

---

Subject: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Fri, 29 May 2009 21:10:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

What is your opinion?

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Fri, 29 May 2009 21:11:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Obama ftw, hasn't made me regret voting for him yet.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 29 May 2009 21:17:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Obama's not a Muslim...

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Fri, 29 May 2009 21:19:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

lol i know i was wondering what fools would vote for that

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 29 May 2009 22:27:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

luv2pb wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 17:11Obama ftw, hasn't made me regret voting for him yet. Are you living under a rock? He's pissed off just about everybody, both Dems and Reps. Unless you're a statist, I don't see how he's anything but a disappointment.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Fri, 29 May 2009 22:44:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 17:27luv2pb wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 17:11Obama ftw, hasn't made me regret voting for him yet. Are you living under a rock? He's pissed off just about everybody, both Dems and Reps. Unless you're a statist, I don't see how he's anything but a disappointment.

---

He's right

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 29 May 2009 22:47:35 GMT

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

---

Given the situation, and the obligations he has to meet, I'd say he's doing a decent job. I don't like much of what he's doing, but I'd like to see some of the armchair policy-wonks take a stab at his job and do any better.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Sat, 30 May 2009 00:03:34 GMT

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

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 17:47 Given the situation, and the obligations he has to meet, I'd say he's doing a decent job. I don't like much of what he's doing, but I'd like to see some of the armchair policy-wonks take a stab at his job and do any better.

cough \*big government\* cough

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 30 May 2009 01:39:44 GMT

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

---

Starbuck wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 17:03 nikki6ixx wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 17:47 Given the situation, and the obligations he has to meet, I'd say he's doing a decent job. I don't like much of what he's doing, but I'd like to see some of the armchair policy-wonks take a stab at his job and do any better.

cough \*big government\* cough

Bawwwwwwwwwwwww

Butthurt!

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 15:27 luv2pb wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 17:11 Obama ftw, hasn't made me regret voting for him yet.

Are you living under a rock? He's pissed off just about everybody, both Dems and Reps. Unless you're a statist, I don't see how he's anything but a disappointment.

Yeah, you're right. Just because the elected officials of the party I most closely associate with aren't happy, that means I can't be, either.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [\[NE\]Fobby\[GEN\]](#) on Sat, 30 May 2009 02:33:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 17:17Obama's not a Muslim...

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sat, 30 May 2009 04:41:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Zeratul wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 16:19lol i know i was wondering what fools would vote for that is there a point in rewriting it?

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 30 May 2009 05:30:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DoverYeah, you're right. Just because the elected officials of the party I most closely associate with aren't happy, that means I can't be, either.  
Nice straw man. That wasn't even my point.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 30 May 2009 06:12:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 22:30DoverYeah, you're right. Just because the elected officials of the party I most closely associate with aren't happy, that means I can't be, either.  
Nice straw man. That wasn't even my point.

What was your point, then? What other Democrats doesn't (Or, at least shouldn't) impact my views.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Pyr0man1c](#) on Sun, 31 May 2009 21:26:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

[NEFobby[GEN] wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 21:33]nikki6ixx wrote on Fri, 29 May 2009 17:17Obama's not a Muslim...

so useless topic

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 02 Jun 2009 21:55:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You have got to be asinine if you think most politicians really give two damns about the religion they claim to be a part of. Most are just showbiz; trying to give an illusion that they do indeed take their religion seriously while infact they are just age old power politics (trying to please and get recognition from a certain group).

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [IAmFenix](#) on Thu, 04 Jun 2009 00:30:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Obama FTL  
I wanted a vet. to step up to the plate, not someone who needs to look at everyone and say: "How the <insertcensorhere> does this work?"  
Anyone who says I'm racist should reconsider the fact of I look at character not skin and we could all be purple and I would not care.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Thu, 04 Jun 2009 03:16:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

IAmFenix wrote on Wed, 03 June 2009 19:30Obama FTL  
I wanted a vet. to step up to the plate, not someone who needs to look at everyone and say: "How the <insertcensorhere> does this work?"  
Anyone who says I'm racist should reconsider the fact of I look at character not skin and we could all be purple and I would not care.

These are the kinds of leaders america needs...

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 04 Jun 2009 05:47:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Zeratul wrote on Wed, 03 June 2009 20:16IAmFenix wrote on Wed, 03 June 2009 19:30Obama FTL  
I wanted a vet. to step up to the plate, not someone who needs to look at everyone and say: "How the <insertcensorhere> does this work?"  
Anyone who says I'm racist should reconsider the fact of I look at character not skin and we could all be purple and I would not care.

These are the kinds of leaders america needs...

---

Great! This means both of you can start bitching the minute he seems lost and helpless. So far, he's been decisive, forward, and moving very quickly considering the right-wing bitchfest he's wading through.

By the way, for a reference on what a lost and helpless president looks like, see footage of Bush being informed 9/11 is happening. Bush was a "vet", right? He was in the White House as a child when his dad was president.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Thu, 04 Jun 2009 11:35:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ITT: Same shit with Bush except now it's the Democrat's turn.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [ErroR](#) on Thu, 04 Jun 2009 12:21:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

At least he's not comunist

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 04 Jun 2009 15:42:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 04:35ITT: Same shit with Bush except now it's the Democrat's turn.

Normally, I wouldn't mind, but Obama hasn't done anything yet. When Obama starts random preemptive wars, or chokes on a pretzel, or does something equally retarded, then you can go ahead and have your bitchfit, but until then it's nothing but pissing in the wind.

ErroR wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 05:21At least he's not comunist

It's a shame, really.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Thu, 04 Jun 2009 16:46:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ErroR wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 13:21At least he's not comunist  
You have a point... but still i don't like him

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 04 Jun 2009 16:57:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Besides, it could've been worse.

It could've been Ron Paul.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [IAmFenix](#) on Thu, 04 Jun 2009 20:04:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ErroR wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 07:21At least he's not comunist  
Absolute monarchs can be beneficial, look at Cathrine the Great of Russia.  
Though, I would not trust him to leader.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 03:53:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

IAmFenix wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 15:04ErroR wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 07:21At least he's  
not comunist  
Absolute monarchs can be beneficial, look at Cathrine the Great of Russia.  
Though, I would not trust him to leader.  
he also has a point

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 04:04:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

can i change my vote to yes?

obama went to egypt he's definitely a muslim now..

edit - p.2 snipa

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 05:38:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

lol he went to egypt?! BURN THE MUSLIM BASTERD!

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 07:14:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Zeratul wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 22:38lol he went to egypt?! BURN THE MUSLIM BASTERD!

Toggle Spoiler

Add a comment please, Dover.

-CarrierII

### File Attachments

---

1) [OPFag.jpg](#), downloaded 1123 times



Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 07:49:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm going to hope that was sarcasm...

Else he's in trouble.

At any rate, posting those sort of pictures is not welcome in this subforum Dover.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 08:40:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I did have a comment originally, Carrier. In fact, the original post didn't have a picture, and consisted entirely of the word "faggot", but I felt that was too dangerously close to flaming. I realize this subforum is meant for debate and other srs bizns, but when the original topic is based on such a stupid premise, and is filled with replies like Zeratul wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 22:38lol he went to egypt?! BURN THE MUSLIM BASTERD!, there's only so far it can go.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 09:00:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"Dangerously close"? lol

Fair enough, I suggest we respond to the topic's lack of premise by not responding to the topic.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 12:36:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 10:42GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 04:35ITT: Same shit with Bush except now it's the Democrat's turn.

Normally, I wouldn't mind, but Obama hasn't done anything yet. When Obama starts random preemptive wars, or chokes on a pretzel, or does something equally retarded, then you can go ahead and have your bitchfit, but until then it's nothing but pissing in the wind.

Yes he certainly never added a ridiculously large stimulus bill, gave it to companies who do NOT deserve it, closed down a terrorist interrogation facility rather than fixing it up, fucks up a ton of small things when it comes to foreign relations, closes down fucking streets for fucking HOURS because he has to try and act like a "common man" by eating out at a restaurant, disregard the

fact that he's closing off streets and the like.

And the sheer fact that he's been in office as long as he has and hasn't done anything really beneficial, is another reason to dislike him.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 13:20:53 GMT

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

---

You seemed to be misinformed, Mr. ZIMMER, so I'll address these one by one.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 05:36 Yes he certainly never added a ridiculously large stimulus bill, gave it to companies who do NOT deserve it,

You misunderstand what the stimulus bill is. The stimulus bill is NOT the free-money bailout (Which, by the way, was a Bush initiative, not Obama's). The only way "undeserving companies" will get a hold of stimulus money is if they enter the employ of the federal or state governments (As in, a construction company receiving money for constructing a building or fixing a road, etc). This in itself isn't anything surprising--that's the way governments get things done.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 05:36 closed down a terrorist interrogation facility rather than fixing it up,

The problem with Guantanamo isn't it's physical condition, but rather the fact that it's in international waters where US laws and similar anti-torture institutions don't apply. The way to "fix it up" would be to invade Cuba and make it the 51st state. Closing it down is the right thing to do, especially since nobody can come up with a halfway-decent reason prisoners of war can't be interrogated some place where laws actually apply.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 05:36 fucks up a ton of small things when it comes to foreign relations,

The term "small things" and "fuck up" tend to be mutually exclusive. In any case, I'm not sure what you're referring to here. He seems to have done a fantastic job when it comes to foreign relations, and nobody besides butthurt conservifags have found anything bad to say about him (And they don't count, as they unfortunately aren't foreign entities)

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 05:36 closes down fucking streets for fucking HOURS because he has to try and act like a "common man" by eating out at a restaurant, disregard the fact that he's closing off streets and the like.

I'm pretty sure he isn't ordering the streets to be closed. In fact, in all the times he's gone out (And we know every time, Faux News never fails to throw a bitchfit), I haven't heard anything about streets being closed. At any rate, even IF he was closing streets left and right, I'd let him get away with such a minor gripe since he's reversing the US's terribad opinion overseas, fixing the economy, re-empowering the scientific community, pulling out of Iraq, and restoring the rule of law. In the light of all that, who cares if he closes a street or two? Better he spend his relaxation

time amongst people instead of some hidden Texas ranch which acts like an ivory tower.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 05:36 And the sheer fact that he's been in office as long as he has and hasn't done anything really beneficial, is another reason to dislike him.

I guess you were expecting the recession to be over in 100 days? He's done plenty. Get your head out of your ass.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [ErroR](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 16:29:59 GMT

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

---

IAmFenix wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 23:04 ErroR wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 07:21 At least he's not comunist

Absolute monarchs can be beneficial, look at Cathrine the Great of Russia.

Though, I would not trust him to leader.

look at the damn comunists ruining our country.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [zeratul](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 18:06:49 GMT

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

---

ErroR wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 11:29 IAmFenix wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 23:04 ErroR wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 07:21 At least he's not comunist

Absolute monarchs can be beneficial, look at Cathrine the Great of Russia.

Though, I would not trust him to leader.

look at the damn comunists ruining our country.

im tired of saying who has a point... cause really eventually my fingers will get tired

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 22:48:56 GMT

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

---

Zeratul wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 11:06 ErroR wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 11:29 IAmFenix wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 23:04 ErroR wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 07:21 At least he's not comunist

Absolute monarchs can be beneficial, look at Cathrine the Great of Russia.

Though, I would not trust him to leader.

look at the damn comunists ruining our country.

im tired of saying who has a point... cause really eventually my fingers will get tired

---

How is that a point? It's not a point, is a statement full of logical fallacies. Specifically, Cherry Picking and the Spotlight Fallacy. "BAWWW LOOK AT THIS PARTICULAR GROUP OF PEOPLE IN MY COUNTRY THAT I DISAGREE WITH THIS MEANS ALL PEOPLE IN THAT GROUP ARE BAD BAWWW". It's pathetic.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 05 Jun 2009 23:34:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

There's communists in the American government? Who knew?...

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sat, 06 Jun 2009 02:28:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 18:34There's communists in the American government? Who knew?...  
EVERYONE... or at least i did ud be surprised how hypocritical this country is.... unless u already know then well... u wouldnt be....

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Barack Obama](#) on Sun, 07 Jun 2009 00:47:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yo you're all a bunch of racists.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [John McCain](#) on Sun, 07 Jun 2009 01:00:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Barack Obama wrote on Sat, 06 June 2009 19:47Yo you're all a bunch of racists.

Nigga, please...

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Mon, 08 Jun 2009 22:13:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Barack Obama wrote on Sat, 06 June 2009 19:47Yo you're all a bunch of racists.  
wtf

John McCain wrote on Sat, 06 June 2009 20:00Nigga, please...  
wtf

neither of you get my pink posts.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [ErroR](#) on Tue, 09 Jun 2009 10:16:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Sat, 06 June 2009 01:48Zeratul wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 11:06ErroR wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 11:29IAmFenix wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 23:04ErroR wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 07:21At least he's not comunist  
Absolute monarchs can be beneficial, look at Cathrine the Great of Russia.  
Though, I would not trust him to leader.  
look at the damn comunists ruining our country.  
im tired of saying who has a point... cause really eventually my fingers will get tired

How is that a point? It's not a point, is a statement full of logical fallacies. Specifically, Cherry Picking and the Spotlight Fallacy. "BAWWW LOOK AT THIS PARTICULAR GROUP OF PEOPLE IN MY COUNTRY THAT I DISAGREE WITH THIS MEANS ALL PEOPLE IN THAT GROUP ARE BAD BAWWW". It's pathetic.

it's actually like that, and more than half of country think so.. people are seriously retarded here. They were going to prottest against comunists and someone threw a rock. that's it a fukin riot started and lasted for 3 days  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3IU4jri5ulc>  
the comunists provoked them by throwing a rock. This is really stupid. They let the parliament burn on purpose so they can suck money out of people after that.  
People wanted to protest against the comunists faking the elections, hell yeah thousands of dead people voted for them

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 09 Jun 2009 13:47:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ErroR wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 03:16Dover wrote on Sat, 06 June 2009 01:48Zeratul wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 11:06ErroR wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 11:29IAmFenix wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 23:04ErroR wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 07:21At least he's not comunist  
Absolute monarchs can be beneficial, look at Cathrine the Great of Russia.  
Though, I would not trust him to leader.  
look at the damn comunists ruining our country.  
im tired of saying who has a point... cause really eventually my fingers will get tired

How is that a point? It's not a point, is a statement full of logical fallacies. Specifically, Cherry Picking and the Spotlight Fallacy. "BAWWW LOOK AT THIS PARTICULAR GROUP OF PEOPLE IN MY COUNTRY THAT I DISAGREE WITH THIS MEANS ALL PEOPLE IN THAT GROUP ARE BAD BAWWW". It's pathetic.

it's actually like that, and more than half of country think so.. people are seriously retarded here. They were going to prottest against comunists and someone threw a rock. that's it a fukin riot started and lasted for 3 days  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3IU4jri5ulc>

the comunists provoked them by throwing a rock. This is really stupid. They let the parliament burn on purpose so they can suck money out of people after that.  
People wanted to protest against the comunists faking the elections, hell yeah thousands of dead people voted for them

...Which of course, means communists everywhere (Including myself) are evil, evil people, right?

Before you answer "yes", the answer is "no, not at all, and fuck you. >:]"

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Tue, 09 Jun 2009 16:21:44 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 08:20

You misunderstand what the stimulus bill is. The stimulus bill is NOT the free-money bailout (Which, by the way, was a Bush initiative, not Obama's). The only way "undeserving companies" will get a hold of stimulus money is if they enter the employ of the federal or state governments (As in, a construction company receiving money for constructing a building or fixing a road, etc). This in itself isn't anything surprising--that's the way governments get things done.  
For one, if it's a Bush initiative, why the fuck is Obama continuing it? I thought Bush's economic plan was failing according to him.

For two, yeah, it pretty much IS free money. The only downside is government regulation, which is causing companies to outright go under because they can't really meet the requirements (GM, etc).

Three, yes, AIG is a surely deserving company, right? Not to mention they hold control of the ports that Dubai should've owned, but don't thanks to stupid pricks in congress.

Dover wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 08:20The problem with Guantanamo isn't it's physical condition, but rather the fact that it's in international waters where US laws and similar anti-torture institutions don't apply. The way to "fix it up" would be to invade Cuba and make it the 51st state. Closing it down is the right thing to do, especially since nobody can come up with a halfway-decent reason prisoners of war can't be interrogated some place where laws actually apply.

Yeah I clearly meant its physical condition . Anyways, while I do understand your point, address this one: where are the terrorists that were held captive going to go? Either they go to another, much more secretive location (LOL BUSH R BAD HE KEEP THINGS SEEKRIT), or they're simply let free. Now, if they're putting it in US waters where our laws apply, and it's not a super secretive location (afterall, doing that is just a failed Bush administration method, amirite), then good. But I haven't quite heard news of that. If you'd like to correct me, feel free to.

Dover wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 08:20The term "small things" and "fuck up" tend to be mutually exclusive. In any case, I'm not sure what you're refering to here. He seems to have done a

fantastic job when it comes to foreign relations, and nobody besides butthurt conservifags have found anything bad to say about him (And they don't count, as they unfortunately aren't foreign entities)

I'm referring to giving the Queen of England an iPod, bowing to a foreign leader (Again, a small thing, but stupid nonetheless). I'm not saying Bush was any better, but for a guy who people hoped would be alot better with foreign relations... yeah. Plus, alot of foreign investors can see US is just going deeper into a shithole, so they're not going to be as apt to help us out.

Most of the apparent "foreign relations" he does is the typical bullshit. Shaking hands, talking with them, etc. Outside of that, it doesn't seem like he's doing a better job than Bush did, really...

Oh, I also like how if people disagree with Obama, they're "butthurt conservifags". Way to be a biased prick, considering plenty of people on both sides of the aisle are disagreeing with various things Obama has done.

Dover wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 08:20 I'm pretty sure he isn't ordering the streets to be closed. In fact, in all the times he's gone out (And we know every time, Faux News never fails to throw a bitchfit), I haven't heard anything about streets being closed. At any rate, even IF he was closing streets left and right, I'd let him get away with such a minor gripe since he's reversing the US's terribad opinion overseas, fixing the economy, re-empowering the scientific community, pulling out of Iraq, and restoring the rule of law. In the light of all that, who cares if he closes a street or two? Better he spend his relaxation time amongst people instead of some hidden Texas ranch which acts like an ivory tower.

I live around the DC area, I should know. He does do this, and actually very frequently. You might not think much of it, but considering the amount of people who do business in DC and can't get through, that's alot of people who are either late to meetings/work/whatever, or who outright can't get to their jobs. Not to mention, this can fuck up local businesses just as well, since everyone is focused on this one business he's going to.

You might not think much of it, but to me, this is fucking bullshit. One man should NOT be able to close down streets and fuck up or "save" a business as he does just because he decides to do so. It's supposed to be a free market, not a market controlled by the government and whatever he wants to go to. He's a fucking President, he needs to start acting like it.

Also, the US still has a pretty shitty view from people overseas, the economy is hardly being "fixed" (He's just pumping money into businesses he deems fit to throw money at... way to continue fiscal irresponsibility that's been plaguing our nation for years, asshole), and I haven't really seen us pull out of Iraq yet (LOL WE'RE GONNA PULL OUT OF IRAQ RIGHT AS I'M ELECTED). I do agree it's good he's finally doing something decent and giving to the scientific community, but who knows, maybe they'll spend shittons of that money trying to research for a vaccine for something minor that's a huge deal all around (Swine flu, anyone). And restoring the rule of law? Hahahahahahahahahahahah. Yeah, no. If anyone should get their head out of their ass, it's you. He's continuing the same bullshit work arounds Bush did, but is adding his own touch of bullshit on top of it all.

Dover wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 08:20 I guess you were expecting the recession to be over in 100 days? He's done plenty. Get your head out of your ass. Actually I was- in a good majority of his speeches, he bashes Bush and his blatant "failed policies" and how he can easily fix them, and that "change" would happen almost immediatly. Now that he's in office, his tone changes to "well, bad things are gonna have to happen first before some good things happen". Once again it's the same fucking bullshit we've been experiencing for the past years.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [ErroR](#) on Tue, 09 Jun 2009 17:34:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

they aren't actually comunists, they only clain they are, they use the same name is it was in USSR, but they are just a bunch of selfish thieves who outsmarted the most of the stupid population here

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 09 Jun 2009 18:43:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21  
For one, if it's a Bush initiative, why the fuck is Obama continuing it? I thought Bush's economic plan was failing according to him.

Because as much as Obama and the rest of the country loves change, the US constitution is designed to resist change and make it very difficult. If the 700billion bank bailouts could've been reversed, I'm sure they would be.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 For two, yeah, it pretty much IS free money. The only downside is government regulation, which is causing companies to outright go under because they can't really meet the requirements (GM, etc).

Again, I should repeat myself. The stimulus package is for the most part NOT FREE MONEY. Just because you repeat it over and over doesn't make it any more true. Free money was the bank bailouts (Under Bush). Even the auto-industry bailouts weren't free money, but they were buying stock, which the government will sell once the company gets back on it's feet(Something Sweden has done successfully in the past).

Oh, and of course. GM was doing SOOOOOO well before Obama came along. Clearly, his less-than-100-days of regulation completely destroyed America's largest corporation.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 Three, yes, AIG is a surely deserving company, right? Not to mention they hold control of the ports that Dubai should've owned, but don't thanks to stupid pricks in congress.

Keep pretending Obama's fault. If you repeat it enough times, it might come true.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 Yeah I clearly meant its physical condition

What the hell does this mean, then?

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 05:36 closed down a terrorist interrogation facility rather than fixing it up,

Fix it up as in give it a new paint-job? Fix it up as in put in new hardwood floor? Fix it up as in somehow bring Guantanamo Bay, Cuba under US National jurisdiction? What did you mean by "fixing it up"?

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 Anyways, while I do understand your point, address this one: where are the terrorists that were held captive going to go? Either they go to another, much more secretive location (LOL BUSH R BAD HE KEEP THINGS SEEKRIT), or they're simply let free. Now, if they're putting it in US waters where our laws apply, and it's not a super secretive location (after all, doing that is just a failed Bush administration method, amirite), then good. But I haven't quite heard news of that. If you'd like to correct me, feel free to.

Keep them in an American Supermax prison. That's what Obama wants to do, and that's what he should do. If you want to see why he hasn't, see the long list of Republican governors and senators that don't want to take them because they think there'll be terrorists living in their neighbor's attic.

I'd like to draw special attention to this:

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 where are the terrorists that were held captive going to go? Either they go to another, much more secretive location (LOL BUSH R BAD HE KEEP THINGS SEEKRIT), or they're simply let free.

You may find this to be informative reading.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 I'm referring to giving the Queen of England an iPod, bowing to a foreign leader (Again, a small thing, but stupid nonetheless). I'm not saying Bush was any better, but for a guy who people hoped would be a lot better with foreign relations... yeah. Plus, a lot of foreign investors can see US is just going deeper into a shithole, so they're not going to be as apt to help us out.

Most of the apparent "foreign relations" he does is the typical bullshit. Shaking hands, talking with them, etc. Outside of that, it doesn't seem like he's doing a better job than Bush did, really...

The thing is, nobody else is complaining! The queen of England doesn't seem the mind getting an iPod, nobody else seems to be making a shitstorm out of the supposed "bow". The only people that seem to give a shit are the people who are pre-disposed to dislike Obama in the first place! Every foreign leader and every country he's visited has given glowing reviews and has nothing but kind words for him and for the US. A big change from the last administration. This is your idea of a fuck up? What's your definition of a catastrophe? What is "good", if this is a fuck-up?

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 Oh, I also like how if people disagree with

Obama, they're "butthurt conservifags". Way to be a biased prick, considering plenty of people on both sides of the aisle are disagreeing with various things Obama has done.

But only butthurt conseri-fags are making a big deal about things that don't matter, like supposed mini-bows, or giving iPods as gifts, or Obama not going to church on Sunday, etc etc. If you do these things, you're a conservi-fag, and chances are you're loaded with pure butthurt.

You can object to Obama's policies without being a retard in the process. Most people just choose not to.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 I live around the DC area, I should know. He does do this, and actually very frequently. You might not think much of it, but considering the amount of people who do business in DC and can't get through, that's alot of people who are either late to meetings/work/whatever, or who outright can't get to their jobs. Not to mention, this can fuck up local businesses just as well, since everyone is focused on this one business he's going to.

You live in DC? There's your first problem.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 You might not think much of it, but to me, this is fucking bullshit. One man should NOT be able to close down streets and fuck up or "save" a business as he does just because he decides to do so. It's supposed to be a free market, not a market controlled by the government and whatever he wants to go to. He's a fucking President, he needs to start acting like it.

We torture, you say "We have to do what we have to do". We start a pre-emptive war against a country that hasn't shown any aggression toward us, you say "They deserved it". A street near you gets shut down, you say "THIS IS FUCKING BULLSHIT".

Also, lol @ the president visiting a business = Market controlled by the government. I won't even comment on that. That's too easy.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 Also, the US still has a pretty shitty view from people overseas,

Obama's fault, I'm sure.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 the economy is hardly being "fixed" (He's just pumping money into businesses he deems fit to throw money at... way to continue fiscal irresponsibility that's been plaguing our nation for years, asshole),

Lol, if someone on this forum called Bush an "asshole", you would greet them with bullshit like "You're unamerican!" and "Why do you hate this country?".

As for the economy, see below.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 and I haven't really seen us pull out of Iraq yet (LOL WE'RE GONNA PULL OUT OF IRAQ RIGHT AS I'M ELECTED).

Wai2listen. He's been saying one battalion a month since the beginning of the campaign. He's been overly-cautious in his speeches ("I will consult with my commanders, etc etc"). If you're going to criticize the guy, at least quote things he's actually said.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 I do agree it's good he's finally doing something decent and giving to the scientific community, but who knows, maybe they'll spend shittons of that money trying to research for a vaccine for something minor that's a huge deal all around (Swine flu, anyone).

Lol @ swine flu.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 And restoring the rule of law? Hahahahahahahahahahahahah. Yeah, no. If anyone should get their head out of their ass, it's you. He's continuing the same bullshit work arounds Bush did, but is adding his own touch of bullshit on top of it all.

Pics or it didn't happen.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 Actually I was- in a good majority of his speeches, he bashes Bush and his blatant "failed policies" and how he can easily fix them, and that "change" would happen almost immediately. Now that he's in office, his tone changes to "well, bad things are gonna have to happen first before some good things happen". Once again it's the same fucking bullshit we've been experiencing for the past years.

Bashing Bush doesn't mean "I can fix this in 100 days". He's made it pretty clear it's going to take a while to fix. After all, it took a while to get into. Expecting otherwise betrays your lack of knowledge on how economics works. Just because your unrealistic expectations aren't met doesn't mean you can start spouting bullshit and expect to be taken seriously.

All in all, you should quit your bitching and suck it up.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 09 Jun 2009 18:44:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ErroR wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 10:34 they aren't actually comunists, they only claim they are, they use the same name as it was in USSR, but they are just a bunch of selfish thieves who outsmarted the most of the stupid population here

I agree, but what does this have to do with Obama, or anything on-topic? Why bring it up at all, unless you want to soil someone else's name, specifically Communists (Read: Me).

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Prulez](#) on Tue, 09 Jun 2009 20:28:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 20:43GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21  
For one, if it's a Bush initiative, why the fuck is Obama continuing it? I thought Bush's economic plan was failing according to him.

Because as much as Obama and the rest of the country loves change, the US constitution is designed to resist change and make it very difficult. If the 700billion bank bailouts could've been reversed, I'm sure they would be.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21For two, yeah, it pretty much IS free money. The only downside is government regulation, which is causing companies to outright go under because they can't really meet the requirements (GM, etc).

Again, I should repeat myself. The stimulus package is for the most part NOT FREE MONEY. Just because you repeat it over and over doesn't make it any more true. Free money was the bank bailouts (Under Bush). Even the auto-industry bailouts weren't free money, but they were buying stock, which the government will sell once the company gets back on it's feet(Something Sweden has done successfully in the past).

Oh, and of course. GM was doing SOOOOOO well before Obama came along. Clearly, his less-than-100-days of regulation completely destroyed America's largest corporation.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21Three, yes, AIG is a surely deserving company, right? Not to mention they hold control of the ports that Dubai should've owned, but don't thanks to stupid pricks in congress.

Keep pretending Obama's fault. If you repeat it enough times, it might come true.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21Yeah I clearly meant its physical condition  
.

What the hell does this mean, then?

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 05 June 2009 05:36closed down a terrorist interrogation facility rather than fixing it up,

Fix it up as in give it a new paint-job? Fix it up as in put in new hardwood floor? Fix it up as in somehow bring Guantanamo Bay, Cuba under US National jurisdiction? What did you mean by "fixing it up"?

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21Anyways, while I do understand your point, address this one: where are the terrorists that were held captive going to go? Either they go to another, much more secretive location (LOL BUSH R BAD HE KEEP THINGS SEEKRIT), or they're simply let free. Now, if they're putting it in US waters where our laws apply, and it's not a super secretive location (afterall, doing that is just a failed Bush administration method, amirite), then good. But I haven't quite heard news of that. If you'd like to correct me, feel free to.

Keep them in an American Supermax prison. That's what Obama wants to do, and that's what he

should do. If you want to see why he hasn't, see the long list of Republican governors and senators that don't want to take them because they think there'll be terrorists living in their neighbor's attic.

I'd like to draw special attention to this:

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 where are the terrorists that were held captive going to go? Either they go to another, much more secretive location (LOL BUSH R BAD HE KEEP THINGS SEEKRIT), or they're simply let free.

You may find this to be informative reading.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 I'm referring to giving the Queen of England an iPod, bowing to a foreign leader (Again, a small thing, but stupid nonetheless). I'm not saying Bush was any better, but for a guy who people hoped would be a lot better with foreign relations... yeah. Plus, a lot of foreign investors can see US is just going deeper into a shithole, so they're not going to be as apt to help us out.

Most of the apparent "foreign relations" he does is the typical bullshit. Shaking hands, talking with them, etc. Outside of that, it doesn't seem like he's doing a better job than Bush did, really...

The thing is, nobody else is complaining! The queen of England doesn't seem the mind getting an iPod, nobody else seems to be making a shitstorm out of the supposed "bow". The only people that seem to give a shit are the people who are pre-disposed to dislike Obama in the first place! Every foreign leader and every country he's visited has given glowing reviews and has nothing but kind words for him and for the US. A big change from the last administration. This is your idea of a fuck up? What's your definition of a catastrophe? What is "good", if this is a fuck-up?

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 Oh, I also like how if people disagree with Obama, they're "butthurt conservifags". Way to be a biased prick, considering plenty of people on both sides of the aisle are disagreeing with various things Obama has done.

But only butthurt conseri-fags are making a big deal about things that don't matter, like supposed mini-bows, or giving iPods as gifts, or Obama not going to church on Sunday, etc etc. If you do these things, you're a conservi-fag, and chances are you're loaded with pure butthurt.

You can object to Obama's policies without being a retard in the process. Most people just choose not to.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 I live around the DC area, I should know. He does do this, and actually very frequently. You might not think much of it, but considering the amount of people who do business in DC and can't get through, that's a lot of people who are either late to meetings/work/whatever, or who outright can't get to their jobs. Not to mention, this can fuck up local businesses just as well, since everyone is focused on this one business he's going to.

You live in DC? There's your first problem.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 You might not think much of it, but to me,

this is fucking bullshit. One man should NOT be able to close down streets and fuck up or "save" a business as he does just because he decides to do so. It's supposed to be a free market, not a market controlled by the government and whatever he wants to go to. He's a fucking President, he needs to start acting like it.

We torture, you say "We have to do what we have to do". We start a pre-emptive war against a country that hasn't shown any aggression toward us, you say "They deserved it". A street near you gets shut down, you say "THIS IS FUCKING BULLSHIT".

Also, lol @ the president visiting a business = Market controlled by the government. I won't even comment on that. That's too easy.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 Also, the US still has a pretty shitty view from people overseas,

Obama's fault, I'm sure.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 the economy is hardly being "fixed" (He's just pumping money into businesses he deems fit to throw money at... way to continue fiscal irresponsibility that's been plaguing our nation for years, asshole),

Lol, if someone on this forum called Bush an "asshole", you would greet them with bullshit like "You're unamerican!" and "Why do you hate this country?".

As for the economy, see below.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 and I haven't really seen us pull out of Iraq yet (LOL WE'RE GONNA PULL OUT OF IRAQ RIGHT AS I'M ELECTED).

Wai2listen. He's been saying one battalion a month since the beginning of the campaign. He's been overly-cautious in his speeches ("I will consult with my commanders, etc etc"). If you're going to criticize the guy, at least quote things he's actually said.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 I do agree it's good he's finally doing something decent and giving to the scientific community, but who knows, maybe they'll spend shittons of that money trying to research for a vaccine for something minor that's a huge deal all around (Swine flu, anyone).

Lol @ swine flu.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 And restoring the rule of law? Hahahahahahahahahahahahah. Yeah, no. If anyone should get their head out of their ass, it's you. He's continuing the same bullshit workarounds Bush did, but is adding his own touch of bullshit on top of it all.

Pics or it didn't happen.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21 Actually I was- in a good majority of his

speeches, he bashes Bush and his blatant "failed policies" and how he can easily fix them, and that "change" would happen almost immediatly. Now that he's in office, his tone changes to "well, bad things are gonna have to happen first before some good things happen". Once again it's the same fucking bullshit we've been experiencing for the past years.

Bashing Bush doesn't mean "I can fix this in 100 days". He's made it pretty clear it's going to take a while to fix. After all, it took a while to get into. Expecting otherwise betrays your lack of knowledge on how economics works. Just because your unrealistic expectations aren't met doesn't mean you can start spouting bullshit and expect to be taken seriously.

All in all, you should quit your bitching and suck it up.  
....Spoony?

(Sorry for off-topicness, just had to say that)

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 09 Jun 2009 20:33:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Prulez wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 13:28  
....Spoony?

(Sorry for off-topicness, just had to say that)

I have a lot of respect for Spoony.  
Really, though, it's the only way to respond to people when they make wall-of-text posts.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Prulez](#) on Tue, 09 Jun 2009 20:36:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I have to agree with that, even though replying to a wall of text, with a wall of text, usually results in an even large wall of text and that... well, do I have to go on?

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 09 Jun 2009 20:37:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Prulez wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 13:36I have to agree with that, even though replying to a wall of text, with a wall of text, usually results in an even large wall of text and that... well, do I have to go on?

Of course. This is the nature of the Heated Debate forum.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [slosha](#) on Tue, 09 Jun 2009 22:48:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ryan3k wrote on Thu, 04 June 2009 23:04can i change my vote to yes?

obama went to egypt he's definitely a muslim now..

edit - p.2 snipa  
I'm not sure if you are joking but...

Not necessarily... Egypt is in my top five places I would like to go in my lifetime. Does that make me muslim too?

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Wed, 10 Jun 2009 02:31:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 13:43GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 09:21You might not think much of it, but to me, this is fucking bullshit. One man should NOT be able to close down streets and fuck up or "save" a business as he does just because he decides to do so. It's supposed to be a free market, not a market controlled by the government and whatever he wants to go to. He's a fucking President, he needs to start acting like it.

We torture, you say "We have to do what we have to do". We start a pre-emptive war against a country that hasn't shown any aggression toward us, you say "They deserved it". A street near you gets shut down, you say "THIS IS FUCKING BULLSHIT".  
thanks for this.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Wed, 10 Jun 2009 04:28:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

well this is the longest any of my posts have lasted...

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Gen\\_Blacky](#) on Wed, 10 Jun 2009 19:43:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Im surprised Obama hasn't been shot yet. He is putting the united sates in a bigger hole spending

---

some much money. giving money to people that don't deserve it. He shouldn't be helping any businesses. Obama has a little to none work experience and has no military experience. How do except someone to run a country with no knowledge of the country .....

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Wed, 10 Jun 2009 19:54:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Im surprised George Bush hadn't been shot. He was putting the United States in a bigger hole spending so much money, as well as giving money to people that don't deserve it. He shouldn't have been bailing out any businesses. George Bush had little to no federal political experience and had no real military experience, either. How did people expect someone to run a country with no knowledge of the country .....

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 10 Jun 2009 20:51:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Gen\_Blacky wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 12:43no military experience.

I love how people keep bringing up military experience like it matters. The two widely-accepted best presidents America has ever had (F.D.R. and Lincoln) both had little to no military experience. F.D.R. had none and Lincoln had six months in a militia that never saw any combat.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [u6795](#) on Wed, 10 Jun 2009 20:55:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 16:51Gen\_Blacky wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 12:43no military experience.

I love how people keep bringing up military experience like it matters. The two widely-accepted best presidents America has ever had (F.D.R. and Lincoln) both had little to no military experience. F.D.R. had none and Lincoln had six months in a militia that never saw any combat. It's more or less because Military Presidents tend to have a deeper understanding of the armed forces and use them more wisely. Perhaps not always, but it is often the case. People were worried about Obama because we're kind of in the middle of two wars, regardless.

Most of the Soldiers I've spoken with recently think he's doing alright. Some think pulling out of Iraq so quickly is a mistake, but I completely understand why most of the United States wants it.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 10 Jun 2009 21:01:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

u6795 wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 13:55Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 16:51Gen\_Blacky wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 12:43no military experience.

I love how people keep bringing up military experience like it matters. The two widely-accepted best presidents America has ever had (F.D.R. and Lincoln) both had little to no military experience. F.D.R. had none and Lincoln had six months in a militia that never saw any combat. It's more or less because Military Presidents tend to have a deeper understanding of the armed forces and use them more wisely. Perhaps not always, but it is often the case. People were worried about Obama because we're kind of in the middle of two wars, regardless.

F.D.R. and Lincoln. World War II and the civil war. Look at two presidents that are known for their military experience: Eisenhower and Kennedy. Vietnam was an abject failure and so was the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Give me one example of a "military" president using armed forces wisely. Major (and preferably recent) examples, not Washington putting down some farmers rebellion or something.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [u6795](#) on Wed, 10 Jun 2009 21:43:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 17:01u6795 wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 13:55Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 16:51Gen\_Blacky wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 12:43no military experience.

I love how people keep bringing up military experience like it matters. The two widely-accepted best presidents America has ever had (F.D.R. and Lincoln) both had little to no military experience. F.D.R. had none and Lincoln had six months in a militia that never saw any combat. It's more or less because Military Presidents tend to have a deeper understanding of the armed forces and use them more wisely. Perhaps not always, but it is often the case. People were worried about Obama because we're kind of in the middle of two wars, regardless.

F.D.R. and Lincoln. World War II and the civil war. Look at two presidents that are known for their military experience: Eisenhower and Kennedy. Vietnam was an abject failure and so was the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Give me one example of a "military" president using armed forces wisely. Major (and preferably recent) examples, not Washington putting down some farmers rebellion or something. How about George Bush's management of the war in Afghanistan? Up until recently that had been going smoothly (I'm not insinuating it's at all tied to Obama) and the Taliban has been nearly crushed (however, once again, recently they have begun a resurgence). Al Qaida has effectively been driven out of Afghanistan, mostly as a result of expert commanders on the part of the United States, but without the freedom to operate and the support of Bush the military would not be as

formidable as it is toda. Iraq, while short sighted in its planning, was executed masterfully and its people were freed from a pretty oppressive douchebag.

George H.W. Bush sent the armed forces to Iraq the first time in 1991 along with the backing of a significant coalition and completely obliterated the Iraqi military in a matter of weeks.

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

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

Nixon I cannot defend. He largely escalated the war and caused thousands more deaths irresponsibly, albeit with good intentions (to end the war honorably through victory) he still underestimated the Vietnamese entirely.

Going back further, Theodore Roosevelt served honorably for several years and went on to make increase the world standing of the United States tenfold. The Great White Fleet basically solidified our role as a world power and international respect in dealings with foreign nations. Even farther back, of course, is George Washington. I don't know, he didn't really do much. I mean, aside from leading our army to victory over the British and establishing the United States, he was a pretty chill guy.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Wed, 10 Jun 2009 22:21:58 GMT

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

---

u6795 wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 16:43

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

Actually, Afghanistan has devolved into a nightmare scenario. Had the United States not gone to

war with Iraq, Afghanistan would be in a much better shape. However, much of the country is in fact governed by militia's, and warlords, many of whom are affiliated with the Taliban. The worst thing is that the poppy industry has created enormous illegal wealth for the Taliban, and al-qaeda sympathizers; meanwhile, the drugs produced by poppies will end up in the hands of Afghans, which can cause addiction and illness, as well as likely appearing on the streets of North America.

It's not fair to fault America totally for Afghanistan; indeed, much of the blame needs to be shouldered by Europe, for withdrawing from the fight, leaving the bulk of the work to come from North America and England.

Obama's decision to refocus on Afghanistan was one of his few policies that I actually liked.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [u6795](#) on Wed, 10 Jun 2009 22:29:15 GMT

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

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 18:21u6795 wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 16:43  
How about George Bush's management of the war in Afghanistan? Up until recently that had been going smoothly (I'm not insinuating it's at all tied to Obama) and the Taliban has been nearly crushed (however, once again, recently they have begun a resurgence). Al Qaida has effectively been driven out of Afghanistan, mostly as a result of expert commanders on the part of the United States, but without the freedom to operate and the support of Bush the military would not be as formidable as it is today. Iraq, while short sighted in its planning, was executed masterfully and its people were freed from a pretty oppressive douchebag.

Actually, Afghanistan has devolved into a nightmare scenario. Had the United States not gone to war with Iraq, Afghanistan would be in a much better shape. However, much of the country is in fact governed by militia's, and warlords, many of whom are affiliated with the Taliban. The worst thing is that the poppy industry has created enormous illegal wealth for the Taliban, and al-qaeda sympathizers; meanwhile, the drugs produced by poppies will end up in the hands of Afghans, which can cause addiction and illness, as well as likely appearing on the streets of North America.

It's not fair to fault America totally for Afghanistan; indeed, much of the blame needs to be shouldered by Europe, for withdrawing from the fight, leaving the bulk of the work to come from North America and England.

Obama's decision to refocus on Afghanistan was one of his few policies that I actually liked. I agree. The Taliban are back now, and there's no disputing that. I completely agree about Obama, though, I'm very glad he's making steps to shift the war on terror back to where it belongs. Unfortunately for the Iraqis we might be gone before true stability can be achieved. Iraq was indeed a mistake, and the assets we've used and wasted there should be in Afghanistan. However there's no question that the Iraqi people are better off today, and I think it would be responsible of us to finish that off completely before pulling out.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 11 Jun 2009 00:22:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

u6795 wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 14:43 Kennedy was assassinated only a short while into major US involvement in Vietnam. We'd already been involved there since like, what, the 50's? Lyndon

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

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

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

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

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

I don't know what Washington did as president.

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

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 11 Jun 2009 01:30:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 19:22 The nation was lied too. Anyone else remember those UN briefings where Colon Powell was giving detailed descriptions of biological weapons loaded on to trucks, complete with diagrams and CGI representaions?  
yep, and you weren't the only ones. Tony Blair told us Saddam could slam us with WMDs in a matter of forty minutes. It later turned out the CIA was privately saying "what the FUCK is he saying?"

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Gen\\_Blacky](#) on Thu, 11 Jun 2009 02:01:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

at least bush did what he said he was going to do.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Thu, 11 Jun 2009 02:54:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

lol, but not all of it.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Thu, 11 Jun 2009 02:55:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Spoony wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 20:30Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 19:22The nation was lied too. Anyone else remember those UN briefings where Colon Powell was giving detailed descriptions of biological weapons loaded on to trucks, complete with diagrams and CGI representaiions?

yep, and you weren't the only ones. Tony Blair told us Saddam could slam us with WMDs in a matter of forty minutes. It later turned out the CIA was privately saying "what the FUCK is he saying?"

Not to mention Bush literally forcing the intelligence services to pull (from their ass) a link between bin Laden and Saddam.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [DeadX07](#) on Thu, 11 Jun 2009 07:26:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Whether you are republican, democratic or other. Whether you like Obama, Bush, or other. I think everyone can agree that any president who is big on government, is a bad president.

I think that one of the biggest problems we have in America, is that the government officials have forgotten that they work for the people, not the other way around.

This goes for cops and other small officials too.

Also, Obama was a US Senator before he was elected, so he was already part of the problem we're in to begin with.

Also, when you see a president who purchases a fancy new pen for each person just so they can sign a bill and look pretty, is a bad president who loves to spend money (your money by the way).

When I see a president use a standard #2 pencil or a bic pen for the first time I might not complain so much.

Controversy for the win.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 11 Jun 2009 09:40:23 GMT

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

---

DeadX07 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 00:26 Whether you are republican, democratic or other. Whether you like Obama, Bush, or other. I think everyone can agree that any president who is big on government, is a bad president.

I think that one of the biggest problems we have in America, is that the government officials have forgotten that they work for the people, not the other way around.

This goes for cops and other small officials too.

Also, Obama was a US Senator before he was elected, so he was already part of the problem we're in to begin with.

Also, when you see a president who purchases a fancy new pen for each person just so they can sign a bill and look pretty, is a bad president who loves to spend money (your money by the way).

When I see a president use a standard #2 pencil or a bic pen for the first time I might not complain so much.

Controversy for the win.

No. You're wrong, and I disagree. Small government is weak, ineffective government. When government leaves a power vacuum, it's filled by people with deep pockets that aren't accountable to the people. No government-run healthcare? Let's have private insurance companies who can fuck you in the ass, laugh about it later, and there's nothing you can do about it, since they're in no way accountable to you. The biggest problem we have in America isn't government officials, and anyone who thinks so is just sucking Reagan's deceased cock (Every time someone says "government is the problem not the solution" or some variation, baby jesus sheds a tear). This is the way government works: You pay taxes, you participate in elections, you do your civic duty (Jury duty, occasional military draft, whatever), and in return you have a society that runs smoothly. You have someone to put a fire out if your house goes up in flames, you have someone to enforce laws, you have someone to pave the roads you drive on, etc etc. Less government means less of all that.

So, what is the biggest problem, then? The biggest problem in America is people don't want to get their heads out of their asses and look beyond their own interests. Nobody wants to pay taxes, nobody wants to cut down their entitlement, nobody wants to put off buying a house until they can afford it. People like you want a smaller government so they can pay less taxes -- More money in

my pocket and to hell with everything else! The government isn't the problem, YOU'RE the problem.

Also, quit thinking everything Obama buys is with your money. He has a ridiculous amount of fundraiser money left over, and presidents get regular donations from private donors and lobbyists all the time (Although the later may be getting a crackdown once these crises are over). I wouldn't be surprised if half the stuff he buys is out-of-pocket (We've never had a poor president). Even if he was spending taxpayer money, Obama has the shittiest job in the world right now, and I do not envy him one bit. If he wants a pen, he'll buy a fucking pen, and I don't mind paying for it. It's the least I can do.

"Controversy for the win"? This is your idea of a controversy? How about secret torture camps in international waters where laws don't apply? How about lying about WMD? How about giving \$700,000,000,000.00 to banks with no strings attached? And here you are bitching about pens.

Also:

DeadX07 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 00:26 everyone can agree that any president who is big on government, is a bad president.

You may find this to be informative reading.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 11 Jun 2009 18:15:13 GMT

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

---

Prulez wrote on Tue, 09 June 2009 15:28....Spoony?

(Sorry for off-topicness, just had to say that)

this isn't jelly forums... these forums don't seem to've been corrupted by the idea that someone making several points in a clear, well-constructed post with the aid of the quote button is such a terrible thing to do that it's equivalent to cheating.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 11 Jun 2009 18:57:56 GMT

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

---

Spoony wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 13:15 these forums don't seem to've been corrupted by the idea that someone making several points in a clear, well-constructed post with the aid of the quote button is such a terrible thing to do that it's equivalent to cheating.

lol who said that?

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [u6795](#) on Thu, 11 Jun 2009 23:40:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 20:22Also, I wouldn't call the war in Afghanistan well-managed. Ever since Iraq started it's been out of the limelight. It's only recently that people are starting to pay attention that we realize how shitty things are going there. You use words like "nearly crushed" and "driven out (except for the resurgence lol)". That's just putting a positive spin on failure.

Since when does the Media pay attention to something when things are going well? As I said, only recently has it all come crumbling down, for many years the Taliban WAS destroyed and fractured, and as Nikki said, simply a bunch of tribal warlords getting rich off Opium and claiming affiliation to the Taliban.

Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 20:22Lastly, while some good may have come out of the invasion of Iraq (The overthrow of an oppressive douchebag), that in itself is not as was not enough reason to invade. North Korea has an oppressive douchebag leader, why don't we play world police and invade them, too? The nation was lied too. Anyone else remember those UN briefings where Colon Powell was giving detailed descriptions of biological weapons loaded on to trucks, complete with diagrams and CGI representaions?

I agree. Our reasons for invading Iraq were misguided and we probably shouldn't be there at all. I'm simply pointing out that we have done good in our time there.

Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 20:22...And yet we ended up invading the same country a decade later. Not what I would call wise use of military forces, if they apparently accomplished nothing.

We destroyed pretty much all of their military infrastructure and crippled their fighting force. A decade, however, is a long time. Even so, we still didn't see any tanks or major organized resistance when we went into Iraq again, did we?

Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 20:22His honorable actions as General and commander of Allied forces in Europe aside, he was a fairly mediocre president. The Korean war was a pathetic clusterfuck. Also, most presidents typically have high approval ratings toward the beginning of wars. It's obvious generals make good generals, but I would argue that they don't nessessarily make good presidents.

The UN got us into Korea. However, I was referring to today- when surveyed people rate Eisenhower as one of the best Presidents.

Eisenhower was a good President. Have you ever driven on the interstate? Thank Eisenhower. He was also a great advocate of Civil Rights, granting some of the first real victories for the movement through the integration of DC public schools, and two Civil Rights acts.

Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 20:22 When mentioning Kennedy, I wasn't referring to his involvement in Vietnam (Which, as you mentioned, had been going on for several years). I was specifically referring to The Bay Of Pigs Invasion, which was a terrible failure. Even if it's only tied to him by his authorization, it means he authorized a terrible failure. Something that lies in direct contradiction to your claim that presidents with military experience have a deeper understanding of armed forces and use them wisely.

As I said before, he was convinced it was destined for success. Luckily, the Bay of Pigs invasion didn't involve the US Armed Forces, simply a few CIA advisers that trained the Cubans.

Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 20:22 Most would argue that in the process of increasing the standing of the United States, he lowered world opinion, both back then by pissing off all of Latin America, and to this day by establishing the American role of "World Police" which presidents unfortunately seem to uphold to this day. You might call that respect, but I don't.

Well then we have a difference in personal opinion, my friend. The fact that the United States is the first name that comes up in most international affairs is a direct result of our nation being the last remaining superpower. Our role as a world police force comes without a choice.

Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 20:22 I don't know what Washington did as president.

First of all, he was offered to serve as King of the United States from the beginning, and pimp slapped the ones who made that offer immediately. He established the foundation of the Presidency and set forth a standard for democratic election of a leader that serves as a framework even today. He also resigned from his Presidency after a few years, inventing the four year standard for a term.

Dover wrote on Wed, 10 June 2009 20:22 What I'm looking for is a clear example of good military leader = good president, and I would maintain that you haven't shown me such an example yet.

I am not in any way saying that to be a good President, one must have military experience. Merely that it helps. Veterans have a higher sense of national duty and often times greater leadership experience which is invaluable commanding the most powerful nation on Earth.

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

You seem to think Military experience means combat experience. This is far from the case. Military training instills a sense of servitude which is absolutely desirable in a man destined to fill the office of President, the ultimate servant of the people. He is elected by the people, and governs for the people and of the people.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 12 Jun 2009 00:18:23 GMT

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

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 16:40 Since when does the Media pay attention to something when things are going well? As I said, only recently has it all come crumbling down, for many years the Taliban WAS destroyed and fractured, and as Nikki said, simply a bunch of tribal warlords getting rich off Opium and claiming affiliation to the Taliban.

Yet five years later, the job still isn't done. Wise and understanding application of military forces? It doesn't seem so.

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 16:40 I agree. Our reasons for invading Iraq were misguided and we probably shouldn't be there at all. I'm simply pointing out that we have done good in our time there.

It's almost an inevitability that some conceivable good would come of any action. We can thank World War II for a leap ahead in military technology that has seen application in the civilian sector and improved all our lives. Does that mean Hitler was a cool guy for starting it all? Of course not. Let's not muddy the waters by equating some good with our original criteria -- Wise and understanding application of military forces. Iraq does not meet these criteria. Like you said, we shouldn't have been there.

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 16:40 We destroyed pretty much all of their military infrastructure and crippled their fighting force. A decade, however, is a long time. Even so, we still didn't see any tanks or major organized resistance when we went into Iraq again, did we?

In terms of politics and history, a decade isn't that long at all. It has been only a little over a decade and Eastern Europe is still associated with communism, despite most former soviet satellite nations being part of the EU.

We didn't see any major organized resistance in Iraq because the second time around we didn't bother to declare war, and instead put a cruise into anything of value before the invasion began, before anyone had any idea what was happening, a luxury not afforded the first time around. Was it effective? Sure. Was it wise and understanding? You yourself said we shouldn't have gone, so I would agree with you and say no, it wasn't.

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 16:40 The UN got us into Korea. However, I was referring to today- when surveyed people rate Eisenhower as one of the best Presidents.

Eisenhower was a good President. Have you ever driven on the interstate? Thank Eisenhower. He was also a great advocate of Civil Rights, granting some of the first real victories for the movement through the integration of DC public schools, and two Civil Rights acts.

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

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 16:40 As I said before, he was convinced it was destined for success. Luckily, the Bay of Pigs invasion didn't involve the US Armed Forces, simply a few CIA advisers that trained the Cubans.

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

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 16:40 Well then we have a difference in personal opinion, my friend. The fact that the United States is the first name that comes up in most international affairs is a direct result of our nation being the last remaining superpower. Our role as a world police force comes without a choice.

Of course it comes with a choice. There are international organizations (Namely, the UN) who's authority is global. There is no need for the United States to assume such a role.

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 16:40 First of all, he was offered to serve as King of the United States from the beginning, and pimp slapped the ones who made that offer immediately. He established the foundation of the Presidency and set forth a standard for democratic election of a leader that serves as a framework even today. He also resigned from his Presidency after a few years, inventing the four year standard for a term.

I meant in terms of a commander-in-chief--the context of this discussion (Or so I thought).

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 16:40 I am not in any way saying that to be a good President, one must have military experience. Merely that it helps. Veterans have a higher sense of national duty and often times greater leadership experience which is invaluable commanding the most powerful nation on Earth.

To say this is to imply that those who are not Veterans lack the leadership abilities to lead America in times when it needs it, but you haven't addressed my first two examples: Both Lincoln and FDR led America through the two wars that were most potentially destructive to the United States, and neither of them had any military experience to speak of.

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 16:40 You seem to think Military experience means combat experience. This is far from the case. Military training instills a sense of servitude which is absolutely desirable in a man destined to fill the office of President, the ultimate servant of the people. He is elected by the people, and governs for the people and of the people.

Theoretically. To stay with the example of Bush, I don't see how doing and dealing Cocaine in a position secured by your Dad's powerful connections helps a man understand the servitude involved in being president.

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?  
Posted by [u6795](#) on Fri, 12 Jun 2009 01:35:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

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

Dover wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 20:18 Put his work in civil rights and highway projects aside. That has nothing to do with applying military forces. Blame to UN all you want for Korea, but it was a direct result of America's shitty "containment" policy, and while the troops in Korea were the UN's by name, they were comprised largely of Americans. The two are inseparable. You asked earlier for an example where a good military leader becomes a great president. In the case of Korea, Eisenhower/Truman were fulfilling our debts to the international community. Whatever your opinion on containment, it's hard to argue the fact that South Korea is a great ally to the United States today as a result.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As I said, FDR had the advantage of some of the most brilliant military strategists of the century at his command and three terms under his belt well into World War II. However I have not said that military experience is a requirement for a great President, simply a bonus. Lincoln didn't have all the same advantages as FDR but also turned out to be a brilliant strategist and had very clear goals.

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

helps a man understand the servitude involved in being president.

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

---

---

Subject: Re: Is Obamas Muslimness Bad?

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 12 Jun 2009 02:13:25 GMT

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

---

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 18:35His management of the war could be absolutely perfect and that still would not guarantee a quick victory. There are thousands of factors that play into a war, namely, the fact that it is a war. I'm not trying to shift the blame, however saying the President is ineffective because a war continues is like blaming the mail man for a late delivery.

It's good that you used the term "could be", because it wasn't. Not only was the war mismanaged, but Bush intentionally diverted. Opening up a second front in a war against a different enemy (Or in this case, an entirely different war) can only divide forces and be to the detriment of both efforts. And, like we've both already agreed upon, we had no use in going to Iraq.

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 18:35You asked earlier for an example where a good military leader becomes a great president. In the case of Korea, Eisenhower/Truman were fulfilling our debts to the international community. Whatever your opinion on containment, it's hard to argue the fact that South Korea is a great ally to the United States today as a result.

...And North Korea is just that much more alienated, as well as China and the USSR for the longest time, and it just escalated the Cold War that much more. We get back to this "Some good" argument, and I just won't accept that. "Some good" isn't enough good, or good enough.

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 18:35I'm not implying that their sacrifice was less important because they were Cubans, but that it is important that they WEREN'T Americans, because the best use of the military, as I've said before, is none at all. Kennedy was seeking through this missions authorization to end a problem without the use of American troops. The Cuban exiles who enlisted for the mission wanted the end goal just as much as the Americans.

I agree with you that the best use of the military is none at all, but this isn't the use of none at all. This is the use of someone else doing your dirty work. Not only did it not work, but it was cowardly and deceitful. Machiavelli would argue that those two qualities aren't necessarily a bad thing so long as they lead to a greater good, but not even that came out of the Bay of Pigs invasion. You can't even say "some good" came of it.

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 18:35As you said before, the vast majority of UN directed troops in Korea were Americans. Even with organizations such as the UN, the United States fulfills most of the troop requirements and is without a doubt a 'leader' amongst the United Nations.

This isn't a role the UN forces upon the US. It's a role the US abuses to fulfill it's own goals (Like their policy of containment)

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 18:35It's what I was initially referring to as well, but in your last post you shifted toward overall Presidential prowess.

I did? Where? If I did, I didn't mean to.

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 18:35Not at all. It's simply a bonus.

Then we're in agreement. Gen. Blacky appears to believe otherwise, although I invite him to respond and clarify if he wants to.

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 18:35As I said, FDR had the advantage of some of the most brilliant military strategists of the century at his command and three terms under his belt well into World War II. However I have not said that military experience is a requirement for a great President, simply a bonus. Lincoln didn't have all the same advantages as FDR but also turned out to be a brilliant strategist and had very clear goals.

Then we're in agreement. Gen. Blacky etc etc copy/paste

u6795 wrote on Thu, 11 June 2009 18:35Cocaine absolutely doesn't help at all. That's a huge black mark on Bush's record particularly, however his experience with the Military (whether unfairly achieved or not) gave the man a much deeper understanding of the military's values and the sacrifices made by soldiers. It's no wonder that at almost every appearance Bush made in Iraq and Afghanistan, he was greeted with standing ovations and thunderous cheering and applause. On the contrary, Barack Obama has been received with respect but little enthusiasm.

That probably has more to do with the Bush policy of picking and choosing who gets on camera with Bush. That's the reason he rarely has to field tough questions. I wouldn't be surprised at all if the thunderous cheering and applause was just another carefully orchestrated PR event.

---