
Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 23:45:01 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

http://photos1.blogger.com/img/227/958/640/approval_alert_graph2.jpg

Hm, seems as if these terror alerts aren't entirely about terrorism...

EDIT - This picture is giving me some trouble properly accessing it, the link might not work, I find that the best way to view it is to copy & paste the link into your browser address bar.

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 13 Aug 2004 23:57:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Uhhhhhhhhhhhhhhhh... I fail to see the relevance between terror alerts and his approval rating. I don't see any jumps around the warnings, nor do I see "suspicious" alerts surrounding important events.

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Sat, 14 Aug 2004 00:00:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So you are saying the more in danger people are the more inclined they are to vote for Bush?

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 14 Aug 2004 02:06:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No, as it seems quite obvious from that chart, whenever Bush's numbers drop, there's a terror alert, a little hop in his ratings, they go down a bit again, terror alert, yadda yadda.

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Sat, 14 Aug 2004 06:43:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's true that it's almost too easy for the Bush administration to issue a terror alert to get some media attention, after which he can hold a speech, which will get him more attention and if he doesn't screw that up too much it will get people to vote for him.

Also, it's pretty much impossible to check whether or not those alerts are actually based on something. I do not want to jump to conclusions, I just want to say it's too easy for him to abuse.

Subject: Terror Alerts
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sat, 14 Aug 2004 06:49:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You've sold me SFE... Here I thought all the terror alerts occurred at once... But according to this new startling data... The Terror alerts happen... over time? It would seem so. I'm gonna do some fact checking first but this may just convert me to your side.

lol

Also heres my own little graphic for you :

I count 15 Terror alerts and at least 26 Approval jumps. I don't see a correlation... That's Half...

As if a man goes to Jewel, then he goes to Cub Foods. You make the assumption that he ONLY shops at Jewel because he went there 50% of the time?

Subject: Terror Alerts
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 14 Aug 2004 13:59:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Doitle, I'm not saying that every time Bush's ratings go down, he calls a terror alert. His approval rising without him using a terror alert is a good sign, but you can see whenever he calls a terror alert, his ratings get a little boost. You can also see that as his popularity lowers, there are more and more alerts.

Subject: Terror Alerts
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 14 Aug 2004 22:47:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And you're saying there are no other possible events that would give a "little boost"?

Subject: Terror Alerts
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 00:52:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Whenever there's a terror alert, his ratings get a small boost. Unless something happens at the same time he calls a terror alert pretty much always, I don't see how terror alerts and rating jumps are unrelated.

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 09:21:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Those triangles span several days... it's hard to pinpoint a true correlation. But I guess the real point is this... why is it a good thing for Bush when the country is in danger, real or fake? Why would Bush get a jump in the polls if a terrorist attack was imminent? Answer me that please.

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 12:22:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

People think that the Bush administration is on top of things and has intelligence about terrorist activity. People feel safer when they think the US is aware of and ready to defend against attacks.

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 15:39:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If I were bulimic and I puked every time I ate something, would you think I just ate something every time I puked?

Some things just aren't cause and effect related..

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 22:14:14 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

These, for the most part, are.

But that's not the point.

The point is is that there seems to be a terror alert whenever Bush's ratings start to fall, and as they get lower and lower, there are more and more terror alerts.

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 15 Aug 2004 23:43:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SEALPeople think that the Bush administration is on top of things and has intelligence about terrorist activity. People feel safer when they think the US is aware of and ready to defend against

attacks.

Do you remember what happened when we thought we were safe? Do you remember when 19 men hijacked 4 planes and took out two of the tallest towers in the world, part of the Pentagon, and were thwarted in one other unknown target?

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 00:42:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And do you remember the overwhelming amount of security emplacements and extra measures taken by the US? People were united. Bush became a man of action, and his approval ratings soared.

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 05:54:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Very good. Now if I give you this theory:

The Democrats questions the alleged "timing" of terror alerts and accuse the Bush Administration of using them for political gain. Now, my conjecture is... the Democrats feel threatened by this because they are weak on defense. They don't like Americans to feel they are in danger because they aren't as strong in handling such threats and responding to them... or preventing them altogether.

Given that theory, how would you argue against it?

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 11:24:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, first, I would ask how the Democrats are weak on defense...

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 16:10:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That is the point of my conjecture. If terror alerts = boost for Bush, is that because Dems are weak on defense? If no, explain why not.

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 16:47:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There's a difference in people believing that the Dems are weak on defence and them actually being it (or not, for that matter). The first, unfortunately, matters in such a case.

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 17:15:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I really don't see any relevance.

-Terror alert is raised.

-America thinks that Government is on the ball, and that they are not just sitting on their thumbs.

-Approval ratings raise because more people gain faith in homeland security dept.

It's that simple.

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 18:13:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So, hypothetically, Kerry wins in November... in March of next year, he raises the terror alert. Would you libs then still say it was for political gain, or that there is a reason for such an alert to occur?

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Mon, 16 Aug 2004 18:25:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Depends on the evidence presented to the public as to why the terror alert was raised. When the terror alert is raised several times with only vague mentions of generic threats, people begin to stop taking the terror alert system seriously. If Kerry treats the terror alert system the same way Bush has (in the eyes of the public), then he will get a similar reaction. I can only speak for myself, but that's at least how I think about it.

Oh, and you don't need to be hypothetical about Kerry winning the next election. It's okay...you can say "when".

Subject: Terror Alerts

Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Tue, 17 Aug 2004 06:36:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CrimsonSo, hypothetically, Kerry wins in November... in March of next year, he raises the terror alert. Would you libs then still say it was for political gain, or that there is a reason for such an alert to occur?

Yes, with a reference to what SEAL said.
