

Gore Is No Good

We supported Al Gore for the Presidency in 2000.

The events of September 11, 2001 caused us to reconsider, and improve, the criteria by which we make such judgements. We now realise that Gore is **fundamentally flawed**, in his relevant political values and personal qualities.

We would not support him again. Nor Kerry. We support George W Bush for the Presidency in 2004.

Here's **David Schneider-Joseph** musing on similar changes that he himself has undergone.

Fri, 05/28/2004 - 22:59 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permlink](#)

Bothered

I would say that Gore's address was fundamentally flawed. As to his personal qualities that's a stretch. He might be plain angry something that even seems out of political character for him.

Much of what he spouted in the address is angry rhetoric and not particularly useful to him or anyone else. I take it at face value as not of much use. However, good people as well as not so good people do get angry and say so publicly.

Something else bothers me, the "Gore No Good" blanket heading. There seems to be much of an amplified knee jerk reaction here, no better than the Gore comments. Is this a political endorsement or a political disendorsement? What bothers me most is that it sounds like it should have a campaign ad trailer saying, "I am George W. Bush and I approve this message."

Politics is surely a dirty business aimed at the gut and often quite void of reason. Adding to the dirty business with a Gore No Good punch heading specifically bothers me.

by a reader on Sat, 05/29/2004 - 16:41 | [reply](#)

Bad Character

The fundamental flaws in Gore's address and in his behaviour since

9/11 are evidence of flaws in his character. The issue is not that he is angry per se, although the fact that he 'did a Dean' does weigh somewhat against him. He and many of his fellow Democrats have attacked Bush's character and policies in the War on Terror in a remarkably unprincipled and vicious manner. Discussing policies and trying to come up with better ways to implement them in cooperation with the Administration would be one thing, foaming at the mouth conspiracy theoretic ranting and unjustified character assassination is quite another. Gore is no good.

I do not say this because Bush has asked me to but because it is true. Nor do I say 'elect Bush' because he has asked me to, but because his policies on the most important political issue of our time (the War on Terror) are basically sound. Bush has flaws, his policies on gay marriage, abortion, embryonic stem cells and probably many other issues are a fatuous waste of air, but these are minor in comparison with his opponents' flaws. It's a recommendation but I doubt Bush would put it on a campaign poster.

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Sun, 05/30/2004 - 01:33 | [reply](#)

Bush Is No Good

I forecast that, in one or two years, you will have a title running, "Bush Is No Good," because you will have realised that he messed up the punishment for 9/11 (where is Bin Laden?), and he messed up our liberties. Puritanism is the only thing he is good for.

by a reader on Sun, 05/30/2004 - 01:40 | [reply](#)

Bush is Plenty Good

'I forecast that, in one or two years, you will have a title running, "Bush Is No Good," because you will have realised that he messed up the punishment for 9/11 (where is Bin Laden?), and he messed up our liberties. Puritanism is the only thing he is good for.'

How exactly did he mess up our liberties?

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Sun, 05/30/2004 - 01:50 | [reply](#)

Liberties

Evidence is everywhere. In all Western countries. Any newspaper. To start, you might want to go to <http://www.free-market.net/search/index.cgi>, and search in "news reports", "civil liberties" and, say, "war terror" as keywords.

by a reader on Sun, 05/30/2004 - 02:52 | [reply](#)

Learning from errors

See <http://www.antiwar.com/mercero/?articleid=2691>

by a reader on Sun, 05/30/2004 - 03:12 | [reply](#)

Northern Irelandization of England

For example (not to talk about abolition of traditional habeas corpus): Terrorism Act 2000 2000 Chapter 11 - continued PART I INTRODUCTORY Terrorism: interpretation. 1. - (1) In this Act "terrorism" means the use or threat of action where- (a) the action falls within subsection (2), (b) the use or threat is designed to influence the government or to intimidate the public or a section of the public, and (c) the use or threat is made for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause.

Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001 2001 Chapter 24 - continued PART 5 RACE AND RELIGION 38 Meaning of fear and hatred In Article 8 of the Public Order (Northern Ireland) Order 1987 (S.I. 1987/463 (N.I. 7)) in the definition of fear and the definition of hatred (fear and hatred defined by reference to a group of persons in Northern Ireland) omit the words "in Northern Ireland".

by a reader on Sun, 05/30/2004 - 17:12 | [reply](#)

Re: Learning from errors

Are you saying Mercer has learned from her errors? I see no indication of that.

by a reader on Sun, 05/30/2004 - 18:58 | [reply](#)

Re: Northern Irelandization of England

Are you saying that making threats intended to intimidate the public for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause is a precious liberty? Are you also saying it was previously legal in England?

by a reader on Sun, 05/30/2004 - 19:03 | [reply](#)

Re:Re: Northern Irelandization of England

Are you saying it is important to have redundant sets of laws?

If making such threats were illegal before why pass a law to make it illegal twice over? Are terrorist willing to break one law but not two?

by a reader on Sun, 05/30/2004 - 22:44 | [reply](#)

Civil Liberties

I'm not particularly convinced that the Patriot Act to which the readers above are presumably referring is anywhere near as bad as it is often portrayed. See

<http://www.lifeandliberty.gov/>

If you can fault the Patriot Act after reading it and thinking about it

rather than doing the knee jerk, security provided by government is automatically bad schtick, then I will be interested.

It is certainly an exaggeration to say that the civil liberties situation is worse than it has ever been before. It is interesting to note that there have been much worse violations of civil liberties in all previous wars. During WW2 both Britain and America took to interning lots of people whom they deemed might be a threat on the basis of ethnicity or nationality, no sign of that this time. It is also interesting to note that the Framers of the US Constitution saw fit to guarantee that:

'No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.'

Evidently this was something that they foresaw might happen sufficiently often that they actually needed to cover themselves in case it did happen. The civil liberties during war situation has got better not worse.

In any case, I'm not entirely sure what abuses of civil liberties in the name of the War on Terror would actually demonstrate about the morality of the war itself, if anything. Islamist terrorists have said often enough that they want to destroy our civilisation and that they despise its values, as have the dictators who support them. They are at war with us whether we like it or not. As such we must wage war against these terrorists and the dictatorships that lend aid to them.

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Tue, 06/01/2004 - 01:39 | [reply](#)

This blog didn't exist in 200

This blog didn't exist in 2000!

by a reader on Thu, 06/03/2004 - 13:21 | [reply](#)

But..

But its editors did.

~Woty
<http://woty.davidsj.com>

by [Woty](#) on Sun, 06/06/2004 - 03:58 | [reply](#)

don't be so mean

surely A Reader meant something other than that the editors of the world didn't have political opinions before they had a blog. i don't know what, but it's gotta be something else. assuming it's something so utterly idiotic is insulting.

-- Elliot Temple

<http://www.curi.us/>

by **Elliot Temple** on Sun, 06/06/2004 - 06:15 | [reply](#)

Copyright © 2007 Setting The World To Rights