

---

Subject: Ooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 15:13:00 GMT

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

---

<http://release.theplatform.com/content.select?pid=B9VLDazWialomHyrhcsC6BaNlrGk7PdC&UserName=Unknown>

Notice anything odd about what he says?

---

---

Subject: Ooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 15:25:02 GMT

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

---

And you are a dumb ass if you do not understand what he meant.

---

---

Subject: Ooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 16:18:26 GMT

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

---

Then I'm not a dumbass. Thanks!

P.S.

Oh, I'm sorry, was that supposed to somehow excuse what he said? "It's okay if he says stupid shit like that as long as people know what he means"? Just because you know what he is trying to say doesn't mean he's not a dumbfuck who can't clearly and coherently get his message across.

Why doesn't he use a teleprompter? And if he does use a teleprompter, why doesn't he learn to read?

---

---

Subject: Ooops

Posted by [setstyle](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 16:38:59 GMT

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

---

Haha I read that quote in Newsweek and laughed out loud.

---

---

Subject: Ooops

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 17:38:02 GMT

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

---

You guys are dumb. The 9/11 commission's report says that our biggest problem was a lack of imagination. We didn't think that the terrorists would take our own places and crash them into

---

buildings. That's what he's alluding to. That we are now doing our best to think of ways that the enemy would harm us so that we can see the signs when they're there.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 19:02:58 GMT

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

---

You have to admit though, it wasn't a very bright way of alluding to that. If its that Bush isn't simply an idiot, and actually intened what you suggest he did (not saying otherwise), there is one simply solution. Stop speaking to the crowd in catchy phrases intended to generate interest (ie. Stop speaking as though people are stupid). Speak plainly, and state exactly what is intended. Problem solved.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 19:14:26 GMT

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

---

But people are stupid, and they will understand what he says better if he says it that way.

You don't need a thesaurus to be president.

And Bush shouldn't have to use bigger and harder to pronounce words.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 20:58:01 GMT

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

---

He should at least pretend he's a smart person.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 21:07:30 GMT

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

---

Apparently whoever wrote that speech didn't realize how petty and stupid you would all be to think he means his administration wants to kill Americans. I think it speaks less of yourselves. I knew exactly what he meant when I read the text of that speech.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 23:06:35 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerBut people are stupid, and they will understand what he says better if he says it that way.

You don't need a thesaurus to be president.

And Bush shouldn't have to use bigger and harder to pronounce words.

I'm surprized you have such a low opinion of yourself. You actually think your stupid? Remeber, Bush is speaking to you as well.

So, saying "Our enemies are looking for ways to attack America, and so are we." is better than saying, "Our enemies are looking for ways to attack America, and we are looking for ways to defend against them."?

Not a single large word thats hard to pronounce there.... unless your including "defend" and "against" in your hard-word list.

Quote:Apparently whoever wrote that speech didn't realize how petty and stupid you would all be to think he means his administration wants to kill Americans.

I think everyone else knew what he meant as well. However the intelligence factor of the statement was aiming pretty low. And considering how low some people consider of Bush's intellect to be in the first place... all it does is reaffirm their opinion.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 23:09:17 GMT

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

---

some people think he needs to talk like a genius to be president.

I said he doesn't need to use big words. Believe it or not there are some really stupid people out there. And they want it put in the simplest term

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 23:10:47 GMT

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

---

Oh, I know there can be some pretty stupid people out there, but why cater to them? All it does is pull everyone else down.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 23:23:04 GMT

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

---

warrantoOh, I know there can be some pretty stupid people out there, but why cater to them? All it does is pull everyone else down.

Because if they don't understand you, then they will get frustrated and stay stupid.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 23:29:02 GMT

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

---

And talking stupid would somehow not make them stay stupid?

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 12 Aug 2004 23:32:49 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiAnd talking stupid would somehow not make them stay stupid?

Is teaching algebra to a three year old in anyway productive?

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 00:02:00 GMT

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

---

I think you are scraping the bottom of the excuse barrel, NodBugger (and Crimson).

We all know Bush can't handle those long, confusing, hard-to-pronounce words...or those shorter difficult words. He is a man that always tries to use a low vocabulary, because if he doesn't, he runs the risk of getting confused and making up a word, like "misunderestimated".

This has nothing to do with the size of his vocabulary. He said something that grammatically, no matter which way you stretch it, meant that "the United states never stops thinking of ways to harm Americans." There was no allusion to anything, just idiocy.

If you think that a man who doesn't have a firm grasp on his native language is fit to run this country, than by all means...vote Bush.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 00:09:49 GMT

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

---

Take it out of context and it sounds like that.

Put it in context and it makes perfect sense and in no way sounds stupid.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 00:11:25 GMT

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

---

SEAL

If you think that a man who doesn't have a firm grasp on his native language is fit to run this country, than by all means...vote Bush.

I have disagree there. Someone who doesn't have a firm grasp can be fit to lead, though usually not very well overall. I bring to the table as an example, the former Canadian Prime Minister. A common joke up here is that he knew neither official language. Sure he could speak it, but either due to the partial paralysis in his face, or some other factor, he would easily slip up. He was in power for a number of terms, only recently stepping down due to a "misplacement" of funds. I'm not saying he's the best PM we've had, far from it... but it doesn't mean he wasn't capable of the job.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 00:31:16 GMT

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

---

You are petty and stupid. I can't believe this is even worth a discussion. The 9/11 commission said that we lacked imagination. They said they we didn't think of the possibility of them hijacking our own planes and using them as weapons.

Then Bush says that his administration is now thinking of ways that our enemies might harm us. It makes perfect sense to me. It shows that the president is ACTING ON what the 9/11 Commission recommended be acted upon. But yet again... this wouldn't help you libs, so you have to nitpick on one possible interpretation of the words he used instead of their meaning.

I think "I actually did vote for the 87 million before I voted against it" ranks up there in the stupid phrases category. Knowing what Kerry MEANT by that changes the interpretation of those words, but the words themselves sound like he's saying "I am a flip-flop". I fail to see how you can differentiate the two sentences.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 00:34:22 GMT

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

---

One possible interpretation? You seem to be in denial that there is pretty much only one grammatical interpretation as to what he said.

Bush's dumb phrases OWN Kerry's dumb phrases.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 00:38:11 GMT

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

---

Ah, so you admit Kerry has "dumb phrases" too. Then why do you defend his phrases so much, then say I'm "scraping the bottom of the excuse barrel" when I do the same? Double standards? Hypocrisy?

Are you actually so stupid from sucking the big Liberal genitalia that you think Bush actually wants to steal a plane and crash into more buildings? I just don't understand you people.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 01:02:45 GMT

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

---

I know what he means, but that doesn't excuse Bush for his dumb phrases.

Quote:Ah, so you admit Kerry has "dumb phrases" too. Then why do you defend his phrases so much, then say I'm "scraping the bottom of the excuse barrel" when I do the same? Double standards? Hypocrisy?

Quote:Bush's dumb phrases OWN Kerry's dumb phrases.

...both in quality and quantity. All I'm saying is that Kerry is not without faults too. He is just no match for Bush when it comes to dumb phrases.

You're one to talk about "Double standards" :rolleyes:

You complain that Kerry voted to authorize Bush to declare war, but support Bush, the person who did the actual declaring.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 01:10:10 GMT

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

---

Well we do that because Kerry voted to go to war , yet he was against it, then he says he would have voted for it any way.

Bush has just said I want to attack Iraq, I am attacking Iraq, and I will continue to attack Iraq.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 01:11:24 GMT

---

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

---

Ah. I withdraw that part of my post then. Thanks for clearing that up.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 01:33:56 GMT

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

---

CrimsonYou are petty and stupid. I can't believe this is even worth a discussion. The 9/11 commission said that we lacked imagination. They said they we didn't think of the possibility of them hijacking our own planes and using them as weapons.

Just as a point of clarification on my part, I'm not saying he was implying that Americans will attack themselves, I'm just saying it was a poor choice of words.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 07:57:24 GMT

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

---

How can you guys criticize him for "Not speaking his own words" and then when said 'words' are fumbled blame him? You have to choose a side. If he reads someone else's speech from a teleprompter than you can fault that, but not the content of the speech then, and if it's his speech than yes it was a poor choice of words, but that's his words.. If it was written for him by a team of writers than go yell at them and say Bush should speak his own words. Jesus... You can't say he has nothing to do with something and everything to do with something... That doesn't work. He's not Bush from the 9th dimension...

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 10:16:04 GMT

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

---

The choice of words for that single complete thought was fallable. Nothing more.

If a candidate or president makes an error in their speech it shouldn't reflect on their ability to lead. This will, and has been eaten up by the media (in fact, it's my setjain because it's humorous as a complete and separate thought), but the meaning of the sentence in proper context is not a bad thing. It shouldn't be construed that way to imply that Bush wants to launch planes into buildings full of innocents.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 11:53:31 GMT

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

---

DoitleHow can you guys criticize him for "Not speaking his own words" and then when said 'words' are fumbled blame him? You have to choose a side. If he reads someone elses speech from a teleprompter than you can fault that, but not the content of the speech then, and If it's his speech than yes it was a poor choice of words, but their his words.. If it was written for him by a team of writers than go yell at them and say Bush should speak his own words. Jesus... You can't say he has nothing to do with something and everything to do with something... That doesnt work. He's not Bush from the 9th dimension...

Yet...somehow...so many presidents and politicians have managed to not look like idiots so often when speaking. How do they do it? How DOOOO they do it?! Oh my god, what's their secret!?

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 13:44:52 GMT

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

---

SEALDoitleHow can you guys criticize him for "Not speaking his own words" and then when said 'words' are fumbled blame him? You have to choose a side. If he reads someone elses speech from a teleprompter than you can fault that, but not the content of the speech then, and If it's his speech than yes it was a poor choice of words, but their his words.. If it was written for him by a team of writers than go yell at them and say Bush should speak his own words. Jesus... You can't say he has nothing to do with something and everything to do with something... That doesnt work. He's not Bush from the 9th dimension...

Yet...somehow...so many presidents and politicians have managed to not look like idiots so often when speaking. How do they do it? How DOOOO they do it?! Oh my god, what's their secret!?

Maybe because you weren't sitting there analyzing every single word they says?

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 18:47:36 GMT

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

---

"I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Miss Lewinsky"

See, I interpreted that as "I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Miss Lewinsky" when in fact what he meant to say was "yeah, she sucked me off in the oval office".

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 20:35:51 GMT

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

---

To Nodbugger:

You think other presidents don't get equal attention to things like this!? If someone ELSE were in



office, and they said the same thing, trust me, you WOULD hear about it. See there are these people that pay close attention to what the president says. Oh yes! I remember know, they are called "RE-PORT-ERS"!

To Crimson:

Clinton lied. What's the relevance?

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 20:39:58 GMT

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

---

SEALTo Nodbugger:

You think other presidents don't get equal attention to things like this!? If someone ELSE were in office, and they said the same thing, trust me, you WOULD hear about it. See there are these people that pay close attention to what the president says. Oh yes! I remember know, they are called "RE-PORT-ERS"!

To Crimson:

Clinton lied. What's the relevance?

This is different.

Before the 2000 election people were generally satisfied with who ever became president. They did not protest because they did not like the outcome. They did not bitch and moan about it during the entire presidency. They did not protest every move that president made no matter how right he was, they did it because they have a grudge.

People are still pissed off Bush won the election and for some reason it is their goal to make his presidency a living hell.

And those people are idiots.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 20:45:14 GMT

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

---

That's pretty presumptuous of you. I happened to like Bush up until I became informed to what really happened regarding Iraq.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [AlostSOul](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 20:59:31 GMT

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

---

Crimson "I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Miss Lewinsky"

See, I interpreted that as "I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Miss Lewinsky" when in fact what he meant to say was "yeah, she sucked me off in the oval office".

"boobay"

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:00:34 GMT

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

---

Javaxcx That's pretty presumptuous of you. I happened to like Bush up until I became informed to what really happened regarding Iraq.

And what really happened in Iraq?

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:05:21 GMT

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

---

Not necessarily what happened in Iraq. I said in regards to Iraq. It's pretty obvious what happened IN Iraq. In regards to it, the war was the product of a violation of international law. I don't care who the President is, or what they've done for their country, if you break the law, you don't deserve to be in office. The same goes for Clinton and every other democratic or republican president in the future.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:16:39 GMT

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

---

Javaxcx Not necessarily what happened in Iraq. I said in regards to Iraq. It's pretty obvious what happened IN Iraq. In regards to it, the war was the product of a violation of international law. I don't care who the President is, or what they've done for their country, if you break the law, you don't deserve to be in office. The same goes for Clinton and every other democratic or republican president in the future.

Yep...we broke the law :rolleyes:

Oh, no some silly UN law is more important than an evil maniacal dictator...you dumb asses need to get your priorities straightened out.

---

---

Subject: Ooops

Posted by [Javacx](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:18:40 GMT

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

---

You need to understand that the law is still the law, child.

---

Subject: Ooops

Posted by [Kholdstare](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:19:21 GMT

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

---

<Insert off topic, witty comment here>

---

Subject: Ooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:25:54 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerBefore the 2000 election people were generally satisfied with who ever became president. They did not protest because they did not like the outcome. They did not bitch and moan about it during the entire presidency. They did not protest every move that president made no matter how right he was, they did it because they have a grudge.

So all us hippie, tree-hugging, environment loving, non-shower-taking liberals had a huge meeting and said, "let's just randomly give this Bush guy a hard time!"?

Maybe the reason that there is so much bitching and moaning compared to other presidencies is because BUSH IS A BAD PRESIDENT.

---

Subject: Ooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:33:06 GMT

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

---

SEALNodbuggerBefore the 2000 election people were generally satisfied with who ever became president. They did not protest because they did not like the outcome. They did not bitch and moan about it during the entire presidency. They did not protest every move that president made no matter how right he was, they did it because they have a grudge.

So all us hippie, tree-hugging, environment loving, non-shower-taking liberals had a huge meeting and said, "let's just randomly give this Bush guy a hard time!"?

Maybe the reason that there is so much bitching and moaning compared to other presidencies is because BUSH IS A BAD PRESIDENT.

But everything you say he has done bad has pretty much been a lie or a Gross exaggeration of truth.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:36:18 GMT

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

---

Javaxcx You need to understand that the law is still the law, child.

That is what they teach you in Canada?

If you drive 10mph over the speed limit and the cop you just passed doesn't care, you haven't broken a law.

Laws are just guidelines, you can bend them and you can break them.

Bush did not break them. He attacked a group of people, Saddam Hussein and Co, and proceeded to give back Iraq to a more responsible and free government.

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:40:18 GMT

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

---

Are you fucking serious? I mean, are you bloody dense? You're implying it's not illegal unless you're caught.

It's a very good thing in this world that you cannot vote given your understanding of the world around you. My God, you think that laws are not rules, but are just "guidelines" that only have to be obeyed if you agree with them.

Guess what kid, that's not how it works. Do you even know what "law" means?

law ( P ) Pronunciation Key (lô)

n.

A rule of conduct or procedure established by custom, agreement, or authority.

The body of rules and principles governing the affairs of a community and enforced by a political authority; a legal system: international law.

The condition of social order and justice created by adherence to such a system: a breakdown of law and civilized behavior.

A set of rules or principles dealing with a specific area of a legal system: tax law; criminal law.

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:46:12 GMT

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

---

Quote:enforced by a political authority

US=Political Authority

---

The UN obviously wasn't going to enforce any of their laws, which you have proven if we did break a law.

So why should we have to follow the rules if every other country gets away with it?

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 21:54:39 GMT

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

---

United Nations = International Authority. You know why? Because your country, and many others, signed the charter saying "we'll play by these rules".

Guess what, if Iraq violates international law, that does NOT give you authority to enforce the repercussions unless the United Nations says so. I don't ever recall seeing a resolution after the warning of resolution 1441 that says "Authorizes all Member States to use all means necessary to overthrow the sovereignty of Iraq".

I do, however remember seeing:

"Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, Kuwait, and the neighbouring States,"

The very fact that the CoW did not follow through with their commitment to the sovereignty of Iraq and overthrew Saddam, however evil and tyrannical he is, makes this war illegal.

Guess what. Two wrongs don't make a right. They don't under Canadian law, and they don't under international law. If I'm mistaken, please, show me ANYWHERE under international law that is says "two wrongs make a right".

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 14 Aug 2004 00:11:39 GMT

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

---

Why the war in Iraq was legal...

(1991 Ceasefire Saddam Breached)

(UN Resolutions on Iraq)

(WH.gov: Saddam Hussein's Defiance of United Nations Resolutions)

(Scotsman: Attorney General Advised Blair War Was Legal - Butler)

(Age Australia: Yes, This War Is Legal)

(United Nations Security Council Resolution #678)

(United Nations Security Council Resolution #687)

(United Nations Security Council Resolution #1441)

(United Nations Charter Article 51)

(United Nations Charter Chapter VII)  
(WFB's Latest: Should We Have Gone to War?)

I didn't screen these links, but they were compiled by a source I trust.

---

---

Subject: Oooops  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 14 Aug 2004 01:06:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Regarding this article: Mr. Hunt fails to mention a very key aspect of resolution 1441 that is extremely important:

"Reaffirming the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq, Kuwait, and the neighbouring States,"

Too fully understand why this is such an important reaffirmation, I suggest you read over 678, 686, 687, and 1441 very carefully.

Another interesting article is Article 51. Something me and Warranto are investigating personally right now. So I'll get back to you on that ASAP.

Finally... I'm not sure where you're going with this article, so please enlighten me.

Just for the record, I have no doubt in my mind that Saddam violated UN Resolutions, so don't think that I don't.

---

---

Subject: Oooops  
Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 02:59:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I can understand what Bush is saying in that particular video clip. The speech uses a little parallelism, that's all. "The terrorists never stop thinking of ways of harming our country, and neither do we..." (however it goes) makes sense, because obviously to defend against terrorists you'd have to think like a terrorist. To directly state "so that we can defend against them" is condescending, IMO.

---

---

Subject: Oooops  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 03:28:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Who are you trying to convince? Yourself?

Grammaticly, George W. Bush's statement in the said video clip has one (1) correct grammatical meaning. Period.

---

Since you people obviously need it outlined for you...

George W. Bush Our enemies are innovative and resourceful, and so are we. They never stop thinking about new ways to harm our country and our people, and neither do we.

Let's take a look at the second sentence. "They" is the subject. It refers to the subject of the previous sentence, which is "Our enemies". So the sentence can logically be replaced with:

"Our enemies never stop thinking about new ways to harm our country and our people, and neither do we."

"Do" is a very important word in the second sentence. "Do" refers to the verb of the second sentence's first clause: "stop", which has the adverb, "never" and is attached to the infinitive "thinking". Thus making the complete action clause, "never stop thinking". The direct object of which is "new ways to harm our country".

Because we are adding a negative word ("never"), we must turn "neither" into "either" in order to maintain the meaning, because double negatives are not allowed in English. So now, we can replace the original sentence with:

"Our enemies never stop thinking about new ways to harm our country and our people, and we never stop thinking about new ways to harm our country and our people either."

Take it to any English teacher. I can't believe that this is even being disputed. :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: Ooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 03:30:50 GMT

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

---

^ I can't believe you are that fucking retarded to even attempt to make it sound like he said something he did not say.

---

---

Subject: Ooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 03:34:54 GMT

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

---

And I can't believe it's not butter. But guess what? I'm still right.

---

---

Subject: Ooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 03:40:15 GMT

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

---

SEAL And I can't believe it's not butter. But guess what? I'm still right.

---

actually no, you are a dumb ass.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 03:47:48 GMT

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

---

Maybe you'd like to counter my posts with actual things to say? Ya know, like: "This statement is wrong because of the following reasons.", or "I disagree with the point you make because of XYZ."

As soon as you're ready to grow up and stop playing a childish game of name-calling, I'll take your replies seriously.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 03:48:47 GMT

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

---

SEALMaybe you'd like to counter my posts with actual things to say? Ya know, like: "This statement is wrong because of the following reasons.", or "I disagree with the point you make because of XYZ."

As soon as you're ready to grow up and stop playing a childish game of name-calling, I'll take your replies seriously.

Nope, you are still a dumb ass.

You knew what he said and it does not matter how grammatically incorrect he was.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 03:52:23 GMT

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

---

Congratulations.

You missed the point. Again.

I know what he meant, but that does not excuse his statement. Maybe if you bothered to look at my previous posts in this thread you would have noticed that I have mentioned that. In fact, I've had to mention it several times because people like you have skulls that are a little to thick.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 03:54:22 GMT



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

---

SEALCongratulations.

You missed the point. Again.

I know what he meant, but that does not excuse his statement. Maybe if you bothered to look at my previous posts in this thread you would have noticed that I have mentioned that. In fact, I've had to mention it several times because people like you have skulls that are a little to thick.

This is your meager attempt to flame Bush for some unmeaningful reason.

He said something and everyone knew what he meant.

You sit here taking the quote out of context arguing something that has no point at all.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 04:01:56 GMT

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

---

How did I take the quote out of context? I explained EVERY alteration I made to the resulting sentence at the end of my post.

There is plenty of point. Many people don't feel Bush is fit to run because they don't like the idea of having a president who can't even speak correct English. If he can't handle basic grammar, how can he handle a country? If you disagree, fine. Just don't be a 12 year old and go around calling names.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 04:03:43 GMT

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

---

SEALHow did I take the quote out of context? I explained EVERY alteration I made to the resulting sentence at the end of my post.

There is plenty of point. Many people don't feel Bush is fit to run because they don't like the idea of having a president who can't even speak correct English. If he can't handle basic grammar, how can he handle a country? If you disagree, fine. Just don't be a 12 year old and go around calling names.

You took the quote out of context because you did not provide the entire speech with it.

And he did not mess up grammatically. He said exactly what he said. Both sides are thinking of ways to harm the country. One side thinks of them so they can stop them the other side thinks of them so they can do them.

In no way did he screw up!

BTW, you are still a dumb ass.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 04:11:05 GMT

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

---

Nodbugger, grow the fuck up.

Adding the rest of the speech would not have added nor taken away any meaning. The two sentences I included were a complete, self-contained, and independant thought.

NodbuggerBoth sides are thinking of ways to harm the country.

You're the one skewing meanings here. He said "our country". Both sides (the enemy and us) are thinking of ways to harm our country.

NodbuggerIn no way did he screw up!

Interesting. I can find at least 10 media sources that think he did.

Google Search: "+and neither +do +we", bush

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 04:13:48 GMT

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

---

SEALNodbugger, grow the fuck up.

Adding the rest of the speech would not have added nor taken away any meaning. The two sentences I included were a complete, self-contained, and independant thought.

NodbuggerBoth sides are thinking of ways to harm the country.

You're the one skewing meanings here. He said "our country". Both sides (the enemy and us) are thinking of ways to harm our country.

NodbuggerIn no way did he screw up!

Interesting. I can find at least 10 media sources that think he did.

Google Search: "+and neither +do +we", bush

He did not miss speak.

He said both sides are thinking of new ways to harm our country.

Which is 100% true. they are just thinking about these ways for different reasons.  
Or is that really hard for you to understand?

When you add the rest of the speech in there, which talks about the ways they want to hurt us, it makes perfect sense.

---

---

Subject: Oooops  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 04:19:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

He wasn't mistaken in what he said, he just didn't use the best means possible to convey the message. As I mentioned before, if he stoped treating America like children with ADD, and stop using words and phrases simply to draw attention and sound "cool", "mistakes" like this wouldn't occur. He used the same phrase structure twice. Why? Because it sounds better. "blah blah blah, and so are we." Had he phrased the meaning in a different way, the same thing could have been stated, without the screw up.

---

---

Subject: Oooops  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 04:23:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NodbuggerHe said both sides are thinking of new ways to harm our country. Which is 100% true.

I certainly hope it's not true. I think it's safe to say that you're the dumbass now.

Step aside, Bush! We have a new village idiot!

---

---

Subject: Oooops  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 04:25:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I can't believe I have to say this.. I feel so dirty now.

I have to agree with Nodbugger on this one SEAL (ewww, did I actually say that?)

Thinking of ways to harm America is something that should be done. Trying to figure out all the possible ways America can be attacked is one of the better ways to prepare an adequate defence.

---

---

Subject: Oooops  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 04:34:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You see, Nodbugger? That's how civilized people debate. You should take notes. Warranto said "I disagree with you, Seal. And here is why."

Warranto: I see your point, but grammatically, I see the sentence as meaning: "The Bush Administration is seeking new ways to harm our country". I see how it can be argued your way, but somehow I seriously doubt Bush said all of that on purpose.

For those fuckwits out there \*cough\* Nodbugger \*cough\*, let me reiterate that that is what I see as the grammatical meaning and I am well aware that he did not mean it he wants to harm America.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 04:38:18 GMT

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

---

heh.. like I said; what was spoken was correct, it just wasn't the best way to do so. And this is speaking from years of effective speaking training and instruction.

edit: it's not so much of a grammar thing as a structure thing. grammatically is WAS correct, however teh sentance structure was what caused the confusion)

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 04:46:13 GMT

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

---

Then maybe you'd like to explain why White House spokesman Scott McClellan said Bush's statement "just shows even the most straightforward and plain-spoken people misspeak." instead of "Bush meant that we must never stop thinking of ways to harm our nation in order to best defend it, but it was worded oddly."?

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 04:51:04 GMT

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

---

misspeak

\Mis\*speak", v. t. To utter wrongly.

Nothing wrong with it grammatically, just not spoken (done) in the best way.

but remember, even double negatives can sometimes be grammatically correct. "Nobody doesn't

like something", believe it or not is grammatically correct.

---

---

Subject: Oooops  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 05:01:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I would say that's quite an incomplete definition, first off. And more importantly, the man is implying that what was said was not intentional.

And I never said anything was wrong with the grammar of the sentence, I said "the grammatical meaning...", etc.

You say "not spoken in the best way" even though your own definition says "wrongly". "Not the best" and "wrong" aren't exactly the same.

I'm going to go to bed. I'll pick this up in the morning. Good night!

---

---

Subject: Oooops  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 05:13:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

pff. semantics. Though I think we have ended up arguing for the same point, but because of the circumstances are agruing against each other.

Regardless, thats the complete definition, you can look it up if you want.

Anyways this is a case of we're both right. The meaning of it can be interpreted in the way you state, though there is nothing inately wrong with the structure of it. And it's the incorrect grammatical meaning of it that you state is the cause of my "not the best way of saying it."

So I can confidantly say your right, because well, I'm right as well!

---

---

Subject: Oooops  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 09:20:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

He was grammatically correct. There is nothing wrong or incorrect in saying that they are thinking of ways to harm the country. What you infer is that he means to act on these ways and actually harm the country... when it's obvious that he actually means that he will act to defend against these ways.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

---

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 12:18:32 GMT

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

---

I guess we will just have to call up Bush and ask.

Is this the first thread in the Hot Issues forum to end so peacefully?

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 14:34:24 GMT

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

---

SEAL I guess we will just have to call up Bush and ask.

Is this the first thread in the Hot Issues forum to end so peacefully?

Nope...fuck you

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 15:04:22 GMT

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

---

LOL...

Well, if you EVER needed proof of nodbuggers maturity, and therefore reasons not to interpret his arguments as acutally including something intelligent, that post right there would be it.

"I lost, so I'm going to resort to namecalling!"

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 15:12:26 GMT

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

---

warrantoLOL...

Well, if you EVER needed proof of nodbuggers maturity, and therefore reasons not to interpret his arguments as acutally including something intelligent, that post right there would be it.

"I lost, so I'm going to resort to namecalling!"

I tried intelligent posts, but they didn't seem to get through to him, but it only took a few posts after the name calling to end this thread in my favor.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 15:31:36 GMT

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

---

Endin your favor? lol, nice logic there.

"I called him a name so I won!"

Lets see what you actually won one, shall we?

arguement 1: "What Bush said was correct, he did not screw up!"

- only partially correct, as I've stated he didn't use the best way to convey the message, so because of the way a large number of people interpreted the speech, he did indeed screw up.

arguement 2: "He did not misspeak."

- Even the White House spokesman stated that Bush has misspoken.

arguement 3 "He did not messa up grammatically!"

- on this one your correct.

wow, 1 1/2 of the arguements out of 3. That is 50%, true. However it hardly constitiues ending in your favor. Especially because you've done enough damage to yourself in the process.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 15:54:19 GMT

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

---

How did I damage myself?

I have always called him a dumb ass for his constant use of dumbassness.

He knows and anyone with a brain knew what Bush was talking about.

Bush haters like him take the quote out of context and put a different meaning on it in an attempt to make him look bad.

I can see a double meaning in it, but as I said before , anyone with a brain would know which meaning he intended for it.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 16:17:13 GMT

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

---

How did you damage yourself? I'm sure any competant debater here will tell you that doing

---

nothing but insulting people will damage any future credibility you even have the chance of possessing.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 17:20:32 GMT

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

---

SEALWho are you trying to convince? Yourself?...

In grammatical terms, I never said it was correct. I already understood the alternative meaning of that segment of the speech, but it would be sheer idiocy to interpret it any other way. As I said, "and neither do we" makes well enough sense if you would just realize that by referring to its antecedent in this way, he means to anticipate and counteract such attempts. It was worded this way because the speech is clearly trying to make it memorable by establishing a parallel line of thought.

I concede that that particular segment could've been worded better, as it does stop to make you think. If you listened more closely, however, in practical terms, the speech makes perfect sense.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 20:01:54 GMT

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

---

"It was worded this way because the speech is clearly trying to make it memorable by establishing a parallel line of thought."

Which is more likely, given Bush's track record of saying dumb things:

-He made a profound and memorable statement that implied that we need to think like a terrorist to catch a terrorist.

or...

-He misspoke, like White House spokesman Scott McClellan said, and to say otherwise is giving Bush too much credit.

The majority of news sources agree with the latter. Whatever floats your boat. Sorry for being so curt earlier with "Who are you trying to convince? Yourself?..." :oops:

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 22:18:05 GMT



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

---

NodbuggerHe knows and anyone with a brain knew what Bush was talking about. Bush haters like him take the quote out of context and put a different meaning on it in an attempt to make him look bad.

I can see a double meaning in it, but as I said before , anyone with a brain would know which meaning he intended for it.

How is this quote out of context? People don't take Bush's linguistic mistakes out of context, because they're linguistic mistakes. And he makes a ton of them. Which doesn't exactly make me think highly of him as an intellectual. However, I would prefer to discuss Bush's incompetence in terms of policies instead of him talking like a fool.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 23:46:59 GMT

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

---

NO ONE, and I repeat NO ONE, interpreted his words as in Bush's Administration is thinking of how they can personally harm this country. None of you is so ignorant that you actually thought he was looking to attack the US. You laugh because his words could possibly mean something that he didn't intend to convey. Period. None of you actually interpreted his words the bad way. None of you watched or read that speech and said "OMG THE PRESIDENT IS GOING TO KILL US! MAN THE BATTLE STATIONS!"

If you did, then you are a real fucking idiot and you need mental help.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 23:57:47 GMT

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

---

if no one interpreted that way, why did the White House spokesperson make that preceding statement about Bush misspeaking?

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 01:37:21 GMT

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

---

Probably to make both sides happy.

Edit:

SEAL

-He made a profound and memorable statement that implied that we need to think like a terrorist to catch a terrorist...

lol, I would not go as far as "profound and memorable," but that is what he tried to imply. But of course, I agree with you that this has not turned out well.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 05:58:17 GMT

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

---

Just because some spokesman said that, doesn't make it true. I believe that he did say what he meant, grammatically, but there are better ways he may have said it. I wouldn't say that it's a lack of intelligence or anything sinister like that. If the press hadn't made such a big deal about it, I don't think it would have even got this far.

Case in point... Kerry fell skiing and fell off his bicycle... neither story got into left-wing media and instead stayed on Drudge Report. Then Bush falls from his mountain bike on a rough downhill trail and Kerry pokes fun at him. This makes it into the media. If Bush's not-the-best phrasing got into the news, shouldn't it also be news when Kerry falls off his bike?

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 07:58:16 GMT

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

---

Kerry falling off his bike doesn't mean he's an incompetent leader. Just as much as Bush attempted that poor use of parallelism doesn't mean he's a bad leader. Remember what I said a while ago about this being like a popularity contest? It was referring to moronic attacks like the ones you've mentioned as an attempt to get voters to go for the other guy. It's really quite pathetic, but it definitely isn't a new tactic.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 08:01:21 GMT

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

---

I agree. It isn't, in fact, a big deal and should have never gotten this far.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 10:58:17 GMT

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

---

Phht...no one can beat choking on a pretzel...not even Bush.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 11:22:50 GMT

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

---

Crimson

Case in point... Kerry fell skiing and fell off his bicycle... neither story got into left-wing media and instead stayed on Drudge Report. Then Bush falls from his mountain bike on a rough downhill trail and Kerry pokes fun at him. This makes it into the media. If Bush's not-the-best phrasing got into the news, shouldn't it also be news when Kerry falls off his bike?

Just to be fair, I personally never heard any of this on the mainstream media. Also, Matt Drudge is pretty much on the payroll of the Republican Party now. He also was always a rumor magazine, anyways. If Drudge prints something that no one else does, that doesn't mean that everyone else is biased.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 16:09:25 GMT

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

---

I never said Drudge wasn't biased. The point is, none of this should make it into the mainstream media.

---

---

Subject: Oooops

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 17:48:05 GMT

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

---

Well, I didn't hear anything about it on my on-and-off viewing of the networks, so I'm betting it's a little story that they just put up to fill airtime because they had nothing else to run.

---