

---

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 18:35 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.

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 18:35 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.

...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 18:35 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.

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 18:35 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.

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 18:35 It'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.

---