
Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Carl](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 17:51:32 GMT

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

first my stance on the war: I'm against it, and against the choices my leader is making

HOWEVER, as an american citizen i have a responsibility to support my troops. They follow orders. I also have a responsibility to support my president. I don't agree with it at all. HOWEVER, I support his decisions, because if i don't then it nullifies the whole meaning of this country.

I also feel however there is absolutely NOTHING wrong with a PEACEFUL protesting of the WAR. I'm not saying a protest of the troops. I can protest the war and support my troops at the same time. There is no flawed logic in this. I don't want my fellow citizens over there fighting in a war i don't agree with. I CARE about them too much.

I also feel that this bullshit like the blocking of highways etc is unacceptable. It accomplishes nothing, except to piss people off. A PEACEFUL protest should be nothing more than a gathering of people, NOT INFRINGING ON ANYONE elses 'unwritten rights' to live their lives without a 'blockade of people. In other words, there is nothing wrong with a protest in a park, or outside a federal building AS LONG as they don't create a blockade. It's peoples right to protest.

Furthermore, It angers me when people automatically assume that protesting the war = protesting soldiers. For me, and EVERYONE i know that disagree with the war, protesting the war != lack of troop/ gov't support.

I'm sure there are some that don't support the troops. But applying that one position to all protesters is absolutely ludicrous.

To restate, and make simple what i have just said:

[list]

[*]Protesting the War DOES NOT mean that a person DOESN'T support our country, leader, and/or troops.

[*]There is NOTHING wrong with peaceful protests.

[*]Peacefull protest means not interfering with traffic, not stopping people from going somewhere etc.

[*]Getting pissed at people for protesting the war makes no sense really. They are simply expressing their opinion.

[*]Automatically assuming that someone who protests the war DOES NOT support our leadership and DOES NOT support our troops, is not only unfair, and unjust, but it's just plain stupid.

[/list:u]

and finally, let's make a definition between SUPPORTING our troops and SUPPORTING the war. Im not sure i have been clear enough.

Supporting War: Supporting the war means you have no problem with the offensive incursion into Iraq. Plain and Simple.

Supporting the Troops: You may or MAY NOT agree with the offensive incursion, but you DO

support our men, because you care about them too much not to.

Not Supporting War, AND NOT Supporting Troops: Makes you a complete and utter idiot. These kinds of persons are the reason that vietnam veterans were so despised upon return, which BTW was bullshit. Vietnam was a pointless war that we should have had nothing to do with. But not supporting the troops = idiocy.

I hope you guys understand the point I'm trying to make.

And calling somebody a jerkoff or something for not agreeing with the war is kind of BS. Really, do we call people idiots because they like different kind of foods? (lame analogy, but it gets the point across).

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 18:04:30 GMT

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

Decent post. I respect your right to believe how you want, and appreciate the constructive way you explained your position. I personally support both the war, and the troops. I firmly believe in taking action on problems.

Debating war really is a moot point. We're human and we fight. It's the reason hippie communes never work out. Someone always gets bent about someone stealing thier granola, or sleeping with thier girlfriend despite thier freelove opinions. Kind of funny really. " hey! Give back that granola, and get off my girl, man!!" :rolleyes:

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 18:16:25 GMT

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

Quote: I also have a responsibility to support my president. I don't agree with it at all. HOWEVER, I support his decisions, because if i don't then it nullifies the whole meaning of this country.

Is this really the way you see things? I thought you had a 'Responsible Government'* If you don't agree with this decision, how can you support it? How does you not supporting your government nullify the meaning of your country? If that is so, that would mean that the entire populace of the USA is a group of political sheep, and i simply refuse to believe that.

Simply look at your recent past, the impeachment trial on Clinton, the US was not 100% supportive of his decisions then, but your country has not been nullified.

*The following link describes the Canadian version of Responsible Government. While I was looking for a clear description of Responsible Government, I came across a few articles that were

If that is so that explains much about how your government is run.

Now the link <http://www2.marianopolis.edu/quebechistory/events/resgovt.htm>

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Carl](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 18:19:10 GMT

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

Cpo64Quote: I also have a responsibility to support my president. I don't agree with it at all. HOWEVER, I support his decisions, because if I don't then it nullifies the whole meaning of this country.

Is this really the way you see things? I thought you had a 'Responsible Government'* If you don't agree with this decision, how can you support it? How does you not supporting your government nullify the meaning of your country? If that is so, that would mean that the entire populace of the USA is a group of political sheep, and I simply refuse to believe that.

Simply look at your recent past, the impeachment trial on Clinton, the US was not 100% supportive of his decisions then, but your country has not been nullified.

*The following link describes the Canadian version of Responsible Government. While I was looking for a clear description of Responsible Government, I came across a few articles that were

If that is so that explains much about how your government is run.

Now the link <http://www2.marianopolis.edu/quebechistory/events/resgovt.htm>

perhaps my statement was a little confusing on that point. what I was trying to say, is that I support the our president until the next election to a certain extent. in other words, I have no choice but to support him until he is out of office. What would it look like to other countries if we didn't support our president at all? How would that PROMOTE democracy in any way, shape, or form?

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 18:38:25 GMT

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

Carlperhaps my statement was a little confusing on that point. what I was trying to say, is that I support the our president until the next election to a certain extent. in other words, I have no choice but to support him until he is out of office. What would it look like to other countries if we didn't support our president at all? How would that PROMOTE democracy in any way, shape, or form?

If you had the option not to promote your president? It would look like a democratic. (Not that it

I don't know what you can do, because from what I can find you do not have a responsible form of government. But in Canada you can do something about it, you could petition for a recall campaign, and if enough of the citizens agree with you, that Member of Parliament (MP) will lose their seat, a by-election would be held and you would get a new MP. If enough MP's lose their seats, the government would lose their majority in the House of Commons, and a new government would be formed.

Your government seems very different; it is so different from mine it is hard to understand. Then again I find it difficult enough how anyone could support war.

In Canada we have the problem of no support for war (not bad) and no support for our forces (BAD!) Yet many Canadian complain that our military is small and outdated, but they are not willing to spend their tax dollars on it. Although due to recent events, more funding is being aimed at our forces.

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [Carl](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 18:44:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

if people were always petitioning like that there would be so much distraction things would never get done. that's why there is a 4 year term. and a 2 term limit.

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 18:49:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Carlif people were always petitioning like that there would be so much distraction things would never get done. that's why there is a 4 year term. and a 2 term limit.

I disagree, it works fine here, recently such a petition occurred in BC, it did not go make it to a referendum, but even still it changed the Provincial Governments policies. It does not happen often, because the government feels pressured to do what is wanted, so that they won't lose their seats. Unlike your government where they don't have to worry till next election, they have to constantly keep it up or else.

(Do things get done anyways?)

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 18:53:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Affirmative, and that's why:

U.S.A > Canada

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [Carl](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 18:57:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

bleh

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 19:06:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

KIRBY098Affirmative, and that's why:

U.S.A > Canada

That was inappropriate, I never said one was better then the other, and most people (other then the US) see it differently. But that is unimportant what we are talking about is elections, and the fact is, our system while not perfect, works better then the US system. We have never had a Florida like incident.

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 19:22:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The constitution of the United States, more specifically the Bill of Rights, grants you the RIGHT to speak your mind against the government, to disagree with the government, and even to bear arms to protect yourself from the government. The Checks and Balances system trickles down from the President down to the citizens.

Some people may THINK our system is flawed, and yet it has lasted over 200 years. Not many governments can say they've lasted in their original form as long. The "Florida issue" will not happen again because as a result of it, many states have changed their voting systems to more modern, accurate ones. Saying the Canadian system "works better" than the American system is your own opinion.

There is certainly a way to remove a president from power, and that's through impeachment. Fortunately, the checks and balances system more or less prevents a corrupted President from taking absolute power over the nation. Look at the case of Clinton. He was corrupt as they come and yet the nation still ran and stayed strong.

And, by the way, I can call someone who disagrees with the war an idiot. That's my opinion, just as it's your opinion that the war is unnecessary/wrong/whatever. One day, I hope your eyes are

opened...

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 19:29:21 GMT

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

CrimsonOne day, I hope your eyes are opened...

This statements scares me, many American attitudes towards this war scares me. My eyes opened to what exactly?

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 19:37:38 GMT

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

Currently, the US, and especially the world, is blinded. Blinded by the largest terrorist organization in the USA, and perhaps the world. The US Media. How does the world get their information about current events that are going on in here? Most likely, it's from the media... Too bad the Democrats control the media and their boy isn't in office, so the underlying message isn't going to be one that speaks of agreement with President Bush.

Once you can step back and look at all the facts and see how the Democrats and the liberals have been, you will see... your eyes will be opened.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 19:51:59 GMT

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

I simply don't understand, these sound like the ramblings of a cult leader.

that Canadian media is influenced my American, that is true, I take all facts with extreme predigest.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 19:55:39 GMT

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

Ad Hominem, do you speak it?

I only speak so harshly to get my point across. Now, stop arguing semantics and address the point.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 20:57:20 GMT

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

CrimsonAd Hominem, do you speak it?

I only speak so harshly to get my point across. Now, stop arguing semantics and address the point.

Sorry, that was not intended as an attack upon you. What is the point you wish me to address exactly?

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 21:12:36 GMT

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

The point where you say our system is flawed and Canada's is so much better.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Fri, 21 Mar 2003 21:21:27 GMT

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

CrimsonThe point where you say our system is flawed and Canada's is so much better.

I did not say your system is flawed i said ours is. I said ours works better, not that it is better.

Cpo64our system while not perfect, works better then the US system.

Our elections are faster, more accurate towards the attitude of each individual Canadian. These things make me thing that our system works better, it is my "opinion."

What points do you have that I have been misslead?

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Krazyfoxx](#) on Sat, 22 Mar 2003 15:57:49 GMT

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

CrimsonCurrently, the US, and especially the world, is blinded. Blinded by the largest terrorist organization in the USA, and perhaps the world. The US Media. How does the world get their information about current events that are going on in here? Most likely, it's from the media... Too bad the Democrats control the media and their boy isn't in office, so the underlying message isn't going to be one that speaks of agreement with President Bush.

Once you can step back and look at all the facts and see how the Democrats and the liberals

have been, you will see... your eyes will be opened.

I've been staying out of this whole debate since it started, but I have to say now that you hit the nail on the head about the media (and, I feel, television programming in general as far as destroying moral standards). When my wife was pregnant with our son 2-1/2 years ago we decided to have our tv cable disconnected, and until you been without for a while it's hard to see just how evil the media is. Now alot of people (especially young ones with no children of their own) will say what good does it do keep kids away from tv and bad things, they're going to be exposed eventually. It's true that eventually they will be exposed, but I believe that the first 5 years (or so) of a child's life are the most influential, and you can do one of two things: shield them from evil as long as possible and teach them to do right, or expose them to everything (while partaking yourselve's) but tell them it's wrong and hope that they believe you vs. the rest of the world (ie. being brainwashed by the media). Personally, I think it's pointless to argue and insult each other over "facts" that have been learned by any source (media) other than first hand experience or "strait from the horse's mouth", and this is why I do not participate in these debates. For what it's worth though, I stand behind my Commander-in-chief 100%, and our troops 100%, and our country100%.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 22 Mar 2003 19:37:20 GMT

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

I completely agree with that. Have you also noticed all the celebrities speaking out against the war... and since the celebrities are "our heroes" (referring only to the trend for most people to look up to them as heroes even though just because someone can act, doesn't mean they are intelligent in World affairs) they are able to influence their fans to think the way they do without even using their own brains to pick a side?

"Britney Spears is against the war, therefore, so am I."

Someone mentioned earlier that an interview was conducted on members of a group of protesters and some of them thought Osama Bin Laden was the leader of Iraq. :rolleyes:

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Duke of Nukes](#) on Sun, 23 Mar 2003 08:59:20 GMT

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

Democrats do not control the media. It's always been in the medias interest to create conflict to make their station the best. It was the same throughout Clintons presidency...and I dont doubt that it's been that way with every president since Nixon. I dispise the media personally...although I dont think sheilding your child is the right thing to do. I see sheilding used to often...our next door neighbors threatened to get our dog put to sleep after their kid kicked our dog in the face and then it bit his jeans and he fell down. That's the kind of idiocy that shielding breeds...

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Tue, 25 Mar 2003 16:58:14 GMT

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

Duke of NukesDemocrats do not control the media. It's always been in the medias interest to create conflict to make their station the best. It was the same throughout Clintons presidency...and I dont doubt that it's been that way with every president since Nixon. I dispise the media personally...although I dont think sheilding your child is the right thing to do. I see sheilding used to often...our next door neighbors threatened to get our dog put to sleep after their kid kicked our dog in the face and then it bit his jeans and he fell down. That's the kind of idiocy that shielding breeds...

How, exactly, does those two issues link together? It shows lack of parenting skill, not shielding. You once again are drawing unspecified conclusions, based on unsupported, and unquantified information you probably heard from a website that quoted a rage against the machine concert.

Shielding is what breeds people who cannot support thier conclusions, because they have never had to actually deal with the aftermath of thier statements. Daddy always picks up the pieces for them. Think before you type, idiot.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Tue, 25 Mar 2003 19:40:36 GMT

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

HERE ARE 10 THINGS TO CONSIDER WHEN VOICING AN OPINION ON THIS IMPORTANT ISSUE:

- 1) BETWEEN PRESIDENT BUSH AND SADDAM HUSSEIN ... HUSSEIN IS THE BAD GUY.
- 2) IF YOU HAVE FAITH IN THE UNITED NATIONS TO DO THE RIGHT THING KEEP THIS IN MIND, THEY HAVE LIBYA HEADING THE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND IRAQ HEADING THE GLOBAL DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE. DO YOUR OWN MATH HERE!
- 3) IF YOU USE GOOGLE SEARCH AND TYPE IN "FRENCH MILITARY VICTORIES", YOUR REPLY WILL BE "DID YOU MEAN FRENCH MILITARY DEFEATS?" (use I feel lucky button)
- 4) IF YOUR ONLY ANTI-WAR SLOGAN IS "NO WAR FOR OIL," SUE YOUR SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR ALLOWING YOU TO SLIP THROUGH THE CRACKS AND ROBBING YOU OF THE EDUCATION YOU DESERVE.
- 5) SADDAM AND BIN LADEN WILL NOT SEEK UNITED NATIONS APPROVAL BEFORE THEY TRY TO KILL US.
- 6) DESPITE COMMON BELIEF, MARTIN SHEEN IS NOT THE PRESIDENT. HE JUST PLAYS ONE ON T.V.

7) EVEN IF YOU ARE ANTI-WAR, YOU ARE STILL AN "INFIDEL!" AND BIN LADEN WANTS YOU DEAD, TOO.

IF YOU BELIEVE IN A "VAST RIGHT-WING CONSPIRACY" BUT NOT IN THE DANGER THAT HUSSEIN POSES, QUIT HANGING OUT WITH THE DELL COMPUTER DUDE!

9) WE ARE TRYING TO LIBERATE THE IRAQI PEOPLE.

10) WHETHER YOU ARE FOR MILITARY ACTION OR AGAINST IT, OUR YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN OVERSEAS ARE FIGHTING FOR US TO DEFEND OUR RIGHT TO SPEAK OUT. WE ALL NEED TO SUPPORT THEM WITHOUT RESERVATION.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 02:54:20 GMT

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

K9Trooper3) IF YOU USE GOOGLE SEARCH AND TYPE IN "FRENCH MILITARY VICTORIES", YOUR REPLY WILL BE "DID YOU MEAN FRENCH MILITARY DEFEATS?"

Lol... Yeah, I tried that and it didn't work...

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 03:43:20 GMT

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

Sir PhoenixxK9Trooper3) IF YOU USE GOOGLE SEARCH AND TYPE IN "FRENCH MILITARY VICTORIES", YOUR REPLY WILL BE "DID YOU MEAN FRENCH MILITARY DEFEATS?"

Lol... Yeah, I tried that and it didn't work...

Click on the "I feel lucky" button

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 03:53:44 GMT

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

Hey the US has lost wars to; they even lost one to Canada, (War of 1812. Well more the Brits, but you got to give us something...) and some others, I don't need to mention them. I am sure you

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 04:00:05 GMT

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

Cpo64Hey the US has lost wars to; they even lost one to Canada, (War of 1812. Well more the Brits, but you got to give us something...) and some others, I don't need to mention them. I am sure you know them. The French have had some victories, although they were sort lived, like sake.

The US has never lost a war in its entire history.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 04:06:39 GMT

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

NodbuggerThe US has never lost a war in its entire history.

I hope you are being sarcastic...

Because if you are not, that is the funniest thing I have heard this year.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [\[sg\]theOne](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 04:11:29 GMT

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

LOL This will unfold quiet nicely...lets see how many 'technicalities' will be introduced to bolster ones stance...

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 04:16:30 GMT

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

Cpo64NodbuggerThe US has never lost a war in its entire history.

I hope you are being sarcastic...

Because if you are not, that is the funniest thing I have heard this year.

ok name one WAR we have offically lost of surrendered.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 04:36:48 GMT

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

Surrender is not the only way to lose a war, you can completely wipe out a country and they may never surrender, does this mean you did not win?

You lose a war when you do not achieve your adjective, or you enemy does achieve there adjective.

This is my definition of Win/Loss, if you say the only way you can lose a war, is by Surrendering, then you are correct, the US, -to my knowledge- has never lost, but I do not believe this is the only way to lose a war, but hey, what do I know.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 05:15:13 GMT

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

Cpo64 Surrender is not the only way to lose a war, you can completely wipe out a country and they may never surrender, does this mean you did not win?

You lose a war when you do not achieve your adjective, or you enemy does achieve there adjective.

This is my definition of Win/Loss, if you say the only way you can lose a war, is by Surrendering, then you are correct, the US, -to my knowledge- has never lost, but I do not believe this is the only way to lose a war, but hey, what do I know.

I know where you are going with this one dumbass. Vietnam was not a war. Any ways the US did meet its objective of KEEPING South Vietnam free from the North. South Vietnam fell after the US pulled out. This is a fact. It was part of my thesis in college. So don't think you were being slick.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 05:20:40 GMT

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

Ok then, Vietnam, I won't mention that one then. How about The War of 1812? I am sure there are others, but at this time I do not have time to research them.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 05:24:15 GMT

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

Cpo64 Ok then, Vietnam, I won't mention that one then. How about The War of 1812? I am sure there are others, but at this time I do not have time to research them.

The US didn't lose the War of 1812. If we had we would now be part of Britain. We lost a lot of battles in the War of 1812, including the campaign to capture Canada, but ultimately a peace

treaty was signed that ended the war without a real loser.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 05:31:08 GMT

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

Cpo64Ok then, Vietnam, I won't mention that one then. How about The War of 1812? I am sure there are others, but at this time I do not have time to research them.

Where the fuck did you hear that we lost the War of 1812? If we would have lost, we would have been part of the English Empire again.

You are sooo FUCKING STUPID! Go back to school.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 05:31:38 GMT

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

There is more then 2 out comes to a war, as I have already stated. The goal of the War of 1812 was dominion over all of North America, (called Manifest Destiny or something like that,) You did not achieve that, your White House was set afire, Canada and the UK invaded New England, we withdrew because we did not want it, signed a peace treaty, we won, you lost.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 05:36:33 GMT

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

Cpo64There is more then 2 out comes to a war, as I have already stated. The goal of the War of 1812 was dominion over all of North America, (called Manifest Destiny or something like that,) You did not achieve that, your White House was set afire, Canada and the UK invaded New England, we withdrew because we did not want it, signed a peace treaty, we won, you lost.

The War of 1812 happened because Britain kept bullying the US. The US got fed up and invaded Canada(british territory), got pushed back by Britain, and the war went on for three years. Britain and the US finally came to an understanding, signed a treaty, and Britain stopped trying to push around the US. So by your definition the US won the War of 1812.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 05:47:29 GMT

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

That is incorrect, what happened was, warmongers in the US who believed in the divine right delivered from god (Manifest Destiny) that the US was to rule over all of North America, so the

invaded Canada thinking it would be an easy fight. They were wrong, and lost a number of American lives over it.

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 05:54:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah sure, the British navy taking American sailors and forcing them to serve in the British navy had absolutely nothing to do with it.

Manifest Destiny was an idea that was come up with decades later in order to justify a westward expansion, not a northern expansion.

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 06:21:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cpo is partly right. although it wasn't manifest destiny. the war of 1812 was a very unpopular campaign pushed forward by warhawks in congress. no one really wanted it besides them and we were happy to get out of it as soon as possible.

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 06:41:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It was pushed by warhawks who wanted to give Britain an ass kicking over Britain's mistreatment of America. I'm sure there were those that wanted to conquer Canada for the land, and overall without the push to war it may have been avoided because of changes that happened in Britain. However the war came about mainly because Britain had no respect for American sovereignty.

http://education.yahoo.com/search/be?lb=t&p=url%3Aw/war_of_1812

<http://www.semo.net/suburb/dlswoff/1812.html>

Check out the timeline on this site. Specifically 1803 - 1812.

Also, I'm still trying to find a source, but I if I remember correctly from American History 1, America lost an insignificant war to Utah in the mid 1800s.

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 07:14:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't see how you can claim we lost when we were never at war against Canada. We were at war against the UK. So again we never lost to you. :rolleyes:

I read that the US declared war against England AFTER hundreds of sailors were kidnaped and forced to work on British ships.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 07:28:49 GMT

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

actually, we just enacted an embargo after that. when a new congress full of war hawks was elected, that's when we actually declared war.

the embargo was a clinton type idea which hurt us more than them.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 13:43:42 GMT

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

Wow... Cpo64 got owned! Just goes to show you that you should actually know what you're talking about before posting.

And noone ever lost to Canada, I laugh at you. (haha, ha...)

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 13:48:47 GMT

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

Sir PhoenixxWow... Cpo64 got owned! Just goes to show you that you should actually know what you're talking about before posting.

And noone ever lost to Canada, I laugh at you. (haha, ha...)

Told you we never lost a war. Look at our Salute we are the only country who salutes with the hand facing down. when a country loses a war they switch it...or so ive heard.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Carl](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 18:26:49 GMT

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

ummm..... what happened to the discussion about protesting?

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Yano](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 18:40:33 GMT

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

I don't know, these stupid protesters are some what hurting America. At this time Police should not be standing in the streets keeping hippies under control, they should be watching our power plants, water supplies and being on the alert for terror.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 20:16:25 GMT

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

Dam, I had this 4 paragraph statement and the computer crashed, dam convenient you say? Yah I can imagine how you could think that, I would.

NodbuggerTold you we never lost a war. Look at our Salute we are the only country who salutes with the hand facing down. when a country loses a war they switch it...or so ive heard.

Many countries salutes with palms turned down. The reason the Commonwealth nations do it is because Queen Elizabeth I decided that she did not want to look at the tarred and ripped up hands of the sailors.

It seems that we agree to disagree, I suppose being that no one really made any advancements both sides are going to say they won, but we did set your White House on fire, which you should be glad of, before that it was green, I think white is a much nicer colour.

No one ever lost to Canada? That is a stupid thing to say, many times we have been an allies of the US, and the US has "never lost" so that means we have had to be victorious a couple of times. Canada was in Vietnam, Korean War, The Gulf War, The Boer War, and The Ceriman War. Not to mention both World Wars, which we were in from the start. We had many victories in both World Wars, most notable being Vimy Ridge, and Dieppe. Canada has also put down many uprisings on our soil, and had revolutions to put down, so our military has had many victories. Best thing about fighting your self is that you come out victorious. Hey, you guys had a civil war, you know all about infighting.

Subject: The protests.

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2003 23:59:45 GMT

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

Cpo64Dam, I had this 4 paragraph statement and the computer crashed, dam convenient you say? Yah I can imagine how you could think that, I would.

NodbuggerTold you we never lost a war. Look at our Salute we are the only country who salutes with the hand facing down. when a country loses a war they switch it...or so ive heard.

Many countries salutes with palms turned down. The reason the Commonwealth nations do it is because Queen Elizabeth I decided that she did not want to look at the tarred and ripped up hands of the sailors.

It seems that we agree to disagree, I suppose being that no one really made any advancements both sides are going to say they won, but we did set your White House on fire, which you should be glad of, before that it was green, I think white is a much nicer colour.

No one ever lost to Canada? That is a stupid thing to say, many times we have been an allies of the US, and the US has "never lost" so that means we have had to be victorious a couple of times. Canada was in Vietnam, Korean War, The Gulf War, The Boer War, and The Ceriman War. Not to mention both World Wars, which we were in from the start. We had many victories in both World Wars, most notable being Vimy Ridge, and Dieppe. Canada has also put down many uprisings on our soil, and had revolutions to put down, so our military has had many victories. Best thing about fighting your self is that you come out victorious. Hey, you guys had a civil war, you know all about infighting.

1 Civil War hardly makes us and EXPERT in that field.

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Thu, 27 Mar 2003 05:49:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sorry, that was kinda of a dig wasn't it?

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 27 Mar 2003 06:21:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Cpo64...Best thing about fighting your self is that you come out victorious.

Actually, to burst everyone's bubble about this statement. You can loose a civil war. If the government that was in control during a civil war is ousted/removed or surrenders, the country then looses the war.

Reason for this logic: A new form of government = a new country, even if it keeps its name. A civil war is more of a fight against a government. If you remove the government, the "Old" country lost and so do all of its supporters.

Subject: The protests.
Posted by [Cpo64](#) on Thu, 27 Mar 2003 19:47:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That was extremely intelligent and well put. Bravo Zulu.
