

---

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

---