

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [u6795](#) on Fri, 12 Jun 2009 01:35:27 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 20:18Yet five years later, the job still isn't done. Wise and understanding application of military forces? It doesn't seem so.

His management of the war could be absolutely perfect and that still would not guarantee a quick victory. There are thousands of factors that play into a war, namely, the fact that it is a war. I'm not trying to shift the blame, however saying the President is ineffective because a war continues is like blaming the mail man for a late delivery.

Dover wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 20:18Put his work in civil rights and highway projects aside. That has nothing to do with applying military forces. Blame to UN all you want for Korea, but it was a direct result of America's shitty "containment" policy, and while the troops in Korea were the UN's by name, they were comprised largely of Americans. The two are inseparable.

You asked earlier for an example where a good military leader becomes a great president. In the case of Korea, Eisenhower/Truman were fulfilling our debts to the international community.

Whatever your opinion on containment, it's hard to argue the fact that South Korea is a great ally to the United States today as a result.

Dover wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 20:18This is just a variation on the Eisenhower example from above. Just because it's a different political organ that the orders are being issued from doesn't change their ultimate source. I can't accept the justification of The Bay of Pigs just because they weren't REAL Americans fighting, "just" Cubans.

I'm not implying that their sacrifice was less important because they were Cubans, but that it is important that they WEREN'T Americans, because the best use of the military, as I've said before, is none at all. Kennedy was seeking through this missions authorization to end a problem without the use of American troops. The Cuban exiles who enlisted for the mission wanted the end goal just as much as the Americans.

Dover wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 20:18Of course it comes with a choice. There are international organizations (Namely, the UN) who's authority is global. There is no need for the United States to assume such a role. As you said before, the vast majority of UN directed troops in Korea were Americans. Even with organizations such as the UN, the United States fulfills most of the troop requirements and is without a doubt a 'leader' amongst the United Nations.

Dover wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 20:18I meant in terms of a commander-in-chief--the context of this discussion (Or so I thought). It's what I was initially referring to as well, but in your last post you shifted toward overall Presidential prowess.

Dover wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 20:18To say this is to imply that those who are not Veterans lack the leadership abilities to lead America in times when it needs it,  
Not at all. It's simply a bonus.

Dover wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 20:18but you haven't addressed my first two examples: Both Lincoln and FDR led America through the two wars that were most potentially destructive to the United States, and neither of them had any military experience to speak of.

As I said, FDR had the advantage of some of the most brilliant military strategists of the century at his command and three terms under his belt well into World War II. However I have not said that

military experience is a requirement for a great President, simply a bonus. Lincoln didn't have all the same advantages as FDR but also turned out to be a brilliant strategist and had very clear goals.

Dover wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 20:18 Theoretically. To stay with the example of Bush, I don't see how doing and dealing Cocaine in a position secured by your Dad's powerful connections helps a man understand the servitude involved in being president.

Cocaine absolutely doesn't help at all. That's a huge black mark on Bush's record particularly, however his experience with the Military (whether unfairly achieved or not) gave the man a much deeper understanding of the military's values and the sacrifices made by soldiers. It's no wonder that at almost every appearance Bush made in Iraq and Afghanistan, he was greeted with standing ovations and thunderous cheering and applause. On the contrary, Barack Obama has been received with respect but little enthusiasm.

---