
Subject: Saddam = ownt.
Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2003 05:03:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Saddam = MotherFuckingOwned.

Nothing like watching US hardware & some Iraqi's take down that statute and proceed to ride his face down the street.

Hey UN, go fuck yourself and your make believe power.

No resources = no power.
No country = no power.
No military = no power.
A bunch of fucks who cant back up their word with someone elses troops = no power.

Ownt.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2003 09:48:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Subject: Saddam = ownt.
Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2003 09:56:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I hope you don't mind me bringing the unheard veiwpoint to this topic.

We can complain when cemeteries are vandalized, when protests turing ugly, when people burn flags, but cheer when people bring down statues of a(n) (ex)head of state.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2003 11:13:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Commando no. 448I hope you don't mind me bringing the unheard veiwpoint to this topic.

We can complain when cemeteries are vandalized, when protests turing ugly, when people burn flags, but cheer when people bring down statues of a(n) (ex)head of state.

Problem being is the statue was of a current head of state. IMO any country that erects a statue of a current leader is screwed up. The only reason the statue was up, was to intimidate the people.

Make them feel they are always being watched. That is a fact in psychology. Thus the reason many dictators do it. The Iraqis were the ones that wanted it down. We just helped.

Saddam is still the head of Iraq until there is a formal surrender, it is proven he left the country or proven he is dead. He is too dangerous to think that just because he isn't visible, he doesn't have any influence on people.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2003 13:28:03 GMT

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

Commando no. 448I hope you don't mind me bringing the unheard veiwpoint to this topic.

We can complain when cemeteries are vandalized, when protests turning ugly, when people burn flags, but cheer when people bring down statues of a(n) (ex)head of state.

It's not the 'unheard' viewpoint it's the wrong viewpoint. The issue is obviously symbolism. What do you think should be done with a stature of your former murderous dictator? I hope those 8,000 lbs worth of guided bombs we dropped the other day 'did the job'. Would you drop off flowers @ his funeral?

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2003 13:54:26 GMT

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

Commando no. 448We can complain when cemeteries are vandalized, when protests turning ugly, when people burn flags, but cheer when people bring down statues of a(n) (ex)head of state.

Okay I will shoot these down one by one:

1. The people who vandalized the cemeteries vandalized graves of people who fought and died for them. Hardly a comparison to ASSISTING the Iraqis in taking down a symbol of their oppression.
2. Protests turning ugly are just stupid. How can people get their point across when they are throwing rocks and setting cars on fire and shit? And don't say "maybe thats the only way they can". All the extremist protesters greatly dillute the real message the serious protesters are trying to convey.
3. People burning flags are looked down upon because they are burning the flag of THEIR OWN COUNTRY (or their allies). Quite a far cry from taking down a symbol of fear and tyranny.
4. Yes we cheered when the statue came down, because it was symbolic of removing Saddams oppression from the people of Iraq. Guess who cheered the most? The Iraqi people who are happy to be out from under the dictatorship.

"Thousands of young people who have known only the dictatorship of Saddam saw it as a new

Yeah thats sounds terrible huh?

"The scenes of joy were repeated at Arbil in the north, where people realised they were at long

What monsters we are :rolleyes:

"Grateful Iraqis picked yellow flowers and handed them to soldiers as symbolic gifts."

I guess to show their hatred of our terrible act!

"The bronze Saddam statue quickly became the focus of the liberation. Groups of young Iraqi men ran to the square to try to topple it. They climbed the column and tied a heavy rope around the

What's this? It was the Iraqis who wanted it down? Aww man, and I thought we were the bastard monument defilers! What am I going to sympathize with now?

Sounds to me like we did the right thing. If you disagree its only because you didn't live under Saddams rule. Its easy to sit back in your air conditioned house, on the internet, using the very freedom you take for granted to put down on your own country isn't it?

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2003 20:06:52 GMT

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

slight gige I have never heard of a wrong veiwpoint. You hear something new everyday. Even if most of it is ridiculous.

And you obviously don't realize I AM CANADAIN! Stop affiliated me with America. It frustrates me because I dislike American foreign policy. I am not putting down on my own country.

The Iraqis are doing something similar to flag burning though. Destroying a statue erected by the country. What if we reversed the roles? Would you cheer if Iraq invaded the United States, took a radical president out of power, and the statue of liberty is toppled?

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2003 21:04:16 GMT

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

Bad comparison. We didn't topple the statue, we just helped the Iraqis who had already started it. And the Statue of Liberty is a symbol of our freedom (or liberty), not a symbol of how our president is always watching us.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2003 21:28:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree bad comparison. Brining down the statues of Saddam in Iraq is symbolism of bringing down the government. It was erected by the government to show it's supremacy over the people of iraq. The statue of liberty was erected to symbolize what it is called. Liberty. And for a foriegn power to bring down the statue of liberty would be an attack on the people's sence of freedom, not on the government.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 11 Apr 2003 01:59:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

and to add onto that...the people wanted it down...we didn't insist on helping them...they asked us to use a tank to help them take it down. And if they were to take down the Statue of Liberty, we would be angered...not rejoicing in our streets and saying, "Thank You Mr. Hussein, we are now free." Instead, we would be like, "WHAT THE FUCK???? MOTHER FUCKING IRAQIS, NUKE THOSE ASSHOLES!!!!!!!!!"* BIG Difference.

*This saying is not necessarily the views of most Americans, but one by me and will continue to be so.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.
Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Fri, 11 Apr 2003 02:08:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Blazer3. People burning flags are looked down upon because they are burning the flag of THEIR OWN COUNTRY (or their allies).
you know...it's truely funny you should mention that...especially since of all the anti french sentiment going around...I mean...with French being a big ally of ours almost constantly since the Revolution...

Subject: Saddam = ownt.
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 11 Apr 2003 12:55:05 GMT

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

One who's served no purpose except to whine and expect help since then.

We've never burned their flag from what I've seen. They do it to us all the time.

HMMMMMM

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Sat, 12 Apr 2003 04:49:29 GMT

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

Commando no. 448*slight gige* I have never heard of a wrong veiwpoint. You hear something new everyday. Even if most of it is ridiculous.

And you obviously don't realize I AM CANADAIN! Stop affiliated me with America. It frustrates me because I dislike American foreign policy. I am not putting down on my own country.

The Iraqis are doing something similar to flag burning though. Destroying a statue erected by the country. What if we reversed the roles? Would you cheer if Iraq invaded the United States, took a radical president out of power, and the statue of liberty is toppled?

Fucking shit..keep giggling while you try and make your weak ass point....

WHAT THE IRAQI PEOPLE ARE DOING IS NOT SIMILAR TO FLAG BURNING..

IS THE STATUE OF LIBERTY OF GEORGE BUSH OR ANY OTHER PRESIDENT?

Then dear God stop making such stupid statement.

GIGGLE :rolleyes:

You try so hard but accomplish so little.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Sat, 12 Apr 2003 09:16:21 GMT

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

Well anyways let's replace the Statue of Liberty then with that mountain with the carved faces in it as you all don't see the connection I saw and thought was apparent.

Well anyways I still feel it was a bad act to allow to happen. That is like sitting back and watching a mob smash cars rather than phoning the police. More so even worse as the tank helped them do it. What about the non-violent saddam supporters? I am sure they watched in horror at the statue's fall. He was a president. I don't think it is right to destroy a president's memorials. If a president took power in the United States then died in office would you go out and destroy his statues just because you didn't like his policy?

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Sat, 12 Apr 2003 13:24:15 GMT

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

Commando no. 448 Well anyways let's replace the Statue of Liberty then with that mountain with the carved faces in it as you all don't see the connection I saw and thought was apparent. LOL...

OMG, what a dumbass, you don't even know what that mountain is called.

It's Mount Rushmore dumbass. And you still don't get it.

Saddam's statues were put there to intimidate his people and to make it known that he's watching over them, Et Cetera.

The Statue of Liberty was put there as a gift from France, it symbolizes freedom, liberty, etc. It is looked upon as a light, a beacon, a symbol of America.

Mount Rushmore was put there to "celebrate", or as a memorial to some of our most important leaders.

You can hardly compare these two monuments to Saddam's statues. You must be really desperate to find some little thing to support your stupid, idiotic and nonsense arguments.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Sat, 12 Apr 2003 15:34:00 GMT

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

I rather post a silly description than name something I was unsure of and have you think I was talking about some normal mountain. I am not as familiar with US history and landmarks as you are.

And still it may have been an intimidating statue yet it was still a statue of the leader. And it was still wrong to help the Iraqis take it down in my eyes. That is like encouraging the looting they are doing to the palaces. And in your country would you get arrested for smashing a person's property regardless of the person? How do we know that a guy smashing the wall of a palace isn't going to get arrested by the military thinking it was OK to destroy government property?

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [AstralFX](#) on Sat, 12 Apr 2003 16:23:21 GMT

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

Another Iraqi View Of 'Dancing In The Street'

(IPPN) -- This email is from an Iraqi corresponding with Lorna, who was over there as part of the Mid Hudson Valley Peace Brigade.

Today is a sad day for all the people of Iraq. Baghdad has been raped.

The singing and dancing in the streets is a terrible movie. I cannot put it in a better way than my husband, as he has said, "the American Army and the Bush administration have used lots of horrible weapons ... but the most lethal weapon of all ...is the savage people, that they have unleashed in the streets of Baghdad, calling them...the people of Iraq!"

Those people that you see on the streets, are the people of "Althowra city" or as they call it sometimes "Saddam's city." Those people do not in any way resemble the people of Iraq. They resemble the community of criminals in Iraq. As you can see, they are not only dancing , but they are also looting, robbing stores, stealing cars, burning places, and trashing the streets!Those people whom you see dancing were the very same people who used to appear on TV, clapping for Saddam like crazy, when everyone else was against him. They are opportunists who have no principles at all. Always with the winner, ... and they sell very cheap.

I don't think that it was a coincidence that the American army has decided to enter Baghdad from this city. Please...you can believe whatever you want, just don't call a bunch of looters and murderers "thepeople of Iraq."

The people of Iraq are not on the streets because they are afraid of those maniacs, who were unleashed into the streets, due to the absence of the authority. Since I was in Iraq, last February, the real people of Iraq were very afraid of what these savages were planning to do, when there was no government control, because the same thing has happened after war in 1991. We don't see people on the streets ... we only see a group of men who are trashing the place and act like idiots.

The movie of "Baghdad Dancing" apparently was successful, because everyone believes it. And no one is asking about what is happening in the rest of Baghdad. A lethal weapon indeed. Now that there is no government, Baghdad is full of chaos.

The reporters are afraid to move, but they've visited Al-Sinek area ... and there it was a different story.

The streets looked dark and deserted...No one was dancing. There are places that have been bombed, and traces of bloodstains covered the road. There were families who are mourning the loss of loved ones ...the death of a father and three daughters.

The reporters drove in different places in Baghdad ... the streets were empty. And there was a demonstration by the foreigners in Iraq, and a lady was saying, "this is all propaganda, many people I know are against any presence of American army in Iraq." Today, the American soldiers shot at an ambulance that was carrying some casualties, killing two and injuring three. In Basra, armed people robbed a bank. Others burned a grain storage ... when the soldiers were just observing and never attempted to stop it. "

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2003 08:16:53 GMT

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

the looting in iraq is in my opinion a terrible thing. i understand looting the warehouses filled with food that was supposed to be handed out to the people, and i understand the toppling of the statues. what i don't like is the looting of the palaces and museums and hospitals.

even some of the statues and signs of saddam should be preserved for historical value.

many of those iraqis are simply criminals who are trying to capitalize on saddam's fall for their own good regardless of the cost to their country when it comes to rebuilding and in the loss of valuable historical treasures.

much of this is like if someone were to nuke the smithsonian(sp?) many valuable historical artifacts have been lost. many valuable buildings will have to be rebuilt. many people are being hurt and denied services due to the unrest. i understand that the people have been oppressed for so long and now they are over joyed to be free. and mob mentality usually takes over like it does after a national championship or a bad court decision, but it sure would be nice if the iraqi citizens would take the gift of freedom they have been given and show the world that they are "adult" enough to be able to handle it and that they are capable of governing themselves in a mature free manner.

now, that being said... it is not the role of the marines and rangers and tank commanders etc. to be guarding this place from looters. they are soldiers not policemen. they don't know which building is which and it would be a big mistake to start harassing the citizens they just freed. the iraqis want to govern themselves? fine, they can start by showing some restraint instead of acting like a bunch of escaped criminals with the town keys.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2003 14:31:52 GMT

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

spotelmomuch of this is like if someone were to nuke the smithsonian(sp?) many valuable historical artifacts have been lost.

Not even close to being the same. If there were to be a nuke detonated there it would cause World War 3. We would waste whoever was behind it and France would veto it and then surrender for no reason.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Deafwasp](#) on Wed, 07 May 2003 19:43:04 GMT

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

look, the fact is that the iraqi people hated saddam. the only ones who were loyal or loved him were people who profit from the evil he did. His soldiers could rape a towns women and not get in trouble, even praised.

If the people fought back they would be killed and the town would be burned to the ground.

when the statue was torn down it was like letting the jews take down the nazi banners from the deathcamps.

You are a fool for saying it is like flag burning. If china invaded the US and won (yah fucking right) and put their flags up and raised statues of their leaders, wouldnt you tear all that down once they were overthrown and us powers restored?

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 15:32:11 GMT

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

I agree that there's nothing wrong...he was a leader no one wanted...a dictator. however...it's not the same as if China took over the US and was later overthrown. Saddam was put in office...he didn't take it over

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Thu, 08 May 2003 16:06:23 GMT

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

The Baath party used coercion and threats to force everyone else into their party. Name me one other political party that ran against Saadaam in the last election.

They abused democratic voting processes to install themselves in power. The last election 100% of the people voted for him. That has never happened in any society unless the ruling party was coercing the public through threats.

The weren't elected, they elected themselves.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [bigwig992](#) on Mon, 12 May 2003 03:05:13 GMT

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

Heh.

We liberated Iraq. Their citizens ripped down the monument because they didn't like Saddam.

Now lets say this happened.

Canada invaded America. Canada won (:rolleyes:). Do you think any of the "liberated" citizens would tear down the Statue of Liberty?

NO! Because our leaders aren't dictators, and in our country we have freedom of speech. Here in America, we enjoy our freedoms, we aren't pushed around, we aren't limited in freedoms. If we had the chance, we (speaking for all Americans) would NOT tear down our Statue. Now, why do you think the Iraqi's took down theirs? It symbolized 20 years of a leader that sucked, plain and simple.

And I agree, letting the Iraqi's take down Saddams statue, is like letting the Jew's take down the banner's and signs at the deathcamps.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Tue, 13 May 2003 12:38:35 GMT

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

bigwig992Heh.

We liberated Iraq. Their citizens ripped down the monument because they didn't like Saddam.

Now lets say this happened.

Canada invaded America. Canada won (:rolleyes:). Do you think any of the "liberated" citizens would tear down the Statue of Liberty?

That would be a good example, except that you have it backwards. They took down Saddam's statues because it was a sign of him, of his power over them, etc. If Canada were to invade and occupy America (Yeah right, they couldn't invade and occupy a shower, let alone another country. j/k), and they were taken out, the Citizens would remove the references to Canada, their statues, symboles, etc, not to past America.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Commando no. 448](#) on Tue, 13 May 2003 19:46:31 GMT

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

Take note in my very first comparison I stated that they were taking A RADICAL PRESIDENT OUT OF POWER! Now let me add some more. Let's say that the president was deemed radical when he destroyed a socialist government the people worked for years to establish. And that the common consensus was that the populas wanted to destroy the old symbols of past presidents (primarily mount Rushmore) as they move into a new age of no supreme federal leader. So now would you, in the role of an Iraqi soilder who has liberated America, help the populas destroy the symbols of the "old regime" of presidents. Or would you try to stop them from destroying their past no matter how hated. Now I am going to leave this arguement to stand on its own as this is about all the work I want to put back in this discussion that I thought had closed. Now I am off to play Counter-Strike and don't expect much more input from me afterwards in this one topic.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Tue, 13 May 2003 23:21:32 GMT

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

Commando no. 448Take note in my very first comparison I stated that they were taking A RADICAL PRESIDENT OUT OF POWER! Now let me add some more. Let's say that the

president was deemed radical when he destroyed a socialist government the people worked for years to establish. And that the common consensus was that the populas wanted to destroy the old symbols of past presidents (primarily mount Rushmore) as they move into a new age of no supreme federal leader. So now would you, in the role of an Iraqi soilder who has liberated America, help the populas destroy the symbols of the "old regime" of presidents. Or would you try to stop them from destroying their past no matter how hated. Now I am going to leave this arguement to stand on its own as this is about all the work I want to put back in this discussion that I thought had closed. Now I am off to play Counter-Strike and don't expect much more input from me afterwards in this one topic.

Now, can you actually come up with a comparision that isn't total bullshit? It's no more than comparing apples with oranges. Mount Rushmore was created to honor our our most valuable leaders that helped create and shape this country. The many statues and pictures of Saddam all around Iraq were created to show their people who's in charge, to install fear among them, to give Saddam just that much more power, a common fad among dictators.

Subject: Saddam = ownt.

Posted by [Afromn96](#) on Thu, 15 May 2003 21:54:51 GMT

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

LMAO commandos comments are hilarious and his stupidity well... he has just got alot of it .
