Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by Javaxcx on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 23:13:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

NodbuggerThe French at the time saw it as acceptable.
If they didn't, why did they great us with open arms?

No, you are avoiding some key text there, friend. I didn't say all that everyone deemed it unacceptable. Nor did I state that all of them said it WAS acceptable. I said that it differed from person to person. Your logic is flawed, yet again.

Quote:The only part that isn't like World War 2 is that now there are people like you who don't care that any of those things were happening.

When did he say he didn't care? I don't understand how you people jump to these conclusions and base entire arguments off them. I don't support this war because it was not legal to begin with. That does NOT mean I do not care. Nor does it mean I condone Saddam Hussein. SuperFlyingEngi has his own reasons for whether or not he supports this war or not. If one of them is that he doesn't care, my sincerest apologies. I somewhat doubt that, though.

Quote:WMD was one of the reasons. One of the most dangerous reasons.

To think we were going in just for that is crazy. The many other reasons were given since the beginning

I find this funny. Read
this. Where in that speech ANNOUNCING THAT THE UNITED STATES IS GOING TO WAR does it give mention to ANY other reasons then WMD? He mentions terrorist ties, yes, but that at no point equates to "terrorists in Iraq? GO GO GO!" If there were other reasons to go to Iraq, don't you think your president would be kind enough to tell the world what they are? I mean, what possible harm is there in saying "Well, we want to liberate the Iraq people from this bad guy."

I'll do you another favour, read this. Now, before you go on one of your trademark emotional tirades, I'll pre-empt that for you:

Quote:Iraq is a part of the war on terror. Iraq is a country that has got terrorist ties, it's a country with wealth, it's a country that trains terrorists, a country that could arm terrorists. And our fellow Americans must understand, in this new war against terror, that we not only must chase down al Qaeda terrorists, we must deal with weapons of mass destruction as well.

I know Bush is beating around the issue there, but terrorism was NOT the reason (or any reason) to go to war. It was a supposed pre-emptive strike into Iraq to prevent terrorists from getting weaponary and training, as Bush kindly put it. Now that we know those weapons were never confirmed to have existed (from ALL fronts, mind you), you have some technical problems to deal with.

So I'm going to challenge you; where, ANYWHERE before the Shock and Awe campaign, did PRESIDENT BUSH (the one who'se in question here) give ANY constitutional (legal) reasons to

go to Iraq for anything other than WMD. Before you post, I suggest you carefully read what you're reading to understand the context. Remember, there is a difference between a reason and a reprecussion. I'll show you a good example taken from that question period:

Quote: (question): What can you say tonight, sir, to the sons and the daughters of the Americans who served in Vietnam to assure them that you will not lead this country down a similar path in Iraq?

BUSH: It's a great question.

Our mission is clear in Iraq. Should we have to go in, our mission is very clear: disarmament.

^^ REASON.

And the next line:

Quote:In order to disarm, it will mean regime change. I'm confident that we'll be able to achieve that objective in a way that minimizes the loss of life.

^^ REPRECUSSION

Quote:Keep in mind WMD have not been ruled out yet, it may take a while to find out the whole truth about them. But at this point in time you cannot make a decision either way.

You're absolutely right, HOWEVER, when your president says they no doubt DO exist, and use that as a reason for going to war and risking thousands of lives, you have a problem. That's what I mean when I say that Bush went to war on shakey grounds. There was no concrete evidence of Saddam's "stockpiles" of weapons, and the CIA report confirms this. (BTW, have you read it? It's a good read.) Ultimately, regardless of whether or not it was Bush's fault that Iraq had confirmed WMD when they did not (personally, I don't think it is his fault and he was just going off information given to him) is irrelevant. It looks bad for Bush. Welcome to politics, children.

Quote:Besides, the humanitarian reasons are a given.

No, they are not. If they are, I want to see an invasion into China sometime in the future with no reasons given to the public. Beacuse, you know, you inferred it was a given that communism isn't for everyone.

Quote:I want you to tell the Iraqi people that they don't want us there. That is simply false. Every poll ever has said the Iraqis do not want us to leave, and they just want their government in place.

Here you go with your generalizations again. The very fact there was a poll proves my point. NOT EVERY IRAQI CITIZEN WANTS AMERICA ON THEIR TURF.

Quote:There is no way you cannot justify taking out Saddam.

The international law does not justify it. [/quote]