

---

## Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by BoiseBYU - 2007/12/05 22:45

---

What is Hawai'i a contraction for?

What are Utes runnin' from?

Is the Big 12 bigger than the Big 10?

Are AP poll voters expected to read the sports scores before voting?

Are the BCS rules more like guidelines?

Given that Pat Robertson endorsed adulterer, gay rights supporting, abortion defender Rudy Guiliani, but evangelical Republicans in large numbers will not support family valued, honest and faithful Mitt Romney merely because he is a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, is there a book in the Bible that I have missed on what a Christian is and does?

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by MagicMax - 2007/12/06 02:26

---

Mitt Romney is a sad representation of Mormonism. He and Hillary are two of the most phony, poll-driven, pandering politicians in contemporary politics.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by ammoncougar1 - 2007/12/06 06:24

---

MagicMax wrote:

Mitt Romney is a sad representation of Mormonism. He and Hillary are two of the most phony, poll-driven, pandering politicians in contemporary politics.

What makes you say that? Will you give examples of how he is like that?

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by wildeone - 2007/12/06 06:48

---

romney does pander to an extent but so does every other candidate

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by imuakahuku - 2007/12/06 08:19

---

ammoncougar1 wrote:

MagicMax wrote:

Mitt Romney is a sad representation of Mormonism. He and Hillary are two of the most phony, poll-driven, pandering politicians in contemporary politics.

What makes you say that? Will you give examples of how he is like that?

So any examples yet? Or is this just something you heard on NPR and figure it must be true if they said it. :dry:

=====

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by harlinestillopen - 2007/12/06 08:32

---

I'm so sick of people bashing Mitt. Seriously who is more qualified than Mitt Romney?

Now you might not agree with some of his political stances, but he is BY FAR the most qualified candidate who has the most experience.

Having said that, I'm not going to vote for Romney strictly because of his religion, I'd be an idiot to do so. I will study up on the candidates and see whose views I agree with the most. This is my first election and I'm pumped!

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Hengst - 2007/12/06 08:34

---

imuakahuku wrote:

ammoncougar1 wrote:

MagicMax wrote:

Mitt Romney is a sad representation of Mormonism. He and Hillary are two of the most phony, poll-driven, pandering politicians in contemporary politics.

What makes you say that? Will you give examples of how he is like that?

So any examples yet? Or is this just something you heard on NPR and figure it must be true if they said it. :dry:

Mitt's not really a representative of Mormonism, he's a politician who happens to be Mormon. I don't really have any problems with anything he has said with regards to his religion. That's his business, and he can believe whatever he wants to. The people that won't vote for him because of his religious beliefs need some tolerance/multicultural education.

I don't agree with his politics, but that's another issue.

(can't believe I just stuck up for Mitt :-))

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by BoiseBYU - 2007/12/06 08:51

---

harlinestillopen wrote:

Having said that, I'm not going to vote for Romney strictly because of his religion, I'd be an idiot to do so. I will study up on the candidates and see whose views I agree with the most. This is my first election and I'm pumped!

You will not vote for him merely because he is a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. Fair enough. I think I am the same on that. The question I have is the flip of that and bears repeating: Why are a large number of Republicans unwilling to vote for Romney solely BECAUSE of his church membership when at the same time leaders of so-called evangelical Christian groups are endorsing a whoremonger?

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by jvip - 2007/12/06 08:57

---

I have a problem with the idea that he is for abortion and gay rights to become governor but now has "seen the light" and is against those things when in a national spotlight where members of the church know what he is doing. I think he is no different than a "flip flopping" John Kerry.

=====

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Hengst - 2007/12/06 09:00

---

BoiseBYU wrote:

harlinestillopen wrote:

Having said that, I'm not going to vote for Romney strictly because of his religion, I'd be an idiot to do so. I will study up the on the candidates and see who's veiws I agree with the most. This is my first election and I'm pumped!

You will not vote for him merely because he is a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. Fair enough. I think I am the same on that. The question I have is the flip of that and bears repeating: Why are a large number of Republicans unwilling to vote for Romney solely BECAUSE of his church membership when at the same time leaders of so-called evangelical Christian groups are endorsing a whoremonger?

I think a lot of evangelicals are really taught that Mormons are evil. I remember in washington there was an evangelical church, and they hated us.

In addition, after whole "flip flop" campaign against John Kerry, I think republicans may feel slightly hypocritical voting for mitt because he has changed his position on a few things (which is another silly reason not to vote for someone, and I actually blogged about it this week - <http://katzcommentary.blogspot.com> - I promise it's not a bunch of liberal propaganda, it's actually pretty neutral :-).

Again, I feel really weird sticking up for Mitt. :ohmy:

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by UliUli79 - 2007/12/06 09:13

---

It's funny how people can twist facts to mean what they want. Some see Mitt as a flip-flopper, others see him as someone who studied the issues and admitted he was wrong changing his stance. Politics are like sports in the sence that everyone thinks that they can do a better job than the guy that's out there. Mitt's a good candidate Mormon or not. However, he's not the ONLY good candidate.

P.S. Anything's better than Hilary.:S

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by ammoncougar1 - 2007/12/06 09:47

---

<http://www.cbn.com/CBNnews/282093.aspx>

Here's the full text of Romney's speech. I am quite impressed. I look forward to hearing others' reponse to it. BTW, when do the moderators come on the site to lock this thread? I guess we can enjoy it while we have it and do all we can to maintain civility while discussing sometimes difficult topics.

Go COugs!!!

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by etyotx - 2007/12/06 09:48

---

From my experience with Baptists, Evangelicals and the like, I have come to the understanding that their self-appointed label as "Christians" (and the exclusion of LDS in that category) has little to do with Christ or his teachings.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

This is a BYU football thread and as this thread should be moved to the "etc." channel but....

Let's be honest here

#1 Mitt has the best track record of governing and business management in the election on either side of the party line - in fact, considering he was a republican governor in a predominately democratic state, and throw in his massive financial successes, he's a relative miracle worker

I agree that based on his "fruits" he's the most qualified candidate, however I don't believe that he'll win his party's nomination

#2 Mitt has zero experience in foreign political relations- but again knowing how he runs business, he wouldn't make poor decisions, he'd put together the best cabinet in the history of this country in my opinion

No one is questioning his decision making ability or success in the past

What you need to ask yourselves if you lean on the GOP/conservative side is this:

1. Can they beat Hillary in a general election- she is every conservatives nightmare- fair or not- (some fears fair, some not)

2. America fears the unknown and often will take the known evil over the unknown evil ("unknown" usually a result of misinformation). The message is getting out in a lot of evangeical christian homes and churches now about this unknown evil of the LDS church.

The fact that the Rev. Mike Huckabee is closing the gap in Iowa and New Hampshire, shows that evangelical christians may be slow to poll but at the end of the day, show up at the ballot box. This bodes poorly for Mitt. Does it help Mike Huckabee? Heck no, he has no chance of winning the GOP nomination. Does it help Rudy Giuliani? Absolutely, lack of momentum in the Iowa and New Hampshire primaries = death of Mitts campaign nationwide. Every dollar Giuliani can utilize elsewhere is a win for him.

Giuliani, a guy that is arguably a more liberal republican than Romney, an ambiguous stance on abortion and gay rights, a roman catholic (which is not high on the "friends of Bob Jones" list either) etc. already knows that whoever wins the GOP nod, also gets every conservative christian vote, because the other option is Hillary Clinton.

Knowing all of this, if you're going to get your hands wet early (ala Pat Robertson, etc.) you're going to side with the likely winner. The guy that people believe can beat Hillary.

That's the reason you don't see guys like Schwarzenager, etc. picking their guy yet. They don't want to do it twice. But rest assured none of them want Hillary in office.

A large majority (not all mind you) of evangelical christians don't vote with their brains, they vote with their hearts. And most of those churches have zero problem with using the pulpit to push politics and bash other religions- so ask yourselves what the typical pentacostal church member in Alabama is being told about Mitt Romney. At the end of the day, the GOP has relied so heavily on this voting base that they aren't capable of winning an election without them (GW really took us down a slippery slope). What we need is a GOP president that overachieves and earns the trust of this country...Do I think Giuliani can do that? Not sure...I think Romney could but I don't think he's going to get elected.

I understand LDS church members being all over the board in their politics and preference; however we have to get past the fact that defending his religion isn't the same as supporting him for president.

We also have to be prepared (I'm one that believes he'd make the best president, considering all the other options) that his religion will be the biggest reason why he doesn't get the nomination. (The last months developments in Iowa alone are pretty good reason to believe that).

The next step is asking yourselves if you lean on the conservative side (which about 95% of LDS households do and the vast majority of nonLDS-christian homes), how do we make sure that Hillary Clinton isn't our next president? I think that's where you find political leaders leaning towards Giuliani now. He could beat Hillary....Thompson flopped coming in late, McCain gets nuttier every day, Ron Paul is Ross Perot 2000, and the others are fairly insignificant as far as viability to win a general election (but they sure can effect the GOP nomination-aka Huckabee)

So there you are....It's possible that those conservative christian leaders (regardless of their good or bad track records) feel the need to pick someone that can beat Hillary. Given the choice to pick Giuliani or Romney, they took the "known perceived evil" simply because #1 Giuliani is a better option than Hillary Clinton and #2 Mitt Romney is Mormon and scary

Romneys' perceived flipping on abortion and gay rights is not the issue here, neither is his track record, voting record, family life, or business dealings and successes- in fact all of those are reasons he's a viable candidate.

Bottom line- he's Mormon and thus when the hard core conservative christians come out of the woodwork, they just can't vote him in. We're seeing that in Iowa right now with the Rev. Mike Huckabee. Sad state of affairs, but that's where we

---

are. Love him, hate him, don't care, the reason Romney can't get his party's nomination is because he's LDS and the perception that he might not be able to beat Hillary because of his religion.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by jvip - 2007/12/06 11:10

---

Let see if we can add a little football in here so this doesn't get locked up.

Mitt=BYU  
Hilary=Utah  
Huckabee=TCU  
Giuliani=UNLV  
Obama=SDSU  
Ron Paul=CSU

BYU does have great values, the problem I see comes with that if you want me to vote for you as a morman than it is hard for me to do that knowing the history of how you got elected as govenor. If BYU wants me to vote as a general person in society i still have to look at what he has done in the past and say that I am having a hard getting over the pro abortion pro gay rights thing because my feeling differ from his. BYU does look like a great "team" but I am just not sure that it will work for me.

Utah is just a huge problem, I don't think that there is anyway that anybody could see that as a good idea.

TCU has a great "team" they just are not say what I general voter wants to hear.

UNLV doesn't not have experience in my mind.

SDSU, I find it wierd that everyone likes this "team" does that seem wierd to anyone else.

CSU does have a lot of ideas that i agree with but i don't think that he even has a shot or is even a contender.

Maybe this will buy us some time!;)

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by BoiseBYU - 2007/12/06 11:13

---

jvip wrote:

Let see if we can add a little football in here so this doesn't get locked up.

Mitt=BYU  
Hilary=Utah  
Huckabee=TCU  
Giuliani=UNLV  
Obama=SDSU  
Ron Paul=CSU

BYU does have great values, the problem I see comes with that if you want me to vote for you as a morman than it is hard for me to do that knowing the history of how you got elected as govenor. If BYU wants me to vote as a general person in society i still have to look at what he has done in the past and say that I am having a hard getting over the pro abortion pro gay rights thing because my feeling differ from his. BYU does look like a great "team" but I am just not sure that it will work for me.

Utah is just a huge problem, I don't think that there is anyway that anybody could see that as a good idea.

TCU has a great "team" they just are not say what I general voter wants to hear.

UNLV doesn't not have experience in my mind.

---

SDSU, I find it wierd that everyone likes this "team" does that seem wierd to anyone else.

CSU does have a lot of ideas that i agree with but i don't think that he even has a shot or is even a contender.

Maybe this will buy us some time!;)

Funny, but I have one question: Why gratuitously offend Hillary? :laugh:

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Hengst - 2007/12/06 11:16

---

jvip wrote:

Let see if we can add a little football in here so this doesn't get locked up.

Mitt=BYU  
Hilary=Utah  
Huckabee=TCU  
Giuliani=UNLV  
Obama=SDSU  
Ron Paul=CSU

BYU does have great values, the problem I see comes with that if you want me to vote for you as a morman than it is hard for me to do that knowing the history of how you got elected as govenor. If BYU wants me to vote as a general person in society i still have to look at what he has done in the past and say that I am having a hard getting over the pro abortion pro gay rights thing because my feeling differ from his. BYU does look like a great "team" but I am just not sure that it will work for me.

Utah is just a huge problem, I don't think that there is anyway that anybody could see that as a good idea.

TCU has a great "team" they just are not say what I general voter wants to hear.

UNLV doesn't not have experience in my mind.

SDSU, I find it wierd that everyone likes this "team" does that seem wierd to anyone else.

CSU does have a lot of ideas that i agree with but i don't think that he even has a shot or is even a contender.

Maybe this will buy us some time!;)

I wouldn't reject Mitt just because at one time he had some different positions on things. I've listened to him answer questions about why he changed his positions, and he gave some pretty well thought out answers. I know it seems convenient, but I think he did some soul searching and believes what he says he believes now. I'm still voting for Obama, because I happen to disagree with some of Mitts new positions as well as his old ones, but don't just dismiss him because he's changed his mind about something. Everyone changes their minds occasionally, just ask my wife, she'll change her mind on an outfit about 4 times in 5 minutes. (not to over-plug my blog, but I did write about this . . . check it out <http://katzscommentary.blogspot.com> ;-)

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by jvip - 2007/12/06 11:18

---

I really had a hard time with that one because it really could go either way if you ask me.:unsure:

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by CAFB\_04-12 - 2007/12/06 11:21

---

---

I'm surprised that everyone fears Clinton so much. I know that much of her image now is moderated in order to get elected, but Obama and Edwards are more liberal on most issues than Clinton. If anything, Clinton would be a much more tenacious Commander in Chief. I mean, would you want to p\*\*\* her off? (I figure if they have to bleep Beck I should censor my foul language!)

I suppose these many years of studying international relations as a graduate student have made me more ambivalent over politics. Weird, I know. Give me an honest man (or woman) with a sophisticated foreign policy and I'll be happy. Remember, Reagan didn't have much experience in foreign policy before 1980. Of course, neither did George W. Bush and look where that's taken us.

So I would say that Edwards is Utah. I can't cheer for him under any circumstance. TCU fits Huckabee. Probably thinks I'm a hell-bound Mormon but will put up a good fight...

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by jvip - 2007/12/06 11:24

Hengst wrote:

I wouldn't reject Mitt just because at one time he had some different positions on things. I've listened to him answer questions about why he changed his positions, and he gave some pretty well thought out answers. I know it seems convenient, but I think he did some soul searching and believes what he says he believes now. I'm still voting for Obama, because I happen to disagree with some of Mitts new positions as well as his old ones, but don't just dismiss him because he's changed his mind about something. Everyone changes their minds occasionally, just ask my wife, she'll change her mind on an outfit about 4 times in 5 minutes. (not to over-plug my blog, but I did write about this . . . check it out <http://katzscommentary.blogspot.com> ;-)

I kind of see it as convenience, he wanted to be governor so it is the easy way to fit in and make it work. Now he wants to be president and needs the LDS vote so he is against it. I feel that I have done some soul searching over these issues as well. I have changed my mind and I feel that everyone is entitled to do so. I just see BYU's as convenience

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by craigocarson - 2007/12/06 11:27

Hillary is Hawaii

She has some people convinced she could do the job, until she has to deal with something of real significance (aka Georgia)

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by jvip - 2007/12/06 11:28

craigocarson wrote:  
Hillary is Hawaii

She has some people convinced she could do the job, until she has to deal with something of real significance (aka Georgia)

That is probably true:laugh:

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by CAFB\_04-12 - 2007/12/06 11:29

---

jvip wrote:  
Hengst wrote:

Now he wants to be president and needs the LDS vote so he is against it. I feel that I have done some soul searching over these issues as well  
The LDS vote gets him what? Utah? Whoever runs on the GOP ticket gets that. It's a gimme.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by craigoscarson - 2007/12/06 11:29

---

I kind of see it as convenience, he wanted to be governor so it is the easy way to fit in and make it work. Now he wants to be president and needs the LDS vote so he is against it. I feel that I have done some soul searching over these issues as well. I have changed my mind and I feel that everyone is entitled to do so. I just see BYU's as convenience

The LDS vote is insignificant...Romney's not worried about winning Idaho or Utah.....He's trying to get "BCS" states

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by jvip - 2007/12/06 11:35

---

craigoscarsen wrote:

I kind of see it as convenience, he wanted to be governor so it is the easy way to fit in and make it work. Now he wants to be president and needs the LDS vote so he is against it. I feel that I have done some soul searching over these issues as well. I have changed my mind and I feel that everyone is entitled to do so. I just see BYU's as convenience

The LDS vote is insignificant...Romney's not worried about winning Idaho or Utah.....He's trying to get "BCS" states

:laugh:

So you are saying that switching his position from offense to defense isn't to gain the christian vote, the conservative vote, the ultra christian conservative vote? He really did just see the light and decided that what he had ran on before was not what he believes now?

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Hengst - 2007/12/06 11:35

---

CAFB\_04-12 wrote:

jvip wrote:  
Hengst wrote:

Now he wants to be president and needs the LDS vote so he is against it. I feel that I have done some soul searching over these issues as well  
The LDS vote gets him what? Utah? Whoever runs on the GOP ticket gets that. It's a gimme.

wo, someone misquoted me a bit somehow, I think you were trying to quote someone else, and somehow my name got attached to it.:unsure:

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by BoiseBYU - 2007/12/06 11:38

---

craigoscarson wrote:  
Hillary is Hawaii

She has some people convinced she could do the job, until she has to deal with something of real significance (aka Georgia)

Well, football is life...so carrying the analogy, would bringing in PAC 10 refs be like appealing to the Supreme Court?

=====

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by jvip - 2007/12/06 11:39

---

Hengst wrote:  
CAFB\_04-12 wrote:  
jvip wrote:  
Hengst wrote:

Now he wants to be president and needs the LDS vote so he is against it. I feel that I have done some soul searching over these issues as well  
The LDS vote gets him what? Utah? Whoever runs on the GOP ticket gets that. It's a gimme.

wo, someone misquoted me a bit somehow, I think you were trying to quote someone else, and somehow my name got attached to it.:unsure:

It was my fault, I totally screwed up the quote thing and then tried to change and now have a different position on the quote thing then I used to but I don't think that it will benefit me.

=====

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by imuakahuku - 2007/12/06 11:46

---

I just have a hard time seeing how anyone could vote for any of the Dems. They all support the following to one degree or another.

Abortion including late term  
Socialism  
Increasing taxes  
Losing in Iraq  
Gay "special" rights including marriage  
Wealth redistribution  
Global Warming A farce to take control of our economy  
Kyoto Agreement A tool of Global Warming  
"Talking" to people like Osama and Amadena"jihad" (while they plot to kill us)

And they do everything they can to weaken our troops efforts in Iraq. If I were in a legal position to do so I would be trying many of them for treason! Just this week they go and weaken our efforts on Iran just gain politically. How many more of our soldier are going to die because they had to pull that stunt this week and cut GWB off at the knees! Now Iran can start sending men and munitions to Iraq to destabilize it again just so the Dems can say "see the surge isn't working, it's a quagmire, you need a Democrat for President". This is absolutely deplorable and Finger and probably Negroponte should be arrested immediately!

=====

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Hengst - 2007/12/06 11:51

imuakahuku wrote:

I just have a hard time seeing how anyone could vote for any of the Dems. They all support the following to one degree or another.

- Abortion including late term
- Socialism
- Increasing taxes
- Losing in Iraq
- Gay "special" rights including marriage
- Wealth redistribution
- Global Warming A farce to take control of our economy
- Kyoto Agreement A tool of Global Warming
- "Talking" to people like Osama and Amadena"jihad" (while they plot to kill us)

And they do everything they can to weaken our troops efforts in Iraq. If I were in a legal position to do so I would be trying many of them for treason! Just this week they go and weaken our efforts on Iran just gain politically. How many more of our soldier are going to die because they had to pull that stunt this week and cut GWB off at the knees! Now Iran can start sending men and munitions to Iraq to destabilize it again just so the Dems can say "see the surge isn't working, it's a quagmire, you need a Democrat for President". This is absolutely deplorable and Finger and probably Negroponte should be arrested immediately!

I would be happy to sit down with you some time and discuss all of my reasons with you at some point. But I don't really have time to do it here, and this is a sports board so I don't really think this is the place.

The Mitt stuff is sort of relevant given that this is a BYU board, and that Mitt has taken some time today to address some specifics regarding BYU's local predominant faith.

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by imuakahuku - 2007/12/06 11:58

Hengst wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

I just have a hard time seeing how anyone could vote for any of the Dems. They all support the following to one degree or another.

- Abortion including late term
- Socialism
- Increasing taxes
- Losing in Iraq
- Gay "special" rights including marriage
- Wealth redistribution
- Global Warming A farce to take control of our economy
- Kyoto Agreement A tool of Global Warming
- "Talking" to people like Osama and Amadena"jihad" (while they plot to kill us)

And they do everything they can to weaken our troops efforts in Iraq. If I were in a legal position to do so I would be trying many of them for treason! Just this week they go and weaken our efforts on Iran just gain politically. How many more of our soldier are going to die because they had to pull that stunt this week and cut GWB off at the knees! Now Iran can start sending men and munitions to Iraq to destabilize it again just so the Dems can say "see the surge isn't working, it's a quagmire, you need a Democrat for President". This is absolutely deplorable and Finger and probably Negroponte should be arrested immediately!

I would be happy to sit down with you some time and discuss all of my reasons with you at some point. But I don't really have time to do it here, and this is a sports board so I don't really think this is the place.

The Mitt stuff is sort of relevant given that this is a BYU board, and that Mitt has taken some time today to address some specifics regarding BYU's local predominant faith.

So you are saying lay off the dems. I think they get enough passes with the mainstream media. ANY of the republican nominations including Romney are far better for this country. If you don't like that statement I am sorry. But I can't lay off of people that do so much to hurt our country for their own political gain. 11% tells it all. Even GW is around 26%!

---

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by ammoncougar1 - 2007/12/06 12:21

---

imuakahuku wrote:

I just have a hard time seeing how anyone could vote for any of the Dems. They all support the following to one degree or another.

Abortion including late term

Socialism

Increasing taxes

Losing in Iraq

Gay "special" rights including marriage

Wealth redistribution

Global Warming A farce to take control of our economy

Kyoto Agreement A tool of Global Warming

"Talking" to people like Osama and Amadena"jihad" (while they plot to kill us)

So you're saying:

"Losing in Iraq"=APS over Michigan

"Increasing taxes"=Kicking off from the 30 instead of the 35

"Global Warming"=Scheduling our away games with Wyoming in September instead of November

"Abortion including late term"=Trying an onsides late in the game with a big lead

"Wealth Distribution"=Adding a 5th BcS game so their sponsers get more money and in turn give even more to the BcS conferences

Is that what you're saying? That's what I heard you say? Am I correct?:laugh:

Go Cougs!!!

---

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Hengst - 2007/12/06 12:27

---

imuakahuku wrote:

Hengst wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

I just have a hard time seeing how anyone could vote for any of the Dems. They all support the following to one degree or another.

Abortion including late term

Socialism

Increasing taxes

Losing in Iraq

Gay "special" rights including marriage

Wealth redistribution

Global Warming A farce to take control of our economy

Kyoto Agreement A tool of Global Warming

"Talking" to people like Osama and Amadena"jihad" (while they plot to kill us)

And they do everything they can to weaken our troops efforts in Iraq. If I were in a legal position to do so I would be trying many of them for treason! Just this week they go and weaken our efforts on Iran just gain politically. How many more of our soldier are going to die because they had to pull that stunt this week and cut GWB off at the knees! Now Iran can start sending men and munitions to Iraq to destabilize it again just so the Dems can say "see the surge isn't working, it's a quagmire, you need a Democrat for President". This is absolutely deplorable and Finger and probably Negroponte should be arrested immediately!

I would be happy to sit down with you some time and discuss all of my reasons with you at some point. But I don't really have time to do it here, and this is a sports board so I don't really think this is the place.

---

The Mitt stuff is sort of relevant given that this is a BYU board, and that Mitt has taken some time today to address some specifics regarding BYU's local predominant faith.

So you are saying lay off the dems. I think they get enough passes with the mainstream media. ANY of the republican nominations including Romney are far better for this country. If you don't like that statement I am sorry. But I can't lay off of people that do so much to hurt our country for their own political gain. 11% tells it all. Even GW is around 26%!

That's not what I'm saying at all (all though, if you think the "mainstream" media "lay off" the dems you need to quite drinking the right wing cool aid, all the mainstream media care about is making money, they rarely cover anything that is important in regards to politics, they treat it more like a sporting event). All I'm saying is, is that I have good reasons for wanting to vote for a democrat, I just don't have time to lay all of those out. you opened your previous statement with "I just don't understand how anyone could vote for" All I was saying is I'd be happy to explain my reasons to you at another time and place, if you really are interested in understanding that is . . . part of my suspects your more interested in making outlandish statements about not being able to understand ;-)

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by CAFB\_04-12 - 2007/12/06 13:03

jvip wrote:

I kind of see it as convenience, he wanted to be governor so it is the easy way to fit in and make it work. Now he wants to be president and needs the LDS vote so he is against it. I feel that I have done some soul searching over these issues as well. I have changed my mind and I feel that everyone is entitled to do so. I just see BYU's as convenience  
Sorry, the quotes kept "Hengst said" even though you weren't actually quoted. The comment should read "jvip said." My bad.

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Real.Men.Wear.Blue - 2007/12/06 13:13

Many pro-life, anti-abortion proponents are converts to that cause. Must they all give an accounting and confession as to why they changed their views? The plaintiff from Roe v. Wade is just such a person. Frankly, I'm just happy to have them onboard the right path.

What I appreciate about Mitt is that he came out and admitted that he was wrong and explained exactly why he changed his mind. He did not attempt to spin it or hide the truth. He owned up to it. Most candidates, John Kerry included, cannot find the guts to do that.

I just got back from a "Lawyers for Mitt Romney" meeting with the chief legal counsel for Mitt's campaign, who was formerly chief counsel for Bush/Cheney in 2000 and 2004, and counsel for the RNC. Mitt is doing well in the polls that count: New Hampshire and Iowa. No republican candidate has ever won the nomination without winning both of those states. That's where Mitt's campaign is focusing their efforts, hoping to build momentum when the bulk of the caucuses are held in early February. Looking at the numbers, I believe Mitt has a very good shot at taking the nomination, despite national poll numbers. The key is to win the early primaries, build momentum, and slingshot into the remaining primaries. That's how virtually all of the democratic and republican nominees have won in the recent past. Governor Clinton, for example, never had more than a 6% voter rating in the national polls before winning New Hampshire and Iowa. After winning those states, his national profile skyrocketed, and ... well, you know the story.

Mitt has a winning strategy, a likeable personality, a strong moral compass, and a lot of money. I wouldn't be surprised to see him take the RNC nomination.

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by WinnemuccaCougar - 2007/12/06 13:36

---

imuakahuku wrote:

Hengst wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

I just have a hard time seeing how anyone could vote for any of the Dems. They all support the following to one degree or another.

Abortion including late term

Socialism

Increasing taxes

Losing in Iraq

Gay "special" rights including marriage

Wealth redistribution

Global Warming A farce to take control of our economy

Kyoto Agreement A tool of Global Warming

"Talking" to people like Osama and Amadena "jihad" (while they plot to kill us)

And they do everything they can to weaken our troops efforts in Iraq. If I were in a legal position to do so I would be trying many of them for treason! Just this week they go and weaken our efforts on Iran just gain politically. How many more of our soldier are going to die because they had to pull that stunt this week and cut GWB off at the knees! Now Iran can start sending men and munitions to Iraq to destabilize it again just so the Dems can say "see the surge isn't working, it's a quagmire, you need a Democrat for President". This is absolutely deplorable and Finger and probably Negroponte should be arrested immediately!

I would be happy to sit down with you some time and discuss all of my reasons with you at some point. But I don't really have time to do it here, and this is a sports board so I don't really think this is the place.

The Mitt stuff is sort of relevant given that this is a BYU board, and that Mitt has taken some time today to address some specifics regarding BYU's local predominant faith.

So you are saying lay off the dems. I think they get enough passes with the mainstream media. ANY of the republican nominations including Romney are far better for this country. If you don't like that statement I am sorry. But I can't lay off of people that do so much to hurt our country for their own political gain. 11% tells it all. Even GW is around 26%!

I'm a conservative but I can't allow you to say stuff like that. Each party, I think really believe their ideals are what is best for the country.

The way the DEMS use (exploit) the media I will agree is dispicable, but the way they govern (although I don't agree with it ) is what they believe to be in the best interests of the USA (all be it misguided). Not even Evil Hillary is trying to hurt this country on purpose, leave that to MARK CUBAN, FAT MIKE MOORE, and others like them.

Both parties believe their way is the way to a better America. So evaluate them all and you will find who should be our next PRES. quit making the partisan fence larger by believing propaganda from ONE SIDE .

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by imuakahuku - 2007/12/06 13:46

---

Hengst wrote:

All I was saying is I'd be happy to explain my reasons to you at another time and place, if you really are interested in understanding that is . . . part of my suspects your more interested in making outlandish statements about not being able to understand ;-)

Not outlandish. I just can't imagine ANY reasons that would cause me to overlook the items I listed. Add to that list the fact that the dems have no desire or capability to be strong on protecting our country or securing our borders. As for the media, to say that the mainstream is not pulling for the dems IS an outlandish statement. There is no possible way to say that they are not slanted toward Hillary and the dems.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by imuakahuku - 2007/12/06 14:00

---

WinnemuccaCougar wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

Hengst wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

I just have a hard time seeing how anyone could vote for any of the Dems. They all support the following to one degree or another.

Abortion including late term

Socialism

Increasing taxes

Losing in Iraq

Gay "special" rights including marriage

Wealth redistribution

Global Warming A farce to take control of our economy

Kyoto Agreement A tool of Global Warming

"Talking" to people like Osama and Amadena "jihad" (while they plot to kill us)

And they do everything they can to weaken our troops efforts in Iraq. If I were in a legal position to do so I would be trying many of them for treason! Just this week they go and weaken our efforts on Iran just gain politically. How many more of our soldier are going to die because they had to pull that stunt this week and cut GWB off at the knees! Now Iran can start sending men and munitions to Iraq to destabilize it again just so the Dems can say "see the surge isn't working, it's a quagmire, you need a Democrat for President". This is absolutely deplorable and Finger and probably Negroponte should be arrested immediately!

I would be happy to sit down with you some time and discuss all of my reasons with you at some point. But I don't really have time to do it here, and this is a sports board so I don't really think this is the place.

The Mitt stuff is sort of relevant given that this is a BYU board, and that Mitt has taken some time today to address some specifics regarding BYU's local predominant faith.

So you are saying lay off the dems. I think they get enough passes with the mainstream media. ANY of the republican nominations including Romney are far better for this country. If you don't like that statement I am sorry. But I can't lay off of people that do so much to hurt our country for their own political gain. 11% tells it all. Even GW is around 26%!

I'm a conservative but I can't allow you to say stuff like that. Each party, I think really believe their ideals are what is best for the country.

The way the DEMS use (exploit) the media I will agree is dispicable, but the way they govern (although I don't agree with it ) is what they believe to be in the best interests of the USA (all be it misguided). Not even Evil Hillary is trying to hurt this country on purpose, leave that to MARK CUBAN, FAT MIKE MOORE, and others like them.

Both parties believe their way is the way to a better America. So evaluate them all and you will find who should be our next PRES. quit making the partisan fence larger by believing propaganda from ONE SIDE .

If its directed to me I have to say I don't believe propaganda. I listen to the facts. I evaluate them and try to understand them. I take everything with a grain of salt because I understand that EVERYONE has an agenda and you have to keep that in mind.

The Dems don't use the media, they are in league with them. They work together to get the types of policies they desire.

They absolutely do things that hurt this country on purpose. Albeit in the idea that it is a worse evil that the GOP is in power so it's okay. Otherwise explain to me why they tried to condemn Turkey all of a sudden of genecide. Or explain the new Iran report and the manner in which it is written. How about Reid saying the War is lost, Kerry calling our soldiers murderers and rapist, the wiretapping leak, the secret prisons leak, the spy satelite program leak (and all indications point to Sen. Rockefeller as the leaker). This is the tip of the iceberg. They are continually looking for things to twist against the GOP and those things hurt our national security, embolden our enemies, and endanger our soldiers lives. And then there is Jamie Garelick's wall. Explain how that was good or at least not bad for the country. Not only did Clinton sell the Chinese military secrets, but he created an intelligence wall that ended up costing thousands of lives in NY. You may accept this as all propaganda but when the dust settles the truth is left standing (that is the truth that isn't in Sandy "the burglar" Berger's pants).

=====

**Re:Questions, Questions, Questions**

Posted by Hengst - 2007/12/06 14:07

imuakahuku wrote:

If its directed to me I have to say I don't believe propaganda. I listen to the facts. I evaluate them and try to understand them. I take everything with a grain of salt because I understand that EVERYONE has an agenda and you have to keep that in mind.

The Dems don't use the media, they are in league with them. They work together to get the types of policies they desire. They absolutely do things that hurt this country on purpose. Albeit in the idea that it is a worse evil that the GOP is in power so it's okay. Otherwise explain to me why they tried to condemn Turkey all of a sudden of genocide. Or explain the new Iran report and the manner in which it is written. How about Reid saying the War is lost, Kerry calling our soldiers murderers and rapist, the wiretapping leak, the secret prisons leak, the spy satellite program leak (and all indications point to Sen. Rockefeller as the leaker). This is the tip of the iceberg. They are continually looking for things to twist against the GOP and those things hurt our national security, embolden our enemies, and endanger our soldiers lives. And then there is Jamie Garelick's wall. Explain how that was good or at least not bad for the country. Not only did Clinton sell the Chinese military secrets, but he created an intelligence wall that ended up costing thousands of lives in NY. You may accept this as all propaganda but when the dust settles the truth is left standing (that is the truth that isn't in Sandy "the burglar" Berger's pants).

Wow for someone who doesn't read propaganda your sure sold on Shawn Hannity's. In fact your starting to sound a lot like this guy -> [http://www.cougarblue.com/images/fbfiles/images/Question\\_34.jpg](http://www.cougarblue.com/images/fbfiles/images/Question_34.jpg)

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by imuakahuku - 2007/12/06 15:03

Hannity is okay but I think he misses a lot of things and he doesn't always ask the hard question. I actually go with a variety of sources. But hey, if the dems have their way they can pass the fairness bill that will knock all those guys off the air.

But in Hannity's defense, the propaganda he spreads is based on facts not half truths or outright lies. If you have proof otherwise please enlighten me.;

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by WinnemuccaCougar - 2007/12/06 15:51

If its directed to me I have to say I don't believe propaganda. I listen to the facts. I evaluate them and try to understand them. I take everything with a grain of salt because I understand that EVERYONE has an agenda and you have to keep that in mind.

The Dems don't use the media, they are in league with them. They work together to get the types of policies they desire. They absolutely do things that hurt this country on purpose. Albeit in the idea that it is a worse evil that the GOP is in power so it's okay. Otherwise explain to me why they tried to condemn Turkey all of a sudden of genocide. Or explain the new Iran report and the manner in which it is written. How about Reid saying the War is lost, Kerry calling our soldiers murderers and rapist, the wiretapping leak, the secret prisons leak, the spy satellite program leak (and all indications point to Sen. Rockefeller as the leaker). This is the tip of the iceberg. They are continually looking for things to twist against the GOP and those things hurt our national security, embolden our enemies, and endanger our soldiers lives. And then there is Jamie Garelick's wall. Explain how that was good or at least not bad for the country. Not only did Clinton sell the Chinese military secrets, but he created an intelligence wall that ended up costing thousands of lives in NY. You may accept this as all propaganda but when the dust settles the truth is left standing (that is the truth that isn't in Sandy "the burglar" Berger's pants). Quoted from a previous post -----

They do try to undermine the GOP because they are DEMS this isn't news! The media helps them do it, this isn't news! The fact that they twist things to make the GOP look bad doesn't mean they are trying to make the USA look bad (again with the exception of CUBAN). Most of this us on this board would agree they (DEMS) are the complete wrong way to go, and I'm not disputing that, I'm saying that they truly believe they will help this country become better. We can't fault them for a desire to help the country, only for the insane ideas they suggest that will never work. Inpuning their patriotism will only make the Gap or Gulf between us larger then nothing will EVER get done in congress. Although clever the "burglar" comment suggests that all DEMS are happy he took those records, read what DEMS and Republican

---

alike said about that situation. Hillary and Bill might have been happy but most DEMS weren't. You are trying to oversimplify the issue by suggesting that ALL DEMS are EVIL and by that token ALL Republicans are good, I think everyone can agree that is BS.

I will vote for Romney, not because he is Mormon (so is Reid and it would be a cold day in hell before I voted for him to be anything) but because he was governor in a Liberal state and still passed tax cuts, helped most people off government run healthcare and on to private accounts, and his ability to help our economy and help decrease our national debt.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by imuakahuku - 2007/12/06 18:49

WinnemuccaCougar wrote:

If its directed to me I have to say I don't believe propaganda. I listen to the facts. I evaluate them and try to understand them. I take everything with a grain of salt because I understand that EVERYONE has an agenda and you have to keep that in mind.

The Dems don't use the media, they are in league with them. They work together to get the types of policies they desire. They absolutely do things that hurt this country on purpose. Albeit in the idea that it is a worse evil that the GOP is in power so it's okay. Otherwise explain to me why they tried to condemn Turkey all of a sudden of genocide. Or explain the new Iran report and the manner in which it is written. How about Reid saying the War is lost, Kerry calling our soldiers murderers and rapist, the wiretapping leak, the secret prisons leak, the spy satellite program leak (and all indications point to Sen. Rockefeller as the leaker). This is the tip of the iceberg. They are continually looking for things to twist against the GOP and those things hurt our national security, embolden our enemies, and endanger our soldiers lives. And then there is Jamie Garelick's wall. Explain how that was good or at least not bad for the country. Not only did Clinton sell the Chinese military secrets, but he created an intelligence wall that ended up costing thousands of lives in NY. You may accept this as all propaganda but when the dust settles the truth is left standing (that is the truth that isn't in Sandy "the burglar" Berger's pants). Quoted from a previous post -----

-----

They do try to undermine the GOP because they are DEMS this isn't news! The media helps them do it, this isn't news! The fact that they twist things to make the GOP look bad doesn't mean they are trying to make the USA look bad (again with the exception of CUBAN). Most of this us on this board would agree they (DEMS) are the complete wrong way to go, and I'm not disputing that, I'm saying that they truly believe they will help this country become better. We can't fault them for a desire to help the country, only for the insane ideas they suggest that will never work. Inpuning their patriotism will only make the Gap or Gulf between us larger then nothing will EVER get done in congress. Although clever the "burglar" comment suggests that all DEMS are happy he took those records, read what DEMS and Republican alike said about that situation. Hillary and Bill might have been happy but most DEMS weren't. You are trying to oversimplify the issue by suggesting that ALL DEMS are EVIL and by that token ALL Republicans are good, I think everyone can agree that is BS.

I will vote for Romney, not because he is Mormon (so is Reid and it would be a cold day in hell before I voted for him to be anything) but because he was governor in a Liberal state and still passed tax cuts, helped most people off government run healthcare and on to private accounts, and his ability to help our economy and help decrease our national debt.

I'm not saying all gop are good. I'm saying all gop presidential nominees are by far better than any and all the democratic presidential nominees. I am also stating that the "mainstream" media is biased towards the democrats and I am also stating that MANY of the democrat leadership have intentionally done things to hurt our country in an effort to further their own political asperations and agendas. They had only one intent when they tried to condemn Turkey for genocide. It was to enfuriat Turkey in the hope that Turkey would cut all aid to US forces in Iraq. A great deal of resources come from and through Turkey but they saw it as a way to cause us to lose in Iraq. And to lose in Iraq would mean the deaths of hundreds if not thousands more of our young men and women serving our country. To me that harms our country.

As for the GOP, I am very sick of all the rinos. I wish we could get a lot more real conservative reps in Washington.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Mars - 2007/12/06 23:55

---

My wife and I read Mitt's "Religion in America" speech out-loud today, and both of us couldn't help but strongly feel the

---

Spirit of God as we did so. I emailed a copy to all of my friends and relatives (most of who are liberal, bless their souls).

I don't understand why politicians aren't allowed to evolve their opinions as they further educate themselves on a topic. Normal people do it every day of their life.

And as far as Obama, I can't imagine voting for a guy who used to admittedly snort coke back in the day. Not that I like adulterating Guliani any better.

=====

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by MagicMax - 2007/12/06 23:56

---

Alright, let me very briefly qualify my statement about Mitt before I go back to writing papers.

I constantly stick up for Mitt when it comes to irrational attacks on Mormonism (the most vehement of which, by the way, come from Evangelical conservatives). When I said Mitt is a sad representation of Mormonism, it is because the image he has projected on the campaign trail is of someone who will do anything to get elected (changing positions, pandering to the far right, heightening the war and torture rhetoric, etc). John McCain appropriately confronted him on the latter issue. Like it or not, Mitt is the face of Mormonism to much of the country and unfortunately during most of his campaign he has tried to distance himself from his religion because of poll-driven politics.

Now, as to some of the unfounded accusations against democrats. First of all, I am not a democrat, though my views typically align closer to them than republicans. The candidate I believe best represents my Mormon values is Barack Obama. And trust me, I've researched all the candidates very carefully.

So let's go over some things. The main difference between republicans and democrats historically is economic paradigms. Conservatives are generally pro free market, capitalism, globalization, etc with as little intervention as possible. Privatize everything. Make everything compete. In other words, every man for himself. Anyone who does a little homework, however, realizes this raises some major moral and ethical issues. Especially when we realize the repercussions (poverty, exploitation, human rights violations, etc) of this system without any checks or restrictions. Needless to say, it's not very Christian.

Liberals, on the other hand, believe that as a society we have some responsibilities to one another. If someone is in poverty we should give them a hand up, if someone needs health care they should get it regardless of their socio-economic status, if someone gets old, they shouldn't just be disposed of like a worn out cog. In other words, we believe in social programs like health care, education, social security, etc. We believe that minimum wage should be liveable. We believe corporations should be responsible and ethical. We believe, ultimately, that people are more important than profit. Sounds healthy enough, right?

As for the other issues:

Abortion- Many democrats aren't pro-abortion, they are pro-choice. Their is a difference.

Gay rights- Are gay people making your life awful in some way? If they want to be by the person they love in the hospital does that just ruin your existence? We do believe in free agency, right?

Environment- Doesn't Mormonism believe the earth is God's creation and we should treat it as such. Is there really any debate about global warming among educated people?

War- Why some Mormons have become so gun ho about war is beyond me. What a tragic and costly mistake. War is rarely the answer and it certainly wasn't anywhere close the answer in the case of Iraq.

Bottom line: Think again when you say that Mormons can't be liberals. Many of us are and find it much more consistent with our values/beliefs than conservatism. When I hear Mitt speak much of his worldview doesn't resonate with mine, but I do hope he is judged on his merits and policies, not on his religion.

=====

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Mars - 2007/12/07 00:46

---

MagicMax wrote:

Abortion- Many democrats aren't pro-abortion, they are pro-choice. Their is a difference.

Gay rights- Are gay people making your life awful in some way? If they want to be by the person they love in the hospital

---

does that just ruin your existence? We do believe in free agency, right?

Environment- Doesn't Mormonism believe the earth is God's creation and we should treat it as such. Is there really any debate about global warming among educated people?

War- Why some Mormons have become so gun ho about war is beyond me. What a tragic and costly mistake. War is rarely the answer and it certainly wasn't anywhere close the answer in the case of Iraq.

Abortion- The Church has a hard-line pro-life stance. As should we all honestly. There's no way around supporting the murder of thousands of babies.

Gay rights- The Church also has a hard-line stance of marriage between a man and a woman. I'm from California, remember? Our ecclesiastical leaders were very involved in the statewide campaign to clearly define marriage as between members of the opposite sex, and they were instructed by the brethren to do so.

Environment- Google "Global Warming" and "PsuedoScience" someday. Millions of people die every year because the money that could have been spent to save their lives was instead wasted on this scare-myth.

War- Read the Book of Mormon. It is the duty of those in power to stand up for people anywhere who are being oppressed.

Some people are LDS and Democrat. How, I don't know.

I used to be very cool towards Mitt because he shared my religion. The more I studied him, the more convinced I become that there's no one else worth wasting a vote on, unless it is the guy running against Hillary (the devil).

And I still don't understand voting for marijuana-smoking, cocaine-snorting, baby-killing, gay-marrying (family-unit wrecking) Barack Obama. Enlighten me.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Sharper - 2007/12/07 00:46

---

MagicMax wrote:

Alright, let me very briefly qualify my statement about Mitt before I go back to writing papers.

I constantly stick up for Mitt when it comes to irrational attacks on Mormonism (the most vehement of which, by the way, come from Evangelical conservatives). When I said Mitt is a sad representation of Mormonism, it is because the image he has projected on the campaign trail is of someone who will do anything to get elected (changing positions, pandering to the far right, heightening the war and torture rhetoric, etc). John McCain appropriately confronted him on the latter issue. Like it or not, Mitt is the face of Mormonism to much of the country and unfortunately during most of his campaign he has tried to distance himself from his religion because of poll-driven politics.

It's a little amazing that Harry Reid, the UT Senators, etc... don't ever have their religion brought up in the same way, isn't it? Makes you wonder what the Media's agenda is... I will say that I agree a bit with your characterization of Mitt's image.

Now, as to some of the unfounded accusations against democrats. First of all, I am not a democrat, though my views typically align closer to them than republicans. The candidate I believe best represents my Mormon values is Barack Obama. And trust me, I've researched all the candidates very carefully.

How could you possibly know that? Obama is about as much of a blank slate that hasn't shown anything as any of the candidates. He has such a small track record of actions that it's almost impossible to tell how he'd actually act if elected. With politicians, policy papers they had their staff write and campaign promises don't count, actions do.

So let's go over some things. The main difference between republicans and democrats historically is economic paradigms. Conservatives are generally pro free market, capitalism, globalization, etc with as little intervention as possible. Privatize everything. Make everything compete. In other words, every man for himself. Anyone who does a little homework, however, realizes this raises some major moral and ethical issues. Especially when we realize the repercussions (poverty, exploitation, human rights violations, etc) of this system without any checks or restrictions. Needless to say, it's not very Christian. Free markets and capitalism have reduced more poverty than anything else in the world ever has. The way you use "exploitation" is in the sense of, "Your employer exploits you by paying you to work for him" and makes no sense at all to the people you claim to have been "exploited". Capitalist economies have the best human rights records of any type of nation in the world. The facts simply don't back up your contentions.

Liberals, on the other hand, believe that as a society we have some responsibilities to one another. If someone is in poverty we should give them a hand up, if someone needs health care they should get it regardless of their socio-economic status, if someone gets old, they shouldn't just be disposed of like a worn out cog. In other words, we believe in social programs like health care, education, social security, etc. We believe that minimum wage should be liveable. We believe corporations should be responsible and ethical. We believe, ultimately, that people are more important than profit. Sounds healthy enough, right? No, the liberals you are talking about don't believe in helping people, they believe in stealing from others in order to help people, gaining power over other people's lives in the process. That's why

---

conservative Republicans donate way more of their own money and time to charity than liberal democrats do. Generally speaking, when a liberal says "we" need to do something, what they actually mean is that "you" need to have your freedom reduced and your earnings confiscated so that "they" can spend it on what "they" find more important since "they" know what's best and "you" don't.

As for the other issues:

Abortion- Many democrats aren't pro-abortion, they are pro-choice. There is a difference. The official position of the LDS church is a pro-life one.

Gay rights- Are gay people making your life awful in some way? If they want to be by the person they love in the hospital does that just ruin your existence? We do believe in free agency, right? I personally don't think that the government should punish gay people for being gay. I also don't think that the government should give them special benefits just because they're gay and have pandered to powerful Democrats. That seems to be what becoming a "protected class" is all about, though.

Environment- Doesn't Mormonism believe the earth is God's creation and we should treat it as such. Is there really any debate about global warming among educated people? We also believe that this creation was meant to be used and taken care of, not artificially restricted as a back-door method of implementing socialism and government control of property. The worst environmental disasters occur when property is controlled by a government. Private owners take care of their property. Government owned property ends up looking like Chernobyl, a "housing project", or a massive wildfire. As for global warming, the earth may be increasing in temperature a little bit over the next couple of hundred years, or it may not. That may or may not be a good thing. The scientific likelihood that we have anything to do with that is miniscule. What is the "ideal" temperature for the world anyway?

War- Why some Mormons have become so gun ho about war is beyond me. What a tragic and costly mistake. War is rarely the answer and it certainly wasn't anywhere close the answer in the case of Iraq. I'm totally against aggressive war. However, we didn't start the war with the terrorists. They've been attacking us for years before 9/11 made us start to actually respond. Saddam made the mistake of attacking Kuwait, leading to his position of a cease fire with the U.S. with very specific conditions. When he stopped following those conditions and gave indications that he was going to be supplying terrorists with chemical weapons, we took him out. In the process, we're stuck rebuilding Iraq as a moral duty. That process appears to be going much better and taking much less time than it ever has in any other county we've ever conquered in the past. It's too bad most Americans have no knowledge of history anymore. Bottom line: Think again when you say that Mormons can't be liberals. Many of us are and find it much more consistent with our values/beliefs than conservatism. When I hear Mitt speak much of his worldview doesn't resonate with mine, but I do hope he is judged on his merits and policies, not on his religion. There are a lot of Mormons who are Liberals and plenty who are also Democrats. You do need to recognize that the vast majority are not and find their belief in freedom of choice and in agency (not the misnomer of "free agency") leads them to be more inclined to support candidates who also believe in freedom of choice for people, rather than forcing them to do the "good" their leaders have decided they must do. Forcing everyone to do what you think is good seems a lot more like what we called "Satan's Plan" back in Primary.

---

## Re: Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by cougarfurr - 2007/12/07 00:47

Let's be real, as important issues that abortion and gay rights are, they're really not relevant issues in electing the next president. Not much is going to change in those areas anyway.

In my opinion we need to elect a president who will:

- 1) Be tough on illegal immigration
- 2) Be tough on terrorism
- 3) Help the economy

These are the big issues facing America today.

As far as #1 & 2 go... Tancredo is the MAN. Unfortunately he doesn't stand a chance.

On # 3 I think Romney is the man. He doesn't stand a chance either. I like Huckabee's fair tax idea although it would never pass.

So, Hillary just needs to be beat, and Giuliani is the only one who could do that.

For the guy who said Obama reflects his Mormon beliefs the most (or something along those lines), try reading a book..like his. He's a piece of garbage.

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by MagicMax - 2007/12/07 01:04

---

To those who are making ad hominem attacks on Barack Obama:

Barack Obama is a man of faith.

Barack Obama is a good husband and father.

Barack Obama believes in helping all Americans, not just the wealthy.

Barack Obama believes in equal rights and equal opportunity.

Barack Obama has the best crossover appeal of any candidate of either party and has consistently worked across party lines to get things done.

Barack Obama is the most intelligent candidate of either party (try actually reading his books or listening to his speeches instead of buying Sean Hannity propaganda)

Barack Obama saw the war for what it was from the beginning and spoke out accordingly.

Barack Obama has experience as a community organizer, a constitutional law professor, a state senator, and a US Senator. He also graduated from Columbia and Harvard (where he was head of the law review).

As for the "baby-killing, coke snorting, blah, blah, blah" diatribe: Half the professors at BYU would disagree with your assessment (not to mention a good percentage of the church, including Harry Reid and Mitt Romney until he decided to run for president)

But life is much easier when you caricature the "enemy," isn't it?

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by shigacoug - 2007/12/07 01:04

---

MagicMax wrote:

Alright, let me very briefly qualify my statement about Mitt before I go back to writing papers.

I constantly stick up for Mitt when it comes to irrational attacks on Mormonism (the most vehement of which, by the way, come from Evangelical conservatives). When I said Mitt is a sad representation of Mormonism, it is because the image he has projected on the campaign trail is of someone who will do anything to get elected (changing positions, pandering to the far right, heightening the war and torture rhetoric, etc). John McCain appropriately confronted him on the latter issue. Like it or not, Mitt is the face of Mormonism to much of the country and unfortunately during most of his campaign he has tried to distance himself from his religion because of poll-driven politics.

Now, as to some of the unfounded accusations against democrats. First of all, I am not a democrat, though my views typically align closer to them than republicans. The candidate I believe best represents my Mormon values is Barack Obama. And trust me, I've researched all the candidates very carefully.

So let's go over some things. The main difference between republicans and democrats historically is economic paradigms. Conservatives are generally pro free market, capitalism, globalization, etc with as little intervention as possible. Privatize everything. Make everything compete. In other words, every man for himself. Anyone who does a little homework, however, realizes this raises some major moral and ethical issues. Especially when we realize the repercussions (poverty, exploitation, human rights violations, etc) of this system without any checks or restrictions. Needless to say, it's not very Christian.

Liberals, on the other hand, believe that as a society we have some responsibilities to one another. If someone is in poverty we should give them a hand up, if someone needs health care they should get it regardless of their socio-economic status, if someone gets old, they shouldn't just be disposed of like a worn out cog. In other words, we believe in social programs like health care, education, social security, etc. We believe that minimum wage should be liveable. We believe corporations should be responsible and ethical. We believe, ultimately, that people are more important than profit. Sounds healthy enough, right?

As for the other issues:

Abortion- Many democrats aren't pro-abortion, they are pro-choice. Their is a difference.

Gay rights- Are gay people making your life awful in some way? If they want to be by the person they love in the hospital does that just ruin your existence? We do believe in free agency, right?

---

Environment- Doesn't Mormonism believe the earth is God's creation and we should treat it as such. Is there really any debate about global warming among educated people?

War- Why some Mormons have become so gun ho about war is beyond me. What a tragic and costly mistake. War is rarely the answer and it certainly wasn't anywhere close the answer in the case of Iraq.

Bottom line: Think again when you say that Mormons can't be liberals. Many of us are and find it much more consistent with our values/beliefs than conservatism. When I hear Mitt speak much of his worldview doesn't resonate with mine, but I do hope he is judged on his merits and policies, not on his religion.

Although I don't agree with most of your rationale, I somewhat understand why you feel the way you do about many of these issues. Some things I don't understand.

1. You say Romney is a sad representation of Mormonism, then complain that he is trying to distance himself from the religion. If you feel he is such a poor representative, then you shouldn't you be happy that he isn't trying to be "Mitt Romney, The Mormon"?

2. Regarding economics, I am not aware of any Republican candidate that is proposing to do away with welfare. My understanding is that conservatives feel that providing opportunities to become independent of the government is better than making them dependent of it. "Feed a man a fish and he eats for a day..."

3. About abortion. It is "pro-abortion." If it was truly "pro-choice," the choice of the unborn child would be considered. I'd say 100% would choose life.

4. Regarding gay rights, it's not about their "rights" in general, just specifically their right to be married. I've changed my view on this slightly and now think there is nothing wrong with civil unions. But marriage should be between a man and a woman. See "Family: A Proclamation to the World"

5. I agree that the we need to closely govern our use of natural resources, but we are also told that it is for our use. This is one issue though that I wish republicans leaned a little more toward the liberals.

6. War is never something that we should desire, but even in our own church history, both in this dispensation and in scriptural times, violence has been used in the name of freedom and defense. Only God can determine whether removing Sadam from power and freeing the Iraqi people is worth the many innocent lives that were lost.

I feel uncomfortable responding to such a serious topic, as I am rarely serious in real life, but wanted to add my opinion why I think that while neither republican nor democratic principals are completely in line with LDS principals, I feel more aligned to consvative values that democratic.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by MagicMax - 2007/12/07 01:10

---

For the record, I am against abortion.

But keep this in mind: Many people actually consider Mormons pro choice because we allow for abortion in cases of rape, incest, and the mother's life being in jeopardy. In addition, I know many people who are pro choice who take that position because they believe that since abortions will happen regardless that they at least should be safe and rare. In fact, if we are being honest this was Mitt Romney's position for the first 50 or so years of his life.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by cougarfurr - 2007/12/07 01:41

---

MagicMax wrote:

For the record, I am against abortion.

But keep this in mind: Many people actually consider Mormons pro choice because we allow for abortion in cases of rape, incest, and the mother's life being in jeopardy. In addition, I know many people who are pro choice who take that position because they believe that since abortions will happen regardless that they at least should be safe and rare. In fact, if we are being honest this was Mitt Romney's position for the first 50 or so years of his life.

---

I have NEVER met a Pro-Life person who thinks that when the mother's life is in jeopardy that they should not be able to end the pregnancy. Are there are there some who say that, yes. But I'm so sick of people acting like that's what Pro-life wants to do. Never has been, never will be. It's so amateur to even bring up such a petty argument. Quit beating around the bush. It's about sticking pole through a baby's skull to kill it (or however they do it now) or not. That's the bottom line.

Shame on you for trying turn attention away from the gruesome reality of what it is. Rape, incest, mother's life in jeopardy, yada yada...forget the rare exceptions. Most pro-lifers don't want to mess with changing that. Sorry, I know its hard for you LDS democrats to face up to the fact that you support people who want to vaccum fetuses. But you do, so quit trying to hide from it. If you're going to stand up for someone than do it with conviction.

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by MagicMax - 2007/12/07 01:45

I'm sorry, maybe my post was in a different language.

Just to clarify. I oppose abortion. And Mitt Romney was pro-choice until a few years ago. Make sense?

BTW I think BYU is offering evening classes for those who want to further their education.

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Mars - 2007/12/07 02:27

MagicMax wrote:

As for the "baby-killing, coke snorting, blah, blah, blah" diatribe: Half the professors at BYU would disagree with your assessment (not to mention a good percentage of the church, including Harry Reid and Mitt Romney until he decided to run for president) But life is much easier when you caricature the "enemy," isn't it?

Do you disagree that Obama is pro-abortion?

Do you refute his statement that he used to snort cocaine?

I didn't think so.

As far as everything else you threw in there, if you had a point I have no idea what it was supposed to be.

And of course Mitt used to support legalized abortion. No duh. Also, BYU used to be called Brigham Young Academy. Dang their flip-flopping!!!

As far as this thread, I have another Princess Bride reference in mind:

"Goodnight thread. Sleep well. I'll most likely have to kill you in the morning." :lol:

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by dYrtbYkerYder - 2007/12/07 02:47

Too bad I only had 1 karma point to give to Max :)

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by dYrtbYkerYder - 2007/12/07 02:54

I want to post but it would literally take me an hour to say what I want to and I'm tired... However, I would like to say this:

Blanket statements about "all" of a group of people really say to me "I am ignorant."

Politicians give "well thought out" answers for a reason... because they are. They mostly think about how to convince you that they are sincere.

---

If anyone explains to me a correlation between 9/11, Iraq, and terrorism, they would be the first.

Oh, and Barack Obama smokes too (but he's trying to quit) so I hate him because of that also :dry: .

Oh, and since it's our job to defend the world from unfair rulers, when we're finished in Iraq let's go to North Korea, Iran, Libya, Syria, Sudan. Then when we're done there, we'll move onto the rest of Africa and Southeast Asia... Sign me up, sounds like fun...

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Tyler1830 - 2007/12/07 05:01

---

Just thought I'd toss this out there before this thread gets locked: If anyone out there was considering voting for Mike Huckabee (which I wasn't) I just thought you should know about his interview yesterday where he refused to admit that Mormons are Christians:

Gov. Huckabee: Well, we certainly believe that doing well in Iowa moves us forward in New Hampshire, where we are also working hard. In addition to that, we're working hard in South Carolina. These three early primary states provide the sling shot to move forward. We've acted to perform in these states. When we do, then we are in the game. And we think we are now. There is going to be a sorting out. It is what typically happens in these early three states. Some folks make it and others just do not get past them. We plan to get past them.

CBSNews.com: Do you believe that Mormonism is a legitimate form of Christianity?

Gov. Huckabee: You know, Mormonism is a faith that people adhere to. And I think people ought to respect anybody's faith. I am not all that familiar with the intricate details. I have enough trouble keeping up with my own faith. So, I do not spend lots of time trying to evaluate somebody else's.

CBSNews.com: But do you think they're real Christians?

Gov. Huckabee: Once again, I am not going to try to judge. That is for them to determine whether they accept Jesus Christ as the only revelation of God on Earth. And, if they do, then that is how a person is a Christian, not by the label they wear, but by the position they take on the role and the personhood of Christ.

Hmmm... You mean to tell me that you're a professional Baptist minister and you really don't know enough to answer this question? Here's my take on this. Either Governor Huckabee (1) really doesn't think Mormons are Christians and he's just worried that by saying so he might offend Mormons or those who hold them in high regard or (2) really does think that Mormons are Christians and he doesn't want to offend his base of religious intolerants. Either way I find it hard to understand how someone who wants a president of integrity could vote for him after this kind of answer.

I know that some of you might be thinking, hey, give Mike a break. Politicians give these kinds of soft answers to questions all the time. You've got a point. Politicians do give meaningless answers whenever they have the chance. But this is the first time I've ever seen a politician try to soft peddle an answer on a question as important to me as my faith.

So to any member of the church who was considering voting for Mike Huckabee, why is it that you are willing to get in bed with someone who obviously holds your faith in contempt?

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Tyler1830 - 2007/12/07 05:01

---

Sorry. Double post.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Tyler1830 - 2007/12/07 05:01

---

---

Sorry again. The rare trifecta.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by happyvalleycougar - 2007/12/07 05:54

shigacoug wrote:

2. Regarding economics, I am not aware of any Republican candidate that is proposing to do away with welfare. My understanding is that conservatives feel that providing opportunities to become independent of the government is better than making them dependent of it. "Feed a man a fish and he eats for a day..."

I've heard another great saying.

Light a man a fire, warm him for a day.  
Light a man on fire, warm him for the rest of his life

Just trying to add a little humor to our discussion.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by byuphil - 2007/12/07 07:22

craigoscarson wrote:

This is a BYU football thread and as this thread should be moved to the "etc." channel but....

Let's be honest here

#1 Mitt has the best track record of governing and business management in the election on either side of the party line - in fact, considering he was a republican governor in a predominately democratic state, and throw in his massive financial successes, he's a relative miracle worker

I agree that based on his "fruits" he's the most qualified candidate, however I don't believe that he'll win his party's nomination

#2 Mitt has zero experience in foreign political relations- but again knowing how he runs business, he wouldn't make poor decisions, he'd put together the best cabinet in the history of this country in my opinion

No one is questioning his decision making ability or success in the past

What you need to ask yourselves if you lean on the GOP/conservative side is this:

1. Can they beat Hillary in a general election- she is every conservatives nightmare- fair or not- (some fears fair, some not)

2. America fears the unknown and often will take the known evil over the unknown evil ("unknown" usually a result of misinformation). The message is getting out in a lot of evangeical christian homes and churches now about this unknown evil of the LDS church.

The fact that the Rev. Mike Huckabee is closing the gap in Iowa and New Hampshire, shows that evangelical christians may be slow to poll but at the end of the day, show up at the ballot box. This bodes poorly for Mitt. Does it help Mike Huckabee? Heck no, he has no chance of winning the GOP nomination. Does it help Rudy Guliani? Absolutely, lack of momentum in the Iowa and New Hampshire primaries = death of Mitts campaign nationwide. Every dollar Giuliani can utilize elsewhere is a win for him.

Giuliani, a guy that is arguably a more liberal republican than Romney, an ambiguous stance on abortion and gay rights, a roman catholic (which is not high on the "friends of Bob Jones" list either) etc. already knows that whoever wins the GOP nod, also gets every conservative christian vote, because the other option is Hillary Clinton.

Knowing all of this, if you're going to get your hands wet early (ala Pat Robertson, etc.) you're going to side with the likely winner. The guy that people believe can beat Hillary.

---

That's the reason you don't see guys like Schwarzenager, etc. picking their guy yet. They don't want to do it twice. But rest assured none of them want Hillary in office.

A large majority (not all mind you) of evangelical christians don't vote with their brains, they vote with their hearts. And most of those churches have zero problem with using the pulpit to push politics and bash other religions- so ask yourselves what the typical pentacostal church member in Alabama is being told about Mitt Romney. At the end of the day, the GOP has relied so heavily on this voting base that they aren't capable of winning an election without them (GW really took us down a slippery slope). What we need is a GOP president that overachieves and earns the trust of this country...Do I think Giuliani can do that? Not sure...I think Romney could but I don't think he's going to get elected.

I understand LDS church members being all over the board in their politics and preference; however we have to get past the fact that defending his religion isn't the same as supporting him for president. We also have to be prepared (I'm one that believes he'd make the best president, considering all the other options) that his religion will be the biggest reason why he doesn't get the nomination. (The last months developments in Iowa alone are pretty good reason to believe that).

The next step is asking yourselves if you lean on the conservative side (which about 95% of LDS households do and the vast majority of nonLDS-christian homes), how do we make sure that Hillary Clinton isn't our next president? I think that's where you find political leaders leaning towards Giuliani now. He could beat Hillary....Thompson flopped coming in late, McCain gets nuttier every day, Ron Paul is Ross Perot 2000, and the others are fairly insignificant as far as viability to win a general election (but they sure can effect the GOP nomination-aka Huckabee)

So there you are....It's possible that those conservative christian leaders (regardless of their good or bad track records) feel the need to pick someone that can beat Hillary. Given the choice to pick Giuliani or Romney, they took the "known perceived evil" simply because #1 Giuliani is a better option than Hillary Clinton and #2 Mitt Romney is Mormon and scary

Romneys' perceived flipping on abortion and gay rights is not the issue here, neither is his track record, voting record, family life, or business dealings and successes- in fact all of those are reasons he's a viable candidate. Bottom line- he's Mormon and thus when the hard core conservative christians come out of the woodwork, they just can't vote him in. We're seeing that in Iowa right now with the Rev. Mike Huckabee. Sad state of affairs, but that's where we are. Love him, hate him, don't care, the reason Romney can't get his party's nomination is because he's LDS and the perception that he might not be able to beat Hillary because of his religion.

Sorry for quoting the whole thing, but I don't have time to edit. I just want to comment on the perception that he wouldn't be able to beat Hillary. Where does this come from? He darn near defeated Teddy Kennedy in a bid for the Senate! He's a Republican governor in arguably the most liberal state in the country. Seems to me if anyone has a proven record of defeating (or nearly defeating--in the case of the institution of Ted Kennedy) it's Romney. Plus, he provided almost universal health care (something democrats would love to see happen) in Massachusetts, and did so without rasing taxes (something Republicans love). But you're right, although he may be the best candidate, these ignorant, prejudiced evangelicals won't vote for him simply because he's Mormon, and irony of ironies, they will end up getting exactly what they don't want--Hillary. Serves 'em right!

God bless America! and Go Coogs!

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by cougarfurr - 2007/12/07 07:44

Tyler1830 wrote:

So to any member of the church who was considering voting for Mike Huckabee, why is it that you are willing to get in bed with someone who obviously holds your faith in contempt?

Why? Because how somebody views my faith is completely irrelevant to how a man runs the United States of America.

I'm not saying I've made up my mind, but I like Huckabee a lot. It bothers me a little to hear him say that, yes. If you live in the south or south east though, you realize that all your baptist friends/neighbors/coworkers feel the same way about it. They still treat you with respect (generally) and are good people.

It would probably bother baptists if Mitt Romney couldn't claim that he believed the Bible as the ONLY word of God (hypothetical). But, I sure hope they just wouldn't vote for him because of that only. Likewise, Mormons shouldn't just shut out Huckabee for that...I think, anyway. But this is coming from a guy with -7 Karma, so you know...it's probably a bunch of crap B)

---

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by UliUli79 - 2007/12/07 10:18

---

cougarfurr wrote:

Why? Because how somebody views my faith is completely irrelevant to how a man runs the United States of America.

I'm not going to disagree as much as point out a couple of things. First off, in the past when people in public office had anti-LDS feelings it didn't bode well for us. I know that that was then and this is now, but if one thing has held true through time it's that history repeats itself. Baptist and Protestant ministers who speak out against the LDS faith don't preach tolerance. Just ask anyone who's served in the south. I experienced it on my mission as well.

P.S. I'm not saying that if Hackabee won he'd put out anti-LDS measures... just that he may not have members best interest in mind.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by BoiseBYU - 2007/12/07 11:39

---

imuakahuku wrote:

I just have a hard time seeing how anyone could vote for any of the Dems. They all support the following to one degree or another.

Abortion including late term

Socialism

Increasing taxes

Losing in Iraq

Gay "special" rights including marriage

Wealth redistribution

Global Warming A farce to take control of our economy

Kyoto Agreement A tool of Global Warming

"Talking" to people like Osama and Amadena "jihad" (while they plot to kill us)

And they do everything they can to weaken our troops efforts in Iraq. If I were in a legal position to do so I would be trying many of them for treason! Just this week they go and weaken our efforts on Iran just gain politically. How many more of our soldier are going to die because they had to pull that stunt this week and cut GWB off at the knees! Now Iran can start sending men and munitions to Iraq to destabilize it again just so the Dems can say "see the surge isn't working, it's a quagmire, you need a Democrat for President". This is absolutely deplorable and Finger and probably Negroponte should be arrested immediately!

Man the only people who can match the antipathy you have toward democrats are the Republican evangelicals and what they think about faithful Latter-Day Saints, republican or not. If they had their way, they would expel us from Missouri all over again. I am neither democrat or republican, so I do not speak directly, but how does it feel to be a member of a party where a significant number of your members think you and I are unworthy to engage in public service and unfit to lead this country? Why be part of a party that views you as a second or third class citizen? And the irony of it all is that on the list you have above, the present leading Republican candidate, Mr. Guiliani, is in lockstep with the evil democrats: he supports abortion rights, he supports gay rights; he actually praised Hillary's health plan when it came out. And to rub salt in the wound, he is getting endorsed by the very Christians who think we are immoral and unfit....Today's Idaho Statesman headline has an article on Mr. Romney's speech and it says local evangelicals "remain skeptical." Of course that makes sense, since they think we are immoral and incapable of telling the truth. Mr. Huckabee was asked if Mr. Romney is christian. Huckabee refused to say yes...I guess he too could not take Mr. Romney's confession of faith in the Savior...Eytoyx got it right: too many of these evangelicals are nothing more than modern day versions of false priests who wrap themselves in the robes of bigotry.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Conosticator - 2007/12/07 11:55

---

---

MagicMax wrote:

For the record, I am against abortion.

But keep this in mind: Many people actually consider Mormons pro choice because we allow for abortion in cases of rape, incest, and the mother's life being in jeopardy. In addition, I know many people who are pro choice who take that position because they believe that since abortions will happen regardless that they at least should be safe and rare. In fact, if we are being honest this was Mitt Romney's position for the first 50 or so years of his life.

What a crock. Mormons are not all conservative Republicans. Many Mormons are Democrats and support the murder of unborn children under the guise of "pro choice". Claiming that the Church's position on abortion is "pro choice" is just plain dishonest.

Using your rationale perhaps we should all be pro murder and pro rape and pro theft since I'm sure we all believe that murder, rape, and theft will happen regardless and that we should at least make it safe for the perpetrators. Perhaps we could make these things just as rare as the estimated world wide total of 46 million abortions per year.

Personally I'm glad Romney has finally come around to support the Church's position on abortion. Perhaps you too might someday support the Brethren on this important issue.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Conosticator - 2007/12/07 12:02

---

cougarfurr wrote:

Tyler1830 wrote:

So to any member of the church who was considering voting for Mike Huckabee, why is it that you are willing to get in bed with someone who obviously holds your faith in contempt?

Why? Because how somebody views my faith is completely irrelevant to how a man runs the United States of America.

I'm not saying I've made up my mind, but I like Huckabee a lot. It bothers me a little to hear him say that, yes. If you live in the south or south east though, you realize that all your baptist friends/neighbors/coworkers feel the same way about it. They still treat you with respect (generally) and are good people.

It would probably bother baptists if Mitt Romney couldn't claim that he believed the Bible as the ONLY word of God (hypothetical). But, I sure hope they just wouldn't vote for him because of that only. Likewise, Mormons shouldn't just shut out Huckabee for that...I think, anyway. But this is coming from a guy with -7 Karma, so you know...it's probably a bunch of crap B)

Before you go overboard with Huckabee, please check his record in Arkansas. I'm looking for a morally AND FISCALLY conservative nominee. Huckabee's record in Arkansas is no where close to being that of a fiscal conservative. The average Arkansas resident's tax burden increased by 47% during Huckabee's governorship. Do you really want that sort of record in the White House with tax & spend dims in control of the House & Senate?

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Hengst - 2007/12/07 12:09

---

Does anyone else think it's funny that some of the longest discussions on this board are about politics?

Someone should start a BYU fan political argument board, judging from this one, it would be pretty successful ;-)

So there is a big showdown of ranked teams on saturday, maybe we should talk a little more about that ;-)

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Conosticator - 2007/12/07 12:13

---

craigoscarson wrote:  
Hillary is Hawaii

She has some people convinced she could do the job, until she has to deal with something of real significance (aka Georgia)

I prefer to think that Hillary is UNLV basketball under Tark, willing to say or do anything to win.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Conosticator - 2007/12/07 12:22

---

I am neither democrat or republican, so I do not speak directly, but how does it feel to be a member of a party where a significant number of your members think you and I are unworthy to engage in public service and unfit to lead this country? Why be part of a party that views you as a second or third class citizen?

Been to San Fran or Beverly Hills lately? Sounds like you are describing both parties.

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by BoiseBYU - 2007/12/07 12:40

---

Conosticator wrote:

I am neither democrat or republican, so I do not speak directly, but how does it feel to be a member of a party where a significant number of your members think you and I are unworthy to engage in public service and unfit to lead this country? Why be part of a party that views you as a second or third class citizen?

Been to San Fran or Beverly Hills lately? Sounds like you are describing both parties.

Touche! Maybe that is why I am not a member of either party...Just a Cougar Fan!

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by imuakahuku - 2007/12/07 13:20

---

BoiseBYU wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

I just have a hard time seeing how anyone could vote for any of the Dems. They all support the following to one degree or another.

Abortion including late term

Socialism

Increasing taxes

Losing in Iraq

Gay "special" rights including marriage

Wealth redistribution

Global Warming A farce to take control of our economy

Kyoto Agreement A tool of Global Warming

"Talking" to people like Osama and Amadena "jihad" (while they plot to kill us)

And they do everything they can to weaken our troops efforts in Iraq. If I were in a legal position to do so I would be trying many of them for treason! Just this week they go and weaken our efforts on Iran just gain politically. How many more of our soldier are going to die because they had to pull that stunt this week and cut GWB off at the knees! Now Iran can start sending men and munitions to Iraq to destabilize it again just so the Dems can say "see the surge isn't working, it's a quagmire, you need a Democrat for President". This is absolutely deplorable and Finger and probably Negroponte should be arrested immediately!

---

Man the only people who can match the antipathy you have toward democrats are the Republican evangelicals and what they think about faithful Latter-Day Saints, republican or not. If they had their way, they would expel us from Missouri all over again. I am neither democrat or republican, so I do not speak directly, but how does it feel to be a member of a party where a significant number of your members think you and I are unworthy to engage in public service and unfit to lead this country? Why be part of a party that views you as a second or third class citizen? And the irony of it all is that on the list you have above, the present leading Republican candidate, Mr. Guiliani, is in lockstep with the evil democrats: he supports abortion rights, he supports gay rights; he actually praised Hillary's health plan when it came out. And to rub salt in the wound, he is getting endorsed by the very Christians who think we are immoral and unfit....Today's Idaho Statesman headline has an article on Mr. Romney's speech and it says local evangelicals "remain skeptical." Of course that makes sense, since they think we are immoral and incapable of telling the truth. Mr. Huckabee was asked if Mr. Romney is christian. Huckabee refused to say yes...I guess he too could not take Mr. Romney's confession of faith in the Savior...Eytoyx got it right: too many of these evangelicals are nothing more than modern day versions of false priests who wrap themselves in the robes of bigotry.

I agree that Guiliani, in my estimation is one of the weakest in terms of morals, of the GOP hopefuls. He has however, stated that he will appoint Supreme Court Justices in the mold of Thomas, Allito and Roberts (Originalists). So his views on those points would be irrelevant because the influence he would have would be in the Justices that he nominated. All the rest are clearly on the conservative side of those issues except for maybe McCain. I have seen estimates that the next president may be appointing three or four justices. Can you image if Hillary or Obama made those appointments? There or four more Ginsburgs. You could just tear up the constitution and rename the country to Sodom or Gomorrhah or the USSA (United States of Socialist America).

I am not a card carrying GOP but I have found that they have most of the same core values that I have. Most of us on this board understand the hypocracy from both sides. The problem with your question on being a memeber of a party is that there is no LDS political party so whether you are a Dem, Rep, or IND you are still seen by that same light. So you can answer that question yourself. How does it feel to be an IND when most other IND's think you and I are unworthy to engage in public service and unfit to lead this country? But this is not unexpected. Joseph was tarred and feathered by Christians not athiests. It is part of the cross we bear. Until they come to an understanding we will continue to have to bear it. Thus we are left with the choice of either withdrawing from society or continuing to function in society and try to educate them through our examples.

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by MagicMax - 2007/12/07 13:33

imuakahuku wrote:

BoiseBYU wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

I just have a hard time seeing how anyone could vote for any of the Dems. They all support the following to one degree or another.

Abortion including late term

Socialism

Increasing taxes

Losing in Iraq

Gay "special" rights including marriage

Wealth redistribution

Global Warming A farce to take control of our economy

Kyoto Agreement A tool of Global Warming

"Talking" to people like Osama and Amadena "jihad" (while they plot to kill us)

And they do everything they can to weaken our troops efforts in Iraq. If I were in a legal position to do so I would be trying many of them for treason! Just this week they go and weaken our efforts on Iran just gain politically. How many more of our soldier are going to die because they had to pull that stunt this week and cut GWB off at the knees! Now Iran can start sending men and munitions to Iraq to destabilize it again just so the Dems can say "see the surge isn't working, it's a quagmire, you need a Democrat for President". This is absolutely deplorable and Finger and probably Negroponte should be arrested immediately!

Man the only people who can match the antipathy you have toward democrats are the Republican evangelicals and what they think about faithful Latter-Day Saints, republican or not. If they had their way, they would expel us from Missouri all over again. I am neither democrat or republican, so I do not speak directly, but how does it feel to be a member of a party where a significant number of your members think you and I are unworthy to engage in public service and unfit to lead this country? Why be part of a party that views you as a second or third class citizen? And the irony of it all is that

---

on the list you have above, the present leading Republican candidate, Mr. Guiliani, is in lockstep with the evil democrats: he supports abortion rights, he supports gay rights; he actually praised Hillary's health plan when it came out. And to rub salt in the wound, he is getting endorsed by the very Christians who think we are immoral and unfit....Today's Idaho Statesman headline has an article on Mr. Romney's speech and it says local evangelicals "remain skeptical." Of course that makes sense, since they think we are immoral and incapable of telling the truth. Mr. Huckabee was asked if Mr. Romney is christian. Huckabee refused to say yes...I guess he too could not take Mr. Romney's confession of faith in the Savior...Eytoyx got it right: too many of these evangelicals are nothing more than modern day versions of false priests who wrap themselves in the robes of bigotry.

I agree that Guiliani, in my estimation is one of the weakest in terms of morals, of the GOP hopefuls. He has however, stated that he will appoint Supreme Court Justices in the mold of Thomas, Allito and Roberts (Orignalists). So his views on those points would be irrelavent because the influence he would have would be in the Justices that he nominated. All the rest are clearly on the conservative side of those issues except for maybe McCain. I have seen estimates that the next president may be appointing three or four justices. Can you image if Hillary or Obama made those appointments? There or four more Ginsburgs. You could just tear up the constitution and rename the country to Sodom or Gommorah or the USSA (United States of Socialist America).

I am not a card carrying GOP but I have found that they have most of the same core values that I have. Most of us on this board understand the hypocrisy from both sides. The problem with your question on being a memeber of a party is that there is no LDS political party so whether you are a Dem, Rep, or IND you are still seen by that same light. So you can answer that question yourself. How does it feel to be an IND when most other IND's think you and I are unworthy to engage in public service and unfit to lead this country? But this is not unexpected. Joseph was tarred and feathered by Christians not athiests. It is part of the cross we bear. Until they come to an understanding we will continue to have to bear it. Thus we are left with the choice of either withdrawing from society or continuing to function in society and try to educate them through our examples.

You've got to be one of the funniest people I've ever heard. Do you live in a bomb shelter in Montana or something? Did you know BYU just invited the Senate Majority leader of the Democratic party to speak on campus? President Samuelson introduced him. You would have loved it, I'm sure. ;)

=====

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by imuakahuku - 2007/12/07 14:03

MagicMax wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

BoiseBYU wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

I just have a hard time seeing how anyone could vote for any of the Dems. They all support the following to one degree or another.

Abortion including late term

Socialism

Increasing taxes

Losing in Iraq

Gay "special" rights including marriage

Wealth redistribution

Global Warming A farce to take control of our economy

Kyoto Agreement A tool of Global Warming

"Talking" to people like Osama and Amadena"jihad" (while they plot to kill us)

And they do everything they can to weaken our troops efforts in Iraq. If I were in a legal position to do so I would be trying many of them for treason! Just this week they go and weaken our efforts on Iran just gain politically. How many more of our soldier are going to die because they had to pull that stunt this week and cut GWB off at the knees! Now Iran can start sending men and munitions to Iraq to destabilize it again just so the Dems can say "see the surge isn't working, it's a quagmire, you need a Democrat for President". This is absolutely deplorable and Finger and probably Negroponte should be arrested immediately!

Man the only people who can match the antipathy you have toward democrats are the Republican evangelicals and what they think about faithful Latter-Day Saints, republican or not. If they had their way, they would expel us from Missouri all over again. I am neither democrat or republican, so I do not speak directly, but how does it feel to be a member of a party where a significant number of your members think you and I are unworthy to engage in public service and unfit to lead this country? Why be part of a party that views you as a second or third class citizen? And the irony of it all is that on the list you have above, the present leading Republican candidate, Mr. Guiliani, is in lockstep with the evil democrats:

---

he supports abortion rights, he supports gay rights; he actually praised Hillary's health plan when it came out. And to rub salt in the wound, he is getting endorsed by the very Christians who think we are immoral and unfit....Today's Idaho Statesman headline has an article on Mr. Romney's speech and it says local evangelicals "remain skeptical." Of course that makes sense, since they think we are immoral and incapable of telling the truth. Mr. Huckabee was asked if Mr. Romney is christian. Huckabee refused to say yes...I guess he too could not take Mr. Romney's confession of faith in the Savior...Eytoyx got it right: too many of these evangelicals are nothing more than modern day versions of false priests who wrap themselves in the robes of bigotry.

I agree that Guiliani, in my estimation is one of the weakest in terms of morals, of the GOP hopefuls. He has however, stated that he will appoint Supreme Court Justices in the mold of Thomas, Allito and Roberts (Originalists). So his views on those points would be irrelevant because the influence he would have would be in the Justices that he nominated. All the rest are clearly on the conservative side of those issues except for maybe McCain. I have seen estimates that the next president may be appointing three or four justices. Can you image if Hillary or Obama made those appointments? There or four more Ginsburgs. You could just tear up the constitution and rename the country to Sodom or Gomorrh or the USSA (United States of Socialist America).

I am not a card carrying GOP but I have found that they have most of the same core values that I have. Most of us on this board understand the hypocrisy from both sides. The problem with your question on being a member of a party is that there is no LDS political party so whether you are a Dem, Rep, or IND you are still seen by that same light. So you can answer that question yourself. How does it feel to be an IND when most other IND's think you and I are unworthy to engage in public service and unfit to lead this country? But this is not unexpected. Joseph was tarred and feathered by Christians not athiests. It is part of the cross we bear. Until they come to an understanding we will continue to have to bear it. Thus we are left with the choice of either withdrawing from society or continuing to function in society and try to educate them through our examples.

You've got to be one of the funniest people I've ever heard. Do you live in a bomb shelter in Montana or something? Did you know BYU just invited the Senate Majority leader of the Democratic party to speak on campus? President Samuelson introduced him. You would have loved it, I'm sure. ;)

What? What does Harry got to do with the GOP? Harry deserves his own thread so lets not get into Pinky. I will just say that because of Harry the DEMs cannot belittle Romney because of his religion.

You may believe that I live in a bombshelter however I have at least outlined my positions and my disgust of ALL the Dem nominees. You just say you don't want to get into it, it would take to long, there are too many things. I strongly believe that democrats have not left their party but that their party leadership has left them. The leaders are now beholden to influences such as George Sauros, Code Pink, International Answer, and others but not to their constituents or the american people. Otherwise, why do they continue to try and push through legislation that will harm our troops or allow for amnesty to illegal immigrants? They have moved so far left that we in the center are now said to be on the right.

How flattering that I amuse you. I'm glad that you find the abhorrance of abortion, distrust of socialists, dispisement of treasons actions to be humorous. Again all I can say is that I can in no way imagine what kind of policies or ideals the Dems could have that would cause me to look the other way when it came to those aforementioned issues.

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by dYrtbYkerYder - 2007/12/07 15:29

imuakahuku wrote:

They have moved so far left that we in the center are now said to be on the right.

Lol? When you support every republican doctrine over that of democrats and you STILL don't agree with the republicans you are not in the center. You are in a different place and it's about as central as Hawaii on a map of the U.S.

---

## Re:Questions, Questions, Questions

Posted by Npliam - 2007/12/07 15:42

Hengst wrote:

Does anyone else think it's funny that some of the longest discussions on this board are about politics?

Someone should start a BYU fan political argument board, judging from this one, it would be pretty successful ;-)

---

So there is a big showdown of ranked teams on saturday, maybe we should talk a little more about that ;-)

This is about the only thing that you have said in this thread that I agree with.

=====