

---

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" clearly 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.

---