

Re: Runaway Global Warming Possible!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-03/5997.html>

From: Ian St. John (*istjohn_at_noemail.usa*)

Date: 03/11/05

Date: Fri, 11 Mar 2005 09:02:09 -0500

Fred J. McCall wrote:

> "Ian St. John" <istjohn@noemail.usa> wrote:

>

>> Lloyd Parker wrote:

>>> In article <1lfn21tklofdvffunqviivq6qa2agktvri@4ax.com>,

>>> Fred J. McCall <fmccall@earthlink.net> wrote:

>>>> lparker@emory.edu (Lloyd Parker) wrote:

>>>>

>>>>> In article <2qfa21p0n857dqfk1lb3g17vqb11o4nalq@4ax.com>,

>>>>> Fred J. McCall <fmccall@earthlink.net> wrote:

>>>>>> lparker@emory.edu (Lloyd Parker) wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> In article <42416fc7.999432908@newsgroups.bellsouth.net>,

>>>>>>> simberg.interglobal@org.trash (Rand Simberg) wrote:

>>>>>>>> On Mon, 28 Feb 2005 11:11:37 -0500, in a place far, far away,

>>>>>>>> "Vendicar Decarian" <VD@Pyro.net> made the phosphor on my

>>>>>>>> monitor glow in such a way as to indicate that:

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> "Rand Simberg" <simberg.interglobal@org.trash> wrote in

>>>>>>>>> message news:424068e1.997667530@newsgroups.bellsouth.net...

>>>>>>>>>> He has made neither of those claims (unless by "about to be"

>>>>>>>>>> you mean many years from now).

>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> "We found WMD. We found em." – George Bush (congenital liar.)

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>> I think you're the congenital liar here. WMD doesn't have to

>>>>>>>>>>>> include nuclear weapons. One can "find WMD" by finding simply

>>>>>>>>>>>> chemical weapons.

>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>> Which we've not done either.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Except, of course, that we have.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> You are lying.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Wrong.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

sci.physics: Re: Runaway Global Warming Possible!

>>>>> *We have found none.*
>>>>
>>>> *Wrong again.*
>>>
>>> *Then tell us what we've found.*
>>
>> *They did. In the final report. Nothing.*
>
> *You should read something before you start making claims about what is*
> *in it.*
>
> *From the report you claim says nothing was found:*
>
> *"...a small number of old, abandoned chemical munitions have been*
> *discovered...."*

Their were no WMDs or facilities for making them. Unexploded munitions, stockpiles of obsolete weapons set for destruction by the U.N and under their bond, do not count as working WMD systems or capabilities. Bush never claimed that there were "a few discarded munitions". Stop the crap before you bury yourself.

>
> *You're lying when you claim the report says nothing was found.*

Nothing was FOUND. That is the key. NO new WMDs or capabilities were found. One cannot say one has 'found gold' because one invades Fort Knox and determines that there is gold there. The U.N. report does acknowledge a few remaining old chemical munitions under bond for disposal. They cannot then be counted as "found" like the U.S.s invasion of a U.N secure site having nuclear waste that was both abandoned, under bond, and documented.

>
>>>>> *Of course, since 2/3 of Republicans*
>>>>> *believe we have, your delusion is quite normal for you.*
>>>>
>>>> *This says that 2/3 of Republicans can actually read, which*
>>>> *apparently puts them well ahead of you.*
>>>>
>>>>>> *What we haven't done is found them in large quantities.*
>>>>>>
>>>>>> *Or small, or medium.*
>>>>
>>>> *I'd say you're merely ignorant, but given your vehemence I think*
>>>> *it's out and out lying.*
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,120137,00.html>
>>>>
>>>> http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/en/doc/2004-01/11/content_297802.htm
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.intellectualconservative.com/article3448.html>

>>>>

>>>> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A24403-2004Jul2.html>

>>>>

>>>> <http://english.pravda.ru/main/2002/12/05/40413.html>

>>>>

>>>> *How many would you like?*

>>>>

>>>> *Liar, Ian. You're merely a liar.*

>>>>

>>>>

>>> *None of which say we've found WMD since we haven't. (OK, maybe Faux*

>>> *News would say that.)*

>>

>> *Main point is that even the U.S. final report admits that their were*

>> *no stockpiles or capabilities, only a risk of 'someday' which is*

>> *meaningless as anyone might do something someday. It was not the*

>> *necessary 'smoking gun' that would justify a 'retaliatory strike'*

>> *but merely a selective interpretation of badly flawed intelligence*

>> *selected to support a private war.*

>

> *Again, you should read things before making claims as to what they*

> *say. From the same report:*

>

> *"A former nerve agent expert indicated that Iraq retained the*

> *capability to produce nerve agent in significant quantities within two*

> *years, given the import of required phosphorous precursors."*

Given the import of the required precursor chemical, *I* could make the SAME nerve agent. This is hardly a claim of finding WMD programs. For that matter, he could import the finished shells. In fact, since, we have gone beyond the bounds of fact, you could speculate that little green aliens might give him superior weapons systems.

Earth Calling Fred....

>

> *You're lying again....*

No. You are being mendacious.