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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 16:20:28 GMT

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

Quote:No, the reason for war is what the justification for sending your troops over there is. In this case, it was Weapons of Mass Destruction, and nothing else. Evidence for this is in President Bush's two speeches prior to the Shock and Awe Campaign.

The reasons for where were what happens after the war. Do you not understand that?

Our reason for war was for what happened after the war. Is that so fucking hard to understand? That speech you provided, bush mentions freeing the Iraqi people several times. Repercussion means a bad result. Something un-intended. Freeing the Iraqi people is not a damned repercussion. The Final result of this war was our reason to go to war.

Quote:You might, but your president said otherwise. WMD were the reason to go to war, and the repercussions of attacking Iraq on this pretense included ridding Saddam Hussein of power, and naturally, liberating the Iraqi people of his tyranny. Those are not reasons, because a reason (a noun) is:

rea·son

n.

The basis or motive for an action, decision, or conviction.

A declaration made to explain or justify action, decision, or conviction.

The basis to go to Iraq was WMD. Your president justified this with the intelligence he gathered, no matter how messed up it was. Note how at no point in his addresses does the President give a basis or motive pertaining to liberating Iraq of its dictator. He makes numerous references to the Iraqi people and their liberation, however, they are, at no point, bases or motives for the action of going to war with Iraq. They are merely repercussions of going to Iraq on the pretense of WMD. Remember, a repercussion is:

re·per·cus·sion

n.

An often indirect effect, influence, or result that is produced by an event or action.

WMD were one of the reason. Did you ever even listen to any of his speeches? He has mentioned freeing the Iraqi people in several of them. With this warm no one had to tell me anything on why to attack Saddam. I would have said yes no matter what anyones reasons were. WMD is the only iffy reason right now an you fuck heads just cling to it. It was not the main reason, just the only one the could blow people th fuck up. If someone said what concerns you more a big ass missile pointed at you are some starving people, most people would say the big ass missile. So getting rid of the big ass missiles were on every bodies minds because of that fact that you could get your

ass blown the fuck up. That is why humanitarian reasons were not hyped about, because they were obvious. Only a dumb ass, yourself, would think there was no humanitarian reason behind the Iraq war. Our goal was to get rid of Saddam. If he had give up, we would have accomplished our goal.

Quote:Now look at it logically: The President tells Saddam Hussein he has 48 hours to leave Iraq. This is the final warning before going to war. If Saddam Hussein had left Iraq, the United States would have gone in to disarm Iraq of its WMD stockpiles (that it didn't have), because it was under this pretense that the United States was going to Iraq in the first place. However, because Saddam did NOT leave Iraq, it must have been because he was not going to give up his authority as dictator of Iraq (or any other reason, really), and therefore, he would have defended his country against an attack. The reason the United States invaded Iraq was the WMD, and Saddam remained in the way despite his opportunity to get OUT of the way, so Saddam would be forcibly taken out of the way to get at the weapons of mass destruction that never existed anyway.

Read that a few times. I know you're going to post saying that its wrong even though you can't prove it otherwise.

You call that logical?

Saddam=Bad

^ Thats logical. Saddam was a menace to the world and we got rid of him. No matter how you attempt to spin it, getting rid of Saddam was a good thing.

We would have gone into Iraq no matter what Saddam did. If he gave up it would have been a lot easier for us to get there.

And you cannot prove WMD don't exist, and don't give me some quotes from Powell or anyone else, because they don't prove anything either.

Quote:I like this, especially. It seems to back up everything that we've said. If the UN majority does not rule, how does that justify Iraq? I'll play it by your logic, saying there was not a vote:

(even though there WAS a vote, the day OF the Shock and Awe Campaign; possibly just before the first missiles and bombs were fired-- and I've already posted the proof for it, but I'll do it again:

List of Security Council Resolutions and their voting results

The Press Release from the UN in response to the Iraq-Kuwait situation. Note that this document shows the statements of all the nations on the Security council that objected to the war, and possibly contributed to the vote leading to "NO ACTION", which does NOT mean "NO VOTE", so don't try and pull that card, either.

The actual meeting record of March 19th, 2003.

You can choose to ignore that information... again, but it does not negate its relevancy.)

Now back on topic; lets just assume that there was no vote, like you said: Would that mean that the UN laws are being ignored because there was not a vote pertaining to the invasion of a

country within the UN by a nation who is ALSO in the UN? Oh, by the way, you DO need to vote to act on a warning. You know, the warning issued in Resolution 1441? Just because that warning is there, does NOT give your country authority to invade Iraq. And no, the UN resolutions do NOT go over the security council. The resolutions are MADE by the security council based off the UN Charter. The Security council makes these resolutions so they may act within the laws issued by the UN charter. I HIGHLY suggest you read the charter instead of assuming what is in it, or disregarding it -- as you've done so many times already.

So it was still illegal.

I'm done playing your little "No vote" game, because there was a vote: On March 19th, 2003, and I've proven it. Now:

None of those in any of your links say anything about the Invasion of Iraq.

It simply was not illegal. Congress voted for it and it passed. Fuck the UN, the United States does not need a permission slip to defend its people. You can go fuck off.

Quote: Note how the warning does NOT give the United States (or any country for that matter) authority to invade Iraq. Nor does it gurantee that Iraq will be invaded. And nor does it say that "You may invade Iraq at will if this last chance is violated". However, the former quote infers that that the United States (and all other member states) MUST leave Iraq alone in terms of effecting the sovereignty and terroritorial integrity of Iraq. Because of these two important quotes, the war in Iraq is ILLEGAL.

Find me where the fuck it is illegal, find me where the UN says it is illegal. you can't because it isn't. Now as I say again, you can go fuck yourself.

Quote: don't like vigilante justice. It's morally flawed and hypocritical. Yeah, that means many of your favorite superheros are criminals too. Don't let TV fool you, crime is crime -- and you've agreed to that, too.

No it isn't you jack ass. If someone is about to kill your entire family and you stop them, ding ding, vigilante justice.

Someone steals a womans purse and you beat them down, ding ding, vigilante justice.

Now again, go fuck yourself.

Quote: The cake exploding is a repercussion and/or a final result of mixing the ingredients together. I'm not really sure where you're going with this. Whatever your reason for making the cake was, unless it was to make it explode, then the explosion is a result of it.

You people cannot understand a simple analogy.

Let me see if I can make it easier for the little kids to understand.

Your goal is to make a cake.

What do you need to make a cake?

You need ingredients to make a cake.

What do you do with the ingredients?

You mix them.

What happens after you mix and bake the ingredients?

You have a cake?

Now why did you mix the ingredients?

To make a cake!

Is that easier to understand?

In order to make a cake you need to mix the ingredients.

In order for you to free the Iraqi people you need to invade Iraq.

Quote:Your reason for war was to disarm Iraq. The only thing that happens DIRECTLY afterwards is Iraq does not have weapons that are to be disarmed. Since Saddam did not leave Iraq, Saddam was crushed along the way. Because of that, the Iraqi people were liberated from him.

Remember, "Disarm Iraq != Liberate people".

"Disarm Iraq = disarming Iraq"

Anything else that happens under that pretense is a REPERCUSSION

The end result of liberation was our goal, do you understand now...after I have said it 100s of times.

You enter a contest to win a prize.

You mix ingredients to make a cake.

Your reasoning for doing the original action, is what happens afterwards.

That is a result, not a repercussion.

Repercussion has such a negative connotation.

Quote:All the evidence presented there does not equate to legally allowing the United States to

invade a member of the United Nations. If the United Nations gave the "OK", then it would be legal. They did not, as per the vote of March 19th, 2003, therefore the actions taken against Iraq were illegal. It is irrelevant whether or not the UN condones what the United States did. Illegal is illegal

The UN did not vote on the invasion of Iraq. Case closed. We do not need the UNs approval. They can also go fuck themselves.

Quote:You DO know that Hitler got into power because of democracy, right?

Actually no he wasn't, he was vice Fuhrer, as I like to say. His boss wasn't doing so good so He named himself Fuhrer. Hitler was not elected. But the Nazi part was.

Quote:So if I were to go after President Bush for being a terrorist because he authorized the invasion of a country unlawfully, you should just stay out of it because you would likely object?

Hmm... Sounds unconstitutional there too. I thought your freedom of speech allowed people to say whatever they wanted. I mean, Michael Moore isn't in prison.

You also seem to think that when anyone says they are against the war, they are against the troops risking their lives. And it's not just you. It's hundreds of disillusioned people. I, for one, commend the soldiers risking their lives and doing their jobs. Just like I commend the soldiers who died defending Iraq. That doesn't mean I commend Saddam Hussein, so don't jump to that conclusion. Anyone who actually fights for their country is a hero, friend, and they have my commendation. Even if they are my enemy.

It wasn't unlawful. Our constitution says we can do it, the UN hasn't said anything. Only dumb ass like yourself are bitching about it.

Don't talk about the America Constitution. You probably have never even read it, as your ignorance of it shows. Yes people have freedom of speech. But only the government cannot stop them. I private citizen cannot violate someone else free speech. So If I owned all the movie theaters in the US, since I am a private citizen. I can ban Michael Moore's movies from showing there.

It is hypocritical to say you are against the war and for the troops. That is like saying I am against the crime but for the criminal. Soldiers don't want your anti-war attitude. They know what is really going on there and they don't want some Canadian pussy telling them what to think when they are actually living it.

Quote:Well, I will now. I was wrong in saying that Saddam was not technically a terrorist. His unlawful invasion into Kuwait was illegal in terms of UN law. However, if I use that logic, then President Bush is also a terrorist for invading Iraq against UN law. So, it's good enough for me

Even if Bush did break UN law, it does not make him a terrorist. Is he blowing up day cares on

purpose?

I hate you people, why don't you look past you stupid fucking ideology and realize who the real fucking terrorist.

I can't wait until Toronto gets blown off the earth, or Paris gets covered in anthrax before you jackasses wake up realize. Sitting there is not going to fix shit.

[quote]Except you are not authorized to act on the cease fire. Darn. The UN Security Council wrote the cease-fire, not the United States. Only the Security Council may say "The cease-fire has been violated, so you may attack at will."

Resolution 687
[/quote]

Sorry, but we are. We can start up Korea again if we wanted to. And your link does not work.

The rest is utter crap.

You are interpreting laws. And making shit up at the same time. The UN has not come out against it.

It is like when people refuse to press charges.
