

---

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 03:52:24 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxPresident Bush never inferred that "we are going to war to liberate Iraqi people". You're misunderstanding those transcripts. The liberation of the Iraqi people is a REPERCUSSION of invading Iraq to disarm.

The Bush ideology is here: "Saddam's weapons are a threat, and he refuses to disarm them. So we will disarm these weapons for him (<-- WARNING: REASON FOR WAR). By doing this, Saddam's regime will be toppled because he will go down fighting. And because of that, the Iraqi people will be free."

That does NOT mean that freeing the Iraqi people is a reason. It means that freeing the Iraqi people is an EFFECT from the CAUSE of going to war on the premise of finding weapons that Saddam is not supposed to have.

I've proven myself logically, etymologically, and legally. You have done nothing but misinterpret information, misconstrued the meaning of simple words (even with definitions provided), and pertained to this awfully emotional stance to justify your leader's violation of international law.

Let me put it in simple terms for you: YOU CANNOT BREAK LAWS BECAUSE YOU THINK THEY ARE UNJUST. IF YOU DO YOU WILL STILL SUFFER THE REPERCUSSIONS (OMG! There it is again!) OF VIOLATING SAID LAWS.

No laws were broken, There were no laws saying though shalt not invade Iraq.

And yes they were reasons.

e want to free Iraqi people. That is a reason. You can argue that as a result of the invasion this will happen. Which is true. But it is not a repercussion as you state. It is a result, it is a product, and it is a reason.

---