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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 15:42:01 GMT

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

I'm up in Musoka for a few days, and come back to, not surprisingly, Nodbugger arguing again after he said he wouldn't! Again! That's kind of funny, considering he's been bashing the UN in so many arguments about their "don't care" attitude toward resolutions.

This'll be a large post, and I would thank you Nodbugger, if you don't quote the whole damn thing again (even though you said you wouldn't argue anymore) you before you make your trademark "WTF UR IDIOT I JUS IGNOR WAT U SAY EVEN THO I HAF NO PROVE NAD U DO!!!!11111" post.

NodbuggerThe reason for going to war is what happens afterwards.

No, the reason for war is what the justification for sending your troops over there is. In this case, it was Weapons of Mass Destruction, and nothing else. Evidence for this is in President Bush's two speeches prior to the Shock and Awe Campaign.

March 17th, 2003 -- Presidential Address

March 6th, 2003 -- Presidential News Conference

Before you blow your own horn again, I remind you that reasons given for war after the matter of fact are irrelevant because the action is already done based on the reasons given prior to the action taken.

Quote:We want a free Iraq so we go to war.

You might, but your president said otherwise. WMD were the reason to go to war, and the repercussions of attacking Iraq on this pretense included ridding Saddam Hussein of power, and naturally, liberating the Iraqi people of his tyranny. Those are not reasons, because a reason (a noun) is:

rea·son

n.

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

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

The basis to go to Iraq was WMD. Your president justified this with the intelligence he gathered, no matter how messed up it was. Note how at no point in his addresses does the President give a basis or motive pertaining to liberating Iraq of its dictator. He makes numerous references to the Iraqi people and their liberation, however, they are, at no point, bases or motives for the action of going to war with Iraq. They are merely repercussions of going to Iraq on the pretense of WMD. Remember, a repercussion is:

re·per·cus·sion

n.

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

Now look at it logically: The President tells Saddam Hussein he has 48 hours to leave Iraq. This is the final warning before going to war. If Saddam Hussein had left Iraq, the United States would have gone in to disarm Iraq of its WMD stockpiles (that it didn't have), because it was under this pretense that the United States was going to Iraq in the first place. However, because Saddam did NOT leave Iraq, it must have been because he was not going to give up his authority as dictator of Iraq (or any other reason, really), and therefore, he would have defended his country against an attack. The reason the United States invaded Iraq was the WMD, and Saddam remained in the way despite his opportunity to get OUT of the way, so Saddam would be forcibly taken out of the way to get at the weapons of mass destruction that never existed anyway.

Read that a few times. I know you're going to post saying that its wrong even though you can't prove it otherwise.

Quote:In the UN Majority does not rule.

I like this, especially. It seems to back up everything that we've said. If the UN majority does not rule, how does that justify Iraq? I'll play it by your logic, saying there was not a vote:

(even though there WAS a vote, the day OF the Shock and Awe Campaign; possibly just before the first missiles and bombs were fired-- and I've already posted the proof for it, but I'll do it again:

List of Security Council Resolutions and their voting results

The Press Release from the UN in reponse to the Iraq-Kuwait situation. Note that this document shows the statements of all the nations on the Security council that objected to the war, and possibly contributed to the vote leading to "NO ACTION", which does NOT mean "NO VOTE", so don't try and pull that card, either.

The actual meeting record of March 19th, 2003.

You can choose to ignore that information... again, but it does not negate its relevancy.)

Now back on topic; lets just assume that there was no vote, like you said: Would that mean that the UN laws are being ignored because there was not a vote pertaining to the invasion of a country within the UN by a nation who is ALSO in the UN? Oh, by the way, you DO need to vote to act on a warning. You know, the warning issued in Resolution 1441? Just because that warning is there, does NOT give your country authority to invade Iraq. And no, the UN resolutions do NOT go over the security council. The resolutions are MADE by the security council based off the UN Charter. The Security council makes these resolutions so they may act within the laws issued by the UN charter. I HIGHLY suggest you read the charter instead of assuming what is in it, or disregarding it -- as you've done so many times already.

So it was still illegal.

I'm done playing your little "No vote" game, because there was a vote: On March 19th, 2003, and I've proven it. Now:

Quote:The war is not illegal. In no way has it ever been illegal. Every thing you have said does not make it illegal.

Since the vote given by the UN on March 19, 2003, said "NO ACTION" in regards to the Iraqi-Kuwait situation, and resolution 1441 CLEARLY states:

"Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, Kuwait, and the neighbouring States,"

And the warning states:

"Recalls, in that context [paragraph 4, 11, and 12], that the Council has repeatedly warned Iraq that it will face serious consequences as a result of its continued violations of its obligations;"

UN Resolution 1441

Note how the warning does NOT give the United States (or any country for that matter) authority to invade Iraq. Nor does it gurantee that Iraq will be invaded. And nor does it say that "You may invade Iraq at will if this last chance is violated". However, the former quote infers that that the United States (and all other member states) MUST leave Iraq alone in terms of effecting the sovereignty and terroritorial integrity of Iraq. Because of these two important quotes, the war in Iraq is ILLEGAL.

Quote:Besides, why are you so agaisnt this war? What is your reasoning.

I don't like vigilante justice. It's morally flawed and hypocritical. Yeah, that means many of your favourite superheros are criminals too. Don't let TV fool you, crime is crime -- and you've agreed to that, too.

Quote:And in no way did I lose and in no way is Java intelligent.

WARNING: IRONY

Quote:How hard is it to understand my cake analogy.

Lets look at your original cake analogy, shall we?

Quote:Say you are baking a cake, you mix all the ingredients together. If they explode that is a repercussion if they make a cake that is a result.

The cake exploding is a repercussion and/or a final result of mixing the ingredients together. I'm not really sure where you're going with this. Whatever your reason for making the cake was, unless it was to make it explode, then the explosion is a result of it.

Quote:Our reasons for going to war were for what happens after wards

Your reason for war was to disarm Iraq. The only thing that happens DIRECTLY afterwards is Iraq does not have weapons that are to be disarmed. Since Saddam did not leave Iraq, Saddam was crushed along the way. Because of that, the Iraqi people were liberated from him.

Remember, "Disarm Iraq != Liberate people".
"Disarm Iraq = disarming Iraq"

Anything else that happens under that pretense is a REPERCUSSION.

Quote:When you have MI6, CIA, and Russian intelligence telling you Saddam has WMD. And you have Putin telling you Iraq has plans to attack in the United States. When you have 40 years of oppression and murderous rampages. When you the use of chemical weapons on a civilian populace. When you have a man that is willing to do anything to stay in power. He doesn't care who has has to kill. That is not someone you leave there.

All the evidence presented there does not equate to legally allowing the United States to invade a member of the United Nations. If the United Nations gave the "ok", then it would be legal. They did not, as per the vote of March 19th, 2003, therefore the actions taken against Iraq were illegal. It is irrelevant whether or not the UN condones what the United States did. Illegal is illegal.

Quote:Democracy worked in Nazi Germany and Democracy worked in Japan. It can certainly work in Iraq.

You DO know that Hitler got into power because of democracy, right?

Quote:Either you start being positive or you can stay out of it.

So if I were to go after President Bush for being a terrorist because he authorized the invasion of a country unlawfully, you should just stay out of it because you would likely object?

Hmm... Sounds unconstitutional there too. I thought your freedom of speech allowed people to say whatever they wanted. I mean, Michael Moore isn't in prison.

You also seem to think that when anyone says they are against the war, they are against the troops risking their lives. And it's not just you. It's hundreds of disillusioned people. I, for one, commend the soldiers risking their lives and doing their jobs. Just like I commend the soldiers who died defending Iraq. That doesn't mean I commend Saddam Hussein, so don't jump to that conclusion. Anyone who actually fights for their country is a hero, friend, and they have my commendation. Even if they are my enemy.

Quote:13. Well he hasn't admitted he is wrong yet.

Well, I will now. I was wrong in saying that Saddam was not technically a terrorist. His unlawful invasion into Kuwait was illegal in terms of UN law. However, if I use that logic, then President Bush is also a terrorist for invading Iraq against UN law. So, it's good enough for me.

Quote:What about how Iraq violated the cease fire on daily basis?

Except you are not authorized to act on the cease fire. Darn. The UN Security Council wrote the cease-fire, not the United States. Only the Security Council may say "The cease-fire has been violated, so you may attack at will."

Resolution 687

Quote:I am saying something and so far everything has been fact.

lol. Except you can't prove any of it.

Quote:From the beginning he told the UN we will do it whether you like it or not.

This statement alone. This VERY statement supports everything we've said. If you don't want to play by the rules, get out.

Quote:They never voted, they have passed resolutions since then.

They did vote. They said "NO ACTION". Resolutions condoning the actions as of late do not negate the inherent illegality of the means.

Quote:Find me where It says the war in Iraq was illegal and I will believe you.

Ok, lets see here:

The United Nations Charter (link above)

The Security Council vote of March 19th, 2003, (link above)

Resolution 1441 (link above)

It was illegal because international law was ignored and action was taken against Iraq. Remember, the United States also violated Resolution 1441.

This has been a long post. And there are MANY references to things that you should read before you post again. Even though you are prone to "shoot first, think never", I don't expect you to understand what, or how the United Nations works.

At least the people that read this post will understand what is legal and what is not. Oh, and for the record: "MORALITY != LAW". If you act on morality against law, it is illegal.

I'm also going to remind you, you said you weren't arguing anymore. So posting again makes you out to be a liar.
