

---

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.

CrimsonYou 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.

---