
Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 02:37:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=17216&c=206>

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.

And 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.

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 02:42:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

aclu.com A document released for the first time today by the American Civil Liberties Union suggests that President Bush issued an Executive Order authorizing the use of inhumane interrogation methods against detainees in Iraq.

Yeah...SUGGESTS. Doesn't say yes or no, and plus, even if it was true...so what? We torture them to get answers. That saves American lives in the long run if we can get important information out of them.

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 02:45:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

P-R-O-P-A-G-A-N-D-A M-O-R-O-N

You need help, your a sad sad shadow of a child, you give our President no respect, you give no one but people who share your hippie views with respect, you do nothing but spread propaganda, which you can not possible belive, if you do i feel sad for you and even worse for your parents (who i think should be beat with a rubber hose and electric lines for teaching you such loads of crap and not beating your ass enough when you were little). How could you possible belive such crap that our president authorized that?? Your simply full of it dude, sad sad sad.

And he's PRESIDENT BUSH not "PRESIDENT" BUSH, , he won office, the people spoke, give him the title he rightfully won.

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 02:47:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, how about you READ the document and decide for yourself?

Oh, and the Geneva Convention CLEARLY outlines that we will not torture people and the Constitution CLEARLY outlines that all signed treaties are the law of the land. Americans are not somehow more "godly" or more deserving to live than non-Americans. We're all people. Get it through your conservative skull.

EDIT: cowmisfit, are you going to read the article or just be an idiot?

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 02:53:05 GMT

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

You people get our soldiers killed EVERYDAY, people like you who post this garbage false propaganda. The terrorist and just normal people see this crap and they believe it, but they have an excuse, they're not educated, YOU however are a fully educated American (even though you hate America) YOU have no excuse to believe this shit except for the fact your parents are morons, which has to be the place you get your FAR FAR FAR FAR FAR FAR left views from. These people who besides the fact wouldn't think of killing one of our men, see this crap and believe it they go out and get one of our boys killed (which I'm sure you don't care anything about as long as we aren't invading on anyone's freedoms and Bush gets blamed for it).

YOU feed the fires of hate, you feed the fire that kills our boys in Iraq and Afghanistan and around the world everyday with your sympathetic feelings toward the terrorist.

Get out of my country, I'm sure France or Canada will take you.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 02:54:14 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiOh, and the Geneva Convention CLEARLY outlines that we will not torture people and the Constitution CLEARLY outlines that all signed treaties are the law of the land. Americans are not somehow more "godly" or more deserving to live than non-Americans. We're all people. Get it through your conservative skull.

Listen to me, mindless drone.

It's people like you who spread this shit that gets to the general public. The general public sees it, and they don't like it. In return, they complain to their elected officials that they don't like the war. The officials, afraid to lose the office, vote against supporting our troops. This weakens our troops, and in return, KILLS MORE OF OUR MEN BECAUSE THEY ARE LESS EQUIPPED. Brilliant strategy you got there, liberals.

Those people aren't POWs. Those people are terrorists attacking our men. They know they can't win, but because their fucked-up loyalties cause them to desire to kill as many of our men as possible. They don't care about dying. In fact, they WANT to die for their cause.

If we torture a few to get the knowledge we need to save more of our men, then LET IT HAPPEN. Yes, they are human, but in order to save more of our men AND more of THEM, we need to get answers NOW.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 02:57:42 GMT

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

j_ball430

If we torture a few to get the knowledge we need to save more of our men, then LET IT HAPPEN. Yes, they are human, but in order to save more of our men AND more of THEM, we need to get answers NOW.

Read taht part closely superflaying, read it very closely and think on it before you post. You probably still won't understand it, but its worth a shot.

I'd love to see video of you telling one of the men who's lives might have been saved or loss by us tourchering prisonors or us not doing so because of people like you.

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

Posted by [MilkyLep](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 02:59:06 GMT

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

SFE I don't like picking sides but i am going to have to go with "them" this time, Shut up. I have relatives over in the middle east that i care about and then the people trying to kill them i would much rather have the retards with no education die then them, interrogation is fine by me, you need to relize as many stupid decisions Bush makes he makes some good ones, just let it go.

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

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:02:58 GMT

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

You actually read the ACLU web site...

YOU ARE A LOSER.

Besides if it is true who the hell cares. Beating the shit outta terrorists for information. Sounds pretty fair to me.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:04:58 GMT

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

Through out history we have broke the "rules" of civilized warfare, we've done it for right and wrong reasons, in vietnam we raped woman for no reason, that was one of the wrong things we've done, we also shot children and woman in vietnam, that was one of the morally objectable things that we were forced to do to save our soilders lives and get info to save our soilders lives, its something that no one wants to do but it has to be done. Kill or be killed, kill or be killed.

Personlly, would i WANT to kill an innocent person, no, would i want to even kill anyone nope, but if it saves the lives of my comrads and protects my freedom and nation, then damn't im gonna kill that son bitch dead.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:06:36 GMT

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

Cowmisfit:

I suppose you chose to go with the latter.

I don't know why I'm wasting my time on such a pathetic case, but I don't have much to do right now. First, my parents. Both got above a 1400 on their SATs, and my dad regularly works side by side with the top scientific brains in the physics textbook industry as a chief development editor. [Clue for the clueless: Important role.] You also can't declare your pretend lala belief that my parents are below the average intelligence level to rest within the level of "fact."

Now, why do I hate America? Because I don't blindly follow our "leaders" like you do? No, that's why I love America. Again, I reiterate:

"Dissent is the highest form of patriotism" -Thomas Jefferson

Now, I'm betting you no Arab fundamentalist fighters are reading Renegade Forums to listen to bitches like you.

I care for our soldiers. Don't say I don't. I don't want them in this war. I want every one of them out of the Middle East right now. I never wanted any of them to be there. I never did, wanted, would, want or ever will want ANY of our soldiers to be hurt.

j-balls430:

First topic: One of the stupidest things I've ever heard. The vast majority of the populace probably never once wrote a complaint to their officials, because they just don't care that much. And those in positions of public office aren't going to vote against any more money for our troops, they're going to vote against our troops being in active combat if the populace demands it. If the citizens of the United States believe our soldiers are in an unjust war, then they can bring them out of the unjust war. Although, since a big chunk of voters on election day were voting on "moral values,"

your group obviously doesn't care.

Terrorists and soldiers aren't the same thing. And that still doesn't justify torture. Are you saying it does? You're wrong. Read the article.

Nope, still wrong. The United States does not torture anyone. Well, until "President" Bush, we didn't.

Now, both of you have one last chance to get back on the topic of this article instead of attacking me ad hominem. If you're not going to address the article and instead try and throw your drive at me, I quite frankly don't give a damn,

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:08:54 GMT

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

I'm sorry, but you have no grasp on reality.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:11:38 GMT

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

DarkDeminYou actually read the ACLU web site...

YOU ARE A LOSER.

Besides if it is true who the hell cares. Beating the shit outta terrorists for information. Sounds pretty fair to me.

No, I got this tidbit from a blog site independent of the ACLU.

MilkyLepSFE I don't like picking sides but i am going to have to go with "them" this time, Shut up. I have relatives over in the middle east that i care about and then the people trying to kill them i would much rather have the retards with no education die then them, interrogation is fine by me, you need to relize as many stupid decisions Bush makes he makes some good ones, just let it go.

Oh, so we should go to their land and then kill them before we can kill us because in your eyes it's the best thing to do? How quaint.

Also, this article is implying that Bush lied about whether or not he knew about torture in the Middle East. If we're going to be doing to them what Saddam did to them, shouldn't we at least know about it? Also, wasn't lying why Clinton was impeached and the main reason most of you dislike him? Or was that somehow different because otherwise you would all be caught in hypocrisy?

Quote:I don't know why I'm wasting my time on such a pathetic case, but I don't have much to do right now. First, my parents. Both got above a 1400 on their SATs, and my dad regularly works side by side with the top scientific brains in the physics textbook industry as a chief development editor. [Clue for the clueless: Important role.] You also can't declare your pretend lala belief that my parents are below the average intelligence level to rest within the level of "fact."

Wow, that means umm nothing?? I dont' give a shit how high of a score they got on there SAT's, it means squat. They have no REAL LIFE skills, they have no COMMON SENSE, things you can't learn from a text book.

SO my statement stands, your parents are morons and shouldn't be raising a child if they are going to instill beliefs of hate for ones country and harboring terrorist into them.

Quote:Now, I'm betting you no Arab fundamentalist fighters are reading Renegade Forums to listen to bitches like you.

Its not the point if there reading HERE, there reading stuff that people in higher people put out on the media waves, teh same crap you support and post here, you support it you support killing our troops as far as im concerned.

[quote]I care for our soldiers. Don't say I don't.[quote]

You don't care about them or you wouldn't be posting crap like this to get them killed.

Quote:I don't want them in this war. I want every one of them out of the Middle East right now. I never wanted any of them to be there. I never did, wanted, would, want or ever will want ANY of our soldiers to be hurt.

If you cared anything about america or its men in arms, you wouldn't have made that statement right there, they are PROTECTING OUR NATION, they don't WANT to be there, but most of them do WANT to be there because thats there job and they want to protect our nation and YOU (well not you, but you as in all of us) Thats the biggest hippie statement i've seen in ages, I DON'T WANT ANY OF THEM IN THE MIDDLE EAST!!! , as i've said before, go tell one of the 9/11 victims family you don't think we should be killing those sons a bitches. O wait, you don't give a shit about them either, you would rather protect the rights of these terrorist bastards than your own american right to defend freedom.

You don't want any soilders hurt??

:rolleyes: :rolleyes: ITS CALLED WAR YOU MORON!! PEOPLE DIE AND GET HURT IN WAR, YOU WANNA CURL UP IN A BALL AND PRAY TO JESUS OR A TREE OR SOMETHING YOU HIPPIE SCUM BAG??? OGM LK I R GIVE UP I R DON"T WANNA HURT YOU EVEN THO YOUR GONNA KILL MY FREINDS AND FAMILY!!, your a pathetic excuse for an american.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:17:55 GMT

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

MilkyLep, I have to agree with SFE here, but ONLY because it has to deal with a universal truth. Impeachment is to be formally accused. Clinton WAS impeached.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:21:39 GMT

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

MilkyLep: Why?

If you can't explain it then you obviously aren't being entirely reasonable in stating it.

[P.S. cowmisfit and j-balls430 have both lost their chances to talk to me because they are too stupid to even think of staying on topic. Too bad.]

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:23:11 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiMilkyLep: Why?

If you can't explain it then you obviously aren't being entirely reasonable in stating it.

[P.S. cowmisfit and j-balls430 have both lost their chances to talk to me because they are too stupid to even think of staying on topic. Too bad.]

cowmisfit and j-ball SCORE: 1

Superflyinghomo SCORE: 0

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:24:22 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi[P.S. cowmisfit and j-balls430 have both lost their chances to talk to me because they are too stupid to even think of staying on topic. Too bad.]

I...CAN'T....STOP....LAUGHING! You think it's an actual PRIVILEGE to talk to you? ROFL! You honestly think you're important enough to give out people "chances" to talk to you? WOW! I must quote my one of my previous posts:

myself I'm sorry, but you have no grasp on reality.

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

Posted by [MilkyLep](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:26:16 GMT

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

Because i am tired and i have nothing better to do and you make these type of topics whenever you see an article bashing the prez which in my opinion make you an attetion whore.

Sleepy time.

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

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:27:36 GMT

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

Wow. Worse reply from SFE ever.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:28:09 GMT

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

Just one more thing: Well, you obviously wanted to come and talk to me, as demonstrated by your coming and talking to me. But now, as warned, I must say no more.

Also, that would be "I wrote".

EDIT:

MilkyLepBecause i am tired and i have nothing better to do and you make these type of topics whenever you see an article bashing the prez which in my opinion make you an attetion whore.

Discourse irritates you? This isn't your kind of forum.

Icedog, read this ACLU article. Then read the documents if you want to. Then think for yourself. Reading and then thinking is the recipe for success.

Now, time to get back on topic. Thoughts on this article? Come on, I know they're there.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:29:33 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiJust one more thing: Well, you obviously wanted to come and talk to me, as demonstrated by your coming and talking to me. But now, as warned, I must say no more.

Also, that would be "I wrote".

Didn't want to talk to you, just didn't want everyone seeing your one sided propaganda and being blinded by it with out seeing the truth.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:29:47 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngil must say no more.
Good for you. Maybe now you'll shut your fucking mouth.

EDIT: I already gave you my response. I don't give a fuck. It's justified, no matter how much your twisted mind thinks it's not.

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

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:33:32 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngilcedog, read this ACLU article. Then read the documents if you want to. Then think for yourself. Reading and then thinking is the recipe for success.

Reading that article has nothing to do with what situation you put yourself in. Reading your replies already shows me how much of a stupid fuck you are.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:39:20 GMT

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

What situation? The situation of having an opinion? Am I stupid for holding one contrary to an "elected" official, namely "President" Bush? Are you so pro-Republican that you can't stand to see anyone doubt their candidates?

And keep your slanderous forked tongue within the confines of your oral cavity.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:40:06 GMT

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

If this can be backed up by another (preferrably MORE credible) source, I'll give it some serious thought. However, the UCLA saying something like this is perhaps as believable as speaking the word "christmas" being a capital offence.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:41:17 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiWhat situation? The situation of having an opinion? Am I stupid for holding one contrary to an "elected" official, namely "President" Bush? Are you so pro-Republican that you can't stand to see anyone doubt their candidates?

And keep your slanderous forked tongue within the confines of your oral cavity.

I've doubted Bush's abilities enough times, and Clinton's too. Also, stop being such a fucking idiot, and RESPECT THE MAN FOR ONCE. He's the highest elected official in the nation. Show some fucking respect. Whether or not you respect him as a person, respect him as the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Yes, that country that you live in.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:42:34 GMT

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

warranto:

Well, this is only the tip of a potential iceberg. Right now the ACLU has a big stack of documents [available for review at the bottom of that article] that they presented to a judge to see whether or not an executive order has to be released and whether or not it must be determined if there was one.

Don't be mistaken, this story hasn't resolved yet, but there is an enormous amount of evidence to suggest what is about to come.

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

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:42:55 GMT

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

The saying comes to mind SFE... "Children should be seen and not heard."

Really you actually believe an organization that supports communism and the overthrowing of the American Governmental system. These people that hate Christians and think they are doing the world a favor by denying all Christian beliefs.

They have sick ideologies, they believe that we shouldn't have done anything about Saddam killing and TORTURING his own people.

Have you not noticed the kidnappings of people in Iraq were they are tortured and beheaded. Terrorists deserve no mercy. I couldn't care less if they beat them to death, as far as I am concerned the second they try to kill an American is the second they forfeit their right to life.

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

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:44:42 GMT

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

j_ball430I've doubted Bush's abilities enough times, and Clinton's too. Also, stop being such a fucking idiot, and RESPECT THE MAN FOR ONCE. He's the highest elected official in the nation. Show some fucking respect. Whether or not you respect him as a person, respect him as the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Yes, that country that you live in.

But you forgot, he doesn't live in America, he was transferred to Canada by MoveThemOn.org.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:45:05 GMT

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

icedog90But you forgot, he doesn't live in America, he was transferred to Canada by MoveThemOn.org.

No, that's just one of his wet dreams.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:47:48 GMT

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

Super:

Like I said, someone who suggests that saying "Merry Christmas" is a capital offence is not a credible source, so (no insult towards you intended) you'll need to provide something else to substantiate it before I comment.

Be that a court order, or another news source (preferably not FOX or CNN, because that will start a whole new "debate" about credibility).

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:48:28 GMT

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

I find it quite comforting to myself that I use bigger words than most of you while being of a younger age. Also, technically, you aren't hearing me, but merely seeing the text I print.

Thanks for your concern.

The ACLU's objective is to assure that the Bill of Rights is upheld, not install a new economic system into the United States. Is this about those court cases where government offices are putting on Christmas displays? Because that and banning Christianity aren't exactly the same

thing, you know.

DarkDemin, I ask you, what good is it if we go into a country claiming to end the regime of a torturer, and then start torturing people while saying we're not? How much better are we than Saddam then?

Not all Arabs are terrorists, you know. And here we go again with your Republican "Americans are more important than other races..." talk. I can't stand it. We invaded their country, and dropped so many bombs more or less all of them know someone personal that we have killed. That's why they hate us and our soldiers and our people, not because of our "freedoms" or any stupid reason like that.

EDIT:

warranto:

No offense taken. I understand that this news hasn't resolved itself yet, so we must wait and see. However, this crowd didn't hold the same restraint in declaring it vile and wrong.

And with that, I must retire for the night. I'll be back on sometime tomorrow.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:48:37 GMT

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

If he gets that from FOX, I'll believe him.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:52:30 GMT

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

Of course, the ACLU is there to make sure Religion has no place in the Government, and on tv, and in the work place, and in schools, and any place the public eye is.

Oh wait, did I say Religion? I meant only Christianity. Any other religion would be discrimination, and thats protected.

But enough about the ACLU's views as related to religion, that can be kept for another topic if it wishes to be discussed.

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

Posted by [xptek](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 04:07:14 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngil find it quite comforting to myself that I use bigger words than most of you while being of a younger age. Also, technically, you aren't hearing me, but merely seeing the text I print.

Use of a thesaurus doesn't really make you superior.

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 04:09:21 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi<http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=17216&c=206>

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.

Did you read the article, or just the blog that pointed it out? Here's what it said about Bush.

acluThe two-page e-mail that references an Executive Order states that the President directly authorized interrogation techniques including sleep deprivation, stress positions, the use of military dogs, and "sensory deprivation through the use of hoods, etc."

Oh my God, the horror. Lack of sleep, uncomfortable seating, listening to barking dogs, and wearing hoods. That's got to be the worst "torture" ever heard of in history. That's right up there with being beaten, raped, maimed and/or killed.

The article also keeps claiming "cover up", yet they have all these documents they got from a freedom of information lawsuit that spells all this out. Wow, that's a tremendous cover up there. Keeping records of all the incidents and releasing them to the ACLU has got to be the most insidious plot ever conceived to hide the truth from the American people. If they were really covering this up, then all the documents would have 'disappeared' before anyone at the ACLU could have got a hold of them.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 04:13:26 GMT

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

Correct me if I'm wrong, but the counter-position to this is that the relevent documents taht condem it, simply state "torture", not specifying what types.

(yes, I'm being broad, but at the moment I'm too tired to remember the names of the documents...)

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 04:20:23 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiOh, and the Geneva Convention CLEARLY outlines that we will not torture people and the Constitution CLEARLY outlines that all signed treaties are the law of the land.

As soon as the terrorists start abiding by the Geneva conventions then We should start and not a moment beforehand.

SuperFlyingEngiYou also can't declare your pretend lala belief that my parents are below the average intelligence level to rest within the level of "fact."

Are you a fucking robot? You dont base all actions based solely on "Fact". Moral objection has to come into play SOMEWHERE DOESNT IT???? Heres how i think you see things:

War == Violence
Voilence == Bad

Dont you ever see a fucking GRAY AREA????

SuperFlyingEngi"moral values,"
The fact that you put quotes around moral values doesnt surprise me.

SuperFlyingEngiAlso, wasn't lying why Clinton was impeached

SuperFlyingEngi, your constant obsession with trying to make our President (notice the lack of qoutes) look like he is insufficient to run this country is both disturbing and absurd. The fact that I share the same country with you makes the taste of vomit form in my mouth. Whats more is your perversion of the statements that our founding fathers said I myself deem unpatriotic. I have news for you, times change and dissent is the opposite of patriotism. Have some pride in your country. You are the worst American I have ever seen.

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 19:48:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ScampUse of a thesaurus doesn't really make you superior.

When did a thesaurus come into play?

NeosaberOh my God, the horror. Lack of sleep, uncomfortable seating, listening to barking dogs, and wearing hoods. That's got to be the worst "torture" ever heard of in history. That's right up there with being beaten, raped, maimed and/or killed.

The article also keeps claiming "cover up", yet they have all these documents they got from a freedom of information lawsuit that spells all this out. Wow, that's a tremendous cover up there. Keeping records of all the incidents and releasing them to the ACLU has got to be the most insidious plot ever conceived to hide the truth from the American people. If they were really covering this up, then all the documents would have 'disappeared' before anyone at the ACLU could have got a hold of them.

"Listening to dogs" is one way of putting being attacked by them. Those are all torture methods designed to make people lose their minds. It is still torture, don't pretend it's not. I'm sure you saw those pictures from Abu Gharib. Do you believe it counts as humane action? We went into Iraq first under false claims of weapons of mass destruction which we now KNOW are not there, and then started pretending we went in for humanitarian reasons, which is not at all how war was justified, where we claim to be removing a torturer. But now, we're torturing people and pretending we're not. Not very humanitarian, if you ask me.

Yes, it is a coverup. These documents were all leaked. Right now, the ACLU is suing to ascertain whether or not there was an executive order condoning torture, of which the administration is apparently trying to cover up.

gbull

As soon as the terrorists start abiding by the Geneva conventions then We should start and not a moment beforehand.

Iraqis = Not Terrorists

I can base actions based on something? Cool.... [Re-think that section]

gbullThe fact that you put quotes around moral values doesnt surprise me.

Well, no, it doesn't surprise me either, because that was the reason stated by so many during the exit polls.

gbull

SuperFlyingEngi, your constant obsession with trying to make our President (notice the lack of quotes) look like he is insufficient to run this country is both disturbing and absurd. The fact that I share the same country with you makes the taste of vomit form in my mouth. Whats more is your perversion of the statements that our founding fathers said I myself deem unpatriotic. I have news for you, times change and dissent is the opposite of patriotism. Have some pride in your country. You are the worst American I have ever seen.

So, I should blindly follow our leaders? No, I'm afraid that's entirely wrong. There must always remain the question in a democracy. I'm not perverting Mr. Jefferson's statement in the least. It's exactly what he meant, and the point remains. This blind "patriotism", if you can call it that, emanating from the Republican party disgusts me. Why am I a bad American? Because I chance a look at what our President does? Should I believe in what he does because you do? You obviously don't understand our political system in the least. If censorship of ideas comes, democracy leaves.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 20:27:39 GMT

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

You people need to to sort out whether or not those who were tortured were innocent of guilty of

anything at all. And no, because American soldiers detained them doesn't mean they are automatically guilty.

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

Posted by [rm5248](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 20:42:24 GMT

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

j_ball430It's justified, no matter how much your twisted mind thinks it's not.

So... theoretically, if your town flew a plane into my school, I could come there and play music 24/7, have dogs bark at you, shine bright lights in your face and put hoods over your head?

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 20:50:43 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi

So, I should blindly follow our leaders? No, I'm afraid that's entirely wrong. There must always remain the question in a democracy. I'm not perverting Mr. Jefferson's statement in the least. It's exactly what he meant, and the point remains. This blind "patriotism", if you can call it that, emanating from the Republican party disgusts me. Why am I a bad American? Because I chance a look at what our President does? Should I believe in what he does because you do? You obviously don't understand our political system in the least. If censorship of ideas comes, democracy leaves.

You're quite the hypocrite, aren't you? You say that Republicans blindly follow Bush, yet everything you say and believe is nothing but Liberal propaganda spouted from Liberal media distributors.

I certainly don't blindly follow Bush. As I said earlier, I've disagreed with him on a lot of subjects, but I see him as a better fit as president than Kerry would have been if he were to have been elected.

I guarantee you that I have more morals than you do. Especially since I come from a religious perspective. I don't like the torture and killings of humans, but it's war. War has completely different rules. You have to do what you have to do in order to save lives and to better lives of people. I know for a fact that if God didn't approve of war, He wouldn't have let David slay Goliath, and then make him the greatest king of Israel.

You can't just look at these situations from one perspective. You have have to look at all of them and then morally choose what's right, and not choose based on your bias.

Yes. I wouldn't like it one bit, but in order to get to those behind the horrible act, then it'd all be worth it. I have enough common sense to know that I sure as hell don't want someone like that in

my town. I wouldn't be protecting them, so what do I have to fear?

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

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 21:11:04 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi"Listening to dogs" is one way of putting being attacked by them. Those are all torture methods designed to make people lose their minds. It is still torture, don't pretend it's not. I'm sure you saw those pictures from Abu Gharib. Do you believe it counts as humane action? We went into Iraq first under false claims of weapons of mass destruction which we now KNOW are not there, and then started pretending we went in for humanitarian reasons, which is not at all how war was justified, where we claim to be removing a torturer. But now, we're torturing people and pretending we're not. Not very humanitarian, if you ask me.

Sleep deprivation, uncomfortable seating, and wearing hoods so you can't see for a while don't count as torture to me. I don't know what's up with the dogs, which is what I was trying to point out. The article just claims "use of dogs" not that they attack people. I've read that dogs are used to scare people, without attacking, so without evidence to the contrary I'm going to consider that to be the case here. I don't consider barking dogs to be torture. A little scary maybe, but not torture.

What happened at Abu Ghraib was abuse and torture. People being beaten and by some reports killed certainly qualifies as such. The people who did it are being punished. Those investigations and court martials were being carried out months before the story even "broke". The military even announced it, but since there weren't any pictures of the torture, no one in the media really listened. However, I don't see anything in this executive order Bush signed that authorized what happened there. Your initial post said Bush authorized torture, but the evidence you've cited says otherwise to me.

SuperFlyingEngiYes, it is a coverup. These documents were all leaked. Right now, the ACLU is suing to ascertain whether or not there was an executive order condoning torture, of which the administration is apparently trying to cover up.

If there was a real cover up, documents would have been destroyed or never made to begin with. Keeping things secret for a time doesn't constitute a cover up. If I write myself a note and don't give it to anyone, I'm not covering it up. If I email a friend and don't announce the contents of the email to the world, I'm not covering things up. A lot of what the government does isn't released for years so current important information doesn't end up in the wrong hands. These documents weren't being "covered up" if they could get into the hands of the ACLU. They were probably just being shelved until the information in them was out of date.

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 21:12:59 GMT

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

War just generates war, in a never ending cycle of hate. It's a circle, and with a circle, just can run

around it until you end up at the beginning. War will never be stopped. We invest in it, and we need it. We started this never ending circle, and the only way to stop it is to have something big stand in the way. But there can never be something big. War must go on. Today's leaders aren't getting any nicer, or any less corrupt. They sink lower and lower into what they call "defence". This "defence" means becoming "offensive" towards other countries. It's the primal instinct of kill or be killed. Scientists say humans need to die off sometime soon, that some big epidemic will kill off a large number of humans. But humans are ending themselves. We can't continue to live the way we do. We're dying slowly. We are fighting amongst ourselves, like primitive creatures. We fight disease and things we should be fighting but to no avail, because government budgets are more set to fighting other human beings. People. But we turn a blind eye. We don't see this part. Most people just think "they hurt us, we hurt them back". It won't end. It's what we're taught. War is bad, there's no way to put it. But we aren't defending ourselves anymore. We're attacking others that we feel threaten us. Primitive instinct. It's what drives war. Nothing more.

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

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 07:43:44 GMT

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

OK, SFE says that the US has never tortured anyone before... and yet John Kerry testified to the Senate that we did in Vietnam... make up your mind you propagandist moron.

George Bush is the President, not the "President" whether you like it or not. Not even your pathetic party contest the results of the election. You are just showing your stupidity and ignorance when you do that.

I think YOU have lost your privilege of talking to ME because you are completely unable to believe anything unless it's written by a left-wing nutjob.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 08:50:31 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiSo, I should blindly follow our leaders? No, I'm afraid that's entirely wrong. There must always remain the question in a democracy. I'm not perverting Mr. Jefferson's statement in the least. It's exactly what he meant, and the point remains. This blind "patriotism", if you can call it that, emanating from the Republican party disgusts me. Why am I a bad American? Because I chance a look at what our President does? Should I believe in what he does because you do? You obviously don't understand our political system in the least. If censorship of ideas comes, democracy leaves.

SFE, they are questioning people with known terrorist ties not just iraqis, music is harmless if you are strong of will, Along with sleep deprivation. I myself THIS MONTH went 4 days with NO sleep, now i would bet that the people in question didnt even have to go that long. You go a little loopy after four days, nothing major. And I do not suggest blindly following our leaders but just NOT to question them ALL the time, when you do, nothing gets done. And SuperFlyingEngi, your

a bad American because there is nothing patriotic in your views: no pride for America, no appreciation for your freedom, and nothing but whining like a little bitch about every little god damn thing Bush or the Republican party does.

Appreciation and Pride for your Country is the Greatest form of Patriotism. Thats just the way it is.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 14:35:03 GMT

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

NeoSaberSleep deprivation, uncomfortable seating, and wearing hoods so you can't see for a while don't count as torture to me. I don't know what's up with the dogs, which is what I was trying to point out. The article just claims "use of dogs" not that they attack people. I've read that dogs are used to scare people, without attacking, so without evidence to the contrary I'm going to consider that to be the case here. I don't consider barking dogs to be torture. A little scary maybe, but not torture.

You 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.

NeoSaberWhat happened at Abu Ghraib was abuse and torture. People being beaten and by some reports killed certainly qualifies as such. The people who did it are being punished. Those investigations and court martials were being carried out months before the story even "broke". The military even announced it, but since there weren't any pictures of the torture, no one in the media really listened. However, I don't see anything in this executive order Bush signed that authorized what happened there. Your initial post said Bush authorized torture, but the evidence you've cited says otherwise to me.

How 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.

NeoSaberIf there was a real cover up, documents would have been destroyed or never made to begin with. Keeping things secret for a time doesn't constitute a cover up. If I write myself a note and don't give it to anyone, I'm not covering it up. If I email a friend and don't announce the contents of the email to the world, I'm not covering things up. A lot of what the government does isn't released for years so current important information doesn't end up in the wrong hands. These documents weren't being "covered up" if they could get into the hands of the ACLU. They were probably just being shelved until the information in them was out of date.

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

CrimsonOK, SFE says that the US has never tortured anyone before... and yet John Kerry testified to the Senate that we did in Vietnam... make up your mind you propagandist moron.

George Bush is the President, not the "President" whether you like it or not. Not even your pathetic party contest the results of the election. You are just showing your stupidity and ignorance when you do that.

I think YOU have lost your privilege of talking to ME because you are completely unable to believe anything unless it's written by a left-wing nutjob.

Why, yes, Crimson, that's why the Vietnam war was a bad war as well and we should never have sent our troops into it.

We really need a new thread to contest the 2000 Florida election, of which could not have been a very clean election, since they never counted all the ballots. And this year, just a couple days ago some anarchist hacker guy testified on the floor of Congress that a Representative [R] from Florida had paid him to back into the electronic voting machines.

But let's save all that for another thread.

gbullSFE, they are questioning people with known terrorist ties not just iraqis, music is harmless if you are strong of will, Along with sleep deprivation. I myself THIS MONTH went 4 days with NO sleep, now i would bet that the people in question didnt even have to go that long. You go a little loopy after four days, nothing major. And I do not suggest blindly following our leaders but just NOT to question them ALL the time, when you do, nothing gets done. And SuperFlyingEngi, your a bad American because there is nothing patriotic in your views: no pride for America, no appreciation for your freedom, and nothing but whining like a little bitch about every little god damn thing Bush or the Republican party does.

Gbull, are you really saying that playing music incredibly loudly 24/7 doesn't amount to torture and that Iraqis are just sissies? Also, how do you know the people we are questioning have terrorist ties? You went 4 days in a row without sleeping? Somehow I feel to believe that. At all. And why do you bet the "people in question" didn't have to go that long? Why? WHYYYYYYYYYYYYYYY?! Alright, it's time for you all to shut up about the "He-Doesn't-Agree-With-Us-So-He's-Bad" There will always be a place for the questioner in American politics, and it will never, NEVER, be a wrong one. And I must continue with the most obvious shard of all for my beliefs, the one which you apparently are bluntly ignorant of, that Dissent is the highest form of patriotism.

I'm gonna go with T.J. before you. Sorry, that's the way the cookie crumbles.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 15:44:35 GMT

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

i have stayed up for 4 days straight several times. Im an insomniac, why do you think i am able to post so often on these forums? cuz i have no life? And yes, they are just sissies, and y do i think they have terrorist ties? BECAUSE THERE WOULD BE NO REASON FOR THE MILITARY TO

DETAIN THEM OTHERWISE. And i never said that just because you dont agree with me that your not a patriot, its the fact that you never ever show any amount of pride or appreciation for this country. All you do is complain and that makes you a Whiney little Bitch. Fact is, I can admit to some great things Democrats have done WHEN THEY DO THEM. You for your life would never admit anything good about the Republican party, or conservatives for that matter. The Fact is, u think methods everyone else uses is wrong u fucking hypocrite. The Military gets answers the way they do things, they dont pamper the detained because every moment they spend ATTEMPTING to get answers is a moment of time that an American Soldiers life could be lost because we didnt have that information. But then when that soldier dies, you wouldve bitched about that too and said it was Bush's fault for not getting intelligence fast enough. There is no winning with liberals if your not one.

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

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 16:48:29 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiYou have seen pictures from Abu Gharib of people being attacked by dogs, haven't you?

No, I haven't. I've seen pictures of people being SCARED by dogs. Typical. :rolleyes:

SFEWhy, yes, Crimson, that's why the Vietnam war was a bad war as well and we should never have sent our troops into it.

Well then don't say that we have "NEVER" tortured/abused anyone. :rolleyes: Geneva Convention doesn't even apply to non-uniformed enemies anyway.

SFEWe really need a new thread to contest the 2000 Florida election, of which could not have been a very clean election, since they never counted all the ballots. And this year, just a couple days ago some anarchist hacker guy testified on the floor of Congress that a Representative [R] from Florida had paid him to back into the electronic voting machines.

Oh PLEASE... this is so straightforward. You think "hmm it wasn't a legit election" in 2000, well, Bush managed to convince enough people he could do the job and being a Republican rules to WIN, completely, even with over 50% of the popular vote which Clinton couldn't accomplish. LET IT GO ALREADY.

SFEGbull, are you really saying that playing music incredibly loudly 24/7 doesn't amount to torture and that Iraqis are just sissies? Also, how do you know the people we are questioning have terrorist ties? You went 4 days in a row without sleeping? Somehow I feel to believe that. At all. And why do you bet the "people in question" didn't have to go that long? Why? WHYYYYYYYYYYYYYYY?! Alright, it's time for you all to shut up about the "He-Doesn't-Agree-With-Us-So-He's-Bad" There will always be a place for the questioner in American politics, and it will never, NEVER, be a wrong one. And I must continue with the most obvious shard of all for my beliefs, the one which you apparently are bluntly ignorant of, that Dissent is the highest form of patriotism.

I'm gonna go with T.J. before you. Sorry, that's the way the cookie crumbles.

Awwwww poor detainees were kept awake. My god, the ramifications will last for YEARS :rolleyes:.... you really lay it on thick, don't you. I should take a magnifying glass to all Clinton's little wars and usage of military. But Patron Saint Clinton never did ANYTHING wrong except lie to the world about getting his weiner sucked off, right? I mean, someone who is willing to not only cheat on their wife and not even have the balls to confess when he was caught never did anything wrong in his entire life except for that. :rolleyes:

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 16:55:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Whoa, you need to stop watching FOX news if you believe Iraqis are sissies. Until you can prove that these people were detained because they had reasonable terrorist ties, you can't go around trumpeting that they did. I love this country, you fool. George Bush is just the worst "President" certainly since Hoover. And yes, I do make a point of stating my opinions on something if I believe it to be wrong, because that's what people do in this democracy. Quite frankly, I would be much happier if Nixon weren't a puppet, Reagan hadn't gone senile in office, Bush Sr. hadn't barfed in the lap of the Japanese ambassador, and if Bush Jr. hadn't gotten our soldiers into this war and created an economic situation where the U.S. in a couple years is going to be slaughtered by inflation. Out of the whole bunch, Bush Sr. was probably the best. Oh, and if I may, what is hypocritical about believing the actions of others are incorrect? No, the military is in fact not supposed to subject people to torture, either physical or mental, since we signed the Geneva Convention. The Constitution defines all signed treaties as the Law of the Land, and Geneva is no exception. No, I would not be disgruntled if a soldier died because we did not torture people enough. I would be disgruntled if a soldier died in a war started with lies, lies lies. [Clue for the clueless: Weapons of Mass Destruction] Also, what substantial proof do you have to determine that we are really getting good information out of these people?

Finally, cursing doesn't make you seem any smarter.

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 17:02:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CrimsonNo, I haven't. I've seen pictures of people being SCARED by dogs. Typical. :rolleyes:

The one picture from Abu Gharib I've seen with a dog in it is where the dog is practically leaping on the guy and snapping at him.

CrimsonWell then don't say that we have "NEVER" tortured/abused anyone. :rolleyes: Geneva Convention doesn't even apply to non-uniformed enemies anyway.

Could you show me the section where the convention says that?

CrimsonOh PLEASE... this is so straightforward. You think "hmm it wasn't a legit election" in 2000, well, Bush managed to convince enough people he could do the job and being a Republican rules to WIN, completely, even with over 50% of the popular vote which Clinton couldn't accomplish. LET IT GO ALREADY.

But Gore had more of a popular vote in 2000... And it can't be proven that he convinced enough people because he got the conservative Supreme Court to not recount the ballots. But, please, let's stop this now and save it for another thread.

CrimsonAwwwww poor detainees were kept awake. My god, the ramifications will last for YEARS :rolleyes:.... you really lay it on thick, don't you. I should take a magnifying glass to all Clinton's little wars and usage of military. But Patron Saint Clinton never did ANYTHING wrong except lie to the world about getting his weiner sucked off, right? I mean, someone who is willing to not only cheat on their wife and not even have the balls to confess when he was caught never did anything wrong in his entire life except for that. :rolleyes:

It amounts to mental torture. That's how you mentally torture people.

Please, take a magnifying glass to all of Clinton's wars. Reagan too. Like how he MINED Nicaragua's harbor and sold weapons to al Qaeda and trained Osama. All those stinger missiles and stuff in Afghanistan right now? Reagan put them there.

Well, he more or less didn't do much wrong except have an affair with some lady which had no reflection WHATSOEVER on his performance in the office of president, but was merely something the press, desperate for some news to attack him on, picked up like crazy animals. And the Republicans in Congress were no better. And now we get news that George Bush may well have lied about TORTURING PEOPLE, and the media is dead silent. Yes, very liberal of them.

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.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 22:15:37 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonNo, I haven't. I've seen pictures of people being SCARED by dogs. Typical. :rolleyes:

The one picture from Abu Gharib I've seen with a dog in it is where the dog is practically leaping on the guy and snapping at him.

CrimsonWell then don't say that we have "NEVER" tortured/abused anyone. :rolleyes: Geneva Convention doesn't even apply to non-uniformed enemies anyway.

Could you show me the section where the convention says that?

CrimsonOh PLEASE... this is so straightforward. You think "hmm it wasn't a legit election" in 2000, well, Bush managed to convince enough people he could do the job and being a Republican rules to WIN, completely, even with over 50% of the popular vote which Clinton couldn't accomplish. LET IT GO ALREADY.

But Gore had more of a popular vote in 2000... And it can't be proven that he convinced enough people because he got the conservative Supreme Court to not recount the ballots. But, please, let's stop this now and save it for another thread.

CrimsonAwwwww poor detainees were kept awake. My god, the ramifications will last for YEARS :rolleyes:.... you really lay it on thick, don't you. I should take a magnifying glass to all Clinton's little wars and usage of military. But Patron Saint Clinton never did ANYTHING wrong except lie to the world about getting his weiner sucked off, right? I mean, someone who is willing to not only cheat on their wife and not even have the balls to confess when he was caught never did anything wrong in his entire life except for that. :rolleyes:

It amounts to mental torture. That's how you mentally torture people.

Please, take a magnifying glass to all of Clinton's wars. Reagan too. Like how he MINED Nicaragua's harbor and sold weapons to al Qaeda and trained Osama. All those stinger missiles and stuff in Afghanistan right now? Reagan put them there.

Well, he more or less didn't do much wrong except have an affair with some lady which had no reflection WHATSOEVER on his performance in the office of president, but was merely something the press, desperate for some news to attack him on, picked up like crazy animals. And the Republicans in Congress were no better. And now we get news that George Bush may well have lied about TORTURING PEOPLE, and the media is dead silent. Yes, very liberal of them. You know what? YOU CAN TAKE A FUCKING 10 FOOT POLE AND SHOVE IT ALL THE WAY UP YOUR FUCKING ASS UNTIL IT COMES OUT OF YOUR MOUTH.

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 22:26:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

EXAMPLE:

be. Lord Moore said it, so it must be so. Bush stole the election, and that's just the way it is.

Now that Lord Moore and the Infallible Church of the ACLU have told you to believe that Bush authorized "torture" (of which, by the way, you have a very pussified definition, but I'll get to that later), it must be true, and there is no contesting it.

Moving on....

Quote:Well, how about you READ the document and decide for yourself?

Oh, and the Geneva Convention CLEARLY outlines that we will not torture people and the Constitution CLEARLY outlines that all signed treaties are the law of the land. Americans are not somehow more "godly" or more deserving to live than non-Americans. We're all people. Get it through your conservative skull.

You obviously never read the Geneva Convention before, or you'd know that terrorists get absolutely no protection under it whatsoever.

I'm amazed how you have claimed in the past to be more "open-minded" than conservatives, then you imply that all conservatives are white-supremacists. Not very open-minded, is it?

You really showed those racist Republicans how open-minded you are! Great job in showing just how much of a hypocrite you are! :thumbsup:

Quote:Cowmisfit:

I suppose you chose to go with the latter.

I don't know why I'm wasting my time on such a pathetic case, but I don't have much to do right now. First, my parents. Both got above a 1400 on their SATs, and my dad regularly works side by side with the top scientific brains in the physics textbook industry as a chief development editor. [Clue for the clueless: Important role.] You also can't declare your pretend lala belief that my parents are below the average intelligence level to rest within the level of "fact."

Proof, ladies and gentlemen, that you can be incredibly book-smart but at the same time have no common sense.

Quote:Now, why do I hate America? Because I don't blindly follow our "leaders" like you do? No, that's why I love America. Again, I reiterate:

"Dissent is the highest form of patriotism" -Thomas Jefferson

The reason we all say you hate America is you're always willing to blame America first for its problems. Before the war ever started, you said it was America's fault for Saddam being there in the first place. You said it was America's fault for giving weapons to the terrorists to fight the Soviets twenty years ago. You said it was America's fault for pissing the terrorists off in the first place.

It's always America that's the belligerent country, isn't it, SuperFlyingLiberalTool? It's never the other side that is actually causing the problem, is it? It's America's fault that more than a thousand soldiers died in Iraq. It can't possibly be the terrorists' fault, even though they were the ones who were setting off the bombs and firing the AK-47s.

Oh, wait, Ted Kennedy says it's America's fault for the war. I forgot; Lord Kennedy of the Kennedy dynasty is always right. My apologies.

[quote]Now, I'm betting you no Arab fundamentalist fighters are reading Renegade Forums to listen to bitches like you.[quote]

:rolleyes:

That wasn't his point, and you know it.

Quote:I care for our soldiers. Don't say I don't.

No, you don't. You care more about the well-being of the terrorists than you do our own soldiers. This thread is a perfect example.

Here you are, bitching about how we're keeping the terrorists up all night to obtain information from them that can be vital to the survival of an entire squad of soldiers (I'll delve deeper into this issue later on). If you truly cared about the well-being of our soldiers, you would step back and let the interrogators do their job and get every little bit of information out of the captured terrorists as possible.

Quote:I don't want them in this war. I want every one of them out of the Middle East right now. I never wanted any of them to be there. I never did, wanted, would, want or ever will want ANY of our soldiers to be hurt.

Here's where you go completely off the deep-end.

In case you haven't noticed, WE'RE IN THERE ALREADY, and now that we're in there, WE CAN'T JUST UP AND LEAVE, OR THE IRAQI PEOPLE WOULD BE ROYALLY FUCKED OVER!!!

Do you want us to build a fucking time machine and prevent the Iraq war from ever happening so Saddam can go back to torturing and murdering his own people? I thought your father, being the brilliant physicist he is, already taught you that time travel is impossible....

We can't leave now that we're in, and if you actually did care about our soldiers, you'd stop being such a hypocrite and let the interrogators do their job. If they have to keep terrorists up all night listening to the fucking Barney song in order to get them to spill their guts about where a terrorist weapons cache is, well Clintondamn it, let them!

Quote:j-balls430:

First topic: One of the stupidest things I've ever heard. The vast majority of the populace probably never once wrote a complaint to their officials, because they just don't care that much.

You're kidding, right? Did you just completely miss the multitudes of protests, both anti- and pro-war, going on around the country when the first tomahawks were landing in Baghdad? You do realize that protests are one way of letting your elected officials know where you stand on a particular issue, right?

If they're willing to go out on a weekend and protest, they're probably motivated enough to write a simple letter to their elected politicians.

See, this is that "common sense" thing I told you about. You wouldn't know what exactly common sense is, though, since Ted Kennedy never said you could have any.

Quote:And those in positions of public office aren't going to vote against any more money for our troops, they're going to vote against our troops being in active combat if the populace demands it. If the citizens of the United States believe our soldiers are in an unjust war, then they can bring them out of the unjust war. Although, since a big chunk of voters on election day were voting on "moral values," your group obviously doesn't care.

No, you only believe that the majority of voters voted on moral values because that's what you've been told to believe.

The majority of voters actually voted because of the War on Terror. Nice try pinning the blame on those bastard Christians who still carry some amount of morals, though.

Quote:Terrorists and soldiers aren't the same thing. And that still doesn't justify torture. Are you saying it does? You're wrong. Read the article.

You actually think we're torturing people in Iraq? Look at what Saddam did to his own people in the underground rape rooms. That's torture. You're comparing that to sleep deprivation? Where the hell is your common fucking sense?

Quote:Nope, still wrong. The United States does not torture anyone. Well, until "President" Bush, we didn't.

Yet, you believed John Kerry when he said we were torturing civilians in Vietnam. :rolleyes:

Hypocrisy just naturally rolls right off of your fingertips onto your keyboard, doesn't it?

Quote:No, I got this tidbit from a blog site independent of the ACLU.

And you say Fox News isn't a reliable source.... :rolleyes:

Quote:Oh, so we should go to their land and then kill them before we can kill us because in your eyes it's the best thing to do? How quaint.

I'm assuming you meant to say, "they can kill us...."

Typos aside, this could be one of the most outrageous remarks you have ever made. Are you saying you want our troops to wait to be shot at first before they can get off the first shot? You do realize an American soldier can be killed by that first shot, right?

How far away from reality can your mind possibly be???

And you say you care about our troops....

Quote:Also, this article is implying that Bush lied about whether or not he knew about torture in the Middle East.

The key word here is "implying." You're taking an article, published by a biased source about a ridiculous case, that makes an accusation of the Bush administration and making it into an absolute truth.

I certainly hope I don't have to point your error here; it's hopefully obvious enough for even you.

Quote:If we're going to be doing to them what Saddam did to them, shouldn't we at least know about it?

I thought your other comments were outrageous, but this remark certainly takes the cake.

I'll post that USA Today article for you again.

For you to even think for one second that what we're doing to interrogate the captured terrorists is even comparable to the torture Saddam forced upon his own people that is plainly exemplified in that report is completely out-of-line and utterly stupid.

Quote:Icedog, read this ACLU article. Then read the documents if you want to. Then think for yourself. Reading and then thinking is the recipe for success.

That's funny. You're telling someone to think for himself when not a single original political thought that might run counter to the goals of the Democratic Party. Most Republicans here can give an example of at least one issue on which they disagree with George W. Bush, whereas you, even when directly challenged by myself, have not ever given one single example of any issue with which you disagree with the general stance of the Democratic Party.

It is you who needs to try thinking for yourself once in a while.

Quote:What situation? The situation of having an opinion? Am I stupid for holding one contrary to an "elected" official, namely "President" Bush? Are you so pro-Republican that you can't stand to see anyone doubt their candidates?

The situation of not having a single independent political thought in your entire body.

See? There you go again, putting "President" in quotation marks again.

Are you so pro-Democrat that you can't stand to see anyone disagree with any holy decree Pope Al Gore makes about George W. Bush?

Thank you for proving my point for me! That makes my job so much easier!

Quote:And keep your slanderous forked tongue within the confines of your oral cavity.

Ah, slandering him while accusing him of slandering you, are we?

Isn't that something a hypocrite would do, generally?

Quote:warranto:

Well, this is only the tip of a potential iceberg. Right now the ACLU has a big stack of documents [available for review at the bottom of that article] that they presented to a judge to see whether or not an executive order has to be released and whether or not it must be determined if there was one.

Don't be mistaken, this story hasn't resolved yet, but there is an enormous amount of evidence to suggest what is about to come.

This all goes back to the ACLU's, and your, definition of "torture." Like I said earlier, you have a very pussified definition. You actually believe keeping the terrorists up all night listening to the Barney song is actually torture. What the hell do you want us to do, put lounge chairs in their jail cells and feed them fucking filet mignon for dinner each day? Do you think that will convince any

one of them to talk?

If we can't make them (gasp!) uncomfortable, how the hell do you expect us to get any information out of them? Ask them nicely? Get down on our knees and beg for the information? These were fuckers who, just a day ago, were trying to kill us! How can you not understand that these terrorists could hold vital information to weapons cache locations, locations of terrorist leaders, and anything else that might prevent the loss of an American soldier's life?

Why the hell aren't you willing to make these bastards "uncomfortable" in order to get them to spill their guts with information?

You want torture? Go back two years to one of those torture rooms in Baghdad described in that USA Today article. THAT is torture. This staying up all night bullshit? Not even comparable.

Just out of curiosity, where was your outrage when Ali Kaddam Kardom was being beaten, refrigerated naked and held underground for being a Shiite?

Quote:I find it quite comforting to myself that I use bigger words than most of you while being of a younger age. Also, technically, you aren't hearing me, but merely seeing the text I print.

Ooo, you can use big words and take what he said literally! You're so much smarter than the rest of us! All bow down to the incredible intellect of SuperFlyingLiberalTool!!!

Typical liberal elitism; coming from this guy, is anyone surprised?

Quote:The ACLU's objective is to assure that the Bill of Rights is upheld

HA! You actually believe that bullshit??? After their assault on Christianity, protection of the "rights" of NAMBLA, and loads of other ridiculous stories, you can honestly say they're trying to uphold the Bill of Rights???

How the hell do you sleep at night???

Quote:not install a new economic system into the United States. Is this about those court cases where government offices are putting on Christmas displays? Because that and banning Christianity aren't exactly the same thing, you know.

DarkDemin, I ask you, what good is it if we go into a country claiming to end the regime of a torturer, and then start torturing people while saying we're not? How much better are we than Saddam then?

Once again, we are not torturing people in the more logical sense the term is usually used (not the sense in which you use it, mind you, since, by your definition, the only way we have to interrogate terrorists is begging).

Look at Saddam's regime to see real torture. Abu Ghraib hardly measures up to the shit Saddam did.

Quote:Not all Arabs are terrorists, you know.

Once again, assuming all conservatives are white-supremacists. How open-minded of you!

Quote:And here we go again with your Republican "Americans are more important than other races..." talk. I can't stand it.

You have the most narrow-minded view of Republicans I have ever seen. For your own sake, do not ever claim you are more open-minded than Republicans, or you will only cement yourself as a hypocrite.

Quote: We invaded their country, and dropped so many bombs more or less all of them know someone personal that we have killed. That's why they hate us and our soldiers and our people, not because of our "freedoms" or any stupid reason like that.
There are so many things wrong with those two sentences, I don't know where to begin.

Okay, in response to the first sentence: there are 26 million Iraqis living in Iraq. It's absurd to think that each and every one of them knew someone killed by U.S. forces when a.) we didn't even invade each and every square inch of the entire country and b.) civilian casualties were minimal at the start and are still minimal with the continuing operations.

I find it funny how you spout how supportive of our troops you say you are when here you're accusing them, the most well-trained soldiers in the entire world, of accidentally or deliberately killing millions of innocent Iraqi civilians.
You support our soldiers while calling them baby-killers.
Yeah, and you're not a hypocrite. :rolleyes:

In response to the second sentence: firstly, you have a grossly overstated view of just how many Iraqis are really fighting us in Iraq right now. As of now, major fighting is occurring in only four of the fourteen total provinces in Iraq. In all, about 5% of the total Iraqi population never wanted us in there to remove Saddam in the first place and are currently aiding the terrorists in their efforts to get us out of there now.
Secondly, if they hadn't hated us for our freedoms and other "stupid" reasons like that, they wouldn't have flown two jets into the World Trade Center twin towers (no, asshole, I'm not saying Saddam had anything to do with that attack) in the first place. We weren't invading any countries before 9/11. How do you explain those attacks? Oh, wait, that's right, it was caused by the U.S.'s presence on Middle Eastern sand and George W. Bush's refusal to do anything about them before they happened, so sayeth the almighty Howard Dean, the soon-to-be Chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

A Democratic politician says it, so it must be true. My mistake.

Quote: When did a thesaurus come into play?
When you substitute short words with longer words in a failed effort to make yourself appear more intelligent as a result of your massive superiority complex.

Quote: "Listening to dogs" is one way of putting being attacked by them.
Listening to doggies barking! *Gasp* The horror!

Quote: Those are all torture methods designed to make people lose their minds. It is still torture, don't pretend it's not.
We'll muzzle the dogs when the terrorists start talking. Until then, they can keep on barkin'.

To a common sensical person, that's not torture, and you're being too overprotective of the terrorists' well-being. They're fucking terrorists! They deserve to be hung up by their balls and

burned with soldering irons, but you know what? We don't use interrogation tactics like those. We're better than that.

However, there are still some methods that must be employed in order to make the bastards talk, but we have never gone as far as Saddam's torture methods have gone.

Quote:I'm sure you saw those pictures from Abu Gharib. Do you believe it counts as humane action?

Not a single person here is saying we should employ the methods used at Abu Ghraib to interrogate the captured terrorists. Though putting women's panties on the heads of captured Iraqi terrorists doesn't amount to shoving rats up the anuses of Iraqi prisoners to have them die from internal bleeding (yes, that was an actual torture method employed by Saddam's regime), it was certainly over-the-line, excessive, and completely unnecessary.

I still don't know where your outrage over those rats being shoved up people's asses is, though.

Quote:We went into Iraq first under false claims of weapons of mass destruction which we now KNOW are not there
Stop talking before you embarass yourself more.

What, exactly, was all that, um, whatchacallit, oh yeah, sarin stuff the Polish troops found a few months ago? Isn't that sarin stuff a weapon of mass destruction? Didn't they also just recently find some more of that stuff in the trunk of a car in Fallujah?

Oh, wait, that must've been a new flavor of jell-o or something. Silly me. I should tell my mom to buy me some sarin jell-o next time she's at the grocery store.

Quote:and then started pretending we went in for humanitarian reasons, which is not at all how war was justified, where we claim to be removing a torturer. But now, we're torturing people and pretending we're not. Not very humanitarian, if you ask me.
I warned you about embarassing yourself....

Quote:Yes, it is a coverup. These documents were all leaked. Right now, the ACLU is suing to ascertain whether or not there was an executive order condoning torture, of which the administration is apparently trying to cover up.
Condoning your pussified version of torture, probably, yes. In the common sensical version of the word, no.

Quote:Well, no, it doesn't surprise me either, because that was the reason stated by so many during the exit polls.
Um, no, it was actually the War on Terror/the war in Iraq.

As I said before, you're just trying to pin Bush's win on those evil Christians and their "morals" going out in droves to vote against the "rights of the sexually-challenged man."
Well, hey, that's what Ted Kennedy said, at least, and Mr. Kennedy is always right, remember?

Quote:So, I should blindly follow our leaders?
You already do, unless you don't consider nearly half of both houses of Congress to be considered leaders.

Quote:No, I'm afraid that's entirely wrong. There must always remain the question in a democracy. I'm not perverting Mr. Jefferson's statement in the least. It's exactly what he meant, and the point remains. This blind "patriotism", if you can call it that, emanating from the Republican party disgusts me.

Yeah, because loving one's country and willing to do whatever it takes to defend it is such a foreign concept to you.

This blind anti-everything-Bush-does-since-he-can't-do-anything-right sentiment emanating from you and the Democratic Party disgusts me.

Quote:Why am I a bad American? Because I chance a look at what our President does? Should I believe in what he does because you do? ... If censorship of ideas comes, democracy leaves. Who the hell is trying to censor you? He wasn't saying you couldn't disagree with the actions taken by the head-of-state, just that in your blind hatred of every little thing done by George W. Bush, you begin hating your own country, which is the opposite of patriotism.

Quote:You obviously don't understand our political system in the least. Don't make me laugh. The same can be said of you.

Quote:You 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.

Geez, again with the pussified version of "torture!" Why is your definition of the word so watered down?

Once again, we'll muzzle the mutt when he spills his guts.

Going by your ridiculous definition, a parent spanking his child or putting him in time-out because he did something bad amounts to fucking torture!!!

Be sure to ask Santa for some common sense this Christmas (that is, if you celebrate Christmas; I wouldn't be surprised if you became an atheist just to make sure you don't offend anyone by celebrating the birth of your lord and saviour, Jesus Christ (well, to normal people it'd be Jesus Christ; to you, it'd be Bill Clinton)).

Quote:How do you know what's in the executive order if you haven't seen it? How do you know there's an executive order when there is no evidence to prove the existence of one?

Quote: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.

No, not really.

Did you even read the documents attached to the article? Out of the 15 I read, they make no references to any executive order whatsoever!

Don't you understand that it's all speculation in an attempt to tarnish Bush's reputation?

Oh, wait, that's right, a prominent Democratic "public interest" group says it, so it must be true. I'm sorry, I forgot to blindly accept everything the ACLU puts out.

Quote:Why, yes, Crimson, that's why the Vietnam war was a bad war as well and we should never have sent our troops into it.

You recognize your own hypocrisy! Good job! :thumbsup:

Quote:We really need a new thread to contest the 2000 Florida election, of which could not have been a very clean election, since they never counted all the ballots. And this year, just a couple days ago some anarchist hacker guy testified on the floor of Congress that a Representative [R] from Florida had paid him to back into the electronic voting machines.

You've embarrassed yourself enough in this post. I don't really need to help you embarrass yourself any further.

Quote:Gbull, are you really saying that playing music incredibly loudly 24/7 doesn't amount to torture

You know Clintondamn well it doesn't!

Quote:Also, how do you know the people we are questioning have terrorist ties?

...Do you HONESTLY have to ask that question?????

You're more a tool than I thought!!!

Quote:You went 4 days in a row without sleeping? Somehow I feel to believe that. At all. And why do you bet the "people in question" didn't have to go that long? Why? WHYYYYYYYYYYYYYYY?! Because maybe after three days they decided to spill their guts about where to find their terror cell leader. Did it ever occur to you that sleep deprivation might actually WORK?

Quote:Alright, it's time for you all to shut up about the "He-Doesn't-Agree-With-Us-So-He's-Bad" There will always be a place for the questioner in American politics, and it will never, NEVER, be a wrong one. And I must continue with the most obvious shard of all for my beliefs, the one which you apparently are bluntly ignorant of, that Dissent is the highest form of patriotism.

No one is saying you can't question the actions of the President; you just happen to disagree with every little thing he does, and your arguments are making us believe you hate your own country since you're so quick to blame America first in any foreign conflict.

Quote:Whoa, you need to stop watching FOX news if you believe Iraqis are sissies. Until you can prove that these people were detained because they had reasonable terrorist ties, you can't go around trumpeting that they did.

...Again, do you HONESTLY have to ask this question???

They were captured on the field of battle fighting for the terrorists!!! IS THAT NOT "REASONABLE" ENOUGH FOR YOU??????????

Quote:I love this country, you fool.

Like hell you do. Why can't you ever admit that America is in the right for once? Why does

America always have to be the first one blamed to you?

Quote:George Bush is just the worst "President" certainly since Hoover. And yes, I do make a point of stating my opinions on something if I believe it to be wrong, because that's what people do in this democracy. Quite frankly, I would be much happier if Nixon weren't a puppet, Reagan hadn't gone senile in office, Bush Sr. hadn't barfed in the lap of the Japanese ambassador, and if Bush Jr. hadn't gotten our soldiers into this war

Typical. You name four Republican presidents and point out one bad quality in each. Nevermind that Nixon negotiated the end of the Vietnam War. Nevermind that Reagan brought about the fall of the Berlin Wall. Nevermind that Bush Sr. oversaw the fall of the Soviet Union (though it began during Reagan's term).

And, of course, nevermind that Bush Jr. freed at least 50 million Iraqis and Afghans and is leading the War on Terror in the best way possible.

Can't name a single bad thing Clinton did in office, can you? Lord Kennedy wouldn't approve!

Quote:and created an economic situation where the U.S. in a couple years is going to be slaughtered by inflation.

You know nothing about economics. Stop acting like you do.

Quote:Out of the whole bunch, Bush Sr. was probably the best. Oh, and if I may, what is hypocritical about believing the actions of others are incorrect? No, the military is in fact not supposed to subject people to torture, either physical or mental, since we signed the Geneva Convention. The Constitution defines all signed treaties as the Law of the Land, and Geneva is no exception.

As I said before, terrorists get no coverage under the Geneva Convention. We can technically do whatever the hell we want with them.

Quote:No, I would not be disgruntled if a soldier died because we did not torture people enough. Yeah, because the well-being of the terrorists is so much more important than the lives of our soldiers.

Either stop complaining about how badly we're "torturing" the FUCKING TERRORISTS to prevent the loss of troop lives or stop saying you care about our troops' well-being, you hypocrite.

Quote:I would be disgruntled if a soldier died in a war started with lies, lies lies. [Clue for the clueless: Weapons of Mass Destruction]

Clue for the fucking blind: WE FOUND WEAPONS OF FUCKING MASS DESTRUCTION!!!

We did NOT start the war with "lies, lies, lies" like Lord Ted Kennedy will have to you believe.

Now that we're there, we cannot leave! Get that through your thick skull!!!

Quote:Also, what substantial proof do you have to determine that we are really getting good information out of these people?

Do you honestly think civilians would have access to most likely classified information obtained from those interrogations?

You're gettin desperate, aren't you?

Quote:Finally, cursing doesn't make you seem any smarter.
Neither does acting like you're better than everyone else.

My Clinton, I have never seen someone with a superiority complex as big as yours.

Quote:The one picture from Abu Gharib I've seen with a dog in it is where the dog is practically leaping on the guy and snapping at him.
Your point?

Quote:But Gore had more of a popular vote in 2000...
You say Gbull doesn't know anything about our political proces....

We use the electoral college to elect our presidents. The popular vote is literally meaningless.
Crimson just mentioned the popular vote to make a point that you obviously missed.

Quote:And it can't be proven that he convinced enough people because he got the conservative Supreme Court to not recount the ballots. But, please, let's stop this now and save it for another thread.
CONSERVATIVE Supreme Court? At THAT point in time? What reality are you living in, boy?
You are such a tool!

Quote:It amounts to mental torture. That's how you mentally torture people.
Once... again... use the common sensical definition of "torture," not your, "Ouch! He thumped me on the head with his finger! TORTURE!!!!"

Quote>Please, take a magnifying glass to all of Clinton's wars. Reagan too. Like how he MINED Nicaragua's harbor and sold weapons to al Qaeda and trained Osama. All those stinger missiles and stuff in Afghanistan right now? Reagan put them there.

Well, he more or less didn't do much wrong except have an affair with some lady which had no reflection WHATSOEVER on his performance in the office of president, but was merely something the press, desperate for some news to attack him on, picked up like crazy animals. And the Republicans in Congress were no better. And now we get news that George Bush may well have lied about TORTURING PEOPLE, and the media is dead silent. Yes, very liberal of them.
Yeah, you keep believing that. I wouldn't want to tarnish the image of your god, William Clinton.

It's obvious that you can't deviate away from the mainstream Democratic Party's platform at all, can you, SuperFlyingLiberalTool?

You've shown yourself to be nothing but a hypocrite and a tool of the Democratic Party.
I honestly cannot understand why you persist in posting anything political in this forum at all since it just turns out to be the same mindless hypocritical dribble we've heard time and again from you.
What's more, you profess to have this open-minded view of the world when your view of conservatives is more narrow-minded than Osama Bin Laden's view of the United States.
You're always willing to blame the United States before anyone else, even when it's in the right!
I find it funny how you call upon others to think for themselves when you yourself have not a

single independent thought in your entire body.

You come in here with your superiority complex and act better than the rest of us, and you don't hesitate to point out just how much better when the opportunity presents itself, as you have done in this thread alone. Have you no class?

Every single post you have made in this single thread alone is nothing but a repeat of the same crap we hear from Ted Kennedy, Michael Moore, etc. and quite frankly, I'm tired of it all. Learn to think for yourself, kid, or you'll only continue to embarrass yourself with your hypocrisy.

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

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 10:47:30 GMT

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

/me applauds loudly. Bravo, hydra! I read that whole thing, it was a brilliant dissection of the stereotypical liberal. It's kinda nice to have a perfect example of a Democrat soldier right here in our own forums to play with, isn't it?

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 13:14:19 GMT

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

hydra1945 > SuperFlyingEngi

damn dude.....geez.....o man.....hey...Super?.....how does it feel to be proven wrong over and over and over and damn....I dont know how to describe this...O YEA!

OWNED

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 14:34:23 GMT

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

Quote:You obviously never read the Geneva Convention before, or you'd know that terrorists get absolutely no protection under it whatsoever.

Except, of course for this provision...

Quote:PART I

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1

The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect and to ensure respect for the present Convention in all circumstances.

and...

Quote:Clue for the fucking blind: WE FOUND WEAPONS OF FUCKING MASS DESTRUCTION!!!

We did NOT start the war with "lies, lies, lies" like Lord Ted Kennedy will have to you believe.

Now that we're there, we cannot leave! Get that through your thick skull!!!

WMDs were found prior to the war starting? As well, I thought the war was to free Iraq, and the "found" WMDs were simply a bonus that could be used to justify an illegal invasion.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 14:38:23 GMT

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

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 15:25:34 GMT

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

The fact that you belittle the successes of the war is disgusting warranto. He makes a point that we found WMDs and you try to make that into a bad thing...bravo, take a seat next to the other Mindless Drone.

Geneva Conventions

ARTICLE 13

Prisoners of war must at all times be humanely treated. Any unlawful act or omission by the Detaining Power causing death or seriously endangering the health of a prisoner of war in its custody is prohibited, and will be regarded as a serious breach of the present Convention. In particular, no prisoner of war may be subjected to physical mutilation or to medical or scientific experiments of any kind which are not justified by the medical, dental or hospital treatment of the prisoner concerned and carried out in his interest.

Likewise, prisoners of war must at all times be protected, particularly against acts of violence or intimidation and against insults and public curiosity.

Measures of reprisal against prisoners of war are prohibited.

You fail to see that ensuring Mental Stability is in no place in this article. And lack of sleep, playing music, barking dogs, and sitting on the floor can hardly be deemed: "seriously endangering the health of the prisoner."

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 18:31:14 GMT

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

warrantoExcept, of course for this provision...

Quote:PART I

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1

The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect and to ensure respect for the present Convention in all circumstances.
Not really.

The incredibly flawed Geneva Convention doesn't even address the proper treatment for captured terrorists. Hell, it doesn't even address terrorists in general!

They certainly don't count as prisoners of war, as you should know, because they don't meet the requirements explicitly put forth in article 4 quoted here (I highlighted key points of the article):

Quote:Article 4

A. Prisoners of war, in the sense of the present Convention, are persons belonging to one of the following categories, who have fallen into the power of the enemy:

1. Members of the armed forces of a Party to the conflict as well as members of militias or volunteer corps forming part of such armed forces.
2. Members of other militias and members of other volunteer corps, including those of organized resistance movements, belonging to a Party to the conflict and operating in or outside their own territory, even if this territory is occupied, provided that such militias or volunteer corps, including such organized resistance movements, fulfil the following conditions:
 - (a) That of being commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates;
 - (b) That of having a fixed distinctive sign recognizable at a distance;
 - (c) That of carrying arms openly;
 - (d) That of conducting their operations in accordance with the laws and customs of war.

3. Members of regular armed forces who profess allegiance to a government or an authority not recognized by the Detaining Power.

4. Persons who accompany the armed forces without actually being members thereof, such as civilian members of military aircraft crews, war correspondents, supply contractors, members of labour units or of services responsible for the welfare of the armed forces, provided that they have received authorization from the armed forces which they accompany, who shall provide them for that purpose with an identity card similar to the annexed model.

5. Members of crews, including masters, pilots and apprentices, of the merchant marine and the crews of civil aircraft of the Parties to the conflict, who do not benefit by more favourable treatment under any other provisions of international law.

6. Inhabitants of a non-occupied territory, who on the approach of the enemy spontaneously take up arms to resist the invading forces, without having had time to form themselves into regular armed units, provided they carry arms openly and respect the laws and customs of war.

B. The following shall likewise be treated as prisoners of war under the present Convention:

1. Persons belonging, or having belonged, to the armed forces of the occupied country, if the occupying Power considers it necessary by reason of such allegiance to intern them, even though it has originally liberated them while hostilities were going on outside the territory it occupies, in particular where such persons have made an unsuccessful attempt to rejoin the armed forces to which they belong and which are engaged in combat, or where they fail to comply with a summons made to them with a view to internment.

2. The persons belonging to one of the categories enumerated in the present Article, who have been received by neutral or non-belligerent Powers on their territory and whom these Powers are required to intern under international law, without prejudice to any more favourable treatment which these Powers may choose to give and with the exception of Articles 8, 10, 15, 30, fifth paragraph, 58-67, 92, 126 and, where diplomatic relations exist between the Parties to the conflict and the neutral or non-belligerent Power concerned, those Articles concerning the Protecting Power. Where such diplomatic relations exist, the Parties to a conflict on whom these persons depend shall be allowed to perform towards them the functions of a Protecting Power as provided in the present Convention, without prejudice to the functions which these Parties normally exercise in conformity with diplomatic and consular usage and treaties.

As you can well see, these captured terrorists hardly count for prisoners of war.

How does the almighty Geneva Convention tell us we should treat captured terrorists, then? If it has the answer to all possible circumstances, how can it be applied in this situation?

The answer is it can't since it doesn't even mention the proper treatment of terrorists.

SuperFlyingLiberalTool was saying the terrorists get coverage under the Geneva Convention, when upon examination of the actual document, they don't. Way to nitpick at a specific point of my post while completely ignoring the general point I was trying to make, though.

Quote:Quote:Clue for the fucking blind: WE FOUND WEAPONS OF FUCKING MASS DESTRUCTION!!!

We did NOT start the war with "lies, lies, lies" like Lord Ted Kennedy will have to you believe.

Now that we're there, we cannot leave! Get that through your thick skull!!!

WMDs were found prior to the war starting? As well, I thought the war was to free Iraq, and the "found" WMDs were simply a bonus that could be used to justify an illegal invasion. Sarin-flavored jell-o, anyone? I found some over in Iraq; it's mighty tasty! It was in a box with wrapping paper around it with a card on it that says, "To Osama; Love, Saddam; Happy Ramadan!"

WMDs were found; there is no denying it, Warranto. They were found in Iraq and date back to years before Saddam's regime ever fell.

One of the reasons the war was waged was because Saddam did not freely hand over his weapons of mass destruction that we knew he had, not because we couldn't find any. It was partly in an effort to enforce the flawed international law that you so closely cling to.

Javacx*insert smartass smiley post here*

Laugh all you want. It doesn't change the fact he was nitpicking at specific points of my post while seeming to ignore the general point of it.

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]bravo, take a seat next to the other Mindless Drone.

On the contrary, Warranto is one of the liberals here that I can actually respect. Though we may differ in our views on a great many subjects, he is an independent thinker and not married to one party or the other (he's not even American, so why should he be married to an American political party?).

Unlike SuperFlyingLiberalTool, he can actually think for himself and doesn't need to be told how to think. That's why I respect his views more than SuperFlyingLiberalTool.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 19:37:17 GMT

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

I suppose....perhaps i was a little too hasty to judge him like i do "Mr. Left" himself. Prolly cuz I have been hearing nothing but the most extreme of liberal bullshit for the last 2 days. I owe you an apology warranto, Im Sorry I called you a mindless Drone. I dont take back what I said to SuperFlyingEni tho, he represents the Democratic party like the Taliban does to Islam.

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

Posted by [xptek](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 20:12:13 GMT

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

Nice Hydra!

SuperFlyingFungi == pwned.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 23:09:33 GMT

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

Rather than requote all that, I'll just point out the parts.

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.

Quote:WMDs were found; there is no denying it, Warranto. They were found in Iraq and date back to years before Saddam's regime ever fell.

One of the reasons the war was waged was because Saddam did not freely hand over his weapons of mass destruction that we knew he had, not because we couldn't find any. It was partly in an effort to enforce the flawed international law that you so closely cling to.

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.

Quote:It doesn't change the fact he was nitpicking at specific points of my post while seeming to ignore the general point of it.

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.

Quote:The fact that you belittle the successes of the war is disgusting warranto.

I'm not belittling the success of the war, I support the war (the timing of the war is another thing though, but that is beside the point), that doesn't make it any less than I have stated it as such.

Quote: And lack of sleep, playing music, barking dogs, and sitting on the floor can hardly be deemed: "seriously endangering the health of the prisoner."

Take a psychology course, and perhaps you'll think differently. These seemingly menial things can have a profound impact on a prisoners health. Both mental and physical. Over the short term, not so much, but over a period of time, most definitely. Of course, the context as to how these methods are being enacted upon them must also be taken into account.

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.

Edit: Quote:On the contrary, Warranto is one of the liberals here that I can actually respect. Though we may differ in our views on a great many subjects, he is an independent thinker and not married to one party or the other (he's not even American, so why should he be married to an American political party?).

Unlike SuperFlyingLiberalTool, he can actually think for himself and doesn't need to be told how to think. That's why I respect his views more than SuperFlyingLiberalTool.

Thanks, I think.

Though I'm not a "liberal" as is usually defined by people here. I'm more along the lines of "ensure what's right is understood prior to arguing for the wrong reasons". If "what's right" happens to be a liberal view, so be it. But if it happens to be a left or right view, well then, so be it.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 23:23:02 GMT

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

I want to make sure u see this warranto, cuz i feel pretty bad about it.

gbulll owe you an apology warranto, Im Sorry I called you a mindless Drone

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 23:31:09 GMT

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

meh, no harm no foul.

I'm quite easy on the insults unless they're persistent.

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

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 23:40:17 GMT

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

Javaxcx

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 23:48:29 GMT

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

k, kewl beans.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 00:48:18 GMT

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

SFE = pwnt on a forum, thats pretty bad.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 01:03:20 GMT

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

No, I've actually been playing with a great fluid simulator for the past two days, other people have semi-stood in for me, and quite frankly I don't have all the time that I used to have to post on these forums. Note how hydra's post up there was about 6 pages long.

Also, have you all heard about the defamation of character and libel suit that John Kerry has against the Swift Boat Hoax?

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 02:02:42 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi

Also, have you all heard about the defamation of character and libel suit that John Kerry has against the Swift Boat Hoax?

Don't matter, he won't win. Swift Boat was just telling everyone the truth , and convinced at least a few people not to vote for that anti-american fool.

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 06:08:25 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiNo, I've actually been playing with a great fluid simulator for the past two days, other people have semi-stood in for me, and quite frankly I don't have all the time that I used to have to post on these forums. Note how hydra's post up there was about 6 pages long.

Ah, okay, so now you're implying that I have no life? Just because I took about an hour and a half out of my life to write that to put you where you belong?

Do you think I was just spontaneously driven to tear your pathetic excuses of arguments apart? Do you think I wrote that as a result of your posts in this thread alone?

If your hypocrisy and mindlessness had been contained in this thread alone, I would never have gone through all the trouble I did in writing that harsh appraisal of your posts.

The problem goes much further back than this.

The problem goes all the way back to the first post you ever wrote in the Politics/Hot Issues forum.

The problem is that you have posted nothing but the same propaganda that's been force-fed to you by the mainstream media since day fucking one!!!

Each and every time you would make a post as mind-numbingly ridiculous and hypocritical as all the others you have posted, we have called you on it ("we" being the dedicated conservatives of the forum).

Time and again, your hypocrisy would be proven and exposed, yet you would continue in bombarding us with your outrageous propaganda and mindless crap, while in the process accusing us Republicans of "blindly following 'President' Bush" simply because we disagree with the utter bullshit you spew out of the asshole you call a mouth!

I don't think you've ever made a single post recognizing anything good that George W. Bush has done ever since he first took office. Hell, even I am willing to admit that Clinton made some correct decisions in office!

No, the Democratic Party has told you hate anything and everything Bush does in office because he "stole" the 2000 election, so like a sheep you will blindly follow their orders no questions asked and hate George W. Bush with every ounce of your being.

Every single post you have ever made in this forum reflects that sentiment, and I, as well as probably many others, am absolutely fed up with it!

We have put up with your crap for long enough, and it's time you finally put an end to your spreading around of Democratic propaganda that we've heard thousands of times over!!!

THINK FOR YOURSELF FOR ONCE!!!

Quote:Also, have you all heard about the defamation of character and libel suit that John Kerry has against the Swift Boat Hoax?

What the hell does that have to do with anything written in this entire thread? I can't even understand why you would decide to put that here when it has absolutely nothing to do with anything we're discussing in this thread whatsoever!

The only conclusion I can draw from this is that you're trying to change the subject to something completely unrelated in order to escape the web of hypocrisy and mindlessness that you have woven for yourself and that I have just exposed.

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

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 08:52:04 GMT

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

It wouldn't be the first time he's changed the subject when he can't win. It's either that or "I need to talk to my dad some more."

I wonder if his dad is the mindless drone and SFE doesn't want to disappoint him by thinking about what we say.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 13:42:29 GMT

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

hydra1945Ah, okay, so now you're implying that I have no life? Just because I took about an hour and a half out of my life to write that to put you where you belong?

No, I'm not implying that you're a loser at all. I'm just saying that I've been busy working on film projects and I need to hurry up.

CrimsonIt wouldn't be the first time he's changed the subject when he can't win. It's either that or "I need to talk to my dad some more."

Oh, honestly. I haven't changed the subject. It's not like there is much more to be debated here anyways, it's come down to a "You're a sucky American!" What needs to be done is more or less to wait and see what the ACLU finds. And Crimson, I've only ever said that I need to have a word with my dad twice, on issues I don't entirely comprehend. Would you prefer that I just make things up on the fly? And if I truly did agree that torturing soldiers outside the U.S. was ok, yeah, I probably would side with you all.

Also,

The Washington PostWar Crimes

Thursday, December 23, 2004; Page A22

THANKS TO a lawsuit by the American Civil Liberties Union and other human rights groups, thousands of pages of government documents released this month have confirmed some of the painful truths about the abuse of foreign detainees by the U.S. military and the CIA -- truths the Bush administration implacably has refused to acknowledge. Since the publication of photographs of abuse at Iraq's Abu Ghraib prison in the spring the administration's whitewashers -- led by Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld -- have contended that the crimes were carried out by a few low-ranking reservists, that they were limited to the night shift during a few chaotic months at Abu Ghraib in 2003, that they were unrelated to the interrogation of prisoners and that no torture occurred at the Guantanamo Bay prison where hundreds of terrorism suspects are held. The new documents establish beyond any doubt that every part of this cover story is false.

Though they represent only part of the record that lies in government files, the documents show that the abuse of prisoners was already occurring at Guantanamo in 2002 and continued in Iraq even after the outcry over the Abu Ghraib photographs. FBI agents reported in internal e-mails and memos about systematic abuses by military interrogators at the base in Cuba, including beatings, chokings, prolonged sleep deprivation and humiliations such as being wrapped in an Israeli flag. "On a couple of occasions I entered interview rooms to find a detainee chained hand

and foot in a fetal position to the floor, with no chair, food or water," an unidentified FBI agent wrote on Aug. 2, 2004. "Most times they had urinated or defecated on themselves, and had been left there for 18 to 24 hours or more." Two defense intelligence officials reported seeing prisoners severely beaten in Baghdad by members of a special operations unit, Task Force 6-26, in June. When they protested they were threatened and pictures they took were confiscated.

Other documents detail abuses by Marines in Iraq, including mock executions and the torture of detainees by burning and electric shock. Several dozen detainees have died in U.S. custody. In many cases, Army investigations of these crimes were shockingly shoddy: Officials lost records, failed to conduct autopsies after suspicious deaths and allowed evidence to be contaminated. Soldiers found to have committed war crimes were excused with noncriminal punishments. The summary of one suspicious death of a detainee at the Abu Ghraib prison reads: "No crime scene exam was conducted, no autopsy conducted, no copy of medical file obtained for investigation because copy machine broken in medical office."

Some of the abuses can be attributed to lack of discipline in some military units -- though the broad extent of the problem suggests, at best, that senior commanders made little effort to prevent or control wrongdoing. But the documents also confirm that interrogators at Guantanamo believed they were following orders from Mr. Rumsfeld. One FBI agent reported on May 10 about a conversation he had with Guantanamo's commander, Maj. Gen. Geoffrey D. Miller, who defended the use of interrogation techniques the FBI regarded as illegal on the grounds that the military "has their marching orders from the Sec Def." Gen. Miller has testified under oath that dogs were never used to intimidate prisoners at Guantanamo, as authorized by Mr. Rumsfeld in December 2002; the FBI papers show otherwise.

The Bush administration refused to release these records to the human rights groups under the Freedom of Information Act until it was ordered to do so by a judge. Now it has responded to their publication with bland promises by spokesmen that any wrongdoing will be investigated. The record of the past few months suggests that the administration will neither hold any senior official accountable nor change the policies that have produced this shameful record. Congress, too, has abdicated its responsibility under its Republican leadership: It has been nearly four months since the last hearing on prisoner abuse. Perhaps intervention by the courts will eventually stem the violations of human rights that appear to be ongoing in Guantanamo, Iraq and Afghanistan. For now the appalling truth is that there has been no remedy for the documented torture and killing of foreign prisoners by this American government.

EDIT: Once I get time, hydra, I'll get back to your post.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 14:15:02 GMT

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

You see, your going to a moron to try and understand the issue, your father is only going to fill you with more hatred for America and its solders, and basicly he's only mis-informing you.

GO FIND SOMEONE ELSE TO TALK POLOTICS WITH, YOUR FATHER IS OBVIOUSLY A NUT CASE WHEN IT COMES TO THEM.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 14:28:13 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiAnd Crimson, I've only ever said that I need to have a word with my dad twice, on issues I don't entirely comprehend.

So look it up yourself. IF you cannot think for yourself then you are the tool everyone says you are. Your problem is that your father has force-fed you all this liberal bullshit and hasn't allowed you to think for yourself long enough to say....damn, this doesnt make any fucking sense, why am I still following someone who will never be president? Take this as constructive criticism because its not meant to be an attack on your character.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 19:07:45 GMT

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

CrimsonI have told you like 493 times that I don't watch FOX news... I read CNN.com for my news and nothing more.

Sorry for any confusion, but I was referring to the guy above you, who called Iraqis sissies.

Aright, hydra, here you go...

hydra1945Why do you have "President" in quotation marks? Oh, wait, that's right, since Michael Moore told you to believe that the 2000 election wasn't legitimate, that's the honest-to-God... oh, wait, I'm sorry, I forgot I can't say "God" for fear of offending an atheist... honest-to-Clinton (because he's the closest thing to a "god" you Democrats have) truth, and there is no other way it can possibly be. Lord Moore said it, so it must be so. Bush stole the election, and that's just the way it is.

No, 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.

hydra1945

Now that Lord Moore and the Infallible Church of the ACLU have told you to believe that Bush authorized "torture" (of which, by the way, you have a very pussified definition, but I'll get to that later), it must be true, and there is no contesting it.

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.

hydra1945

You obviously never read the Geneva Convention before, or you'd know that terrorists get absolutely no protection under it whatsoever.

I believe warranto touched on this one.

hydra1945

I'm amazed how you have claimed in the past to be more "open-minded" than conservatives, then you imply that all conservatives are white-supremacists. Not very open-minded, is it? You really showed those racist Republicans how open-minded you are! Great job in showing just how much of a hypocrite you are!

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.

hydra1945

Proof, ladies and gentlemen, that you can be incredibly book-smart but at the same time have no common sense.

I think you mean booksmart and yet not agree with the ideals of others. Didn't you just earlier imply that you were more open about the ideas of others than I am?

hydra1945

The reason we all say you hate America is you're always willing to blame America first for its problems. Before the war ever started, you said it was America's fault for Saddam being there in the first place. You said it was America's fault for giving weapons to the terrorists to fight the Soviets twenty years ago. You said it was America's fault for pissing the terrorists off in the first place.

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? Did I indeed say it was some president's fault that Saddam was in power? Was that back when I was 11 or something?

hydra1945

It's always America that's the belligerent country, isn't it, SuperFlyingLiberalTool? It's never the other side that is actually causing the problem, is it? It's America's fault that more than a thousand soldiers died in Iraq. It can't possibly be the terrorists' fault, even though they were the ones who were setting off the bombs and firing the AK-47s.

America is not the infallible entity you would like it to be. 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. 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.

hydra1945

Oh, wait, Ted Kennedy says it's America's fault for the war. I forgot; Lord Kennedy of the Kennedy dynasty is always right. My apologies.

He's actually getting pretty old. I haven't seen him speak in a while.

hydra1945That wasn't his point, and you know it.

His "point," if you could call it that, was that I was somehow empowering Arabs to shoot our men. Not many of them are going to hear what I have to say. Are you suggesting that we should cover up everything bad the government does and portray a better picture of ourselves, like in 1984?

hydra1945No, you don't. You care more about the well-being of the terrorists than you do our own soldiers. This thread is a perfect example.

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?

hydra1945Here you are, bitching about how we're keeping the terrorists up all night to obtain information from them that can be vital to the survival of an entire squad of soldiers (I'll delve deeper into this issue later on). If you truly cared about the well-being of our soldiers, you would step back and let the interrogators do their job and get every little bit of information out of the captured terrorists as possible.

Are you really so befuddled in your mind as to believe that all Iraqis are terrorists? 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]

hydra1945In case you haven't noticed, WE'RE IN THERE ALREADY, and now that we're in there, WE CAN'T JUST UP AND LEAVE, OR THE IRAQI PEOPLE WOULD BE ROYALLY FUCKED OVER!!!

Why, yes, you're right. However, that doesn't suddenly make this war a just cause, and what do you propose we do from here on? Shoot them all until there's no one to fight us? Well, that is kind of against the point of this humanitarian war the Republicans have turned WMDs into.

hydra1945

We can't leave now that we're in, and if you actually did care about our soldiers, you'd stop being such a hypocrite and let the interrogators do their job. If they have to keep terrorists up all night listening to the fucking Barney song in order to get them to spill their guts about where a terrorist weapons cache is, well Clintondamn it, let them!

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.

hydra1945

You're kidding, right? Did you just completely miss the multitudes of protests, both anti- and pro-war, going on around the country when the first tomahawks were landing in Baghdad? You do realize that protests are one way of letting your elected officials know where you stand on a

particular issue, right?

If they're willing to go out on a weekend and protest, they're probably motivated enough to write a simple letter to their elected politicians.

There were pro-war rallies? Didn't see many of those on any large scale. And even then, that's still only a very small majority. One of the biggest demonstrations probably ever witnessed in the U.S. was the protest outside the Republican Convention this year, which only made up a quarter of one percent or less of the population.

hydra1945No, you only believe that the majority of voters voted on moral values because that's what you've been told to believe.

The majority of voters actually voted because of the War on Terror. Nice try pinning the blame on those bastard Christians who still carry some amount of morals, though.

I suppose that'll teach me to ever turn on FOX NEWS, because that's where I heard about all this "voting your morals" business.

hydra1945You actually think we're torturing people in Iraq? Look at what Saddam did to his own people in the underground rape rooms. That's torture. You're comparing that to sleep deprivation? Where the hell is your common fucking sense?

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.

hydra1945Yet, you believed John Kerry when he said we were torturing civilians in Vietnam.
icon_rolleyes.gif

Hypocrisy just naturally rolls right off of your fingertips onto your keyboard, doesn't it?

Why, yes, that was a bad war as well. The point I was trying to get across, which I perhaps could have been clearer on, is that the U.S. has laws that we don't torture people. We should not have been in Vietnam, and we should not be in Iraq now. An occupation of a Middle Eastern country is almost a joke.

hydra1945

And you say Fox News isn't a reliable source...

Why, yes, I do. I triangulate a lot of my news from different blog sites. Generally, they're run by Washington insiders who'll print better and more accurate stories than major media. They also run all stories, not pick & choose like FOX news.

hydra1945I'm assuming you meant to say, "they can kill us...."

Typos aside, this could be one of the most outrageous remarks you have ever made. Are you saying you want our troops to wait to be shot at first before they can get off the first shot? You do

realize an American soldier can be killed by that first shot, right?
How far away from reality can your mind possibly be???

And you say you care about our troops....

I'm assuming you meant to say, "Typo aside,"

Typo aside, that was in reponse to a remark that more or less stated that we should kill any opposing people in the way of our arbitrary goals.

You may have missed that one.

hydra1945The key word here is "implying." You're taking an article, published by a biased source about a ridiculous case, that makes an accusation of the Bush administration and making it into an absolute truth.

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. I'm not saying this is an absolute truth. I'm posting this as a "here's-where-we-know." 'Sides, if you want to read an unbiased source, just read all those documents they have.

hydra1945For you to even think for one second that what we're doing to interrogate the captured terrorists is even comparable to the torture Saddam forced upon his own people that is plainly exemplified in that report is completely out-of-line and utterly stupid.

Read the Washington Post editorial.

hydra1945That's funny. You're telling someone to think for himself when not a single original political thought that might run counter to the goals of the Democratic Party. Most Republicans here can give an example of at least one issue on which they disagree with George W. Bush, whereas you, even when directly challenged by myself, have not ever given one single example of any issue with which you disagree with the general stance of the Democratic Party.

It is you who needs to try thinking for yourself once in a while.

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.

hydra1945The situation of not having a single independent political thought in your entire body. See? There you go again, putting "President" in quotation marks again. Are you so pro-Democrat that you can't stand to see anyone disagree with any holy decree Pope Al Gore makes about George W. Bush?

I don't think Al Gore ever said the election was stolen.

hydra1945Ah, slandering him while accusing him of slandering you, are we?

Isn't that something a hypocrite would do, generally?

I don't think that statement is entirely comperable to him calling me a "fuck."

hydra1945This all goes back to the ACLU's, and your, definition of "torture." Like I said earlier, you have a very pussified definition. You actually believe keeping the terrorists up all night listening to the Barney song is actually torture. What the hell do you want us to do, put lounge chairs in their jail cells and feed them fucking filet mignon for dinner each day? Do you think that will convince any one of them to talk?

If we can't make them (gasp!) uncomfortable, how the hell do you expect us to get any information out of them? Ask them nicely? Get down on our knees and beg for the information? These were fuckers who, just a day ago, were trying to kill us! How can you not understand that these terrorists could hold vital information to weapons cache locations, locations of terrorist leaders, and anything else that might prevent the loss of an American soldier's life?

Why the hell aren't you willing to make these bastards "uncomfortable" in order to get them to spill their guts with information?

You want torture? Go back two years to one of those torture rooms in Baghdad described in that USA Today article. THAT is torture. This staying up all night bullshit? Not even comparable.

Just out of curiosity, where was your outrage when Ali Kaddam Kardom was being beaten, refrigerated naked and held underground for being a Shiite?

When was that ever the ACLU's definiton of torture? Again, read the Washington Post editorial and LOOK at the ACLU documents! Those will outline what kinds of torture they think were authorized.

Yes, Saddam was a minor league dictator, but the U.S. is not an international police force. And we went in claiming an imminent threat from WMDs, which was a bald-faced lie. Then you all tried to change the pretext to a humanitarian issue, because otherwise Georgio would look bad.

NOTE: Okay, this thing is too long. I'm going to pick and choose major topics out of your mile-long post.

Hydra1945Secondly, if they hadn't hated us for our freedoms and other "stupid" reasons like that, they wouldn't have flown two jets into the World Trade Center twin towers

Either that or because we killed those terrorist's families when we shelled the Bekaa Valley with the U.S.S. North Carolina's battle cannons.

These issues aren't one-sided. You have to look at them from everyone's points of view.

hydra1945When you substitute short words with longer words in a failed effort to make yourself appear more intelligent as a result of your massive superiority complex.

I still don't engage in the use of a thesaurus.

hydra1945Stop talking before you embarass yourself more.

What, exactly, was all that, um, whatchacallit, oh yeah, sarin stuff the Polish troops found a few months ago? Isn't that sarin stuff a weapon of mass destruction? Didn't they also just recently find some more of that stuff in the trunk of a car in Fallujah?

Oh, wait, that must've been a new flavor of jell-o or something. Silly me. I should tell my mom to buy me some sarin jell-o next time she's at the grocery store.

Didn't the Duelfer report say that there were no Weapons of Mass Destruction? The Bushies have been so lax about border control that it's a small wonder there are nerve agents in the country now. Found them a few months ago? That doesn't mean anything. It's been so long since we've invaded that these could have come from any neighbouring country.

hydra1945You already do, unless you don't consider nearly half of both houses of Congress to be considered leaders.

Democrats in Congress aren't exactly the leaders right now. And if they had gotten into this Iraq mess, I would have been just as mad. You don't notice many Democrats getting into mass bloodshed battles, do you? [Come on, say something about Clinton.]

hydra1945

Who the hell is trying to censor you? He wasn't saying you couldn't disagree with the actions taken by the head-of-state, just that in your blind hatred of every little thing done by George W. Bush, you begin hating your own country, which is the opposite of patriotism.

There's actually a bill on the floor of the Congress right now trying to ban liberal viewpoints on the internet.

hydra1945Don't make me laugh. The same can be said of you.

Kindly don't compare me to cowmisfit, or whoever I was talking to there.

hydra1945Be sure to ask Santa for some common sense this Christmas (that is, if you celebrate Christmas; I wouldn't be surprised if you became an atheist just to make sure you don't offend anyone by celebrating the birth of your lord and saviour, Jesus Christ (well, to normal people it'd be Jesus Christ; to you, it'd be Bill Clinton)).

Stop typecasting Democrats with a couple ACLU suits.

hydra1945How do you know there's an executive order when there is no evidence to prove the existence of one?

Because so many leaked FBI documents point to one. And right now, the ACLU is suing to see if there is one. Time will tell.

hydra1945

No one is saying you can't question the actions of the President; you just happen to disagree with

every little thing he does, and your arguments are making us believe you hate your own country since you're so quick to blame America first in any foreign conflict.

No, conflicts that stop genocides are pretty good, like if Bush invaded Sudan to stop what's going on in there. That would be pretty good. And also, the invasion of Afghanistan was most certainly a good move, although elections aren't going very well over there.

hydra1945Typical. You name four Republican presidents and point out one bad quality in each. Nevermind that Nixon negotiated the end of the Vietnam War. Nevermind that Reagan brought about the fall of the Berlin Wall. Nevermind that Bush Sr. oversaw the fall of the Soviet Union (though it began during Reagan's term).

And, of course, nevermind that Bush Jr. freed at least 50 million Iraqis and Afghans and is leading the War on Terror in the best way possible.

Nixon was too early for me to talk about the Vietnam war.

Reagan and Bush Sr. didn't do much to end the Soviet Union, it collapsed from its own internal problems with its economic system.

Bush Jr. is fighting the war on Iraq in a terrible way, namely putting soldiers in Iraq and telling them to shoot people who shoot at them. There hasn't been much news from Afghanistan.

hydra1945You know nothing about economics. Stop acting like you do.

Gold is at 434+ right now and the Euro is worth 1.3 dollars. Those are horrible signs of inflation.

hydra1945Neither does acting like you're better than everyone else.

My Clinton, I have never seen someone with a superiority complex as big as yours.

Tell me, how am I supposed to state a differing opinion from someone else and yet not act better than them, in your eyes?

hydra1945We use the electoral college to elect our presidents. The popular vote is literally meaningless. Crimson just mentioned the popular vote to make a point that you obviously missed.

Crimson didn't make much sense when she touched on the popular vote. I didn't quite understand what she meant, and I'm not sure you did, either.

When did I say we elected officials based on the popular vote? No, I really didn't.

Well, there you go. After the bold, the rest of those points I had already touched on or where too stupid for me to care about, statements like "You are such a tool!"

Have fun.

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

Posted by [xpTek](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 19:27:45 GMT

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

cowmisfitSuperFlyingEngi

Also, have you all heard about the defamation of character and libel suit that John Kerry has against the Swift Boat Hoax?

Don't matter, he won't win. Swift Boat was just telling everyone the truth, and convinced at least a few people not to vote for that anti-american fool.

You really need to stop calling everything you don't agree with anti-american.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 20:05:24 GMT

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

Quote:You really need to stop calling everything you don't agree with anti-american.

This is the most valuable thing you've ever said.

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

Posted by [xpTek](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 22:16:02 GMT

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

Gah, I'm trying to take that as a compliment.

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

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 23:36:34 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngihydra1945We use the electoral college to elect our presidents. The popular vote is literally meaningless. Crimson just mentioned the popular vote to make a point that you obviously missed.

Crimson didn't make much sense when she touched on the popular vote. I didn't quite understand what she meant, and I'm not sure you did, either.

CrimsonOh PLEASE... this is so straightforward. You think "hmm it wasn't a legit election" in 2000, well, Bush managed to convince enough people he could do the job and being a Republican rules to WIN, completely, even with over 50% of the popular vote which Clinton couldn't accomplish. LET IT GO ALREADY.

Bush managed to convince enough people that he could do that job, and the Republican party convinced enough people that Republican is the way to be. He won, completely, even with over

50% of the popular vote. Clinton couldn't manage 50% of the popular vote.

I do not agree with my fellow Republicans who say that the war is for humanitarian reasons. I will stick by the WMD reasoning that's been there since day 1. I will use the Duelfer report outlining the vast corruption in the United Nations that prevented more countries from supporting action against the guy who gave them lots of money as the reasoning why all countries in the UN weren't with us.

I would say that if my grandma died, not one of you would truly care about it, though you might feel bad for me for like a few minutes. I don't really honestly give a shit about a couple prisoners being kept awake. It's retarded. They need to send Sheriff Joe Arpaio from Phoenix over there.

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

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 28 Dec 2004 00:32:32 GMT

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

Quote:Either that or because we killed those terrorist's families when we shelled the Bekaa Valley with the U.S.S. North Carolina's battle cannons.

Engi, check your facts before you post please. the USS North Carolina was decommissioned on June 27 1947. You are either making things up, or you have the wrong battleship.

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.

Come back when you have the REAL numbers, will you? And if you truly believe that the US military, as professional and well-trained as it is, has killed 100,000 civilians, you need to re-aquaint yourself with reality. People holding weapons do not count as civilians. What, you want our troops to stand there while some goon with an AK-47 blasts them, just because he isn't wearing a uniform? Come on. Anyone who poses a threat to our soldiers is NOT a civilian. I really wish people would stop trying to paint the US as a gang of baby-killing thugs to get an anti-war message across... anyone who knows someone in the military, or anyone who IS in the military, will tell you that our soldiers would NEVER intentionally attack unarmed civilians. Every effort is made to cut down the possibility of civilian casualties.

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](#)

warrantoIn 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 prisoners 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 shepherds 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 propoganda 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-are-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.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2004 17:40:16 GMT

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

hydra1945...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.

Just a note on this... Those sanctions and the sanctions of the NPT are the only "legal" stipulations holding Iraq back from producing nuclear WMDs. (The NPT only deals with nuclear weapons, as far as I've read). Technically, Iraq is ALLOWED to have restarted those programs after sanctions were up if and ONLY if they declare their arsenals to the United Nations. Something that we can debate forever, but can never conclude upon.

I could go into the technicalities on why it isn't the United State's authority to call any state on that issue, but that is another discussion.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2004 18:45:14 GMT

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

Quote: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.

Quite interesting, considering I believe America is up in arms about people being taken hostage by the Iraqi "terrorists". I guess this falls under the "It's ok, as long as it doesn't happen to me" category.

If you're not willing to admit that this is the exact same reasoning that the other side uses, and accept that it is ok, your argument holds no strength.

Quote: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.

And the truth is that the ends do not justify the means. The war was entered into illegally, no way around that. Whether or not something incriminating was found as a result does not matter. After all, if the police force their way into a home and perform an illegal search, what usually happens?

Quote: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!!!!

Gasp! A country's people are defending themselves from an invading force by any means available to them! Terrorists!

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2004 19:07:08 GMT

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

warranto If you're not willing to admit that this is the exact same reasoning that the other side uses, and accept that it is ok, your argument holds no strength.

Unfortunately, no one seems to want to recognize that they are utilizing a double standard for American or coalition forces when in fact there is none.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2004 20:02:31 GMT

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

how is there no double standard?

France gets praise for utilizing similar tactics during their occupation in WWII, but when Iraq does it, it's the ultimate evil?

Note: I said similar, not same.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2004 20:10:37 GMT

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

Ah, but you're looking at it from the die-hard war supporter's view. Objectively, there is none.

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

Posted by [Deathgod](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2004 20:19:24 GMT

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

warrantoGasp! A country's people are defending themselves from an invading force by any means available to them! Terrorists!

No shit. If someone invaded my country I'd respond in the same way as the Iraqis have.

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

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2004 22:14:07 GMT

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

That's interesting- considering that the majority of insurgents that have been killed or captured so far weren't from Iraq. They even found several French citizens in the pile. Defending their own country, my ass. It isn't their own country any more than China is mine.

Tell me, how many soldiers have you talked to before blabbering on about "how bad" it is over there? Any at all? I know a few who are close family friends who have served/are serving in Iraq, and they don't paint so dark a picture as you do. I keep hearing stories of towns getting running water for the first time, schools being re-opened for the first time in years...funny how you never mention anything good. It's almost as if you don't want to believe anything good is happening at all. Funny, that.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 30 Dec 2004 22:33:39 GMT

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

Nukelt15That's interesting- considering that the majority of insurgents that have been killed or captured so far weren't from Iraq. They even found several French citizens in the pile. Defending their own country, my ass. It isn't their own country any more than China is mine.

Except the problem you people have is you view them as one solid terrorist army. There are

rebels involved, Iraqi fundamentalists, terrorists, and the like among the "insurgent" force. An insurgent in this war isn't necessarily a terrorist, especially if they fall into the Iraqi fundamentalist category, and it is extremely uninformed and prejudice to think that they are.

Remember, it was YOUR coalition that lept head first into this invasion illegally, fucked up the standing recognized sovereignty, and established YOUR ideal representative government to be recognized as legit until this election happens-- whenever it happens. As far as those rebels and fundamentalists are concerned, Iraq is still their nation and do not recognize the government established by this coup d'etats. That does NOT make them terrorists by any reasoning.

Quote:Tell me, how many soldiers have you talked to before blabbering on about "how bad" it is over there? Any at all? I know a few who are close family friends who have served/are serving in Iraq, and they don't paint so dark a picture as you do. I keep hearing stories of towns getting running water for the first time, schools being re-opened for the first time in years...funny how you never mention anything good. It's almost as if you don't want to believe anything good is happening at all. Funny, that.

This isn't even remotely on topic to what we were discussing. No one denies the improvement of life in Iraq, and nor do we want it to stop. However, when you look at the larger picture, past, present, and future, the basis of that improvement stemmed from grounds that couldn't possibly justify it legally.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2004 01:09:23 GMT

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

JavaxcxNo one denies the improvement of life in Iraq, and nor do we want it to stop. However, when you look at the larger picture, past, present, and future, the basis of that improvement stemmed from grounds that couldn't possibly justify it legally.

who says it was illegal? the UN? that corrupt mob that hordes money in exchange for peoples happiness, health, and freedom? If thats what you mean by illegal then call me a criminal. In the end, The Iraqi people wont care how it came to pass, only that they can now embrace freedom. A right that should have been theirs at birth.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2004 01:51:43 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]who says it was illegal? the UN? that corrupt mob that hordes money in exchange for peoples happiness, health, and freedom? If thats what you mean by illegal then call me a criminal. In the end, The Iraqi people wont care how it came to pass, only that they can now embrace freedom. A right that should have been theirs at birth.

This is sheer hypocrisy. How can you support the actions of the coalition, a coalition comprised of

countries that have done the very thing you're accusing the U.N. of doing throughout their histories. And while it is likely true that the U.N. has done what you've stated, that does not mean that the U.N. prioritizes what you've mentioned over people all of the time. Who do you think plays the critical role in humanitarian organization and deployment and multilateral diplomatic negotiations worldwide? Here's a hint, it's not the United States alone.

As for the war being illegal. As a matter of fact it is. Another thing that amazes me is that you people tend to forget that YOU ALL SIGNED THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS. YOU AGREED TO THE TERMS WITHIN IT. Not only that, you've signed AND ratified them. That means, when Resolution 687 says "Affirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Kuwait and Iraq..." and the charter says "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations," you are NOT legally allowed to violate Iraqi government or territory no matter how evil you believe it to be.

Does that mean I don't wish for the Iraqi people to be given the right to the same liberties that I supposedly have? Of course not. They, as far as "I" am concerned deserve the same rights and benefits as I do. The law doesn't work that way. What more, you've gone one over and affirmed that law. But does that mean I support this war? I can't make the leap and support an illegal war. But that certainly doesn't mean the results of the war are bad. It simply means that the ends cannot justify the means.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2004 04:38:00 GMT

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

JavaxcxAh, but you're looking at it from the die-hard war supporter's view. Objectively, there is none.

erm, I thought the die-hard war supporter view would be that Iraqi fighters ARE terrorists...

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

Posted by [glyde51](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2004 04:40:47 GMT

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

Very off topic, but...

Quote:Osama Bin Laden is offering 25000 for anyone willing to be a suicide bomber. So far none of those four people that took the offer have appeared to collect their cash.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2004 04:51:01 GMT

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

warrantoJavaxcxAh, but you're looking at it from the die-hard war supporter's view. Objectively, there is none.

erm, I thought the die-hard war supporter view would be that Iraqi fighters ARE terrorists...

That too, obviously. But how many die-hard pro-war people like the French at all?

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2004 13:58:23 GMT

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

glyde51Very off topic, but...

Quote:Osama Bin Laden is offering 25000 for anyone willing to be a suicide bomber. So far none of those four people that took the offer have appeared to collect their cash. maybe the money is to fund their attack, not reward it :rolleyes:

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2004 15:15:00 GMT

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

Spoonyglyde51Very off topic, but...

Quote:Osama Bin Laden is offering 25000 for anyone willing to be a suicide bomber. So far none of those four people that took the offer have appeared to collect their cash. maybe the money is to fund their attack, not reward it :rolleyes:

Does it really matter which its for?? Either way he's paying for someone to kill innocent people, i suppose you support this sort of thing or something.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2004 20:37:55 GMT

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

Your right java, it is hipocracy. Hipocritical that they support sanctions on them while members of the UN give sadaam what he needs and money. The fact that they lie to their own member nations just because they dont like them is why they cant be trusted and shouldnt have ANY say in what we do. And yes they are a corrupt mob. I dont blame George W for going on with the war without the UN's permission, I blame the UN for not giving permission fast enough. We as a country needed to deploy fast before the Iraqis got entrenched, had we not then it might have costed much more time and more soldiers lives. But again the UN doesnt care about US soldiers, they just care about how much they can get away with, without us knowing about it. You claim

that they are humanitarians, while that may be true it holds no justification for their actions. And many of the terms of the charter were broken by the UN themselves, SO WHY THE HELL SHOULD WE FOLLOW IT? And to those Iraqis that have freedom and no fear of being raped and tortured, I believe that they will agree: The ends justify the means.

And your right, I don't like the French, gotta problem with that? I don't care, that's just the way it is. If they don't like us just for the sake of hating us, I can do the same.

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

Posted by [Javacx](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2004 20:49:02 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]Your right java, it is hypocrisy. Hypocritical that they support sanctions on them while members of the UN give Saddam what he needs and money. The fact that they lie to their own member nations just because they don't like them is why they can't be trusted and shouldn't have ANY say in what we do. And yes they are a corrupt mob. I don't blame George W for going on with the war without the UN's permission, I blame the UN for not giving permission fast enough. We as a country needed to deploy fast before the Iraqis got entrenched, had we not then it might have costed much more time and more soldiers lives. But again the UN doesn't care about US soldiers, they just care about how much they can get away with, without us knowing about it. You claim that they are humanitarians, while that may be true it holds no justification for their actions. And many of the terms of the charter were broken by the UN themselves, SO WHY THE HELL SHOULD WE FOLLOW IT? And to those Iraqis that have freedom and no fear of being raped and tortured, I believe that they will agree: The ends justify the means.

"Well HE did it" isn't legal justification for anything. And take special note: it certainly doesn't make what the UN OR the US have done legal by any means.

The fact of the matter is, you signed a contract saying you wouldn't go fucking around with other member states and their governments unless the Security Council says so, and they did not. Here we are today, and the U.S. and the coalition are in the wrong legally on the matter. Therefore, the ends cannot possibly justify the means because the means to which the ends have come about have been illegal in nature. That too, gbull, is hypocrisy on the part of the United States and their coalition as well.

And I'm going to let you in on a little secret, the Polish probably didn't give a damn who liberated them from Hitler. In comparison, this argument has no merit in this discussion.

Quote:And your right, I don't like the French, gotta problem with that? I don't care, that's just the way it is. If they don't like us just for the sake of hating us, I can do the same.

Bigotry isn't cool. Especially when you don't know that all the French don't like you. I suggest you open your eyes and see that the French, like Americans, or Europeans, or Germans, or whatever, are generally a good people. And what you spew here is nothing but hatred.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2004 21:09:26 GMT

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

Wow. I wish I had the time to read all these posts but people attacking SFE waste so much of their time acting like 5 years olds by telling him to stick a pole up his butt, that all that garbage is interwoven with their actual points.

I love how SFE apparently "hates America" now, and that anything that he says is somehow "propoganda." If SFE blindly follows "liberal propoganda" than all you dipshits blindly follow whatever our government tells us. Stop watching NASCAR and learn to question.

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

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2004 21:41:00 GMT

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

And here comes SEAL with his typical stereotyping... I hate race cars.

These bastards are willing to strap on a bomb and blow themselves up for their "Allah"... and we can't make them listen to dogs barking? Please.

The "insurgents" in Iraq are not primarily Iraqis. They are from other countries, members of terrorist organizations who do NOT want to see Iraq turn to a Democracy. They are also trying to stop the elections because they know that if we succeed in Iraq, it will be bad for them. In Afghanistan, people braved suicide bombing threats and long lines just to exercise their democracy, and the Iraqis will too.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 31 Dec 2004 22:25:48 GMT

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

Quote:I hate race cars.

Thank you very very much.

Anywhoot:

Does it really matter what THEY do? We are THE most powerful military force on the planet, and if ANY military should be the "bigger man" and not stoop down to dirty levels of warfare, we should be able to. Just because they attack us with suicide bombs, doesn't mean we can go around and take a shit on the Geneva Convention.

I know this relies on whether or not you think what happened was a violation of the Geneva Convention or not, so don't bother bringing that up please.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sat, 01 Jan 2005 18:19:16 GMT

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

SEALStop watching NASCAR and learn to question

Thanks ass, i hate NASCAR too. So if being Conservative makes me a NASCAR lover then its safe to say that your a baby killer. Make sense? of course not. And we do question. I bet almost all Republicans or Conservatives can name one thing that they dont agree with Bush on. For me its how he wanted to make illegals legal. Bet you cant do the same with Clinton. And purely saying, i didnt agree with the way he "handled" his interns does not constitute any important policy. I can think of one thing already that i didnt agree with William on.

And i didnt say the French arent good people i just said i dont like them, and before your play the bigotry card, im part French so get off my case.

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

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 01 Jan 2005 19:11:22 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]And i didnt say the French arent good people i just said i dont like them, and before your play the bigotry card, im part French so get off my case.

You being part french has no bearing on the issue. You generalize the entire French nation when you say you don't like them. And I highly doubt you know even the number of people in France, let alone having a non-prejudiced reason for disliking all of them.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Sat, 01 Jan 2005 19:16:17 GMT

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

cowmisfitSpoonyglyde51Very off topic, but...

Quote:Osama Bin Laden is offering 25000 for anyone willing to be a suicide bomber. So far none of those four people that took the offer have appeared to collect their cash. maybe the money is to fund their attack, not reward it :rolleyes:

Does it really matter which its for?? Either way he's paying for someone to kill innocent people, i suppose you support this sort of thing or something. take that back please?

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sat, 01 Jan 2005 20:21:57 GMT

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

SpoonycowmisfitSpoonyglyde51Very off topic, but...

Quote:Osama Bin Laden is offering 25000 for anyone willing to be a suicide bomber. So far none of those four people that took the offer have appeared to collect their cash. maybe the money is to fund their attack, not reward it :rolleyes:

Does it really matter which its for?? Either way he's paying for someone to kill innocent people, i suppose you support this sort of thing or something. take that back please?

What?? Its a quite simple concept, its the same thing, either way your funding someone or driving someone to do it with cash, your paying for an innocent civillians murder either way. Now if your saying it matters and its not a problem if there FUNDING IT as long as there not REWARDING the attack then i'd have to say that you indeed are supporting the murders.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 01 Jan 2005 21:04:31 GMT

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

There is a difference...

Fund: To give money so something can be accomplished.

Reward: To give money AFTER something has been accomplished.

Saying that there is a difference does not mean that it is being supported.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Sat, 01 Jan 2005 22:08:53 GMT

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

Cowmisfit, I must congratulate you on your complete misinterpretation of my statement.

The original post mentioned suicide bombers somehow not turning up to claim the payment offered for their attacks... because if you were to attack someone in a suicide-bomber stylee, obviously you'd be somewhat dead. I was suggesting perhaps the 25,000 (currency unknown) was to actually pay for the bomb (an integral part in the whole "suicide bomber" concept, wouldn't you say?)

I'm struggling to understand how you got the impression that I support suicide bombing from that.

EDIT: reworded the last sentence

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 01 Jan 2005 22:23:20 GMT

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

SpoonyI'm struggling how you got the impression that [he supports] suicide bombing from that.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 02:00:09 GMT

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

JavaxcxSpoonyI'm struggling how you got the impression that [he supports] suicide bombing from that.

I'll concede the point that I worded that last sentence rather incompetently, but I'm fairly sure this...

Cowmisfiti suppose you support this sort of thing or something.

...was directed to me, no one else...

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 02:57:27 GMT

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

I wasn't out to insult your grammar. I very much agree with you and drew the same conclusion.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 03:06:24 GMT

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

Oh, I see.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 04:01:37 GMT

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

Java i meant the french government dumbass. How the hell can i not like someone i dont know. thats just stupid. I figured it went without saying that i meant the government but i guess i have to implement every detail before posting. i even said that I am part french. How can i hate something i am? jeez o pete's.....

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 04:21:06 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]Java i meant the french government dumbass. How the hell can i not like someone i dont know. thats just stupid. I figured it went without saying that i meant the government but i guess i have to implement every detail before posting. i even said that I am part french. How can i hate something i am? jeez o pete's.....

Keep it up champ. You're just digging deeper and deeper. You implied absolutely no such thing. And I quote:

Quote:And i didnt say the French arent good people i just said i dont like them,

There is nothing there that even remotely implies that you are referring to the government. Oh, and yes, you can hate something that you are.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 05:41:38 GMT

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

gbulland before your play the bigotry card, im part French so get off my case.

gbullIf they dont like us just for the sake of hating us, I can do the same.

idiot, the French government are the ones who hate us. And like i said before, get off my case. I cant hate what i am without hating myself. Comprendre? I dont believe i even cared this much to reply to your post if you dont know anything about me to begin with. Think what you want about me, i dont give a shit. If you can make such generalizations about me, then I can do the same about you. Its just i will have the class to keep them to myself, and not fall to your level of Stereotypical thinking.

and dont call me Champ.

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

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 05:47:02 GMT

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

Half of America hates their own government.... It amuses me when they tell the other half they shouldn't hate the French..

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

Posted by [Javacx](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 05:54:50 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]idiot, the French government are the ones who hate us. And like i said before, get off my case. I cant hate what i am without hating myself. Comprendre?

I'm going to let you in on a little secret. The French government probably doesn't hate you; it doesn't help them any and they have no grounds to do so. Nor is it likely that most of the French people hate you. What astounds me is how you can say how much you dislike them, imply their government (without ACTUALLY implying it), and have the audacity to say:

Quote:i dont like the French...thats just the way it is...If they dont like us just for the sake of hating us, I can do the same.

Quote:How the hell can i not like someone i dont know

Keep digging kid, it's still amusing to watch you try and squirm out of this one.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 05:59:23 GMT

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

wtf dude, do you live on these forums??? i post and as im editing it you already reply while im in the process of creating the post. dude. I made my point, think what you want. If you think im a bigot. So be it. But just remember what i said before:

gbullIf you can make such generalizations about me, then I can do the same about you. Its just i will have the class to keep them to myself, and not fall to your level of Stereotypical thinking.

and dont call me kid either, Chump.

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

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 05:59:33 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]I dont believe i even cared this much to reply to your post if you dont know anything about me to begin with. Think what you want about me, i dont give a shit. If you can make such generalizations about me, then I can do the same about you. Its just i will have the class to keep them to myself, and not fall to your level of Stereotypical thinking.

and dont call me Champ.

Nice to see you editing your posts, too. What may be new information to you, I know about you only what you allow me to know. You said you don't like the French. You also said you didn't like them because they didn't like you. You generalized their nation prejudicedly (because you DID NOT say their government), and thus you are a bigot. It's not my fault you decided to post here, champ and reveal this unsympathetic and disgraceful side of yourself. Especially after your little tirades about capital punishment.

Quote:not fall to your level of Stereotypical thinking.

You're chalk full of irony tonight, aren't you?

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 06:02:24 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]wtf dude, do you live on these forums???

Nope.

Quote:I made my point, think what you want. If you think im a bigot. So be it.

Your point didn't make sense and established that you are a bigot. I'm guessing that isn't what you wanted to make public, but I guess you can't communicate your ideas very well either.

Quote:and dont call me kid either, Chump.

Why? Your behavior is childish. This quote alone proves it.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 06:10:12 GMT

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

Omg I just said above that i edited my posts. And you Generalize me without even knowing me, so thus, this makes you a bigot as well. Tell, wut races am I other than French? I bet the first thing that pops into your head is White regardless of what you say. Point is, we are all Bigots, its just the level which supposedly dictates whether you can be called one or not.

Javaxcxchamp

I would come up with better words, but these will do: Fuck You . Yes....That'll do for now.

And yes I am unsympathetic because Life is a Bitch and then you die. If you dont like me then dont expect me to like you back. And that goes for anybody, including the French. At least im a bigot against everyone who hates me huh.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 06:16:32 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]And you Generalize me without even knowing me, so thus, this makes you a bigot as well.

What you fail to realize is that I've made conclusions based ONLY on what you've told me. That isn't generalization. Think hard, kid. It's not tough.

Quote:Tell, wut races am I other than French?

French isn't a race. And I don't know what other nationalities you are, and nor is it relevant to the

discussion.

Quote:Point is, we are all Bigots, its just the level which supposedly dictates whether you can be called one or not.

While arguably true, the bigotry you've obviously been practicing is something that can easily be avoided. We're likely all human beings with the ability to reason, so it should not be a problem... at least for some of us. :rolleyes:

Quote:If you dont like me then dont expect me to like you back. And that goes for anybody, including the French.

Except it is highly likely you don't know that all of the French don't like you. You're generalizing that nation again. And no, you have not specified their government, and nor would it matter. You probably don't know that everyone in the French government doesn't like you either.

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

Posted by ----- on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 06:38:42 GMT

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

Gbull j00 g07 p4n3d ph4g

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

Posted by [U927](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 06:41:49 GMT

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

The score so far:

Javacx - The number of spelling and grammar errors gbull has made.
gbull - His own age.

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

Posted by ----- on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 06:44:30 GMT

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

Umbral_DelaFlareThe score so far:

Javacx - The number of spelling errors gbull has made.
gbull - His own age.

hahaha my calculator broke trying to figure out Javacx's score. Overflow error.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 13:00:00 GMT

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

The French do not hate America any more than I do. Have any of the anti-French brigade actually been to France lately? I doubt it, otherwise you'd know it's one of the most beautiful countries there is. Or actually talked to a French person? No... it's so much simpler to judge the entire country by the outlook of a few politicians.

The United Kingdom's politicians would be an extraordinarily bad representation of our actual country. (Just putting things in perspective)

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 15:09:32 GMT

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

Taskbot, go back to where you came from nobody. You fail to see that the topic that we are discussing at the moment is one that you have just fallen prey to. You called me a ph4g or a fag. Meaning your also a bigot. Congratulations and thank you for proving my point even more. With one line of complete bafoonery you have just become a hipocrite for claiming i got 'p4n3d' (whatever paned is, i'll just assume that somewhere in your mind that means 'pwnd') for being a bigot while you just displayed bigotry your self. In Java's words- "Keep it up Champ".

And Java, not all of us are blessed with the ability to write what we mean. And since you know so much about me, maybe I'll tell you a little about myself in the Renegade community. See that tag next to my name in my actual account name? DT is Dark Twenty. I was the clan leader of this clan before we merged with a good friend of mine's other clan known as the GEE clan. GEE stood for Global Elite Empowerment. So when we merged, we came up with GDE, or Global Dark Elite, which may be found in my siggy. Now, remember that friend I told you about? He doesn't speak English that well but he is very proficient at Web Design as was I. He is also very skilled at Renegade and has been in many great clans. Wanna know where this is going? He is French. Yep, that's right, the Hitler among the French that Java has painted a picture for everyone has a French speaking person as his own good friend and co-head leader of the clan GDE. Don't believe he is French? go to <http://www.gde-clan.com> and go to "forums", you will see that the entire forum layout is in French. My clan, the people that I have chosen, have people from countries such as Canada, America, Bulgaria, Australia, Germany, and I'm probably forgetting some but that's what happens when your clan hits about 50 members in size. Also, it is a prerequisite for people to have TS2 so we can get to know them as being a clan isn't enough, I want to know the people. We also have Females and different races in our clan. In fact, I don't think there has been a clan with as many women as I have had in it in which there has been 4 in my clan, only 2 are left, but there were 4 total. Now it's my turn to ask you- How diverse is your clan FUD? or do you even know...

and it's funny that you mock my age but none of you know how old I actually am. And as for Generalizing me as a bigot to the French community.... Shove it.

Javaxcx What you fail to realize is that I've made conclusions based ONLY on what you've told me.

You dont know me and by two threads of posting you think you can judge my character? I dont know what you think generalization is, but I got news for a ya Champ, your doing it.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 15:28:04 GMT

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

SpoonyThe French do not hate America any more than I do. Have any of the anti-French brigade actually been to France lately? I doubt it, otherwise you'd know it's one of the most beautiful countries there is. Or actually talked to a French person? No... it's so much simpler to judge the entire country by the outlook of a few politicians.

The United Kingdom's politicians would be an extraordinarily bad representation of our actual country. (Just putting things in perspective)

I have a news paper artical were a bunch of frenchiese came to our school to see america and said we were a bunch of fat idiots and such. I'll have to see if i can find it on the web, i threw it out.

French people hate america for the most part, is there some that like us?? Yep sure are, but the majority do not. This is because of there leader and the war on terror ,which they do not back us on , yet once it comes time for them to MAKE MAKE MAKE money in the reconstruction effort they wanna jump right on aboard (greedy terrorist dealin sons a bitches). We saved there asses in WWI WWII , thats twice and im sure we'll have to save They're asses again at one point or another, tho we shouldn't , and what will they do ?? They'll turn around and stab us in the back because they are NOT our allie they are NOT our freinds , THEY ARE ungreatful bastards.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 15:50:23 GMT

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

cowmisfitI have a news paper artical were a bunch of frenchiese came to our school to see america and said we were a bunch of fat idiots and such. I'll have to see if i can find it on the web, i threw it out.

Well...we ARE fatter as a nation. I don't think America is any stupider than France though.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 16:19:30 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]Now its my turn to ask you- How diverse is your clan FUD? or do you even know...

I don't care about your life story, and nor is this relevant in ANY way to this discussion.

Quote:and its funny that you mock my age but none of you know how old I actually am.

Like everything else I've stated about you, I can only make conclusions about your character with the information YOU YOURSELF HAVE ALLOWED ME TO SEE-- That includes your behavior and maturity. Don't think you've done that? Let me refresh your memory:

Quote: i dont like the French

You failed to provide a rational or confirmed reason for you disliking every French person, thus you are prejudiced, thus you are bigotted.

Quote:And as for Generalizing me as a bigot to the French community.... Shove it.

It's not generalization to reply to you what you yourself have written. Maybe you can provide some evidence suggesting that 100% of the French people (like you literally referred to) hate America in turn. Then maybe, your little quibble with their nation would hold some ground.

Quote:You dont know me and by two threads of posting you think you can judge my character?

Actually, I do have tidbits of your persona from those various threads. Here's one:

Quote: i dont like the French

Unless of course you didn't mean to say "I" and meant to refer to someone other than yourself.

Quote:I dont know what you think generalization is, but I got news for a ya Champ, your doing it.

<http://www.dictionary.com> <-- Have fun. You're still wrong, by the way.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 16:32:18 GMT

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

cowmisfitI have a news paper artical were a bunch of frenchiese came to our school to see america and said we were a bunch of fat idiots and such.

Well, the percentage of Americans who are unhealthily obese is... around 65%, isn't it? And, at the risk of sounding racist, the percentage of Americans who are somewhat dimwitted might be considered higher than that.

cowmisfitFrench people hate america for the most part

Wrong

cowmisfitand the war on terror ,which they do not back us on

Hold on... the French are the only nation who are officially Not Backing the war on terror? k thanks

for the info.

cowmisfit(greedy terrorist dealin sons a bitches)
Wow... that's overlooking something, wouldn't you say?

cowmisfitWe saved there asses in WWI
That's a joke, right?

cowmisfitWWII , thats twice
Why don't you read a history book which wasn't written by an American?

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 18:08:42 GMT

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

JavaxcxI don't care about your life story, and nor is this relevant in ANY way to this discussion.

You accuse me of hating all french people, so i believe the relevance is there since if you read It I clearly say:

gbullNow, remember that friend I told you about? He doesnt speak english that well but he is very proficient at Web Design as was I. He is also very skilled at Renegade and has been in many great clans. Wanna know where this is going? He is French. Yep, thats right, the Hitler among the French that Java has painted a picture for everyone has a French speaking person as his own good friend and co-head leader of the clan GDE.

JavaxcxYou failed to provide a rational or confirmed reason for you disliking every French person, thus you are prejudiced, thus you are bigotted.

I said I hate all people who hate me equally. And believe what you may, but most of the French hate us. No matter what you think. I know this is a hard thing to believe but....guess what, i'll let ya in on a little secret....MOST OF THE WORLD HATES US. Whether its by jealousy or what have you, many nations hate us, not just the French.

And you dont know anything about me. I still know you know nothing about me, and you will never know anything about me unless you have a conversation with me thats not typed out.

I'm sorry the word i was looking for wasn't generalizing. It was assuming, and you know what that does. It makes an ass out of you. Because again, you know nothing about me. nuff said.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 18:26:56 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]You accuse me of hating all french people, so i believe the relevance is there since if you read It I clearly say:

I haven't accused you of anything. I have stated what you are as a result of what you said, which in case you haven't been paying attention was:

Quote:i dont like the French

Quote:but most of the French hate us.

Prove it.

Quote:And you dont know anything about me.

I know you're a bigot. You let me know that, remember?

Quote:I'm sorry the word i was looking for wasn't generalizing. It was assuming, and you know what that does. It makes an ass out of you. Because again, you know nothing about me. nuff said.

It is not an assumption to analyze what you yourself have said. You're still grasping at straws, you're still wrong, and you're still an entertaining spectacle to watch while you try and justify your little position.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 18:43:10 GMT

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

JavaxcxI haven't accused you of anything. I have stated what you are as a result of what you said, which in case you haven't been paying attention was:

JavaxcxYou failed to provide a rational or confirmed reason for you disliking every French person

Now u didnt do what again?

I'm man enough to admit I was wrong when I said I dont like French People. And I apologize. I even stated a counterexample to my OWN statement. But you just can't seem to get you mind on the here and now can you? I said a French Speaking person is a good friend of mine and you just cant get off the statement i made earlier. It's like talking to a freakin wall. I'm man enough to apologize for what I said, I just wonder if you are. And if you dont, whatever. However if you do I might have a little respect for you. but as of now I'll Take the road of the bigger man and say: I'm sorry I said I hate all french people. Why dont you qoute that from now on, or are you completely hell bent on trying to make me look bad.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 19:24:31 GMT

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

Quote:Now u didnt do what again?

That isn't an accusation or a generalization. It is an observation made from the data you gave me.

Quote:I'm man enough to admit I was wrong when I said I dont like French People. And I apologize.

That is all you had to say, you know. There is a big difference between trying to avoid responsibility by trying to weasel out of it and admitting ignorance.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 19:50:21 GMT

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

cowmisfitFrench people hate america for the most part, is there some that like us?? Yep sure are, but the majority do not. This is because of there leader and the war on terror ,which they do not back us on , yet once it comes time for them to MAKE MAKE MAKE money in the reconstruction effort they wanna jump right on aboard (greedy terrorist dealin sons a bitches). We saved there asses in WWI WWII , thats twice and im sure we'll have to save They're asses again at one point or another, tho we shouldn't , and what will they do ?? They'll turn around and stab us in the back because they are NOT our allie they are NOT our freinds , THEY ARE ungreatful bastards.

I wonder who provided all the materials for you guys to rise up and seperate yourselves from our little Empire...

The only ungreatful bastard I see around here is you. When exactly have France stabbed anyone in the back? Last I heard they were waiting for evidence that Iraq had WMD's...

Aren't we all waiting for that evidence...

And whoa whoa whoa little feller! Where did:

Quote:(greedy terrorist dealin sons a bitches)

THAT come from? I'd like to see some proof that France has supplied terrorists with wea...

say. I wonder what weapons the insurgents in Iraq are using right now.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 20:58:26 GMT

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

Meh, it doesn't really matter if France supported the terrorists or some way or not. Though this would be a case of "it takes one to know one".

Or have people forgotten who America hired to help with the Russians in Afganistan?

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 21:06:00 GMT

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

DaveGMMcowmisfit French people hate america for the most part, is there some that like us??
Yep sure are, but the majority do not. This is because of there leader and the war on terror ,which they do not back us on , yet once it comes time for them to MAKE MAKE MAKE money in the reconstruction effort they wanna jump right on aboard (greedy terrorist dealin sons a bitches). We saved there asses in WWI WWII , thats twice and im sure we'll have to save They're asses again at one point or another, tho we shouldn't , and what will they do ?? They'll turn around and stab us in the back because they are NOT our allie they are NOT our freinds , THEY ARE ungreatful bastards.

I wonder who provided all the materials for you guys to rise up and seperate yourselves from our little Empire...

The only ungreatful bastard I see around here is you. When exactly have France stabbed anyone in the back? Last I heard they were waiting for evidence that Iraq had WMD's...

Aren't we all waiting for that evidence...

And whoa whoa whoa little feller! Where did:

Quote:(greedy terrorist dealin sons a bitches)

THAT come from? I'd like to see some proof that France has supplied terrorists with wea...

say. I wonder what weapons the insurgents in Iraq are using right now.

They didn't come to iraq because they had dealings with saddam once again THEY'D LOOSE MONEY , the most important thing in the world to them.

About reading a non-american text book, i have , im in College Prep European History were we have an Biased left wing text book peice of shit that says were only in Iraq for oil and its supposed to be new and updated with all important events , yet it has HALF A PARAGRAPH on 9/11.

Spoony if your saying we didn't help save the french in WWI or WWII you really need to go talk to a few of your elders, your grandfather or soemthing or someoen elses grandfather, see what there opinon of that is, tho considering how much you stand up for the french over your own nation , talking to someone in your family might not be the best option.

Dave, when did they stab anyone in the back?? RIGHT NOW THEY ARE, your a forigner so i wouldn't expect you to understand this concept with out an argument, but what do you call right now?? There supposed to be our allie, if 3000 of there citizins were killed we'd follow and back them 100% becasue we are there ALLIE, it happens to american and they pretty much say shuv it

until we can get something out of it. You can bitch and moan all you want about the french people not hating us, but you can't deny the french goverment hates our goverment and would trully love to see America crumble. Guess what, were not gonna let your nations stop us from defending us, if you can't get the concept of hit before your hit first then die.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 21:21:47 GMT

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

cowmisfitThey didn't come to iraq because they had dealings with saddam once again THEY'D LOOSE MONEY , the most important thing in the world to them.

Wow... You really don't know what America's been doing lately, do you?

cowmisfitAbout reading a non-american text book, i have , im in College Prep European History were we have an Biased left wing text book peice of shit that says were only in Iraq for oil Biased? Perhaps. Left wing? Certainly. But if you replace "only" with "mainly", it's right.

cowmisfitSpoony if your saying we didn't help save the french in WWI or WWII you really need to go talk to a few of your elders, your grandfather or soemthing or someoen elses grandfather, see what there opinon of that is,

I didn't say you didn't "help". You said "we saved their asses", implying the USA won WWII single-handedly, and that's garbage, sorry bud.

cowmisfittho considering how much you stand up for the french over your own nation What the hell?

cowmisfitDave, when did they stab anyone in the back?? RIGHT NOW THEY ARE Since when is "not wanting to fight a war" "stabbing you in the back"?

cowmisfityour a forigner so i wouldn't expect you to understand this concept with out an argument At the moment, I don't expect you to understand anything at all.

cowmisfitif 3000 of there citizins were killed we'd follow and back them 100% becasue we are there ALLIE

Funny, because when thousands of Afghani civilians are killed by the inaccuracy of the USA's child-maiming cluster bombs, that's perfectly acceptable? I really hate to burst this bubble for you, but a human life is not worth more or less whether it belongs to a USA sports commentator, a Chinese student, a French salesman, whatever.

cowmisfitit happens to american and they pretty much say shuv it until we can get something out of it.

No, they say "the war is bullshit", which it kinda is...

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 21:32:02 GMT

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

Spoony war is bullshit?? /me smakes you, welcome back to reality were freedom has to be protected becasue not everything is hunky dorry and not everyone understands talking, would i love to talk with teh iraqies and afganies to stop whats going on now?? Hell yes i would have, before 9/11, i have no symptathy for them waht so ever.

Your calling USA child mamers?? Waht the fuck is wrong with you, GUESS WAHT ITS WAR , PEOPLE DIE AND GET HURT IN WAR, JESUS CHIRST WHY CAN'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?? Yea, i agree with you 100% it sucks that children get hurt, but guess what thats war, sorry.

Saying we saved there asses does not imply we did it all by ourselves at all, i know we didn't do it by our selves. Millions of russians and thousands of british died to help us and many other natinalitys as well, france even. But guess what, with out us there to help the allies we would probably be living in a totally different world today, no telling what would be happening now or if some of us would even still be alive.

I'll stop now , im goin outside.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 21:33:44 GMT

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

cowmisfitDave, when did they stab anyone in the back?? RIGHT NOW THEY ARE, your a forigner so i wouldn't expect you to understand this concept with out an argument, but what do you call right now?? There supposed to be our allie, if 3000 of there citizins were killed we'd follow and back them 100% becasue we are there ALLIE, it happens to american and they pretty much say shuv it until we can get something out of it. You can bitch and moan all you want about the french people not hating us, but you can't deny the french goverment hates our goverment and would trully love to see America crumble. Guess what, were not gonna let your nations stop us from defending us, if you can't get the concept of hit before your hit first then die.

France is your ally. They were in Afghanistan, and appropriately working with the Afghani coalition to deal with the man who took those 3000 lives.

Quote:As soon as United Nations Security Council Resolution 1378 was issued on 18 October 2001, France forces were sent in Afghanistan... In total, some 5,500 French service members were sent to the region
source

France had no obligation to assist you in your Iraq war. It had nothing to do with 9/11 and Saddam was still under his sanctions. It is irrelevant that what we know now portrays people in the French government in a suspicious light. In March 2003, you knew no such thing and went to war illegally anyway.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 21:41:46 GMT

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

cowmisfitSpoony war is bullshit?? /me smakes you, welcome back to reality were freedom has to be protected becasue not everything is hunky dorry and not everyone understands talking, would i love to talk with teh iraqies and afganies to stop whats going on now?? Hell yes i would have, before 9/11, i have no symptathy for them waht so ever.

Your calling USA child mamers?? Waht the fuck is wrong with you, GUESS WAHT ITS WAR , PEOPLE DIE AND GET HURT IN WAR, JESUS CHIRST WHY CAN'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?? Yea, i agree with you 100% it sucks that children get hurt, but guess what thats war, sorry.

Saying we saved there asses does not imply we did it all by ourselves at all, i know we didn't do it by our selves. Millions of russians and thousands of british died to help us and many other natinalitys as well, france even. But guess what, with out us there to help the allies we would probably be living in a totally different world today, no telling what would be happening now or if some of us would even still be alive.

I'll stop now , im goin outside.

Of course, the only reason you entered the war in the first place is because of Japan's alliance with Germany. They declared war on you, so America had no choise but to fight.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 21:53:07 GMT

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

cowmisfit if you can't get the concept of hit before your hit first then die.

Rephrase that to "Hit first, even when we don't know if we're justified, don't know if we'll kill the right people and don't know if we'll get the man" and I'll accept that... or at least moreso than the drivvel you write.

Quote:Your calling USA child mamers?? Waht the fuck is wrong with you, GUESS WAHT ITS WAR , PEOPLE DIE AND GET HURT IN WAR, JESUS CHIRST WHY CAN'T YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?? Yea, i agree with you 100% it sucks that children get hurt, but guess what thats war, sorry.

You're fighting a losing battle there. Like it or not, the USA uses bombs that they know are unreliable and only detonate xx% of its payload, leaving the other bomblets on the ground until some unsuspecting child picks it up and finds that he has no hands or feet soon after.

No shit people die in war, but that's no justification for killing non-combatants, or worse, condoning actions (or in this case, inactions) leading to their deaths. Kill the people firing guns at you, don't kill the people cowering in a house because they've been caught up in a war that has nothing to

do with them, eh?

Quote: But guess what, with out us there to help the allies we would probably be living in a totally different world today,

Oh, the "America saved your sorry asses SO BE FUCKING GREATFUL" response. Just remember who saved your asses in the war of Independance.

Quote:Dave, when did they stab anyone in the back?? RIGHT NOW THEY ARE, your a forigner so i wouldn't expect you to understand this concept with out an argument, but what do you call right now?? There supposed to be our allie, if 3000 of there citizins were killed we'd follow and back them 100% becasue we are there ALLIE, it happens to american and they pretty much say shuv it until we can get something out of it. You can bitch and moan all you want about the french people not hating us, but you can't deny the french goverment hates our goverment and would trully love to see America crumble. Guess what, were not gonna let your nations stop us from defending us

They're stabbing you in the back because they're being good and not following GWB into an illegal war... Ok. I can't argue with that :rolleys:

You're right, I can't deny that the French government hate you, because I have no fucking clue what the French government are thinking. Let's remember that dodgy intelligence is what got you in this mess.

We're not asking you to stop defending yourselves, we're asking you to stop killing people for no reason whatsoever.

Pretty please?

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 22:24:55 GMT

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

cowmisfitSpoony war is bullshit?? /me smakes you, welcome back to reality were freedom has to be protected becasue not everything is hunky dorry and not everyone understands talking, would i love to talk with teh iraqies and afganies to stop whats going on now?? Hell yes i would have, before 9/11, i have no symptathy for them waht so ever.

Define "them"?

cowmisfitMillions of russians and thousands of british died to help us and many other natinalitys as well, france even. But guess what, with out us there to help the allies we would probably be living in a totally different world today,

Yeah, and it was really nice of the USA to wait until they got attacked, wasn't it?

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 22:28:05 GMT

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

We weren't going to fight a war that wasn't ours to fight. It was how we felt back in the early 20th century and even before then. Things, obviously, have changed since then. The nation would NOT have been behind the war if we weren't attacked first. Hence why we waited. Roosevelt wanted to join the war, but he didn't because of the reaction the nation would have.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 22:39:39 GMT

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

Dave once again you don't get it. No reason what so ever besides millions of innocent iraqies killed by saddam , 3000 americans and counting killed because of groups saddam funds and supports, hundreds and probably thousands of innocent people in isreal and abroad killed by suicide bombing saddam funded and rewarded.

YOur right, NOOOOO FUCKING REASON TO BE IN IRAQ AT ALL What the hell was i thinking.

Spoony just in your last comment

Quote:Yeah, and it was really nice of the USA to wait until they got attacked, wasn't it?

All you do is question and denounce the actions of your country, why do you hate your nation so much? Is it because the powerful people from the internet will think your cool or something?? I don't get it.

edit and dave, we don't kill innocent civilians or use weapons that we KNOW will kill an child , you need to re-think your morals and those you think we hold if your gonna say that. Thats just pure ignorance to say we intentially hurt children.

Know what, we woudln't have to even place bombs in the area's were children or innocent people may be killed if the terrorist didn't hide with in them like the coweredds they are. THEY WANT US to come after them and kill innocent people so we look bad, not hard to understand. Its the same concept of them hiding in holy places such as mosq (or how ever its spelled).

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 22:42:00 GMT

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

cowmisfitDave once again you don't get it. No reason what so ever besides millions of innocent iraqies killed by saddam , 3000 americans and counting killed because of groups saddam funds and supports, hundreds and probably thousands of innocent people in isreal and abroad killed by suicide bombing saddam funded and rewarded.

How do you know Saddam killed millions of Iraqis?

No, he really wasn't involved in 9/11. It's funny though how about 80% or something of Bush supporters believe that. You people need to read.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 22:43:31 GMT

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

cowmisfitAll you do is question and denounce the actions of your country, why do you hate your nation so much?

Reading this question makes me nearly as confused as you were when you wrote it.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 22:51:01 GMT

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

cowmisfitDave once again you don't get it. No reason what so ever besides millions of innocent iraqies killed by saddam , 3000 americans and counting killed because of groups saddam funds and supports, hundreds and probably thousands of innocent people in isreal and abroad killed by suicide bombing saddam funded and rewarded.

YOur right, NOOOOO FUCKING REASON TO BE IN IRAQ AT ALL What the hell was i thinking.

Spoony just in your last comment

Quote:Yeah, and it was really nice of the USA to wait until they got attacked, wasn't it?

All you do is question and denounce the actions of your country, why do you hate your nation so much? Is it because the powerful people from the internet will think your cool or something?? I don't get it.

edit and dave, we don't kill innocent civilians or use weapons that we KNOW will kill an child , you need to re-think your morals and those you think we hold if your gonna say that. Thats just pure ignorance to say we intentially hurt children.

Know what, we woudln't have to even place bombs in the area's were children or innocent people may be killed if the terrorist didn't hide with in them like the cowereds they are. THEY WANT US to come after them and kill innocent people so we look bad, not hard to understand. Its the same concept of them hiding in holy places such as mosq (or how ever its spelled).

hmm.. I think I missed something.

The only thing Dave mentioned in his last post was that the war was illegal. So.. I don't get why you make things up to try to deminish someone elses stance. That doesn't do you no good.

Remember people: Legality and reason are two completely separate things.

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

Posted by [U927](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 22:53:18 GMT

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

cowmisfitDave, when did they stab anyone in the back?? RIGHT NOW THEY ARE, your a forigner so i wouldn't expect you to understand this concept with out an argument, but what do you call right now?? There supposed to be our allie, if 3000 of there citizins were killed we'd follow and back them 100% becasue we are there ALLIE, it happens to american and they pretty much say shuv it until we can get something out of it. You can bitch and moan all you want about the french people not hating us, but you can't deny the french goverment hates our goverment and would trully love to see America crumble. Guess what, were not gonna let your nations stop us from defending us, if you can't get the concept of hit before your hit first then die.

Stop the fuck right there.

First of all, how the hell is not participating in a war, one that was NOT passed through the UN, make you a backstabber? By your logic, let's say my friend wanted to rob a convenience(sp?) store and wanted me to help him. I say no. Does that make me a backstabber?

Also, why the hell would they want to see America, a nation which they helped give birth to, crumble? Are you honestly so right-winged that you think every nation is out to get us and we should attack them first before they attack us? Without France, we wouldn't have been able to supply our militias in the Revolutionary War. Without the assistance of a French general, General Lafayette, Washington would not have been able to assemble raggedy minutemen into the Continental Army. Without the French Navy, we would not have been able to capture General Cornwallis, which ultimately led to the surrender of the British and the annexation of the thirteen colonies from Britain to form the United States.

As for hitting other nations before they hit us, that may be true, but ONLY if they present an imminent and immediate threat to us. Now, when, exactly, did Iraq present a threat to us? You can ramble on about WMDs, but I've yet to see working missile silos that can launch an ICBM at one of our major cities.

You are an embarrassment to Conservatives everywhere. Please, shut the hell up before you make yourself look like more of an ass than you are now.

EDIT: Fixed some typos.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 22:58:27 GMT

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

hmm.. I just thought of this, and am curious as to what the answer would be.

cowmisfit, since France among others are helping the terrorists, as you say they are, what do you suggest we should do to a country to assists/funds/ etc. terrorists?

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:08:18 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngicowmisfitDave once again you don't get it. No reason what so ever besides millions of innocent iraqies killed by saddam , 3000 americans and counting killed because of groups saddam funds and supports, hundreds and probably thousands of innocent people in isreal and abroad killed by suicide bombing saddam funded and rewarded.

How do you know Saddam killed millions of Iraqis?

Okay, even you liberals can agree with me here, this is one of the stupidest questions and statements i've ever seen.

Okay, i was thinking of posting pictures, but i'd get banned from teh forums most likely. So i'll just have to try and tell you.

OKAY, we've found the tourcher chambers, we've found the mass graves, we've got the records (Saddam kept records like hitler , very detailed ones at that of most of the people he killed (i saw video of a ware house were thsee were held on MSNBC show on saddam) , We've got the pictures and video of him killing people, EVEN THE IRAQI CITIZENS SAY THIS IS TRUE , and in a lot of cases that they have had family or freinds that "dissappear" or were held in the tourcher chambers of saddam and never seen again.

That question blows my mind.

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:09:59 GMT

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

No, you fool. Not if he killed people. How do you know he killed millions of people? I shouldn't have to italicize that for you.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:11:48 GMT

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

warrantohmm.. I just thought of this, and am curious as to what the answer would be.

cowmisfit, since France among others are helping the terrorists, as you say they are, what do you suggest we should do to a country to assists/funds/ etc. terrorists?

Call them "Cheese eating surrender monkeys" and boycott them.

Or are you seriously expecting him to say that America should invade France

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:15:26 GMT

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

warranto

cowmisfit, since France among others are helping the terrorists, as you say they are, what do you suggest we should do to a country to assists/funds/ etc. terrorists?

France is an established country , that i have to admit, is quite a big player in the world scene, so we can't just go in and rid the terrorist with bombs and such as we have in Iraq, i know that.

So what do we do.

We wait until we are done or at least have some more funding and troops to spread out after the Afganistan and Iraqi war is over. We then send diplomats to these country's (not just france as theres also north korea and syria, lybia , sadi arabia to deal with as well , france will go after these nations) And demmand OUR inspectors NOT the UN be allowed into the country and have access to all goverment files. We give a dead line, if these demands are not made we begin with a halt and possible a barcade to the nations ports if they have them. We step up spying efforts on the nation if its one like France who we can't just go in and bomb the hell out of, if its not france we threaten force. However not a full scale invasion like we did in iraq (we had a reason to go into iraq because we had 20 years of evidence and reason). I would agree with you for the most part if tommrow we invaded a country like syria and lybia for reasons of supporting terrorist because then i would want proof, but i have the faith in my nation that we would ahve the proof, i just don't have faith in your nations to back us even if we showed it right to all of your faces.

And i'll finish this in a sec, shower time.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:15:34 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiHow do you know Saddam killed millions of Iraqis?

Mass graves and attempted Genocide of the Kurds using his Chemical Weapons.

Umbral_DelaFlareFirst of all, how the hell is not participating in a war, one that was NOT passed

through the UN, make you a backstabber? By your logic, let's say my friend wanted to rob a convenience(sp?) store and wanted me to help him. I say no. Does that make me a backstabber? No relevance whatsoever. Once again if the law is UN then the law is corrupt as the UN has become corrupt. <---Insert dumbass rebuttle like "Yea, but its still the law" after this post.

Umbral_DelaFlareAlso, why the hell would they want to see America, a nation which they helped give birth to, crumble?

France did help us with our independence, but only to hurt Britain. And to tell you the truth they were late, as Washington had Cornwallis backed into Yorktown as the French began to help with their Navy. Either way, Cornwallis would have been defeated.

Umbral_DelaFlareNow, when, exactly, did Iraq present a threat to us? cowmisfit3000 americans and counting killed because of groups saddam funds and supports I'm pretty sure cow already answered that.

Umbral_DelaFlareYou are an embarrassment to Conservatives everywhere. Please, shut the hell up before you make yourself look like more of an ass than you are now. I got news for ya dude, he makes his point clear and all you Lefties do is say: "nope thats wrong". The only Liberal here that actually backs up his statements with clear info is Javacx. All ive seen Spoony and others here do is, well, stuff like this:

cowmisfitThey didn't come to iraq because they had dealings with saddam once again THEY'D LOOSE MONEY , the most important thing in the world to them.SpoonWow... You really don't know what America's been doing lately, do you?

or this great statement with no Reference whatsoever:

cowmisfitAbout reading a non-american text book, i have , im in College Prep European History were we have an Biased left wing text book peice of shit that says were only in Iraq for oilSpoonBiased? Perhaps. Left wing? Certainly. But if you replace "only" with "mainly", it's right.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:16:18 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiNo, you fool. Not if he killed people. How do you know he killed millions of people? I shouldn't have to italicize that for you.

I just told you, we have the records we have the video we have the stories of iraq's citizians, stop being a moron.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:24:25 GMT

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

cowmisfitwarranto

cowmisfit, since France among others are helping the terrorists, as you say they are, what do you suggest we should do to a country to assists/funds/ etc. terrorists?

France is an established country , that i have to admit, is quite a big player in the world scene, so we can't just go in and rid the terrorist with bombs and such as we have in Iraq, i know that.

So what do we do.

We wait until we are done or at least have some more funding and troops to spread out after the Afganistan and Iraqi war is over. We then send diplomats to these country's (not just france as theres also north korea and syria, lybia , sadi arabia to deal with as well , france will go after these nations) And demmand OUR inspectors NOT the UN be allowed into the country and have access to all goverment files. We give a dead line, if these demands are not made we begin with a halt and possible a barcade to the nations ports if they have them. We step up spying efforts on the nation if its one like France who we can't just go in and bomb the hell out of, if its not france we threaten force. However not a full scale invasion like we did in iraq (we had a reason to go into iraq because we had 20 years of evidence and reason). I would agree with you for the most part if tommrow we invaded a country like syria and lybia for reasons of supporting terrorist because then i would want proof, but i have the faith in my nation that we would ahve the proof, i just don't have faith in your nations to back us even if we showed it right to all of your faces.

And i'll finish this in a sec, shower time.

1984.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:26:37 GMT

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

omg, wut did i just say. EXPLAIN, a simple 1984 isnt gonna do it. What happened in 1984 that you want to Highlight????

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:28:24 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]No relevance whatsoever. Once again if the law is UN then the law is corrupt as the UN has become corrupt. <---Insert dumbass rebuttle like "Yea, but its still the law" after this post.

By that logic, if any part of a nation or agency is corrupt, its laws are corrupt. Which would blackmail just about every nation, yes, including America, to the same fate you've degraded the U.N. to.

Quote:I'm pretty sure cow already answered that.

If cowmisfit was referring to Iraq, which I doubt, then that number is wrong on all fronts. I'm better he was PROBABLY referring to the WTC incident. In which case that would not constitute invading Iraq and toppling its standing sovereign government as they had literally nothing to do with it. All that terrorist connections information that is spewwed around is, as far as I've seen and read, circumstantial and does not tie Iraq to the WTC incident.

That is not a threat to America. The information utilized on March 19th, 2003 would not support that allegation and the administration itself couldn't say for certain if Saddam played a role in WTC to tie with this ridiculous allegation you and cowmisfit are making.

I would really like to see what was used to justify the invasion in the first place. Because there was no imminent threat to America whatsoever on March 19th, 2003.

Quote:The only Liberal here that actually backs up his statements with clear info is Javacx.

I don't agree with you most of the time, but I am certainly not a liberal. You people need to stop assuming that whoever disagrees with you is on the opposite end of the spectrum.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:29:16 GMT

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

Good god. It's a Book by George Orwell, don't tell me you've never heard of it...

Basically, the continent of Oceania is ruled by "The Party" who controls everything under the sun.

This damn well sounds like empire building. "Give us this or we boycott you". Give me a fucking break.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:33:31 GMT

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

1984 can mean anything from a statistic, to your book, to the very year historically. Like i said simply saying 1984 does nothing, explain what you meant by 1984 like you did above. Was that so freakin hard?

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:34:37 GMT

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

I made the mistake of assuming people round here would have read a book that wasn't "Iraqi hating 101" and would associate 1984 with one of the best books ever written.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:37:12 GMT

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

very mature.... :rolleyes:

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:48:03 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]

I got news for ya dude, he makes his point clear and all you Lefties do is say: "nope thats wrong". The only Liberal here that actually backs up his statements with clear info is Javacx. All ive seen Spoony and others here do is, well, stuff like this:

cowmisfitThey didn't come to iraq because they had dealings with saddam once again THEY'D LOOSE MONEY , the most important thing in the world to them.SpoonyWow... You really don't know what America's been doing lately, do you?

or this great statement with no Reference whatsoever:

cowmisfitAbout reading a non-american text book, i have , im in College Prep European History were we have an Biased left wing text book peice of shit that says were only in Iraq for oilSpoonyBiased? Perhaps. Left wing? Certainly. But if you replace "only" with "mainly", it's right.

Firstly, I am hardly what you would call a "Leftie", but since you would automatically assume anyone who doesn't agree with everything you say is passionately anti-American, your misconceptions don't surprise me.

Secondly, "what America has been doing lately" involves raping a lot of the rest of the world in the pursuit of oil. Now, Britain has the North Sea... which admittedly may not last forever, but at least we don't need to bomb anyone with the pretense of moral high ground to get it

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

Posted by [U927](#) on Sun, 02 Jan 2005 23:48:07 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]Umbral_DelaFlareAlso, why the hell would they want to see America, a nation which they helped give birth to, crumble?

France did help us with our independence, but only to hurt Britain. And to tell you the truth they

were late, as Washington had Cornwallis backed into Yorktown as the French began to help with their Navy. Either way, Cornwallis would have been defeated.

Wrong. Cornwallis had his navy in Yorktown as a means of escape. If the French Navy wasn't there, Cornwallis would have fled, allowing the war to continue.

Umbral_DelaFlareNow, when, exactly, did Iraq present a threat to us? 3000 americans and counting killed because of groups saddam funds and supports I'm pretty sure cow already answered that.

Osama bin Laden was one son out of 25 of a billionaire oil businessman in Saudi Arabia. He didn't need funding. Also, just because you "support" a cause doesn't mean someone should go out and beat the living hell out of you just because they oppose it.

Now then, on to the biggr retard.

France is an established country , that i have to admit, is quite a big player in the world scene, so we can't just go in and rid the terrorist with bombs and such as we have in Iraq, i know that.

So what do we do.

We wait until we are done or at least have some more funding and troops to spread out after the Afganistan and Iraqi war is over. We then send diplomats to these country's (not just france as theres also north korea and syria, lybia , sadi arabia to deal with as well , france will go after these nations) And demmand OUR inspectors NOT the UN be allowed into the country and have access to all goverment files. We give a dead line, if these demands are not made we begin with a halt and possible a barcade to the nations ports if they have them. We step up spying efforts on the nation if its one like France who we can't just go in and bomb the hell out of, if its not france we threaten force. However not a full scale invasion like we did in iraq (we had a reason to go into iraq because we had 20 years of evidence and reason). I would agree with you for the most part if tommrow we invaded a country like syria and lybia for reasons of supporting terrorist because then i would want proof, but i have the faith in my nation that we would ahve the proof, i just don't have faith in your nations to back us even if we showed it right to all of your faces.

This method is just looking for a fight. You KNOW these nations have large Anti-American feelings, and you expect the United States to block them off ALONE and demand that they allow OUR inspectors to make sure they don't have any WMDs?

All you would be doing is painting a giant target on your back. There is NO way these nations are going to back down to America, especially Iran, whose people are greatly influenced by the Ayatollah, who has great Anti-American sentiments.

The United States is not the police of the world. That is why the United nations was created, so a majority of nations can agree on a situation and what to do about it, be it war or economic policy. We signed the agreement, and are therefore obliged to keep it. If we go around saying "We will do whatever we want, however we want, so fuck you all" , then we will have even more countries who will hate us.

We cannot allow our pride and arrogance to get in the way. We are not exempt from the rules in the UN Charter, so we have to follow the laws placed by the UN, no matter how unfair they may seem.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 00:05:39 GMT

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

cowmisfitSuperFlyingEngiNo, you fool. Not if he killed people. How do you know he killed millions of people? I shouldn't have to italicize that for you.

I just told you, we have the records we have the video we have the stories of iraq's citizens, stop being a moron.

Saddam killed 600,000 Iraqi civilians, and 100,000 Kurdish Iraqis. Last time I checked, the word "million" does not occur in "seven hundred thousand."

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 00:25:08 GMT

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

cowmisfitwarranto

cowmisfit, since France among others are helping the terrorists, as you say they are, what do you suggest we should do to a country to assists/funds/ etc. terrorists?

France is an established country , that i have to admit, is quite a big player in the world scene, so we can't just go in and rid the terrorist with bombs and such as we have in Iraq, i know that.

So what do we do.

We wait until we are done or at least have some more funding and troops to spread out after the Afganistan and Iraqi war is over. We then send diplomats to these country's (not just france as theres also north korea and syria, lybia , sadi arabia to deal with as well , france will go after these nations) And demmand OUR inspectors NOT the UN be allowed into the country and have access to all goverment files. We give a dead line, if these demands are not made we begin with a halt and possible a barcade to the nations ports if they have them. We step up spying efforts on the nation if its one like France who we can't just go in and bomb the hell out of, if its not france we threaten force. However not a full scale invasion like we did in iraq (we had a reason to go into iraq because we had 20 years of evidence and reason). I would agree with you for the most part if tommrow we invaded a country like syria and lybia for reasons of supporting terrorist because then i would want proof, but i have the faith in my nation that we would ahve the proof, i just don't have faith in your nations to back us even if we showed it right to all of your faces.

And i'll finish this in a sec, shower time.

Interesting.

Ok, you heard it here folks. Cowmisfits idea for what to do to America for supporting/funding/etc. terrorism.

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

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 00:41:31 GMT

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

I have my doubts about the War on Terror, more specifically, the current situation in Iraq...

What is happening, is we are pissing off large numbers of Iraqis and Middle-Easterners in general, and inadvertently contributing to the memberships of terrorist groups in the process.

Now, civilians are indeed unintentional casualties during war. But think of this scenario:

Picture a child in Iraq, and during the initial bombing raid on Baghdad, his parents were killed when a building was bombed. Yes, it wasn't 'intentional.' But because his life was essentially ruined due to the United States, as he would proclaim, he is going to dedicate his life to resisting American 'occupation' and will probably become a terrorist. So, we killed terrorists when we bombed the building, but we essentially created terrorists in the process. Don't deny that this sort of thing is happening.

Anyway, what's the alternative? I'm not sure, I think we've already done an immense amount of damage that is going to plague us in the future. But what I do know, is that this war is exacerbating the problem of anti-American feelings in the Middle East, contributing to the ranks of terrorist groups. This is how I see the 'War on Terror' to be a paradox.

This is a stupid question, and maybe it's because I'm too tired, so forgive me. What are we still doing in Iraq?

Oh, and about the whole 1984-mini-argument... I haven't even read it, and I still knew what DaveGMM was referring to when he made his post. Good grief, is it so unreasonable for someone to assume a general level of intelligence on these boards and reference an immensely popular book? :rolleyes:

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 00:49:04 GMT

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

page eight

1984 owned

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 00:49:56 GMT

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

Ryan3kOh, and about the whole 1984-mini-argument... I haven't even read it, and I still knew what DaveGMM was referring to when he made his post. Good grief, is it so unreasonable for someone to assume a general level of intelligence on these boards and reference an immensely popular book? :rolleyes:

You and I both know that you don't need to ask that.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 03:17:26 GMT

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

of course I knew of 1984, but as I was in a more advanced composition class, and i didnt have to read it, thus I didnt. So i guess being of the more intelligent portion of my class hindered my learning in that department. Anyway, in an attempt to stop this topic from spiralling into a Revolution discussion, I wont reply to that Umbra.

however SEAL, 700,000 is just as bad as one million dont you think. Quoting Red Alert: If you kill one, it is a tragedy, if you kill one million, it is a statistic. In this case its a statistic and 700,000 or one million, it is still a personal holocaust that sadaam was running. And Osama did not need funding, your right there Umbra, but how about the Taliban? Running an army of that size for that long while supplying them with explosives and weapons costs a pretty penny on the Black Market where the prices are even more steep.

While I agree that Blockading France would not be tolerated by the masses of nations, I also believe they need to be more under control. Because as of now, they have done nothing but try to hinder us when it comes to the war on terror, and allies dont do that. Personally, I think It would be better if the US attempted to drop out of the UN and take Britain, Australia, and the rest of the coalition of the willing with us. If that were possible of course. Also, I think attempting to set up an alliance with China would be a great asset, because all regimes come to a sunset. And to tell you the truth, the next one will be China unless the US toughens up as a nation.

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

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 05:04:22 GMT

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

How was France backstabbing us? Read about a little thing called the Duelfer report which outlines in detail Millions upon Millions of dollars being fraudulently passed around in defiance of the United Nations' Oil for Food program. Saddam was bribing nations like Russia, Germany, and France with huge sums of money and oil futures contracts in order to get them to defend him on the world stage. Backstabbing.

700,000 people is like 233 September 11th, 2001 attacks... it's like 3 or 4 Indian Ocean Tsunamis

(of course I can only estimate since the death count isn't complete)... such a massive loss of life, and they didn't get the "mercy" of being drowned or smashed against a building causing instant death... many/most of these people were TORTURED (real torture, not liberal "omg dogs barking" "torture").

The fact that so many terrorist organizations have sent their men into Iraq to "resist" the US forces PROVES that what we are doing is a noble cause. Why else would they be fighting back so hard if the stakes weren't high against them?

Just so you know, I do not use oil or liberation as my primary rationale for the war in Iraq. I stand with the President's word since the beginning that a liberated Iraq is a step in the right direction towards peace in the Middle East and later on, the world.

However, it's foolish is discount oil as such an invalid reason to go to war. In Phoenix, AZ, we experienced a gas pipeline burst and subsequent closure. Though we had enough reserves in town to support our needs, the possibility of a fuel shortage drove everyone to the pumps to fill their tanks. Two and three hour waits were common. We had to have fuel shipped in from California and Texas in trucks to replenish the supply. People followed the tanker trucks around waiting for them to unload. Before you say oil isn't a good reason to go to war, just think about what would happen without it.

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

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 05:20:02 GMT

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

CrimsonHow was France backstabbing us? Read about a little thing called the Duelfer report which outlines in detail Millions upon Millions of dollars being fraudulently passed around in defiance of the United Nations' Oil for Food program. Saddam was bribing nations like Russia, Germany, and France with huge sums of money and oil futures contracts in order to get them to defend him on the world stage. Backstabbing.

////////////////////////////////////

700,000 people is like 233 September 11th, 2001 attacks...

1. The little thing called the Duelfer report = tool of vengence. (EDIT: Not being serious, but you could easily think so.)

2. Have you been watching South Park lately? :((EDIT: Err, I mean, you've watched Team America, right?)

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 05:43:01 GMT

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

Crimson700,000 people is like 233 September 11th, 2001 attacks...

Really?! Oh....wow! And I'm sure you'll have a follow-up post on why 700,000 can be described as "millions" too!! Because...you know...that was my point.

Crimson...not liberal "omg dogs barking" "torture"

I see you used the word "liberal" as a synonym for "weak" or "gentle." Very mature. God, you people are such mother-conservativiers.

Gbullhowever SEAL, 700,000 is just as bad as one million dont you think. Quoting Red Alert: If you kill one, it is a tragedy, if you kill one million, it is a statistic. In this case its a statistic and 700,000 or one million...

That was Stalin, I believe. 700,000 is not just as bad as 1,000,000. In fact, I believe 1,000,000 is about 300,000 lives worse. The point is that the word "millions" was thrown around stupidly.

And another thing...

cowmisfitNo reason what so ever besides millions of innocent iraqies killed by saddam , 3000 americans and counting killed because of groups saddam funds and supports

How are casualties sustained during a war justification for going to war?

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 06:16:58 GMT

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

In response to all issues regarding the UN: fuck the UN.

The United States should withdraw all UN funding immediately and officially give it the finger. The United States cannot be a part of an organization that is composed of anti-American countries doing everything they can to hurt the United States. Why, you ask? Because they all want power. Take not only the War on Terror but also the Kyoto Treaty for example. I'm sure you've all heard the great international outcry against the United States for refusing to sign the Kyoto Treaty. The document's effects on the economy of the United States would have been catastrophically adverse, and those were the very reasons cited for our refusal, yet UN diplomats still castigated the United States for refusing to sign the incredibly flawed document.

"Oh no! Can't you see you're killing the environment by not signing this document? Can't you see you'll kill your planet if you refuse to sign? You're going to single-handedly bring about global warming if you don't sign this document!!!"

The Oil-for-Food scandal is another perfect example. The United States is actually being criticized by other countries in the UN for pursuing this \$20 billion scandal. No one else really seems to care; the media certainly doesn't, at least.

The United Nations receives the majority of its funding from the United States. It's time to stop letting them bite the hand that feeds them.

SuperFlyingLiberalToolHow do you know Saddam killed millions of Iraqis?

No, he really wasn't involved in 9/11. It's funny though how about 80% or something of Bush supporters believe that. You people need to read.
You really need to stop posting in this subforum for all our sakes.
I honestly think my I.Q. drops a point each time I read anything you write in relation to politics.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 08:35:57 GMT

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

CrimsonHowever, it's foolish is discount oil as such an invalid reason to go to war. In Phoenix, AZ, we experienced a gas pipeline burst and subsequent closure. Though we had enough reserves in town to support our needs, the possibility of a fuel shortage drives everyone to the pumps to fill their tanks. Two and three hour waits were common. We had to have fuel shipped in from California and Texas in trucks to replenish the supply. People followed the tanker trucks around waiting for them to unload. Before you say oil isn't a good reason to go to war, just think about what would happen without it.

It's already been discovered what happens without it.

A couple of years back, a group (quite a small group) of British farmers and truckers got pissed at the Government's endless pushing up of petrol prices (Bear in mind truckers get petrol subsidised, and farmers' tractors use something called "white petrol" or something which is cheaper anyway) So they took it upon themselves to set up a more-or-less peaceful blockade at the major ports, not letting any tankers through.

Result: the entire fucking country comes to a standstill. That was achieved by a handful of peaceful farmers and truck drivers, remember.

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

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 08:52:49 GMT

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

Running out of oil would probably cause more deaths than the tsunamis, the war in Iraq, Saddam's torture, 9-11 put together. In fact it could kill every last one. Think total breakdown of society.

We are at a point now where we need oil for survival. If you have an hour ride to work, you now have, what, a 4 hour bike ride to work? 8 hours on foot? It's simply not possible. Millions and Millions are out of work. Most services shut down because the people aren't able to operate and maintain them. Limits on water usage electricity usage natural gas usage. As we approach a complete depletion of oil racketeering and hoarding will settle in, I foresee national guard at all gas stations, ration systems being put into place, freezes on wages and prices, riots, scandals. The poor saying the rich are using all the oil while the rich say the poor use all the oil, class conflict breaks out, we have a sort of Russian Revolution style proleteriet vs. upper class. Arsons, vandalisms on a widespread scale.

Martial Law in place, national guard spread to each city. Curfews for all citizens, checkpoints and mandatory placement into areas, possibly relocation or just denial of travel. People who drive SUV's beaten in the streets a la LA Riots.

This keeps snowballing, government begins to lose control of the country as a whole. Society as we know it pretty much gone after a month. Civilization reduced to nomadic tribes and gangs a la Waterworld, (Minus the water that is) and only the strong survive. The majority of the population are unable to make the conversion and perish due to starvation or violence. Most of the people in this modern age couldn't last very long without electricity, natural gas, fossil fuels and running water. Anarchy ensues, and all the anarchists realize that anarchy sucks and die from starvation or disease.

This scene repeated in other countries to a lesser extent depending on their dependence on fossil fuels. The entire world reduced to 3rd world nations. 3rd world nations are renamed 6th world nations. Earth makes a big ol frown and we get set back a thousand years and re enter the dark ages, only like... the technology infused dark ages where people wear headbands and live in huts made from parts of cars and aircraft.

Pretty bleak eh? Let's just cross our fingers and hope someone figures out how to burn water soon.

(DISCLAIMER: Yes this is exaggerated but not as much as you'd probably think. Running out of Fossil Fuels would be a mondo bad thing and would definately cause the breakdown of society)

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

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 09:54:55 GMT

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

Well composed.

So my point is... if (hypothetically), the war is "for oil"... then at least many of you understand why oil is so important rather than simplifying it to "omg people have to die because of this black goeey stuff!"

I am not using "liberal" for "weak" or "gentle". However, it is the liberals who believe that listening to dogs bark or being made to stay up for days is tortuous. Even though these same people would gladly strap on a bomb and kill some infidels.

I never said 700,000 was "millions". I knew it wasn't "millions" already. Just because one of the conservatives made a mistake doesn't make all of us at fault for it. Don't hold me responsible for

his mistake.

Oh, and I don't watch South Park. I only have room for one intellectually devoid show on my recording schedule and that show isn't it.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 11:37:23 GMT

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

SEAL

How are casualties sustained during a war justification for going to war?

Please tell me how we were at war on September 10, 2001 please because i'd love to hear that one.

and let me correct myself. I OVER EXAGGERATED OKAY I ADMIT IT, but i do belive its MIILLION not MILLIONS.

I do belive it would go into at least a million and + some, if you combine not only all of his own people he's killed over the years, but the operations he's funded and 9/11.

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

Posted by [Spoonycowmisfit](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 11:44:22 GMT

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

cowmisfitSEAL

How are casualties sustained during a war justification for going to war?

Please tell me how we were at war on September 10, 2001 please because i'd love to hear that one.

and let me correct myself. I OVER EXAGGERATED OKAY I ADMIT IT, but i do belive its MIILLION not MILLIONS.

I do belive it would go into at least a million and + some, if you combine not only all of his own people he's killed over the years, but the operations he's funded and 9/11.

America's response to 9/11 killed far more innocent bystanders than 9/11 itself, you do realise that? Oh wait... human life is worth more if you're American, isn't it?

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 11:58:38 GMT

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

SpoonycowmisfitSEAL

How are casualties sustained during a war justification for going to war?

Please tell me how we were at war on September 10, 2001 please because i'd love to hear that one.

and let me correct myself. I OVER EXAGGERATED OKAY I ADMIT IT, but i do believe its MIILLION not MILLIONS.

I do believe it would go into at least a million and + some, if you combine not only all of his own people he's killed over the years, but the operations he's funded and 9/11. America's response to 9/11 killed far more innocent bystanders than 9/11 itself, you do realise that? Oh wait... human life is worth more if you're American, isn't it?

In a broad sense no , every life is the same.

But you don't understand something called defending YOUR nation (i emphetize YOUR because you seem to despise YOUR nation)

I've already told you this , ITS CALLED WAR PEOPLE DIE IN WAR GET OVER IT!!! INNOCENT PEOPLE DIE IN WAR AND GUESSS WHAT TOO BAD TO SAD IF THAT HAS TO HAPPEN TO DEFEND MY NATION I DON'T GIVE A RATS ASS.

Its so pointless trying to talk to a left wing , you can't get anything through there OMG LIK CURL UP IN A BALL AND LET THEM HIT YOU CAUSE WE DON'T WANNA HURT NO ONE FEELIN OMG state of mind.

Spoony, after 9/11, were you opposed to entering afganistan ??? (NOT IRAQ, AFGANISTAN.)

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 12:29:45 GMT

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

its like talking to a wall eh cow? They just dont seem to grasp the concept that in war people die, and people includes innocents.

Anyway, doitle, nice story. They should make it into a movie

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 13:00:47 GMT

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

cowmisfiti emphetize YOUR because you seem to despise YOUR nation
I don't know where you get your ideas from. Must be a pretty weird place. Since you clearly don't have a fucking clue what you're saying, I'd advise you stop making these assumptions about the way I regard my country. I'd be surprised if you even knew what country I live in.

cowmisfit!ve already told you this , ITS CALLED WAR PEOPLE DIE IN WAR GET OVER IT!!!
INNOCENT PEOPLE DIE IN WAR AND GUESSS WHAT TOO BAD TO SAD IF THAT HAS TO
HAPPEN TO DEFEND MY NATION I DON'T GIVE A RATS ASS
It'd be pretty easy for Bin Laden to say the same thing, wouldn't it?

cowmisfitIts so pointless trying to talk to a left wing , you can't get anything through there OMG
LIK CURL UP IN A BALL AND LET THEM HIT YOU CAUSE WE DON"T WANNA HURT NO ONE
FEELIN OMG state of mind.

Firstly I am not left wing, secondly the reason you can't get anything through to me is because you
don't actually have anything valid to get through.

cowmisfitSpoony, after 9/11, were you opposed to entering afganistan ??? (NOT IRAQ,
AFGANISTAN.)

Define "entering"? I was in favour of sending in some elite troops to actually find Bin Laden
instead of bombing the fuck out of random villages in the vague hope Bin Laden happened to be
there, regardless of how many bystanders got in the way.

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]its like talking to a wall eh cow?
whereas talking to you is like talking to a complete idiot.

No, wait... there's no "like" about it, is there?

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 13:04:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:In a broad sense no , every life is the same.

Quote:INNOCENT PEOPLE DIE IN WAR AND GUESSS WHAT TOO BAD TO SAD IF THAT
HAS TO HAPPEN TO DEFEND MY NATION I DON'T GIVE A RATS ASS.

Polar opposite views in less than three lines... that's got to be a record. This is a classic Yes
Minister reply, for those of you that have watched that excellent British piece of comedy. In a
"broad" sense indeed.

That's an answer that sounds like a real answer, but is totally devoid of meaning.

Quote:Its so pointless trying to talk to a left wing

And this is the reason why I don't take anything you say seriously. All you do to try and prove your
point is throw the "liberal/left wing commie" crap around.

Quote:I do belive it would go into at least a million and + some, if you combine not only all of his
own people he's killed over the years, but the operations he's funded and 9/11

And if you include all the civilians that the Coalition has killed, I'm sure it'll go into two million.

Oh, and on a related topic:

Quote:We are at a point now where we need oil for survival.

Well then, we're all doomed.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 13:07:37 GMT

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

survival, no.... civilisation, yes

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 14:14:01 GMT

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

an idiot am i? At least i realise that civilian casualties are a part of war and they cant be avoided, whereas you think its the ultimate evil for us to protect our country. Spoony, you claim we dont know where you are from so i'll take that as your not american. If your not american than you dont know how pissed off the true patriots are of 9/11. Because the Antiwar mongers seem to have forgotten about it and their patriotism as if it is a worn fad. And yes Bin Laden would say that, because he knows what war is. Some instances you need to wage a passive total war in order to sustain peace and preserve life later on so the war isnt waged over the course of a few centuries. And villages were not just carpet bombed in Aphganistan. You say this and you call me dumb:

SpoonyDefine "entering"? I was in favour of sending in some elite troops to actually find Bin Laden instead of bombing the fuck out of random villages in the vague hope Bin Laden happened to be there, regardless of how many bystanders got in the way.

and obviously a few elite troops cannot take down the taliban. You would be sending in the best of the best to be martyred in vain. The taliban had thousands in their ranks, a few elites cannot take that down. You act as if groups like Delta are gods when they are still flesh and blood.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 16:07:06 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]whereas you think its the ultimate evil for us to protect our country. I think this adequately proves how stupid you are. If you want to actually debate this, then let's. At the moment, you seem intent on spouting absolute garbage instead.

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]Spoony, you claim we dont know where you are from so i'll take that as your not

american. If your not american than you dont know how pissed off the true patriots are of 9/11. So one act of terrorism warrants another, is that what you're saying?

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 16:19:36 GMT

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

I'm sorry, but defending your country is not terrorism. We were attacked, and are not going to allow that to happen again. We're going after the leaders and supporters of terrorist groups. Now, you may say, the radical Iraqis are defending their country, so we can't call them terrorists, but they're not defending they country. They're committing suicide while taking out as many "infidels" as possible. Their reasoning to attack the coalition forces is jihad. There are also plenty of Saddam loyalists, but they're all criminals, anyways.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 17:04:23 GMT

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

j_ball430I'm sorry, but defending your country is not terrorism.
Indeed it isn't, and I'm not the one in this thread who can't make the distinction.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 17:04:36 GMT

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

j_ball430and supporters of terrorist groups.

Best train the guns on all the American people who donated funds to the IRA then... or has the memory of those Irish terrorists diminished in the past few years?

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 17:09:22 GMT

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

Why not? Anybody who supports terrorism should be shot anyways.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 18:13:51 GMT

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

Really now?

Shoot Americans! They support Terrorism!

^^ Interesting viewpoint you have there j_ball.

Afterall...

Russia invasion of Afganistan, America supplies funds AND CIA training to a small group of people, lead by a man named ...yup, Osama Bin Laden.

World War II, America assists the French Terrorists against German occupation.

Bad America! Let us take Cowmisfits and j_balls suggestion and punish America!

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 18:23:19 GMT

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

Not really interesting...just fair.

I don't agree with the CIA training of terroristic actions. I never said I agreed with it. I don't like it, and I never have.

I don't exactly see how they were terrorists. They were resistance fighters. They were organized, and were fighting Germans for their country. They took risks in order to help free their country. That's just a LITTLE different from the radicals we're fighting now. Don't you think?

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 18:23:38 GMT

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

Funny. All their gab about protecting their country when what they really want to do is declare war on themselves

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 18:26:59 GMT

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

No, only those who support evil. Those who support terrorists only put the rest of the nation and it's people in danger. Example: Training of Afghanis to fight Russia. Kind of backfired, didn't it? Ended up hurting us in the long run.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 18:30:54 GMT

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

Quote:No, only those who support evil. Those who support terrorists only put the rest of the nation and it's people in danger.

Like Warranto's been saying.

America.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 18:32:10 GMT

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

Most of America doesn't support terrorism. kthx.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 18:41:50 GMT

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

j_ball430! don't exactly see how they were terrorists. They were resistance fighters. They were organized, and were fighting Germans for their country. They took risks in order to help free their country.

I never ever thought I'd hear an American say something about WWII which was actually accurate.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 18:50:34 GMT

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

I know my 20th century history. Especially the World War II era.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:02:20 GMT

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

j_balll don't exactly see how they were terrorists. They were resistance fighters.

You're just putting a positive spin on the same thing.

It's not shell shock! It's post-traumatic stress disorder!

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:04:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yay, and you ignored the rest of my post that proves that statement true. Congratulations for missing the point!

Spoony even agrees as to what I said. Why? Because it's truth. Something you democrats will never understand.

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:11:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warrantoLet us take Cowmisfits and j_balls suggestion and punish America!

no countries have the gonads to try and hurt america after 9/11. We proved that we wont be dicked around with. And supporting French Resistance against our enemy the Axis was not supporting terrorism as the Nazis outstepped their bounds. Your an idiot if you think otherwise. nuff said.

fighting oppression and oppressing is two different things, get your head out of your ass

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:15:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]warrantoLet us take Cowmisfits and j_balls suggestion and punish America!

no countries have the gonads to try and hurt america after 9/11. We proved that we wont be dicked around with. And supporting French Resistance against our enemy the Axis was not supporting terrorism as the Nazis outstepped their bounds. Your an idiot if you think otherwise. nuff said.

fighting oppression and oppressing is two different things, get your head out of your ass
It is blindingly obvious you don't understand what you're saying, nor what anyone else is saying.
Oh, and nice post edit by the way.

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:19:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430Yay, and you ignored the rest of my post that proves that statement true. Congratulations for missing the point!

Spoony even agrees as to what I said. Why? Because it's truth. Something you democrats will never understand.

You didn't PROVE anything. Giving a few reasons why YOU think they are different doesn't prove it.

"I don't exactly see how they were terrorists. They were resistance fighters. They were organized, and were fighting Germans for their country. They took risks in order to help free their country. That's just a LITTLE different from the radicals we're fighting now. Don't you think?"

The terrorists in Iraq are resistance fighters. They are an organized entity, or at least as organized as they are capable of being. They are fighting American's for their country (their perspective). They are taking risks in order to free their country (again, their persepective). Calling a group resistance fighters or freedom fighters vs. terrorists is just a way of making them look better or worse.

I did read your entire post, and I understood your point. I still disagree with it. Don't jump to conclusions.

Democrats will never understand the truth? Fuck you. Uncalled for and false.

Quote:no countries have the gonads to try and hurt america after 9/11. We proved that we wont be dicked around with. And supporting French Resistance against our enemy the Axis was not supporting terrorism as the Nazis outstepped their bounds. Your an idiot if you think otherwise. nuff said.

The idea that Germany was overstepping it's bounds (while a very popular one) depended on what perspective you were looking at the situation with. Many other people and nations see the United States as overstepping its bounds.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:25:05 GMT

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

Only if you mean that they're being paid by the same entity as organized, then yes, they're organized.

Fighting for their country? Wrong. They're fighting for the people who are paying them do DIE for their country. Not fight. They don't expect to come out alive. They go in to kill Americans and make money for their families.

Taking risks? They're killing themselves. There is no "risk" involved. They kill themselves, take as many people with them as they can, and get money for their family. Seems pretty straight forward.

You're comparing occupied France rising up against the NAZI army with the Iraqi rebels who are killing themselves to kill Americans in "jihad". Yeah...they're EXACTLY the same...

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:27:34 GMT

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

so.. the French were resistance fighters? Lets ask what they were considered by the side they were fighting against... ah yes! Terrorists!

So.. America was helping French Terrorists. Afterall, the only side that matters is how they are viewed by the side that they are fighting, correct?

Edit: interestingly enough, I don't see people trying to refute the fact that America assisted Bin Laden...

Edit 2: Quote:fighting oppression and oppressing is two different things, get your head out of your ass

Kind of like how the Iraqi resistance are fighting the oppression of America (the west)? At least thats why they think they are doing...

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:32:59 GMT

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

Let me put this more clearly:

Nazi Germany were oppressing the French.

The French RESISTANCE didn't walk out into streets and explode themselves in order to kill Nazis (on a regular basis, at least. I havn't heard of any of these actions, so I can't say they NEVER did.)

The French Resistance usually helped Allied soldiers to safety, so they wouldn't be captured. The French were doing this for their country. Not for some guy who offers to give their family money if they kill themselves.

Edit: I'm not defending America's training of Afghanis to fight Russia. I condemn it as I said in an earlier post.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:35:16 GMT

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

j_ballYou're comparing occupied France rising up against the NAZI army with the Iraqi rebels who are killing themselves to kill Americans in "jihad". Yeah...they're EXACTLY the same...

You're right, they aren't the same. But they don't need to be exactly the same to both warrant calling people freedom fighters.

Fighting others knowing that you are going to die is not still fighting?

Look, I'm not saying France was in the wrong when rising up against Nazi Germany. They were very very justified in doing so. All I'm saying is that you can call a group of people terrorists/freedom fighters depending on what kind of spin you want to put on it. People fighting American troops in Iraq CAN be called resistance fighters/freedom fighters, but no one does it because to us, they are the enemy.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:39:43 GMT

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

When you're going against someone with the purpose to die...that's night fighting.

I know you can put a spin on it all you want, but it's obvious that there is a clear distinction between the two.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:40:55 GMT

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

As far as they are concerned, the West is oppressing them. (as far as they are concerned, America is an occupation force, forcing the Iraqi people to behave in the Western way, which is about equal to siding with the Devil)

The Iraqi resistance kills people who oppose them, the French resistance kills people who oppose them. How it is done is meaningless.

The Iraqi RESISTANCE usually helps their allies.

The Iraqi's are doing it for their country as well. I'm sure the payments are incentives to assist, and I can assure you people in the French resistance accepted bribes to help as well.

Regardless of how you put it, there are direct similarities between the groups. The only difference is that the French were on your side, and the Iraqis are not.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:42:26 GMT

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

Quote:When you're going against someone with the purpose to die...that's night fighting.

Except, of course the people who are on your side conduct needful "suicide missions".

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:43:27 GMT

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

I still don't see it as fighting.

There are not many similarities at all. It's clear that they're different.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 19:46:07 GMT

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

To fight: To attempt to harm or gain power over an adversary by blows or with weapons.

-dictionary.com

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 20:39:29 GMT

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

warrantoReally now?

Shoot Americans! They support Terrorism!

The ones that are saying they support them, and down with bush cause we all know he's hitler, should be sent to iraq or france or something to live just because there simply idiots, the ones that actually act and go to iraq and help train / fund / give intelligence to the enemy, sure shoot them.

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

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 21:23:51 GMT

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

CrimsonWell composed.

So my point is... if (hypothetically), the war is "for oil"... then at least many of you understand why oil is so important rather than simplifying it to "omg people have to die because of this black goeey stuff!"

Oh, and guess what? You can already replace that black goeey stuff with hydrogen, but because of the little capitalist system we're all working in, nobody can afford to buy a hydrogen car just yet except the so called 'high class'.

At least I can comfort myself by saying that they'll be worth just as much as a regular car in two years from now...

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 21:59:29 GMT

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

cowmisfitwarrantoReally now?

Shoot Americans! They support Terrorism!

The ones that are saying they support them, and down with bush cause we all know he's hitler, should be sent to iraq or france or something to live just because there simply idiots, the ones that actually act and go to iraq and help train / fund / give intelligence to the enemy, sure shoot them.

I didn't say Iraq.. I said terrorists. Iraq is NOT the only "terrorist" in the world.

Regardles, be sure to pass your desires to kill the Americans involved in training/finding/providing intelligent to Al Queda. I believe a few presedential figures were involved, perhaps some military generals and CIA members were involved in that... I can't believe you'd be willing to kill Americans involved in something they thought was right.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 23:34:33 GMT

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

cowmisfitwarrantoReally now?

Shoot Americans! They support Terrorism!

The ones that are saying they support them, and down with bush cause we all know he's hitler, should be sent to iraq or france or something to live.

This is the single most pathetic argument anybody has ever come up with, and the frankly baffling thing is I see it said in UK tabloids every day.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Mon, 03 Jan 2005 23:49:21 GMT

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

warrantocowmisfitwarrantoReally now?

Shoot Americans! They support Terrorism!

The ones that are saying they support them, and down with bush cause we all know he's hitler, should be sent to iraq or france or something to live just because there simply idiots, the ones that actually act and go to iraq and help train / fund / give intelligence to the enemy, sure shoot them.

I didn't say Iraq.. I said terrorists. Iraq is NOT the only "terrorist" in the world.

Regardless, be sure to pass your desires to kill the Americans involved in training/finding/providing intelligent to Al Queda. I believe a few presidential figures were involved, perhaps some military generals and CIA members were involved in that... I can't believe you'd be willing to kill Americans involved in something they thought was right.

You always try to take anything specific i say , and generalize it to crap that doesn't even have to do with the subject in order to make me seem like an idiot. Its sad.

Im speaking of americans that

PROTECT terrorist (and since you'll probably come up with some comment that comes out your ass like OMG LIK SOILDERS HELP PROTECT OSSAMA'S BROTHERS AND SISTERS AND SOME TERRORIST OMFG LIK U R DUMB crap, i mean those who aid them in hiding from our men and woman in arms who are trying to find them and bring them to justice or stop an attack),

that GIVE THEM HELP IN HARMING OUR CITIIZENS (once again you'll come back with some dumbass comment like "OMFG LIKE GUESS WHAT THE TERRORIST IN IRAQ ARE FIGHTING WITH NOW OMFG LIK WEAPONS FROM U !@!1!@!!!@11" , I mean americans who go and train to get terrorist in to america, and help the get clearence and such to succeed in an attack *and they KNOW they are going to preforme the attack, not someone who was fooled and didn't have any thought of it *

GIVE THEM MONEY TO HELP ATTACK OUR (and since you all think im soooo anti everyone else *your retards for even trying to say that*) PEOPLE AND YOUR PEOPLE. (And since you'll insert one of your thoughtless comebacks such as "WELL GUESS WHAT AMERICANS GAVE HIM MONEY BEFORE THE 9/11 AND HE"S USING IT AGAINST U !@!!!@!!!!" i mean people who are funnlng funds they knowingly will buy terrorist weapons, passports and fake documents and such to help pull out an attack.

And about your adding "finding" , its funding, not finding, why the hell would i be agaisnt the people that are trying to find the terrorist and kill them :rolleyes:

Okay *INSERT YOUR PATHETIC OMG LIK U CAN"T SPELL OMFG comebacks HERE*

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

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 00:03:06 GMT

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

AprimeOh, and guess what? You can already replace that black gooey stuff with hydrogen, but because of the little capitalist system we're all working in, nobody can afford to buy a hydrogen car just yet except the so called 'high class'.

At least I can comfort myself by saying that they'll be worth just as much as a regular car in two years from now...

That's the most retarded thing I've ever read. Congrats.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 00:08:40 GMT

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

cowmisfit(and since you all think im soooo anti everyone else *your retards for even trying to say that*)

It's equally retarded of you to say I despise my own country, but that doesn't stop you saying it :rolleyes:

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 00:19:32 GMT

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

you are american correct? If not im sorry and i take back what i said, but i thought you were an american, if you are my statement still stands.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 00:24:24 GMT

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

SpoonycowmisfitwarrantoReally now?

Shoot Americans! They support Terrorism!

The ones that are saying they support them, and down with bush cause we all know he's hitler, should be sent to iraq or france or something to live.

This is the single most pathetic argument anybody has ever come up with, and the frankly baffling thing is I see it said in UK tabloids every day.

I've given up reading the Tabloids... in fact I think the only one I've bought in recent months was the one after Piers "Morgan" Moron was sacked to see the groveling apology from the Mirror

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 00:37:27 GMT

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

SpoonyOh, and nice post edit by the way.

I always edit my posts before i finalize what I mean. I realised before that if i dont go back and comb over it, then you guys will take every little detail to heart and twist it so thats entirely not wut I meant at all.

SEALMany other people and nations see the United States as overstepping its bounds.

SEALPeople fighting American troops in Iraq CAN be called resistance fighters/freedom fighters

And how about the ones who think of the Americans as freedom fighters. Because they are out there.

SEALMany other people and nations see the United States as overstepping its bounds.

We dont intend to stay, Hitler did. Thats the difference.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 00:42:55 GMT

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

cowmisfityou are american correct?

No?

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 01:26:12 GMT

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

Spoonycowmisfityou are american correct?

No?

BRITISH?

o don't tell me, youra canadian ain't you.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 01:57:52 GMT

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

I think hes from the UK

SpoonyThis is the single most pathetic argument anybody has ever come up with, and the frankly baffling thing is I see it said in UK tabloids every day.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 02:59:49 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]I think hes from the UK

SpoonyThis is the single most pathetic argument anybody has ever come up with, and the frankly baffling thing is I see it said in UK tabloids every day.

ooo, then i'll be the big guy and take back what i said. If your any kind of a forigner i almost expect you to hate us lol.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 05:50:54 GMT

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

Quote:And about your adding "finding" , its funding, not finding, why the hell would i be agaisnt the people that are trying to find the terrorist and kill them

Oh yes, hitting i instead of u is such a big mistake :rolleyes: take a look at your keyboard for a second.

Quote:You always try to take anything specific i say , and generalize it to crap that doesn't even have to do with the subject in order to make me seem like an idiot. Its sad.

Specific in to something general? My, why ever would I do that? I doubt it could be that you ALWAYS make stupid comments such as implying that Iraq is the ONLY terrorist group in the world. :rolleyes:

I say, "Assist terrorists", you reply, "Those assisting go to Iraq!" :rolleyes:

Quote:PROTECT terrorist (and since you'll probably come up with some comment that comes out your ass like OMG LIK SOILDERS HELP PROTECT OSSAMA'S BROTHERS AND SISTERS AND SOME TERRORIST OMFG LIK U R DUMB crap, i mean those who aid them in hiding from our men and woman in arms who are trying to find them and bring them to justice or stop an attack),

Osama's family are Terrorists? Really... perhaps you should notify the American Government of that.

Quote:that GIVE THEM HELP IN HARMING OUR CITIIZENS (once again you'll come back with some dumbass comment like "OMFG LIKE GUESS WHAT THE TERRORIST IN IRAQ ARE FIGHTING WITH NOW OMFG LIK WEAPONS FROM U !!@!!!@!!!@11" , I mean americans who go and train to get terrorist in to america, and help the get clearence and such to succeed in an attack *and they KNOW they are going to preforme the attack, not someone who was fooled and didn't have any thought of it *

Gasp! You only qualify as a terrorist if you harm American Citizens! :rolleyes:

Quote: i mean people who are funnlng funds they knowingly will buy terrorist weapons, passports and fake documents and such to help pull out an attack.

You mean like America did for Al Queda in Afganistan?

Quote: Okay *INSERT YOUR PATHETIC OMG LIK U CAN"T SPELL OMFG comebacks HERE*

Doing this would be pointless. People can figure that out for themselves. Oddly enough, you criticize a neighbor error, and yet you can't spell accurately yourself. Great work there!

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 06:50:05 GMT

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

warranto, put the names of the people who said the quotes, it makes it easier on me lol.

warrantolraq is the ONLY terrorist group in the world

i never saw cow say that, but its late and i might have missed it, correct me if im wrong.

Quote:Gasp! You only qualify as a terrorist if you harm American Citizens!

to an American, yes. to you, No. The point is we dont take crap from people who harm our citizens. And no matter what your definition is, we dont care, a terrorist to us is someone not in uniform from an antiamerican sentiment that harms america. He may be someone's freedom fighter, but not ours. So if you cant handle that we are going to get him before he gets us, then keep your nose out of it. Its not your business. They started it, we'll end it, with the aid of our TRUE allies: The Coalition of the Willing.

warrantoYou mean like America did for Al Queda in Afganistan?

A mistake yes, but not of our time. It may be true that we are paying for it now, but at the time the intentions were just to resist the Communist Juggernaut from overwhelming what we thought to be resistance. And at the time they were a restistance group fighting for their freedom. But that freedom was corrupted and thus, a terrorist regime is born, hell bent on destruction not for overtaking opressors but for the sole purpose of harming America.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 07:43:05 GMT

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

Just checking, you do know that the Coalition of the Absolutely Essential contains one nation without an army, and at least one nation that you've recently invaded?

Did Afghanistan have a warlord that lended you a load of weapons or something?

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 08:01:11 GMT

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

The point is that they dont get in our way and help all that they can. And we are grateful seeing as how there are alot of asshole countries trying to hinder us.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 08:09:20 GMT

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

Erm, wasn't Afghanistan supposed to be hiding Osama? And since he's not yet been found, still is?

Some help they are to the Coalition of the Pointless Name

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 08:18:55 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]warranto, put the names of the people who said the quotes, it makes it easier on me lol.

warrantoIraq is the ONLY terrorist group in the world

i never saw cow say that, but its late and i might have missed it, correct me if im wrong.

Quote:Gasp! You only qualify as a terrorist if you harm American Citizens!

to an American, yes. to you, No. The point is we dont take crap from people who harm our citizens. And no matter what your definition is, we dont care, a terrorist to us is someone not in uniform from an antiamerican sentiment that harms america. He may be someone's freedom fighter, but not ours. So if you cant handle that we are going to get him before he gets us, then keep your nose out of it. Its not your business. They started it, we'll end it, with the aid of our TRUE allies: The Coalition of the Willing.

warrantoYou mean like America did for Al Queda in Afganistan?

A mistake yes, but not of our time. It may be true that we are paying for it now, but at the time the intentions were just to resist the Communist Juggernaut from overwhelming what we thought to be resistance. And at the time they were a restistance group fighting for their freedom. But that freedom was corrupted and thus, a terrorist regime is born, hell bent on destruction not for overtaking opressors but for the sole purpose of harming America.

To the first request:

I said: "shoot Americans! They support Terrorism!"; In relation to all terrorists past and present

Cow states: " the ones that actually act and go to iraq and help train / fund / give intelligence to the

enemy"; specifying only Iraq as have ever existing as a potential terrorist agency

second quote:

Quote:to an American, yes. to you, No.

Thats exactly the type of flawed arguement I'm opposing, simply because using arguements such as this give justification to what the real terrorists are doing, simply because they have the same mentality, which, by using these flawed arguements, you are supporting.

Third quote:

Again, the flawed logic that I'm opposing. The point I'm trying to make is that Americans think that the action were necessary at the time, therefore ok to do (generalizing here, as there is definatly more to it... but just to keep the explanation brief). The Terrorists and those assisting them that America is fighting now have the exact same view point. Once again, you justify this by justifying the actions done in the past. This "It's ok if we do it, but not if you do it" mentality does nothing to help a worthy cause.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 11:58:16 GMT

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

There you go again , taking my post and turning them into something there not. Congrats.

Not once did i ever say Iraq is the only terrorisric nation, you did, so thanks for proving my point yet again you silly silly forigner.

Quote:Gasp! You only qualify as a terrorist if you harm American Citizens!

Never said that either, what do ya know he twisted my words again , moron. You see people this is the same thing liberals do on the news talk shows EVERY night, they dodge the subject, and then say they don't. They are asked a specific question , and then instead of giving an answer, they ask another question and turn the questinars question into some mumble jumbo bullshit against them.

Quote:Iraq is the ONLY terrorist group in the world

^^ Another thing i never said, congrats you get a cookie warrantard.

Soo soo sad, O and how could i have pridectied he was gonna do this

Quote:And since you'll insert one of your thoughtless comebacks such as "WELL GUESS WHAT AMERICANS GAVE HIM MONEY BEFORE THE 9/11 AND HE"S USING IT AGAINST U !@!!!@!!!!"

Quote:You mean like America did for Al Queda in Afganistan?

Okay my stomach hurts from lauging to much and i've got schoool, in closing.

Warranto, Before you post again, make sure the person actually said what your accusing and didn't just make it up in your fucking brain you fucking retard.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 12:30:46 GMT

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

cowmisfitIf your any kind of a forigner i almost expect you to hate us lol.
The irony is that I am not even slightly anti-American.

You may as well say, if I was against some decisions Tony Blair made, I'd be anti-British.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 15:01:38 GMT

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

Spoony, if you dont know what it is to be American, you cant possibly comprehend what it means to be anti-american. Saying you understand what being an american is like me saying I understand what it is to be British.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 15:18:57 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L=]Spoony, if you dont know what it is to be American, you cant possibly comprehend what it means to be anti-american. Saying you understand what being an american is like me saying I understand what it is to be British.
You're incredibly stupid.

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 19:03:06 GMT

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

cowmisfitThere you go again , taking my post and turning them into something there not.
Congrats.

Not once did i ever say Iraq is the only terrorisric nation, you did, so thanks for proving my point yet again you silly silly forigner.

Quote:Gasp! You only qualify as a terrorist if you harm American Citizens!

Never said that either, what do ya know he twisted my words again , moron. You see people this is the same thing liberals do on the news talk shows EVERY night, they dodge the subject, and then say they don't. They are asked a specific question , and then instead of giving an answer, they ask another question and turn the questinars question into some mumble jumbo bullshit against them.

Quote:Iraq is the ONLY terrorist group in the world

^^ Another thing i never said, congrats you get a cookie warrantard.

Soo soo sad, O and how could i have pridectied he was gonna do this

Quote:And since you'll insert one of your thoughtless comebacks such as "WELL GUESS WHAT AMERICANS GAVE HIM MONEY BEFORE THE 9/11 AND HE"S USING IT AGAINST U !@!!!@!!!!"

Quote:You mean like America did for Al Queda in Afganistan?

Okay my stomach hurts from lauging to much and i've got schoool, in closing.

Warranto, Before you post again, make sure the person actually said what your accusing and didn't just make it up in your fucking brain you fucking retard.

Har, funny.

Let's look back, shall we? Since when I explained it to gbull, it obviously went over your head.

What I said: Assist terrorists (note that this implies all terrorists past and present since I did not specify)

What you responded with: Talks about Bush and sending those who assist Iraq. (Quite interesting how when I specify all terrorosts past and present, you take that to mean ONLY Iraq).

You never said that to qualify as a terrorist you had to attack Americans? Let's look ath that one!

Once again, it was a post inreferral to my post where I was (once again) reffering about all terrorists past and present. You go and say that:

"Im speaking of americans that...that GIVE THEM HELP IN HARMING OUR CITIIZENS"

Quite interesting that in a responce to a view about all terrorists past and present, you refer to not

only just Iraq, but also the only targets being Americans. Of course if it was an American assisting a terrorist to harm another country, THAT wouldn't matter.

And of course, you go and misquote me in an attempt to humiliate me. Well, that doesn;t quite work as I can always just restate for the record what I has infact said.

What you said:

Quote:i mean people who are funnling funds they knowingly will buy terrorist weapons, passports and fake documents and such to help pull out an attack.
(gasp! That looks nothing like what you said I has quoted!)

And then, what I said in relation to that quote:

Quote:You mean like America did for Al Queda in Afganistan?

Gasp! Quite the difference in meaning! I can only wonder why you would have misquoted me like that. Perhaps you had nothing more intelligent to say?

Edit: Ah yes, before I forget about THIS tidbit:

Quote:Warranto, Before you post again, make sure the person actually said what your accusing and didn't just make it up in your fucking brain you fucking retard.

Yes, the use of foul language is such a showing of intelligence :rolleyes:. Though I find it very ironic how you mention talking about making sure the person said what was acutally said. Hypocrite.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 19:03:47 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]Spoony, if you dont know what it is to be American, you cant possibly comprehend what it means to be anti-american. Saying you understand what being an american is like me saying I understand what it is to be British.

Are terrorists anti-American?

Think very carefully before you answer, because you've just gone 6ft. under.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 20:31:37 GMT

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

Whats odd is how i c and p'd exactly waht i and you typed, so how could i have "mis-quoted" You are just a regular ol mike moore ain't ya, taking things out of context to get someone to belive your views.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 20:44:03 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]Spoony, if you dont know what it is to be American, you cant possibly comprehend what it means to be anti-american. Saying you understand what being an american is like me saying I understand what it is to be British.

So you're arguing that the subjective impressions and ideas infused into the mind SOMEHOW by being American automatically overrule the deontological truths that both Britian and America (and QUITE a few other nations) were founded on?

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 21:22:24 GMT

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

cowmisfitWhats odd is how i c and p'd exactly waht i and you typed, so how could i have "mis-quoted" You are just a regular ol mike moore ain't ya, taking things out of context to get someone to belive your views.

so.. please explain how

Quote:Quote:

i mean people who are funnling funds they knowingly will buy terrorist weapons, passports and fake documents and such to help pull out an attack.

Quote:

You mean like America did for Al Queda in Afganistan?

Copy and pastes into

Quote:Quote:

And since you'll insert one of your thoughtless comebacks such as "WELL GUESS WHAT AMERICANS GAVE HIM MONEY BEFORE THE 9/11 AND HE"S USING IT AGAINST U !@!!!@!!!!!"

Quote:

You mean like America did for Al Queda in Afganistan?

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 21:34:50 GMT

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

u guys are thinking way to much into what i said. What i said is exactly what i meant and nothing

else. Nice try trying to reverse it on me tho. You Non-Conservatives i'll just say (because Java says he doesnt consider himself liberal) always employ that worn out tactic when debating.

and yes, all terrorists TO AMERICA, are anti-american. But then again, that may differ to you because terrorists to us may not be terrorists to you.

SpoonyYou're incredibly stupid.

your ignorance never ceases to amaze....

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 21:40:47 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]u guys are thinking way to much into what i said. What i said is exactly what i meant and nothing else. Nice try trying to reverse it on me tho.

I didn't reverse anything on you. Read again.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 21:53:12 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]SpoonyYou're incredibly stupid.

your ignorance never ceases to amaze....

Good logic, coming from someone who just claimed that only an American could possibly be Anti-American.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 21:57:20 GMT

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

I never said that anywhere, try reading. And let me add something to that statement before. An American and an Anti-American are the only ones who understand.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 22:03:42 GMT

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

Well then, how can they be anti American when they can't appreciate what it is to be American in the frist place? They wouldn't know it was Anti-American

Quote:You Non-Conservatives i'll just say (because Java says he doesnt consider himself liberal) always employ that worn out tactic when debating.

Quote:The only Liberal here..

Quote:force-fed you all this liberal bullshit

Quote:There is no winning with liberals if your not one.

Quote:the most extreme of liberal bullshit

Er... worn out tactics? Oh, and just in case you don't realise, they were all said by you.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 22:04:40 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]I never said that anywhere, try reading. And let me add something to that statement before. An American and an Anti-American are the only ones who understand.

But you said that the only people who can understand Anti-Americanism are Anti-Americans.

What about the uncle-Americans? It would make your quaint little paradoxes more entertaining.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 22:06:22 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]I never said that anywhere, try reading.

Yes, you did, it's right there in your previous post.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 22:07:32 GMT

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

what tactic? calling you liberals? i thought that i was just stating what you were. Im sorry if you dont like the truth Dave...

DaveGMMBut you said that the only people who can understand Anti-Americanism are Anti-Americans.

What about the uncle-Americans? It would make your quaint little paradoxes more entertaining.

Crack is bad for you.

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 23:01:57 GMT

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

And you're going round in fucking circles with your arguments. That's not exactly the healthiest thing to do.

You're not calling us liberals, you're calling anyone who thinks that war is bad, that civilians shouldn't be killed, that is "Anti American" [whatever the hell that is] or is just disagreeing with you a "liberal" [again, whatever that is].

I've seen so many definitions around here that rhyme liberal with scum that it's unfunny - you're just the latest republican to say it.

See what I did there?

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 04 Jan 2005 23:45:36 GMT

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

to me, liberals are the opposite extreme to bigotry. Which is just as bad.

But dictionary.com has it put differently:

liberal-Favoring proposals for reform, open to new ideas for progress, and tolerant of the ideas and behavior of others; broad-minded.

Conservative-Traditional or restrained in style

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

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 00:00:41 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=] and tolerant of the ideas and behavior of others; broad-minded.

I think in listening to your garbage in this thread, I've been tolerant of you.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 00:17:11 GMT

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

hehe, likewise.

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

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 00:49:22 GMT

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

cowmisfitwarrantocowmisfitwarrantoReally now?

Shoot Americans! They support Terrorism!

The ones that are saying they support them, and down with bush cause we all know he's hitler, should be sent to iraq or france or something to live just because there simply idiots, the ones that actually act and go to iraq and help train / fund / give intelligence to the enemy, sure shoot them.

I didn't say Iraq.. I said terrorists. Iraq is NOT the only "terrorist" in the world.

Regardles, be sure to pass your desires to kill the Americans involved in training/finding/providing intelligent to Al Queda. I believe a few presedential figures were involved, perhaps some military generals and CIA members were involved in that... I can't believe you'd be willing to kill Americans involved in something they thought was right.

You always try to take anything specific i say , and generalize it to crap that doesn't even have to do with the subject in order to make me seem like an idiot. Its sad.

Im speaking of americans that

PROTECT terrorist (and since you'll probably come up with some comment that comes out your ass like OMG LIK SOILDERS HELP PROTECT OSSAMA'S BROTHERS AND SISTERS AND SOME TERRORIST OMFG LIK U R DUMB crap, i mean those who aid them in hiding from our men and woman in arms who are trying to find them and bring them to justice or stop an attack),

that GIVE THEM HELP IN HARMING OUR CITIIZENS (once again you'll come back with some dumbass comment like "OMFG LIKE GUESS WHAT THE TERRORIST IN IRAQ ARE FIGHTING WITH NOW OMFG LIK WEAPONS FROM U !@!@!!!@11" , I mean americans who go and train to get terrorist in to america, and help the get clearence and such to succeed in an attack *and they KNOW they are going to preforme the attack, not someone who was fooled and didn't have any thought of it *

GIVE THEM MONEY TO HELP ATTACK OUR (and since you all think im soooo anti everyone else *your retards for even trying to say that*) PEOPLE AND YOUR PEOPLE. (And since you'll insert one of your thoughtless comebacks such as "WELL GUESS WHAT AMERICANS GAVE HIM MONEY BEFORE THE 9/11 AND HE"S USING IT AGAINST U !@!!!@!!!!" i mean people who are funnling funds they knowingly will buy terrorist weapons, passports and fake documents and such to help pull out an attack.

And about your adding "finding" , its funding, not finding, why the hell would i be agaist the people that are trying to find the terrorist and kill them :rolleyes:

Okay *INSERT YOUR PATHETIC OMG LIK U CAN"T SPELL OMFG comebacks HERE*

^^ Right there buddy. :rolleyes:

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

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 01:16:32 GMT

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

Still doesn't tell how copy and paste substitutes one part of what I said with something else.

:rolleyes:

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

Posted by [splnwezel](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 03:51:11 GMT

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

Wow... I am glad I am Canadian... the only thing I really have to complain about is that all our tax dollars get funnelled towards the provinces that vote for the controlling party. Sigh... the only real problem with representative democracy... but I still think Canada's election process makes more sense than America's.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 04:13:59 GMT

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

splnwezelbut I still think Canada's election process makes more sense than America's.

Well said. The electoral college made sense at one point in our history, but not now.

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 05:01:50 GMT

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

Thus proving you have no knowledge about the mechanics or the reasoning behind the electoral college.

Your ignorance is on par with SuperFlyingLiberalTool's.

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

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 20:28:36 GMT

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

hydra1945Thus proving you have no knowledge about the mechanics or the reasoning behind the

electoral college.

You've done the same thing just there, you know. At least refute what he said rather than giving him a hardy slice of ad hominem.

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 21:35:36 GMT

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

The mechanics of the electoral college, straight from the Constitution:

U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section 1 Each state shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the state may be entitled in the Congress, but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.

This sentence is particularly crucial, which is why I'm commenting on it now.

This gives the power to only the state legislatures to decide how the electors are chosen. If the legislatures chose, they could lawfully allow people named Bubba Joe to popularly elect the electors; hell, they don't even have to have a popular vote for electors at all! If they wanted, they could make it where only the State's governor or General Assembly can appoint electors!

Quote: The electors shall meet in their respective states, and vote by ballot for two persons, of whom one at least shall not be an inhabitant of the same state as themselves. And they shall make a list of all the persons voted for, and of the number of votes for each; which list they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such majority, and have an equal number of votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by ballot one of them for President; and if no person have a majority, then from the five highest on the list the said house shall in like manner choose the President. But in choosing the president, the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. In every case, after the choice of the President, the person having the greatest number of votes of the electors shall be the Vice-President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal votes, the Senate shall choose from them by ballot the Vice-President.

This section is further amended by Amendment XII, which changes the last few sentences of that article, specifically referring to the election of the Vice-President:

Twelfth Amendment to the Constitution The electors shall meet in their respective states, and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; the President of the

Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of death or other constitutional disability of the President. The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

There you have it, the mechanics of the electoral college.

Now, explain to me, please, how all of that doesn't "make any sense" nowadays. Be sure you actually read all of it so you know what you're talking about.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Wed, 05 Jan 2005 22:52:56 GMT

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

Keep in mind that I'm not trying to be hostile, I'm just presenting MY opinion as to why the Electoral College is a bad system.

An essay I had to write a long time ago:

America was founded on the notion that power should not rest in the elite, but that it should be held by the masses. The Government should have the consent from its people, and this consent comes from majority rule. With these ideas in mind, our country set forth into its experiment with democracy. Given the initial fragmented nature of the young nation, it fared relatively well.

It was decided, however, that the selection of our president would be conducted with an indirect election. While this wasn't a democracy per se, it was the best our country could do given the massive shortcomings of communications technology of that era. There were no radios, no televisions, and no national newspapers (in fact, most people were illiterate). The idea of "an

candidate on a national level would have been quite an undertaking. The Electoral College was a way of making this process more practical by allowing the counting to be done on a state level. It was also a way to keep the states unified (something that wasn't a guarantee at the time) so each could have a say in who would be the president. The Electoral College made sense at the time, even if it didn't maintain pure democratic ideals.

Times have changed though. We can travel to any point in the United States in hours, not weeks. We can send information to billions of people in under a second. We are now fully capable of holding a direct election for the United States presidency. We're more than ready to move beyond the outdated Electoral College, and embrace direct elections like we already do for so many other state and local positions. If Afghanistan can do it, so can we.

An indirect election is not a true democracy. The Government needs to have the consent of the people to rule as stated in our Constitution, but the Electoral College can create a situation where a president finds himself in power, but the majority of the nation did not vote him in there. In fact, this has happened four times in our nation's history. In electing a leader, one person's vote is not the same as someone from a different state. Yet, all US citizens are supposed to have an equal say. Something is amiss here.

Take as an example, a state with twenty electoral points and a voter population of ten million. Now, say 5,000,001 people vote for one candidate and 4,999,999 people vote for the other. Because of the way the Electoral College works, this state could very well turn the election even though it was a tie for all intents and purposes. Those 4,999,999 votes for the other guy are

toward one person. Not only is this counter-intuitive to a democratic mindset, it's needlessly complicated and illogical in this day and age. A possible solution would be to divvy out the electoral points in proportion to the percent the candidate won by (if someone gets 70% of the votes, they get 70% of the twenty points), but this would be a complicated version of a regular direct election, so why not go for the real deal? Another option is to make it so the winner of that state gets his 70%, but instead of the opponent getting 30%, they get nothing. But again, this is just needlessly complicated, and is only another substitute for a direct election.

Additionally, electors have been known to vote for a candidate other than the one they pledged to vote for. Most recently, Reagan lost an electoral point and Nixon lost one twice thanks to these so out the middleman and just let the people speak?

The number of state representatives (which is based on the state's population) plus the number of state senators determine the number of electoral points any state is granted. Any state needs at least one representative, which means that any state will have a minimum of three

should be based on population. Voters in a state with a small population have more power than they deserve since they are guaranteed at least three electoral points.

Additionally, in the case of a tie under the Electoral College, the vote is thrown to the House. Having a very select and elite few decide an incredibly major part of our nation's future regardless of what the people want sounds a lot more like an oligarchy than a democracy.

As a Massachusetts resident, my vote is not worth the same as a resident in California or Rhode Island, for example. That's just not fair, period. America is old enough to graduate to a truer form of democracy.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2005 00:58:19 GMT

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

i think the Electoral College is a little flawed as well...

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2005 01:41:51 GMT

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

I think it might surprise the Americans among us that "majority rules" is not the philosophy of your nation. At least, not on the level which ultimately matters.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2005 01:58:41 GMT

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

it does matter but not to the extent it should i think. When the founding fathers came up with the Constitution i think they were working on it under the prediction that people are Stupid and Greedy.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2005 02:21:51 GMT

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

If that is true, they did not do much about it. People are still stupid and greedy.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2005 03:42:20 GMT

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

noone will ever change that, its human nature.

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

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2005 04:02:38 GMT

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

Then why persist with old habits (in this case, the elective college) when the principle it was founded on is futile in nature? Assuming of course, that we're both still talking about "stupid and greedy".

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

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2005 05:08:29 GMT

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

The electoral college is cool. I want to be just like it when I grow up.

Seriously though I don't have any problem with it, AND to show I'm not biased that's coming from a republican in Illinois. My County goes solid republican every year, almost all the counties do. Then Cook county and a county down south go Democrat. Even just COOK county could go democrat and the state will go Democrat but I don't mind. It seems to be working so far. Why starve what isn't morbidly obese.

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

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2005 22:44:42 GMT

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

Popular vote throughout the nation is a morbidly STUPID idea and would never work until/unless we had accurate vote counting... COMPLETELY 99.99% accurate. And even after that, I don't think a raw popular vote would work for us. People are stupid.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 06 Jan 2005 22:52:17 GMT

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

CrimsonAnd even after that, I don't think a raw popular vote would work for us. People are stupid.

Tell me about it.

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

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2005 00:02:27 GMT

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

Popular voting would never work, as the major population centers would dictate what the rest of the country had to experience and live through. No way, that's total bullshit.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2005 00:05:23 GMT

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

Is that why Bush won 2004? Because the major population centers voted for him?

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2005 01:12:25 GMT

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

no, but he did get the popular even tho it means jack shit

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2005 01:46:26 GMT

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

Legally it means nothing. But that fact is important for many people.

And people act like switching to a popular vote will be that big of a deal. The popular vote and the electoral points have agreed with eachother 91% of the time.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2005 08:50:11 GMT

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

personally, i think a point system for counties would best represent who America wants.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 07 Jan 2005 21:22:01 GMT

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

That does kinda meet it half way... But you are getting closer and closer to a popular vote anyway, might as well just go all the way.

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

Posted by [Cassie](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2005 00:09:45 GMT

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

Quote:YOU ARE WRONG

Clinton wasn't impeached.

And....

Clinton was acquitted. I would have to agree that what he did was morally and publicly wrong, but he stood trial for what he did, and was acquitted. He was not impeached.

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

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2005 09:01:44 GMT

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

He did however go through the impeachment process.

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

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2005 09:04:07 GMT

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

SEALs that why Bush won 2004? Because the major population centers voted for him?

No, he won the election because the majority of NON-major population centers voted for him. Speaking of the largest cities, such as Orlando, Los Angeles, New York City, Detroit, Chicago, etc...

The electoral vote gives everyone an equal voice, instead of having the massed population of one area in a state dictate what everyone else thinks.

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

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2005 10:38:33 GMT

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

Clinton WAS impeached. "Impeach" refers to the trial, not the actual removal from office.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2005 13:29:29 GMT

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

AircraftkillerThe electoral vote gives everyone an equal voice, instead of having the massed population of one area in a state dictate what everyone else thinks.

Equal voice, huh? People in very low populated states who, proportionately, should have less than three electoral points, have an equal say? No. They get more than their share because they are guaranteed three. That's not equal, that's inflated.

As I said before, if popular vote would always "dictate what the rest of the country had to experience and live through," then why has the popular vote and the electoral points agreed for all but four times?

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

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 08 Jan 2005 16:29:38 GMT

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

AircraftkillerThe electoral vote gives everyone an equal voice, instead of having the massed population of one area in a state dictate what everyone else thinks.

Funny thing is, the exact opposite is true.

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

Posted by [Cassie](#) on Sun, 09 Jan 2005 02:31:17 GMT

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

That makes alot of sense, SEAL Because the states with low numbers of electoral votes hardly impact any of the canidates running for president. Canidates mainly only worry about the big states like California, Florida, ect. Which means those smaller states don't really have the same kinda voice as the big ones

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 09 Jan 2005 06:52:41 GMT

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

Dr. Hydra says: take two pills of common sense and get back to me in the morning, and if that doesn't cure your ignorance about the electoral college, try taking a crowbar to your head.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 09 Jan 2005 06:53:44 GMT

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

not to mention people living in all-democrat or all-republican states almost dont have the other side heard, so it feels like our vote is thrown away when its all said and done. Thanks alot democrat Michigan

but even tho the vote isnt heard, the college still is fairly accurate.

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

Posted by [prox](#) on Sun, 09 Jan 2005 15:18:30 GMT

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

warrantolf this can be backed up by another (preferrably MORE credible) source, I'll give it some serious thought. However, the UCLA saying something like this is perhaps as believable as speaking the word "christmas" being a capital offence.

Even if it IS true, I fail to see how it is a bad thing to do...

Quote:I find it quite comforting to myself that I use bigger words than most of you while being of a younger age.

I find it quite comforting to myself that I use more common sense than someone that uses bigger words than most of us.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 09 Jan 2005 19:19:52 GMT

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

hydra1945Dr. Hydra says: take two pills of common sense and get back to me in the morning, and if that doesn't cure your ignorance about the electoral college, try taking a crowbar to your head.

Way to give a link that also includes a strong argument for the opposite of your point.

No matter what points you give, the electoral college inflates the importance of some votes and deflates the importance of others, and it is not a true democratic process. Prevention of third parties? So the fuck what? If the third party has a stance that people agree with, why shouldn't people vote for him? Given the current system, a vote for a third party is throwing your vote away (this doesn't mean I like Nadar).

I love how you assume that my position on the issue is just sheer ignorance, and your position must be correct. You're so fucking arrogant. YES, THERE ARE TWO VALID SIDES TO THIS ARGUMENT. JUST BECAUSE YOU ARE ON ONE END, DOES NOT MEAN THE OTHER END IS "IGNORANT."

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2005 02:26:51 GMT

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

SEALYES, THERE ARE TWO VALID SIDES TO THIS ARGUMENT. JUST BECAUSE YOU ARE ON ONE END, DOES NOT MEAN THE OTHER END IS "IGNORANT."

I dont really know where i stand on this issue, because SEAL is right, there are two Valid points. Although it is right 91% of the time, that 9% of inaccuracy means alot in historical terms. Think about how much different it would have been if Gore were elected instead of Bush. Too horrible to think about for me.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2005 03:06:12 GMT

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

BUT OMG!!!11! LIEK HE INVNTED THE ITNERNET!!!11!

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

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2005 04:47:32 GMT

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

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]not to mention people living in all-democrat or all-republican states almost dont have the other side heard, so it feels like our vote is thrown away when its all said and done.

Thanks alot democrat Michigan

but even tho the vote isnt heard, the college still is fairly accurate.

My dad wants to Register in a state around Illinois that is more 50/50 so his vote could actually do something.

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

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2005 05:03:20 GMT

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

CrimsonClinton WAS impeached. "Impeach" refers to the trial, not the actual removal from office. Yes, he was indeed impeached, but the meaning of the word impeach is to be formally accused.

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2005 10:47:25 GMT

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

SEALBUT OMG!1!1! LIEK HE INVNTED THE ITNERNET!!!11!

ROFL that makes me laugh every time i see it.

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

Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2005 12:01:41 GMT

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

page thirteen

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

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2005 17:29:58 GMT

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

what will it take to get you to stop doing that, its really annoying.

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [Spoony_old](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2005 17:33:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

you're just jelos my skiLL

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2005 22:01:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nodbugger=[DT=gbull=[L]=]not to mention people living in all-democrat or all-republican states almost dont have the other side heard, so it feels like our vote is thrown away when its all said and done. Thanks alot democrat Michigan

but even tho the vote isnt heard, the college still is fairly accurate.

My dad wants to Register in a state around Illinois that is more 50/50 so his vote could actually do something.

See what kind of ridiculous things the electoral college can cause people to do? If it was a simple popular vote, moving wouldn't make a difference at all.

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2005 02:40:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yes but you have to remember, i simple popular vote may make inaccuracies less apparent and corruption cannot happen when it comes to a serious situation such as this. The electoral college may be the "Renguard" of the political world, solving most problems, but not all of course. All the while coming at a price which is the innacuracy of itself being that a state only goes one way and the other sides votes are not heard. This is a tough issue, I dont know if there is a truely right answer here.

Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2005 02:43:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoonypage thirteen

Idiot #12651656

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Tue, 11 Jan 2005 03:23:28 GMT

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

That's a good point. I suppose the nation's voting methods need to be improved greatly (i.e. all done electronically with backup paper trail).

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

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 12 Jan 2005 16:38:12 GMT

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

SEALWay to give a link that also includes a strong argument for the opposite of your point. Did you just completely miss the section that refutes what all the anti-electoral college people are saying? Perhaps you should go back and read the .pdf file in its entirety.

Quote:No matter what points you give, the electoral college inflates the importance of some votes and deflates the importance of others

Tell me how ensuring people in lowly populated areas have an equal influence on the election is a bad thing.

Do you want all the elections to be decided solely by whom people in heavily populated areas choose?

You seem to forget that the electoral college facilitates in choosing a president that is satisfiable to all regions of the country.

They explain that pretty explicitly in that .pdf file to which I linked you.

Quote:and it is not a true democratic process.

Considering how our country was never meant to be a democracy in the first place, that's a good thing!

Quote:I love how you assume that my position on the issue is just sheer ignorance, and your position must be correct. You're so fucking arrogant. YES, THERE ARE TWO VALID SIDES TO THIS ARGUMENT. JUST BECAUSE YOU ARE ON ONE END, DOES NOT MEAN THE OTHER END IS "IGNORANT."

Where did I ever say there wasn't another valid side to the argument? YOU seem to have twisted what I wrote into something that never entered my keyboard. Never have I said the electoral college is an infallible institution and that it doesn't have its flaws. Anything humans create have their flaws since humans are naturally imperfect.

I have, however, been saying that a direct popular vote is much more flawed than the electoral college and was one of the things the founding fathers were trying to prevent with the invention of the electoral college (if you read the .pdf file, you'd know that), yet you ignorantly believe that the United States was meant to be a democracy from the beginning and that we should be a democracy now.

I have never even once declared myself the end-all knower of all that is truth, nor have I ever assumed my side of an argument was absolutely correct. Tell me how that is being "arrogant."

Quote:See what kind of ridiculous things the electoral college can cause people to do? If it was a simple popular vote, moving wouldn't make a difference at all.

Yes, it would, even under a direct popular vote.

People would flock to major cities and highly populated areas since the votes of people who live in rural areas would suddenly become inconsequential on the election. Like I said before, an electoral college ensures that those people still have a bearing on the election.

EDIT: a point I forgot to mention: voter fraud would be much easier to commit with a direct popular vote since it could be committed in a single area and have a drastic effect on the outcome of the election, while voter fraud with an electoral college would be increasingly more difficult since it has to be committed in as many states as possible to have an equal effect.

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

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 14 Jan 2005 02:27:31 GMT

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

You've made your points, I've made mine. Now it seems that we're both just repeating information. I don't care to argue this any further, so I'll shut up, and I can only hope you do the same.
