved at all?

As I recall, the US did not want anything to do with either war. We were an isolationist nation, meaning we didn't want to deal with the shit in the world. The rest of the world was getting its ass kicked in both wars. We didn't join in on WWI until two years before it was over because of Germany's unrestricted submarine warfare. We didn't want to, but we were forced into that one. WWII, same story. We didn't want any involvement. Japan had other ideas however and attacked the US first.

Where would you all be now if we hadn't been there to help?

And about the current war on terror...again we were attacked first. Iraq is a mistake, I admit, but do you want us to leave Iraq without footing or fixing our errors? If we leave now our losses will have been in vain and guess what? That tribal warfare/civil war will just ignite (if it already hasn't) and Iraq will be worse off. We may, as a matter of fact, be better off, as the tribal mentality that runs so rampant through that region will hamper any attempts at peace.

I can only think of five wars the US has started on its own. The US Revolutionary War, the US Civil War, the Gulf War, The Mexican American War, and the war in Iraq, one of them being for independence. What happened to Korea and Vietnam, not to mention the Cold War altogether? You can't pin that all on the US, the blame equally falls upon Soviet Russia for those wars as heavily. The US willingly stepped up to the bat to stem the tide of Communism which was very aggressive. Note how well Communism has succeeded since its iteration. Don't tell me "look at China, they're doing good and they're Communist." You ignore the fact that they have a Capitalist market in place of a Communist one.

Ah, the U.N. What a useless piece of crap that is. Hell, every "league of nations" type organization has failed before and will likely fail again.

What will you all do if the US goes isolationist once again? I don't know about my fellow Americans, but I'm tired of my nation bailing everyone else out of a bad situation only to be spat in

the face and ridiculed. When the world's in flames and you come running to the US, don't be surprised if we're fed up and tell you "deal with it yourselves."

And part two in response to some jerkoffs thinking otherwise: (Note I am now livid. Opening line does not refer to you guys.)

You all have got to be the stupidest people known to man.

How can any of you compare Hitler to Bush? Dumbasses.

Let's see, Hitler: Killed millions on his hellbent quest to take over the world. Brainwashed his nation and took advantage of them. Attempted to wipe out an entire ethnicity. HIS OWN ETHNICITY.

Bush: As far as I know, has not taken anything over (and kept it), has not killed millions, has not tried to wipe an ethnicity off of the face of the planet. Clearly has not brainwashed his nation if so many of "you" are in such great and united opposition of him. He's done his fair share of idiotic things, but there is no way in hell that he can be compared to Hitler. You dumbasses actually believe that a president, no better, no worse than any other in U.S. History, save, the world, is as evil and vile as Adolf Hitler, the man closest to being the devil.

It sickens me to my core that any of you can believe that filth. Do you want to know why the United States sticks it's nose in other people's business? Because you shitheads can't even take care of your own shit. How many times has the U.S. saved your asses. How many times have we tried to help you only to receive your refusal? Not only that, but (especially to Europeans) don't see the irony in all of their U.S. Bashing claiming what the U.S. cannot be anything else like the rest of the "peaceful" world. You shitheads pretty much created the United states. You created every ideal that the United states has borrowed from. You spawned the United States from your own corruption. YOU, are what created everything the United States is, and ever will be. Don't believe me, read up on your history, and look at the total number of wars, the amount of corruption, the brutal nature of "civilization", the raping of land and peoples that occurred before the United States, and who will you find at the helm? That's right. The rest of the world. It's human nature, deal with it. You say we don't care about the world, but remember, you didn't care first.

I am not happy, I'm going to bed.

greatest US defense ever. Wingdingo is from Texas btw.

EDIT: fixed quote just had to vote, on the sheer awesomeness of the quote.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 03:45:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

This guy wins a prize.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 03:47:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wow. That was godly.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 05:22:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Geez, that's a kick to the berries to all of the tools out there. Well done.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 05:59:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I only read half of this before, I just finished reading it.

One thing I want to insert 2 cents on:

I don't think Hitler was "Evil." WAIT, LET ME FINISH! I didn't say that I don't think what he did was a horrible, horrible thing, I just think that the word "Evil" and Hitler are just in two completely different leagues. Or like using a football to play baseball.

I see Hitler as more of a Psychologically Imbalanced or Disturbed, rather than "Evil."

My reasons for saying that is... well, I don't really know.. it just stood out to me and I thought I'd say something about it.

Maybe it is because Hitler believed he was doing the right thing. An Evil person would consciously be doing the wrong thing.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 06:35:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 23:59: I only read half of this before, I just finished reading it.

One thing I want to insert 2 cents on:

I don't think Hitler was "Evil." WAIT, LET ME FINISH! I didn't say that I don't think what he did was a horrible, horrible thing, I just think that the word "Evil" and Hitler are just in two completely different leagues. Or like using a football to play baseball.

I see Hitler as more of a Psychologically Imbalanced or Disturbed, rather than "Evil."

My reasons for saying that is... well, I don't really know.. it just stood out to me and I thought I'd say something about it.

Maybe it is because Hitler believed he was doing the right thing. An Evil person would consciously be doing the wrong thing.

That's the way I see it. If Hitler was truly insane or mentally unstable, he would consider himself as having done the right thing in killing masses of people, which would be appalling to a person in a normal mental state.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 06:39:24 GMT

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

---

Funny how he justifies the cold war part. "Oh, that was against communism. It doesn't count. The blame goes to the soviets". Horse shit. Also, he forgot the war of 1812. And all those "wars" with Native Americans (Oh, people hate to bring up Native Americans in threads like this--it tends to knock the US down a notch). In fact, he forgot all of these.

The Hitler thing I agree with. Bush = Hitler is a bad analogy. It doesn't mean I like either party, but what're you going to do, right?

His last paragraph is pure bullshit.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 09:26:19 GMT

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

---

I have to disagree with 1 part: "VOLUNTEERED"

They did so because they're pumped with fear and violence every day, because they are poor and looking for a quick fix, so to speak, and because they have propaganda thrown in their faces from the military.

Now, I expect a good page of flaming to ensue, so I'm probably not even going to bother looking at this thread again.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 10:46:35 GMT

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

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 23:59I only read half of this before, I just finished reading it.

One thing I want to insert 2 cents on:

I don't think Hitler was "Evil." WAIT, LET ME FINISH! I didn't say that I don't think what he did was a horrible, horrible thing, I just think that the word "Evil" and Hitler are just in two completely different leagues. Or like using a football to play baseball.

I see Hitler as more of a Psychologically Imbalanced or Disturbed, rather than "Evil."

My reasons for saying that is... well, I don't really know.. it just stood out to me and I thought I'd say something about it.

Maybe it is because Hitler believed he was doing the right thing. An Evil person would consciously be doing the wrong thing.  
LMFAO nAzi COwcLO LZ!

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 10:52:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think you miss the point of not only American soldier dieing, but millions of Iraqi Men, Women and children being blown to bits to kill a very few "millitants" which pose a tiny threat to the "West". George Bush is either Evil or mentaly disturbed. He has some sad vision that Iraq, Iran and North Korea are the "Axis of Evil". How sad.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 13:20:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cnc95fan wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 21:52George Bush is either Evil or mentaly disturbed.

He's neither. He doesn't make any decisions for the country, others do that for him. You still think that the President runs the entire country? Hah! Nope. There are people higher up. Have you ever wondered why presidents that really would have changed the world got ASSASSINATED?

Anyhow, George Bush can't even decide which sock to wear, let alone run a country.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 14:32:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

He was our best choice. In 2004 we had to vote for the lesser of the two evils. John Kerry was

just an idiot and was the more of the two evils.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 14:52:20 GMT

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

---

Dreganius wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 03:26I have to disagree with 1 part: "VOLUNTEERED"

They did so because they're pumped with fear and violence every day, because they are poor and looking for a quick fix, so to speak, and because they have propaganda thrown in their faces from the military.

Now, I expect a good page of flaming to ensue, so I'm probably not even going to bother looking at this thread again.

Don't group everyone up into that category. My neighbor is a marine and he WANTS to see combat. He told me this himself. He hates the fact that he isn't in Iraq.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 16:21:58 GMT

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

---

Jecht wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 08:52Dreganius wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 03:26I have to disagree with 1 part: "VOLUNTEERED"

They did so because they're pumped with fear and violence every day, because they are poor and looking for a quick fix, so to speak, and because they have propaganda thrown in their faces from the military.

Now, I expect a good page of flaming to ensue, so I'm probably not even going to bother looking at this thread again.

Don't group everyone up into that category. My neighbor is a marine and he WANTS to see combat. He told me this himself. He hates the fact that he isn't in Iraq.

There will be exceptions but doesn't mean the majority are not influenced by what Dreganius is talking about.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 17:35:19 GMT

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

---

Muad Dib15 wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 08:32He was our best choice. In 2004 we had to vote for the lesser of the two evils. John Kerry was just an idiot and was the more of the two evils.

---

You didn't have to vote for them, nobody was forcing you to.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [cnc95fan](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 19:10:36 GMT

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

---

Dreganius wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 05:20cnc95fan wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 21:52George Bush is either Evil or mentaly disturbed.

He's neither. He doesn't make any decisions for the country, others do that for him. You still think that the President runs the entire country? Hah! Nope. There are people higher up. Have you ever wondered why presidents that really would have changed the world got ASSASSINATED?

Anyhow, George Bush can't even decide which sock to wear, let alone run a country.

Quote:"This war is a Crusade"

Several days later.

Quote: I retract that statement"

How can you vote in such a retard he doesn't even know what a crusade is..

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 19:42:18 GMT

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

---

Dreganius wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 07:20cnc95fan wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 21:52George Bush is either Evil or mentaly disturbed.

He's neither. He doesn't make any decisions for the country, others do that for him. You still think that the President runs the entire country? Hah! Nope. There are people higher up. Have you ever wondered why presidents that really would have changed the world got ASSASSINATED?

Anyhow, George Bush can't even decide which sock to wear, let alone run a country.

OH NOES ITS THE PATRIOTS (Metal Gear Solid if anyone is wondering what the fuck I'm on about).

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 04:42:06 GMT

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

---

Here's some news, seems that America's run by the banks and their owners.

According to Zeitgeist, that is. [www.zeitgeistmovie.com](http://www.zeitgeistmovie.com)

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 05:53:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

cnc95fan wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 13:10

Quote:"This war is a Crusade"

Several days later.

Quote: I retract that statement"

How can you vote in such a retard he doesn't even know what a crusade is..

How does this prove he doesn't know what a crusade is?

It means he realized he said something that pissed off a shitload of Muslims and retracted it.

But how can I reply to such a retard who doesn't even know what "retract" means?

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 09:28:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dreganius wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 04:26I have to disagree with 1 part: "VOLUNTEERED"

They did so because they're pumped with fear and violence every day, because they are poor and looking for a quick fix, so to speak, and because they have propaganda thrown in their faces from the military.

Now, I expect a good page of flaming to ensue, so I'm probably not even going to bother looking at this thread again.

I really awt to slap you for that comment. My Uncle, being so low knowledge with using a computer, made me go with him step-by-step into getting him hired for a job out there, which he is now there today. I had to type up resumes and send emails.

He is now a work foreman running mid-night convoys from one town to the next.

He isn't a marine, he isn't fighting, he is helping to rebuild, but that doesn't mean the Iraqis won't try and kill him. Just a few months ago one of the vehicles in his convoy was hit by a roadside bomb.

And not only that, but he went there back in I believe 05. He has visited back home one time so far, and has refused to come back home ever since.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dreganius](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 23:32:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well slap me then. I was talking about the majority. Your uncle is obviously not part of that



majority.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Sn1per74\\*](#) on Mon, 14 Jan 2008 03:39:11 GMT

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

---

Dreganius wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 03:26 I have to disagree with 1 part: "VOLUNTEERED"

They did so because they're pumped with fear and violence every day, because they are poor and looking for a quick fix, so to speak, and because they have propaganda thrown in their faces from the military.

Now, I expect a good page of flaming to ensue, so I'm probably not even going to bother looking at this thread again.

The other day I was talking to somebody in the armed forces. I asked him "Do you support the war?" and he responded "I support whatever my country wants me to do." Basing an assumption on what he said, yes, they DID volunteer.

[quote title=Dover wrote on Sat, 12 January 2008 00:39]Funny how he justifies the cold war part. "Oh, that was against communism. It doesn't count. The blame goes to the soviets". Horse shit. Also, he forgot the war of 1812. And all those "wars" with Native Americans (Oh, people hate to bring up Native Americans in threads like this--it tends to knock the US down a notch). In fact, he forgot all of these.

What country are you from Dover? It says you are from the U.S., but by the way you talk about it, it doesn't seem like you are.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [z310](#) on Mon, 14 Jan 2008 04:47:44 GMT

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

---

He goes to the college I go to. He's in Southern California.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 14 Jan 2008 05:54:25 GMT

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

---

Sn1per74\* wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 22:39 Funny how he justifies the cold war part. "Oh, that was against communism. It doesn't count. The blame goes to the soviets". Horse shit. But he didn't say that. He said blame equally falls on the Soviets. Like you can blame the US because the Soviets started to build WMDs in Cuba, right outside the US' bounties.

I don't know about you, but I kind of like the east cost of the United states, it is kinda where I live.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 14 Jan 2008 08:06:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 21:54Sn1per74\* wrote on Sun, 13 January 2008 22:39Funny how he justifies the cold war part. "Oh, that was against communism. It doesn't count. The blame goes to the soviets". Horse shit.  
But he didn't say that. He said blame equally falls on the Soviets. Like you can blame the US because the Soviets started to build WMDs in Cuba, right outside the US' bounties.

I don't know about you, but I kind of like the east cost of the United states, it is kinda where I live.

Funny. I don't recall Soviet Russia having anything to do with Vietnam or Korea.

And how can you be bitching about WMDs in Cuba when the US has bombers capable of carrying nukes from the West Coast to Moscow since the mid-late 1970s? I guess threatening countries with nuclear destruction is only okay when the US does it.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 14 Jan 2008 20:00:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I don't recall Vietnam or Korea having anything to do with the Cold War...

And because, the US isn't apart of Eurasia. We don't have any large super-power countries bordering us, we are surrounded by water. There would be absolutely no reason for us to pack up a nuclear missile and travel halfway across the globe to fire it and start a war.

However, when a known non-ally starts massing WMD out side of our country, of course we are going to act.

Why the hell would they start massing missiles THAT far away from home and THAT close to American soil? I mean, without any intention for using them. Or at least using them to threaten the country.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Mon, 14 Jan 2008 22:50:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 00:13:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 12:00I don't recall Vietnam or Korea having anything to do with the Cold War...

Lol.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 12:00And because, the US isn't apart of Eurasia. We don't have any large super-power countries bordering us, we are surrounded by water. There would be absolutely no reason for us to pack up a nuclear missile and travel halfway across the globe to fire it and start a war.

Mostly because we wouldn't need to. Like in my above post, the US has had bombers capable of delivering nukes (This means "bombing the shit out of", not delivering in the FedEx sense) from the West Coast to Moscow since the mid-late 1970s. That's the same thing as setting up nukes within launching range, only with the mode of delivery being the difference.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 12:00However, when a known non-ally starts massing WMD out side of our country, of course we are going to act.

Why the hell would they start massing missiles THAT far away from home and THAT close to American soil? I mean, without any intention for using them. Or at least using them to threaten the country.

So, it's okay for the US to deliver military equipment to Afghanistan "THAT far away from home" to help out "Allies" but the Soviets can't deliver military equipment to Cuba (One of THEIR allies)? American hypocrisy speaks again.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 00:52:01 GMT

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

---

You know what Dover, if you don't like this country, go back where you came from. I hate people like you that just bash our country when a) they live here and b) they aren't citizens yet/ are illegal immigrants.

Why do you think the last paragraph is complete bullshit? Is it because you don't like the fact that everything in there is completely true? We would have been completely content in staying isolationist, and because of the Japs we came into WW2. You say that the US is the epitome of evil, yet you fucking hypocrites continue to live here because you like the way you can do stuff here without getting in trouble. Would you be fine with the Soviet Union taking on the world out of desperation to save it, because it is completely screwed because they tried to stay afloat using communism? Why do you think the world has such good relations with the biggest and potentially most dangerous country in the world? Nixon. Guess what, Nixon was an American. What would you European leftists do if China attacked us?

"Oh, look. Our country has just been nuked. Lets go over to the Chinese and tell them to stop shooting missiles at us because that's not nice." That doesn't work. Look at what happened in 1939 because of that attitude.

Your pacifism sickens me.

Sadukar, think of new insults.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 01:01:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You think Dover is an illegal immigrant? LOL. Your IQ deteriorate everytime. Instead of posting personal insults, get back on topic.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 01:11:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 19:13R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 12:00However, when a known non-ally starts massing WMD out side of our country, of course we are going to act.

Why the hell would they start massing missiles THAT far away from home and THAT close to American soil? I mean, without any intention for using them. Or at least using them to threaten the country.

So, it's okay for the US to deliver military equipment to Afghanistan "THAT far away from home" to help out "Allies" but the Soviets can't deliver military equipment to Cuba (One of THEIR allies)? American hypocrisy speaks again.  
What the hell are you talking about?! I didn't think it was that possible to be that thick headed!

What purpose would Cuba have with WMDs in such an isolated area with absolutely nothing near then except for the US which they aren't allied with.

There is a large difference in delivering weapons to Afghanistan and building WMDs in Cuba.  
-There is a war going and supplies are kind of needed. There was no reason for Cuba to have WMDs because there wasn't any reason for them to go to war, as far as I know.  
-Delivering weapons to continue a war is different than creating nukes just for fun. For one reason one of the above doesn't destroy everything in a 2 mile radius.

The only reason for me to understand why you don't understand (did that make sense?) is if you where to live in Eurasia, which I thought you lived in southern California...

But just in case you didn't get my point before, I will try to explain it again.

Countries in Europe and Asia all live neighboring each other. If they wanted to start a war with each other, then what is the point of porting the WMDs across the Pacific ocean right next to one single country? The only reason is if they wanted to launch the missiles onto the US, that is the

only reason I can think of, short of simply hiding missiles for later use on other countries, which even in that case, it was good for them to be dismantled.

Lets say the Soviets wanted to build nukes to attack lets just say for the sake of argument, China. Why would they port missiles across the Pacific and hide them in Cuba, to which the US is well within the firing range of, only to be later transported back?

It is completely different that dropping a bomb from a plane that took off from the West Coast. First of all, moving missiles into Cuba is like preparing to fire them onto the US. The US having a bomber that can take off from the West coast and travel to Moscow isn't preparing for an attack, it is waiting to be attacked.

One is simply offense, and the other one is defense. There is absolutely no reason why the US would pick a nuclear war with some other county for no reason. And that is the reason why we can't trust anyone else with a nuke.

Haven't you heard the expression if you can't have something done right, you have to do it yourself? Well, it applies here. We know we can trust ourselves to not offensively fire a nuke without warning on another nation, but how can we be so sure that some other nation feels the same way? Call it paranoia if you will.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 02:30:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 17:11  
What the hell are you talking about?! I didn't think it was that possible to be that thick headed!

Ad hominem.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 17:11 What purpose would Cuba have with WMDs in such an isolated area with absolutely nothing near then except for the US which they aren't allied with.

What purpose does any country have with nukes?

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 17:11-There is a war going and supplies are kind of needed. There was no reason for Cuba to have WMDs because there wasn't any reason for them to go to war, as far as I know.

Bay of pigs.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 17:11-Delivering weapons to continue a war is different than creating nukes just for fun. For one reason one of the above doesn't destroy everything in a 2 mile radius.

Bombs and weapons are bombs and weapons. It's simply a matter of degree.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 17:11 Countries in Europe and Asia all live neighboring each other. If they wanted to start a war with each other, then what is the point of porting the WMDs across the Pacific ocean right next to one single country? The only reason is if they wanted to launch the missiles onto the US, that is the only reason I can think of, short of simply hiding missiles for later use on other countries, which even in that case, it was good for them to be dismantled.

Lets say the Soviets wanted to build nukes to attack lets just say for the sake of argument, China. Why would they port missiles across the Pacific and hide them in Cuba, to which the US is well within the firing range of, only to be later transported back?

It's a common logical falicity in these kinds of discussions (And I've had plenty of these kinds of discussions) to equate Communist countries with Soviets. The USSR (United Soviet Socialist Republic) is a Union of 15 states into one whole, similar to the USA. Having that said, Most communist countries (Portions of East Europe, China, North Korea, CUBA) ARE NOT SOVIET.

If anyone was going to launch nukes from Cuban soil at the East coast, it would be Cubans. And can you blame them? How many decades of imperialism and being treated as second-class citizens in their own country did they suffer through before Castro takes over?

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 17:11 It is completely different that dropping a bomb from a plane that took off from the West Cost. First of all, moving missiles into Cuba is like preparing to fire them onto the US. The US having a bomber that can take off from the West coast and travel to Moscow isn't preparing for an attack, it is waiting to be attacked. One is simply offense, and the other one is defense.

I fail to see the difference. A bomber parked in Washington State with a nuke loaded that has the word "Moscow" painted on it is no better than an ICBM in Havana with the word "New York" painted on it.

Oh, and nukes can't be defense. Ever. To illustrate this point, imagine using a Nuclear Strike Beacon to defend against an attack in Renegade.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 17:11 There is absolutely no reason why the US would pick a nuclear war with some other county for no reason.

Read the OP. Apperantly, there is a reason, as popular US sentiment is that the USSR has done something terribly wrong in being a Communist state. So much so that blame for two wars they didn't partake in and four decades of an arms race "falls equally" to them.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 17:11 And that is the reason why we can't trust anyone else with a nuke.

And who elected the US to be the sole Nuclear guardian in the world?

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 17:11 Haven't you heard the expression if you can't

have something done right, you have to do it yourself? Well, it applies here. We know we can trust ourselves to not offensively fire a nuke without warning on another nation, but how can we be so sure that some other nation feels the same way? Call it paranoia if you will.

You THINK you can trust yourself not to nuke countrys into oblivion. Can anybody else trust you?

And considering the list of nuclear attacks that have ever occured, the US's track record isn't looking too good.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 02:46:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oh boy, 2 nukes that ended a war.

And another thing I don't like, is when people break posts up like that into quotes and reply to each one separately... it means I can't reply to it unless I feel like putting in 30 min of work, which I don't want to do.. :\

So all I can do is generalize. Some of the things you said either reiterated what you quoted or just are completely different, and others I'll give to you.

But let me ask you a question, if you are so smart: If what you say is true, what is the reason behind the USSR porting WMDs to Cuba in the first place? Because according to you: "Having that said, Most communist countries (Portions of East Europe, China, North Korea, CUBA) ARE NOT SOVIET."

Why would they bother moving nukes over to Cuba if they aren't affiliated. Last I know, Cuba wants to be independent.

Also, another thing I wanted to key in on. That offense/defense thing. I didn't mean in terms of defending anything physical. I mean in terms of how it is used.

preparing a nuke to be fired with no prior warning and with no reason to fire in the first place: That is offensively. Going out of a countries way to spread what it can do.

If a country is attacked first, and uses a nuke to retaliate, that is defensively. A nuke sitting on a plane isn't being prepared to fire, it is just taking the first step in retaliation, shall it occur.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Sn1per74\\*](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 04:16:07 GMT

---

Where are you from Dover?

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 05:59:52 GMT

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

---

The stupidity in this thread (except for Dover) is incredible and almost unbelievable. But it is for real and that's why I have been forced to reply.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 14:00

Why the hell would they start massing missiles THAT far away from home and THAT close to American soil? I mean, without any intention for using them. Or at least using them to threaten the country.

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 20:46But let me ask you a question, if you are so smart: If what you say is true, what is the reason behind the USSR porting WMDs to Cuba in the first place?

My long reply below answers Razor's stupid questions in the two quotes above.

That's a typical "dumb civilian" question with lack of basic military knowledge and history. Learn on your own instead of listening to false information and garbage from school and TV. You want to know why?

Here's the short version:

-The Soviet Union placed missiles in Cuba because the United States placed missiles in Turkey (in 1961) that could reach Moscow in 16 minutes. Placing missiles in Cuba (in 1962) was the just and fair Soviet retaliation for American actions.

I just fucked up your previous argument(s). But for the sake of the other name-calling people here, the long version:

Remember that the Cuban Missile Crisis happened early in the Cold War (1962). Bombers, land-based nuclear missile platforms, and unworthy missile submarines were the order of the day. Nuclear missiles did not have such very advanced guidance systems and the probability of a missile failing was high. Their range was also limited. So, the closer the missiles were to your targets, the higher the chances of a successful strike.

And forget the "duck-and-cover" bullshit you learned in school, there were NO Soviet bombers capable of such a mass attack on the United States. The whole bullshit "Russians-have-a-million-bombers-and-they-can-nuke-America-anytime-in-one-big-fucking-bombing-raid" was a conjured up lie that was born during the days of McCarthy's paranoia and the Red Scare.

In 1962, the year of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the U.S. had almost 28,000 nuclear warheads. The



Soviets had a mere 3,300+. These figures are true and confirmed by both nations and NATO. So, those who think the Soviets were going to start a war and wipe out humanity can go to hell.

The Soviet Union NEVER was equal to the United States when it came to the military. Throughout the Cold War, they were ALWAYS one step behind the United States in terms of evolution of military warfare, tactics, technology, flexibility. They caught up rather impressively in the late 1980's but then did not last too long after that to see the "glory."

The Soviets made awesome strides in some areas of sea and land warfare but always lagged behind the U.S. in other aspects. Only the vast amounts of nuclear warheads, the later advanced missile capability, and their adoption and integration of advanced foreign electronics into their tanks/aircraft in the 1980's ensured that the USSR maintained a rough nuclear/conventional parity and therefore "equal" status with the United States.

So, in such a crucial period of military technological backwardness of the 1960's, the Soviet Union had no other choice than to deploy missiles in Cuba. No, they were not going to start a war but there was no other option on the table.

And Cuba, located close to the U.S., was the best and only option to even the tide.

My maps will explain for those who can't read/understand words:

Map 1: After the end of WWII, the Soviet Union was isolated. It's biggest allies were the Eastern Bloc nations. It also eventually gained the trust of Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Iraq (after the Colonists left them). Observe the nuclear symbols representing locations of nuclear weapons:

MAP 1

Do you people see any **IMBALANCE** in the first map? Is there something "uneven" about it? Sure...American nukes are **ASSRAMMED** right near Soviet controlled areas **POSING DIRECT THREAT TO MOSCOW** while not a single Soviet nuke is anywhere near the American mainland.

I don't expect a few people here to see this in a military prespective and understand but thank fuck I can.

A well-trained military force with the intelligent command hierarchy like that of the Soviet Union would, not surprisingly, be looking for an opportunity to fix this strategic imbalance.

And they did fix it when the Cuban Communists opened up their arms to Moscow in 1959. It was the most timely and perfect opportunity for the Soviet Union to get even when it came to the distributed deployment of nuclear weapons. (Refer to Map II below)

MAP 2:

So, now the Soviet's had evened the playing field but then you all know what happened.

Understand now? They were not going to start a war but were making a highly intelligent and strategic military maneuver in a Nuclear Age. The same kind of military strategy with which Americans had nukes assrammed in Europe and Turkey in the first place!

But Kennedy and then-Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev (two great men) agreed to a deal to have the Soviet's remove the missiles from Cuba if Americans removed their missiles from Turkey. So, it was a sort of good ending that was achieved by two great men who did everything possible to solve the crisis peacefully.

There are people who say that the Soviets "putting missiles in Cuba" was not justified and see it as a provocation by the USSR to go to war. What fucking idiots! As explained above, the USSR was in no position to start a war; they were simply playing by the rules of the Cold War.

If it had been some other Latin-American country that befriended Moscow, then the Soviets would have deployed missiles there. So simple to understand.

By putting nukes in Cuba, the Soviet Union maximized its chances that it had of having a successful strike IN THE EVENT of war. Deploying nukes in Cuba was NOT a prelude to war but a necessary measure to be successful in case of war.

This is also where my next strong rebuttal takes place:

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 19:11 We know we can trust ourselves to not offensively fire a nuke without warning on another nation, but how can we be so sure that some other nation feels the same way? Call it paranoia if you will.

This is the stupidity that I find in some people (everywhere) and CANNOT agree with. Not only is this paranoia but also stupidity, arrogance and self-righteousness.

Did you know that the sole reason the Cold War never became a hot war? Not because you did all the the "good" shit but because Russians are not the animals you think they are. And they are not the animals you have brainwashed others into thinking they are.

Sure, the Russian government is not that clean and have committed atrocities in the past.

But remember that the Russians are a civilized race. They have made strides in all subjects and science and sent man into space. And they most understood the concept of "Mutual-Assured-Destruction" (MAD).

Stop classifying the Russians as animals and then maybe your attitude about them can change.

BTW, I am coming from the most peaceful and open nuclear-armed nation and I can speak on behalf of my politicians and my fellow countrymen that we understand the power of the nuclear weapon and are as trustworthy as you. The same goes for every other nuclear armed nation.

So, you can go eat your paranoia. I use my commonsense more often. I run on commonsense, not fear, blind emotions, and religion.

NOTE: To those who are asking pathetic questions like "where are you from" and "you need to go back to your country", I have a question for you:

Since when was thinking critically a crime worthy of deportation in the United States of America?

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 07:34:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 20:30  
Oh, and nukes can't be defense. Ever. To illustrate this point, imagine using a Nuclear Strike Beacon to defend against an attack in Renegade.

I've seen this happen and work.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 19:49:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 00:59  
Here's the short version:  
-The Soviet Union placed missiles in Cuba because the United States placed missiles in Turkey (in 1961) that could reach Moscow in 16 minutes. Placing missiles in Cuba (in 1962) was the just and fair Soviet retaliation for American actions.

I didn't read any of your post except for that. I didn't know that.

EDIT:

I decided to peek a little more into what you said, cause I feel like I wasted your time by not reading any more than I did:

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 00:59  
This is the stupidity that I find in some people (everywhere) and CANNOT agree with. Not only is this paranoia but also stupidity, arrogance and self-righteousness.  
No offence, but you're the one being stupid here. Can I at least have back up information explaining why it is "stupidity, arrogance, and self-righteousness?" \*edit\* self-righteous is a given\*

I never said that the US couldn't trust other countries, I just said that it can only trust in itself 100%.

I'm not even in the same argument as you. I'm not arguing facts, I'm arguing ethics. The result of what could happen, how many lives could be lost. Not because of this, this has happened and you are to blame for it. Because honestly, I hate history, and it puts me to sleep. I have little to no interest in it what so ever, and I have hardly a clue at what the hell I'm talking about when it comes

to that.

But what I do know, I try my best to use. For example, I believe you took the comment I said the wrong way.

It is the same as trusting a convicted murderer with a gun to stand next to you and not kill you. There is no way to prove that what they say is what they are going to go by. Just like you have no way to prove that what the US says is what they are going to go by. The only thing you can trust in is yourself. That is why I said we can trust ourselves, but not others. Just like you can trust yourselves but not others. I didn't mean it in as a superiority "we are more responsible than you are" comment.

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 00:59

Did you know that the sole reason the Cold War never became a hot war? Not because you did all the the "good" shit but because Russians are not the animals you think they are. And they are not the animals you have brainwashed others into thinking they are.

But I never said that. I never implied that. I never even thought that. No body said the US thought they where "animals." From my point of view, the only difference is the type of economy each country runs.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 19:57:03 GMT

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

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 13:49Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 00:59  
Here's the short version:

-The Soviet Union placed missiles in Cuba because the United States placed missiles in Turkey (in 1961) that could reach Moscow in 16 minutes. Placing missiles in Cuba (in 1962) was the just and fair Soviet retaliation for American actions.

I didn't read any of your post except for that. I didn't know that.

As long as you got the point...which you obviously did now.

I do suggest you read the rest as it may alleviate some ignorance on your part.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 20:02:57 GMT

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

I edited.

\*edit\*

I edited again

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 21:03:43 GMT

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

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 18:46 Oh boy, 2 nukes that ended a war.

Which happen to be the only two nukes ever used in a war.

Was the second one nessessary, even? It was dropped a mere three days after the first. Given typical government beurocracy, poor (Relative to today) international communincation, and seeing how it was during a total war, I don't see how that's a justifiable amount of time if it was a purely diplomatic move. So what does tell me? The US had two nukes at the time, and god dammit it's going to use two nukes!

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 18:46 preparing a nuke to be fired with no prior warning and with no reason to fire in the first place: That is offensively. Going out of a countries way to spread what it can do.

If a country is attacked first, and uses a nuke to retaliate, that is defensively. A nuke sitting on a plane isn't being prepared to fire, it is just taking the first step in retaliation, shall it occur.

To my understanding, the nukes were never "prepared to fire with no prior warning and no reason to fire to begin with". I don't even think they made it all the way to Cuba.

Sn1per74\* wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 20:16 Where are you from Dover?

Bulgaria. And yourself?

Starbuzz wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 21:59 (Insert Epic Win here)

PlastoJoe wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 23:34 I've seen this happen and work.

So have I. I've done it personally several times.

But now imagine the server has Friendly Fire turned on, and nukes work (somewhat more) realistically. But servers usually don't turn Friendly Fire on for that same reason, huh?

I suppose a more common example would be use Demolition Trucks to defend from enemy rushes in Red Alert: A Path Beyond (Or regular Red Alert, for that matter).

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 11:49 I never said that the US couldn't trust other countries, I just said that it can only trust in itself 100%.

There is a skill called empathy. One popular use for it involves putting yourself in another person's shoes and examining the situation from their perspective, then combining your finds with your perspective to create a more complete picture and to foster mutual understanding and comradery.

Sure, the US thinks it can trust in itself 100%.

But the US isn't the only part of the equation here. The USSR probably (Read: Definatly) had a

similar mindset. "We can trust ourselves, but can we trust those crazy Americans? Look what they did to Japan!"

Is it really that hard to fathom? Are you so rooted in what you know and are comfortable with?

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 11:49 It is the same as trusting a convicted murderer with a gun to stand next to you and not kill you. There is no way to prove that what they say is what they are going to go by. Just like you have no way to prove that what the US says is what they are going to go by. The only thing you can trust in is yourself. That is why I said we can trust ourselves, but not others. Just like you can trust yourselves but not others.

Except, you know, the Soviet Union can't be compared to convicted murderers.

Oh, and I just noticed this:

Muad Dib15 wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 16:52 You know what Dover, if you don't like this country, go back where you came from. I hate people like you that just bash our country when a) they live here and b) they aren't citizens yet/ are illegal immigrants.

Why do you think the last paragraph is complete bullshit? Is it because you don't like the fact that everything in there is completely true? We would have been completely content in staying isolationist, and because of the Japs we came into WW2. You say that the US is the epitome of evil, yet you fucking hypocrites continue to live here because you like the way you can do stuff here without getting in trouble. Would you be fine with the Soviet Union taking on the world out of desperation to save it, because it is completely screwed because they tried to stay afloat using communism? Why do you think the world has such good relations with the biggest and potentially most dangerous country in the world? Nixon. Guess what, Nixon was an American. What would you European leftists do if China attacked us?

"Oh, look. Our country has just been nuked. Lets go over to the Chinese and tell them to stop shooting missiles at us because that's not nice." That doesn't work. Look at what happened in 1939 because of that attitude.

Your pacifism sickens me.

Lol.

If you could please direct me to where I said I didn't like this country, or to where I said the US were the epitome of evil.

Also, the US was involved (out of combat) in WW2 far before Pearl Harbor, giving large amounts of money and military equipment to European allies. Don't get me wrong--There's nothing wrong with that, but don't pull the isolationist bullshit.

Oh, and Nixon was a douchebag.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 21:09:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I don't feel compelled to reply to any of that. Because you only quoted half of what I had said, and answered the parts that I would have already answered if you just quoted the entire thing.

The only thing I want to reply to is this:

youmelt is the same as trusting a convicted murderer with a gun to stand next to you and not kill you. There is no way to prove that what they say is what they are going to go by. Just like you have no way to prove that what the US says is what they are going to go by. The only thing you can trust in is yourself. That is why I said we can trust ourselves, but not others. Just like you can trust yourselves but not others.

Except, you know, the Soviet Union can't be compared to convicted murderers.

Why do people keep putting words in my mouth, I never said that. I never related my example to being strictly Soviet. I related it to EVERY SINGLE NATION INCLUDING SOVIET.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 21:11:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 14:49 It is the same as trusting a convicted murderer with a gun to stand next to you and not kill you.

No, it's not the same thing. For once, you don't even have the facts to back up the claim that the other country is equal to a "convicted murderer." The mistake being made is that you making up your mind beforehand that they maybe evil.

Sure that maybe true or false since most people make that decision by relying on garbage from the mass media instead of coming to conclusions themselves by using facts available to them. In America, pretty much every township has an awesome public library full of knowledge and truth right under your noses.

Think about the people who love to have that opportunity but are stuck in nations whose governments feed and control the people through mass media.

In America, even with knowlege and truth everywhere, people still insist on believing what comes from the fucking TV and the latest rumor.

Remember, if history bores you, you might as well go back to your ordinary dawn to dusk life.

The whole story of the Cuban Missile Crisis has been severely twisted and an altogether different version, one that puts the Russians in very bad light, presented to kids in American high schools. I know this because I went through this. I just sat through it all in disbelief.

I went to one of the most prestigious high schools in Pennsylvania. Yet, the history teacher (in 11th grade) made us all to do the "duck-and-cover" bullshit in class to mimic a Russian nuclear bomber attack!

And the word "Turkey" was not mentioned at all in class. I am pretty sure most schools here do the same.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 14:49 I'm not even in the same argument as you. I'm not arguing facts, I'm arguing ethics. The result of what could happen, how many lives could be lost.

That's a nice (and lame) try to get out of the hole you dug for yourself.

I am not sure when you decided to pull the "ethics" crap. Because quite honestly, was the United States being "ethical" in putting advanced and faster Jupiter nuclear missiles in Turkey in 1961?

If America had not done that to the USSR, the Soviet's would not have deployed nuclear missiles in Cuba in wrathful retaliation so quickly the following year in 1962.

You seriously and honestly believe that an educated race like the Russians were going to nuke the world? Get over it.

So, there goes your "ethics" argument to hell.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 13:49 Because honestly, I hate history, and it puts me to sleep. I have little to no interest in it what so ever, and I have hardly a clue at what the hell I'm talking about when it comes to that.

This is the main source of the problem. Without a solid foundation in history, proven facts, figures, and statistics, you are in no position whatsoever to get into arguments involving them.

The whole world opinion of the United States has dangerously deteriorated due to this stubborn refusal to learn the past. Even Europe laughs now.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 21:16:20 GMT

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

---

@ Quote number 1.

Yes it is exactly the same. I'm not trying to compare the motive to kill with starting a war if that is what you are thinking. I am comparing the ability to trust.

If you where standing next to a serial killer and he said he wasn't going to kill you, would you believe him?

@ Quote number 2.



Lol, wow. I don't even want to touch that one... but I will cause it will look like I'm avoiding it: I specifically said I'm not arguing facts. And what did you do? Use facts to argue.

And another thing. From what you said, you make it sound as if I am defending the US..

@ Quote number 3.

See quote number 2.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 21:36:14 GMT

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

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 13:09 I don't feel compelled to reply to any of that. Because you only quoted half of what I had said, and answered the parts that I would have already answered if you just quoted the entire thing.

I suppose you have that right. That's fine.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 13:09 The only thing I want to reply to is this:

you melt is the same as trusting a convicted murderer with a gun to stand next to you and not kill you. There is no way to prove that what they say is what they are going to go by. Just like you have no way to prove that what the US says is what they are going to go by. The only thing you can trust in is yourself. That is why I said we can trust ourselves, but not others. Just like you can trust yourselves but not others.

Except, you know, the Soviet Union can't be compared to convicted murderers.

Why do people keep putting words in my mouth, I never said that. I never related my example to being strictly Soviet. I related it to EVERY SINGLE NATION INCLUDING SOVIET.

All the more so, then, because there are definately countries more cute and cuddly than the Soviet Union (The netherlands, for example).

Not everyone is a convicted murder. Not everyone is out to get you.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 13:16 @ Quote number 1.

Yes it is exactly the same. I'm not trying to compare the motive to kill with starting a war if that is what you are thinking. I am comparing the ability to trust.

If you where standing next to a serial killer and he said he wasn't going to kill you, would you believe him?

If I were standing next to a known serial killer, and I matched the type of person this known serial killer hunted, and he assured me that I he would not kill me? No. I would not believe him.

Now, if I was standing next to a stranger on the street, or (for an even closer example), someone I had been talking to on a regular basis for several years/months, and they assured me they would not kill me. Would I believe them? Yes, I would.

I'll leave it to you to decide which is a more appropriate analogy for this situation.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 13:16@ Quote number 2.

Lol, wow. I don't even want to touch that one... but I will cause it will look like I'm avoiding it: I specifically said I'm not arguing facts. And what did you do? Use facts to argue.

And another thing. From what you said, you make it sound as if I am defending the US..

@ Quote number 3.

See quote number 2.

There is no such thing as arguing without facts. Arguing without facts is nothing but yelling/insulting back in forth, similar to what you might know as a "bitchfit". Not a "Heated Discussion/Debate" (As per the subforum name) at all. If you don't like arguing using facts, perhaps this subforum isn't the right place for you.

And he doesn't need to make it sound like you're defending the US. You're doing a fine job making it sound like you're defending the US all by yourself.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 22:20:54 GMT

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

---

DoverMuad Dib15 wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 16:52 You know what Dover, if you don't like this country, go back where you came from. I hate people like you that just bash our country when a) they live here and b) they aren't citizens yet/ are illegal immigrants.

Why do you think the last paragraph is complete bullshit? Is it because you don't like the fact that everything in there is completely true? We would have been completely content in staying isolationist, and because of the Japs we came into WW2. You say that the US is the epitome of evil, yet you fucking hypocrites continue to live here because you like the way you can do stuff here without getting in trouble. Would you be fine with the Soviet Union taking on the world out of desperation to save it, because it is completely screwed because they tried to stay afloat using communism? Why do you think the world has such good relations with the biggest and potentially most dangerous country in the world? Nixon. Guess what, Nixon was an American. What would you European leftists do if China attacked us?

"Oh, look. Our country has just been nuked. Lets go over to the Chinese and tell them to stop shooting missiles at us because that's not nice." That doesn't work. Look at what happened in 1939 because of that attitude.

Your pacifism sickens me.

Lol.

If you could please direct me to where I said I didn't like this country, or to where I said the US were the epitome of evil.

Also, the US was involved (out of combat) in WW2 far before Pearl Harbor, giving large amounts of money and military equipment to European allies. Don't get me wrong--There's nothing wrong with that, but don't pull the isolationist bullshit.

Oh, and Nixon was a douchebag.

Yes, I know about Nixon, but that wasn't the point. My point was, that he was the only person in the world that successfully smoothed out the path for the world with China.

Of course we would give money to the allies. We realized that he was a bad man, but we didn't want to get involved in a war half way across the world that didn't really concern us at the time. Once the Japanese attacked us though, we had a good reason to defend our selves. Sure we had an embargo on them, but that was because they were allied with hitler. In that argument, don't get me started on the mass Chinese rape in the late 1930s. (can't remember exactly what it was called) We didn't like the Japanese and what they were doing, so we put an embargo on them to stop their war effort. Then they attacked us and got us directly involved in the war.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 22:37:02 GMT

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

---

Muad Dib15 wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 14:20DoverMuad Dib15 wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 16:52You know what Dover, if you don't like this country, go back where you came from. I hate people like you that just bash our country when a) they live here and b) they aren't citizens yet/ are illegal immigrants.

Why do you think the last paragraph is complete bullshit? Is it because you don't like the fact that everything in there is completely true? We would have been completely content in staying isolationist, and because of the Japs we came into WW2. You say that the US is the epitome of evil, yet you fucking hypocrites continue to live here because you like the way you can do stuff here without getting in trouble. Would you be fine with the Soviet Union taking on the world out of desperation to save it, because it is completely screwed because they tried to stay afloat using communism? Why do you think the world has such good relations with the biggest and potentially most dangerous country in the world? Nixon. Guess what, Nixon was an American. What would you European leftists do if China attacked us?

"Oh, look. Our country has just been nuked. Lets go over to the Chinese and tell them to stop shooting missiles at us because that's not nice." That doesn't work. Look at what happened in 1939 because of that attitude.

Your pacifism sickens me.

Lol.

If you could please direct me to where I said I didn't like this country, or to where I said the US were the epitome of evil.

Also, the US was involved (out of combat) in WW2 far before Pearl Harbor, giving large amounts of money and military equipment to European allies. Don't get me wrong--There's nothing wrong with that, but don't pull the isolationist bullshit.

Oh, and Nixon was a douchebag.

Yes, I know about Nixon, but that wasn't the point. My point was, that he was the only person in the world that successfully smoothed out the path for the world with China.

Of course we would give money to the allies. We realized that he was a bad man, but we didn't want to get involved in a war half way across the world that didn't really concern us at the time. Once the Japanese attacked us though, we had a good reason to defend our selves. Sure we had an embargo on them, but that was because they were allied with hitler. In that argument, don't get me started on the mass Chinese rape in the late 1930s. (can't remember exactly what it was called) We didn't like the Japanese and what they were doing, so we put an embargo on them to stop their war effort. Then they attacked us and got us directly involved in the war.

k.

Edit: To elaborate on what I mean by "k", you haven't addressed your earlier claim of me being an America-hating hypocritical illegal immigrant. I'm still waiting.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 23:33:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sorry about the illegal immigrant thing. I was pissed at the time no call for that though. And by bashing our country, if you don't like it, then go back to Bulgaria. You so pissed about what Bush is doing and it doesn't even concern you since you aren't a citizen of the US. The only contry I've heard of that has been attacked by Al Queda aside from us, is the UK. It's not even affecting you over there, so why does Europe hate us. I see about as many people from the UK that don't like us as do, but it seems that everyone on the continent of Europe hates us.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 15 Jan 2008 23:52:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Muad Dib15 wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 15:33Sorry about the illegal immigrant thing. I was pissed at the time no call for that though. And by bashing our country, if you don't like it, then go

back to Bulgaria. You so pissed about what Bush is doing and it doesn't even concern you since you aren't a citizen of the US. The only contry I've heard of that has been attacked by Al Queda aside from us, is the UK. It's not even affecting you over there, so why does Europe hate us. I see about as many people from the UK that don't like us as do, but it seems that everyone on the continent of Europe hates us.

You're getting a bit ahead of yourself here. I don't nessessarily approve of the actions of the US's current administration, but I haven't meantioned bush at all, nor have I "bashed" this country any more than unbiased true history has.

As for it "not affecting us over there", perhaps you're unaware of Bulgaria's participation in the "Axis of the willing", or whatever the BS terminology is? Or about the Bulgarian contrators dying left in right in Iraq from IEDs and such? Or about the six Bulgarian nurses held in Lybia for several years for "War crimes" and to be executed (Supossedly, intentionally infecting babies with AIDS), only recently released and flown home with intervention from the EU?

Americans have a habit of ignoring (Wether intentionally, or just through being ill-informed, I don't know) the rest of the world (Except any country that Fox News mentions, of course. Then everybody is an expert).

And as for going back, I do. Almost every summer. I try to spend around three months of every year back in Bulgaria, but budget constraints usually mean it's more like every-other year, and usually for a lot less than three months.

As for the hating...well, it's easy to hate the ignorant. I don't say you're ignorant to insult or bash anybody, but just look at this thread so far. Starbuzz summed it up nicely with this:

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 13:11This is the main source of the problem. Without a solid foundation in history, proven facts, figures, and statistics, you are in no position whatsoever to get into arguments involving them.

The whole world opinion of the United States has dangerously deteriorated due to this stubborn refusal to learn the past. Even Europe laughs now.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Sn1per74\\*](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 01:35:46 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 15:03

Sn1per74\* wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 20:16Where are you from Dover?

Bulgaria. And yourself?

U.S. of A my friend.

On your name it says your American, and I was wondering why you bashed it so much.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 02:18:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Sn1per74\* wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 17:35Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 15:03  
Sn1per74\* wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 20:16Where are you from Dover?

Bulgaria. And yourself?  
U.S. of A my friend.  
On your name it says your American, and I was wondering why you bashed it so much.

It's a sad day when a man can't question or critizes the country he lives in and not be labeled a "basher", "hypocrite", "illegal immigrant", or something similar.

I wasn't bashing, "my friend". What Prasp does is bashing. You really can't see the difference between what he and I do?

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 02:46:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

No.

Well I don't anyway. Because what I do is criticize the US. What you been doing is bashing. At least that is how I see it..

"R315r4z0r"The thing the US once stood for doesn't exist anymore.

Today the US isn't built on the Constitution. It is built on loop holes and ways to avoid breaking the Constitution.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 02:49:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 18:46No.

Well I don't anyway. Because what I do is criticize the US. What you been doing is bashing. At least that is how I see it..

"R315r4z0r"The thing the US once stood for doesn't exist anymore.

Today the US isn't built on the Constitution. It is built on loop holes and ways to avoid breaking the Constitution.

Apperantly, I've been "bashing" the country I live in for serveral posts in several threads without

---

even realizing it! Could someone please direct me to these "bash" posts I've made? I can't seem to find them.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 02:55:50 GMT

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

---

Well this thread for starters. You obviously would rather the outcome of the argument to be against the US being in a better light of the situation.

I.E. taking points in history and using them to make the US look bad as well as those who live in it.

Where as if you where to simply criticize, you would at least leave room for improvement.

You can't improve upon the past.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:11:00 GMT

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

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 20:55 Well this thread for starters. You obviously would rather the outcome of the argument to be against the US being in a better light of the situation.

Like WOW! Stop tossing shit around needlessly after you clearly got owned.

Obviously for you, blind patriotism takes priority over rationality.

I would say you are pretty stupid if you think that is bashing. Seriously, go get a proper education. Why don't you start with Wikipedia? Here is something for starters:

Quote:Bashing: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bashing\\_\(pejorative\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bashing_(pejorative))

Critical thinking: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical\\_thinking](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_thinking)

If someone was criticizing my country, I would home in on what the subject matter is, what the other person is saying, analyze it, make a mature counter-argument with the backing of credible facts, and then I will go engage the other person in argument.

I would not become an insecure idiot like a few people here and say "get out of my country" as a matter of fact.

And Razor, you are a tool.

Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 20:18 It's a sad day when a man can't question or criticizes the country he lives in and not be labeled a "basher", "hypocrite", "illegal immigrant", or something similar.

I wasn't bashing, "my friend". What Prasp does is bashing. You really can't see the difference between what he and I do?

Ooo you spoke for me, pretty much.

It's pretty sad indeed when people can't discern the difference between bashing and criticism. I hate when this happens because it creates the perfect situation in which the truth is forced to die in a fire of emotions.

What Prasp does is indeed bashing. His posts are littered with accusations and these are not backed up with credible evidence. Either he provides little proof or the "source" of his evidence is not trustworthy.

I for one have only history as proof. And no blind hatred and stupidity can be found in my posts here (the same can be said for Dover).

And telling someone to "leave the country" is like resorting to swearing when you are losing an argument.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:13:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Excuse me. Trolling is the term for criticizing in the internets.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:20:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I didn't get "owned" what the hell are you talking about? I'm not a "patriot." I completely hate the fact of separate counties thinking they are better than everyone else. Hence my part in this debate.

Criticizing can be one of two things:

- Saying something is great and leaving info on how it could improve or keep it the same.
- Saying something is bad and leaving information or feed back on how it can become better.

Bashing is flat-out disrespect with no intention for suggestions.

Now quote me something that Dover or yourself have said in this thread that suggests a way to "amend" what bad things you pointed out about the US.

You can't say them now, you have to quote something you already said.

---

---



Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:23:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 21:20I didn't get "owned" what the hell are you talking about?

Criticizing can be one of two things:

- Saying something is great and leaving info on how it could improve or keep it the same.
- Saying something is bad and leaving information or feed back on how it can become better.

Bashing is flat-out disrespect with no intention for suggestions.

[krit-uh-sahyz]

–verb (used with object)

1. to censure or find fault with.
2. to judge or discuss the merits and faults of: to criticize three novels in one review.

–verb (used without object)

3. to find fault; judge unfavorably or harshly.

;o <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/criticize>

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:25:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally Blue wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 22:232. to judge or discuss the merits and faults of: to criticize three novels in one review.

Thank you.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:26:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Originally Blue wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 21:23

Quote:

Bashing is flat-out disrespect with no intention for suggestions.

3. to find fault; judge unfavorably or harshly.

;o <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/criticize>

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:27:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 18:55 Well this thread for starters. You obviously would rather the outcome of the argument to be against the US being in a better light of the situation.

I.E. taking points in history and using them to make the US look bad as well as those who live in it.

Where as if you where to simply criticize, you would at least leave room for improvement.

You can't improve upon the past.

You can use the past to improve upon the future.

And if I take the opposite stance and point out what's great about the US? I'd be repeating what "your camp" is saying. I'd basically be spamming "lol ya I agree".

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:20 I didn't get "owned" what the hell are you talking about? I'm not a "patriot." I completely hate the fact of separate counties thinking they are better than everyone else. Hence my part in this debate.

Criticizing can be one of two things:

- Saying something is great and leaving info on how it could improve or keep it the same.
- Saying something is bad and leaving information or feed back on how it can become better.

Bashing is flat-out disrespect with no intention for suggestions.

No, this is wrong. The ACTUAL definitions are found here:

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:11 Bashing:  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bashing\\_\(pejorative\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bashing_(pejorative))  
Critical thinking: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical\\_thinking](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_thinking)

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:27:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Lol, I was just about to edit my above post, again.

I was going to say:

Since the word "bashing" doesn't mean as what it would in a dictionary, at least in terms of its use on the internet, it would be safe to assume that "bashing" is the negative extreme of criticizing.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:29:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:25Originally Blue wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 22:232. to judge or discuss the merits and faults of: to criticize three novels in one review.

Thank you.

+

Originally Blue wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:26Originally Blue wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 21:23

Quote:

Bashing is flat-out disrespect with no intention for suggestions.

3. to find fault; judge unfavorably or harshly.

;o <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/criticize>

+

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:20I didn't get "owned" what the hell are you talking about?

=

Lulz.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:30:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:27Lol, I was just about to edit my above post, again.

I was going to say:

Since the word "bashing" doesn't mean as what it would in a dictionary, at least in terms of its use on the internet, it would be safe to assume that "bashing" is the negative extreme of criticizing.

What I'm doing isn't an extreme of anything.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

---

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:30:59 GMT

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

---

Omg stop posting so fast, I can only quote one thing at a time.

Ok, first post:

Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 22:27And if I take the opposite stance and point out what's great about the US? I'd be repeating what "your camp" is saying. I'd basically be spamming "lol ya I agree".

Umm.. no.

Wait for me to edit

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:32:48 GMT

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

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:30Omg stop posting so fast, I can only quote one thing at a time.

Ok, first post:

Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 22:27And if I take the opposite stance and point out what's great about the US? I'd be repeating what "your camp" is saying. I'd basically be spamming "lol ya I agree".

Umm.. no.

Wait for me to edit

It'd be really great if you could say what you want to say on the first try, and not have to edit.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:33:52 GMT

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

---

I'm sorry, I'm not psychic.

Since you posted, I don't feel guilty about double posting.

Your second post:

Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 22:29R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:25  
Originally Blue wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:26

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:20

\*Look at times of quotes\*

EDIT:

Your 3rd post:

Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 22:30R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:27LoI, I was just about to edit my above post, again.

I was going to say:

Since the word "bashing" doesn't mean as what it would in a dictionary, at least in terms of its use on the internet, it would be safe to assume that "bashing" is the negative extreme of criticizing.

What I'm doing isn't an extreme of anything.

I meant in terms of definition #3 that Bluethen posted.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:35:27 GMT

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

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:33I'm sorry, I'm not psychic.

Since you posted, I don't feel guilty about double posting.

Your second post:

Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 22:29R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:25  
Originally Blue wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:26

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:20

That's fine. Double posting doesn't trigger the forum nazi alarm with me.

In any case, I'm not psychic either. I just address each post as I see it.

Edit: What about the times? I'm sorry for being efficient?

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:37:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

What I meant by "I'm not psychic" is that I can't post everything at once because you haven't replied to it yet.

How can I reply to a criticism you make without you first making the criticism?

Quote:

Edit: What about the times? I'm sorry for being efficient?

Well, you implied I got "owned" when Bluethen posted the definitions, correct?

Well Bluethen posted the definitions AFTER Starbuzz already accused me of being "owned." That is what I meant. That hole Quote + Quote thing didn't make chronological sense.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:39:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:33  
Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 22:30What I'm doing isn't an extreme of anything.

I meant in terms of definition #3 that Bluethen posted.

That's fine, but I'm still not at the "extreme" of anything. So even IF we allow extreme criticism to be termed "bashing", I have not "bashed" anything.

Unless you can direct me to some evidence that I have done otherwise?

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 03:42:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

OMG! I forgot!

Going back all the way up to Starbuzz's post about me getting "owned" and then saying get an education by going to wikipedia.

L.O.L.

That.. that is really all I wanted to say about that.

Edit:

Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 22:39Unless you can direct me to some evidence that I

have done otherwise?

K, hang on..

Ok, the first paragraph of your first reply in this thread. Bashes Wingdingo on his argument. Basically sarcastically implying something that you harshly meant to say... or so it appears.

I don't want to get into any more nit-picky bashing that you did towards me, because the rest of your posts in this thread revolve around me almost 90% of the time.

Now Starbuzz on the other hand, bashes everything that he doesn't agree with. Much like he will find a way to bash what I am saying now. No, I'm not confusing bashing and flaming, because flaming is mindlessly insulting a person on the internet, where as he is using different faults and proofs to, not make the situation better or worse of, but to single out someone and flat out insult them for things that have either been said before from the victim, or just because he doesn't like the person. (Which is plainly obvious)

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 04:19:52 GMT

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

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:42OMG! I forgot!

Going back all the way up to Starbuzz's post about me getting "owned" and then saying get an education by going to wikipedia.

L.O.L.

That.. that is really all I wanted to say about that.

Edit:

Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 22:39Unless you can direct me to some evidence that I have done otherwise?

K, hang on..

Ok, the first paragraph of your first reply in this thread. Bashes Wingdingo on his argument. Basically sarcastically implying something that you harshly meant to say... or so it appears.

I don't want to get into any more nit-picky bashing that you did towards me, because the rest of your posts in this thread revolve around me almost 90% of the time.

Now Starbuzz on the other hand, bashes everything that he doesn't agree with. Much like he will find a way to bash what I am saying now. No, I'm not confusing bashing and flaming, because flaming is mindlessly insulting a person on the internet, where as he is using different faults and proofs to, not make the situation better or worse of, but to single out someone and flat out insult

them for things that have either been said before from the victim, or just because he doesn't like the person. (Which is plainly obvious)

So, in 60something replys, out of which I can claim about 1/3 as my own, you found ONE example of me being sarcastic, POSSIBLY implying that I MIGHT have something harsher to say but held back?

You're right. I'm a big-time basher.

Starbuzz, on the other hand, has used even more evidence and support in his posts, none of which are anything that can be called "bashing" by any of the definitions we've gathered here.

I hereby declare this thread over. We've squeezed what debate we could out of it, but now it's deteriorated to bruised egos and getting defensive over e-honor.

Brace for Plecos spam.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 04:42:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 19:42OMG! I forgot!

Going back all the way up to Starbuzz's post about me getting "owned" and then saying get an education by going to wikipedia.

L.O.L.

That.. that is really all I wanted to say about that.

What is this nonsense? I doubt you will ever leave your little den and go pick up a book. Best way for you to learn is Wikipedia. Then you can graduate to Encarta to attain even more knowledge.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 21:27

Since the word "bashing" doesn't mean as what it would in a dictionary, at least in terms of its use on the internet, it would be safe to assume that "bashing" is the negative extreme of criticizing.

Tell me when me or Dover went over to that "negative extreme" of criticizing?

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 20:42Now Starbuzz on the other hand, bashes everything that he doesn't agree with.

What are you aiming for now? Personal insults?



Let me tell you: I don't let personal preferences get in my way when dealing with other matters. I DO NOT think in the "agree/disagree" method. I use crucial evidence, knowledge, and thinking to rationally solve any argument.

Seriously! You were the one who did not agree and stubbornly insisted that Soviet's put a nuke in Cuba to nuke America. Me blasting that false information with history is equal to insults?

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 20:42 Much like he will find a way to bash what I am saying now.

This is a perfect example of "internet insurance." Sorry, my friend, I am slow to anger but fast to think rationally.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 20:42 No, I'm not confusing bashing and flaming, because flaming is mindlessly insulting a person on the internet...

Flaming = bashing. Your point is irrelevant.

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 20:42 where as he is using different faults and proofs to, not make the situation better or worse of, but to single out someone...

WOW @ your childishness. What "situation" are we talking about? We were debating history (we can't change that) and I brought up VALID, CREDIBLE, and TRUE information that can be found in any public township library to prove my points. How is it an insult?

When did I ever use "faults" to prove my point? And WHO did I single out?

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 20:42 and flat out insult them for things that have either been said before from the victim, or just because he doesn't like the person. (Which is plainly obvious)

"Flat out"? Give me an example. Give me an example where I "flat out insulted" anybody in this thread. And who don't I like in this thread? You think I hate you?

Do you even know my stance on the Iraq War? Do you think I am a supporter of terrorists? Do you think I hate America? Do you think I sympathize with the beheaders? Do you think I am a criminal? Do you think I am a Communist? Do you think I am a terrorist because I am not American? Do you think I am an immigrant who needs to be deported?

You don't know do you? You have not a clue.

Seriously, my friend, you have gone TOO FAR with your blatant and criminal false accusations of me.

Stop right NOW, and think on what you are doing before carrying out this unholy triade against me.

NOTE: In all that I have seen so far, it is clearly obvious that Razor is unfit to argue in this sub-forum and this thread proves it.

-----

EDIT!

R315r4z0r wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 21:55l.E. taking points in history and using them to make the US look bad as well as those who live in it.

LMAO. You are such a little kid. You keep going back to your old posts and adding new things after we post. Shows how unstable you are.

-----

Thanks to you Dover. And yes, I agree, this thread is over and some immature people are clearly upset at their "e-honor" being tarnished.

BRACE FOR INCOMING PLECOS!

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 04:44:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thread over. Call in the Plecos strikes.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 05:02:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

One small one for me, then I'm done. I'm not very good at this Plecos business, so I'll leave the majority of the attacks to be carried out by more experienced plecos commanders.

Hay guize am i doin it rite?

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 06:15:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Stop with posting the fucking fish pictures. I just deleted Starbuzz's post with a 4MB one that took my browser 80 seconds to download.

Grow the fuck up, if you can't have a halfway decent conversation without resorting to plecos posts, then you apparently are too immature to have a discussion in this area of the forums (the ONE area where people try to have real discussions).

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 06:30:05 GMT

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

---

Blazer wrote on Wed, 16 January 2008 00:15 Stop with posting the fucking fish pictures. I just deleted Starbuzz's post with a 4MB one that took my browser 80 seconds to download.

I am so sorry it was my pleco of all the plecos that was ever posted in this subforum that consumed bandwidth and hence got deleted.

Blazer wrote on Wed, 16 January 2008 00:15 Grow the fuck up, if you can't have a halfway decent conversation without resorting to plecos posts, then you apparently are too immature to have a discussion in this area of the forums (the ONE area where people try to have real discussions).

Anyway, I had no intention of carrying on with it.

And no, just to make it absolutely clear, the "halfway decent conversation" was already over a long time ago (if you cared to read) and while the plecos were unnecessary, it can in no way be described as us "resorting" to plecos posts. Like as if we were losing the argument.

Thanks.

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2008 07:46:53 GMT

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

---

Blazer wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 22:15 Grow the fuck up, if you can't have a halfway decent conversation without resorting to plecos posts, then you apparently are too immature to have a discussion in this area of the forums (the ONE area where people try to have real discussions).

Under any other circumstances, Blazer, I would agree wholeheartedly. But if you actually read the thread you'd see the halfway decent conversation ended sometime around a page ago. The topic has since then been horribly and irreparably derailed, and has been reduced to little more than huff-n-puff ego-defense.

If the moderation feels Plecos spam is an inappropriate way to kill this slowly dying topic and put it out of it's misery, can I request a more conventional technique (lock please)?

---

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Sn1per74\\*](#) on Fri, 18 Jan 2008 05:50:50 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 20:18Sn1per74\* wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008

17:35Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 15:03

Sn1per74\* wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 20:16Where are you from Dover?

Bulgaria. And yourself?

U.S. of A my friend.

On your name it says your American, and I was wondering why you bashed it so much.

It's a sad day when a man can't question or criticizes the country he lives in and not be labeled a "basher", "hypocrite", "illegal immigrant", or something similar.

I wasn't bashing, "my friend". What Prasp does is bashing. You really can't see the difference between what he and I do?

Whoa hey dude, I don't mind what your saying. I wasn't trying to be rude.

---

Subject: Re: US bashing (I strike back)

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 18 Jan 2008 10:06:50 GMT

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

---

Sn1per74\* wrote on Thu, 17 January 2008 21:50Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008

20:18Sn1per74\* wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 17:35Dover wrote on Tue, 15 January 2008 15:03

Sn1per74\* wrote on Mon, 14 January 2008 20:16Where are you from Dover?

Bulgaria. And yourself?

U.S. of A my friend.

On your name it says your American, and I was wondering why you bashed it so much.

It's a sad day when a man can't question or criticizes the country he lives in and not be labeled a "basher", "hypocrite", "illegal immigrant", or something similar.

I wasn't bashing, "my friend". What Prasp does is bashing. You really can't see the difference between what he and I do?

Whoa hey dude, I don't mind what your saying. I wasn't trying to be rude.

You weren't being rude.

---