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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 17:01:41 GMT

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

<http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20040816&c=1&s=dugger>

Read this article. It's 9 pages, but you must read it. This is how President Bush is going to steal the election to be re-elected this November. By using faulty touch-screen electronic voting machines that leave no paper record so there can be no record. These machines are also easily hackable. All of the data disks that store the votes to be sent to central computers have the same password (1111). All 22,000 of them. And, Diebold [One of the companies that makes these machines] has posted the source code for the machines on an unprotected FTP site.

President Bush can't win the good 'ole fashion way by getting more votes than John Kerry, so he's going to use Republican-controlled voting machine companies and disenfranchise thousands and thousands of black voters.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 17:13:34 GMT

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

I haven't read the article yet because I don't have the time to at the moment, so excuse any ignorance on my part here:

People seem to think of Bush as someone with a moral code comparable to that of bloody Hitler. I've heard people say that he authorized 911 indirectly by not pre-empting it, and just used it as an excuse to get some black gold overseas.

Personally, when I think of someone who wants to be president of the most "successful" country in the world, I have to believe that he has a moral code that at least respects the humanity of the people around him.

The way this kind of propaganda comes off as is pretty unrealistic, considering Bush is a devout Methodist. Look, I don't know exactly what happened in Florida four years ago, and I don't think electronic balloting exclusively is a good call. If he wanted accurate statistics, there should be two: The paper ballot, and the electronic one.

I'm sorry, I still believe that people are born with a conscience, just like I believe that Bush earnestly believes that he is doing the right thing in Iraq.

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

Posted by [mahkra](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 17:20:52 GMT

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

But Java, Bush might also earnestly believe he's the best candidate for President. And even if he

has a conscience, he might think he's on a "mission from God" or something, and that would probably justify something as extreme as rigging an election.

Bush isn't the only one who might rig an election though. Here's just a few potential culprits:

- Bush
 - Kerry
 - any member of either campaign
 - any member of either party
 - foreign countries
 - the US military or Secret Service or FBI or whatever
 - pretty much any special interest group
-

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 17:35:26 GMT

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

I know what you mean, but look at the war for example:

I can't speak exactly for Bush, but I would think that he believes that ridding the world of Saddam and liberating the Iraqis as a good thing.

But you know, if someone breaks into my house, threatens my family with lethal weaponry, and I have a chance to actually STOP him, it would be morally right for me to protect my family. Unfortunately, the law doesn't agree with this morality.

This is the way I see it. I know what happened with the UN might seem minor to many Americans, but being one of the countries being "betrayed" by the actions thereafter, even in the name of mortality, I can't feel safe here. I'm not American, so I can't vote, but I don't want to be on the wrong end (or even a part of) of the next "Moral war" when I'm innocent.

I know what you're getting at when you say he might believe he is the best candidate, but you know, so does Kerry and Nader, and all the rest. Frankly, I trust none of them. But stooping to cheating (and to the Dems, a second time) would not go over well for him. Remember how everyone is saying how polarized this election is? Well, just think of the massive negative repercussions that might happen if the Dems thought Bush was cheating. And vice versa.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 18:34:18 GMT

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

Quote:he believes that ridding the world of Saddam and liberating the Iraqis as a good thing.

How could it not be a good thing?

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 18:43:48 GMT

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

Thousands and thousands of people could die, including over 900 of our soldiers...

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 19:40:29 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiThousands and thousands of people could die, including over 900 of our soldiers...

Ya and? 3,000 French civilians were killed the first 15 min of D-day. And according to the French, that was acceptable.

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

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 19:54:53 GMT

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

NodbuggerHow could it not be a good thing?

I didn't say it was a good thing. I didn't say it was a bad thing, either.

Quote:Ya and? 3,000 French civilians were killed the first 15 min of D-day. And according to the French, that was acceptable.

I wouldn't speak for anyone if I were you. What is acceptable to one person differs from what is acceptable to another.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 20:03:05 GMT

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

NodbuggerSuperFlyingEngiThousands and thousands of people could die, including over 900 of our soldiers...

Ya and? 3,000 French civilians were killed the first 15 min of D-day. And according to the French, that was acceptable.

And that justifies 900 American lives...how?

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 20:34:54 GMT

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

NodbuggerYa and? 3,000 French civilians were killed the first 15 min of D-day. And according to the French, that was acceptable.

Iraq is not comparable to WWII. In WWII we went to war to stop a mass genocide across the whole of Europe, while the whole of Europe was being conquered by an evil dictator. We went to war with Iraq to...uh, well, we were going to prevent the imminent threat his WMDs presented us, but then there were no WMDs, so then we were freeing the Iraqi people, but they don't want us there...

And Saddam isn't causing a genocide or conquering the whole of Europe.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 20:37:03 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi so then we were freeing the Iraqi people, but they don't want us there...

Some of the Iraqi people don't want America there.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 21:08:33 GMT

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

SEALNodbuggerSuperFlyingEngiThousands and thousands of people could die, including over 900 of our soldiers...

Ya and? 3,000 French civilians were killed the first 15 min of D-day. And according to the French, that was acceptable.

And that justifies 900 American lives...how?

You cannot expect to have a war with no casualties.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 21:09:38 GMT

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

JavaxcxNodbuggerHow could it not be a good thing?

I didn't say it was a good thing. I didn't say it was a bad thing, either.

Quote:Ya and? 3,000 French civilians were killed the first 15 min of D-day. And according to the French, that was acceptable.

I wouldn't speak for anyone if I were you. What is acceptable to one person differs from what is acceptable to another.

The French at the time saw it as acceptable.

If they didn't, why did they greet us with open arms?

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 21:18:19 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiNodbuggerYa and? 3,000 French civilians were killed the first 15 min of D-day. And according to the French, that was acceptable.

Iraq is not comparable to WWII. In WWII we went to war to stop a mass genocide across the whole of Europe, while the whole of Europe was being conquered by an evil dictator. We went to war with Iraq to...uh, well, we were going to prevent the imminent threat his WMDs presented us, but then there were no WMDs, so then we were freeing the Iraqi people, but they don't want us there...

And Saddam isn't causing a genocide or conquering the whole of Europe.

Iraq is comparable to world war 2.

Genocide, evil dictator, invades his neighbors. Took it easy in the beginning.

The only part that isn't like World War 2 is that now there are people like you who don't care that any of those things were happening.

I've always wondered if the anti-war crowd was conscious during the months leading up to the war.

WMD was one of the reasons. One of the most dangerous reasons.

To think we were going in just for that is crazy. The many other reasons were given since the beginning. You just tend to hype on the parts that are a little shady at the moment. Keep in mind WMD have not been ruled out yet, it may take a while to find out the whole truth about them. But at this point in time you cannot make a decision either way. If you did it would be like saying that there is/isn't a cure for cancer. Just because we haven't found it does not mean it doesn't exist.

Besides, the humanitarian reasons are a given. You do not need to tell someone Saddam is an evil bastard that deserves a hell of a lot worse of what he is getting.

I want you to tell the Iraqi people that they don't want us there. That is simply false. Every poll ever has said the Iraqis do not want us to leave, and they just want their government in place.

I know tons of soldiers that have spent a year or more in Iraq. Every Iraqi they have met is very happy about getting rid of Saddam.

There is no way you cannot justify taking out Saddam.

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

Posted by [mahkra](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 22:03:26 GMT

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

NodbuggerThere is no way you cannot justify taking out Saddam.

Hmmm. The UN, in their infinite wisdom, somehow saw things differently...

EDIT: People want to say that this Iraq thing is like WWII. (I think that's total BS though...) But instead let's look at WWI. Germany was crushed, but the situation wasn't handled properly, and it led to Hitler's Nazi Germany. Destroying Iraq and getting rid of Saddam might just lead to something even worse.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 23:00:02 GMT

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

NodbuggerWMD was one of the reasons. One of the most dangerous reasons.

Particularly dangerous in the fact that we have demonstrated that Saddam has no WMDs and was disarmed. He also had practically no army.

NodbuggerTo think we were going in just for that is crazy. The many other reasons were given since the beginning. You just tend to hype on the parts that are a little shady at the moment. Keep in mind WMD have not been ruled out yet, it may take a while to find out the whole truth about them. But at this point in time you cannot make a decision either way. If you did it would be like saying that there is/isn't a cure for cancer. Just because we haven't found it does not mean it doesn't exist.

Using the same argument, check inside your laundry hamper and see if there are any WMDs. Let me know if you find any.

NodbuggerBesides, the humanitarian reasons are a given. You do not need to tell someone Saddam is an evil bastard that deserves a hell of a lot worse of what he is getting.

I assume that you want to go into Darfur, Sudan and resolve that crisis immediately, and that you will then choose to solve the starvation crisis in Africa, which on a humanitarian scale is between

100 to 1,000 times worse than Saddam, including how everyone in Africa will in fact die, instead of just be oppressed.

NodbuggerI want you to tell the Iraqi people that they don't want us there. That is simply false. Every poll ever has said the Iraqis do not want us to leave, and they just want their government in place.

Can I ask where you found your data, because reality seems to be quite the opposite.

Falls Church News PressAlso prior to Falluja came a scientific CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll of the Iraqi people, the results of which were reported last night. The poll shows that a solid majority of Iraqis think the U.S. operation in Iraq has been "unjustified," and that 57% believe the U.S. forces should leave the country "immediately."

NodbuggerI know tons of soldiers that have spent a year or more in Iraq. Every Iraqi they have met is very happy about getting rid of Saddam.

There are over 900 dead U.S. soldiers who won't agree with that.

NodbuggerThere is no way you cannot justify taking out Saddam.

Well, international law is one way to justify it, seeing as how Saddam was the head of a sovereign nation. The cost of 270 billion dollars for the U.S. is another way to justify it. And if we have to occupy for five years, as some generals believe, let's call it an even trillion. 900 dead and 8,000 wounded would be justification for some others. Some would justify it with 13,000 dead Iraqis.

The near universal condemnation of the civilized world also carries some weight in some places.

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

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 23:13:21 GMT

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

NodbuggerThe French at the time saw it as acceptable. If they didn't, why did they great us with open arms?

No, you are avoiding some key text there, friend. I didn't say all that everyone deemed it unacceptable. Nor did I state that all of them said it WAS acceptable. I said that it differed from person to person. Your logic is flawed, yet again.

Quote:The only part that isn't like World War 2 is that now there are people like you who don't care that any of those things were happening.

When did he say he didn't care? I don't understand how you people jump to these conclusions and base entire arguments off them. I don't support this war because it was not legal to begin with. That does NOT mean I do not care. Nor does it mean I condone Saddam Hussein.

SuperFlyingEngi has his own reasons for whether or not he supports this war or not. If one of them is that he doesn't care, my sincerest apologies. I somewhat doubt that, though.

Quote:WMD was one of the reasons. One of the most dangerous reasons.

To think we were going in just for that is crazy. The many other reasons were given since the beginning

I find this funny. Read this. Where in that speech ANNOUNCING THAT THE UNITED STATES IS GOING TO WAR does it give mention to ANY other reasons then WMD? He mentions terrorist ties, yes, but that at no point equates to "terrorists in Iraq? GO GO GO!" If there were other reasons to go to Iraq, don't you think your president would be kind enough to tell the world what they are? I mean, what possible harm is there in saying "Well, we want to liberate the Iraq people from this bad guy."

I'll do you another favour, read this. Now, before you go on one of your trademark emotional tirades, I'll pre-empt that for you:

Quote:Iraq is a part of the war on terror. Iraq is a country that has got terrorist ties, it's a country with wealth, it's a country that trains terrorists, a country that could arm terrorists. And our fellow Americans must understand, in this new war against terror, that we not only must chase down al Qaeda terrorists, we must deal with weapons of mass destruction as well.

I know Bush is beating around the issue there, but terrorism was NOT the reason (or any reason) to go to war. It was a supposed pre-emptive strike into Iraq to prevent terrorists from getting weaponry and training, as Bush kindly put it. Now that we know those weapons were never confirmed to have existed (from ALL fronts, mind you), you have some technical problems to deal with.

So I'm going to challenge you; where, ANYWHERE before the Shock and Awe campaign, did PRESIDENT BUSH (the one who'se in question here) give ANY constitutional (legal) reasons to go to Iraq for anything other than WMD. Before you post, I suggest you carefully read what you're reading to understand the context. Remember, there is a difference between a reason and a repercussion. I'll show you a good example taken from that question period:

Quote: (question): What can you say tonight, sir, to the sons and the daughters of the Americans who served in Vietnam to assure them that you will not lead this country down a similar path in Iraq?

BUSH: It's a great question.

Our mission is clear in Iraq. Should we have to go in, our mission is very clear: disarmament.

^ REASON.

And the next line:

Quote:In order to disarm, it will mean regime change. I'm confident that we'll be able to achieve

that objective in a way that minimizes the loss of life.

^ REPRECUSION

Quote:Keep in mind WMD have not been ruled out yet, it may take a while to find out the whole truth about them. But at this point in time you cannot make a decision either way.

You're absolutely right, HOWEVER, when your president says they no doubt DO exist, and use that as a reason for going to war and risking thousands of lives, you have a problem. That's what I mean when I say that Bush went to war on shaky grounds. There was no concrete evidence of Saddam's "stockpiles" of weapons, and the CIA report confirms this. (BTW, have you read it? It's a good read.) Ultimately, regardless of whether or not it was Bush's fault that Iraq had confirmed WMD when they did not (personally, I don't think it is his fault and he was just going off information given to him) is irrelevant. It looks bad for Bush. Welcome to politics, children.

Quote:Besides, the humanitarian reasons are a given.

No, they are not. If they are, I want to see an invasion into China sometime in the future with no reasons given to the public. Because, you know, you inferred it was a given that communism isn't for everyone.

Quote:I want you to tell the Iraqi people that they don't want us there. That is simply false. Every poll ever has said the Iraqis do not want us to leave, and they just want their government in place.

Here you go with your generalizations again. The very fact there was a poll proves my point. NOT EVERY IRAQI CITIZEN WANTS AMERICA ON THEIR TURF.

Quote:There is no way you cannot justify taking out Saddam.

The international law does not justify it. [/quote]

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sat, 31 Jul 2004 23:34:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Owned?

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 00:29:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mahkraNodbuggerThere is no way you cannot justify taking out Saddam.
Hmmm. The UN, in their infinite wisdom, somehow saw things differently...

EDIT: People want to say that this Iraq thing is like WWII. (I think that's total BS though...) But

instead let's look at WWI. Germany was crushed, but the situation wasn't handled properly, and it led to Hitler's Nazi Germany. Destroying Iraq and getting rid of Saddam might just lead to something even worse.

the UN never voted on it. and France was the only country voting 'no' that actually mattered.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 00:39:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

International law is slanted towards nations that allow wholesale slaughter of innocent civilians for absolutely no reason beyond "We're making deals with them, so they can do whatever they want to."

International law means about as much as a burrito you ate last year.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 00:45:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Or international law is:

international law
n.

A set of rules generally regarded and accepted as binding in relations between states and nations.

The fact of the matter is that your country agreed to the terms of the UN. If they did not want to be subject to them, then the Unites States should not be part of the UN.

You may consider international law to be nothing important, but fortunately a decent portion of the rest of the world disagrees.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 00:51:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Particularly dangerous in the fact that we have demonstrated that Saddam has no WMDs and was disarmed. He also had practically no army.

Prove Saddam does not have WMD. And who disarmed him? Do you seriously think he did it out of the goodness of his heart?

What do you mean he had practically no Army? They all surrendered. At the POW camp my dad was at at one point they had over 10,000k Military prisoners. the British Camp down the road was stocked with over 15,000. And thousands were coming in and leaving every day. I think he said

there were over 100,000 total prisoners processed while at his camp while he was

Quote:Using the same argument, check inside your laundry hamper and see if there are any WMDs. Let me know if you find any.

What the hell is your point here? My laundry hamper has never gassed its own clothing, or invaded another laundry hamper to steal it's baking soda.

[quote]I assume that you want to go into Darfur, Sudan and resolve that crisis immediately, and that you will then choose to solve the starvation crisis in Africa, which on a humanitarian scale is between 100 to 1,000 times worse than Saddam, including how everyone in Africa will in fact die, instead of just be oppresed.[quote]

Now this is funny, I have mentioned the Genocide going on in Sudan for the past 3 years, And no one on any forum cared about it or looked into it. Yet when the news finally starts reporting on it people come out and say Bush is evil for not going there. Well guess what. The UN was put in place to stop Genocides. 2 Genocides are going on under the UNs watch. And they have not done anything about them. It just proves once again the UN is pointless.

And another point I would like to make. You say the war in Iraq is not justified. And you are saying if you do one you HAVE to do them all. Doesn't that sound stupid do you? you are against any military action, yet you complain when we don't attack other countries? Am I getting this through to you? We don't have to invade them all in a 2 year period to still do something good. We cannot rid the worlds problems in a few years by ourselves. We do our part. We do what we can. Just because we cannot do us all, according to you makes us bad? What have you been smoking.

Quote:Can I ask where you found your data, because reality seems to be quite the opposite.

Actually, no reality is exactly what i said.

<http://www.n00bstories.com/image.fetch.php?id=1140856674>

<http://www.n00bstories.com/image.fetch.php?id=1403533929>

These Iraqi kids look really sad.

This Iraqis blog, which would never have existed without this war, Shows how happy he is.

<http://iraq-iraqis.blogspot.com/>

Here are some polls.

<http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=110003991>

<http://www.rumormillnews.com/cgi-bin/archive.cgi?noframes%3Bread=34383>

Quote:There are over 900 dead U.S. soldiers who won't agree with that.

I can guarantee you that every soldier that has gone to Iraq, been killed or injured are very proud of what they have done there.

Ever watch Oprah? She went to a military hospital expecting something completely opposite of what they heard. She interviewed soldiers injured in Iraq. One guy lost both legs, another guys entire body was burned. Another guy lost sight in is one eye. Every single one of them said they would go right back to Iraq if they could and they all said they are very proud of what they were part of.

Quote:Well, international law is one way to justify it, seeing as how Saddam was the head of a sovereign nation. The cost of 270 billion dollars for the U.S. is another way to justify it. And if we have to occupy for five years, as some generals believe, let's call it an even trillion. 900 dead and 8,000 wounded would be justification for some others. Some would justify it with 13,000 dead Iraqis.

The near universal condemnation of the civilized world also carries some weight in some places.

11 Security resolutions are international law. International law calls for the removal of Saddam if any of them were broken. Every single one was broken.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 01:03:56 GMT

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

JavaxcxNodbuggerThe French at the time saw it as acceptable.
If they didn't, why did they great us with open arms?

No, you are avoiding some key text there, friend. I didn't say all that everyone deemed it unacceptable. Nor did I state that all of them said it WAS acceptable. I said that it differed from person to person. Your logic is flawed, yet again.

Quote:The only part that isn't like World War 2 is that now there are people like you who don't care that any of those things were happening.

When did he say he didn't care? I don't understand how you people jump to these conclusions and base entire arguments off them. I don't support this war because it was not legal to begin with. That does NOT mean I do not care. Nor does it mean I condone Saddam Hussein. SuperFlyingEngi has his own reasons for whether or not he supports this war or not. If one of them is that he doesn't care, my sincerest apologies. I somewhat doubt that, though.

Quote:WMD was one of the reasons. One of the most dangerous reasons.

To think we were going in just for that is crazy. The many other reasons were given since the beginning

I find this funny. Read
this. Where in that speech ANNOUNCING THAT THE UNITED STATES IS GOING TO WAR

does it give mention to ANY other reasons then WMD? He mentions terrorist ties, yes, but that at no point equates to "terrorists in Iraq? GO GO GO!" If there were other reasons to go to Iraq, don't you think your president would be kind enough to tell the world what they are? I mean, what possible harm is there in saying "Well, we want to liberate the Iraq people from this bad guy."

I'll do you another favour, read this. Now, before you go on one of your trademark emotional tirades, I'll pre-empt that for you:

Quote:Iraq is a part of the war on terror. Iraq is a country that has got terrorist ties, it's a country with wealth, it's a country that trains terrorists, a country that could arm terrorists. And our fellow Americans must understand, in this new war against terror, that we not only must chase down al Qaeda terrorists, we must deal with weapons of mass destruction as well.

I know Bush is beating around the issue there, but terrorism was NOT the reason (or any reason) to go to war. It was a supposed pre-emptive strike into Iraq to prevent terrorists from getting weaponry and training, as Bush kindly put it. Now that we know those weapons were never confirmed to have existed (from ALL fronts, mind you), you have some technical problems to deal with.

So I'm going to challenge you; where, ANYWHERE before the Shock and Awe campaign, did PRESIDENT BUSH (the one who'se in question here) give ANY constitutional (legal) reasons to go to Iraq for anything other than WMD. Before you post, I suggest you carefully read what you're reading to understand the context. Remember, there is a difference between a reason and a repercussion. I'll show you a good example taken from that question period:

Quote: (question): What can you say tonight, sir, to the sons and the daughters of the Americans who served in Vietnam to assure them that you will not lead this country down a similar path in Iraq?

BUSH: It's a great question.

Our mission is clear in Iraq. Should we have to go in, our mission is very clear: disarmament.

^ REASON.

And the next line:

Quote:In order to disarm, it will mean regime change. I'm confident that we'll be able to achieve that objective in a way that minimizes the loss of life.

^ REPERCUSSION

Quote:Keep in mind WMD have not been ruled out yet, it may take a while to find out the whole truth about them. But at this point in time you cannot make a decision either way.

You're absolutely right, HOWEVER, when your president says they no doubt DO exist, and use that as a reason for going to war and risking thousands of lives, you have a problem. That's what I mean when I say that Bush went to war on shakey grounds. There was no concrete evidence of

Saddam's "stockpiles" of weapons, and the CIA report confirms this. (BTW, have you read it? It's a good read.) Ultimately, regardless of whether or not it was Bush's fault that Iraq had confirmed WMD when they did not (personally, I don't think it is his fault and he was just going off information given to him) is irrelevant. It looks bad for Bush. Welcome to politics, children.

Quote:Besides, the humanitarian reasons are a given.

No, they are not. If they are, I want to see an invasion into China sometime in the future with no reasons given to the public. Because, you know, you inferred it was a given that communism isn't for everyone.

Quote:I want you to tell the Iraqi people that they don't want us there. That is simply false. Every poll ever has said the Iraqis do not want us to leave, and they just want their government in place.

Here you go with your generalizations again. The very fact there was a poll proves my point. NOT EVERY IRAQI CITIZEN WANTS AMERICA ON THEIR TURF.

Quote:There is no way you cannot justify taking out Saddam.

The international law does not justify it. [/quote]

How is it flawed? If we gave up on the first 15 min of d-day because of some casualties Europe would be one big Nazi love fest.

Actually no it wasn't "against the law", it was perfectly within the law. 11 Security resolutions. Remember those? Every one broken? Every one calling for severe and immediate action against Saddam?

Quote:This regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbors and against Iraq's people.

Quote:Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast, and I have a message for them: If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you.

Quote:As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free.

In free Iraq there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms.

The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near.

It is too late for Saddam Hussein to remain in power. It is not too late for the Iraq military to act with honor and protect your country, by permitting the peaceful entry of coalition forces to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Our forces will give Iraqi military units clear instructions on actions they can take to avoid being attack and destroyed.

Quote:Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty, and when the dictator has departed, they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation.

Quote:The United States with other countries will work to advance liberty and peace in that region. Our goal will not be achieved overnight, but it can come over time. The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land, and the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace. That is the future we choose.

Quote:Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent, and tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility.

Good night, and may God continue to bless America.

Ya...that speech mentions NOTHING about liberating the Iraqi people....

How is terrorism not the reason? You don't need to be al-qeda to be a terrorist. Terrorists come in all shapes and sizes. Saddam was most definitely a terrorist.

What do you mean by legal reasons? There are tons of them that you just like to skip over. In no way was it illegal. No where in American or UN law does it say war is illegal. There is no law anywhere, that the US adheres to, that says you cannot pre-emptively attack a country.

We had information, we acted on it. It may be bad but we don't know. As president you simply cannot ignore that information. Especially when you have several countries telling you the same exact things.

everything down from that is just bull.

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

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 01:15:37 GMT

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

Quote:The fact of the matter is that your country agreed to the terms of the UN. If they did not want to be subject to them, then the United States should not be part of the UN.

<http://www.getusout.org>

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 01:45:46 GMT

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

Wow, I misjudged your ignorance. I really didn't think that you would not be able to comprehend the difference between LAW and MORALITY.

NodbuggerHow is it flawed? If we gave up on the first 15 min of d-day because of some casualties Europe would be one big Nazi love fest.

Don't speak for the French, or anyone for that matter. Any objecters are entitled to their reasons. You CANNOT just say "Yeah, the French (meaning ALL the French) said it was acceptable" because you do not speak for an entire population. You speak for ONE person, yourself.

Quote:Actually no it wasn't "against the law", it was perfectly within the law. 11 Security resolutions. Remember those? Every one broken? Every one calling for severe and immediate action against Saddam?

It was against the law. Read the UN Charter: The Charter of the United Nations

Just because Saddam Hussein violated the 11 Security resolutions you keep bringing up DOES NOT GIVE THE UNITED STATES THE AUTHORITY TO TAKE MATTERS INTO THEIR OWN HANDS. This is a concept that you cannot seem to grasp. When the police pull you over for speeding and decide to give you a warning instead of a ticket, does that mean that a civilian can legally flag you down and force the ticket on you? It might surprise you, but the United States is NOT the legal police authority of the world just because they have the biggest army.

Quote:This regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbors and against Iraq's people.

Remember what I told you to watch for when I said context? Can't you read or comprehend? This is NOT a reason for war.

Quote:Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast, and I have a message for them: If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you.

This is NOT a reason for going to war, either.

Quote:As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free.

Remember what the difference between REASON and REPERCUSSION is? This is a REPERCUSSION, not a REASON. THINK, KID!

Quote:In free Iraq there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms.

These are not REASONS for going to war, either! These are the REPERCUSSIONS of removing Saddam from power.

Quote:The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near.

Should I be surprised? This is a repercussion as well.

Quote:It is too late for Saddam Hussein to remain in power. It is not too late for the Iraq military to act with honor and protect your country, by permitting the peaceful entry of coalition forces to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Our forces will give Iraqi military units clear instructions on actions they can take to avoid being attack and destroyed.

My God, THIS PROVES MY POINT INSTEAD!

Quote:Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty, and when the dictator has departed, they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation.

This too, is NOT a reason for going to war. This is a belief that your government has NO authority to impress on any other nation. As cold as it sounds, THAT IS WHAT THE LAW SAYS. This is just one example of morality and law conflicting. Even more so, these are REPERCUSSIONS to removing Saddam from power, not justification.

Quote:The United States with other countries will work to advance liberty and peace in that region. Our goal will not be achieved overnight, but it can come over time. The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land, and the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace. That is the future we choose.

Where is the reasoning? These are goals, not reasons. There is a key difference.

Quote:Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent, and tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility.

This isn't a reason for going to war either! Hell, this is just a reiteration of "We are going to protect ourselves". Oh, which by the way is NOT a reason for going to war on shakey grounds.

Quote:Ya...that speech mentions NOTHING about liberating the Iraqi people....

Too bad the challenge wasn't to find quotes of reference to the repercussions of going to war. I asked you to find REASONS for war that were not WMD. You failed.

Quote:How is terrorism not the reason? You don't need to be al-qeda to be a terrorist. Terrorists come in all shapes and sizes. Saddam was most definitely a terrorist.

Terrorism is not a reason because it was never stated that terrorism was the reason to go to war.

Oh, and are you enjoying being force fed what FOXnews tells you? Saddam Hussein is not a terrorist. He is a heartless, remorseless, cruel person and dictator, but he is not a terrorist.

ter-ror-ism

n.
The unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence by a person or an organized group against people or property with the intention of intimidating or coercing societies or governments, often for ideological or political reasons.

Saddam Hussein, whether to want to believe it or not, was the LEGAL head of the sovereignty of Iraq. Anything he does in the context of "coercing societies or governments" is an act of the government of Iraq, not of "Saddam Hussein" exclusively. Notice how Bin Laden was not the ruler of any nation but used unlawful force and violence against GOVERNMENTS for his own ideological reasons?

Quote:What do you mean by legal reasons? There are tons of them that you just like to skip over. In no way was it illegal. No where in American or UN law does it say war is illegal. There is no law anywhere, that the US adheres to, that says you cannot pre-emptively attack a country.

The Charter of the United Nations says otherwise. The link is provided for you above. Oh, and it might startle you, but the US is supposed to adhere to the UN Charter. I mean, they DID agree to it, after all.

Quote:We had information, we acted on it. It may be bad but we don't know. As president you simply cannot ignore that information. Especially when you have several countries telling you the same exact things.

I am not debating who's to blame for the misinformation. I'm telling you that the action was illegal. And according to international law, it was.

Quote:everything down from that is just bull.

lol. And you're the one saying that I skip over facts. Tell you what, why don't you try not bouncing around an issue with your "UR RONG BUT I WONT SAY Y" logic.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 01:48:08 GMT

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

AircraftkillerQuote:The fact of the matter is that your country agreed to the terms of the UN. If they did not want to be subject to them, then the Unites States should not be part of the UN.

<http://www.getusout.org>

Good luck with that.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 02:01:43 GMT

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

JavaxcxWow, I misjudged your ignorance. I really didn't think that you would not be able to comprehend the difference between LAW and MORALITY.

NodbuggerHow is it flawed? If we gave up on the first 15 min of d-day because of some casualties Europe would be one big Nazi love fest.

Don't speak for the French, or anyone for that matter. Any objecters are entitled to their reasons. You CANNOT just say "Yeah, the French (meaning ALL the French) said it was acceptable" because you do not speak for an entire population. You speak for ONE person, yourself.

Quote:Actually no it wasn't "against the law", it was perfectly within the law. 11 Security resolutions. Remember those? Every one broken? Every one calling for severe and immediate action against Saddam?

It was against the law. Read the UN Charter: The Charter of the United Nations

Just because Saddam Hussein violated the 11 Security resolutions you keep bringing up DOES NOT GIVE THE UNITED STATES THE AUTHORITY TO TAKE MATTERS INTO THEIR OWN HANDS. This is a concept that you cannot seem to grasp. When the police pull you over for speeding and decide to give you a warning instead of a ticket, does that mean that a civilian can legally flag you down and force the ticket on you? It might surprise you, but the United States is NOT the legal police authority of the world just because they have the biggest army.

Quote:This regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbors and against Iraq's people.

Remember what I told you to watch for when I said context? Can't you read or comprehend? This is NOT a reason for war.

Quote:Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast, and I have a message for them: If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you.

This is NOT a reason for going to war, either.

Quote:As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free.

Remember what the difference between REASON and REPERCUSSION is? This is a REPERCUSSION, not a REASON. THINK, KID!

Quote:In free Iraq there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms.

These are not REASONS for going to war, either! These are the REPERCUSSIONS of removing Saddam from power.

Quote:The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near.

Should I be surprised? This is a repercussion as well.

Quote:It is too late for Saddam Hussein to remain in power. It is not too late for the Iraq military to act with honor and protect your country, by permitting the peaceful entry of coalition forces to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Our forces will give Iraqi military units clear instructions on actions they can take to avoid being attack and destroyed.

My God, THIS PROVES MY POINT INSTEAD!

Quote:Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty, and when the dictator has departed, they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation.

This too, is NOT a reason for going to war. This is a belief that your government has NO authority to impress on any other nation. As cold as it sounds, THAT IS WHAT THE LAW SAYS. This is just one example of morality and law conflicting. Even more so, these are REPERCUSSIONS to removing Saddam from power, not justification.

Quote:The United States with other countries will work to advance liberty and peace in that region. Our goal will not be achieved overnight, but it can come over time. The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land, and the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace. That is the future we choose.

Where is the reasoning? These are goals, not reasons. There is a key difference.

Quote:Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent, and tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility.

This isn't a reason for going to war either! Hell, this is just a reiteration of "We are going to protect ourselves". Oh, which by the way is NOT a reason for going to war on shakey grounds.

Quote:Ya...that speech mentions NOTHING about liberating the Iraqi people....

Too bad the challenge wasn't to find quotes of reference to the repercussions of going to war. I asked you to find REASONS for war that were not WMD. You failed.

Quote:How is terrorism not the reason? You don't need to be al-qeda to be a terrorist. Terrorists come in all shapes and sizes. Saddam was most definitely a terrorist.

Terrorism is not a reason because it was never stated that terrorism was the reason to go to war.

Oh, and are you enjoying being force fed what FOXnews tells you? Saddam Hussein is not a terrorist. He is a heartless, remorseless, cruel person and dictator, but he is not a terrorist.

ter·ror·ism

n.
The unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence by a person or an organized group against people or property with the intention of intimidating or coercing societies or governments, often for ideological or political reasons.

Saddam Hussein, whether to want to believe it or not, was the LEGAL head of the sovereignty of Iraq. Anything he does in the context of "coercing societies or governments" is an act of the government of Iraq, not of "Saddam Hussein" exclusively. Notice how Bin Laden was not the ruler of any nation but used unlawful force and violence against GOVERNMENTS for his own ideological reasons?

Quote:What do you mean by legal reasons? There are tons of them that you just like to skip over. In no way was it illegal. No where in American or UN law does it say war is illegal. There is no law anywhere, that the US adheres to, that says you cannot pre-emptively attack a country.

The Charter of the United Nations says otherwise. The link is provided for you above. Oh, and it might startle you, but the US is supposed to adhere to the UN Charter. I mean, they DID agree to it, after all.

Quote:We had information, we acted on it. It may be bad but we don't know. As president you simply cannot ignore that information. Especially when you have several countries telling you the same exact things.

I am not debating who's to blame for the misinformation. I'm telling you that the action was illegal. And according to international law, it was.

Quote:everything down from that is just bull.

lol. And you're the one saying that I skip over facts. Tell you what, why don't you try not bouncing around an issue with your "UR RONG BUT I WONT SAY Y" logic.

A 'repercussion' is a reason you jackass.

If we go in this will happen.

That is a reason.

No you not fucking understand that?

They are reasons whether you like it or not.

Everyone knew Saddam did horrible things. He did not need to make that case as often.

What many people did know his his use and willingness to use wmd. So that was pointed out many times.

Like I said before, If you are a president and England, Russia, CIA, and many other countries tell you Saddam has wmd. Do you just ignore that?

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javacx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 02:12:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

re-per-cus-sion

n.

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

^

That is not a reason. That is an effect to an act. The act must be justified with a reason.

rea-son

n.

The basis or motive for an action, decision, or conviction. See Usage Note at because.

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

I've made it fairly clear that the act is not justified. It's not my fault that you don't understand that. But hey, you didn't know what "objective" meant either, so this is hardly surprising.

Not only that, but I have never said that Saddam's actions were not horrible. You're still bouncing around the issue.

Not only THAT, but I never blamed Bush for acting on misinformation. I said that I DIDN'T blame him. LEARN HOW TO READ.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 02:19:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So we then what is your problem?? what are you bitching about?

Lets go back before we invaded. We know nothing about what is happening now.

Many countries say Saddam has wmd, no evidence point opposite. Saddam is evil. We can liberate Iraqi people.

What do you do? You have 3 reasons to go to war. 2 endanger you and the people you were hired to protect. The other is a good deed that will benefit millions of people.

There is no way to not justify Iraq.

And where are you getting this repercussion shit from.

Liberating the Iraqi people is a reason to go to war. Same with freeing the French, Chinese, Austrians, Polish, Russians, Korean, Vietnamese and countless other countries taken over by Hitler.

They were not just a bi-product. They were a reason to go to war.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 02:41:08 GMT

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

NodbuggerSo we then what is your problem?? what are you bitching about?

Remember kid, you were the one who thought a reprecussion was a reason. I merely corrected you, as I've been doing all night.

Quote:Lets go back before we invaded. We know nothing about what is happening now.

Gladly. I'll go to March 17th, 2003.

Quote:Many countries say Saddam has wmd, no evidence point opposite.

I could argue that, but I'll humour you.

Quote:Saddam is evil.

Undisputable. But not a reason to go to war. It wasn't stated this was a reason to go to war on the 17th OR before.

Quote:We can liberate Iraqi people.

Again, not a reason to go to war. Read the transcripts. At no point does Bush even infer that "we are going to Iraq for the reason to liberate the people."

Quote:What do you do? You have 3 reasons to go to war.

I have "1" reason to go to war as of the 17th of March, 2003.

Quote:2 endanger you and the people you were hired to protect. The other is a good deed that will benefit millions of people.

One reason endangers people. The other two "reasons" are repercussions of the first.

Quote:There is no way to not justify Iraq.

I've stated many times now that the International Law that the United States AGREED to proves this war is not justified. Also the lack of WMD that were promised in stockpiles, but I see no need to kick a dead horse.

Quote:And where are you getting this repercussion shit from.
Liberating the Iraqi people is a reason to go to war.

No it was not. You are taking information from those spechcs that was not ever there.

Quote:Same with freeing the French, Chinese, Austrians, Polish, Russians, Korean, Vietnamese and countless other countries taken over by Hitler.

The reasons for going to Iraq and the reasons for taking out Hitler are completely different. This point is moot.

Quote:They were not just a bi-product. They were a reason to go to war.

No, they were not. Stop arguing in a circle, it grows tiresome.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 02:47:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm going to stop arguing with you.
You are just too stupid to realize that Liberating an oppressed people is a reason to go to war.
And I pointed out to you several times bush said them as reasons.

You are one of the reasons Canada can kiss my ass.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 02:50:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And people such as yourself are the reasons that Bush should not get a second term.

Oh, and by the way, he didn't. You're making up information... again.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 03:14:41 GMT

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

JavacxAnd people such as yourself are the reasons that Bush should not get a second term.

Oh, and by the way, he didn't. You're making up information... again.

Quote:This regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbors and against Iraq's people.

Quote:

Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast, and I have a message for them: If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you.

Quote:

As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free.

In free Iraq there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms.

The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near.

It is too late for Saddam Hussein to remain in power. It is not too late for the Iraq military to act with honor and protect your country, by permitting the peaceful entry of coalition forces to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Our forces will give Iraqi military units clear instructions on actions they can take to avoid being attack and destroyed.

Quote:

Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty, and when the dictator has departed, they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation.

Quote:

The United States with other countries will work to advance liberty and peace in that region. Our goal will not be achieved overnight, but it can come over time. The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land, and the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace. That is the future we choose.

Quote:

Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent, and tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility.

Good night, and may God continue to bless America.

Yep, Bush never mentioned liberating Iraq nor did he mention freeing them....

Are you really that stupid....?

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

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 03:20:12 GMT

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

First of all, you said you were going to stop arguing.

Second of all, those are not reasons.

Read the definition of reason that I so kindly provided and re-read what you've highlighted. They do not go hand in hand at all. They DO however, fit under the "repercussion" category.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 03:27:18 GMT

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

Quote:

rea·son (P) Pronunciation Key (rzn)

n.

The basis or motive for an action, decision, or conviction. See Usage Note at because. See Usage Note at why.

A declaration made to explain or justify action, decision, or conviction: inquired about her reason for leaving.

An underlying fact or cause that provides logical sense for a premise or occurrence: There is reason to believe that the accused did not commit this crime.

The capacity for logical, rational, and analytic thought; intelligence.

Good judgment; sound sense.

A normal mental state; sanity: He has lost his reason.

Logic. A premise, usually the minor premise, of an argument.

We want to go to war.

Why?

To free Iraqis.

It is a reason jackass.

Quote:re-per-cus-sion (P) Pronunciation Key (rpr-kshn, rpr-)

n.

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

A recoil, rebounding, or reciprocal motion after impact.

A reflection, especially of sound.

The liberation of Iraqis is no no way indirect.

Once again you lose.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 03:38:25 GMT

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

He's got you there Nodbugger. Not once did any quote you provide state that the REASON for going to war was to free them. All that you quoted was him saying that because of the war, the Iraqi people would be free. Bush is basically saying "Saddam is a bad man, this war will remove him from power and you will be free". He did NOT say "We are going to war in order to free you from Saddams tyrrany".

Had that been the case, any presumtions of WMD's, terrorist connections or whatever, would not have been needed.

As for the whole "justification" of it, sure you can justify it, but most arguements of any value lean towards the side that it was an illegal war in the first place. I don't care how much you justify what was done, or the good that came out of it, it was still illegal. The UN said not to invade, yet America did it anyways. I could also care less if you agree with it or not. You're a part of the group, you obey their rules. Don't like it, leave. But until then, you have no choice. It's the same regardless of any group you belong to.

You belong to these forums, you obey the rules. You live in America, you obey it's rules. You live in Iraq, you obey it's rules. Now that's not to say that rules can not be changed, but in order to do that you have to be in power. You can't just end up getting caught breaking the rules (lets say, creating a resistance in Iraq under Saddam), then state that "We had good intentions". I highly doubt that would have any chance of freeing you, even in America.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 03:41:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

President Bush never inferred that "we are going to war to liberate Iraqi people". You're misunderstanding those transcripts. The liberation of the Iraqi people is a REPERCUSSION of invading Iraq to disarm.

The Bush ideology is here: "Saddam's weapons are a threat, and he refuses to disarm them. So we will disarm these weapons for him (<-- WARNING: REASON FOR WAR). By doing this, Saddam's regime will be toppled because he will go down fighting. And because of that, the Iraqi people will be free."

That does NOT mean that freeing the Iraqi people is a reason. It means that freeing the Iraqi people is an EFFECT from the CAUSE of going to war on the premise of finding weapons that Saddam is not supposed to have.

I've proven myself logically, etymologically, and legally. You have done nothing but misinterpret information, misconstrued the meaning of simple words (even with definitions provided), and pertained to this awfully emotional stance to justify your leader's violation of international law.

Let me put it in simple terms for you: YOU CANNOT BREAK LAWS BECAUSE YOU THINK THEY ARE UNJUST. IF YOU DO YOU WILL STILL SUFFER THE REPERCUSSIONS (OMG! There it is again!) OF VIOLATING SAID LAWS.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 03:50:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warrantoHe's got you there Nodbugger. Not once did any quote you provide state that the REASON for going to war was to free them. All that you quoted was him saying that because of the war, the Iraqi people would be free. Bush is basically saying "Saddam is a bad man, this war will remove him from power and you will be free". He did NOT say "We are going to war in order to free you from Saddams tyranny".

Had that been the case, any presumptions of WMD's, terrorist connections or whatever, would not have been needed.

As for the whole "justification" of it, sure you can justify it, but most arguements of any value lean towards the side that it was an illegal war in the first place. I don't care how much you justify what was done, or the good that came out of it, it was still illegal. The UN said not to invade, yet America did it anyways. I could also care less if you agree with it or not. You're a part of the group, you obey their rules. Don't like it, leave. But until then, you have no choice. It's the same regardless of any group you belong to.

You belong to these forums, you obey the rules. You live in America, you obey it's rules. You live in Iraq, you obey it's rules. Now that's not to say that rules can not be changed, but in order to do

that you have to be in power. You can't just end up getting caught breaking the rules (lets say, creating a resistance in Iraq under Saddam), then state that "We had good intentions". I highly doubt that would have any chance of freeing you, even in America.

The UN never voted, get your head out of your ass.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 03:52:24 GMT

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

JavaxcxPresident Bush never inferred that "we are going to war to liberate Iraqi people". You're misunderstanding those transcripts. The liberation of the Iraqi people is a REPERCUSSION of invading Iraq to disarm.

The Bush ideology is here: "Saddam's weapons are a threat, and he refuses to disarm them. So we will disarm these weapons for him (<-- WARNING: REASON FOR WAR). By doing this, Saddam's regime will be toppled because he will go down fighting. And because of that, the Iraqi people will be free."

That does NOT mean that freeing the Iraqi people is a reason. It means that freeing the Iraqi people is an EFFECT from the CAUSE of going to war on the premise of finding weapons that Saddam is not supposed to have.

I've proven myself logically, etymologically, and legally. You have done nothing but misinterpret information, misconstrued the meaning of simple words (even with definitions provided), and pertained to this awfully emotional stance to justify your leader's violation of international law.

Let me put it in simple terms for you: YOU CANNOT BREAK LAWS BECAUSE YOU THINK THEY ARE UNJUST. IF YOU DO YOU WILL STILL SUFFER THE REPERCUSSIONS (OMG! There it is again!) OF VIOLATING SAID LAWS.

No laws were broken, There were no laws saying though shalt not invade Iraq.

And yes they were reasons.

e want to free Iraqi people. That is a reason. You can argue that as a result of the invasion this will happen. Which is true. But it is not a repercussion as you state. It is a result, it is a product, and it is a reason.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 03:55:00 GMT

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

The definition of "reason" says you are wrong. Your logic is flawed.

Did you even read the UN Charter? I'm guessing you didn't, because you're still saying that there

are no laws.

Seeing how you didn't read that Quaterly Report I posted a while back either, I'll tell you what the charter says in laymen's terms:

"You need our authorization before invading another country."

No authorization was given.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 03:59:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So a reason for going to war was to free the Iraqi people. Interesting. Though I would have to see some proof to evaluate that statement. Oh, and don't bother quoting what you did before, because as Javacx and I have shown, those aren't reasons for going to war, but rather a side effect of it.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javacx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:01:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Interestingly enough, he agreed that it was a result as well. Too bad he doesn't want to acknowledge what "repercussion" means.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [SencneS](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:05:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[01] <Javacx> Just post that Reason != repercussion

Reason is not Repercussion....

SencneS

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:05:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavacxThe definition of "reason" says you are wrong. Your logic is flawed. Did you even read the UN Charter? I'm guessing you didn't, because you're still saying that there are no laws.

Seeing how you didn't read that Quaterly Report I posted a while back either, I'll tell you what the charter says in laymen's terms:

"You need our authorization before invading another country."

No authorization was given.

How does the definition of reason prove me wrong.

We want a free Iraqi people.

So lets invade Iraq.

If we want Iraq to be free, we must invade.

In order to make Iraq free we must invade.

No matter what your little mind comes up with, liberation of the Iraqi people is and was a reason.

Security Council resolutions override the charter.

Besides, they didn't seem to care when Clinton bombed Iraq or started a military campaign in Somalia.

They didn't seem to care about Vietnam, they didn't seem to care about the Iraq-Iraq war. They didn't care about all those little skirmishes in Latin and African countries.

The UN doesn't care most of the time.

As you can see the UN has not condemned the attack. In fact they have added a section about it to their website.

They even passed a new Resolution praising in the invasion and actually looking forward to a free Iraq.

<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N04/381/16/PDF/N0438116.pdf?OpenElement>

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:06:59 GMT

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

warrantoSo a reason for going to war was to free the Iraqi people. Interesting. Though I would have to see some proof to evaluate that statement. Oh, and don't bother quoting what you did before, because as Javaxcx and I have shown, those aren't reasons for going to war, but rather a side effect of it.

Repercussion, the Freedom of Iraqis is not an in-direct affect.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:08:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxInterestingly enough, he agreed that it was a result as well. Too bad he doesn't want to acknowledge what "repercussion" means.

repercussion is not a result.

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.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:13:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NodbuggerHow does the definition of reason prove me wrong.

Because a reason and an indirect result are not the same thing. America went to war for the reason to disarm Iraq. That in NO way directly equates to freeing the Iraqi populas. Etymology proves you wrong.

Quote:We want a free Iraqi people. So lets invade Iraq.

That was not a reason. This has been proven all ready. Iraq was invaded for the reason to disarm Saddam's weapon arsonal. Because of this fact, (that everyone BUT you seems to unequivocally agree) the rest of your "liberation" points are moot.

Quote:Security Council resolutions override the charter.

I suggest you read Resolution 1441. The Unites States does not get the authority to override the Security Council. No member of the UN does. Thank God for oligarchies.

Quote:Besides, they didn't seem to care when Clinton bombed Iraq or started a military campaign in Somalia.

They didn't seem to care about Vietnam, they didn't seem to care about the Iraq-Iraq war. They didn't care about all those little skirmishes in Latin and African countries.

The UN doesn't care most of the time.

These are irrelevant. None of these have anything to do with the United States violating international law. Whats the solution if you're unhappy? Leave the UN. I for one, would feel safer.

Quote:As you can see the UN has not condemned the attack. In fact they have added a section about it to their website.

Would you condemn the actions of your biggest contributor? The UN is notorious for this. This doesn't change the fact that international law was agreed to.

Quote:They even passed a new Resolution praising in the invasion and actually looking forward to a free Iraq.

<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N04/381/16/PDF/N0438116.pdf?OpenElement>

Your link doesn't work.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:15:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't recall Bush saying
"I as President, have ordered the immediate invasion of Iraq... but DEFINATELY NOT to free the Iraqi people. If that happens I'ma gonna go cry..."

"I'm gonna go pick up a burger"
"You got FRIES? YOU DID NOT MENTION THESE FRIES"
"I didn't say I wouldn't get them"
"YOU ONLY SAID BURGER... BURRRRRRRRRGGGGGGGEEEEERRRRR"
foaming

<Later at the Emergency Room>
"What happened to this one?"
"Heart attack induced by political angst over a misinformation on fast food"

Or something...

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:17:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NodbuggerwarrantoSo a reason for going to war was to free the Iraqi people. Interesting. Though I would have to see some proof to evaluate that statement. Oh, and don't bother quoting what you did before, because as Javafx and I have shown, those aren't reasons for going to war, but rather a side effect of it.

Repercussion, the Freedom of Iraqis is not an in-direct affect.

And what does that have to do with my statement of wanting proof that the reason for going to war was so that the citezens of Iraq would be freed? I also never once mentioned the word "in-direct effect", I said side effect. These is a difference there. An In-direct effect would be one that occured

where it was related to, but not as a result of the actions taken. An imaginary example would be, Because of the war on Iraq, the son of a freed citezen grows up to discover Cold-Fusion. It could of only happened because of the war, but was not a result of the war. A side effect on the other hand, is an expected result of an action taken. The next time you watch a comercial for a new type of medicine, listen to it. What phrase is uttered when they state things that could happen to you if you take it. That's right, "side effects may include..." They're expected to occure because of the action taken.

In this case, the "War on Terrorism" (note not 'War to free Iraq') is to remove Saddam from power. A side effect (as it was not the initial reason for going to war [WMD's and terrorism were]) of this is that the Iraqi people will be free from Saddam.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:18:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[quote="Doitle"]I don't recall Bush saying
"I as President, have ordered the immediate invasion of Iraq... but DEFINATELY NOT to free the Iraqi people. If that happens I'ma gonna go cry..."[quote]

Except he didn't say that he DID go for the reason to liberate Iraq.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:21:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Exactly! He didn't say either way... After the press leaves on his War declaration day, he mighta spun around in his chair, looked out his window and said "I'm doin' this for you, 2-Pac".

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [SencneS](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:22:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'd like to point out that if any country sends in troops and military to "Free its people from the current Government" is called a coup d'etat.
Although its dictionary definition is

coup d'é-tat (P) Pronunciation Key (k d-tä)
n. pl. coups d'état (k) or coup d'états (d-täz)

The sudden overthrow of a government by a usually small group of persons in or previously in positions of authority.

This is illegal for other countries to do. Samala (SP) is a sovran state of the United States of America. When Clinton sent troops over it was not an act of war but to protect agenst a Civil war

or a coup d'etat.

Iraq is not a sovran state of the USA non are it's residents. To sent military forces into another country to FREE it's citizen from the current govenment is no worse then a local group of Terroriest trying to overthrow the govenment. Bush and his military machine performed a coup d'etat on a another non-sovran state. THAT is illegal on so many signed documents and peace treadies that the entire world's govenments signed that now make up the UN.

What Bush did was illegal on so many levels it's not funny. If anything he should be tried as a war criminal.

SencneS

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:24:19 GMT

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

JavaxcxNodbuggerHow does the definition of reason prove me wrong.

Because a reason and an indirect result are not the same thing. America went to war for the reason to disarm Iraq. That in NO way directly equates to freeing the Iraqi populas. Etymology proves you wrong.

Quote:We want a free Iraqi people. So lets invade Iraq.

That was not a reason. This has been proven all ready. Iraq was invaded for the reason to disarm Saddam's weapon arsonal. Because of this fact, (that everyone BUT you seems to unequivocally agree) the rest of your "liberation" points are moot.

Quote:Security Council resolutions override the charter.

I suggest you read Resolution 1441. The Unites States does not get the authority to override the Security Council. No member of the UN does. Thank God for oligarchies.

Quote:Besides, they didn't seem to care when Clinton bombed Iraq or started a military campaign in Somalia.

They didn't seem to care about Vietnam, they didn't seem to care about the Iraq-Iraq war. They didn't care about all those little skirmishes in Latin and African countries.

The UN doesn't care most of the time.

These are irrelevant. None of these have anything to do with the United States violating international law. Whats the solution if you're unhappy? Leave the UN. I for one, would feel safer.

Quote:As you can see the UN has not condemned the attack. In fact they have added a section

about it to their website.

Would you condemn the actions of your biggest contributor? The UN is notorious for this. This doesn't change the fact that international law was agreed to.

Quote:They even passed a new Resolution praising in the invasion and actually looking forward to a free Iraq.

<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N04/381/16/PDF/N0438116.pdf?OpenElement>

Your link doesn't work.

Every thing I quoted Bush said, we will free Iraq and its people will be happy with democracy and no more torture.

How the hell is that not a reason?

I can't believe you are seriously this stupid.

He said it it is right there. We want to invade to give Iraqis freedom and rights. He says it right there.

Why the hell do you keep denying it?

If you understood the English language, I said Security council resolutions over ride that charter. 1441 called for immediate action and severe consequences to be taken against Saddam Hussein.

And his broke them we followed the law to the word.

There is the UNs Iraq home page.

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocusRel.asp?infocusID=50&Body=Iraq&Body1=inspect>

Res 1546.

Every single one of those is examples of countries belong to the UN violating this so called UN charter. Yes Iraq is a member of the UN. Not so sure about Iran. But Iraq attacked. America attacked places. Never even telling the UN until it was on the news that night. Yet they didn't care then. And they don't care now. They are pointless.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:24:39 GMT

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

So if he didn't say either way, how does that automatically equate to "We are going to Iraq for the reason to liberate the people"?

But I'll play your logic here:

Bush went to Iraq a while back to go and give the troops a moral boost. He didn't say that he was going there to find a really cool looking rock. But he never said that he was doing that, either.

This was directed at Doitle, btw.

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

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:27:02 GMT

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

If bush wanted to go to Iraq for a really cool rock, I'd trust his leadership skills. I bet it'd be a really bitchin rock too.

Especially if we were goin in for live rock ;P Nodbugger lol

That one's pretty cool.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:28:49 GMT

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

warrantoNodbuggerwarrantoSo a reason for going to war was to free the Iraqi people. Interesting. Though I would have to see some proof to evaluate that statement. Oh, and don't bother quoting what you did before, because as Javaxcx and I have shown, those aren't reasons for going to war, but rather a side effect of it.

Repercussion, the Freedom of Iraqis is not an in-direct affect.

And what does that have to do with my statement of wanting proof that the reason for going to war was so that the citezens of Iraq would be freed? I also never once mentioned the word "in-direct effect", I said side effect. These is a difference there. An In-direct effect would be one that occured where it was related to, but not as a result of the actions taken. An imaginary example would be, Because of the war on Iraq, the son of a freed citezen grows up to discover Cold-Fusion. It could of only happened because of the war, but was not a result of the war. A side effect on the other hand, is an expected result of an action taken. The next time you watch a comercial for a new type of medicine, listen to it. What phrase is uttered when they state things that could happen to you if you take it. That's right, "side effects may include..." They're expected to occure because of the action taken.

In this case, the "War on Terrorism" (note not 'War to free Iraq') is to remove Saddam from power. A side effect (as it was not the initial reason for going to war [WMD's and terrorism were]) of this is that the Iraqi people will be free from Saddam.

If you even read the definition of repercussion you would know what in-direct effect was.

And the operation for Iraq was called Operation Iraqi freedom. If you paid any attention at all you would know this. they dubbed it this before we ever invaded.

And no it is not a side effect. It is a reason. Our reason was that we can liberate the Iraqi people if we invade.

It is a reason for the invasion and an accomplishment of the invasion.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:31:40 GMT

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

SencneSI'd like to point out that if any country sends in troops and military to "Free its people from the current Government" is called a coup d'etat.

Although its dictionary definition is

coup d'é-tat (P) Pronunciation Key (k d-tä)

n. pl. coups d'état (k) or coup d'états (d-täz)

The sudden overthrow of a government by a usually small group of persons in or previously in positions of authority.

This is illegal for other countries to do. Samala (SP) is a sovran state of the United States of America. When Clinton sent troops over it was not an act of war but to protect agenst a Civil war or a coup d'etat.

Iraq is not a sovran state of the USA non are it's residents. To sent military forces into another country to FREE it's citizen from the current govenment is no worse then a local group of Terroriest trying to overthrow the govenment. Bush and his military machine performed a coup d'etat on a another non-sovran state. THAT is illegal on so many signed documents and peace treadies that the entire world's govenments signed that now make up the UN.

What Bush did was illegal on so many levels it's not funny. If anything he should be tried as a war criminal.

SencneS

And you sir are an idiot.

If Hitler existed now we would have to leave him in power wouldn't we?

We didn't need to leave Milosevic in power did we?

Your little thing there is utter shit.

When someone as bad as Saddam gets in power I do not care what the fuck some little asshole says. We needed to get rid of Saddam.

And no way is getting rid of Saddam illegal.

Only an ass rat like you would think so.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:39:29 GMT

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

Nodbugger, what you quoted Bush saying was everything that would happen as a RESULT of the war. NOT ONCE did he say, "We are going to invade Iraq to free it's people!"

-his regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbors and against Iraq's people.

No reason for war stated...

-Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast, and I have a message for them: If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you.

Nothing stated here about freeing the people as a reason for war, just that the people won't be targets..

-As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free.

'During the war, we will help you', no reason for going to war stated here either.

-In free Iraq there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms.

Here he states what will happen after the war, not the reason for going to war.

-The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near.

'When Saddam is gone, and you'll be free' once again, not a statement for a reason of going to war, just a statement of what will happen as a result.

-It is too late for Saddam Hussein to remain in power. It is not too late for the Iraq military to act with honor and protect your country, by permitting the peaceful entry of coalition forces to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Our forces will give Iraqi military units clear instructions on actions they can take to avoid being attack and destroyed.

Nothing here as well. All he says is that Saddam will be removed.

-Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty, and when the dictator has departed, they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation.

Once again, what will happen after the war is over. Nothing stated as a reason for going to war.

-The United States with other countries will work to advance liberty and peace in that region. Our goal will not be achieved overnight, but it can come over time. The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land, and the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace. That is the future we choose.

This one would be the closest, but not quite. Oddly enough he doesn't specify the Iraqi people being saved, but rather "peace in that region". But considering it's a "War on Terrorism", all that could stand for is to get rid of all the terrorists "in that region"

-Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent, and tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility.

Notice the "Our People"? Not once is it stated that Iraqi people are the reason, but rather to protect "Our People"

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:40:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NodbuggerEvery thing I quoted Bush said, we will free Iraq and its people will be happy with democracy and no more torture.

How the hell is that not a reason?

Because that is a REPERCUSSION OF DISARMING SADDAM. IT IS NOT A REASON. LOOK AT THE DEFINITION!

Quote:He said it it is right there. We want to invade to give Iraqis freedom and rights. He says it right there.

Why the hell do you keep denying it?

I've denied nothing. I'm telling you that there is a difference between a reason and a repercussion. You're constantly beating around the bush and ignoring WHAT ETYMOLOGY TELLS YOU IS TRUE. I have addressed this and many other statements like this in almost every post of this discussion. I suggest you re-read some of the posts (even though you're likely not to, given this bloody arrogance you're plagued with) to clarify why you are WRONG.

Quote:If you understood the English language, I said Security council resolutions over ride that charter. 1441 called for immediate action and severe consequences to be taken against Saddam

Hussein.

And his broke them we followed the law to the word.

If you understood international law, you would know that the United States is not the "World Police". They had no authorization to do what they did. You obviously have STILL not read the charter. Why must you continue you argue in total ignorance?

Quote:There is the UNs Iraq home page.

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocusRel.asp?infocusID=50&Body=Iraq&Body1=inspect>

Thanks for posting that. I'm currently reading another document that disproves everything you have just said. Once I'm done, I'll post it.

Quote:Every single one of those is examples of countries belong to the UN violating this so called UN charter. Yes Iraq is a member of the UN. Not so sure about Iran. But Iraq attacked. America attacked places. Never even telling the UN until it was on the news that night. Yet they didn't care then. And they don't care now. They are pointless.

It is irrelevant to whether you think they care or not. Law is still the law.

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

Posted by [SencneS](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:45:52 GMT

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

Nodbugger you're the idiot..

I am not posting opinion I am posting what coup d'etat.

You yourself said "The war was about free the people" Did you even look at the definition you stupid ass.

:The sudden overthrow of a government:

Does Saddam still control Iraq's govenment? No.

Is Saddam still considered in the govenment? No.

What happen to Saddam to lose his govenement? He was overthrow by the use of Military Force. Who controlled that military force? President and Commander and Chief of the United States of America.

Who is the President and Commander and Chief of the United States of America? George W. Bush.

As commander of a military force under current USA military code of conduct. Is said Commander responsible for any actions taken by anyone under his command? Yes

Did the United States of America military force oversee or partake the military actions of Iraq on

Iraq soil? Yes

Was the outcome of the military task the result of Loss of current Government? Yes

Was the loss of Current Government requested by the citizen of Iraq through proper channels or requested to the UN for assistance? No.

hmmm.... Sounds like a coup d'etat and guess what - That's illegal. Ask any military personal over in Iraq. Is it your duty to perform your action as directed by your commanding officer? They will say "YES"

Since the Commanding officer takes responsibility of the actions of his/her soldiers it leads back to Bush... HE is telling the troops to overthrow the Iraq government HE is responsible HE is a war criminal.

Plain and simple - if you think otherwise you're a moron.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:48:42 GMT

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

warrantoNodbugger, what you quoted Bush saying was everything that would happen as a RESULT of the war. NOT ONCE did he say, "We are going to invade Iraq to free it's people!"

-his regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbors and against Iraq's people.

No reason for war stated...

-Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast, and I have a message for them: If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you.

Nothing stated here about freeing the people as a reason for war, just that the people won't be targets..

-As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free.

'During the war, we will help you', no reason for going to war stated here either.

-In free Iraq there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms.

Here he states what will happen after the war, not the reason for going to war.

-The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near.

'When Saddam is gone, and you'll be free' once again, not a statement for a reason of going to war, just a statement of what will happen as a result.

-It is too late for Saddam Hussein to remain in power. It is not too late for the Iraq military to act with honor and protect your country, by permitting the peaceful entry of coalition forces to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Our forces will give Iraqi military units clear instructions on actions they can take to avoid being attack and destroyed.

Nothing here as well. All he says is that Saddam will be removed.

-Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty, and when the dictator has departed, they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation.

Once again, what will happen after the war is over. Nothing stated as a reason for going to war.

-The United States with other countries will work to advance liberty and peace in that region. Our goal will not be achieved overnight, but it can come over time. The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land, and the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace. That is the future we choose.

This one would be the closest, but not quite. Oddly enough he doesn't specify the Iraqi people being saved, but rather "peace in that region". But considering it's a "War on Terrorism", all that could stand for is to get rid of all the terrorists "in that region"

-Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent, and tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility.

Notice the "Our People"? Not once is it stated that Iraqi people are the reason, but rather to protect "Our People"

I feel sorry for your mother.

Every single one of those is a reason.

Do you not understand that.

Hey we want to free the Iraqis so we are going to invade and get rid of Saddam?

You people are just bush haters, not matter how much evidence I give you you will never be satisfied because of your blind ideology.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:50:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What were the proper channels for getting help when a dictators killing people who oppose him? Are they supposed to stick a leaf blower and a toaster together, tape it to a fedora and wear it and use that to send telepathic messages to the UN? Telepathic messages through the right CHANNELS that follow proper regulations for oppressed peoples telepathic messages? I'm sorry but thats just not 23-Skiddooin...

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:50:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NodbuggerIf you even read the definition of repercussion you would know what in-direct effect was.

And the operation for Iraq was called Operation Iraqi freedom. If you paid any attention at all you would know this. they dubbed it this before we ever invaded.
And no it is not a side effect. It is a reason. Our reason was that we can liberate the Iraqi people if we invade.

It is a reason for the invasion and an accomplishment of the invasion.

Ah, ok, so your right about Javaxcx meaning indirect. It doesn't mean anything, as I SPECIFIED side-effect.

Interesting how "Iraqi Freedom" Has everything to do with Weapons of Mass Destruction and Terrorist ties. I'd think "Iraqi Freedom" would mean simply freeing a people..."

Well, there's one person who passed among the top of his class in the school of Blind-Follower.

As for your retort to Senc, it's complete garbage. If Hitler came into Pwer after the UN was formed, I'm sure the UN would have resolved that it was ok for the war to occur, if not, REGARDLESS OF THE REASON, it would still be illegal to go to war.

Here is a question for you: A starving Child steals a loaf of bread to feed his equally starving family. Was it illegal for him to steal it or not?

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:52:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Interesting how "Iraqi Freedom" Has everything to do with Weapons of Mass Destruction and Terrorist ties. I'd think "Iraqi Freedom" would mean simply freeing a people..."

Ok how about this, the Iraqi people are free from having the cloud over their head that if their "Cheery" leader happens to go chemical on the US that they wont be Blown the fuck up to the

umpteenth grain of fused sand?

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:56:47 GMT

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

JavaxcxNodbuggerEvery thing I quoted Bush said, we will free Iraq and its people will be happy with democracy and no more torture.

How the hell is that not a reason?

Because that is a REPERCUSSION OF DISARMING SADDAM. IT IS NOT A REASON. LOOK AT THE DEFINITION!

Quote:He said it it is right there. We want to invade to give Iraqis freedom and rights. He says it right there.

Why the hell do you keep denying it?

I've denied nothing. I'm telling you that there is a difference between a reason and a repercussion. You're constantly beating around the bush and ignoring WHAT ETYMOLOGY TELLS YOU IS TRUE. I have addressed this and many other statements like this in almost every post of this discussion. I suggest you re-read some of the posts (even though you're likely not to, given this bloody arrogance you're plagued with) to clarify why you are WRONG.

Quote:If you understood the English language, I said Security council resolutions over ride that charter. 1441 called for immediate action and severe consequences to be taken against Saddam Hussein.

And his broke them we followed the law to the word.

If you understood international law, you would know that the United States is not the "World Police". They had no authorization to do what they did. You obviously have STILL not read the charter. Why must you continue you argue in total ignorance?

Quote:There is the UNs Iraq home page.

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocusRel.asp?infocusID=50&Body=Iraq&Body1=inspect>

Thanks for posting that. I'm currently reading another document that disproves everything you have just said. Once I'm done, I'll post it.

Quote:Every single one of those is examples of countries belong to the UN violating this so called UN charter. Yes Iraq is a member of the UN. Not so sure about Iran. But Iraq attacked. America attacked places. Never even telling the UN until it was on the news that night. Yet they didn't care

then. And they don't care now. They are pointless.

It is irrelevant to whether you think they care or not. Law is still the law.

For the last fucking time

'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.

But that is not solely what a repercussion is.

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

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.

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

I also do not care what the charter says. As I have said before. A Security Resolution totally overrides 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.

The UN failed to do their job. So we did it for them. In no way was it illegal. Saddam was illegal. Saddam is the one you should be protesting. He is the war criminal.

Why don't you peace loving hippies go protest him?

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

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 04:59:11 GMT

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

NodbuggerI feel sorry for your mother.

Every single one of those is a reason.

Do you not understand that.

Hey we want to free the Iraqis so we are going to invade and get rid of Saddam?

You people are just bush haters, not matter how much evidence I give you you will never be satisfied because of your blind ideology.

Ah, can't think of anything better to say, so you attempt to insult my mother?

If it were a REASON for going to war, Bush would have said "We are going to war to free the iraqi people!" Instead he stated. " We are going to war because Saddam has Weapons of Mass Destruction and ties to Terrorism!"

Never ONCE in all the news I have read about it was "Freeing Iraq" a stated reason.

Oh yes...

Quote:You people are just bush haters, not matter how much evidence I give you you will never be satisfied because of your blind ideology.

Crimson, Blazer, Aircraftkiller, Javafx and the rest of you, I hate you! I disagree with something you did, so I automatically hate you now! :rolleyes:

I mean, grow up nodbugger. If you want to talk about blind ideologies, look at yourself. You read into whatever Someone says inorder for it to agree with your idea's. Look at it word for word and tell me it states that freeing iraq is a reason for going to war. NOWHERE does it say that. Not ONCE in ALL you quoted did it say "We are going to war to free you". ALL it states is that "Because of the war, you will be free". Thats a BIG difference.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:03:41 GMT

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

warrantoNodbuggerIf you even read the definition of repercussion you would know what in-direct effect was.

And the operation for Iraq was called Operation Iraqi freedom. If you paid any attention at all you would know this. they dubbed it this before we ever invaded.

And no it is not a side effect. It is a reason. Our reason was that we can liberate the Iraqi people if we invade.

It is a reason for the invasion and an accomplishment of the invasion.

Ah, ok, so your right about Javafx meaning indirect. It doesn't mean anything, as I SPECIFIED side-effect.

Interesting how "Iraqi Freedom" Has everything to do with Weapons of Mass Destruction and Terrorist ties. I'd think "Iraqi Freedom" would mean simply freeing a people..."

Well, there's one person who passed among the top of his class in the school of Blind-Follower.

As for your retort to Senc, it's complete garbage. If Hitler came into Pwer after the UN was formed, I'm sure the UN would have resolved that it was ok for the war to occur, if not, REGARDLESS OF THE REASON, it would still be illegal to go to war.

Here is a question for you: A starving Child steals a loaf of bread to feed his equally starving family. Was it illegal for him to steal it or not?

Iraqi Freedom was the name of the operation. As operation Overlord d-day and Operation Desert Storm was the Gulf War.

Bush did not name it. The military named it. I have 35 t-shirts my dad and other friends in Iraq bought there that say Operation Iraq Freedom on them.

How in any way am I a blind follower? Who Am I following blindly? Saddam was an asshole. If any other president was in charge and did the same thing as Bush I would support that decision.

I do not blindly follow people.

Why would they vote for it? In 1933 if the UN was around Hitler hadn't done anything wrong yet. Fast Forward to 1939 and so far, what we know about, has done exactly what Saddam has done. And that was enough to start a war.

After that we found out he murdered 12 million people.

If you knew were in charge in 1933 and you knew what Hitler was going to do would you pre-emptively attack him?

Now after getting rid of Saddam we no longer have to wonder what he may do. The most he can do now is walk 4 week in any direction.

And yes, stealing is stealing. how ever we did not break any law.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:09:20 GMT

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

warrantoNodbuggerI feel sorry for your mother.

Every single one of those is a reason.

Do you not understand that.

Hey we want to free the Iraqis so we are going to invade and get rid of Saddam?

You people are just bush haters, not matter how much evidence I give you you will never be satisfied because of your blind ideology.

Ah, can't think of anything better to say, so you attempt to insult my mother?

If it were a REASON for going to war, Bush would have said "We are going to war to free the iraqi

people!" Instead he stated. " We are going to war because Saddam has Weapons of Mass Destruction and ties to Terrorism!"

Never ONCE in all the news I have read about it was "Freeing Iraq" a stated reason.

Oh yes...

Quote:You people are just bush haters, not matter how much evidence I give you you will never be satisfied because of your blind ideology.

Crimson, Blazer, Aircraftkiller, Javafx and the rest of you, I hate you! I disagree with something you did, so I automatically hate you now! :rolleyes:

I mean, grow up nodbugger. If you want to talk about blind ideologies, look at yourself. You read into whatever Someone says in order for it to agree with your idea's. Look at it word for word and tell me it states that freeing Iraq is a reason for going to war. NOWHERE does it say that. Not ONCE in ALL you quoted did it say "We are going to war to free you". ALL it states is that "Because of the war, you will be free". Thats a BIG difference.

If it was not a reason...why was it mentioned so many times.

And for a big 'duh factor' here, in order for us the Free Iraq we had to invade. You could not flip that around. Liberation is a product of invasion. How ever our reason for invasion was the product of liberation.

It goes back to my cake analogy.

For you to get a cake you need to put ingredients together. You cannot flip it around. So in order to get a cake you need to mix the ingredients. your reason for mixing the ingredients was to form a cake.

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 speeches [Javafx 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.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:16:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nodbugger'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 acknowlegded 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 overrides 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.

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

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:24:22 GMT

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

World War II

Agreement (1942) - British landing in North Africa

Alphabet - (year?) evacuation of British troops from Norway

Ambassador (1940) - British commando raid on Guernsey

Amherst (1945) - British airborne raid in the Netherlands

Anvil (1944) - invasion of Southern France. Name later changed to Dragoon

Anthropoid (1942) British assassination of Reinhard Heydrich.

Archery (1941) - British commando raid on Maaloy, Norway

Artur ("Arthur") (1941) - German plan to support IRA activities

Attila (1940) - German seizure and occupation of Vichy France

Avalanche (year?) - Allied landings near Salerno, Italy

Boardman (year?) - deception operation for Avalanche

Barbarossa (1941) - German invasion of the Soviet Union

Platinfuchs ("Platinum Fox") (1941) - German attack towards Murmansk from Finnish Petsamo

Polarfuchs ("Polar Fox") (1941) - German attack towards Kandalaksha from Finnish Lapland

Basalt (1942) - British raid on Sark

Baytown - Allied landings in Calabria, Italy

Bertram - part of the Second Battle of El Alamein

Begonia (1943) - British POW rescue in Italy

Birke ("Birch") (1944) - German plan to withdraw from northern Finland prior to the Lapland War

Birkhahn ("Black Cock") (1945) - German withdrawal from Norway

Biting (1942) - Commando raid on radar site in France

Blau ("Case Blue") (1942) - German offensive in the southern USSR

Blücher (1942) - German campaign in the Caucasus

Bodenplatte ("Baseplate") (1945) - German aerial attack on 27 Allied airbases

Büffel (1940) - German operation to relieve troops in Narvik, Norway.

Candytuft (1943) - British raid on the Italian east coast

Canuck (1945) - SAS operation near Turin

Cerberus (1942) - escape of German capital ships from Brest to home ports in Germany

Chariot (1942) - British raid on Saint Nazaire

Chastise (1943) - attack on German dams

Clawhammer (1942) - planned commando raid on a radar site in France

Claymore (1941) - British raid on Norwegian islands

Cobra (1944) - American breakout from Normandy

Dunhill (1944) - SAS operations in Normandy to support Cobra
Cold Comfort (1945) - British raid on rail lines in Italy
Colossus (1941) - airborne raid against rail targets in Italy
Compass (1940) - British counteroffensive in North Africa
Cooney - French commando raid
Crusader (1941) - British attempt to relieve Tobruk
Deadlight (1945) - postwar scuttling of U-boats
Defoe (1944) - SAS patrols in Normandy
Donnerschlag ("Thunderclap") (1942) - planned breakout of the German 6th Army from Stalingrad

Downfall (1945) - planned invasion of Japan
Olympic (planned for 1945, not executed) - first of two prongs of the invasion of Japan
Coronet (planned for 1945, not executed) - second of two prongs of the invasion of Japan
Dragoon (1944) - Allied landing in southern France
Dove - gliderborne component of Dragoon
Span - deception operation in support of Dragoon
Driftwood (1944) - failed raid on rail targets north of Rome
Drumbeat (1942) - German U-boat attack on east coast shipping of the United States
Dynamo (1940) - British evacuation from Dunkirk
Edelweiss (1942) - proposed German capture of the oil fields of Baku
Eisenhammer (1943) - plan to destroy Soviet power generators in Moscow and Gorky (not the same as Iron Hammer)
Epsom (1944) - British assault west of Caen, Normandy
Fall Blau ("Case Blue") (1942) - German offensive in the southern USSR
Fall Gelb ("Case Yellow") (1940) - German offensive against western Europe
Fall Gruen ("Case Green") (year?) - the German invasion of Czechoslovakia
Fall Rot ("Case Red") (1935) - German defense plan in case of an incursion by France when Czechoslovakia is invaded
Fall Weiss ("Case White") (1939) - German invasion of Poland
Felix (1940-41) - planned German invasion of Gibraltar
Feuerzauber ("Fire Magic") (1942) - planned German capture of Leningrad
Fischereiher ("Heron") (1942) - German offensive to capture Stalingrad
Fortitude (1944) - Allied deception in Europe
Foxley (year?) - a plan to kill Adolf Hitler that was never carried out
Frankton (1942) - commando raid on shipping port in France
Frühlingserwachen ("Spring Awakening") (1945) - German counterattack against Russian forces in Hungary
Gaff (1944) - attempt to kill Erwin Rommel
Gauntlet (1941) - raid on Spitzbergen
Goodwood (1944) - British breakout attempt from Normandy
Greif ("Grab") (1944) - German troops disguised as Allied soldiers during Battle of the Bulge
Grenade (1945) - American/Canadian crossing of the Rhine
Grün [1] ("Green") (year?) - the Nazi invasion of Czechoslovakia
Grün [2] ("Green") (1940) - decoy invasion of Ireland in conjunction with Seelöwe
Gunnarside (1943) - raid on a Norwegian heavy water plant
Habakkuk (year?) - project to construct an aircraft carrier out of ice
Operation Herbstnebel
Herbstreise ("Autumn Journey") (1940) - decoy invasion of Scotland

Herkules (1942) - planned Axis airborne invasion of Malta
Wacht am Rhein ("Watch on the Rhine") (1944) - German counteroffensive in the Ardennes (in Belgium, Luxembourg and France); the Battle of the Bulge
Husky (1943) - Allied invasion of Sicily
Ikarus (1940) - planned German invasion of Iceland
Juno (1940) - German naval operation to disturb allied supplies to Norway.
Lachsfang (1942) - Proposed combined German and Finnish attack against against Kandalaksha and Belomorsk.
Lightfoot (1942) - first attack by the British at El Alamein
Lost (1944) - British raid on Brittany
Loyton (1944) - large SAS patrol in French mountains
Marita (1941) - German invasion of Greece
Margarethe (1944) - German operation to keep Hungary from defecting
Manhattan Project (-1945) - American program to build an atomic bomb
Market Garden (1944) - Allied airborne attempt to cross the lower Rhine
Merkur ("Mercury") (1941) - German invasion of Crete
Mondscheinsonate ("Moonlight Sonata") (1940) - German aerial raid on Coventry
Morgenrote ("Dawn") (1944) - German counterattack against Anzio landings
Narcissus (1943) - British commando raid
Nelson (1944) - cancelled SAS patrol in France
Newton (1944) - SAS raid in France
Nordlicht [1] ("Northern Lights") (1942) - planned German assault on Leningrad
Nordlicht [2] ("Northern Lights") (1944) - German withdrawal from the Kola Peninsula into Norway
Nordwind ("North Wind") (1945) - German offensive in the Alsace
Overlord (1944) - Allied landings in Normandy
Bodyguard - overall deception plan
Detroit - American airdrop in Normandy
Chicago - American airdrop in Normandy
Dingson - Free French commando raid
Tonga - British airdrop in Normandy
Neptune - landing phase of Overlord
Maple - Allied naval minesweeping operations
Gambit - British midget submarine operations
Lüttich - German counter-offensive at Mortain
Pegasus (1944) - Allied rescue of troops after failure of Market Garden
Paperclip (1945) - part-military, part-scientific operation to scoop up Nazi scientists, engineers, experiments, prototypes, data, etc., after WWII
Paukenschlag ("Beat of the Kettle Drum") (1942) - German U-boat offensive on the east coast of the United States
Pedestal Allied convoy to Malta.
Plunder (1945) - British crossing of the Rhine
Archway - SAS operation to support Plunder
Varsity - airborne crossing in conjunction with Plunder
Pluto (year?) - construction of undersea oil pipelines between England and France
Reinhard (1943) - German reprisals for Anthropoid
Renntier ("Reindeer") (1941) - German occupation of Finnish Petsamo
Rheinübung ("Exercise Rhine") (1941) - German attacks on Allied shipping conducted by Bismarck and Prinz Eugen

Rösselsprung [1] ("Knights Move") (1942) - German naval campaign to sink Arctic convoys
Rösselsprung [2] ("Knights Move") (1944) - German attempt to capture Josip Broz Tito
Roundup (1942) - planned Allied landings in France
Seelöwe ("Sea Lion") (1940) - planned German invasion of Britain
Adler ("Eagle") - German air offensive
Grün [2] ("Green") (1940) - decoy invasion of Ireland in conjunction with Seelöwe
Herbstreise ("Autumn Journey") - decoy invasion of Scotland in conjunction with Seelöwe.
Shingle (1944) - Allied landings at Anzio
Baobab - commando raid in support of Shingle
Chettyford - deception plan to support Shingle
Pomegranate (1944) - Raid in support of Shingle
Sledgehammer (1942) - planned Allied landings in France
Sonneblume - movement of German troops to north Africa as a result of the British Compass
Sonnenwende ("Winter Solstice") (1945) - German offensive to relieve Pomerania from Russian forces and halt advance on Berlin
Supercharge (1942) - second attack by British at El Alamein
Taifun ("Typhoon") (1941) - German autumn offensive to capture Moscow
Tanne Ost (1944) - failed German attempt to capture Suursaari from Finland
Tanne West (1944) - planned German attempt to capture the Åland Islands from Finland
Tannenbaum - The planned German invasion of Switzerland.
Theseus (1942) - German offensive to drive Allies out of Cyrenaica and Egypt
Tiger (1944) - Allied training prior D-Day, near Slapton, England
Tombola (1945) - SAS raid in Italy
Torch (1942) - Allied landings in North Africa
Totalize (1944) - Allied effort to trap German armor in Normandy
Watchtower (1942) - U.S. invasion of Guadalcanal
Weiss (1939) - German invasion of Poland.
Weserübung ("Weser Exercise") (1940) - German invasion of Denmark and Norway
Wintergewitter ("Winter Storm") (1942) - German attempt to relieve encircled 6th Army at Stalingrad
Zitadelle ("Citadel") (1943) - German counteroffensive at Kursk
Zitronella (1943) - German raid against a Norwegian/British station on Svalbard.
Zombie (1941) - airborne raid against rail targets in Italy

Cold War Era

Agatha (1946) - British attack on Hagana and Irgun in Palestine
Ajax (1953) - Anglo-British plan for coup in Iran
Anadyr - Soviet plan to base nuclear weapons in Cuba; the cause of the Cuban Missile Crisis
Argus (1959) - test of nuclear bombs in the upper atmosphere
Attila (1974) - Turkish invasion and occupation of northern Cyprus
Balak (1948) - smuggling of arms to Israel
Blowdown (1963) - Australia/US/UK simulated nuclear explosion in a rain forest
Claret (1964) - British patrols into Indonesia
El Dorado Canyon (1986) - US strikes against Libya
Earnest Will (1987-88) - American protection of Kuwaiti oil tankers in the Persian Gulf during the Iran-Iraq War
Praying Mantis (1988) - U.S. retaliates against Iran for mining frigate.
Prime Chance (1987-88) - Special operations to protect Kuwaiti tankers, run largely from barges

in the northern Persian Gulf.

Entebbe (1976) - Israeli rescue operation at Entebbe, Uganda. Later renamed Jonathan

Evening Light (1980) - US attempt to rescue embassy hostages in Tehran

Gold (1954) - covert American tunnel under the Berlin Wall

Golden Pheasant (1988) - US deployment in Honduras

Horev (1948) - Israeli attack in northern Israel

Jonathan (1976) - rescue of hostages at Entebbe, Uganda

Just Cause (1989) - US invasion of Panama

Mongoose (1962) - plan for information gathering, sabotage, civil insurrection and the overthrow of the Cuban government

Nimrod (1980) - rescue of hostages in the Iranian embassy, London

Northwoods (1960s) - plan to incite war between the United States and Cuba

Orion (1960) - DARPA project to design a nuclear pulse propulsion system

Peter Pan (1960s) - transfer of Cubans to the U.S.

Power Pack (1965) - U.S. deployment in the Dominican Republic

Provide Comfort (1991) - relief effort in northern Iraq

Restore Hope (1992) - American name for UNITAF, humanitarian intervention in Somalia

Silver (year?) - covert British tunnel in Austria

Suzannah (1954) - Israeli plan to bomb American interests in Egypt

Urgent Fury (1983) - U.S. invasion of Grenada

Vittles (1948) - Berlin Airlift

Operation Planefare - British part of the Berlin Airlift

Post-Cold War

Addition (2000) - Canada's contribution to the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE)

Anaconda (2002) - U.S. sweep in Afghanistan

Apollo (2002) - the Canadian Navy's operations in support of United States forces in Afghanistan

Assistance (1997) - Canadian assistance to Manitoba after major flooding

Athena (2003) - Canadian Forces contribution to ISAF in Kabul.

Bljesak ("Flash") (1995) - Croatian offensive against western Slavonian parts of Krajina

Boleas (1998) - South African military intervention in Lesotho

Bramble Bush (1992) - Israeli plan to kill Saddam Hussein

Caravan (year?) - Canadian contribution to the French-led Interim Emergency Multinational Force in the Democratic Republic of Congo

Central (1998) - Canada's assistance to Central America after the devastation of Hurricane Mitch

Chaperon - Canada's contribution to the United Nations of one military observer (UNMO)

Constable (1997) - Canada's contribution to the United Nations Mission in Haiti

Deliverance (1993) - Canadian mission to Somalia

Desert Shield (1990) - American buildup prior to Gulf War

Granby - British codename for operations during Gulf War

Desert Storm (1991) - Gulf War

Desert Saber - Gulf War ground campaign

Determination (early 1998) - Canadian deployment in the Persian Gulf to force Iraq to comply with United Nations inspection agreements

Enduring Freedom (2001-2002) - US and UK invasion of Afghanistan

Anaconda - US effort to capture al Qaeda members and Taliban in Afghanistan

Apollo - the Canadian Navy's operation in support of the United States forces in Afghanistan

Athena (2003) Canadian Forces contribution to ISAF in Kabul.
Avalanche (December 2003) - US-led offensive of Afghanistan
Haven Denial (July 2003) - US and Italian operation against Taliban remnants and Al Qaeda fighters in southeast Afghanistan
Headstrong (2003) - British special forces secretly training Afghan commandos to seek out and destroy drug labs
Mountain Resolve (launched on November 7, 2003) - US-led operation in Nurestan and Konar provinces, Afghanistan
Mountain Viper (late August, 2003) - US-Afghan attack on suspected Taliban forces in Zabul province, Afghanistan
Slipper - the Royal Australian Navy's contribution to the invasion of Afghanistan
Warrior Sweep (July 23, 2003) - first major military operation of the Afghan National Army
Essential Harvest (2001) - month-long NATO mission of disarming ethnic Albanians in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Falklands War:
Rosario - Argentine invasion
Corporate - British liberation
Black Buck - British long-range bombing raid
Canbelow - British anti-aircraft naval ambush
Keyhole - British commando raid
Purple Warrior - British training exercise incorporating lessons from the Falklands War
Sutton - British amphibious landings
Flavius (1988) - SAS action against the IRA in Gibraltar
Forage - Canadian contribution to NATO's Essential Harvest
Granby (1991) - British codename for operations during the Gulf War
Harmony - Canada's contribution to the United Nation Protection Force (UNPROFOR), which was created in February 1992 to ensure the protection and demilitarization of three UN Protected Areas in Croatia
Infinite Justice - original name for Enduring Freedom
Iraqi Freedom (2003) - US invasion of Iraq
Bulldog Mammoth - American search of an apartment complex
Iron Hammer - US forces in Iraq "ferreting out" the opposition (not the same as Eisenhower)
Ivy Blizzard - counter insurgency sweep by US forces
Ivy Cyclone II - American operation near Tikrit
Operation Red Dawn (2003) - American capture of Saddam Hussein
Rifles Blitz - border security operations in Iraq
Telic - codename for British operations
Valiant Resolve (2004) Operations around Fallujah
Kinetic - Canada's contribution to NATO's mission KFOR to secure Kosovo and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and to provide humanitarian needs to displaced persons
Litani (1978) Israeli invasion of Lebanon.
Megaphone - Canada's return of equipment used in Kosovo
Oluja ("Storm") (1995) - Croatian offensive against Krajina
Northern Watch (1990s) - northern No-Fly Zone over Iraq
Peace for Galilee - Israeli invasion of Lebanon
Peregrine - British Columbia forest fire fighting assistance by soldiers
Persistence (1998) - Canadian operation at Peggy's Cove, Nova Scotia to recover bodies after crash of SwissAir Flight 111

Potkova ("Horseshoe") (1999) - Yugoslav army offensive against the KLA
Provide Comfort (1991) - security and humanitarian aid to Kurds in northern Iraq
Quadrant - Canada's mission in Kosovo
Rainbow - Israeli incursion into the Gaza Strip in 2004.
Record (1991) - Canadian mission to secure Iraqi-Kuwaiti border
Recuperation (1998) - Canadian assistance after major snowstorms in eastern Canada
Sharp Edge (1990-91) - evacuation of Americans from Liberia
Shining Express (2003) - evacuation of Americans from Liberia
Southern Watch (1990s) - southern No-Fly Zone over Iraq
Slipper - the Royal Australian Navy's contribution to the invasion of Afghanistan
Support (September 11-14, 2001) - Canadian Forces operations after terrorist September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks
Telic (2003) - British codename for operations against Iraq
Torrent (1999) - Canadian assistance after earthquake in Turkey
Toucan - Canada's contribution to the United Nations' International Force in East Timor (INTERFET) and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET)
Unified Spirit - large NATO exercise held every two years to train the armed forces of member nations in joint and combined operations.
Urgent Fury - American Invasion of Grenada
Veritas (2001) - British codename for operations in Afghanistan

Other/Unknown

Artisan - Canadian Forces contribution to the Rinas Airfield Rehabilitation Project in Tirana, Albania
Echo - Canada sending air forces to Aviano, Italy to enforce a no-fly zone over Balkan region (UNSFOR and UNKFOR)
Eclipse - deployment of Canadian soldiers to east Africa in support of the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE)
Fusion - Canada's combined contribution to Allied Harmony and Concordia
Prudence - Canada's participation in the Mission des Nations Unies dans la République Centrafricaine (MINURCA)

Law Enforcement

Avalanche (1999) - American anti-pedophilia effort
Falcon (2004) - anti-pedophilia raid against companies handling credit card payments
Ore (2003) - American led anti-pedophilia effort
Pin (2003) - British-led anti-pedophilia effort

Other

List of amphibious assault operations
List of Nuclear Tests
Project Daedalus - British Interplanetary Society study to create a plausible design for an interstellar probe
Project Jennifer (1974) - CIA lifting of a sunken Soviet submarine
Project RAND
Project Vanguard

Non-military operations

Bojinka - terrorist plot by al-Qaida members Ramzi Yousef and Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, foiled in 1995

Clambake - anti-Scientology

I gotta say they dont all make sense. lol but some definately do.

Thus; Operation Iraqi Freedom = Freedom for Iraqi's,

Operation Overlord != Over the Lord

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:27:59 GMT

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

warrantohmm.. 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 speeches [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.

Overlord was later dropped.

But yes, the Operation names do infer what the Operation is about.

Desert Storm- Invade Kuwait

Desert Shield- Protect Kuwait

Desert Fox- Attack Iraq Stealthily

Iraq Freedom- Free Iraqis.

Overlord- Dominance over everyone

Do you seriously think they would name it that if it had nothing to do with freeing Iraqis?

Actually it does hold an Argument, Bill Oreilly proved this with Michael Moore. MM admitted he would pre-emptively attack Hitler knowing what he would do. We don't know what Saddam will do, why take the chance?

Bush Jr didn't do anything because starting a war you first week in office isn't the best thing to start a presidency on.

Bush Sr didn't do it because the UN said no. Remember that High Way of Death thing? American helicopters decimated what was left of the Iraqi military. The attack took place inside Iraq.

Actually no. The US did not sit back. Without US supplies, planes, vehicles, gasoline. ammunition...the allies would not have lasted. The Battle of Britain would have been lost if America did not produce almost all of Britain's fighters. We originally developed the P-51 mustang for the British.

Besides we entered in 1942. Only two years after Hitler invaded Europe. Were were fighting Japan within weeks of Pearl Harbor. And it took Allied forces 3 more years to develop Operation Over Lord.

We did not just sit by and do nothing.

And allied soldier knew about the concentration camps until we actually found them.

The UN never voted.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:32:03 GMT

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

Since both are you are complete dumbasses I will do this again, and i will explain every bit of it.

And for a big 'duh factor' here, in order for us the Free Iraq we had to invade. You could not flip that around. Liberation is a product of invasion. How ever our reason for invasion was the product of liberation.

It goes back to my cake analogy.

For you to get a cake you need to put ingredients together. You cannot flip it around. So in order to a get a cake you need to mix the ingredients. your reason for mixing the ingredients was to form a cake.

The ingredients/mixing is the invasion, the Cake is Freedom.

We want a cake. So we mix ingredients, out pops a cake.

Why did we mix ingredients? To get a cake!

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.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:37:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've got three documents for you to look at.

<http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/scact2003.htm>

Please note the far right column: Security Council Action / Vote. The security council debates and votes on ALL of these issues when they meet. That is why and how they work. When it says "no action", it means that the vote did not equate to a resolution.

Now look at March 19th, 2003. "NO ACTION". In fact, March 12th, on both Iraq-Kuwait issues, there was NO ACTION perscribed.

<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/PRO/N03/286/04/PDF/N0328604.pdf?OpenElement>

This is a report of the meeting and the speakers prior to the voting.

<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2003/sc7696.doc.htm>

And that is the press release.

All of which prove to you, once and for all that this war is illegal.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:39:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxI've got three documents for you to look at.

<http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/scact2003.htm>

Please note the far right column: Security Council Action / Vote. The security council debates and votes on ALL of these issues when they meet. That is why and how they work. When it says "no action", it means that the vote did not equate to a resolution.

Now look at March 19th, 2003. "NO ACTION". In fact, March 12th, on both Iraq-Kuwait issues, there was NO ACTION perscribed.

<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/PRO/N03/286/04/PDF/N0328604.pdf?OpenElement>

This is a report of the meeting and the speakers prior to the voting.

<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2003/sc7696.doc.htm>

And that is the press release.

All of which prove to you, once and for all that this war is illegal.

And yet they don't care.

Meaning it isn't illegal. Because resolution 1546 praises it.

Now fuck off, you lose.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:40:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh, and another thing. You're still wrong. Resolutions do not make the charter void. They are made in ACCORDANCE to the charter. It's not called "resolution" for no reason.

You obviously have no idea how the UN works, either. You're still wrong.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:41:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And I'm sure it being called the "War on Terrorism" meant that it was for Iraqi's to be freed, right? Like I stated earlier, had freeing Iraqi citezens been the reason for going to war, ideas of WMD's and Terrorism ties would NEVER of been introduced.

And hind-sight arguements don't hold water, in any arguement where you plan to hold any sort of strength. Using your logic, we should execute you, and half the worlds population because we don't know what they'd do.

so Bush jr decides to wait over 6 months? And seeing as how you enjoy hind-sight arguements, here's one of my own. Had 9/11 not happened, I somehow doubt he would have invaded.

Oh, and sending supplies doesn't mean anything. At least it seems not to when it's Canada doing rather than participating in the war...

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:42:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NodbuggerAnd yet they don't care.
Meaning it isn't illegal. Because resolution 1546 praises it.
Now fuck off, you lose.

Consider yourself owned. You won't even read those articles proving you wrong. Just like you won't read documents stating Iraq was disarming. And just like you won't read the UN charter.

It doesn't matter what the UN says today. I'm concerned with what happened in March 2003.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:45:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh, and another thing. Bush did say that Iraq is part of the War on Terror:

<http://www.cnn.com/2003/US/03/06/bush.speech.transcript/>

Quote:(Bush): Iraq is a part of the war on terror.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:46:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh, so someone praising something makes it less illegal? Where have I head something similar... oh yes, vigilante cases! Law enforcement officials usually praise the work thats being done, publically or not, but when it comes down to that final desicion, IT'S STILL ILLEGAL EVEN IF IT ENDS UP BEING FORGIVEN.

LLiberty is the product of invasin, that has never been disputed (so I don't know why you seem to think it has been. It must make you feel better or something?) However, that DOES NOT mean that Liberty is a REASON for invading, it's simply a product.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:47:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxOh, and another thing. You're still wrong. Resolutions do not make the charter void. They are made in ACCORDANCE to the charter. It's not called "resolution" for no reason.

You obviously have no idea how the UN works, either. You're still wrong.

<http://www.un.org/Docs/scres/2002/sc2002.htm>

'Recognizing the threat of Iraq's non-compliance with Council Resolutions and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles poses international peace and security'

It is all in Resolution 1441.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:49:52 GMT

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

warrantoAnd I'm sure it being called the "War on Terrorism" meant that it was for Iraqi's to be freed, right? Like I stated earlier, had freeing Iraqi citezens been the reason for going to war, ideas of WMD's and Terrorism ties would NEVER of been introduced.

And hind-sight arguements don't hold water, in any arguement where you plan to hold any sort of strength. Using your logic, we should execute you, and half the worlds population because we don't know what they'd do.

so Bush jr decides to wait over 6 months? And seeing as how you enjoy hind-sight arguements, here's one of my own. Had 9/11 not happened, I somehow doubt he would have invaded.

Oh, and sending supplies doesn't mean anything. At least it seems not to when it's Canada doing rather than participating in the war...

It is the War on Terror.

Is Saddam not a terrorist?

Your logic is seriously flawed. I am not Saddam. I have not done what Saddam has done. You have no reason to suspect me of anything. Saddam on the other hand.....you get my drift.

The Military Operation was called 'Operation Iraq Freedom'

You are jackass. Plain and simple. Europe would have failed in 15 minutes if we did not supply them.

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

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:50:12 GMT

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

I've read Resolution 1441. It does not negate the authority of the Security Council. Just like no other Resolution does. But you know, it doesn't give the United States permission to invade other countries either.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:51:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NodbuggerIs Saddam not a terrorist?

Actually, technically he is not. I addressed this with the definition of Terrorism something like 2 pages ago.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:52:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxNodbuggerAnd yet they don't care.
Meaning it isn't illegal. Because resolution 1546 praises it.
Now fuck off, you lose.

Consider yourself owned. You won't even read those articles proving you wrong. Just like you won't read documents stating Iraq was disarming. And just like you won't read the UN charter.

It doesn't matter what the UN says today. I'm concerned with what happened in March 2003.

I have read them hundreds of times before.

I do not need to read them now.

Not reading them for the 600th time in no way proves me wrong.

I do not care what the charter says. I care what the Security Resolutions say. Because they override anything in the charter.

Iraq was not disarming. Until a couple months ago we had every reason to believe Saddam Had wmd everywhere.

For all we know they are still hiding or were shipped out.

But it is 100% fact that as of 2002 they were there.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:53:10 GMT

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

JavaxcxI've read Resolution 1441. It does not negate the authority of the Security Council. Just like no other Resolution does. But you know, it doesn't give the United States permission to invade other countries either.

If you are going to stay ignorant don't do it here.

Security Resolutions negate the charter.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:54:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You keep saying that the resolutions override the security council, yet you have no logical evidence (or any, for that matter) proving it. Just like you have no proof saying that he "100%" had WMD in 2002.

Oh, you're still wrong.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:54:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JavaxcxNodbuggerIs Saddam not a terrorist?

Actually, technically he is not. I addressed this with the definition of Terrorism something like 2 pages ago.

Because giving money to Palestinians suicide bombers doesn't make him a terrorist.

Killing raping Genocide, naw definitely not terrorism. :rolleyes:

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:55:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

He is acting as the sovriegn leader of Iraq. A GOVERNMENT. THAT IS NOT TERRORISM. TERRORISTS != LEGITIMATE GOVERNMENT

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:55:56 GMT

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

JavaxcxYou keep saying that the resolutions override the security council, yet you have no logical evidence (or any, for that matter) proving it. Just like you have no proof saying that he "100%" had WMD in 2002.

Oh, you're still wrong.

Why don't you crawl into a hole and die?

Why would they pass a resolution saying

We blow blow Saddam up if he doesn't cooperate.

If we cannot blow him up?

Are you that fucking stupid.

I quote...again. For you dumb asses.

'Recognizing the threat of Iraq's non-compliance with Council Resolutions and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles poses international peace and security'

Right there Res 1441 written in 2002.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 05:58:20 GMT

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

You don't understand how those resolutions work. They are REFERING to previous resolutions before they make the resolution they are writing. It is the way they proof themselves so they don't have to put up with the beaucratic crap associated with "Well, where is your evidence?"

And that still doesn't negate the authority of the Security Council. So you're still wrong. Oh, and another thing: Ad Hominem is only funny when it's someone witty doing it. You are not.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 06:00:34 GMT

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

JavaxcxHe is acting as the sovriegn leader of Iraq. A GOVERNMENT. THAT IS NOT TERRORISM. TERRORISTS != LEGITIMATE GOVERNMENT

Go look up the damn definition of terrorism.
Im done arguing here.

You are an idiot and you will not admit it.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 06:01:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I already did. You obviously chose to ignore it.

Consider yourself owned, kid. You don't know how the world works. [/i]

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 06:04:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Your logic is seriously flawed. I am not Saddam. I have not done what Saddam has done. You have no reason to suspect me of anything. Saddam on the other hand.....you get my drift.

I never stated you were Saddam, I never stated that you had done what he did. All I am saying is that by using your logic of not knowing the future, everyone should be taken care of, simply because they "may" do something.

See what I mean by hind-sight arguements not holding any strength? Unless, for whatever reason, it's you providing them :rolleyes:

Was he a terrorist? Yes. However, if the plan was to free the peopel of iraq, would the war not have been called something else, and the whole idea of the war NOT revolve around WMD's and terrorist ties?

Quite interesting here.. Resolution 1441 also states something else...

"Reaffirming the comittement of all member states soverignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, Kuwait, and all the neighboring states."

And then again in 1443 (which I'm pretty sure comes after 1441)...

"Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the soverignty and territorial integrity of Iraq"

Kind of suggests that nothing should happen to them... no?

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 06:06:17 GMT

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

Javaxcxl already did. You obviously chose to ignore it.

Consider yourself owned, kid. You don't know how the world works. [/i]

I cannot believe I am replying.

In no way am I a kid and In no way am I owned.

I proved you wrong every single post.

any Sane person could see that.

You are just too Canadian to admit you were wrong...Isn't is past your bed time?

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 06:07:49 GMT

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

And Javaxcx, he's right about the terrorist thing...

Specifically, "The unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence by a person against people with the intention of intimidating or coercing societies, often for ideological or political reasons."

Edit: sorry Javaxcx, I guess I hate you now.

And nodbugger, I severly suggest you watch what you say about Canadians.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 06:08:33 GMT

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

warrantoQuote:Your logic is seriously flawed. I am not Saddam. I have not done what Saddam has done. You have no reason to suspect me of anything. Saddam on the other hand.....you get my drift.

I never stated you were Saddam, I never stated that you had done what he did. All I am saying is that by using your logic of not knowing the future, everyone should be taken care of, simply because they "may" do something.

See what I mean by hind-sight arguements not holding any strength? Unless, for whatever reason, it's you providing them :rolleyes:

Was he a terrorist? Yes. However, if the plan was to free the peopel of iraq, would the war not

have been called something else, and the whole idea of the war NOT revolve around WMD's and terrorist ties?

Quite interesting here.. Resolution 1441 also states something else...

"Reaffirming the comittement of all member states sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, Kuwait, and all the neighboring states."

And then again in 1443 (which I'm pretty sure comes after 1441)...

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

Kind of suggests that nothing should happen to them... no?

We are talking about past events. Saddam did bad things before.

We can now get rid of him.

So why the hell do you care so much?

there is no reason to be against the war.

Other than you are just a stupid jackass that needs something to complain about.

Sovereignty of Iraq. Not Saddam.

Try again jackass.

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

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 06:09:31 GMT

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

You have proven nothing, actually. Both Warranto, AND myself have provided evidence. Evidence you have chosen to ignore.

Your statements are full of logical fallacy, ad hominem, and false assumptions.

And another thing, that's twice now you've said you were done arguing here. And that's now that you've replied thereafter in short succession.

Oh, and I know you're a kid, too. A little bird told me.

Now scuttle off, you have been owned.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 06:12:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Uhh... Saddam (was) the leader of Iraq. As long as he stayed on Iraqi soil, you could not touch him.

When did I ever say I was against the war? Oh, right.. never.

I never stated I cared, however your complete ignorance of things being discussed is just astounding.

I could care less if Saddam Nuked every country in Europe, if the UN stated that Iraq was not to be touched, INVADING WOULD STILL BE ILLEGAL.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 06:32:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh, one more thing. Is this the vote that you said never happened?

Quote:Divergent views were expressed by the representatives of the United States, United Kingdom and Spain, which had tabled a further resolution on the situation on 7 March containing a deadline of Monday, 17 March, for Iraq's full compliance. Failing to win the necessary support for the draft in the Council and amid the threat of a veto by a permanent member, the three announced on Monday that they would not put it to a vote

If so, that "vote that never happened" was to set the "full compliance" for that monday. Nothing about attacking Iraq or not.

If I'm mistaken, please point out where I could find the answer to what you mean.

Subject: Re: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 07:57:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Note that I couldn't be bothered to read through five pages of what has probably degenerated into a flamfest, but I just want to say this:

SuperFlyingEngiAnd, Diebold [One of the companies that makes these machines] has posted the source code for the machines on an unprotected FTP site.

That is because then everyone can check the source code for errors, bugs or downright fraud. Whilst if the source wasn't released to the public you never know what errors may be in it and the company would be less inclined to fix things because they may think noone has noticed anyway. I just wanted to point out that they put it online on purpose.

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 terror 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

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 15:08:03 GMT

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

JavaxcxYou have proven nothing, actually. Both Warranto, AND myself have provided evidence. Evidence you have chosen to ignore.

Your statements are full of logical fallacy, ad hominem, and false assumptions.

And another thing, that's twice now you've said you were done arguing here. And that's now that you've replied thereafter in short succession.

Oh, and I know you're a kid, too. A little bird told me.

Now scuttle off, you have been owned.

Too bad I am right.

The reason for going to war is what happens afterwords.

That is reason. Do you not understand that?

We want a free Iraq so we go to war. Why did we go to war to free Iraq.

It is that simple.

It was a reason.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 15:14:39 GMT

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

warrantoOh, one more thing. Is this the vote that you said never happened?

Quote:Divergent views were expressed by the representatives of the United States, United Kingdom and Spain, which had tabled a further resolution on the situation on 7 March containing a deadline of Monday, 17 March, for Iraq's full compliance. Failing to win the necessary support for the draft in the Council and amid the threat of a veto by a permanent member, the three announced on Monday that they would not put it to a vote

If so, that "vote that never happened" was to set the "full compliance" for that monday. Nothing about attacking Iraq or not.

If I'm mistaken, please point out where I could find the answer to what you mean.

As it says, it never happened. They were going to vote to go to Iraq.

France was going to vote No. They were the only one voting no they had the Veto power. So out of the 7 or so that mattered. Only 1 was going to vote no.

In the UN Majority does not rule.

And as I have said before. The war is not illegal. In no way has it ever been illegal. Every thing you have said does not make it illegal.

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

Don't say casualties, or terrorist attacks. We knew those were going to happen. Everyone knew that was going to happen. The fact is less happened than people thought were going to happen. People were saying thousands of American soldiers will die and hundreds of thousands of Iraqis will be killed. Well it isn't even close to that. And when you do get rid of a government in a country you will always have people that do not like that. No matter who you take out of power or what country you are going into what is going on in Iraq is what has happened every time anyone has done something like this. And every time we have replaced their style of government the country becomes much better for it.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 15:34:51 GMT

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

Quote: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.

When I get pissed off I generally start to swear. If I argued with you in person it would seem better. Typing words doesn't bring out the full emotion of actual speaking.

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

How hard is it to understand my cake analogy.

Our reasons for going to war were for what happens after wards.

We cannot have the "what happens after wards" with out the war.

Quote:1 Iraq is predominately Shi'a. The Head of the Shi'a branch of Islam is Iran. This is why BushSr 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.

The UN said no, Bush told the Iraqi people to rise up against Saddam, which they did. then the cease fire was signed. And Saddam slaughtered all of the rebels.

Quote:2 'Shrub's reason's 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 otehr 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 thereis/was sufficient evidence to believe that Saddam was researching WMD's but we still haven't found definitive proof.

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.

Quote:

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?

There are not many countries who have posed as much of a significant threat as Saddam. Saddam is a very well known dictator. Very few people do not know of his crimes. Saddam is what i would call the poster boy for Evil Dictators. When every they need an evil guy to make fun of

they go straight to Saddam. Every watch South Park? Saddam is a raving homosexual with Satan. On Saturday night live he is also getting blow jobs by Monica Lewinsky. There was no better place to start than Iraq. Besides Iran is now giving up secrets. Libya, they just gave up. They don't want to end up like Saddam did. Korea, they are still on the shelf. Negotiations are still going on. And as you said you really cannot just invade a country with millions in their Army and Nuclear weapons.

Quote: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

One thing Saddam did good was his schooling. while it was filled with propaganda about him the people did learn. Iraqis are in no way stupid or poor. Given just like everything you have the stupid and poor. But it isn't as widespread as you think.

My dad was stationed near Iraqis only port city. You would think they would rich as hell. Well Saddam did not like them so much. So they are poor as hell. When American troops first rolled through their city every Iraqi there was as happy as a person could possibly be. Coalition soldiers have built them roads, schools, they have gotten them clean water, they are getting jobs working on things. Armor divisions pay Iraqis to swap out parts when ever they are needed. Satellite dish and used car sales have gone through the roof. People can actual get information from outside of Iraq.

I think you would know that Iraq at one point was a Republic. Well it has been a Republic. It is just Saddam has kept the Republic part out of it. He kills all political opponents and forces people to vote for him. Democracy worked in Nazi Germany and Democracy worked in Japan. It can certainly work in Iraq.

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

It really is not that many people. 99% of Iraqis want to live their lives how they want to live their lives. They are glad Saddam is gone and they want everything to settle down. There are now 200,000k Iraqi police patrolling the streets. that is about 3 times the Amount of Americans Guarding anything.

They want their country to be better and by saying the things you are you are just slowing down the effort. Either you start being positive or you can stay out of it. If you don't want anything to do with it then you can just shut the fuck up.

PS...Don't ever compare this to Vietnam.

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

Posted by [hareman](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 16:19:48 GMT

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

OK, I am in a position to know so much more than you about anything involving Terrorism. You

don't know anything except what you read.

Your points are inane and self serving. You try to argue but instead look like an ass. My bit out intellectual honesty is on the money with you.

Trying to refute what I said makes you look desperate and combative. I am in a position to know and be able to prove everything I said while you on the other hand offer glib statements in rebuttle (sp?).

Number one what do you know of the histoory of the region? Your assinine statement that Bush told then to rise up was shear lunacy. after that I did not bother to continue reading as you lack any credibilty after that one idiotic point.

NEWSFLASH: Saddam's trouble with the kurds predates BushSr's war. Did you forget the US backed him against Iraq? even while our country was brokering an arms for hostages deal with IRAN that violated so many laws that your children will be feeling its repercussions.

So what is your reason for that? Go look it up on the web somewhere and copy and paste it.

YOu are the type of person who propagates myths, urban legends, half truths, and outright fallacies becuae you lack the moral courage and intelectual honesty to question what you see.

The truth is that we are where we are because of outrageous intelligence failuers, shamefull foriegn diplomacies debacles, outright bad policy, shamefull treatment of our allies, lack of respect for other cultures but this is my country and I love it. I serve it to this day by helping to defend it. I work for the Office of Homeland Security (the very name makes me sick) and I fight the war on terror very day.

What do you do? Sit behind a computer and pat yourself in the back for not have the necessaey fortitude to ask why? If you believe your drivel so much go serve in Iraq. We definately need more cannon fodder.

As far as your crack about Java. I have known him for over 2 year. HE at least admits when he is in error and is willing to look at things a new way. He may look down at you but this only because YOU have not earned his respect and you never will this way.

SO GO ENLIST OR DO SOMETHING TO HELP

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 16:55:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I hate when people make assumptions.

I'm going to make a few points here.

1. My dad guarded Iraqi prisoners in Saudi Arabia for 10 months during the Gulf War.
2. My dad guarded prisoners in Iraq for 1 year in this current war.
3. I currently know well over 100 soldiers who have been or are in Iraq.
4. I have frequent contact with many of them.
5. You know you are wrong when the people who are fighting and dieing are saying what we are doing in Iraq is the greatest thing that has ever happened to these people.
6. You know you are wrong when the Iraqi people believe this is one of the best things that could ever happen to them.
7. Bush Sr Did tell the Iraqis to rise up against Saddam. We signed a cease-fire and Saddam killed thousands of Rebels. That is factual information.
8. I know more about the region than you ever will. I have been to the region. I have looked up and read and watched tons of things on the region. I know the history of it and I know the history of Saddam. You for some reason just like to throw it right out the window.
9. We back Saddam because at the Time Iran was much worse than Iraq. We figured we could weaken them both and take them out at the same time. Why waste our resources when they can waste themselves.
10. What myths? what Urban legends? What half truths? What out right fallacies? Every thing I have said is 100% fact.
11. We are there for hundreds of reasons. Saddam has broken every UN resolution, Freeing the Iraqi people, making Iraq peaceful nation, stopping the torture, getting rid of all the deceit, and last but not least getting rid of an evil bastard that has no right to be in charge of a country.
12. I asked why. And I received an answer. That answer was good enough for me. It seems the murder of millions of people and the torture of millions more really doesn't matter to you. I knew Saddam was a bad guy before Bush ever mentioned his name. I knew he was a bad guy before Bush was ever elected. I would have supported a war to get rid of him no matter who was leading it.
13. Well he hasn't admitted he is wrong yet. He is wrong.
14. Why would I enlist? I want to go to college. After that maybe ill get commissioned.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 20:10:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NodbuggerwarrantoOh, one more thing. Is this the vote that you said never happened?

Quote:Divergent views were expressed by the representatives of the United States, United Kingdom and Spain, which had tabled a further resolution on the situation on 7 March containing a deadline of Monday, 17 March, for Iraq's full compliance. Failing to win the necessary support for the draft in the Council and amid the threat of a veto by a permanent member, the three announced on Monday that they would not put it to a vote

If so, that "vote that never happened" was to set the "full compliance" for that monday. Nothing about attacking Iraq or not.

If I'm mistaken, please point out where I could find the answer to what you mean.

As it says, it never happened. They were going to vote to go to Iraq.

France was going to vote No. They were the only one voting no they had the Veto power. So out of the 7 or so that mattered. Only 1 was going to vote no.

In the UN Majority does not rule.

And as I have said before. The war is not illegal. In no way has it ever been illegal. Every thing you have said does not make it illegal.

Besides, why are you so against this war? What is your reasoning.

Don't say casualties, or terrorist attacks. We knew those were going to happen. Everyone knew that was going to happen. The fact is less happened than people thought were going to happen. People were saying thousands of American soldiers will die and hundreds of thousands of Iraqis will be killed. Well it isn't even close to that. And when you do get rid of a government in a country you will always have people that do not like that. No matter who you take out of power or what country you are going into what is going on in Iraq is what has happened every time anyone has done something like this. And every time we have replaced their style of government the country becomes much better for it.

Ya, I know. You don't bother to read things.. so let me quote it once more for your benefit...

warrantoWhen did I ever say I was against the war? Oh, right... never.

I never stated that majority rules in the UN, so I don't know why you like making up "facts" that people supposedly say, all it does is damage your credibility. Strike two, all in one post.

As for completely ignoring my post in the first place, I guess that forces me to repeat what I had asked. Where is the documentation that states the supposed vote was not going to happen? I mean, even the vote-that-never-happened regarding the March 17 deadline was documented. But I'll just take your word for it, no vote happened regarding the attack on Iraq. Thank you for supporting the statement that it was illegal! Using the proof that you provided (resolution 1441) and subsequent resolutions on it has affirmed and reaffirmed the "sovereignty and territorial

integrity of Iraq". Perhaps you don't quite understand what that means, so here are some definitions for you to remember...

sovereignty

n 1: government free from external control

ter-ri-to-ri-al (tr-tôr-l, -tr-)

adj.

Of or relating to the geographic area under a given jurisdiction: the territorial limits of a country.

n-teg-ri-ty (n-tgr-t)

n.

The state of being unimpaired; soundness or wholeness.

In other words, no one was allowed to usurp control, or violate the territory of Iraq. Guess what America did? Right... usurped control and violated the territory of Iraq. And since there was no vote to do otherwise, it WAS ILLEGAL.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 01 Aug 2004 20:49:20 GMT

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

OK, since you are going to keep babbling on about Resolutions and that it was illegal and all that bull.

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

The Gulf War never ended. It was only put at a cease-fire. Every time Iraq attacked an American or British plane patrolling the area we could have started the war right back up.

And I never said you said anything about you saying something. I said this is factual information that I am saying. I do not care what you said. I am saying something and so far everything has been fact.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 01:16:22 GMT

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

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

So? What does that have to do with America's attack? America hasn't been appointed the world police, you do realize that don't you?

Quote:The Gulf War never ended. It was only put at a cease-fire. Every time Iraq attacked an

American or British plane patrolling the area we could have started the war right back up.

If you want to use this as a defence, then explain to me the pretence of going in because Iraq had WMD's? I'm sure that if the war was still going on, something that serious would not have been needed. Had this been the case, the subject matter would not have even begun to go through the UN, to not be voted on.

Oh.. so me saying I didnt agree with the war is factual? Show me where I stated this. You've accused me three times now, saying that those accusations were factual. So, please show me where I stated this.

In short, nothing you have supplied gives any reason to thing that the war was legal. The UN not voting on it does not make it legal to do something. In order to enter the country of a UN member, more so for the purpose of conducting war on them, you need the UN's approval. As you so fondly point out, it was not voted on. Therefor the United Stats and Britian did not have the approval of the UN to go in and start fighting. That makes it illegal.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 01:41:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

As I said, the cease-fire.

If Bush just started up a war he would get criticized.

Here he at least told them about it and gave them a better reason than the shot at our planes. People wouldn't go with that as the only reason.

From the beginning he told the UN we will do it whether you like it or not. They never voted, they have passed resolutions since then. The UN has never said it is illegal.

It is just a fallacy the anti-war crowd uses.

And if you were not against the war why do you keep hyping about how illegal it was?

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [U927](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 02:13:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NodbuggerFrom the beginning he told the UN we will do it whether you like it or not. They never voted, they have passed resolutions since then. The UN has never said it is illegal.

So let me get this straight; just because the UN doesn't say it is illegal, it is automatically legal?

I can't wait for Javafx to get a hold of this one.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 03:05:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Umbral_DelaFlareNodbuggerFrom the beginning he told the UN we will do it whether you like it or not. They never voted, they have passed resolutions since then. The UN has never said it is illegal.

So let me get this straight; just because the UN doesn't say it is illegal, it is automatically legal?

I can't wait for Javacx to get a hold of this one.

No it means the UN never made a decision either way.

So you can interpret UN documents how ever you want to.

But when it comes down to what the UN says, they haven't said anything against it.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 03:44:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How I feel about the war won't make it any less illegal. I've always supported the outcome of the war, it doesn't make it any less illegal though. Once again, I refer to the vigilante cause. Some people not entrusted with the security of the people go out and stop criminals, it is usually accompanied with public support, though some complain. Even though the cause is just, and I happen to support what was does, doesn't make it any less against the law.

As you said so yourself, the UN never said yay or nay in regards to the invasion of Iraq. That in itself makes any invasion illegal, regardless of who invades who.

As I stated earlier, you need the UN's approval to invade another Member State. Thats the whole point of belonging to the UN, and why the UN usually offers punishment if a member does something it's not supposed to.

Bases on your logic, once again, I'm sure you'd go out and steal a car if you could. The Police never told you that you couldn't do it, so I guess it must be legal for you to do it!

And remember, just because the UN may hav eforgiven it, doesn't mean it was never illegal. You said so yourself, stealing is stealing. Even though I'm sure that kid who stole the loaf of bread was forgiven.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 04:02:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

Until then the UN has never said we shouldn't have, they have never said it was illegal.

Saying it was illegal is just crap.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 04:06:11 GMT

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

ok then.. the proof. The Document was published 27 June 2000, and states what the "Crime of Aggression" is.

<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N00/503/08/PDF/N0050308.pdf>

It's an interesting read. It was a complete fluke that I found this as well as I was searching the UN website for stuff relating to it's charter. In short, it states what I've been saying. One country attacking the other without approval.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 04:15:10 GMT

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

And the UN says it does not exist.

It gets an error.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 04:34:13 GMT

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

hmm.. I can open it fine. I'll just post the search link then...

This should be a direct link to the text version, via the search:
Clicky

This should be to the search page if the above does not work. Click on the PCNICC link.

clicky

And if none of them work, go to the UN homepage (<http://www.UN.org>) and search for this topic: Charter +invasion, thats how I found it.[/url]

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 aggressor. This was legal.

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

2003 - W's reign of terror ... We invaded Iraq. We WERE the aggressor. 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.

Subject: Re: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 14:54:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NHJ BV

SuperFlyingEngiAnd, Diebold [One of the companies that makes these machines] has posted the source code for the machines on an unprotected FTP site.

That is because then everyone can check the source code for errors, bugs or downright fraud. Whilst if the source wasn't released to the public you never know what errors may be in it and the company would be less inclined to fix things because they may think noone has noticed anyway. I just wanted to point out that they put it online on purpose.

No, the source code can be checked by some government authorities working in the voting machine department. If you put the source code for the otherwise secret voting machines on an unprotected FTP server, then people can download the code and hack into voting machines, and play whatever tricks they want, like one candidate getting 1,337 vote, and another getting 8 billion. These electronic voting machines are a terrible idea. There should always be a paper trail for the vote, so we can recount if necessary. But all the Republicans in Congress are blocking bills for a paper trail and saying, "Why do we need a paper trail? Just trust us and these machines that have been proven time and time again to not work."

Like you, I also cannot be bothered to read the previous 3 pages and everyone making mountain-sized posts.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 17:15:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Done. Didn't realize that was one where no quotation marks were needed. Never thought of that.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 02 Aug 2004 23:16:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

These voting machines could be "tweaked" either way. Maybe two hackers will get into a hacking war and each candidate will get 479 bazillion votes. You just assume that it will be tweaked in a way that doesn't help you.

Of course that's based on the assumption that any tampering will occur.

As for the war justification, I couldn't care less about international law blah blah blah... The United States Congress voted in a large majority to disarm Saddam Hussein. I don't believe the liberation of the people was a main goal, but merely a very nice side effect. I see firsthand the improvements in Iraq through the appearance of a Cisco Networking Academy in the country. This tells me that the citizens of Iraq are now going to be able to learn higher technology. Couple that with the oil in Iraq and that country is well-equipped to stand on its own feet. It will take a couple years, yes... but they are on the right path. Iraq was a largely unstable area and it's been proven time and time again that Saddam fostered and nurtured terrorists. It's a great place to start turning

that region into a more productive and safe place for their citizens and the world.

Since the start of military action in Iraq, we have others who DO definitely have nukes who are now willing to play ball and have diplomatic relations with the United States (and the UN I'm sure) because they see that the US takes care of its own. You can shove the politics and the red tape of international law and the UN right up your asses because I don't want myself or anyone I care about become the victim of another terrorist attack.

The troops who are there right now were not forced to serve. Every single one of them knows that they may die in service. I don't want to see a single person die, but the worst thing we can do to those brave men and women is to dishonor them by saying that they died for nothing. The strength of the military's numbers lies in how we treat them when they come back. To read your own countrymen saying that your friends who died in the sand died for no good reason would infuriate me.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 03 Aug 2004 01:40:57 GMT

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

CrimsonThese voting machines could be "tweaked" either way. Maybe two hackers will get into a hacking war and each candidate will get 479 bazillion votes. You just assume that it will be tweaked in a way that doesn't help you.

Of course that's based on the assumption that any tampering will occur.

I know they could be tweaked either way. That's bad. What we should do is just not use electronic voting machines, especially when they show themselves to be highly unreliable and that they don't leave a paper trail. Besides, it seems like Republicans want to tweak the vote, since they have stonewalled any attempts to get rid of these highly ineffective voting machines, and don't believe in a paper trail...

These machines need to be gone. It's far too simple to make big changes in something that should never be tampered with.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Tue, 03 Aug 2004 01:56:38 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonThese voting machines could be "tweaked" either way. Maybe two hackers will get into a hacking war and each candidate will get 479 bazillion votes. You just assume that it will be tweaked in a way that doesn't help you.

Of course that's based on the assumption that any tampering will occur.

I know they could be tweaked either way. That's bad. What we should do is just not use electronic

voting machines, especially when they show themselves to be highly unreliable and that they don't leave a paper trail. Besides, it seems like Republicans want to tweak the vote, since they have stonewalled any attempts to get rid of these highly ineffective voting machines, and don't believe in a paper trail...

These machines need to be gone. It's far too simple to make big changes in something that should never be tampered with.

You can say that all you want, but what is better?

It is obvious the hole punching method doesn't work too well either.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 03 Aug 2004 04:57:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Personally I would have a system that took your votes electronically (touch screen maybe), prevented errors like over or under-voting, then printed a hard copy that you would review and hand in. Then the electronic results could be compared to hard copies without hanging chads and dimpled chads.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 03 Aug 2004 05:11:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CrimsonThese voting machines could be "tweaked" either way. Maybe two hackers will get into a hacking war and each candidate will get 479 bazillion votes. You just assume that it will be tweaked in a way that doesn't help you.

Heh, someone comes out with "Final Vote", giving each Candidate big heads.

Ok, ya that was lame...

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [ViperFUD](#) on Tue, 03 Aug 2004 11:14:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto
Heh, someone comes out with "Final Vote", giving each Candidate big heads.

LOL ... but Kerry's already got a huge noggin. He's easy to HS from anywhere (kinda like

gunner). I think he needs a few more hit points to balance things out. Or a prototype assault suit ...
you should fix that in ren alert.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 03 Aug 2004 11:43:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CrimsonPersonally I would have a system that took your votes electronically (touch screen maybe), prevented errors like over or under-voting, then printed a hard copy that you would review and hand in. Then the electronic results could be compared to hard copies without hanging chads and dimpled chads.

Hillary Clinton and another senator proposed a voting system where you enter your vote on a touch screen, and then a printer prints out a hard copy of your vote, which you can view through glass, and if the hard copy is who the voter voted for, he hits a button and the vote is submitted, with the paper falling down into a bin for collection. I think it's a really good idea, but it was stonewalled again, by Republicans in Congress just saying, "Trust us."

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 03 Aug 2004 17:45:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Somehow I doubt that... link?

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javafx](#) 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 response 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 guarantee 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 territorial integrity of Iraq. Because of these two important quotes, the war in

Iraq is ILLEGAL.

Quote:Besides, why are you so against 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 superheroes 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 afterwards

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 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.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by ----- on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 15:46:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

PLD Javaxcx

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 16:20:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: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.

The reasons for where were what happens after the war. Do you not understand that?

Our reason for war was for what happened after the war. Is that so fucking hard to understand? That speech you provided, bush mentions freeing the Iraqi people several times. Repercussion means a bad result. Something un-intended. Freeing the Iraqi people is not a damned repercussion. The Final result of this war was our reason to go to war.

Quote: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.

WMD were one of the reason. Did you ever even listen to any of his speeches? He has mentioned freeing the Iraqi people in several of them. With this warm no one had to tell me anything on why to attack Saddam. I would have said yes no matter what anyones reasons were. WMD is the only iffy reason right now an you fuck heads just cling to it. It was not the main reason, just the only one the could blow people th fuck up. If someone said what concerns you more a big ass missile pointed at you are some starving people, most people would say the big ass missile. So getting rid of the big ass missiles were on every bodies minds because of that fact that you could get your ass blown the fuck up. That is why humanitarian reasons where not hyped about, because they were obvious. Only a dumb ass, yourself, would think there was no humanitarian reason behind the Iraq war. Our goal was to get rid of Saddam. If he had give up, we would have accomplished our goal.

Quote: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 oppurtunity 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.

You call that logical?

Saddam=Bad

^ Thats logical. Saddam was a menace to the world and we got rid of him. No matter how you attempt to spin it, getting rid of Saddam was a good thing.

We would have gone into Iraq no matter what Saddam did. If he gave up it would have been a lot easier for us to get there.

And you cannot prove WMD don't exist, and don't give me some quotes from Powell or anyone else, because they don't prove anything either.

Quote: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 response 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:

None of those in any of your links say anything about the Invasion of Iraq.

It simply was not illegal. Congress voted for it and it passed. Fuck the UN, the United States does not need a permission slip to defend its people. You can go fuck off.

Quote: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 territorial integrity of Iraq. Because of these two important quotes, the war in Iraq is ILLEGAL.

Find me where the fuck it is illegal, find me where the UN says it is illegal. you can't because it isn't. Now as I say again, you can go fuck yourself.

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

No it isn't you jack ass. If someone is about to kill your entire family and you stop them, ding ding, vigilante justice.

Someone steals a womans purse and you beat them down, ding ding, vigilante justice.

Now again, go fuck yourself.

Quote: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.

You people cannot understand a simple analogy.

Let me see if I can make it easier for the little kids to understand.

Your goal is to make a cake.

What do you need to make a cake?

You need in ingredients to make a cake.

What do you do with the ingredients?

You mix them.

What happens after you mix and bake the ingredients?

You have a cake?

Now why did you mix the ingredients?

To make a cake!

Is that easier to understand?

In order to make a cake you need to mix the ingredients.

In order for you to free the Iraqi people you need to invade Iraq.

Quote: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 REPERCUSSIONp

The end result of liberation was our goal, do you understand now...after I have said it 100s of times.

You enter a contest to win a prize.
You mix ingredients to make a cake.

Your reasoning for doing the original action, is what happens after wards.

That is a result, not a repercussion.

Repercussion has such a negative connotation.

Quote: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

The UN did not vote on the invasion of Iraq. Case closed. We do not need the UNs approval. They can also go fuck themselves.

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

Actually no he wasn't, he was vice Fuhrer, as I like to say. His boss wasn't doing so good so He named himself Fuhrer. Hitler was not elected. But the Nazi part was.

Quote: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.

It wasn't unlawful. Our constitution says we can do it, the UN hasn't said anything. Only dumb ass like yourself are bitching about it.

Don't talk about the America Constitution. You probably have never even read it, as your ignorance of it shows. Yes people have freedom of speech. But only the government cannot stop them. I private citizen cannot violate someone else free speech. So If I owned all the movie theaters in the US, since I am a private citizen. I can ban Michael Moore's movies from showing there.

It is hypocritical to say you are against the war and for the troops. That is like saying I am against the crime but for the criminal. Soldiers don't want your anti-war attitude. They know what is really going on there and they don't want some Canadian pussy telling them what to think when they are actually living it.

Quote: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

Even if Bush did break UN law, it does not make him a terrorist. Is he blowing up day cares on purpose?

I hate you people, why don't you look past your stupid fucking ideology and realize who the real fucking terrorist.

I can't wait until Toronto gets blown off the earth, or Paris gets covered in anthrax before you jackasses wake up realize. Sitting there is not going to fix shit.

[quote]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]

Sorry, but we are. We can start up Korea again if we wanted to. And your link does not work.

The rest is utter crap.

You are interpreting laws. And making shit up at the same time. The UN has not come out against it.

It is like when people refuse to press charges.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 18:26:43 GMT

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

LMAO. Wow, that was better than watching Miller cut up Kerry last night.

NodbuggerThe reasons for where were what happens after the war. Do you not understand that?

First of all, that sentence doesn't make a shred of sense. The reasons for something are the basis or motivation for something. They are also the declarations to justify doing an act.

At NO point in Bush's speeches does he give the reason (the justification, the basis, the motive) for going into Iraq to liberate the people. Your literacy skills are pathetic. Hell, you were quoting his speech totally out of context and tried, vainly I might add, to prove your point. You are still making up information that is not in his speeches. It's funny how you are the ONLY person who has posted who thinks the way you do. Thank God.

Quote:Our reason for war was for what happened after the war.

The reason for war was to disarm Iraq. That is all. Anything you've said otherwise is made up, taken out of context, and wrong. Oh, and you haven't unequivocally proven any of your points either. So anything you say isn't credible, either.

Quote:That speech you provided, bush mentions freeing the Iraqi people several times.

I already said that. You're forgetting to mention that he doesn't mention "we are going to Iraq to free the people". Nor does he infer it. You're making shit up. THERE IS NO TIGER CLAW AND NO PEN MISSILE.

Quote:Repercussion means a bad result.

It's only given the negative connotation to you. Ever hear of the phrase: "Two birds with one stone"?

Quote:Freeing the Iraqi people is not a damned repercussion. The Final result of this war was our reason to go to war.

Sorry kid, it is a repercussion. And the final result of this war is yet to be determined, too.

Quote:WMD were one of the reason.

According to your president, it was the only reason.

Quote:With this warm no one had to tell me anything on why to attack Saddam.

Yeah, that doesn't make any sense. I don't even know what you're trying to say there.

Quote:WMD is the only iffy reason right now an you fuck heads just cling to it. It was not the main reason, just the only one the could blow people th fuck up.

Actually, it's the only reason, and its "iffyness" is irrelevant because the law was broken when the first bomb dropped.

Quote:If someone said what concerns you more a big ass missile pointed at you are some starving people, most people would say the big ass missile. So getting rid of the big ass missiles were on every bodies minds because of that fact that you could get your ass blown the fuck up.

I would agree. Except the law says I cannot. I would go through the proper channels and get authorization before I acted on something as big as sending fathers, mothers, and children to war.

Quote:That is why humanitarian reasons where not hyped about, because they were obvious.

Except you can't play the "implied" game when you're sending people to WAR.

Quote:Our goal was to get rid of Saddam.

Your "goal" was to disarm Iraq. Saddam was merely in the way. Using your logic, if he fled into Iran, you would launch a Shock and Awe campaign in Iran too? What if he escaped to Russia, or any other place? That isn't a reason for war. It is a repercussion of Saddam not leaving Iraq in 48 hours when he was warned.

Quote:Saddam=Bad

^ Thats logical. Saddam was a menace to the world and we got rid of him. No matter how you attempt to spin it, getting rid of Saddam was a good thing.

I never said that ridding the world of Saddam was a bad thing. I said the means to go it were bad. You're putting words in my mouth, and still miscontruing it.

Quote:And you cannot prove WMD don't exist, and don't give me some quotes from Powell or anyone else, because they don't prove anything either.

That's funny, you can't prove they do exist. Neither could the CIA, MI6, Russia, or anyone else appearantly. In correct context, of course.

Quote:None of those in any of your links say anything about the Invasion of Iraq.

That's because the invasion hadn't HAPPENED yet. They also don't explicitly say "You may not invade Iraq, President Bush" because that was not the reason the Security Council was meeting for. They were debating whether or not action SHOULD be taken, and it was inconclusive. The United States merely acted thereafter in total disregard to the followup to that meeting. Did you even READ it?

Quote:It simply was not illegal. Congress voted for it and it passed.

Too bad Congress can't go around the policy of the UN. The fact of the matter is, when you sign a contract, you are in full agreement with all of the terms of said contract. In this case, it's the Charter (which I'm guessing you've chosen not to read) of the United Nations. When you violate your contract, no matter who you are, or your justification for it, YOU ARE BREAKING THE LAW.

Quote:Fuck the UN, the United States does not need a permission slip to defend its people.

Thanks for that confirmation that you are wrong. Your country signed a contract with the UN 60 or so years ago, and on March 19th, 2003, they violated it. UH OH! Broken law! The Charter says you need permission to invade one of the member states. You didn't get permission, and you invaded anyway. It is irrelevant how horrible the person ruling the member state is, it is still illegal to be a vigilante. Not only that, you overthrew the government at the time. That's illegal too. Coup D'etats are illegal.

Quote:Find me where the fuck it is illegal, find me where the UN says it is illegal. you can't because it isn't. Now as I say again, you can go fuck yourself.

I've already shown you the documents proving the action was illegal. You've obviously chosen to ignore that evidence, again. It doesn't matter, intelligent people may read the documents and know for certain the actions of March 19, 2003 were illegal in accordance with international law. I don't really need to convince you, you can't even vote. That's a good thing, by the way.

Quote:No it isn't you jack ass. If someone is about to kill your entire family and you stop them, ding ding, vigilante justice.

Someone steals a womans purse and you beat them down, ding ding, vigilante justice.

The only difference here is that I would be willing, and I would fully recommend lawful action against me in either case. Your president, does not.

Quote:Your goal is to make a cake.
What do you need to make a cake?
You need in ingredients to make a cake.
What do you do with the ingredients?
You mix them.
What happens after you mix and bake the ingredients?
You have a cake?
Now why did you mix the ingredients?
To make a cake!
In order to make a cake you need to mix the ingredients.

In order for you to free the Iraqi people you need to invade Iraq.

I hope you can see why this is irrelevant, now. The liberation of the Iraqi people was not a reason for the war. You used this analogy in the silly idea that it was a reason. It was not. The speeches prove this.

Quote:The end result of liberation was our goal, do you understand now...after I have said it 100s of times.

It was not. The speeches say the reasons for war was disarmament. Not liberation. When Saddam is removed from power, the United States must help rebuild the Iraqi government. Since the reason for war wasn't to over throw the government, and only to get the weapons, anything else is a REPERCUSSION.

Quote:Your reasoning for doing the original action, is what happens after wards.

The definition for reason says otherwise. The basis or motivation for an act. The declaration of justification for an act. Not "what happens after an act".

Quote:Repercussion has such a negative connotation.

Yeah, that's subjective.

Quote:The UN did not vote on the invasion of Iraq. Case closed.

Actually, they did vote on the issue of Iraq. They said "NO ACTION." I see you've chosen to ignore evidence again.

Quote:We do not need the UNs approval. They can also go fuck themselves.

Sure you do! You signed a contract with the UN saying you'll play by the rules. You gave yourself the ball'n'chain, and now you're whining because it's a little too tight.

Quote:Actually no he wasn't, he was vice Fuhrer, as I like to say. His boss wasn't doing so good so He named himself Fuhrer. Hitler was not elected. But the Nazi part was.

Wrong, again.

"Upon the death of Hindenburg in August 1934, Hitler was the consensus successor."

Quote:It wasn't unlawful. Our constitution says we can do it, the UN hasn't said anything.

Your "rights and freedoms" of your constitution are only valid to United States citizens. You cannot apply your rights and freedoms to people who are not American citizens. The UN charter, on the other hand, infers that you cannot go and invade whoever you want for whatever reason you want. Instead of assuming what's in it, READ IT.

Quote:Don't talk about the America Constitution. You probably have never even read it, as your ignorance of it shows.

I'll talk about whatever I want in here. Crimson allows me to say what I want. Oh, and I have read your constitution. Looks like you haven't, though.

Quote:It is hypocritical to say you are against the war and for the troops.

Actually, the soldiers are the pawns here. Your crook for a president says "Go" and its their job, THEIR JOB, to do it. If they don't, they get thrown in prison, and they lose the money they need to support their families. It is a shame that the soldiers in the coalition are at the mercy of the orders of President Bush. That doesn't mean that I don't like them. I don't like the man pushing the button.

Quote:The know what is really going on there and they don't want some Canadian pussy telling them what to think when they are actually living it.

Bigotry isn't cool, kid. Haven't you been taught that in school?

Quote:Even if Bush did break UN law, it does not make him a terrorist. Is he blowing up day cares on purpose?

Yeah, two wrongs don't make a right. If he broke international law, and used "unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence by a person or an organized group against people or property with the intention of intimidating or coercing societies or governments, often for ideological or political reasons." then he is a terrorist.

UH OH! He did. Whoops.

Quote:I hate you people, why don't you look past you stupid fucking ideology and realize who the real fucking terrorist.

Sorry kid. I don't have to agree with the law. I merely have to abide by it. What my morality says and what the law says are two completely different things. That is a concept you seem to be forgetting.

Quote:I can't wait until Toronto gets blown off the earth, or Paris gets covered in anthrax before you jackasses wake up realize. Sitting there is not going to fix shit.

"fixing shit" is subjective. By breaking the law, I'd say your president has done a fair bit of damage himself. Sure, fixing Iraq up is a good thing, but the ends don't justify the means. Another concept you seem to be unfamiliar with.

Quote:Sorry, but we are. We can start up Korea again if we wanted to. And your link does not work.

Oh drat, there you go making conclusions without any proof again.
Resolution 687

It's on a different site, but it's the same resolution.

Quote: You are interpreting laws. And making shit up at the same time. The UN has not come out against it.

I'm looking at what the law says, what happened prior to, just before, during, and after the events of March 19th, 2003, and informing people like you, who are so disillusioned on this matter that they will just absorb everything CNN has poured out to them.

READ THE DOCUMENTS.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [ViperFUD](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 19:03:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Alright.

Gotta chime in real fast.

java:

You keep using the word "infer" where you mean "imply". Cut that shit out. It's fuckin annoying.

Nodbugger:

You keep talking out your ass rather than thinking about shit. Cut it out. It's fucking annoying.

I said it once already, but i'm going to cut and paste it here since you obviously didn't listen before, as to how results relate to reasons.

<FLASHBACK>

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 get Saddam" (action) ->

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

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

</FLASHBACK>

Now, before you call me unintelligent or some shit, I think you really need to check yourself. Cause I will hit you with all guns blazing.

And for the record, java is about twice as intelligent as you. Just FYI.

~Viper

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 19:09:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ViperFUDAnd for the record, java is about twice as intelligent as you. Just FYI.

That's insulting.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 19:18:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I didn't think someone this stupid could exist.

I'm not even go to reply to that post because it is all Bull Shit.

1. Tell me where the UN has said it is illegal, not where you say it is. The UN. Where have they said it?

2. The speeches say we are going to liberate and Free the Iraqi people. Someone does something because of what happens afterward.

Examples:

Someone wants money
So they rob a bank
Assuming they get away with it they ow have money

Wants Money=reason
Robbing the bank=action
Got money= Result

Is it really that hard for you to understand?

No where does Bush say, "Went went in only for WMD"

No where has he said they you just keep making things up. He says he wants yo liberate the Iraqi people, I knew that is what was going to end up happening. I knew we were going to get rid of Saddam. Our goal from the beginning was to get rid of Saddam. We were not leaving without capturing or killing him. Bush said that many times. He mentions every reason you could need to go to Iraq. You just keep saying wmd was the only reason. which simply is not true.

3. You are a hypocrite and need to shut up. you say the way we did it was bad. Well Mr. I know everything...how do you suggest we would do it? He wasn't going to do it by himself. And giving him time obviously doesn't work. Invading was the only way. So unless you come up with a better more feasible idea then you have no room to talk.

4. The Un did not vote and at this moment in time they are not saying it is illegal. Only people who are not the UN are saying it was illegal. If the UN won't say it then it isn't. Simple as that.

5. Congress can go around what ever they want. the UN does not rule the US. Like I said before, the US does not need a permission slip to defend itself.

6.I do not care what documents say. You are wrong about them. You are interpreting them differently than the UN. They never said it was illegal so it isn't illegal.

7.Well you are an idiot for not doing anything. Some people can;t wait for the police. Every time you see on TV about someone that stopped a murder or robbery. You are against people acting by themselves. you are an idiot if you believe. Stay in Canada. Man I can;t wait for Canada to blow up. You are a bunch of idiots up there.

8. The result of the war was the reason to go to war. Why do you keep lying? I pointed it out in the speech. If it was not a fucking reason why did he mention it so many times? If he didn't want to do it why did we? If it was not a reason why is so much energy focused on it? The Results of the fucking where were our reasons. Our reasons where to get rid of Saddam and liberate the Iraqi people. You just keep lying.

9. "Upon the death of Hindenburg in August 1934, Hitler was the consensus successor."

Ya, jackass. He was not elected. He was a successor. now go die.

He was not elected.

10. I am totally correct about the constitution. If Crimson wanted to ban you she could. If you were babbling outside a store the owner can force you to leave. a private citizen can stop another private citizens free speech. The government cannot.

11, i think you forget both parents at one point where in the Army. My dad was in Iraq...twice. And may be going to Afghanistan. He agrees with the war and has been waiting for this to happen since 1991 when he was there first.

Every soldier who was in the Gulf War, would say we need to take out Saddam. every soldier in this war will say we need to take out Saddam. They all know what they are doing is a great thing. Have you ever even talked to American soldier, do me a favor...never talk on their behalf again.

12. No Bush is not a terrorist. Saddam is a terrorist. Osama is a terrorist. You are a jackass for even attempting to compare them.

13. the means...congress voted. We kept our own sovereignty and Iraq is free. The UN isn't complaining only jackasses like you. I don't see where I am wrong.

14. Where does it say we cannot start up the cease-fire? If Iraq attacks us, we can get rid of it and do what we want.

15. I don't watch CNN.

I listen to people that have actually been to Iraq. The people who have suffered. The people are happy. The Iraqis that are very Happy about this.

Now until you find what i ask for, you are wrong.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 19:25:35 GMT

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

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

You are wrong about that.

The Military Dubbed the Operation "Operation Iraq Freedom" At 9:34 PM EST on March 19, 2003 (5:34 AM local time in Baghdad on March 20).

The name of this Operation for British troops is Operation Telic. For Australian Troops involved, it is Operation Falconer.

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

Posted by [ViperFUD](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 19:56:29 GMT

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

NodbuggerI didn't think someone this stupid could exist.

Neither did I. But apparently, you do.

NodbuggerI'm not even go to reply to that post because it is all Bull Shit.

Ok, good. So this is the end of your post?

... Oh, apparently not ...

Nodbugger1. Tell me where the UN has said it is illegal, not where you say it is. The UN. Where have they said it?

HE DID. LET ME REPOST IT FOR YOU, SINCE YOU ARE AN IDIOT:

List of Security Council Resolutions and their voting results

The Press Release from the UN in reponse to the Iraq-Kuwait situation.

Nodbugger2. The speeches say we are going to liberate and Free the Iraqi people. Someone does something because of what happens afterward.

Examples:

Someone wants money

So they rob a bank

Assuming they get away with it they ow have money

Wants Money=reason

Robbing the bank=action

Got money= Result

Is it really that hard for you to understand?

No where does Bush say, "Went went in only for WMD"

He says, "We're going in to disarm Iraq". That's it. Just because something is going to happen does NOT make it a reason. But apparently you're some kinda tard kid who doesn't understand this.

Nodbugger3. You are a hypocrite and need to shut up. you say the way we did it was bad. Well Mr. I know everything...how do you suggest we would do it? He wasn't going to do it by himself. And giving him time obviously doesn't work. Invading was the only way. So unless you come up with a better more feasible idea then you have no room to talk.

You're an idiot and need to shut up. You are making EVERY AMERICAN in these forums look like an idiot by being one yourself. MIGHT DOES NOT MAKE RIGHT. Just because we can go in and blow them the fuck up does not mean we SHOULD. The UN was resolving the situation through diplomatic means. Embargos, tariffs, and lots of pressure. Had things worked out the way they SHOULD have, the Iraqi people would have risen up in a revolution against Saddam themselves (perhaps requesting US help) and things would be a lot better off.

Nodbugger4. The Un did not vote and at this moment in time they are not saying it is illegal. Only people who are not the UN are saying it was illegal. If the UN won't say it then it isn't. Simple as that.

Actually, the UN IS saying it's illegal, which is why there is such a big fuss about things in the UN right now. Read a newspaper.

Nodbugger5. Congress can go around what ever they want. the UN does not rule the US. Like I said before, the US does not need a permission slip to defend itself. ROFLMAO. WRONG. Congress does NOT have the right to do "what ever they want." Here's an analogy: South Carolina says "we don't care what the US says; we can do whatever we want." result? Civil war.

The US is part of the UN. We voluntarily agreed to follow the rules and mandates it set forth. We cannot just ignore them because we don't like them anymore. The US canNOT just do whatever it wants.

Nodbugger6.I do not care what documents say. You are wrong about them. You are interpreting them differently than the UN. They never said it was illegal so it isn't illegal. You should care what documents say. God fucking damn, man. How can you say this and expect to be taken seriously at all? Think before you speak.

Nodbugger7.Well you are an idiot for not doing anything. Some people can;t wait for the police. Every time you see on TV about someone that stopped a murder or robbery. You are against people acting by themselves. you are an idiot if you believe. Stay in Canada. Man I can;t wait for Canada to blow up. You are a bunch of idiots up there. Just FYI, java voluntarily joined the Canadian military. He wants to Fix Shit that's Fucked Up. But the important thing is to do it in the Right Way. Why can't you seem to understand that the ends never justify the means?

Nodbugger8. The result of the war was the reason to go to war. Why do you keep lying? I pointed it out in the speech. If it was not a fucking reason why did he mention it so many times? If he didn't want to do it why did we? If it was not a reason why is so much energy focused on it? The Results of the fucking where were our reasons. Our reasons where to get rid of Saddam and liberate the Iraqi people. You just keep lying. I almost can't follow this drivell. Are you mentally retarded?

I think what you're saying here is: "The results of the war are the reasons to go to war. If they weren't reasons, then why did he mention them?" Now, after you wipe the spittle off your lips, allow me to answer: they were effects, results, yes. But that does NOT make them a reason. And if you notice, Bush said, "We are going to war to rid Iraq of WMD's" (paraphrase). He did NOT say, "We are going to war to free the Iraqi people!" At least, not until we failed to find WMD's.

Nodbugger9. "Upon the death of Hindenburg in August 1934, Hitler was the consensus successor."

Ya, jackass. He was not elected. He was a successor. now go die.

He was not elected.
I think you need to learn English.

con-sen-sus

1 a : general agreement : UNANIMITY <the consensus of their opinion, based on reports... from the border -- John Hersey> b : the judgment arrived at by most of those concerned <the consensus was to go ahead>

ie. The consensus of the vote - the result (why do you have so much trouble with this concept?)

Nodbugger10. I am totally correct about the constitution. If Crimson wanted to ban you she could. If you were babbling outside a store the owner can force you to leave. a private citizen can stop another private citizens free speech. The government cannot.

Actually, you are totally **WRONG** about the Constitution; if you're babbling outside a store the owner can't force you to leave unless you're endangering the safty of others.

I think you need to actually **READ** the Constitution rather than just assuming based on what you saw on TV.

Nodbugger11, i think you forget both parents at one point where in the Army. My dad was in Iraq...twice. And may be going to Afghanistan. He agrees with the war and has been waiting for this to happen since 1991 when he was there first.

Every soldier who was in the Gulf War, would say we need to take out Saddam. every soldier in this war will say we need to take out Saddam. They all know what they are doing is a great thing. Have you ever even talked to American soldier, do me a favor...never talk on their behalf again. Perhaps. but just because people want something does **NOT** make it morally right. I think **YOU** need to **STFU** before talking on their behalf; you make them look like small minded idiots. I know they aren't; I support our troops; but i think you could best support our troops by not supporting them so vocally.

Nodbugger12. No Bush is not a terrorist. Saddam is a terrorist. Osama is a terrorist. You are a jackass for even attempting to compare them.

Hmmm ... what would you call someone who goes into someone else's country and blows stuf up? (hint: who am I talking about here? Bush, Saddam, or Osama? The fact that you can't tell which one I mean should tell you something.)

Nodbugger13. the means...congress voted. We kept our own sovereignty and Iraq is free. The UN isn't complaining only jackasses like you. I don't see where I am wrong.

Actually, Iraq **LOST** it's sovereignty, the UN **IS** complaining, and you are wrong. Iraq is free again, but they **DID** lose their sovereignty for a while. And they still don't have it back; they're still under our thumb.

Nodbugger14. Where does it say we cannot start up the cease-fire? If Iraq attacks us, we can get rid of it and do what we want.

What the fuck? How was any of that a cease-fire? It was a fucking **START**-fire. What we did to Afganistan, ok, that was justifiable. But what we did to Iraq? **WRONG**. If they had **NO** WMD's, then they weren't a threat to us, and we had no right to go in after them. Which is why WMD's are the **ONLY ACCEPTABLE** reason for the war.

Nodbugger15. I don't watch CNN.

I listen to people that have actually been to Iraq. The people who have suffered. The people are

happy. The Iraqis that are very Happy about this.

Now until you find what i ask for, you are wrong.

Maybe you should. Or at least some news. I don't understand why you think saying "I have no knowledge of this situation" will help your argument. Individual soldiers have little to no knowledge of the big picture. That's not their problem. Their problem is killing Habib before he kills them. That's it.

I think you need to seriously Shut The Fuck Up before you get WTFOwned again. You look like an idiot to all of us. Grow up, read the Constitution, read the UN Charter, fuckin read the Nuremburg trial transcripts and resolutions before you speak again.

If Bush loses this election, it won't be because of liberals. It'll be because of jackass conservatives like you who keep running their mouths instead of sitting down and shutting up.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 20:28:06 GMT

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

And where is your proof.

Don't show me documents. Show me here the current UN says it is illegal. Show me a conference where they deemed it was illegal. Until the says it was Illegal is is legal.

It does not just say that. He says we are going to disarm Iraq and we will free the Iraqi people.

Saddam was a problem that need fixing. No one had a better idea so we used the only idea. Case closed.

The Iraqis tried to revolt. Saddam killed thousands of Iraqis after it. Or did you forget that?

The UN cannot tell us what to do when it comes to our safety. When you have people giving you warning. You don't just let them go. You act on the information given.

How can you not understand that? Is is simple. I guess you are just too stupid to understand it.

He never said we are going in only for WMD. He said he wants to bring freedom and liberty to the Iraqi people. Show me any where that supports you claim. because everyone of Bushes speeches about Iraq talk about Liberating the Iraqi people.

Consensus does not mean vote. He was not voted in, rather he was just the next in line.

I am in no way wrong about the constitution. No where does It say i cannot stop you from excessing the right. It says the government cannot stop you. Am I the government? NO! So I am right again.

I repeating exactly what the hundreds of soldiers I have talked to have said.
I am right you are wrong, case closed.

When you blow stuff up for different reasoned. Our intent is to blow up military and insurgent targets., We are not there to kill or wound as many people as possible. Now go fuck yourself and die.

Iraq has a government now. You lose again. They are no sovereign.

After the Gulf war we signed a cease-fire. One of the agreements of the cease-fire is that you can't shoot at us. Well they did. They broke it and we followed the law to the word. WMD are in no way the only acceptable reason for war.

Saddam killing and torturing i own people are a reason for war. Saddam using wmd on people are a reason for war. Saddam torturing and stopping every freedom possible is a reason for war. There is no sane reason to have left Saddam there. You people are just stupid for even thinking that. It would have been irresponsible of Bush to leave Saddam there.

And stop talking about what soldiers think. They get to watch news. they experience what the news is talking about. They know the truth and you don't.

I have read all these documents.

And I am correct about every single one.

Neither of you have yet to prove anything.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 22:04:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have only one thing to say, get the US out of the UN!

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [cokemaster](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 22:05:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:I have read all these documents.

And I am correct about every single one.

Neither of you have yet to prove anything.

I wonder if you got dropped on your head at birth. Java has provided time and time again clear

links to documents proving his position. I understand, and I'm sure most people would as well.

I don't know why you insist to stick to your act of that the US can do no wrong. It doesn't prove anything, except your stupidity in the manner. You remind me of someone on the pitts forums by the name of VM - any relation?

Thats all I have to write at the moment, I have a history lecture that I have to attend in about 12 minutes.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 22:12:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cokemasterQuote:I have read all these documents.

And I am correct about every single one.

Neither of you have yet to prove anything.

I wonder if you got dropped on your head at birth. Java has provided time and time again clear links to documents proving his position. I understand, and I'm sure most people would as well.

I don't know why you insist to stick to your act of that the US can do no wrong. It doesn't prove anything, except your stupidity in the manner. You remind me of someone on the pitts forums by the name of VM - any relation?

Thats all I have to write at the moment, I have a history lecture that I have to attend in about 12 minutes.

VM , ya he used to be on every forum I have been on arguing the same points. Haven't talked to him in a while.

Yes he provided documents.

But he is just interpreting.

I want him to show me where the UN has come out and said the invasion of Iraq was illegal.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 22:24:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NodbuggerI didn't think someone this stupid could exist.

You're here. I'm just as surprised as you are.

Quote:1. Tell me where the UN has said it is illegal, not where you say it is. The UN. Where have they said it?

Lets see here... where in the UN does it say that invading another member state without authorization is illegal? Lets see... OH! The charter you never read!

The Charter of the United Nations, Chapter VII, Article 39:

"The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Looks to me that the Security Council decides the measures that will be taken. Not the United States.

Article 41:

"The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations."

And Article 42:

"Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations."

Looks to me that Article 41 & 42 give the power of authorization to the Security Council! Not the United States!

Article 43:

"All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the

Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

This one says that you need to pass vital data through the Security Council through a "special agreement". Then the Security Council decides how many forces are to be deployed... and where! Then these agreements are negotiated between the Security Council and the Member States. Hmm... Maybe there is a typo, but I don't see "You may invade a member nation on pre-emptive circumstances without the authorization of the Security Council."

I really like this one: Article 46

"Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee."

Pretty self explanatory. Application of armed force is made by the security council, not the United States.

Article 48

"The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

Such decisions shall be carried out by the Members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members."

This one says that the Security Council makes a decision, and the member states are the ones who carry it out. I don't know about the rest of society, but I sure as hell don't remember the Security Council saying "Iraq is to be invaded."

Oh, I like this one the most:

"HAVE RESOLVED TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS TO ACCOMPLISH THESE AIMS
Accordingly, our respective Governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations."

Now lets take a look at Resolution 1441, shall we?

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

Do you remember a resolution before March 19th, 2003 saying that this commitment may be disregarded? I don't. And likely neither will any other sane person.

Now lets look at what happened, shall we? In fact, lets jump to March 17th, 2003.

The President gives a speech announcing that Saddam Hussein must leave Iraq in 48 hours or a military conflict will break out. Your president states:

"For the last four and a half months, the United States and our allies have worked within the Security Council to enforce that council's longstanding demands. Yet some permanent members of the Security Council have publicly announced that they will veto any resolution that compels the disarmament of Iraq."

This resolution was debated on two days after this speech.
The results of this debate can be viewed here:

Results of the resolution debate on March 19th, 2003 in terms of the Iraqi-Kuwait situation

Note that debate wasn't on whether the US is allowed to invade or not. It was a debate on the resolution to allow any invasion into Iraq. The resolution failed. The vote on it was objected to by MANY member states:

Lets see... I'm not going to paste the entire statement from each nation mentioned that objected to the war, but I'll paste the name of the nation and give you the URL to the file so you can read it yourself. Even though I know you won't:

JOSCHKA FISCHER, Deputy Chancellor and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany.

DOMINIQUE DE VILLEPIN, Minister for Foreign Affairs of France

IGOR S. IVANOV, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation

FAROUK AL-SHARA', Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Syria

MUNIR AKRAM (Pakistan)

ADOLFO AGUILAR ZINSER (Mexico)

WANG YINGFAN (China)

MOHAMMED ALDOURI (Iraq)

The Press conference may be viewed here.

The Meeting Record may be viewed here.

At the end of the Press Release:

"Secretary-General KOFI ANNAN fully shared the regrets expressed by many Council members at the fact that it had not been possible to reach a common position. "Whatever our differing views on this complex issue, we must all feel that this is a sad day for the United Nations and the

disappointment, and were deeply alarmed by the prospect of imminent war. He paid tribute to the United Nations staff, both international and Iraqi, who had worked so hard in Iraq up to the last possible moment. That included the inspectors, whose work had now sadly been suspended."

At no point does it give the United States authorization to go into Iraq. At NO point in those documents does it say "You may act upon the warning issued in Resolution 1441". And at NO point does it say "You may act on the cease-fire from resolution 687". The very fact that the United States DID act despite their lack of authorization proves that it was ILLEGAL.

Quote:2. The speeches say we are going to liberate and Free the Iraqi people.

Those speeches say that America is going to Iraq to disarm the WMD that were thought to be there. At no point does it say "we are going to Iraq for the reason to liberate the people".

In fact, if Bush DID say that, then the war would still be illegal. Resolution 1441 says:

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

Liberation would therefore be illegal since it was not authorized by the UN, and this commitment was never suspended.

Quote:He says he wants yo liberate the Iraqi people

Actually, he says: (This is when he begins to address the issue of liberation as a repercussion of invading Iraq)

"As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free."

That VERY word: "AS". That word implies that Liberation is a side-effect. "As this is happening, this will happen". NOT a reason. You've perverted literacy, now cut it out.

Quote:3. You are a hypocrite and need to shut up.

WARNING: IRONY

Remember kid, you were the one who said he wouldn't be arguing anymore. Twice now. And twice, you've replied in argument.

Quote:you say the way we did it was bad.

Anything that is against the law is inherently wrong. Ever hear the saying: "The road to hell is paved with good intention"?

Quote:Well Mr. I know everything...how do you suggest we would do it?

I would trust the UN to deal with the situation as they have been. The Quarterly report I posted a while back was evidence that Saddam's weapons were being destroyed. In fact, they were reported to be disarming up to March 18th, 2003, when the inspectors were whisked out of the nation for their own safety. I know you didn't read that report, otherwise you wouldn't be arguing this. I certainly wouldn't have sent thousands of fathers, mothers, and children to war on the SHAKEY PRETENSE that Saddam had stockpiles of weapons. Which, by the way, turned out to be false. Whoops!

I completely agree with the Russian Federation's resolve to the issue. You can find it in the links I've provided.

Quote:4. The UN did not vote and at this moment in time they are not saying it is illegal. Only people who are not the UN are saying it was illegal. If the UN won't say it then it isn't. Simple as that.

Ho boy, where do I begin with THIS one. After I stop laughing at your total ignorance, I suggest you read those links I've provided. There was a debate on the issue of Iraq, and the vote was inconclusive. THAT DOES NOT EQUATE TO "YOU MAY INVADE IRAQ".

And another thing: Are you trying to say "It's not illegal if you don't get caught"? Because that's what I got from that statement.

Quote:5. Congress can go around what ever they want. the UN does not rule the US. Like I said before, the US does not need a permission slip to defend itself.

Congress can do whatever they want legally within the United States. They have no authority in international dealing with invasion of a member state of the United Nations. You gave up that "freedom" when your country signed the Charter of the United Nations. Don't like it? Get out.

[quote]6.I do not care what documents say.[/url]

LOL. I think that summed up your credibility.

Quote:They never said it was illegal so it isn't illegal.

Well, after reading the charter and the resolutions, it is.

Quote:7.Well you are an idiot for not doing anything. Some people can;t wait for the police. Every time you see on TV about someone that stopped a murder or robbery. You are against people acting by themselves. you are an idiot if you believe.

Who said I would do nothing? I surely didn't. You, on the other hand, have put words in my mouth again. They're misconstrued and you don't know what they mean. I don't want them in my mouth.

I still think you don't understand what vigilante justice is. It is ILLEGAL. It still has a good outcome in many cases, but it is nonetheless ILLEGAL.

Quote:Stay in Canada. Man I can;t wait for Canada to blow up. You are a bunch of idiots up there.

Keep this kind of talk up, and I'll personally see to your banning from these forums.

Quote:8. The result of the war was the reason to go to war.

The result of this war is that the Iraqi people are free from Saddam, who is now in custody, and that no weapons of mass destruction have been found. That is not the same thing as a reason. Read the definitions again.

Quote:If it was not a fucking reason why did he mention it so many times?

Are you forgetting that he said that the Iraqi people can see the text in Iraq? He mentions the repercussion of their war being the freedom of the Iraqi people. That is not a reason.

Quote:If it was not a reason why is so much energy focused on it?

You're just being stupid again, right? Did you even see the pictures of Iraq after the Shock and Awe campaign? Can you imagine the turmoil the United States would be in if they just left Iraq the way it was?

Quote:Ya, jackass. He was not elected. He was a successor. now go die.

Go look up the definition of consensus. Oh, you're still wrong.

Quote:10. I am totally correct about the constitution. If Crimson wanted to ban you she could. If you were babbling outside a store the owner can force you to leave. a private citizen can stop another private citizens free speech. The government cannot.

Your government does not have the "right" to impress the constitution, or the rights and freedoms of your constitution on people that are not American citizens. If it does, please, point it out to me.

Quote: Have you ever even talked to American soldier, do me a favor...never talk on their behalf again.

I've talked to Kirby on a regular basis. From what I gather with him, he doesn't agree with this war. That's all I need to know. I for one, support the troops who are risking their lives for their country. I do not support the man sending them away illegally. This is something you seem to have confused.

Quote:12. No Bush is not a terrorist. Saddam is a terrorist. Osama is a terrorist. You are a jackass for even attempting to compare them.

I think Viper said it best, but I'll add to it:

"What would you call someone who unlawfully goes into someone else's country and blows stuff up?"

Quote:13. the means...congress voted. We kept our own sovereignty and Iraq is free. The UN isn't complaining only jackasses like you. I don't see where I am wrong.

Iraq lost its sovereignty when Saddam was captured. That in itself is a violation of Resolution 1441. I don't understand where you're supposed to be going with this point.

Quote:14. Where does it say we cannot start up the cease-fire?

I have a better question: Where does it say you CAN start up the cease-fire. Seems to me that charter says you can't, though.

Quote:5. I don't watch CNN.

Good. Now stop watching FOXnews. That's far worse.

Quote:I listen to people that have actually been to Iraq.

I listen to the people making the decisions. I also listen to the law.

Quote:The people who have suffered. The people are happy. The Iraqis that are very Happy about this.

WARNING: MORALITY VERSUS LEGALITY CONFLICT

Guess what champ, you can't always legally do what you think is right.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [hareman](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 22:36:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

:rolleyes:

java quit picking on the challenged

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 22:45:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

NodbuggerAnd where is your proof.

That's a good question. Where is your proof, Nodbugger?

Quote:Don't show me documents.

I'm not sure how that works in your favour.

Quote:Until the says it was Illegal is is legal.

Viper is right: You are an idiot. I've proven the war is illegal. Warranto proved it, Hareman WORKS in Homeland Security and he says it was wrong, and Viper proved it too. You, on the otherhand, have done nothing but ramble senselessly with NO relevant proof whatsoever!

Quote:They know the truth and you don't.

So by that logic you don't know the truth either. Right. :rolleyes:
You're not a soldier.

Quote:I have read all these documents.

You're either lying, or you can't read. I'm willing to bet on the former.

Quote:And I am correct about every single one.

Nope. And you haven't proven it either.

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 22:51:41 GMT

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

I still do not see what I asked for.

You did not answer a single one of my question.

1. Where has the UN come out and Said the Iraq war was illegal.
2. A result of the war was an incentive for going to war. Disarming Iraq is also a result. Liberating the Iraqi people, disarming Saddam, and getting rid of Saddam are all reasons and results.
3. The UN was not dealing with it. The only responsible thing was to get rid of Saddam. Now Saddam is no longer and it will be better because of it.
4. You still cannot prove WMD do not exist, so stop making the claim.
5. They did not come to a conclusion. They never said it was illegal, they never said it was legal. We went with what we wanted to do. They haven't said anything so it is still legal.
6. America can do what it wants when it involves the safety of its peoples. As I have said before We did not need a permission slip to defend ourselves.
7. Vigilante justice is not illegal. It all depends on how you go about it. If you defend yourself that is vigilante Justice. If you stop a robbery that is vigilante justice. If you stop somebody like

Saddam from doing the things he is doing you re not doing anything illegal. People who stop criminals are always hailed as hero's. For some reason it isn't working now. Because for some strange reason people think Bush is worse than Saddam and Hitler.

8. Those pictures were of government buildings. I have seen plenty of pictures from Iraq. I have 3 Cd's with over 5000 pictures and 40 something videos taken by soldiers inside of Iraq.

9. A consensus is just a general agreement. No where in that link you provided says the people of Germany democratically elected Hitler. He was put into the position by the administration of that time. As would an American Vice-President if something happens to the President.

10. We have the right to bring freedom and democracy to the rest of the world. We have the right to express our opinions. We have the right to take action. We have the right to defend people from those who oppress them.

11. Who is Kirby and what does he do?

12. Bush is in no way a terrorist. Did you forget who the real terrorists are?

13. Saddam lost his sovereignty. We never at one point took over Iraq. We set them up with their supplies so they can do it themselves. They can change anything they want to.

14. It is a general rule of cease fires. If you sign a cease-fire and the other side breaks it the cease-fire can be called off. We however did not do that.

15. Canada doesn't get FOX news, so how would you know how bad it is? Or do you pay extra for it?

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 04 Aug 2004 23:25:01 GMT

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

Nodbugger1. Where has the UN come out and Said the Iraq war was illegal.

To my knowledge, the UN has never come out front and said "The US-led war in Iraq is illegal". That does NOT make the act legal. No one sane person in this world would say that it is legal because no one has said anything about it. That's like saying "it's only illegal if you're caught".

I have, repeatedly mind you, proven that this war is illegal in terms of the Charter and resolutions. You, as usual, have skipped over all that information because you're too damn arrogant to see facts for what they are.

Quote:2. A result of the war was an incentive for going to war.

Do you even know what "incentive" means?

in-cen-tive

n.

Something, such as the fear of punishment or the expectation of reward, that induces action or motivates effort.

That sentence is flawed. And you're still wrong.

Quote:Disarming Iraq is also a result. Liberating the Iraqi people, disarming Saddam, and getting rid of Saddam are all reasons and results.

They are all results. Only the WMD is a reason. This was proven already. Stop arguing in a circle.

Quote:3. The UN was not dealing with it.

Don't you understand? Just because you believe the UN is not dealing with it, (even though the UNMOVIC is dealing with the situation of disarmament) that does NOT give the United States the right to invade and institute an illegal coup d'etat.

Quote:The only responsible thing was to get rid of Saddam. Now Saddam is no longer and it will be better because of it.

No one has doubted this. Stop bringing it up. It's still not justification for breaking international law.

Quote:4. You still cannot prove WMD do not exist, so stop making the claim.

You can't prove they DO exist. Stop pertaining to that claim.

Quote:5. They did not come to a conclusion. They never said it was illegal, they never said it was legal. We went with what we wanted to do. They haven't said anything so it is still legal.

"Ok guys! We've just robbed a bank and they don't know we did it! It's still legal because they haven't said 'JAVIX U CANAE ROB BANQ ITZ ELEGAL.'"

lol, that logic is so messed up, I don't even need to comment on it.

Quote:6. America can do what it wants when it involves the safety of its peoples. As I have said before We did not need a permission slip to defend ourselves.

As the law says, you cannot attack someone pre-emptively. You can't do it here in Canada, and you can't do it with the United Nations. It's a stupid law, I agree, but it is still the LAW.

If I assault someone who threatens my family when he has not touched me at all, "I" get charged. And I would fully support that charge. I know I did the right thing, and I would fully accept the responsibility for breaking the law to do it. I would also do it again. It is STILL illegal, though.

Quote:7. Vigilante justice is not illegal.

Folks, THIS is the voice of your future American voter. Look upon it, and be ashamed.

Quote:If you defend yourself that is vigilante Justice.

If you pre-emptively defend yourself, that is vigilante justice, and it is illegal. The law says (at least in Canada) you may defend yourself if you are assaulted first.

Quote: If you stop a robbery that is vigilante justice.

If the robbers have not touched you, then you are in the wrong as much as they are according to the law.

Quote:If you stop somebody like Saddam from doing the things he is doing you re not doing anything illegal.

You're not the police. It's still illegal. Whoops!

Quote:8. Those pictures were of government buildings. I have seen plenty of pictures from Iraq. I have 3 Cd's with over 5000 pictures and 40 something videos taken by soldiers inside of Iraq.

I'm going to pertain to the photos that Michael Moore got for F911 (which, unless you can prove otherwise, are genuine) that show Iraqi civilians crushed, burned, and homeless.

Quote:9. A consensus is just a general agreement. No where in that link you provided says the people of Germany democratically elected Hitler. He was put into the position by the administration of that time. As would an American Vice-President if something happens to the President.

So he was elected into office by the representative administrative government at the time. But he was still elected. That sounds democratic to me.

Quote:10. We have the right to bring freedom and democracy to the rest of the world.

Any American patriots, I suggest you take a look at what your youth believe they can do with the world. Please show me in your constitution where it says you can do that.

Quote:We have the right to express our opinions.

You have the right only to do that in America. You don't have that right in places that don't allow that freedom.

Quote:We have the right to take action.

Only if the Security Council says you can. Remember, you signed the contract.

Quote:We have the right to defend people from those who oppress them.

No, you do not. Show me where it says you are allowed to in your constitution.

Quote:11. Who is Kirby and what does he do?

Kirby is a veteran from the Gulf War.

Quote:12. Bush is in no way a terrorist. Did you forget who the real terrorists are?

No one has forgotten who the real terrorists are. They are just being informed of another one. "The unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence by a person or an organized group against people or property with the intention of intimidating or coercing societies or governments, often for ideological or political reasons." THAT is terrorism. What Bush did was unlawful, therefore he is a TERRORIST. He is a terrorist fighting for what you believe to be good, just as the terrorists that Usama hired believed (likely) that what HE was doing was good.

I don't think you'd hear any of the Al-Qaeda calling their leader a terrorist, so I don't expect you to admit that your leader is one.

Quote: We never at one point took over Iraq.

LOL. I mean. WOW. I'm speechless. In fact, I'm going to make that bigtext for everyone to see.

Here's a newsflash. THE COALITION OCCUPIED IRAQ. THEY ALSO SET UP A REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.

Quote:14. It is a general rule of cease fires. If you sign a cease-fire and the other side breaks it the cease-fire can be called off. We however did not do that.

Except you didn't MAKE the cease fire. The UN did. They are the only ones who can call it off. Not Congress or your president.

Quote:15. Canada doesn't get FOX news, so how would you know how bad it is? Or do you pay extra for it?

We've had FOXnews for a while. At least, in my region.

Now, I have a question for you:

Why are you still arguing when you said you weren't going to? TWICE?

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 01:50:15 GMT

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

Nodbugger7. Vigilante justice is not illegal. It all depends on how you go about it. If you defend yourself that is vigilante Justice. If you stop a robbery that is vigilante justice. If you stop somebody like Saddam from doing the things he is doing you re not doing anything illegal. People who stop criminals are always hailed as hero's. For some reason it isn't working now. Because for

some strange reason people think Bush is worse than Saddam and Hitler.

vig-i-lan-te P (vj-lnt)

n.

One who takes or advocates the taking of law enforcement into one's own hands.

Your right, in most cases it's not illegal. However, if you break a law while performing such acts, then it is illegal, regardless of intent.

Example 1: A civillain tripping a thief while he tries to get away with stolen goods. Not illegal (unless the thief decides to sue for assault. Ain't America great?)

Example 2: A civillian shooting a thief as he tries to get away with stolen goods. Very much illegal as a crime was committed.

Example 3: US invading Iraq to save innocent civillains from a corrupt government (as you put it). Illegal as it goes against the UN charter, REGARDLESS of the inactivity taken by the UN. You keep saying America was forgiven after evading Iraq. Well guess what? It could not have been forgiven if it WAS NOT WRONG (in this case ILLEGAL) in the first place.

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Pak](#) on Thu, 05 Aug 2004 08:24:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GO BUSH GO

Subject: How Bush will steal the 2004 Election...
Posted by [Riftgarde](#) on Sat, 14 Aug 2004 00:55:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

At the convention tell the americans we're going to set up plans for a flat type tax and abolish the tax code and IRS.

But people forget their taxes are taken out during the year and they get a refund. Now they would no longer get a refund check and think they are getting ripped off, even though they now get paid more during the year.

Hell, abolish the W2 before the flat tax, when people have to pay their taxes for once they might get a clue.

If you make \$100 and pay \$6 tax the guy getting paid \$200 should pay \$12 not be punished and pay \$18 for making more.

Some lady on the tonight show thought the Cartwright brothers from Bonanza invented the airplane, we expect them to understand the tax sham?
