

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:50:27 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerIf you even read the definition of repercussion you would know what in-direct effect was.

And the operation for Iraq was called Operation Iraqi freedom. If you paid any attention at all you would know this. they dubbed it this before we ever invaded.

And no it is not a side effect. It is a reason. Our reason was that we can liberate the Iraqi people if we invade.

It is a reason for the invasion and an accomplishment of the invasion.

Ah, ok, so your right about Javaxcx meaning indirect. It doesn't mean anything, as I SPECIFIED side-effect.

Interesting how "Iraqi Freedom" Has everything to do with Weapons of Mass Destruction and Terrorist ties. I'd think "Iraqi Freedom" would mean simply freeing a people..."

Well, there's one person who passed among the top of his class in the school of Blind-Follower.

As for your retort to Senc, it's complete garbage. If Hitler came into Pwer after the UN was formed, I'm sure the UN would have resolved that it was ok for the war to occur, if not, REGARDLESS OF THE REASON, it would still be illegal to go to war.

Here is a question for you: A starving Child steals a loaf of bread to feed his equally starving family. Was it illegal for him to steal it or not?

---