
Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [Panther](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 01:35:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Post your response to tonight's debate here.

To me Kerry is winning, but I know saying that will merely anger the republicans here. Sorry in advance.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 01:39:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kerry just fucked himself on the last question about Homeland security and Bush nailed him on it. Bush tripled the budget for homeland security. He also nailed Kerry on the fact that Kerry voted to CUT Intelligence by \$7.5 billion after the first WTC bombing. Kerry is an idiot. Plain and simple. W '04.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 02:07:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430Kerry is an idiot. Plain and simple.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 02:13:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:I'm wishi-washi, and I'm a flip-flopper.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 03:00:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I watched the whole thing as objectively as possible, and I must say that Bush won.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 14:41:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hm...I'd say it was pretty much a tie, both candidates handled themselves well, Bush much better than his last appearance.

However, the tie-braker will probably be the number of lies Bush told, which were fairly numerous.

Here's a transcript of the whole thing, in case anyone's interested:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/08/politics/campaign/09dtext-full.html?oref=login&pagewanted=print&position=>

More later.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 14:56:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There were no lies Bush told that I heard.

Kerry however lied about all those Generals he was talking about.

And he made a few ridiculous statements.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 14:59:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

General Schizgelblizy or whatever his name was, who Kerry said got removed from his post before he wanted to be? Well, that one turns out to actually be true. There's no better person to talk to on this matter than the General himself, who says that he was prematurely forced from his post.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 15:04:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngiGeneral Schizgelblizy or whatever his name was, who Kerry said got removed from his post before he wanted to be? Well, that one turns out to actually be true. There's no better person to talk to on this matter than the General himself, who says that he was prematurely forced from his post.

The only one who was retired early was Clark. Shinseki(SP) had his retirement papers in hand. That jack ass made the Army wear berets. That is gay as hell and many people hate him for that.

And he also said something about the Air Force General during the Gulf War who led the air

campaign. He did no thing. He was on the Joint Chiefs of staff and had nothing to do with the air campaign.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 18:52:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:DEGENHART: Senator Kerry, suppose you are speaking with a voter who believed abortion is murder and the voter asked for reassurance that his or her tax dollars would not go to support abortion, what would you say to that person?

KERRY: I would say to that person exactly what I will say to you right now.

First of all, I cannot tell you how deeply I respect the belief about life and when it begins. I'm a Catholic, raised a Catholic. I was an altar boy. Religion has been a huge part of my life. It helped lead me through a war, leads me today.

But I can't take what is an article of faith for me and legislate it for someone who doesn't share that article of faith, whether they be agnostic, atheist, Jew, Protestant, whatever. I can't do that.

But I can counsel people. I can talk reasonably about life and about responsibility. I can talk to people, as my wife Teresa does, about making other choices, and about abstinence, and about all these other things that we ought to do as a responsible society.

But as a president, I have to represent all the people in the nation. And I have to make that judgment.

Now, I believe that you can take that position and not be pro- abortion, but you have to afford people their constitutional rights. And that means being smart about allowing people to be fully educated, to know what their options are in life, and making certain that you don't deny a poor person the right to be able to have whatever the constitution affords them if they can't afford it otherwise.

That's why I think it's important. That's why I think it's important for the United States, for instance, not to have this rigid ideological restriction on helping families around the world to be able to make a smart decision about family planning.

You'll help prevent AIDS.

You'll help prevent unwanted children, unwanted pregnancies.

You'll actually do a better job, I think, of passing on the moral responsibility that is expressed in your question. And I truly respect it.

Great way to dodge the question with a convoluted answer like that, Senator! :thumbsup:

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 23:33:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OK, Bush won. Why? Because when Kerry spoke, I had to keep checking to make sure I hadn't started watching last week's debate by mistake. I didn't hear much different from him than what he said last week... at least in regards to foreign policy.

Even after Bush, Cheney, and several news sites corrected the fact that the costs in Iraq are \$120 billion, he still continues to stick with his \$200b figure.

I wish Bush would have hit more on the contents of the Duelfer report, but I know he wouldn't really want to hit the UN's corruption too hard when his staffers are probably still digesting the massive report.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 23:44:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

KerryAnd that means being smart about allowing people to be fully educated, to know what their options are in life, and making certain that you don't deny a poor person the right to be able to have whatever the constitution affords them if they can't afford it otherwise.

YAY!! If he's elected then I can help poor people kill their unborn children! WOOT WOOT WOOT WOOT WOOT WOOT!!!!!!

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 09 Oct 2004 23:51:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's funny to hear him suggest that people have a constitutional right to abortion.

Exactly which amendment guarantees the right to an abortion, Senator? :rolleyes:

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 05:12:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kerry only says what Bush didn't do. He almost never said what he would do, but he had a 'plan' for everything. But he never said how these plans worked.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 12:53:50 GMT

SuperFlyingEngiHm...I'd say it was pretty much a tie, both candidates handled themselves well, Bush much better than his last appearance.

However, the tie-braker will probably be the number of lies Bush told, which were fairly numerous.

Here's a transcript of the whole thing, in case anyone's interested:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/08/politics/campaign/09dtext-full.html?oref=login&pagewanted=print&position=>

More later.

Bush did not tell any lies, or at least any more than Kerry or any other politician. He DID NOT lie to the nation. British intelligence, Russian intelligence, Chinese intelligence and American intelligence ALL SAID nukes were in Iraq, that's pretty damn sure there they were and THEY WERE THERE they were shipped out before the war or still in the ground somewhere. That is not a lie saying WMD's were there then we can't find them, it would be a lie if all of the intelligence agencies said "there not there don't go do it". Stupid ass liberals.

"Every word that comes out of that man's (John Kerry) mouth is a lie" - My CISCO teacher

John Kerry "You can not send troops into war with out the proper tools to fight it, blah blah blah moms and dads buying armor off the internet" - WHY DID HE VOTE AGAINST IT THEN?? ANOTHER BLATENT LOAD OF CRAP OUT OF HIS MOUTH

John Kerry is for the middle-class - I just have to laugh at this one, why did he vote against tax breaks that would have benefited the middle-class??

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 15:28:21 GMT

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

cowmisfitBush did not tell any lies, or at least any more than Kerry or any other politician. He DID NOT lie to the nation. British intelligence, Russian intelligence, Chinese intelligence and American intelligence ALL SAID nukes were in Iraq, that's pretty damn sure there they were and THEY WERE THERE they were shipped out before the war or still in the ground somewhere.

What about the Duelfer report that says that Saddam was in no way able to procure WMDs, and hadn't had them since roughly 1991? Unless we were working on intelligence 13+ years old, Bush was lying.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 16:11:55 GMT

SuperFlyingEngicowmisfitBush did not tell any lies, or at least any more than Kerry or any other politician. He DID NOT lie to the nation. British intelligence, Russian intelligence, Chinese intelligence and American intelligence ALL SAID nukes were in Iraq, that's pretty damn sure there they were and THEY WERE THERE they were shipped out before the war or still in the ground somewhere.

What about the Duelfer report that says that Saddam was in no way able to procure WMDs, and hadn't had them since roughly 1991? Unless we were working on intelligence 13+ years old, Bush was lying.

<http://www.thisislondon.com/news/articles/13656141?source=Evening%20Standard>

Quote: The author of the final report into Iraqi weapons of mass destruction threw Tony Blair and George Bush a lifeline today by saying the world was "better off" without Saddam Hussein.

Quote: But giving evidence to the Senate armed services committee, he supported the military campaign. "The world is better off," he said.

Quote: He said Saddam had made "a lot of progress" in eroding sanctions to the point at which he could begin building such weapons again - in fact it was the terror attacks of September 11 that undermined his plans.

Quote: The report reveals how Saddam breached sanctions by abusing the oil-for-food programme. Instead of ensuring oil from Iraq was used to buy food and medicine for its people, the CIA-sponsored report alleges he spent millions bribing UN staff and foreign governments.

No he wasn't.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 16:29:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

But he did not have WMDs, which is what Bush repeatedly, over and over and over said. Charles Duelfer is doing all he can to help Bush out, but there really isn't all that much he can do.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 16:29:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's not a lifeline when the primary justification for the war turns out to be false, just FYI.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [Panther](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 17:31:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Why are you people arguing about the debate? Everyone's opinion will be the same when it's all said and done...

Subject: Re: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 17:46:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

PantherPost your response to tonight's debate here.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [Panther](#) on Sun, 10 Oct 2004 18:04:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

hmm.. you do have a point..

but, jeez... i didnt expect it to be like "YOUR RESPONZE IS WRONG!! omg" :/

So much hate just over politics....

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.
Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 00:33:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngiBut he did not have WMDs, which is what Bush repeatedly, over and over and over said. Charles Duelfer is doing all he can to help Bush out, but there really isn't all that much he can do.

Dude, im trying to be "nice" in these threads as i've been advised by a few people, but your making it afully damn hard to be. IF FUCKING ALL OF THE WORLD POWERS TOLD YOU BEFORE THIS NEW REPORT CAME OUT THAT HE HAD THEM IT WOULD NOT BE A DAMN LIE WHICH IS EXACTLY WHAT HAPPEND.

I pity your goal, and your apparent inability to understand simple concepts.

christ help us

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 00:52:48 GMT

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

It's a lie if it's not true. That's sort of the definition or something...

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 01:01:47 GMT

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

Actually no, a lie is purposely presenting a falsity as being something truthful.

For example, if I knew you were going to get \$500 in the mail, a lie would be "You're needed down at the office!" when you're really not. That way I can steal your money and you'd be none the wiser.

The justification for war may have been wrong. That doesn't make it a lie though.

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 01:25:52 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi*insert the crap about "BUSH LIED!!" here*

It's official: you're Nodbugger's liberal counterpart (no offense, Nodbugger).

Subject: New Presidential Debate Thread.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 11 Oct 2004 04:18:15 GMT

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

How can this be made ANY more clear? Saddam didn't have WMD (perhaps, I'm still not convinced because it doesn't make any logical sense to me that he didn't have them and then deceived the inspectors)... and theoretically he didn't have the means to make/come across said weapons... but also in the report is a discussion of the Oil for Palaces program which Saddam was using to bribe France, Germany, and Russia to get the sanctions on Iraq lifted. Doesn't it make sense? All this stuff going around trying to make it sound like Saddam was just some peaceful guy running a prosperous nation of people who loved their dictator? Wouldn't it make sense that it's all a conspiracy to get the sanctions lifted? Saddam's a nice guy... he doesn't need

these little sanctions in his way. I think he's served his pennance... right?
