

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 21:52:32 GMT

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

---

I can't vote directly yet, so my only hope is to try and influence old people. Anyway, test your friends!

ANSWERS:

1. Depends
2. Not C or E
3. Not D, B is half credit
4. A
5. A
6. A or B, not all Republicans are bad
7. C or D

SCORING RUBRIC:

5-7: A well-informed voter

3-4: Pushing it...

0-2: You must be one of Rush Limbaugh's dittoheads.

I contemplated putting this in the Politics section, but not too many people read that one, and I had to express my political stance. Remember this, if you would vote for Bush, vote for the Democratic presidential candidate instead to make up for my inability to vote, please.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 21:54:39 GMT

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

---

That was completely pointless. If young Americans will start doing this as an alternative to actually looking up the issues that each politician stands for and what their history is, well, I think I'll be finding a different country to live in... Before the shit hits the fan.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 21:58:18 GMT

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

---

Pardon me, but I actually did look up political issues...in english, the word "youth" doesn't translate into "stupid".

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 22:06:41 GMT

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

---

Your mastery of low-end sarcasm isn't showing anything more than you biting into Democratic propaganda. You sound almost like another Michael Moore...

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 22:31:25 GMT

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

---

While I must agree with you that, yes, I'm not a master of sarcasm, are you saying that Bush is a good President? Bush has hurt America with big tax cuts that primarily help the rich. Now, you may be saying that it only seems like poor people didn't get much help because of Democrats distorting statistics with their "propaganda". Here's a simplified version: The bottom 60% of income levels in America got 14.7 % of the help from Bush's tax cuts. And Bush has always been saying the vast majority of the help from his tax cuts will go to those at the bottom of the spectrum. Yep, that's definitely a mark of a great president. [Look, more sarcasm!] Now, on to the so-called "War on       ". Despite what FOX news tells you [FOX news is conservative propaganda if there ever was any, because FOX is basically a branch of conservatives. One way to support this is that the President of FOX was an advisor to George Bush Senior.] there really aren't any "Weapons of Mass Destruction" in Iraq. There really never were any, although I will bet my soul that troops will "find" some of them right before the election. Now, I am all for evil dictators like Saddam being kicked out of power, but not under false pretexts. [Weapons of Mass Destruction]. Besides, Bush went about removing Saddam in about the worst way possible. He basically flicked off the U.N. and went his merry way.

Now tell me I don't look up the issues. Although it's hard for me to prove over a chatroom, I didn't cruise over to Wherever.com and look all this up. I knew this. That's why I don't like Bush. That's why I utilized my capacity for sarcasm. And that's why I wish I could vote.

Oh, and Al Franken's books aren't propaganda. They're facts. So I guess I've been biting into the truth too much. Sorry. [Yay! More sarcasm!]

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 22:33:44 GMT

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

---

Don't expect to get much of a positive response to a non-right wing political opinion on these forums.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 22:49:15 GMT

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

---

Yeah, like I said, you bit into propaganda. Look up the tax statistics? Who pays the most? That's right, the wealthy do. It's only "fair" that they get a proportional share of their money back. People who are in the middle class don't pay nearly as much as the wealthy citizens do. People who are poor pay next to nothing, if nothing at all. So why do they deserve tax breaks of thousands of dollars? Because they're poor? Sorry dude, look up the Constitution - where in it does it state that your fellow man is required to work FOR YOU instead of work for himself? The entire point of free enterprise is not to dole out money to the government to feed bloated social projects, it's to get yourself ahead in life. If you don't like this and the way the government was formed, you do have the option of trying to change it - however, you'd fit in more with Germany, seeing as how it's a welfare state.

So what if he told the UN to fuck off? We sat on our hands for twelve years while they did nothing but pass meaningless resolutions that Saddam ignored. I don't care WHAT pretext we went in under, every single one of them cited was a valid justification to enter the country and overtake it by force.

Quote:Oh, and Al Franken's books aren't propaganda. They're facts.

"A half truth is always a full lie."

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 23:01:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yes, it is one view that since rich people pay more taxes, they should get more back from tax cuts. But then again, rich people don't have to go hungry. Rich people don't have to make sacrifices to put their children through college. Rich people don't have to work two jobs just to support their kids. But, I guess fair is fair.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 23:05:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

By the way:  
Whether or not something is propaganda does not depend on whether it's true or not.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [bigjoe14](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 23:16:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Tax cuts being only for the rich is a lie. We all got the tax cuts. The only people who didn't were the people on welfare who, may I remind you, don't have to pay taxes. The only people who got the tax cuts were the people who pay taxes, not just "rich people". Stop spinning.

Oh, and I see that you read Al Franken books, or "King Contradiction" as I like to call him. Yea, the one who complained that Ann Coulter was too insulting, yet he wrote a book called "Rush Limbaugh is a Big, Fat, Idiot." :rolleyes:

[http://www.amazon.com/gp/reader/0440508649/ref=sib\\_dp\\_pt/103-0830515-5934261#reader-link](http://www.amazon.com/gp/reader/0440508649/ref=sib_dp_pt/103-0830515-5934261#reader-link)

People who hate America read Al Franken books.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 23:22:56 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiYes, it is one view that since rich people pay more taxes, they should get more back from tax cuts. But then again, rich people don't have to go hungry. Rich people don't have to make sacrifices to put their children through college. Rich people don't have to work two jobs just to support their kids. But, I guess fair is fair.

And your point is? You think it's alright to circumvent the Constitution, making one man into an economic slave for another man's prosperity? Poverty is a sad thing, I won't argue with you about that. However, you make it out to be that eliminating poverty is the job of everyone who's wealthier than you. Do you deserve money because others have it?

That, my friend, is called jealousy. Some people grow up and become mature enough to figure out that coveting what others have and being irrationally jealous of them is simply nothing but a self-destructing ideal that people believe in. The premise is negative. The emotions you receive from it are negative. All it does is destroy whoever your personality is, leaving you a corrupt, empty shell after greed and power -- all because you want it since others have it.

If you worked for your whole life, had millions of dollars to live off of, and ended up being sucked dry by taxes - would you feel the same way? I seriously doubt it.

It's not the federal government's job to feed the hungry or shelter the poor. It's the government's job to protect us from foreign invaders, among other things.

If you want to help eliminate poverty - do it by donating your own time and money to the cause. Not by forcing others to do what you think they should do.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [asdfg195](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 23:27:40 GMT

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

---

And people wonder why companies are outsourcing. If taxes weren't so high for companies to feed people that don't want to work then maybe some would bother staying in the US.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 23:29:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That wasn't very funny. Ever hear of Berke Breathed? People like him are able to make people laugh at themselves, when I was a conservative (I'm now a Libertarian/Juris Naturalist), I laughed, and still laugh at it all the time.

And take a look the Whats-his-name Jones of the Free-Lance Star. He pissed off and amused just about everybody in the area.

You really need to make your stuff better so many people are amused.

SuperFlyingEngiRich people don't have to work two jobs just to support their kids.

Maybe because TAXES are bogging down on families? You know who get hurt the MOST by liberal economic policy? The middle class. They can't afford great tax avoidance like the rich, yet they don't get things like welfare for the rich.

Look at the Salvation Army, Goodwill and the Red Cross, THAT'S how we should be helping the poor; not by having the government rob Dan to help Joe. Read some Richard Maybury books, it'll give you a WHOLE new perspective on things.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [smwScott](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 23:43:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I certainly agree that Bush is a terrible president, although getting your facts from Al Franken is about the same as getting them from Dennis Miller. I think he's funny and I agree with his opinions, but they are just opinions.

The tax cuts were given with the purpose of giving money to the rich. \$100 isn't going to save a lower class family, \$15,000 is going towards buying some rich kid a Lexus. I'm not saying we should distribute the tax cuts unevenly, I'm saying we should raise taxes. By doing so the economy would improve and it would create more jobs.

About the decision to enter war - it was totally unjustified and done entirely for political reasons. It's sad how many people just go along with it. The best argument to give against Bush is to just show people where we were in 2000, and show them where we are now.

I would give a longer, more in depth opinion, but I only slept 2 hours last night and I'm not thinking too clear.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 30 Jan 2004 23:54:07 GMT

---

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

---

No, you aren't, 'cause the last time I checked, the economy was doing great... What're you even talking about?

More taxes? If you didn't know, tax cuts are exactly what Reagan passed, which led to Clinton's success... Now Bush passed them, and the economy is growing - we've won two wars, successful economy, you really think he's a horrible president?

Sure, okay... Lets put Hussien in power, since no one seems to object to him ruling anything..

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 00:34:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

smwScott.....I'm saying we should raise taxes. By doing so the economy would improve and it would create more jobs.....

Read this book:

<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0942617312/002-9285411-3484047?v=glance>

Go ahead, buy it, you won't regret it. After you're done with it, buy these too:

<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0942617312/002-9285411-3484047?v=glance>  
[http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/094261710X/qid=1075508827/sr=1-1/ref=sr\\_1\\_1/002-9285411-3484047?v=glance&s=books](http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/094261710X/qid=1075508827/sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/002-9285411-3484047?v=glance&s=books)

You won't regret buying those either.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 00:48:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ah, the wonders of economics. The solution to one problem is what causes the next. Raising taxes works fine for a while, but eventually the economy starts to decline. (people can't afford the things, so prices drop to a buyable range, only to have the economy slump because the amount of money being brought in is now less) Lowering the taxes stops this, but brings about it's own problems. People have money to spend, so the economy booms, until inflation catches up, and we're right back where we started. Solve that by raising taxes... and 'round and 'round we go.

Yes, this is only part of a larger picture, but in regards to the raising taxes question, I think it answers it. Same answer applies to bank loan rates as well.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

---

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 00:57:31 GMT

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

---

The following post concerns all countries, and is entirely my opinion(of course):

One's ability to succeed in life has everything to do with what one's parents can afford to provide, in the areas of education especially. Many people are born into poverty, and many are born into wealth. Obviously, the people whose parents are rich have a better chance to prosper in life. This isn't fair. I realize, of course, that "life isn't fair," but that's not an excuse to ignore the issue entirely. All of us have a social responsibility to help the less fortunate, be it through taxes, or volunteering our time.

There are poor people who manage to overcome the odds to attain success, and there are poor people who do nothing and live off of welfare. It's also important to remember that there are people who genuinely need welfare to help them survive long enough to get a job.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 01:01:33 GMT

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

---

The rich are rich... They're rich cause life worked for them. If your gonna give a tax cut that's across the board, the rich will make out better because they're paying more in the first place.

If two people have bank accounts at a fixed rate of 6%.

One with 1000\$ in the bank

One with 10000\$ in the bank

After one compounding,

One has 1060\$

One has 10600\$

The first guy says "hey how come he gets more than me! We have the same rate!"

The reason: He has more money than you to start.

This was the best financial analogy I could find. I've been thinking a lot about economics so this is the first thing that surfaced in my head.

I'm a republican and I support bush wholeheartedly. I don't see anything he's done that makes me go "that ain't right!" Everyone's so mortified and calling bush an evil infidel... I just don't get it. He's the president and he's doing presidential duties... I just don't get people's beef...

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 01:18:44 GMT

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

---

mrpirateThe following post concerns all countries, and is entirely my opinion(of course):

---

One's ability to succeed in life has everything to do with what one's parents can afford to provide, in the areas of education especially. Many people are born into poverty, and many are born into wealth. Obviously, the people whose parents are rich have a better chance to prosper in life. This isn't fair. I realize, of course, that "life isn't fair," but that's not an excuse to ignore the issue entirely. All of us have a social responsibility to help the less fortunate, be it through taxes, or volunteering our time.

There are poor people who manage to overcome the odds to attain success, and there are poor people who do nothing and live off of welfare. It's also important to remember that there are people who genuinely need welfare to help them survive long enough to get a job.

I ask this: "So?"

You think it's more fair to redistribute wealth to those who did nothing to deserve it?

You can keep spouting off about how we all have some invisible responsibility to take care of others... As if you're going to sit there and say that if your own money is being taken to give to someone else.

"Everything is possible for the man who doesn't have to do it himself."

You need to realize: This country has a set of rules. Those are defined in the Constitution. When you propose that we all have to give our money away to people, just to make life "fair" for them, what you're doing is being unfair to those who you're stealing from. Thus, you've made them into economic slaves.

Is that fair? No, it isn't. NOTHING IS FAIR. Get used to it! If you have problems with being poor, work! Get a job! Not everyone will give you handouts. And expecting people to feed and clothe you just because you're unable to do it is lunacy. If you want to do it, DO IT YOURSELF, donate YOUR OWN MONEY AND TIME to take care of those who are less fortunate than you are.

After all, it's YOUR self-proclaimed responsibility. Not anyone else's.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 01:21:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Aircraftkiller You need to realize: This country has a set of rules. Those are defined in the Constitution.

Our Charter of Rights and Freedoms is better than your Constitution.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 01:22:13 GMT

---

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

---

Yeah, and my penis is bigger than Canada. Your point?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 01:28:34 GMT

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

---

AircraftkillerYeah, and my penis is bigger than Canada. Your point?

Canada is larger by mass than America.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 01:29:12 GMT

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

---

mrpirateAll of us have a social responsibility to help the less fortunate, be it through taxes...

I don't pay taxes, because I have magical powers.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 02:23:54 GMT

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

---

JavaxcCanada is larger by mass than America

Hurray you can grow more crops.

But nothing much else beyond that, I'm sorry to say.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 02:29:10 GMT

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

---

Nah, we're not war monger's either.

---

---

Subject: "the quiz"  
Posted by [kittyhawk](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 02:43:14 GMT

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

---

Not to be an ass but it is kinda stupid

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [bigejoe14](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 03:53:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

JavafxNah, we're not war monger's either.  
At least we didn't legalize pot.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 03:56:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I was against that law. Furthermore, it was reprimanded. It is illegal.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 04:23:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Let's not turn this into a US vs. Canada thread. Because we all know that Canada SUCKS! Just kidding about the latter.

Just buy and read the damn books I linked to, problem solved.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 04:27:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Stop copying my signature

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 04:37:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quiet, Canadian!

EDIT: By the way, do you know imitation is a sign of admiration? lol

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 04:39:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Actually, I just looked at the number of which we joined.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 05:59:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Take it as a compliment! It's always nice to know others wish to emulate Canadians!

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 09:07:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You left-wingers still need to explain why it's my responsibility to help those who don't make as much money as I do. Don't tell me anything based on morals. We are not a communist society. If someone doesn't help make the bread, they shouldn't get to help eat the bread. I'd like to see more tax breaks for businesses, so they can afford to hire more people and create more jobs... then those people buy things and create more jobs.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Ferhago](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 14:21:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Cool this has ballooned into a large stereotype fight. It needs to be locked

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 14:32:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I don't know about everyone else, but I never said anything about you giving your money to those less fortunate. I was talking about Bush's tax cut being unfairly biased to the rich. Yes, it's true the rich definitely pay more taxes than the poor, but even then Bush's cuts gave too much to the wealthy. The best way to stimulate the economy is to let poor people pocket more money. Then, they immediately go out and buy things that they need, and therefore money given to them jumps right in to the economy. I didn't see any morals there. And poor people are helping to make the bread. What do you think would happen if every poor person just left the country? America would come crashing down. There would be no sanitation workers, few police, the armed forces would drastically decrease in size, and other jobs that make our nation what it is. About cutting taxes for companies to make more jobs, giving poor people more money back would still work better, because what would they do with it? Immediately buy things. Then, the companies still get the money, so they hire more people, and then more jobs gives more poor people more money, so they go out and buy things, which makes MORE jobs. And all this time, that money gets taxed, so the government prospers as well.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

---

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 16:49:05 GMT

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

---

And what would the rich do with the extra money? Invest it in the stock market. And what happens when you buy lots of stock? The price goes up. Both scenarios can be just fine for the economy. However, the tax cuts only benefitted the rich more because they are taxes more. If they did a 1% cut across the board, the rich would benefit more because 1% of their taxes is a lot more than 1% of some poor guy's taxes. It's math. It's all just twisting of facts to make someone look bad.

Let's use another scenario has been used. Let's say government workers in some random industry get a 4% raise every year. But in order to spare a few layoffs, some committee decides they will only get 3% this year. There are people who will call this a CUT, even though they're all still getting raises, still getting more money.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 17:32:29 GMT

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

---

Well, since both scenarios work just fine, how come Bush has managed to put the economy in a huge slump? 3.2 million jobs have been lost while Bush has been president. He must be doing something wrong.

Now, giving money back to pretty much anyone from taxes should have a positive effect on the economy - I'd give help to the poor, you'd give help to the wealthy. If this is true, why do Bush's tax cuts not work?

But back to the main topic of this thread which was my initial purpose and only one person has answered: Do you or do you not think George W. Bush is a good president?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 17:39:43 GMT

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

---

And more than that have been gained, in addition to the economy being at its highest since the Clinton years...

What're you talking about? The fuck? You keep saying "Bush isn't doing this or that" when it's fucking obvious that everything he's done has brought this nation out of depression! Stop reading that propaganda bullshit.

He's a great president. Hell of a lot better than electing someone like you...

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 17:43:33 GMT

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

---

When you say the economy is at its highest, how are you measuring that?

Clinton didn't leave America in a depression. How could Bush bring America out of a depression if it was never in one?

Luckily for you, I never plan on becoming a president. I wouldn't be able to stand the media always clammering over each other's heads to ask a question.

Oh, and thanks for finally answering the question that this thread was originally for.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [bigjoe14](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 17:55:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiClinton didn't leave America in a depression. How could Bush bring America out of a depression if it was never in one?

Yes, Clinton did leave America in an economic slump for Bush to handle. Clinton rode Regans economic reform plan and Clinton claimed that it was his economic reforms that caused the economic boost during his 8 years. He didn't to jack shit for the economy when he was in office and it's been proven.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 19:35:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

bigjoe14He didn't to jack     for the economy when he was in office and it's been proven.

By whom, if I may be so bold?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 31 Jan 2004 19:51:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I find one thing very, very interesting...the same people that take a so-called "humanitarian" stance on taxes are the ones that would rather have left Saddam in power in Iraq. Interesting how your morals and ethics go right out the window when the issue doesn't affect you directly, isn't it?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 00:45:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Clinton did NOT ruin our economy. When there is a boom, there will be a BUST, it's simple. It was expected that inflation would stop in 1998, but it continued. And when inflation continues, money becomes worthless, and when it stops, the stock market, etc. will slump. We could've been in the "Greater Depression" if we didn't lower taxes and regulations. If we did something like the New Deal, the economy would be a DISASTER.

Buy and read the books I mentioned above, there, problem resolved.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [asdfg195](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 04:36:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Stealing is a crime even if you're the IRS.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Gernader8](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 05:08:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

AircraftkillerThat was completely pointless. If young Americans will start doing this as an alternative to actually looking up the issues that each politician stands for and what their history is, well, I think I'll be finding a different country to live in... Before the shit hits the fan.

I hear Brazil is nice this time of year.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Alkaline](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 07:19:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

AircraftkillerThat was completely pointless.

I agree... may you entertain us with one of your great PM's?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 08:02:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You don't make much of a case to warrant treating you in a decent manner...

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

---

Posted by [Alkaline](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 08:42:51 GMT

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

---

Aircraftkiller You don't make much of a case to warrant treating you in a decent manner...

I see you have been talking to the mirror lately..

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 09:12:16 GMT

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

---

To answer the question, Bush has my vote in November... unlike most of you here who will speak your mind and then when it comes to the crunch, forget or decline to fucking vote.

I have an enormous respect for the way he treats us and the way he's cleaning up the mess that Bill Clinton left behind. Clinton is without a doubt one of the worst things that could have happened to us. And it's all summed up quite nicely in his final act as president when he stole furniture, etc from the White House when he moved out. Leaving the White House in worse shape than when he got in... it's the same thing that he did to the USA.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Ferhago](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 14:11:34 GMT

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

---

Alkaline surely you can come up with better retorts than this "No im not YOU are" crap.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 17:12:29 GMT

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

---

Crimson To answer the question, Bush has my vote in November... unlike most of you here who will speak your mind and then when it comes to the crunch, forget or decline to ing vote.

I have an enormous respect for the way he treats us and the way he's cleaning up the mess that Bill Clinton left behind. Clinton is without a doubt one of the worst things that could have happened to us. And it's all summed up quite nicely in his final act as president when he stole furniture, etc from the White House when he moved out. Leaving the White House in worse shape than when he got in... it's the same thing that he did to the USA.

While you say Bush is cleaning up the mess that Clinton left behind, what mess are you talking about? Did Clinton make the deficit way too small? If that's the case, Bush is cleaning up quite nicely. And while you say that Clinton is "without doubt" a bad president, what facts do you have to support this? Yes, he had an affair and yes, it was a bad thing, but how did that hurt our country? Answer: It didn't. That's called conservative propaganda. About Clinton supposedly

"stealing furniture" from the White House: that story is utter and total bullsh\*t. It is a complete and total lie. Heres how it went down:

When Clinton left office, some conservatives came up with a crazy off-the-wall story about him taking all the Ws out of the keyboards, stealing furniture, etc., so they called for a group to look into Clinton's "treachery". So then, Democrats really pushed for the group, and so one was made. This group stalled for as long as possible and never found anything. So, President Clinton's term was best summed up by a big conservative lie? Right...next time, get your facts straight.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 18:25:35 GMT

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

---

I like how you totally ignored what she said and went on to something that had no relevance to it.

That's something the Democrats are quite good at doing.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 18:32:26 GMT

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

---

Did your eyes just roll out of your head? I was debasing what Crimson said, not going on to irrelevant topics. If you're going to say that I edited my post to something entirely different, that's called a lie, something conservatives are quite good at doing. What I fixed in my edit was that I spelled a word wrong and I forgot to write how Clinton stealing furniture from the White House is complete and total B.S.

And wwhen you say Democrats are quite good at ignoring topics and moving on to different ones, I would have been slightly more tempted to agree with you if you had actually given some examples. Now, it may be your opinion that Democrats randomly change the subject, and you're entitled to your opinion. But then I'm entitled to my opinion that your opinion sucks.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 19:50:29 GMT

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

---

THE thing I am most afraid of is having another president elected who will prematurely withdraw troops from Iraq and Afghanistan, leaving both regions unstable and potentially dangerous. Bush won't do that, but the Democratic candidates, who are mostly against the war, would.

I don't pretend to support Bush on every issue, but that one alone is enough to guarantee him my vote this year (first election for me...been waiting a while for it!). It's stupid to change parties in the middle of a war, especially when the other party would either screw it up, withdraw, or lose it.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 21:53:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

If you think all Clinton did was get head in the Oval Office, then you are not suitable to debate this.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 22:31:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Apparently luckily for me, that's not at all what I think of Clinton. Clinton did wonders for the economy. He proved that when the economy goes up, crime goes down, even though Republicans kept saying that they were cracking down on crime. Let's take a look at some other things Clinton never got credit for while he was president:

Clinton seized all of the weapons grade nuclear material in Russia as it was falling apart to prevent it from getting into the hands of terrorists. Perhaps if he hadn't done this there would in fact be Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq. [Hint - that's a bad thing]

Clinton created more jobs than any other president, as opposed to Bush losing more jobs than any other president.

Now tell me I don't know anything about Clinton except his rather unpopular acts during his term.

EDIT: \*&^% internet blocker makes me fix some words so post is readable.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 22:55:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

OK, my dad spent well over year poring over books, websites, court documents, etc... he found pretty much every seedy thing former President Clinton and her husband had their dirty little hands into. You are forcing me to pull this data I think. Unfortunately it's in a large poster form so it would require a lot of typing.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 22:57:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Talk is cheap.

Let's see your poster.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 23:02:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

While I find that, you find the jobs created/lost numbers for Clinton and Bush.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 23:04:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Done and done.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 23:07:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFly, the government does not create jobs. The economy creates jobs on it's own. The government's so-called "stimulation" of the economy is basically the government lowering taxes and lessening regulations. In other words, the government stops breathing down the economy's throat, or at least a little bit. The economy can live on it's own without government intervention.

And the federal deficit problem was WAY before Clinton and Bush, it was around since the 80s.

"It's Clinton's fault!", "No, it's Bush's fault!" :rolleyes:

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 23:17:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

So you're saying that the government doesn't actually control the economie's ups and downs? That's just plain wrong. And please don't tell me to read any silly books.

EDIT: Crimson, I got those statistics you wanted. Lets take a look at them, shall we?

In Clinton's two terms, roughly 23 million new jobs were created. Now, when I say roughly, I mean between 22 and 24 million jobs, not between 30,000 and 1 million. He was able to create that many new jobs because he inherited a horrible economy from George Bush Senior, and then he fixed it, contrary to what ACK said before about it being from Reagan's tax cuts. That's just wrong, plain and simple. I took this number out of a transcript from Kerry talking to some media person.

So far in Bush's term, he's managed to lose nearly 3 million jobs, or about 2.9 million. I found this buried deep in <http://www.fedstats.org>, a website that doesn't take sides.

Well, looks like Bush wasn't quite as good as Clinton for the economy. Even though he said he

promised to help the economy in his election speeches for his first term. So, please see his speeches for the B.S. they are later this year.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javalcx](#) on Sun, 01 Feb 2004 23:54:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

/me sits on his moose and points and laughs at California

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 00:23:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Javalcx/me sits on his moose and points and laughs at California

:rolleyes:

Moose?

I'm ashamed to share this country with you!

Beavers are much more comfy.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javalcx](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 00:25:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Knock off those damn innuendos.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 00:55:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That's not what I asked for. You only pulled two of the four figures.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 01:09:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Perhaps I mis-phrased myself slightly...those numbers are net jobs lost/gained.

---

For Clinton, from the beginning of his first term to the end of his second term, there were 23 million more jobs in America. This includes jobs lost.

Same goes for Bush in that from the beginning of his first term until just a short while ago, nearly 3 million jobs have been lost in America. This includes jobs gained.

I find it hard to see how this could possibly be considered distorting the facts, so please don't say ththat unless you have a really good reason.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 01:28:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Javaxcx/me sits on his moose and points and laughs at California

May I join you?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [asdfg195](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 01:29:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You know what caused alot of jobs to be lost? Companies out sourcing because of heavy corporate taxes.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 01:35:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Not only that, but also because of some organized labor (unions).

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 01:36:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

So companies spontaneously started rabidly outsourcing when Bush became president even though the only thing he knows how to do concerning the economy is cut taxes?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 01:51:31 GMT

---

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

---

He shit happens. The president has no control of the economy. He cannot magically make it go up and he cant wave his wand and create jobs. in 1929 shit just started falling, people put too much moeny into stocks and the company was making no profits and shit just happaned.

Also if you look at the numbers in 98 the economy started falling, when sept 11th happaned it just made it even worse. Then after that a few companys went bankrupt making people lose their jobs and become poor. All those people who lost millions on stocks were stupid, they shouldnt have put ALL their money into one company.

And the people losing ther jobs also have no room to talk. There are millions of ways to make money in the US. There is always a carreer in the military and you can do mslal jobs like cleaning peoples houses. They get payed upwards of \$15 an hour. You don't need to be on a payroll to have a job.

May i show you the unemployment numbers

US-5.8%  
Canada-7.6%  
England-5.2%  
France-9.1%  
Germany-9.8%  
Denmark5.1%  
Finland-8.5%

See where im going? Ours is high, yet it is still lower than many others.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [tarsonis9](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 02:15:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wait a sec, what's that over there? Oh, I see what it is now. It's the Politics forum, just waiting for ya'll to crowd into it.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 02:18:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

tarsonis9Wait a sec, what's that over there? Oh, I see what it is now. It's the Politics forum, just waiting for ya'll to crowd into it.

I already explained that one - good job not reading the whole thread.

Nodbugger: Where'd those statistics come from? And from what year where they?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [tarsonis9](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 02:26:38 GMT

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

---

I am referring to how this post is turning into a "Republicans are better than Democrats" kind of thing, and I believe, (not that I am a moderator or anything, just my .02 dollars) that this should be moved to the Politics forum, and be continued there. And, by the way, doesn't the title of this forum's description read as: "General Discussion of Command and Conquer: Renegade."?

Just another thought...

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 02:36:50 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngitarsonis9Wait a sec, what's that over there? Oh, I see what it is now. It's the Politics forum, just waiting for ya'll to crowd into it.

I already explained that one - good job not reading the whole thread.

Nodbugger: Where'd those statistics come from? And from what year where they?

<http://www.cia.gov>

the world factbook,

they are between 2001 and 2003, and maybe add a 1 or 2 percent margine of difference from then and now. because those 3 million jobs are only a 1% change.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 03:50:31 GMT

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

---

That's great and all, but since you obviously don't want to discuss it, don't fucking respond to it.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 06:56:19 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiSo companies spontaneously started rabidly outsourcing when Bush became president even though the only thing he knows how to do concerning the economy is cut taxes?

Yeah, kinda proves that the current president has to kinda work with the previous president's mistakes/good ideas.

---

The market did not start falling in 1998. It was in 2000.

BigCharts graph of the NASDAQ composite indicates this. When was Bush inaugurated? Oh yeah, January 2001. And where was the NASDAQ? Oh yeah, it was at half of its 5000+ peak reached in March of 2000. So there's a huge-ass boulder tumbling downhill and suddenly Bush is placed in front of it... and you expect him to stop it.

Now, today, we're about 400 points below where we were when Bush took office.

And yet, he's ruining the economy.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [exnyte](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 07:22:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiFor Clinton, from the beginning of his first term to the end of his second term, there were 23 million more jobs in America. This includes jobs lost.

Same goes for Bush in that from the beginning of his first term until just a short while ago, nearly 3 million jobs have been lost in America. This includes jobs gained.

How can you possibly compare these numbers when your taking numbers from Clinton's 2 terms and from the first 3 years of Bush's term? Wow... Impressive! Clinton can gain more jobs in a longer period of time than Bush can!

You can't argue this point until both are in office the same amount of time, unless you use like periods of time to compare, (i.e. Clinton's first term, and Bush's first term when it's finished).

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 07:32:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

LOL -- good point majikent. I totally didn't even think of that.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 17:50:24 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Moved this to politics forum.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

---

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 21:04:08 GMT

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

---

majikent

How can you possibly compare these numbers when your taking numbers from Clinton's 2 terms and from the first 3 years of Bush's term? Wow... Impressive! Clinton can gain more jobs in a longer period of time than Bush can!

You can't argue this point until both are in office the same amount of time, unless you use like periods of time to compare, (i.e. Clinton's first term, and Bush's first term when it's finished).

Your point would have more merit if more jobs were being created than lost right now during Bush's first term. 3 years into his first term, Clinton had actually created more jobs in America, not lost them. Are you suggesting that Bush will radically turn around and start creating loads and loads of jobs in America to catch up to Clinton's 23 million? If his father was any hint, this WILL NOT happen. What I was showing is that Clinton did a great job as president by creating 23 million jobs in America, contrary to the idiocy displayed by Bigjoe14 when he said it has been proven that Clinton didn't do jack for the economy. Then I showed how well Bush has done so far in his term, which you can't say is a good job. Did I make a graph comparing the two? No.

Besides, Crimson originally asked for these numbers in the first place. I merely supplied them. Speaking of which, where's your so-called poster of Clinton's bad things? And your graph kind of shows how good a president Clinton was. where you set it to 5 years, set it to All Data. Now, the one huge spike there is right in the middle of Clinton's terms. After a big long trail of the NASDAQ being nice and low, Clinton comes in and the market starts skyrocketing. Now, want to know why Bush jr. actually has an O.K. record for the stock exchange? He wants to have social security work by people putting their S.S. money in the stock exchange. After Bush was payed large sums of money by the heads of the stock exchange, because having everyone invest large sums of money in the stock market would let brokers charge big money for all those transactions. Now, this is bad because if the market crashes or if stocks go down, elderly people lose a ton of their retirement money. And that graph can't just explain away almost 3 million net jobs being lost under President Bush junior.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 23:11:36 GMT

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

---

It's not a 'so-called' poster. It does actually exist. I just can't find it, so I'll have to get another one.

Some more points you'll have to address are:

1) What did Clinton DO to create these jobs? Just because jobs became available, doesn't mean you can pinpoint any real or probable Clinton causes for these jobs.

2) Why do you think a huge spike is such a good thing? I say it's not. While many people were making millions of dollars in that market upswing, many of them lost all it, and much more. I worked at Charles Schwab talking to traders all day long during that market upswing, and plenty

of the way into the fall as well (until June 2002 in fact), so I was there day to day knowing what was going on on the trading floors. And most of them were cursing Clinton for it.

3) "3 years into his first term, Clinton had actually created more jobs in America, not lost them." -- Once again, no facts to back this up. If you're going to try and interpret this way, then you'd have to supply some sort of year-by-year comparison. And you're only guessing about the future. If, for example, Bush "loses" 27 million jobs in the first year, then each year after that gains 8 million jobs, then you're looking at a net loss of 3 million jobs at the three-year mark, but if that upward trend continues, you'd look at 37 million net jobs gained at the end of his hypothetical 8 year term.

Note that was an example, created to point out glaring flaws in your logic.

Also, I'd prefer a steady constant gain in the market indicators rather than erratic sharp movements up and down. People lose money that way all too easily, no matter which way it's going. Smooth steady growth is better for everyone, except for the minority who trade short.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [asdfg195](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 23:18:55 GMT

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

---

You do should give him a little credit. He did approve NAFTA.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 03 Feb 2004 02:31:25 GMT

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

---

I hold Clinton responsible for the lack of a suitable replacement for the aging and inadequate Space Shuttle. It was one of his less-publicized decisions...he cancelled the program for a replacement early in his first term (in 1993, I believe). It takes about a decade to develop anything of that nature- had the program not been cancelled, we might have been sending a new ship up on its first flights last year instead of mourning the loss of a shuttle crew. Clinton was not responsible for the loss of Colombia, but he WAS responsible for there not being a vehicle to replace our current 20 year old design. Now, instead of being on the cutting edge of space travel, we're sitting on our asses sending astronauts up in Russian ships.

Summary, for those too lazy to read that: Clinton nerfed the space program.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [exnyte](#) on Tue, 03 Feb 2004 06:16:48 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngilf his father was any hint, this WILL NOT happen.

What you need to remember is that the current president isn't his father. They have the same

name, they even kind of look alike. That doesn't make them the same person. You can't base what our current president has done, or is going to do, by what his father did in his run as president. That's like saying you'll have three kids because your dad did. Or you'll be laid off from a job because your father was previously. It doesn't make any sense. Two completely different people. This isn't to say he isn't influenced by his father, as I'm sure he is. How could his father possibly be a hint to what he is going to do in the next year, and possibly 4 years after that?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 01:23:25 GMT

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

---

i i would like to start off by saying that i am incredibly rich. i love george w bush becasue he gives me more money. this i find absolutel DELECTABLE because i deserve it. its not like i contribute to society like those worthless middle class people and poor people do itm just lucky i dont have to put up with the fact that clinton was a great president. even though he WASNT!!!! wanna know why? because he didnt ive me money and that is unfair. why should i only get a seven story mansion with twelve bigscreen TV's. i dont care about poor people who are CONTRIBUTING to our society and economy (which is in the shitter) but its lucky i am buddies with george bush ( its good i used to smoke crack with him back in the day) cbecause i dont have to deal with the so called "economy" you democrats disgust me! trying to create jobs and fix our economy because george is a drunken fool! I WANT MORE MONEY GODDAMMIT AND I DONT WANNA WORK FOR IT!!!! well i must sayi also dont care about veterans i did what george w bush did and went AWOL but it would be nice if you didnt tell anyone that because thats unpatriotic just like those GODDAM DEMOCRATS ughhh and who needs social securtiy if anyone tries to fucking touch me ill have them fed to my sharks which are housed in a gold plated fish tank which only costed 27 thousand dollars which is pocket change ever since those tax cuts. Speaking of taxes what the fuck IS tax? i shouldnt have to pay for other people that is WAY too much to ask for. i should care only about myself becaue im the only person that matters in the ENTIRE world GO GEORGE W. BUSH AND MAKE ME MORE MONEY AND SCREW EVERYONE ELSE

Note: I am NOT rich im just making fun of you moronic conservatives.

PSS wanna bash me with your constitutionsal bullshit? comeon there i also something in there called freedom of speech bet thats a new one

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 01:33:44 GMT

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

---

^ your a fucking retard. When tax cuts go acroos the board everyone is equal. I goes by precent. If you have more you get more. And you think people living off of welafre work? Hell alot of people with money made money becuase they worked. Rich people pay the same percentage wise as everyone else. percentages are always fair. I dont get why you fucktards do not understand that. \$10 to you or me is like \$1,000,000 to Bill gates. Why? Because he has 90 billion. He has more

therefore he gets more. What dumbass.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 01:43:55 GMT

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

---

im sorry nodbugger but all i really got from your pst is that "I have the intelligence of my president" its sad our country is getting run by idiots who dont know their ass from there head. oh great insults by the way i liked the juvenile twang they had

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 02:04:35 GMT

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

---

CrimsonIt's not a 'so-called' poster. It does actually exist. I just can't find it, so I'll have to get another one.

Some more points you'll have to address are:

1) What did Clinton DO to create these jobs? Just because jobs became available, doesn't mean you can pinpoint any real or probable Clinton causes for these jobs.

2) Why do you think a huge spike is such a good thing? I say it's not. While many people were making millions of dollars in that market upswing, many of them lost all it, and much more. I worked at Charles Schwab talking to traders all day long during that market upswing, and plenty of the way into the fall as well (until June 2002 in fact), so I was there day to day knowing what was going on on the trading floors. And most of them were cursing Clinton for it.

3) "3 years into his first term, Clinton had actually created more jobs in America, not lost them." -- Once again, no facts to back this up. If you're going to try and interpret this way, then you'd have to supply some sort of year-by-year comparison. And you're only guessing about the future. If, for example, Bush "loses" 27 million jobs in the first year, then each year after that gains 8 million jobs, then you're looking at a net loss of 3 million jobs at the three-year mark, but if that upward trend continues, you'd look at 37 million net jobs gained at the end of his hypothetical 8 year term.

Note that was an example, created to point out glaring flaws in your logic.

Also, I'd prefer a steady constant gain in the market indicators rather than erratic sharp movements up and down. People lose money that way all too easily, no matter which way it's going. Smooth steady growth is better for everyone, except for the minority who trade short.

First things first: If you can't find the poster, it doesn't exist in my eyes. get another one and let me tear it apart, will you?

Moving on...[paragraph by paragraph]

What did Clinton do to create these jobs.....if jobs can't be traced back to Clinton, I guess it's just a HUGE COINCIDENCE that jobs started increasing as soon as he got into office until he left and jobs started going down under Bush Jr. And don't even lie to yourself about Bush "trying to stop a boulder going down a hill." It's Bush's own inability to control the market tht is causing a decrease in jobs, not what Clinton did.

So markets going up are a bad thing.....you probably should have given a few details here other than, "Oh, I was in the business, I would know." And so many people were cursing Clinton for it? Yah, probably the same people who try to drink coffee through the handle of their cup.

Oh, sorry I didn't "supply" facts, I guess if you want them you're going to have to throw some numbers of your own in to the pot. So far I've been talking numbers and statistics, and you've been saying about how you "were there" and "everyone hates Clinton" without anything to back it up. Don't tell me to put numbers behind everything until you start doing it yourself.

Ah yes, about the market...

There is no way in hell you can make the market staaay steady. Unless you play like Bush Senior and keep the market nice and low so it really can't take big spikes down. Please note that I'm still using your chart here.

To sum this up:

- 1) Get your supposed "poster"
- 2) Post said poster here so I can have a good laugh at how silly the whole concept is.
- 3) Flush poster down toilet
- 4) Come back here so I can convince you to vote for the Democratic presidential candidate instead of Bush.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 02:16:58 GMT

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

---

ummmmm..... yeah crimson wtf? i am also eager to see this "poster: it is kind of convenient you "lost" it. i think instead o falling back on your daddys lies and mistakes you should tryi being like superfly and actually try to learn something

OH WAIT YOUR REPUBLICAN MY BAD!!!!!!

try and find the poster i really wanna see how crappy it is!

PS- falling back on daddys lies and wel . . . daddy in general you remind me of george w bush

PSS- that is a bad thing if you idnt know

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 02:24:50 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451im sorry nodbugger but all i really got from your pst is that "I have the intelligence

of my president" its sad our country is getting run by idiots who dont know their ass from there head. oh great insults by the way i liked the juvenile twang they had

Im sorry you cant understand anything. I suggest you stay indoors.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 02:37:40 GMT

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

---

please nodbugger you are killing me. ill give you some credit you did a little better this time we're getting there. what you dont have in political understanding you are almost making up for in dissing. then again since you have no political understanding WHATSOEVER there isnt much to be made up for now is there? how unfortunate, you might want to either get informed, or maybe if your feeling really ya know ABSOLUTELY CRAZY try waatching something besides FOX news. . . but i doubt one of your level would be able to do that . . . but we can dream cant we?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 03:07:18 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451 please nodbugger you are killing me. ill give you some credit you did a little better this time we're getting there. what you dont have in political understanding you are almost making up for in dissing. then again since you have no political understanding WHATSOEVER there isnt much to be made up for now is there? how unfortunate, you might want to either get informed, or maybe if your feeling really ya know ABSOLUTELY CRAZY try waatching something besides FOX news. . . but i doubt one of your level would be able to do that . . . but we can dream cant we?

What the hell are you talking about?

A percent is a percent, it is fair for everyone.

Its not my fault you don't make as much money as other people.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 03:46:55 GMT

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

---

dude, i make a nice amount of money which shows you do not have to be poor or a treehugger to be a democrat . . . a percent IS a percent but at least i am not i denial man. we NEED more taxes we are over 450 billion dollars in debt ok? after clinton less we were in the highest surplus EVER? guess who was runnin the gov't when we had the Great Depression . . . take a WILD guess . . . if you guessed republicans you are correct, you have not won a million dollars but for the sake of being for the sake of we'll say that you have . . . without more taxes you kids will be learning about

science and geography from a friggin Bob the builder book and i am relatively sure there are no underlying themes of any and all sciences in Bob the Builder.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 04:12:28 GMT

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

---

Ok for one its a deficit, not debt. Go learn the difference. Besides if we stopped paying lazy people to do nothing we could easily get rid of that plus some. It was a republican at the Great Depression and a Democrat during it. And FDR really didn't fix it. He just had people set stuff up that helped. I just went through this in a history class. The Great depression never really ended until the mid 1940s.

And my high school is living proof more money does not make people learn. My school is a very good school, good teachers up to date equipment and new taxes are being put in every few months to give them more money. Yet there are still some students who do not care. Teachers still protest they want more (even they get paid highest than any other teachers in the state, these are normally teachers who have been there less than 5 years)

More money does not make better grades. Will to learn and teach does. If the student wants to learn and the teacher wants to teach will get more accomplished than a million dollar classroom and two people who hate each other and hate their jobs.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 05:47:38 GMT

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

---

Llama Man, I get a headache trying to read through your typos and broken English. Quite obviously you are a Democrat... you want the government to pay your way because you're not driven enough to accomplish anything, much less spelling your words out.

No matter how long this conversation goes out, I will not EVER vote for a Democrat. I have a fucking brain kthx.

Because I'm not living off the government and I'm making my money to support the lazy liberals, I haven't had time to go to my parents' house and get another copy of the poster.

This isn't some half-assed effort, either. Several high ranking government officials praised his work and still communicate with him to this day. He's also been asked several times to give political lessons to Boys State. And, he's converted more people from Democrat to Republican than you can ever hope. Hell, he converted me from not caring to Republican... though, not really Republican so much as a Constitutionalist.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 20:58:13 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerOk for one its a deficit, not debt. Go learn the difference. Besides if we stopped paying lazy people to do nothing we could easily get rid of that plus some. It was a republican at the Great Depression and a Democrat during it. And FDR really didn't fix it. He just had people set stuff up tha helped. I just went through this in a history class. The Great depression never really ended until the mid 1940s.

And my high school is living proof more moeny does not make people learn. My school is a very good school, good teachers up to date equipment and new taxes are ebing put in every few months to give them more money. Yet there are still some students who do not care. Teachers still protest they want more(even they get payed highest than any other teachers in the state, these are normally teachers who have been there less than 5 years)

More money does not make better grades. Will to learn and teach does. If the student wants to learn and the teacher wants to teach will get more accomplished than a million dollar classroom and two people who hate each other and hate their jobs.

First off, deficit and debt are not crazily different words. Deficit is just a fancy word for how much the government owes, and the definition of debt, according to dictionary.com, is "Something owed, such as money, goods, or services." Wow, big difference.

FDR didn't help the depression? Are you crazy? Now, it is a given that the nation did not fully recover until the early 1940s, but the nation probably wouldn't have recovered until at least the 1960s if FDR didn't do what he did. He got people to trust the banks again by having them be protected by Congress, and he created many groups and organizations funded by the government to help the poverty-stricken. If FDR hadn't been there, our nation wouldn't be ANYTHING NEAR what it is now.

Oh your school is absolute proof beyond reasonable doubt tht money dooesn't help kids learn? Then why do school distriicts with more funds always have better test scores than those that could use more funding? Magic? No. Now, yes, there are alwways some students who just don't want to learn, but there are many more of those in poverty areas than there are in good school systems. And, your one school can't really prove anything. It's like reaching into a bag of skittles, pulling out one, and thinking that all the skittles in that bag will be the same color as the one you just pulled out. And you are more likely to find a teacher who wants to teach and a student who wants to learn in a rich environment than a poor one. Also, a school system that has more money can pump out more prepared students than one without proper funding because a well-funded school has more resources to educate pupils with.

Well, Crimson, we will say whether you vote democrat or republican....just keep coming back and I can throw facts at you all day.

Being a liberal doesn't make someone a welfare recipient who complains about other people's masses of money. Just look at John Kerry. He's by far the richest senator AND he's a liberal. How can this be? Maybe Kerry is smart enough to realize all the Republican lies that get thrown around the media.

About your daddie's "poster"... Which "government people" contacted him about it? Media reps who want to make idiot attacks at Clinton in the news because there aren't any real good insults you can throw at a great president? More people from Democrat to Republican....again, this is a spot where numbers might help your failing argument. This shows why you shouldn't complain to me about not having enough statistics behind what I say. Is it just me or does it sound like Boys State is an incredibly conservative school that you vaguely defined so that I couldn't look it up on the internet? And, I don't ever hope to convert anyone from a Democrat to a Republican. Ever. One more thing, please don't call yourself a constitutionalist. You're a Republican, straight and simple.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 22:07:14 GMT

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

---

I knew already that Boys' State teaches young adults about government, but here's a link to a Boy's State group in Tennessee that explains it well:

<http://www.tntech.edu/tnboysstate/aboutboysstate.htm>

Boys' State is like Model UN or FFA, it's an extracurricular activity group that students can be a part of to learn more about a subject. It's not a school in itself.

Quote:Well, Crimson, we will say whether you vote democrat or republican....just keep coming back and I can throw facts at you all day.

Um, I don't understand what you mean by this. I don't think you can physically move my hand when I'm in the ballot box and make me check something that goes against what I believe.

I find it quite laughable that you think there are "Republican lies" in the media. I believe the lies are Democrat lies. Especially when you look at the political affiliations of who owns the media outlets...

As for "government people", you are trying to belittle my words. I said "government officials", so don't put quote marks around words to quote things that I didn't, in fact, say. That's a very clever little debate tactic but I see right through it. Also, the media isn't part of the government, so I don't see how I would say "government officials" when the people in question are media reps. They are not media reps. Dumbass.

The only name I know off the top of my head is Frances Emma Barwood whom my dad corresponds with frequently.

And yes, I am in fact a Constitutionalist. Don't DARE tell me what my opinions ARE. You can TRY to change my opinions, but it's not up to you whether or not I change my mind. EVER.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 22:09:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Man he still cant read can he?  
He just had people set stuff up that helped

And yes it is. Sure schools need uodtaed text books and computers and basic stuff. But the money that school districts are getting now mostly go towards teachers paychecks. Not the schools.

And mine is an example. It shows that even an extremely high funded school can have bad students. Even though are test scores are extremely high overall. There are alot of students that dont do well. And well in every school there are students that don't do well. And What I am saying is just becuae you pump more moeny in doesn't mean its going to get better. If you look into inner city schools most students drop out. Why you may ask? Wellll alot just dont want to be inschool. Other has to do with having a kid or drugs or gangs.

The idea that putting more money into something will automatically make it bette is just crazy.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 22:09:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Please also reference this link:

[http://www.calegion.org/programs/boys\\_state/grads/grads.html](http://www.calegion.org/programs/boys_state/grads/grads.html)

Which shows former members of Boys' State and how they fared in a political career.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 22:41:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

im really glad, nodbugger, that you can figure out simple things like some kids dont want to learn, but money is not the only issue about schools and i am sure i didnt say that it wasnt i did bring up the point that we do need money from taxes for new books etc., etc. which you also agreed. hmmm sounds like someone is a pissed off conservaitve!! whats he gonna do?

make up bullshit lies like the "liberal bias" media (ahem Crimson) you have got to be kidding! well get to that later though

back to schools with bush's no child left behind policy my kid is going to be in a normal english class with people who do not want to learn. this is stupid because students who do want to excel and learn are going to have problems with students who could care less.

Crimson . . . liberal propaganda. im sorry those periods were me laughing uncontrollably. firstly we have dianne sawyer asking bush questions and he replying "neither in french, nor spanish, nor mexican" and such other classics like "bring it on" and he is a glorious good christian and he is right because "God chose him" and God is ALWAYS right no matter what. Meanwhile Howard Dean makes an excellent speech and ends it with a scream.  
APOCALYPSE NOW!!!!!!!!!! HE IS AN EVIL MAN AND SHOULD NOT BE PPRESIDENT  
BECAUSE HE SCREAMED!!!!!!"

this so called "liberal propoganda" is a joke and you know it.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 22:46:55 GMT

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

---

So that's Boy's State...well, looks cool, but I'd never be caught going there willingly.

CrimsonUm, I don't understand what you mean by this. I don't think you can physically move my hand when I'm in the ballot box and make me check something that goes against what I believe.

I never said I'd be following you when you go to the polls. That would be a big waste of my time. What I can do is influence you by disproving Bush enough to make you take another look.

CrimsonI find it quite laughable that you think there are "Republican lies" in the media. I believe the lies are Democrat lies.

I, on the other hand, find it quite laughable that you can't see the Republican lies in the media. [If it means anything, when I say lies in the media I mean lies that the media reports but doesn't bother showing them for what they really are] For instance, you were talking about Clinton stealing furniture from the White House...LIE!. Rush Limbaugh is in the media, right? Pretty much 3/4 of the things he says are lies. One time he even said styorfoam is more biodegradeable than paper. [This is a lie, too.] I could make a big list if you want me to, but looking at it while I type would probably hurt my eyes. Bush jr. is a nice little show of lies, as well. Just look at his speech about his budget. He's calling a 521 billion dollar budget, which is still big, but neglected to add the cost of being in Iraq, the single biggest expenditure of our country right now, to his budget. He also neglected to count his tax cuts. The money he cut from taxes is still there in his budget. That ain't math. That's a lie. When you say to look at media outlet affiliations, this another nice spot to put some facts like, i don't know, NAMES. Or at least something to verify what you said.

CrimsonAs for "government people", you are trying to belittle my words. I said "government officials", so don't put quote marks around words to quote things that I didn't, in fact, say. That's a very clever little debate tactic but I see right though it. Also, the media isn't part of the government, so I don't see how I would say "government officials" when the people in question are media reps. They are not media reps. Dumbass.

Perhaps I misphrased myself. I think media rep was the wrong word. I meant people who work for important political figures who handle the media. THESE are the people who would like random

little stupid things to say about Clinton. As for "Government people", I apologize. I should have said "Government officials"

Hee hee, I looked up Frances Emma Barwood, and one of her big things to [I guess] attract votes is demand an explanation for every UFO sighting over Arizona. And she was apparently a high-ranking government official in that she was on the City Council and was once even....Dum Da Da DUM DUM!!! Vice-Mayor. High-ranking in that holding any rank in the government is considered high.

If you don't mind me asking, what exactly is a constitutionalist? I've never heard the term before. Also, I would have taken back my statement about you being a Republican if you hadn't called me a:

CrimsonDumbass

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 23:30:12 GMT

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

---

Quote:And yes it is. Sure schools need uodtaed text books and computers and basic stuff. But the money that school districts are getting now mostly go towards teachers paychecks. Not the schools.

My high school used to be one of the top schools in the state, but it isn't anymore...the building is just now undergoing the first renovation it's had in 30 years, and the renovated parts have already started falling apart. Most of the busses failed their safety inspections, but are used all the time anyway. The teachers are not overpaid; many of them have been there for several decades and still don't get what they deserve.

I don't know if you're aware of this, but many states have laws that force schools to always take the lowest bid when hiring bus companies, buying computers, doing renovations, etc. That has nothing to do with the federal government, it's something the state decides. And guess what? The governor (McGreevey, or McGreedy, whichever you want to call him...) and most of the legislature in NJ is democrat. They COULD change that, but they aren't. The money isn't going to the schools, it isn't going to teachers or anyone but the politicians.

Quote:back to schools with bush's no child left behind policy my kid is going to be in a normal english class with people who do not want to learn. this is stupid because students who do want to excel and learn are going to have problems with students who could care less.

I just LOVE that one. That statement assumes that EVERY person who does poorly at something does not care about it, and that could not be more wrong. The "No Child Left Behind" thing is slightly skewed, as well...it fails to take into account personal learning styles and the speed at which some people learn. That tries to force everyone to go along at the same speed, cramming information in that can't be absorbed fast enough. There ARE people who don't care, that's true...but more frequently it's just someone who learns in a different way than how the teacher is teaching. That is not a lack of interest; it's a failure in communication.

Both parties are equally corrupt and equally cash-hungry, it's just a question of who happens to support more of your issues during an election... at the moment, more of the issues I support are being supported by Bush. That's not to say there aren't things I don't like about him...a more appropriate phrase would be: I hate him LESS than the other guy.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 23:36:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Or you could say you like him more than any other guy.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 23:45:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That would work too, but it's really a case of the lesser of the two evils. I'd rather keep Bush and make sure things like the space program and the second amendment stay firmly in place (plus, there's always the changing presidents in the middle of a war thing...especially if he wants to press on and the dems want to back off) than change presidents and have some new nincompoop screw everything up.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 04 Feb 2004 23:57:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I just LOVE that one. That statement assumes that EVERY person who does poorly at something does not care about it, and that could not be more wrong. The "No Child Left Behind" thing is slightly skewed, as well...it fails to take into account personal learning styles and the speed at which some people learn. That tries to force everyone to go along at the same speed, cramming information in that can't be absorbed fast enough. There ARE people who don't care, that's true...but more frequently it's just someone who learns in a different way than how the teacher is teaching. That is not a lack of interest; it's a failure in communication.

when did i say that all peoplewho do poorly do not care? i said that they are put in classes with people who dont care AND THERE ARE A LOT OF THEM AROUND. yes that is true communication can be an issue but at the sam time it can make almost no diferece at all. i am legally blind and it was a bit of a challenge for me going through school. but i still got exceptional grades . . . of course this is only me . . . but im saying if i can do it there is a chance that other people will be able to do it as well. however, you did present a good point and supported it cohereantly unlike crimson and her "poster" which got huge critical acclaim for a nut obsessed with UFO's. that i will give you props for.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 00:00:42 GMT

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

---

the top half of my last post was supposed to be quote. unfortunately i could not figure out how to .

..

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 00:43:23 GMT

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

---

Nukelt15That would work too, but it's really a case of the lesser of the two evils. I'd rather keep Bush and make sure things like the space program and the second amendment stay firmly in place (plus, there's always the changing presidents in the middle of a war thing...especially if he wants to press on and the dems want to back off) than change presidents and have some new nincompoop screw everything up.

Have you ever possibly considered that Bush doesn't always carry through on what he says he does? Apparently, the answer is a resounding "NO". If you payed any attention to the news, you might catch on. My 2 cents is to read the New York time for 3 weeks straight. And here comes Bush saying that we have to go to the moon? Why? No reason, really. He just wants to start big, expensive government programs to fool people in to thinking that he has the country under control, when in real life the space program is one of the last things we need to be starting. Ahh, the second amendment? That's just an ancient amendment made way back when the country was very, very different, and America was still a fledgling country and was still under threat from invasion. Nowadays, the only reason anyone needs a gun in their home is for hunting, there is very little reason to have a gun in one's home for personal defence. You're about 30 times more likely to shoot a family member than a robber. Although, one of the big reasons I don't like the NRA [they definitely sponsor the second amendment] is because they are so crooked when they come to politics. They bribe people left and right to keep the second amendment alive.

You know, there never really was a "War" in Iraq. it was more like an armed beatdown. For this reason, the U.S. doesn't really need a huge military presence in Iraq any more. All they do now is sit around and take pot shots at the odd extremist group. And Bush is lying about how much the war is costing us. When he submitted his budget to Congress, he conveniently left out the "War" in Iraq, the biggest expenditure by this country right now. Do you really want to vote for a president who uses lies to try and convince people that he is actually a good president. And none of those democratic presidential candidates are a "nincompoop". Except Lieberman, I'll give you that. But he isn't going to get on the ballot against Bush anyway. Moving on, how would any of the other candidates screw things up in Iraq? The fact that someone said that earlier in this post doesn't make it true. None of them are just going to make every last troop pack up and leave as soon as they get into office.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 00:57:30 GMT

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

---

Ok, now the gun piont. Your wrong. Old people have the most guns..why? Well becuae they are scared. Now thats a reason. Having guns is something nice. It allows us to defend ourselves.

And no Iraq was a war. People did die or get injured. My dad will be home within a few days after being there for 1 year.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 01:10:04 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerOk, now the gun piont. Your wrong. Old people have the most guns..why? Well becuae they are scared. Now thats a reason. Having guns is something nice. It allows us to defend ourselves.

And no Iraq was a war. People did die or get injured. My dad will be home within a few days after being there for 1 year.

This was an interesting post because you cleverly ignored at least half of my post about Bush not following through on what he says. Why? Because I'm right.

So...old people have the most guns....I'd actually be inclined to believe you iif you had put numbers in to support this. If you don't know exactly what the numbers are and don't want to do any research to figure it out, then your point matters not to me. Seems to me like I've been talking numbers and all you other people come up with these piddly-ass comebacks. ESPECIALLY yours, bugger. It's almost like you're trying to avoid logic and facts by always coming back without numbers. Next time, don't make a post unless you have facts to back it up. Because I won't be paying any attention.

People dying doesn't constitute a war. First, dying is something people do. When American soldiers stationed around the world get attacked by a small militant group, it's not called a war, but people often die. While it's good for you that your dad will be coming back home soon, that has pretty much no relevance to this topic. I think everyone here already knew that people went off to fight in Iraq. While your definition of a war might be whenever the media calls it a war, mine is when two countries of fairly level military power fight each other an actually get in a big fight instead of one side just getting creamed by the other.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 01:10:34 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiIf you don't mind me asking, what exactly is a constitutionalist? I've never heard the term before. Also, I would have taken back my statement about you being a Republican if you hadn't called me a:

CrimsonDumbass

Well, see, if you hadn't pelted me with all the ad-hominem, I wouldn't have had to show you a taste of your own medicine. Bitter, isn't it?

And just because your first google search for Frances Emma Barwood turned up something about UFOs doesn't discredit her as an individual. Furthermore, as I said, it's the only name I recall at the moment.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 01:12:55 GMT

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

---

yeah good point superfly, why are we exactly going to the moon? we KNOW there is nothing there except friggin rocks! also it is the last thing we need with the 465 billion dollar DEFICIT (crimson are you happy) we are facing right now!!!

another thing the war on iraq is it just me or was it just a war? werent we supposed to be fighting terrorists? i though osama was in afghanistan. and if we werent fighting terrorists when it comes to iraq, why does bush always mention 9-11 and terrorists? also every premis for the war was kind of moronic. the only good thing that came from it was saddam being captured (note: georgie was on the TV all day when that happened and wasnt he the hero of the century. i know that is so LIBERAL BIAS!) MWD's we never found and what is this about liberating the people. liberating doesn't usually involve forcing our beliefs and ideologies on them, does it? and if the people are so happy in Iraq, why is it that almost every day i hear about soe suicide bombing? they're terrorists right? once again i thought osama and the other "evil doers" he hangs out with were in afghanistan.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 01:15:08 GMT

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

---

cut the drama crimson what "bitter medicine" superfly has given about a hundred statistics and last time i checked all you did was talk about a poster that as of yet does not exist or mean anything.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 01:20:32 GMT

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

---

CrimsonWell, see, if you hadn't pelted me with all the ad-hominem, I wouldn't have had to show you a taste of your own medicine. Bitter, isn't it?

And just because your first google search for Frances Emma Barwood turned up something about

UFOs doesn't discredit her as an individual. Furthermore, as I said, it's the only name I recall at the moment.

Well, I guess we're even for the moment on name-calling.

No, my first google search result is NOT what I used for defining my opinion of Frances Emma Barwood. I looked at the whole first page from google, and the whole first page from Ask Jeeves, and I got fairly correlating results, at least enough to verify my opinion on her, in that she has a big thing for UFOs. And if it's the only name that you know of, you could have conceivably just called your father and asked him for some names, since you said that he is in contact with these government people, he would probably have a phone.

Oh, and you never answered my question about what a consitutionalist was, and I am actually fairly interested in figuring out what one is. Please don't neglect things like this in the future.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 02:04:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The best reference I can find at the moment is here:

<http://home.earthlink.net/~jmarkels/cp.html>

I suppose my dad summed it up well:

"I demand that the country be run the constitution that all in the government have sworn an oath to uphold!!! Silly thought I know!"

Llama Man, I'm not the one who pointed out the difference in "deficit" and "debt" wording.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 02:05:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN SUPERFLYINGENGL IS GOING FOR THE TOUCHDOWN HE RUNS PAST NOBUGGER AND EASILY DODGES CRIMSON HES GOING HES GOING . . HE'S GONNA MAKE IT . . . TOUCHDOWN!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 02:07:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Such posts are counterproductive, irrelevant, and unnecessary.

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 02:09:20 GMT

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

---

hey crimson sorry bout the deficit, debt crack i will take ownership for my mistake

on the other hand stick that in your pipe and smoke it nodbugger!!!!!!

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 02:10:51 GMT

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

---

my bad . . . i just feel its my "CONSTITUTIONALIST" duty to spice things up alittle on this forum, no offense crimson . . . well yeah actually . . . but nothing personal

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 03:26:39 GMT

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

---

OK, I got the Clinton poster... entitled "A Course of Conduct: The Clinton Legacy". It had as least 50 individual facts and figures, so it'll be a bit before I have them typed up.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 03:42:17 GMT

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

---

hooray we finally here the controversial poster!!!!!!!!!!!! please be sure to list reliable sources and etc.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 04:15:40 GMT

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

---

<http://www.n00bstories.com/clinton/scandals.php>

Here's all I have converted so far. Please note that this was compiled in 1999 so some of the phrases and tense is from back then.

Also note that there are a couple typos I noted but I kept them in.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 04:40:24 GMT

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

---

Quote:Ahh, the second amendment? That's just an ancient amendment made way back when the country was very, very different, and America was still a fledgling country and was still under threat from invasion. Nowadays, the only reason anyone needs a gun in their home is for hunting, there is very little reason to have a gun in one's home for personal defence. You're about 30 times more likely to shoot a family member than a robber. Although, one of the big reasons I don't like the NRA [they definitely sponsor the second amendment] is because they are so crooked when they come to politics. They bribe people left and right to keep the second amendment alive.

Sorry to make this so blatantly obvious, but it's in the fucking BILL OF RIGHTS. If you can take that out, you can alter any of the first 10, something which has not been done for 200+ years, and should never be done. Anything that's in the Bill of Rights is one of the ideas that the USA was founded on; those ten amendments are separated from the rest for a good reason: they weren't meant to be changed. Some argue that the National Guard is the militia mentioned in the second amendment, but a militia is a civil force not under governmental control, and the National Guard can be federalized by the president. The entire purpose of that amendment was to allow the average citizen to keep a weapon in their home in case things got out of hand, so they could organize with other armed citizens.

And about the space program- at least Bush is giving attention to it. Clinton, as I said before, cancelled the Shuttle replacement. Bush's new programs, if their aim is the moon, will get us a new spacecraft at least, something which is sorely needed after two deadly failures of the current design. Even if it doesn't push all the way to the moon, we can at least work on getting in and out of orbit without killing our crews. All that aside, If you're looking for a hubble replacement, there's no better place than the moon- an orbit which will never decay, one side always facing away from the Earth, and the possibility of storing spare components on site(which means fewer trips to fix it). A moon base would provide a safer launch point for probes going to Mars and other parts of the Solar System, with no risk of bad weather to impede launches. Materials could be ferried up and probes could be assembled in sterile environments at the launch site. Neither of those would require a human to ever set foot in space. Sounds idealistic, but it's possible with today's technology.

Bush is the only one pushing for those two issues, and the only one who openly says he will not abandon the war on terror. Clark is probably the safest bet for a middle-fo-the-road candidate-he would probably see the war in Iraq through, and being a former general would know a few things more than Bush about what to do there- but he's made himself too ambiguous to be worth the risk. Dean would abandon Iraq and Afghanistan entirely, which would absolutely ruin the US' credibility(as if it weren't bad enough already). Kerry is rather aggressive in his campaigning, which probably means he would be somewhat of an extreme left president(that's all well and good for the democratic primaries, but no republican would ever vote for him).

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 07:47:18 GMT

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

---

Look, here's what it's really all about. Our Constitution gives the government 19 responsibilities. The cost for these is \$700 billion per year. However, the government is taking \$2.4 trillion per year in taxes. Giving themselves responsibilities not originally granted to them in the Constitution. They get away with this by pitting right against left, conservative vs liberal, white vs black, east vs west... you get the idea.

How does a pickpocket operate? He distracts you so he can take your wallet. He might bump into you, drop something, have some woman "accidentally" flash her tits... he distracts you while he takes your money. That's what the government does to us.

#### The Constitution

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Establishes the IRS. All citizens taxed the same regardless of state.

Quote:To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

Part of the US Treasury, issuing bonds, etc.

Quote:To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

Self-explanatory

Quote:To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States;

I don't see how these two duties are lumped into one phrase, but ok...

Quote:To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

#### US Mint

Quote:To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

Self-explanatory

Quote:To establish post offices and post roads;

Self-explanatory

Quote:To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries;

Copyrights and patents

Quote:To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

Lower courts, as in state courts and superior courts.

Quote:To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations;

I would interpret this within our obligation in foreign affairs, such as Iraq, but I could be wrong.

Quote:To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years;

To provide and maintain a navy;

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the states respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

All self-explanatory

Quote:To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular states, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings;--And

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

All those duties above are it. \$700 billion. Nowhere in there was the government supposed to support the lazy non-working folks, and the people with one leg shorter than the other.

That's what makes a Constitutionalist over a Republican or a Democrat.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 21:26:04 GMT

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

---

ok firstly nuke, the bill of rights was an amendment to the constitution (not that its that big of a deal or anything) which makes part of the constitution. secondly whow could you say clark and kerry would be bad for you guys????? the republicans are pushing clark as much as they can why? because about two weeks before clark decided to run he made a little "decision" CLARK WAS REPUBLICAN HIS ENTIRE LIFE UP UNTIL TWO WEEKS BEFORE HE STARTED TO RUN!!! secondly kerry has voted on 5/6 of all of bush's stupid plans (patriot act, iraq) you are crazy if you think he would be deep left!

crimson- about your poster . . . firstly almost all of the "facts" said "alleged" or "allegedly" which doesnt really make them "facts" now does it? secondly a lot of them were either about random things that didnt make any sense, or werent even or just plain irrelevant. also i think i have a better definition of CONSTITUTIONALIST, even though yours was pretty god

CONSTITUTIONALIST- n (con-sti-tu-tion-a-list) greedy asshole who thinks he can impose on anyones business whenever and wherever he feels like, also known to care only about his/her self.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 21:41:41 GMT

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

---

The governments job is to interfere with the people. Otherwise they wouldn't be a government.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 21:45:43 GMT

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

---

"Nodbugger"The governments job is to interfere with the people. Otherwise they wouldn't be a government.

the shit would really hit the fan if nodbugger ever became president

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 22:20:44 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451NodbuggerThe governments job is to interfere with the people. Otherwise they wouldn't be a government.

the shit would really hit the fan if nodbugger ever became president

Man you really dont know shit do you?

<http://www.n00bstories.com/image.fetch.php?id=1160849548>

Yes it is very big. But it makes it easier to read becuae of the folds and crap in it. I had to read this in ROTC.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 22:44:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Prime Minister > President.  
<----

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 22:52:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Nodbugger, let me say this in the simplest way possible -  
YOU-DO-NOT-KNOW-ANYTHING-ABOUT-POLITICS-OR-THE-ECONOMY.

What in the hell are you talking about, the government is supposed to interfere with people? Just because you have some crappy book that says this doesn't mean it's true. If it's a school textbook, that doesn't make it true. The government is supposed to keep a country in order, not interfere with the people. If the U.S. didn't have a government, I suppose you would think that it would be a better place. [in fact, there wouldn't even be a U.S. for 5 days if it didn't have a government] But then you would be a dimwit.

And Crimson, about your poster, I was right in saying that you should flush it down the toilet earlier, in that it's just a big wad of crap. Most of those Whatever-gates start with "Allegedly,..." Anything with this in front of it is a lie someone threw into the news without having any standing behind it. Here's something: Allegedly, Westwood studios is cloning an army of super-human lawyers to kill EA and take back control of their company. B.S.? Yes. Just like your poster. That whole Whitewatergate whatever thing was just stupid. All you said was that it happened. I guess details aren't really very important when it comes to making up incredibly stupid lies. You know how I was saying to use real numbers instead of your opinions earlier in this thread? This is decidedly NOT what I was talking about. If you're going to type up more of this trash, please skip over anything that has "allegedly" in it. You know, I was actually hoping for something a bit better than this that would actually make me look at it and think. But this is just garbage.

Java, will you please stop saying random things about how good Canada is? Although, Canada's health care system owns up on America's. And you would be right in that Canadian Prime Minister > Bush [either one] Uh, but America has more ICBMs. A lot more.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 22:55:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Llama Man 451crimson- about your poster . . . firstly almost all of the "facts" said "alleged" or "allegedly" which doesnt really make them "facts" now does it? secondly a lot of them were either about random things that didnt make any sense, or werent even or just plain irrelevant. also i think i have a better definition of CONSTITUTIONALIST, even though yours was pretty god

CONSTITUTIONALIST- n (con-sti-tu-tion-a-list) greedy asshole who thinks he can impose on anyones business whenever and wherever he feels like, also known to care only about his/her self.

LOL - he had to use "allegedly" wherever he didn't have complete proof that the event took place. It's a word you have to use to avoid being sued for libel or slander. I'm sure you don't have quite so many "allegedly"s tied to your past. And this is only a tiny part of all the information on there. Actually, I should have bet money that you'd jump on the "allegedly" and not think about what you've read.

Your insult of the Constitution is blatantly rude and ignorant. To insult the very document that this nation was founded on and has operated under for over 200 years is not only ignorant, but practically treasonous! But mostly ignorant.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 22:56:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Did I ever say anything about not having a government? Go back to like 4th grade and learn how to comprehend what you read.

this article xplains why we need government. As the government is supposed to infewre in a way that they protect everyones rights. If the government never stepped into domestic affairs noone would survive. This is one reason why the patriot act was passed.

And I know more than you about politics and the economy. You think president is elected by popular vote and accross the board tax cuts are unfair to poor people.

And no it wasnt in a fucking text book.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 22:58:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiJava, will you please stop saying random things about how good Canada is?

No.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 23:31:52 GMT

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

---

crimson i bet you think you are real clever with the whole bunch of you have to use alleged crap. notice you also said you had to say alleged when he had no proof . . . . MORON  
DUUUUUUUUHHHH!!!!!!!

as for you nodbugger, if your idea of simply "interfearing" is making all background checks on anyone of a different race, looking at books you bought or got from a library, and throwing you in jail with no trial, then i guess interferring isn;t a very good thing. thank God the fuckin patriot act is gonna go away. crimson didnt you mention something about following the constitution??? jackass

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 23:33:10 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxSuperFlyingEngiJava, will you please stop saying random things about how good Canada is?

No.

(Quoting the post above you is bad, right?)

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 23:38:17 GMT

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

---

CrimsonLOL - he had to use "allegedly" wherever he didn't have complete proof that the event took place. It's a word you have to use to avoid being sued for libel or slander. I'm sure you don't have quite so many "allegedly"s tied to your past. And this is only a tiny part of all the information on there. Actually, I should have bet money that you'd jump on the "allegedly" and not think about what you've read.

Your insult of the Constitution is blatantly rude and ignorant. To insult the very document that this nation was founded on and has operated under for over 200 years is not only ignorant, but practically treasonous! But mostly ignorant.

He had to use "allegedly" because there is no truth behind any of it. If there was, he wouldn't need said word. Also, he probably would have given some sources instead of writing down his opinions. You know what Whitewater was? Complete baloney. The Clintons got involved in a small real

estate deal that they never got profit from, and conservatives turned it into a big scandal. What followed was a 40 million dollar investigation of what Clinton did, and they NEVER FOUND A GOD DAMN THING. Instead of telling me to comprehend what I read before I say something, which I did, I'm going to tell you to open your eyes before you believe something. Because you obviously took the first hint you got about this "Whitewater" crap.

Ahh, Nodbugger, your incomprehension is so glaring this time. [just like all the others] I NEVER said that the president was elected by a popular vote. Maybe YOU should go back to 4th grade and re-learn reading comprehension. And no, across the board tax cuts are not unfair to people. Bush's tax cuts were NOT a flat percent. And since they weren't, why did he lie about the vast majority of the help going to those at the bottom? Because uninformed people like you are willing to believe him.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 23:45:07 GMT

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

---

you are seriously an idiot, I cant beleive crimson hasnt banned you yet for such idiocy.

You obsiously would rather have gore as president. And Bushes tax cuts were acroos the board. Meaning everyone got the same percent. Thats the only way residential tax cuts work!

And Bush hasnt lied. I dare you to prove it with facts. And not from bushsucks.com

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 23:56:47 GMT

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

---

NODBUGGER HAVE YOU READ ANY OF THE THREAD SUPERFLYINGENGL HAS GIVEN SO MANY STATISTICS AND NUMBERS IT MAKE MY HEAD SPIN duh!!! as for giving crimson the idea of kicking him off your just upset because you know superfly can shove every lie you believe right back in your fac with the truth! does it just suck being you??

for another thing everyone got like 300\$ moron so its impossible to say most went to the poor when the most are considered middle class forget 4th grade your hopeless but keep posting stuff you just crack me up

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 05 Feb 2004 23:58:44 GMT

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

---

When did I ever say I would rather have Gore as president? What's that? Never? Oh yeah. Don't say something if you don't have anything to stand behind when it comes back to you. It's apparent that you don't because you didn't say why you think I would want Gore as president.

---

If you know so much about residential tax cuts and how they work, then what are they? Hmm?

Bush did lie, you are just....not....listening. Bush promised America in a campaign speech that the "vast majority of the help will go to those at the bottom." This is a direct quote. And when Bush's tax cuts roll around, the bottom 60 percent got 14.7 percent of the help. He didn't lie? My ass he didn't. And now you're telling me to go back to 4th grade?

Here's a nice little site to look through so you can find some more lies Bush has thrown around.  
<http://www.bushwatch.com>

No, I never got ANY of my facts from bushsucks.com.

I find it amusing that you want me banned from these forums because of your opinions that are not supported by any real facts other than more of your opinions. You can't prove a point without having something substantiating behind it.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 00:32:05 GMT

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

---

And your piont has been sustained by anything? Ive only countered your opinion with common sense.

Its all I need to get rid of you.

And the website is not a source. Its an opinion site that is obviously biased.

And if you eve go that site I can see why you are soo stupid.

And the tax cuts were across the board. They helped everyone that payed taxes.

And may I ask you a few questions

1. How would leaving Saddam in power promote Peace in the middle east?
2. Do you agree Saddam needed to be dealt with?
3. If not for war, what other way could we remove Saddam from power?

(BTW I have never heard someone like you answer these questions)

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 00:48:16 GMT

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

Llama Man, seriously... until you start posting like a rational, thinking human being, I'm not going to even respond to your blathering.

OK, listen up... 96.03% of U.S. Income taxes are paid by the top 50% of wage earners in the USA. The top 10% of wage earners pay 64.89%. Don't believe me?

<http://www.irs.ustreas.gov/pub/irs-soi/01in01ts.xls>

There's a nice huge Excel spreadsheet. Not from some anti-Bush site. Not from some anti-Democrat site. It's from the IRS. The people collecting the money.

Take time and add it up if you want. Or read here:

[http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/home/menu/top\\_50\\_\\_of\\_wage\\_earners\\_pay\\_96\\_09\\_\\_of\\_income\\_taxes.guest.html](http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/home/menu/top_50__of_wage_earners_pay_96_09__of_income_taxes.guest.html)

where they've done the math already.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 01:02:28 GMT

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

- 
1. How would leaving Saddam in power promote Peace in the middle east?
  2. Do you agree Saddam needed to be dealt with?
  3. If not for war, what other way could we remove Saddam from power?

these questions are really easy to answer nodbugger

1. ok saddam was not having an effect on all of the middle east theis whole israel pakistan thing is having adverse effects as well. secondly no, it wouldnt, which is what both superfly and i said earlier in the thread.

also you might not forget that the US supplied saddam with missles and weapons and we were his ally for quite awhile

2. yes i do agree saddam needed to be dealt with, but a full blown war which would send us into a 356 billion dollar or something debt is definately not the way we should hae handeled it.

3. ok looking for someon with troops and looking for someone with troops while blowing everything up are completely different things the war did not help find saddam at all we did blow up things "and kill him" several times. in fact we were able to blow up a restarant "he was in" and OOPS WE KILLED 200 PEOPLE OUR BAD! also the CIA came out and admitted today that they had told th Bush Administration countless times that they had no real intelligence and they had no one on location with reliable infromation however bush continued to lie about WMD's which he is currently saying he never said. unfortunately, you probably didnt see that because im pretty sure they didnt show it on FOX nes. in conclusion we did not have to kill innocent Iraqis and

Americans in order to get Saddam for false premises that were now proven to be inaccurate and unreliable before we should determine anything we should have gotten secret trained professionals over there to figure out what was going on

oh and by the way did you ever take into consideration that you've never heard anyone answer these questions maybe it was because you don't take anyone else's point of view into account and would probably have had a tantrum and/or have run away screaming before they had a chance to answer

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 01:05:18 GMT

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

---

ok i do respond coherently crimson just because you are so megalomaniacal and easy to disprove doesn't mean you have to piss yourself, christ

in response to this:

Llama Man, seriously... until you start posting like a rational, thinking human being, I'm not going to even respond to your blathering.

YOU JUST MAD CAUSE . . . TONIGHT YOU SUCKAHS GOT SERVED!!!!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 01:13:45 GMT

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

---

My reply to you bad answers

1. Saddam did have an effect on that region. Kuwait was scared to death of Iraq. they didn't promote a good image and Saddam was bad as you already know.

2. Well then what is the way we should have handled it?

3. and well you need to check some facts. Bush did not lie intentionally (and many still don't believe he lied at all. i don't think he did) And I do not watch Fox news. I really do not watch any news. I just get little tidbits from everywhere.

And what do you mean false premises? The fact he killed thousands of Kurds? Or the one where he tortured countless number of people? Or what about the one where he invaded a small country for no reason and killed thousands of people so he can get oil?

And we do not need specially trained people over there to determine Saddam being in charge of a

country was not right.

What if wmd was neevr an issue would you support it then? You know ytoud be hipocritical. Because there were atleast 10 good reasons to do it. Besides if we didn't go in wed be wondering if he had them or not and the inteligence would neevr of changed and Saddam would till be in power killing raping and torturing hundreds of people.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 01:14:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<http://www.cnn.com/2004/US/02/05/tenet.transcript.ap/index.html>

In Tenet's speech, you are inferring that he meant "we kept telling Bush that Saddam wasn't anything to worry about". You are dead wrong. All he said was "we didn't say he was an imminent threat". That doesn't mean he wasn't one.

TenetRather, they painted an objective assessment for our policy-makers of a brutal dictator who was continuing his efforts to deceive and build programs that might constantly surprise us and threaten our interests. No one told us what to say or how to say it.

One can only wonder how much more we would have known, had Clinton not cut our military in half after Reagan built it up.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 01:21:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

U.S. Navy Capt. Ouimette is the XO of NAS, Pensacola. Here is a copy of the speech he gave earlier this month. A wonderful and accurate account of why we are in trouble today.

America WAKE UP!

That's what we think we heard on the 11th of September 2001 and maybe it was, but I think it should have been "Get Out of Bed!" In fact, I think the alarm clock has been buzzing since 1979 and we have continued to hit the snooze button and roll over for a few more minutes of peaceful sleep since then.

It was a cool fall day in November 1979 in a country going through a religious and political upheaval when a group of Iranian students attacked and seized the American Embassy in Tehran. This seizure was an outright attack on American soil; it was an attack that held the world's most powerful country hostage and paralyzed a Presidency. The attack on this sovereign US embassy set the stage for the events to follow for the next 23 years.

America was still reeling from the aftermath of the Viet Nam experience and had a serious threat

from the Soviet Union when then, President Carter, had to do something. He chose to conduct a clandestine raid in the desert. The ill-fated mission ended in ruin, but stood as a symbol of America's inability to deal with terrorism. America's military had been decimated and downsized / right sized since the end of the Viet Nam war. A poorly trained, poorly equipped and poorly organized military was called on to execute a complex mission that was doomed from the start.

Shortly after the Tehran experience, Americans began to be kidnaped and killed throughout the Middle East. America could do little to protect her citizens living and working abroad. The attacks against US soil continued. In April of 1983 a large vehicle packed with high explosives was driven into the US Embassy compound in Beirut. When it explodes, it kills 63 people. The alarm went off again and America hit the Snooze Button once more. Then just six short months later a large truck heavily laden down with over 2500 pounds of TNT smashed through the main gate of the US Marine Corps headquarters in Beirut. 241 US servicemen are killed. America mourns her dead and hit the Snooze Button once more. Two months later in December 1983, another truck loaded with explosives is driven into the US Embassy in Kuwait, and America continues her slumber. The following year, in September 1984, another van was driven into the gates of the US Embassy in Beirut and America slept.

Soon the terrorism spreads to Europe. In April 1985 a bomb explodes in a restaurant frequented by US soldiers in Madrid. Then in August a Volkswagen loaded with explosives is driven into the main gate of the US Air Force Base at Rhein-Main, 22 are killed and the Snooze Alarm is buzzing louder and louder as US soil is continually attacked. Fifty-nine days later a cruise ship, the Achille Lauro is hijacked and we watched as an American in a wheelchair is singled out of the passenger list and executed. The terrorists then shift their tactics to bombing civilian airliners when they bomb TWA Flight 840 in April of 1986 that killed 4 and the most tragic bombing, Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland in 1988, killing 259. America wants to treat these terrorist acts as

Up alarm is louder and louder.

The terrorists decide to bring the fight to America. In January 1993, two CIA agents are shot and killed as they enter CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia. The following month, February 1993, a group of terrorists are arrested after a rented van packed with explosives is driven into the underground parking garage of the World Trade Center in New York City. Six people are killed and over 1000 are injured. Still this is a crime and not an act of war? The Snooze alarm is depressed again.

Then in November 1995 a car bomb explodes at a US military complex in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia killing seven service men and women. A few months later in June of 1996, another truck bomb explodes only 35 yards from the US military compound in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. It destroys the Khobar Towers, a US Air Force barracks, killing 19 and injuring over 500.

The terrorists are getting braver and smarter as they see that America does not respond decisively. They move to coordinate their attacks in a simultaneous attack on two US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. These attacks were planned with precision, they kill 224. America responds with cruise missile attacks and goes back to sleep.

The USS Cole was docked in the port of Aden, Yemen for refueling on 12 October 2000, when a small craft pulled along side the ship and exploded killing 17 US Navy Sailors. Attacking a US

War Ship is an act of war, but we sent the FBI to investigate the crime and went back to sleep.

And of course you know the events of 11 September 2001. Most Americans think this was the first attack against US soil or in America. How wrong they are. America has been under a constant attack since 1979 and we chose to hit the snooze alarm and roll over and go back to sleep.

In the news lately we have seen lots of finger pointing from every high official in government over what they knew and what they didn't know. But if you've read the papers and paid a little attention I think you can see exactly what they knew. You don't have to be in the FBI or CIA or on the National Security Council to see the pattern that has been developing since 1979. The President is right on when he says we are engaged in a war. I think we have been in a war for the past 23 years and it will continue until we as a people decide enough is enough.

America has to "Get out of Bed" and act decisively now. America has changed forever. We have to be ready to pay the price and make the sacrifice to ensure our way of life continues. We cannot afford to hit the Snooze Button again and roll over and go back to sleep. We have to make the terrorists know that in the words of Admiral Yamamoto after the attack on Pearl Harbor "that all they have done is to awaken a sleeping giant."

Thank you very much.

Dan Ouimette  
Pensacola Civitan  
19 Feb 2003

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 01:23:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Llama Man 451ok i do respond cohereantly crimson just because you are so megalomaniacal and easy to disprove doesnt mean you have to piss yourself, christ

in response to this:

Llama Man, seriously... until you start posting like a rational, thinking human being, I'm not going to even respond to your blathering.

YOU JUST MAD CAUSE . . . TONIGHT YOU SUCKAHS GOT SERVED!!!!

Hey, if I'm so easy to disprove, then disprove the numbers from the IRS, eh? Instead of resulting to insulting me, a pathetic ad hominem tactic.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 01:34:54 GMT

---

NodbuggerAnd your piont has been sustained by anything? Ive only countered your opinion with common sense.

Its all I need to get rid of you.

And the website is not a source. Its an opinion site that is obviously biased.

And if you eve go that site I can see why you are soo stupid.

And the tax cuts were across the board. They helped everyone that payed taxes.

And may I ask you a few questions

1. How would leaving Saddam in power promote Peace in the middle east?
2. Do you agree Saddam needed to be dealt with?
3. If not for war, what other way could we remove Saddam from power?

(BTW I have never heard someone like you answer these questions)

First off, you "countered" me with opinions, in which you believe that your opinions are common sense. This is an opinion. Opinions do not equal facts, except apparently in your crazy world. Your common sense is all you need to get rid of me? Man, shut up. I keep coming back, and I'm not going away because of your opinions.

Yes, that website may be an opinion site, until they get to quoting Bush about his speeches. You can't bias something that someone else said. My god, as soon as you see something that doesn't like Bush, all you people go in an uproar about the site being biased, where in fact the site is telling the truth. That site is a source, plain and goddam simple. (Notice how I don't care at all about your opinions. I can't recall you uttering a single number to support your cause YET.) And in the future, don't say that I'm stupid because I went to a website in which it is your opinion that the site is bad.

You still didn't explain to me how residential tax cuts work, which makes it apparent to me that you have no concept of how they work. And don't give me that stupid baby argument of "Oh, I know how they work, it's just that YOU want me to explain it to you." That's just stupid.

If the tax cuts were across the board and you know it, how about you get me some numbers to support it?

My answers to your questions:

- 1) Yes, Saddam had an effect on the region. Yes, it was a bad one. Yes, it would have made me happy to see him step down.
- 2) Yes, Saddam needed to be dealt with. Bush did it in about the worst way possible. He basically flicked off the U.N. and went his merry way. He also went in saying to the media that they knew WMDs were in Iraq. Can you say wrong? I know I can.

3) There really was no correct way to remove Saddam Hussein from power at the time.

Listen up, don't call me a hypocrite because I thought Saddam was bad but I also thought Bush made sucky decisions to get him out of power.

Crimson: WHAT THE HELL. Clinton cut the military in half? To support such a crazy "fact" like that you really need some numbers.

Finally, Nodbugger, this thread is about Bush is good or bad, not about whether anyone else is, although I am happy to defend Clinton all day long. And you really have to get some numbers to support what you are saying. Because all of your opinion posts are really getting on my nerves, and they don't really prove much of anything other than that you can't prove a point.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:03:42 GMT

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

---

nodbugger give me a friggin break thae fact that you say you dont watch the news is proof enough yooou dont know shit about politicswhich you already have proved earlier in the thread. anyay i said that saddam didnt have an effect on ALL of the middle east idiot, kuwiit was scared to death i know!!!! also false premises weapons of mass destruction, liberation of theiraqui people, an end to terrorism, we dont want oil. . . read between the lines!!! we didnt do any of those we found no weapons we are turning Iraq into a friggin anarchy practically, we are talking about going to saudi arabia and there was never any proof about sadddams link to terrorism it was bin ladin (or so they say)nthose were false premises.

crimson- that was a good speech but i dont understand the point of it exactly, it still doesnt answer why we went to war with iraq and seriously if my facts and comebacks are pissing you off maybe you should come up with osme of your own (not to brag or anything)i must congratulate you on your IRS bit (if you ask me, you can trust the IRS as far as you can sling a piano) but compared to nodbugger King of Assuming He's Right here you are Socrates. unfortunately it still doesnt really level out the scale and i still wanna hear what these taxes are all about nodblugger

also like superfly said this was about current events not how awesome of a president clinton was, so maybe we should talk about things that are happening now like abortion and stuff. im getting bored of proving nodblugger wrong and i think it would be good to moveon to a new topic.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:07:37 GMT

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

---

Why do people think Iraq is being torn apart? Stop listening to the media. Both sides are screwing this whole thing up. My dad is in New Jersey right now after being in Iraq for a year. I think he knows what has been going on. And he has pretty mcuh said everoyn ie happy we were there. Some want us to leave others want us to stay and most of the people doing the attacks are not

Iraqis.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:21:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Llama Man 451crimson- that was a good speech but i dont understand the point of it exactly,

If you can't swim with the big fishes, don't jump in the ocean.

Quote:it still doesnt answer why we went to war with iraq

Yeah, well, maybe you hit the snooze button again.

Quote:and seriously if my facts

Facts? Where?

Quote:and comebacks are pissing you off maybe you should come up with osme of your own (not to brag or anything)

Sorry I prefer to discuss like an adult.

Quote:i must congratulate you on your IRS bit (if you ask me, you can trust the IRS as far as you can sling a piano)

Oh, so now we just can't trust the numbers when they don't end up in your favor, eh? Maybe I should have added the word "allegedly" to it?

Quote:also like superfly said this was about current events not how awesome of a president clinton was, so maybe we should talk abou things that are happening now like abortion and stuff. im getting bored of proving nodblugger wrong and i think it would be good to moveon to a new topic.

You want a different topic, start a new thread. I'm not arguing how "awesome Clinton was" because the truth was the exact opposite.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:21:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

nodblugger- i TOTALLY agree with you Iraq is TOTALLY stable. thats why we need a large, expensive military presence there . . . theyre about as stabledick cheneys blood pressure

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:24:54 GMT

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

---

facts where- last time i checked crimson i had given more facts than your alleged clinton poster and im sorry for suggesting something i should have know you are right about everything

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:33:27 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451nodbugger- i TOTALLY agree with you Iraq is TOTALLY stable. thats why we need a large, expensive military presence there . . . theyre about as stabledick cheneys blood pressure

Well I guess by your way of thinking we shouldn't have 100s of thousands of troops in the United States then.(Just to let you know there are just as many troops in Germany as Iraq) And very few of the troops in Iraq are doing combat jobs.

Besides we have to be american military, american cops, Iraqi militcary and Iraqi cops. So we are doing a few jobs.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:35:07 GMT

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

---

CrimsonIf you can't swim with the big fishes, don't jump in the ocean.

The fact that you posted someone giving an eloquent speech about the U.S. not responding to terrorism with wars instead of sending that sissy F.B.I. organization out...is actually fairly irrelevant. I feel for llama man when he can't quite follow randomness.

CrimsonYeah, well, maybe you hit the snooze button again.

What in the world are you talking about? Iraq had no connections with terrorism, except when that little assassin group came in, but if it didn't justify a war back then, why should it justify one now? Contrary to what the media says, Iraq had no connection with 9/11.

CrimsonFacts? Where?

You really could have been more specific in addressing a post then quoting 5 words of it and saying that it's wrong.

CrimsonSorry I prefer to discuss like an adult.

---

Then why'd you call me a Dumbass earlier, if you're such an adult?

CrimsonOh, so now we just can't trust the numbers when they don't end up in your favor, eh?

Im gonna have to go with you on this one, the IRS really isn't biased one way or another.

CrimsonYou want a different topic, start a new thread. I'm not arguing how "awesome Clinton was" because the truth was the exact opposite.

I'm afraid I was a little misunderstood when I told Nodbugger to stay focused on Bush. What I meant was that he should stop dissing me because of his opinions, because it's childish and doesn't get anywhere. And it would only seem as if Clinton were a bad president because conservatives tried to get Clinton in so many scandals, like Whitewater, which was just stupid. Yeah, Clinton definitely sucked enough to create 23 million jobs while he was president.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:40:03 GMT

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

---

HOLY SHIT hell has frozen over nodbugger has agreed with someone no way im glad that you put up a random thing about germany. however we are not invading and killing germany so it is quite different CRIMSON YOU NEED TO CHILL OUT AND ACTUALLY READ WHAT OTHER PEOPLE SAY NOT JUST SKIMM IT? AND STOP TRYING TO FALL BACK ON stupid peoples speeches sorry bout caps but i in response to your little conniption

DMAN I AM CONTROVERSIAL!!!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:40:59 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451facts where- last time i checked crimson i had given more facts than your alleged clinton poster and im sorry for suggesting something i should have know you are right about everything

Idiot. You've shown no proofs to any single claim you've made. Everything you have said is arguably "alleged". Crimson on the other hand has made several references to websites, documents and letters. You; you've spewwed out nothing but incoherent drivel tied in with "OMFG U FAG I FUKIN NO MOR THEN U!!!!!!!111111"

If you don't believe me, go and find where you've directly linked a proof, or given reference to the exact wordings of a document instead of your own interpretation. And for God's sake, stop being a hypocrite.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:41:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Llama Man 451HOLY SHIT hell has frozen over nodbugger has agreed with someone no way im glad that you put up a random thing about germany. however we are not invading and killing germany so it is quite different

What do you mean agreed? I think Iraq is stable for what it just went thorough. Hell its like you going through a brain transplant.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javacx](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:43:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngi

What in the world are you talking about? Iraq had no connections with terrorism, except when that little assassin group came in, but if it didn't justify a war back then, why should it justify one now? Contrary to what the media says, Iraq had no connection with 9/11.

For the sake of argument; Put your money where your mouth is. Prove it.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:43:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Facts: Clinton cut the active military in half:

Total counts of Active Duty Military Personnel (Army + Navy + Marine Corps + Air Force)

1987: 2,174,217

(Bush, Sr. takes office)

1988: 2,138,213

1989: 2,130,229

1990: 2,043,705

1991: 1,985,555

(Clinton takes office)

1992: 1,807,180

1993: 1,705,103

1994: 1,610,490

1995: 1,518,224

1996: 1,471,722

1997: 1,438,562

1998: 1,406,830

1999: 1,385,703

(Clinton leaves office)

These figures show a net loss of 788,514 active military personnel, which is 36% of the military that Reagan had at the end of his term in 1988. You can see a graphical representation of this:

<http://web1.whs.osd.mil/mmid/military/ms8.pdf>

or the actual numbers at:

<http://web1.whs.osd.mil/mmid/military/ms9.pdf>

Note that these numbers do not include the FBI or CIA, which I think I need to dig up, because I know that their funding was cut along with the DoD funding.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:47:49 GMT

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

---

nodbugger, what the hell are you talking about they are doing well there are about two suicide bombings a week!!!

java, which side are you on?

if itll make you happy here

<http://www.bushin30seconds.org>

besides java, have you put in anything besides random shit about canada

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:50:12 GMT

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

---

What an ironic statement. You've contributed less to this thread then I have.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:51:48 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxFor the sake of argument; Put your money where your mouth is. Prove it.

Did you watch the news the day Saddam was captured? The media [this doesn't count FOX news, because I DO NOT watch FOX news] was randomly flashing pictures of the 9/11 terrorists along with their coverage of Saddam being captured without explaining why they were doing it. Moving on, it's rather difficult to prove something that hasn't been proven, like Iraq being involved with the

9/11 terrorist bombings.

But congratulations! Java, you've gone 3 entire posts on this thread without comparing anything Canadian to anything else.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 02:55:11 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451nodbugger, what the hell are you talking about they are doing well there are about two suicide bombings a week!!!

java, which side are you on?

if itll make you happy here

<http://www.bushin30seconds.org>

besides java, have you put in anything besides random shit about canada

No, he said proof. Not yet another anti-Bush link.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 03:02:58 GMT

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

---

CrimsonFacts: Clinton cut the active military in half:

Total counts of Active Duty Military Personnel (Army + Navy + Marine Corps + Air Force)

1987: 2,174,217

(Bush, Sr. takes office)

1988: 2,138,213

1989: 2,130,229

1990: 2,043,705

1991: 1,985,555

(Clinton takes office)

1992: 1,807,180

1993: 1,705,103

1994: 1,610,490

1995: 1,518,224

1996: 1,471,722

1997: 1,438,562

1998: 1,406,830

1999: 1,385,703

(Clinton leaves office)

These figures show a net loss of 788,514 active military personnel, which is 36% of the military that Reagan had at the end of his term in 1988.

It's not 36% of the military Reagan had, it's 36% of the people. Now, after Reagan left the presidency, a little place I like to refer to as the Soviet Union collapsed, which was pretty much the last big super-power that stood in the way of the U.S. (INTERESTING FACT: If Clinton hadn't seized most of the weapons-grade nuclear fuel in the collapsing Soviet Union, there might have actually been WMDs in Iraq.) It's for this reason that active personnel went down during the Clinton Administration. This does not, however, mean that the strength of the military went down. Under Clinton, new technology came around, and Clinton stopped throwing money to sleazy defense contractors for research for development of special weapons that didn't even come close to working.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 03:07:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Actually, I didn't want the news when Saddam was captured. I've learned that the on-the-spot news has revealed half-truths and biased propoganda. I'm completely serious, so don't get the impression that I'm attacking you by saying that.

See, the problem with proving that Iraq had no connections to 9/11 is like trying to find a needle in a haystack. Media can be twisted to support a certain idea, circumstantial evidence, or political sway. This has been proven time and time again. If you need proof, just look at different news sites and look at the avid differences in opinion.

On a side note: Personally, I think that alot of the democrat/republic "battle" in the eyes of a voter is: "Well, I think THIS side will win, so I'll support them". Of course, I might be wrong, but thats my opinion.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [U927](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 03:13:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

These long debates are the reason why I stay out of politics.

But USA still pwnz Canada.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

---

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 03:17:06 GMT

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

---

Canada is, and continues to be the better place to live. Take it from someone with experience.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 03:18:58 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonFacts: Clinton cut the active military in half:

Total counts of Active Duty Military Personnel (Army + Navy + Marine Corps + Air Force)

1987: 2,174,217

(Bush, Sr. takes office)

1988: 2,138,213

1989: 2,130,229

1990: 2,043,705

1991: 1,985,555

(Clinton takes office)

1992: 1,807,180

1993: 1,705,103

1994: 1,610,490

1995: 1,518,224

1996: 1,471,722

1997: 1,438,562

1998: 1,406,830

1999: 1,385,703

(Clinton leaves office)

These figures show a net loss of 788,514 active military personnel, which is 36% of the military that Reagan had at the end of his term in 1988.

It's not 36% of the military Reagan had, it's 36% of the people. Now, after Reagan left the presidency, a little place I like to refer to as the Soviet Union collapsed, which was pretty much the last big super-power that stood in the way of the U.S. (INTERESTING FACT: If Clinton hadn't seized most of the weapons-grade nuclear fuel in the collapsing Soviet Union, there might have actually been WMDs in Iraq.) It's for this reason that active personnel went down during the Clinton Administration. This does not, however, mean that the strength of the military went down. Under Clinton, new technology came around, and Clinton stopped throwing money to sleazy defense contractors for research for development of special weapons that didn't even come close to working.

And this proved her right. Maybe not the "half" she claimed, but the military's strength was in fact cut down quite considerably. She never said reduced in power, or your definition of military strength, just "cut in half".

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 03:18:59 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxActually, I didn't want the news when Saddam was captured. I've learned that the on-the-spot news has revealed half-truths and biased propaganda. I'm completely serious, so don't get the impression that I'm attacking you by saying that.

See, the problem with proving that Iraq had no connections to 9/11 is like trying to find a needle in a haystack. Media can be twisted to support a certain idea, circumstantial evidence, or political sway. This has been proven time and time again. If you need proof, just look at different news sites and look at the avid differences in opinion.

On a side note: Personally, I think that alot of the democrat/republic "battle" in the eyes of a voter is: "Well, I think THIS side will win, so I'll support them". Of course, I might be wrong, but thats my opinion.

No offense taken about your opinions of on-the-spot news. I think it sucks, too.

That's an interesting way to look for what's true and what's not, by looking for conflicting stories, but I got enough evidence to satisfy myself for a lifetime after I watched the news that day. They had no reason to show pictures of 9/11 bombers, and yet they did, right in the middle of the Saddam Captured broadcast.

Well, at least I'm not picking a side [Democrat/Republican/Constitutionalist?] because I can't vote.

And thanks for an intellectual post that didn't insult anyone.

Quote:And this proved her right. Maybe not the "half" she claimed, but the miitary's strength was infact cut down quite considerably. She never said reduced in power, or your definition of military strength, just "cut in half".

I beg to differ. The fact that there are less people in the military doesn't mean that it is less potent. Although, this whole "military going down in size" thing is silly because the U.S. spends more money to support it's military than all the other countries in the world. Combined.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 03:21:22 GMT

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

---

Well look at this way; A picture says 1000 words. How many times did you see that picture of Saddam with his unkept hair?

How many stories and opinions sprouted from that?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 03:22:50 GMT

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

---

java- three posts is pretty monumental i must say but i do respect your opinoi on the reublican-democrat battle. but in my opinion it is more of people fighting for what they believe in. i believe that if bush is reelected we will face a timem worse than the great depression and even if he is not elected again we will remember this for a loooooong time, whereas crimson, nodbugger believe othewise.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [U927](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 03:23:00 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxActually, I didn't want the news when Saddam was captured. I've learned that the on-the-spot news has revealed half-truths and biased propaganda. I'm completely serious, so don't get the impression that I'm attacking you by saying that.

See, the problem with proving that Iraq had no connections to 9/11 is like trying to find a needle in a haystack. Media can be twisted to support a certain idea, circumstantial evidence, or political sway. This has been proven time and time again. If you need proof, just look at different news sites and look at the avid differences in opinion.

I wholeheartedly agree with you on this one. Today in my debate class we were discussing propaganda, and the issue of media came up.

For example: 9/11. Our entire focus goes to Afghanistan and the capture of Osama. Then, after the Afghani conflict is resolved, another issue pops up: North Korea and its nuclear arsenal. Afterwards, Iraq. We fought a "war" (if you really want to call it one) and won. Seven months later we capture Hussein. Now what's on the news. Janet Jackson's boob.

What I find incredulous is the way people interpret the media. They see all the negative things going on in the country because that is all the media focuses on. Therefore, they can go and say that all the bad things happening are due to the administration. This applies to both parties, so don't go saying "LEIK OGM Y R U SUPOTRING TEM!!!!111".

It's all about the ratings. The "big issues" in the presidential debates are mostly going to be red herrings.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 03:23:57 GMT

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

---

bah.. Politics is a corrupt business anyways. I don't think there has been one leader in the US, or Canada for that matter, that has done a perfect job, and the way things appear to be going, there isn't going to be a over-all decent leader as long people only vote for the "democratic" or

"Republican" (US) or "liberal" (Canadian) party. It should be the person with the better ideals that runs a country, regardless of which party they affiliate themselves with.

But then, I sometimes live in a fantasy world where the perfect society resides.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 03:26:21 GMT

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

---

Quote: I beg to differ. The fact that there are less people in the military doesn't mean that it is less potent. Although, this whole "military going down in size" thing is silly because the U.S. spends more money to support it's military than all the other countries in the world. Combined.

Just as potent, just as "strong", most money spent... doesn't negate the fact that the military has been reduced.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 05:35:58 GMT

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

---

If reducing the numbers in the military didn't make a difference, explain the intelligence failure on 9/11 and the intelligence failure in finding WMD so far.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 15:17:53 GMT

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

---

Look, you retards...Saddam USED WMD's. Remember the attacks on the kurds in northern Iraq? He used CHEMICAL WEAPONS such as mustar dgas and nerve agents to carry out those attacks. WMD does NOT mean just germs, or just nukes. Did you know that in the earliest days of the war, US troops found large quantities of agricultural chemicals (which are actually quite potent as nerve agents) which NO Iraqui under Sadam would have been able to afford? We're talking dozens of barrels, here, not just your average tank and sprayer. They've already FOUND weapons of mass destruction, but everyone's so damn busy looking for nukes that they don't notice what they already have. Just because it isn't made by a company dedicated to military equipmnet does NOT mean it can't be used as a weapon; McVeigh showed that when he used FERTILIZER to blow up the federal building in Oklahoma City. The Agricultural chemicals found in Iraq could kill a human in minutes if they were used in the quantities and concentrations that were discovered. That was on the news, but it's been overshadowed because people have been bitching about finding weaponized WMD's, AND NOT THE MATERIALS USED TO MAKE THEM! I know exactly what these chemicals could have been used for, my dad used to work with shit like this. Improvised weapons can be obtained by legal means, and are legal right up until you assemble them- and no one would be the wiser if they didn't know what you were up to.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 21:05:59 GMT

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

---

nuke- i dont think you realize the idiocy in your statement . . . agricultural items can be used as weapons that is true but then again so can a pencil

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 06 Feb 2004 21:20:00 GMT

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

---

So they found WMD's? Wonder why they released a statement saying that they were wrong and that there are none...

oh yes... your saying that ordinary household items are the weapons of mass destruction. Guess that makes every citizen in the US and Canada a potential terrorist. Why don't we just ban everything that can be used as an ingrediant because of it's potential.

But then again, the UN defines the WMD's as those made specifically for mass destruction, not weapons that you put on your lawn to encourage growth.

But then you said it best...

Quote:Improvised weapons can be obtained by legal means, and are legal right up until you assemble them

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2004 03:09:36 GMT

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

---

Hey Crimson, I looked over your "poster" again, and realizing I didn't do it full justice simply saying it was a load of B.S. Here's a little more in-depth view in to just how wrong your dad was:

"Whitewatergate"

A complex ponzi scheme

No, the issue (for which the Clintons were exonerated, as you no doubt remember) was about a loan, not a ponzi scheme. Foolish rumors were circulating (more about those foolish rumors below), so Clinton appointed a independent counsel in 1994 to clear things up in a way that no one could argue with. Got that? Clinton appointed the independent counsel.

involving real estate and Madison Guaranty S&L ending with 18 felony counts and up to 3 years in prison for some of the principles.

Up to three years! Goodness. If you think the sentence contributes something, let's ask what some of those other 14, not 18, sentences were. Suspended. Suspended. 21 days. (21 days! For this we paid \$40 million!?)

Did you think the Clintons were found guilty? Let's ask the minority counsel of the Whitewater committee, Richard Benveniste, what he thinks. "It didn't surprise me that there was nothing illegal, much less noteworthy, about Whitewater." [Check the quote with google.]

One of the "Whitewater" convicted, David Hale, was a witness for Kenneth Starr! He was that figure of legend, the crook who sees the error of his ways and corrects his sins by making a deal with the prosecutor to turn in someone else.

The others? Who were they? Can you name one besides the MacDougals? They were people Clinton never even \_heard\_ of, who had as much to do with Whitewater as Monica Lewinsky did. They were all the bad people Starr could find who had ever done business with anyone who had ever done business with people who had done business with Clinton. Starr rounded them up and dropped the boom on them so that he could claim convictions in the "Whitewater case." \_Three\_ of the convictions were connected in any way with Whitewater. None were connected in any way with the Clintons. Even MacDougal's fraud conviction had nothing to do with the Clintons.

The whole thing would have been a vicious joke, except that it cost \$40 million. Or to put it another way, \$40 million was transferred from the public treasury and converted into a lying Republican campaign ad. For which, in the opinion of thinking people, at least several Republicans should have been hanged.

"Foster's files"  
Allegedly

What is this "allegedly"? Do you know who made these "allegations"? I do. He wrote a book about it, and you really need to read it. It's called "Blinded by the Right," by the scabrous David Brock. He was hired to make up lies about the Clintons by a truly disgusting being called Richard Scaife, who financed the anti-Clinton industry. Sit around a table, make up lies, spread them far and wide, ride out the debunking, then spread the same lies again. Over and over and over. It wasn't as if we needed Brock to write his book to know about it. But then Brock felt Jesus tap on his shoulder and in the consuming flame of humiliation, Brock confessed his crimes in his book. That's a Republican thing, apparently. Give yourself over to wickedness, and then when some crisis occurs in your life and you finally hear the Old Man tapping his feet, confess and beg forgiveness. It's called "doing a Lee Atwater." (If you don't get it, google "Lee Atwater deathbed." Or "Reagan political director deathbed beg forgiveness")

many files were removed from Vince Foster's White House office shortly after his death. Access to the office was denied authorities, and while White House Staffers denied removing files several of the Secret Service officers on duty stated that files were being removed.

This is all nonsense. Chief White House counsel Bernard Nussbaum removed files relating to the Clintons after Foster killed himself. With Foster dead, the files were the responsibility of the White

House counsel. What does it mean?! What does it mean?! It means Nussbaum was doing his job. In the presence, as you point out, of Secret Service officers. Why is this a scandal? Because David Brock and the beast Scaife spread lies about the story, ranging from "stolen files" for anyone foolish enough to believe it, to "Hillary killed Foster" for anyone insane enough to believe it. It's still going on. You're part of it.

Allegedly many of the Clinton's business and personal files had been kept there, by their personal attorney, Vince Foster.

Not their personal attorney. Deputy White House counsel. Worked for Nussbaum.

#### "Missing Billing Records"

Allegedly, Hillary Clinton was not able to produce the subpoenaed Rose Law Firm records

Not allegedly. She was unable to produce them. Didn't know where they were. What were they? Sheets listing what hours she had billed for various jobs. Quick, where is your time card from February 19, 1994? Produce it or be damned.

that detailed her denied involvement in the Whitewater/Castle Grande real estate scandal

Jaysus, they didn't "detail her involvement"! When they were found they exonerated her! Starr got the records, and to his disgust, they revealed exactly what Hillary Clinton said they would reveal.

until days before the statute of limitations expired. The documents found in the private quarters at the White House with Hillary's fingerprints on them.

Of course they had her fingerprints on them! They were her billing records! Surely you know how they got lost? Everyone knows this. White House assistant Carolyn Huber had filed them, then realized they were what everyone was looking for. Starr wept with frustration when he realized the whole thing was claptrap.

There's this wierd junkie with a radio show who keeps retelling this story without telling the whole story. Maybe that's where you heard it. He's not reliable.

#### "No Justice"

With crucial information either 'hidden', 'lost', or 'destroyed', & silent witnesses with blind loyalties, the whole truth about the Clinton's role in Whitewater may never be fully known.

glub glub glub. It was a \$40 million campaign ad by a Republican majority evil enough to steal that much and push it that far.

#### "Hubblegate"

Allegedly Webster Hubble was rewarded for his silence with approximately \$500,000 in 'consulting fees'

Independent counsel Robert Ray (successor to Starr) threw this one in the garbage. It was bunk. You'll want to read the final report on the Whitewater investigation turned over on 9/20/2000. You seem not to have heard that the Clintons were exonerated on every charge, with no exceptions. After a \$40 million investigation.

"Studentgate"

Allegedly two former students of Clinton's law classes made controversial decisions that favored their old professor. One decision in the Paula Jones civil suit,

Your ignorance is starting to get on my nerves. The former student was Judge Susan Webber Wright. She's the judge who, controversially, ruled Clinton in contempt for lying about Monica Lewinsky. Are all your facts going to be this sound? "Former student favors old professor by ruling him in contempt." If this is your ammunition about "scandals," you're in desperate shape.

the other in an RTC criminal referral back in 1983.

Did you just make this one up?

I can't help noticing that last week VP Cheney, with a case about to be ruled on in the United States Supreme Court, took one of the Supreme Court justices on a duck-hunting trip, paying for his plane ticket (NY Times). He also allegedly gave the Justice \$500,000 to rule in Cheney's favor. The case is important, because it could reveal that Dick Cheney--ready now?--Dick Cheney killed Vince Foster!

"Cattlegate"

Hillary Rodham Clinton's friend Jim Blair, lawyer for Dan Tyson, Tyson Foods, was able to turn \$1000.00 into almost \$100,000.00 in just 9 months in the commodities futures market for Hillary.

The futures wasn't even a scandal. That's what happens in commodities markets. A scandal is when George W. Bush is given \$600,000 by Harken Energy and \$100,000 a year for nothing--except that his father is president. Then he borrows \$100,000 from Harken at 3 points below market, with the very strange provision that if the loan tanks, the lender will pay it back, then he discovers that Harken is going to tank, so he ditches all his stock for 800 large, then someone tells him about insider trading, so he declines to report the sale to the SEC as required by law.

Why didn't the SEC prosecute? After all, an SEC memo confirms a finding that Bush broke the law. The decision to prosecute SEC cases is made by the SEC general counsel, who at the time was James Doty. Who conveniently enough was...George W. Bush's lawyer! Doty decided no prosecution was required. That was OK with his boss, SEC chairman Richard Breeden, who was--conveniently enough!--deputy counsel to George Bush Sr., when he was vice president, and was made SEC chairman by Bush Sr as president.

Isn't that \_disgusting\_!!

"Lincoln Bedroomgate"

Clinton rewarded high dollar contributors with overnight visits in the Lincoln 'bed & breakfast' bedroom.

Know who sleeps there now? High dollar contributors to Bush. That's what presidents do with the Lincoln bedroom. It's the White House guest room. Where guests sleep.

The rest of your list is too tired and stupid to bother answering. And they've each been debunked 500 times elsewhere. You know about google? Type <http://www.google.com> and then type in the important words from each of your foolish entries below to read what really happened. It's easy! You don't have to be such a dupe anymore!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2004 05:53:47 GMT

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

---

Quote:But then again, the UN defines the WMD's as those made specifically for mass destruction, not weapons that you put on your lawn to encourage growth.

But then you said it best...

Quote:

Improvised weapons can be obtained by legal means, and are legal right up until you assemble them

That's what I was trying to point out- we may never know what exactly he was capable of, simply because the weapons may be improvised rather than "official" weapons. You can't arrest someone based on what they COULD do with something, even if you know that they WOULD do it. The thing is, the statement that Iraq had NO WMD capabilities, with all those nerve and blister agents sitting around, is pure bull. Saddam HAD the capability, but it was not in the form anyone was expecting.

Unfortunately, the ability of a person like Saddam to produce such weapons apparently does not equate to a threat in most peoples' minds, nor do they see that as justification for an invasion. You have to watch him use one first.[/sarcasm] :rolleyes:

The invasion of Iraq was NOT started under false pretenses. The administration and the CIA are both being stupid by caving in to the negative media pressure and presenting a false apology. Lies may have been told; that is the nature of intelligence- you don't tell people all of what you know, because that would be a severe security breach. The administration has done nothing wrong that I can see besides apologizing for a mistake which was not made.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2004 11:09:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiHey Crimson, I looked over your "poster" again, and realizing I didn't do it full justice simply saying it was a load of B.S. Here's a little more in-depth view in to just how wrong your dad was:

"Whitewatergate"  
A complex ponzi scheme

No, the issue (for which the Clintons were exonerated, as you no doubt remember) was about a loan, not a ponzi scheme. Foolish rumors were circulating (more about those foolish rumors below), so Clinton appointed a independent counsel in 1994 to clear things up in a way that no one could argue with. Got that? Clinton appointed the independent counsel.

Isn't it interesting that if Clinton appoints a counsel to look into a matter that will save or fry his ass, it's good of him, and when Bush appoints a counsel to investigate the failure of intelligence in WMD which, regardless of the outcome, won't be a CRIME, we can't trust the counsel?

Hmm...

As for the rest, I still trust 450 hours of research over your google queries that pretty much just say "nuh uh those were lies cooked up by those dirty rotten republicans". But I'll consult with my dad and see what he has to say about that. I can already find a couple questionable logic flaws in your reply, but I'd rather do the respect of a full rebuttal.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2004 16:27:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

crimson you would have maybe made a good pint between clinton and bush but unfortunately, clinton wasnt the one who started to WARS one of them for no good reason which is sightly didfferent than a "scandal" that never really happened. also clintons cost 40 million where george bush's cost something like 356 milllion which is another slight difference in my book. youd think a conservative of all people would realize that. lets look at the base word of conservative CONSERVE lets look this up shall we?

To use carefully or sparingly, avoiding waste: kept the thermostat lower to conserve energy.

that definately does not match the whole lets blow away 356 million dollars thing.

by the way if you want to check that definiton go to <http://www.dictionary.com> it is letter b. on the first entry

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2004 18:16:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Llama Man 451 crimson you would have maybe made a good pint between clinton and bush but unfortunately, clinton wasnt the one who started to WARS one of them for no good reason which is sightly didfferent than a "scandal" that never really happened. also clintons cost 40 million where george bush's cost something like 356 milllion which is another slight difference in my book. youd think a conservative of all people would realize that. lets look at the base word of conservative CONSERVE lets look this up shall we?

To use carefully or sparingly, avoiding waste: kept the thermostat lower to conserve energy.

that definately does not match the whole lets blow away 356 million dollars thing.

by the way if you want to check that definiton go to <http://www.dictionary.com> it is letter b. on the first entry

Now lets look at the defnintion of coservative

Favoring traditional views and values; tending to oppose change.  
Traditional or restrained in style: a conservative dark suit.  
Moderate; cautious: a conservative estimate.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2004 19:27:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

if conservatives are so into old traditions what the fuck happened to the constitution?????

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [pimp boy joe](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2004 19:38:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

you fucking republican bitches!!!! whyd you fuck up our government!!! god, its not clinton fauly he go serviced, but it is george bushes fault that he snorted too much crack and that his dad was so damn rich that he got to go to yale, evn though he fucking flunked out he still got to go, good job destroying the enviornment and ruining everyhting the deomcrats have ever done for us!!! you guys are probably all catholics!!!! catholicism sucks!!1 your stupid popes rape children you sick bastards, i bet your all duke fans!! well you know what duke can suck my balls!!!!!! i fucking hat duke!!! FUK THEM GODDAM THEMM I HATE THEM SOO MUCH THEY RUINED MY LIFE !!!!! fuck republicans!!!!!! fcuk all you republican bastards that post stuff on here i fucking hate and go to hell!!! . . . BITCH ILL BE BACK

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [bigjoe14](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2004 20:10:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I am interested in knowing how the Republican party "ruined your life". Please pimp boy joe, tell us.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2004 20:19:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

bigjoe14I am interested in knowing how the Republican party "ruined your life". Please pimp boy joe, tell us.

Im wondering why he mis-spelled every word in there. And it looks like he was trying to bypass the non-existant forum filter.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 07 Feb 2004 21:15:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wow, that was quite the eloquent argument there...

Feeding data into the "rate-your-stupidity" machine...

- \*crappy grammar
- \*crappy logic
- \*crappy spelling
- \*crappy punctuation
- \*crappy attitude
- \*assuming unknown information
- \*acting like a "gangsta"
- \*no evidence
- \*using a celebrity you hate in place of real information
- \*being a fucktard, asshat, and general loser

Conclusion: Your post sucks donkey balls, try again after:

- \*anger management
- \*english class
- \*staying completely sober for more than 3.5 milliseconds
- \*finding some real proof to back up the bullshit

Thank you, have a nice day!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [pimp boy joe](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 02:23:52 GMT

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

---

See here's how i see it. Republicans suck, and bitches such as the people how said i have bad grammer etc. can suck my balls. I don't care what you guys say. i'm still going to go on pimpin'. For all i care you guys can suck michael jackson's balls. fuck you guys, i hate you guys. You think you're all great, and high and mighty. Well, in my book you don't have to be rich, and republican, and snotty, and stuck up, and obnocscious, and pompous to be great. You do have to be smart, and maybe give a damn about other people in the world. I got news for you republican bastards, you suck, you suck balls, you think people aren't as good as you just beecause they are a little less well to do. The whole world doesn't revolve around you, you jackassed bitches. I've seen the sight, republican guys like you are gettin' shown up left and right by llama man, and superfflyingengi. I wish i knew them. I guess i'll end on a good note. You guys keep doing what you do best (republicans), which is getting made fools of, please, because it's funny. Have a good one assholes.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 02:37:25 GMT

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

---

pimp boy joeSee here's how i see it. Republicans suck, and bitches such as the people how said i have bad grammer etc. can suck my balls. I don't care what you guys say. i'm still going to go on pimpin'. For all i care you guys can suck michael jackson's balls. fuck you guys, i hate you guys. You think you're all great, and high and mighty. Well, in my book you don't have to be rich, and republican, and snotty, and stuck up, and obnocscious, and pompous to be great. You do have to be smart, and maybe give a damn about other people in the world. I got news for you republican bastards, you suck, you suck balls, you think people aren't as good as you just beecause they are a little less well to do. The whole world doesn't revolve around you, you jackassed bitches. I've seen the sight, republican guys like you are gettin' shown up left and right by llama man, and superfflyingengi. I wish i knew them. I guess i'll end on a good note. You guys keep doing what you do best (republicans), which is getting made fools of, please, because it's funny. Have a good one assholes.

Id reply to this, but its just a bunch of non-sense. Why is he even on here? This board does have a teen rating.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [pimp boy joe](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 02:52:47 GMT

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

---

Hey republicans check this song out. Man, i really thought that it was a masterpiece. That's one of the reason's i'm posting it, and to piss you guys off. You're responses are really funny to laugh at. Bad grammer, bad spelling, ouch you guys that really hurt, i started crying, and... and well, no i didn't start crying, because those are the lamest comebacks that i've ever heard. Anyways, here's the song.

bush is sniffin' crack,  
maybe shootin' smack  
goin' to war with Iraq  
man that's whack,

Maybe bush is bin laden,  
what's he been hidin',  
the drug laws he's not obidin',  
man that's whack,

HE'S REALLY NOT A GREAT PRESIDENT,  
LOOK AT THE ECONOMY, SEE THAT BIG DENT,  
BY 2005 MOST OF HIS FAMILY MONEY IS GONNA BE SPENT  
(probably on crack)  
MAN...THAT'S WHACK.

Brilliant, isn't it. I thought that you'd like it. I found it right ... off the top of my head, yep that's right, bush's that easy to make fun of. Bush is such a retard, as a matter of fact so is the rest of the republican party, for voting for him. One last thing, all you republican WANGSTA'S better shutt the fuck up, and stop fakin'. Until next time I'm gonna keep pimpin'. Have a good one, you stupid fucks.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 03:03:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

- A) I am a Libertarian
- B) You should talk about bad grammar.
- C) Didn't you say you were going to "end on a good note?"
- D) Please post something with value.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 03:03:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

As said before, this board does have a teen rating.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [pimp boy joe](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 03:18:35 GMT

maybe i wasn't talking about you mr.bob, ever figure that one out, the ten million times i said i hate REPUBLICANS.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 03:24:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Brilliant, isn't it. I thought that you'd like it.

Actually, that has to be the single most retarded thing I've ever seen. You apparently registered and started posting just so you could be a troll.

In case you haven't learned this yet, pissing and moaning and being an asshole does not help your case any- you ruin the credibility of those who you support by posting such irrelevant crap; nobody will listen to you while you're spewing flames out of your ears.

A few little tidbits to suck on, unless you're too busy "pimpin":

1. Not all Republicans support Bush.
2. Not all Bush supporters are Republican.
3. Not all Bush supporters are Catholic.
4. Not all Bush supporters are Duke fans.
5. Not all Bush supporters are rich.
6. Not all Bush supporters are dumb.
7. This statement is a contradiction:

Quote:Well, in my book you don't have to be rich, and republican, and snotty, and stuck up, and obnoxious, and pompous to be great.

It is a contradiction because you are snotty, and stuck up, and obnoxious, and pompous.

8. This statement is a contradiction as well:

Quote:You do have to be smart, and maybe give a damn about other people in the world.

It is a contradiction because you obviously don't give a damn about other people in the world.

9. No one has any great desire to suck your balls.[/b]
- 

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 03:26:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

pimp boy joe Brilliant, isn't it. I thought that you'd like it. I found it right ... off the top of my head, yep thats right, bush's that easy to make fun of.

I don't particularly like President Bush (looking from a 3rd person point of view), but you're just as easy, if not easier to make fun of. And no, Ice Cube, I'm not talking about your grammar.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 03:33:07 GMT

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

---

NodbuggerId reply to this, but its just a bunch of non-sense.

Is it just me, or did you actually reply to his post?

Hell, I was gonna say the same thing about your crap arguments except I knew you'd come back with the little kid response of something like: "Oh yeah? Well, you just know I'm right and you're trying to back out of something you started."

Funny, thing is, you're calling his arguments stupid because [I'm going out on a limb here] he didn't use as many facts as you're accustomed to from [I'm trying to be modest, I really am] me. While in fact, you really don't have anything to show for what you say except for that stupid book that for all anyone knows you typed yourself, printed the pages and bound them in to what you probably thought was a good argumental piece.

Crimson: Wow, your dad spent about 450 hours working on that piece of trash poster? I'm afraid that I cannot restrain myself when I say "Ha Ha!". He really needs to get a life.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 03:34:29 GMT

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

---

You need to grow up.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 03:39:11 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiNodbuggerId reply to this, but its just a bunch of non-sense.

Is it just me, or did you actually reply to his post?

Hell, I was gonna say the same thing about your crap arguments except I knew you'd come back with the little kid response of something like: "Oh yeah? Well, you just know I'm right and you're trying to back out of something you started."

Funny, thing is, you're calling his arguments stupid because [I'm going out on a limb here] he didn't use as many facts as you're accustomed to from [I'm trying to be modest, I really am] me. While in fact, you really don't have anything to show for what you say except for that stupid book that for all anyone knows you typed yourself, printed the pages and bound them in to what you probably thought was a good argumental piece.

Crimson: Wow, your dad spent about 450 hours working on that piece of trash poster? I'm afraid

---

that I cannot restrain myself when I say "Ha Ha!". He really needs to get a life.

Reply as in give a response to what "information" in his post.

And why were my arguments crap? Because they totally ripped apart your half-assed "argument"?

And what book are you talking about? That page I scanned was the only part of this book I have ever seen. Like I said before. It was part of a reading comprehension test we had to do in ROTC (preparing for SAT)

And I found it interesting because it made sense and proved you wrong. And when have I ever given a "Oh yeah? Well, you just know I'm right and you're trying to back out of something you started." statement about anything. From what I've seen you've said bullshit, I presented facts and you kept digging in deeper until you no longer made sense.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [U927](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 03:39:13 GMT

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

---

pimp boy joeyou fucking republican bitches!!!! whyd you fuck up our government!!! god, its not clinton fauly he go serviced, but it is george bushes fault that he snorted too much crack and that his dad was so damn rich that he got to go to yale, evn though he fucking flunked out he still got to go, good job destroying the enviornment and ruining everyhting the deomcrats have ever done for us!!! you guys are probably all catholics!!!! catholicism sucks!!1 your stupid popes rape children you sick bastards, i bet your all duke fans!! well you know what duke can suck my balls!!!!!! i fucking hate duke!!! FUK THEM GODDAM THEM I HATE THEM SOO MUCH THEY RUINED MY LIFE !!!!! fuck republicans!!!! fcuk all you republican bastards that post stuff on here i fucking hate and go to hell!!! . . . BITCH ILL BE BACK

Jesus Christ, this is so funny I'm going to have to wait a few minutes so I can stop laughing before responding.

OK, your post has not one hint of evidence to say "republicans suck". Hell, your entire paragraph is nothing but insults, as with every other post you made after this one. While I'm not a Republican, I can safely say that both Republicans AND Democrats alike in this thread would call you a retard. This thread is for logical discussion and debating over things that can actually be debated, not over "goerge bush snorting too much crack".

You father doesn't happen to be your brother too, does he?

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 03:54:22 GMT

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

NodbuggerFrom what Ive seen Youve said bullshit, I presented facts and you kep digging in deeper until you no longer made sense.

What's the matter? Did you get a sudden memory lapse and forget about the whole rest of this thread? So, you've presented facts...like? Like nothing. Re-read this whole thread. You'll notice a pattern of me putting up facts and YOU calling me stupid and what-not because of reasons only known to yourself. A couple pages ago you said that you were beating me with "common sense" [which you really weren't, since opinions don't equal facts.] And now, without really adding anything, you're saying that you're shutting down my B.S. arguments with your "facts". Re-read the thread. Show me what "facts" you've presented thus far.

NodbuggerAnd why were my arguments crap?

Because they were. Now sit down and shut up until you get something to back up what you're saying. And saying that you already have doesn't count. Because quite frankly, you haven't.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 04:28:44 GMT

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

---

damn pmp boy you laid down the line so badly that even crimson cant come up with another poster hher dad threw his life away for for 700 hours.

my response to your last post nodbugger (there are two)

1. holy shit you can read!!!!

2.you have not presented any reliable facts this entire thread . . . all you do is talk about how stupid someone is after they something that proves you wrong. im surprisede ou republicans always make up lies about some incorrect reading or some document when it seems you don read very thouroughly at all . . .

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [U927](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 05:02:06 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451damn pmp boy you laid down the line so badly that even crimson cant come up with another poster hher dad threw his life away for for 700 hours.

my response to your last post nodbugger (there are two)

1. holy shit you can read!!!!

2.you have not presented any reliable facts this entire thread . . . all you do is talk about how stupid someone is after they something that proves you wrong. im surprisede ou republicans

always make up lies about some incorrect reading or some document when it seems you don't read very thoroughly at all . . .

He didn't "lay down the line". He's a retarded fuck who thinks that insulting a side in the argument will make him look cool, even though this debate is solely based on legit and valid arguments, not incoherent ad hominem.

He's a fucktard, and if you praise him because of his posts, you are no better than he is.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 08:56:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

OK, retard. I said 450 hours, not 700. And 450 OR 700 hours does not constitute "laying down one's life".

That said, here's something he put together for you all... since you all ignored me last time I said it, now I post his words for you to once again ignore:

-----

To the person debating the integrity of former President Clinton... I have this to say...

There exists a need for any organization to rally its followers, members, the unwashed to join together in a common cause. The Nazis used the Jews for this purpose. We can see pep rallies in high schools to whip up support for the team to beat a rival school in a sports game. We see it in the Olympics when we cheer for the team representing the country. We see the "Ford" vs. "Chevy" fight as to which company makes the best pick-up truck. The negative side of this is when we see a group of minorities being used as the scapegoat. I'm sure you have heard others blame white men, blacks, Mexicans, gays, people in the north, the south, east/west coasts, Christians, Jews, Muslim or atheists for the problems in the world. What you are doing is the same thing...blaming Bush or the Republicans for the problems. Let me ask you this...when a pick pocket thief wants to take your money, what does he have to do first?.....He has to create a distraction!! What is happening in today's America is this infighting among the population. The results of this is the US Government is picking the pockets of Americans for \$3,000,000,000,000.00 a year. The federal government was given 19 functions and those functions not given to the Feds was to be left to the individual states. Example of these functions include "provide for the common defense", "mint the money", and "mediate between the states". To fund these functions requires, according to Economics Professor Walter E. Williams, about \$700 billion. Instead we have empowered the fed to become "Robin Hoods" and take from the rich and give to the poor about \$2.3 trillion!!! Our country has divided into those who suckle from the public mammary and those who have become the mammary. The US Government has "dumbed down" our population. You can hear candidates back to Windrow Wilson speaking about more money for education. The present Democratic candidates are screaming about health care and the public has forgotten that Clinton tried and failed to correct health care issues in his first year in office and did NOT touch it during the rest of his seven years. ALL candidates only use the buzz

words to fool the electorate to vote for them. It rare to see a promise kept by either party. There never seems to be a shortage of new "programs" to keep the idiots coming back for more. A few years ago there was a million dollars set aside to restore the boyhood home of Lawrence Welk. You mean that I have to give up my money for that? An unwed woman has unprotected sex and gets pregnant and the US Government wants me to pay for it? A kid throws spit balls in class and doesn't learn his lessons and as an adult is not able to get a better than minimum wage job and wants me to pay to improve his life! A former KKK member in the US Senate becomes so powerful that his state gets 59% more than they contribute, <http://www.ppiny.org/nybalpayments.htm#table> , and they end up with highways to nowhere! A Harvard buddy helps another to molest a girlfriend and then is rewarded with contract for \$600 toilet seat and \$300 hammers and I'm to pay for this! I'm to pay for some "artist" to piss in a bottle with a picture of the Pope! I'm to pay for internet for the poor! Damn look how thick the federal budget in book form is! You will NOT convince me that half of the spending is the responsibility of the federal government. So as far as I'm concerned the left and the right are screwing ALL of us. We need to stop fighting amongst ourselves and unite to stop our government from the "pick pocketing" of the people. Look at your paycheck and then try to convince me that you need to PAY MORE TAXES!!!

-----

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 14:34:26 GMT

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

---

even though you act as though you are conservative mr. crimson, it seems you are definately blasting clinton waaaay more than bush, and bush is the one with the 91 IQ. you blast clinton for health care . . . bush probably doesnt even know how to spell that let alone deal with it. all of bush's claims that he ran for as president have not been fulfilled. he had talks of the environment and social security. shit, his plan of "social security" was friggin duct tape!!!! DUCT TAPE!!!! also i feel that it was hypocritical of you to start off the letter as to those who think clinto was a good president (not exact quote) when at the end you sad we should get over our differences and stop fighting about political parties that sorta doesnt make any sense at all. also, if clinton was the bad president why are you calling the government bush appointed a thief? i think your speech is slightly flawed . . . but in some aspects true . . . but mostly just flawed. tell me to look at my paycheck and see if i cant pay (laughs) if every person paid \$5 to help out poror/uneducated/etc. that would add up to approximately \$1,375,000,000 . . . that is assuming there are exactly 275,000,000 which there may be more or less . . . but still that is over a billion dollars well over as a matter of fact. it is ridiculous to say if you get a paycheck that you cannot put up five dollars!!!

and crimson i knew it was 450, i was just havin a little fun, but i forgot when it comes to politics NO FUN IS ALLOWED AT ALL.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 18:57:34 GMT

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

---

wait..."mr" crimson?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 19:05:06 GMT

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

---

ummm yeah "mr" crimson those were her dads words maybe you should learn to read

umbral- not that it has anything to do with anything but your icon thing is cool looking

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2004 19:36:22 GMT

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

---

You're inferring things that I didn't say. Read the note again, then read your reply, and see if you can find your errors.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [exnyte](#) on Mon, 09 Feb 2004 10:51:45 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451i think your speech is slightly flawed . . . but in some aspects true . . . but mostly just flawed.

... Huh? So you're saying that the speech is slightly flawed, with some true aspects, but mostly flawed... Read that again and tell me you don't go... huh? You might as well as said that you can talk, but really you can't.

Llama Man 451tell me to look at my paycheck and see if i cant pay (laughs) if every person paid \$5 to help out poror/uneducated/etc. that would add up to approximately \$1,375,000,000 . . . that is assuming there are exxactly 275,000,000 which there may be more or less . . .

Two things.. First, your formula would only work if all (roughly) 275,000,000 were making an income. If all 275,000,000 were making an income, everyone wouldn't need to give \$5 to help out the poor. Second, there is well more than \$5 taken out of each and every one of my checks. If this isn't going to help the "poror/uneducated/etc.", where the hell is it going, and why do they keep taking it?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 09 Feb 2004 21:20:42 GMT

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

---

Where does all of that money go?

Well, the biggest single expenditure by the U.S.A. right now is the War in Iraq. Hurray! Your tax money gets to go in to a war that was started on false pretexts (WMDs)! Funny thing is, Bush didn't include the cost of the War in Iraq in the budget he submitted to Congress a month or two ago. He classified it as a "special expenditure". Special enough that it would make his budget look really bad. Another thing that would make his budget look bad is the tax cuts he passed. The money the government no longer gets in the form of taxes because of those cuts is still included in Bush's budget. He's basing his spending on money that isn't there. Oh, don't worry. He can cut health care to get all the money that he needs!

Why do they keep taking your money?

Because that's how governments work. They tax citizens so that they can have money to pay salaries of civil servants and maintain the country to the best of their ability.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Mon, 09 Feb 2004 23:58:42 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451 wrote:

i think your speech is slightly flawed . . . but in some aspects true . . . but mostly just flawed.

... Huh? So you're saying that the speech is slightly flawed, with some true aspects, but mostly flawed... Read that again and tell me you don't go... huh? You might as well as said that you can talk, but really you can't.

this statement is useless and idiotic on your part, i hope you werent trying to make a point because you failed miserably. ill try to express myself monosyllabically next time cuz i know you have problems sometimes. in other words

most of the speech was bullshit. some of it had some truth in it. but it was mostly bullshit. it is NOT hard to understand.

also, if more is getiting taken out from each person who makes money that would help make up for lost money from people who have no income. even so it would still easily exceed the 1,000,000,000 dollar point.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [pimp boy joe](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 00:07:20 GMT

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

---

hey you bitch-ass republicans da pimp is back in the motherfuckin hizzouse. i know you worthless

bitches me talkin bout suckin my balls. (crimson last night was crappy by the way, you should try ahrder) but anyway after my fuckin brilliant masterpiece song i felt i should holler back at youz guyz and remind you that you fucking suck michael jacksons balls when you arent smoking crack with g dubya jackass. now you republican fuckers in the hizzie know me, i wanna end on good notes for shizzie. crimson, you suck, and so do you nodbugg-ass bitch (you like that asshole, you want somma dis? bitch bring your gay ass swastika you jew hating bastard!!!). any of you motherfuckers who say i suck SUCK balls. whenever you see a fine pimp such as myself walk by you say oooooooh i wanna suck his balls to bad i got an appointment with micheal jackson tonight. well homies i gots to go rub some whore ass so fuck you bitch ass republicans!!!! as always i hate you . . . and you suck donkey balls

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [U927](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 00:58:45 GMT

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

---

pimp boy joehey you bitch-ass republicans da pimp is back in the motherfuckin hizzouse. i know you worthless bitches me talkin bout suckin my balls. (crimson last night was crappy by the way, you should try ahrder) but anyway after my fuckin brilliant masterpiece song i felt i should holler back at youz guyz and remind you that you fucking suck michael jacksons balls when you arent smoking crack with g dubya jackass. now you republican fuckers in the hizzie know me, i wanna end on good notes for shizzie. crimson, you suck, and so do you nodbugg-ass bitch (you like that asshole, you want somma dis? bitch bring your gay ass swastika you jew hating bastard!!!). any of you motherfuckers who say i suck SUCK balls. whenever you see a fine pimp such as myself walk by you say oooooooh i wanna suck his balls to bad i got an appointment with micheal jackson tonight. well homies i gots to go rub some whore ass so fuck you bitch ass republicans!!!! as always i hate you . . . and you suck donkey balls

Once again, I have to ask, is your father your brother as well?

Crimson, please ban this fuckhead from this forum. He is providing no productive input whatsoever in this arguement.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [MrBob](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 01:20:44 GMT

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

---

pimp boy joehey you bitch-ass republicans da pimp is back in the motherfuckin hizzouse. i know you worthless bitches me talkin bout suckin my balls. (crimson last night was crappy by the way, you should try ahrder) but anyway after my fuckin brilliant masterpiece song i felt i should holler back at youz guyz and remind you that you fucking suck michael jacksons balls when you arent smoking crack with g dubya jackass. now you republican fuckers in the hizzie know me, i wanna end on good notes for shizzie. crimson, you suck, and so do you nodbugg-ass bitch (you like that asshole, you want somma dis? bitch bring your gay ass swastika you jew hating bastard!!!). any of you motherfuckers who say i suck SUCK balls. whenever you see a fine pimp such as myself walk by you say oooooooh i wanna suck his balls to bad i got an appointment with micheal

jackson tonight. well homies i gots to go rub some whore ass so fuck you bitch ass republicans!!!! as always i hate you . . . and you suck donkey balls

Are you serious? Or, I should say trying to be serious? Because you can't possibly be.

I agree, "pimp boy joe" needs a bannin'

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [pimp boy joe](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 01:52:23 GMT

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

---

yo you censorist motherfuckers i cant believe dis shit, just cuz im trying to speak the word and you aint got no comebacks you gonna ban me??? dats almost as whacka g dubya, and it is typically republican which is why i hate you assholes. go ahead ban me and prove the stereotye right about you assholes.

if you let me stay on, you communist republican assholes, i swear ill tone it down a little, but i only said the things i did cuz you suckahs deserved it

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [U927](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 02:04:09 GMT

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

---

pimp boy joeyo you censorist motherfuckers i cant believe dis shit, just cuz im trying to speak the word and you aint got no comebacks you gonna ban me??? dats almost as whacka g dubya, and it is typically republican which is why i hate you assholes. go ahead ban me and prove the stereotye right about you assholes.

if you let me stay on, you communist republican assholes, i swear ill tone it down a little, but i only said the things i did cuz you suckahs deserved it

This is not a forum for you to take a dump on. Children visit these threads, and you WILL censor your language and act like a decent person with actual arguments, instead of spewing out insults which you think actually affect us.

Also, what stereotye? If you really want to know, I am a Democrat. So because I tell you to shut the hell up you automatically think I'm a Republican? You have some serious issues, my friend. Resolve them first, then come back to these forums and make your posts actually understandable and legit, not that name-calling crap you posted above.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 03:18:10 GMT

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

---

Speaking of stereotypes, did you know that all your "homies" are probably republican by association?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 03:40:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

My main concern is his obsession with sucking balls.

He needs a banning.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 03:53:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Instead of just sitting here and complaining about pimp boy joe, can we get back to the issue at hand? There's a nice little thread in General Discussion concerning said person, and this thread is losing what it was meant for.

So, to start everyone off again, here's some stuff about Bush being bad:

Bush said 2 of the Army's 10 active divisions were not ready for combat. However, he did not furnish the real reason for that circumstance. According to Steven Lee Myers in Monday's issue of the NYT, the two divisions in question, "the 10th Mountain and the 1st Mechanized Infantry, were briefly classified as unready for war last fall, not because they suffered from budget cuts and low morale, as Mr. Bush suggested, but rather because large parts of the divisions were keeping peace in Bosnia and Kosovo."

During his fifth year as a guardsman, Bush's records show no sign he appeared for duty.

May 24, 1972: Bush, who has moved to Alabama to work on a US Senate race, gets permission to serve with a reserve unit in Alabama. But headquarters decided Bush must serve with a more active unit.

Sept. 5, 1972: Bush is granted permission to do his Guard duty at the 187th Tactical Recon Group in Montgomery. But Bush's record shows no evidence he did the duty, and the unit commander says he never showed up.

November 1972 to April 30, 1973: Bush returns to Houston, but apparently not to his Air Force unit.

May 2, 1973: The two lieutenant colonels in charge of Bush's unit in Houston cannot rate him for the prior 12 months, saying he has not been at the unit in that period.

Have fun!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

---

Posted by [exnyte](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 07:03:02 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiWhere does all of that money go?

Well, the biggest single expenditure by the U.S.A. right now is the War in Iraq. Hurray! Your tax money gets to go in to a war that was started on false pretexts (WMDs)!

That's just fine! I'm happy to help pay for this. Why? It's simple! I don't want my money to go to those who aren't trying to help themselves. The Iraqi people couldn't do it alone and I'm happy that we were able to assist them. Even if you believe that the reasons for going into Iraq were false, doesn't make them less of a threat. You have to remember that you don't speak for everyone and you screaming it everytime the opportunity arises doesn't make your claims any more true. I'm glad my money is going to help the Iraqi people start a better life with out Saddam's rule. I'd rather it go there than to help someone on welfare because they decided welfare is easier than getting a job.

Llama Man 451this statement is useless and idiotic on your part...

Acually, all your statements are useless and idiotic. You have yet to say anything productive. All you've done is mimic everything SuperFlyingEngi has said.

Llama Man 451"i think your speech is slightly flawed . . . but in some aspects true . . . but mostly just flawed."

"most of the speech was bullshit. some of it had some truth in it. but it was mostly bullshit. it is NOT hard to understand."

These two statements are completely different. Your first statement first states the speech was slightly flawed, then immediately stated that it's mostly flawed. That's called contradiction. This is the reason it makes no sense. Your second statement, on the other hand, does make sense. It says it's bullshit, then states it does have some truths, then reiterates that it's mostly bullshit. A structurally valid statement, even if the premises of it are false. I hope you understand that now, and at least learn from your mistakes. Now if only you'd just stop posting. Or at least start posting with what most others would call grammar and sentence structure. Also, if you're going to use big words like "monosyllabically", you might want to make sure you spell them right first.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 09:14:45 GMT

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

---

pimp boy joeyo you censorist motherfuckers i cant believe dis shit, just cuz im trying to speak the word and you aint got no comebacks you gonna ban me???

I can't believe that the IP you have been posting from is the same as Llama man

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [exnyte](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 11:27:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Blazerpimp boy joeyo you censorist motherfuckers i cant believe dis shit, just cuz im trying to speak the word and you aint got no comebacks you gonna ban me???

I can't believe that the IP you have been posting from is the same as Llama man

Why doesn't that surprise me? ... The way they speak and form sentences was very similar.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 18:39:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

majikentEven if you believe that the reasons for going into Iraq were false, doesn't make them less of a threat.

Actually, Saddam not having weapons of mass destruction DOES make him less of a threat than if he did. A lot less.

majikentI'm glad my money is going to help the Iraqi people start a better life with out Saddam's rule.

Yeah, instead of helping out those dumb 'ole people on welfare in our own country, lets go attack another and shove freedom down their throats. Who cares if people die? And not everyone on welfare is on it because they don't want to work. Granted, some are, but others might be on welfare because they grew up in a poverty household and went to a bad school system. Why should anyone help them?

majikentYou have to remember that you don't speak for everyone

When did I say I was speaking for everyone? I said taxpayer dollars were going in to a war that was started on false pretexts, like WMDs, which President Bush said that he knew where there, and now he is coming out saying that he was wrong and acted incorrectly on intelligence reports, when he really lied to the American people.

majikentThese two statements are completely different. Your first statement first states the speech was slightly flawed, then immediately stated that it's mostly flawed. That's called contradiction. This is the reason it makes no sense. Your second statement, on the other hand, does make sense. It says it's bullshit, then states it does have some truths, then reiterates that it's mostly bullshit. A structurally valid statement, even if the premises of it are false. I hope you understand that now, and at least learn from your mistakes. Now if only you'd just stop posting. Or at least start posting with what most others would call grammar and sentence structure. Also, if you're going to use big words like "monosyllabically", you might want to make sure you spell them right

first.

Instead of poking out grammar imperfections, can we stay on topic?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [pimp boy joe](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 20:47:18 GMT

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

---

Actually blazer, we work in the same building. I don't have a buisness computer because i can't afford one yet. I am an intern, Llama Man, is my boss. He showed me this sight, because we both have similar political veiws, granted his aren't as erratic as mine. So, now if he finds out that i used his computer once or twice, for this i could lose my job. Thank a lot asshole. You know when i said that dukies had ruined my life (duke fans), i was joking. i did not need you to try and get me fiered jackass. I bet you feel pretty good right now, you fucking computer nerd. Why don't you hack someones system, maybe it will make your life a little funner. But, then you probably wouldn't think about the consequinces it may have on other peoples lives you dirty mother fucker. Now i'm done, so you can get back to looking up gay porn, and creating viruses. "cuase everyone knows thats all you do blazer you fucking loser. have a good time ruining other people's lives.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 21:15:06 GMT

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

---

wow, being as how smart you are blazer i would have imagined that you might have consiered that pimp boy was my intern, i cannot believe all of the filthy shit he sadi and it is completely inappropriate. i have fired him because of this immature act of stupidity, and because that bastard had the nerve to use MY computer! seeing as this is a felony i could not have that jackass who always took the last doughnut in my staff any longer (thats right he took my doughnuts. not to mention my computer)

i know this sounds odd but it is true. but knowing pimp boy (whos name will not be disclosed at this time) he will probsably find a way to get back on. he always took the jelly one too that rat bastard.

also on another hwo cna you say all i did was mimic superflyingenl i do agree with most of his points but i have brought up some pints or arguing points that he did not have (and NO he isnt an intern) im sorry if my grammar offends (even though im not) but unlike you losers i have a job. also even though this is being hypocritical i do agree with superflying we should stay on topic and not dwell on this mistake that anyone could have made. im sorry for my stupid ass intern again, i fired his ass.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [U927](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 21:34:08 GMT

pimp boy joeActually blazer, we work in the same building. I don't have a buisness computer because i can't afford one yet. I am an intern, Llama Man, is my boss. He showed me this sight, because we both have similar political veiws, granted his aren't as erratic as mine. So, now if he finds out that i used his computer once or twice, for this i could lose my job. Thank a lot asshole. You know when i said that dukies had ruined my life (duke fans), i was joking. i did not need you to try and get me fiered jackass. I bet you feel pretty good right now, you fucking computer nerd. Why don't you hack someones system, maybe it will make your life a little funner. But, then you probably wouldn't think about the consequences it may have on other peoples lives you dirty mother fucker. Now i'm done, so you can get back to looking up gay porn, and creating viruses. "cuase everyone knows thats all you do blazer you fucking loser. have a good time ruining other people's lives.

At least now you learned your lesson, dumbfuck. If you had posted actual facts and material that was even RELEVANT to the topic at hand, you could have been saved. But no, you go ahead and slander off, thinking we actually care what comes out of your incessant little hands.

On a side note, Blazer didn't get you fired; you got yourself fired. All admins can see the IPs of the poster. If you were stupid enough to use your bosses computer instead of finding another to post from, you would have been saved. Now, I guess he's going to staple the classifieds ads onto your next paycheck.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 21:44:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Do you really expect me to believe this bullshit? "omg he always took the last doughnut" -- that sold me right there that you're lying. You know if this were true you wouldn't say you fired him and you wouldn't say anything about doughnuts.

Therefore, I conclude that you're full of shit and they are the same person.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 21:49:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

EDIT:

CrimsonYou know if this were true you wouldn't say you fired him and you wouldn't say anything about doughnuts.

Why? Because your boss is like this? It makes perfect sense....except not.

END EDIT

Llama Man 451also even though this is being hypocritical i do agree with superflying we should stay on topic and not dwell on this mistake that anyone could have made.

Pretty please?

Also, did you know that the percentage of unemployed people looking for a job for over 27 weeks this year is 23%, the highest in 20 years?

Something Bush said that wasn't true:

"An official British investigation into two trailers found in northern Iraq has concluded they are not mobile germ warfare labs, as was claimed by Tony Blair and President George Bush, but were for the production of hydrogen to fill artillery balloons, as the Iraqis have continued to insist."

--Observer 06.15.03

On the Observer's quote:

"The report discounted the possibility the vehicles could have been used for hydrogen production

hydrogen generation systems. The fact that such equipment would have been denied Iraq by

familiar with the trailers, the vehicles, if used as biological labs, would have been even more

Now that pimp boy joe [supposedly] went away, we can get back on track.[/b]

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2004 21:56:15 GMT

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

---

jesus christ you cynical freak i told you that pimp boy was gone now get over it (crimson) if everyone else believes why cant you. if you are listening to george bush's lies so eagerly youd think you could handle the truth for once but noooo.....

also it is true i hated that stupid intern since the day he got here he always stole the freakin doughnuts i hope it isnt funny to you cuz it sure as heck isnt to me. jeez.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 11 Feb 2004 00:22:38 GMT

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

---

LOL.

Funny thing about alabis, they're supposed to be good.

It's kind of pathetic that the two (or is it merely one?) of you at one point worked together. Whats even MORE pathetic is the fact that you both joined relatively at the same time; even if he showed "you" the site, it's a far cry for a grown man in a professional business to be so obsessed what a bunch of people on the internet think to go to the lengths which have occurred.

I'm sure it's a safe bet to say you're just a pathetic child with some odd dream of being an intern at one point. Oh yeah, one other thing:

Duke on!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Wed, 11 Feb 2004 00:23:11 GMT

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

---

You just keep making your case better and better, don't you?

If there is one thing I loathe, it is people diferring the blame when it clearly falls on them.

"No, it wasn't me! It was either my sibling, cat, dog, or other pet! Honest!"

I find it very hard to believe that two people share the same sense of sentance structure, wording and mentality.

Also - You seem to post within minutes of eachother sometimes. Coincidence? I think not.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 11 Feb 2004 00:34:46 GMT

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

---

I've opened the window to post a message several times on this forum, and when I post, someone else like Nodbugger or Crimson has posted since I started composing my post. This has happened to me at least 3 times, and I am NOT Crimson or Nodbugger.

Anyway, can we PLEASE get back on topic?

Have you looked at the news today? The White House finally released Bush's "military record". Funny thing is, it doesn't prove anything about Bush actually being in the national guard between '72 and '73. All it shows is that he got payed for that time. If that's the best they can pull out, it's pretty obvious that the president went AWOL after he decided that he didn't want to be a plane pilot. If he had actually been there, they would have gotten people who can testify that they had seen Bush there all that time. I read about it, and then saw it on CNBC or whatever, which showed the footage of the press secretary presenting Bush's record papers to the public, but the camera cut off before the media people started shouting back at the White House press guy.

Isn't that great? Bush got payed for being in the national guard after he LEFT the national guard prematurely, which is against the law.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 11 Feb 2004 01:22:44 GMT

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

---

ok assholes, like superfly siad i have posted so many times and coame back to find another post, you people are so immature i would love it if you would get over it! you are just pissed off because you cant point the finger at someone.

and gmm im not blaming someone else because there is no blame to place idiot, i am simply telling the truth. probably a shock to a conservative like you however. not to mention the fact that it is a cold day in hell when i even think about considering you as my "king" i think you ARE the pathetic child when it comes to that one

oh superfly, you forgot to mention that bush passed the flight test by about two points and was sent way ahead of countless people so that he could have what he wanted. Then he went AWOL

oh by the way if you think pimp boy and i talk the same, you obviously have not read any of his or my posts bcause i do not need countless profanities in my post to make a point, and i have never once mentioned sucking someones balls. if you are saying i have similar sentence structure you are insanea . . . youd probably get along really well with ol' georgie in the white house

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Wed, 11 Feb 2004 18:44:31 GMT

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

---

"You people are so immature"...LOL that is quite amusing since it is you who created the "pimp boy joe" account and proceeded to make an ass of yourself by pretending to be someone else and talking like you are straight out of Compton. And then when you get busted on it you try to say he is an employee of yours and you fired him (yeah right like you even have a job). You make me laugh, sad and pathetic person you are. :twisted:

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 11 Feb 2004 19:32:10 GMT

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

---

blazer who the crap ARE you. you cannot just randomly pop into a forum and start posting stuff taht is not even remotely on topic you moron. you are just mad because your stupid republican friends are wrong. have you ever heard of logic. apparetnly not becasue a grown man such as myself would not need to create another account. have you checked the other IP addresses they are ALL different!!! hmmm????????? no because you are a moron who cannot deal with the truth. get the fuck over it and go the hell away lzer you have contributed nothing to this thread and neither has pimp boy, I ADMIT IT my stupid intern has done nothing ok?????/ christ

you need to shut up blazer

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Wed, 11 Feb 2004 20:17:03 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451ok assholes, like superfly siad i have posted so many times and coame back to find another post, you people are so immature i would love it if you would get over it! you are just pissed off because you cant point the finger at someone.

and gmm im not blaming someone else because there is no blame to place idiot, i am simply telling the truth. probably a shock to a conservative like you however. not to mention the fact that it is a cold day in hell when i even think about considering you as my "king" i think you ARE the pathetic child when it comes to that one

oh superfly, you forgot to mention that bush passed the flight test by about two points and was sent way ahead of countless people so that he could have what he wanted. Then he went AWOL

oh by the way if you think pimp boy and i talk the same, you obviously have not read any of his or my posts bcause i do not need countless profanities in my post to make a point, and i have never once mentioned sucking someones balls. if you are saying i have similar sentence structure you are insanea . . . youd probably get along really well with ol' georgie in the white house

Who needs ammunition when you have him?

It still seems like one hell of a coincidence. Same IP.. alledgedly same building.. and same post times.

Quote:probably a shock to a conservative like you however

That's "Mr. Liberal" to you.

Quote: considering you as my "king" i think you ARE the pathetic child when it comes to that one

Yet you don't recognise it for what it is, a take-off from a film.

Quote:i do not need countless profanities in my post to make a point

Followed by..

Quote:no because you are a moron who cannot deal with the truth. get the fuck over it

Yeah. Keep on lying, you have no case to help.

Quote:cannot just randomly pop into a forum and start posting stuff taht is not even remotely on topic you moron.

And I suppose that is on topic?

Quote:have you ever heard of logic.

Quote:jesus christ you cynical freak i told you that pimp boy was gone now get over it (crimson) if

everyone else believes why cant you. if you are listening to george bush's lies so eagerly youd think you could handle the truth for once but noooo.....

also it is true i hated that stupid intern since the day he got here he always stole the freakin doughnuts i hope it isnt funny to you cuz it sure as heck isnt to me. jeez.

Have you?

Quote:no because you are a moron who cannot deal with the truth.

I don't need say anything there.. do I?

Face it. You're busted, and now you are \*trying\* to cover up your lies with even more lies. I just hope I'm here when the house of cards falls on you.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 11 Feb 2004 20:39:56 GMT

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

You keep saying llama man is "busted" because you're all building upon each other about what you really think happened. It seems to me that it went down something like this:

- 1) AIIIE SAME IP HAHAHA
- 2) No wonder they have the same sentence structure
- 3) llama man you are stupid u have same IP and sentence structure
- 4) Your story is stupid!
- 5) That stupid story closes the case! Let's bother llama man instead of talking about how bad Bush is!
- 6) I knew they were the same person all along because they have the same sentence structure and post at the same time and thaat story was stupid

I bet few or none of you have reread the thread comparing and contrasting what llama man and P.B.J. said. You're just snowballing each other's stories without thinking for yourself and calling llama man immature the whole time.

And all this while, you're conducting something I like to call "stalling". At least the conservative people dissing llama man are. Why? Because Bush is a bad president and that's just the straight and simple. If you had some proof about Bush being a good president, I'm sure you would have come back at me by now.

Vote Democratic in 2004!

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 11 Feb 2004 22:18:56 GMT

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

YOU ALL HAVE TO BE THE BIGGEST HYPOCRITES IN THE WORLD!!!! I CANNOT BELIEVE HOW FREAKIN IMMATURE YOU ARE!!!!!! NOT ONLY ARE PEOPLE WHO HAVE NTO CONTRIBUTED ANYTHING WHATSOEVER TO THIS THREAD COMING IN AND GIVING ME CRAP, THEY ARE SAYING IM NOT ON TOPIC!!!!!! WHAT A LOAD OF SHIT, YOU ARE THE ONES STAYINF OFF TOPIC I AM TRYING TO TELL THE TRUTH AND YOU GUYS KEEP BEING JERKS ABOUT IT!!! THIS WOULD HAVE BEEN OVER A LONG TIME AGO IF SEVEN HUNDRED PEOPLE HADNT HAVE RANDOMLY JOINED IN TO ALK ABOUT THINGS THAT DONT HAVE TO DO WITH POLITICS.

YOU WANT A SHITTY STORY??? WANNA KNOW WHY CRIMSON HASNT POSTED FOR ABOUT A DAY?

IM CRIMSON I HAVE SPLIT PERSONALITY DISORDER AND I AM KLETOMANIACAL HEE HEE HEE!!!!!!

THAT IS A SHITTY STORY WHEREAS MINE IS TRUE (EXCEPT THE DOUGHNUT PART I JUST THOUGHT THAT WAS FUNNY) OK CHRIST!!!!!! EVERYONE IN THIS COUNTRY THESED DAYS TAKES EVERYTHING WAAAAAY TO SERIOUSLY. WHEN I TRY TO ADD ONE BIT OF HUMOR IT IS NOT SERIOUS AND I AM UNPATRIIOTIC. I AM NOT PIMP BOY JOE GET OVER IT.

oh GMM all of your little "comebacks" were completely flawed if you took four seconds to think about it. why would we have the sam IP address  
ALREADY TOLD YA THAT ONE BUDDY

we have the sam post times.

MAYBE HE DIDNT WANT TO GET CAUGHT, I GET ON WHEN IM NOT WORKING AND WHEN I GET OFF I USUALLY TAKE A BREAK, THAT LEAVES HIM ABOUT A THREE MINUTE WINDOW.

your profanity point.

I HAVE USED PROFANITY ABOUT THREE TIMES IN THIS POST WHEREAS PMB USED PROFANITY ABOUT THREE HUNDRED TIMES IN HIS POST.

you claiming i havent heard of logic

WELL APPARETNLY I HAVE BEEN "SCHOOLING" YOU PRETTY BADLY SO FAR!

why? because face it, i have been a thorn in peoples sides since i got on, but then again the thread has doubled in length since i got on!!!!!! hmm do i see a remarkable resemblance to the conservative media i think i do. once again i will say you guys need to back the crap up and except the simple truth. can we get back on topic or do you children want to keep pointing the finger at me?

look at superflying engls last post it was defending me so I MUST BE HIM TOO GASP!!!! I MIGHT HAVE POSTED WITHIN ONE MINUTE OF HIM ONCE!!!!!! ANOTHER GASP!!!!!! hey i think a couple pages ago superflyingengl had a typo, he must be llama man too!!!!!!

sound familiar?

(and dont even think for one second im superflyngengl)

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 00:30:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

And someone let you be the boss of something?

Anyone see any similarities to Dilbert?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 00:32:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

yeah but dilbert is the funiest cartoon out there

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 00:48:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiYou keep saying llama man is "busted" because you're all building upon each other about what you really think happened. It seems to me that it went down something like this:

- 1) AIIIE SAME IP HAAAAHA
- 2) No wonder they have the same sentence structure
- 3) llama man you are stupid u have same IP and sentence structure
- 4) Your story is stupid!
- 5) That stupid story closes the case! Let's bother llama man instead of talking about how bad Bush is!
- 6) I knew they were the same person all along because they have the same sentence structure and post at the same time and that story was stupid

I bet few or none of you have reread the thread comparing and contrasting what llama man and P.B.J. said. You're just snowballing each other's stories without thinking for yourself and calling llama man immature the whole time.

And all this while, you're conducting something I like to call "stalling". At least the conservative people dissing llama man are. Why? Because Bush is a bad president and that's just the straight and simple. If you had some proof about Bush being a good president, I'm sure you would have come back at me by now.

Vote Democratic in 2004!

Yes, because that isn't a piece of Democrat propaganda at all :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 00:51:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

C'mon people, if he lied, let it be. He's the one who has to look in the mirror, it's HIS integrity.

Man, this thread has had three topics: bad joke, Blue vs. Red, and now, well, I'll just call it "Stupidio."

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 00:53:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Llama Man 451yeah but dilbert is the funiest cartoon out there

:eh: <-- this is you

"Point" <-- This is the point I was making

"Point"  
.....:eh: <--- this is the point going over your head.

Any questions?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 00:56:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

What is it.. Seven Sixteenths of an inch... I think that's the idistance bewteen the A key and the CapsLock key. Perhaps you should use your energy to turn it off. Anyway..

Quote:I CANNOT BELIEVE HOW FREAKIN IMMATURE YOU ARE!!!!!!

Perhaps not, but we can all believe jow much you are.

Quote:I AM TRYING TO TELL THE TRUTH AND YOU GUYS KEEP BEING JERKS ABOUT IT!!!

That's all we are doing, yet you seem to be being "jerkish" about it.

Quote:YOU WANT A SHITTY STORY??? WANNA KNOW WHY CRIMSON HASNT POSTED FOR ABOUT A DAY?

IM CRIMSON I HAVE SPLIT PERSONALITY DISORDER AND I AM KLETOMANIACAL HEE HEE HEE!!!!!!

Quote:I CANNOT BELIEVE HOW FREAKIN IMMATURE YOU ARE!!!!!!

Quote:oh GMM all of your little "comebacks" were completely flawed if you took four seconds to think about it. why would we have the sam IP address  
ALREADY TOLD YA THAT ONE BUDDY

You can tell me the same lie as many times as you like. Repeating the same flawed statement will not make it more true.

Quote:why? because face it, i have been a thorn in peoples sides since i got on, but then again the thread has doubled in length since i got on!!!! hmm do i see a remarkable resemblance to the conservative media i think i do. once again i will say you guys need to back the crap up and except the simple truth. can we get back on topic or do you children want to keep pointing the finger at me?

This is ironic. Do you even know what the "conservative media" is? Hell, do you even know what media is?

The sooner we get back on topic is the sooner you leave this thread.. and I can say that any more remarks about Crimson being a... sorry.. just picked up on something.

You say Crimson has a multiple personality disorder, and then link that with being a kleptomaniac....

What is she stealing? Your intelligence? Don't need it, mate.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 01:01:44 GMT

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

---

DaveGMMYes, because that isn't a piece of Democrat propaganda at all

Are you trying to justify ing yourself over some random person? Also, you quoted my whole post and referred to a small part of it. Not the way to prove a point. I had one question in there. "Why?". "Yes" isn't exactly a good answer to why questions.

MrBobC'mon people, if he lied, let it be.

Finally, someone else actually thinking instead of building on other's insults.

warrantoAny questions?

Yes, I have one. Is absolutely no humor in any shape or form allowed on the politics forum?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 01:11:14 GMT

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

---

GMM does it just suck being you, the reason i am being jerkish about it is because there is a 85.73% chance that you are a lonely nerd sitting in your moms basement with nothing to do beside make fun of other people to make yourself feel good, which is going to take a lot of insults, seeing as you have thrown a lot of insults at me. the sooner we get on topic is not when i leave it is when you SHUT UP. how do you have the right to tell me how to type when you yourself made an obvious error, i cannot type that great when i do not hve a lot of time im sorry if that is offensive to you but you need t grow up and i will stick by my story simply because it is the truth. if you didnt spend so much time making fun of everybody and thinking about how cool you are maybe you would realize some of these obvious things. oh wait, thatll never happen.

and i was joking about crimson, you make yourself out to be really smart but your disguise isnt very plausible now is it?

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 01:31:55 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451GMM does it just suck being you, the reason i am being jerkish about it is because there is a 85.73% chance that you are a lonely nerd sitting in your moms basement with nothing to do beside make fun of other people to make yourself feel good, which is going to take a lot of insults, seeing as you have thrown a lot of insults at me. the sooner we get on topic is not when i leave it is when you SHUT UP. how do you have the right to tell me how to type when you yourself made an obvious error, i cannot type that great when i do not hve a lot of time im sorry if that is offensive to you but you need t grow up and i will stick by my story simply because it is the truth. if you didnt spend so much time making fun of everybody and thinking about how cool you are maybe you would realize some of these obvious things. oh wait, thatll never happen.

and i was joking about crimson, you make yourself out to be really smart but your disguise isnt very plausible now is it?

It seems chance is on my side today... if there was an 85.73% chance I was:

Quote: lonely nerd sitting in your moms basement with nothing to do beside make fun of other people to make yourself feel good

then I appear to have hit the other 14.27%. Lucky me.. or unlucky you, in this case.

Quote:and i was joking about crimson, you make yourself out to be really smart but your disguise isnt very plausible now is it?

Strange, your jokes seem a lot like your normal writing. I guess with all the propaganda and caps, it might get a tad confusing to distinguish between the two.

Perhaps if you spent more time doing English than eathing donuts, you wouldn't be in that problem.

Quote:how do you have the right to tell me how to type when you yourself made an obvious error,  
And which error might this be?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 01:33:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngi

Are you trying to justify ing yourself over some random person? Also, you quoted my whole post and referred to a small part of it. Not the way to prove a point. I had one question in there. "Why?". "Yes" isn't exactly a good answer to why questions.

The point of my post wasn't to give an answer, it was to point out that you went from listing points (valid or otherwise) and then tying this discussion in line with some kind of government viewpoint.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 01:41:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DaveGMMStrange, your jokes seem a lot like your normal writing. I guess with all the propaganda and caps, it might get a tad confusing to distinguish between the two.  
Perhaps if you spent more time doing English than eathing donuts, you wouldn't be in that problem.

What propaganda? Perhaps this might be your:

DaveGMMAnd which error might this be?

DaveGMMDo you even know what the "conservative media" is? Hell, do you even know what media is?

You obviously don't. Did you know the head of the FCC is Colin Powell's son?

DaveGMMYou say Crimson has a multiple personality disorder, and then link that with being a kleptomaniac....

Did you not read what he said? He was putting out another stupid story with no basis in fact whatsoever.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

---

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 01:44:43 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiDid you not read what he said? He was putting out another stupid story with no basis in fact whatsoever.

Correct me if I'm wrong, but he didn't say that at the time, did he?

Nooooo. No use in a libel trial going "Oh, I didn't \*mean\* all those nasty things I said".

You're a democrat, aren't you supposed to be coming up with a better defence?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 02:10:39 GMT

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

---

GMM you are really starting to piss me off if you had read all of the post weher i said "i was crimson" you would see the words you wanna hear a shitty story? which explains it all you jackass get the fuck off this thread because you are making everyon go away it is you fucking fault this has all gone to hell so just you mouth ok i am getting royally pissed off and if you want the error you said jow instead of how READ jackass READ

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 02:54:36 GMT

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

---

This gets funnier by the minute. I've never seen someone try so hard to cover their ass when they got owned. Everyone point and laugh at Llama Man. No worries soon he will go away and go back to undressing his sisters barbie dolls and fantasizing about the day that he might become a man (only to realize he will probably lose his virginity to some toothless \$20 whore in Vegas) :twisted:

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 03:05:32 GMT

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

---

I'm curious, where and what exactly is it you do? Moreso, how did you get to a seniority position (if you ACTUALLY work) with the kind of attitude and obvious lack of vocabulary you express in this public (and yes, this IS a public) setting.

Note: I've already contributed to this thread with my political 2 cents, my views on this matter are clear, so I am free to ignore the debate I do not agree with, and to reply to the topic of the supposed anti-republican P.B.J/Llama man.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 03:07:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Llama Man 451GMM you are really starting to piss me off if you had read all of the post weher i said "i was crimson" you would see the words you wanna hear a shitty story? which explains it all you jackass get the fuck off this thread because you are making everyon go away it is you fucking fault this has all gone to hell so just you mouth ok i am getting royally pissed off and if you want the error you said jow instead of how READ jackass READ

\*I'm\* starting to piss \*you\* off? Now that's irony for you.

Ohhh.. I see now. You are imitating Crimson.  
Last I checked, Crimson spoke properly, typed properly, and clearly didn't have issues. Unlike you.

And again, you say you don't need profanities to prove your points.. lo and behold, I see em in that post.

Oh, and I love this bit of pedantry:

Quote:and if you want the error you said jow instead of how READ jackass READ

If that's the stuff you are resorting to to even remotely TRY and win this argument, you are beyond hope.

I think it is time that you... ah...

Quote:get the fuck off this thread

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 03:09:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Actually, Dave, it's time you left, since you've been trying to redirect this thread ever since you started posting on it. I doubt you know anything about politics and just came here so you could point and laugh at someone along with everyone else.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 03:11:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiActually, Dave, it's time you left, since you've been trying to redirect this thread ever since you started posting on it. I doubt you know anything about politics and just came here so you could point and laugh at someone along with everyone else.

And again, you seem to be blaming me for this thread going "off topic".

I suggest you go and re-read the thread...I'm more of a fuel than a spark.

I also know a fair few things about politics. And if this is the point where you try to baffle me with your brilliant insights on the workings of American politics, spare me. Heard it all before, and from people with a damn slight more intelligence than you.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [hareman](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 04:02:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hey Dave what is up my man long time no see

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 05:54:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngi

Yes, I have one. Is absolutely no humor in any shape or form allowed on the politics forum?

Oh, humor is allowed. But it's interesting that when I bring up a point to insult someone, he goes and agrees with it!

Since you missed it as well; Llama man is supposedly the boss of pimp boy. So I mention the likeness of the comic strip 'Dilbert'. Go read a few strips, and see how the boss acts.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 19:35:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Back on topic...

A quote by William Safire, a NY Times columnist, from the editorial page of The Times(Princeton Metro), my local newspaper:

Quote:In the town of Kalar, about a hundred miles northeast of Baghdad, Kurdish villagers recently reported suspicious activity to the pesh merga.

That Kurdish militia has for years been waging a bloody battle with Ansar al-Islam, the terrorist group affiliated with al-Qaida in Afghanistan and supported by Saddam Hussein in Iraq. It captured a courier carrying a message that demolishes the repeated claim of Bush critics that there was never a "clear link" between Saddam and Osama bin Laden.

The terrorist courier with a CD-ROM containing a 17-page document and with other messages

---

was Hassan Ghul, who confessed he was taking to al-Qaida the Ansar document setting forth a strategy to start an Iraqi civil war, along with a plea for re-enforcements. The Kurds turned him over to Americans for further interrogation, which is proving fruitful.

Hello! No link, is there? But wait, it gets better!

Quote:The New York Times reporter Dexter Filkins in Baghdad, backed up by Douglas Jehl in D.C., broke the story exclusively. Editors marked its significance by placing it on the front page above the fold. Although the Washington Post the next day buried it on page 17 (and Newsweek may construe as bogus any Saddam-Osama connection) the messages' authenticity was best attested by the amazed U.S. official who told Reuters, "We couldn't make this up if we tried."

On to the final part...you can look the rest up if you wish to, along with the articles in the NY Times and Washington Post, which were mentioned above. Go ahead, really- please look at them.

Quote:Of the liberation's three casus belli, one was to stop mass murder, bloodier than Kosovo; we are finding horrific mass graves in Iraq. Another was informed suspicion that a clear link existed between world terror and Saddam; this terrorist plea for Qaida reinforcements to kill Iraqi democracy is the smoking gun proving that.

The third was a reasoned judgement that Saddam had a bio-weapon that could wipe out a city; in time, we are likely to find a buried suitcase containing that, too.

That "supposed" link between Saddam and Osama just got some hard evidence backing it up, in case you didn't bother reading that. Not that anyone will actually bother to counter this, since anything else I've said has been talked around or ignored, but the case made by the war opposition is falling apart.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 19:39:02 GMT

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

---

GMM- piss off i hope you think you are really clever, no i really do, ecause your going to need one hell fo a self esteem to get by with your shitty life. you have not compared or contrasted any of pimp boys and I's posts. go away were you unpopular in school are you unpopular now, it must be true becasue you sure are an asshole.

also java i work at the NC clinic of mental health, and i am the head honcho that runs everything there basically i am the boss, envy bitches cuz i know you do. i coordinate every patients medicine make sure they get, etc. etc.

how do you like that go away GMM you hve done nothing but disrupt this. you can say all you want about being a man, but you are still a worthless child.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 20:07:36 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451GMM- piss off i hope you think you are really clever, no i really do, ecause your going to need one hell fo a self esteem to get by with your shitty life. you have not compared or contrasted any of pimp boys and I's posts. go away were you unpopular in school are you unpopular now, it must be true becasue you sure are an asshole.

also java i work at the NC clinic of mental health, and i am the head honcho that runs everything there basically i am the boss, envy bitches cuz i know you do. i coordinate every patients medicine make sure they get, etc. etc.

how do you like that go away GMM you hve done nothing but disrupt this. you can say all you want about being a man, but you are still a worthless child.

I don't need to think it when I have an academic record that proves it

Where is your psyhology degree? You seem to be connecting how I post on a message baord to my life... and even if you did have one, there are only a handful of people who would be able to do that.

And those people can type better than you, too.

I am perfectly happy with how my life is. As with all people, I do wish some things were different, but then the realist kicks in, and I realise I'm happy with what I have.

Also, I have never, ever, ever said:

Quote:all you want about being a man

Which demonstrates to me that you have a serious lack of intelligence. You have either read or inferred from one of my posts a piece of information that doesn't exist.

Now, you can be the head honcho of a mental health place all you like, but I thought that people who see things were meant to be inside.

Correct me if I'm wrong, but you seem like the one who would know.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 20:34:54 GMT

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

---

Sounds like the lunatics are running the asylum... especially since there is no establishment in North Carolina called the "Clinic of Mental Health" or the "NC Clinic of Mental Health".

I still think Llama Man and his second personality pimpboyjoe is a 15 year old teenager who posts when he gets home from school.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

---

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 20:41:42 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451also java i work at the NC clinic of mental health, and i am the head honcho that runs everything there basically i am the boss, envy bitches cuz i know you do. i coordinate every patients medicine make sure they get, etc. etc.

I personally find it very hard to believe that someone of your obvious attitude and obvious lack of intellect could possibly be a "head honcho" in a medical facility. It wouldn't be a far cry to assume that you're just saying that to cover up for your other account, or you're just copying the medical career of mommy or daddy.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 23:33:21 GMT

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

---

ok you found me out, i dont work in a clinic whoopdi friggin doo! its not my fault i had to go along with pimp boy joe who made up the bulshit story about that whole intern shit.

i know PBJ and he posted at my house a couple times . . . there i hope your hapy..... yeah but i am still NOT pimp boy joe, i hope you are happy that you continued the thread for two fucking pages. christ, you people are crazy. im glad tat GMM went away though

as for the NC clinic thing, i just made that up

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2004 23:37:22 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451ok you found me out, i dont work in a clinic whoopdi friggin doo! its not my fault i had to go along with pimp boy joe who made up the bulshit story about that whole intern shit.

i know PBJ and he posted at my house a couple times . . . there i hope your hapy..... yeah but i am still NOT pimp boy joe, i hope you are happy that you continued the thread for two fucking pages. christ, you people are crazy. im glad tat GMM went away though

as for the NC clinic thing, i just made that up

I've gone away?

News to me.

And, isn't this like the 6th time you changed you story? First of all he worked in the same office as you, then he works in the same clinic.. now you just know him and he posts at your house? Bah, I've lost track of all your lies.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 00:12:26 GMT

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

---

warranto'Dilbert'

It's my favorite cartoon, I read it all the time and know all about the pointy-haired managers. It is, however, only a cartoon that's designed to be funny, not accurate.

Crimsonespecially since there is no establishment in North Carolina called the "Clinic of Mental Health" or the "NC Clinic of Mental Health".

You mean it didn't turn up in your google search? Maybe it's a new building or doesn't have a web page or whatever.

DaveGMMWhere is your psychology degree? You seem to be connecting how I post on a message board to my life

Managers don't necessarily need degrees in what their subordinates work. You want to see someone who's been trying to connect forum talk to real life? You. Constantly calling two people one person and how he talks and blah blah blah...

DaveGMMI also know a fair few things about politics.

Talk is cheap.

DaveGMMHeard it all before, and from people with a damn slight more intelligence than you.

You know my intelligence level how? That's like me saying thaatt your penis is really small because me and you don't agree on certain things.

DaveGMMI'm more of a fuel than a spark.

And this somehow makes you uninvolved with the whole "off-topic" thing?. I wasn't blaming you for the entire fiasco about llama man's and pimp boy joe's same IPs. I was blaming you for not letting it go. Same goes for anyone else who won't.

Javafx obvious attitude and obvious lack of intellect could possibly be a "head honcho" in a medical facility.

What's obvious here is that these are your opinions. It's hard to be able to judge someone in the real world by how they make posts on the internet. Or are you a psychic?

EDIT: llama man and DaveGMM posted between me starting aand finishing this post; therefore, some of it may be irrelevant.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 00:21:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiwarranto'Dilbert'

It's my favorite cartoon, I read it all the time and know all about the pointy-haired managers. It is, however, only a cartoon that's designed to be funny, not accurate.

Ah. It's your favourite, but you don't know it's based of the thousands of e-mails Scott gets? Have you ever read his books?

SuperFlyingEngi  
Crimsonespecially since there is no establishment in North Carolina called the "Clinic of Mental Health" or the "NC Clinic of Mental Health".

You mean it didn't turn up in your google search? Maybe it's a new building or doesn't have a web page or whatever.

2 points to me. He just said it wasn't true. Goodie for you for believing him in the first place, jackass.

SuperFlyingEngi  
DaveGMMI'm more of a fuel than a spark.

And this somehow makes you uninvolved with the whole "off-topic" thing?

You need to re-read what I said.

SuperFlyingEngi  
Javaxcx obvious attitude and obvious lack of intellect could possibly be a "head honcho" in a medical facility.

What's obvious here is that these are your opinions.

No shit! Whose others would they be?

SuperFlyingEngi  
DaveGMMI also know a fair few things about politics.

Talk is cheap.

Oh, the irony.

Face it. You are a moron for trusting what he said, and even MORE of a moron for defending him.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 00:38:59 GMT

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

---

DaveGMMAh. It's your favourite, but you don't know it's based of the thousands of e-mails Scott gets? Have you ever read his books?

Have you ever read a Dilbert collection? You can't say it's how actual businesses work, which is what I was saying that it wasn't.

DaveGMM2 points to me. He just said it wasn't true. Goodie for you for believing him in the first place, jackass.

Innocent until proven guilty. I was saying that you people didn't have enough reasons to make that many caims against llama man.

DaveGMMNo shit! Whose others would they be?

Exactly my point. His opinions don't justify much in an argument against someone.

DaveGMMFace it. You are a moron for trusting what he said, and even MORE of a moron for defending him.

Again, innocent until proven guilty. For more, see above.

DaveGMMOh, the irony.

I'm taking it that you didn't read the whole thread. I've been throwing out political knowledge for at least 8 pages, and all you've said is that you know politics.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 00:54:19 GMT

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

---

Where, oh where did I ever say Dilbert was an accurate account of management?

Oh, wait... I didn't. All I did was state the surprizingly similar attributes of Dilberts boss and Llama boy. He's the boss of pimp boy... or sorry, he WAS the boss of him. Err, wait, thats also wrong, they just know each other and post at the same house. But regardless, he had claimed to be the boss of people, hence my accurate comparison of him and Dilberts boss.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 01:01:32 GMT

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

---

Hell, now that he came clean [supposedly], maybe he would be like the pointy-haired manager if he ever became a boss in a company. But then again, neither you nor me could possibly know this, since neither of us personally know llama man.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 01:44:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Let's get him a pointy-haired boos avatar for the forum!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 02:12:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

well now tghat i have made a complete ass of myself and gotten everyones panties al fucked up why dont we continue with the topic.

George Bush is the worst thing that could have happened to america

let the arguing begin

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 02:58:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

No... Franklin Roosevelt, Lindin Johnson, and Edward Kennedy are some of the worst things that happened to America.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 03:12:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

MrBobNo... Franklin Roosevelt, Lindin Johnson, and Edward Kennedy are some of the worst things that happened to America.

Nooo. The worst thing to happen to America was the birth of these two morons.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

---

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 04:20:15 GMT

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

---

MrBobLet's get him a pointy-haired boos avatar for the forum!

Well, I couldn't resist. Here are 3 pics I scanned in that can be used as avatars...

BOSS 1 -

<http://www.n00bstories.com/image.fetch.php?id=1350453554>

BOSS 2 -

<http://www.n00bstories.com/image.fetch.php?id=1186319342>

BOSS 3 -

<http://www.n00bstories.com/image.fetch.php?id=1281809552>

If you want to make one of these an avatar, that would be pretty awesome.

DaveGMMNooo. The worst thing to happen to America was the birth of these two morons.

The fact that we don't agree doesn't make me a moron and you a king, superhero, whatever.

MrBob, you didn't mean Franklin Delacorte Roosevelt when you were talking about the worst things to ever happen to America, did you? He pulled America out of the Depression. Although, if Hoover hadn't made a slew of poor decisions right before the depression, like giving lots of money to the rich so they can invest it in the stock market, the nation could have gotten out of the depression in 9 months, not until the early 1940s.

And without Lyndon Johnson, civil rights would not have come around for a lot longer. Perhaps he wasn't the greatest man as an actual person, but he was brilliant at political maneuvering.

Contrary to President Bush, who has lost America almost 3 million jobs, and sent America in to a "war" under false pretexts [WMDs] while lying to American people about how he knew there were WMDs in Iraq and that Saddam could deploy them within an hour.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 04:29:52 GMT

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

---

No, Bush didn't go into Iraw because of WMDs.

He gave you a lot of reasons why. Saddam.. oil... y'know, them.

Bliar is in deep shit because WMDs was the ONLY reason.... and they haven't found any.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 05:02:56 GMT

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

---

\*sigh\*

\*wonders why he even bothers posting when people just argue around it without paying any attention\*

To sum up:

Mass murder, torture, and rape of Iraqi citizens- STOPPED

Connection between Saddam and Osama- ESTABLISHED(see my last post)

WMD's- FOUND, BUT NOT IN THE FORM THEY WERE HOPING FOR. Large quantities of nerve and blister agents, in the form of agricultural chemicals which NO average Iraqi under Saddam could have afforded, were found, but were not weaponized! People are off looking for missiles and bombs, and ignoring the big goddamn barrels of the stuff that are sitting right under their noses!

Was Saddam in violation of UN weapon restrictions?- YES! In the very first days of the invasion, Saddam used banned missiles on Kuwait!

On Oil- Iraq produces a very, very, very, VERY, VERY small percentage of the world's oil. If it was oil we were after, we would have gone after some other country. I mean, use your damn brains- if Iraq were a country with enough oil to be worth invading for, would Saddam have invaded Kuwait for its oil?

Were France and Russia, who opposed the invasion, selling banned weapons to Saddam?- A HEARTY YES! Where in the hell do you think all his military hardware came from? Saddam was equipped with the latest in French and Russian military gear, which means both nations were selling him stuff AFTER the first Gulf War!

What in the name of all things highly explosive are you people not seeing here? It's blatantly obvious! Granted, I live with an Army Colonel, and get any information that comes down the pipe (that is, anything that's not classified, of course), but any of the information I've been spewing could be found with about an hour's worth of research!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 08:32:55 GMT

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

---

FYI -- I didn't search Google. If you're looking for a specific location you get much better results with the YELLOW PAGES on DexOnline.com.

:rolleyes:

And looky, I (and others) were proved right. I think SuperFlyingEngi just likes to argue. Maybe he's compensating for something lacking in his life.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [exnyte](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 08:53:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Maybe so Crimson... I just think he likes seeing what he posts. Seeming how he's been saying the same exact thing for the past 5 pages.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 23:15:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

CrimsonAnd looky, I (and others) were proved right. I think SuperFlyingEngi just likes to argue. Maybe he's compensating for something lacking in his life.

I don't argue just for the sake of arguing, I was pointing out how all you people were building on each other's accusations without taking a step back first. None of you had the capability to prove llama man and pimp boy joe were the same person. The fact that you were proved right doesn't justify what you were doing, it just means you got lucky.

majikent, this is another example of building off of what other people say without applying rational thought. I haven't been saying the exact same thing for five pages. More like two, really, and it's because all of you people wouldn't stop with your accusations that were not founded in fact. Again, you all getting proved right doesn't justify what you were doing, it just means you got lucky.

majikentI just think he likes seeing what he posts.

I just think you like re-posting what others post without thinking.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2004 23:23:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Look sparky! More proof for Bush supporters!

The link (in case you don't bother to read below):

<http://preview.news.aol.com/news/article.adp?id=20040210090609990004>

The article(in case you can't see it, or feel like reading):

Quote:(Feb. 13) - A retired Alabama Air National Guard officer said Friday that he remembers George W. Bush showing up for duty in Alabama in 1972, reading safety magazines and flight manuals in an office as he performed his weekend obligations.

"I saw him each drill period," retired Lt. Col. John "Bill" Calhoun said in a telephone interview with The Associated Press from Daytona Beach, Fla., where he is preparing to watch this weekend's big NASCAR race.

"He was very aggressive about doing his duty there. He never complained about it. ... He was very dedicated to what he was doing in the Guard. He showed up on time and he left at the end of the day."

Calhoun, whose name was supplied to the AP by a Republican close to Bush, is the first member of the 187th Tactical Reconnaissance Group to recall Bush distinctly at the Alabama base in the period of 1972-1973. He was the unit's flight safety officer.

The 69-year-old president of an Atlanta insulation company said Bush showed up for work at Dannelly Air National Guard Base for drills on at least six occasions. Bush and Calhoun had both been trained as fighter pilots, and Calhoun said the two would swap "war stories" and even eat lunch together on base.

Calhoun is named in 187th unit rosters obtained by the AP as serving under the deputy commander of operations plans. Bush was in Alabama on non-flying status.

"He sat in my office most of the time - he would read," Calhoun said. "He had your training manuals from your aircraft he was flying. He'd study those some. He'd read safety magazines, which is a common thing for pilots."

Democrats have asked for proof that Bush, then a 1st lieutenant with the Texas Air National Guard, turned up for duty in Alabama, where Bush had asked to be assigned while he worked on the U.S. Senate campaign of family friend Winton "Red" Blount.

Pay and medical records released by the White House this week failed to quash allegations that Bush shirked his Guard responsibilities.

The 187th's former commander, retired Brig. Gen. William Turnipseed, has said he doesn't remember Bush ever turning up on base, and more than a dozen members of the 800-person unit, including its commander, told The Associated Press this week they have no recollection of Bush. Critics have made much of the fact that the White House has failed to produce anyone who could remember seeing Bush there.

Calhoun said he contacted Texas GOP leaders with his story in 2000 when the issue was raised just before the November general election.

"I got on the phone and got information and called Austin, Texas, and talked to the Republican campaign. They said I was talking to the campaign manager," he said. "I told him my story and said I would be glad to provide information to that effect. At that time they said ... The story is not true. And we don't think it's got enough weight to stay out as a story.' And they said, 'But if it does we'll call you back.' And I never heard from them again."

Last week as the issue raged again, Calhoun sent an e-mail to the White House offering to tell his story. "I got a response back, one of those automatic responses," he said. It wasn't until his wife contacted Georgia GOP officials that Calhoun's name surfaced.

White House press secretary Scott McClellan said Friday that the White House was not making any effort to try to locate people who might have served with Bush. He also accused reporters of trying to raise new lines of questioning, beyond whether Bush served in Alabama.

Critics have suggested that Bush used his family connections to get the safe Guard assignment ahead of thousands of others. But Calhoun said Bush never mentioned his congressman father while they sat together at Dannelly.

"I knew he was working in the senatorial campaign, and I asked him if he was going to be a politician," said Calhoun, who is a staunch Republican. "And he said, 'I don't know. Probably.'"

Calhoun has not made any donations to Bush this election season or during the 2000 season, according to campaign finance records.

02-13-04 1313EST

There's the monkey wrench in the gears for the AWOL argument. Looks like Bush did his time after all.

\*In the mean time, everyone else continues to rag on each other...\*

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sat, 14 Feb 2004 01:36:52 GMT

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

---

wow, i never thought anyone could be more hypocritical than me DAMN that whole awol thing . . . what a bunch of bs. you said in there that 800 people had never heard or remembered him (not an exact quote) but it must be true if this one REPUBLICAN who happens to have this disclosed AFTER the whole thing came out completely a couple of days ago, it might make one with a brain wonder. . . sucks for you.

as for whoever psoted that comment about the war. you are nuts. we you say that frnace and russia supplied weapons, guess who else did. WE DID. ummm duh! also we have "WMD's" that you mentioned as well but since we will kick anyone and everyone who tries to fuck with us's ass they aren't going to invade, it could be becasue they dont have a friggin dyslexic retard on a power trip in control. also, you think we arent after oil, several interviews with Iraqui citizens say

that they are unhappy with americans, being they gaurd the oil wells and stand there as tanks smash the crap out of innocent commuters/bystanders . . . sound like they are happy with the "liberty" we are giving them. also we are making new plans to move on in the middle east (syria, almost EVERYWHERE) when we have intelligence that north korea is the bigger threat. liberating is not demolishing infrastructure and imposing our beliefs on them. hey anyone ever hear of spain comin over and kicking the shit out of nine million native americans? but that was completely different . . . . right?

also crimson i believe in an earlier post, you were babbling about acting like an adult. well i think your previous post might state otheerwise.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 14 Feb 2004 04:49:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonAnd looky, I (and others) were proved right. I think SuperFlyingEngi just likes to argue. Maybe he's compensating for something lacking in his life.

I don't argue just for the sake of arguing, I was pointing out how all you people were builing on each other's accusations without taking a step back first. None of you had the capability to prove llama man and pimp boy joe were the same person. The fact that you were proved right doesn't justify what you were doing, it just means you got lucky.

Not lucky. After how long I (and many others) have been on the internet and especially in there forums (over 2 years now), you can read people like a book.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [exnyte](#) on Sat, 14 Feb 2004 08:19:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngimajikentI just think he likes seeing what he posts.

I just think you like re-posting what others post without thinking.

That's funny... I don't remember anyone else saying this:

majikentSuperFlyingEngiFor Clinton, from the beginning of his first term to the end of his second term, there were 23 million more jobs in America. This includes jobs lost.

Same goes for Bush in that from the beginning of his first term until just a short while ago, nearly 3 million jobs have been lost in America. This includes jobs gained.

How can you possibly compare these numbers when your taking numbers from Clinton's 2 terms and from the first 3 years of Bush's term? Wow... Impressive! Clinton can gain more jobs in a longer period of time than Bush can!

You can't argue this point until both are in office the same amount of time, unless you use like periods of time to compare, (i.e. Clinton's first term, and Bush's first term when it's finished).

Or this:

majikentSuperFlyingEngilf his father was any hint, this WILL NOT happen.

What you need to remember is that the current president isn't his father. They have the same name, they even kind of look alike. That doesn't make them the same person. You can't base what our current president has done, or is going to do, by what his father did in his run as president. That's like saying you'll have three kids because your dad did. Or you'll be laid off from a job because your father was previously. It doesn't make any sense. Two completely different people. This isn't to say he isn't influenced by his father, as I'm sure he is. How could his father possibly be a hint to what he is going to do in the next year, and possibly 4 years after that?

But yet, you seemed to miss those. And the reason I said you have been going on about the same thing for the last five pages is because the first three of those pages could be summarized like this:

You...Blah... blahblah... blah... numbers... blah blah blah... blah. blah blah blah research... blah blah blah.... blah google... blah blah numbers... blah blah blah... blah numbers... blah blah blah... bush bad... blah blah blah... blah... blah facts... blah blah blah... blah numbers...

You get the point... Then the past two pages you defend Llama and his "friend". Why? No clue. Maybe the reason they figured out they were both the same person was because they did did have the capability to prove it. Why go against what everyone else is saying, even when there is some sort of proof, and you have nothing backing your argument? This is most likely why Crimson brought up the idea that you just like to argue. Or maybe, you just like to see yourself post. Oh wait! I was the first one to say that too.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sat, 14 Feb 2004 15:14:47 GMT

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

---

i just up and admitted that he was not my intern and you are still having a fucking heart attack over it, christ! you REALLY need to grow up. wow, you have two posts as evidence!!!!!! that doesnt fill up five whole pages my friend!

as for the first five pages, superflyingengl had no other choice becasue AFC (aircraftkiller) basically just kept saying, uh! oh my god! you point is??? i dont see a point! uh! OH MY GOD!!! george bush is a good president and that means your wrong!!!!!! UH!!!!!!

with crappy arguments like that along with other stupid things from nodbugger (who hasnt posted for several pages i might add, maybe because he finally learned he was full of shit) its kind of hard not to demand some shred of proof, oh wait AFC hasnt posted for a while EITHER hmmm

....

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 14 Feb 2004 16:20:56 GMT

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

---

Me...but not really...Blah... blahblah... blah... numbers... blah blah blah... blah. blah blah blah research... blah blah blah.... blah google... blah blah numbers... blah blah blah... blah numbers... blah blah blah... bush bad... blah blah blah... blah... blah facts... blah blah blah... blah numbers...

Actually, I don't recall ever saying this. Did you read the first three pages where I belted out facts and numbers? That's not blather, it's arguing.

majikentThat's funny... I don't remember anyone else saying this:

This makes it inherently untrue because why? Also, I was just making a stupid statement to show how dumb your earlier one was.

majikentYou get the point...

Yes, I do...you're an idiot. All those things you said were just stupid, and you didn't post my later replies to them, which would make it look like I didn't know what I was talking about, when in fact I did.

majikentThen the past two pages you defend Llama and his "friend". Why? No clue.

Seems like someone hasn't bothered reading what I post except what others post about it. I already said why I was defending llama man and pimp boy joe, because innocent until proven guilty. Everyone attacking llama man and pimp boy joe only had a same IP and opinions, which was pretty silly in my eyes.

majikentMaybe the reason they figured out they were both the same person was because they did did have the capability to prove it.

Perhaps, but highly unlikely. I doubt any of them work at the psychic friends hotline or personally know pimp boy joe or llama man.

majikentWhy go against what everyone else is saying, even when there is some sort of proof, and you have nothing backing your argument?

Alright, lets say some cops arrest someone and take him to court. In the court he is charged with murder because both the police officers recall seeing him in the same city on the same day the murder was committed. You think that would ever fly in courts? Hell no. If the opposing argument isn't strong, you don't need anything to back you besides that.

maajikentOr maybe, you just like to see yourself post. Oh wait! I was the first one to say that too.

Congratulations, you must have not read the thread.[/i]

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 14 Feb 2004 20:04:28 GMT

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

---

Wow, Llama, think you could type an intelligent response without swearing every single sentence?

Quote: we you say that frnace and russia supplied weapons, guess who else did. WE DID. ummm duh!

Reality check to Llama, which decade are you referring to? It is unfortunately true, the US did, at one point, back Saddam, but that was not our current administration (read that: not Bush), and it happened before the first Gulf War- and is therefore not contradictory to UN weapon restrictions, which were put in place after that! France and Russia, on the other hand, have sold Saddam weapons between 1991 and 2003, which IS in violation of weapon restrictions (and under their current administrations, too).

Quote:also, you think we arent after oil, several interviews with Iraqi citizens say that they are unhappy with americans

Ok, smart boy, howzabout you ask them if they want Saddam back? Somehow I don't think that would go over well, either- odds are they'd choose us over him any day. Go ahead, go over there and ask if you have any doubts...or weren't the scenes of Iraqis cheering and greeting American troops when they arrived good enough for you?

Quote:being they gaurd the oil wells and stand there as tanks smash the crap out of innocent commuters/bystanders

Where do you pull your info from, the supermarket tabloids? The US military never intentionally targets civilians. If the president were to order that, any sane officer would refuse to carry out such orders.

As for guarding oil wells... It's that same oil which will support Iraq's economy when this is all over- allowing those to be destroyed would leave the country with little to no way of getting back on its feet again. Since the Iraqi military is in shambles, and their police still not at full strength, the only force in the region capable of protecting those wells IS the US military. When we eventually pull out, I'd expect that the oil wells will be transferred to the control of a new Iraqi force.

Quote: liberating is not demolishing infrastructure and imposing our beliefs on them

No, you're right, it's leaving a sadistic, aggressive, pompous ass of a dictator in power who will rape, pillage, burn, mutilate, murder, and imprison innocent people in his own country! Yup, there's the very essence of liberty right there, yessireeeee...[/sarcasm] :rolleyes:

Quote:hey anyone ever hear of spain comin over and kicking the shit out of nine million native americans? but that was completely different . . . . right?

Actually, my slightly retarded friend, yes. For one, the US isn't after gold. Secondly, we aren't turning the Iraqi population into slave labor. Third, we aren't trying to turn them all into Catholics. Fourth, we're trying to help preserve any historical sites in Iraq, not demolish them.

Quote:becasue they dont have a friggin dyslexic retard on a power trip in control

Since when did dyslexia equate to retardation? Watch your step, here, several of my family are dyslexic, and you'd be well advised to not use that as an insult- they're smarter than you'll ever be.

As for people on power trips...people like Saddam?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sat, 14 Feb 2004 22:01:02 GMT

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

---

LOL @ Catholic

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sat, 14 Feb 2004 22:22:30 GMT

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

---

nuke- have you ever heard of the phrase, putting words in my mouth? if not yo just won the prize for being the best person at it!!!!!! hurrrrayyy!!!!!!

yes, we did take saddam away, but right NOW almost all iraquis are totally pissed off at the US. also, how can you say we are trying to preserve sites when we are randomly dropping bombs all over the place??? also, i did say takin saddam was good and i have said that dictators like him need to be stoped in earlier posts!!!! but we are trying to impose democracy on them, when we should be imposing democracy on ourselves!!!!!! it is not a free country anymore at all. all the new, media, etc, ect. are owned by corporations, all the corporations are friends of SURVEY SAYS: GEORGE BUSH N' FRIENDS!! this is leaving about a 2% chance that the newspaper/ station/ channel will be correct, which i snot good!

as for the tank bit, i read it in an interview online unfortunately it was a while back and i do not have the link. i would gladly give it to you if i had it.

i wanna say sorry about the dyslexic comment, but i dont realy feel that i need to because by stating the near truth in that our president is dsylexic i am in no way insulting you family members. that is like you calling democrats blind to the truth, and me being horribly offended (i am legally blind) but if you did take any offense i apologize for i did not intend any to you and yours.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [exnyte](#) on Sun, 15 Feb 2004 06:13:09 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiActually, I don't recall ever saying this. Did you read the first three pages where I belted out facts and numbers? That's not blather, it's arguing.

You're right. You weren't belting out facts and numbers. What I was saying was that all you were saying was that no one else had done any research, gotten any facts, or given you any numbers. Repeatedly. That was your defense for every statement anyone made... Get it now?

SuperFlyingEngiYes, I do....you're an idiot. All those things you said were just stupid, and you didn't post my later replies to them, which would make it look like I didn't know what I was talking about, when in fact I did.

Way to resort to name-calling. When being involved in an "adult" conversation we don't have to do this. I quoted those posts because what you accused me of was just copying what everyone else said. These posts are clearly the first to mention any of the content in those posts, making your original accusation of my just copying everyone else untrue. I didn't need to post your replies for two reasons, 1) Your replies didn't have anything to do with the reason I was posting them, as explained above. Making the idea that I posted them in a way to make you look like you didn't know what you're talking about irrelevant. 2) If anyone wanted to see those replies all they had to do was look.

SuperFlyingEngiSeems like someone hasn't bothered reading what I post except what others post about it. I already said why I was defending llama man and pimp boy joe, because innocent until proven guilty. Everyone attacking llama man and pimp boy joe only had a same IP and opinions, which was pretty silly in my eyes.

The thing that you don't get is that one of the people who run this forum called him out on this. They have been doing this for quite some time, so credibility would be on his side. The very first post he stated that both had the same IP address, which most likely implies that these multiple users are the same person. Immediately after that, I pointed out that the two users had the same attitude and sentence structure. Since both users posted with the same attitude, sentence structure, and foul language, naturally people are going to say that this person is the same person. You've been around Renegade for some time I'm sure, at least long enough to see the cheating epidemic. When "PBJ" started claiming he was Llama's intern, like when many cheaters

not that no one read your posts, it's just that the evidence was already there.

SuperFlyingEngiPerhaps, but highly unlikely. I doubt any of them work at the psychic friends hotline or personally know pimp boy joe or llama man.

As I (and Crimson) mentioned previously, they have been running forums much like this for over the past 2 years. In that time they surely see trends in how users who do such a thing act. If anyone can spot someone doing this without actually be standing behind them while they are doing it would be Blazer and Crimson.

SuperFlyingEngiAlright, lets say some cops arrest someone and take him to court. In the court he is charged with murder because both the police officers recall seeing him in the same city on the same day the murder was committed. You think that would ever fly in courts? Hell no. If the opposing argument isn't strong, you don't need anything to back you besides that.

You're right. That wouldn't fly in court. The difference is this isn't court, and you don't have the right to be innocent until proven guilty. In this domain it's what the administrator says, goes.

Again the credibility thing comes up again. Since they have been doing this for some time, when they say two users are more than likely the same person, everyone else tends to believe them. This would also go along with why it's been said you like to argue, since you were going against what was already laid out in front of you.

SuperFlyingEngiCongratulations, you must have not read the thread.

Congratulations, you must have missed my point. As I said earlier, the whole point of my post was to show you that I haven't just reiterated what others have said. Apparently since you seem to think that you're the only person who has original ideas around here, I don't see why I should be surprised you responded the way you did.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sun, 15 Feb 2004 15:50:54 GMT

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

---

majikent you must be the most incompetant stubborn jerk in the entire world!!!! i already admitted that he was not my intern, that he had posted at my house once or twice, and that he made the entire intern bit up!!!!!! what more proof do you want, check some of the other IP addresses (ii have said this before as well) they are not the same because he posted at HIS house. also you keep trying to say the "FOUL language" thing. READ HIS POSTS . . . OK? STILL WITH ME?? THEN READ MINE . . . again you are the most incompetant and stubborn person on the face of this planet (except george w bush, who is a friggin retard, youd guys get along great!)

what do you want from me a signed confession!!!!????? I TOLD YOU THE TRUTH ALREADY JUST BACK OFF!!!!!! ok, I TOLD YOU THE FRIGGIN TRUTH!!!! JUST SHUT UP, I KNOW IT MAKES YOU FEEL GOOD ABOUT YOURSELF TO SEE THAT YOU ARE RIGHT, BUT PLEASE JUST SHUT UP!!! i think YOUR the one who likes to argue/ see himself post, because i have told SO many times that we are different people yet you keep arguing and posting

JUST BACK OFF!!!!!!

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 15 Feb 2004 17:44:05 GMT

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

---

Quote:but right NOW almost all iraqis are totally pissed off at the US.

And how would you know that? Have you asked them? Taken a poll perhaps? The simple fact is that the media goes after the stories that are the most negative- because those are the stories that get them the highest ratings! Naturally, you're going to see the discontent and protesting before you'll see any acts of kindness- just think about how stories are reported in this country: the murder investigation is always reported before the baby being rescued from a burning building, right? Same thing everywhere else. I read a story a few months ago that had in it several different pictures that you would never see on the evening news...they might be surprisingly heart-warming

compared to what the media reports.

Another matter- why do you think the Iraqis are even able to protest right now? They were never allowed to do that under Saddam, and all of a sudden, dissent is allowed, even encouraged. That is something which is brand new, something that has been brought about by this invasion; the Iraqi people have discovered a little something folks in the US know as the first amendment. Free speech anyone? They've tried it, and it's pretty obvious that they like the new liberties that have been given to them...otherwise, they wouldn't be protesting at all!

Quote:also, how can you say we are trying to preserve sites when we are randomly dropping bombs all over the place???

That's a bunch of senseless drivel, and you know it. Even our unguided weapons are accurate to within a foot or two of the target, with the guided ones- yes, even cruise missiles from hundreds of miles away- are accurate to within inches. The days of randomly dropping bombs died with Vietnam; only human error causes such incidents now.

Hell, I'm not aware of any major bombings by US troops since the middle of last year...the only ones that are randomly bombing anything they see are the terrorists with car bombs.

Quote:also, i did say takin saddam was good and i have said that dictators like him need to be stoped in earlier posts!!!! but we are trying to impose democracy on them, when we should be imposing democracy on ourselves!!!!!! it is not a free country anymore at all.

Explain how. None of our government officials, the sole exception being the supreme court, have life posts. ANY government official (including supreme court justices) can be removed from office if they don't do their job right. ANYONE can criticize the government, for any reason, at any time; you're doing it right now! It's hypocritical to say it isn't a free country when you're excersizing the very rights that make the country free.

Quote:all the new, media, etc, ect. are owned by corporations, all the corporations are friends of SURVEY SAYS: GEORGE BUSH N' FRIENDS!!

Which has to be the reason why the media is bashing his nuts in! Genius, Watson, genius! Proof please.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 15 Feb 2004 18:58:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

^^ \*applauds\*

That's one the better posts I've seen in here in a while!

Remember the true motto of the press: If it bleeds, it leads!

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sun, 15 Feb 2004 19:37:13 GMT

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

---

oh yes the country is free as in google now wont let you search certain things that are ant government, that is verry free. oh yes bashing his balls in? could you tell me about what exactly?? we have known about his being AWOL and getting paid for YEARS! and now when it does come out NO BIG DEAL. also now i will bet you to draw attention away from this they will start bashing kerry (even though he deserves it) about his drugs, sex affairs, and botox (im not sure if that is how you speel it) when georgie is about the sam thing!!!! betcha didnt know his wife ran someone down when she was nineteen cuz she was drunk, did ya?

also do you know how many times they played dean's "scream speech" about 700 times which makes him look like a total dick, when dianne sawyers noticed he had the mic that filters out the crowd, HE HAD TO SCREAM BECAUSE HE COULDN'T EVEN HEAR HIMSELF, and on meet the press theguy who was interviewing him kept blasting him about everything negative, however georgie was a fucking hero, he had stooped "them evil doers" and saved the world, becasue God said he was supposed to be president. what a bunch of bullshit!!!! and then george here has three wholl books fill of his stupid quote. dianne sawyer has a live interview and he denies every question or turns it away, and then randomly brings up 9-11 when they are talking about something completely different like health care!!!! you must not watch the news bcasue your whole statement is bullshit

as for the iraqi bombing, they are pretty random and worthless, its funny you should talk about the first amendment, because an american reporter asked this newspaper (which started after saddam came down) if they thought america was doing a good job. everyone raised their hands for "no" also, buildings in peoples back yards are getting blown up for no reason whatsoever. no i havent gone over to personally poll iraquis, your lame attempt at sarcasm was pretty crappy i must say, you should stick with your "facts" that anyone can disprove in a second

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 15 Feb 2004 20:04:24 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451no i havent gone over to personally poll iraquis, your lame attempt at sarcasm was pretty crappy i must say, you should stick with your "facts" that anyone can disprove in a second

You suck at sarcasm.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 16 Feb 2004 05:50:16 GMT

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

---

Quote:oh yes the country is free as in google now wont let you search certain things that are ant government

Oh no! Google won't let you search for some things! The world's ending! Opression, oprression, whatever shall we do?!

Google is not government owned. They reserve the right to not show you whatever the hell they don't want to show you. The simple soluton is to use a different search engine!

Quote:oh yes bashing his balls in? could you tell me about what exactly?? we have known about his being AWOL and getting paid for YEARS! and now when it does come out NO BIG DEAL

Are you even aware of how the National Guard works? It's even less demanding than the reserves are- the required service time per year is less than six weeks total. The six months in question are a fraction of the time he would have had off. The only time when the National Guard becomes a full time job is when it is mobilized- otherwise, it's part time, and not even frequently. In addition to that, odds are that all the people that said they never saw him probably never did- they may have been on post at different times than he was, and even if they were there at the same time, it's not as if everyone would get a chance to see any particular individual anyway!

Quote:also now i will bet you to draw attention away from this they will start bashing kerry (even though he deserves it) about his drugs, sex affairs, and botox (im not sure if that is how you speel it) when georgie is about the sam thing!!!!

When did anyone mention Kerry? You brought that up, no one else- if people choose to discuss that now, it's because you've just presented it as an issue.

Quote:betcha didnt know his wife ran someone down when she was nineteen cuz she was drunk, did ya?

What does his wife have to do with anything?

Quote:also do you know how many times they played dean's "scream speech" about 700 times which makes him look like a total dick

I said it before- the media latches on to anything negative, because that is what gets the best ratings for their network. Good business for them, bad business for Dean, who now seems terminally shafted. It doesn't matter why it happened; it happened, and it destroyed him, that's the way it works. Bush is discovering the same thing; anything he says or does that can be interpreted in a negative way gets splurged all over the TV screens of America.

Quote:however georgie was a fucking hero, he had stoopped "them evil doers" and saved the world, becasue God said he was supposed to be president. what a bunch of bullshit!!!! and then george here has three wholl books fll of his stupid quote.

One single word sums all that up: Whaaaaaaat? I can almost picture you frothing at the mouth right now; that wasn't an argument, it was a rabid rant. I won't even bother trying to figure out that incoherent mess.

Quote:dianne sawyer has a live interview and he denies every question or turns it away, and then randomly brings up 9-11 when they are talking about something completely different like health

care!!!! you must not watch the news bcasue your whole statement is bullshit

Reality check: Politicians do that. Their business is to make you look at what they've done well, and they will avoid questions they know they don't have answers for. Bush is not quite as eloquent (more like downright horrid) as others in doing that, but the same holds true for any politician. They're trying to sell themselves to the public, which means bringing up the high points in their career, or how they did such-and-such for so-and-so however many years ago. Wait until the political ads get going; you'll see exactly what I mean.

Quote:as for the iraqi bombing, they are pretty random and worthless

Quote:also, buildings in peoples back yards are getting blown up for no reason whatsoever.

There's just no talking that tabloid crap out of you, is there? The only thing the US military bombs is what the intelligence community tags as a legitimate military target. That means something that could potentially pose a threat, genius, not a random carpet bombing. Every weapon has a specific target when it is used; this is not a "spray-and-pray" blast fest. If something gets blown up, it's been blown up for a good reason.

Quote: its funny you should talk about the first amendment, because an american reporter asked this newspaper (which started after saddam came down) if they thought america was doing a good job. everyone raised their hands for "no"

And why, exactly, are they allowed to say "no" now? Why can people criticize the handling of postwar Iraq? Go on, say it: Because the US invaded! You don't see the CIA going in and busting reporters' lips for speaking out against us, do you? Hot tip: if we weren't doing a good job, Iraqis would still have to fear for their lives every time they raised their own opinions.

Quote:no i havent gone over to personally poll iraquis, your lame attempt at sarcasm was pretty crappy i must say, you should stick with your "facts" that anyone can disprove in a second

Funny how you haven't disproved anything yet. Actually, now you're adding issues in what looks like an unsuccessful attempt to draw attention away from the issue that is currently under discussion. Kind of like what you're criticizing Bush for, isn't it?

---

Subject: 300th post!

Posted by [U927](#) on Mon, 16 Feb 2004 06:39:45 GMT

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

---

w00t for 300th post in this thread of rambling!!

P.S. Llama Man 451 is a retard. All of your arguments are being shot to hell, yet you can't accept the fact that you are losing and continue to ramble on.

I think he's going to start reductio ad absurdum any moment now.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 16 Feb 2004 11:15:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Or bring in another "intern" to amuse us.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 16 Feb 2004 17:41:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Lookie! 29 lies about Saddam and weapons of mass destruction!

Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction.

Dick Cheney  
Speech to VFW National Convention  
August 26, 2002

Right now, Iraq is expanding and improving facilities that were used for the production of biological weapons.

George W. Bush  
Speech to UN General Assembly  
September 12, 2002

If he declares he has none, then we will know that Saddam Hussein is once again misleading the world.

Ari Fleischer  
Press Briefing  
December 2, 2002

We know for a fact that there are weapons there.

Ari Fleischer  
Press Briefing  
January 9, 2003

Our intelligence officials estimate that Saddam Hussein had the materials to produce as much as 500 tons of sarin, mustard and VX nerve agent.

George W. Bush  
State of the Union Address  
January 28, 2003

We know that Saddam Hussein is determined to keep his weapons of mass destruction, is determined to make more.

Colin Powell  
Remarks to UN Security Council  
February 5, 2003

We have sources that tell us that Saddam Hussein recently authorized Iraqi field commanders to use chemical weapons -- the very weapons the dictator tells us he does not have.

George W. Bush  
Radio Address  
February 8, 2003

If Iraq had disarmed itself, gotten rid of its weapons of mass destruction over the past 12 years, or over the last several months since (UN Resolution) 1441 was enacted, we would not be facing the crisis that we now have before us . . . But the suggestion that we are doing this because we want to go to every country in the Middle East and rearrange all of its pieces is not correct.

Colin Powell  
Interview with Radio France International  
February 28, 2003

So has the strategic decision been made to disarm Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction by the leadership in Baghdad? . . . I think our judgment has to be clearly not.

Colin Powell  
Remarks to UN Security Council  
March 7, 2003

Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised.

George W. Bush  
Address to the Nation  
March 17, 2003

Well, there is no question that we have evidence and information that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction, biological and chemical particularly . . . all this will be made clear in the course of the operation, for whatever duration it takes.

Ari Fleisher  
Press Briefing  
March 21, 2003

There is no doubt that the regime of Saddam Hussein possesses weapons of mass destruction. And . . . as this operation continues, those weapons will be identified, found, along with the people who have produced them and who guard them.

Gen. Tommy Franks

Press Conference  
March 22, 2003

I have no doubt we're going to find big stores of weapons of mass destruction.

Defense Policy Board member Kenneth Adelman  
Washington Post, p. A27  
March 23, 2003

One of our top objectives is to find and destroy the WMD. There are a number of sites.

Pentagon Spokeswoman Victoria Clark  
Press Briefing  
March 22, 2003

We know where they are. They're in the area around Tikrit and Baghdad and east, west, south and north somewhat.

Donald Rumsfeld  
ABC Interview  
March 30, 2003

Obviously the administration intends to publicize all the weapons of mass destruction U.S. forces find -- and there will be plenty.

Neocon scholar Robert Kagan  
Washington Post op-ed  
April 9, 2003

But make no mistake -- as I said earlier -- we have high confidence that they have weapons of mass destruction. That is what this war was about and it is about. And we have high confidence it will be found.

Ari Fleischer  
Press Briefing  
April 10, 2003

We are learning more as we interrogate or have discussions with Iraqi scientists and people within the Iraqi structure, that perhaps he destroyed some, perhaps he dispersed some. And so we will find them.

George W. Bush  
NBC Interview  
April 24, 2003

There are people who in large measure have information that we need . . . so that we can track down the weapons of mass destruction in that country.

Donald Rumsfeld  
Press Briefing  
April 25, 2003

We'll find them. It'll be a matter of time to do so.

George W. Bush  
Remarks to Reporters  
May 3, 2003

I'm absolutely sure that there are weapons of mass destruction there and the evidence will be forthcoming. We're just getting it just now.

Colin Powell  
Remarks to Reporters  
May 4, 2003

We never believed that we'd just tumble over weapons of mass destruction in that country.

Donald Rumsfeld  
Fox News Interview  
May 4, 2003

I'm not surprised if we begin to uncover the weapons program of Saddam Hussein -- because he had a weapons program.

George W. Bush  
Remarks to Reporters  
May 6, 2003

U.S. officials never expected that "we were going to open garages and find" weapons of mass destruction.

Condoleeza Rice  
Reuters Interview  
May 12, 2003

I just don't know whether it was all destroyed years ago -- I mean, there's no question that there were chemical weapons years ago -- whether they were destroyed right before the war, (or) whether they're still hidden.

Maj. Gen. David Petraeus, Commander 101st Airborne  
Press Briefing  
May 13, 2003

Before the war, there's no doubt in my mind that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, biological and chemical. I expected them to be found. I still expect them to be found.

Gen. Michael Hagee, Commandant of the Marine Corps  
Interview with Reporters  
May 21, 2003

Given time, given the number of prisoners now that we're interrogating, I'm confident that we're going to find weapons of mass destruction.

Gen. Richard Myers, Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff  
NBC Today Show interview  
May 26, 2003

They may have had time to destroy them, and I don't know the answer.

Donald Rumsfeld  
Remarks to the Council on Foreign Relations  
May 27, 2003

For bureaucratic reasons, we settled on one issue, weapons of mass destruction (as justification for invading Iraq) because it was the one reason everyone could agree on.

Paul Wolfowitz  
Vanity Fair interview  
May 28, 2003

weapons, as you say, in some of the forward dispersal sites. Believe me, it's not for lack of trying. We've been to virtually every ammunition supply point between the Kuwaiti border and Baghdad, but they're simply not there.

Lt. Gen. James Conway, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force  
Press Interview  
May 30, 2003

information out there."

Maj. Gen. Keith Dayton, Defense Intelligence Agency  
Press Conference  
May 30, 2003

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Mon, 16 Feb 2004 21:00:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

manjiko- you must not read all of my posts because i have said repeatedly, that saddam was bad and needed to be stopped!!!! as for the whole bombing/tank thing i didnt read at the supermarket, it was online on some site, i dont remember where it was. why do you think google

is not letting people look at ceratin sites??? maybe it is because the government, tripped, fell, and accidentally paid them some money. you say politicians are paid to turn away questions, and point out the thightlights of their careers. if about 3000 people getting smashed by some planes is a highlight, then obviously george bush has had a terrible career (duh)! also, you admitted that george bush was horrible at answering questions and cannot do it "as eloquently as others" yet you still support him why? hell, he's worse tan me at speaking, let alone typing (not one of my fine points as you have complained about many times). as for the negative george bush thing people have been focusing on you still havent shon anything . . .

hell, i dont care, i know no one wasnt talking about kerry once again proving you cannot read very well, i was using him as an example. lets talk about kerry, he is a retard, and if he gets nominated you should be happy, there is no way he could win, and it is ludicrous to call him a democrat, he is a pansy mofo, if you ask me.

hey java-

"You suck at sarcasm"

in response

You suck at life. Period.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 16 Feb 2004 21:13:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, unlike you, I actually HAVE a job, and a pretty good income. If that constitutes sucking at life, than I guess you're one in a minority who must rock at it because you do absolutely nothing for anyone, right?

Aside from your proofless attempt at an insult, someone has to only read your posts to understand that YOU SUCK AT SARCASM.

Period.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 16 Feb 2004 22:56:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Tue, 17 Feb 2004 00:50:29 GMT

---

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

---

Riiiggght :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 17 Feb 2004 02:05:55 GMT

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

---

How Democrats See It:

- Anyone who supports the President is a war monger who drinks oil instead of orange juice!!!
- All Bush supporters must be uber-right-wing conservative evagelical Christians!!!
- Republicans must be paying off the media, because nobody could ever support Bush!!!
- Everything Bush says is a big fat dirty hairy lie, so we can just ignore any counter-arguments as rightist propaganda!!!
- If I can't get every single little bit of information I want, it must be a Bush plot to stifle opposition to the Republican party!!!

DON'T BE A DUMBASS! Using stereotypical crap as an argument is the single worst thing you could have come up with.

[/b]

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 17 Feb 2004 02:33:52 GMT

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

---

Oh yeah, I forgot, NO JOKES!

Please, I just posted that picture for some humor. If you want to look at something substantial, look just a couple posts up to find quoted lies about WMDs in Iraq.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 01:44:26 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiOh yeah, I forgot, NO JOKES!

Please, I just posted that picture for some humor. If you want to look at something substantial, look just a couple posts up to find quoted lies about WMDs in Iraq.You think it's so freakin' easy to find the WMDs he had in Iraq, don't you? Let's put this in perspective...

At one time, Iraq claimed it had 8,500 liters of liquid anthrax. Colin Powell said he may have three times as many liters as that figure. That would make 25,500 liters of liquid anthrax. If you weighed

all of that anthrax, it would come out to be approximately 25.5 tons (1 ton = approx. 1,000 liters of anthrax). Sounds like a lot, doesn't it? If there is so much anthrax, why hasn't George Bush found any of it yet? He must have lied!

But wait! How much space would it take to hold all of that anthrax? One 18-wheeler tanker truck. That's it.

There's more. What if you were to reduce all of that liquid anthrax to powdered anthrax? How much space would that take up? About 12 suitcases. 25.5 tons of liquid anthrax could have been reduced to just twelve simple suitcases. These cases could have been hidden in an area as small as Saddam's spider hole.

Of course, this is with 25,500 liters of liquid anthrax, so 8,500 liters would be even easier to hide.

NOW how easy is it to find all of the weapons of mass destruction Saddam has?

Keep in mind that Saddam had 12 years to perfect these methods of hiding WMDs.

EDIT: Forgot to mention, the UN itself has said Saddam was in possession of 8,500 liters of liquid anthrax and does not know where it could be to this day. Saddam himself has said he once had 8,500 liters of liquid anthrax! Of course, he says he got rid of it, but are you going to honestly trust a man who had murdered millions of his own people?

Another EDIT: One more thing I forgot to mention, twenty-five to thirty Mig-29 jets were found buried beneath the sand, and we weren't even looking for those. How hard do you think it would be to find a place to bury an eighteen wheeler tanker truck or twelve suitcases?

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [jorge the man](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 02:15:41 GMT

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

---

Although, i am not a fan of kerry because of many of the acts he supports, including no child left behind\*\*, i think he is the only democrat that has a chance. The only other democrat left, is Edwards, who i like a little more, but not much, and he won't win. If Edwards, decided to become vice for kerry, there might be a chance of someone beating bush. Even though i don't like Edwards, i have to say he is smart.

\*\*The no child left behind policy has got to be one of the stupidest policies ever, especially in todays school systems. Basically it's saying if one student fails one of the statewide tedtd, then the teachers are innoficient. Half of the students today couldn't care less if they flunked. This does not mean that the teachers are not profficient, because it is just the lack of effort by the student. We especially don't need this what with the lack of teachers already. Calling some fialures, is not going to help.

Furthermore the bush administration claims to be making education better. But, if you look at the tax cuts, those only went to the rich, so teachers, who definitely don't make much money aren't going to be inspired to teach, because hey, who wants to have to live off nothing. Tax breaks also

helped people who were already wealthy enough to go to private schools. I'm not saying that all private schools are better than all public schools, because they're not. But, in hickville places, that can barely afford textbooks, the private schools provide a much better education.

So, the bush administration claims to be helping education, while at the same time, they are not allowing more people to have a better education, and are most definitely discouraging people to become teachers. because money is a factor, in what job you take.

This election, i don't like any of the candidate's, republican or democratic, veiw on education. But, i will still vote democratic, because i support some things that the democratic canidates support.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 02:54:08 GMT

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

---

jorge the manAlthough, i am not a fan of kerry because of many of the acts he supports,

Like the Patriot act. What a stupid act. The main point of it is to let the government arrest people they even slightly suspect of being      ists and stick them in Guantanamo Bay without a fair trial or a lawyer. Guantanamo Bay is basically a concentration camp located in Cuba. A while back, the U.S. and Cuba signed a treaty thing that would allow America to always have a military base in Cuba. Now, Castro wishes we were off of his rock, but the U.S. is never leaving because the treaty is indefinite. Now, the U.S. [or should I say "Bush Administration?"] uses it to lock people up who they don't like without even requiring evidence.

jorge the manmight be a chance of someone beating bush.

Kerry is already up in popularity and looks like he will beat Bush if everything keeps going like it is. America is starting to      Bush, and the media is starting to gear up against him as well, and the media controls a lot of stupid people's votes.

jorge the manThe no child left behind policy has got to be one of the stupidest policies ever

Silly 'ole President Bush for passing the NCLB act. It was his way of telling stupid people that he wanted to help education by making an act that looks good on the outside but sucks and doesn't work on the inside. [like Communism] And then, President Bush further showed his support for education by cutting back on funding for it. I guess he shows that even someone with 93 I.Q. can become President, so education isn't important, as long as you have lots of money and rich friends.

jorge the manBut, if you look at the tax cuts, those only went to the rich, so teachers

His tax cuts didn't only go to the rich, they were just unfairly biased towards the rich. Note to Bush supporters: NOT A FLAT CUT!

hydra, so you're saying "at one time" Iraq had lots of chemical weapons. Is one time now? No. Could Iraq have possibly destroyed those chemical weapons between now and then? [now and

then being about 10 years, at least, if I am correct] Well, Bush said Saddam wasn't doing what the U.N. said, so he MUST be right!

hydra1945Keep in mind that Saddam had 12 years to perfect these methods of hiding WMDs.

Or possibly perfecting strategies of disarming WMDs.

Nukelt15-Anyone who supports the President is a war monger who drinks oil instead of orange juice!!!

-All Bush supporters must be uber-right-wing conservative evangelical Christians!!!

-Republicans must be paying off the media, because nobody could ever support Bush!!!

-Everything Bush says is a big fat dirty hairy lie, so we can just ignore any counter-arguments as rightist propaganda!!!

-If I can't get every single little bit of information I want, it must be a Bush plot to stifle opposition to the Republican party!!!

-No, anyone who supports President Bush is uninformed who probably drinks orange juice just like everyone else.

-A lot of them are.

-Colin Powell's son is the head of the FCC.

-Bush doesn't have a whole ton of credibility now that his lies about National guard duty have been exposed. I don't ignore counter arguments. I listen to them and then say why they're wrong. It's a lot of fun, but kind of hard to do if you're a conservative.

-Colin Powell's son is the head of the FCC.

I just couldn't resist.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 03:30:10 GMT

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

---

this is what will happen if bush is re elected

<http://albinoblacksheep.com/flash/end.php>

(that was a joke for all of you uptight freaks)

java, if you dont "suck at life" then how come you spend all your time on a site about a computer game when you are a grown man?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Javafx](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 03:39:21 GMT

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

---

I have a better question:  
Why did you pretend to be one?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 18:14:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

jorge the man

But, if you look at the tax cuts, those only went to the rich....Tax breaks also helped people who were already wealthy enough to go to private schools.

I am not rich (Believe it or not but firefighters do not make a lot of money) and I noticed extra money in my pocket from the tax cuts. When he gave the tax credit I got over \$600. And for the first time in 10 years I got a tax return. So don't give me this bullshit that tax cuts went to the rich.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 18:24:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I already posted this, but:

[http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/home/menu/top\\_50\\_\\_of\\_wage\\_earners\\_pay\\_96\\_09\\_\\_of\\_income\\_taxes.guest.html](http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/home/menu/top_50__of_wage_earners_pay_96_09__of_income_taxes.guest.html)

THIS chart derived directly from the IRS figures shows who pays the most taxes.

I, too, have felt a lighter load, but now that I'm a contractor (1099 employee), I have to actually save money frlom my checks and deposit them by hand with the IRS... believe me, it's going to be painful.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 18:39:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

CrimsonI already posted this, but:

[http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/home/menu/top\\_50\\_\\_of\\_wage\\_earners\\_pay\\_96\\_09\\_\\_of\\_income\\_taxes.guest.html](http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/home/menu/top_50__of_wage_earners_pay_96_09__of_income_taxes.guest.html)

THIS chart derived directly from the IRS figures shows who pays the most taxes.

I, too, have felt a lighter load, but now that I'm a contractor (1099 employee), I have to actually save money frlom my checks and deposit them by hand with the IRS... believe me, it's going to be painful.

---

Quicken has some nice software to help you out with that.  
My sister-in-law has to do the same thing. If you didn't already know that I will try and find what programs she uses.

PS. One of my favorite sites

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 20:44:28 GMT

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

---

hydra: Didn't even think of the amount of space any biological or chemical agents take up- nice one.

I might take this opportunity to point out that the smallest operational nuclear warhead fits in a suitcase or backpack, and both the US and Russia have weapons of that size. Since Russia is known for selling weapons on the black market, is it not possible that everyone's favorite dictator could have acquired one? Note that this is just speculation now, not factual evidence- just something to get the 'ol mental gears turning. If you could hide those 20-someodd fighters under the desert, how easy would it be to hide a single suitcase or backpack (building on hydra's anthrax example)?

Remember to keep your minds open- I know the possibility exists that we may never find a biological or nuclear weapon in Iraq (chemical is another story, since we've already found thousands of gallons of stuff that could be used in those)...anyone else should remember that Iraq is still a big place, with plenty of sand to bury things under, and you really can't say "it isn't there" until the entire country has been thoroughly searched- and that could take years, I'm sorry to say; instant results are not guaranteed by looking through established military sites. This is not a simple matter of walking up to an Iraqi official and asking for the keys to the WMD cabinet.

HERE IS THE IMPORTANT PART:

As far as I'm concerned, if Saddam refused to allow inspection of his country by UN officials, he had to have been hiding something big- if he were dismantling it, there would be no reason to keep that information secret, since it could have only benefited him.

Whenever any weapon of mass destruction is dismantled, it MUST be observed, or it has not been dismantled at all. If no one can see it happen, then it cannot be confirmed. Papers do not serve as acceptable proof; any document can be forged, and any photograph can be doctored and edited(yes, I DO realize this goes both ways). An eyewitness or some other form of visual observation that is NOT under the control of the weapon's owner must be available to prove that the destruction was indeed carried out. Saddam never provided solid evidence, only paper.

Take the US and Russia for example- you may not be aware, but when either one dismantles a weapon, it is done in front of UN observers. Aerial reconnaissance and satellites confirm the destruction of such things as nuclear-capable bombers, ICBM silos, mobile launchers, and even

ballistic missile submarines. Both nations have dismantled their Chemical and Biological warfare programs, and did that under inspection as well.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 21:26:48 GMT

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

---

Yes, Iraq is a big place where stuff could be hidden easily, but that is what intelligence is for. Funny how Tenet said that Iraq was not an "imminent threat". Well, I guess we need a war to set things straight.

Crimson, yes, you have shown that graph before. Funny thing is, it doesn't show that Bush's tax cuts were unfairly biased to the rich. It shows that the rich pay most of the taxes. Therefore, that graph is completely irrelevant since it doesn't state Bush's tax cuts.

K9TrooperPS. One of my favorite sites

I think it's kind of ironic that Rush Limbaugh lost his hearing since he never listened to any political issues anyway. He used to always say how horrible anyone who uses      is, until he got caught being addicted to a prescription      , which he used his power to obtain in large quantities. Now, he says that he NEVER said anything about people who are addicted to illegal      , which is not true. The only reason Rush SURVIVES is because he surrounds himself with a bunch of morons [dittoheads] who believe anything he says. In studies, its been shown that people who listen to Rush Limbaugh's radio show [comparative to stuff like reading the newspaper and watching CNN] think that they are the most informed about political issues, yet when they take a test, it shows that they are the LEAST informed. Rush Limbaugh just lies about everything and these crazy people BELIEVE HIM!

Rush LimbaughThe economy is doing pretty well. It's roaring back. You've got to get in gear and understand that Kerry and his willing accomplices in the press all paint an entirely different picture.

The economy ISN'T doing pretty well. It's roaring back...what he means is this: About 6 months ago, Bush went out to say that he would turn the economy around. Now, Bush has to make 150,000 jobs a month to break even. Recently, he created about 90,000 jobs in a month, and all the Republicans are declaring it the economic victory. But, in fact, he lost 60,000 jobs that month. Now that he's almost 3 million net jobs down, he's still losing jobs and saying he won.

You know why Rush won't go on TV shows any more? Because anyone besides his crazy audience who listens to his radio show      S HIM. One time he showed up on the David Letterman show, and by the end of the show the crowd was booing him so much David Letterman remarked, "Do you wake up some nights just feeling like you're full of hot air?" Amid the audience clapping heavily.

Also, if you look on the website, you can find out how Rush Limbaugh is incredibly obsessed with himself.

Rush Limbaugh's websiteThe Rush Parody Achive features over 100 parodies from the greatest

radio show on earth!

Also, he just always says stuff like "Liberals are bad blah blah blah blah blah. Just because."

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 22:19:14 GMT

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

---

Have you actually read his stuff?? A lot of it is good old fashioned common sense.

Right from the home page he has a quote from him basically saying that if he denies allegations made about him, he must be lying, but if Kerry denies having that affair with an intern, it's OK and we believe him. Interesting double standards.

I'm not sitting here and saying the Rush is god and he's absolutely correct in everything. Yes, he's a bit radical and exaggerates a bit, but I don't take his words as gospel truth, but use them as a basis for what I believe to be true.

And he doesn't say "liberals are bad just because". He's got plenty of data to back that up. What he says makes a lot more sense than the wild accusations made by the desperate Democrats trying to pull themselves out of being the minority party... just don't forget that there's a REASON they are now the minority party. There are things that they said, did, or want to do that has brought this upon them.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 18 Feb 2004 23:27:09 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngijorge the manBut, if you look at the tax cuts, those only went to the rich, so teachers

His tax cuts didn't only go to the rich, they were just unfairly biased towards the rich. Note to Bush supporters: NOT A FLAT CUT!

Lets get one thing straight. The tax cuts were not just given to rich people. They were given to the people who PAY TAXES. See, that's what a TAX CUT does, it allows people to keep more of the money they make by not taking it away from them through income taxes. The majority of low-income families DO NOT PAY INCOME TAXES AT ALL!!!!

SuperFlyingEngihydra, so you're saying "at one time" Iraq had lots of chemical weapons. Is one time now? No. Could Iraq have possibly destroyed those chemical weapons between now and then? [now and then being about 10 years, at least, if I am correct] Well, Bush said Saddam wasn't doing what the U.N. said, so he MUST be right!

So you're going to trust Saddam Hussein's word that he dismantled those weapons of mass destruction without any proof at all? Do you know the magnitude of the man's lying?

For all we know, Saddam could have been planning on handing off all of his weapons to Osama Bin Laden before the US ever set foot in Iraq to foil his plans. You would have taken the risk of believing him when he said he dismantled those weapons?

SuperFlyingEngihydra1945Keep in mind that Saddam had 12 years to perfect these odds of hiding WMDs.

Or possibly perfecting strategies of disarming WMDs.

Again, you would take the risk of believing Saddam Hussein, a man who gassed millions of his own people?

Nukelt15-Anyone who supports the President is a war monger who drinks oil instead of orange juice!!!

-All Bush supporters must be uber-right-wing conservative evagelical Christians!!!

-Republicans must be paying off the media, because nobody could ever support Bush!!!

-Everything Bush says is a big fat dirty hairy lie, so we can just ignore any counter-arguments as rightist propaganda!!!

-If I can't get every single little bit of information I want, it must be a Bush plot to stifle opposition to the Republican party!!!

SuperFlyingEngi-No, anyone who supports President Bush is uninformed who probably drinks orange juice just like everyone else.

-A lot of them are.

-Colin Powell's son is the head of the FCC.

-Bush doesn't have a whole ton of credibility now that his lies about National guard duty have been exposed. I don't ignore counter arguments. I listen to them and then say why they're wrong. It's a lot of fun, but kind of hard to do if you're a conservative.

-Colin Powell's son is the head of the FCC.

-Anyone who supports George Bush realizes the threat terrorism poses to the United States

-How the hell do you know? Have you gone out and asked each and every Republican what is religion is and where he would fall on the political spectrum?

-So? The son of Newsweek's main editor is the head of the Socialist Party. Who the hell cares?

-Why was he honorably discharged if he went AWOL? Who the hell cares?This recent attack on George Bush's service in the National Guard is nothing new to Democrats. Cal Thomas sums it up pretty well. It's time to get back to the issues at hand.

-Blow me.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 00:45:23 GMT

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

---

That's a very nice article. Makes a LOT of sense. Learning from history and trying to repeat the good, and not repeat the bad.

I have heard, however, that it's been disproven now that Kerry sat with Jane Fonda and that it was just a clever Photoshop job. It's those radicals that make the rest of us look bad.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 02:17:53 GMT

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

---

Quote:-How the hell do you know? Have you gone out and asked each and every Republican what is religion is and where he would fall on the political spectrum?

That was sarcasm, numbnuts. I was poking fun at that moronic cartoon engi posted. :rolleyes: I personally happen to be an atheist Bush supporter who considers himself somewhere in the middle of the political spectrum (or half on one side and half on the other, since I tend to be somewhat extreme in my views). At the moment, Bush is going for what I consider to be most important- The War on Terror. After looking closer at the tax cuts, I support him on those now too (you pay more money, you get more back. It's that simple).

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [MrBob](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 02:25:36 GMT

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

---

Here I shall leave some points to think about:

"In other words, governments do not collect taxes to provide services, they provide services as an excuse to collect taxes" - Richard Maybury

Anti-Idiotarian Manifesto (2.0)

Ron Paul blabs (Needs Windows Media Player)

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 02:27:17 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngi-No, anyone who supports President Bush is uninformed who probably drinks orange juice just like everyone else.

-A lot of them are.

-Colin Powell's son is the head of the FCC.

-Bush doesn't have a whole ton of credibility now that his lies about National guard duty have been exposed. I don't ignore counter arguments. I listen to them and then say why they're wrong. It's a lot of fun, but kind of hard to do if you're a conservative.

-Colin Powell's son is the head of the FCC.

I just couldn't resist.

hydra1945-Anyone who supports George Bush realizes the threat terrorism poses to the United States

-How the hell do you know? Have you gone out and asked each and every Republican what is

---

religion is and where he would fall on the political spectrum?

-So? The son of Newsweek's main editor is the head of the Socialist Party. Who the hell cares?

-Why was he honorably discharged if he went AWOL? Who the hell cares? This recent attack on George Bush's service in the National Guard is nothing new to Democrats. Cal Thomas sums it up pretty well. It's time to get back to the issues at hand.

-Blow me.

I WASN'T replying to your post, numbnuts . That's why I quoted SuperFlyingEngi's post before I put my response.

I posted what you had written so people would know where SuperFlyingEngi got his response from. Try to pay a little more attention to what you read :rolleyes:.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 02:35:07 GMT

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

CrimsonI have heard, however, that it's been disproven now that Kerry sat with Jane Fonda and that it was just a clever Photoshop job. It's those radicals that make the rest of us look bad. I've heard that the photo is real from some sources, I've heard it's fake from others, who the hell knows, who the hell cares. If it's fake, it's irrelevant; if it's real, it's STILL irrelevant. Took place thirty-five years ago; has no effect in today's world whether or not John Kerry went to an anti-war rally with Jane Fonda (though it wouldn't surprise me if he did).

P.S. Sorry for the double post .

Didn't realize until it was too late .

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 03:44:24 GMT

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

hydra- its funny you should bring up trusting a liar, because look who weve got in office!!!

how can you be an athist supporter of bush???? there is just nothing else to say, ill leave it at that.

you know what is also funny (going back to NCLB) i am currently reading a book entitled Fahrenheit 451 (you may have heard of it, i think it is supposed to be pretty well known) and basically it is saying that in the future we burn books and ignore good education because smart people, different races, people with different views, etc., etc. could not keep up with it, so the gov't decided to make everything happy and easy. Seeing a slight resemblance here??? the whole point is that is BAD. that is what could very wel happen if the NCLB thing keeps going on.

yeeeeeeaaaaaaaahhhhhh . . . everyone got tax cuts, that is true, and it is also true that the

majority went to the rich, but put this in perspective.. the poor got A LITTLE money back (they need it the most). the middle class got SOME money back (they need a lot because more people are in this category and end up paying a whole lot) the rich get a TON of money back (yeah . . . they're RICH) they dont need the money they can have a nice life without \$300!!!! the idiocy is actually sort of amusing!!!!

hey guys i just figured out why bush's name is bush!!!!!! it isnt really a name it is an acronym!!!

Braindead  
Unintelligent  
Sociopathic  
Hick

It all makes sense!!!!!!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 03:45:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Aren't you going to answer my question?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 03:48:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

what question, oh the whole why do you pretend to be thing???

oh, firstly i never did tpretend to beanything (except that whole intern thing) i have never played renegades in my entire life, i just go to the politics forum.

PS- that was a pretty crappy comeback!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 03:52:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Llama Man 451

oh, firstly i never did tpretend to beanything (except that whole intern thing)

Why don't you get your priorities straight. You DID pretend to be something, rather, you pretended to be of an age and occupation which you were not. And you have the blantant insolance to say that \*I\* suck at life?

My stupid friend, you have proved quite well to myself, and everyone here that "you are what you

eat": You suck at life, kid.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 04:07:38 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451 (I'll be referring to this bozo as "Retard Man IQ-of-1)hydra- its funny you should bring up trusting a liar, because look who weve got in office!!!  
Oh please, spare me the "Bush is a liar!" argument. That's been tried so many times, it's not even funny.

Tell me the undeniable truths that Bush lied about. You can't use, "There weren't any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, so Bush lied!" because that is not an undeniable truth.

Retard Man IQ-of-1yeeeeeeaaahhhhhh . . . everyone got tax cuts, that is true, and it is also true that the majority went to the rich, but put this in perspective.. the poor got A LITTLE money back (they need it the most). the middle class got SOME money back (they need a lot because more people are in this category and end up paying a whole lot) the rich get a TON of money back (yeah . . . they're RICH) they dont need the money they can have a nice life without \$300!!!! the idiocy is actually sort of amusing!!!!

George W. Bush proposed a tax cut, not an income redistribution program. The poor do not pay ANY taxes WHATSOEVER!!!! The middle class pay only a minimum amount of taxes!!! "RICH" PEOPLE PAY THE MOST IN TAXES!!!

Think about this: people are where they are in life because of their own personal actions. In other words, rich people are rich because they repeatedly do the things that make them rich; poor people are poor because they repeatedly do the things that make them poor.

Retard Guy IQ-of-1they guys i just figured out why bush's name is bush!!!!!! it isnt really a name it is an acronym!!!

Braindead  
Unintelligent  
Sociopathic  
Hick

It all makes sense!!!!!!

That is just stupid. Just plain stupid. Not funny, just stupid. This just proves you are an idiot.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 20:35:08 GMT

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

---

Quote:how can you be an athist supporter of bush???? there is just nothing else to say, ill leave it at that.

Easy. I support Bush, and I'm an atheist. Ever hear of separation of church and state? I do not apply religion to politics, only common sense.

Quote:you know what is also funny (going back to NCLB) i am currently reading a book entitled Fahrenheit 451 (you may have heard of it, i think it is supposed to be pretty well known) and basically it is saying that in the future we burn books and ignore good education because smart people, different races, people with different views, etc., etc. could not keep up with it, so the gov't decided to make everything happy and easy. Seeing a slight resemblance here??? the whole point is that is BAD. that is what could very wel happen if the NCLB thing keeps going on.

OK, I have read Fahrenheit 451, and I must say I see no connection at all between burning books and NCLB. I do not believe in that aptricular program, but how you could possibly draw that connection boggles my mind. There is a vast difference between a program that attempts to make everyone learn at the same speed (yeah, right...even though I support Bush in general, that is not going to ever work) and the stifling of all written literature.

Quote:the poor got A LITTLE money back (they need it the most). the middle class got SOME money back (they need a lot because more people are in this category and end up paying a whole lot) the rich get a TON of money back (yeah . . . they're RICH)

The taxes some rich people pay exceed the annual income of many poor families. Let's remember here, they may have tons of money to blow, but IT'S STILL THEIR MONEY! You can't justify taking more of it away because someone else doesn't make as much in a year- that's a step towards communism.

Say you made 7 figures a year, and a friend of your made only 5 figures a year. Both of you must pay an approximate 30% income tax. According to your logic, the person with the lower income should get back...maybe 2%, while you would get only 1% back. Is that fair? No, it isn't- it would be flat out unconstitutional, because it would be favoring one group over another. The tax cuts are balanced in that every person gets the same PERCENTAGE of their taxes back(not the same amount). You put more in, you get more out. Putting pennies into a change machine and expecting quarters to fall back out is ludicrous, but that seems to be what you're expecting.

Don't believe for a second that a person who is poor will stay that way simply because they don't have the money to do better- that just is not true. If you have the will to do better, you will do better. If you do not, no amount of tax cuts will get you out of your rut, because you simply do not want it bad enough. Catch my drift? That is not to say all poor people are poor because they want to be- but they all have the potential to go out and succeed. A greater tax cut would only serve to reduce that drive, because people would then know that their government would be able to do everything for them.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 21:03:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yes, I'm a atheist and support Bush as well. though I wouldn't say that I am so in the sense that I

do not believe there is truly a god, but I don't specifically DISbelieve.

I guess I just feel that the Democrats seem to want ME to pay back the debts with my money, but I would rather they spend the money they ARE getting more intelligently. Throwing more money at the problem isn't going to change the fact that it's being spent on the wrong things. We need to get the Old Guard republicans like Dole out of there and get fresh thinking.

Knowing that I'm working for my money, giving about 25% of it to the IRS every quarter (of course I will probably get a refund but I'm being careful) -- to know that some of that is going for the STUPIDEST shit like rebuilding the childhood home of Lawrence Welks who I don't really give a damn about.

What happened to churches helping the poor, and people donating to the churches for that purpose? What happened to it being MY choice whether I want to give some of my money to those less fortunate? WHY should the government decide it for me?

Rush Limbaugh has a few articles on his site today and after I read them, I was thinking "I thought the same thing!!". All I read on CNN each day is "yet another Kerry victory". All these polls about him being a contender for the Oval Office. And yet we sit here and talk and none of you Democrats are enthusiastic about Kerry. There's no excitement about him.

So basically if I were to make a poll for who would vote for whom... instead of "Bush" or "Kerry", I would have to put "Bush" or "Not Bush" and the votes would be more accurate. I greatly fear people voting for the WRONG man just because he's "Not Bush".

Those who actually do their own digging and don't just read CNN will find a lot of bad PROVABLE lies being told by Kerry.

[http://magic-city-news.com/article\\_944.shtml](http://magic-city-news.com/article_944.shtml)

Here you can see that he has voted FOR things that he is now saying he's against, and voting AGAINST things that he says he supports. Remember, this is not opinion. This is fact. It can be looked up and verified how he voted on these issues. And now he's saying the opposite? Hmm...

But it doesn't really matter, does it?? He's not Bush, so you'll vote for him if it's said that he's "electable".

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [MrBob](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 21:39:25 GMT

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

---

CrimsonYes, I'm a atheist and support Bush as well. though I wouldn't say that I am so in the sense that I do not believe there is truly a god, but I don't specifically DISbelieve.

Then that means you're agonstic.

CrimsonRush Limbaugh has a few articles on his site today and after I read them, I was thinking "I

thought the same thing!!". All I read on CNN each day is "yet another Kerry victory". All these polls about him being a contender for the Oval Office. And yet we sit here and talk and none of you Democrats are enthusiastic about Kerry. There's no excitement about him.

So basically if I were to make a poll for who would vote for whom... instead of "Bush" or "Kerry", I would have to put "Bush" or "Not Bush" and the votes would be more accurate. I greatly fear people voting for the WRONG man just because he's "Not Bush".

.....Here you can see that he has voted FOR things that he is now saying he's against, and voting AGAINST things that he says he supports. Remember, this is not opinion. This is fact. It can be looked up and verified how he voted on these issues. And now he's saying the opposite? Hmm...

But it doesn't really matter, does it?? He's not Bush, so you'll vote for him if it's said that he's "electable".

Very true, The Left is so desperate for a leader they'd choose anybody (besides Bush). And who did that sort of thing too? That's right, the Germans. They were so desperate they chose Hitler.

Kerry's also very political, meaning he'd do or say anything to stay in power. I'm not saying only Democrats are like that, Bush doesn't stick what he says much either.

And that's reminds me, I'm pretty pissed about Congress making the decision to authorize the president to go war. Why? Because they made such an important decision without thinking through. Why weren't the investigations and such done BEFORE the war? Kerry, Edwards and and many others made the decision a year ago (or close to it), and now they're complaining. Would you vote for somebody who voted to go to war, then changing his mind months later? That doesn't show very consistent behavior, does it?

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javalcx](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 21:44:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MrBob  
Then that means you're agnostic

Agnosticism is the only logical way to consider the concept of God.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 23:21:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Excellent point on the Democratic candidates...Bush wanted to go to war, but it was Congress that approved it. They could have said no, but they didn't. Kerry said yes, go to war. Which is worse, a liar, or a liar who is also a hypocrite? Kerry and Edwards are the front runners in the Democratic primaries, and you would be advised to think carefully before voting for someone who changes

their mind that easily. At least Bush makes up his mind and sticks with it; you know where you stand with him. Kerry is indecisive, and so is Edwards- and the last thing this country needs is a president who cannot make up his mind (or who talks out both sides of his mouth, saying one thing and meaning another).

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 23:35:52 GMT

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

---

^^^

the way bsh said there were indefinately WMD'S in Iraq and now is saying he didnt say it?

also, i am going to have to agree that we, as democrtas, are desperate for a leader . . . ANYONE on teh democrats is better than bush even though they REALLY should be classified as republican. i think our economy is hopeless now that dean has dropped out. we can only hope sharpton gets it (which wont happen on account of all the hicks in this country)

i can see how you can compare the democratic leader to hitler, they worked hard and took a long, decisive, intelligent route to where they get, whereas bush just got his dad's name stamped on his resume.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 19 Feb 2004 23:57:49 GMT

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

---

WHY RUSH LIMBAUGH IS BAD

He either doesn't know much about the government or he just wont talk straight.

Rush LimbaughWith the exception of the military, I defy you to name one government program that has worked and alleviated the problem it was created to solve. Hhhmmmmmm? I'm waiting. . . . Time's up.

Now, here are some government programs important conservatives say have worked:

George F. Will: The Interstate Highway System.

Rep. John Kasich: National Institutes of Health, Youth Summer Jobs Program.

Ben Stein: Social Security, Medicare, Head Start, Food Stamps.

And that's only a few.

Rush Limbaugh is a hypocrite. He S poor people. In his book The Way Things Ought to Be, he says that the poor are the biggest piglets at the mother pig's s. But, funnily enough, he was at one time on welfare because he was too lazy to get a job. He wasn't physically disabled or

anything.

People who listen to Rush Limbaugh's radio show are stupid and don't understand politics.

Kathleen Hall Jamieson of the University of Pennsylvania We just concluded a study of 360 people. whom we watched watch the health care reform debate for nine months. At the end of that period, we took the people who said they relied on talk radio, and by this, we mean primarily Rush Limbaugh. . . . And we asked them how well informed they felt. . . . Of all the people we watched, they said they were the best informed. And of all the people we watched, they were the least informed.

Why? Because Limbaugh's radio show sucks. Just like everything Limbaugh says.

Let's take a look at some stupid things Rush has said about liberals:

Rush Limbaugh Liberals love misery. It makes them feel necessary.

Rush Limbaugh Liberals don't want the homeless to hold a job that has any real promise.

Rush Limbaugh Some of them-many of them, perhaps-are just plain diabolical and dishonest to the core.

Stupid? Yes. Right? Wrong.

Rush knows that other people know that he is full of trash, so when asked if he would want to appear on "Indecision '92", he demanded that no one be on the camera with him at the same time. Also, no one could comment on anything he said. He never appeared on the show.

Some stupid things that Rush Limbaugh said:

In April of 1994, Rush said "there is no conclusive proof that nicotine's addictive. . . . And the same thing with cigarettes causing emphysema, lung cancer, heart disease."

On June 9, 1994, Rush said that there is a federal regulation which says if you have a Bible at your desk at work, then you're guilty of religious harassment.

In See, I Told You So, Rush said, "There are more American Indians alive today than there were when Columbus arrived." Actually, in 1492 there were 5-15 million indians in America, but today there are fewer than 2 million.

In 1992 Rush said it didn't matter if the polar ice caps melted because "Even if the polar ice caps melted, there would be no rise in ocean levels. . . . After all, if you have a glass of water with ice cubes in it, as the ice melts, it simply turns to liquid and the water level in the glass remains the same." But, most of the world's ice is on land, not in the water. If the ice caps melted, the sea level would go up roughly 200 feet.

In 1991, Rush said Styrofoam was biodegradable and paper wasn't.

That's all for now.

Moving on...

MrBobAnd who did that sort of thing too? That's right, the Germans. They were so desperate they chose .

Hitler didn't come in to power because Germans were crazy loony birds. He slowly crept up the power chain by first taking over the police force. He became head of the police and appointed his own crazy guys to control the police, which did his dirty work. When the party got in to power, there were O.K. people and there were crazy loony retards like . One night, called the Night of the Long Knives or something, ordered the of all the normal s. About 150 political figures died that night. Then, the party felt it should make Chancellor. Also, 's propaganda minister figured out that if you say something long enough and loud enough, people will start to believe it no matter how crazy it is. Republicans are doing this now with "Liberals America" and they used to be doing it with "Flag Burning"

CrimsonI guess I just feel that the Democrats seem to want ME to pay back the debts with my money

Well, SOMEONE's got to pay back Bush's big deficit. OH MY GOD, ITS THE TAX PAYERS!

CrimsonAnd yet we sit here and talk and none of you Democrats are enthusiastic about Kerry. There's no excitement about him.

I think Kerry would make a great president. He's a great campaigner, and he's winning everything. You know, right now Kerry AND Edwards are up in popularity from Bush. It's just that the conversation hasn't veered that way until now. Here: YAYAYAYAY KERRY IS COOL!

CrimsonThose who actually do their own digging and don't just read CNN will find a lot of bad PROVABLE lies being told by Kerry.

As bad as not including the War in Iraq to the 2004 budget? As bad as INCLUDING tax money in the 2004 budget that no one gets any more because of Bush's short-sighted tax cuts?

Nukelt15Ever hear of separation of church and state? I do not apply religion to politics, only common sense.

I know, that's why it makes me really mad that a lot of America is really religiously biased. Rush Limbaugh opens his radio show "With talent on loan from god..." And Bush is always saying "God bless America"

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 00:53:11 GMT

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

Quote:I know, that's why it makes me really mad that a lot of America is really religiously biased. Rush Limbaugh opens his radio show "With talent on loan from god..." And Bush is always saying "God bless America"

It's a hard habit to break, when the vast majority of the government is Protestant Christian...and the rest is either Catholic (a minority) or Jewish (an even smaller minority). I've never heard of a Muslim, Pagan, Atheist, Buddhist, or other religion being followed by a US politician, correct me if I'm wrong...it is interesting to note that prior to the 1960's, there was no "under God" in the pledge of allegiance- that part was added by a Democratic president. It's also interesting to note that despite a growing number of non-Christian US citizens, you still swear on a Bible in court, swearing you will tell the truth "so help you God." Religion, more specifically Christianity, is very deeply imbedded in how American politics work- the simple reason being that our government has always been dominated by them. It's a sad truth that you'll never find a government that is truly separated from a religious bias, but it seems pathetic that the single most diverse country in the world would not be a bit more secular.

Quote:we can only hope sharpton gets it (which wont happen on account of all the hicks in this country)

Sharpton is far too extreme to be electable. If extreme conservatives(not the more moderate ones, the old-school suit-and-tie ones) weren't religiously biased enough already, every single thing that man does is based on his religion. We do NOT need a preacher for a president. See above^.

Quote:I think Kerry would make a great president. He's a great campaigner, and he's winning everything.

I think Kerry would make a horrible president. Yes, I do think that photo of him protesting with Jane Fonda is that important- anyone who hangs around with a traitor willingly and knowingly should never be allowed to campaign for the highest office in the nation. That goes for anyone- if it was ever revealed that Bush did anything similar, I'd be voting independent. I also believe he's one hell of a bullshit artist- he's just a little bit smoother at doing it than Bush is, being very photogenic(read that- he always smiles for the camera) and co-ordinated. I don't think for a second that he would carry out a single one of his promises.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [jorge the man](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 02:58:35 GMT

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

---

Maybe the bush administration should stop and think before we go to war. See, if you look at past wars, in which countries have tried to impose a government on a people, just because the government works for them things have not ended up pretty. Take ww2 for example, the Nazis try to take over, and impose their communist gov't on the world. Didn't work. Now the Nazis are considered evil, But maybe in the Nazis opinion they were doing the right thing, and trying to convert the lesser gov'ts.

As a metaphor Africans were considered heathens for hundreds of years, because their religion was muslim, and the whites in power were christian. Slave traders brought them over to utilize

their labor, and convert them to christianity. They thought that they were doing the right thing, and saving them from the heathen land. Now racists are considered evil.

We go into Iraq to take out the leader who is corrupt, but also to change the government to a democracy. We go over to utilize oil, and convert the gov't. We are considered evil over there because maybe, just maybe what works for us does not work for them. Where one form of democracy works for us (republic), it might not work for them. We say gosh, i wonder why they are mad at us. Hmmmm... maybe it's because they don't want their country to be taken over, and converted into a democracy, maybe its because we haven't been able to do what we tried.

See a similarity between the examples and the war on iraq, maybe there is a reason they hate us. Could it be that we think we are better than them, and the rest of the non democratic countries, and want them all to be a democracy, so that everyone will just get along.

Of course we are going to try and act like the good guys, and try to "rebuild the country" This means rebuilding buildings that WE bombed, possibly setting an economy that was not perfect when we arrived, but was a lot worse after we killed thousands, and dropped hundreds of missles. What we don't have to do is impose our government in their country.

Reasons for going to war with iraq:

- To take out Saddam
- To rebuild the government into a democracy
- To rebuild the economy
- To rid of Al queda links
- To rid of WMD's

First thing we did when we arrived:

Took over all the oil mines to make sure that they were not harmed.

Well, golly, I didn't see "make sure that the oil supply for the US was safe, so that we could drive or eight mile to the gallon SUVs." First we make sure that the oil mines are not harmed at all, saying that it is an important strategic factor in the war, and that it is a key factor to rebuilding their economy. Then, we bomb the crap out of the capitol, kill hundreds of innocent people search for WMDs, take over Bahgdad, search for WMDs, capture saddam, search for WMDs some more, finnally tell the world about the false intelegence, blaim it on the CIA. Man... i don't know about you guys but this war to me seems to be just a little bit faulty, and a benefit to us more than Iraq. That's just possibly ironic, seeing as the war was started for "the Iraqi's well being."

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [MrBob](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 03:17:06 GMT

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

---

Quote:Nukelt15Ever hear of separation of church and state? I do not apply religion to politics, only common sense.

I know, that's why it makes me really mad that a lot of America is really religiously biased. Rush Limbaugh opens his radio show "With talent on loan from god..." And Bush is always saying "God bless America"

"Wow, Bush says "God bless America," he must be a right-wing extremist evangelist Christian! Oh nos"! :rolleyes:

Seriously, I'm so sick of this "secular" bullshit. It's only "evidence" are some things taken out of context. Many claim that the word "God" never appears in the Constitution. Well, "Seperation of church and state, isn't mentioned in the Constitution either. You have to truly look at the works of the Founding Fathers, you have to look at what they really meant.

First, saying that many legislators and such have "religous bias" while wanting America to be "secular" is a contradiction. Atheism is a "religion", you're believing that there is no God, without absolute proof. By making America "secular," you are putting your own "religous bias" on America.

Furthermore, things such as the Ten Commandments at public buildings is not wrong. Of course, it would be wrong if only the Ten Commandments were allowed, but there was nothing retring anybody putting up a Muslim, Hindu, or even an atheist object. And, isn't prohibiting anything "religous" forcing Athesim on the people?

"We have staked the whole future of American civilization, not upon the power of government, far from it. We have staked the future...upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves, to substain ourselves, according to the Ten Commandments of God." - James Madison, 1778

Now what exactly was he saying? If this is true, why aren't the Ten Commandments part of the Constitution? Because if you ever studied American religion, many people would fight over (rather small) religious differences. They had the same foundation of belief and Divine Law, The Bible, yet there were so many interpretations. Many of the colonies had religous laws that forced people to go to "approved" churches every sunday, and so on. So instead of having the government force little things down people's thoats, they can govern themselves according to their own belief.

There's nothing about forcing public officials to not say "God" or pray while doing their job. Would you want somebody to sacrifice their most personal and core beliefs for "statesmanship," the fancy word for doing whatever appears neccessary? How would you like it if I forced you to keep your atheist beliefs "at home?"

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 03:27:14 GMT

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

---

MrBobAtheism is a "religion", you're believing that there is no God, without absolute proof.

While atheism by definition isn't a religion, it's savage hypocrisy does make it qualify.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 04:28:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

jorge the man\*~~Mindless yammering deleted~~\*

Same IP as Pimp Boy Joe. You are really pathetic. Let me guess, this time it was the janitor who was cleaning out Pimp Boy Joes desk, and found the URL to this discussion :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 04:36:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yes, I actually consider myself agnostic but the word "atheist" was the discussion point.

Obviously someone doesn't remember their history lessons. I know, 1991 was a long time ago. :rolleyes: I was about 11 when we went to war with Iraq and the biggest thing I can remember is that Saddam burned several oil fields. So if I were Commander in Chief of the military, I'd secure those first. There's no reason to waste a valuable resource like oil no matter what. Saddam had done enough damage to Iraq, our job was to put a stop to it, and one of those things to stop was him burning away the oil.

Just remember that about 2% of our oil comes from Iraq. Do you really think we'd go through all this trouble for a little oil? C'mon...

Remember, I've said this like twice now. I don't expressly agree with Rush Limbaugh, nor do I worship him. Hell, I don't even LISTEN to him. I just read his website among many others that I get my news from, including CNN. Let me say that again, in bold, so you might read it, because you don't read much that I type. I do not listen to Rush Limbaugh, I simply read his material. Last I checked, reading one guy's opinions does NOT in fact make me worship him.

That said, you can stuff all your anti-Rush shit right back from where you pulled it because it's irrelevant. What IS relevant is that I happened to agree with a couple of his articles, most specifically the one about lack of enthusiasm about Kerry. I can say he's in a position to know. He finds all this information about Kerry and puts together interesting articles, but the phone calls just aren't there for him to talk about Kerry. They're very rare, according to him. I can't prove this because once again, I don't listen to his show, but it sounds believable considering the only cheering I've heard for Kerry is from you. So now answer this, and tell the truth... have you wanted to vote for Kerry since he put his name on the ballot, or are you more of a fair-weather fan who just goes for the front runner on the Dem side?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 04:44:09 GMT

---

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

---

Ergh, I forgot one more point.

We the taxpayers do not have to pay more taxes to make up the deficit. We've got plenty of our hard-earned cash going their way. They just need to make better decisions on where to spend it. Remember that the deficit number is not a finite figure of how much we the country owe. It's the difference between the expected revenue from taxes and the expected money that's to be spent in that same time period.

Problem is, a roaring economy doesn't so us much good when we don't protect our citizens and our borders. If terrorists start picking off office buildings and other nations come and destroy our cities then all that money won't really do much. Bush doesn't fuck around. He told them they messed with the wrong guy after September 11th, and he sure as heck went out there and started taking care of business. And so far, he's done a great job, considering we haven't had any more planes hijacked and slammed into buildings.

And save the human rights whining for another day. You can't pretend you really care about some random guy being locked up when he's innocent. Yeah, it sucks, but I'd rather lock up an innocent guy for a while than to let a guilty one come take our planes.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 05:27:06 GMT

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

---

Quote:Very true, The Left is so desperate for a leader they'd choose anybody (besides Bush). And who did that sort of thing too? That's right, the Germans. They were so desperate they chose Hitler.

GODDAMMIT HITLER HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THIS LET US GET THROUGH ONE POLITICAL THREAD WITHOUT PEOPLE MASHING THE HITLER BUTTON HERE'S A CLUE NOTHING HITLER DID IS EVER ANALOGOUS TO THE PRESENT SITUATION NO MATTER THE SITUATION EVEN IF BUSH HIMSELF DONNED AN SS UNIFORM BEGAN SALUTING AND SAYING "HAY GUYS HOW ABOUT A BAR-BE-JEW" HE COULD BUILD A GODDAMN ADOLF HITLER DAY CAMP AND FUN FAIR COMPLETE WITH EASY BAKE OVENS AND GAS SHOWERS AND IT DOESN'T FUCKING MATTER BECAUSE INVOKING HITLER IS THE LAZIEST POSSIBLE FORM OF POLITICAL ANALYSIS IN THE HISTORY OF ANYTHING EVER SO WHENEVER YOU GET THAT URGE TO MASH THE HITLER BUTTON JUST SHUT THE FUCK UP FOR THE LOVE OF GOD NO ONE CARES WHAT YOU THINK HITLER WOULD DO

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 07:56:59 GMT

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

---

You've been waiting for someone to bring Hitler into this haven't you.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [jorge the man](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 17:40:30 GMT

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

---

Hopefully the people who voted for bush in the previous election, and realize that they don't want a president that lies to them. Now many of you may say that Clinton lied to us, and I agree that was bad. But, Clinton lying to us was about a sex scandal. Bush lying to us was about information on WMD. Both were lies, one lead us to war, was it bush, or was it Clinton. It was bush. If you're president lies to you about something, and then you go to war over it, despite the minority of votes reason not to vote for him again.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 19:10:25 GMT

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

---

Clinton lied about a LOT more than just getting head in the Oval Office, pimpboyjoe.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 21:31:30 GMT

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

---

CrimsonClinton lied about a LOT more than just getting head in the Oval Office, pimpboyjoe.

Clinton lied about a lot more stuff.....like what? You mean all that crap your daddy came up with that isn't true? If it isn't true, then Clinton didn't lie about it.

Just so you know, here's some stuff Clinton did to thwart terrorism:

Thirty-eight days after Clinton took office the World Trade Center was attacked for the first time. [No, not with planes, it was a truck bomb that was detonated in the underground parking complex.] Thus, Clinton swept in to action. He captured, tried, convicted, and imprisoned Ramzi Yousef, Abdul Hakim Murad, and Wali Khan Amin Shah, those who were responsible for the bombing. And he never even had to go to war. These terrorists were also involved in plots to assassinate the pope and blow up 12 airliners simultaneously. But these never happened. Perhaps they would have, if Clinton hadn't been President.

Some other things Clinton thwarted:

- 1) Bomb attack against UN Headquarters
- 2) Bomb attack against the FBI Building
- 3) Bomb attack against the Israeli embassy in Washington
- 4) Bomb attack against the LA and Boston Airports
- 5) Bomb attack against the Lincoln and Holland tunnels
- 6) Bomb attack against the George Washington bridge

The U.S. wouldn't have been a happy place if all of these terrorist attacks had occurred.

How did he do it? He tripled the counterterrorism budget for the FBI. He doubled counterterrorism

funding overall. He rolled up Al Qaeda cells in more than 20 countries. He created a top-level national security post to coordinate all federal counterterrorism activity. His first and second crime bills contained stringent antiterrorism legislation. He created a national stockpile of drugs and vaccines, which included 40 million doses of smallpox vaccines.

Barton Gellman of the Washington Post By any measure available, Clinton left office having given greater priority to terrorism than any president before him.

You think Republicans were cooperating with what Clinton was doing? Hell no. The same people who said Clinton didn't do enough to stop terrorism days after 9/11 were the ones who were fighting his terrorism decisions in Congress. When Clinton asked for more terrorism funding in 1996, Orrin Hatch said, ""The administration would be wise to utilize the resources Congress has already provided before it requests additional funding." After the Oklahoma City bombing, which happened a year before that, Clinton proposed to expand the intelligence agency's wiretap authority to combat terrorism. On FOX News Sunday, Newt Gingrich said,

Newt Gingrich, the guy who divorced his wife while she was recovering from cancer When you have an agency that turns nine hundred personell files over to people like Craig Livingstone. . . . it's very hard to justify giving that agency more power

Gingrich was referring to Filegate, one of the many FOX-hyped investigations that yielded zip and then quietly went away.

Right after terrorists attacked US Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, Clinton issued a presidential directive to authorize the assassination of Osama bin Laden. Sean Hannity [a conservative crackpot] always brings up Reagan's Executive Order 12333, which prohibits assassinating foreign heads of state. The only thing is, Osama bin Laden isn't a foreign head of state.

The final major attack during the Clinton era was when terrorists bombed the USS Cole, killing 17 US sailors. That got Clinton pissed. Instead of funding them and giving them weapons like Reagan, Clinton set out to destory them. He assigned Richard Clarke in charge of creating a plan to eliminate al Qaeda. This became a cover story for Time Magazine [August 12, 2002]. Clarke produced a strategy paper that he gave to Sandy Berger and other national security principals on December 20, 2002. Here's what the plan detailed:

Systematically attack financial support for al Qaeda terrorist activities.

Break up al Qaeda cells and arrest their members.

Freeze al Qaeda assets and stop funding through fake charities.

Give aid to governments having trouble with al Qaeda.

Scale up covert action in Afghanistan to eliminate the training camps and reach bin Laden himself.

But this plan was never put in to action. Because Clinton's two terms were up. And even though he lost the election, President Bush came in to office. The only reason the plan was not implemented is because the Clinton administration didn't want a hand Bush a war when he got in to office. And Bush never used the plan, either. Clinton gave the plan to Bush and trusted him to protect America. Instead, all Bush did was launch a big hyped-up war to make people think he's doing all he can.

The End.

Moving on...

ACK, actually, looking back on history is a prime way to avoid making the mistakes of the past in the future. Although Hitler and the Nazi party have nothing to do with the current Democratic presidential candidates.

CrimsonAnd save the human rights whining for another day. You can't pretend you really care about some random guy being locked up when he's innocent. Yeah, it sucks, but I'd rather lock up an innocent guy for a while than to let a guilty one come take our planes.

Yeah, I mean, who cares about the rules of the United States of America? The president should be whatever he wants to do whenever he feels like it. Come to think of it, why shouldn't the U.S. be a dictatorship?

Rules are there for a reason.

CrimsonJust remember that about 2% of our oil comes from Iraq. Do you really think we'd go through all this trouble for a little oil? C'mon...

About 2% of our oil comes from Iraq. That DOES NOT mean that there is a small amount of oil in Iraq. It means they don't want to sell us much. If we come in and take it, it will turn in to a lot more than 2%.

Crimsonbut the phone calls just aren't there for him to talk about Kerry. They're very rare, according to him.

You want to know why? Because Limbaugh carefully screens all of his callers so only the stupidest conservatives in the world ever get to talk on his show.

Crimsonhave you wanted to vote for Kerry since he put his name on the ballot, or are you more of a fair-weather fan who just goes for the front runner on the Dem side?

Well, actually, I would have voted for Dean, but since he dropped out, I would definitely vote for Kerry. He's been in the Senate for a long time, and knows a lot about government.

MrBob"Wow, Bush says "God bless America," he must be a right-wing extremist evangelist Christian! Oh nos"!

It shows his biases, that's for sure.

CrimsonI do not listen to Rush Limbaugh, I simply read his material.

So listening to material and reading material are entirely different things?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 20 Feb 2004 23:27:14 GMT

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

---

Quote:Some other things Clinton thwarted:

- 1) Bomb attack against UN Headquarters
- 2) Bomb attack against the FBI Building
- 3) Bomb attack against the Israeli embassy in Washington
- 4) Bomb attack against the LA and Boston Airports
- 5) Bomb attack against the Lincoln and Holland tunnels
- 6) Bomb attack against the George Washington bridge

Some other things Clinton DIDN'T thwart:

- 1.) Bombing of USS Cole (an attack on a US warship is an act of war, and el presidente did jack shit about it).
- 2.) Oklahoma City bombing- not organized terror, but nevertheless a very serious attack that was not prevented.
- 3.) A military DEBACLE in Mogadishu, Somalia- when US troops were pinned down in the city, Clinton actually refused to provide them with tank support- the local commander ended up having to beg Pakistani troops to BORROW armor support. His decision resulted in more US casualties, and when he pulled US troops out, he didn't even bother to recover the bodies of the dead, which were left to be desecrated. Real great job he did there.

If you want, I could go find more. Clinton was a piece of shit for a president.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 21 Feb 2004 00:45:30 GMT

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

---

Look, I posted just the first part of a large poster. LESS THAN 10% of it. And the point of the poster is NOT to nitpick at the details. As I already stated, the poster is entitled "A course of conduct". It's really only through reading the entire poster and the 90%+ I haven't typed out that you get the true perspective of why Clinton was a bad guy to have in that office.

I also like how Clinton spent more money going after Bill Gates than he did going after Osama Bin Laden. :rolleyes: Guess he couldn't handle Bill not giving large donations to him.

And yes, they are different things. I am NOT a loyal listener who relies on Rush for all my political news and views. I had never visited his website until a couple of days ago. Therefore, YOU CAN'T TRY AND LUMP ME WITH THE PEOPLE YOU ARE QUOTING. I simply do NOT fit the demographic. Therefore, pulling up the supposed, ALLEGED stupidity of Rush listeners is a huge waste of time and completely irrelevant. Just because I happen to agree with some of his research does not make me a "rushhead", and also, just because Rush isn't 100% right 100% of the time doesn't mean that everything he says is a lie or total bullshit.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sat, 21 Feb 2004 00:52:33 GMT

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

---

first and foremost i would like to ay this:

congratulations blazer, you have no life!!!

ok done with that. sorry bout that whole fahrenheit 451 thing it made a lot more sense when i thought of it and it didnt come out exactly right . . .

crimson- you are saying that people dont care about people gettin locked up for checking out ceratin books, etc. etc. maybe not but think of how WWE look now. god, i cant remember te books name but it starts out with a man finding two men in his house there to arrrest him, they wont tell him why and he cannot have a lawyer, i think it might be The Trial or something... picture having to deal with that, that is complet bullshit.

unfortunately, i am going to have to disagree with you, superflyingengl, i think kerry would be a HORRIBLE president, he would be way better than bush (which is not saying much) but crimson is right, kerry changed around what he said to try and gain popularity. he voted for the war, and the patriot act (it might have been NCLB) but it was one of those. kerry is more a republican than democrat, but right now i would vote for him, just cuz he is better than that jackass edwards

abot al sharpton, i dont really want him to win i just think he is frigin hilarious

ACK if you are getting so uptight about mentioning hitler, you might want to note it was one of your republican buddies who mentioned it. also you might have heard the saying history repeats itself. in my opinoin PBJ/jorge the man made an excellent point in relating the war to racism and the whole WW2 thing.

^^crimson- yes it does

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 21 Feb 2004 00:54:29 GMT

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

---

I assure you Blazer has a life and gets laid a lot... it doesn't take "not having a life" to click the "ip" button and seeing the forum software immediately say that the IP matches another poster's IP.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sat, 21 Feb 2004 00:57:08 GMT

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

---

crimson, how would you know blazer gets laid a lot??

i think i have a more appropriate script for this

---

<http://www.georgewbush.com/angrydemocrats/>

tired of freedom of speech . . . ?

tired of someone telling the truth . . . ?

tired of people standing up and fighting for what they believe in . . . ?

then vote for george bush in 2004, he'll make sure that'll stop

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [MrBob](#) on Sat, 21 Feb 2004 01:09:30 GMT

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

---

AircraftkillerQuote:Very true, The Left is so desperate for a leader they'd choose anybody (besides Bush). And who did that sort of thing too? That's right, the Germans. They were so desperate they chose Hitler.

GODDAMMIT HITLER HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THIS LET US GET THROUGH ONE POLITICAL THREAD WITHOUT PEOPLE MASHING THE HITLER BUTTON HERE'S A CLUE NOTHING HITLER DID IS EVER ANALOGOUS TO THE PRESENT SITUATION NO MATTER THE SITUATION EVEN IF BUSH HIMSELF DONNED AN SS UNIFORM BEGAN SALUTING AND SAYING "HAY GUYS HOW ABOUT A BAR-BE-JEW" HE COULD BUILD A GODDAMN ADOLF HITLER DAY CAMP AND FUN FAIR COMPLETE WITH EASY BAKE OVENS AND GAS SHOWERS AND IT DOESN'T FUCKING MATTER BECAUSE INVOKING HITLER IS THE LAZIEST POSSIBLE FORM OF POLITICAL ANALYSIS IN THE HISTORY OF ANYTHING EVER SO WHENEVER YOU GET THAT URGE TO MASH THE HITLER BUTTON JUST SHUT THE FUCK UP FOR THE LOVE OF GOD NO ONE CARES WHAT YOU THINK HITLER WOULD DO

Alright, calm down and get a drink of water. After that, please study grammar, history, and social sciences.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Sat, 21 Feb 2004 01:13:23 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451crimson, how would you know blazer gets laid a lot??

Someone needs to brush up on their forum 101... or at least on forum relationships 103..

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Nukelt151.) Bombing of USS Cole (an attack on a US warship is an act of war, and el presidente did jack shit about it).

2.) Oklahoma City bombing- not organized terror, but nevertheless a very serious attack that was not prevented.

3.) A military DEBACLE in Mogadishu, Somalia- when US troops were pinned down in the city, Clinton actually refused to provide them with tank support- the local commander ended up having to beg Pakistani troops to BORROW armor support. His decision resulted in more US casualties, and when he pulled US troops out, he didn't even bother to recover the bodies of the dead, which were left to be desecrated. Real great job he did there.

Duh-Duh-Didn't-Read-My-Post Unit.

1) You didn't read my post: Here: I said that Clinton got super pissed and appointed Richard Clarke to make a plan to kill al Qaeda once and for all. Why isn't al Qaeda gone yet? Because Bush didn't follow up on Clinton's plan.

2) After this, Clinton proposed to expand wiretap capabilities for intelligence agencies, which was fought against by the Republican congress on stupid issues which I won't put here because it's kind of long so go and READ MY POST!

3) This didn't have anything to do about terrorists. It was a UN peacekeeping mission to settle Somalia down. Clinton didn't go after the dead? You know what would have happened if that task force did? A lot more of them would have died. But I guess it's all in a day's work. Why didn't Clinton send more armor in? Maybe because there was already armor there that the task force could use? It would have taken probably longer to ship in armor and get it all set up then to borrow some from other allied military factions. Did you ever read the book, Black Hawk Down? It's a really good book. I haven't seen the movie, but I don't think it would measure up to the book. That whole Somalia situation was pretty ugly, because the U.S. sent in a task force [composed of people from Ranger and Delta forces] hoping to help these people, and then everyone turned on them and then they got in to a huge firefight in the city. That's why there were so many casualties.

CrimsonLook, I posted just the first part of a large poster. LESS THAN 10% of it. And the point of the poster is NOT to nitpick at the details. As I already stated, the poster is entitled "A course of conduct". It's really only through reading the entire poster and the 90%+ I haven't typed out that you get the true perspective of why Clinton was a bad guy to have in that office.

Well, lets see the whole poster, so I can have a nice laugh. Then show you why it's wrong.

CrimsonI also like how Clinton spent more money going after Bill Gates than he did going after Osama Bin Laden. Guess he couldn't handle Bill not giving large donations to him.

If Clinton had one more term, he probably would have rolled up Osama and most of al Qaeda. Like I said before, he had an expert make a detailed plan, but didn't have time to implement it before Bush jr. became president, and then Bush never bothered to use it. [Yes, Clinton did give it to Bush jr.]

CrimsonAnd yes, they are different things. I am NOT a loyal listener who relies on Rush for all my political news and views. I had never visited his website until a couple of days ago. Therefore, YOU CAN'T TRY AND LUMP ME WITH THE PEOPLE YOU ARE QUOTING. I simply do NOT fit the demographic. Therefore, pulling up the supposed, ALLEGED stupidity of Rush listeners is a huge waste of time and completely irrelevant. Just because I happen to agree with some of his research does not make me a "rushhead", and also, just because Rush isn't 100% right 100% of the time doesn't mean that everything he says is a lie or total bullshit.

OK, lets just drop the whole Rush thing. I don't like him, and I gave my reasons.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 21 Feb 2004 02:58:41 GMT

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

---

Quote:1) You didn't read my post: Here: I said that Clinton got super pissed and appointed Richard Clarke to make a plan to kill al Qaeda once and for all. Why isn't al Qaeda gone yet? Because Bush didn't follow up on Clinton's plan.

Clinton fired a few cruise missiles at supposed al Qaeda headquarters locations, and they all missed. That's the extent of what he did. Appointing people does nothing if immediate action is not taken.

Quote:2) After this, Clinton proposed to expand wiretap capabilities for intelligence agencies, which was fought against by the Republican congress on stupid issues which I won't put here because it's kind of long so go and READ MY POST!

Wiretaps. Great, how about increased security around government buildings? So that some asshole with a truckload of fertilizer can't park at the front gate and blow the place apart?

Quote:3) This didn't have anything to do about terrorists. It was a UN peacekeeping mission to settle Somalia down. Clinton didn't go after the dead? You know what would have happened if that task force did? A lot more of them would have died. But I guess it's all in a day's work.

The US Army Rangers have an unwritten rule that no one gets left behind, living or dead. Clinton forced a withdrawal when US forces could have, should have, and would have brought back the dead so their families would not have to watch their mutilated bodies being dragged through the streets.

Quote:Why didn't Clinton send more armor in? Maybe because there was already armor there that the task force could use? It would have taken probably longer to ship in armor and get it all set up then to borrow some from other allied military factions.

Perhaps because there was US armor already in the area? The Joint Chiefs of Staff didn't help much, either; we should have had our own tanks in there- that could have been done very quickly, much faster than going through someone else's chain of command.

Quote:Did you ever read the book, Black Hawk Down? It's a really good book. I haven't seen the movie, but I don't think it would measure up to the book. That whole Somalia situation was pretty ugly, because the U.S. sent in a task force [composed of people from Ranger and Delta forces] hoping to help these people, and then everyone turned on them and then they got in to a huge firefight in the city. That's why there were so many casualties.

The objective was to capture a warlord because all of the aid being sent in was being confiscated by his goons and not going to the Somali people. That could have been accomplished. There were more than enough US troops, armor assets, and aircraft in the region to do that. Clinton pulled out instead.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 21 Feb 2004 03:58:04 GMT

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

---

Nukelt15Clinton fired a few cruise missiles at supposed al Qaeda headquarters locations, and they all missed. That's the extent of what he did. Appointing people does nothing if immediate action is not taken.

Do you make it your business to not comprehend what you read? I said he had a large plan to scour al Qaeda from the face of the earth, but finished it weeks before Bush jr's inauguration, and didn't want to have Bush start off his presidency with a small-scale war on his hands.

Nukelt15Wiretaps. Great, how about increased security around government buildings? So that some asshole with a truckload of fertilizer can't park at the front gate and blow the place apart?

With more extensive wiretapping and other such surveillance, the U.S. could know that these attacks were coming and more intelligently deploy large forces around buildings they knew would be attacked as a last resort. By increasing security around government buildings, what do you mean? Have 20 guards watching every building 24/7 and build huge concrete walls around every conceivable target? It just isn't feasible. Using intelligence to know that the attack will come is a far better alternative.

Nukelt15The US Army Rangers have an unwritten rule that no one gets left behind, living or dead. Clinton forced a withdrawal when US forces could have, should have, and would have brought back the dead so their families would not have to watch their mutilated bodies being dragged through the streets.

Sometimes people in high places have to step in and give orders that not everyone will agree with in order to preserve human life. Here, if the Rangers had gone back, we could have lost 30-50 more soldiers and millions of dollars of equipment looking for bodies. You know, it takes some really crazy people to drag corpses around a city as in a parade.

Nukelt15Perhaps because there was US armor already in the area? The Joint Chiefs of Staff didn't help much, either; we should have had our own tanks in there- that could have been done

very quickly, much faster than going through someone else's chain of command.

Even then, in close quarters urban fighting, tank drivers probably HATE being there. So many RPG soldiers pop out and blow up tanks, if the Somalians had gotten themselves organized, they could have destroyed a large column of armor. There really is no way to go in to a city like that without huge loss of life without just mowing the city down with depleted uranium shells. But that's not really what the U.N. stands for.

Nukelt15The objective was to capture a warlord because all of the aid being sent in was being confiscated by his goons and not going to the Somaili people. That could have been accomplished. There were more than enough US troops, armor assets, and aircraft in the region to do that. Clinton pulled out instead.

Oh yeah, that's right, I read the book last year and forgot about that retard despot warlord foo foo. If Clinton hadn't pulled out, though, we could have llost a ton of people. This task force proved that it really wasn't fully ready for urban combat against an entire city of RPGs and AK-47s. If this task force had kept going back in trying to get this elusive figure and recover their dead, nearly the whole task force could have wound up dead or dying.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 21 Feb 2004 10:50:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngiWith more extensive wiretapping and other such surveillance, the U.S. could know that these attacks were coming and more intelligently deploy large forces around buildings they knew would be attacked as a last resort.

But, but I thought you were against the Patriot Act?

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 21 Feb 2004 15:27:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm against putting people in a concentration camp without a lawyer or a fair trial on even the slightest bit of intelligence. Also, when these people are put in jail/camps, they're families aren't told where they are going. It's just not how our country works.

If one part of the Patriot acts had a part about more wire-tapping capabilities, then I support that, not the whole act.

By the way, the Patriot acts have a really stupid name [probably] designed to make Bush seem like an All-American.

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sat, 21 Feb 2004 23:26:26 GMT

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

---

[quote="Nukelt15"]

Clinton fired a few cruise missiles at supposed al Qaeda headquarters locations, and they all missed. That's the extent of what he did. Appointing people does nothing if immediate action is not taken.

But i thought all missles we fired hit the mark within an inch.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2004 04:11:34 GMT

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

---

I mostly like the timing of said attacks:

January 26 1998

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

January 27 1998

Clinton attempts to create support in the U.N. for a military strike on Iraq and warns Saddam Hussein not to defy the will of the world.

---

June 30 1998

The release of Clinton's Paula Jones civil suit deposition

June 30 1998

F-16 fighter fires on Iraqi radar site.

---

August 20 1998

Monica Lewinsky testifies before Starr's Grand Jury

August 20 1998

Clinton launches cruise missiles at Sudan and at Afghanistan at a cost of \$100 Million.

---

November 13 1998

Clinton settles the Paula Jones civil suit. Starr delivers boxes of evidence to House of Representatives.

November 14 1998

Clinton once again prepares to launch attacks on Iraq, then stands down.

---

December 17 1998  
House of Representatives is set to vote on impeachment.

December 17 1998  
Clinton launches major strikes on Iraq. It cost \$400 Million in Cruise Missiles alone.

---

March 1999  
Juanita Brodderick  
Chinagate  
Chinese espionage and nuclear missiles are the talk of the month.

March 1999  
Clinton launches attacks on Kosovo

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2004 05:49:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:But i thought all missles we fired hit the mark within an inch.

Not if you put the wrong target in they don't.

Hehe, interesting how all the "action" Clinton took coincides with his less glorious moments, isn't it? Can we say..."shovel shit on the resume so no one notices the slip-ups"?

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2004 08:43:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The poster I pulled those from calls that section "Wagging the dog?"

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2004 13:53:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Llama Man 451first and foremost i would like to ay this:  
congratulations blazer, you have no life!!!

You are pathetic. You really are. Kid, you suck at life.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2004 20:31:53 GMT

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

---

Crimson, about your "Wagging the Dog?" thing:

Your father seems to have the terrible burden in that he is unable to think for himself. The Republicans kept up the sham Starr investigation for years. What timing is he talking about? That during the spurious, nonsensical Starr investigation, which went on, sinfully, for years, Clinton attacked ists and the maniac in Iraq? There was not a single day during the criminally political Starr investigation that the Republicans couldn't say Clinton was trying to divert attention from their puppetshow. That was one of their goals.

Let's talk about the timing of George W. Bush. America gets involved in a bitter war in Viet Nam. The war heats up in 1972. George Bush blows off the last two years of his term of service in the National Guard.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2004 21:03:48 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngi

Let's talk about the timing of George W. Bush. America gets involved in a bitter war in Viet Nam. The war heats up in 1972. George Bush blows off the last two years of his term of service in the National Guard.

ROFL.., talk about someone that doesn't know their facts.. "The war heats up" in 1972?  
[Audience laughter sign lights up]

Did you just think that one up for your comeback? rofl..

The official date of full troop withdrawal was November 30, 1972... So yea.. "The war heated up" around 1972..

Hey.. has anyone seen Elvis? I had a question for him..

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2004 21:53:57 GMT

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

---

Quote:The war heats up in 1972. George Bush blows off the last two years of his term of service in the National Guard.

Will you people make up your minds on how much time Bush was supposedly AWOL for? First it's six months, then a year, now it's two years? It seems the closer we come to the election, the more time he "missed." Odd, isn't it? Sometimes I just get to thinking those claims got pulled out of someone's ass to stir up the opposition.

msgtpain is right- the US pulled out during 1972. The only "heating up" that was going on was the heat coming off our aircraft engines as we departed the area.Or perhaps you mean that after the US pullout, the South Vietnamese started losing badly? Either way, in 1972 Bush was in no danger of being mobilized.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2004 22:41:00 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiLet's talk about the timing of George W. Bush. America gets involved in a bitter war in Viet Nam. The war heats up in 1972. George Bush blows off the last two years of his term of service in the National Guard.Haven't we been over George W. Bush's military record before, and how it means nothing in today's world? First of all, you made that crap about the war "heating up" in 1972 up. We were already pulling out at that time. Second of all, WHO THE HELL CARES WHAT GEORGE W. BUSH'S MILITARY RECORD IS? It has nothing to do with fighting terrorism around the world or strengthening an already-growing economy, so why is it an issue???

SuperFlyingEngiThat during the spurious, nonsensical Starr investigation, which went on, sinfully, for years, Clinton attacked       ists and the maniac in Iraq?Oh, so now Clinton was fighting terrorists in Iraq and Saddam Hussein is a maniac not to be trusted? But I thought Saddam was a trustworthy guy who didn't have any WMDs at all and terrorists didn't exist in the country!  
:rolleyes:

How odd, Bill Clinton makes a case for war with Iraq and gets praised by his Democratic colleagues. George W. Bush makes the exact same case, and he gets crucified by the same Democrats that once supported Bill Clinton.

Can you say, "double standard?"

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2004 23:05:50 GMT

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

^^^

hydra, you would have made a good case if you werent another one of the brainwashed fucks who run their mouths about shit they dont understand.

clinton DID fight a war on terror over the above mentioned attacks. he went to the source.

george bush however, "fights a war on terror" away from the problem which is afghanistan, he fought in iraq, dont pull the al queda card either, becuae once they saw things were gettin crazy in iraq you can safely say they goot themselves over there quick.

definitely a slight difference there

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2004 23:16:19 GMT

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

---

About Bush going AWOL/Desertion:

The chart above is based on information obtained from news reports and other sources as well as the book, "Fortunate Son" by J.H. Hatfield. According to Hatfield, G.W. Bush did community service at Professionals United for Leadership League (PULL) from around June 1972 until August 1972. Hatfield presents arguments that this was mandated service - a result of a drug offense that has since been wiped from the record.

About Vietnam:

The war did start heating up in '72. Early in '72, Reagan announced the biggest bombing campaign ever, among other things.

hydra1945How odd, Bill Clinton makes a case for war with Iraq and gets praised by his Democratic colleagues. George W. Bush makes the exact same case, and he gets crucified by the same Democrats that once supported Bill Clinton.

What Bill Clinton would have done and what Bush did are not the same thing. Clinton talked about putting special forces on the ground in Afghanistan, among other things, not steamrolling over an entirely different country. NOT THE EXACT SAME THING! Oh, and earlier I misspoke. I wasn't talking about Hussein and put that in there by accident.

hydra1945WHO THE HELL CARES WHAT GEORGE W. BUSH'S MILITARY RECORD IS? It has nothing to do with fighting terrorism around the world or strengthening an already-growing economy, so why is it an issue???

I don't suppose it would happen to be a credibility issue, since Bush said he was in the national guard the whole time?

Nukelt15Will you people make up your minds on how much time Bush was supposedly AWOL for? First it's six months, then a year, now it's two years? It seems the closer we come to the

election, the more time he "missed." Odd, isn't it? Sometimes I just get to thinking those claims got pulled out of someone's ass to stir up the opposition.

You want to know why the numbers kept going up? Because people kept discovering the truths. That's how it works. The more gaps that are found in more and more papers, the more the story comes out. Incredibly, as time went on, it became closer and closer to the election. Who would have known? Well, if you think all this AWOL stuff is just being made up, you're wrong. All these papers that keep coming out show that Bush has been out for long amounts of time. The Bush administration is fighting such a lost cause that now they're starting to pull dental records out to show that he got a dental check sometime.

msgtpainThe official date of full troop withdrawal was November 30, 1972... So yea.. "The war heated up" around 1972..

The war heated up early '72 when Reagan announced all that huge bombing stuff. If I'm correct, November isn't in the beginning of the year. In fact, it's very far towards the END of the year.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2004 23:40:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiThe war heated up early '72 when Reagan announced all that huge bombing stuff. If I'm correct, November isn't in the beginning of the year. In fact, it's very far towards the END of the year.

I never knew the Governor of California ordered the bombing of Vietnam. I learned something today!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2004 23:48:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngihydra1945How odd, Bill Clinton makes a case for war with Iraq and gets praised by his Democratic colleagues. George W. Bush makes the exact same case, and he gets crucified by the same Democrats that once supported Bill Clinton.

What Bill Clinton would have done and what Bush did are not the same thing. Clinton talked about putting special forces on the ground in Afghanistan, among other things, not steamrolling over an entirely different country. NOT THE EXACT SAME THING! Oh, and earlier I misspoke. I wasn't talking about Hussein and put that in there by accident.

What other maniac in Iraq were you talking about?? If you are going to tell me that Clinton wanted to leave Hussein alone you're going to have to pull some proof because I think UN documents will probably SHOW that Clinton wanted to strike them. And I think you'll also find that we DID send

some missiles towards Iraq during Clinton's 8 year stay.

If I'm not mistaken, we did do a little military action in Afghanistan too... wait, I remember now, we fucking liberated the country from Taliban hold! And we still have troops there to this day.

Quote:hydra1945WHO THE HELL CARES WHAT GEORGE W. BUSH'S MILITARY RECORD IS? It has nothing to do with fighting terrorism around the world or strengthening an already-growing economy, so why is it an issue???

I don't suppose it would happen to be a credibility issue, since Bush said he was in the national guard the whole time?

Interesting that all these scandals Clinton had his hand in do nothing to damage his credibility. WHEE double standards EVERYWHERE! :rolleyes:

I'm also trying to figure out how Reagan was Commander in Chief before 1980. If you can't remember who was president in 1972, then how can I trust anything else you say?

Llama Man 451hydra, you would have made a good case if you werent another one of the brainwashed fucks who run their mouths about shit they dont understand.

Classic case of ad hominem... if you can't refute what the person says, try to discredit them with personal insults. Sorry, that sort of un-intellectual garbage won't fly here.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 23 Feb 2004 00:09:03 GMT

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

---

First and foremost, sorry about the Reagan thing, it was actually Nixon who was president in 1972. Now THERE'S an actual scandal, unlike all the crap Republicans threw at Clinton that wasn't even true.

CrimsonWhat other maniac in Iraq were you talking about?? If you are going to tell me that Clinton wanted to leave Hussein alone you're going to have to pull some proof because I think UN documents will probably SHOW that Clinton wanted to strike them. And I think you'll also find that we DID send some missiles towards Iraq during Clinton's 8 year stay.

If I'm not mistaken, we did do a little military action in Afghanistan too... wait, I remember now, we fucking liberated the country from Taliban hold! And we still have troops there to this day.

If Bush had used Clinton's plan, we would probably have Osama right now without having a big military presence in Afghanistan, al Qaeda would be near termination, and September 11th would have never happened.

CrimsonInteresting that all these scandals Clinton had his hand in do nothing to damage his

credibility. WHEE double standards EVERYWHERE!

I'm also trying to figure out how Reagan was Commander in Chief before 1980. If you can't remember who was president in 1972, then how can I trust anything else you say?

What scandals are you talking about? All the incorrect ones on your little "poster"? The only real scandal Clinton was involved in was the whole Monica Lewinsky thing, which is not a plural, therefore does not constitute multiple scandals. Again, sorry 'bout that Reagan/Nixon thing.

CrimsonClassic case of ad hominem... if you can't refute what the person says, try to discredit them with personal insults. Sorry, that sort of un-intellectual garbage won't fly here.

It sure as hell flies with Sean Hannity, Rush Limbaugh, Bill O'Reilly, Newt Gingrich, etc. etc.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 23 Feb 2004 00:55:26 GMT

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

---

Quote:The chart above is based on information obtained from news reports and other sources as well as the book, "Fortunate Son" by J.H. Hatfield.

And so the supposed amount of AWOL time changes again...That chart of yours shows 6 months, and you said 2 years only a few posts ago...really now, which one is it? It's beginning to look like nobody really knows what they're talking about on this issue. Keep in mind that only the little blue section represents the time he was missing for- the other sections that aren't under that slice represent time which was given to him as leave (AWOL meaning Absent WithOut Leave).

Quote:All these papers that keep coming out show that Bush has been out for long amounts of time.

Again, the National Guard is a PART TIME JOB. You do not have to be there every day, nor even every week. Not knowing everything about it myself, I'd go so far as to say you probably wouldn't even have to report in every month, let alone every day for 6 years. The amount of "ANG"(Air National Guard) time shown is consistent with the required amount of service, period. Remember, also, that the time spent in training is service as well.

Quote: The Bush administration is fighting such a lost cause that now they're starting to pull dental records out to show that he got a dental check sometime.

I have been waiting for someone to bring that up, I really have...Those dental records are part of a more complete physical, which Bush had done when he was supposedly AWOL. There's one problem with that- He could not have possibly been AWOL if he had a physical; he could not have been absent at all- you have to be on the base to get a physical; you can't just go to your family doctor for it. That means that he did report in during that time.

Quote:According to Hatfield, G.W. Bush did community service at Professionals United for

Leadership League (PULL) from around June 1972 until August 1972. Hatfield presents arguments that this was mandated service - a result of a drug offense that has since been wiped from the record.

OK, so Bush did drugs at some point in his life. That hardly makes any difference, since Clinton admitted to doing exactly that on live television, and that wasn't an issue in either of his two terms- and he never did community service for his offense, now did he?

Quote:The war did start heating up in '72. Early in '72, Nixon announced the biggest bombing campaign ever, among other things.

I think you're referring to Operation Linebacker II, right? I thought that came earlier in the war, but I could have been mistaken. Oh well, everyone makes mistakes about dates. And I even corrected your presidential blunder for you in the quote.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Mon, 23 Feb 2004 01:07:12 GMT

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

---

is it just me, or does nobody read my posts, yeah i kinda cussed out hydra, but i did present my point in the next paragraph thing.

wanna know something that will depress you?

about 73% people in the US learned all they know about viet nam from forrest gump. it was a pretty good movie though . . .

i still dont understtand this whole liberating thing, "fighting for peace is like fucking for virginity" i ust dont see how we have the nerve to say we are liberating them when we are dropping bombs on them. it would sem we care more about iraq than our own country . . . which is strange for republicans . . . once again oil comes into play . . . hmmmmm?????

SADDAM NEEDED TO BE STOPPED

ok that should stop any statement sounding like this "blah blah blah blah stupid democrat liar blah blah blah saddam blah blah balh 9-11 9-11 blah blah blah"

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 23 Feb 2004 01:38:42 GMT

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

---

Nukelt15And so the supposed amount of AWOL time changes again...That chart of yours shows 6 months, and you said 2 years only a few posts ago...really now, which one is it? It's beginning to look like nobody really knows what they're talking about on this issue. Keep in mind that only the

little blue section represents the time he was missing for- the other sections that aren't under that slice represent time which was given to him as leave (AWOL meaning Absent WithOut Leave).

I didn't say two years. I said between '72 and '73.

Nukelt15I have been waiting for someone to bring that up, I really have...Those dental records are part of a more complete physical, which Bush had done when he was supposedly AWOL. There's one problem with that- He could not have possibly been AWOL if he had a physical; he could not have been absent at all- you have to be on the base to get a physical; you can't just go to your family doctor for it. That means that he did report in during that time.

So, if Bush was present for 1-2 days, that OBVIOUSLY proves that he was there for whenever you say he was.

Nukelt15OK, so Bush did drugs at some point in his life. That hardly makes any difference, since Clinton admitted to doing exactly that on live television, and that wasn't an issue in either of his two terms- and he never did community service for his offense, now did he?

A lot of political figures have admitted to doing drugs while they were younger.

Nukelt15I think you're referring to Operation Linebacker II, right? I thought that came earlier in the war, but I could have been mistaken. Oh well, everyone makes mistakes about dates. And I even corrected your presidential blunder for you in the quote.

Thank you.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 23 Feb 2004 03:28:10 GMT

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

---

Retard Man IQ-of-1wanna know something that will depress you?

about 73% people in the US learned all they know about viet nam from forrest gump. it was a pretty good movie though . . .

Where'd you pull that statistic from, your ass?

Retard Man IQ-of-1i still dont understtand this whole liberating thing, "fighting for peace is like fucking for virginity" i ust dont see how we have the nerve to say we are liberating them when we are dropping bombs on them.

With that statement, you prove how ignorant you really are on the subject. You have no idea how far we went to prevent civilian casualties. There was one instant where a few of Saddam's troops were holed up in a hospital using the patients as human shields. U.S. troops went in and checked each room one by one for the troops to prevent any civilian losses. Now, had we not cared, we would have just bombed that entire hospital to hell, with both the innocent patients inside and Saddam's troops. But we didn't. U.S. soldiers put themselves in harm's way to try to save the lives of innocent Iraqi patients. If I remember correctly, not one patient or soldier was lost and

Saddam's troops were killed.

Of all the civilians that had died during the major fighting, only a very small percentage were killed by U.S. fire. Most of the civilians were killed by Saddam's troops, not U.S. soldiers.

Retard Man IQ-of-1 it would seem we care more about Iraq than our own country . . . which is strange for Republicans . . . once again oil comes into play . . . hmmm???

In securing Iraq, we take away one more country for terrorists to hide in and one more source of weapons of mass destruction. Oil had absolutely nothing to do with the decision to go to war. If Bush was going to go to war for oil, like some hippies say, he would have invaded Saudi Arabia, not Iraq, because Saudi Arabia has the largest oil reserves in the world.

Retard Man IQ-of-1 SADDAM NEEDED TO BE STOPPED  
That's the first intelligent thing you have said this whole time.

Retard Man IQ-of-1 ok that should stop any statement sounding like this "blah blah blah blah stupid democrat liar blah blah blah Saddam blah blah balh 9-11 9-11 blah blah blah" Where did you ever hear a statement even remotely close to this?

SuperFlyingEngiSo, if Bush was present for 1-2 days, that OBVIOUSLY proves that he was there for whenever you say he was.  
I guess now you're going to say Bush was AWOL at two separate times :rolleyes:.

Bush was on the base getting a physical during the time people say he was AWOL. He had to have reported in to get the physical in the first place. So, there is no possible way Bush was AWOL during the time you say he was. There is irrefutable evidence supporting this fact.

Now, 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:  
SuperFlyingEngi don't suppose it would happen to be a credibility issue, since Bush said he was in the National Guard the whole time?  
No, it wouldn't because it happened THIRTY YEARS AGO! The same thing goes for Clinton's addiction to pot. It happened thirty years ago and means nothing to ANY issue we face right now. IT'S A NON-ISSUE!

SuperFlyingEngi A lot of political figures have admitted to doing drugs while they were younger. So I guess that means we can trust no political figure because it's a credibility issue :rolleyes:.

Quote: What Bill Clinton would have done and what Bush did are not the same thing. Clinton talked about putting special forces on the ground in Afghanistan, among other things, not steamrolling over an entirely different country. NOT THE EXACT SAME THING! Oh, and earlier I misspoke. I wasn't talking about Hussein and put that in there by accident.  
The 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.

SuperFlyingEngilf Bush had used Clinton's plan, we would probably have Osama right now without having a big military presence in Afghanistan, al Qaeda would be near termination, and September 11th would have never happened.

"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?"

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 23 Feb 2004 04:00:44 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiFirst and foremost, sorry about the Reagan thing, it was actually Nixon who was president in 1972. Now THERE'S an actual scandal, unlike all the crap Republicans threw at Clinton that wasn't even true.

- 1) 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.

Quote:If Bush had used Clinton's plan, we would probably have Osama right now without having a big military presence in Afghanistan, al Qaeda would be near termination, and September 11th would have never happened.

"probably"... there's more faith in nothing.

Quote:What scandals are you talking about? All the incorrect ones on your little "poster"? The only real scandal Clinton was involved in was the whole Monica Lewinsky thing, which is not a plural, therefore does not constitute multiple scandals. Again, sorry 'bout that Reagan/Nixon thing.

Once 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.

Quote:It sure as hell flies with Sean Hannity, Rush Limbaugh, Bill O'Reilly, Newt Gingrich, etc. etc.

Wait, 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.?

--

But 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!

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 23 Feb 2004 05:13:30 GMT

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

---

Quote:Let's talk about the timing of George W. Bush. America gets involved in a bitter war in Viet Nam. The war heats up in 1972. George Bush blows off the last two years of his term of service in the National Guard.

Quote:I didn't say two years. I said between '72 and '73.

Didn't say what? At least be consistent with your own posts, will you? It takes away from your credibility to not pay attention to your past comments when making new ones.

Quote:So, if Bush was present for 1-2 days, that OBVIOUSLY proves that he was there for whenever you say he was.

This isn't like cutting class- if you walk off a base when you're not supposed to, SOMEONE is going stop you. I don't know how secure things were during Vietnam, but unless you're a relatively high-ranking officer(in which case all they do is look at a sticker on the bumper representing your pay grade), you get checked going in and out. One way of confirming his presence would be to find out if there are any records of who went into or out of that particular post during that time period, and when. If that record doesn't exist, then both arguments are sort of screwed, aren't they?

Quote:A lot of political figures have admitted to doing drugs while they were younger.

Exactly. 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.

Quote:Thank you.

You're Welcome.

To Llama:

Quote:i still dont understtand this whole liberating thing, "fighting for peace is like fucking for virginity" i ust dont see how we have the nerve to say we are liberating them when we are dropping bombs on them.

I don't see how any liberation would be possible without removing the oppressive regime that was in power- parts of which are still there, and very determined to not be defeated. For the last fucking time, the US is not targeting the Iraqi citizens, we are targeting the terrorist cells that

operate within the country. If a building is destroyed, it is because intel told the military there was enemy activity inside it. If someone gets shot by a US soldier, it is a certainty that that person represented a threat to that soldier or one of his fellow servicemen.

Quote: it would sem we care more about iraq than our own country . . .

At the moment, we have to. The US is stable; it is not going to collapse. Mass anarchy will not result from putting a little more effort into ensuring stability in Iraq, which WOULD collapse if we were not there supporting it right now.

Quote:which is strange for republicans . . . once again oil comes into play . . . hmmmmm?????

No...no, it doesn't. The USA has more oil in it now than Iraq ever has had, or ever will. If Bush wanted oil, he could have gone drilling up in Alaska like he wanted; bypassing the EPA is a lot less costly than starting a war. Since oil would be about profit, it's quite obvious that starting a war over a reserve which is smaller than our own untapped resources would be pure stupidity. Only you or your fellow oil ranters would even consider such an idiotic possibility.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 23 Feb 2004 06:42:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Nukelt15Quote: it would sem we care more about iraq than our own country . . .

At the moment, we have to. The US is stable; it is not going to collapse. Mass anarchy will not result from putting a little more effort into ensuring stability in Iraq, which WOULD collapse if we were not there supporting it right now.

We 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.

Nukelt15Quote:which is strange for republicans . . . once again oil comes into play . . . hmmmmm?????

No...no, it doesn't. The USA has more oil in it now than Iraq ever has had, or ever will. If Bush wanted oil, he could have gone drilling up in Alaska like he wanted; bypassing the EPA is a lot less costly than starting a war. Since oil would be about profit, it's quite obvious that starting a war over a reserve which is smaller than our own untapped resources would be pure stupidity. Only you or your fellow oil ranters would even consider such an idiotic possibility.

I usually agree with what you say most of the time, but here I must disagree.

I don't know where you got the idea the U.S. has more oil than Iraq. It is a known fact Iraq has the second largest oil reserves in the world. Last I checked, an estimated 300 billion gallons of oil had yet to be touched by humans, compared to the approx. 50 billion gallons in Alaska.

But you raise a valid point. If it was for oil, then why didn't Bush go for the 50 billion gallons in Alaska? And you are right when you say it is less costly to bypass the EPA than it is to wage a

war.

To 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? Bush could have made a pretty decent case against Saudi Arabia since 15 of the 19 hijackers were Saudis, and how the government has for years ignored terrorist activities within their own borders. But you know what? He didn't. You know why? Because the war is not about oil.

---

---

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 get 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.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Mon, 23 Feb 2004 23:19:46 GMT

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

---

hey crimson, remember when we were arguing about how crappy your dads poster was about last page, i believe you said you posted not even 10% of the facts on it. well, when you originally posted it you said there were at least fifty facts on it . . . you typed 19 facts (i think) now that is 190+ facts on it if you didnt even type ten percent. either you dont know how to count or you are REALLY REALLY bad at estimating.

you can say war isnt about oil, but look now we are spreading all over the middle east, going to syria, and i believe liberia (i think i hear or read that somewhere)

why didnt bush go to alaska? maybe he grew a brain for a few seconds and realized that his enviornmental plan was already a complete faliure at best. basically he said in ordedr to prevent forest fires, cut down all the trees!

and, no, i didnt pull that fact out of my ass about viet nam and its not like i was aiming it at you hydra, i think you have serious emotional problems  
(and dont tell me i have some too, i already know that)

---

---

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!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 24 Feb 2004 00:35:54 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451hey crimson, remember when we were arguing about how crappy your dads poster was about last page, i believe you said you posted not even 10% of the facts on it. well, when you orignally posted it you said there were at least fifty facts on it . . . you typed 19 facts (i think) now that is 190+ facts on it if you didnt even type ten percent. either you dont know how to count or you are REALLY REALLY bad at estimating.

Hmm... so my alleged bad estimate means Clinton was a good president and we can all go home now? What a waste of typing. Seriously, learn how to debate better. Why don't you argue points that actually are NOT a waste of time and ARE in fact relevant to this discussion??

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [exnyte](#) on Tue, 24 Feb 2004 06:17:07 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451why didnt bush go to alaska? maybe he grew a brain for a few seconds and realized that his enviornmental plan was already a complete faliure at best. basically he said in ordedr to prevent forest fires, cut down all the trees!

Maybe Bush didn't goto Alaska because he knew it is the 49th state? Would be rather stupid to attack it for it's oil, since it's been a part of the United States since 1959... And where did that environmental plan stuff come from? It didn't have anything to do with what anyone else was currently talking about, nor did it coincide with what you were even talking about. You may want to take Crimson's advice.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 25 Feb 2004 02:01:10 GMT

---

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

---

oh crimson, it seems like you are getting a little mad because you contradicted yourself.

see democrats may be known for "basing all of our ideas on opinions" but republicans are known for exaggerating horribly and then trying to back down from it and change the topic to 9-11.

you still have not commentd on what i actually said and it seems you are getting a little pissed..... hee hee hee in fact your entire post was completely irrelevant and didnt make any sense whatsoever!!!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 25 Feb 2004 08:28:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I contradicted myself??

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 25 Feb 2004 08:45:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Llama, it has to be said.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [hareman](#) on Wed, 25 Feb 2004 19:10:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

KILL THIS THREAD BEFORE IT MULTIPLIES

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 25 Feb 2004 22:00:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

haremanKILL THIS THREAD BEFORE IT MULTIPLIES

NO! Politics is a very important topic, and should not just be removed from public viewing. Just because you [apparently] don't know anything about politics doesn't mean it should be banned. Go back to posting more spam in the General Discussion area of the forums.

CrimsonThere'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?

It's not perhaps possible that, rushlimbaugh.com or somewhere directed people to this poll to vote on what they thought? Because in that case, it's pretty obvious what the outcome would be.

CrimsonWhat 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.

Did you read what I said later on about your poster? The part where I SHOWED why all that stuff was wrong?

CrimsonReally? 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?

Again, you apparently didn't read the post I made where I Owned up on your poster.

CrimsonNo, 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 allegedlymurdered Kathy Johnson" after he was arrested today.

See above.

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

Because I'm not a great Democrat president. What happened was crazy Republicans had nothing to attack Clinton with, so they started making up these insane scandals to try and make the public hate him. And it obviously worked on you. I bet you never once thought that it might possibly be crazy Republicans making up random lies or horribly bending the truth when you read about all these scandal things in the newspapers. Such a horrid course of conduct in that people accused him of random things?

CrimsonUh oh, he mashed the Hitler button again.

At least I showed that I have an understanding of history. Besides, Hitler and Hitler's Propaganda Minister weren't the same person. And it also directly relates to today? How, you ask? Read my posts.

CrimsonNo, 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.

I bet you didn't proofread your whole post again before you submitted it. These huge posts can get kind of annoying, can't they?

CrimsonObviously 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.

I have read his stuff. When you pointed out that table thing, i took the time to read all the articles on the front page. They made me sad. Also, when you showed those IRS statistics then directed people to Limbaugh's site, you said he added everything up. He didn't. He took one number from the lower right of the IRS spreadsheet and made a graph out of it.

CrimsonConsidering 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.

"Between 1996 and 2001, federal spending on counterterrorism increased dramatically to more than \$12 billion annually. The FBI's counterterrorism budget rose even more sharply, from \$78 million in 1996 to \$609 million in 2000, tripling the number of agents assigned to such activities and creating a new counterterrorism center at the bureau's Washington headquarters." - Salon.com

Oh, and the whole cutting the military thing is kind of silly because  
A) The Soviet Union, the last real superpower in the world collapsed.  
B) The U.S. spends more on its military than the rest of the world combined.

CrimsonNo, 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.

How much did Clinton spend hunting Microsoft?

CrimsonReally? 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!

He wasn't after Saddam for being a terrorist, which is what I meant. He went after Saddam for being mean and invading Kuwait, I believe. He wasn't trying to go in under false pretexts like

WMDs.

CrimsonOhhh... 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!!!

What in the world are you talking about? I hate Saddam. I wish he would go away. What I don't like about Bush is swarming Iraq with soldiers and decieving America in to following him.

CrimsonDUHHHHHHHHH 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.

Yes, but was Iraq really the largest threat?

Did you read that link I posted in my last..erhm...post?

CrimsonHmm... so my alleged bad estimate means Clinton was a good president and we can all go home now?

No, but it perhaps suggests that you were being a little shady with the actual poster.

CrimsonMaybe Bush didn't goto Alaska because he knew it is the 49th state? Would be rather stupid to attack it for it's oil, since it's been a part of the United States since 1959... And where did that environmental plan stuff come from? It didn't have anything to do with what anyone else was currently talking about, nor did it coincide with what you were even talking about. You may want to take Crimson's advice.

majikent, you don't necessarily have to attack an area to get oil from it. And Bush's forest plan does involve chopping down the largest trees so as to reduce the risk of forest fires. Even though you would be hard-pressed to find a scientist who believes in this crazy talk. First, big trees keep the forest moist and actually PREVENT forest fires. Second, the low-lying plants are what actually cause fires. And, all this time we have been talking about Bush. It's not a crime to point out something bad about someone else, even though Bush would like to have you think that it's unpatriotic.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 25 Feb 2004 22:42:10 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngil bet you didn't proofread your whole post again before you submitted it. These huge posts can get kind of annoying, can't they?

Yes they can, which is why I'll be responding to the rest of your post at a later time (got a math project due tomorro that I haven't even started ) but first, I MUST respond to this post of idiocy...

Look at these two posts:

SuperFlyingEngiAt least I showed that I have an understanding of history. Besides, Hitler and Hitler's Propaganda Minister weren't the same person. And it also directly relates to today? How, you ask? Read my posts.

An understanding of history, huh? Then why did you post this...

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonReally? 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!

He wasn't after Saddam for being a terrorist, which is what I meant. He went after Saddam for being mean and invading Kuwait, I believe. He wasn't trying to go in under false pretexts like WMDs.

:rolleyes:

Does this even merit a response?

Let's see, you're either talking about George H. W. Bush, or you're making up the history you have such a thorough understanding of :rolleyes:.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sun, 29 Feb 2004 22:28:41 GMT

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

^^^ aparently this math project has taken you about two days or else you would have posted you BS by now!!!!r

in response to your signature:

what do all republicans have in common? they are lying backstabbing control freaks who'll do anything to make a buck!!!

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [U927](#) on Sun, 29 Feb 2004 23:32:09 GMT

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

Good god, even the most hardcore Democrats in here will be ashamed of what you say.

Please shut up. If you have nothing productive to say to anybody, don't bother saying anything at all.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [pimp boy joe](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 17:44:33 GMT

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

---

Ho, i ain't ashamed of what llama man be saying, so go suck dick Umbral\_DelaFlare you pansy ass bitch fuck off fuck you UNC Rules fuck you suck michael jackson's balls you sukka bleebadee you crack whore mother fucker. Go talk to alejandro at the corner of fifth and broad if you want answers. NOOOOWWWW!!!!!!!!! MOTHERRR FFUUCCKKEERR!!!!!!!!! :twisted:

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 19:24:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

lol

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 20:23:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ooo, pimp boy the wonder-fucktard is back...having fun there, Llama? Or did your "intern" steal the computer? Or was it your cousin's best friend's roommate this time?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [hareman](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 20:38:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:hareman wrote:  
KILL THIS THREAD BEFORE IT MULTIPLIES

NO! Politics is a very important topic, and should not just be removed from public viewing. Just because you [apparently] don't know anything about politics doesn't mean it should be banned. Go back to posting more spam in the General Discussion area of the forums.

Sorry Crimson but this little shit got my Ire up

Number One: FuckHead You know me from the shit that oozes from your keyboard. You are one of those candy ass whimers who has never Been There OR Done That. I participate in the POLITICAL process everyday.

Numero Du: How you ask? Becasue I am a Political Appointee To the Department of Homeland Security. I influence (on an everyday basis) what happens and how some of our politicians become educated on the positions that they take. I have written papers on terrorism. violent criminal apprehension, drug interdiction, and hostage rescue. I have been serving MY COUNTRY FOR OVER 20 YEARS SO THAT YOU CAN HAVE THAT ASSININE THING YOU

CALL AN OPINION, What the FUCK have you ever done beside enjoy the freedom I HELPED TO PROVIDE FOR YOUR IGNORANT ASS

Nombre Trois Obviously you are to ignorant AND uneducated to see much less understand your own entrapment in the two party system. I am educated enough to decide for myself what is right and wrong and to judge the issues on their merits not the party affiliation of someone who is repeating what others have already decided.

SO HERE IS THE END ALL

Go play with your Barbies until you are ready to join the rest of us who actually do something to make the world a better place, quit criticizing those that who do. You are so typical of Americans today and a great reason why the rest of the world looks on us with suspicion and distrust.

GROW UP

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 21:01:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hareman would be such a fun president to watch.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [hareman](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 21:04:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Nah I would Nuke the world

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 21:04:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

And like the typical Canadian, I'd sit back and watch the fireworks

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 21:07:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"hareman"Quote:hareman wrote:  
KILL THIS THREAD BEFORE IT MULTIPLIES

NO! Politics is a very important topic, and should not just be removed from public viewing. Just because you [apparently] don't know anything about politics doesn't mean it should be banned. Go back to posting more spam in the General Discussion area of the forums.

Sorry Crimson but this little shit got my Ire up

Number One: FuckHead You know me from the shit that oozes from your keyboard. You are one of those candy ass whimers who has never Been There OR Done That. I participate in the POLITICAL process everyday.

Numero Du: How you ask? Becasue I am a Political Appointee To the Department of Homeland Security. I influence (on an everyday basis) what happens and how some of our politicians become educated on the positions that they take. I have written papers on terrorism. violent criminal apprehension, drug interdiction, and hostage rescue. I have been serving MY COUNTRY FOR OVER 20 YEARS SO THAT YOU CAN HAVE THAT ASSININE THING YOU CALL AN OPINION, What the FUCK have you ever done beside enjoy the freedom I HELPED TO PROVIDE FOR YOUR IGNORANT ASS

Nombre Trois Obviously you are to ignorant AND uneducated to see much less understand your own entrapment in the two party system. I am educated enough to decide for myself what is right and wrong anf to judge the issues on their merits not the party affiliation of someone who is repeating what others have already decided.

SO HERE IS THE END ALL

Go play with your Barbies until you are ready to join the rest of us who actually do something to make the world a better place, quit critizing those that who do. You are so typical of Americans today and a great reason why the rest of the world looks on us with suspicion and distrust.

GROW UP

you are saying superflyingengl is uneducated and uninformed....? i thought you were a republican?

you work in homeland security? was it you who thought duct tape and plastic or whatever would save us from biological warfare?

you are doing your part to protect america? oh, so you are protecting us by scaring us into war eh? that makes sense.....

you influence political figures? no wonder bush is so damn retarded

you say superflyingengl makes people hate our country? check out your signature you right wing self righteous dumbass!!!!

with that out of the way you were close about my "roomates best friend" i have some things to say.

1. i already said it was my friend DUH!
2. HE made up the intern story .... not me.
3. you are calling ME immature? you are the one dwelling on trivial issues with no relevance at all to what we are talking about!!!! :rolleyes:

javacx: even though you have bitched at me quite a lot, i must say you are friggin hilarious

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [hareman](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 21:20:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Fuck LLama you are alomst as stupid as Super Sucking N00bie

Get a fucking life here is a nickel maybe you can buy one at least one that is better than the one you have now..

You are another one of those whiners who complains but does nothing to make things better.

As for my siggy it seems you ARE IGNORANT. Most found it amusing. So take your PC loving hypocritical ass to the juvenile forum where it belongs and bother the adults no longer.

A couple of last questions:

What the FUck have you ever done to make the world a better place?

Have you ever arrested a multiple murderer? NO!

Have you ever served? Probably not!

Fuck why bother little snot weasels like you can't be bothered to actually work for a better world you can only sit back and complain and second guess those who do. So when you are ready to do something then you can address me until that day you little worm GO FUCK YOUR SELF

Ha Ha no EARepOrion TO save your worthless asses here my toadies

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 21:23:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ah, someone else who agrees with me. I do not infact believe that everyone should fall under one

of two parties. It's ridiculous. It's a trap, as hareman said. Get you to rally behind your team and blindly support whatever they say?? NO! Hell no.

I do not agree that gays shouldn't be married. While I myself am straight as an arrow, I do not believe that if two soul mates happen to be the same gender that their union should be worth any less than the union of a man and a woman. Holding aside any related gay debate, what this means is that I'm not a die-hard republican. I still think both sides are taking too damn much of our money.

The difference being that Bush is cutting my taxes, while the Democrats want to take more of my money away. Bush trusts me to spend my money. (And believe me, I spend it!) Bush gives more money to the businesses so they can invest back into their own businesses. When a business gets an extra, let's say, 10 grand, they can go buy some machine. Now, they have to pay someone to operate that machine. They just created a job. That's what we want. I don't see how, if the government takes more and more of our money, how that's going to create a job. I just don't.

You could pump it into education... so now you have more people who know how to work, but no place for them TO work.

You could pump it into welfare programs... so people don't have to work and can be lazy. (but that's communism)

Just where can the Federal government invest money that would create a job? This nation is NOT a dictatorship. We are a democracy. A collective (ah! The borg!) of people who work together for the common good. There's a saying -- if you build a better mousetrap, the world will beat a path to your door. Let's keep the incentive to make a better mousetrap and improve your station in life by letting you keep most of the money you earn from it. How could anyone possibly think this is wrong?? If some Bill makes a crapload of dough from his ideas, why does his money, all of a sudden, have to go to support the lazy welfare mothers and the guys who have one leg shorter than the other?

Enough of that...

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [hareman](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 21:32:47 GMT

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

---

I agree with what you said maybe this thread should be locked if they want to continue let 'em start a new one.

My point is QUIT COMPLAINING AND DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT.

Those of you who refuse to do anything (even if it is differrent from what I do) drag down those of us who do something. It isn't all that hard.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 22:00:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

hareman: Thank you for your in-depth comments about what I think. They will be duly noted and I will try my best to incorporate them in to my every-day life. However, naturally I am far too busy to respond to everything I see, so I'm afraid that I cannot comment on your educated opinions about me. Thank you for your help.

Crimson: If giving money back to people and companies is good for everyone, then why has Bush lost almost 3 million net jobs this far in his term?

Crimsonlazy welfare mothers

Not everyone on welfare is lazy. Maybe these people have a baby or two and have to work two jobs to support their family, but they get fired because of poor education in which case they are classified as an able-bodied person who refuses to work. Yea, that's pretty lazy.

CrimsonThe difference being that Bush is cutting my taxes

And simultaneously raising the deficit, so in 30-50 years, you will be paying all of this money back. There's a reason the government taxes people, and it's not so politicians can all have a fancier car than you.

Crimsonwhile the Democrats want to take more of my money away.

As in how? You mean like Whitewater, the 40-million dollar investigation that came out of taxpayer's pockets, never yielded anything, and was basically a Republican campaign ad?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [hareman](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 23:00:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT AND QUIT TALKING

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 23:06:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

hareman- your ego is so disgusting it makes me want to throw up!!

your calling me a hypocrite???? what a joke!!!!!! you call me a child when you use insults about fucking myself and such.... very adultlike. power trip republicans like you are what is making this country go down the tube.

there is really only two words that can fully describe you:

## COMPLETE MEGALOMANIAC

you asked me several questions in your last post and then answered them for me; where is the logic in that???

and for your information i am doing something asshole, i go to rallies, protests, try to help with organizing meetings and such, what do you do? sit on the computer and tell people how full of yourself you are congratulations you are a bonefied loser!!!!

crimson- i too agree that this whole constitutional amendment thing about gay marriages is BS.

george bush may have created some million jobs or w/e but that does not mke up for all that he has lost

as for taxes i think they should go partly to welfare people but the amount they get should somehow depend on what they do, like super said they may be capable but just made some bad decisions in their life.

i dont know if that qualifies as a great idea but i also feel it is sort of a lost cause if we are paying them to sit around and do nothing, i would like to help them out but i want to know they are getting HELP....

only republican hick christian goody goods could ever find you siggy amusing horeman . . . you disgust me you are everything wrong with america.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [U927](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 23:17:45 GMT

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

---

pimp boy joeHo, i ain't ashamed of what llama man be saying, so go suck dick Umbral\_DelaFlare you pansy ass bitch fuck off fuck you UNC Rules fuck you suck michael jackson's balls you sukka bleebadee you crack whore mother fucker. Go talk to alejandro at the corner of fifth and broad if you want answers. NOOOOWWW!!!!!!!!!! MOTHERRR FFUUCCKKEERR!!!!!!!!!! :twisted:

I find it funny that YOU should respond when I directed my comment at RetardMan451. You think some words on a forum are going to hurt my fellings? "OH NO! SOMEONE JUST CALLED ME A DICKSUCKER ON THE INTERNET! I AM SCARRED FOR LIFE!!!"

:rolleyes:

Please kid. Go fuck yourself, as I'm sure you can do that with your multiple personalities.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 23:21:20 GMT

---

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

---

i have told you time and time again that i am NOT pimp boy joe!!!!!!!

please you can call him whatever you want but dont call me shit because you think iam him!!!!

you have been commenting on pimp boy joes umbrel but have you read horeman's post, they are disturbing, if you think I have issues you should check that due out.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [hareman](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 23:25:45 GMT

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

---

OOOOOOOOOOOOOO

I go to pep rallys I am involved

OOOOOOOOOOOOOO

YOU do jack shit I noticed you didn't bother to deny a word I said. AS to me being a republican lmao obviously you never learned to read either.

Thank You for validating all of my points. Did you have to lokk up all the long words or did a 6th grader help you?

and is llama really your name or sexual affiliation?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [U927](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 23:31:56 GMT

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

---

RetardMan451, since both of your word choice, snetence sturcture, AND grammar are nearly equal, it is safe to assume that you and pimp boy joe are the same. Also, it seems a bit coincidental that when I throw a personal attack at you, pimp boy joe is there to defend you.

As for hareman, I've seen what he writes. I've seen what he says on mIRC as well. He's OK in my book, because unlike you, he actually uses proof and support for his statements, unlike your ad-hominem filled attacks.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 23:41:21 GMT

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

---

I TOLD YOU HE IS MY BEST FRENED OF COURSE HELL STICK UP FOR ME!!!!

hareman i DID deny what you said you worthless piece of trash!!! do you have friends?? i dont think i could stand your oversized ego for more than thirty seconds. why dont you get a life!!!

umbrel- WHAT PROOF????? ALL HE HAS POSTED ARE CONDESCENDING SNIDE COMMENTS THIS ENTIRE TIME!!!!!! PEOPLE LIKE YOU MAKE ME WANT TO SHOOT MYSELF IN THE HEAD GAAAAAAHHHHH!!!!!!

i just dont see how a democrat could be as stupid as you hareman it makes no sense, no i havent tried a convicted murderer im fucking fourteen asshole, and im smarter than youll ever be ok? just because i cant type for shit doesnt mean i ain smart, god i swear i cannot put up with this any onger

I HAVE TOLD THE TRUTH AND YOU WILL NOT LEAVE ME BE I AM TRYING TO SPEAK MY OPINION AND YOU ARE TO STUCK UP, SELF RIGHTEOUS, CONDESCENDING, HOT HEADED, FUCKED UP, SNOT NOSED, WORTHLESS, ARROGANT, IGNORRANT, AND I AM ALMOST POSITIVE I AM TALKIG TO A LABOTOMY PATIENT!!!!!!!

hareman- good job not making a point by spelling LOOK wrong, jackass!

i cant believe people like you actually exist....

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [U927](#) on Mon, 01 Mar 2004 23:50:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Llama Man 451umbrel- WHAT PROOF????? ALL HE HAS POSTED ARE CONDESCENDING SNIDE COMMENTS THIS ENTIRE TIME!!!!!! PEOPLE LIKE YOU MAKE ME WANT TO SHOOT MYSELF IN THE HEAD GAAAAAAHHHHH!!!!!!

First, it's Umbral.

Second, I ain't stoppin' ya.

Third, although hareman makes snide comments, he has contributed a lot to the Renegade community. He was known before a foenix (I think I spelled it wrong), and he was a member of both the Dominion Guild and Forces of Diversion, the largest clans in Renegade. He also ran fodsvr01, the first sever to fill up in the manyFOD servers there were.

He has earned my respect a long time ago. You, well, see the second suggestion.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 00:24:17 GMT

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonlazy welfare mothers

Not everyone on welfare is lazy. Maybe these people have a baby or two and have to work two jobs to support their family, but they get fired because of poor education in which case they are classified as an able-bodied person who refuses to work. Yea, that's pretty lazy.

- 1) You are talking about the minority.
- 2) WHY DO I HAVE TO SUPPORT THEM? I am not the one who made the bad decisions. Please please answer me this, because you continue to skate around it.

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonThe difference being that Bush is cutting my taxes

And simultaneously raising the deficit, so in 30-50 years, you will be paying all of this money back. There's a reason the government taxes people, and it's not so politicians can all have a fancier car than you.

You are making predictions. Maybe I predict that his tax cuts will bring more money in. After all, that's what happened when Reagan did it.

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonwhile the Democrats want to take more of my money away.

As in how? You mean like Whitewater, the 40-million dollar investigation that came out of taxpayer's pockets, never yielded anything, and was basically a Republican campaign ad?

Here you go with the off-topic crap. The Democrats publically and unabashedly tell you and us that the first thing they will do when they get in office is to take back Bush's tax cuts. That means I will have to pay more money to the Federal government. THAT'S how they take more of my money away.

Once again, you can't prove Whitewater any more than I can disprove it, therefore it's really really ignorant of you to continue to bring it up. Just because Clinton wasn't found guilty, that does NOT mean he was found innocent. All it means is that it could not be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. That's all. When I look at Clinton's Course of Conduct, I believe differently than you.

Fortunately, for now, it doesn't matter, because he's not in office. Unfortunately, I already know that Bush will win in 2004 because the Democrats are putting an un-electable man (Kerry) in the front-runner position so that Bush will win and they can send Hillary up against a new Republican hopeful in 2008.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [hareman](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 00:39:07 GMT

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

---

foenixz I don't know no stinking grubby foenixz

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [U927](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 00:53:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

haremanfoenixz I don't know no stinking grubby foenixz

Odd, since you were able to spell his name correctly.

Plus the fact that you mentioned the shutdown of fodsvr01 in the General Forum and people referred to you by that name.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [hareman](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 01:02:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

LMAO so someone actually read that thread. Its not really a secret anymore but at one it was and only a few knew I was also foenixz. As for the clan affiliations currently I involved in no clans though if EOE does accept to clan against flaminrek I am onboard for that.

I have done more for this community than most. but that is not in question as Crimson is the queen of renegade though who should be King would be a hotly debated topic. she is by far the most vocal supporter without her and noobstories I would have left renegade long ago.

I keep that server up as a tribute to treyD and the good times we had on it in the past.

As for you people debating still move on go outside get a life

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 01:39:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson1) You are talking about the minority.

2) WHY DO I HAVE TO SUPPORT THEM? I am not the one who made the bad decisions. Please please answer me this, because you continue to skate around it.

1) You know this how?

2) Because getting the poor back on their feet lets them get back in the swing of things, they get jobs, they contribute to society, they make the economy prosper, and all that good comes back to you.

Crimson You are making predictions. Maybe I predict that his tax cuts will bring more money in. After all, that's what happened when Reagan did it.

Supply-side economics was complete baloney. Here's something on Greg Mankiw, An economist currently on Bush's team. He's the man who walked into the Bush Administration having written that supply-side economics was a brand of "fad economics" popularized by "cranks and charlatans". And if the government stops getting money from taxes, what's it going to do? Increase debt. Someone's gotta pay that money back.

CrimsonHere you go with the off-topic crap. The Democrats publically and unabashedly tell you and us that the first thing they will do when they get in office is to take back Bush's tax cuts. That means I will have to pay more money to the Federal government. THAT'S how they take more of my money away.

Well, yeah, of course they're going to repeal Bush's short-sighted tax cuts. Tax cuts that are putting this country in big debt. Tax cuts that are so bad that the money we don't get from them any more is included in Bush's 2004 budget. Why? Because Bush's budget doesn't look so hot unless he's getting that money. And yet you blindly stand behind him because the more money you get, the better the government is, right? Not so, especially not when we're having an expensive war in Iraq right now [Note: Bush didn't include the cost of being in Iraq in his 2004 budget, either. Huh...]

CrimsonOnce again, you can't prove Whitewater any more than I can disprove it, therefore it's really really ignorant of you to continue to bring it up. Just because Clinton wasn't found guilty, that does NOT mean he was found innocent. All it means is that it could not be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. That's all. When I look at Clinton's Course of Conduct, I believe differently than you.

Even though you can't prove Whitewater, you blindly stand behind it? You don't have to fall behind your dad, you know. Even though Clinton was proved guilty, the fact that an independent group to investigate Whitewater found nothing EVEN AFTER the unbiased guy in charge was replaced by the Republican Congress by Starr, who is a RADICAL Clinton hater. When you look at his Course of Conduct...More like if you choose to randomly believe things that you see. So far, nothing you've shown about your poster has any real merit.

CrimsonUnfortunately, I already know that Bush will win in 2004 because the Democrats are putting an un-electable man (Kerry) in the front-runner position so that Bush will win and they can send Hillary up against a new Republican hopeful in 2008.

Even though Kerry AND Edwards are ahead of Bush in popularity. Kerry isn't un-electable, it's just what FOX, Rush, etc. want you to think.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 02:38:24 GMT

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

---

hee hee hee ya know whats funny? crimson you were saying you wre having to pay back your tax cuts because of democrats.

well, because of the war in iraq each person will have to pay back 342 dollars!!! you just lost forty two dollars. now if gore had been elected (even though he was technically) you wouldnt have lost as much money for two reasons

1. since gore is competant unlike our current head honcho he wouldnt have gone to war with iraq and hewould have done something about 9-11 (they had a call on 9-10 informing them that there was going to be terrorist activity!!!)

2. we wouldnt be in the horrible deficit we are facing now!!!! hee hee hee

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 03:11:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Llama Man 4512. we wouldnt be in the horrible deficit we are facing now!!!! hee hee hee

It takes a special kind of idiot to laugh hysterically at himself.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 10:06:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Llama Man 451hee hee hee ya know whats funny? crimson you were saying you wre having to pay back your tax cuts because of democrats.

No, I said that if a Democrat got into the White House in this next election, I would no longer have the tax cuts.

Quote:1. since gore is competant unlike our current head honcho he wouldnt have gone to war with iraq and hewould have done something about 9-11 (they had a call on 9-10 informing them that there was going to be terrorist activity!!!)

Yeah, you're going to have to prove that.

Quote:2. we wouldnt be in the horrible deficit we are facing now!!!! hee hee hee

Uh, you're insane...

Obviously since you two are 15, you really don't know anything. All you know is suckling your mommy and daddy's teats. Until you support yourself, you really know nothing. If you're not a Democrat when you're 18, you have no heart. If you aren't a Republican when you're 40, you have no brain. Until you are making more than \$40,000 per year you have absolutely no frame of

reference.

If some welfare mom gets money for free, there is NO incentive to get back to work. If you get enough money to support yourself without working, why would you work? You still haven't said why I have to support her. Even if some people, again the minority, use the program to get back on their feet, that still doesn't explain why I, a hard-working middle-class income earner, have to support her. Back in "the day", this mom would appeal to her church for aid, and they were able to provide with almost 0% overhead. The government supplies these programs with over 70% overhead. Once again, it's not about taking more money, it's about spending the money they have more efficiently.

Quote:Well, yeah, of course they're going to repeal Bush's short-sighted tax cuts. Tax cuts that are putting this country in big debt. Tax cuts that are so bad that the money we don't get from them any more is included in Bush's 2004 budget. Why? Because Bush's budget doesn't look so hot unless he's getting that money. And yet you blindly stand behind him because the more money you get, the better the government is, right? Not so, especially not when we're having an expensive war in Iraq right now [Note: Bush didn't include the cost of being in Iraq in his 2004 budget, either. Huh...]

Tax cuts are not what put this country in debt.

<http://www.federalbudget.com/>

Reference the above link for a non-partisan look at the budget. Also note the following items:

"The deficit for FY03 was a lot less than expected. Tax revenues were up. President Bush got a tax rate cut and the revenue went up. So it wasn't a tax cut, it was a tax rate cut! and it worked perfectly."

<http://www.publicdebt.treas.gov/opd/opdfaq.htm>

The link above is also government-hosted FAQ's about the difference between debt and deficit. Remember not to confuse the two. They are VERY VERY different.

If you make \$40,000 in a year, and you project to spend \$50,000, then your budget has a \$10,000 deficit. If you borrow \$12,000 from a bank, you now have a \$12,000 debt.

Throughout the year, you make payments on your debt and reduce your principal to \$11,000.

Next year, you get a raise. You now make \$45,000 per year. But through inflation, etc. your monthly requirement is now \$57,000. For that year, you have a \$12,000 deficit in your budget. You again borrow \$14,000. You are now in debt \$25,000.

Of course a person would rarely be trusted with this type of money, but treasury bills are backed by the full faith and credit of the US Government.

The National Debt has risen every year since 1957.

<http://www.federalbudget.com/whopays.html>

Here's another fantastic article about who's really paying the taxes in this country. BACKED BY FACTS. Completely derived from publically-available figures.

You can sit and argue individual expenditures until you're blue in the face, but if you do a bit of digging into history you'll find that there have been debatable expenditures all the time, every day, for decades. Putting your Democrat into office isn't going to fix that.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 21:10:42 GMT

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

---

firstl- im not insane the zoloft was just kicking in

i have no heart if i am a democrat??? hello, we are trying to make a better life for our society and economy, you republicans are so obsessed with youelves (cough! hareman! cough!) that you are too blind to see that!!!

hell, one of those poor people could be someone that refvolutionizes the world

abraham lincoln was poor ya know, and look what he did, he helped a lot of people out (yes i know he was republican but that was when the parties were flip flopped, know the republicans are the racists )

anyway i know it is true that there is no way to prove this but think of all of the people out there that just need a couple bucks so that they can support their family....

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 21:47:52 GMT

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

---

Then those taxes should be optional.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 22:03:42 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451i have no heart if i am a democrat??? hello, we are trying to make a better life for our society and economy, you republicans are so obsessed with youelves (cough! hareman! cough!) that you are too blind to see that!!!

:rolleyes: Learn how to read. There is a saying that if you are NOT a democrat when you're 18, then you have no heart. Therefore, if you ARE a Democrat, according to that saying, you DO have a heart.

---

Believe me, I know that people who don't have a wealthy upbringing can succeed. My parents barely got by, and I didn't exactly have a lot of clothes growing up, mostly hand-me-downs. And yet now here I am, 24 years old, nothing but a high school diploma, and yet I make over \$60,000 per year.

But I got there without ANY help from the government. I do not accept handouts.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Javacx](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 22:49:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

/me gives Crammy a cookie

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [hareman](#) on Tue, 02 Mar 2004 23:22:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

/me steals the cookie and runs to corner

my preeeeeeeeeeessssssshhhhhhhhhuuuuuuuuuus

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Wed, 03 Mar 2004 01:35:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ok officially hareman and javacx have no right to call me an idiot anymore :rolleyes:

also crimson- oops! i know how to read ya know.... um thats all im comin up with... :oops:

what do you do that is a pretty nice cash flow....

w/e. can we please address this whole democratic pres thing because it seems that our "conversation" is diminishing.....or something else ya know... w/e.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [U927](#) on Wed, 03 Mar 2004 01:50:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Who are you to say that they have no right to call you an idiot? They act like that because they can; notice it isn't attacking anybody nor is it TOTALLY retarded.

They are known here, therefore people know they are joking.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Javacx](#) on Wed, 03 Mar 2004 02:01:32 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451ok officially hareman and javacx have no right to call me an idiot anymore  
:rolleyes:

You obviously missed the punchline... idiot.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [hareman](#) on Wed, 03 Mar 2004 03:20:12 GMT

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

---

LMAO @ the ..... you guessed it IDIOT

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 01:58:38 GMT

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

---

Retard Man IQ-Of-1's posts are just completely stupid, so I'll respond to something a bit more intelligent...

SuperFlyingEngiCrimson: If giving money back to people and companies is good for everyone, then why has Bush lost almost 3 million net jobs this far in his term?

Bush didn't lose those jobs. The economy went into recession 5 months after Bush was elected president, which means the economic policy of Bill Clinton sent the country into recession. When the economy goes into recession, businesses lose money and must fire employees in order to stay in business (or risk bankruptcy and have every single worker lose his job; sometimes people must be fired to save the jobs of others; that's called business).

Bush didn't lose those jobs; Clinton did.

Bush created thousands of jobs; Clinton didn't.

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonlazy welfare mothers

Not everyone on welfare is lazy. Maybe these people have a baby or two and have to work two jobs to support their family, but they get fired because of poor education in which case they are classified as an able-bodied person who refuses to work. Yea, that's pretty lazy.

Why start a family you can't support if you don't have a good education to get a well-paying job?

Oh, and you wouldn't be fired for having a poor education; you'd be fired for fucking up on the job or not doing well at all; you wouldn't be hired in the first place if you have a crappy education.

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonThe difference being that Bush is cutting my taxes

And simultaneously raising the deficit, so in 30-50 years, you will be paying all of this money back. There's a reason the government taxes people, and it's not so politicians can all have a fancier car than you.

Tax cuts do not raise the deficit. You know what does? Excess government spending on failed social programs like welfare, social security, and medicare. Each of those programs will cost exponentially more over the next decade than the tax cuts could ever cost, since the most money from the federal government is poured into each of those programs. If you want to see the deficit shrink a thousandfold, then cut the spending of each of those programs in half.

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonwhile the Democrats want to take more of my money away.

As in how? You mean like Whitewater, the 40-million dollar investigation that came out of taxpayer's pockets, never yielded anything, and was basically a Republican campaign ad? No, as in how they want to raise tax rates to outrageous numbers.

CrimsonObviously since you two are 15, you really don't know anything.  
Does this apply to sixteen-year-olds?

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 02:19:56 GMT

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

^^^ hydra firstly it is ok if you make fun of me but you should know something, if you have an IQ below four you forget to breathe, so how about Retard Man with IQ of 5?

secondly, also ^^^ you say why have a family if you are uneducated and cannot do it, if you think this way why are most republicans against abortion?

thirdly, ^^^ you sure are immature for a sixteen year old

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 03:08:14 GMT

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

I used the age of 15 because most teenagers who are still mostly dependent on their parents to support them instinctively feel that it's only fair that once they leave the nest, the government should act like the parents and continue to support the people.

But when these people get older and start seeing hundreds of dollars taken off their paychecks under the "Federal Tax" heading, many of them start to realize that the system isn't working.

I literally have to put 25% of my paychecks aside for my tax obligation. For my \$2400 bi-weekly paychecks, that's \$600 EVERY TWO WEEKS. And I can only hope to get about \$1000 of that back at the end of the year. So, if I'm going to earn that money and give it to them, it's my expectation that they will spend it wisely. Do NOT spend \$500,000 of that money to restore the boyhood home of Lawrence Welk (yes, they wanted to do that).

Basically, Bush is the closest thing we have to this. If taxes are reduced, and the reduction is made permanent, then Congress will be forced to cut budgets on other less successful and unsuccessful programs to make up for the loss of funds.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 03:22:02 GMT

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

---

Llama Man 451secondly, also ^^^ you say why have a family if you are uneducated and cannot do it, if you think this way why are most republicans against abortion?  
Keep your legs closed and a kid won't pop out.

Unborn fetuses are humans too, you know.

CrimsonI used the age of 15 because most teenagers who are still mostly dependent on their parents to support them instinctively feel that it's only fair that once they leave the nest, the government should act like the parents and continue to support the people.

But when these people get older and start seeing hundreds of dollars taken off their paychecks under the "Federal Tax" heading, many of them start to realize that the system isn't working. Oh I know. I was just saying that I'm 16 and I already know that system doesn't work .

P.S. I've been getting an error message that says "Invalid\_session" when I try to post a reply to some threads and my entire post is lost. What's causing that problem?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [hareman](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 04:41:02 GMT

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

---

Oh boy 2 retards insulting me please make thm stop

hydra you fall in to the catagory of no nothing done nothing snot nosed brat like SSN and the other moron.

FOR THE SLOW AND DIMWITTED

GET A LIFE DO SOMETHING INSTEAD OF TALKING ABOUT

I work every day in making the world a safer and better place so you overpriviledged, non-working, crumb snatchers can come here and voice an opinion that is assinine (Not including Crimson she

works). So get a life already.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 04:49:35 GMT

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

---

haremanOh boy 2 retards insulting me please make thm stop  
Where did I insult you?

haremanhydra you fall in to the catagory of no nothing done nothing snot nosed brat like SSN and the other moron.

Whoa man, what did I ever do to you?

haremanFOR THE SLOW AND DIMWITTED

GET A LIFE DO SOMETHING INSTEAD OF TALKING ABOUT

Being only 16, there isn't much I can do besides go to school, get a good education and not end up a drain on society.

haremanI work every day in making the world a safer and better place  
Thank you.

haremanso you overpriviledged, non-working, crumb snatchers can come here and voice an opinion that is assinine (Not including Crimson she works). So get a life already.

I'm only 16. I'm doing about all I can at this age by not dropping out of school and becoming another welfare recipient. What do you expect me to do?

Hareman, I wasn't attacking you at all. If it seems like I did in anyway, I'm sorry. I don't know what brought this on, but I didn't do anything to insult you.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [hareman](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 16:41:44 GMT

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

---

TY I must have mistaken your post.

If your last one is genuine than I owe you an apology.

More to follow

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 16:55:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

haremanTY I must have mistaken your post.

If your last one is genuine than I owe you an apology.

More to follow  
Ha ha no problems  
Perfectly alright.

Hell, I agree with just about everything you said (except for the post about me being a snot-nosed brat (I try not to be, at least) ).

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [pimp boy joe](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 17:45:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Two boys in Raleigh were playing basketball when one of them was attacked by a rabid Rottweiler.

Thinking quickly, the other boy ripped a board off a nearby fence, wedged it into the dog's collar and twisted it, breaking the dog's neck.

A newspaper reporter from the N&O witnessed the incident and rushed over to interview the boy.

The reporter begins entering data into his laptop, beginning with the headline .....

"Young Heels Fan Saves Friend from Vicious Animal."

"But I'm not a Heels fan," the little hero interjected. "Sorry," replied the reporter. "But since we are in North Carolina, I just assumed your were."

Hitting the delete key, the reporter begins again,

"NC State Fan rescues friend from Horrific Attack."

"But I'm not a State fan either," the boy responds.

I assumed everybody in this state was either for the Heels or the Wolfpack. What team do you root for?" "I'm a Duke fan," the boy says.

Hitting the delete key, the reporter begins again,

"Arrogant Little Yankee Bastard Kills beloved Family Pet."

Wut now shitwads, that one goes to all you fucking pansy ass mother fucking bitchy ass whore republican catholic duke ffans. WATSUP BITCH!!!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 18:53:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Here's a little proof that CNN is Democratically-biased.

As I post this, these two stories take the top billing on each site.

<http://www.cnn.com/2004/ALLPOLITICS/03/04/elec04.prez.bush.ads.ap/index.html>

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,113245,00.html>

The first link is CNN. They talk all about the Bush ads and how people are bitching about him using September 11th images in them.

The second link is FoxNews and talks about how Bush is campaigning against Kerry, and then gives all the same information about the anti-9/11 stuff.

I did a little experiment for my own peace of mind this last week. I read nothing but CNN for my news. I can tell you that I really thought Bush wasn't even campaigning yet while Kerry was running all over the country gathering interest and enthusiasm. Now that I'm done with that experiment I can see I was wrong.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [hareman](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 20:26:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

CRimson ban this pimp boy shit head

You and both know on the old boards he would have been banned :twisted:

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 21:09:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

pimp boy joeTwo boys in Raleigh were playing basketball when one of them was attacked by a rabid Rottweiler.

Thinking quickly, the other boy ripped a board off a nearby fence, wedged it into the dog's collar and twisted it, breaking the dog's neck.

A newspaper reporter from the N&O witnessed the incident and rushed over to interview the boy.

The reporter begins entering data into his laptop, beginning with the headline .....

"Young Heels Fan Saves Friend from Vicious Animal."

"But I'm not a Heels fan," the little hero interjected. "Sorry," replied the reporter.

"But since we are in North Carolina, I just assumed your were."

Hitting the delete key, the reporter begins again,

"NC State Fan rescues friend from Horrific Attack."

"But I'm not a State fan either," the boy responds.

I assumed everybody in this state was either for the Heels or the Wolfpack.

What team do you root for?" "I'm a Duke fan," the boy says.

Hitting the delete key, the reporter begins again,

"Arrogant Little Yankee Bastard Kills beloved Family Pet."

Wut now shitwads, that one goes to all you fucking pansy ass mother fucking bitchy ass whore republican catholic duke ffans. WATSUP BITCH!!!

Was this supposed to be funny? Because it came off as just plain stupid. It has absolutely nothig to do with what this thread is about and is nothing more than spam. All you seem to do is post meaningless spam.

I would advise Crimson to give Pimp Boy Joe a temporary ban for a week and a permanent ban if he continues to spam.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 21:57:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

He's obviously unfit for a discussion between intelluctuals and Democrats.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [U927](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 22:13:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

pimp boy joeTwo boys in Raleigh were playing basketball when one of them was attacked by a rabid Rottweiler.

Thinking quickly, the other boy ripped a board off a nearby fence, wedged it into the dog's collar and twisted it, breaking the dog's neck.

A newspaper reporter from the N&O witnessed the incident and rushed over to interview the boy.

The reporter begins entering data into his laptop, beginning with the headline .....

"Young Heels Fan Saves Friend from Vicious Animal."

"But I'm not a Heels fan," the little hero interjected. "Sorry," replied the reporter. "But since we are in North Carolina, I just assumed your were."

Hitting the delete key, the reporter begins again,

"NC State Fan rescues friend from Horrific Attack."

"But I'm not a State fan either," the boy responds.

I assumed everybody in this state was either for the Heels or the Wolfpack. What team do you root for?" "I'm a Duke fan," the boy says.

Hitting the delete key, the reporter begins again,

"Arrogant Little Yankee Bastard Kills beloved Family Pet."

Wut now shitwads, that one goes to all you fucking pansy ass mother fucking bitchy ass whore republican catholic duke ffans. WATSUP BITCH!!!

I'm beginning to think RetardMan451 has a multiple personality disorder. He uses his normal one to write semi-accurate responses, and this one to write incessant flames.

I say ban him immediately. Plus, continue cross-checking his IP. If he says he's fired, like in previous posts, then the IP will be totally different. If they are the same, ban both accounts.

pimp boy joe: You honestly think words on a message board are going to scar us for life? You must truly be sad to even believe that, and that means YOU get easily offended by insults on the internet as well. Seriously, get a fucking life. You are giving nothing productive to this conversation, and at the rate you are going, you are going to be banned soon.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [pimp boy joe](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 22:29:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Mogizzle UNC is goin' to da' NCAAs dis yer. Wut now buhkow. My IQ is 135, i got that off an internet IQ site woohoo. Bitch whos fuckin stupid now. :oops: :rolleyes: :twisted:

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [xptek\\_disabled](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 22:44:57 GMT

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

---

pimp boy joeMogizzle UNC is goin' to da' NCAAs dis yer. Wut now buhkow. My IQ is 135, i got that off an internet IQ site woohoo. Bitch whos fuckin stupid now. :oops: :rolleyes:  
:twisted:

IQ means absolutely nothing...

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [U927](#) on Thu, 04 Mar 2004 22:47:49 GMT

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

---

pimp boy joeMogizzle UNC is goin' to da' NCAAs dis yer. Wut now buhkow. My IQ is 135, i got that off an internet IQ site woohoo. Bitch whos fuckin stupid now. :oops: :rolleyes:  
:twisted:

I could care less if you are Stephen Hawkings. The point is that you act like a total fucking retard in here. That is why you are getting banned, because you spam thread with unneccesary garbage like what you posted above. Yes, we have seen the smilies before. Now take your easily amused ass out of here.

P.S Internet IQ sites are stupid. Last time I checked, my IQ was 176. The only real IQ tests you can trust are the ones given to you by the schoolboard and/or by the state.

Get out of here, tard.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Fri, 05 Mar 2004 01:22:35 GMT

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

---

umbral- i will say this again.

i am not pimb boy joe. you even admitted this yourself without knowing it in your post before last you saisd i have split personality disorder meaning pimp boy joe and i and jorge the man are the same people. this is nott rue i might add. but it that same post you havea separate section devoted addressing pimp boy joe, but beginning the post about me ( i noticed you changed your nickname for me ) now why would you do that, if you thought i was the same person as pimp boy joe, wouldnt you still refer to me as retard man 451?

crimson- you say you made something over 40,000 dollars right, now if the taxes took away

twenty five percent exactly that would leave you approximately 30,000 dollars which is definately enough to live comfortably, not to mention the fact that your husband (im assuming) has a good job like you and makes money as well. even if he made only 16,000 dollars that is still 42,000 dollars at the end of the year!!!! you have no reason to complain, you should be happy 14,000 dollars ids going to benefit children (education, poor people) and all sorts of other causes. ii dont think it is the democrats whoare brats but the republicans!!!!

also i noticed you made a minor mistake, you were referring to the two main parties and you said Intellectuals and democrats, you obviously forgot that republicans were on here too and simply just said a truthful synonym for democrats :oops: it would be intellectuals and republicnas no biggie though!

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 05 Mar 2004 02:54:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just something interesting I'm going to point out about paying taxes. It's a two way street here. If you want a high standard of living (with or without the 'extras' like free health care, and other social assistanc programs), it's going to cost money. With the States currently trillions of dollars in debt, I'm assuming it's reasonable to say people want it paid off. With the debt taking away from the GNP, other sources of income need to be sought for infrastructure. Roads, hospitals, the judicial system, The large military allocation (at least for America). It all costs money to maintain, and even more to improve. So the question is: (And yes other things are a factor, but for the purpose of this I'm going to assume the money is being spent wisely)

How much are you willing to pay for a better life?

The less taxes you pay, the less the overall comfort of living (not using standard of living here). On the flip side, the more you pay, the more the higher comfort of living you could have.

Comfort of living, in the way I'm using it is simply how high quality a countries infrastructure is (and the abundance of "extras" if applicable)

I'm also not saying this to say that overly high taxes are a good idea, but rather to point out that a rise in taxes aren't always a bad thing, and a lowering in them a good thing. (Once again, assuming that the funds are infact going to what they should be, in a perfect world)

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Fri, 05 Mar 2004 03:03:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Retard Man IQ-Of-1umbral- i will say this again.

i am not pimb boy joe. you even admitted this yourself without knowing it in your post before last you saisd i have split personality disorder meaning pimp boy joe and i and jorge the man are the

same people. this is nott rue i might add. but it that same post you havea separate section devoted addressing pimp boy joe, but beginning the post about me ( i noticed you changed your nickname for me ) now why would you do that, if you thought i was the same person as pimp boy joe, wouldnt you still refer to me as retard man 451?

crimson- you say you made something over 40,000 dollars right, now if the taxes took away twenty five percent exactly that would leave you approximately 30,000 dollars which is definately enough to live comfortably, not to mention the fact that your husband (im assuming) has a good job like you and makes money as well. even if he made only 16,000 dollars that is still 42,000 dollars at the end of the year!!!! you have no reason to complain, you should be happy 14,000 dollars ids going to benefit children (education, poor people) and all sorts of other causes. ii dont think it is the democrats whoare brats but the republicans!!!!

also i noticed you made a minor mistake, you were referring to the two main parties and you said Intellectuals and democrats, you obviously forgot that republicans were on here too and simply just said a truthful synonym for democrats :oops: it would be intellectuals and republicnas no biggie though!

I would respond to this post if it actually made sense. It's so full of grammatical errors and mindless gibberish that it means absolutely nothing. The only thing I could make out of that garbage is that you believe in the philosophy, "From each according to his ability; to each according to his need." That's a communist philosophy. You have just proven you are a communist. Who are you to say what is a comfortable salary for Crimson to live with? Who are you to say \$40,000 is too much money and that she can live perfectly alright with only \$30,000? That's communism to its extreme.

Does Crimson not have bills to pay, or mortgage to pay, or food to buy, or clothes to buy, or medicine to buy? She can pay for a lot more of those necessities with \$40,000 than she can with only \$30,000.

The government pisses enough of our money away. You actually think the money she pays in taxes goes to poor people? Not to go off on a different tangent here, but why are those people poor in the first place? I'll tell you why--the decisions they have made in the past. Those poor people have no one to blame but themselves for their status in society, and it is not the role of government to just give them money because they will keep doing the things that make them poor.

EDIT: Forgot to mention that Crimson said she made about \$60,000 a year. Can you not read, Retard Man IQ-Of-1? :rolleyes:

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [hareman](#) on Fri, 05 Mar 2004 03:04:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Actually, CRimson did say they were one and same when she said they both post from teh same IP

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 05 Mar 2004 03:20:13 GMT

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

---

hydra1945Bush didn't lose those jobs; Clinton did.  
Bush created thousands of jobs; Clinton didn't.

Just so you know, Clinton created about 23 million net jobs in his two terms.  
And right after Bush becomes president, the economy starts going in to a funk. What do you do?  
Blame Clinton! AHHH! AHHH! Bush created thousands of jobs? Weeee... Except so far he's lost  
nearly 3 million net jobs.

hydra1945Tax cuts do not raise the deficit.

Yes they do. The government gets less money. The government takes out more loans from other  
places. The deficit goes up. Simple as that. And again, Bush's tax cuts look so bad that the money  
the government doesn't get any more because of his cuts is still in his 2004 budget.

hydra1945No, as in how they want to raise tax rates to outrageous numbers.

Like what? Repealing Bush's short-sighted tax cuts isn't an outrageous raise.

CrimsonBasically, Bush is the closest thing we have to this. If taxes are reduced, and the  
reduction is made permanent, then Congress will be forced to cut budgets on other less  
successful and unsuccessful programs to make up for the loss of funds.

Or, like Bush is doing now, they could just loosen environmental regulations and gut agencies that  
enforce regulations. Why? Because big people for companies that want to mess with the  
environment like to accidentally give Bush money so he can make those nasty regulations go  
away. Right now, the Republican controlled government has brought in LOBBYISTS!!!! to re-write  
environmental regulations, claiming that they are the "experts".

hydra1945Unborn fetuses are humans too, you know.

In that case, why don't human egg cells count as humans as well? Then, killing a woman would  
be something like 40,000 counts of murder.

haremanGET A LIFE DO SOMETHING INSTEAD OF TALKING ABOUT

No. Now, go away.

CrimsonHere's a little proof that CNN is Democratically-biased.

Mainstream media is negative. That's just how they work. And you can't say FOX is

democratically biased. For one, Rupert Murdoch, a crazy billionaire conservative owns FOX news, which he uses for his own highly evil agenda. Second, the news director is Roger Ailes, another INSANE conservative.

CrimsonHe's obviously unfit for a discussion between intellectuals and Democrats.

Oh, come now. I know pimp boy whatever is being stupid, but don't go accusing democrats of being not smart.

#### WHY BUSH IS BAD FOR THE ENVIRONMENT:

First, the deputy secretary of the interior right now is J. Steven Griles. Griles has opened public lands to gas, oil, and mining interests, all while receiving money from his former employees in the gas, oil, and mining industries. His appointment has been a particular boon to a sector of the coal mining industry that is not afraid to think big: the sector that removes mountaintops. When you remove the top of a mountain, you get easy access to the resources inside. But, the mountaintop doesn't just vanish. Normally, it goes to a nearby valley. Griles was an executive at United Company, where he oversaw the Dal-Tex mine in West Virginia, which had one of the largest mountaintop removals since Krakatoa. When miners detonate the ridges, they fill in valleys and bury streams with trees, rocks, and 13 species of birds, as well as sending boulders flying in to houses along with creating asthma-causing debris. And then, United Company sets up coal-mining machines that run 24 hours a day right next to homes. For a while, environmental acts like the Clean Water act have made it illegal to dump mountaintops in streams. But now, the Bush administration has re-written the act to allow mining waste to be dumped right into waterways.

Lets look at some other people who probably shouldn't be where they are right now under the Bush administration:

Mark Rey:

Position: Undersecretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment

Currently in charge of: Forests

Previously lobbied for polluters of: Forests.

Bennet W. Raley:

Position: Interior Assistant Secretary for Water and Science

Currently in charge of: Water

Previously lobbied for polluters of: Water

Rebecca Watson:

Position: Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land and Minerals Management

Currently in charge of: Land that contains minerals

Previously lobbied for polluters of: Land that contains minerals

Carmen Toohy:

Position: Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior for Alaska

Currently in charge of: Alaska

Previously lobbied for polluters of: Alaska

Patricia Lynn Scarlett:

Position: Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Policy, Management, and Budget

Currently in charge of: Government regulations

Previously lobbied for poluters of: Everything

Get the drift?

Lets look at pig production:

20 years ago, the hogs in this county were raised by family farmers. Today, three companies produce 60 percent of all the hogs in America. They produce these hogs in factory farms called CAFOs: Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations. These places generate a lot of, erhm, poop. One hog produces ten times as much feces as a human being. One CAFOs is home to about 850,000 hogs. That's as much sewage as New York. New York has 14 water treatment plants, whereas CAFOs have none. In order to dispose of hog waste, family farmers used it as fertilizer to grow more crops. However, New York's sewage is a little too much to grow anything on. So CAFOs operators take over vaste tracts of land which they turn into feces lagoons. Line a huge area with plastic, and dump untreated feces into it. That's gotta smell, right? Well, pilots can smell a CAFOs from a height of 3 thousand feet. And once a CAFOs is started up, real estate [homes] in the area drop dramatically in the area of prices. Drink a glass of orange juice near a CAFOs and it tastes like sewage. The stink gets even worse from the practice of spraying some of the hog feces in to the air and on to lush bermuda grass. While CAFOs operators say this is good for the grass, the grass becomes so toxic that anything that eats it dies. Most of this sprayed feces seeps into groundwater, those sort of places. In 1995, a spill from one of these CAFOs killed a billion fish in the Neuse river in North Carolina. Every year since, dead fish wash up on the shores by the tens of millions. These fish are falling prey to pfiesteria piscida, a recently unknown dinoflagellate that is deadly to fish, because it kills them in very nasty ways that I won't go in to here. Also, fishermen and bridge keepers get unsightly sores from this organism, so they have to wear long pants when they go on a date, although it would be pretty hard to get a date because of lethargy, headaches, and cognitive impairment so sever you can't remember your name or dial a phone number. All of these are caused by pfiesteria piscida. Big company hog farms have put the small farmer out of business. Twenty years ago there were 27,500 small hog farmers in North Carolina. Today there are none. However, these factory farms have ratcheted down the cost of meat for consumers. As long as you don't factor in the feces. Bobby Kennedy jr., President of the Waterkeeper Alliance, says if the waste were disposed of legally, CAFOs couldn't keep up with small farmers.

Bobby Kennedy, Jr. They cannot produce hogs, or pork chops, or bacon more efficiently than a family farm without breaking the law. They aren't about the free market, because they can't compete without committing criminal acts every single day. Their whole system is built on being able to disable or capture government agencies. They're not in favor of responsibility, or democracy, or private property. It's just about privatizing the air, water, all the things that the public's supposed to own. They are trying to take them away from us, privatize them, and liquidate them for cash. That's the only coherent philosophy they have. That's it.

Just so you know, the Clinton administration did do stuff about this. Towards the end of his administration, the EPA issued stringent new CAFO regulations regarding waste disposal and took up suits against several offenders.

Then comes Bush.

His appointees gutted the regulations. Eric Schaeffer, head of enforcement for the EPA, resigned in disgust when told to drop the agency's cases against offending conglomerates. The administration cut a deal giving immunity to factory farm air polluters, and Republican allies in Congress defeated a proposal by Paul Wellstone to bar hog producers from also owning slaughterhouses.

hareman, please take your negativity somewhere else. You too, pimp boy joe/jorge the man. I'm all for ending cursing in this thread. Just seems kind of silly to me.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 05 Mar 2004 19:00:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngihydra1945Bush didn't lose those jobs; Clinton did.  
Bush created thousands of jobs; Clinton didn't.

Just so you know, Clinton created about 23 million net jobs in his two terms.  
And right after Bush becomes president, the economy starts going in to a funk. What do you do?  
Blame Clinton! AHHH! AHHH! Bush created thousands of jobs? Weeee... Except so far he's lost nearly 3 million net jobs.

Do I need to reference you to my post about this already? I showed you a chart of the NASDAQ, a very important market indicator, which clearly shows that the stock market started falling well before Bush took office. If you try to keep saying it over and over, it won't change the truth.

Quote:hydra1945Tax cuts do not raise the deficit.

Yes they do. The government gets less money. The government takes out more loans from other places. The deficit goes up. Simple as that. And again, Bush's tax cuts look so bad that the money the government doesn't get any more because of his cuts is still in his 2004 budget.

The Federal Government is granted 17 functions by the Constitution. To perform those duties requires about \$750 million per year. You can't make this problem go away by throwing more money at it, you have to spend the money better!

Quote:hydra1945No, as in how they want to raise tax rates to outrageous numbers.

Like what? Repealing Bush's short-sighted tax cuts isn't an outrageous raise.

If it's not an outrageous raise, then why bother? If it's not so much money, then why not let me keep it?

Quote:CrimsonBasically, Bush is the closest thing we have to this. If taxes are reduced, and the reduction is made permanent, then Congress will be forced to cut budgets on other less successful and unsuccessful programs to make up for the loss of funds.

...blah blah environmental stuff...

I still don't understand how you can claim corruption in the Bush administration while being completely blind to the corruption in the Clinton administration.

Quote:CrimsonHere's a little proof that CNN is Democratically-biased.

Mainstream media is negative. That's just how they work. And you can't say FOX is democratically biased. For one, Rupert Murdoch, a crazy billionaire conservative owns FOX news, which he uses for his own highly evil agenda. Second, the news director is Roger Ailes, another INSANE conservative.

I never said that Fox is completely unbiased. It was just an example of partisan influence in the media.

Llama Man 451crimson- you say you made something over 40,000 dollars right, now if the taxes took away twenty five percent exactly

On my 2003 Federal return, My adjusted gross income was \$36,000. I was able to write off business expenses (since I'm self-employed in the eyes of the government since I'm a contractor, I can write off my home office) and the interest I paid on the mortgage on my house, plus my vehicle license tax, and real estate taxes. That left me with about \$24,000 left to be taxed. Of that, I ended up giving \$4500 to the federal government for 2003.

Quote:that would leave you approximately 30,000 dollars which is definately enough to live comfortably,

\$32,000, but close. But who are you to say how much I need to live comfortably? Do you know how much the cost of living is in Phoenix, AZ? Do you know how much I have to pay in gas to get to work? How big my house is? What car I drive?

Quote:not to mention the fact that your husband (im assuming) has a good job like you and makes money as well.

I'm not married.

Quote:even if he made only 16,000 dollars that is still 42,000 dollars at the end of the year!!!! you have no reason to complain,

I'm not complaining that I don't have enough money to live off of. I'm complaining that they are wasting what I do give them.

Quote:you should be happy 14,000 dollars ids going to benefit children (education, poor people)

and all sorts of other causes. ii dont think it is the democrats whoare brats but the republicans!!!!

Who are you to say I should give up my money? Did those welfare mothers learn my profession and go to my job every day and do the work? No. Just because I wasn't stupid and used protection and don't have a kid that I can't afford to burden me, why should I have to pay for someone who decided "oh condoms are uncomfortable so I will take my chances even though I'm 17 and my mom still supports me"?

We are NOT a communist society!! If you need to pay the bills, then get your ass out there and get a job! Communism doesn't work on a large scale. If I am smarter and make more money, then I should get to live more comfortably.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Fri, 05 Mar 2004 23:30:18 GMT

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

---

firstly hydra- if you said you wouldnt respond to my post, why did you/TM

also, communism isnt a bad idea, it jjust requires something impossible- a perfect society.

wanna know how i have the right to tell you how comfortably you live, well i cannot do that, but it is common sense which you claim to have but obviously dont. my family makes LESS than you and we live much more than comfortably, even though my parents are republicans. also, maybe if you made wise choices about the car your drive your car point is worthless. if you want to save money dont buy a friggin ferrari it is simple!!!

you are not necessarily smarter than the people on welfare ya know... in fact i bet a lot of them are actually smarter than YOU. unfortunately neither of us can prove/disprove this but it is probably the truth. any and all money you spend is your decision.

i am not a communist, i simply care about other people, whereas none of you republicans do.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 06 Mar 2004 00:05:52 GMT

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

---

Quote:also, communism isnt a bad idea, it jjust requires something impossible- a perfect society.

Well, that's one thing you have right...communism is not possible on a large scale, given human nature- the transitional government has always refused to relinquish control. How did that one go? "Everyone is equal, but some are more equal than others?"

It is interesting to note, however, that communism DOES work on a very small scale- if you want an example, look at the Kibbutz(spelling?) communities in Israel...those are just about as successful as communism has ever been(even though they still fall under the national

government).

I would never want to live under communism- under a communist philosophy, everyone deserves the same conditions, rewards, etc, regardless of what they give back to society. If you do more work than the next guy, you should have every right to capitalize on your success. You should not be bogged down by his misfortune; if you decide to help him out that's your own business. No one should tell you that another person deserves better than you unless their poverty is a direct result of your success.

Quote:you are not necessarily smarter than the people on welfare ya know... in fact i bet a lot of them are actually smarter than YOU. unfortunately neither of us can prove/disprove this but it is probably the truth. any and all money you spend is your decision.

I know that isn't directed at me, but I'm just gonna cut in and answer it anyway- there are many people who are very smart and live in poor households; I know a few. There are stupid people who live in rich households; I know a few of those too. What connection is there between intelligence and one's financial situation anyway? I don't recall anyone ever taking a poll to find out if rich people were smarter- even a person who is not the brightest bulb on the tree can be willing to work hard and get rich. On the other side of the coin, there are plenty of people who are very intelligent, but just plain lazy.

There are plenty of good people on welfare, who are just there until they can secure a new job and get back on their feet again. However, there are also plenty of people who are on welfare because they do not have the motivation to work, and are essentially freeloaders clinging onto the taxpayers' wallets like leeches. A successful citizen should not have to pay the bills for someone who does not even try to pay their own- and I stress again that many people on welfare do want to change their situation, and are willing to work to change their status. But there are many, many people who get welfare for no other reason besides that they simply do not want to work.

Quote:i am not a communist, i simply care about other people, whereas none of you republicans do.

That has to be the single most arrogant statement you've made yet. That says to me that your opinion falls under the "well I'm this and you're that so I'm superior NYEH!" category, which essentially means you've run out of arguments and are instead attacking the morality of people you have never, and probably will never meet. That's hypocritical; by making such a high-and-mighty statement about people you do not know you have proven yourself to be just as prejudiced and cold as you claim your opponents are.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 06 Mar 2004 10:48:52 GMT

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

---

I don't drive a Ferarri, but if I did, and could afford it, why shouldn't I? And when did I say I wanted to save money? Short answer is, I don't... I spend my paychecks as fast as I get them. Not just on me... anyone who is around me when I have money gets free meals and stuff all the time. I am very generous with my money when I know I'm giving my friends or family a nice meal or a

pedicure and making them happy.

You still live with your parents... wait until you have to support yourself. My dad kicked my ass out of the house two weeks after I turned 18 and expressly forbid me ever moving back there. I'm responsible for me. No one else is. That's how I was raised.

When I said "smarter" I didn't necessarily mean in the IQ sense of the word (though mine was measured well over 150 by some psychiatrist when I was about 4 and had taught myself to read at 2)... I mean logic, street smart, common sense... I knew that I wasn't ready to raise a child, I wasn't married, therefore I used protection and consequently didn't get pregnant. I also finished high school and didn't wimp out early. I also taught myself my current profession as a web applications developer. So I would think I deserve every penny I make.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 06 Mar 2004 22:36:01 GMT

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

---

CrimsonDo I need to reference you to my post about this already? I showed you a chart of the NASDAQ, a very important market indicator, which clearly shows that the stock market started falling well before Bush took office. If you try to keep saying it over and over, it won't change the truth.

What it clearly shows is that the stock market was acting like a normal stock market. It's basically an impossibility to make the market go straight up without ups and downs for several years in a row. As the market was going up under Clinton near the middle of his term, it wasn't going straight up. It was taking ups and downs, but was obviously rising. But OBVIOUSLY when it took a hop down this time, Clinton was OBVIOUSLY crashing the market. And you want to know why the market's going up bit by bit now? Because Bush wants to privatize social security and have people put all their retirement money in the stock market. After accepting donations from traders, because they make a ton of money if S.S. is invested in the market.

[quote="Crimson"]The Federal Government is granted 17 functions by the Constitution. To perform those duties requires about \$750 billion per year. You can't make this problem go away by throwing more money at it, you have to spend the money better!  
[quote]

You meant 750 billion, right? Well, if you want to cut spending, let's not have a 500 billion dollar war. A war that was in no way justified by the intelligence agencies. Last night on C-SPAN, Ed Kennedy was owning up on Bush for his reasons on invading Iraq. The Ed Kennedy all Republicans call "Kerry's Chief Campaign Surrogate Kennedy" to make it sound like something shady is going on. [Hint: Nothing shady is going on.]

"Crimson" If it's not an outrageous raise, then why bother? If it's not so much money, then why not let me keep it?

It's not an outrageous raise because the government was already getting that money. What Bush does is make stupid decisions, and when someone starts to get on him, give everyone a big tax cut so everybody can be happy. And the government lost a lot of money from Bush's tax cuts. Like, 2.4 trillion or something. And AGAIN, Bush's tax cuts look SO bad that the money the government doesn't get from those taxes any more is still included in his 2004 budget.

CrimsonI still don't understand how you can claim corruption in the Bush administration while being completely blind to the corruption in the Clinton administration.

What corruption in the Clinton administration? Monica Lewinsky was pretty much it. Oh, wait, you're referring to all that crap on your little poster that has nothing behind it. Oh, but there's so much of it that everything must be true! It's impossible that republicans distorted and lied to make Clinton look bad, and then got FOX to hype up a ton of the investigations!

CrimsonI never said that Fox is completely unbiased. It was just an example of partisan influence in the media.

Well, here's how it's going down right now: The mainstream media is mostly crap when it comes to politics. A lot of the time, some one will hit on the story and it will be ALL OVER the news for months. It doesn't matter if it's true or not. Right now, the media is railing on Bush. In the 2000 election, which Gore actually won, except for the biased supreme court, the media was railing on Gore because he said he "invented the internet". Well, actually he was just taking credit for a program he championed and funded. He saw the value of ARPANET and stood behind it. And took credit for it. It's what government people do.

CrimsonI'm not complaining that I don't have enough money to live off of. I'm complaining that they are wasting what I do give them.

Like the War in Iraq. The media likes to call this the War on Terror, but it's not, really. Terrorism is a tactic. You can't attack a tactic. You attack people using a tactic. Like the Taliban. Like not Saddam.

Crimsonhad taught myself to read at 2

Damn!

--

I thought it was real pretty how no one even touched on the environmental stuff except for Crimson going Blah Blah Environmental Stuff... when in fact the environment is GOD DAMN important. It's where we live. Once the environment goes, so do we. And we can't really habitate another planet yet. Earth is what we have. And Bush and his piss-ass company friends who want to ruin the environment for their own personal gain...are still being supported by so many people who want to look away.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 07 Mar 2004 01:05:13 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiWhat it clearly shows is that the stock market was acting like a normal stock market. It's basically an impossibility to make the market go straight up without ups and downs for several years in a row. As the market was going up under Clinton near the middle of his term, it wasn't going straight up. It was taking ups and downs, but was obviously rising. But OBVIOUSLY when it took a hop down this time, Clinton was OBVIOUSLY crashing the market. And you want to know why th market's going up bit by bit now? Because Bush wants to privatize social security and have people put all their retirement money in the stock market. After accepting donations from traders, because they make a ton of money if S.S. is invested in the market.

The fact that you actually believe what you are saying astounds me. All the time you hear about the "dot com bubble" popping. The "dot com bubble" cleary popped in March of 2000. Once the NASDAQ saw 5000, that was pretty much the end of it.

So now traders are bribing President Bush to make the market go up?? IF ONLY it were that simple! I guess you forgot that the market affects everyone, and bribe or no bribes, Bush would not only HAVE to do what he can to make it rise, but also WANT to make it rise! But no... he needs a bribe to do that. :rolleyes: What you are saying makes no damn sense. None at all.

Why are you so against privatizing Social Security? Do you think the government is doing a great job managing the money we give them? They essentially have a monopoly on those funds. If it's privatized, we win. The companies we decide to invest our retirement money with will have to compete for it. When businesses compete, we win. Right now, they can take our SS and piss it away (which they do) and it's really a giant Ponzi scheme. Privatizing SS makes sure that everyone gets their share, plus they can make more money on the market.

Quote:CrimsonThe Federal Government is granted 17 functions by the Constitution. To perform those duties requires about \$750 million per year. You can't make this problem go away by throwing more money at it, you have to spend the money better!

You meant 750 billion, right?

Yes, I did, sorry.

Quote:Well, if you want to cut spending, lets not have a 500 billion dollar war. A war that was in no way justified by the intelligence agencies. Last night on C-SPAN, Ed Kennedy was owning up on Bush for his reasons on invading Iraq. The Ed Kennedy all Republicans call "Kerry's Chief Campaign Surrogate Kennedy" to make it sound like something shady is going on. [Hint: Nothing shady is going on.]

Defending the US is one of the 17 functions that the Constitution grants the federal government. Regardless of your opinion about whether we should have gone to war. Therefore your argument here is moot.

Quote:It's not an outrageous raise because the government was already getting that money.

And would you feel that way if it were your money being taxed? HONESTLY?

Quote:What Bush does is make stupid decisions, and when someone starts to get on him, give everyone a big tax cut so everybody can be happy. And the government lost a lot of money from Bush's tax cuts. Like, 2.4 trillion or something. And AGAIN, Bush's tax cuts look SO bad that the money the government doesn't get from those taxes any more is still included in his 2004 budget.

<http://www.nber.org/feldstein/wj032800.html>

Where do you get \$2.4 trillion?? The only figures I could find were around \$600 billion over the next 10 years. But, as the following article displays, the so-called "cost" of a tax cut shouldn't enter into this, because that figure does not take into account changes in taxpayer activity. Using that figure means that you honestly believe that if I get, let's say, \$2000 less per year tax liability, that I'm just going to put that money under my mattress. Literally. And not just me. Everyone will put their extra money under their mattresses (and put Sealy out of business j/k).

<http://www.techcentralstation.com/012703C.html>

Well, you're wrong. That extra money doesn't go into a mattress. It goes to the stock market. It goes into people's retirement accounts (heck, \$2000 is just about an entire allowed IRA contribution for a year)... goes into the cash registers at department stores, electronics stores, grocery stores. If I grab a new DVD player off the shelf, someone had to design that DVD player. Someone had to build that DVD player. Someone had to sell the DVD player to the store. Someone had to drive the truck to bring the DVD player to the store. Someone had to put it on the shelf. Someone had to ring up my purchase. I had to pay sales tax on that purchase.

On the most basic level of speaking, if people have more money, they will buy more stuff. To say otherwise is ignorant.

Also, project tax liabilities change our behavior in other ways. Here's a real-life example:

My aunt is a nurse. She's actually is the charge nurse / clinical team lead on her floor. She makes about \$35 an hour. If she worked 40 hours per week, it would put her into a higher tax bracket. So instead, she works about 30 hours a week and stays in the lower bracket. And as a result, she makes just about the same amount of money as a 40 hour week, but gets more time away from work. So she makes less money and works less hours because of the tax laws. And she's in a profession where they are desperate for workers.

Quote:CrimsonI still don't understand how you can claim corruption in the Bush administration while being completely blind to the corruption in the Clinton administration.

What corruption in the Clinton administration? Monica Lewinsky was pretty much it. Oh, wait, you're referring to all that crap on your little poster that has nothing behind it. Oh, but there's so much of it that everything must be true! It's impossible that republicans distorted and lied to make Clinton look bad, and then got FOX to hype up a ton of the investigations!

Yes, all the accusations of corruption in the Clinton administration are obviously just lies, while in the Bush administration they are true. You are completely blind and exceptionally ignorant to make that claim. Never mind that Clinton was disbarred and fined thousands of dollars. He was a good man. :rolleyes:

Do you really, truly, honestly believe that if Clinton was that close to so many shady dealings that he didn't have anything to do with ANY of them? Personally, I believe that there are even more of these dealings going on that we will never even know about. And I really like how you shrug off the Monica Lewinsky thing. Yeah, let's just shrug off our President lying to the entire world on national television and then being proved wrong. It's OK that he cheated on his wife. It's OK that he blatantly lied. You sure don't see President Bush getting "serviced" in his office, cheating on his wife. He's a good man who stands by his values.

Sorry, but this just makes you a huge hypocrite.

Quote:CrimsonI never said that Fox is completely unbiased. It was just an example of partisan influence in the media.

Well, here's how it's going down right now: The mainstream media is mostly crap when it comes to politics.

I agree.

Quote:A lot of the time, some one will hit on the story and it will be ALL OVER the news for months. It doesn't matter if it's true or not. Right now, the media is railing on Bush.

Yes, because they want to influence you to believe what they believe. Unfortunately, you are.

Quote:In the 2000 election, which Gore actually won, except for the biased supreme court,

We'd need another year to argue that point.

Quote:the media was railing on Gore because he said he "invented the internet". Well, actually he was just taking credit for a program he championed and funded. He saw the value of ARPANET and stood behind it. And took credit for it. It's what government people do.

I think Gore is dumb for making that claim, too. But since we both agree that the media is "mostly crap" when it comes to politics, I don't need to say anything more.

Quote:CrimsonI'm not complaining that I don't have enough money to live off of. I'm complaining that they are wasting what I do give them.

Like the War in Iraq. The media likes to call this the War on Terror, but it's not, really. Terrorism is a tactic. You can't attack a tactic. You attack people using a tactic. Like the Taliban. Like not Saddam.

Saddam was found with \$750,000 in American money. What's a lonely old dictator doing with that much American money if he's not funding terrorists?

Quote:I thought it was real pretty how no one even touched on the environmental stuff except for Crimson going Blah Blah Environmental Stuff... when in fact the environment is GOD DAMN important. It's where we live. Once the environment goes, so do we. And we can't really habitate another planet yet. Earth is what we have. And Bush and his piss-ass company friends who want to ruin the environment for their own personal gain...are still being supported by so many people who want to look away.

Before you say that, read the link below on the fallacies in science.

<http://www.junkscience.com/news/prma.html>

Not everything that the media tells you about the environment is true. If you can agree on that about politics, you have to agree on it for the environment, too.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sun, 07 Mar 2004 02:23:58 GMT

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

---

um crimson- you were saying how awful it is clinton lied to EVERYONE about the whole lewinski thing on national tv.... guess what bush does whenever he makes a speech???

and bush has been proven wrong once again bringing up the WMD's. also, he lied about his tax cuts, you want ot talk actual scandals, george bush'ss dad (the other pres) was largely involved in some drug smuggling operation or something....

wanna know why the lewinski thing isnt a big deal??? it doesnt matter in politics at all!!!! george bush being a friggin retard does!!!! his IQ is 91 for crying out loud!!!!

dont even say that he got better SAT scores than gore because bush was a member of the skulls and bones which is a secret fraternity which easily could have "helped him out" a little bit.

also in the constitution it says everyone is garunteed the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.... how do you expect people on welfare to do this if they have to work so much just to get the BARE BARE minimum for their family??? crimson, you being a "constitutionalist" youd have thought you would know that.

also as far as i am concerned saddam was not any threat at all to us, it was osama we should have gone after, not saddam. we had NO intelligence that saddam was funding attacks or planning them in any way.... as for the american money thing i dont know that is a little suspicious, but you cant just say he is funding terror just because he is a cranky old dictator (even though it is a perfectly reasonable assumption)

with all that aside, i am very happy saddam has been captured but am still furious of the hypocrisy about this whole war thing. he says we are getting money from the tax cuts when we

are losing billions of dollars because of this stupid war!!!! iraq is a third world country, africa is a third world continent, why arent we helping them??? face it, bush is not a good man in the slightest, he is a callow, deceiving, rat bastard who will do anything to help out his buddies in the big corporations.

which may be why he is "raising the stock market" where do you think people put there money???? the big corporations on the stock market DUH! maybe that is why they would bribe bush so more people will back them on the stock.

i will say this now. i am not a frequent follower of the stock market but i know some key things about it.

i know this is random but you peeps should really check out the comic johnny the homicidal maniac IT IS HILARIOUS!!!!

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 07 Mar 2004 06:29:27 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiYou meant 750 billion, right? Well, if you want to cut spending, lets not have a 500 billion dollar war. A war that was in no way justified by the intelligence agencies. Last night on C-SPAN, Ed Kennedy was owning up on Bush for his reasons on invading Iraq. The Ed Kennedy all Republicans call "Kerry's Chief Campaign Surrogate Kennedy" to make it sound like something shady is going on. [Hint: Nothing shady is going on.]

Where in the hell did you see that the Iraq war would cost \$500 billion? Last time I checked it was barely at \$100 billion. Besides, this has nothing to do with the fact that spending for failed social programs like welfare and medicare is out of control and will make this country go bankrupt in a matter of decades. No matter how much the war on Iraq could cost, there is no way in hell it could possible cost more than social security or welfare.

Wars end. Excess spending on social programs can continue on forever.

The bankruptcy of this country will not be a result of a war; it will be the result of excess spending on failed social programs! Get that through your head!

SuperFlyingEngilt's not an outrageous raise because the government was already getting that money.

Money that was given back to the people through a major tax cut. It will be a raise because those rates are not currently that high.

SuperFlyingEngiWhat Bush does is make stupid decisions, and when someone starts to get on him, give everyone a big tax cut so everybody can be happy. And the government lost a lot of money from Bush's tax cuts. Like, 2.4 trillion or something.

\$2.4 trillion was the size of the federal budget, numbnuts.

SuperFlyingEngiAnd AGAIN, Bush's tax cuts look SO bad that the money the government doesn't get from those taxes any more is still included in his 2004 budget.

That's true. The biggest mistake the Republicans have made is spending money "like a drunken sailor" (in the words of Sen. John McCain).

SuperFlyingEngiWhat corruption in the Clinton administration? Monica Lewinsky was pretty much it. Oh, wait, you're referring to all that crap on your little poster that has nothing behind it. Oh, but there's so much of it that everything must be true! It's impossible that republicans distorted and lied to make Clinton look bad, and then got FOX to hype up a ton of the investigations! You must've forgotten about the Whitewater scandal, "Troopergate," his pardoning of 140 convicts on his last day of office, including Carlos Vignali (convicted on cocaine trafficking, Marc Rich (a fugitive of tax evasion), Susan McDougal (a Whitewater witness who spent 18 months in prison for contempt of court for refusing to cooperate with special prosecutor Kenneth Starr), Henry Cisneros and Patty Hearst, and sexual harassment accusations from Paula Jones. Do I need to go on?

SuperFlyingEngiWell, here's how it's going down right now: The mainstream media is mostly crap when it comes to politics. A lot of the time, some one will hit on the story and it will be ALL OVER the news for months. It doesn't matter if it's true or not. Right now, the media is railing on Bush. Holy crap. Did you just say something intelligent for once? Holy shit, hell must've frozen over. SuperFlyingEngiIn the 2000 election, which Gore actually won, except for the biased supreme court, Oh no! You blew it! You were doing so well, too .

Biased Supreme Court decision. Give me a break :rolleyes:.

SuperFlyingEngithe media was railing on Gore because he said he "invented the internet". Well, actually he was just taking credit for a program he championed and funded. He saw the value of ARPANET and stood behind it. And took credit for it. It's what government people do. And I funded and championed the invention of the automobile :rolleyes:.

SuperFlyingEngiLike the War in Iraq. The media likes to call this the War on Terror, but it's not, really. Terrorism is a tactic. You can't attack a tactic. You attack people using a tactic. Like the Taliban. Like not Saddam. And this is relevant...how?

SuperFlyingEngiI thought it was real pretty how no one even touched on the environmental stuff except for Crimson going Blah Blah Environmental Stuff... when in fact the environment is GOD DAMN important. It's where we live. Once the environment goes, so do we. And we can't really habitate another planet yet. Earth is what we have. And Bush and his piss-ass company friends who want to ruin the environment for their own personal gain...are still being supported by so many people who want to look away. Bush isn't ruining the environment for his own personal gain. Stop talking out of your ass.

Here, you want someone to respond to that environmental crap you posted earlier? Here it is. SuperFlyingEngiWHY BUSH IS BAD FOR THE ENVIRONMENT:

First, the deputy secretary of the interior right now is J. Steven Griles. Griles has opened public lands to gas, oil, and mining interests, all while receiving money from his former employees in the gas, oil, and mining industries. His appointment has been a particular boon to a sector of the col

mining industry that is not afraid to think big: the sector that removes mountaintops. When you remove the top of a mountain, you get easy access to the resources inside. But, the mountaintop doesn't just vanish. Normally, it goes to a nearby valley. Griles was an executive at United Company, where he oversaw the Dal-Tex mine in West Virginia, which had one of the largest mountaintop removals since Krakatoa. When miners detonate the ridges, they fill in valleys and bury streams with trees, rocks, and 13 species of birds, as well as sending boulders flying in to houses along with creating asthma-causing debris. And then, United Company sets up coal-mining machines that run 24 hours a day right next to homes. For a while, environmental acts like the Clean Water act have made it illegal to dump mountaintops in streams. But now, the Bush administration has re-written the act to allow mining waste to be dumped right into waterways. Did you just pull all of this from your ass, or do you have something to back this up?

SuperFlyingEngi Lets look at some other people who probably shouldn't be where they are right now under the Bush administration:

Mark Rey:

Position: Undersecretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment

Currently in charge of: Forests

Previously lobbied for polluters of: Forests.

<http://www.usda.gov/agencies/gallery/rey.htm>

Would you tell me who these polluters of forests this guy lobbied for are, please?

SuperFlyingEngi Bennet W. Raley:

Position: Interior Assistant Secretary for Water and Science

Currently in charge of: Water

Previously lobbied for polluters of: Water

<http://www.doi.gov/bio/raleybio.html>

Would you tell me who these polluters of water this guy lobbied for are, please?

SuperFlyingEngi Rebecca Watson:

Position: Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land and Minerals Management

Currently in charge of: Land that contains minerals

Previously lobbied for polluters of: Land that contains minerals

This is getting old...

<http://www.doi.gov/bio/watsbio.html>

Would you tell me who these polluters of land that contains minerals this lady lobbied for are, please?

SuperFlyingEngi Carmen Toohey:

Position: Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior for Alaska

Currently in charge of: Alaska

Previously lobbied for polluters of: Alaska

This is getting REALLY OLD...

Who are these so-called polluters of Alaska Mrs. Toohey lobbied for?

SuperFlyingEngi Patricia Lynn Scarlett:

Position: Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Policy, Management, and Budget

Currently in charge of: Government regulations

Previously lobbied for poluters of: Everything

You have said nothing that doesn't make me believe you just crapped all this out this morning and posted it whenever you felt like it. Some evidence would be nice.

As for the rest of your post, I refer you to the article on junkscience.com Crimson posted.

Retard Man IQ-Of-1um crimson- you were saying how awful it is clinton lied to EVERYONE about the whole lewinski thing on national tv.... guess what bush does whenever he makes a speech???

Okay, Retard Man IQ-Of-1, you really have to cut out the mindless crap that you randomly think of and post that means absolutely nothing. They're always full of simple errors my eight-year-old cousin could correct and don't mean shit.

Retard Man IQ-Of-1and bush has been proven wrong once again bringing up the WMD's. also, he lied about his tax cuts, you want ot talk actual scandals, george bush'ss dad (the other pres) was largely involved in some drug smuggling operation or something.... :rolleyes:

This doesn't even merit a response.

Retard Man IQ-Of-1wanna know why the lewinski thing isnt a big deal??? it doesnt matter in politics at all!!!! george bush being a friggin retard does!!!! his IQ is 91 for crying out loud!!!! So committing perjury means absolutely nothing, but having a low IQ does?

:rolleyes:

How the hell do you know George Bush's IQ, anyway? Did Al Franken tell you George Bush was legally retarded?

Retard Man IQ-Of-1dont even say that he got better SAT scores than gore because bush was a member of the skulls and bones which is a secret fraternity which easily could have "helped him out" a little bit.

Stop talking, okay? Just stop. You're digging yourself a hole that you won't be able to climb out of.

Retard Man IQ-Of-1also in the constitution it says everyone is garunteed the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.... how do you expect people on welfare to do this if they have to work so much just to get the BARE BARE minimum for their family??? crimson, you being a "constitutionalist" youd have thought you would know that.

That's the Declaration of Independence, asshole.

People on welfare should not have a family they cannot support, nor should they even be on welfare in the first place. Look to yourself or your fellow men for help in financial situations, not the government.

Retard Man IQ-Of-1also as far as i am concerned saddam was not any threat at all to us, it was osama we should have gone after, not saddam. we had NO intelligence that saddam was funding attacks or planning them in any way.... as for the american money thing i dont know that is a little suspicious, but you cant just say he is funding terror just because he is a cranky old dictator (even

though it is a perfectly reasonable assumption)  
Thank you Al Gore :rolleyes:.

Iraq harbored terrorists. Iraq had a terrorist training camp located in northern Iraq. That training camp had a 777 jet (forgot the exact model of the airplane) used for training terrorists to hijack an airliner. Saddam Hussein let all of this happen. He knew all about it. He was definitely a threat.

Retard Man IQ-Of-1 with all that aside, i am very happy saddam has been captured but am still furious of the hypocrisy about this whole war thing. he says we are getting money from the tax cuts when we are losing billions of dollars because of this stupid war!!!! iraq is a third world country, africa is a third world continent, why aren't we helping them??? face it, bush is not a good man in the slightest, he is a callow, deceiving, rat bastard who will do anything to help out his buddies in the big corporations.

Bullshit you're happy! How the hell do you get rid of a brutal dictator that refuses to reason? You take him out militarily.

Face it, you are a retard who doesn't know what the hell he's talking about.

In response to the rest of your post, you don't know jack shit about the stock market.

Holy fucking shit, was that long!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 07 Mar 2004 09:36:50 GMT

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

---

I agree. He doesn't know a damned thing about the stock market. Just remember that I worked at Charles Schwab for 3 years and I spoke to traders all day, every day. Do NOT take me on in this area unless your experience outweighs mine. Sorry, but that has to be said.

Llama Man, you are nothing but a conspiracy theorist who eats everything CNN feeds him. You really don't belong in this argument because your intellect is far inferior to anyone else who posts in here. (Not counting your split personalities of course)

Quote:also in the constitution it says everyone is guaranteed the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.... how do you expect people on welfare to do this if they have to work so much just to get the BARE BARE minimum for their family??? crimson, you being a "constitutionalist" you'd have thought you would know that.

First off, it wasn't the Constitution that said this.

Second, tell me where this isn't being fulfilled.

Life: These people are alive.

Liberty: They are free. Freedom of speech, etc... people who are poor do not lose any liberties granted to them by the Bill of Rights.

Pursuit of Happiness: Since when was money equal to happiness? There are people who can't pay their bills who are still happy, and there are people who are rich who are not happy. And we don't even guarantee happiness, we just guarantee the right to pursue it.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 07 Mar 2004 18:49:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Absolutely right. It's the right to pursue happiness, not the right to have it given to them .

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 08 Mar 2004 00:58:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

CrimsonThe fact that you actually believe what you are saying astounds me. All the time you hear about the "dot com bubble" popping. The "dot com bubble" clearly popped in March of 2000. Once the NASDAQ saw 5000, that was pretty much the end of it.

Oh no, here we go with the "Blame Clinton for the bad stuff, take away credit for the good stuff" ...stuff.

CrimsonWhy are you so against privatizing Social Security?

Because Bush gives money back to people and makes it so they can't let the government hold on to it, then stupid people lose their retirement on bad investments and go on welfare, which you so radically hate.

Crimson If it's privatized, we win.

"We" as in "Not stupid and/or unlucky people".

CrimsonPrivatizing SS makes sure that everyone gets their share, plus they can make more money on the market.

Not everyone wins on the market. Keeping SS with the government keeps homeless people off of the street.

CrimsonRight now, they can take our SS and piss it away (which they do) and it's really a giant Ponzi scheme.

Actually, now the government takes what you put in for Social Security and uses that money to

pay for the social security of the people who get it now. It's going to be a HUGE problem when the baby boomers go into retirement and social security goes Up Up Up.

CrimsonDefending the US is one of the 17 functions that the Constitution grants the federal government. Regardless of your opinion about whether we should have gone to war. Therefore your argument here is moot.

Oh, I meant to type 50 billion instead of 500, but no one really knows how much it costs because ITS NOT INCLUDED IN BUSH'S 2004 BUDGET!

CrimsonAnd would you feel that way if it were your money being taxed? HONESTLY?

If it's necessary to keep the country running well, than yes. HONESTLY.

---

Let's talk about the government only needing 750 billion a year to run. You know what the government spends per year on the military? About 450 billion dollars. How much per year does the government spend on the national debt? Well, the whole debt service gets about 383 billion a year, and about 95% of that goes towards paying interest on the national debt. So far that's over 800 billion dollars. And you want to cut taxes? That's pretty much one of the last things that we should do.

--

CrimsonThe only figures I could find were around \$600 billion over the next 10 years.

And that's a good thing? See above.

CrimsonWell, you're wrong. That extra money doesn't go into a mattress. It goes to the stock market. It goes into people's retirement accounts (heck, \$2000 is just about an entire allowed IRA contribution for a year)... goes into the cash registers at department stores, electronics stores, grocery stores. If I grab a new DVD player off the shelf, someone had to design that DVD player. Someone had to build that DVD player. Someone had to sell the DVD player to the store. Someone had to drive the truck to bring the DVD player to the store. Someone had to put it on the shelf. Someone had to ring up my purchase. I had to pay sales tax on that purchase.

So everyone buying some entertainment item is better than using the money to pay off the national debt? 7 trillion dollars doesn't just vanish.

Crimson]On the most basic level of speaking, if people have more money, they will buy more stuff. To say otherwise is ignorant.

Guess who buys the most stuff with money? The poor. But god damn, we better not give THOSE

losers any money!

CrimsonDo you really, truly, honestly believe that if Clinton was that close to so many shady dealings that he didn't have anything to do with ANY of them?

Ooh, like how he was soooo close to Whitewater? Read the part where I talked about your poster in full, probably 14 or so pages back.

CrimsonYeah, let's just shrug off our President lying to the entire world on national television and then being proved wrong.

I think the Clinton/Lewinsky thing was really bad. But what's worse: Lying to the American people about personal affairs, or lying to the American people about going to war and the environment? Take a minute on that one.

CrimsonYes, because they want to influence you to believe what they believe. Unfortunately, you are.

Yes, I too see how incredibly obvious it is that I get EVERYTHING from the media. However, one way to make the media more truthful is cross-reference stories. If there are too many holes, you can tell something's up. But again, I don't learn everything from the media.

CrimsonI think Gore is dumb for making that claim, too.

I don't think he was dumb for making that claim. If anything, he was dumb for saying something the right could distort into something that makes people think he's a lying monster.

CrimsonSaddam was found with \$750,000 in American money. What's a lonely old dictator doing with that much American money if he's not funding terrorists?

What the crap? Maybe he was using that money to buy things like food or stuff. But since he was being hunted by the armed forces, it's obvious the first thing on his mind was to give money to terrorists from down in a hole.

CrimsonBefore you say that, read the link below on the fallacies in science.

That means you shouldn't always believe unfounded science.

Oops, dinner calls. I'm going to come back in an hour or so and edit this post. Please pardon the discomfort.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Mon, 08 Mar 2004 03:07:29 GMT

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

---

hydra- you know whats really getting old???? you saying "ehhh im a stuck up asshole sixteen

year old, did you pull that out of your ass retard man iq of 1?? ehhh... its unfortunate i contribute less than that freak retard man who has .... ehhh.... eh..... you pull that out of your ass.... you crapped that out didnt you..... ehhhhhhhhh!!!!!!" honestly your starting to make me angry. in response to your post about your eight year old cousin.

Firstly, he is unfortunate to have such an asshole for a cousin.

Secondly, since you are so determined that i have split personalities, maybe i am your cousin.....

I AM SORRY ABOUT THE STOCK MARKET LIKE I SAID I AM NOT WELL LEARNED IN THAT FIELD, BUT I TRIED MY BEST. I AM OPENLY ADMITTING WHEN IT COMES TO THAT TOPIC CRIMSON IS MUCH MUCH MUCH SMARTER.

:oops: :oops:

well, now that i have fed your egos i will .... give it laxatives.... in a manner of speaking.... or at least thing i am

why do they call it the war on iraq when we are trying to liberate it, i thought saddam was what we were trying to fix not the whole damn country

also, saying that we would have wasted the money that we already wasted on the war is stupid. it might be true for all i know but even if we did "waste it" it would help a lot more people for a lot longer of a time. im not saying welfare taxes are the greatest thing in the world (actually ift might seem like it but there goes the split personality again her huh! ((that was laughing)) ) i understand where you are coming from about people having welfare as a career basically, maybe that is why clinton pretty much got rid of it during his term.

as for the drug smuggling thing (im not sure if that was it, but it was something equally scandalous, i will try to find a link or reference)

i would like to reiterate this (even though it is futile because i basically made fun of myself using this) but i am not schizophrenic and i do not have split personality disorder. you say i have the same IP but have you checked any of the other IPs i bet they are all different.

i hate to say this, but i am sorry if i offend you horribly. im also sorry i am not that good at typing. but please just because i think or express myself differently than you other guys doesnt mean i am totally worthless, say what you want, but as long as i know that you are respecting my opinion and beliefs i will feel a little bit better about myself.

i would be very grateful for the above, and i will TRY to tone down my posts.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 08 Mar 2004 05:38:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiOh no, here we go with the "Blame Clinton for the bad stuff, take away credit for the good stuff" ...stuff.

Tell me what good Clinton is responsible for. Not what good happened during his term, but what he is directly responsible for. You say the economy grew because of him. What economic policy did Clinton implement and how did that make the economy grow?

If Clinton did all good and no bad during his term, then why did the economy go into recession five months after his term ended?

SuperFlyingEngiBecause Bush gives money back to people and makes it so they can't let the government hold on to it, then stupid people lose their retirement on bad investments and go on welfare, which you so radically hate.

That's why they're called stupid people, because a smart person would put a portion of that money in a savings fund in the bank where it can safely gain interest, and/or invest another portion of that money in USTBs.

SuperFlyingEngi"We" as in "Not stupid and/or unlucky people".

"We win" as in businesses would have to compete with each other and offer cheaper and better services.

If you lose all of your money because of a stupid decision you made, I should not have to pay for it.

SuperFlyingEngiNot everyone wins on the market. Keeping SS with the government keeps homeless people off of the street.

Keeping SS with the government keeps the budget deficit high.

SuperFlyingEngiActually, now the government takes what you put in for Social Security and uses that money to pay for the social security of the people who get it now. It's going to be a HUGE problem when the baby boomers go into retirement and social security goes Up Up Up. Which means Social Security is really just an income redistribution method used by the government to plunder from the successful and give to the lazy.

Give me one good reason why you should not have to pay for your own needs with your own money.

SuperFlyingEngiOh, I meant to type 50 billion instead of 500, but no one really knows how much it costs because ITS NOT INCLUDED IN BUSH'S 2004 BUDGET!

You're mad about a \$50 billion war, which is necessary for our country's self-defense, when over \$400 billion will be spent on medicare, which is just an elaborate and expensive vote-buying scheme to buy the votes of geriatrics, over the next few years?

You need to get your priorities straight.

SuperFlyingEngiIf it's necessary to keep the country running well, than yes. HONESTLY. Too bad it's not running well.

SuperFlyingEngiLet's talk about the government only needing 750 billion a year to run. You know

what the government spends per year on the military? About 450 billion dollars. How much per year does the government spend on the national debt? Well, the whole debt service gets about 383 billion a year, and about 95% of that goes towards paying interest on the national debt. So far that's over 800 billion dollars. And you want to cut taxes? That's pretty much one of the last things that we should do.

\$750 billion would be all that is needed if the government was reduced to its constitutionally mandated size. As of now, the government is exponentially larger than what our forefathers had previously planned for the size to actually be. Granted, some services require more money now than was required when the Constitution was written (we need to spend billions of dollars on our kick-ass military to make sure it stays the best in the world), but programs like welfare and medicare did not even cross the minds of our forefathers.

SuperFlyingEngiAnd that's a good thing? See above.

Yes, it is, because that money is going to be put back into the economy. That money would be given to the people to spend and invest which would make the economy grow bigger.

Tax cuts=larger economy.

SuperFlyingEngiSo everyone buying some entertainment item is better than using the money to pay off the national debt? 7 trillion dollars doesn't just vanish.

Everyone buying an increased amount of goods and services is good for the economy. If the government would stop spending so much damn money, there wouldn't be such a huge national debt.

So the national debt is \$7 trillion now? :rolleyes:  
I'd like to see where you pulled that statistic from.

SuperFlyingEngiGuess who buys the most stuff with money? The poor. But god damn, we better not give THOSE losers any money!

This may be true in your own little world, but in reality, rich people buy the most stuff with money because they actually have money.

Poor people are poor because they keep doing the things that make them poor. You are where you are in life as a result of your own decisions. If you have made bad decisions before in your life, you should look to yourself or your fellow man for help! NOT THE GOVERNMENT!!!! The role of government is to protect the rights of its citizens, not give a free handout to anyone who doesn't want to work! There are plenty of private organizations and charities that would gladly help you if you are in a bad position in your life. Do not look to the government for help unless one of your rights has been infringed.

SuperFlyingEngiOoh, like how he was soooo close to Whitewater? Read the part where I talked about your poster in full, probably 14 or so pages back.

Clinton is guilty as sin and you know it. Just how desperate he was during the Lewinsky investigation should be enough to get anyone to believe he was guilty! He tried to explain the meaning of the word "is" for cryin' out loud!!! How can you defend a man who gets desperate enough to debate the meaning of the word "is?" :rolleyes:

SuperFlyingEngiI think the Clinton/Lewinsky thing was really bad. But what's worse: Lying to the

American people about personal affairs, or lying to the American people about going to war and the environment? Take a minute on that one.

Well, since one lie was under oath in a court of law, which is a felony, and the other "lie" is only a personal conviction you have with no evidence to prove those lies to be lies, which really isn't a lie at all, then I would have to say the first lie is worse simply because the second "lie" is not a lie at all.

SuperFlyingEngiYes, I too see how incredibly obvious it is that I get EVERYTHING from the media. However, one way to make the media more truthful is cross-reference stories. If there are too many holes, you can tell something's up. But again, I don't learn everything from the media. That's good that you don't get all of your news from one source since there is no such thing as a purely objective news source.

SuperFlyingEngiI don't think he was dumb for making that claim. If anything, he was dumb for saying something the right could distort into something that makes people think he's a lying monster.

The "something" that the "right" distorted was the claim that he invented the internet.

So you just said Al Gore was dumb for making that claim.

SuperFlyingEngiWhat the crap? Maybe he was using that money to buy things like food or stuff. But since he was being hunted by the armed forces, it's obvious the first thing on his mind was to give money to terrorists from down in a hole.

:rolleyes:

He was going to use \$750,000 to buy food, riiiiiiiiight.

It never occurred to you that a terrorist group was planning to meet Saddam to pick up the cash while he was in hiding?

SuperFlyingEngiThat means you shouldn't always believe unfounded science.

It also means that a single study doesn't necessarily mean anything until more and more studies and experiments are conducted to support the findings of that study.

Retard Man IQ-Of-1hydra- you know what's really getting old???? you saying "ehhh im a stuck up asshole sixteen year old, did you pull that out of your ass retard man iq of 1?? eh hh... its unfortunate i contribute less than that freak retard man who has .... eh hh.... eh..... you pull that out of your ass.... you crapped that out didnt you..... eh hhhhhhhhh!!!!!!" honestly your starting to make me angry. in response to your post about your eight year old cousin.

Firstly, he is unfortunate to have such an asshole for a cousin.

Secondly, since you are so determined that i have split personalities, maybe i am your cousin..... I haven't accused you of having split personalities. I accused you of having multiple accounts simply for the purpose of spamming under those accounts so this one doesn't get deleted.

Your "response," if you can even call it that, to my post about my eight-year-old cousin is just plain stupid. It shows you completely missed the point of what I said and you have no ability whatsoever to pick up on simple sarcasm.

Retard Man IQ-Of-1why do they call it the war on iraq when we are trying to liberate it, i thought saddam was what we were trying to fix not the whole damn country  
Who the hell cares? It's completely irrelevant to what we are arguing here.

Retard Man IQ-Of-1also, saying that we would have wasted the money that we already wasted on the war is stupid. it might be true for all i know but even if we did "waste it" it would help a lot more people for a lot longer of a time.  
Your inability at forming a cohesive sentence using basic grammar skills astounds me.

Someone tell me what the hell this guy is trying to say.

Retard Man IQ-Of-1im not saying welfare taxes are the greates thing in the world (actually ift might seem like it but there goes the split personality again her huh! ((that was laughing)) )  
i understand where you are coming from about people having welfare as a career basically, maybe that is wy clinton prettty much got rid of it during his term.

:rolleyes:

Are you seriously that uninformed? Clinton proposed major spending increases on welfare, one of the reasons why it costs so damn much right now.

Clinton did anything BUT get rid of welfare.

Retard Man IQ-Of-1as for the drug smuggling thing (im not sure if that was it, but it was something equally scandalous, i will try to find a link or reference)

Retard Man IQ-Of-1i hate to say this, but i am sorry if i offend you horribly. im also sorry i am not that good at typing. but please just because i think or express myself differently than you other guys doesnt mean i am totally worthless, say what you want, but as long as i know that you are respecting my opinion and beliefs i will feel a little bit better about myself.

There's an easy way to fix the typing thing. It's called proofreading. Before you make a post, proofread it first and make sure it makes sense. We don't mind that you have an opinion different from ours, it's that you don't take the time to read your own posts before posting them to make sure they make sense. The reason why I call you retarded is because you make posts that look like they were written by a monkey hitting random keys because he liked the color of the keyboard. None of your posts ever have a single thought that is clearly expressed; you always smash a bunch of random thoughts together in the form of one long, run-on sentence. You rarely, if ever, use punctuation of any kind, so we cannot even begin to understand your post because it just does not make any sense.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 08 Mar 2004 08:24:49 GMT

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

---

And why would Saddam buy food with American money. Surely Iraqi food is bought with Iraqi money. :rolleyes: I didn't know they used American dollars in Iraq.

I seriously doubt that many companies, if any, would allow you to throw your SS money on tech stocks and high-risk mutual funds. I know if I were in charge, I'd restrict the types of investments one can make. Safe investments like treasury bills, low-risk diversified mutual funds (diversified between US and foreign markets, too). Something that gets moderate gains with minimal risk.

And before you disagree that SS is a Ponzi scheme, I invite you to look at the definition of a Ponzi scheme:

n.  
An investment swindle in which high profits are promised from fictitious sources and early investors are paid off with funds raised from later ones.

The problem is, the workers (us) are supposed to get back what we put in. But, there's overhead for all the workers who deal with SS and keep the books. But you're supposed to get back what you put in. So in order to make sure you get that money, they take money from those who are currently working to pay you, expecting to pay those people back with money from future generations of workers. That's exactly what a Ponzi scheme is, and we need to break out of it before SS's own debt becomes too large.

---

hydraSo the national debt is \$7 trillion now?  
I'd like to see where you pulled that statistic from.

Unfortunately, this is the right figure.

<http://www.publicdebt.treas.gov/opd/opdpenny.htm>

Current	Amount
03/04/2004	\$7,099,563,768,330.73

---

Other than that, I agree with your rebuttal, hydra.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [hareman](#) on Mon, 08 Mar 2004 20:14:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Are you guys federally subsidized to use the quote button?

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Mon, 08 Mar 2004 21:12:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hydra-

Yes, the forefathers may not have intended for medicare and social security to happen. But your argument about the gov't becoming larger is just plain old dumb. What do you think the department of Homeland Security is? It was just something created to take jobs away from the FBI.

Also, tax cuts may better the economy if you spend the money that is actually a good point. But if you think about it in the long run, tax cuts are definitely NOT good for the economy. Because the government loses sooooo much money from these cuts they cannot supply basic needs for everyone else (social security, welfare, medicare.) This in turn destroys any system of medicare or social security because the government would either

A) Have to take back the tax cuts (which would make a lot of people angry.)

B) Have to repeal all the programs (which would make even more people angry.)

Basically, in the long run, tax cuts will come back to bite the American people in the ass.

Also, you said if you do not have money you should look to your fellow man . . . so is the government not considered your fellow man?

Another thing about tax cuts, notice Bush is doing another one, conveniently right before the next election and right after this whole AWOL business. Could it be he is trying to take attention away from this? Bill Clinton did the same thing concerning Monica Lewinski, you may say which is entirely true, but at the same time that affair affected the American people in no way (unless you count all of the SNL skits which were pretty damn funny)!

Basically, what I have been trying to say is that short sightedly tax cuts are great and may appear to be helping the country out a whole bunch, but in the long term they are nothing but scandalous tricks which will come back to bite us in the ass. Hard.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Mon, 08 Mar 2004 23:28:50 GMT

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

---

Oh, Superflyingengl, about you saying that the poor people but the most stuff, I am not completely sure that is right . . . I may be wrong. 2% of the world's population owns something like 90% of the world's assets.

Not that I am trying to prove you wrong or anything but you know . . . just a little tid bit of information.

Hee hee hee, your post was funny, keep it up.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 09 Mar 2004 01:00:12 GMT

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

---

First off, sorry about the absence, but my cable got knocked out by a storm after dinner so I couldn't post another reply.

Now, lets look at some Bush lies:

[http://www.house.gov/appropriations\\_democrats/caughtonfilm.htm](http://www.house.gov/appropriations_democrats/caughtonfilm.htm)

-----

On Medicare: Most every Republican says that Medicare is a success, even people like Mr. Sapphire.

haremanAre you guys federally subsidized to use the quote button?

Yes.

CrimsonAnd why would Saddam buy food with American money. Surely Iraqi food is bought with Iraqi money.

I was using food as a generic term. Who knows what he was doing with that money. I'm not in to the psychology of people. But here comes everyone "Terrorist Terrorist!"

Why privatizing Social Security is bad:

Well, first, with all those retirement investments going in to the stock market, that's a load of trades, right? The Bush administration will pick someone like Payne Weber to do those trades, instantly making several people multi-billionaires. So, these people will get everyone to invest their money in McDonalds or something, inflating the stock's price far higher than it's worth. Then, over the weekend, the stock comes crashing down, and a couple people take everyone's retirement.

hydra1945Tell me what good Clinton is responsible for. Not what good happened during his term, but what he is directly responsible for. You say the economy grew because of him. What economic policy did Clinton implement and how did that make the economy grow?

You want me to name what Clinton did? Do you know what you're talking about? You think these posts right now are big? You can just keep right on coming with your random stuff about how the spontaneous 23 million jobs created under Clinton were the product of Reagan's tax cuts or whatever. Or how, out of the blue, while Clinton was in office, it was obvious that the Republicans were causing violent crime to drop vastly instead of the president.

hydra1945why did the economy go into recession five months after his term ended?

Because Bush is bad. Duh.

hydra1945Keeping SS with the government keeps the budget deficit high.

So does spending more money on the military than the entire rest of the world combined.

hydra1945Which means Social Security is really just an income redistribution method used by the government to plunder from the successful and give to the lazy.

So elderly people are naturally lazy because they have reached their retirement age and put money into social security the whole time?

hydra1945You're mad about a \$50 billion war, which is necessary for our country's self-defense, when over \$400 billion will be spent on medicare, which is just an elaborate and expensive vote-buying scheme to buy the votes of geriatrics, over the next few years?

Again, even Republicans like Mr. Sapphire think medicare is one of the most successful programs in the U.S. Besides, unlike wars, the purpose of medicare is not killing people. It's saving people.

hydra1945Too bad it's not running well.

And you have a solution? Besides give me my money and go away?

hydra1945\$750 billion would be all that is needed if the government was reduced to its constitutionally mandated size. As of now, the government is exponentially larger than what our forefathers had previously planned for the size to actually be. Granted, some services require more money now than was required when the Constitution was written (we need to spend billions of dollars on our kick-ass military to make sure it stays the best in the world), but programs like welfare and medicare did not even cross the minds of our forefathers.

You mean hundreds of billions of dollars to support our military.

So because about 300 years ago the founding fathers didn't think of medicare and welfare means it's a crappy program now? What in the world are you talking about?

hydra1945Tax cuts=larger economy.

You wish. That's called supply-side economics. Created by rich people so they can have more money. The standard comeback for supply-side economics is that during our country when the rich have been taxed less, the economy has been at it's best. What was the marginal tax rate for the top 1% during the Eisenhower administration? 88%.

hydra1945This may be true in your own little world, but in reality, rich people buy the most stuff with money because they actually have money.

Ehrm...if you mean by buying things you mean putting it in the bank....

--

Here's a little something I have to say about welfare:

There's a homeless guy out on the street. he needs a cheeseburger or he's going to die. Pretty much everyone in this situation would buy the man a cheeseburger. But then we get to whether the government should provide that cheeseburger.

Here's another:

You're on a bridge, and someone below you is drowning. You happen to be carrying a rope with you. Do you throw the rope down to him, or not throw the rope because it would get your nice rope all wet?

Before Reagan, there used to be warm places homeless people could go to on a particular cold night. Then Reagan came, and stopped the funding. Months later, he was proud to say that there were far fewer homeless on the streets than there used to be because they had toughed up and got a job. What had actually happened? They died. Also, when my dad used to commute in New York, he passed through Penn station, an open place where people can come and go as they pleased. Before Reagan, there were a few beggars down there. But during his administration, you'd literally be stepping over these people who weren't even bothering to beg, they were just down there to be in a warm place. Also, Reagan cut funding to crazy houses in New York, so all these people who needed medical treatment were suddenly let loose in the streets. It saved New York a load of money, but greatly increased the number of homeless. Until they died, of course.

--

hydra1945Clinton is guilty as sin and you know it.

Wrong.

hydra1945Just how desperate he was during the Lewinsky investigation should be enough to get anyone to believe he was guilty! He tried to explain the meaning of the word "is" for cryin' out loud!!! How can you defend a man who gets desperate enough to debate the meaning of the word "is?"

Ok, let's talk about desperate. How about the Bush administration being desperate to prove that he wasn't AWOL so far that they are releasing dental records. Dental records normally just get released when people die. They released dental records for cryin' out loud!!! How can you defend a man desperate enough to release dental records?

hydra1945and the other "lie" is only a personal conviction you have with no evidence to prove those lies to be lies, which really isn't a lie at all, then I would have to say the first lie is worse simply because the second "lie" is not a lie at all.

Cruise around <http://www.bushwatch.com> and see what you find. And don't give me crap about it

being biased. Nowadays, anything that is anti-bush is biased.

hydra1945The "something" that the "right" distorted was the claim that he invented the internet.

So you just said Al Gore was dumb for making that claim.

You really missed out on what i said. First off, I was being sarcastic. I as pointing out how Republicans used a fairly legitimate claim and distorted it to make Gore look bad.

hydra1945It never occured to you that a terrorist group was planning to meet Saddam to pick up the cash while he was in hiding?

Where'd you pull that one from? Out of your ass?

hydra1945It also means that a single study doesn't necessarily mean anything until more and more studies and experiments are conducted to support the findings of that study.

Yeah, all science is crap. The only thing we can have faith in is UFOs and government cover-ups.

hydra1945So the national debt is \$7 trillion now?  
I'd like to see where you pulled that statistic from.

You don't know much, do you?

NOTE: I am editing this post several times because the quotes aren't working right.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 09 Mar 2004 01:45:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

WTF? I have no idea what is going on with my posts. Every time I edit something, a new post is formed. Crimson, could you please delete the top two renditions of my post? The third one is the final form, although I have no idea what is happening.

Anyway, sorry about that.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 09 Mar 2004 07:26:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

done

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 09 Mar 2004 20:58:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thanks, Crimson. I think my mouse pointer was off and when I thought I was clicking on the edit button I was actually clicking on the quote button, which confounded me greatly.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 21:52:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<http://www.cnn.com/2004/ALLPOLITICS/03/12/fri/index.html>

This ought to clear up any confusion.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 22:12:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Could you please post a video link to that first negative ad Kerry aired on television? I want to see it.

But this is going to be a very negative campaign.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 23:11:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Interestingly enough, all his ads from before the beginning of December are not on his own website. Also, all his blog links to content are dead as well. However, I was able to find a blog entry dated September 5th that blasts Bush by name:

John Kerry blog  
The one person in America who deserves to be laid off...  
Press Release  
September 5, 2003

John Kerry Blasts Bush on August Job Losses

jobless recovery is no recovery at all. George Bush insults every American who has been thrown around. We lost more of the manufacturing jobs that made America strong and more of the states to raise taxes and cut investments in jobs, driving up property taxes on the middle class,

and driving up deficits and debt crowding out investments in jobs, health care, and education.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today that employment declined by 93,000 in August, and the unemployment rate was essentially unchanged at 6.1 percent. Job losses continued in manufacturing and information. The report also provided a look

nearly 1.7 million persons (not seasonally adjusted) were marginally attached to the labor force, 209,000 higher than a year earlier. These individuals wanted and were available to work and had looked for a job sometime in the prior 12 months. They were not counted as unemployed, however, because they did not actively search for work in the 4 weeks pre-ceding the survey. Of the 1.7 million, 503,000 were discouraged workers--persons who were not currently looking for

Posted in In The News | Entry link | | Comments (47)  
By Jon Favreau on September 5, 2003 at 12:15 PM

I challenge YOU to find an attack earlier than this.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 13 Mar 2004 01:53:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'll take your word that this is the earliest attack, but notice that it's not something stupid like Kerry's girlfriend that never happened. Also, did you read it? It's a lot of fun.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 00:08:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Am I the only one that hates a candidate more for every new ad they put on the air? Each ad gets more and more negative... In the Mercer County Executive elections last year, one candidate sunk so low that he was attacking his opponent for being adopted as a child. If you ask me, that's just screwed up.

I think I'm going to make a point out of not watching any ads at all...maybe I'll just change channels whenever one comes on. If anyone wants my vote, they're going to get it based on their credentials, not based on how far below the belt they can hit their opponent.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 00:20:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I agree. Negative ads are just negative, especially stupid ones that don't have anything at all to do with politics, like Jesse Helm's last attack ad against that black guy. It looked like the black guy was going to win in a landslide, but Helms comes out with a RASCIST ad basically saying: "Did you know \_\_\_\_\_ goes to a BLACK CHURCH? Did you know \_\_\_\_\_ is BLACK?..." And Helms won. Negative ads control people who can't think.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 07:27:21 GMT

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

---

-----  
I completely agree with Rush Limbaugh that there is NO PASSION whatsoever out there for Kerry. From all I've read from the Leftists out there, they can only talk about what a horrible president Bush is. They have no real reasons for wanting Kerry in office other than the fact that he's "not Bush".

It's really scary that the media controls public / popular opinion so much. My eyes were opened fairly recently to the horrendous brainwashing on, for example, CNN.com. I used them as my news source for quite a while, though I'd never say I took their text as word. Someone like me with "open eyes" can see how they will pretend to be un-biased and run some pro-Bush story, but they'll always, always end it with some pro-Kerry or anti-Bush rebuttal at the end. To the skimming reader, the thoughts that enter the mind last are generally the ones that stick.

Bearing that in mind, I don't feel that the Bush campaign can make much headway with the American people by bashing Kerry. No one gives a damn about him. He's not Bush, therefore he walks on water to these brainwashed test monkeys. Their focus should NOT include stooping to their level. People need to know that Bush is a straight shooter who will do whatever it takes to protect this nation. People need to understand that the Democrats want to take our money.

Furthermore, I completely agree that this B.S. about this horrible job crisis is completely false. There are new job listings in my profession (web developer) more than ever before and heck, I even HAVE a job in my chosen profession making great money. I don't know where these jobless folks are, because everyone I knew that was laid off when the "dot-com bubble" burst has found a new job by now, and many are better off than they were before.

The point I really wanted to make is that I hope the Republicans will put a huge effort forth to correct the lies and misconceptions being fed to us via the mainstream media. Fighting Kerry is not as important as boasting Bush. They need to realize that Bush is not bad for this country!

-----

The above email is a revision of one that I wrote about my opinions about the Republican strategy.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test



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

---

Your signature defies any form of rational and logical thinking.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Tue, 16 Mar 2004 21:15:22 GMT

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

---

It's spelled "douche bag," douche bag. Lay off the...whatever it is you're smoking. :rolleyes:

How is he not banned yet?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 16 Mar 2004 23:10:53 GMT

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

---

Notice how this guy has posted only in this thread.

Whoever he is, I'd say IP ban this asshole. That account was probably made by someone on the boards and is just used to spam this thread. Yup, an IP ban would be fair.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 16 Mar 2004 23:26:17 GMT

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

---

Banned now.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Wed, 17 Mar 2004 03:51:00 GMT

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

---

Yay! That's one less asshole we have to worry about spamming up the forums! Thank you, Crimson!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 19 Mar 2004 19:16:35 GMT

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

---

Did SuperFlyingLiberal give up?? I have enough material for weeks!

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 20 Mar 2004 00:20:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

did he just say all republicans are catholics? what a fucking bitch, glad he's gone. i for one am a republican but am in no way shape or form a Catholic. I used to be catholic until i switched to a more unrestricting and sensible faith. i continue to be christian, but i don't believe in the restrictions of the catholic church and their practices.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Llama Man 451](#) on Sat, 20 Mar 2004 04:43:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Crimson (I believe it was you or Nuke that said this) well whoever said it . . . I totally agree that voting Kerry into office because he is not Bush is a pretty dumb reason . . . but in all fairness it is the truth. At this point I would rather be told the horrible truth than force fed lies from a moron that cant put sentences together.

Also, Crimson you complained that Democrats are taking our money. What do you think we are paying for right now??? The war in Iraq for nothing which took your tax cuts away and then some. Basically you would have more money in your pocket right now if Gore had been elected.

Another reason that we are losing money from Bush. Bush came out and openly said that he would put a lock box on the social security money. When the budget came out THE NEXT DAY it said that he had taken \$1,000,000,000,000 (one trillion) dollars out of the "lock box." That definately doesn't fall into the "saving money" category.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 20 Mar 2004 14:35:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I havn't been paying attention to the election as I should be, but right now, I still plan on voting Bush. It wouldn't be so bad if Kerry won, even Rush Limbaugh had thoughts on that.

Yeah, we would have more money in our pockets if Gore was elected, but we'd probably be in a more fucked up state if he was. 9/11 more than likely would have happened, and I really don't wanna think about what that dumbass would have done about it. He wouldn't have taken action. Money, or fighting for what's right? What would you want? If there wasn't action done, we would be subject to more terrorist attacks. Bush took action and fighting for what's right, not what Democrats and Gore think is right. And another thing, Gore woulda been the greatest president of them all, because he probably would have given everybody free internet, seeing that he invented it and all. :rolleyes:

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

---

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 21 Mar 2004 02:28:45 GMT

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

---

CrimsonDid SuperFlyingLiberal give up??

No, I've just been grinding away at a BIG school project. And let's steer away from name calling, Crimservative.

CrimsonI have enough material for weeks!

I'm sure there's a good reason for not posting it. Let's see some.

da\_shizhe [Gore] probably would have given everybody free internet, seeing that he invented it and all.

Oh jeez, do I need to repeat myself again? Al Gore did say "I invented the internet". Why? Because he saw the value of ARPANET, and stood behind it with funding. Then he took credit for it. It's what politicians do. Now, some people might disagree with him saying "invented" EHRMCRIMSONEHRM, but it's really not that far off the wall. Not enough for weeks of news agencies attacking him for it and Republicans calling him a "pathological liar".

da\_shiz Bush took action and fighting for what's right

Fighting for what's right like trying to justify attacking Iraq over false evidence like nuclear weapons material coming in to the country from Africa while THE CIA WAS SAYING THE EVIDENCE WAS AN OBVIOUS FORGERY?!?!?

da\_shiz9/11 more than likely would have happened, and I really don't wanna think about what that dumbass would have done about it.

He probably wouldn't have politicized the hell out of it and referenced it in basically everything he said. But then FOX "News" would scream and yell that he didn't care about 9/11 and those lost, but if Gore talked about it all the time, FOX "News" would scream and yell that he was politicizing the lives of those lost in 9/11

Here's something on how much money you're actually saving with Bush, and cruise around the website to look at other things Republicans say about Kerry that aren't true.

<http://blog.johnkerry.com/dbunker/archives/001419.html>

EDIT: I changed some mis-spellings.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 21 Mar 2004 15:33:38 GMT

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

---

yeah...let me go to a biased site and hear propaganda. i'd rather not waste my time going to

kerry's site.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 21 Mar 2004 16:50:13 GMT

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

---

shiz, they must be biased, especially when they get their information from places like THE CENSUS BUREAU!!!

John Kerry's SiteIncome Decrease: \$1,462. Under President Clinton, family income increased \$7,202 from 1992 to 2000. Under President Bush family income has declined \$1,462 from 2000 to 2002. [Source: U.S. Census Bureau]

LOOK!!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 21 Mar 2004 16:59:21 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiOh jeez, do I need to repeat myself again? Al Gore did say "I invented the internet". Why? Because he saw the value of ARPANET, and stood behind it with funding. Then he took credit for it. It's what politicians do. Now, some people might disagree with him saying "invented" EHRMCRIMSONEHRM, but it's really not that far off the wall. Not enough for weeks of news agencies attacking him for it and Republicans calling him a "pathological liar". First of all, no one person invented the internet, so he would be lying if he says, "I invented the internet," because he wouldn't have been the only person working on it.

As said on a previous page of this thread, there is a difference between funding and actually inventing the thing. He may have funded it, but he didn't invent it.

SuperFlyingEngiFighting for what's right like trying to justify attacking Iraq over false evidence like nuclear weapons material coming in to the country from Africa while THE CIA WAS SAYING THE EVIDENCE WAS AN OBVIOUS FORGERY?!?!?

Your boy Clinton went to war with Iraq for nuclear weapons, too. :rolleyes:

da\_shizHe probably wouldn't have politicized the hell out of it and referenced it in basically everything he said. But then FOX "News" would scream and yell that he didn't care about 9/11 and those lost, but if Gore talked about it all the time, FOX "News" would scream and yell that he was politicizing the lives of those lost in 9/11

I like how you talk about what Al Gore "wouldn't" have done when the statement was what he "would" have done. :rolleyes:

SuperFlyingEngiHere's something on how much money you're actually saving with Bush, and cruise around the website to look at other things Republicans say about Kerry that aren't true.

<http://blog.johnkerry.com/dbunker/archives/001419.html>

I like how you put "news" in quotes when referring to Fox News, but you refer to John Kerry's website as a credible source. :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 22 Mar 2004 00:30:01 GMT

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

---

hydra1945First of all, no one person invented the internet, so he would be lying if he says, "I invented the internet," because he wouldn't have been the only person working on it.

As said on a previous page of this thread, there is a difference between funding and actually inventing the thing. He may have funded it, but he didn't invent it.

AIE! He championed a program and took credit for it! It's what politicians do! Even if his choice of words may have been slightly inaccurate, does it really condone calling him a "pathological liar"? He was obviously trying to get Americans to think that he sat in his office late at night and wrote the code that allowed for packet swapping.

hydra1945Your boy Clinton went to war with Iraq for nuclear weapons, too.

Actually, from what I can remember, Clinton bombed a nuclear power plant Iraq had set up.

And there wasn't incorrect evidence that the CIA was currently telling him was a forgery, either.

hydra1945I like how you talk about what Al Gore "wouldn't" have done when the statement was what he "would" have done.

The discussion was what would have happened if Gore was President now.

[quote="hydra1945"]I like how you put "news" in quotes when referring to Fox News, but you refer to John Kerry's website as a credible source.[/quote]

NO! Kerry's website is credible because they get their information from credible sources like the U.S. CENSUS BUREAU!!!! LIKE I ALREADY SAID!!!

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 22 Mar 2004 00:38:25 GMT

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

---

Here's a letter from the Senate Committee on Armed Services to President Bill Clinton on October 9, 1998. It reminds the president of the February resolution authorizing military force if Saddam failed to comply with UN Security Council resolutions "concerning the disclosure and destruction of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction."

The letter concludes: "[W]e urge you, after consulting with Congress, and consistent with the U.S. Constitution and laws, to take necessary actions (including, if appropriate, air and missile strikes on suspect Iraqi sites) to respond effectively to the threat posed by Iraq's refusal to end its weapons of mass destruction programs." Along those who signed are the following Senate Democrats: Levin, Lieberman, Lautenberg, Dodd, Kerrey, Feinstein, Mikulski, Daschle, Breaux, Johnson, Inouye, Landrieu, Ford and Kerry.

I guess this letter has to be a forgery - either that or the senators who signed the letter must be lying because Clinton wanted to bomb Iraq to distract from impeachment. If you liberals are to be consistent on this, that's what you have to say. This letter doesn't leave a grain of doubt (neither do Clinton's speeches from the era, which we've posted here), as to whether or not Saddam had and sought these weapons. Many of these same people are out there mindlessly parroting the mantra that President Bush lied about WMDs, made up intelligence data and dragged the nation into war under false pretenses.

Yet they are on record urging the use of force based on what? The very intelligence data they now say is total B.S. manufactured by the White House! Not one of them called it a fake at the time. In fact, they were ready to go to war because the information on Saddam's weapons scared the quorum out of them. You would not be told this before the EIB Network came along, and started doing the job the mainstream press used to do in the old days. The left thinks they can still get away with burying the past and changing what they believe from one day to the next, because they have all the news sources in their back pocket. But they can't - not anymore, not with us here.

(slightly edited text from an article written by Rush Limbaugh)

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 22 Mar 2004 21:39:47 GMT

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

---

Quote:Actually, from what I can remember, Clinton bombed a nuclear power plant Iraq had set up.

And there wasn't incorrect evidence that the CIA was currently telling him was a forgery, either.

No, but your information source is incorrect...ISRAEL bombed the power plant, not the US. Clinton hit a few SAM sites and ignored anything more serious. It's interesting to note that Clinton's administration recieved the same type of intelligence that Bush did regarding Iraq- to quote Slick Willy himself:

Quote:One way or the other, we are determined to deny Iraq the capacity to develop weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver them. That is our bottom line.-(Feb. 4, 1998)

And his Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright:

Quote:Hussein has...chosen to spend his money on building weapons of mass destruction and palaces for his cronies.-(Nov. 10, 1999)

Sound familiar? This wasn't cooked up by Bush in an attempt to grab publicity, it was valid intelligence that was available to the previous administration (and the one before that, as well). Oh wait, but there's more...much more. In case you missed it, that letter Crimson posted was signed by Presidential hopeful and bleeding heart "I was duped by Bush" anti-war campaigner John Kerry. Fool him once, shame on him. Fool him twice, shame on Bush? I don't think so.

This was very, very close to the end of Clinton's eight year double term. How likely do you think it is that Saddam, having numerous banned weapons reported by intelligence(which, by all logic, MUST be valid, since it wasn't collected under Bush :rolleyes: ), would have disarmed the moment Bush entered office? Or even when he published his "report" of what had been disarmed?

I don't need to remind you that paper is no substitute for visual evidence; if it would not be accepted at a trial in court, it should not be accepted by the world- if Saddam truly disarmed, why in the name of all things unholy would he have hidden the evidence of his compliance? Please, PLEASE don't tell me you're that naive. It doesn't take a four digit IQ to figure out that he was hiding something...key word here is HIDING! As in, NOT MEANT TO BE FOUND! Given the vast area he had to hide whatever he had in, and the possible size of the hidden weapons, it could take decades to turn anything up...yet people like you are willing to say there's no possibility of anything being found after only ONE year. How long did it take to find Saddam himself, hiding in that little hole? And he was right under our damn noses, too! If you have 100% absolute, rock-solid, factual evidence, with no room for doubt, that says there is nowhere left to hide something in Iraq, please present it now. Otherwise, it is logical to assume that something still might be found. After all, it wouldn't be a search if we knew where to look, would it?

Just a follow-up on WMD's made from legal substances, sometimes probable cause can be more than enough to justify the seizure of those materials. Say a man who lives in the suburbs purchases a van, six barrels' worth of fertilizer, 100' of fuse, and a zippo lighter. He puts all of the above in the back of said van. Now, this may be perfectly legal to own, but what in the name of bloody hell do you THINK he's gonna do with it, when he has no farmland and no practical use for fuse? That may be exaggerated, but the same applies in Iraq- if you find multiple 50-gallon drums of chemicals(which they HAVE found...imagine what they HAVEN'T), mostly pesticides that are deadly nerve agents, for use on crops, in an area with almost no viable farmland, few types of insects that eat those crops, and a dictator who thinks he should rule the entire region, do you REALLY think those chemicals will be used to kill insects?

I truly wish people would use their logic for once...

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 22 Mar 2004 21:51:50 GMT

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

---

Yes, my dad gave me this analogy which works well...

Imagine that I have a sparsely populated land mass the size of California at my disposal. I have buried a treasure chest somewhere on this land. Not only will I not give you a map, but I will also send suicide bombers after you, booby traps, and have most of my troops trained to mislead you.

Tell me how long it will take you to find that treasure chest.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 22 Mar 2004 22:49:26 GMT

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

---

I'm reminded of a line out of "Crimson Tide" (that movie with Denzel Washington and Gene Hackman, not Crimson ): "You don't put a condom on unless you're gonna fuck!"

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 01:59:36 GMT

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

---

Have any of you seen Richard Clarke on the enws these past couple of days?

Well, it's a lot of fun.

And Dick Cheney had the nerve to come out today and say that Richard Clarke was never really "in the loop." Well, actually Clarke was the loop. He's been the chief guy on counter-terrorism for 20 years and four presidencies. So he's not some disgruntled former employee. Which is what Republicans want you to think.

Also, FOX "News" screwed up BIG time. On the front page of their website yesterday, they had an exclusive transcript of a background interview with Richard Clarke from 2002.

Now, background briefings are where reporters go to talk to people completely off the record. People are willing to say different things when they are off the record, but reporters are in no way allowed to quote anyone or anything like that.

And FOX goes and records the conversation and posts a transcript on their website. Don't be surprised if FOX reporters aren't allowed anywhere important in the future.

hydra1945(which they HAVE found...imagine what they HAVEN'T)

On finding things...you mean like when they find mysterious white powder in an Iraq factory, FOX hypes it up as the WMDs, and then it turns out that it is in fact a box of Tide?

Crimson: That analogy would work if intelligence didn't exist.

Crimson Clinton wanted to bomb Iraq to distract from impeachment.

No he didn't. Republicans were assaulting him every day with things and it's no wonder that Clinton did important actions the same day as something else with one of their random scandals. [Like Whitewater, which was just cooked-up trash.] I already said this. Please don't refuse to learn.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2004 18:27:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Fox news did NOT violate the rules. The reporter ASKED the White House if he could reveal the tape and the White House said that he could (I mean, why wouldn't they?) Clarke as a former employee had no say in the release of his own words spoken in a professional context.

I love you libs. I really do. Instead of focusing on the fact that Clarke is a BIG FAT LIAR, you'd rather talk about how you THINK Fox news wasn't allowed to reveal that it was Clarke on that tape.

And the meaning of Cheney saying Clarke wasn't "in the loop" is because he moved to Cyber defense very shortly after Bush took over.

Interview with Dick Cheney on March 22Q All right, let's get straight to what the news is all about now, before we branch out to things. Why did the administration keep Richard Clarke on the counterterrorism team when you all assumed office in January of 2001?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, I wasn't directly involved in that decision. He was moved out of the counterterrorism business over to the cyber security side of things, that is he was given a new assignment at some point here. I don't recall the exact time frame.

Q Cyber security, meaning Internet security?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Yes, worried about attacks on the computer systems and the sophisticated information technology systems we have these days that an adversary would use or try to the system against us.

Q Well, now that explains a lot, that answer right there explains -- (Laughter.)

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Well, he wasn't -- he wasn't in the loop, frankly, on a lot of this stuff. And I saw part of his interview last night, and he wasn't --

Q He was demoted.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: It was as though he clearly missed a lot of what was going on. For example, just three weeks after the -- after we got here, there was communication, for example, with the President of Pakistan, laying out our concerns about Afghanistan and al Qaeda, and the importance of going after the Taliban and getting them to end their support for the al Qaeda. This was, say, within three weeks of our arrival here.

So I guess, the other thing I would say about Dick Clarke is that he was here throughout those eight years, going back to 1993, and the first attack on the World Trade Center; and '98, when the embassies were hit in East Africa; in 2000, when the USS Cole was hit. And the question that ought to be asked is, what were they doing in those days when he was in charge of counterterrorism efforts?

Q Well, the media finally has what it wants -- I'm talking about the partisan media has what it

wants. It's got an independent contractor, a man whose worked for both administrations, now launching full barrels at the President. And one of the claims that Clarke is making is that -- and you just countered it -- he said the President didn't treat al Qaeda as a serious threat before September 11th. He keeps harping on the fact that even before your administration assumed office, you guys wanted to go in and level Iraq.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Yes, that's -- again, that's just not the case. The fact is, what the President did not want to do is to have an ineffective response with respect to al Qaeda. And we felt that up until that point that much of what had been done vis-a-vis al Qaeda had been totally ineffective: some cruise missiles fired at some training camps in Afghanistan that basically didn't hit anything. And it made the U.S. look weak and ineffective. And he wanted a far more effective policy for trying to deal with that. And that process was in motion throughout the spring.

And yes, that analogy DOES work. Intelligence exists mostly in informants who take a bribe to tell secrets. Informants don't always tell the truth. Overall, you're still looking at a huge open desert the size of California, and it hasn't all been searched yet.

I think you're the one who's refusing to learn. Why don't you take a page out of Zell Miller's book? He's a Democrat and he sees firsthand how desperate the Left is getting in order to try and gain back their seat in the Oval Office. He sees firsthand that the Democratic party in general is no longer embracing the values they used to.

You arguments are weak and easily countered. If you honestly think that Clinton did anything against terrorism, then you are even more misguided than I thought. Even the Democrats are letting Clinton take some hits and admitting he didn't do the best job in the hopes that Bush will take some hits too. They have stopped attacking his weaknesses and are now going after his strengths. They'll fail there, too.

There's no shame in being wrong from time to time. Why can't you admit that?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 27 Mar 2004 04:21:54 GMT

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

---

Clarke - the big fat liar.

I wonder why he was the chief guy on counterterrorism for four presidencies...probably because presidents like people who lie.

So Clarke was speaking in a professional context...even though he never expected his words to be released. Again, it wouldn't be a far cry to see FOX reporters lose a lot of their positions in big places.

Yeah, Clarke is obviously just carrying on, even though the presidential administration wouldn't give any thought to his al Qaeda plan before 9/11. His plane finally got forwarded to an executive committee of people including Cheney to ratify the plan and send it the President on SEPTEMBER 4TH! The Clintons left office telling Bush that the one thing he MUST do is roll up

Osama.

Did you watch Clarke on TV?

Argh, I saw Zell Miller on Hannity and Colmes and he makes me so angry. For one, he said stupid stuff like Kerry voting to raise taxes 350 times, which is entirely false.

<http://slate.msn.com/id/2097656/>

It's one of those Republican things were they get something and just keep saying it and saying it and saying it and saying it and saying it until people start to believe it.

And it's hard for an average person to judge what the government is doing for intelligence, because it's rather secret stuff. However, it is more than informants. You can have people skulking around Qaeda homes using laser mics to pick up conversations through windows.

[Laser mics really work - they detect tiny vibrations in glass to determine what sound waves are bounding around the room on the other side, and in turn produce working audio from inside the room. Cool stuff, I wish I had one.]

CrimsonYou arguments are weak and easily countered.

Which is why you leave things hanging, like those 20+ Bush lies I posted in one of these threads that you never came back on?

CrimsonEven the Democrats are letting Clinton take some hits and admitting he didn't do the best job in the hopes that Bush will take some hits too.

So Richard Clarke is secretly a Democratic Liberal Communist plant who hates everything conservative and is in the liberal's pocket? Well, actually no.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 27 Mar 2004 06:52:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

20 Bush lies...hmm, let's see if we can dig that up! Looking...looking...DING!

Quote:Lookie! 29 lies about Saddam and weapons of mass destruction!

Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction.

Dick Cheney  
Speech to VFW National Convention  
August 26, 2002

Prove it false.

Quote:Right now, Iraq is expanding and improving facilities that were used for the production of biological weapons.

George W. Bush  
Speech to UN General Assembly  
September 12, 2002

Unknown, possibly false.

Quote:If he declares he has none, then we will know that Saddam Hussein is once again misleading the world.

Ari Fleischer  
Press Briefing  
December 2, 2002

Can you prove it false?

Quote:We know for a fact that there are weapons there.

Ari Fleischer  
Press Briefing  
January 9, 2003

Prove otherwise please...

Quote:Our intelligence officials estimate that Saddam Hussein had the materials to produce as much as 500 tons of sarin, mustard and VX nerve agent.

George W. Bush  
State of the Union Address  
January 28, 2003

Unknown, since the public does not have access to all the intelligence yet.

Quote:We know that Saddam Hussein is determined to keep his weapons of mass destruction, is determined to make more.

Colin Powell  
Remarks to UN Security Council  
February 5, 2003

Saddam's intent is something of a mystery, but Powell should not have made that assumption.

Quote:We have sources that tell us that Saddam Hussein recently authorized Iraqi field commanders to use chemical weapons -- the very weapons the dictator tells us he does not have.

George W. Bush

Radio Address  
February 8, 2003

Once again, please produce some hard evidence why this is a lie.

Quote:If Iraq had disarmed itself, gotten rid of its weapons of mass destruction over the past 12 years, or over the last several months since (UN Resolution) 1441 was enacted, we would not be facing the crisis that we now have before us . . . But the suggestion that we are doing this because we want to go to every country in the Middle East and rearrange all of its pieces is not correct.

Colin Powell  
Interview with Radio France International  
February 28, 2003

Hrm...not sure here; from one of my "sources," I hear that there were a few more reasons beyond toppling Saddam and WMD's...none involved oil, but there were more. In part, the war served as a message to other countries in the region- "clean up your damn act and stop harboring terrorists, or you're next," could be one way of putting it. A very non-diplomatic way of getting a point across, but if you looked at nations known to support terrorism, they've already begun to get their asses in gear, so to speak. It could be said that we are giving them an ultimatum, and allowing them to "re-arrange their pieces" by themselves. While this is not classified data in any way, the person I got it from would not like it very much if I gave you his name, so you should take that with a grain of salt if you don't believe me.

Quote:So has the strategic decision been made to disarm Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction by the leadership in Baghdad? . . . I think our judgment has to be clearly not.

Colin Powell  
Remarks to UN Security Council  
March 7, 2003

Let's put it this way: would you rather have left Iraq alone and waited for Saddam to make the first move?

Quote:Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised.

George W. Bush  
Address to the Nation  
March 17, 2003

Prove it false. You don't know what the intelligence was; odds are nobody will ever have the whole story. It cannot be proven either way until the whole of Iraq has been searched.

Quote:Well, there is no question that we have evidence and information that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction, biological and chemical particularly . . . all this will be made clear in the course of the operation, for whatever duration it takes.

Ari Fleisher  
Press Briefing  
March 21, 2003

You know about the 50-gallon drums containing chemicals that could be used as nerve agents...since you seem to question Saddam's intent to use those as weapons, let me point out that Saddam once tried to build a giant cannon out of perfectly legal pipe segments. If completed, it could have hit Tel Aviv and beyond. If you can make a weapon out of legal materials at lower risk, and still maintain the effectiveness of the weapon, why would you advertize use of illegal materials instead?

I say that quote is not a lie, but a statement of common goddamn sense.

Quote:There is no doubt that the regime of Saddam Hussein possesses weapons of mass destruction. And . . . as this operation continues, those weapons will be identified, found, along with the people who have produced them and who guard them.

Gen. Tommy Franks  
Press Conference  
March 22, 2003

Here we go again...let's see some concrete evidence why this is false. You have yet to produce any.

Quote:I have no doubt we're going to find big stores of weapons of mass destruction.

Defense Policy Board member Kenneth Adelman  
Washington Post, p. A27  
March 23, 2003

That looks like an opinion to me, not a statement of truth or falsehood. Plus, it cannot be proven until Iraq has been fully searched.

Quote:One of our top objectives is to find and destroy the WMD. There are a number of sites.

Pentagon Spokeswoman Victoria Clark  
Press Briefing  
March 22, 2003

Reword that: There are a number of sites that could have been moved or hidden. You can't prove it false.

Quote:We know where they are. They're in the area around Tikrit and Baghdad and east, west, south and north somewhat.

Donald Rumsfeld  
ABC Interview

March 30, 2003

Rummy may have gotten a little ahead of himself, and waited for confirmation before stating something like that on TV. For all we know, that statement could have been the reason why we didn't find anything in those areas (Saddam watched the news, in case you weren't aware of that).

Quote:Obviously the administration intends to publicize all the weapons of mass destruction U.S. forces find -- and there will be plenty.

Neocon scholar Robert Kagan  
Washington Post op-ed  
April 9, 2003

Does not give a date or a specific location; cannot be proven false yet.

Quote:But make no mistake -- as I said earlier -- we have high confidence that they have weapons of mass destruction. That is what this war was about and it is about. And we have high confidence it will be found.

Ari Fleischer  
Press Briefing  
April 10, 2003

"High confidence" does not constitute a statement intended to be taken as the truth. Cannot be a lie if it is given as an opinion.

Quote:We are learning more as we interrogate or have discussions with Iraqi scientists and people within the Iraqi structure, that perhaps he destroyed some, perhaps he dispersed some. And so we will find them.

George W. Bush  
NBC Interview  
April 24, 2003

Cannot be proven; we haven't searched the whole county yet. However, the statement is mostly true; that is the kind of information that was being gained from interrogations. That was one of the primary reasons to interrogate anyone in the first place.

Quote:There are people who in large measure have information that we need . . . so that we can track down the weapons of mass destruction in that country.

Donald Rumsfeld  
Press Briefing  
April 25, 2003

How is this a lie? Would you say that no one knows where the WMD's are or what happened to them? Someone knows. Truth.

Quote:We'll find them. It'll be a matter of time to do so.

George W. Bush  
Remarks to Reporters  
May 3, 2003

Again, impossible to prove either way until all of Iraq has been searched.

Quote:I'm absolutely sure that there are weapons of mass destruction there and the evidence will be forthcoming. We're just getting it just now.

Colin Powell  
Remarks to Reporters  
May 4, 2003

Stated as an opinion; that reflects personal beliefs, not an attempt to impress a belief upon someone else, and thus not a lie.

Quote:We never believed that we'd just tumble over weapons of mass destruction in that country.

Donald Rumsfeld  
Fox News Interview  
May 4, 2003

POSSIBLE lie. I think there were some people in the administration who thought that WMD's would be easy to locate, but it's really impossible to prove, since you can't read the thoughts of every last person in the executive branch.

Quote:I'm not surprised if we begin to uncover the weapons program of Saddam Hussein -- because he had a weapons program.

George W. Bush  
Remarks to Reporters  
May 6, 2003

Again, an opinion. See the "I'm not surprised" (probably meant to be "I wouldn't be surprised," from the context), which marks it as the President's opinion, not truth or lie.

Quote:U.S. officials never expected that "we were going to open garages and find" weapons of mass destruction.

Condoleeza Rice  
Reuters Interview  
May 12, 2003

Again, possibly false, but really impossible to prove without knowing what said US officials were thinking.

Quote:I just don't know whether it was all destroyed years ago -- I mean, there's no question that there were chemical weapons years ago -- whether they were destroyed right before the war, (or) whether they're still hidden.

Maj. Gen. David Petraeus, Commander 101st Airborne  
Press Briefing  
May 13, 2003

You must be desperate to use that. It has been proven without any shadow of a doubt that Saddam has used chemical weapons before. The rest is a statement of personal uncertainty.

Quote:Before the war, there's no doubt in my mind that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, biological and chemical. I expected them to be found. I still expect them to be found.

Gen. Michael Hagee, Commandant of the Marine Corps  
Interview with Reporters  
May 21, 2003

That's another personal view, not a statement of what the American people are meant to believe.

Quote:Given time, given the number of prisoners now that we're interrogating, I'm confident that we're going to find weapons of mass destruction.

Gen. Richard Myers, Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff  
NBC Today Show interview  
May 26, 2003

This is simply pathetic. Can you find ANYTHING that can be proven to be a lie, that is NOT a personal goddamn opinion? Opinions are not lies, they are personal views which may or may not be AFFECTED by truth or lies! Get your statements straight!

Quote:They may have had time to destroy them, and I don't know the answer.

Donald Rumsfeld  
Remarks to the Council on Foreign Relations  
May 27, 2003

Maybe he didn't know the answer. Can you prove he did?

Quote:For bureaucratic reasons, we settled on one issue, weapons of mass destruction (as justification for invading Iraq) because it was the one reason everyone could agree on.

Paul Wolfowitz  
Vanity Fair interview  
May 28, 2003

Very likely the truth. The Government has to choose a reason to give the American people, one

which will make them support the war and not oppose it. There were other reasons, but that's the one they chose to wave on the propaganda flyers. The same thing has happened in every war in the past...Vietnam and Korea had "fighting Communist aggression" as their theme, which was part of the reason for both wars, but not all of it. Since it has not yet been proven that there were no WMD's in Iraq, it cannot yet be called a false justification.

uncovered weapons, as you say, in some of the forward dispersal sites. Believe me, it's not for lack of trying. We've been to virtually every ammunition supply point between the Kuwaiti border and Baghdad, but they're simply not there.

Lt. Gen. James Conway, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force  
Press Interview  
May 30, 2003

Interesting that you would list this as a lie, since it is a statement that agrees with your viewpoint. Oh well. Once again, I point out that not every place in Iraq has been searched.

Quote:Do I think we're going to find something? Yeah, I kind of do, because I think there's a lot of information out there."

Maj. Gen. Keith Dayton, Defense Intelligence Agency  
Press Conference  
May 30, 2003

Stop offering up people's opinions as examples of lies. Opinions are not lies; only the data behind those opinions can be proven false. Which it has not been yet!

You still have yet to provide any conclusive, concrete evidence that there were/are no WMD's in Iraq. I eagerly await such evidence, because it would finally bring some justification to your continued use of that argument.

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 27 Mar 2004 14:42:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

So, prove all of these false? If they had been right, FOX "News" would have been screaming their heads off all this time. These people just say that they know everything is their without showing anyone anything. It's impossible to prove that something is not there. But it's pretty obvious when after as long as we have been in Iraq nothing has surfaced.

On that last one - a Major General would probably know a fair bit about information pertaining to Weapons of Mass Destruction, so him saying that all of this evidence is out there would kind of suggest that it actually is.

You can take that one or leave it.

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 04:55:59 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngilf they had been right, FOX "News" would have been screaming their heads off all this time. These people just say that they know everything is their wwithout showing anyone anything.

Would you PLEASE stop putting News in quotes? Fox News is a reliable news source and you know it.

I assume you would think your precious <http://www.bushwatch.org> is sooo much better than Fox News :rolleyes:.

SuperFlyingEngilt's impossible to prove that something is not there. But it's pretty obvious when after as long as we have been in Iraq nothing has surfaced.

Ya know, Iraq is a big place to look for a single 18-wheeler tanker truck (which is all that is needed to store 8500 liters of anthrax agent in its liquid form). Remember those thirty-odd Migs they found buried under the Iraqi desert that we had no idea about? If you can bury a jet fighter, how easy would it be to hide an 18-wheeler tanker truck?

SuperFlyingEngiOn that last one - a Major General would probably know a fair bit about information pertaining to Weapons of Mass Destruction, so him saying that all of this evidence is out there would kind of suggest that it actually is.

You can take that one or leave it.

And what would suggest that there isn't any evidence? What would suggest that the Major General is wrong?

---

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 30 Mar 2004 07:01:32 GMT

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

---

Topic: OT: Political IQ Test

Wow, this is a lot of interest in a simple political IQ test!

---