

---

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:56:47 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxNodbuggerEvery thing I quoted Bush said, we will free Iraq and its people will be happy with democracy and no more torture.

How the hell is that not a reason?

Because that is a REPERCUSSION OF DISARMING SADDAM. IT IS NOT A REASON. LOOK AT THE DEFINITION!

Quote:He said it it is right there. We want to invade to give Iraqis freedom and rights. He says it right there.

Why the hell do you keep denying it?

I've denied nothing. I'm telling you that there is a difference between a reason and a repercussion. You're constantly beating around the bush and ignoring WHAT ETYMOLOGY TELLS YOU IS TRUE. I have addressed this and many other statements like this in almost every post of this discussion. I suggest you re-read some of the posts (even though you're likely not to, given this bloody arrogance you're plagued with) to clarify why you are WRONG.

Quote:If you understood the English language, I said Security council resolutions over ride that charter. 1441 called for immediate action and severe consequences to be taken against Saddam Hussein.

And his broke them we followed the law to the word.

If you understood international law, you would know that the United States is not the "World Police". They had no authorization to do what they did. You obviously have STILL not read the charter. Why must you continue you argue in total ignorance?

Quote:There is the UNs Iraq home page.

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocusRel.asp?infocusID=50&Body=Iraq&Body1=inspect>

Thanks for posting that. I'm currently reading another document that disproves everything you have just said. Once I'm done, I'll post it.

Quote:Every single one of those is examples of countries belong to the UN violating this so called UN charter. Yes Iraq is a member of the UN. Not so sure about Iran. But Iraq attacked. America attacked places. Never even telling the UN until it was on the news that night. Yet they didn't care then. And they don't care now. They are pointless.

It is irrelevant to whether you think they care or not. Law is still the law.

For the last fucking time

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

The Liberation of the Iraqi people was not an indirect effect. It was not an influence. It was produced by an event or action.

But that is not solely what a repercussion is.

Our goal was to free the Iraqi people and get rid of Saddam. In order to do that we must invade.

For every action there is an equal and opposite reaction.

We invade they got liberated. One of our reasons for invasion was for the goal of liberation to be accomplished.

I do not care what 'ETYMOLOGY' says. I am saying our goal in Iraq was to Get rid of Saddam and Liberate Iraqis.

I also do not care what the charter says. As I have said before. A Security Resolution totally overrides everything else. a Vote is not necessary to enact on a Resolution. We just wanted to tell them our idea and we will do it if they vote or not.

The UN failed to do their job. So we did it for them. In no way was it illegal. Saddam was illegal. Saddam is the one you should be protesting. He is the war criminal.

Why don't you peace loving hippies go protest him?

Oh ya, Republican are so much More evil than murderous genocidal dictators.

---