

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 24 Feb 2004 00:34:02 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngil never said Bush lied thirty years ago. He's been lieing about the National Guard thing for [rough estimate] his whole term. If a president lies while he is in office and it has nothing to do with anything, then i guess everything concerning Monica Lewinsky is null and void.

There'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?

Quote:2) Well, if your poster is any suggestion, then I said they weren't true. Also, if you more than glanced at what these people are talking about, then you will see so much stupid in there that YOU would realize they weren't true.

What 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.

Quote:I DID prove them false.

Really? 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?

Quote:Call your poster what you will, but I exposed all that crap for what it was, and yet you still deny it.

No, 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.

Quote:So, the more bad things you say about someone, the more true it gets?

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

Quote:That's how Hitler's propaganda minister got Germans to hate Jews.

Uh oh, he mashed the Hitler button again. :rolleyes:

Quote:the Democrat's reasons are often founded in truth

No, 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.

Quote:wherease Rush Limbaugh is always blathering on about "Liberals hate america..."

Obviously 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.

Quote:Clinton tripled the FBI's counterterrorism budget, among other things.

Considering 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.

Quote:Go back and read my posts, which I have already shown what Clinton did aganst terrorism. AHHH AHH WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT MICROSOFT!!!!

No, 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.

Quote:Clinton wasn't after Saddam Hussein,

Really? 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!

Quote:because Saddam Hussein isn't a terrorist, just a cranky old dictator. How hard is it for Bush to tell the army to go to a country and tell the soldiers to shoot at anyone who shoots at them?

Ohhh... 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!!!

Quote:hydra1945We don't necessarily care more about Iraq than we do our own country, because in removing Saddam's regime from Iraq, we are ensuring our own security by taking out one more country that aides and harbors known terrorists. Other than that, I would agree with your post.

If a way to prevent terrorism in the U.S. is to invade countries that have small terrorist connections, why don't we go on a campaign to invade all the countries in the middle east? And while we're at it, why don't we wipe North Korea from the map?

DUHHHHHHHHHH 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.

Quote:hydra1945Because the war is not about oil.

Im sure it's a nice bonus, though.

Oh, so now you are conceding that the war isn't about oil. THANK YOU!

---