

---

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:13:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NodbuggerHow does the definition of reason prove me wrong.

Because a reason and an indirect result are not the same thing. America went to war for the reason to disarm Iraq. That in NO way directly equates to freeing the Iraqi populus. Etymology proves you wrong.

Quote:We want a free Iraqi people. So lets invade Iraq.

That was not a reason. This has been proven all ready. Iraq was invaded for the reason to disarm Saddam's weapon arsonal. Because of this fact, (that everyone BUT you seems to unequivocally agree) the rest of your "liberation" points are moot.

Quote:Security Council resolutions override the charter.

I suggest you read Resolution 1441. The Unites States does not get the authority to override the Security Council. No member of the UN does. Thank God for oligarchies.

Quote:Besides, they didn't seem to care when Clinton bombed Iraq or started a military campaign in Somalia.

They didn't seem to care about Vietnam, they didn't seem to care about the Iraq-Iraq war. They didn't care about all those little skirmishes in Latin and African countries.

The UN doesn't care most of the time.

These are irrelevant. None of these have anything to do with the United States violating international law. Whats the solution if you're unhappy? Leave the UN. I for one, would feel safer.

Quote:As you can see the UN has not condemned the attack. In fact they have added a section about it to their website.

Would you condemn the actions of your biggest contributor? The UN is notorious for this. This doesn't change the fact that international law was agreed to.

Quote:They even passed a new Resolution praising in the invasion and actually looking forward to a free Iraq.

<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N04/381/16/PDF/N0438116.pdf?OpenElement>

Your link doesn't work.

---