

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 11 Jun 2009 00:22:59 GMT

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

---

u6795 wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 14:43 How about George Bush's management of the war in Afghanistan? Up until recently that had been going smoothly (I'm not insinuating it's at all tied to Obama) and the Taliban has been nearly crushed (however, once again, recently they have begun a resurgence). Al Qaida has effectively been driven out of Afghanistan, mostly as a result of expert commanders on the part of the United States, but without the freedom to operate and the support of Bush the military would not be as formidable as it is today. Iraq, while short sighted in its planning, was executed masterfully and its people were freed from a pretty oppressive douchebag.

I would hardly consider Bush a "military president". A few months safeguarding the airspace of Texas from...uhm...someone? That's military experience?

Also, I wouldn't call the war in Afghanistan well-managed. Ever since Iraq started it's been out of the limelight. It's only recently that people are starting to pay attention that we realize how shitty things are going there. You use words like "nearly crushed" and "driven out (except for the resurgence lol)". That's just putting a positive spin on failure.

Lastly, while some good may have come out of the invasion of Iraq (The overthrow of an oppressive douchebag), that in itself is not as was not enough reason to invade. North Korea has an oppressive douchebag leader, why don't we play world police and invade them, too? The nation was lied too. Anyone else remember those UN briefings where Colonel Powell was giving detailed descriptions of biological weapons loaded on to trucks, complete with diagrams and CGI representations?

u6795 wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 14:43 George H.W. Bush sent the armed forces to Iraq the first time in 1991 along with the backing of a significant coalition and completely obliterated the Iraqi military in a matter of weeks.

...And yet we ended up invading the same country a decade later. Not what I would call wise use of military forces, if they apparently accomplished nothing.

u6795 wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 14:43 Dwight Eisenhower commanded the Allied Forces to total victory in Europe. FDR was a wise politician, but as with ALL Presidents, true responsibility for victory lies within the military leaders. He went on to serve as President during the Korean War, an admittedly nasty war that fortunately was prevented from escalating into another world conflict, and was behind the cease fire. He also maintains one of the highest Presidential approval ratings.

His honorable actions as General and commander of Allied forces in Europe aside, he was a fairly mediocre president. The Korean war was a pathetic clusterfuck. Also, most presidents typically have high approval ratings toward the beginning of wars. It's obvious generals make good generals, but I would argue that they don't necessarily make good presidents.

u6795 wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 14:43 Kennedy was assassinated only a short while into major

US involvement in Vietnam. We'd already been involved there since like, what, the 50's? Lyndon Johnson was President for the majority of the war. Kennedy was also largely behind the resolution of the Cuban Missile Crisis and averted a lot of death through political means, rather than the various military solutions proposed (full invasion, airstrikes, etc). A wise use of the military, in many cases, is no use. The Bay of Pigs, however, is only tied to Kennedy by his authorization. The mission was planned by the CIA months in advance and he merely received a copy to approve or disapprove. Most likely promised of its success by the CIA and seeking to eliminate an enemy in the Caribbean without the use of our own forces, Kennedy said yes. That is the extent of his involvement.

When mentioning Kennedy, I wasn't referring to his involvement in Vietnam (Which, as you mentioned, had been going on for several years). I was specifically referring to The Bay Of Pigs Invasion, which was a terrible failure. Even if it's only tied to him by his authorization, it means he authorized a terrible failure. Something that lies in direct contradiction to your claim that presidents with military experience have a deeper understanding of armed forces and use them wisely.

u6795 wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 14:43 Going back further, Theodore Roosevelt served honorably for several years and went on to make increase the world standing of the United States tenfold. The Great White Fleet basically solidified our role as a world power and international respect in dealings with foreign nations.

Most would argue that in the process of increasing the standing of the United States, he lowered world opinion, both back then by pissing off all of Latin America, and to this day by establishing the American role of "World Police" which presidents unfortunately seem to uphold to this day. You might call that respect, but I don't.

u6795 wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 14:43 Even farther back, of course, is George Washington. I don't know, he didn't really do much. I mean, aside from leading our army to victory over the British and establishing the United States, he was a pretty chill guy.

I don't know what Washington did as president.

What I'm looking for is a clear example of good military leader = good president, and I would maintain that you haven't shown me such an example yet.

---