

---

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 understand 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-1it would sem we care more about iraq than our own country . . . which is strange for republicans . . . once again oil comes into play . . . hmmmmm?????

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-1SADDAM NEEDED TO BE STOPPED

That's the first intelligent thing you have said this whole time.

Retard Man IQ-of-1ok 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 seperate 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!

SuperFlyingEngiA 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?"

---