
Subject: Bush Takes Back State of the Union Speech
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 03 Feb 2006 02:36:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And it only took one day... Why are we supposed to listen to the President when his own administration says his speech isn't even true?

Quote:Administration backs off Bush's vow to reduce Mideast oil imports
By Kevin G. Hall
Knight Ridder Newspapers

WASHINGTON - One day after President Bush vowed to reduce America's dependence on Middle East oil by cutting imports from there 75 percent by 2025, his energy secretary and national economic adviser said Wednesday that the president didn't mean it literally.

Oh, and check this out:
<http://connecticutblog.blogspot.com/2006/02/see-lieberman-ju mp-for-joy.html>

Subject: Re: Bush Takes Back State of the Union Speech
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 03 Feb 2006 13:27:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't see how it was wrong, the article clearly states that they want to use less middle eastern oil, which is exactly what bush said.

Subject: Re: Bush Takes Back State of the Union Speech
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 03 Feb 2006 17:03:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ah, but that is splitting hairs, Nodbugger.

Bush DID make a statement about replacing "more than 75 percent of our oil imports from the Middle East by 2025."

Only to have his administration take that back, stating that Bush meant it in such a way that "This was purely an example."

Whether or not this is true, it's still Bush showing his lack of intelligence. How many times has Bush stated something that "Wasn't how it sounded," or, "Has been misinterpreted"? It seems to be quite often that an explanation of what "Bush really meant" had to be issued.

Subject: Re: Bush Takes Back State of the Union Speech
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 03 Feb 2006 20:28:49 GMT

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

How is it unintelligent to want to remove dependence on foreign oil by 2025?

Subject: Re: Bush Takes Back State of the Union Speech

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 03 Feb 2006 21:29:35 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Fri, 03 February 2006 12:03Ah, but that is splitting hairs, Nodbugger.

Bush DID make a statement about replacing "more than 75 percent of our oil imports from the Middle East by 2025."

Only to have his administration take that back, stating that Bush meant it in such a way that "This was purely an example."

Whether or not this is true, it's still Bush showing his lack of intelligence. How many times has Bush stated something that "Wasn't how it sounded," or, "Has been misinterpreted"? It seems to be quite often that an explanation of what "Bush really meant" had to be issued.

I believe you are splitting hairs.

Either way, our dependence will not be on oil from the middle east.

Subject: Re: Bush Takes Back State of the Union Speech

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 04 Feb 2006 00:05:15 GMT

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

Aircraftkiller wrote on Fri, 03 February 2006 13:28How is it unintelligent to want to remove dependence on foreign oil by 2025?

It's not. But to state one thing, when you (according to his administration) actually meant something else, is.

Quote:I believe you are splitting hairs.

Either way, our dependence will not be on oil from the middle east.

Heh, it will be on Canada

Subject: Re: Bush Takes Back State of the Union Speech

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Sat, 04 Feb 2006 00:38:33 GMT

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

The president saying that he is committed to reducing middle east oil 75% by 2025 is just about as stupid as someone saying that he didn't mean it literally, or someone arguing about who we should believe.

President Bush will most likely be DEAD by 2025, or at least in an electric wheeled cart eating mashed carrots. I think it is OBVIOUS that whatever he said wasn't meant LITERALLY as HIM being dedicated to it; in two years, he won't give a rat's ass about it.

What I think is REALLY stupid is that some far-left liberal tool would begin a forum topic entitled "Bush Takes Back State of the Union Speech", when all they really want to talk about is one line in the entire speech.

Subject: Re: Bush Takes Back State of the Union Speech
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sat, 04 Feb 2006 08:27:19 GMT

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

Will President Bush be in office in 2025? Seems pretty dumb to be worrying about this no matter what...

Subject: Re: Bush Takes Back State of the Union Speech
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Tue, 21 Feb 2006 15:03:09 GMT

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

Yay, the US now want 100 more nuclear plants to reduce this dependency. How nice is that? It's nicer to have nuclear waste than to depend on the middle east...

Subject: Re: Bush Takes Back State of the Union Speech
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 21 Feb 2006 15:55:33 GMT

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

Actually, yes, it is nicer. It's a hell of a lot safer, too; nuclear power stations have a much lower accident rate than do oil-fired plants. Not only that, but the same mass of fuel that will last a nuclear plant for months takes an oil plant mere MINUTES to burn through (though Uranium is, admittedly, a more limited resource). Both types have roughly the same conversion efficiency (+/- 60%), which is the current known limit for systems which use superheated steam to turn a turbine. Nuclear plants do not produce the same volume of pollution that conventional plants do; the only problem that exists right now is that of finding a place to store the radioactive waste. Nuclear plants will also work anywhere, unlike other alternatives such as solar, hydroelectric, and wind.

Until fusion finally gets up on its legs, nuclear fission is the best option we've got to kill dependence on fossil fuel power (including coal as well, which is still the dominant source).

Subject: Re: Bush Takes Back State of the Union Speech

Posted by [Scythar](#) on Wed, 22 Feb 2006 19:24:10 GMT

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

Nukelt15 wrote on Tue, 21 February 2006 10:55

Until fusion finally gets up on its legs, nuclear fission is the best option we've got to kill dependance on fossil fuel power (including coal as well, which is still the dominant source).

Kind of like me playing Renegade until Duke Nukem: Forever comes out

OR, we could solve several issues in on shot/shit: Ban condoms and birth regulations, and then remove excessive babies from their families and insert them into the giant human farm in which they create power, Matrix-style...

But yeah, seriously, there aren't any real alternative to nuclear power yet in most countries. It's quite clean, contrary to the common belief, as long as the waste is stored well. Maybe, if NASA got their space elevator up and running, we could safely transfer the waste to space too.
