

---

## More evidence that Romney's religion was

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/11 23:42

---

a factor in evs voting against him in the primaries.

Pastors for Huckster.

The Biblical Case Against

Voting For A Mormon

Why Christians Who Support Romney

Actually Violate Scripture

Should a Christian support or vote for a Mormon running for President? To even ask the question is to open oneself to be labeled a bigot. Trust me, I know. However, Christians shouldn

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney's religion was

Posted by Mars - 2008/02/12 00:24

---

Should a Christian support or vote for a Mormon running for President? To even ask the question is to open oneself to be labeled a bigot. Trust me, I know. However, Christians shouldn't be concerned with what the world thinks about them. Jesus told us that the world would hate us. He told us that, "The servant is not greater than his master." He said that, "If they hated me they will hate you." So, if you're not hated by the world then maybe you're compromising or you're not Christian.

Good news- the Nazis were right! The world's hatred of them just proves that they were Christian!! :dry:

And THIS LINK should work:

<http://pastors4huckabeeblog.files.wordpress.com/2008/01/the-biblical-case-against-voting-for-a-mormon-for.pdf>

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney's religion was

Posted by Mars - 2008/02/12 00:29

---

The website continues on, claiming that Mormons are all anti-Christ, that it is a sin to let a Mormon into your house, and that they (we) worship a Jesus completely different from the one found in the Bible.

<http://pastors4huckabeeblog.com/fast-facts-chart-comparing-the-true-jesus-of-the-bible-and-the-antichrist-imposter-jesus-of-mormonism/>

Waaay out in left field, these ignorant hicks. :angry:

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney's religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 07:14

---

I posted this in the "other" ongoing post as well.

Just a thought to all those who support "candidates" other than McCain and Huckabee to a degree. If those states left to vote in the primary will split their votes they can then prevent McCain from getting the 1191 delegates needed to win the nomination. If after all the states "vote" and nobody gets the required delegates then ALL the candidates are back in it.

Here is the sad part of this whole thing. It appears that because the primary is not an actual election there are no laws to govern them. As it turns out (Washington's voting brought this to light) that those in charge of the primary for each state can call it when they want. It actually looks like Romney may have very well won California, Florida, and Georgia except that the voting was called while McCain led in two and Huckabee led in GA (It was reported that McCain's group called

the GA election board and told them to call it for Huckabee before all the votes were counted).

So the action to take is to give mix up the voting enough that neither McCain nor Huckabee get to 1191 delegates. It would then come down to the convention and hopefully (as far as I am concerned) Romney could then return with a very good chance of winning the nomination.

Politics...with parties like these who need organized crime!

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by Real.Men.Wear.Blue - 2008/02/12 07:27

imuakahuku wrote:

It actually looks like Romney may have very well won California, Florida, and Georgia except that the voting was called while McCain led in two and Huckabee led in GA (It was reported that McCain's group called the GA election board and told them to call it for Huckabee before all the votes were counted).

Romney lost Florida and California by a wide margin. I don't think that the failure to count every last vote was the cause of that. Your argument might hold more water for the Georgia primary, but I have faith in the electoral process. It's not perfect, but it is one of the best in the world. Romney lost fair and square, and he was smart to exit the election when he did.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by craigocarson - 2008/02/12 07:48

3-5% is not a wide margin. That's just enough anti- mormon Hucksters to make a difference. I don't think it's a stretch to say that 7-10 out of every 100 voters chose against Romney because of his religion. 7% more in every state he ran in would have gotten him the nomination. Let's not be naive.....

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by MizzouCoug - 2008/02/12 08:11

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by MizzouCoug - 2008/02/12 08:24

I'd love to think that most of the "real" Christians do not subscribe to such thinking. However, polling numbers wrt voting for a Mormon evidences how much distrust still remains. I'll leave it to others to dissect this amateurish mess, but I for one am putting this baby in my journal!

My favorite lines all come in the first paragraph:

"However, Christians shouldn

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by MizzouCoug - 2008/02/12 08:24

How come my posts keep getting cut off halfway?

---

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 08:27

---

Real.Men.Wear.Blue wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

It actually looks like Romney may have very well won California, Florida, and Georgia except that the voting was called while McCain led in two and Huckabee led in GA (It was reported that McCain's group called the GA election board and told them to call it for Huckabee before all the votes were counted).

Romney lost Florida and California by a wide margin. I don't think that the failure to count every last vote was the cause of that. Your argument might hold more water for the Georgia primary, but I have faith in the electoral process. It's not perfect, but it is one of the best in the world. Romney lost fair and square, and he was smart to exit the election when he did.

I got this info from a VERY inside the rep loop source that does not say much but when he speaks its very accurate. Take it for what it's worth but the republican leaders calling it early in washington has brought this to the forefront.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 08:29

---

MizzouCoug wrote:

How come my posts keep getting cut off halfway?

If you are using word or wordperfect (;) ) then you cannot use and apostrophe ' or double quote ". You have to leave them out then put them in after cutting and pasting. I have just about given up on using word because there is always one you miss and it gets to be a pain. Thus I have been making a lot of fat fingered mistakes recently.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by Slugger - 2008/02/12 08:36

---

Don't say I didn't tell you...

Romney is the smartest and most capable candidate, period. Hear me out...Huck and McCain created a sort of "alliance" to keep Romney from getting the Republican nomination and eventual presidency. It would have been almost certain that a McCain/Huck campaign for president/vice president would have ensued, garnering both the christian vote as well as the liberal republican and patriotic vote. It would have been a slam dunk for them and they would have had the joy of seeing Romney lose. However, Romney decides to "suspend" his campaign (that will come in later) basically pitting Huck and McCain, buddies, against each other. Now, neither of them want to concede victory so the campaign goes on, while Romney gets to sit back and watch the "buddies" go after each other. But this isn't all, because Romney only suspended his campaign, he is essentially still part of the run for presidency and in the event of a Huck/McCain fallout, he would still be a legit candidate with his awarded delegates and could potentially jump back into the race and...win. My point? Romney is brilliant, he is playing McCain and Huck like pawns against each other and it will be fun to watch how it unfolds. B)

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/02/12 08:50

---

MizzouCoug wrote:

How come my posts keep getting cut off halfway?

This website has an automatic filter that filters out portions of posts that it deems to be unenlightening... ;)

---

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by GolfDiveNCougs - 2008/02/12 08:56

---

Conosticator wrote:

MizzouCoug wrote:

How come my posts keep getting cut off halfway?

This website has an automatic filter that filters out portions of posts that it deems to be unenlightening... ;)Harsh, but funny. I'm still chuckling.

---

---

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by jbar1221 - 2008/02/12 09:07

---

I found myself having this conversation over and over here at BYU: me "Who do you like in the election?"

"Romney OF COURSE!!"

"Oh really? Why?"

"Well the obvious reason"

"Oh yea whats that?"

"He's a member of the church"

In my experience here at BYU 9 out of 10 of the people who gave this reason for voting for Romney had no idea what his platform was. There only reasoning was that a Mormon candidate is more fit for office BECAUSE he is mormon.

Now I in NO WAY agree with this! But my question is this, why is supporting Mitt based solely on his religion deemed OK but opposing him based solely on his religion is seen as a terrible injustice?

For the record Im not accusing anyone on the board of this thinking but am intersted to hear some responses.

---

---

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 09:09

---

Slugger wrote:

Don't say I didn't tell you...

Romney is the smartest and most capable candidate, period. Hear me out...Huck and McCain created a sort of "alliance" to keep Romney from getting the Republican nomination and eventual presidency. It would have been almost certain that a McCain/Huck campaign for president/vice president would have ensued, garnering both the christian vote as well as the liberal republican and patriotic vote. It would have been a slam dunk for them and they would have had the joy of seeing Romney lose. However, Romney decides to "suspend" his campaign (that will come in later) basically pitting Huck and McCain, buddies, against each other. Now, neither of them want to concede victory so the campaign goes on, while Romney gets to sit back and watch the "buddies" go after each other. But this isn't all, because Romney only suspended his campaign, he is essentially still part of the run for presidency and in the event of a Huck/McCain fallout, he would still be a legit candidate with his awarded delegates and could potentially jump back into the race and...win. My point? Romney is brilliant, he is playing McCain and Huck like pawns against each other and it will be fun to watch how it unfolds. B)

I sent an email the day before he dropped out to a conservative host suggesting he drop out to get Huck to drop out then jump back in but when the Huckster didn't drop out I thought, well I guess it didn't work because the Huckster actually beleives he is so great. This may turn out to be even better. If the huckster takes enough delegates to keep them both from getting the nomination then Romney (and all the rest) will be back in it come time for the convention.

---

---

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

---

Posted by RogDog118 - 2008/02/12 09:12

---

jbar1221 wrote:

I found myself having this conversation over and over here at BYU: me "Who do you like in the election?"

"Romney OF COURSE!!"

"Oh really? Why?"

"Well the obvious reason"

"Oh yea whats that?"

"He's a member of the church"

In my experience here at BYU 9 out of 10 of the people who gave this reason for voting for Romney had no idea what his platform was. There only reasoning was that a Mormon candidate is more fit for office BECAUSE he is mormon.

Now I in NO WAY agree with this! But my question is this, why is supporting Mitt based solely on his religion deemed OK but opposing him based solely on his religion is seen as a terrible injustice?

For the record Im not accusing anyone on the board of this thinking but am intersted to hear some responses.

Because the supporters are right.

Just kidding. It is preferable that everyone do their research and then selects the candidate that best fits the issues that that individual finds important. Too bad that is too difficult for people to do. That is what the Church tells us to do.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 09:16

---

jbar1221 wrote:

I found myself having this conversation over and over here at BYU: me "Who do you like in the election?"

"Romney OF COURSE!!"

"Oh really? Why?"

"Well the obvious reason"

"Oh yea whats that?"

"He's a member of the church"

In my experience here at BYU 9 out of 10 of the people who gave this reason for voting for Romney had no idea what his platform was. There only reasoning was that a Mormon candidate is more fit for office BECAUSE he is mormon.

Now I in NO WAY agree with this! But my question is this, why is supporting Mitt based solely on his religion deemed OK but opposing him based solely on his religion is seen as a terrible injustice?

For the record Im not accusing anyone on the board of this thinking but am intersted to hear some responses.

One arguement is that those voting for him because he is Mormon are Mormon too and already have a pretty good understanding of what his values are. Whereas those who oppose him because he is Mormon do so on a biased and non-informed or incorrectly informed basis.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by BlueBlood75 - 2008/02/12 09:18

---

jbar1221 wrote:

I found myself having this conversation over and over here at BYU: me "Who do you like in the election?"

"Romney OF COURSE!!"

"Oh really? Why?"

"Well the obvious reason"

"Oh yea whats that?"

"He's a member of the church"

In my experience here at BYU 9 out of 10 of the people who gave this reason for voting for Romney had no idea what his

---

platform was. There only reasoning was that a Mormon candidate is more fit for office BECAUSE he is mormon.

Now I in NO WAY agree with this! But my question is this, why is supporting Mitt based solely on his religion deemed OK but opposing him based solely on his religion is seen as a terrible injustice?

For the record Im not accusing anyone on the board of this thinking but am intersted to hear some responses.

I agree with you. It is odd that we can vote for him because he is Mormon, but he cannot be dismissed for being Mormon.:unsure:

However, in my circle of associations the fact that he is Mormon caused many to say, "hey, we've got a Mormon candidate, someone that I can stand behind," and then this fact that he was Mormon caused them to get interested in politics and research the issues. So I think you have both types: people who vote for him because he is Mormon, and people who got interested in really studying the issues because he is Mormon. I'm not sure if studying the issues changed their vote, but I have some close friends and family who were voting for Mitt who now are more politically active than I have ever seen them.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by BlueBlood75 - 2008/02/12 09:19

imuakahuku wrote:

jbar1221 wrote:

I found myself having this conversation over and over here at BYU: me "Who do you like in the election?"

"Romney OF COURSE!!"

"Oh really? Why?"

"Well the obvious reason"

"Oh yea whats that?"

"He's a member of the church"

In my experience here at BYU 9 out of 10 of the people who gave this reason for voting for Romney had no idea what his platform was. There only reasoning was that a Mormon candidate is more fit for office BECAUSE he is mormon.

Now I in NO WAY agree with this! But my question is this, why is supporting Mitt based solely on his religion deemed OK but opposing him based solely on his religion is seen as a terrible injustice?

For the record Im not accusing anyone on the board of this thinking but am intersted to hear some responses.

One arguement is that those voting for him because he is Mormon are Mormon too and already have a pretty good understanding of what his values are. Whereas those who oppose him because he is Mormon do so on a biased and non-informed or incorrectly informed basis.

Good point.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by Hengst - 2008/02/12 09:23

imuakahuku wrote:

jbar1221 wrote:

I found myself having this conversation over and over here at BYU: me "Who do you like in the election?"

"Romney OF COURSE!!"

"Oh really? Why?"

"Well the obvious reason"

"Oh yea whats that?"

"He's a member of the church"

In my experience here at BYU 9 out of 10 of the people who gave this reason for voting for Romney had no idea what his platform was. There only reasoning was that a Mormon candidate is more fit for office BECAUSE he is mormon.

---

Now I in NO WAY agree with this! But my question is this, why is supporting Mitt based solely on his religion deemed OK but opposing him based solely on his religion is seen as a terrible injustice?

For the record Im not accusing anyone on the board of this thinking but am intersted to hear some responses.

One arguement is that those voting for him because he is Mormon are Mormon too and already have a pretty good understanding of what his values are. Whereas those who oppose him because he is Mormon do so on a biased and non-informed or incorrectly informed basis.

That statement seems to reflect your biases more than anything else . . .

I agree that one of the big reasons romney didn't get the rep nomination was because of his religion, and I think it's unfortunate.

I personally don't think a candidates religion should matter at all. I would hope that one day in this country even a budhist or muslim could be elected to political office . . .

---

=====

### Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by lovelldog - 2008/02/12 09:28

---

I always love it when I am told by other groups what we actually believe. It was good to finally learn from them great pastors how the immaculate conception occurred. Anybody else remember learning this is Sunday School?

"They actually teach that Elohim came down and had sex with Mary and that is why Jesus is the

---

=====

### Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by jbar1221 - 2008/02/12 09:31

---

lovelldog wrote:

I always love it when I am told by other groups what we actually believe. It was good to finally learn from them great pastors how the immaculate conception occurred. Anybody else remember learning this is Sunday School?

"They actually teach that Elohim came down and had sex with Mary and that is why Jesus is the

I never heard that taught in sunday school but my Mission President taught that as Doctrine on more then one occasion.

---

=====

### Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by ABYUFAN - 2008/02/12 09:32

---

I voted for him because his dad ran AMC. I gotta support a fellow car guy. I wonder, is that any better than voting for him because he is Mormon?

---

=====

### Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by snoscythe - 2008/02/12 09:33

---

imuakahuku wrote:

One arguement is that those voting for him because he is Mormon are Mormon too and already have a pretty good understanding of what his values are. Whereas those who oppose him because he is Mormon do so on a biased and non-informed or incorrectly informed basis.

Ah yes, is it worse to refuse to vote for someone because of their religion, or to vote for them because of their religion. The problem with assuming that we know his religion and therefore know his values is that we are now discriminating

---

against the other candidates because we do not know their religion and values--we are pretty much doing the same thing that people who refuse to vote for Romney are doing.

Those who refuse to vote for Romney because he is Mormon are generally those who are unfamiliar with the Mormon church and do not understand it fully. They choose instead to vote for candidates with whose values they are more familiar.

Mormons voting for Romney simply because he is Mormon and they think they understand his values are making the same fallacy. They are eliminating other candidates because they are unfamiliar with their religions. For all they know, McCain's religion may be just as morally rigorous as Mormonism, but they are too apathetic to find out. The difference is that non-Mormons voting against Romney are only discriminating against one candidate, those voting for Romney because of his faith are discriminating against every other candidate on the ticket.

The counsel of the First Presidency of the Church has always been to carefully evaluate issues and candidates, and to make the best decision. The idea of voting for someone simply because they are Mormon flies in the face of the very presiding authority of that Church.

Now, this is not to say that Mitt is not the best candidate, he very well may be, but vote for him for that reason, not for his faith.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by MizzouCoug - 2008/02/12 09:33

---

GolfDiveNCougs wrote:

Conosticator wrote:

MizzouCoug wrote:

How come my posts keep getting cut off halfway?

This website has an automatic filter that filters out portions of posts that it deems to be unenlightening... ;)Harsh, but funny. I'm still chuckling.

Are you crazy? I dictated the final resolution to the dispute between real Christians and Mormons that will finally bring peace to the world. But it got deleted. Oh well.

I actually just wanted to point out the ironic nature of the first paragraph of this entertaining expose that states how if you are not hated by the world then you are not Christian--apparently this irony escapes the authors of an article laced with demeaning references to Mormons as "antichrists."

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by MizzouCoug - 2008/02/12 09:34

---

GolfDiveNCougs wrote:

Conosticator wrote:

MizzouCoug wrote:

How come my posts keep getting cut off halfway?

This website has an automatic filter that filters out portions of posts that it deems to be unenlightening... ;)Harsh, but funny. I'm still chuckling.

Are you crazy? I dictated the final resolution to the dispute between real Christians and Mormons that will finally bring peace to the world. But it got deleted. Oh well.

I actually just wanted to point out the ironic nature of the first paragraph of this entertaining expose that states how if you are not hated by the world then you are not Christian--apparently this irony escapes the authors of an article laced with demeaning references to Mormons as "antichrists."

=====

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by jbar1221 - 2008/02/12 09:38

---

imuakahuku wrote:

One arguement is that those voting for him because he is Mormon are Mormon too and already have a pretty good understanding of what his values are. Whereas those who oppose him because he is Mormon do so on a biased and non-informed or incorrectly informed basis.

I dont think that argument stands up because it assumes that all people who oppose Romney based on religion are uninformed. I dont think thats true, some people are well informed about the church and just dont agree.

Personally I strongly feel that as members of the Church we have a greater responsibility to understand as much of a Member candidates policy because if elected, whether we agree or not, EVERYTHING that he (or she) did in their term would be associated with the church and its membership. I think if someone is going to be a national representation of me I should understand what they believe before I give them my support.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by cougarz - 2008/02/12 09:44

---

I am a BYU student and have been a member of the church my whole life, but I did NOT vote for Romney. I do not like the guy at all. But, I think it is a "crime" in America these days for someone to be discriminated against because of a person's religion. But that is okay, I'm not going to vote for a woman or a black ;)

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 10:59

---

snoscythe wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

One arguement is that those voting for him because he is Mormon are Mormon too and already have a pretty good understanding of what his values are. Whereas those who oppose him because he is Mormon do so on a biased and non-informed or incorrectly informed basis.

Ah yes, is it worse to refuse to vote for someone because of their religion, or to vote for them because of their religion. The problem with assuming that we know his religion and therefore know his values is that we are now discriminating against the other candidates because we do not know their religion and values--we are pretty much doing the same thing that people who refuse to vote for Romney are doing.

Those who refuse to vote for Romney because he is Mormon are generally those who are unfamiliar with the Mormon church and do not understand it fully. They choose instead to vote for candidates with whose values they are more familiar.

Mormons voting for Romney simply because he is Mormon and they think they understand his values are making the same fallacy. They are eliminating other candidates because they are unfamiliar with their religions. For all they know, McCain's religion may be just as morally rigorous as Mormonism, but they are too apathetic to find out. The difference is that non-Mormons voting against Romney are only discriminating against one candidate, those voting for Romney because of his faith are discriminating against every other candidate on the ticket.

The counsel of the First Presidency of the Church has always been to carefully evaluate issues and candidates, and to make the best decision. The idea of voting for someone simply because they are Mormon flies in the face of the very presiding authority of that Church.

Now, this is not to say that Mitt is not the best candidate, he very well may be, but vote for him for that reason, not for his faith.

No, it is not the same. They are not eliminating the other because they don't know their religion. When I buy chocolate ice cream it is because I like chocolate ice cream not because I haven't tasted the other flavors but because the chochoalte satisfies me. Neither do I need to taste the other flavors if I am satisfied with the chocolate flavor. Maybe

---

strawberry is better but if I am satisfied then I am satisfied. There is no discrimination. But to vote against him (in other words for someone else because you don't want the Mormon to win) is discrimination.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by snoscythe - 2008/02/12 11:16

---

imuakahuku wrote:

snoscythe wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

One argument is that those voting for him because he is Mormon are Mormon too and already have a pretty good understanding of what his values are. Whereas those who oppose him because he is Mormon do so on a biased and non-informed or incorrectly informed basis.

Ah yes, is it worse to refuse to vote for someone because of their religion, or to vote for them because of their religion. The problem with assuming that we know his religion and therefore know his values is that we are now discriminating against the other candidates because we do not know their religion and values--we are pretty much doing the same thing that people who refuse to vote for Romney are doing.

Those who refuse to vote for Romney because he is Mormon are generally those who are unfamiliar with the Mormon church and do not understand it fully. They choose instead to vote for candidates with whose values they are more familiar.

Mormons voting for Romney simply because he is Mormon and they think they understand his values are making the same fallacy. They are eliminating other candidates because they are unfamiliar with their religions. For all they know, McCain's religion may be just as morally rigorous as Mormonism, but they are too apathetic to find out. The difference is that non-Mormons voting against Romney are only discriminating against one candidate, those voting for Romney because of his faith are discriminating against every other candidate on the ticket.

The counsel of the First Presidency of the Church has always been to carefully evaluate issues and candidates, and to make the best decision. The idea of voting for someone simply because they are Mormon flies in the face of the very presiding authority of that Church.

Now, this is not to say that Mitt is not the best candidate, he very well may be, but vote for him for that reason, not for his faith.

No, it is not the same. They are not eliminating the other because they don't know their religion. When I buy chocolate ice cream it is because I like chocolate ice cream not because I haven't tasted the other flavors but because the chocolate satisfies me. Neither do I need to taste the other flavors if I am satisfied with the chocolate flavor. Maybe strawberry is better but if I am satisfied then I am satisfied. There is no discrimination. But to vote against him (in other words for someone else because you don't want the Mormon to win) is discrimination.

Definition of discriminate:

dictionary.com states

1. to make a distinction in favor of or against a person or thing on the basis of the group, class, or category to which the person or thing belongs rather than according to actual merit; show partiality: The new law discriminates against foreigners. He discriminates in favor of his relatives.

You are discriminating in favor of the chocolate, and by extension against the strawberry. Legal precedent has established this as "reverse discrimination", meaning that by voting for Romney because of his religion, you discriminate in his favor, and therefore against all other candidates. If you are an employer and you discriminate in favor of the minority, you can be sued for discrimination against the minority.

Granted there are no lawsuits involved, but discrimination is discrimination. Unless you are making distinctions based upon merit, you are discriminating.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/02/12 11:35

---

---

cougarz wrote:

I am a BYU student and have been a member of the church my whole life, but I did NOT vote for Romney. I do not like the guy at all. But, I think it is a "crime" in America these days for someone to be discriminated against because of a person's religion. But that is okay, I'm not going to vote for a woman or a black ;)

Wo is me for you are undone.

Guess we need to find a black female LDS candidate. How about if the candidate can sing, too??? :)

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by Conosticator - 2008/02/12 11:43

---

Granted there are no lawsuits involved, but discrimination is discrimination. Unless you are making distinctions \_base\_d upon merit, you are discriminating.

So who defines "merit"? Why is "merit" more important than other criteria. Isn't that also descriminatory? How about if I define merit as being a middle aged white "Christian" guy?

Seems like we are on a slippery slope here. Perhaps we just need to let the Commies run things and declare all us worker bees to be equal and kill anyone that disagrees. Crap! I guess that would be discriminatory, too.

Oh heck, just nuke'm all and let God sort it out!!! :silly:

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by blue42 - 2008/02/12 11:43

---

snoscythe wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

One arguement is that those voting for him because he is Mormon are Mormon too and already have a pretty good understanding of what his values are. Whereas those who oppose him because he is Mormon do so on a biased and non-informed or incorrectly informed basis.

Ah yes, is it worse to refuse to vote for someone because of their religion, or to vote for them because of their religion. The problem with assuming that we know his religion and therefore know his values is that we are now discriminating against the other candidates because we do not know their religion and values--we are pretty much doing the same thing that people who refuse to vote for Romney are doing.

Those who refuse to vote for Romney because he is Mormon are generally those who are unfamiliar with the Mormon church and do not understand it fully. They choose instead to vote for candidates with whose values they are more familiar.

Mormons voting for Romney simply because he is Mormon and they think they understand his values are making the same fallacy. They are eliminating other candidates because they are unfamiliar with their religions. For all they know, McCain's religion may be just as morally rigorous as Mormonism, but they are too apathetic to find out. The difference is that non-Mormons voting against Romney are only discriminating against one candidate, those voting for Romney because of his faith are discriminating against every other candidate on the ticket.

The counsel of the First Presidency of the Church has always been to carefully evaluate issues and candidates, and to make the best decision. The idea of voting for someone simply because they are Mormon flies in the face of the very presiding authority of that Church.

Now, this is not to say that Mitt is not the best candidate, he very well may be, but vote for him for that reason, not for his faith.

I will have to respectfully disagree with this argument. According to this definition every single person who votes for any candidate is discriminating against the others for which ever reason they choose one candidate over the others. A huge number of people who vote do it based off emotion more than anything, if not we would have pretty much the same

---

number of people vote every single election and we know that does not happen. The race for the White House is still a popularity contest more than anything else, just like the Miss America pageant, only without the swimsuit competition, (I cant even imagine McCain or Hillary in a swimsuit!!!! Please gouge out my eyes now!!!) and they get elected based on the fears and beliefs of the voters and how big of an emotional appeal they present. Every single issue is an emotional issue, healthcare, border control, religious affiliations, war in Iraq, what does this candidate want to take away from me and what does this one want to give me, so even though it really is about the "issues", it is based off the emotion those issues create.

So if I do not vote for Hillary or Obama, that would make me a male chauvinist pig and a racist, not because I do not agree with their stance or values but just because I did not vote for them. Not voting for Romney because of his religion is discrimination and there are laws in this country against discrimination based on race, gender and religion, but voting for someone because of their religion is a huge stretch to say they are discriminating against the other candidates because of their religion because they know they have someone who has the same values they have and would rather vote for that than for someone who does not. Now this unofficial survey taken at BYU where 9 out of 10 said they are voting for Romney because he is Mormon I have to take with a grain of salt because I am pretty sure if you asked the same question on whether they would vote for Harry Reid if he was running for President you would probably get 9 out of 10 that would say no. Both are LDS but I think you would get that response, both are probably very good members of the Church, but it would be perceived that one appeals more to the conservative values than the other. (and no I am not turning this into a debate about the virtues of one party over the other.)

I also know the First Presidency does not back any political candidate or party and ALWAYS tell the members to study the issues and vote accordingly and that is because that is the way it should be and also then know the importance of maintaining that separation between Church and State, especially in Utah.

So this reverse discrimination thing I really don

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by NotSackless - 2008/02/12 11:45

---

So this reverse discrimination thing I really don

Truncated!!! Your comments must have become unenlightening... Keep trying Pilgrim. ;)

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by Slugger - 2008/02/12 11:51

---

imuakahuku wrote:

Slugger wrote:

Don't say I didn't tell you...

Romney is the smartest and most capable candidate, period. Hear me out...Huck and McCain created a sort of "alliance" to keep Romney from getting the Republican nomination and eventual presidency. It would have been almost certain that a McCain/Huck campaign for president/vice president would have ensued, garnering both the christian vote as well as the liberal republican and patriotic vote. It would have been a slam dunk for them and they would have had the joy of seeing Romney lose. However, Romney decides to "suspend" his campaign (that will come in later) basically pitting Huck and McCain, buddies, against each other. Now, neither of them want to concede victory so the campaign goes on, while Romney gets to sit back and watch the "buddies" go after each other. But this isn't all, because Romney only suspended his campaign, he is essentially still part of the run for presidency and in the event of a Huck/McCain fallout, he would still be a legit candidate with his awarded delegates and could potentially jump back into the race and...win. My point? Romney is brilliant, he is playing McCain and Huck like pawns against each other and it will be fun to watch how it unfolds. B)

I sent an email the day before he dropped out to a conservative host suggesting he drop out to get Huck to drop out then jump back in but when the Huckster didn't drop out I thought, well I guess it didn't work because the Huckster actually beleives he is so great. This may turn out to be even better. If the huckster takes enough delegates to keep them both from getting the nomination then Romney (and all the rest) will be back in it come time for the convention.

Exactly! I'm glad someone else sees the big picture here. Romney is playing them like a deck of cards. It isn't guaranteed

---

to work but it is worth a chance, and now it backs Huckelberry and McSugarCane into a proverbial corner. Mormons can be shrewd too!!

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by snoscythe - 2008/02/12 11:52

---

Let me make it abundantly clear that you are only guilty of discrimination if you vote for Romney because of his religion. If you have assessed the issues and like his economic policy, his plans for border security, etc., then there is no discrimination involved as you have made your decision based upon his personal merit.

It is when you make your decision based upon a category that you discriminate. Refusing to vote for Hillary or Obama is not racism or sexism if you refuse based upon her socialist ideals or Obama's permissive attitude toward infanticide while a State Senator in Illinois. You are only discriminating if the category in question is a qualifying criterion for the decision.

I am not bashing Romney or his platform. I am only bashing those who refuse to look beyond religion, either for him or against. I simply am standing by the perpetual counsel of the First Presidency to carefully study issues and candidates before elections and to make informed decisions.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 11:53

---

snoscythe wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

snoscythe wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

One argument is that those voting for him because he is Mormon are Mormon too and already have a pretty good understanding of what his values are. Whereas those who oppose him because he is Mormon do so on a biased and non-informed or incorrectly informed basis.

Ah yes, is it worse to refuse to vote for someone because of their religion, or to vote for them because of their religion. The problem with assuming that we know his religion and therefore know his values is that we are now discriminating against the other candidates because we do not know their religion and values--we are pretty much doing the same thing that people who refuse to vote for Romney are doing.

Those who refuse to vote for Romney because he is Mormon are generally those who are unfamiliar with the Mormon church and do not understand it fully. They choose instead to vote for candidates with whose values they are more familiar.

Mormons voting for Romney simply because he is Mormon and they think they understand his values are making the same fallacy. They are eliminating other candidates because they are unfamiliar with their religions. For all they know, McCain's religion may be just as morally rigorous as Mormonism, but they are too apathetic to find out. The difference is that non-Mormons voting against Romney are only discriminating against one candidate, those voting for Romney because of his faith are discriminating against every other candidate on the ticket.

The counsel of the First Presidency of the Church has always been to carefully evaluate issues and candidates, and to make the best decision. The idea of voting for someone simply because they are Mormon flies in the face of the very presiding authority of that Church.

Now, this is not to say that Mitt is not the best candidate, he very well may be, but vote for him for that reason, not for his faith.

No, it is not the same. They are not eliminating the other because they don't know their religion. When I buy chocolate ice cream it is because I like chocolate ice cream not because I haven't tasted the other flavors but because the chocolate satisfies me. Neither do I need to taste the other flavors if I am satisfied with the chocolate flavor. Maybe strawberry is better but if I am satisfied then I am satisfied. There is no discrimination. But to vote against him (in other words for someone else because you don't want the Mormon to win) is discrimination.

Definition of discriminate:

dictionary.com states

1. to make a distinction in favor of or against a person or thing on the basis of the group, class, or category to which the person or thing belongs rather than according to actual merit; show partiality: The new law discriminates against foreigners. He discriminates in favor of his relatives.

You are discriminating in favor of the chocolate, and by extension against the strawberry. Legal precedent has established this as "reverse discrimination", meaning that by voting for Romney because of his religion, you discriminate in his favor, and therefore against all other candidates. If you are an employer and you discriminate in favor of the minority, you can be sued for discrimination against the minority.

Granted there are no lawsuits involved, but discrimination is discrimination. Unless you are making distinctions based upon merit, you are discriminating.

- 2. note or observe a difference; distinguish accurately: to discriminate between things.
- 3. to make or constitute a distinction in or between; differentiate

And if I make no distinction because I know nothing of Strawberry (or the other candidates) I cannot descriminate against it (or them). I make the decisions based on the merits that each posses. In the case of chocolate the merit is the flavor whereas with Romney the merit is the fact that he is Mormon which in my estimation identifies him as pro-choice, anti roe v wade, anti civil unions, etc. I do not have to know what everyone else stands for if I know what the first stands for and am satisfied with that evaluation. I don't have to taste strawberry to know I like chocolate.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 11:59

jbar1221 wrote:  
imuakahuku wrote:

One arguement is that those voting for him because he is Mormon are Mormon too and already have a pretty good understanding of what his values are. Whereas those who oppose him because he is Mormon do so on a biased and non-informed or incorrectly informed basis.

I dont think that argument stands up because it assumes that all people who oppose Romney based on religion are uninformed. I dont think thats true, some people are well informed about the church and just dont agree.

Personally I strongly feel that as members of the Church we have a greater responsibility to understand as much of a Member candidates policy because if elected, whether we agree or not, EVERYTHING that he (or she) did in their term would be associated with the church and its membership. I think if someone is going to be a national representation of me I should understand what they believe before I give them my support.

I said biased, and uninformed or misinformed. I gave different classes from which to choose. You discriminate which category they fit in. :lol:

Oh and I found a cure for

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by snoscythe - 2008/02/12 12:00

imuakahuku wrote:  
snoscythe wrote:  
imuakahuku wrote:  
snoscythe wrote:  
imuakahuku wrote:

One arguement is that those voting for him because he is Mormon are Mormon too and already have a pretty good understanding of what his values are. Whereas those who oppose him because he is Mormon do so on a biased and non-informed or incorrectly informed basis.

Ah yes, is it worse to refuse to vote for someone because of their religion, or to vote for them because of their religion.

---

The problem with assuming that we know his religion and therefore know his values is that we are now discriminating against the other candidates because we do not know their religion and values--we are pretty much doing the same thing that people who refuse to vote for Romney are doing.

Those who refuse to vote for Romney because he is Mormon are generally those who are unfamiliar with the Mormon church and do not understand it fully. They choose instead to vote for candidates with whose values they are more familiar.

Mormons voting for Romney simply because he is Mormon and they think they understand his values are making the same fallacy. They are eliminating other candidates because they are unfamiliar with their religions. For all they know, McCain's religion may be just as morally rigorous as Mormonism, but they are too apathetic to find out. The difference is that non-Mormons voting against Romney are only discriminating against one candidate, those voting for Romney because of his faith are discriminating against every other candidate on the ticket.

The counsel of the First Presidency of the Church has always been to carefully evaluate issues and candidates, and to make the best decision. The idea of voting for someone simply because they are Mormon flies in the face of the very presiding authority of that Church.

Now, this is not to say that Mitt is not the best candidate, he very well may be, but vote for him for that reason, not for his faith.

No, it is not the same. They are not eliminating the other because they don't know their religion. When I buy chocolate ice cream it is because I like chocolate ice cream not because I haven't tasted the other flavors but because the chocolate satisfies me. Neither do I need to taste the other flavors if I am satisfied with the chocolate flavor. Maybe strawberry is better but if I am satisfied then I am satisfied. There is no discrimination. But to vote against him (in other words for someone else because you don't want the Mormon to win) is discrimination.

Definition of discriminate:  
dictionary.com states

1. to make a distinction in favor of or against a person or thing on the basis of the group, class, or category to which the person or thing belongs rather than according to actual merit; show partiality: The new law discriminates against foreigners. He discriminates in favor of his relatives.

You are discriminating in favor of the chocolate, and by extension against the strawberry. Legal precedent has established this as "reverse discrimination", meaning that by voting for Romney because of his religion, you discriminate in his favor, and therefore against all other candidates. If you are an employer and you discriminate in favor of the minority, you can be sued for discrimination against the minority.

Granted there are no lawsuits involved, but discrimination is discrimination. Unless you are making distinctions based upon merit, you are discriminating.

2. note or observe a difference; distinguish accurately: to discriminate between things.  
3. to make or constitute a distinction in or between; differentiate

And if I make no distinction because I know nothing of Strawberry (or the other candidates) I cannot discriminate against it (or them). I make the decisions based on the merits that each possess. In the case of chocolate the merit is the flavor whereas with Romney the merit is the fact that he is Mormon which in my estimation identifies him as pro-choice, anti roe v wade, anti civil unions, etc. I do not have to know what everyone else stands for if I know what the first stands for and am satisfied with that evaluation. I don't have to taste strawberry to know I like chocolate.

Definition #1 is the most applicable as it refers to distinctions made on the basis of a group or category. Romney belongs to the category of Mormon, and hence the decision is made.

And if you feel like you don't have to learn about what the other candidates stand for simply because you know Mitt is Mormon and they are not, you are still discriminating buddy. You are still discriminating based upon definitions 1, 2, and 3, whether you like it or not. If you refuse to learn about the other candidates because you use an availability heuristic with which to evaluate Romney, you still are discriminating (for better or worse) and you cannot be certain that you are truly voting for the candidate that best represents you, because you have not truly evaluated all candidates.

=====

**Re:More evidence that Romney's religion was**

Posted by happyvalleycougar - 2008/02/12 12:00

---

Sure, you can call it discrimination if you want. I personally think you should look at all the candidates and see who best matches your views and vote for that person. Just a couple of weeks ago my Thesis advisor said "Well, I guess I know who you're voting for this election..." (I'm not at BYU) and I said I am voting for Romney, but not because of his religion, but because of his economic understanding.

I also don't believe that voting for Romney because he's LDS is equal to not voting for him because he's LDS. Going with the Ice Cream example. If I really like chocolate and someone asks me what flavor to get, I'll say chocolate, even if I might actually enjoy strawberry more (but I haven't tasted it). On the otherhand, if I tell someone, get anything but strawberry, because I've heard it's bad, that would be discrimination in my book. Again, I personally don't think you should vote for someone just because they are LDS, but that's not as bad as not voting for them because they are LDS.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney's religion was

Posted by Uncle Iroh - 2008/02/12 12:02

I want to say, that I was never going to vote for Mitt, I never trusted the guy. I always felt that I just couldn't throw my support behind a person, who as I saw it, changed his stances to get elected. Yes, I know, that is politics, but I still don't understand it. As much as Bush was never respected, at least he had his perspective, and stuck to it. He always had at least that. I don't know who said it, but there is an old quote, "Till I die, I shall not remove my integrity from me." I felt that he removed some measure of his integrity to get where he is, and I always had real problems with that.

As far as Mormons overwhelmingly throwing support behind him, I completely understand it. Look at the data from the exit polls, black are overwhelmingly voting for Obama, women for Clinton, evangelicals for Huckabee. You vote for those who are like you, who you can relate to you. So it is completely understandable. I wanted Mitt to represent himself, the Church, and me as a member well. I still am up in the air on that.

That said. I served a mission in the Bible Belt, I faced this discrimination every single day. But the percentages were low. The thing that really bothers me about these evangelicals is this, We live in a day and time when Islamic Extremists seek to eradicate the infidel. And who is the infidel, us, Jews, Christians, Westerners. How can a supposed christian not see this. It bothers me that even in the church, there are some who have the same opinions toward evangelicals, or other Protestant faiths. We should be banding together as believers in Christ, like President Hinckley would say, "Bring the good parts with you, and see if we can add to it." People are stubborn, and ignorant, out of and in the church.

it is absolutely amazing that there are still so many who can be so shallow and narrow minded. There is a great big world out there. With all of our Heavenly Fathers children on it. It drives me nuts to see people, who call themselves good christians, be so bigoted, and shortsighted.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney's religion was

Posted by snoscythe - 2008/02/12 12:03

happyvalleycougar wrote:

Sure, you can call it discrimination if you want. I personally think you should look at all the candidates and see who best matches your views and vote for that person. Just a couple of weeks ago my Thesis advisor said "Well, I guess I know who you're voting for this election..." (I'm not at BYU) and I said I am voting for Romney, but not because of his religion, but because of his economic understanding.

I also don't believe that voting for Romney because he's LDS is equal to not voting for him because he's LDS. Going with the Ice Cream example. If I really like chocolate and someone asks me what flavor to get, I'll say chocolate, even if I might actually enjoy strawberry more (but I haven't tasted it). On the otherhand, if I tell someone, get anything but strawberry, because I've heard it's bad, that would be discrimination in my book. Again, I personally don't think you should vote for someone just because they are LDS, but that's not as bad as not voting for them because they are LDS.

The ice cream example is still discrimination, but not with all the negative connotations that we give to it. It is ignorant discrimination as opposed to willful discrimination.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney's religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 12:16

---

snoscythe wrote:  
imuakahuku wrote:  
snoscythe wrote:  
imuakahuku wrote:  
snoscythe wrote:  
imuakahuku wrote:

One argument is that those voting for him because he is Mormon are Mormon too and already have a pretty good understanding of what his values are. Whereas those who oppose him because he is Mormon do so on a biased and non-informed or incorrectly informed basis.

Ah yes, is it worse to refuse to vote for someone because of their religion, or to vote for them because of their religion. The problem with assuming that we know his religion and therefore know his values is that we are now discriminating against the other candidates because we do not know their religion and values--we are pretty much doing the same thing that people who refuse to vote for Romney are doing.

Those who refuse to vote for Romney because he is Mormon are generally those who are unfamiliar with the Mormon church and do not understand it fully. They choose instead to vote for candidates with whose values they are more familiar.

Mormons voting for Romney simply because he is Mormon and they think they understand his values are making the same fallacy. They are eliminating other candidates because they are unfamiliar with their religions. For all they know, McCain's religion may be just as morally rigorous as Mormonism, but they are too apathetic to find out. The difference is that non-Mormons voting against Romney are only discriminating against one candidate, those voting for Romney because of his faith are discriminating against every other candidate on the ticket.

The counsel of the First Presidency of the Church has always been to carefully evaluate issues and candidates, and to make the best decision. The idea of voting for someone simply because they are Mormon flies in the face of the very presiding authority of that Church.

Now, this is not to say that Mitt is not the best candidate, he very well may be, but vote for him for that reason, not for his faith.

No, it is not the same. They are not eliminating the other because they don't know their religion. When I buy chocolate ice cream it is because I like chocolate ice cream not because I haven't tasted the other flavors but because the chocolate satisfies me. Neither do I need to taste the other flavors if I am satisfied with the chocolate flavor. Maybe strawberry is better but if I am satisfied then I am satisfied. There is no discrimination. But to vote against him (in other words for someone else because you don't want the Mormon to win) is discrimination.

Definition of discriminate:  
dictionary.com states

1. to make a distinction in favor of or against a person or thing on the basis of the group, class, or category to which the person or thing belongs rather than according to actual merit; show partiality: The new law discriminates against foreigners. He discriminates in favor of his relatives.

You are discriminating in favor of the chocolate, and by extension against the strawberry. Legal precedent has established this as "reverse discrimination", meaning that by voting for Romney because of his religion, you discriminate in his favor, and therefore against all other candidates. If you are an employer and you discriminate in favor of the minority, you can be sued for discrimination against the minority.

Granted there are no lawsuits involved, but discrimination is discrimination. Unless you are making distinctions based upon merit, you are discriminating.

2. note or observe a difference; distinguish accurately: to discriminate between things.  
3. to make or constitute a distinction in or between; differentiate

And if I make no distinction because I know nothing of Strawberry (or the other candidates) I cannot discriminate against it (or them). I make the decisions based on the merits that each possesses. In the case of chocolate the merit is the flavor whereas with Romney the merit is the fact that he is Mormon which in my estimation identifies him as pro-choice, anti Roe v Wade, anti civil unions, etc. I do not have to know what everyone else stands for if I know what the first stands for and am satisfied with that evaluation. I don't have to taste strawberry to know I like chocolate.

Definition #1 is the most applicable as it refers to distinctions made on the basis of a group or category. Romney belongs to the category of Mormon, and hence the decision is made.

---

And if you feel like you don't have to learn about what the other candidates stand for simply because you know Mitt is Mormon and they are not, you are still discriminating buddy. You are still discriminating based upon definitions 1, 2, and 3, whether you like it or not. If you refuse to learn about the other candidates because you use an availability heuristic with which to evaluate Romney, you still are discriminating (for better or worse) and you cannot be certain that you are truly voting for the candidate that best represents you, because you have not truly evaluated all candidates.

I am not refusing to do anything. When I lose something I always stop looking when I find it (usually the last place I look ;)). I am merely stopping because I am satisfied with my results. I don't need to compare them to anything else because I am satisfied. If it is assumed that I must continue looking at the other candidates then why must I stop there because I am able to write in a vote as well. And if I do continue I will be forced to discriminate between the candidates. So if I stop as soon as I am satisfied then I will not be forced to discriminate between them. Because that is what everyone who evaluates the candidates must then do. Find distinctions and discriminate based on those distinctions. :lol:

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney's religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 12:19

snoscythe wrote:

happyvalleycougar wrote:

Sure, you can call it discrimination if you want. I personally think you should look at all the candidates and see who best matches your views and vote for that person. Just a couple of weeks ago my Thesis advisor said "Well, I guess I know who you're voting for this election..." (I'm not at BYU) and I said I am voting for Romney, but not because of his religion, but because of his economic understanding.

I also don't believe that voting for Romney because he's LDS is equal to not voting for him because he's LDS. Going with the Ice Cream example. If I really like chocolate and someone asks me what flavor to get, I'll say chocolate, even if I might actually enjoy strawberry more (but I haven't tasted it). On the otherhand, if I tell someone, get anything but strawberry, because I've heard it's bad, that would be discrimination in my book. Again, I personally don't think you should vote for someone just because they are LDS, but that's not as bad as not voting for them because they are LDS.

The ice cream example is still discrimination, but not with all the negative connotations that we give to it. It is ignorant discrimination as opposed to willful discrimination.

Since when was all discrimination bad? It isn't.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney's religion was

Posted by jbar1221 - 2008/02/12 12:27

blue42 wrote:

Now this unofficial survey taken at BYU where 9 out of 10 said they are voting for Romney because he is Mormon I have to take with a grain of salt because I am pretty sure if you asked the same question on whether they would vote for Harry Reid if he was running for President you would probably get 9 out of 10 that would say no.

I imagine this is directed at my post. You took what I wrote out of context. Heres what I said jbar1221 wrote:

In my experience here at BYU 9 out of 10 of the people who gave this reason for voting for Romney had no idea what his platform was. There only reasoning was that a Mormon candidate is more fit for office BECAUSE he is mormon.

So what I'm saying is in my experience people who supported Mitt because he was Mormon were ill informed as to policy, record, experience, etc. Now I thought I made it clear that this was MY experience and didn't try to generalize.

I still don't see the difference between supporting Mitt because he is Mormon and opposing him because of the same. I also think it's ridiculous to support Hillary because she is a woman or Obama because he is Black. In the same way it is ridiculous to oppose them because of their gender and race. As for the assumption that BECAUSE Mitt is Mormon members know what he believes in and can trust him. I have never had a Bishop use my idea of sound economic policy or health care reform to determine whether I am a good worthy member of the church. There are TOO many important aspects of a presidential campaign that are not covered by knowing he holds a temple recommend to base my support or

opposition on his membership in the church.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 12:42

jbar1221 wrote:

blue42 wrote:

Now this unofficial survey taken at BYU where 9 out of 10 said they are voting for Romney because he is Mormon I have to take with a grain of salt because I am pretty sure if you asked the same question on whether they would vote for Harry Reid if he was running for President you would probably get 9 out of 10 that would say no.

I imagine this is directed at my post. You took what I wrote out of context. Heres what I said jbar1221 wrote:

In my experience here at BYU 9 out of 10 of the people who gave this reason for voting for Romney had no idea what his platform was. There only reasoning was that a Mormon candidate is more fit for office BECAUSE he is mormon.

So what Im saying is in my experience people who supported Mitt because he was Mormon were ill informed as to policy, record, experience, etc. Now I thought I made it clear that this was MY experience and didnt try to generalize.

I still dont see the diference between supporting Mitt because he is Mormon and opposing him because of the same. I also think its ridiculous to support Hillary because she is a woman or Obama because he is Black. In the same way it is ridiculous to oppose them because of their gender and race. As for the assumption that BECAUSE Mitt is mormon members know what he believes in and can trust him. I have never had a Bishop use my idea of sound economic policy or health care reform to determine whether I am a good worthy member of the church. There are TOO many important aspects of a presidential campaign that are not covered by knowing he holds a temple recomend to base my support or opposition on his membership in the church.

For some though because he holds a temple recommend that is enough. He does not affiliate with all those things they say in the interview. Some people may not give a hoot about the war in Iraq or about healthcare or about the economic stance that he takes. Some people just want to eat chocolate ice cream.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by snoscythe - 2008/02/12 12:49

imuakahuku wrote:

snoscythe wrote:

happyvalleycougar wrote:

Sure, you can call it discrimination if you want. I personally think you should look at all the candidates and see who best matches your views and vote for that person. Just a couple of weeks ago my Thesis advisor said "Well, I guess I know who you're voting for this election..." (I'm not at BYU) and I said I am voting for Romney, but not because of his religion, but because of his economic understanding.

I also don't believe that voting for Romney because he's LDS is equal to not voting for him because he's LDS. Going with the Ice Cream example. If I really like chocolate and someone asks me what flavor to get, I'll say chocolate, even if I might actually enjoy strawberry more (but I haven't tasted it). On the otherhand, if I tell someone, get anything but strawberry, because I've heard it's bad, that would be discrimination in my book. Again, I personally don't think you should vote for someone just because they are LDS, but that's not as bad as not voting for them because they are LDS.

The ice cream example is still discrimination, but not with all the negative connotations that we give to it. It is ignorant discrimination as opposed to willful discrimination.

Since when was all discrimination bad? It isn't.

Only when the discrimination is made on the basis of category instead of merit.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by a1247 - 2008/02/12 12:50

---

Has anyone seen the video of McCain and his mother on a national TV show talking about Romney and what he did for the Olympics? McCain's mother starts to go off on how the "Mormons" put the Olympics in the situation to have to have Romney come in and fix the problem and how it was all "the Mormons" fault everything went wrong. If you haven't seen the video its all over the internet.

So my question is this. As a state that is a red blooded republican state, is the LDS population still going to vote for a man who has a mother that is anti LDS? Yes it might be his mother and not so much him but to have his mother sitting right there next to him and have her go off on the LDS religion leaves an extremely bad taste in my mouth. If you have not seen this video I really suggest that you go online and find the video. This man with his Mormon hating mom could be our next president and the worst part is you could be giving him your vote.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by happyvalleycougar - 2008/02/12 12:51

---

snoscythe wrote:

happyvalleycougar wrote:

Sure, you can call it discrimination if you want. I personally think you should look at all the candidates and see who best matches your views and vote for that person. Just a couple of weeks ago my Thesis advisor said "Well, I guess I know who you're voting for this election..." (I'm not at BYU) and I said I am voting for Romney, but not because of his religion, but because of his economic understanding.

I also don't believe that voting for Romney because he's LDS is equal to not voting for him because he's LDS. Going with the Ice Cream example. If I really like chocolate and someone asks me what flavor to get, I'll say chocolate, even if I might actually enjoy strawberry more (but I haven't tasted it). On the otherhand, if I tell someone, get anything but strawberry, because I've heard it's bad, that would be discrimination in my book. Again, I personally don't think you should vote for someone just because they are LDS, but that's not as bad as not voting for them because they are LDS.

The ice cream example is still discrimination, but not with all the negative connotations that we give to it. It is ignorant discrimination as opposed to willful discrimination.

Then everything is discrimination. I discriminate against politicians I think don't understand fiscal policy. When we say our favorite color is Blue, that's discrimination. So you are right, it still is discrimination to vote for someone because they're LDS, but not as bad as not voting for them because they are LDS.

Because this is Cougarblue, I will use a football example. I am fine with people cheering for the Utes... I don't agree with it, but I am fine with them. I don't enjoy people only cheering against the Cougars. I'm sure we've all complained that most Utes would rather BYU lose than Utah win. That's all I'm saying.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by jbar1221 - 2008/02/12 12:52

---

imuakahuku wrote:

jbar1221 wrote:

blue42 wrote:

Now this unofficial survey taken at BYU where 9 out of 10 said they are voting for Romney because he is Mormon I have to take with a grain of salt because I am pretty sure if you asked the same question on whether they would vote for Harry Reid if he was running for President you would probably get 9 out of 10 that would say no.

I imagine this is directed at my post. You took what I wrote out of context. Heres what I said jbar1221 wrote:

In my experience here at BYU 9 out of 10 of the people who gave this reason for voting for Romney had no idea what his platform was. There only reasoning was that a Mormon candidate is more fit for office BECAUSE he is mormon.

So what Im saying is in my experience people who supported Mitt because he was Mormon were ill informed as to policy, record, experience, etc. Now I thought I made it clear that this was MY experience and didnt try to generalize.

---

I still dont see the difERENCE between supporting Mitt because he is Mormon and opposing him because of the same. I also think its ridiculous to support Hillary because she is a woman or Obama because he is Black. In the same way it is ridiculous to oppose them because of their gender and race. As for the assumption that BECAUSE Mitt is mormon members know what he believes in and can trust him. I have never had a Bishop use my idea of sound economic policy or health care reform to determine whether I am a good worthy member of the church. There are TOO many important aspects of a presidential campaign that are not covered by knowing he holds a temple recomend to base my support or opposition on his membership in the church.

For some though because he holds a temple recommend that is enough. He does not affiliate with all those things they say in the interview. Some people may not give a hoot about the war in Iraq or about healthcare or about the economic stance that he takes. Some people just want to eat chocolate ice cream.

So then why is it discrimination if I oppose Mitt because he holds a recommend??

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/12 12:56

---

I recall the exit polls for Utah were running 90% Romney in the Republican primary among Mormons. When analyzed further, it was clear that many remember what a great job Romney did with the Olympics, they remembered what Hucklebee said about Mormons and his overt bigotry, and they further cited that McCain has never had a following among Mormon Republicans. Romney was really the default candidate because he had done very well when in Utah with the Olympics and he wasn't the other candidates.

Obama did exceptionally well among Mormon Democrats as well, due to his positive speaking ability and because HE AINT CLINTON!!!

My personal experience in coming around to support Romney is this. I actually used his religion against him. I know he's an active Mormon and being Mormon myself, I would be branded as supporting him on that basis only. Plus, there were other candidates who had distinguished themselves at the national level already. It wasn't until I began seeing he was gaining the support of the conservative columnists who explained his platforms, his changes in light of what a Republican can and can't do in Massachussets, which I've lived and voted before so I knew what that meant and counted it a plus for Romney, and what he needed to do to attract a wider base than what he had to garner within the Mormon community and Massachussets. Once I saw he had the mettle and policies that stood apart from his faith, then I came around and supported him as the best candidate in either party.

I hope others did the same thing, even if they didn't get to explain that when polled in the exit polls.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by happyvalleycougar - 2008/02/12 13:02

---

Here's a news release talking about a study about Romney.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by blue42 - 2008/02/12 13:09

---

So the point of this thread we can all take and sleep well at night is that everybody discriminates every single day they are alive. (I don't know if you can discriminate when you are dead, unless you discriminate against the other cemeteries by being buried at one and not the others.)

By the pure definition of discrimination if you choose to do one thing over the other you are discriminating against the things you do not choose. So when I go to the store and have a choice of which checkout line I get in, I will go to the smaller one, even though that always moves the slowest, because I am anti long lines and therefore I discriminate against long lines. There I said it and I am glad I finally got it off my chest, I HATE LONG LINES!!! So see we can nit pick anything we want and twist any definition to meet our agenda, which is discriminating against other agendas!!!! Will

it ever stop?? Oh the humanity. I think I am getting pretty dizzy on this ride.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 13:11

snoscythe wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

snoscythe wrote:

happyvalleycougar wrote:

Sure, you can call it discrimination if you want. I personally think you should look at all the candidates and see who best matches your views and vote for that person. Just a couple of weeks ago my Thesis advisor said "Well, I guess I know who you're voting for this election..." (I'm not at BYU) and I said I am voting for Romney, but not because of his religion, but because of his economic understanding.

I also don't believe that voting for Romney because he's LDS is equal to not voting for him because he's LDS. Going with the Ice Cream example. If I really like chocolate and someone asks me what flavor to get, I'll say chocolate, even if I might actually enjoy strawberry more (but I haven't tasted it). On the otherhand, if I tell someone, get anything but strawberry, because I've heard it's bad, that would be discrimination in my book. Again, I personally don't think you should vote for someone just because they are LDS, but that's not as bad as not voting for them because they are LDS.

The ice cream example is still discrimination, but not with all the negative connotations that we give to it. It is ignorant discrimination as opposed to willful discrimination.

Since when was all discrimination bad? It isn't.

Only when the discrimination is made on the basis of category instead of merit.

I choose meat over vegetables. My kids choose candy over food. Because we "want" something doesn't mean we "don't want" something else. If you want to be technical you can say we discriminate with EVERY choice we make. That does not make every choice the same.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by jbar1221 - 2008/02/12 13:11

a1247 wrote:

Has anyone seen the video of McCain and his mother on a national TV show talking about Romney and what he did for the Olympics? McCain's mother starts to go off on how the "Mormons" put the Olympics in the situation to have to have Romney come in and fix the problem and how it was all "the Mormons" fault everything went wrong. If you haven't seen the video its all over the internet.

So my question is this. As a state that is a red blooded republican state, is the LDS population still going to vote for a man who has a mother that is anti LDS? Yes it might be his mother and not so much him but to have his mother sitting right there next to him and have her go off on the LDS religion leaves an extremely bad taste in my mouth. If you have not seen this video I really suggest that you go online and find the video. This man with his Mormon hating mom could be our next president and the worst part is you could be giving him your vote.

To start I will not vote for John McCain. But trying to slander him with a 30 second rant by his senile mother is ridiculous. If you watch the whole video (The 10 minute version) McCain states at the end that his mothers words are not his and goes on to say he respects and admires mormons and thinks Romney's religion should not be an issue in the election.

---

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/02/12 13:21

CougarPeasant wrote:

I recall the exit polls for Utah were running 90% Romney in the Republican primary among Mormons. When analyzed further, it was clear that many remember what a great job Romney did with the Olympics, they remembered what

---

Hucklebee said about Mormons and his overt bigotry, and they further cited that McCain has never had a following among Mormon Republicans. Romney was really the default candidate because he had done very well when in Utah with the Olympics and he wasn't the other candidates.

Obama did exceptionally well among Mormon Democrats as well, due to his positive speaking ability and because HE AIN'T CLINTON!!!

My personal experience in coming around to support Romney is this. I actually used his religion against him. I know he's an active Mormon and being Mormon myself, I would be branded as supporting him on that basis only. Plus, there were other candidates who had distinguished themselves at the national level already. It wasn't until I began seeing he was gaining the support of the conservative columnists who explained his platforms, his changes in light of what a Republican can and can't do in Massachussets, which I've lived and voted before so I knew what that meant and counted it a plus for Romney, and what he needed to do to attract a wider base than what he had to garner within the Mormon community and Massachussets. Once I saw he had the mettle and policies that stood apart from his faith, then I came around and supported him as the best candidate in either party.

I hope others did the same thing, even if they didn't get to explain that when polled in the exit polls.

To be honest when I heard of the Mormon in the race I didn't immediately jump up and yell halleluia. I thought I hope he is not like Reed. So I carefully read and listened to whatever I could find and tried getting as much background about him as I could. Meanwhile I kept up on the other candidates and after all my evaluations I came to the conclusion that he would be the best candidate for the job. Because of his religion I was much more attentive to the details of his past and not just what people were saying about him. I hoped for the best but expected the worst. I think he got much closer to the best than the worst.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by Raul - 2008/02/12 13:29

---

jbar1221 wrote:

blue42 wrote:

Now this unofficial survey taken at BYU where 9 out of 10 said they are voting for Romney because he is Mormon I have to take with a grain of salt because I am pretty sure if you asked the same question on whether they would vote for Harry Reid if he was running for President you would probably get 9 out of 10 that would say no.

I imagine this is directed at my post. You took what I wrote out of context. Heres what I said jbar1221 wrote:

In my experience here at BYU 9 out of 10 of the people who gave this reason for voting for Romney had no idea what his platform was. There only reasoning was that a Mormon candidate is more fit for office BECAUSE he is mormon.

So what Im saying is in my experience people who supported Mitt because he was Mormon were ill informed as to policy, record, experience, etc. Now I thought I made it clear that this was MY experience and didnt try to generalize.

I still dont see the difrence between supporting Mitt because he is Mormon and opposing him because of the same. I also think its ridiculous to support Hillary because she is a woman or Obama because he is Black. In the same way it is ridiculous to oppose them because of their gender and race. As for the assumption that BECAUSE Mitt is mormon members know what he believes in and can trust him. I have never had a Bishop use my idea of sound economic policy or health care reform to determine whether I am a good worthy member of the church. There are TOO many important aspects of a presidential campaign that are not covered by knowing he holds a temple recomend to base my support or opposition on his membership in the church.

The difference that I see between supporting Mitt "because he is Mormon" and opposing him because he is Mormon is the difference in knowledge. I personally don't believe that anyone supports Mitt because he is a Mormon, though that's what is said. I believe someone who supports Mitt because he is a Mormon, is not in fact supporting him due to the fact that Mitt happens to be Mormon, but more because that individual believes that Mitt believes in being "honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtous, and in doing good to all men." That he believes in the importance of the family, and has a knowledge that families can be Eternal and just what that means. If it is a known fact that Mitt is active/has a Temple recommend, it is a high probability that we can assume a lot about his character (Honest with fellow man, loyal to wife/family, etc.) In contrast, a person who votes for someone other than Mitt for the only reason that he is Mormon, without knowing what that means, is doing so in ignorance and based solely on the fact that Mitt is Mormon.

Having said that, I do think that deciding to vote for anyone just based on religion alone is a mistake and more reasearch

---

should be done into policies and plans. I can think of a lot of Mormons that I would not vote for as President of the United States.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/12 14:04

---

imuakahuku wrote:

To be honest when I heard of the Mormon in the race I didn't immediately jump up and yell halleluia. I thought I hope he is not like Reed. So I carefully read and listened to whatever I could find and tried getting as much background about him as I could. Meanwhile I kept up on the other candidates and after all my evaluations I came to the conclusion that he would be the best candidate for the job. Because of his religion I was much more attentive to the details of his past and not just what people were saying about him. I hoped for the best but expected the worst. I think he got much closer to the best than the worst.

And were Reid running for president I would not vote for him, especially because he is LDS. But that is just me. ;)

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by Mars - 2008/02/12 16:36

---

imuakahuku wrote:

To be honest when I heard of the Mormon in the race I didn't immediately jump up and yell halleluia. I thought I hope he is not like Reed. So I carefully read and listened to whatever I could find and tried getting as much background about him as I could. Meanwhile I kept up on the other candidates and after all my evaluations I came to the conclusion that he would be the best candidate for the job. Because of his religion I was much more attentive to the details of his past and not just what people were saying about him. I hoped for the best but expected the worst. I think he got much closer to the best than the worst.

EXACTLY!

Almost every single member of the Church I know was VERY worried when they heard about there being a Mormon Presidential candidate. They were very wary of him and any damage he might do to the Church, any mud he might slime on their good name. And the more my family and friends learned about him, the more we liked him. He is the perfect conservative candidate, while all the rest were adulterers, anti-mormons, and liberals. Many of my friends liked Ron Paul as well, because his "small government" principles match up with the teaching of the Church... and they chose to overlook his stance on Iraq. The rest of the Republican field was basically non-options, though one or two liked how McCain stood out in national polls against Clinton.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by gordito - 2008/02/12 17:02

---

Mars wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

To be honest when I heard of the Mormon in the race I didn't immediately jump up and yell halleluia. I thought I hope he is not like Reed. So I carefully read and listened to whatever I could find and tried getting as much background about him as I could. Meanwhile I kept up on the other candidates and after all my evaluations I came to the conclusion that he would be the best candidate for the job. Because of his religion I was much more attentive to the details of his past and not just what people were saying about him. I hoped for the best but expected the worst. I think he got much closer to the best than the worst.

EXACTLY!

Almost every single member of the Church I know was VERY worried when they heard about there being a Mormon Presidential candidate. They were very wary of him and any damage he might do to the Church, any mud he might slime on their good name. And the more my family and friends learned about him, the more we liked him. He is the perfect conservative candidate, while all the rest were adulterers, anti-mormons, and liberals. Many of my friends liked Ron Paul as well, because his "small government" principles match up with the teaching of the Church... and they chose to overlook his stance on Iraq. The rest of the Republican field was basically non-options, though one or two liked how

---

McCain stood out in national polls against Clinton.

That was my sentiment as well. When Romney announced I was worried that he would represent the church poorly. I didn't support him originally because the last thing I wanted was to be accused of supporting him only because he was Mormon. I was almost looking for something about his policies to criticize and justify supporting Thompson or Paul. Romney wasn't perfect and I think he tried to hard to say what the polls indicated he should, but I found him to match my views closer than any other candidate. He's not much of an entertainer but I still think he has just the right style to be a dynamic leader.

BTW, that PastorsforHuckabee website that opened this thread was pretty unbelievable. It's sad for those people--even worse that it's so pervasive. I was shocked when I heard Rick and Bubba (for anybody that lives in the South) say similar things on the air. I'm grateful for those few with open minds and hearts.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/02/12 17:16

---

What's even worse is that Huckabee criticized the way Romney ate fried chicken merely because Romney took the skin off first. I actually am in the Huckabee camp on that one because it was KFC. ;) And we all know that if it wasn't for us Mormons, KFC wouldn't be the house hold name that is today. mmmmmmmm KFC...

gordito wrote:

Mars wrote:

imuakahuku wrote:

To be honest when I heard of the Mormon in the race I didn't immediately jump up and yell halleluia. I thought I hope he is not like Reed. So I carefully read and listened to whatever I could find and tried getting as much background about him as I could. Meanwhile I kept up on the other candidates and after all my evaluations I came to the conclusion that he would be the best candidate for the job. Because of his religion I was much more attentive to the details of his past and not just what people were saying about him. I hoped for the best but expected the worst. I think he got much closer to the best than the worst.

EXACTLY!

Almost every single member of the Church I know was VERY worried when they heard about there being a Mormon Presidential candidate. They were very wary of him and any damage he might do to the Church, any mud he might slime on their good name. And the more my family and friends learned about him, the more we liked him. He is the perfect conservative candidate, while all the rest were adulterers, anti-mormons, and liberals. Many of my friends liked Ron Paul as well, because his "small government" principles match up with the teaching of the Church... and they chose to overlook his stance on Iraq. The rest of the Republican field was basically non-options, though one or two liked how McCain stood out in national polls against Clinton.

That was my sentiment as well. When Romney announced I was worried that he would represent the church poorly. I didn't support him originally because the last thing I wanted was to be accused of supporting him only because he was Mormon. I was almost looking for something about his policies to criticize and justify supporting Thompson or Paul. Romney wasn't perfect and I think he tried to hard to say what the polls indicated he should, but I found him to match my views closer than any other candidate. He's not much of an entertainer but I still think he has just the right style to be a dynamic leader.

BTW, that PastorsforHuckabee website that opened this thread was pretty unbelievable. It's sad for those people--even worse that it's so pervasive. I was shocked when I heard Rick and Bubba (for anybody that lives in the South) say similar things on the air. I'm grateful for those few with open minds and hearts.

=====

## Re:More evidence that Romney\'s religion was

Posted by a1247 - 2008/02/13 03:43

---

jbar1221 wrote:

a1247 wrote:

Has anyone seen the video of McCain and his mother on a national TV show talking about Romnney and what he did for the Olympics? McCain's mother starts to go off on how the "Mormons" put the Olympics in the situation to have to have Romney come in and fix the problem and how it was all "the Mormons" fault everything went wrong. If you haven't seen

---

the video its all over the internet.

So my question is this. As a state that is a red blooded republican state, is the LDS population still going to vote for a man who has a mother that is anti LDS? Yes it might be his mother and not so much him but to have his mother sitting right there next to him and have her go off on the LDS religion leaves an extremely bad taste in my mouth. If you have not seen this video I really suggest that you go online and find the video. This man with his Mormon hating mom could be our next president and the worst part is you could be giving him your vote.

To start I will not vote for John McCain. But trying to slander him with a 30 second rant by his senile mother is ridiculous. If you watch the whole video (The 10 minute version) McCain states at the end that his mothers words are not his and goes on to say he respects and admires mormons and thinks Romney's religion should not be an issue in the election.

Whom every your comfortable with is your vote. As of right now I couldn't say one way or another who I want to vote for. But I think your kidding yourself if you don't think he was only trying to smooth the situation over. I did see the entire segment and also the end were he and his mother are walking away and she apologies to McCain for the rant.

=====