

Re: Registered Republican Voters . . .

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2004-10/3152.html>

From: Nomen Nescio (*nobody_at_dizum.com*)

Date: 10/24/04

Date: Sun, 24 Oct 2004 07:00:05 +0200 (CEST)

On Sat, 23 Oct 2004, "Morituri-Max" <newage@sendarico.net> wrote:

>some Al-Qaeda sympathizer wrote:

>> * Bill Clinton: Did not serve. Student deferments. Entered draft but
>> received #311.

>

>Yeah I noticed one.. your democratic roots are showing... are they blonde?

>Noticed you didn't say that Bill Clinton actually *dodged* the draft.. instead

>you call it something cute like "deferment." So this makes the rest of your

>post suspect. Bias is such a terrible thing.. if Bush had really wanted to

>dodge the military he could have easily used all that power you say people

>wielded on his behalf and avoided any service of *any* kind..

>

>Also, when is the last time you piloted the kind of jets Bush flew in.. let me

>know when you do how safe it is to fly them. I noticed with all this emphasis

>you place on Kerry's combat record and how much he risked his life you don't

>mention that he did so for as short a time as possible.. 3 1/2 to 4 months of

>combat (driving up and down the river in a big well armed boat occasionally

>shooting kids in the back and burning down villages full of dangerous unarmed

>vietnamese civilians) is not nearly as risky as the time Bush spent in a

>cockpit

>of a combat jet... in point of fact anyone in the military piloting any kind

>of

>aircraft put their lives more at risk than Kerry who liked gathering up purple

>hearts for minor wounds..

>

>And as gung ho as Kerry likes to claim he was, including all the trouble he

>went

>to to get sent into combat on the swift boats, he sure did get clear as fast as

>he could.. I guess he really didn't care that much about his crewmembers since

>they got to stay in combat while he took the optional out with his 3 hearts..

>so

>long guys, screw you, I'm out to a nice cushy desk job..

>

>..speaking of which, what military experience do you have? and as for mine, I

>have 10 years in the Air Force including the 1st Gulf War.

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

I'm grateful to every brave soul who has served in the United States military since the founding of our great nation, irrespective of his or her party affiliation or lack thereof. And though Senator Kerry's brief stint in Vietnam has raised some questions among many of his fellow swift boat vets, it's not so much what he did in Vietnam that concerns Americans, but is what he did AFTER he returned to the U.S.

Once STOLEN HONOR & CELSIUS 41.11 hit the theaters, and Sinclair's one-hour special on the subject is aired on all 62 of their stations before election-day, Kerry's egregious and treasonous betrayal of his fellow soldiers serving in Vietnam, with many being tortured in POW camps in North Vietcong, Kerry's indisputably dishonorable behavior is going to come back to haunt him on election-day, rest assured...

And while the Vietnam conflict was FAR from popular and there were probably some atrocities committed by a minuscule percentage of mentally-unstable cowboys run amuck (probably suffering from PTSD), the vast majority of Vietnam vets served honorably—and many became highly-decorated war heroes worthy of ever medal they were awarded. And notably, unlike Kerry, none of them "threw their medals away".

The number one issue facing voters in this election is terrorism, and the clear and present danger that terrorists will attack the United States again, but this time it will likely be a thousand times more destructive and lethal than their attack on 9/11/2001. So the voting populace must ask themselves, WHO will aggressively take the fight to the enemy Islamic Jihadists on a planetary scale in order to eliminate the terrorist threat at its source? Clearly, the answer is President George W. Bush. Even if we were living in peace time, a simple F.B.I. background check on Hanoi John Kerry would easily preclude him from ever serving as commander-in-chief of the United States military. Because of this, I know that Bush will remain in office long after his re-inauguration January 20th.

Blinded with bitterness over the 2000 "election" and subsequent appointment of GW Bush to the Oval Office, the Democrats simply nominated the WRONG person for president! Maybe in 2008 they'll be more careful before nominating their candidate for president, or at least they'll be damn-sure that their chosen man or woman isn't on record as having so horribly betrayed American soldiers in wartime as John Kerry went so far out of his way to do upon returning from Vietnam. Kerry's just *NOT* presidential material, and I'm entirely confident that those in charge of our National Security already know that John Kerry will NEVER become president, and I find that assurance most comforting. Bush-Cheney will breeze past Kerry-Edwards by whatever means are necessary. That's a given.

But what does deeply concern me are the Democrat-Anarchists, who are likely to be so insanely angry over GW Bush's guaranteed re-election that they are apt to be helping Al-Qaeda sleeper cells who are believed to be already here in the U.S., and armed with

sci.astro.amateur: Re: Registered Republican Voters . . .

WMDs, and planning to attack vulnerable and crowded targets on or before election-day, in hopes of disrupting America's election process like they've recently accomplished in Spain and elsewhere.

I do believe that the more reasonable and patriotic moderates in the Democrat Party will recognize WHY John Kerry can't be allowed to compromise our national security and jeopardize the US military ever again--most especially NOT from the position of commander-in-chief over the most powerful military complex in the modern world!

Moderate Democrats who simply don't like President George W. Bush no matter what should vote for Ralph Nader or some other write-in candidate where available, or just don't vote for any presidential candidate. At least Ralph Nader didn't betray US soldiers in wartime.

VOTE your Conscience,
Daniel Joseph Min

*Min's Google-Archived Home Page On The WWW (updated October 3, 2004):
<http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=XJBDEJF138262.9022453704@anonymous.poster>

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----

iQA/AwUBQXsflpljD7YrHM/nEQIEXQCg6JjryVJHRv00D518LXrt34OK18An0Ii
ZE58wODVhv5AyRTUh460/F1M
=TD33

-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----