

---

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 18:29:21 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiYou have seen pictures from Abu Gharib of people being attacked by dogs, haven't you? That's what I would be led to believe is the most likely avenue. And torture is not just limited to being hit with a real big stick. Dictionary.com defines it as Excruciating physical or mental pain. That's what we were subjecting people at Abu Gharib to, and that wasn't the only incident, apparently.

Dictionary.com says torture includes excruciating mental pain. How is sleep deprivation excruciating? I've been deprived of sleep for a couple days before. It was annoying, not excruciating. Stress positions? Being hand cuffed to the floor doesn't count as excruciating in my book. Growling dogs? (Note: I've changed from barking to growling based on the news reports on this that I saw yesterday). I've had plenty of dogs bark at me. It can be scary, not excruciating. Then there's the hood wearing. I can't see (pun intended) how being blindfolded for a while counts as excruciating.

SuperFlyingEngiHow do you know what's in the executive order if you haven't seen it? That's the whole point of this article, some people in the FBI leaked documents to the ACLU, and the ACLU went to court suing under the Free Information Act or whatever to ascertain whether or not there was an executive order, because all the evidence seems to point to there being one. And that's where we are right now.

They say in the article they know what's in the executive order. I'll admit, I mis-read that originally. I thought they meant they already had it when they were just saying they know what's in it, despite not having it. That lack of evidence is what they are citing when they say Bush authorized sleep deprivation, stress positions, etc. Citing evidence they didn't have confused me at first into thinking they had the evidence, I should have known better though.

It never says they are after the executive order. At the end, the article says:Quote:The ACLU and its allies are scheduled to go to court again this afternoon, where they will seek an order compelling the CIA to turn over records related to an internal investigation into detainee abuse. They don't say they are after the executive order. They want records they claim exist about internal investigations into abuse.

SuperFlyingEngiThese documents weren't intended to come out. They were leaked by federal employees. That's not the same thing as freely distributing them, FYI.

I didn't see anything about them being leaked to the ACLU. I'm just going by the article you posted about. In that article it says the documents came from a lawsuit the ACLU filed:

Quote:The documents were obtained after the ACLU and other public interest organizations filed a lawsuit against the government for failing to respond to a Freedom of Information Act request.

By the way, you said:

SuperFlyingEngiAnd guess what? This story will NEVER make the media outlets unless it snowballs, because they are not news. Don't feign yourselves into thinking they are.

Like I said above, I have seen a few stories on this already. The first story I saw was basically

saying what the ACLU said verbatim. The only exception being, the story said "growling dogs" instead of "use of dogs". It was Fox News that ran these stories, I haven't watched the other channels enough to know if they are talking about it.

I don't think the story will go much further unless the media gets bored, as there isn't really a story here. Most of what the ACLU said is already known information. I'd even heard of that executive order months ago. I think I saw it being debated on O'Reilly. Regardless of what some may think about him, he has some of the highest rating of the news channels. If he was talking about it, then people know.

If you want to get into big stories the media missed, I know of one where there's video of John Kerry, at a democratic fundraiser, taking money from known terrorists.

---