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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 18:26:43 GMT

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

LMAO. Wow, that was better than watching Miller cut up Kerry last night.

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

First of all, that sentence doesn't make a shred of sense. The reasons for something are the basis or motivation for something. They are also the declarations to justify doing an act.

At NO point in Bush's speeches does he give the reason (the justification, the basis, the motive) for going into Iraq to liberate the people. Your literacy skills are pathetic. Hell, you were quoting his speech totally out of context and tried, vainly I might add, to prove your point. You are still making up information that is not in his speeches. It's funny how you are the ONLY person who has posted who thinks the way you do. Thank God.

Quote:Our reason for war was for what happened after the war.

The reason for war was to disarm Iraq. That is all. Anything you've said otherwise is made up, taken out of context, and wrong. Oh, and you haven't unequivocally proven any of your points either. So anything you say isn't credible, either.

Quote:That speech you provided, bush mentions freeing the Iraqi people several times.

I already said that. You're forgetting to mention that he doesn't mention "we are going to Iraq to free the people". Nor does he infer it. You're making shit up. THERE IS NO TIGER CLAW AND NO PEN MISSILE.

Quote:Repercussion means a bad result.

It's only given the negative connotation to you. Ever hear of the phrase: "Two birds with one stone"?

Quote:Freeing the Iraqi people is not a damned repercussion. The Final result of this war was our reason to go to war.

Sorry kid, it is a repercussion. And the final result of this war is yet to be determined, too.

Quote:WMD were one of the reason.

According to your president, it was the only reason.

Quote:With this warm no one had to tell me anything on why to attack Saddam.

Yeah, that doesn't make any sense. I don't even know what you're trying to say there.

Quote: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.

Actually, it's the only reason, and its "iffyness" is irrelevant because the law was broken when the first bomb dropped.

Quote: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.

I would agree. Except the law says I cannot. I would go through the proper channels and get authorization before I acted on something as big as sending fathers, mothers, and children to war.

Quote:That is why humanitarian reasons where not hyped about, because they were obvious.

Except you can't play the "implied" game when you're sending people to WAR.

Quote:Our goal was to get rid of Saddam.

Your "goal" was to disarm Iraq. Saddam was merely in the way. Using your logic, if he fled into Iran, you would launch a Shock and Awe campaign in Iran too? What if he escaped to Russia, or any other place? That isn't a reason for war. It is a repercussion of Saddam not leaving Iraq in 48 hours when he was warned.

Quote: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.

I never said that ridding the world of Saddam was a bad thing. I said the means to go it were bad. You're putting words in my mouth, and still misconstruing it.

Quote: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.

That's funny, you can't prove they do exist. Neither could the CIA, MI6, Russia, or anyone else appearantly. In correct context, of course.

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

That's because the invasion hadn't HAPPENED yet. They also don't explicitly say "You may not invade Iraq, President Bush" because that was not the reason the Security Council was meeting for. They were debating whether or not action SHOULD be taken, and it was inconclusive. The United States merely acted thereafter in total disregard to the followup to that meeting. Did you even READ it?

Quote:It simply was not illegal. Congress voted for it and it passed.

Too bad Congress can't go around the policy of the UN. The fact of the matter is, when you sign a contract, you are in full agreement with all of the terms of said contract. In this case, it's the Charter (which I'm guessing you've chosen not to read) of the United Nations. When you violate your contract, no matter who you are, or your justification for it, YOU ARE BREAKING THE LAW.

Quote:Fuck the UN, the United States does not need a permission slip to defend its people.

Thanks for that confirmation that you are wrong. Your country signed a contract with the UN 60 or so years ago, and on March 19th, 2003, they violated it. UH OH! Broken law! The Charter says you need permission to invade one of the member states. You didn't get permission, and you invaded anyway. It is irrelevant how horrible the person ruling the member state is, it is still illegal to be a vigilante. Not only that, you overthrew the government at the time. That's illegal too. Coup D'etats are illegal.

Quote: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.

I've already shown you the documents proving the action was illegal. You've obviously chosen to ignore that evidence, again. It doesn't matter, intelligent people may read the documents and know for certain the actions of March 19, 2003 were illegal in accordance with international law. I don't really need to convince you, you can't even vote. That's a good thing, by the way.

Quote: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.

The only difference here is that I would be willing, and I would fully recommend lawful action against me in either case. Your president, does not.

Quote:Your goal is to make a cake.
What do you need to make a cake?
You need in 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!
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.

I hope you can see why this is irrelevant, now. The liberation of the Iraqi people was not a reason for the war. You used this analogy in the silly idea that it was a reason. It was not. The speeches prove this.

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

of times.

It was not. The speeches say the reasons for war was disarmament. Not liberation. When Saddam is removed from power, the United States must help rebuild the Iraqi government. Since the reason for war wasn't to over throw the government, and only to get the weapons, anything else is a REPERCUSSION.

Quote:Your reasoning for doing the original action, is what happens after wards.

The definition for reason says otherwise. The basis or motivation for an act. The declaration of justification for an act. Not "what happens after an act".

Quote:Repercussion has such a negative connotation.

Yeah, that's subjective.

Quote:The UN did not vote on the invasion of Iraq. Case closed.

Actually, they did vote on the issue of Iraq. They said "NO ACTION." I see you've chosen to ignore evidence again.

Quote:We do not need the UNs approval. They can also go fuck themselves.

Sure you do! You signed a contract with the UN saying you'll play by the rules. You gave yourself the ball'n'chain, and now you're whining because it's a little too tight.

Quote: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.

Wrong, again.

"Upon the death of Hindenburg in August 1934, Hitler was the consensus successor."

Quote:It wasn't unlawful. Our constitution says we can do it, the UN hasn't said anything.

Your "rights and freedoms" of your constitution are only valid to United States citizens. You cannot apply your rights and freedoms to people who are not American citizens. The UN charter, on the other hand, infers that you cannot go and invade whoever you want for whatever reason you want. Instead of assuming what's in it, READ IT.

Quote:Don't talk about the America Constitution. You probably have never even read it, as your ignorance of it shows.

I'll talk about whatever I want in here. Crimson allows me to say what I want. Oh, and I have read your constitution. Looks like you haven't, though.

Quote:It is hypocritical to say you are against the war and for the troops.

Actually, the soldiers are the pawns here. Your crook for a president says "Go" and its their job, THEIR JOB, to do it. If they don't, they get thrown in prison, and they lose the money they need to support their families. It is a shame that the soldiers in the coalition are at the mercy of the orders of President Bush. That doesn't mean that I don't like them. I don't like the man pushing the button.

Quote:The 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.

Bigotry isn't cool, kid. Haven't you been taught that in school?

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

Yeah, two wrongs don't make a right. If he broke international law, and used "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." then he is a terrorist.

UH OH! He did. Whoops.

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

Sorry kid. I don't have to agree with the law. I merely have to abide by it. What my morality says and what the law says are two completely different things. That is a concept you seem to be forgetting.

Quote: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.

"fixing shit" is subjective. By breaking the law, I'd say your president has done a fair bit of damage himself. Sure, fixing Iraq up is a good thing, but the ends don't justify the means. Another concept you seem to be unfamiliar with.

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

Oh drat, there you go making conclusions without any proof again.
Resolution 687

It's on a different site, but it's the same resolution.

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

I'm looking at what the law says, what happened prior to, just before, during, and after the events of March 19th, 2003, and informing people like you, who are so disillusioned on this matter that

they will just absorb everything CNN has poured out to them.

READ THE DOCUMENTS.
