

---

Subject: Fahrenheit 9/11

Posted by [ViperFUD](#) on Wed, 14 Jul 2004 15:31:41 GMT

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

---

Ok. I'm almost afraid to reply to this, but my natural inclination to argue is taking over.

First off, I want to start by complementing SuperFlyingEngi. First, you claim to be 14; then you prove that you have to be at least twice that with your accurate grasp of the english language and laws of grammar. I'm also impressed with your knowledge of American government, and current events.

That being said, I feel there are a few points that should be addressed.

1. Michael Moore skews his stories ridiculously. He edits statements and takes them out of context.
2. Bush, and his PR people, skew their stories ridiculously. They edit statements and take them out of context.

What does this tell us? First, everyone lies. The political industry in America is built on shit. Lots and lots of shit.

Second, it's impossible to get the truth from just one side of any discussion. And Michael Moore makes it especially difficult. He's out to convince people, not just reveal truth. This makes me sad, as I feel that his arguments would be stronger if they were presented in a less biased way. After all, there's no denying that some things were done poorly, but how much does it help to present half truths? All that this does:

1. Liberals say, "yeah, we hate that" ... but they didn't need to be convinced in the first place, as he's attacking things done by conservatives.
2. Conservatives say, "no, look. he lied about this and messed this up" ... meanwhile they miss the main points cause they're pointing to the details.

End result? Nothing changes except people get mad. As seen here. No one makes any changes; things aren't done differently. Companies don't change how they do things, so that Michael Moore has nothing to make films about; instead they give their employees mandatory "dealing with Michael Moore" seminars. How does this help? Now they're fucking shit up, AND they're learning to lie about it better.

I do have a few ... problems? ... with people saying stuff about "people who don't send their own children to war." Mainly because these people praise Clinton (a draft dodger) as a great president. I'm not saying he was or wasn't, or that politicians do this or that ... I'm just saying it's kinda hypocritical.

now on to specifit quotes:

CrimsonHis point was... if they are so in favor of the war, why won't they send their own kids? It's obvious because they can't control their kids.

No, I think SEAL was on the right track there; it's better to make a living safely rather than going to

war. But if it's something you really believe in, if you're willing to ask others to die for it ... then shouldn't you be willing to die for it (or at least send your own kids)? And you KNOW that high-ranking politicians procure spots in the National Guard or Coast Guard for their kids. (I'm not insulting either of those Guards ... I'm just saying it's safer than being a Navy SEAL.)

SuperFlyingEngiThis is a war we shouldn't be in, just like the Senate committee saying a couple days ago that the reasoning for this war was wrong, and then Bush making a public appearance where he said, "I know the cause was wrong, but it was really right." And too many people are dying for an unjust cause.

Could you provide a link to this, please? I'm not saying he did or didn't, I just wanna read it. Preferably on cnn.com, or usnews or something (ie, not "The Onion" ).

NHJ BVThe war in Afghanistan, maybe. The war in Iraq, no. The war in Iraq only increased terrorism, especially in the long run (more hatred against US in ME).

Please. The war in Iraq perhaps increased the hatred of Americans in NOT the Middle East, but it's doubtful that it changed how people felt about us there. Maybe more fear, but probably not hatred. People who hated us before hate us now. People who liked us (and hated those who hated us ... enemy of my enemy, and all that) still like us, and are glad we killed people they hated.

Now, I'm not saying what we did was right, but I would prefer a moral argument based on our action, not on presumptions about how what we did makes people feel about us. If a cop throws a drug dealer in jail, and the drug dealer hates the cop, does that make the cop evil? No. Now, does that mean that we (America) should act as the cops for the whole world? Again, no. We're more like the guy who sees the drug dealer, goes home, gets a shotgun, and kills the drug dealer. Then for good measure, kills all his friends. And a few members of his family. And a few innocent bystanders. Is the world better afterwards? You be the judge. Do we have a right to do it? I'll be the judge: no.

Still, what really bothers me is when people blame the shotgun. Support the troops; they're doing their duty and trying to protect us. Maybe that's not what they're accomplishing right now, because they're being pointed in the wrong direction, but you MUST respect them. They feel America is the greatest country on Earth, and are willing to give their lives for it.

Finally as for weapons of mass destruction, I'd like to quote something Dana Carvey said: "Well, if they didn't have any weapons of mass destruction, then they were pretty stupid. All they would have had to do would have been let the weapons inspectors in. Instead, they kicked them out of the country. Now they're like, 'Oops ... I used to live in a palace ... now I live in a ditch.' "

---