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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2004 11:16:01 GMT

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

warrant. In regards to this whole terrorists and prisoners of war bit. If Iraqi insurgents aren't being held as prisoners of war, what are they being held as? Even normal prisoners have certain rights that must be upheld.

They're being held as captured terrorists; that's what they are, at least. As has been established, they cannot be held as prisoners of war since they do not meet the requirements to be considered as such according to the Geneva Convention, which is the legal document to which we are relating.

The proper treatment or "rights" of captured terrorists (or the existence of, for that matter) is not outlined in the Geneva Convention, so they receive no coverage under said document.

To my knowledge, there is actually no document whatsoever that really dictates how we're supposed to treat these captured terrorists (if there is, please let me know and show it to me), and it seems that we're not drilling holes into their ankles, pulling their teeth out with pliers, and gouging their eyes out (three examples of types of torture Saddam's interrogators used on their prisoners (THAT'S real torture)) out of our good grace, even though the bastards certainly deserve it.

Quote: Not according to the UN just prior to war being declared. And that is all that really matters, regardless of what you may happen to think about the UN.

Not really since all that really matters is the truth; whether or not they were found before or after the war is irrelevant. The truth is he had them, and the programs for their development were just waiting to be restarted as soon as enough people in the U.N. were paid off through the Oil-for-Food program and sanctions were lifted.

Quote: That is true, I was nitpicking. This is only because, while those in captivity have done unspeakable things (I'm assuming this as people are labeling them terrorists) and deserve what they are getting, the point is that it is still not the "right" thing to do, to which you appear to be arguing the alternative.

The "right" thing to do is to get them to divulge any information that may be helpful to U.S. troops out on the battlefield; an example that I have given before of one such piece of information could possibly be the location of a large terrorist weapons cache. Get the captured terrorist to spill his guts about this weapons cache, and that's a boatload of weapons that the soldiers don't have to worry about since they'd be able to use that information given by the captured terrorist to go to that location and secure the weapons.

We are not gouging their eyes out; we are not shoving rats up their asses through metal pipes to eat them from the inside out; we're not forcing them to sit on broken Pepsi bottles to fill it up with their blood.

Quote: Take a psychology course, and perhaps you'll think differently. These seemingly menial things can have a profound impact on a prisoner's health. Both mental and physical... A simple dog barking won't do a thing bad, however, a dog sounding like it will attack, while it's being held on a leash in front of your face, will.

Who gives a shit about the terrorists' well-being? When U.S. soldiers' lives are on the line, every

measure possible should be taken to ensure their survival. If that means scaring a few captured terrorists with some german shepards to get them to divulge whatever helpful information they may have, so be it.

Like I said before, we'll muzzle the mutts when they spill their guts.
Until they get to talkin', they can keep on barkin'.

SuperFlyingLiberalToolNo, Moore's movie came out quite a while after the election. Quite a while after I had thought this through and seen events unfold. Also, I think you're typecasting Christmas-bashing with Democrats a bit too much here. It's not exactly a stated goal of the DNC. I actually didn't get all that much out of F 9/11. Just another movie.

The Democratic Party's platform shares the same goals that the ACLU and most other organizations that are pitching such a huge fit about Christmas's, and religion's in general, presence in the public venue have in relation to that issue. In fact, they're nearly identical.

If you don't want to be "typecasted," don't associate yourself so closely to the party.

Quote:Well, you and your "crew" certainly flat out deny any possibility of it and that's the way it must be. Don't pretend that you're leaning over the fence and I'm not.

You seem to forget from whom this story is originating: the ACLU, which is, at best, nothing more than a liberal think tank. You're taking this small (and probably wrong) allegation and turning it into some scandal as big as the Oil-for-Food scandal. You're blindly accepting it as fact since the ACLU published it and it appears to hurt Bush.

I'm not saying there's no possibility of "torture" in the sense that you mean it. According to your definition, thumping someone on the head with your middle finger is "torture." In that case, I hope we're "torturing" the captured terrorists. I reiterate: if they have to listen to doggies yip each day and receive daily thumpings on the head to get them to talk, so be it.

I certainly hope you didn't imply you were "leaning over the fence" at any time in this thread; such a move would be very uncharacteristic of you.

Quote:I think you mean booksmart and yet not agree with the ideals of others.
I meant exactly what I said.

Quote:I have claimed to be more open-minded on issues of race? And also, speech never comes out very well if you end two sentences, one right after the other, with "you are!" Just a tidbit of advice.

I wasn't even referring to a race issue. Besides, you incriminate yourself later on in your post:

Quote:These issues aren't one-sided. You have to look at them from everyone's points of view. You essentially call me closed-minded while basically proclaiming you have an open-minded view. Yet, you seemingly have a very closed-minded view on conservatives.

By the way, people generally find it offensive when you're correcting their minor grammar mistakes, so unless you want to make a name for yourself as an asshole, you might want to keep from pointing out minor errors like that. Just a tidbit of advice.

Quote:Didn't you just earlier imply that you were more open about the ideas of others than I am?

I didn't imply anything. I said bluntly that you were on a moral power-trip to prove yourself somehow better than conservatives.
I guess it's the superiority complex talking.

Quote:You do realize that Reagan did indeed give enormous amounts of arms to the Afghans and pretend to the American people that it wasn't happening?
You just proved the point I was making.

Quote:Did I indeed say it was some president's fault that Saddam was in power? Was that back when I was 11 or something?
You know what I meant and what my point was. Stop nitpicking at details.

Quote:America is not the infallible entity you would like it to be.
Too bad I've never said or even implied that America is infallible.

Quote:Yes, there are more than a handful of people in Iraq and Afghanistan out to kill our soldiers. Some of it is because of all of the hate propaganda over there. But you have to open your eyes, hydra. Right now, almost everyone in Iraq knows someone personal that we have killed with bombs and such.
You make a statement like that right after telling me to open my eyes?

First of all, it's not even mathematically plausible. Later on in your post, you claim 100,000 civilians have been killed by coalition forces. That's 0.38% of the total Iraqi population. Tell me, please, how mathematically 99.62% of the rest of the population can know at least one person of that 0.38%.

Like Nukelt15 said, if you honestly think the best-trained and most-sophisticated military in the entire fucking world has killed 100,000 civilians, whether intentionally or unintentionally, you need to open your eyes to reality.

Your statement would have been more correct to reality had you said, "Right now, almost everyone in Iraq knows someone personal that Saddam has killed with torture methods." Need I repost that USA Today article for you so you can read it again (based on your comment, something tells me you didn't)?

Quote:They take that pretty seriously over there. And we've killed a LOT of civilians. It's not just because they're evil satanists, it's because they have genuine reasons to be mad at the U.S. These things need to be recognized if we're to bring peace back to Iraq, which isn't going to happen at a snap of the fingers.
We haven't killed as many people as Saddam has during his reign of terror. I again cite the USA Today article I previously posted. The true number of people tortured to death by Saddam may never be known since they're making new discoveries of the horrific torment placed on thousands, if not millions, of Iraqi citizens during Saddam's reign.

You also greatly overestimate the numbers of Iraqis that are truly resistant to America's presence in Iraq. According to an interview with an Army general on Fox News (I might as well stop here since you won't believe for a second anything Fox News says), about 95% of the Iraqi population is truly grateful for their liberation, are truly satisfied with how things are going, and wish the

United States to stay as long as needed to get the job done. That leaves only 5% that is angered at our presence there, and most of that 5% is peaceful resistance.

Now what the hell kind of statement is "they have genuine reasons to be mad at the US"? You're going to pull that "we killed their babies!" argument on me now, aren't you? As I said before, anyone believing that argument for a second needs a jolt of reality. They're mad because they're told to be mad by their oppressive government. I don't know where you're getting this "genuine reasons to be mad" bullshit from.

By the way, I have never implied the Iraq war would be a short one. Stop trying to imply that I, any other Republican on this message board, or George W. Bush has ever said it would be.

Quote:Are you suggesting that we should cover up everything bad the government does and portray a better picture of ourselves, like in 1984?

We shouldn't act so damn surprised when something bad does happen; it's a war for Clinton's sake! Quite frankly, the public doesn't need to know about every little bad thing that might happen during the war until all the facts are known about it.

Quote:So I should be more gung-ho and not care about how harshly we deal with soldiers we capture when it's AGAINST OUR LAWS?

"Soldiers" isn't the right term to describe them; "human pieces of shit" would be more fitting.

You do know just who these people are, right? These were terrorists who were trying to kill our own soldiers. I can't believe you would actually put their well-being above that of the American soldier.

Oh, and exactly against what law is making the captured terrorists listen to dogs bark?

Quote:Are you really so befuddled in your mind as to believe that all Iraqis are terrorists? Sometimes I wonder if you even read what I write....

I cannot BELIEVE that you actually thought that I was saying all Iraqis are terrorists. WHEN did I EVER say ANYTHING REMOTELY CLOSE TO ANYTHING LIKE THAT?????

Don't you see that I'm the only one here who actually cares about the well-being of the Iraqis?? You're the one who didn't want the war waged in the first place! You're the one who would rather have Saddam back in power than to see George W. Bush succeed! YOU'RE THE ONE WHO WANTS THE RAPE ROOMS AND TORTURE ROOMS TO BE FILLED WITH SCREAMS AND CRIES OF HORRIBLE PAIN AND TERROR!!!!!!!

Can't you see just how much good this war did to the Iraqi people?? Can't you see that Saddam was no "small-scale dictator" as you labeled him later on?? Can you not see past your Democratic indoctrination to realize anything good that came out of this war?????

Quote:Terrorists flew planes into our buildings. Guerilla soldiers are what we're fighting right now in Iraq. And keeping people up all night is one way to describe the torture going on. [See Washington Post editorial]

No, TERRORISTS are what we're fighting right now in Iraq. Not "insurgents" or "Iraqi militants" or

"resistance fighters" or any other prettied-up term the anti-war media might play up. These are TERRORISTS. Keeping people up all night is NOT torture IN ANY NORMAL SENSE OF THE WORD!!!!

Find something other than a damn editorial to back up your arguments. I might as well post one of the articles Neal Boortz wrote on his webpage and call it "evidence supporting my viewpoint." How about an actual news article instead of a damn editorial?

Quote:and what do you propose we do from here on?
Help the Iraqis become self-sufficient (the rest of your post was too stupid to reply to).

Quote:So the ends justify the means? We should break our own rules all we want to get information that we can't even prove is truly helpful? One of the discoveries of the 20th century is that people subjected to torture are going to tell the torturers what they want to hear, not what they know. It's not a truly effective technique for coaxing information out of someone. You keep referring to some set of "rules" that somehow dictates how we're supposed to treat captured terrorists. Show me these rules.

Do you honestly think we as civilians would have access to any information that may have been gathered during interrogations when these "torture" methods were employed?

One of the discoveries made by common sense is that the prisoners, no matter what the situation, will always portray the conditions of his prison far worse than how they really are in order to garner support from the public in an ultimate goal of being released. It is therefore not possible to go solely by what the captured terrorists are claiming about their conditions since they are more likely than not lying about the extreme of their conditions. Some people will even injure themselves to make it look like they have suffered daily beatings.

Quote:Yeah, Saddam was a small-scale dictator. One what size did he kill people here? Surely not 100,000 civilians or more, like the number we've probably killed from bombing and fighting, although the President won't release any numbers, because whenever he does they make him look bad. Again, read the Post Editorial I C&P'ed a couple posts up.
Like I said before, Saddam was no "small-scale dictator." I can't believe you would insult the thousands, if not millions, of Iraqis who have suffered in his torture chambers. Since you seem like you never actually read that USA Today article, I'll link you to it again (this time, actually read it): http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2003-04-13-saddam-secrets-usat_x.htm

Like I said before, the true number of the people tortured and killed by Saddam's regime may never be known. New, horrifying discoveries are made every day that reveal just how badly Saddam tortured his own people.
How can you sit back and call that "small-scale?"

Also, again, like Nukelt15 said and like I said earlier in this post, how can you possibly believe the best military in the world accidentally killed 100,000 civilians? Take Nuke's advice and come back with the real numbers before you start throwing false statistics around.
I thought you said you cared about our soldiers; why, then, would you proceed to insult them in such a way?
You damn hypocrite.

Quote:The ACLU is suing right now under Freedom of Information for an executive order that leaked documents are pointing straight to an executive order, and they want to see it... 'Sides, if you want to read an unbiased source, just read all those documents they have.
I've read the documents, and no, they do not.

Quote:I'm not saying this is an absolute truth. I'm posting this as a "here's-where-we-know."
Let's look at your very first post in this thread, shall we?

Quote:Yes, that's right. Seems as if "President" Bush authorized torture and this wasn't just a small isolated thing. But anyone who reads news already knew that.
The contradiction is obvious. I rest my case.

Quote:Read the Washington Post editorial.
First, you read the USA Today news article, then find me an unbiased news article that substantiates your argument.

Quote:But you all almost exclusively disagree with the Republican party on issues of religious zealotism, not actual political issues. If I entirely re-wrote the DNC's stand on everything, it wouldn't be the same, but I agree with their general ideals.
Please, for the love of all things sacred and holy, tell us where they would differ at all, even if it's in regard to only one issue. Give us just one issue where you disagree with the Democratic Party's stance. Take note of how I'm not talking about "general ideals;" I'm talking a specific issue where your view differs from the Democratic Party to any degree.

More to come later.
I leave you with that challenge.
