
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.
