

---

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:16:49 GMT

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

---

hmm.. now you've confused me. I though you were saying that the name was designed so because the purpose of the war was to free Iraq. So using that logic, "Operation Overlord" was an operation to... Over the Lord? Thats the only reason I could think of for you to make the connection between the two... Here's a hint: the name of the operation does not automatically mean it's the purpose of the Operation.

Your right, in 1933 when Hitler was doing whatever, noone would have done anything. Infact, no one DID anything. Using the past "if you knew" doesn't hold any strength in any sort of arguement. But if you want to... Why didn't Bush go to war as soon as he came to office? I mean, Saddam had already been in power for a while, and everyone knew the stuff he had done. Infact, why didn't Bush Sr do something about it seeing as he was mere miles from his front door?

Infact, if you want to argue semantics about Hitler, the US sat back and WATCHED Hitler murder thousands, only entering the war when Japan attacked, and Germany declared war on the US as a result of the two countries being allies. Millions of people dead, and the United States of America did absolutely nothing about it, even though they knew what was going on...

stealing is stealing, and yes that means the thief broke the law. I'm glad you can see that. It's unfortunate however that you fail to see how it connects to the topic at hand. The UN had stated that the US could not enter Iraq (Bush even recognized this in one of his speaches [Javaxcx has it, perhaps he can enlighten you to it's content]), yes the chose to do so, Violating the UN's desicion... the law was broken right then and there, regardless of the "noble" and "Virtuous" reasons Bush had.

Edit: as it's a short retort to what you just posted, I'll do this rather than make a new post. Since when did "outcome" automatically mean "reason" as you seem to suggest by your cake analogy? Just because 'freedom' was an outcome doesn't mean it was the reason for going in. As for the cake analogy, it's flawed in regards to this anyways. Look at it like this:

I'm assuming cake=freedom here.

Try baking a cake by puting a cake in first.. it doesn't work does it? Freedom was an outcome of the war (a side effect, but an outcome). It wasn't a reason for the war though, for the reasons I've given many times over.

---