

---

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!

SuperFlyingEngiIt'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. SuperFlyingEngiln 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?

SuperFlyingEngil 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?

SuperFlyingEngiLets 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?

SuperFlyingEngiBennet 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?

SuperFlyingEngiRebecca 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?

SuperFlyingEngiCarmen 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?

SuperFlyingEngiPatricia 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-1with 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.

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!

---