

---

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:34:24 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxNodbugger'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.

Yeah, too bad that is exactly what a repercussion is. And you've solidly disproven yourself and acknowledged my point. The reason to go to war, as stated by your President, was to disarm Iraq. The REPERCUSSION (side-effect, indirect action, consequence, what have you!) of that disarmament IS THAT IRAQ'S PEOPLE ARE FREE FROM SADDAM'S TYRANNY. You seem to be forgetting, and often misunderstanding, that your president did NOT say "we are going to Iraq to free the people". My God, he doesn't even infer that! Why is this so hard for you to grasp!?

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

A goal and a reason are not the same thing.

Goal

n. The final purpose or aim; the end to which a design tends, or which a person aims to reach or attain.

reason

n.

The basis or motive for an action, decision, or conviction.

A declaration made to explain or justify action, decision, or conviction

Your goal in school might be to get a high mark. That is not your reason you're going to school. Your reason might be any number of things: complete school, get a good job, etc.

Stop arguing with words you don't even know how to use.

Quote: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.

THAT IS A REPERCUSSION.

Cause: Invade Iraq on pretense of disarmament.

Effect: No weapons (at all, really)

No Saddam

Iraqi Freedom

That does NOT equate to "liberation = reason". You are perverting the English language.

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

Etymology tells you how to use language. Something you obviously have difficulty with. YOU yourself can have goals of liberating Iraq, but they are not reasons to go to Iraq. Your President said that the weapons were the reason, not the people.

Quote:I also do not care what the charter says. As I have said before. A Security Resolution totally over rides 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.

Sorry friend, the law says otherwise. Stop ignoring the link to the Charter I provided. It will clarify everything for you.

Quote:The UN failed to do their job. So we did it for them.

You are not authorized by the laws you agreed to invade Iraq. The charter clarifies this, and so does this document I'm reading. It's pretty good.

Quote:In no way was it illegal.

Yes it was. You're pertaining to your ignorance again, kid.

Quote:Saddam was illegal. Saddam is the one you should be protesting. He is the war criminal.

I don't need to protest Saddam anymore. It is unequivocally agreed by a large majority (including myself) that Saddam was evil.

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

Nope, there you go with your generalizations again. Crimson is republican, and I don't think she is evil.

You are so fucking retarded it isn't even funny.

I will say it for the last fucking time.

UN SECURITY RESOLUTIONS MAKE THE UN CHARTER VOID.

EVERYTHING YOU SAY IS COMPLETE AND UTTER SHIT, NOW REVERT TO MY CAKE ANALOGY.

---