

---

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

Posted by [ViperFUD](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 14:03:17 GMT

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

---

Nodbugger.

You make everyone who is in favor of this war look like an idiot by arguing on their side. I wanted to grab quotes of every dumb thing you said, but there are too many of them to fit. So I'm just going to try to address all the points I can remember after reading 5 pages of your drivel.

Let me start with this statement:

Your cake analogy is stupid, flawed, and contributes nothing to the discussion. All you're saying is that a "reason" causes an action. Something you should remember: desire for a certain result can be a reason ... but just because a result happens does NOT, repeat does NOT make it a reason.

Now, this is the natural progression of things:

reason -> action -> result/repercussion

and FYI, a "repercussion" is the exact same thing as a "result," except in common terminology, a "repercussion" creates secondary results.

Lets look at the war on Iraq.

"They have weapons of mass destruction" (reason) ->

"We will get Saddam" (action) ->

"The Iraqi people are free" (result), "The world hates the US" (repercussion)

What Bush did, however, was about 1/2 through "Operation Fuck Iraq up" was say, "Oh, shit, no WMD's ... umm, let's call it 'Operation Iraqi Freedom.'"

And before you call me a "Bush-hater," look at my other posts. I plan to vote for Bush, but just cause Kerry's a lying piece of shit. Bush is an honest idiot, which IMO is better than a smart crook.

Anyway.

Saddam was bad. The UN should have done something about him. And OH EMM GEE, they were. Through a process called "diplomacy." But rather than waiting, we (the US) rushed in. This is patently illegal.

See, back during the gulf war, (GB Sr.) Iraq invaded Kuwait. We went there to help Kuwait out. We were not the agressor. This was legal.

During WWII, Germany invaded France. We went there to help France out. We were not the agressor. This was legal.

2003 - W's reign of terror ... We invaded Iraq. We WERE the agressor. This was illegal.

Now, I'm not saying it was Right or Wrong (yet). I'm making no judgements on morality. I'm simply saying that it WAS illegal, and now we have to deal with the consequences of that.

Here is a statement I'm going to make.  
The ends do NOT justify the means.

What does that mean? It means that even if what we does results in a Good Thing, if we do it in a Bad Way then it is a Bad Thing.

So even if freeing the Iraqi's was a Good Thing, we did it in a Bad Way, so therefore it is a Bad Thing.

Look at it this way: what if France was under poor leadership (as always), and one of their neighbors decided to help them out? Say, oh ... Germany. Germany sees that France needs help, so they go over to France and remove the current leadership. They post their army there, as a "Police Force," and install a new government in France that feels "the right way" about things.

Cause me, I'd call that World War II. Now, replace "Germany" with "The US" and "France" with "Iraq" and tell me what you get.

Here are a couple other salient points:  
as for terrorism, from m-w:

the use of violence (as bombing) committed by groups in order to intimidate a population or government into granting their demands

Now, does that sound like "Operation Iraqi Freedom" to anyone else?

Also, calling java an idiot, while you consider to spout the same drivel about a cake (that is a MEANINGLESS analogy) does not help your argument at all. In fact, if you want to be taken seriously, you need to back off the arguments and add to the proof.

Just my \$.02 (abotu \$.0266 CAD)

Viper.

PS. Warranto - could you do us a favor and alias those links (ie, [url="-long shit-"] CLICK HERE [/URL]) so they don't extend the page off the end? Thanks.

---