
Anti-war stance defended

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/13 09:21

This thread discusses the Content article: Anti-war stance defended

Amen! What kind of society have we become where defending murder is more popular than defending peace? I wonder which is the more moral? The Republican "moral majority" left the arena 12 years ago!

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Ultra Bob - 2008/07/13 09:36

Yea Sara.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by ericmiami - 2008/07/13 09:42

Thank you, Sara.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by The Keeper - 2008/07/13 09:50

We were the aggressors in this war, and other than getting Saddam out what have we done other than open the country up to daily and continuous attacks by terrorists which before our invasion they never had.

If you want to know "what have we have done", read the book, The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy And Its Geostrategic Imperatives, 1998, by Polish born, Zbigniew "I hate Russia" Brzezinski, former national security adviser to President Jimmy Carter (1977-81). Obama's presidential marionette string puller.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by truthhurts - 2008/07/13 09:50

I totally agree, Sara. You are entirely correct.

That won't, however, stop Decaf, Raymond, and a few others from calling you a "comlib", "Saddam lover", and, yes, even "Anti-American".

But that is OK...this is America, where even the loonies can have their say. At least for the time being, though Bush and his cronies are working on even that.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by The Keeper - 2008/07/13 09:54

truthhurts wrote:

I totally agree, Sara. You are entirely correct.

That won't, however, stop Decaf, Raymond, and a few others from calling you a "comlib", "Saddam lover", and, yes, even "Anti-American".

But that is OK...this is America, where even the loonies can have their say. At least for the time being, though Bush and

his cronies are working on even that.

That's right! Thanks in part to Orin Hatch and Bob Bennett, 'FISA' will take care of all of those complainers, now that we don't have a 4th Amendment.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by lucid_green - 2008/07/15 11:40

I was against the war from the start. I remember the chatter about it while in basic training at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Now, because of it, I'm a veteran. I thank my lucky stars I wasn't in Iraq during my tour, but in Afghanistan where the true perpetrator are still lurking and going nearly unchecked do to the Iraqi distraction. So I've served my country overseas. You can't tell me I'm un-American or unpatriotic. I've given more than the whole administration who put us there, may they be tried for their crimes.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by eric hussein miami - 2008/07/15 12:01

Thanks, Lucid. For your service and courage in standing up for what you know is right.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by lucid_green - 2008/07/15 12:20

It's amazing how different you view the world and your country after having served in such a capacity. Thankfully, it has opened my eyes and not closed them further.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by leftintheuc - 2008/07/15 12:31

How sad that we are living in a time when an American has to defend an anti-war stance. We have historically been a country of progress. Our Founding was instigated behind the flag of Liberty; our Founding failures were eventually atoned for in the Civil War. Whether or not the Civil War was just, in need of defense or criticism, is irrelevant today when viewed through the lens of atonement. It was necessary.

Today, we can longer afford to be isolationist and look only to our own interests. Our global community must look to the miracle of America in no less the same way a sailor of old looked to the lighthouse. What better form of government has mankind yet conceived? Yet, tragically, this war has broken that lighthouse, rendered it blind. America has become belligerent in the eyes of the world. America, or rather its current governing administration, has destabilized tumultuous regions, fostered hostility towards its citizens, and worn its noble military far too thin. In a world where distances are electronically erased via the internet, where everyone can and should seek the same ideal and where, importantly, we, and many others, still have the nuclear means to annihilate humanity entire, opposing the criminal, foolish and selfish reasons behind this war is in no need of defense. It is the true American belief! For those who blindly see this war as necessary, defend then the decision to ignore the true perpetrators of 9/11. For those who see this war as a means to prevent further American civilian bloodshed, defend then the hostility towards America this war has created, defend the instability of dangerous regions it has fostered. Sara is right-justice, love and the Peace of God; to know, believe and practice this ideology is to really understand what America is and always should be.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2008/07/15 13:38

lucid_green wrote:

I was against the war from the start. I remember the chatter about it while in basic training at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Now, because of it, I'm a veteran. I thank my lucky stars I wasn't in Iraq during my tour, but in Afghanistan where the true perpetrator are still lurking and going nearly unchecked do to the Iraqi distraction. So I've served my country overseas. You can't tell me I'm un-American or unpatriotic. I've given more than the whole administration who put us there, may they be tried for their crimes.

Thank you. I was deployed elsewhere when the Iraq war was started and was also against it. My comrades knew it, and tried convincing me that the Iraq was was justified, but I could not the reasoning and evidence to it. I, too, was deployed 5 times (mostly Asia and South America), and received my veteran status honorably. That said, I too am against the iraq war. I think our valuable resources are wasted there, while the perpetrators of 9/11 got away with murder. Regardless of what armchair quarterbacks who agree with everything that Bush says, there is a large and growing number of veterans who see the fallacy in believing the iraq war is just.

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Everybody Loves Raymond - 2008/07/15 15:05

lucid_green wrote:

I was against the war from the start. I remember the chatter about it while in basic training at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Now, because of it, I'm a veteran. I thank my lucky stars I wasn't in Iraq during my tour, but in Afghanistan where the true perpetrator are still lurking and going nearly unchecked do to the Iraqi distraction. So I've served my country overseas. You can't tell me I'm un-American or unpatriotic. I've given more than the whole administration who put us there, may they be tried for their crimes.

So let me get this straight, you volunteered to go in the Army, but you were against the war? Did you go in just to stir up trouble among the other troops? What was your real motivation? Being a plant for Moveon.org? It is asses like you that go in hating the Army instead of loving it and then come out and moan and groan about cold peas in the chow line, the mattresses are too firm or Humvees that don't have showers in them or something trival like that instead of supporting the Commander in Chief, who has kept us safe since 9/11, in the war against Islamic terror.

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/15 15:33

Ray, you are a up of the highest order. Shows that convicts can not be rehabilitated! Here is an article for the sane readers to read.....

Obama, McCain clash on what to do about Iraq war

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20080715/ap_on_el_pr/candidates_iraq

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2008/07/15 16:49

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:

lucid_green wrote:

I was against the war from the start. I remember the chatter about it while in basic training at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Now, because of it, I'm a veteran. I thank my lucky stars I wasn't in Iraq during my tour, but in Afghanistan where the true perpetrator are still lurking and going nearly unchecked do to the Iraqi distraction. So I've served my country overseas. You can't tell me I'm un-American or unpatriotic. I've given more than the whole administration who put us there, may they be tried for their crimes.

So let me get this straight, you volunteered to go in the Army, but you were against the war? Did you go in just to stir up trouble among the other troops? What was your real motivation? Being a plant for Moveon.org? It is asses like you that go in hating the Army instead of loving it and then come out and moan and groan about cold peas in the chow line, the mattresses are too firm or Humvees that don't have showers in them or something trival like that instead of supporting the

Commander in Chief, who has kept us safe since 9/11, in the war against Islamic terror.

There is nothing in the post that indicates that they hated the army or despised serving their country. Only the resentment of being deceived. Why the hate? Military members are entitled to their own thoughts and actions. I would be more afraid of a military incapable of conscience individual thought.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Cooter - 2008/07/15 16:56

utocoman wrote:

Ray, you are a up of the highest order. Shows that convicts can not be rehabilitated! Here is an article for the sane readers to read.....

Obama, McCain clash on what to do about Iraq war

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20080715/ap_on_el_pr/candidates_iraq

Truth be told Obama is a leftist loon who will destroy the country from the inside out. McCain is not much better. Bush is s sell out, he has turned his back on our countries most vital interests and crushed the dreams of the common man. Despite McCain's military service he was born with a silver spoon and does not understand the "common man". Get rid of welfare (both corporate and individual), get rid of illegal immigrants, hang rapists, murderers, drug lords and career criminals in city parks. Divide Iraq into three countries and immediately bring the troops home when Iraq is secure. Keep a strong military presence throughout the world, but seek to avoid small non-threatening conflicts. Reduce the federal govt by 1/2 by 2018 and lower taxes by 1/2 by the same year. Give the states back their rights. Get the out of the UN, and last but not least, become energy indep by drilling in ANWR, Gulf of Mexico, and southern Utah. One more thing, if you live in the US speak English!:angry:

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Uncle_Bud - 2008/07/15 19:59

Cooter wrote:

utocoman wrote:

Ray, you are a fu\$k up of the highest order. Shows that convicts can not be rehabilitated! Here is an article for the sane readers to read.....

Obama, McCain clash on what to do about Iraq war

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20080715/ap_on_el_pr/candidates_iraq

Truth be told Obama is a leftist loon who will destroy the country from the inside out. McCain is not much better. Bush is s sell out, he has turned his back on our countries most vital interests and crushed the dreams of the common man. Despite McCain's military service he was born with a silver spoon and does not understand the "common man". Get rid of welfare (both corporate and individual), get rid of illegal immigrants, hang rapists, murderers, drug lords and career criminals in city parks. Divide Iraq into three countries and immediately bring the troops home when Iraq is secure. Keep a strong military presence throughout the world, but seek to avoid small non-threatening conflicts. Reduce the federal govt by 1/2 by 2018 and lower taxes by 1/2 by the same year. Give the states back their rights. Get the F#CK out of the UN, and last but not least, become energy indep by drilling in ANWR, Gulf of Mexico, and southern Utah. One more thing, if you live in the US speak English!:angry:

By Gawd, ye hit the nail on the head on these issues. We ought to regulate all these Lawyers, that are making a mess out of our system. To bad more people can't see that this is just what we need.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by SaraA - 2008/07/15 21:44

I was really surprised and quite happy to see that so many agree with me. I was quite sad to see myself called an anti-American, simply because I am anti-war. My eldest son served in the first Iraq war, the one in which Kuwait asked us for help and then in the end came back and paid us for the cost of the war.

It would be nice if we could be the world police, but we cannot, at least not now, and truly I doubt ever. There are so many places in the world that are being torn apart by war, mans answer to greed.

Raymond I salute you. My son saw things when he was there he will not even discuss and I remember sitting with my eyes glued to the tv to see if I could just see him. We went 3 months before hearing from him, it was hard.

I pray that all citizens will go to the polls this year and get these war mongers out of office. Also I don't see anyone allowing Bush's latest attempt to remove our freedoms from us.

Thank you all for your kind remarks, and to the person with the profane comment, go wash your mouth out with soap. We are adults, so slander and profanity are not needed.....my opinion of course.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Wren - 2008/07/16 06:16

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:

lucid_green wrote:

I was against the war from the start. I remember the chatter about it while in basic training at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Now, because of it, I'm a veteran. I thank my lucky stars I wasn't in Iraq during my tour, but in Afghanistan where the true perpetrator are still lurking and going nearly unchecked do to the Iraqi distraction.

So I've served my country overseas. You can't tell me I'm un-American or unpatriotic. I've given more than the whole administration who put us there, may they be tried for their crimes.

So let me get this straight, you volunteered to go in the Army, but you were against the war? Did you go in just to stir up trouble among the other troops? What was your real motivation? Being a plant for Moveon.org? It is asses like you that go in hating the Army instead of loving it and then come out and moan and groan about cold peas in the chow line, the mattresses are too firm or Humvees that don't have showers in them or something trivial like that instead of supporting the Commander in Chief, who has kept us safe since 9/11, in the war against Islamic terror.

you Raymond, (Sara, I have soap ready for myself, but sometime such folks as him have to be told the way it is), and the horse you rode in on. Oh, excuse me, you are already servicing her, Raymond?

Have you ever served in the Armed Forces, Raymond?

Have you ever been wounded or injured in the service of your country, Raymond?

We veterans have a far greater right and moral obligation to speak out our minds, Raymond, on these issues than you ever could.

Bush has betrayed the Armed Forces and all veterans. More than 60% of the veterans will vote against McCain this fall -- look it up and weep, podjo.

Sara, I salute your calm, reasoned patriotism. It is such a wonderful window through which to view the poisoned field in which the Raymonds of our country are trying to raise a diseased crop of neocon and libertarians voters.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Wren - 2008/07/16 06:18

Cooter wrote:

utocoman wrote:

Ray, you are a fu\$%k up of the highest order. Shows that convicts can not be rehabilitated! Here is an article for the sane readers to read.....

Obama, McCain clash on what to do about Iraq war

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20080715/ap_on_el_pr/candidates_iraq

Truth be told Obama is a leftist loon who will destroy the country from the inside out. McCain is not much better. Bush is s sell out, he has turned his back on our countries most vital interests and crushed the dreams of the common man. Despite McCain's military service he was born with a silver spoon and does not understand the "common man". Get rid of welfare (both corporate and individual), get rid of illegal immigrants, hang rapists, murderers, drug lords and career criminals in city parks. Divide Iraq into three countries and immediately bring the troops home when Iraq is secure. Keep a strong military presence throughout the world, but seek to avoid small non-threatening conflicts. Reduce the federal govt by 1/2 by 2018 and lower taxes by 1/2 by the same year. Give the states back their rights. Get the F#CK out of the UN, and last but not least, become energy indep by drilling in ANWR, Gulf of Mexico, and southern Utah. One more thing, if you live in the US speak English!:angry:

Leave your Libertarian loonacy at the door, Cooter.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by The Keeper - 2008/07/16 07:03

utocoman wrote:

Ray, you are a fu\$k up of the highest order. Shows that convicts can not be rehabilitated! Here is an article for the sane readers to read.....

Obama, McCain clash on what to do about Iraq war

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20080715/ap_on_el_pr/candidates_iraq

They don't clash on selling out America!

Both Obama and McSame are advocating full citizenship for the 12 million illegal Mexicans in this country. This stance is typical of those who favor the North American Union!

NEWS BRIEF: "Obama says he'll make immigration reform a priority", The Statesman, July 14, 2008

"SAN DIEGO - Democrat Barack Obama told a Latino group Sunday that he will make changes to immigration policy a top priority and create a way for 12 million illegal immigrants in the United States to get 'out of the shadows' and gain citizenship if he is elected president."

John McCain is also advocating "Immigration Reform" which will allow full citizenship rights to Mexican illegal immigrants in this country.

NEWS BRIEF: "McCain: I've earned Hispanics' trust", Associated Press, July 13, 2008

"WASHINGTON (AP) - John McCain says he has earned the trust of Hispanic voters by championing an immigration reform bill that nearly killed his presidential bid ... McCain, a senator from Arizona, saw his White House bid nearly collapse from conservatives' anger over his effort to pass comprehensive immigration reform, which opponents branded 'amnesty' for millions of illegal immigrants."

The word, "amnesty" is a code word meaning "citizenship". This next news segment makes that quite clear.

"Since the defeat of the immigration reform bill, McCain has tried to make peace with critics in his party by stressing the need for border security before creating a path to citizenship."

There you have the true meaning of McCain's stance on illegal immigration. He is proposing to create "a path to citizenship".

What neither Obama nor McCain are willing to admit is that this "citizenship" which they are proposing for all 12 million illegal Mexican immigrants is NOT American citizenship! Oh, no, the kind of citizenship both Democrat and Republican presidential candidates are proposing is North American Union (NAFTA) citizenship -- for all people living in Canada, the United States, and Mexico!

Therefore, both candidates are striking a blow for the creation of the North American Union -- without having to admit it.

Globalists covet the North American Union because it is one of the superstates in their 10-nation reorganization of the world.

This common stance proves, once again, that there is absolutely no difference between the Democrat and the Republican parties. In the final analysis, the leadership of each party is equally committed to the development of the "New World Order".

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by The Keeper - 2008/07/16 08:29

Wren wrote:

Cooter wrote:

utocoman wrote:

Ray, you are a fu\$%k up of the highest order. Shows that convicts can not be rehabilitated! Here is an article for the sane readers to read.....

Obama, McCain clash on what to do about Iraq war

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20080715/ap_on_el_pr/candidates_iraq

Truth be told Obama is a leftist loon who will destroy the country from the inside out. McCain is not much better. Bush is s sell out, he has turned his back on our countries most vital interests and crushed the dreams of the common man. Despite McCain's military service he was born with a silver spoon and does not understand the "common man". Get rid of welfare (both corporate and individual), get rid of illegal immigrants, hang rapists, murderers, drug lords and career criminals in city parks. Divide Iraq into three countries and immediately bring the troops home when Iraq is secure. Keep a strong military presence throughout the world, but seek to avoid small non-threatening conflicts. Reduce the federal govt by 1/2 by 2018 and lower taxes by 1/2 by the same year. Give the states back their rights. Get the F#CK out of the UN, and last but not least, become energy indep by drilling in ANWR, Gulf of Mexico, and southern Utah. One more thing, if you live in the US speak English!:angry:

Leave your Libertarian loonacy at the door, Cooter.

This is Thomas Paine, circa 1777, writing about the British Empire. Read it closely, and realize that you're living in the American Empire and it's going down, too.

The words were written in the midst of the war with Britain to cast them from our shores. If you mentally inserted the word "America" in that writing where it says Britain, you've read the epitaph of America.

"If ever a nation was mad and foolish, blind to its own interest and bent on its own destruction, it is Britain. There are such things as national sins, and though the punishment of individuals may be reserved to another world, national punishment can only be inflicted in this world. Britain, as a nation, is, in my inmost belief, the greatest and most ungrateful offender against God on the face of the whole earth. Blessed with all the commerce she could wish for, and furnished, by a vast extension of dominion, with the means of civilizing both the eastern and western world, she has made no other use of both than proudly to idolize her own "thunder," and rip up the bowels of whole countries for what she could get. Like Alexander, she has made war her sport, and inflicted misery for prodigality's sake. The blood of India is not yet repaid, nor the wretchedness of Africa yet requited. Of late she has enlarged her list of national cruelties by her butcherly destruction of the Caribbs of St. Vincent's, and returning an answer by the sword to the meek prayer for "Peace, liberty and safety." These are serious things, and whatever a foolish tyrant, a debauched court, a trafficking legislature, or a blinded people may think, the national account with heaven must some day or other be settled: all countries have sooner or later been called to their reckoning; the proudest empires have sunk when the balance was struck; and Britain, like an individual penitent, must undergo her day of sorrow, and the sooner it happens to her the better."

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Sir John the Apostate - 2008/07/16 08:58

The Keeper wrote:

truthhurts wrote:

I totally agree, Sara. You are entirely correct.

That won't, however, stop Decaf, Raymond, and a few others from calling you a "comlib", "Saddam lover", and, yes, even "Anti-American".

But that is OK...this is America, where even the loonies can have their say. At least for the time being, though Bush and his cronies are working on even that.

That's right! Thanks in part to Orin Hatch and Bob Bennett, 'FISA' will take care of all of those complainers, now that we don't have a 4th Amendment.

Now watch them try to go after the 1st Amendment.

Well 1984 wasn't 1984 after all. But looks like it started in 2000 instead. Only off by sixteen years, not to bad really.
http://www.heraldextra.com/images/fbfiles/images/Crazy_eyes-60bc1b9b2cbeb07ecccf6b39244a6e07.gif

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by itschmee - 2008/07/16 10:04

Sara let me see if I can give you a feeling for why some Americans feel that to be Anti-war is Anti-american.

As a young 19 year old I packed up my bags and reported to Ft Leonard Wood to begin my service to my country. I lost an Uncle in WW2 and my mother was completely convinced that he died to save america. I grew up with a sense of to be and american we answered to our countries call. I did. I spent a year in Viet Nam. Many of my classmates and contemporaries did not and were actively anti-war. In those days to be anti-war was to be anti-soldier. I returned from that awful place and was called "baby killer", "war-monger", and other hateful names. I could not wear my uniform outside a military base. I could not leave anything in my car that looked army or my car would be vandalized. As a matter of fact my car was spray painted with "Baby killer" because it had a army post sticker on the bumper. I was spit on in airports. The experience was horrible. It made me an "Anti-war" hater. I stayed on in to Military for over 20 years. I served a second time in a war. The first Iraq war. Coming home from that war was a whole different experience. The parades, the cheers, the yellow ribbons it left me confused.

Another thing Sara, no sane person that has ever seen the face of war, loves war. I hate war more than you do. But also no one savors the scent of freedom quite as much as someone that has been called upon to put his life on the line for that freedom.

So do me a favor Sara. Don't call yourself Anti-war. For me that makes you Anti-American. Call yourself a War Hater and you are then of the brotherhood.

There are many out there like me. The term Anti-War just brings up terrible memories of a time when America was confused.

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Wren - 2008/07/16 10:12

Yeah, you are right, itschmee, and I have been wrong, too, in my terminology. "War Hater" fits better what I feel than "anti-war.". Anyone can hate war, but if we think that war as a tool of governments is going away can go enlist now.

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by leftintheuc - 2008/07/16 10:22

itschmee wrote:

Sara let me see if I can give you a feeling for why some Americans feel that to be Anti-war is Anti-american.

As a young 19 year old I packed up my bags and reported to Ft Leonard Wood to begin my service to my country. I lost an Uncle in WW2 and my mother was completely convinced that he died to save america. I grew up with a sense of to be

and american we answered to our countries call. I did. I spent a year in Viet Nam. Many of my classmates and contemporaries did not and were actively anti-war. In those days to be anti-war was to be anti-soldier. I returned from that awful place and was called "baby killer", "war-monger", and other hateful names. I could not wear my uniform outside a military base. I could not leave anything in my car that looked army or my car would be vandalized. As a matter of fact my car was spray painted with "Baby killer" because it had a army post sticker on the bumper. I was spit on in airports. The experience was horrible. It made me an "Anti-war" hater. I stayed on in to Military for over 20 years. I served a second time in a war. The first Iraq war. Coming home from that war was a whole different experience. The parades, the cheers, the yellow ribbons it left me confused.

Another thing Sara, no sane person that has ever seen the face of war, loves war. I hate war more than you do. But also no one savors the scent of freedom quite as much as someone that has been called upon to put his life on the line for that freedom.

So do me a favor Sara. Don't call yourself Anti-war. For me that makes you Anti-American. Call yourself a War Hater and you are then of the brotherhood.

There are many out there like me. The term Anti-War just brings up terrible memories of a time when America was confused.

As a younger liberal not of the Viet Nam generation, I have developed a great disdain for the counter-culture of the 60's. It helped no one, certainly not their cause, to pass their feelings on the Viet Nam war on to the soldier. It was not only unfair to the troops, it significantly hurt their cause. Further, this criminal notion of attacking the troops for the government's war has really created and fostered the environment that Sara is lamenting in her letter. It is always American to question your leaders; to oppose wars included. But, because of the thoughtless legacy created by the anti-war counter-culture of the 60's, we cannot voice an opinion of Iraq without being called anti-american/anti-troop. Shameful, really.

I am against this war. I am against the thoughtless, irrational and reactive decisions that lead to this war. That there should be debate on these decisions is the essence of America. It should be welcomed. Let us all talk. And yet, perhaps even because of my feelings, the respect I have for the soldier cannot be overstated. Noble and brave, only a real coward will question their motivations.

If being a "war-hater" is more acceptable for you, whose service I applaud, then I have no problem adapting the nomenclature. Consider it done. Does not change my opinions on Iraq, however.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by The Keeper - 2008/07/16 10:27

War is the federal government's lifeblood and to end war we really have to starve, disable, restrict, constrain that state. Washington should take the money it's spending on war, trillions of dollars, and instead rebuild this country's infrastructure, solve the education, health care, and aging-population crisis. But what do we get? Always, more spending, and always more war. It is easy to understand this country is economically oriented around offensive and security related industry. So when government gets a buck, it is beholden to the security, offensive and war-related lobbyists, industrial and political.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Everybody Loves Raymond - 2008/07/16 12:18

No one has to serve in the military to be a patriot. I am a patriot because I pay the taxes of these so-called soldiers, and yes, I am their boss, ultimately, and as their boss I deserve to have a military that honors and obeys the commander in chief without question, or else get out of the Army and work at Sears.

I have not been wounded, but I have been wounded by the liberals on this site who have nothing but scorn for Bush, Cannon, traditional American values, traditional marriage, traditional roles of the races and genders, . . . traditions that made this nation the envy of the planet. Now we're being brought down by feminazis, minority rights, minority set asides, minoritys in our schools, our hospitals, promotion of the Gay Agenda, anti-Christian rhetoric and degradation of Israel. That is what is happening.

But there is a light coming thru the darkness. This New Yorker mag cover shows that even the liberals know the true feelings of the Magic Messiah Obama and his Anti-American Wife. They say it is satire but the truth comes thru. That cover is the beginning of the end of the Obama Campaign.

Thus saith I.

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Wren - 2008/07/16 13:56

Ray, you are so lost in the neocon cyber space!

No, you are not anyone's boss in government, and the soldiers answer to their chain of command, not you.

The fact that you miss the satire of the New Yorker's cover which is aimed at folks like you for your foolish and stupid beliefs indicated that you miss the satire that is your beliefs.

Get over it, our world is changing, and your outdated, outmoded, and often flat wrong -- ways are changing forever, and your ilk is going out on the ashheap of history.

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2008/07/16 14:01

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:

No one has to serve in the military to be a patriot. I am a patriot because I pay the taxes of these so-called soldiers, and yes, I am their boss, ultimately, and as their boss I deserve to have a military that honors and obeys the commander in chief without question, or else get out of the Army and work at Sears.

I have not been wounded, but I have been wounded by the liberals on this site who have nothing but scorn for Bush, Cannon, traditional American values, traditional marriage, traditional roles of the races and genders, . . . traditions that made this nation the envy of the planet. Now we're being brought down by feminazis, minority rights, minority set asides, minoritys in our schools, our hospitals, promotion of the Gay Agenda, anti-Christian rhetoric and degraation of Israel. That is what is happening.

But there is a light coming thru the darkness. This New Yorker mag cover shows that even the liberals know the true feelings of the Magic Messiah Obama and his Anti-American Wife. They say it is satire but the truth comes thru. That cover is the beginning of the end of the Obama Campaign.

Thus saith I.

Being a patriot means paying taxes? That would make many illegal immigrants and foreign corporations patriots. Last I checked, military members are citizen volunteers. They have their own constitutional rights, including rights such as this: <http://usmilitary.about.com/cs/militarylaw1/a/obeyingorders.htm>

The president also is our employee according to your definition. As the vast majority of the people are against the iraq war, does that not mean that he needs to obey us and withdraw immediately?

Who is bringing you down? Is your standard of living dropping?

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Everybody Loves Raymond - 2008/07/16 14:43

unaffiliated_person wrote:

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:

No one has to serve in the military to be a patriot. I am a patriot because I pay the taxes of these so-called soldiers, and yes, I am their boss, ultimately, and as their boss I deserve to have a military that honors and obeys the commander in chief without question, or else get out of the Army and work at Sears.

I have not been wounded, but I have been wounded by the liberals on this site who have nothing but scorn for Bush, Cannon, traditional American values, traditional marriage, traditional roles of the races and genders, . . . traditions that made this nation the envy of the planet. Now we're being brought down by feminazis, minority rights, minority set asides, minoritys in our schools, our hospitals, promotion of the Gay Agenda, anti-Christian rhetoric and degradation of Israel. That is what is happening.

But there is a light coming thru the darkness. This New Yorker mag cover shows that even the liberals know the true feelings of the Magic Messiah Obama and his Anti-American Wife. They say it is satire but the truth comes thru. That cover is the beginning of the end of the Obama Campaign.

Thus saith I.

Being a patriot means paying taxes? That would make many illegal immigrants and foreign corporations patriots. Last I checked, military members are citizen volunteers. They have their own constitutional rights, including rights such as this: <http://usmilitary.about.com/cs/militarylaw1/a/obeyingorders.htm>

The president also is our employee according to your definition. As the vast majority of the people are against the Iraq war, does that not mean that he needs to obey us and withdraw immediately?

Who is bringing you down? Is your standard of living dropping?

Yes, we are the boss of Bush. And if the American people hated him as much as you Liberal Nutjobs think, they would elect a Congress to impeach him. But they didn't. They elected a Dem congress (with their allies in the Media) by the slimest of margins and then put those twin as leaders Pelosi and Reid (who should be excommunicated this afternoon) in charge. They are so worthless as leaders they couldn't go to Burger King to get a Kid's Meal without screwing it up and you Liberal Puppets know it!

And Bush knows they are weak and can shove down their throats whatever he wants as long as he wants, including this ruling. Whatever you think about Bush, Congress is in more crap.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Wren - 2008/07/16 15:02

Congress struggles with a slim majority because the neocon lies convinced the voters to elect enough neocon reps and senators to work with the commander-in-thief, Bush.

Twenty-eight percent of the voters yesterday indicated that they are fine with Bush, which means that my party, Ray, because of fools like you, is going to get the beating of a lifetime in November.

We may never be in the majority for another twenty years because of neoconservatism and autocratic capitalism.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by waterhead - 2008/07/18 13:21

Is this what you guys do all day sit on this thing and boob. Blame Bush blame the church blame.....

I just thought this was a free way to read the paper. so how long has the herald been a liberal anti Mormon trash paper? I move out of state for a few years come back to find this. how sad. LONG LIVE BUSH

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2008/07/18 13:47

waterhead wrote:

Is this what you guys do all day sit on this thing and boob. Blame Bush blame the church blame.....

I just thought this was a free way to read the paper. so how long has the herald been a liberal anti Mormon trash paper? I move out of state for a few years come back to find this. how sad. LONG LIVE BUSH

I tend to go along moderate lines, but I see many hard core right wingers tend to believe everyone is a liberal if they disagree. Here is the definition of a liberal.

Liberal:

1 a: of, relating to, or based on the liberal arts barchaic : of or befitting a man of free birth2 a: marked by generosity : openhanded b: given or provided in a generous and openhanded way c: ample, full3obsolete : lacking moral restraint : licentious4: not literal or strict : loose 5: broad-minded; especially : not bound by authoritarianism, orthodoxy, or traditional forms6 a: of, favoring, or based upon the principles of liberalism bcapitalized : of or constituting a political party advocating or associated with the principles of political liberalism; especially : of or constituting a political party in the United Kingdom associated with ideals of individual especially economic freedom, greater individual participation in government, and constitutional, political, and administrative reforms designed to secure these objectives

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/liberal>

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by woody - 2008/07/18 14:05

unaffiliated_person wrote:

waterhead wrote:

Is this what you guys do all day sit on this thing and boob. Blame Bush blame the church blame.....

I just thought this was a free way to read the paper. so how long has the herald been a liberal anti Mormon trash paper? I move out of state for a few years come back to find this. how sad. LONG LIVE BUSH

I tend to go along moderate lines, but I see many hard core right wingers tend to believe everyone is a liberal if they disagree. Here is the definition of a liberal.

Liberal:

1 a: of, relating to, or based on the liberal arts barchaic : of or befitting a man of free birth2 a: marked by generosity : openhanded b: given or provided in a generous and openhanded way c: ample, full3obsolete : lacking moral restraint : licentious4: not literal or strict : loose 5: broad-minded; especially : not bound by authoritarianism, orthodoxy, or traditional forms6 a: of, favoring, or based upon the principles of liberalism bcapitalized : of or constituting a political party advocating or associated with the principles of political liberalism; especially : of or constituting a political party in the United Kingdom associated with ideals of individual especially economic freedom, greater individual participation in government, and constitutional, political, and administrative reforms designed to secure these objectives

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/liberal>

you forgot, baby killing in the definintion.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by leftintheuc - 2008/07/18 14:07

waterhead wrote:

Is this what you guys do all day sit on this thing and boob. Blame Bush blame the church blame.....

I just thought this was a free way to read the paper. so how long has the herald been a liberal anti Mormon trash paper? I move out of state for a few years come back to find this. how sad. LONG LIVE BUSH

Idiot-

If this forum does have a liberal bent-though, in actuality, it is really quite diverse-it is most certainly not reflected in the content of the paper itself. The editorial board, selected stories and commentary are, I assure you, right wing enough for your narrow mind to handle. Go back to your hole. Sleep well.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by utocoman - 2008/07/18 14:10

woody wrote:

unaffiliated_person wrote:

waterhead wrote:

Is this what you guys do all day sit on this thing and boob. Blame Bush blame the church blame.....

I just thought this was a free way to read the paper. so how long has the herald been a liberal anti Mormon trash paper? I move out of state for a few years come back to find this. how sad. LONG LIVE BUSH

I tend to go along moderate lines, but I see many hard core right wingers tend to believe everyone is a liberal if they disagree. Here is the definition of a liberal.

Liberal:

1 a: of, relating to, or based on the liberal arts barchaic : of or befitting a man of free birth2 a: marked by generosity : openhanded b: given or provided in a generous and openhanded way c: ample, full3obsolete : lacking moral restraint : licentious4: not literal or strict : loose 5: broad-minded; especially : not bound by authoritarianism, orthodoxy, or traditional forms6 a: of, favoring, or based upon the principles of liberalism bcapitalized : of or constituting a political party advocating or associated with the principles of political liberalism; especially : of or constituting a political party in the United Kingdom associated with ideals of individual especially economic freedom, greater individual participation in government, and constitutional, political, and administrative reforms designed to secure these objectives

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/liberal>

you forgot, baby killing in the definintion.

That's right Woody, you prefer to send them to slaughter after they grow up and have their own families! You know Woodman, the regular posters already know you are a Republican nutjob but why do you try so hard to show the newer readers that your IQ is in the single digits?

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Sir John the Apostate - 2008/07/18 15:36

waterhead wrote:

Is this what you guys do all day sit on this thing and boob. Blame Bush blame the church blame.....

I just thought this was a free way to read the paper. so how long has the herald been a liberal anti Mormon trash paper? I move out of state for a few years come back to find this. how sad. LONG LIVE BUSH

I could care less how long he lives. I just can't wait till he's out of office.

Oh happy day!!!! http://www.heraldextra.com/images/fbfiles/images/Big_Smile-f8d75984e8fbfc10df3c339eab1c84de.gif

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Sir John the Apostate - 2008/07/18 15:41

leftintheuc wrote:

waterhead wrote:

Is this what you guys do all day sit on this thing and boob. Blame Bush blame the church blame.....

I just thought this was a free way to read the paper. so how long has the herald been a liberal anti Mormon trash paper? I move out of state for a few years come back to find this. how sad. LONG LIVE BUSH

Idiot-

If this forum does have a liberal bent-though, in actuality, it is really quite diverse-it is most certainly not reflected in the content of the paper itself. The editorial board, selected stories and commentary are, I assure you, right wing enough for your narrow mind to handle. Go back to your hole. Sleep well.

This guy is going to just love Raymond!

<http://emoticons.msn-beta.com/big/9.gif>

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by waterhead - 2008/07/18 23:32

Sir John the Apostate wrote:

waterhead wrote:

Is this what you guys do all day sit on this thing and boob. Blame Bush blame the church blame.....

I just thought this was a free way to read the paper. so how long has the herald been a liberal anti Mormon trash paper? I move out of state for a few years come back to find this. how sad. LONG LIVE BUSH

I could care less how long he lives. I just can't wait till he's out of office.

Oh happy day!!!! http://www.heraldextra.com/images/fbfiles/images/Big_Smile-f8d75984e8fbfc10df3c339eab1c84de.gif

why, in a big rush to see the country go to a third world after your buddy Obama takes over and more than dubbles the taxes. with that and the cost for gas the lower class will be gone you will have only upper middle and upper classes. yep that will be something:dry: to look for I guess :dry: now i am going to go hug my bible and kiss my guns good night.

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by The Keeper - 2008/07/19 04:09

Time and time again, we see that every presidential candidate is closely related to European royalty, or to one of the other ones. In 2004 Harold Brooks-Baker, publishing director of Burke's Peerage, the encyclopedic bible of European aristocratic genealogy, said about the subject of US presidential candidates:

Brooks-Baker said there has always been a significant "royalty factor" in those who aspired to the White House, with Presidents George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan among others all with strong blue blood links.

"The chance of winning certainly seems much higher with more royal connections and one could make a big case that royal genes or chromosomes will tell," Brooks-Baker said.

A common way of pooh-pooing the bloodline connections between presidents is to say the usual, everyone's related if you go back far enough. Not this closely related! Obama, according to various media outlets is Dick Cheney's 9th cousin, although Cheney's wife says that they are actually 8th cousins. She would probably be in a better position to know, wouldn't she? Hillary Clinton is also closely related to Barbara Bush and the queen demon herself, Elizabeth II of England. According to New England Historical Society genealogist Christopher Child, Obama's a 10th cousin once removed of George W. Bush, and McCain is a 6th cousin of Laura Bush. Note that Brooks-Baker said there has always been a significant royalty factor. This means that no election has ever been of the people and by the people. I understand people coming across this information for the first time might rightly be a little skeptical, but why is it that the ratio of people in positions of power belonging to secret societies like the Freemasons, Skull & Bones, and Knights of Malta is so high compared to those who are not? The Freemasons admit proudly on their own websites that most of the American presidents, royalty, leading businessmen, and heads of state are Freemasons.

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Actually waterhead is right. When McCain pulls troops out of Czechoslovakia, we'll have plenty for a surge in Canada or Mexico or whatever country he wants to attack next.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by The Keeper - 2008/07/19 08:01

We've seen what McCain thinks of veterans!

Considering that he is supposed to be this big war hero who endured five agonizing years of torture, it is impossible to reconcile this with the fact that he has consistently and viciously blocked every attempt by families of Vietnam POWs to get them back to the US. He has pushed through and amended legislation in order to block not only the release of information about POWs and MIAs that were still in Vietnam after the war, despite massive evidence of them being alive, but also the release of his own military records.

He comes across as being sympathetic to veterans who are being denied healthcare, who have to pay for their own meals at military hospitals while they recover from getting their arms and legs blown off, and how they have to wait for eons to get their benefits. But is McCain really speaking from his heart or a script? He has made it perfectly clear he isn't against torture, when he voted against a bill to ban it, as reported by the NY Times: The leading Republican presidential candidate, Senator John McCain of Arizona, a former prisoner of war who steadfastly opposes the use of torture, voted against the bill. Mr. McCain said the ban would limit the C.I.A.'s ability to gather intelligence. "We always supported allowing the C.I.A. to use extra measures," he said. Sprinkling in some doublespeak, he says that he believes torture is illegal and should be banned. Voted for the Military Commissions Act, which we are told applies only to enemy combatants. It permits trials without the accused present, gives the Secretary of Defense the power to appoint judges, allows evidence gotten without warrants, and makes it so lawyers cannot see their clients without government monitoring. Former Attorney General Gonzales has said that the president can strip Americans of their citizenship, turning them into enemy combatants, which makes it applicable to American citizens. Voted no to establishing mandatory rest periods for the troops between deployments, which would be a great help in reducing post traumatic stress disorder. Speaking of PTSD, McCain voted against a bill that would have provided \$500 million for veterans mental health services like rehab and counseling. These are the actions of someone who hates veterans, not one who sympathizes with them.

About the only real difference between McCain and Bush is that one looks like Frankenstein and the other doesn't.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by SaraA - 2008/07/20 11:33

I was a young mother when Viet Nam happened, I hated it then, so many of my friends dying? I know what you went thru, I was there. and it was terrible, no matter what cause a soldier goes to was for, he or she is still a soldier and has all my support. And yes, I hate war, especially one that should have never happened. I salute your bravery. As I said my son is also a veteran, and I will always support our troops, even when they are in where they should not be. I pray that all the troops in Iraq come home soon. I look for Bush in order to get more republican votes to pull out troops just before the November vote, that's a neat trick they have done before, so
fohttp://www.heraldextra.com/components/com_fireboard/template/default/images/english/emoicons/smile.png
:) r you I will I hate war, :)

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by SaraA - 2008/07/20 11:33

I was a young mother when Viet Nam happened, I hated it then, so many of my friends dying? I know what you went thru, I was there. and it was terrible, no matter what cause a soldier goes to was for, he or she is still a soldier and has all my support. And yes, I hate war, especially one that should have never happened. I salute your bravery. As I said my son is also a veteran, and I will always support our troops, even when they are in where they should not be. I pray that all the troops in Iraq come home soon. I look for Bush in order to get more republican votes to pull out troops just before

the November vote, that's a neat trick they have done before, so
fohttp://www.heraldextra.com/components/com_fireboard/template/default/images/english/emoticons/smile.png
:) r you I will I hate war, :)

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by SaraA - 2008/07/20 11:33

I was a young mother when Viet Nam happened, I hated it then, so many of my friends dying? I know what you went thru, I was there. and it was terrible, no matter what cause a soldier goes to was for, he or she is still a soldier and has all my support. And yes, I hate war, especially one that should have never happened. I salute your bravery. As I said my son is also a veteran, and I will always support our troops, even when they are in where they should not be. I pray that all the troops in Iraq come home soon. I look for Bush in order to get more republican votes to pull out troops just before the November vote, that's a neat trick they have done before, so
fohttp://www.heraldextra.com/components/com_fireboard/template/default/images/english/emoticons/smile.png
:) r you I will I hate war, :)

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by SaraA - 2008/07/20 11:39

Amen. lets have a party!

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by SaraA - 2008/07/20 11:44

ok sorry don't know how that happened, can I blame it on my computer?

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Ilandra - 2008/07/20 14:20

sorry to say this but there are terrorists in Iraq. Plain pure and simple. If you were a proud american soldier you would go where you were told without qualms.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Wren - 2008/07/20 15:11

Ilandra wrote:

sorry to say this but there are terrorists in Iraq. Plain pure and simple. If you were a proud american soldier you would go where you were told without qualms.

We have terrorists here, political terrorists.

They are the political neocons, who like the gadiantons, have tried to pull our government down from the inside.

They nearly succeeded.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by eric hussein miami - 2008/07/20 15:23

Ilandra wrote:

sorry to say this but there are terrorists in Iraq. Plain pure and simple. If you were a proud american soldier you would go where you were told without qualms.

I presume if Lt. Calley were your CO and he told you to kill women and children you might have a qualm or two?

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Sir John the Apostate - 2008/07/20 16:10

Ilandra wrote:

sorry to say this but there are terrorists in Iraq. Plain pure and simple. If you were a proud american soldier you would go where you were told without qualms.

And just how long did you serve?

:P

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by lucid_green - 2008/07/23 10:24

I feel sorry for your convoluted sense of what is anti-American. Vietnam, for whatever it was has so many things in common with this war in Iraq.

First, no official declaration of war was ever issued. Only Congress has that right and they passed on it. In fact, we have not declared war since WWII.

Second, it's political.

The Vietnam War was fought like a game of political chess. We were trying to win but at the same time stave off all out war with the USSR and China and the rest of the communist world.

As for the Iraq War, everything from how we started this war to the reason for fighting it have been shifted and changed to fit some political exploits of American emotions.

I don't think anyone knows why we really went into this war except Cheney, Bush, Rumsfeld and perhaps a handful of other people. The simple fact is they were determined to find a reason, and when they failed to find that reason, they began to make reasons where they shouldn't have. In short, we are there because of a lie.

Then we got there. Our troops did a great job of doing what they were told. Once we achieved our initial purpose, however, no one had a clue as to what to do next. Those who were eventually put in charge were then left high and dry and mistakes were made which led to an insurgency. Then Al-Qaeda got involved after seeing that we were weak.

Finally, Rumsfeld and his posturing attitude were booted and a surge was implemented. This coupled with the sentiment from the Iraqi people wanting to end the occupation and the insurgency led to a more stable environment where better progress could be made toward our eventual total withdrawal.

So you tell me which is more anti-American. The irresponsible handling of the Iraq War in every aspect of how it was conceived to how it has been administered or the overwhelming desire to distance ourselves from such an overwhelming mistake. Which do you think it is? People are anti-War because this is Bush's War, not ours. He and his administration cooked it up. Now we are paying for it.

Now I see the need to finish what we started. The only problem is, I don't think we can fix Iraq the way we want and I think that's the problem with current mentality. We can't make a little America in the Middle East. Instead we should be fixing Iraq how they want it. With that in mind, I would like to see a SOFA agreement that stipulates just what goals the Iraqi government has and just how we can comply with their rights as a sovereign nation. We are no longer the ones in charge over there. We are now guests and we should act like it. And you can bet they want us 100% out of there.

Once you come out of your shell and try to understand the opposition, then maybe you can make a better argument.

While we as veterans may have had to bear to burdens of idiots in office, at least we don't have to bear the same burdens before God. Whether we will see justice in this life, is unlikely, but we may just see it in the next.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2008/07/23 10:29

lucid_green wrote:

I feel sorry for your convoluted sense of what is anti-American. Vietnam, for whatever it was has so many things in common with this war in Iraq.

First, no official declaration of war was ever issued. Only Congress has that right and they passed on it. In fact, we have not declared ware since WWII.

Second, it's political.

The Vietnam War was fought like a game of political chess. We were trying to win but at the same time stave off all out war with the USSR and China and the rest of the communist world.

As for the Iraq War, everything from how we started this war to the reason for fighting it have been shifted and changed to fit some political exploits of American emotions.

I don't think anyone knows why we really went into this war except Cheney, Bush, Rumsfeld and perhaps a handful of other people. The simple fact is they were determined to find a reason, and when they failed to find that reason, they began to make reasons where they shouldn't have. In short, we are there because of a lie.

Then we got there. Our troops did a great job of doing what they were told. Once we achieved our initial purpose, however, no one had a clue as to what to do next. Those who were eventually put in charge were then left high and dry and mistakes were made which led to an insurgency. Then Al-Qaeda got involved after seeing that we were weak.

Finally, Rumsfeld and his posturing attitude were booted and a surge was implemented. This coupled with the sentiment from the Iraqi people wanting to end the occupation and the insurgency led to a more stable environment where better progress could be made toward our eventual total withdrawal.

So you tell me which is more anti-American. The irresponsible handling of the Iraq War in every aspect of how it was conceived to how it has been administered or the overwhelming desire to distance ourselves from such an overwhelming mistake. Which do you think it is? People are anti-War because this is Bush's War, not ours. He and his administration cooked it up. Now we are paying for it.

Now I see the need to finish what we started. The only problem is, I don't think we can fix Iraq the way we want and I think that's the problem with current mentality. We can't make a little America in the Middle East. Instead we should be fixing Iraq how they want it. With that in mind, I would like to see a SOFA agreement that stipulates just what goals the Iraqi government has and just how we can comply with their rights as a sovereign nation. We are no longer the ones in charge over there. We are now guests and we should act like it. And you can bet they want us 100% out of there.

Once you come out of your shell and try to understand the opposition, then maybe you can make a better argument.

While we as veterans may have had to bear to burdens of idiots in office, at least we don't have to bear the same burdens before God. Whether we will see justice in this life, is unlikely, but we may just see it in the next.

Thank you. Well thought out response.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by lucid_green - 2008/07/23 11:20

There are terrorists in just about every country, but we don't invade them for the same reason that we didn't invade Iraq in the name of fighting terrorism. Anyone who believes we did has been deceived.

As I recall, we went into Iraq after a non-existent nuclear arsenal.

Now we did find uranium, but none of it came from anywhere in Africa. In fact, the uranium that was there had already been discovered by the UN years ago and was inaccessible to Saddam Hussein. So that point is moot.

The simple fact is, Saddam was not trying to acquire any nuclear weapons, nor did he have access to them. So none of the reasons for going into Iraq have panned out. All of them have been proven false. So now all the reasons for being in Iraq now are different from why we went in there in the first place. Some would rather weather it to save face, but they all belong to the same party.

As for my service in Afghanistan, you have no idea what I went through. You have no idea what I did. You have no idea how I felt, nor how I conducted myself.

My deployment was not voluntary in the sense that I raised my hand and said, "Here am I, send me." I was never given that option, nor would I have volunteered if given the option. Instead I received a call and I answered it. I went against my better judgment and I served. I did not speak out. I did not argue, though many who were there with me did. One guy from the inactive ready reserve did was especially vocal but he had some bad knees and was probably scared, like the rest of us.

My deployment also came at a very bad time in my life. I was planning to get married soon. When the call came I had to plan a wedding in a week. I ended up getting married the day after Christmas and reported 3 days later. You tell me that wasn't hard.

On top of that my original destination was Iraq. I accepted the call believing that I would be serving in Iraq. I was so relieved to find out only weeks before shipping out that we would be going to Afghanistan. So I was lucky. I got to fight where I believed we should have been and that probably lessen a lot of the sting.

I am only so thankful to my wonderful wife who has stood by me through it all. Without her, I doubt this could have been bearable.

Today, my wife and I are still married. We'll be having our 5th anniversary in December and I'm so glad that I made it through that.

Despite everything and the Army's complete bungling of our entire mobilization I did my part and I am proud to say that I have served my country. I've done what most people only preach.

So you can say what you want but like most people whose predatory arguments only stand on half the story, you really have no idea.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by lucid_green - 2008/07/23 11:28

I'm LDS and I'm against the war. I'm also a veteran who served in Afghanistan. I guess that totally hoses your stereotype.

As for party affiliation, I only registered Democrat so I could vote against Hillary in the primaries, though it would seem there were enough people out there who were scared enough of her to do the same.

In reality, I don't like to affiliate with either party. I think parties and the rhetoric behind them is hurting our nation today. Call me naive, but I'm starting to wonder if we wouldn't be better off without them.

And FYI, I recall the First Presidency of the LDS Church expressing some concern over the Iraq War at about the time of its onset. It kind of makes you wonder, doesn't it? That's the whole reason I began to look into the motives behind it and followed a lot of what was being said. I think that means that supporters of the war really can't hide behind the LDS faith.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by lucid_green - 2008/07/23 11:37

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:
lucid_green wrote:

I was against the war from the start. I remember the chatter about it while in basic training at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Now, because of it, I'm a veteran. I thank my lucky stars I wasn't in Iraq during my tour, but in Afghanistan where the true perpetrator are still lurking and going nearly unchecked do to the Iraqi distraction. So I've served my country overseas. You can't tell me I'm un-American or unpatriotic. I've given more than the whole administration who put us there, may they be tried for their crimes.

So let me get this straight, you volunteered to go in the Army, but you were against the war? Did you go in just to stir up trouble among the other troops? What was your real motivation? Being a plant for Moveon.org? It is asses like you that go in hating the Army instead of loving it and then come out and moan and groan about cold peas in the chow line, the mattresses are too firm or Humvees that don't have showers in them or something trivial like that instead of supporting the Commander in Chief, who has kept us safe since 9/11, in the war against Islamic terror.

You really have no idea...

There was no war when I joined. I actually joined in June 2001, roughly 3 months before 9-11.

But I stayed the course and my commitment. It led me to serving in Afghanistan, a service of which I am proud. The only complaining I did was in private and I often listened to both sides of the argument. I still do.

As for you, I think your comments warrant being reported.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by Betzz - 2008/07/23 11:41

lucid_green wrote:

Everybody Loves Raymond wrote:

lucid_green wrote:

I was against the war from the start. I remember the chatter about it while in basic training at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Now, because of it, I'm a veteran. I thank my lucky stars I wasn't in Iraq during my tour, but in Afghanistan where the true perpetrator are still lurking and going nearly unchecked do to the Iraqi distraction.

So I've served my country overseas. You can't tell me I'm un-American or unpatriotic. I've given more than the whole administration who put us there, may they be tried for their crimes.

So let me get this straight, you volunteered to go in the Army, but you were against the war? Did you go in just to stir up trouble among the other troops? What was your real motivation? Being a plant for Moveon.org? It is asses like you that go in hating the Army instead of loving it and then come out and moan and groan about cold peas in the chow line, the mattresses are too firm or Humvees that don't have showers in them or something trivial like that instead of supporting the Commander in Chief, who has kept us safe since 9/11, in the war against Islamic terror.

You really have no idea...

Don't pay much attention to "raymond." He's just a troll.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by lucid_green - 2008/07/23 11:47

That explains it.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2008/07/23 13:35

lucid_green wrote:

I'm LDS and I'm against the war. I'm also a veteran who served in Afghanistan. I guess that totally hoses your stereo-type.

As for party affiliation, I only registered Democrat so I could vote against Hillary in the primaries, though it would seem there were enough people out there who were scared enough of her to do the same.

In reality, I don't like to affiliate with either party. I think parties and the rhetoric behind them is hurting our nation today. Call me naive, but I'm starting to wonder if we wouldn't be better off without them.

And FYI, I recall the First Presidency of the LDS Church expressing some concern over the Iraq War at about the time of its onset. It kind of makes you wonder, doesn't it? That's the whole reason I began to look into the motives behind it and followed a lot of what was being said. I think that means that supporters of the war really can't hide behind the LDS faith.

Here is a speech by the former pres hinckley regarding the war:
<http://lds.org/conference/talk/display/0,5232,49-1-353-27,00.html>

Here is his conversation with Larry King:

We're also showing you military scenes around the world celebrating the Christmas season. I would imagine there are members of your faith in Iraq.

HINCKLEY: There are.

KING: How does that affect you, that whole war? Is it hard to deal with - a man of peace - in this war?

HINCKLEY: Of course it is. We believe in peace. We work for peace. We pray for peace. But we are all citizens of the nation. And we meet our responsibility, as that responsibility is defined by our leadership in the nation.

KING: What if you disagree with the leadership?

HINCKLEY: Well, we can disagree, but we still have an obligation, a responsibility.

KING: Have you spoken to men or women who have gone over to Iraq?

HINCKLEY: Oh, yes. I've spoken to some, yes.

KING: Have you ever had to deal with them? Have you lost anyone yet?

HINCKLEY: We've lost some here, yes. Not right here. But, yes. It's a tragedy. It's a terrible tragedy. I pray every night that this thing may come to a peaceful conclusion, that we can get along together without carrying on war endlessly over there.

KING: Billy Graham - a friend of yours and mine - told me once that, basically, he thought his mission had failed in that, with all the preaching and all the talk, we still have war. We still have prejudice. We still have people hating people.

HINCKLEY: Meanness. So much meanness.

KING: Why?

HINCKLEY: Well, God gave us our agency. He taught us a way. He showed us what to do. But he gave us our agency and left us free to act as we choose to do. But with that freedom comes responsibility and accountability. And we shall have to answer for that which we do.

No good ever comes from war unless it is in defense of your lives (home family, etc.)

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by ThomasK - 2008/07/23 17:34

lucid_green wrote:

I'm LDS and I'm against the war. I'm also a veteran who served in Afghanistan. I guess that totally hoses your stereotype.

As for party affiliation, I only registered Democrat so I could vote against Hillary in the primaries, though it would seem there were enough people out there who were scared enough of her to do the same.

In reality, I don't like to affiliate with either party. I think parties and the rhetoric behind them is hurting our nation today. Call me naive, but I'm starting to wonder if we wouldn't be better off without them.

And FYI, I recall the First Presidency of the LDS Church expressing some concern over the Iraq War at about the time of its onset. It kind of makes you wonder, doesn't it? That's the whole reason I began to look into the motives behind it and followed a lot of what was being said. I think that means that supporters of the war really can't hide behind the LDS faith.

Thank you for your service.

As far being against the war, are you talking about Afghanistan and/or Iraq?

I don't understand your last sentence. What do you mean?

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2008/07/24 10:58

Thomask wrote:

lucid_green wrote:

I'm LDS and I'm against the war. I'm also a veteran who served in Afghanistan. I guess that totally hoses your stereotype.

As for party affiliation, I only registered Democrat so I could vote against Hillary in the primaries, though it would seem there were enough people out there who were scared enough of her to do the same.

In reality, I don't like to affiliate with either party. I think parties and the rhetoric behind them is hurting our nation today. Call me naive, but I'm starting to wonder if we wouldn't be better off without them.

And FYI, I recall the First Presidency of the LDS Church expressing some concern over the Iraq War at about the time of its onset. It kind of makes you wonder, doesn't it? That's the whole reason I began to look into the motives behind it and followed a lot of what was being said. I think that means that supporters of the war really can't hide behind the LDS faith.

Thank you for your service.

As far being against the war, are you talking about Afghanistan and/or Iraq?

I don't understand your last sentence. What do you mean?

Based upon their previous posts, I think against the Iraq war. I have a difficult time finding people against the Afghan war.

=====

Re:Anti-war stance defended

Posted by unaffiliated_person - 2008/07/25 08:29

Interesting compilation:

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=0L5ZQ1usR-w>

=====