

 **TODAY'S "SHORT TOPIC"**
SOME POLITICIANS
OPPOSING ENHANCED
INTERROGATION
TECHNIQUES ARE JUST
COVERING THEIR BUTTS! 



By Stephen L. Bakke  December 21, 2014

Here's what provoked me:

Hey SB! Did you read the Wall Street Journal editorial section with this description of the Senate's Majority (Democrat) Report on Torture: "The report on CIA interrogations is a collection of partisan second-guessing ... The report is more important for illustrating how fickle Americans are about their security, and so unfair to those who provide it." Do you know why this is, SB? Because interrogation techniques and torture have never been classified or defined, politicians can interpret it in whatever way they desire, if it serves their purpose. And without any clear definition, interpretations "drift" over time. – Stefano Bachovich – obscure curmudgeon and wise political pundit – a prolific purveyor of opinions on just about everything – SB's primary "go to guy."

Here's my response:

Some politicians opposing enhanced interrogation techniques are just **COVERING THEIR BUTTS!**

It's interesting to observe how politicians' (in this case Democrats) interpretations can "drift" over time! Keeping the Democrats' "Torture Report" in mind, here are just a few examples of what some of these same people were saying, "back in the day," about the enhanced interrogation measures most of them now oppose. They now act as if "it's new to me":



- Every one of us can imagine the following scenario: We get lucky and we get a number three guy in al-Qaida and we know there's a big bomb going off in America in three days and we know this guy knows where it is – know (sic) we have the right and responsibility to beat it out of him. – Bill Clinton in 2006
- We have to do some things that historically we have not wanted to do to protect ourselves. – Senator Diane Feinstein, shortly after 9/11
- We understood what the CIA was doing We gave the CIA our bipartisan support; we gave the CIA funding to carry out its activities. – Porter Goss, Nancy Pelosi's chairman on the House Intelligence Committee. Pelosi was then the ranking member of the committee – this was shortly after 9/11.

- I wouldn't take anything off the table where he is concerned. – Democrat Senator Jay Rockefeller, while vice chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee in 2003, when asked about turning over Khalid Sheik Mohammed to countries known to torture.
 - I'd like to interject a note of balance here I think there are probably very few people in this room or in America who would say that torture would never be used, particularly if thousands of lives are at stake. Take the hypothetical: If we knew there was a nuclear bomb hidden in an American city and we believed that some kind of torture, fairly severe maybe, would give us a chance of finding that bomb before it went off, my guess is that most Americans and most senators, maybe all, would say, "Do what you have to do." – Senator Chuck Schumer, during a Senate hearing in 2004 – quite different from his current position!
-

Democrats who approved of enhanced interrogation at the time (such as Feinstein) must now construct an elaborate fantasy world in which they were not knowledgeable and supportive. They postulate a new reality in which they were innocent and deceived – requiring a conspiracy from three former CIA directors, three former deputy directors and hundreds of others. – Michael Gerson, Washington Post