
Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 01:45:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wow, I misjudged your ignorance. I really didn't think that you would not be able to comprehend the difference between LAW and MORALITY.

NodbuggerHow is it flawed? If we gave up on the first 15 min of d-day because of some casualties Europe would be one big Nazi love fest.

Don't speak for the French, or anyone for that matter. Any objecters are entitled to their reasons. You CANNOT just say "Yeah, the French (meaning ALL the French) said it was acceptable" because you do not speak for an entire population. You speak for ONE person, yourself.

Quote:Actually no it wasn't "against the law", it was perfectly within the law. 11 Security resolutions. Remember those? Every one broken? Every one calling for severe and immediate action against Saddam?

It was against the law. Read the UN Charter: The Charter of the United Nations

Just because Saddam Hussein violated the 11 Security resolutions you keep bringing up DOES NOT GIVE THE UNITED STATES THE AUTHORITY TO TAKE MATTERS INTO THEIR OWN HANDS. This is a concept that you cannot seem to grasp. When the police pull you over for speeding and decide to give you a warning instead of a ticket, does that mean that a civilian can legally flag you down and force the ticket on you? It might surprise you, but the United States is NOT the legal police authority of the world just because they have the biggest army.

Quote:This regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbors and against Iraq's people.

Remember what I told you to watch for when I said context? Can't you read or comprehend? This is NOT a reason for war.

Quote:Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast, and I have a message for them: If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you.

This is NOT a reason for going to war, either.

Quote:As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free.

Remember what the difference between REASON and REPERCUSSION is? This is a REPERCUSSION, not a REASON. THINK, KID!

Quote:In free Iraq there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms.

These are not REASONS for going to war, either! These are the REPERCUSSIONS of removing Saddam from power.

Quote:The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near.

Should I be surprised? This is a repercussion as well.

Quote:It is too late for Saddam Hussein to remain in power. It is not too late for the Iraq military to act with honor and protect your country, by permitting the peaceful entry of coalition forces to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Our forces will give Iraqi military units clear instructions on actions they can take to avoid being attack and destroyed.

My God, THIS PROVES MY POINT INSTEAD!

Quote:Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty, and when the dictator has departed, they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation.

This too, is NOT a reason for going to war. This is a belief that your government has NO authority to impress on any other nation. As cold as it sounds, THAT IS WHAT THE LAW SAYS. This is just one example of morality and law conflicting. Even more so, these are REPERCUSSIONS to removing Saddam from power, not justification.

Quote:The United States with other countries will work to advance liberty and peace in that region. Our goal will not be achieved overnight, but it can come over time. The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land, and the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace. That is the future we choose.

Where is the reasoning? These are goals, not reasons. There is a key difference.

Quote:Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent, and tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility.

This isn't a reason for going to war either! Hell, this is just a reiteration of "We are going to protect ourselves". Oh, which by the way is NOT a reason for going to war on shakey grounds.

Quote:Ya...that speech mentions NOTHING about liberating the Iraqi people....

Too bad the challenge wasn't to find quotes of reference to the reprecussions of going to war. I asked you to find REASONS for war that were not WMD. You failed.

Quote:How is terrorism not the reason? You don't need to be al-qeda to be a terrorist. Terrorists come in all shapes and sizes. Saddam was most definitely a terrorist.

Terrorism is not a reason because it was never stated that terrorism was the reason to go to war.

Oh, and are you enjoying being force fed what FOXnews tells you? Saddam Hussein is not a terrorist. He is a heartless, remorseless, cruel person and dictator, but he is not a terrorist.

ter·ror·ism

n.
The unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence by a person or an organized group against people or property with the intention of intimidating or coercing societies or governments, often for ideological or political reasons.

Saddam Hussein, whether to want to believe it or not, was the LEGAL head of the sovereignty of Iraq. Anything he does in the context of "coercing societies or governments" is an act of the government of Iraq, not of "Saddam Hussein" exclusively. Notice how Bin Laden was not the ruler of any nation but used unlawful force and violence against GOVERNMENTS for his own ideological reasons?

Quote:What do you mean by legal reasons? There are tons of them that you just like to skip over. In no way was it illegal. No where in American or UN law does it say war is illegal. There is no law anywhere, that the US adheres to, that says you cannot pre-emptively attack a country.

The Charter of the United Nations says otherwise. The link is provided for you above. Oh, and it might startle you, but the US is supposed to adhere to the UN Charter. I mean, they DID agree to it, after all.

Quote:We had information, we acted on it. It may be bad but we don't know. As president you simply cannot ignore that information. Especially when you have several countries telling you the same exact things.

I am not debating who's to blame for the misinformation. I'm telling you that the action was illegal. And according to international law, it was.

Quote:everything down from that is just bull.

lol. And you're the one saying that I skip over facts. Tell you what, why don't you try not bouncing around an issue with your "UR RONG BUT I WONT SAY Y" logic.
