

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 11 Mar 2004 15:40:43 GMT

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

---

What a dumbass.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,113882,00.html>

Already the Democrapts are starting the negitave campaigning and mud slinging. I always felt the one who throws more "mud" is more crooked than the other. I wish the Republicans would be more agresive.

Kerry's comments are way out of line.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [EvoSnipe](#) on Thu, 11 Mar 2004 15:54:58 GMT

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

---

k9, eat my ass with a spoon u little kock mouth!

ure the guy from EoE

i want to play ure weakass klan!

shrakk plays santa claus with small children!

ure klan is reely poor quality

Evo

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 11 Mar 2004 16:22:04 GMT

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

---

? ok..

Sorry to burst your bubble here, but your not one to talk about the quality of anything. I'm sure if the quality of your post were to improve, we for one would be able to understand what you just said.

back on topic..

I'd rather see a mud-slinging campaign (nothing out of the ordinary for American Politics) than seeing someone use tragic events to benifit themselves.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 11 Mar 2004 16:46:53 GMT

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

---

EvoSnipek9, eat my ass with a spoon u little kock mouth!  
ure the guy from EoE  
i want to play ure weakass klan!  
shrakk plays santa claus with small children!  
ure klan is reely poor quality  
Evo

Oh cry me a river you little baby. My 3 year old son has more maturity than you. Even better, my 1 year old daughter has more maturity than you.

BTW everyone, Evo was banned from EoE's servers because of cheats. If you want his IP to ban ask Shrakk to get it for you. I banned him from our forums for crap like this...

Back on topic...

Warranto,  
Do you really think a Democrate wouldn't have done that if they were president? I for one felt that it showed how he kept his cool in a time when most would have folded. That's the kind of president we need. One who isn't afraid to take a stand. If this happened during Clintons time he would have done the same thing and played it like it was his saxiphone.

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.  
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 11 Mar 2004 17:09:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The Democrats act like such children... it sickens me. I don't blame Bush for having to fight back. If he didn't bother to defend himself over Kerry's outrageous and bold attacks, most of the idiot Americans who don't pay any damn attention will vote for the wrong person, then complain when they have to pay more taxes.

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 11 Mar 2004 17:41:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

K9, I'm not taking Democratic or Republican sides here. What I stated applies to both sides, regardless of who takes what action.

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.  
Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Thu, 11 Mar 2004 18:09:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I understand, but you know that if this happened in any presidents term they would have done the same thing. It is funny how they (the democrats) are the ones complaining about it and say it was innappropriate, yet they can go out and say the entire Republican Party is "Crooked". Now how



Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [xptek\\_disabled](#) on Thu, 11 Mar 2004 20:38:39 GMT

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

---

lol, he writes one of the lamest posts in history and then ends it with regards...

"OMG LEIK EAT ME!11!!!111! one one!!111!!

Regards,

Evesnipe"

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [vicious15](#) on Thu, 11 Mar 2004 21:05:41 GMT

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

---

i dont think its very nice to talk about little children like that evo i think you should apologize for that one, its disgusting and very wrong. if you had a child (which you will most likely never, and if you do i pray for that child) i dont think you would want someone talkin about them like that.

about politics i am not able to vote so whatever, but i think mud slinging is stupid they should not focus on the flaws of there opponents, but there strengths. i know that it is hard to do that, but i would vote for anyone who could do that

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [almor999](#) on Thu, 11 Mar 2004 21:44:46 GMT

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

---

This is off topic but...

Can someone ban evosnipe already, all he does is talk about how great he is and never contributes anything useful.

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 11 Mar 2004 22:12:52 GMT

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

---

9/11 and the events thereafter is what defines the Bush presidency. Not the "bad" economy, not the supposed job crisis the Democrats have cooked up, but the War on Terror and 9/11. This president has shown he's not going to take any crap from anybody when it comes to national defense, so why shouldn't he be able to say so in his re-election campaign? People need to be reminded about the events on 9/11 that could very well happen again if John Kerry ever gets elected president. Which would you prefer, a president who has said he would go out and arrest terrorists when they threaten our country, or a president who has said he would seek and kill any

---

terrorist that threatens our country's security? John Kerry wants to get a permission slip from the UN when it comes to nation defense; George Bush wants to find the fuckers who attacked us and blow them to hell. Now tell me, which president would you prefer?

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 11 Mar 2004 22:32:52 GMT

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

---

EvoSnipeyou shouldnt be talking about goddamn politics on a RENEGADE forum

Hey, guess what? I run these forums and I do not wish to limit anyone's discussions, so I created the "Hot Topics" forum for that purpose. If you don't want to have a part in these discussions, then DON'T VISIT THIS FORUM... go spend your time in the General forum or Tactics and Strategies.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 01:12:46 GMT

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

---

I gotta put a stop to this trash.

First, Kerry called Republicans crooked and all that because....dum dum da dum.....They have been during his campaign.

- 1) They made up that STUPID rumor about him having a girlfriend that NEVER had ANY merit behind it and was just a Republican tactic to get stupid people to side with them.
- 2) Republicans have gotten angry at Kerry for cutting defense by voting to take a billion dollars out of the intelligence budget. Only problems with this? First, the bill Kerry was voting for was to cut funding to a billion dollar satellite that didn't even work and never got off the ground after a billion dollars. Second, the bill was created by GEORGE BUSH SENIOR! Little hole there, wouldn't you say? Third, basically everyone voted for this bill because it was just a routine cleaning of the budget by cutting out things that don't have a deserving purpose, like the Comanche helicopter which was recently given the thumbs-down.
- 3) I reference you to <http://www.bushwatch.com> Have some fun looking at all that stuff.
- 4) Republicans get talking cards from Karl Rove's office regularly that tell them what to say to the press. Ever noticed how all Republicans always say the same thing? Now it's "Kerry owes America an apology for what he said." [At least something along those lines.]
- 5) Let's not forget Watergate, an actual [Note: Whitewater does not count as an actual scandal because it was not, actually, a scandal] scandal involving Nixon.
- 6) Al Gore and the internet. Al Gore was talking to reporters and said "I invented the internet." Now, Republicans would be quick to speak out against this because it's a lie [Actually, it really

isn't.] while in fact it was a fairly legitimate claim. See, Gore was taking credit for a program that he championed and funded. He saw the value in ARPANET and stood behind it with funding. Then he took credit for it. It's what government people do. But here come the Republicans calling Gore a pathological liar to try and win more votes for Bush. And people believed them.

And now these same people [Republicans] are demanding an apology because Kerry made a fairly legitimate claim against them. What's wrong with these people. And why can't you all see past this? Oh, and I would like to point out that the starting point for this thread came from FOX news, probably the most biased news source in America.

Have fun.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [MrBob](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 01:34:40 GMT

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

---

News flash:

Both Republicans and Democrats are crooked. Whether its Kerry's double-sided stance on everything, Bush's "compassionate conservatism", to the Not so Honorable Mr. I-should-be-in-jail-for-murder-but-am-in-the-senate.

Sorry I didn't provide any real facts or evidence. I just thought this has truth to it and is quite funny. I'll eventually make a post worth reading.....maybe.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 02:35:02 GMT

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

---

I'm going to get it for saying this I'm sure, but if Bush is completely anti-terrorist as he claims to be (suggesting neutrality, not pro-terrorism here), why did he wait to be attacked before going out to get them, when terrorist activities can be viewed almost every day in other parts of the world?

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 03:02:28 GMT

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

---

Also, why did he not act on the comprehensive anti-al Qaeda plan that Clinton passed on to him at the begininning of his term? A couple weeks before Clinton's term was over, one of his aides came to him with the final draft for a comprehensive plan to eliminate al Qaeda in many Middle Eastern countries. Bush never acted on this. Instead, he waits for September 11th, talks about it in almost everything he says, and launches a war over it to make it seem to the public like he's doing the best thing possible, when in reality he was very far from it.

I said more on this in that 475+ post thread.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 03:53:05 GMT

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

---

warranto!m going to get it for saying this I'm sure, but if Bush is completely anti-terrorist as he claims to be (suggesting neutrality, not pro-terrorism here), why did he wait to be attacked before going out to get them, when terrorist activities can be viewed almost every day in other parts of the world?

Because they made a vicious attack(s) on our (capitol) cities, which would dictate a more aggressive response than one from witnessing some random acts of terrorism committed by some overseas country against another that we don't give a rats ass about?

I see people break the law almost everyday, do I do anything about it? 99.9% of the time no. I don't have time to go and meddle in everyones affairs and try to save the world. But if someone breaks the law in my own backyard, they get the smackdown.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 04:39:34 GMT

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

---

The countires had the capabilities and desire to attack America (and other non-Arab peoples) prior to 9/11, yet nothing was done about it until it was too late (common sense, not the "faulty intelligence" that people blame). When the world, or at least seemingly Arab countries views America in such a bad light, Isolationist policies won't work. As well (past president, I know), supplying terrorists with training and funding to attack the enemy isn't a good idea either. It would have been prudent to start a defence once it's realized "hey, we trained this guy, now he hates us", rather than sit and do nothing while waiting for the attack. I'm not saying to go out and invade, or openly declare war on the terrorists, but act on the threat nonetheless.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 17:08:55 GMT

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

---

People can always go and say the information about the attacks was right there in front of their faces prior to the attacks but no one acted. Funny. Hindsight is always 20/20. I heard that the Clinton Administration may have had some information about the attacks but nothing is said about that.

If I had information saying that a terrorist attack was going to happen against the US by air. I would have never suspected that the planes would have originated from within our own borders. I would have suspected a last minute hijacking from a trans-atlantic flight, not a domestic. So even

---



if they had information of a possible attack. How were they suppose to act? I'm sure you have the answers now because it already happened. A person can always sound smart when they talk history, because it already happened and you can play "Monday Morning Quarterback". Look in to the future here for a second. What would you do to prevent further terrorist attacks and how would you stop each and every possible type of attack without further damaging the economy? (Which took a major hit on 9-11)

How would you prevent an attack method like a "Dirty Bomb" You know there is an attack possible, yet you don't know where or the exact date?

You get information that a major cities water supply is going to get attacked with ricen. Again what do you do? How are you going to determine the target city? Then how are you going to identify the suspects in time. They could very well be an employee of the Water Dpt.

Also remember, Oliver North testified to a Senate Arms Commitee about the Iran-Contra weapons scandel to Al Gore that he felt Bin Laden was the most dangerous person in the world and he needed to be taken out otherwise he will be a direct threat to the entire US. How come way back in the 80's we had this warning and evidence, yet there was no action? Why is there no hearing on that? If we would have acted back then there wouldn't have been an attack on the US and possible no al Queera. Remember that hindsight? There it is again.

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 17:13:33 GMT

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

---

Well said K9. I think that everyone knows hindsight is 20/20, and nobody "really" blames the president for 9/11...however its just too easy to use it as a bashing tool to make lesser-minded people and followers jump on the bandwagon. When you ask these people what should have been done, as you just did, you just get the blank stare

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 17:28:35 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngi4) Republicans get talking cards from Karl Rove's office regularly that tell them what to say to the press. Ever noticed how all Republicans always say the same thing? Now it's "Kerry owes America an apology for what he said." [At least something along those lines.]

And that's worse than the Democrats finding a couple 9/11 widows to read talking cards about Bush using 9/11 imagery in his ads? I think not.

Quote:5) Let's not forget Watergate, an actual [Note: Whitewater does not count as an actual scandal because it was not, actually, a scandal] scandal involving Nixon.

So 18 felony counts and up to 3 years in prison for some of the principles... and it wasn't a



scandal? Just because they weren't able to pin anything on "Teflon" Clinton, doesn't mean it wasn't a scandal.

Quote:6) Al Gore and the internet. Al Gore was talking to reporters and said "I invented the internet." Now, Republicans would be quick to speak out against this because it's a lie [Actually, it really isn't.] while in fact it was a fairly legitimate claim. See, Gore was taking credit for a program that he championed and funded. He saw the value in ARPANET and stood behind it with funding. Then he took credit for it. It's what government people do. But here come the Republicans calling Gore a pathological liar to try and win more votes for Bush. And people believed them.

INVENTING something and championing the funding for something are QUITE different things! If I invent a robot that cleans your house, and some rich guy gives me \$10 million to improve it and market it and produce it, that doesn't mean the rich dude can claim he invented it. It's really two completely different things, inventing and funding, and Gore had no rights to make the "invented" claim.

Quote:And now these same people [Republicans] are demanding an apology because Kerry made a fairly legitimate claim against them. What's wrong with these people. And why can't you all see past this? Oh, and I would like to point out that the starting point for this thread came from FOX news, probably the most biased news source in America.

I believe CNN to be far more biased than Fox. Just yesterday I found an article via the Drudge report that the woman recently arrested for spying for Iraq worked for 3 or 4 Democrat politicians, including Carol Moseley Braun, back in the early 90's during the first Gulf War. CNN puts that same article Under the "US News" subheading and doesn't even give it top billing. And, CNN's version fails to mention Susan Lindauer's prior employment history, but instead leaves the reader believing she was some random lady.

And I know, because I read the CNN article first, and I was like "ok, but who was this chick?"

OOh, more Kerry lies!

<http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040312-120719-7926r.htm>

And one more thing, did you expect the Republicans to say "Oh yeah, well, that's true, we are a bunch of crooked liars." NO! Republicans are public officials too, and as a result, they are defending themselves and telling everyone that it's not true. DUH, this is common sense, you know.

BOTH sides have to use smoke and mirrors in order to sway the idiots who don't pay enough attention to read policy. Use of imagery to sway your emotions, double speak, you name it. As voters, our responsibility is to decide which side's agenda is going to benefit ourselves or the nation more, and cast a vote for that candidate.

But on a more specific level, I find it VERY disturbing that Kerry is being caught red handed in lie after lie! But you won't find THAT on CNN!

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [K9Trooper](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 17:51:58 GMT

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

---

Quote:The only instance found when Mr. Kerry was in the same town as a foreign leader was Sept. 24, when New Zealand Foreign Minister Philip Goff was in Washington meeting with State Department officials. On that day, according to his schedule, Mr. Kerry received the endorsement of the International Association of Fire Fighters in Washington

Sad to say I'm a member but he will never get my endorsement.

BTW.

Thaks Blazer.

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 19:09:28 GMT

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

---

Just to clarify, I'm not blaming the president for 9/11, nor saying it could have in any way been expected. As well, I'm not using past events to say "this is how it should have gone". Point in context, the Oliver North testimony. I know this is stating it as hindsight, but something should have been done then, rather than sitting and waiting for what seemed to be the inevitable to happen. The form of attack may not have been preventable, but an attack itself may have been.

Is Bush to blame for this? Not solely. Everyone involved from that testimony (if not up to the initial funding of Osama) on should recieve some blame. It's sort of the "I told you so" argument on a larger scale.

American leaders were warned something like this might happen, yet -as it didn't affect them at that point in time- nothing was done. The same thing happened in World War one, AND two. America did nothing until they were directly threatened, in WWII that time was almost too late.

Am I suggesting that Countries go out of their way to stop the terrorists of another country? No. Am I suggesting that more could of been done to prevent an attack that had been cautioned about? Yes. In relation to the initial arguement, if you know something is going to happen, act on it rather than waiting for it to happen. I'm not suggesting this was the motive behind waiting, but it's an observation based on peoples reaction. Bush seems to become an American hero because of the new aggressive anti-terrorist stance, yet refused to act on it when he had the Oliver North testimony cautioning that Osama was a threat. I don't know about you, but if I knew that someone was a threat, yet how, when, why, if, etc. was unknown, I'd go to them to stop it before it they came to me.

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 12 Mar 2004 20:29:02 GMT

---

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

---

Oliver did no such thing. It was an internet rumor debunked by snopes.com and Ollie himself issued a statement denying this claim.

<http://www.snopes.com/rumors/north.htm>

^^ All the details.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 13 Mar 2004 02:12:50 GMT

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

---

CrimsonAnd that's worse than the Democrats finding a couple 9/11 widows to read talking cards about Bush using 9/11 imagery in his ads? I think not.

When did that ever happen?

CrimsonSo 18 felony counts and up to 3 years in prison for some of the principles... and it wasn't a scandal? Just because they weren't able to pin anything on "Teflon" Clinton, doesn't mean it wasn't a scandal.

14 felony counts. Remember that this whole investigation started as Republicans believing Clinton was guilty and then tried to prove it. So Republicans are circulating all these stupid rumors about a huge Clinton scandal in which the Clintons actually LOST 50,000 dollars, and so Clinton calls for an independent investigation. Even after the independent head of this investigation is changed to Kenneth Starr, a radical Clinton hater, they still can't find anything on Clinton. The biggest American political investigation ever exonerated Clinton. In essence, it was a 40 million dollar Republican campaign ad. Want a real scandal?

Haliburton.

CrimsonINVENTING something and championing the funding for something are QUITE different things! If I invent a robot that cleans your house, and some rich guy gives me \$10 million to improve it and market it and produce it, that doesn't mean the rich dude can claim he invented it. It's really two completely different things, inventing and funding, and Gore had no rights to make the "invented" claim.

Summary: Gore championed a program and took credit for it. It's what politicians do. Would you call Gore a pathological liar for it? Like Republicans did during the 2000 election? Here are some actual mistruths from Bush:

1)During the 2000 election campaign, Bush claimed that, during the Vietnam conflict, "My first impulse and first inclination was to support the country". His first impulse seems, in fact, to have been to avoid both the draft and active duty. George W Bush was, at best, a bit free with the truth.

2) Bush said no one to his knowledge helped him get into the National Guard. In fact, according to testimony by Texas Speaker of the House Ben Barnes, Houston businessman (and Bush family

James Rose. Rose got Bush into the Guard ahead of 500 other applicants (most far more qualified than Dubya). George W Bush lied.

3) Bush claims to have "some recollection" of turning up for the drills required of Guardsmen during his last year of duty. In fact, there is no record that he showed up at all - and testimony from his commanding officer that he never saw Bush once during that period. George W Bush lied - and deserted.

4) Early last year, Bush told Bob Kiss, Speaker of the West Virginia House of Delegates, that he had "been to war". In fact, he has never been to war - he's just trying to send tens of thousands of other people to war. George W Bush lied.

5) Bush has repeatedly denied any wrongdoing in his sale of Harken stock preceding their disclosure of more than \$23 million in losses, which caused the stock to fall 20 percent. In fact, on June 11, 1990, Bush attended a meeting on Harken's plan to sell off two subsidiaries to avert bankruptcy. The Haynes and Boone law firm advised Harken officers and directors on June 15,

would be considered illegal trading. On June 22, 1990, Bush sold 212,140 shares (originally purchased 40% below face value) to a still-unidentified buyer (rather than on the open market) for four dollars per share. They are now worth two cents apiece. George W Bush lied, cheated, and broke the law.

6) For years, Bush claimed that he sent the reports of that stock sale and three others in on time

fact, we still don't know why he missed the deadlines by up to eight months, but we do know that, regarding having sent the reports in on time, George W Bush lied.

7) Bush has repeatedly avoided answering questions about his cocaine abuse and possible addiction. He has never outright denied it, but has consistently refused to acknowledge his abuse. Three independent sources now report that Bush was arrested in 1972 for cocaine possession and taken to Harris County Jail, but avoided jail or formal charges through an informal diversion plan involving community service with Project PULL, an inner city Houston program for troubled youths. Another witness admits to having sold Bush cocaine. George W Bush has refused to be honest or truthful.

bipartisan efforts as Governor of Texas. In fact, Bush vehemently opposed the expansion of CHIP and, after losing the legislative battle (which did, indeed, have bipartisan support - just not Dubya's), he claimed credit for the CHIP expansion and his success in working with Democrats during the 2000 election campaign. George W Bush lied.

9) Bush cited as his most significant environmental accomplishment as Governor the setting of new rules for grand-fathered industrial plants, previously exempt from Texas clean air laws. In fact, those plants were asked only to voluntarily comply with the clean air rules with no penalties

industries might have written for themselves (and as it turned out, they had). George W Bush lied.

10) During the October 11, 2000, debate, Bush stated that the Clinton-Gore administration "took 40 million acres of land out of circulation without consulting local officials," an example of their administration "just unilaterally acting without any input." In fact, according to the Sierra Club, "the Forest Service conducted 600 public meetings about the proposal nationwide and more than one million Americans urged the administration to strengthen the proposal. There was ample

opportunity for local officials and others to comment on the proposal." George W Bush lied.  
11)On his own record in Texas, Bush also claimed that "our water is cleaner now". In fact, the discharge of industrial toxic pollution into surface waters in Texas increased from 23.2 million pounds in 1995 to 25.2 million pounds in 1998, the last year with data available. George W Bush lied.

12)As Danya has pointed out, Bush contends that he doesn't needed focus groups or polls to tell him what to think. "We've got too much polling and focus groups going on in Washington today," Bush said. "We need decisions made on sound principles." In fact, his campaign spent roughly \$1

report by NBC News. Indeed, Bush changed his campaign slogan from "Compassionate Conservative" (another egregious lie) to "Real Plans for Real People" because of poll analysis. Mike Allen describes Bush as "preoccupied by public perceptions of the war, looking at polling data from Rove, even after pretending to have no interest." George W Bush lied.

13)In the first presidential debate, Bush claimed that the Gore campaign had "out-spent me". In fact, Bush had raised and spent more than twice as much money in the election at that stage as Gore had raised and spent. George W Bush lied.

14)During the final presidential debate, Al Gore accused Bush of opposing a patients' bill of rights. "Actually, Mr. Vice President, it's not true," Mr. Bush replied. "I do support a national patients' bill of rights. As a matter of fact, I brought Republicans and Democrats together to do just that in the state of Texas, to get a patients' bill of rights through." He added that Texas was "one of the first states that said you can sue an HMO for denying you proper coverage." In fact, in 1995 Bush vetoed the first version of the patients' rights bill that the Legislature sent him and two years later he let the section of the bill granting the right to sue go into effect without his signature. George W Bush lied.

15)While on the campaign trail, Bush promised that "as soon as I take office I will begin the process of moving the US ambassador to the city Israel has chosen as its capital." In fact, six months after taking office, signed a memorandum delaying the congressionally mandated relocation of the U.S. embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. George W Bush lied.

16)Last May, Bush claimed to have read a 268-page report by the Environmental Protection Agency on global warming. In fact, as Ari Fleischer later had to point out, he did not read the report. George W Bush lied.

In his infamous "trifecta" joke, Bush claimed repeatedly that he stated during the 2000 campaign that he would keep the budget balanced except in event of war, recession, or national emergency. In fact, he never made such a statement: Bush contended that he would balance the budget without qualification. Some guy by the name of Gore, however, did use those three items as examples of what could force the government back into deficit spending. George W Bush lied about his statement, plagiarized from Gore, and broke his promise about balancing the budget.

17)When the SCI scandal broke in Texas, Bush swore in a July, 1999 affidavit, that he "had no conversations with [SCI] officials, agents, or representatives concerning the investigation or any dispute arising from it." In fact, according to SCI's boss, Robert Waltrip, and his lawyer, Johnnie B. Rogers, they visited Bush in the Governor's office and discussed the investigation. Bush and Joe Allbaugh later admitted that this was the case. George W Bush lied under oath.

18)Regarding stem cell research, Bush stated that his Great Compromise was "way beyond politics... it will lead at once to breakthrough therapies and cures... and do so without crossing a fundamental moral line." In fact, his decision was completely about politics; it will slow the progress to breakthrough therapies and cures; and it did force the pro-life movement he ostensibly endorses to cross a fundamental moral line. George W Bush lied and lied and lied.

19)Regarding Enron, Bush contended, in effect, "I did not have corporate relations with that man,



Kenneth Lay." He claimed that he only "got to know" Mr. Lay in 1994. In fact, according to the Chicago Tribune, "President Bush had business ties with Enron and its predecessor companies, and first met Kenneth Lay, its chairman, sometime in the late 1980s... Previously, the president had not mentioned his business dealings with Enron and had said that he got to know Lay after he was elected governor of Texas in 1994. On Tuesday, White House communications director Dan Bartlett told the Tribune that Bush's relationship with Lay probably started when Bush was in Washington in 1987 and 1988, working on his father's presidential campaign. It could have started earlier, he said. George W Bush lied.

Bush also claimed that Kenny Boy "was a supporter" of Governor Ann Richards. While Richards simply laughs this off ("It was so silly. Why didn't he just say Ken Lay was a strong supporter and gave him a half-million dollars and is a good friend, and he's really sorry Ken's in these terrible circumstances?"), Mr. Lay, in fact, told Frontline last year that he "did support Mr. Bush over Ms. Richards" in their Texas race. George W Bush lied.

20) Bush claims to be "very supportive" of the Nunn-Lugar program and, according to Condi Rice, "The funding was not cut.. All the way back in the campaign, the president talked about perhaps even increasing funding for programs of this kind." In fact, the administration's budget request cut the Department of Energy part of the Nunn-Lugar program from \$872 million to \$774 million and the Department of Defense portion by another \$40 million; the "materials protection and accounting" program was cut \$35 million; the program to subsidize research facilities another \$10 million. If Condoleeza Rice can be believed, George W Bush lied.

21) A few months into his presidency, Bush wrote to the Senator Chuck Hagel, arguing that carbon dioxide was not a pollutant and was not considered as such by the Clean Air Act. In fact, carbon dioxide is specifically mentioned in two passages in the Clean Air Act. George W Bush lied.

22) According to the Bush-Cheney "National Energy Policy", "no more than 2,000 acres will be disturbed" by the development of Area 1002 of ANWR. In fact, the Bush-Cheney plan would render over 1,000 square miles of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge useless for anything other than drilling and support activities. Bush-Cheney lied.

Now for that Washington Times article:

For one, the Washington Times is obviously conservatively biased. Just look at the ads in the margins.

Now, this article is complaining that Kerry won't release details about what foreign people he met with, when his aides said they wouldn't release details for fear of dis-trust between the Bush administration and certain countries.

CrimsonBut on a more specific level, I find it VERY disturbing that Kerry is being caught red handed in lie after lie! But you won't find THAT on CNN!

Like what? What lies? Maybe you won't find them on CNN because they are completely unsubstantiated. Not everything makes it in to the mainstream media.

Remember, the Drudge report is the big time rumor site. Matt Drudge takes a chance and normally has all the rumors up on his site before anyone else. It's not the most reliable news source I've ever seen.

CrimsonAnd one more thing, did you expect the Republicans to say "Oh yeah, well, that's true, we

are a bunch of crooked liars." NO! Republicans are public officials too, and as a result, they are defending themselves and telling everyone that it's not true. DUH, this is common sense, you know.

But Kerry doesn't owe them an apology, because of the atrocious things that they have said. And here all of you people go saying Kerry is super-stupid without paying any attention at all.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Sat, 13 Mar 2004 02:17:10 GMT

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

---

EvoSnipe4 one do not even talk about maturity, u guys r so dense u would not hear me out! i dont cheat, you shouldnt be talking about goddamn politics on a RENEGADE forum, and u can still eat my ass

your daughter too

take that as immaturity, not wat i posted above, that was true

Regards,

Evo

You are wierd.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 13 Mar 2004 03:42:18 GMT

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

---

CrimsonOliver did no such thing. It was an internet rumor debunked by snopes.com and Ollie himself issued a statement denying this claim.

<http://www.snopes.com/rumors/north.htm>

^^ All the details.

Well, I have to admit I know nothing of that subject or Oliver North, so I was going with the information supplied.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 13 Mar 2004 06:09:20 GMT

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

---

Before I read the rest of the spam in this topic, I feel I must reply to this little snipit in one of SuperFlyingEngi's posts:SuperFlyingEngiOh, and I would like to point out that the starting point for this thread came from FOX news, probably the most biased news source in America.

Okay, you say FOX News is biased, yet you keep referencing us back to

<http://www.bushwatch.org?> Are you friggin' serious???? :rolleyes:

---



There is not one article that even ATTEMPTS objectivity. All of their articles are "Bush is bad because he fucked up the economy!" or "Bush is bad because he fucked up the War on Terror!" NONE of them even make an attempt at objectivity!!! How can you read such crap? I would rather take FOX, a bona fide news organization that despite all your accusations of its bias, is much more credible than your stupid <http://www.bushwatch.org>.

I'll be editing this post more as I read more of what people wrote.

warrantoI'm not saying to go out and invade, or openly declare war on the terrorists, but act on the threat nonetheless. You just contradicted yourself .

warrantoAm I suggesting that more could of been done to prevent an attack that had been cautioned about? Yes. At the time, the United States was afraid of upsetting the balance of the area and didn't feel like it was directly threatened. It turns out we were wrong since 9/11 did occur. You say more could have been done. What more could have been done? The day before the Sept. 11 attacks, we knew there would be a terrorist attack on an unknown American city through unknown means by unknown people. All we knew at the time was that there was going to be a terrorist attack sometime soon and not much else.

Besides, you just know that if any of the 19 hijackers in the 9/11 attacks were caught that the ACLU would jump to their aid and racial profiling accusations would go flying everywhere.

SuperFlyingEngiCrimsonAnd that's worse than the Democrats finding a couple 9/11 widows to read talking cards about Bush using 9/11 imagery in his ads? I think not.

When did that ever happen?  
Don't you ever watch the news? :rolleyes:

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 13 Mar 2004 08:19:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It wasn't quite a contradiction, though perhaps I could have phrased it differently. By invasion I was implying a full-scale war-like form of operation, and by war, well a full blown official war status.

As for the second point you made, I was basing it on (apparently) false information. So until I'm able to get a straight answer about that, my thought that America had been warned about a person that was dangerous is more or less moot at this point.

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.  
Posted by [Blazer](#) on Sat, 13 Mar 2004 12:16:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I like how one of Kerrys spokesmen claims that the foul words found on his official website were because of "a virus". :rolleyes: Yeah maybe he really said "poop eating grin" and the evil virus searched and replaced!

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 13 Mar 2004 16:33:09 GMT

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

---

hydra1945Okay, you say FOX News is biased, yet you keep referencing us back to <http://www.bushwatch.org>? Are you friggin' serious????

There is not one article that even ATTEMPTS objectivity. All of their articles are "Bush is bad because he fucked up the economy!" or "Bush is bad because he fucked up the War on Terror!" NONE of them even make an attempt at objectivity!!! How can you read such crap? I would rather take FOX, a bona fide news organization that despite all your accusations of its bias, is much more credible than your stupid <http://www.bushwatch.org>.

A little something on FOX news being biased:

<http://www.mypoliticaltake.com/article11-21-03foxnews.htm>

And are you too stupid to read? What you just said highly suggests that. Mostly, bushwatch.com takes Bush's quotes, then shows what he actually did. And last I checked, they didn't have stupid crap like "Oh my god, Bush secretly killed 400 people in the state of Texas while he was governor!" Stuff you might find on FOX during the Clinton administration.

hydra1945Don't you ever watch the news?

Yes, but I don't take it all for granted.

hydra1945You just contradicted yourself .

No he didn't. You don't have to declare war on a country to purge terrorists from it. Although it's apparently the only thing Bush knows how to do.

hydra1945Before I read the rest of the spam in this topic

I sure hope you didn't call my posts spam, but were in fact referring to something else.

Here's something else on that Kerry statement:

<http://www.americanpolitics.com/20040310Koop.html>

I especially like this part:

That website Naturally, FOX "News" is thunderous about this, quick on its GOP callgirl feet to attempt to make a mockery of Kerry's statements. The usual ultra-right-wing web-based spoutoffs

have also joined in the fray, attacking Kerry for his statement.

NOTE: I've edited this post several times for updated content.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 03:00:15 GMT

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

---

SuperFlyingEngiA little something on FOX news being biased:

<http://www.mypoliticaltake.com/article11-21-03foxnews.htm>

And are you too stupid to read? What you just said highly suggests that. Mostly, bushwatch.com takes Bush's quotes, then shows what he actually did. And last I checked, they didn't have stupid crap like "Oh my god, Bush secretly killed 400 people in the state of Texas while he was governor!" Stuff you might find on FOX during the Clinton administration.

You have GOT to be kidding me. Did you even take a look at the sources this guy used?

In the years before WWII, the nazis conducted thousands of experiments to prove that aryan people were superior to jewish people. Each one of these experiments were set up in such a way that it would be proven every single time that the aryan was a superior human being. That is exactly what is being done by the author of every single source you post. The authors of the articles at bushwatch.org are out there to prove that George W. Bush is bad in every way, shape and form. In order to do this, they conduct phony research that will make George W. Bush out to be the bad guy every single time. Al Franken wrote his crappy book with the conception that all Republicans are liars and set out to prove that in his book.

SuperFlyingEngiNo he didn't. You don't have to declare war on a country to purge terrorists from it. Although it's apparently the only thing Bush knows how to do.

There is no other way to purge that country of terrorists if the country offers aid and support and harbors the very terrorists you are trying to kill.

Do you suggest we try to reason with people who want to kill us? :rolleyes:

SuperFlyingEngiHere's something else on that Kerry statement:

<http://www.americanpolitics.com/20040310Koop.html>

I especially like this part:

That website Naturally, FOX "News" is thunderous about this, quick on its GOP callgirl feet to attempt to make a mockery of Kerry's statements. The usual ultra-right-wing web-based spoutoffs have also joined in the fray, attacking Kerry for his statement.

That wasn't the statment everyone got angry at, numbnuts. Kerry's statement was, "This is the most crooked, lying group I've ever seen." Who was he referring to? The Bush adminisitation, of course! This was said right after a speech in which he said he had been victimized by the "Republican attack machine."

Since you are using biased sources and articles to support your views, SuperFlyingEngi, I thought I'd find an article of my own support my own views on this subject. Oh, but unlike your sources, this guy says on his home page not to believe anything he says unless it is concurrent with what you already know to be true or what you have researched for yourself. He doesn't claim to be 100% correct about everything, unlike your articles SuperFlyingEngi.  
<http://boortz.com/nuze/200403/03112004.html>

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 03:54:07 GMT

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

---

hydra1945You have GOT to be kidding me. Did you even take a look at the sources this guy used?

Did you?

hydra1945The authors of the articles at bushwatch.org are out there to prove that George W. Bush is bad in every way, shape and form. In order to do this, they conduct phony research that will make George W. Bush out to be the bad guy every single time.

Phony research? Like what?

hydra1945Al Franken wrote his crappy book with the conception that all Republicans are liars and set out to prove that in his book.

No he didn't. You're rephrasing what I said earlier about Whitewater and applying it to a different context, which in this case doesn't work. Al Franken's books have extensively exquisite research. Try and prove his books wrong on anything [besides where he's making an obvious joke.]

hydra1945There is no other way to purge that country of terrorists if the country offers aid and support and harbors the very terrorists you are trying to kill.

Commando operations don't fall under "War". A war is something that makes it to the media. It is in fact possible to assassinate terrorists without steamrolling a country. Which is just what Clinton did when he issued a presidential directive authorizing the assassination of Osama bin Laden.

And although Sean Hannity likes to say this would go against the rule Reagan made about not being able to assassinate foreign heads of state, Osama bin Laden is not a head of state. Just so you know.

hydra1945That wasn't the statment everyone got angry at, numbnuts. Kerry's statement was, "This is the most crooked, lying group I've ever seen." Who was he referring to? The Bush adminsitration, of course! This was said right after a speech in which he said he had been victimized by the "Republican attack machine."

Crimson was jumping over Kerry for his statement about foreign leaders EARLIER IN THIS THREAD, numbnuts. And he had been victimized by the Republican attack machine, like the time where they said he had a girlfriend, which NEVER had ANY merit WHATSOEVER, or the time where they say he voted to gut intelligence, when in fact he had voted for a bill to cut funding to a billion dollar satellite that never got off the ground, basically everyone voted for it, and the bill was offered by GEORGE BUSH SENIOR! But they aren't crooked. And let's not forget that Kerry didn't know he was on camera at the time.

hydra945He doesn't claim to be 100% correct about everything

And it's a damn good thing he says that, too, because his articles are pretty silly. The site he references in the third paragraph of your link is just stupid, too. Kerry's "alleged heroism"? It's not alleged, he won medals in Vietnam! The war in Iraq isn't the biggest thing since WWII, I would say Vietnam probably was, considering how many Americans died there. President's actions in the wake of 9/11 were nothing short of heroic? You mean the part where he's been politicizing it the WHOLE TIME? How are Bush's references to 9/11 milder than Kerry and his part in Vietnam? Bush tlaks about 9/11 in pretty much everything he says. This whole business about only people who don't like 9/11 ads got in the news...where are all the families who support 9/11 references in his ads? Oh my god, the [i]liberal[/i] mainstream media [Guess who owns most of the mainstream media outlets? Conservatives.] is suppresing them! Well, there's no proof that they are in fact there. Oh wait! I saw one on Rush Limbaugh's show! After being screened, he talked with Limbaugh on the radio about how he thought the ads were in good taste. But wait! Limbaugh is the guy who said styrofoam was more biodegradeable than paper.

That crappy websitehis [Kerry's] campaign is marshalling to its banner sub-rosa forces whose agenda can only be described as anti-American.

What the hell are they talking about?

That first crappy websiteThe reference to Kerry's "crooks and liars" comment was buried in the

Oh my god! It was in the MIDDLE of the story! What about all of the people who can't stand reading long enough to finish a story? What about all of the people who just glance at headlines without buying the paper? These people are SO UNINFORMED because of the liberal media!

hydra1945During that speech he detailed all of the positive news about America's economic picture, and mentioned that the the Democrats were attacking an economy that was strong and

on Economy."

I'm sure he just barely touched on Democrats attacking an economy that has lost nearly 3 million jobs so far, and yet every year Bush says is getting better. I bet the WHOLE TIME he was talking about the economy getting better. But wait - why didn't the liberal media use a more sympathetic title, like Bush blasts Democratic Opinions on Economy." It's probably some kind of liberal reverse psychology.

detailing Kerry's "crooks and liars" comment only mention's Kerry's desire for deeper middle class

I do. Bush was meaning to talk to the media when he messed with the Democrats, and then Kerry is off-camera talking to someone and attacks Republicans, after crooked things they did to him, like accusing him of having a girlfriend. I wonder if FOX even bothered to cover this. Probably not, considering how liberally biased they are.

And on that War Widow group being poised to strike at Bush's ads...if one of your family members had been killed during 9/11, would you be happy about a politician politicizing your family members grave? I wouldn't. And we can just know that members of this group lost sleep over watching for 9/11 ads. I'm sure that's how it went down.

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 05:35:00 GMT

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

---

Quote:A little something on FOX news being biased:

<http://www.mypoliticaltake.com/article11-21-03foxnews.htm>

And are you too stupid to read? What you just said highly suggests that. Mostly, bushwatch.com takes Bush's quotes, then shows what he actually did. And last I checked, they didn't have stupid crap like "Oh my god, Bush secretly killed 400 people in the state of Texas while he was governor!" Stuff you might find on FOX during the Clinton administration.

"Blah blah blah, I won't address the points, I'll just say Fox News is bad again, that'll shift his attention away from what his original statement was.."

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 07:21:08 GMT

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

---

1) Obviously Clinton did a great job defending the country against terrorism. :rolleyes: Why don't

you tell that to the widows and widowers and orphans of 9/11 and see if they think Clinton did a great job. We sure haven't had a single attack since 9/11 now, have we?

2) Kerry issued a statement saying HE KNEW HIS MIC WAS STILL ON! Whether he knew or not, he owned up to his comments. Now he made his bed and has to lie in it, whatever the result. Don't try and say it was an accident because it WASN'T.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 15:18:39 GMT

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

---

Aircraftkiller"Blah blah blah, I won't address the points, I'll just say Fox News is bad again, that'll shift his attention away from what his original statement was.."

Did you not read? He was talking about Bushwatch being bad and FOX being good, right? Well, first, I posted a link from a website that talks about FOX's conservative bias. Then, in the NEXT PARAGRAPH I went back to bushwatch.com.

Crimson:

1) Clinton did a great job defending America against terrorism. After the attack on the U.S.S. Cole, Clinton put Richard Clarke in charge of creating a comprehensive plan to wipe out al Qaeda. Clarke produced a strategy paper on December 20, 2000. The plan involved these things:

- 1) Break up al Qaeda cells and arrest their personnel.
- 2) Systematically attack financial support for its terrorist activities.
- 3) Stop it's funding through fake charities
- 4) Give aid to governments having trouble with al Qaeda. (Uzbekistan, the Phillipines, and Yemen.)
- 5) Scale up covert action in Afghanistan to eliminate the training camps and reach bin Laden himself.

Clarke also proposed bulking up support for the Northern Alliance and putting Special Forces troops on the ground in Afghanistan.

But the plan was never carried out. It was completed just a few weeks before Bush was inaugurated, and Clinton did not want to hand Bush a war when he came in to office. He trusted Bush to defend America. It was probably the biggest mistake of his career.

(A former senior Clinton aide told Time "We would be handing [the Bush Administration] a war when they took office.")

Clinton's national security advisor, Sandy Berger attended ten briefings for his succesor, Condoleeza Rice, and her deputy Stephen Hadley. Berger made a special point of attending the briefing on terrorism. He told Dr Rice, "I believe the Bush Administration will spend more time on terrorism in general, and on al Qaeda specifically, than any other subject."



When Time asked about the conversation, "Rice declined to comment, but through a spokeswoman said she recalled no briefing at which Berger was present."  
Here's a December 31, 2001 New York Times article: "As he prepared to leave office last January, Mr. Berger met with his successor, Condoleeza Rice, and gave her a warning. He said that terrorism-and particularly Mr. bin Laden's brand of it-would consume far more of her time than she had ever imagined."

Bush announced a task force on MAY 8, 2001 that would be led by Vice President Cheney, and said that he himself would "periodically chair a meeting of the National Security Council to review these efforts." Bush never chaired such a meeting, though. Probably because Cheney's task force never actually met.

On April 30, Clarke presented an updated version of his plan to deputies of Cheney's Chief of Staff, Lewis Libby, the State Department's Richard Armitage, DOD's Paul Wolfowitz, and the CIA's John McLaughlin. They were impressed, and called for four meetings: One on Pakistan, One on al Qaeda, One on Indo-Pakistani Relations, and a fourth to integrate the three meetings. Sure, scheduling these meetings would take months and delay the possibility of acting on the plan to roll up al Qaeda, but it was sort of a step in the right direction.

On July 10, 2001, Phoenix FBI Agent Kenneth Williams sent a memo to headquarters regarding concerns over some Middle Eastern students at an Arizona Flight School, who were suggested as being al Qaeda operatives by Williams, and he urged the FBI to look in to their backgrounds. Had to dots been connected, 9/11 could have possibly been prevented.

Meanwhile, Richard Clarke and George Tenet were going nuts. Bush administration insiders would later say they had never been fully on board. Tenet was getting more and more reports of terrorism-related radio chatter. In mid-July, "George briefed Condi that there was going to be a major attack" an official told Time.

On August 6th, CIA Director Tenet, delivered a report to President Bush entitled "Bin Laden Determined to Strike in U.S." The report warned the al Qaeda might be trying to hijack airplanes. President Bush did nothing to follow up on the memo.

On July 16, the deputies finally met in the integration meeting and approved the plan to send it to the Principals Committee, which would not meet on the plan until September 4th. (Just so you know, President bush spent 42% of his first 7 months in office either at Camp David, the Bush compound in Kennebunkport, or at his ranch in Crawford, Texas. On August 3rd, after signing off on a plan to cut funding for programs guarding unsecured or "loose" nukes in the former Soviet Union, he headed to Crawford for the longest presidential vacation in 32 years. On September 4th, the Principals Committee got together to approve the plan for Bush, but advise a phased-in approach, with the first phase to be demand cooperation from the Taliban. Only 8 months after Clarke briefed Condi on the plan, and almost 11 months after Clinton told Clarke to create it, his plan was finally on the move.

Oops, too late

Crimson2) Kerry issued a statement saying HE KNEW HIS MIC WAS STILL ON! Whether he

knew or not, he owned up to his comments. Now he made his bed and has to lie in it, whatever the result. Don't try and say it was an accident because it WASN'T.

That's his way of saying that he has no intention of taking his comments back, and I would too if someone accused me of having a girlfriend with NO PROOF at ALL.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 19:08:19 GMT

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

---

Before anything else, it was the Drudge Report that broke the story about Kerry's girlfriend, but it was the other Democratic candidates who were chastizing Kerry for it. No one from the Bush administration even mentioned a word about it! The Democrats were eating each other alive at that point to try to get the nomination. Bush said nothing about it.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 20:37:41 GMT

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

---

OK, let me get this straight... Clinton started "doing something" about the terrorist attacks in 2000, after the USS Cole bombing?

What about in January 1993, two CIA agents are shot and killed as they enter CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia. The following month, February 1993, a group of terrorists are arrested after a rented van packed with explosives is driven into the underground parking garage of the World Trade Center in New York City. Six people are killed and over 1000 are injured.

Then in November 1995 a car bomb explodes at a US military complex in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia killing seven service men and women. A few months later in June of 1996, another truck bomb explodes only 35 yards from the US military compound in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. It destroys the Khobar Towers, a US Air Force barracks, killing 19 and injuring over 500.

The terrorists are getting braver and smarter as they see that America does not respond decisively. They move to coordinate their attacks in a simultaneous attack on two US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. These attacks were planned with precision, they kill 224. America responds with cruise missile attacks.

This was a minimally-edited summary of terrorist acts against our country from 1993 - 2000 (Clinton's term) excluding the USS Cole attack. If you remember, I posted this before, it was written by Dan Ouimette, Pensacola Civitan, on 19 Feb 2003.

These terrorist attacks have been going on since November 1979, in a country going through a religious and political upheaval. A group of Iranian students attacked and seized the American Embassy in Tehran.

Remember, I am not saying that 9/11 was Clinton's fault. But I am saying that he did basically not a damn thing against terrorism. Because ever since Bush got our troops out there to overthrow the regimes supporting terrorism, we haven't had a single attack against American soil. No embassies have been attacked, no planes hijacked... nothing. We haven't been attacked in over two years. That HAS to say SOMETHING, doesn't it?

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [EvoSnipe](#) on Sun, 14 Mar 2004 23:11:29 GMT

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

---

well guys, its like this

1.i am pretty krunk at renny

2.i dont want to rape his daughter (crabs-JK its a joke!)

3.this guy is a punk

4.i like to contribute long, useful posts, but then sumone has to reply with gay shizzle that just isnt kewl

5.did i mention im krunk?

6.Regards,

EvoKrunk

P.S. i voted bush (yes i AM 19), he did alot of good stuff 4 the country, and i like his thinking kill the towel-heads!

nah arabs r okay, i know a guy named Ignesh

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 15 Mar 2004 01:42:35 GMT

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

---

EvoSnipewell guys, its like this

1.i am pretty krunk at renny

2.i dont want to rape his daughter (crabs-JK its a joke!)

3.this guy is a punk

4.i like to contribute long, useful posts, but then sumone has to reply with gay shizzle that just isnt kewl

5.did i mention im krunk?

6.Regards,

EvoKrunk

P.S. i voted bush (yes i AM 19), he did alot of good stuff 4 the country, and i like his thinking kill the towel-heads!

nah arabs r okay, i know a guy named Ignesh

Is there an online translator for whatever this language is? :huh: :eh:

It's nice you voted for Bush. You should do it again but what you shouldn't do again is post a meaningless flame post like you did before.

---

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Mon, 15 Mar 2004 02:15:03 GMT

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

---

## CLINTON ON TERRORISTS:

Thirty-eight days after Clinton took office, the car bomb attack on the World Trade Center launched him in to action. He captured, tried, convicted, and imprisoned the men responsible: Ramzi Yousef, Abdul Hakim Murad, and Wali Khan Amin Shah. These men are all currently behind bars. These people were involved in further plots to kill the Pope and blow up 12 U.S. jetliners simultaneously. [Sons of b\*tches] But neither happened. And neither did the huge attacks that were planned against the FBI building, the Israeli embassy in Washington, UN Headquarters, the LA and Boston airports, the Lincoln and Holland tunnels, and the George Washington bridge. Why, you ask? Because Clinton thwarted them.

How, you ask?

For one, he tripled the FBI's counterterrorism budget and doubled counterterrorism funding overall. And rolled up al Qaeda cells in more than 20 countries. And created a top-level national security post to coordinate all federal counterterrorism activity.

[i>Salon.com[/i]]Between 1996 and 2001, federal spending on counterterrorism increased dramatically to more than \$12 billion annually. The FBI's counterterrorism budget rose even more sharply, from \$78 million in 1996 to \$609 million in 2000, tripling the number of agents assigned to such activities and creating a new counterterrorism center at the bureau's Washington headquarters.

His first crime bill contained stringent antiterrorism legislature, as did his second. The Clinton administration sponsored a series of simulations to see how local, state, and federal officials should coordinate their responses to a terrorist strike. He created a national stockpile of drugs and vaccines, including 40 million doses of smallpox vaccine. And a huge long list of other stuff.

Barton Gellman's four-part series for the Washington PostBy any measure available, Clinton left office having given greater priority to terrorism than any president before him. [Clinton's administration was the] first administration to undertake a systematic anti-terrorist effort.

So on this counterterrorism stuff, you'd think both parties would be willing to put politics aside and work together, right? Wrong. Once Republicans took hold of the Congress, they fought Clinton with the same bitterness as the Whig Congress fought President James Knox Polk. Republicans fought Clinton on terrorism spending. When Clinton asked for more antiterrorism funding in 1996, Orrin Hatch objected. "The administration would be wise to utilize the resources Congress has already provided before it requests additional funding." After the Oklahoma City bombing, Republicans objected to Clinton's proposed expansion of wiretap abilities.

House Speaker Newt GingrichWhen you have an agency that turns nine hundred personell files over to people like Craig Livingstone, it's very hard to justify giving that agency more power

Gingrich was making a remark about Filegate, one of the many FOX-hyped investigations that yielded nothing and fizzled out.

In 1998, when Clinton struck targets in Sudan and Afghanistan with Tomahawk missiles in retaliation for terrorist strikes against embassies in Tanzania and Kenya, Gingrich said, "The President did exactly the right thing. By doing this, we're sending the signal that there are no sanctuaries for terrorists." Then, on September 13, 2001, Gingrich told FOX, "The lesson has to be that firing a few Tomahawks, dropping a few bombs is totally inadequate."

Immediately after the embassy bombings, Clinton issued a presidential directive authorizing the assassination of Osama bin Laden. The final al Qaeda attack of the Clinton administration came with the bombing of the U.S.S. Cole, which is where I come to Richard Clarke's anti-Qaeda plan.

Oh, I know! Let's talk about Reagan's relations with terrorists!

Nearly five hundred American lives were lost between the 1983 Marine barracks bombings in Beirut and the destruction of Pan Am Flight 103. Reagan's only direct response was a single bombing run against Libya in 1986. Reagan supplied arms to violent Muslim extremists among the Afghani Mujahedeen, as well as friends in Iraq and Iran.

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Mon, 15 Mar 2004 04:40:03 GMT

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

Quote:

well guys, its like this

1.i am pretty krunk at renny

2.i dont want to rape his daughter (crabs-JK its a joke!)

3.this guy is a punk

4.i like to contribute long, useful posts, but then sumone has to reply with gay shizzle that just isnt kewl

5.did i mention im krunk?

6.Regards,

EvoKrunk

P.S. i voted bush (yes i AM 19), he did alot of good stuff 4 the country, and i like his thinking kill the towel-heads!

nah arabs r okay, i know a guy named Ignesh

Honestly, towel-heads?!?! How dumb can you get.

---

Subject: :/ What a dumbass.

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 15 Mar 2004 04:48:44 GMT

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

It was a joke. Lighten up.

---