

---

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

Posted by [hareman](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 14:45:32 GMT

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

---

Preface: Normally I don't post here anymore, personal reasons and the little children like nodbugger trying to argue with intelligent people and then resorting to insults when it's obvious they can't win an argument.

It sort of reminds me of my own arguments with raveslaw long ago, except he was intelligent and he also had seen many of the things he was talking about first hand.

For those who were not around, he and I (and a number of others) debated quite frequently on the issue of Serbia. He was as far as I understand it actually from there. My position was that Serbia was not worth one American life unless the rules of engagement actually allowed the soldiers to do their job. They weren't actually protecting legitimate US interests. They were "peacekeepers".

And so now Java has directed me to an argument that sounds sort of reminiscent of my flame wars with raveslaw.

Some enlightening information:

1 Iraq is predominately Shi'a. The Head of the Shi'a branch of Islam is Iran. This is why Bush Sr did not finish off Iraq the first time. He believed (quite rightly), that any government formed post US-Coalition would eventually devolve into a fundamentalist government and fall into the majority Shi'a hands. Which would be unduly influenced by Iran.

2 'Shrub's reasons for going to war which have been so ably pointed out in this thread were basically manufactured to suit his own needs. The intel he was given on WMD was single sourced and came from someone known to have an axe to grind. What other intel he used to prove his reason for this was all conjecture. Not one piece of proof has surfaced. I am in a position to know it has or will surface as well. Before anyone attacks this, yes there is/was sufficient evidence to believe that Saddam was researching WMD's but we still haven't found definitive proof.

3 I will say this now since the evidence is out there for anyone to see if they have an open mind. Iraq was a war the US couldn't lose that is why we are there. Who else could we so easily beat with minimal loss of life so our president could point to his victory on terror?

Iran? I mean not happening despite real physical evidence they still support terror worldwide. Training camps, active nuclear weapons program, repeated violations of international treaties, financial funding of terror suspects, shelter for wanted international terror suspects ... but wait we couldn't win a war here easily and the cost in US lives would be really high

Korea? State sponsored terrorism at its finest, Nuclear weapons program but they do have a standing 2 million man army. And China has publicly stated they will intervene for N Korea if attacked. Diplomacy is the best option but it will take time a lot of time.

So who does that leave for an easy victory? Columbian Drug lords? Gosh no, they keep their terrorism confined to the police the courts government officials. Besides they are harder to get rid of

than damn roaches.

I have also seen people debating what will happen in Iraq now that the "War" is done.

Democracy? oops one problem with that. Do they still teach in school that it takes a certain level of education and financial prosperity for democracy to work. Sorry, but it doesn't work in this situation. Why?

Kind of hard to care about who is charge if you have to struggle to feed your family everyday isn't it?

So, what does that leave us?

Hmmmmm

Lots of sand small, angry brown men who don't like us?...

<here comes some sarcasm just so you know>

Veitnam without the jungle?

Doubt anyone will actually see my points and cataully consider them without having real intelectual honesty

---