
Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 25 Feb 2004 22:00:22 GMT

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

haremanKILL THIS THREAD BEFORE IT MULTIPLIES

NO! Politics is a very important topic, and should not just be removed from public viewing. Just because you [apparently] don't know anything about politics doesn't mean it should be banned. Go back to posting more spam in the General Discussion area of the forums.

CrimsonThere's an informal survey on Vote.com with over 15,000 respondents, and 75% of them say that Bush releasing proof of his National Guard service is good enough proof that he served his time correctly. So why can't YOU drop it too?

It's not perhaps possible that, rushlimbaugh.com or somewhere directed people to this poll to vote on what they thought? Because in that case, it's pretty obvious what the outcome would be.

CrimsonWhat about the poster suggests that they weren't true? Unless you have proof that he was not involved, I will still think that he was involved... looking at his entire course of conduct I draw my conclusions about his guilt or innocence, and you can draw yours. All that's required for him to be innocent is to cast reasonable doubt in the judge or jury's mind. That's pretty easy when you can use your tongue prettier than a French whore to dance your way around questions like you're Michael Flatley, Lord of the Dance.

Did you read what I said later on about your poster? The part where I SHOWED why all that stuff was wrong?

CrimsonReally? I don't think you did. Saying that the courts found him not guilty is as convincing as the president's annual Turkey pardoning on Thanksgiving. Means nothing. And if he WERE such a great guy I doubt Arkansas would have disbarred him, eh?

Again, you apparently didn't read the post I made where I Owned up on your poster.

CrimsonNo, you really didn't... just because the word "allegedly" appears doesn't mean that it's false information. The media uses that word ALL the time unless they are talking about something that DID happen, like "Blacks staged a rally in Central Park..." But "Michael Smith allegedly murdered Kathy Johnson" after he was arrested today.

See above.

CrimsonWell, I'm sure I couldn't find you so closely involved with so many scandals and following such a horrid course of conduct.

Because I'm not a great Democrat president. What happened was crazy Republicans had nothing to attack Clinton with, so they started making up these insane scandals to try and make the public

hate him. And it obviously worked on you. I bet you never once thought that it might possibly be crazy Republicans making up random lies or horribly bending the truth when you read about all these scandal things in the newspapers. Such a horrid course of conduct in that people accused him of random things?

CrimsonUh oh, he mashed the Hitler button again.

At least I showed that I have an understanding of history. Besides, Hitler and Hitler's Propaganda Minister weren't the same person. And it also directly relates to today? How, you ask? Read my posts.

CrimsonNo, they are founded in opinion. Just because you believe what you say does NOT make them truth. The easiest example, find me an inter-office memo that shows we attacked Iraq for oil. If you can't, then it's not truth and you are basing your "war for oil" argument on an opinion or a supposition.

I bet you didn't proofread your whole post again before you submitted it. These huge posts can get kind of annoying, can't they?

CrimsonObviously you haven't read his stuff. There's a little more meat to it than that. Though, yet again, I merely read his stuff to see his viewpoint. I do not in any way agree with all of it.

I have read his stuff. When you pointed out that table thing, i took the time to read all the articles on the front page. They made me sad. Also, when you showed those IRS statistics then directed people to Limbaugh's site, you said he added everything up. He didn't. He took one number from the lower right of the IRS spreadsheet and made a graph out of it.

CrimsonConsidering I proved that he cut our armed forces by at least 36% over his term, I'm going to have to ask that you prove this. It's all public information. Your source must be government-hosted information, not some article on a web site. If the person who wrote the article found it, you can too.

"Between 1996 and 2001, federal spending on counterterrorism increased dramatically to more than \$12 billion annually. The FBI's counterterrorism budget rose even more sharply, from \$78 million in 1996 to \$609 million in 2000, tripling the number of agents assigned to such activities and creating a new counterterrorism center at the bureau's Washington headquarters." - Salon.com

Oh, and the whole cutting the military thing is kind of silly because

- A) The Soviet Union, the last real superpower in the world collapsed.
- B) The U.S. spends more on its military than the rest of the world combined.

CrimsonNo, we're not talking about Microsoft, however, seeing how much he spent fighting them compared to how much he spent fighting terror, you can see that his priority did not lie in protecting us from terrorist attack.

How much did Clinton spend hunting Microsoft?

CrimsonReally? So he wasn't trying to get UN support to attack Saddam? Oh, but he was, my friend. And he was supported by the same Democrats who are now against Bush for doing the same thing. Including Kerry!

He wasn't after Saddam for being a terrorist, which is what I meant. He went after Saddam for being mean and invading Kuwait, I believe. He wasn't trying to go in under false pretexts like WMDs.

CrimsonOhhh... so from what I can tell, it's OK for Saddam to run a country, but it's not OK for Bush to? VOTE SADDAM 2004!!!

What in the world are you talking about? I hate Saddam. I wish he would go away. What I don't like about Bush is swarming Iraq with soldiers and decieving America in to following him.

CrimsonDUHHHHHHHHHH You start with the largest threats first and work your way down. We are not attacking North Korea because they already have nukes and it's too late to deal with them militarily. They are being dealt with diplomatically.

Yes, but was Iraq really the largest threat?

Did you read that link I posted in my last..erhm...post?

CrimsonHmm... so my alleged bad estimate means Clinton was a good president and we can all go home now?

No, but it perhaps suggests that you were being a little shady with the actual poster.

CrimsonMaybe Bush didn't goto Alaska because he knew it is the 49th state? Would be rather stupid to attack it for it's oil, since it's been a part of the United States since 1959... And where did that environmental plan stuff come from? It didn't have anything to do with what anyone else was currently talking about, nor did it coincide with what you were even talking about. You may want to take Crimson's advice.

majikent, you don't necessarily have to attack an area to get oil from it. And Bush's forest plan does involve chopping down the largest trees so as to reduce the risk of forest fires. Even though you would be hard-pressed to find a scientist who believes in this crazy talk. First, big trees keep the forest moist and actually PREVENT forest fires. Second, the low-lying plants are what actually cause fires. And, all this time we have been talking about Bush. It's not a crime to point out something bad about someone else, even though Bush would like to have you think that it's unpatriotic.
