

---

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:17:55 GMT

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

---

Nodbuggerwarranto So a reason for going to war was to free the Iraqi people. Interesting. Though I would have to see some proof to evaluate that statement. Oh, and don't bother quoting what you did before, because as Javafx and I have shown, those aren't reasons for going to war, but rather a side effect of it.

Repercussion, the Freedom of Iraqis is not an in-direct affect.

And what does that have to do with my statement of wanting proof that the reason for going to war was so that the citizens of Iraq would be freed? I also never once mentioned the word "in-direct effect", I said side effect. There is a difference there. An In-direct effect would be one that occurred where it was related to, but not as a result of the actions taken. An imaginary example would be, Because of the war on Iraq, the son of a freed citizen grows up to discover Cold-Fusion. It could only have happened because of the war, but was not a result of the war. A side effect on the other hand, is an expected result of an action taken. The next time you watch a commercial for a new type of medicine, listen to it. What phrase is uttered when they state things that could happen to you if you take it. That's right, "side effects may include..." They're expected to occur because of the action taken.

In this case, the "War on Terrorism" (note not 'War to free Iraq') is to remove Saddam from power. A side effect (as it was not the initial reason for going to war [WMD's and terrorism were]) of this is that the Iraqi people will be free from Saddam.

---