

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 23 Feb 2004 21:28:44 GMT

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

---

On the war in Iraq

Read this:

<http://bushwatch.org/bush6.htm>

And read the whole article before you say it's biased. Anything that goes against Bush is supposedly "biased" these days.

Moving on...

hydra1945Now, it's a non-issue that's just used by Democrats as a distractor from the real issues. But then people will say, "It's a credibility issue! How can you trust a man who lied thirty years ago?" like SuperFlyingEngi said in this quote:

I 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.

hydra1945So I guess that means we can trust no political figure because it's a credibility issue .

No, I'm saying it's kind of silly to accuse someone of doing pot when they SAID THEY DID AND WEREN'T LIEING ABOUT IT [from what you said earlier]

hydra1945The special forces played one of the biggest, if not the biggest, role in the Afghanistan war. They made thousands of surgical strikes on locations where Taliban officials were thought to have been hiding, and often resulted in a few dead or captured Taliban officials. Very few civilian casualties were caused by U.S. forces. Most were killed by the Taliban themselves to make the U.S. look bad.

Well of course special forces did a lot of work in Afghanistan, but that doesn't make up for the fact that we had an army there as well.

hydra1945"If Bush would have used Bill Clinton's plan! If Bush would have used Bill Clinton's plan!" Tell me, what exactly was "Bill Clinton's plan" that would have solved all of the problems with terrorists and Saddam Hussein, and how is what Bush did so different from "Bill Clinton's plan?"

READ THE THREAD! About a page ago I said what Clinton's plan was.

Crimson1) not talking about Nixon

2) Who said they weren't true? Just because he wasn't convicted does NOT mean he didn't do any of those things. You're basing that on faith.

- 1) Yes, I know we weren't talking about Nixon, but I felt like throwing that in there.
- 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.

CrimsonOnce again, not incorrect. You can't prove them false any more than I can prove them true. Remember that the poster is a course of conduct. When you put together every little scandal or potential scandal he was involved in before and during his presidency, everything he's said, everything he's written, that Hillary's written... he just doesn't come together as a man I would have trusted with our great nation.

I DID prove them false. Call your poster what you will, but I exposed all that crap for what it was, and yet you still deny it. So, the more bad things you say about someone, the more true it gets? That's how Hitler's propaganda minister got Germans to hate Jews.

CrimsonWait, we're talking about those people? Which of them is running for president? They are all commentators, they have a very large podium to post their opinions. I fail to see how any of this is relevant. The Democrats are calling the president all sorts of names and attacking him, too... how is that any different.?

Ahh, I KNOW we weren't talking about these people. It's not like I ignored the topic and went right on to this. Oh, the only way Democrat attacks and Republican attacks [in general] between these two groups are that the Democrat's reasons are often founded in truth, whereas Rush Limbaugh is always blathering on about "Liberals hate america..."

CrimsonBut on the subject of wars, Clinton accomplished absolutely not a damn thing against terrorism when he was president. Hell, he couldn't even finish his attack on Microsoft, for fuck's sake. But here's Bush... in less than 4 years he has liberated two nations full of citizens with no rights or freedoms, afraid to cross their "government". And we've captured Saddam Hussein. You can say all day long that we didn't Osama yet, but Clinton didn't either. AND he didn't get Saddam!

Clinton tripled the FBI's counterterrorism budget, among other things. Go back and read my posts, which I have already shown what Clinton did against terrorism. AHHH AHH WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT MICROSOFT!!!! Clinton wasn't after Saddam Hussein, 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?

Nukelt15Exactly. So it proves nothing to bash a candidate based on past drug use, when so many of our current politicians did drugs as well. If credibility is determined by whether or not someone did drugs, then there's an awful lot of people who you can't trust.

Exactly.

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?

hydra1945To emphasize Nuke's point, if it's oil Bush wants, why didn't he attack Saudi Arabia, since it has the largest oil reserves in the world?

Because Saudi Arabia doesn't already have a bad rep.

hydra1945Bush could have made a pretty decent case against Saudi Arabia since 15 of the 19 hijackers were Saudis

I bet a lot of suicide bombers in Israel come from Palestine. Let's go blow up Palestine.

hydra1945Because the war is not about oil.

Im sure it's a nice bonus, though.

---