
Subject: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins ControversialNAB Speech (not political)

Posted by [Bill L](#) on Wed, 16 Apr 2008 13:03:10 GMT

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

<http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>

Right on.

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial NAB Speech (not political)

Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Wed, 16 Apr 2008 17:08:43 GMT

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

Nice catch Bill. I'm not a fan of his politics (which he gracefully left out) but that was a good piece of work on his part.

AA

"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message <news:4805fbe6@linux...>

> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>

>

> Right on.

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins ControversialNAB Speech (not political)

Posted by [Bill L](#) on Wed, 16 Apr 2008 17:38:57 GMT

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

Not surprised the NAB didn't want it getting ot. Broadcasters have been largely taking the low road as far as civic responsibility for a looong time and I am actually very proud of him for urging them to change their ways. They have a huge impact on society and they should take more responsibility for their messages. Make the world a better place.

Aaron Allen wrote:

> Nice catch Bill. I'm not a fan of his politics (which he gracefully left

> out) but that was a good piece of work on his part.

> AA

>

> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message <news:4805fbe6@linux...>

>> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>

>>

>> Right on.

>

>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 17:40:55 GMT

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

Hollywood blowhard.

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

><http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>

>

>Right on.

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins
ControversialNAB Speech (not political)

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 18:55:19 GMT

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

Thanks for the link Bill. Maybe it'll start some reflective
conversations in the broadcasting world.

Cheers,

-Jamie

www.JamieKruz.com

Bill L wrote:

> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>

>

> Right on.

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 19:43:26 GMT

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

Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?

TCB wrote:

> Hollywood blowhard.

>

> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>

>>

>> Right on.

>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 20:49:02 GMT

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

I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going on about politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a campaign or run for office.

TCB

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?

>

>TCB wrote:

>> Hollywood blowhard.

>>

>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>>> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>

>>>

>>> Right on.

>>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [kerryg](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 21:07:58 GMT

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

Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too, pretty much by definition?

:D

- Kerry

On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1@linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going on about

> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a campaign

> or run for office.

>

> TCB

>

> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?

>>

>> TCB wrote:
>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>
>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>
>>>>
>>>> Right on.
>>>
>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial NAB Speech (not political)
Posted by [Carl Amburn](#) on Thu, 17 Apr 2008 21:59:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Right on indeed. I pretty much never check out the other groups (i.e. General), so I appreciate posts like this.

-Carl

"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:4805fbe6@linux...
> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>
>
> Right on.

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2008 02:17:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kerry, I don't think Thad has a problem with his being an artist.

Actually I do think we all have a responsibility to say what we believe and what we think will be of value to others. Great artists have powerful voices and they absolutely should communicate for the betterment of society and the future of the civilization. Frankly I would much rather hear heart felt opinions from an intelligent actor like Tim Robbins (Erik the Viking!) than the compromised party line we hear from most pragmatic politicians.

Has anyone been watching the John Adams HBO series? Even at the birth of our Republic we had bankers' pawns like Hamilton scheming to put the country into debt with an expensive army and war.

Kerry Galloway wrote:
> Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too, pretty

> much by definition?
>
> :D
>
> - Kerry
>
>
> On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1@linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com>
> wrote:
>
>> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going on about
>> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a campaign
>> or run for office.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?
>>>
>>> TCB wrote:
>>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>>
>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>
>>>>>
>>>>> Right on.
>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2008 20:46:20 GMT

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

On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I don't like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at paintings by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he should volunteer.

As far as John Adams, it's hard to hear his take on Hamilton and not wind up hating the guy. Nobody, not even Thomas Jefferson, hated Hamilton more than Adams. Hamilton was also far from a 'pawn' of bunch of nefarious bankers. Pawn implied control by others. Hamilton was keenly aware of how finance worked, often to a greater degree than the bankers he was dealing with, and turned out to be right more often than not. His vision of America, as a dominant power in the Western hemisphere built on a powerful manufacturing economy and a strong currency backed by a central bank, was more or less right. Jefferson's yeomen farmers reaping the fruits of their own labor and the labor of their

dark hued indentured help, while reading Gibbon in the library at night, was winsome and romantic. Hell, even Jefferson, with his sizzling gifts and endless energy, couldn't manage to get out of debt in his life.

Of the 'big four' Adams is probably the most likable, and the second easiest to understand. His appetites and vices were modest, his opinions were fairly straightforward and honest. It's good to see him getting a day in the sun, it's richly deserved.

TCB

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>Kerry, I don't think Thad has a problem with his being an artist.

>

>Actually I do think we all have a responsibility to say what we believe

>and what we think will be of value to others. Great artists have
>powerful voices and they absolutely should communicate for the
>betterment of society and the future of the civilization. Frankly I
>would much rather hear heart felt opinions from an intelligent actor
>like Tim Robbins (Erik the Viking!) than the compromised party line we
>hear from most pragmatic politicians.

>

>Has anyone been watching the John Adams HBO series? Even at the birth of

>our Republic we had bankers' pawns like Hamilton scheming to put the
>country into debt with an expensive army and war.

>

>Kerry Galloway wrote:

>> Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too, pretty
>> much by definition?

>>

>> :D

>>

>> - Kerry

>>

>>

>> On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1 @linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com>
>> wrote:

>>

>>> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going
>>> on about

>>> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a campaign
>>> or run for office.

>>>

>>> TCB

>>>

>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>>>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?
>>>>
>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>>>
>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>> http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Right on.
>>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2008 21:20:01 GMT

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

Hey Thad, Personally I would love to see more CEOs sing and accountants dance. They might discover a higher motivation than making money. The great thing about our nation is we ALL contribute to its political process. I'm not a fan of "Authorities" telling us what to think. I prefer seeing leaders coming from every walk of life.

In the case of Robbins, he is perfectly suited to give his opinion to the NAB. They rely utterly on artists like him for their very existence - they f/g better listen! Whether you like what today's artists say or not, they are generally very intelligent people many of whom care a lot more than the average Joe about changing things for the better in our world. Maybe a slightly less jaded look at the contributions of many artists will show you they are trying to help.

I don't claim to be a scholar of our early American history, but I gotta think that Hamilton's intentions to create a central bank and bring the USA into a war were not good things. Look where we are now with our central bank, withering paper currency and wars. I loved how Adams handled it.

My favorite Founding Father is B. Franklin, Printer. What a total f/g genius, Renaissance Dude and towering personage he was.

TCB wrote:

> On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I don't
> like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at paintings
> by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current
> affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he should
> volunteer.
>
> As far as John Adams, it's hard to hear his take on Hamilton and not wind
> up hating the guy. Nobody, not even Thomas Jefferson, hated Hamilton more

> than Adams. Hamilton was also far from a 'pawn' of bunch of nefarious bankers.
> Pawn implied control by others. Hamilton was keenly aware of how finance
> worked, often to a greater degree than the bankers he was dealing with, and
> turned out to be right more often than not. His vision of America, as a dominant
> power in the Western hemisphere built on a powerful manufacturing economy
> and a strong currency backed by a central bank, was more or less right. Jefferson's
> yeomen farmers reaping the fruits of their own labor and the labor of their
> dark hued indentured help, while reading Gibbon in the library at night,
> was winsome and romantic. Hell, even Jefferson, with his sizzling gifts and
> endless energy, couldn't manage to get out of debt in his life.

>

> Of the 'big four' Adams is probably the most likable, and the second easiest
> to understand. His appetites and vices were modest, his opinions were fairly
> straightforward and honest. It's good to see him getting a day in the sun,
> it's richly deserved.

>

> TCB

>

> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>> Kerry, I don't think Thad has a problem with his being an artist.

>>

>> Actually I do think we all have a responsibility to say what we believe

>

>> and what we think will be of value to others. Great artists have
>> powerful voices and they absolutely should communicate for the
>> betterment of society and the future of the civilization. Frankly I
>> would much rather hear heart felt opinions from an intelligent actor
>> like Tim Robbins (Erik the Viking!) than the compromised party line we
>> hear from most pragmatic politicians.

>>

>> Has anyone been watching the John Adams HBO series? Even at the birth of

>

>> our Republic we had bankers' pawns like Hamilton scheming to put the
>> country into debt with an expensive army and war.

>>

>> Kerry Galloway wrote:

>>> Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too, pretty
>>> much by definition?

>>>

>>> :D

>>>

>>> - Kerry

>>>

>>>

>>> On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1 @linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com>
>>> wrote:

>>>

>>>> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going

> on about
>>>> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a campaign
>>>> or run for office.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Right on.
>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 18 Apr 2008 22:09:46 GMT

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

We can agree to disagree about Tim Robbins. I don't want to hear him yapping.

About Adams. You'll rarely find an American more isolationist than I. However, laying the blame for our current perpetually-at-war-with-someone militarism as well as our Federal Reserve at Hamilton's door is grossly unfair. Even if you don't like the current federal reserve, the US would have to have SOME kind of central bank and banking regulation. And as isolationist as I am the US would have to have SOME military to defend our borders and ensure safe passage of goods on the seas.

Hamilton's 'strong central government' was one that could do things like pass laws for the whole country and collect taxes on imports and exports. Jefferson at one point argued that the state of Virginia could legislate to ignore a federal law and if they did so anyone trying to enforce that law could be hanged for treason to the state of Virginia. By opposing this Hamilton was for 'strong central government.' Hardly the Patriot Act. The National Security Act of 1947 would be considered reason for armed revolt by every single founder. Then again so would have our entrance into WW I.

We also shouldn't forget that Adams was a loud and largely lonely advocate of a standing Navy, and pushed the Alien and Sedition Acts. Even Adams was more complex than our cardboard cutout politicians today.

I'm with you on Big Ben. A great second book to read about his is called 'The Americanization of Benjamin Franklin.' Superb book that will really expand your ideas about him.

TCB

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>Hey Thad, Personally I would love to see more CEOs sing and accountants

>dance. They might discover a higher motivation than making money. The

>great thing about our nation is we ALL contribute to its political

>process. I'm not a fan of "Authorities" telling us what to think. I

>prefer seeing leaders coming from every walk of life.

>

>In the case of Robbins, he is perfectly suited to give his opinion to

>the NAB. They rely utterly on artists like him for their very existence

>- they f/g better listen! Whether you like what today's artists say or

>not, they are generally very intelligent people many of whom care a lot

>more than the average Joe about changing things for the better in our

>world. Maybe a slightly less jaded look at the contributions of many

>artists will show you they are trying to help.

>

>I don't claim to be a scholar of our early American history, but I gotta

>think that Hamilton's intentions to create a central bank and bring the

>USA into a war were not good things. Look where we are now with our

>central bank, withering paper currency and wars. I loved how Adams

>handled it.

>

>My favorite Founding Father is B. Franklin, Printer. What a total f/g

>genius, Renaissance Dude and towering personage he was.

>

>TCB wrote:

>> On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I

don't

>> like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at paintings

>> by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current

>> affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he should

>> volunteer.

>>

>> As far as John Adams, it's hard to hear his take on Hamilton and not wind

>> up hating the guy. Nobody, not even Thomas Jefferson, hated Hamilton more

>> than Adams. Hamilton was also far from a 'pawn' of bunch of nefarious

bankers.

>> Pawn implied control by others. Hamilton was keenly aware of how finance

>> worked, often to a greater degree than the bankers he was dealing with,
and
>> turned out to be right more often than not. His vision of America, as
a dominant
>> power in the Western hemisphere built on a powerful manufacturing economy
>> and a strong currency backed by a central bank, was more or less right.
Jefferson's
>> yeomen farmers reaping the fruits of their own labor and the labor of
their
>> dark hued indentured help, while reading Gibbon in the library at night,
>> was winsome and romantic. Hell, even Jefferson, with his sizzling gifts
and
>> endless energy, couldn't manage to get out of debt in his life.
>>
>> Of the 'big four' Adams is probably the most likable, and the second easiest
>> to understand. His appetites and vices were modest, his opinions were
fairly
>> straightforward and honest. It's good to see him getting a day in the
sun,
>> it's richly deserved.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>> Kerry, I don't think Thad has a problem with his being an artist.
>>>
>>> Actually I do think we all have a responsibility to say what we believe
>>
>>> and what we think will be of value to others. Great artists have
>>> powerful voices and they absolutely should communicate for the
>>> betterment of society and the future of the civilization. Frankly I
>>> would much rather hear heart felt opinions from an intelligent actor

>>> like Tim Robbins (Erik the Viking!) than the compromised party line we

>>> hear from most pragmatic politicians.
>>>
>>> Has anyone been watching the John Adams HBO series? Even at the birth
of
>>
>>> our Republic we had bankers' pawns like Hamilton scheming to put the

>>> country into debt with an expensive army and war.
>>>
>>> Kerry Galloway wrote:
>>>> Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too,
pretty
>>>> much by definition?

>>>>
>>>> :D
>>>>
>>>> - Kerry
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1 @linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going
>> on about
>>>>> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a
campaign
>>>>> or run for office.
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Right on.
>>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Sat, 19 Apr 2008 13:38:52 GMT

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

I'll check out that book.

TCB wrote:

> We can agree to disagree about Tim Robbins. I don't want to hear him yapping.
>
>
> About Adams. You'll rarely find an American more isolationist than I. However,
> laying the blame for our current perpetually-at-war-with-someone militarism
> as well as our Federal Reserve at Hamilton's door is grossly unfair. Even
> if you don't like the current federal reserve, the US would have to have
> SOME kind of central bank and banking regulation. And as isolationist as
> I am the US would have to have SOME military to defend our borders and ensure
> safe passage of goods on the seas.
>

> Hamilton's 'strong central government' was one that could do things like
> pass laws for the whole country and collect taxes on imports and exports.
> Jefferson at one point argued that the state of Virginia could legislate
> to ignore a federal law and if they did so anyone trying to enforce that
> law could be hanged for treason to the state of Virginia. By opposing this
> Hamilton was for 'strong central government.' Hardly the Patriot Act. The
> National Security Act of 1947 would be considered reason for armed revolt
> by every single founder. Then again so would have our entrance into WW I.
>
>
> We also shouldn't forget that Adams was a loud and largely lonely advocate
> of a standing Navy, and pushed the Alien and Sedition Acts. Even Adams was
> more complex than our cardboard cutout politicians today.
>
> I'm with you on Big Ben. A great second book to read about him is called
> 'The Americanization of Benjamin Franklin.' Superb book that will really
> expand your ideas about him.
>
> TCB
>
> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>> Hey Thad, Personally I would love to see more CEOs sing and accountants
>
>> dance. They might discover a higher motivation than making money. The
>> great thing about our nation is we ALL contribute to its political
>> process. I'm not a fan of "Authorities" telling us what to think. I
>> prefer seeing leaders coming from every walk of life.
>>
>> In the case of Robbins, he is perfectly suited to give his opinion to
>> the NAB. They rely utterly on artists like him for their very existence
>
>> - they f/g better listen! Whether you like what today's artists say or
>> not, they are generally very intelligent people many of whom care a lot
>
>> more than the average Joe about changing things for the better in our
>> world. Maybe a slightly less jaded look at the contributions of many
>> artists will show you they are trying to help.
>>
>> I don't claim to be a scholar of our early American history, but I gotta
>
>> think that Hamilton's intentions to create a central bank and bring the
>
>> USA into a war were not good things. Look where we are now with our
>> central bank, withering paper currency and wars. I loved how Adams
>> handled it.
>>
>> My favorite Founding Father is B. Franklin, Printer. What a total f/g
>> genius, Renaissance Dude and towering personage he was.

>>
>> TCB wrote:
>>> On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I
> don't
>>> like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at paintings
>>> by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current
>>> affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he should
>>> volunteer.
>>>
>>> As far as John Adams, it's hard to hear his take on Hamilton and not wind
>>> up hating the guy. Nobody, not even Thomas Jefferson, hated Hamilton more
>>> than Adams. Hamilton was also far from a 'pawn' of bunch of nefarious
> bankers.
>>> Pawn implied control by others. Hamilton was keenly aware of how finance
>>> worked, often to a greater degree than the bankers he was dealing with,
> and
>>> turned out to be right more often than not. His vision of America, as
> a dominant
>>> power in the Western hemisphere built on a powerful manufacturing economy
>>> and a strong currency backed by a central bank, was more or less right.
> Jefferson's
>>> yeomen farmers reaping the fruits of their own labor and the labor of
> their
>>> dark hued indentured help, while reading Gibbon in the library at night,
>>> was winsome and romantic. Hell, even Jefferson, with his sizzling gifts
> and
>>> endless energy, couldn't manage to get out of debt in his life.
>>>
>>> Of the 'big four' Adams is probably the most likable, and the second easiest
>>> to understand. His appetites and vices were modest, his opinions were
> fairly
>>> straightforward and honest. It's good to see him getting a day in the
> sun,
>>> it's richly deserved.
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>> Kerry, I don't think Thad has a problem with his being an artist.
>>>>
>>>> Actually I do think we all have a responsibility to say what we believe
>>>> and what we think will be of value to others. Great artists have
>>>> powerful voices and they absolutely should communicate for the
>>>> betterment of society and the future of the civilization. Frankly I
>>>> would much rather hear heart felt opinions from an intelligent actor
>
>>>> like Tim Robbins (Erik the Viking!) than the compromised party line we
>

>>>> hear from most pragmatic politicians.
>>>>
>>>> Has anyone been watching the John Adams HBO series? Even at the birth
> of
>>>> our Republic we had bankers' pawns like Hamilton scheming to put the
>
>>>> country into debt with an expensive army and war.
>>>>
>>>> Kerry Galloway wrote:
>>>>> Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too,
> pretty
>>>>> much by definition?
>>>>>
>>>>> :D
>>>>>
>>>>> - Kerry
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1@linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com>
>>>>> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going
>>> on about
>>>>>> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a
> campaign
>>>>>> or run for office.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>> http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Right on.
>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [bunuel](#) on Sat, 19 Apr 2008 20:17:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>

>On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I don't
>like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at paintings
>by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current
>affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he should
>volunteer.

Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you will forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not sing, but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no, according to you.

Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and that's all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not only legitimate but essential. It may be opportunism, but so what? From your perspective, nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken seriously on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on policy?), not editors/writers (the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military people, nor economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is a streak of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core: governing is the province of the elite alone. It's vintage Duke of Wellington.

By this logic, in fact, your OWN amateur pronouncements on politics must be considered utterly without merit. Yet, if you had Tim Robbins's platform, considering how strongly held and sophisticated your viewpoint is, and how avidly you promote it even to this tiny audience here, would you decline such an opportunity to promote it to the world at large? I can't see it, and I wouldn't fault you. Do you feel that Tim Robbins is less politically sophisticated than yourself?

Venceremos!
bunuel

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Sun, 20 Apr 2008 09:13:48 GMT

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

I respectfully disagree very much about artists speaking out, and am reminded of heated arguments with my parents on this very subject. I think if talent and good luck grant somebody a communication line that powerful, they definitely should speak out on important issues. My parents saw this kind of thing as arrogant biting of the hand that feeds you, but I just see it as being a responsible human being. To suggest that artists should just do their art and keep their mouths shut seems uncomfortably similar to suggesting that women should do the same, their "art" being the cookin' and

cleanin' and raisin' the kids.

Also, I think a lot of outspoken artists do volunteer, join campaigns, and/or run for office. But if they don't, if they just want to take advantage of their fame to flap their yaps, I'm fine with that. Flap away.

S

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4809089c\$1@linux...

>

> On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I

> don't

> like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at

> paintings

> by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current

> affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he

> should

> volunteer.

>

> As far as John Adams, it's hard to hear his take on Hamilton and not wind

> up hating the guy. Nobody, not even Thomas Jefferson, hated Hamilton more

> than Adams. Hamilton was also far from a 'pawn' of bunch of nefarious

> bankers.

> Pawn implied control by others. Hamilton was keenly aware of how finance

> worked, often to a greater degree than the bankers he was dealing with,

> and

> turned out to be right more often than not. His vision of America, as a

> dominant

> power in the Western hemisphere built on a powerful manufacturing economy

> and a strong currency backed by a central bank, was more or less right.

> Jefferson's

> yeomen farmers reaping the fruits of their own labor and the labor of

> their

> dark hued indentured help, while reading Gibbon in the library at night,

> was winsome and romantic. Hell, even Jefferson, with his sizzling gifts

> and

> endless energy, couldn't manage to get out of debt in his life.

>

> Of the 'big four' Adams is probably the most likable, and the second

> easiest

> to understand. His appetites and vices were modest, his opinions were

> fairly

> straightforward and honest. It's good to see him getting a day in the sun,

> it's richly deserved.

>

> TCB

>

> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>> Kerry, I don't think Thad has a problem with his being an artist.
>>
>> Actually I do think we all have a responsibility to say what we believe
>
>> and what we think will be of value to others. Great artists have
>> powerful voices and they absolutely should communicate for the
>> betterment of society and the future of the civilization. Frankly I
>> would much rather hear heart felt opinions from an intelligent actor
>> like Tim Robbins (Erik the Viking!) than the compromised party line we
>> hear from most pragmatic politicians.
>>
>> Has anyone been watching the John Adams HBO series? Even at the birth of
>
>> our Republic we had bankers' pawns like Hamilton scheming to put the
>> country into debt with an expensive army and war.
>>
>> Kerry Galloway wrote:
>>> Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too,
>>> pretty
>>> much by definition?
>>>
>>> :D
>>>
>>> - Kerry
>>>
>>>
>>> On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1@linux, "TCB"
>>> <nobody@ishere.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going
> on about
>>>> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a
>>>> campaign
>>>> or run for office.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>
>>>>>>>

>>>>>> Right on.

>>>

>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Sun, 20 Apr 2008 12:33:16 GMT

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

Let's be smarter than the media-created 2 party, 2 ideology national feud. Sometimes an idea is simply good and it does not make all your other ideas wrong to agree with it.

Sanity could be defined as the ability to differentiate. Vive la difference!

Sarah wrote:

> I respectfully disagree very much about artists speaking out, and am
> reminded of heated arguments with my parents on this very subject. I think
> if talent and good luck grant somebody a communication line that powerful,
> they definitely should speak out on important issues. My parents saw this
> kind of thing as arrogant biting of the hand that feeds you, but I just see
> it as being a responsible human being. To suggest that artists should just
> do their art and keep their mouths shut seems uncomfortably similar to
> suggesting that women should do the same, their "art" being the cookin' and
> cleanin' and raisin' the kids.

>

> Also, I think a lot of outspoken artists do volunteer, join campaigns,
> and/or run for office. But if they don't, if they just want to take
> advantage of their fame to flap their yaps, I'm fine with that. Flap away.

>

> S

>

>

> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4809089c\$1@linux...

>> On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I

>> don't

>> like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at

>> paintings

>> by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current

>> affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he

>> should

>> volunteer.

>>

>> As far as John Adams, it's hard to hear his take on Hamilton and not wind

>> up hating the guy. Nobody, not even Thomas Jefferson, hated Hamilton more

>> than Adams. Hamilton was also far from a 'pawn' of bunch of nefarious

>> bankers.

>> Pawn implied control by others. Hamilton was keenly aware of how finance

>> worked, often to a greater degree than the bankers he was dealing with,
>> and
>> turned out to be right more often than not. His vision of America, as a
>> dominant
>> power in the Western hemisphere built on a powerful manufacturing economy
>> and a strong currency backed by a central bank, was more or less right.
>> Jefferson's
>> yeomen farmers reaping the fruits of their own labor and the labor of
>> their
>> dark hued indentured help, while reading Gibbon in the library at night,
>> was winsome and romantic. Hell, even Jefferson, with his sizzling gifts
>> and
>> endless energy, couldn't manage to get out of debt in his life.
>>
>> Of the 'big four' Adams is probably the most likable, and the second
>> easiest
>> to understand. His appetites and vices were modest, his opinions were
>> fairly
>> straightforward and honest. It's good to see him getting a day in the sun,
>> it's richly deserved.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>> Kerry, I don't think Thad has a problem with his being an artist.
>>>
>>> Actually I do think we all have a responsibility to say what we believe
>>> and what we think will be of value to others. Great artists have
>>> powerful voices and they absolutely should communicate for the
>>> betterment of society and the future of the civilization. Frankly I
>>> would much rather hear heart felt opinions from an intelligent actor
>>> like Tim Robbins (Erik the Viking!) than the compromised party line we
>>> hear from most pragmatic politicians.
>>>
>>> Has anyone been watching the John Adams HBO series? Even at the birth of
>>> our Republic we had bankers' pawns like Hamilton scheming to put the
>>> country into debt with an expensive army and war.
>>>
>>> Kerry Galloway wrote:
>>>> Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too,
>>>> pretty
>>>> much by definition?
>>>>
>>>> :D
>>>>
>>>> - Kerry
>>>>
>>>>

>>>> On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1@linux, "TCB"
>>>> <nobody@ishere.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going
>> on about
>>>>> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a
>>>>> campaign
>>>>> or run for office.
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Right on.
>
>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [TCB](#) on Sun, 20 Apr 2008 23:56:50 GMT

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

I don't think my logic is flawed. It's very difficult for one human being to become an expert in one field, much less two or three. I know, as I have failed at a half dozen. Would you listen to Tim Robbins' opinions about maritime archeology? Habermas? Cambodian architecture? Politics is as difficult to master as those, but somehow because someone is a good actor we are supposed to take their opinions seriously.

This all stems, in my opinion, in the greatly overstated role that 'artists' played in various movements of the baby boomer's youth.

TCB

"bunuel" <bunuel@conar.fr> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I don't

>>like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at paintings
>>by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current
>>affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he should
>>volunteer.

>

>

>Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you will
>forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not sing,
>but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no, according
to
>you.

>

>Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and that's
>all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not only
>legitimate but essential. It may be opportunism, but so what? From your perspective,
>nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken seriously
>on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on policy?),
>not editors/writers (the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military people,
nor

>economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is a
streak

>of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core: governing
>is the province of the elite alone. It's vintage Duke of Wellington.

>

>By this logic, in fact, your OWN amateur pronouncements on politics must
>be considered utterly without merit. Yet, if you had Tim Robbins's platform,
>considering how strongly held and sophisticated your viewpoint is, and how
>avidly you promote it even to this tiny audience here, would you decline
>such an opportunity to promote it to the world at large? I can't see it,
>and I wouldn't fault you. Do you feel that Tim Robbins is less politically
>sophisticated than yourself?

>

>

>

>Venceremos!

>bunuel

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>
>
>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [rick](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 08:49:41 GMT

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

what i love are the radio jocks who slam anyone of note for expressing
an opinion because of thier celebrity while they do the same daily.
and what really boggles the mind is that there are those who agree and
do not see the irony.

On Sun, 20 Apr 2008 02:13:48 -0700, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>
wrote:

>I respectfully disagree very much about artists speaking out, and am
>reminded of heated arguments with my parents on this very subject. I think
>if talent and good luck grant somebody a communication line that powerful,
>they definitely should speak out on important issues. My parents saw this
>kind of thing as arrogant biting of the hand that feeds you, but I just see
>it as being a responsible human being. To suggest that artists should just
>do their art and keep their mouths shut seems uncomfortably similar to
>suggesting that women should do the same, their "art" being the cookin' and
>cleanin' and raisin' the kids.

>

>Also, I think a lot of outspoken artists do volunteer, join campaigns,
>and/or run for office. But if they don't, if they just want to take
>advantage of their fame to flap their yaps, I'm fine with that. Flap away.

>

>S

>

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message [news:4809089c\\$1@linux...](news:4809089c$1@linux...)

>>

>> On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I

>> don't

>> like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at

>> paintings

>> by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current

>> affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he

>> should

>> volunteer.

>>

>> As far as John Adams, it's hard to hear his take on Hamilton and not wind

>> up hating the guy. Nobody, not even Thomas Jefferson, hated Hamilton more

>> than Adams. Hamilton was also far from a 'pawn' of bunch of nefarious

>> bankers.
>> Pawn implied control by others. Hamilton was keenly aware of how finance
>> worked, often to a greater degree than the bankers he was dealing with,
>> and
>> turned out to be right more often than not. His vision of America, as a
>> dominant
>> power in the Western hemisphere built on a powerful manufacturing economy
>> and a strong currency backed by a central bank, was more or less right.
>> Jefferson's
>> yeomen farmers reaping the fruits of their own labor and the labor of
>> their
>> dark hued indentured help, while reading Gibbon in the library at night,
>> was winsome and romantic. Hell, even Jefferson, with his sizzling gifts
>> and
>> endless energy, couldn't manage to get out of debt in his life.
>>
>> Of the 'big four' Adams is probably the most likable, and the second
>> easiest
>> to understand. His appetites and vices were modest, his opinions were
>> fairly
>> straightforward and honest. It's good to see him getting a day in the sun,
>> it's richly deserved.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>> Kerry, I don't think Thad has a problem with his being an artist.
>>>
>>> Actually I do think we all have a responsibility to say what we believe
>>
>>> and what we think will be of value to others. Great artists have
>>> powerful voices and they absolutely should communicate for the
>>> betterment of society and the future of the civilization. Frankly I
>>> would much rather hear heart felt opinions from an intelligent actor
>>> like Tim Robbins (Erik the Viking!) than the compromised party line we
>>> hear from most pragmatic politicians.
>>>
>>> Has anyone been watching the John Adams HBO series? Even at the birth of
>>
>>> our Republic we had bankers' pawns like Hamilton scheming to put the
>>> country into debt with an expensive army and war.
>>>
>>> Kerry Galloway wrote:
>>>> Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too,
>>>> pretty
>>>> much by definition?
>>>>
>>>> :D

>>>>
>>>> - Kerry
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1@linux, "TCB"
>>>> <nobody@ishere.com>
>>>> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going
>> on about
>>>>> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a
>>>>> campaign
>>>>> or run for office.
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> <http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Right on.
>>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 15:04:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh yeah and Mr. No Spin (Bill O'Reilly) is the biggest spinner of them all. In fact any time he makes the no spin point, you know he just spun the crap out of something.

I reckon it's just entertainment. If you take it seriously you WILL end up with your head tilting hard to the right.

rick wrote:

> what i love are the radio jocks who slam anyone of note for expressing
> an opinion because of thier celebrity while they do the same daily.
> and what really boggles the mind is that there are those who agree and
> do not see the irony.
>

> On Sun, 20 Apr 2008 02:13:48 -0700, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>

> wrote:

>

>> I respectfully disagree very much about artists speaking out, and am
>> reminded of heated arguments with my parents on this very subject. I think
>> if talent and good luck grant somebody a communication line that powerful,
>> they definitely should speak out on important issues. My parents saw this
>> kind of thing as arrogant biting of the hand that feeds you, but I just see
>> it as being a responsible human being. To suggest that artists should just
>> do their art and keep their mouths shut seems uncomfortably similar to
>> suggesting that women should do the same, their "art" being the cookin' and
>> cleanin' and raisin' the kids.

>>

>> Also, I think a lot of outspoken artists do volunteer, join campaigns,
>> and/or run for office. But if they don't, if they just want to take
>> advantage of their fame to flap their yaps, I'm fine with that. Flap away.

>>

>> S

>>

>>

>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4809089c\$1@linux...

>>> On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I

>>> don't

>>> like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at

>>> paintings

>>> by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current

>>> affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he

>>> should

>>> volunteer.

>>>

>>> As far as John Adams, it's hard to hear his take on Hamilton and not wind

>>> up hating the guy. Nobody, not even Thomas Jefferson, hated Hamilton more

>>> than Adams. Hamilton was also far from a 'pawn' of bunch of nefarious

>>> bankers.

>>> Pawn implied control by others. Hamilton was keenly aware of how finance

>>> worked, often to a greater degree than the bankers he was dealing with,

>>> and

>>> turned out to be right more often than not. His vision of America, as a

>>> dominant

>>> power in the Western hemisphere built on a powerful manufacturing economy

>>> and a strong currency backed by a central bank, was more or less right.

>>> Jefferson's

>>> yeomen farmers reaping the fruits of their own labor and the labor of

>>> their

>>> dark hued indentured help, while reading Gibbon in the library at night,

>>> was winsome and romantic. Hell, even Jefferson, with his sizzling gifts

>>> and

>>> endless energy, couldn't manage to get out of debt in his life.

>>>
>>> Of the 'big four' Adams is probably the most likable, and the second
>>> easiest
>>> to understand. His appetites and vices were modest, his opinions were
>>> fairly
>>> straightforward and honest. It's good to see him getting a day in the sun,
>>> it's richly deserved.
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>> Kerry, I don't think Thad has a problem with his being an artist.
>>>>
>>>> Actually I do think we all have a responsibility to say what we believe
>>>> and what we think will be of value to others. Great artists have
>>>> powerful voices and they absolutely should communicate for the
>>>> betterment of society and the future of the civilization. Frankly I
>>>> would much rather hear heart felt opinions from an intelligent actor
>>>> like Tim Robbins (Erik the Viking!) than the compromised party line we
>>>> hear from most pragmatic politicians.
>>>>
>>>> Has anyone been watching the John Adams HBO series? Even at the birth of
>>>> our Republic we had bankers' pawns like Hamilton scheming to put the
>>>> country into debt with an expensive army and war.
>>>>
>>>> Kerry Galloway wrote:
>>>>> Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too,
>>>>> pretty
>>>>> much by definition?
>>>>>
>>>>> :D
>>>>>
>>>>> - Kerry
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1@linux, "TCB"
>>>>> <nobody@ishere.com>
>>>>> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going
>>>>> on about
>>>>>> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a
>>>>>> campaign
>>>>>> or run for office.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>>>>>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Right on.
>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Napolean Blownapart](#) on Mon, 21 Apr 2008 21:39:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Eh, Thad, if your logic isn't flawed, then you need to either quit the sponge monkeys or stop talking about god, the founding fathers, and systems architecture. If you still reserve the right to make music, be passionate about religion/sociology, history, and IT, then you've just shot your own argument in the ass. By your own admission, you are not an expert in all (if any) of these fields.

And for my next obiter dictum, since when does one need to be an expert to make a valid observation or have a good idea? That's rather elitist, no?

NB

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>I don't think my logic is flawed. It's very difficult for one human being
>to become an expert in one field, much less two or three. I know, as I have
>failed at a half dozen. Would you listen to Tim Robbins' opinions about
>maritime
>archeology? Habermas? Cambodian architecture? Politics is as difficult to
>master as those, but somehow because someone is a good actor we are supposed
>to take their opinions seriously.

>
>This all stems, in my opinion, in the greatly overstated role that 'artists'
>played in various movements of the baby boomer's youth.

>
>TCB

>
>"bunuel" <bunuel@conar.fr> wrote:

>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>>
>>>On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I

>don't

>>>like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at paintings
>>>by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current
>>>affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he should
>>>volunteer.

>>

>>

>>Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you
will

>>forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not sing,
>>but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no, according
>to

>>you.

>>

>>Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and that's
>>all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not
only

>>legitimate but essential.It may be opportunism, but so what? From your
perspective,

>>nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken seriously

>>on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on policy?),

>>not editors/writers(the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military people,

>nor

>>economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is a

>streak

>>of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core: governing

>>is the province of the elite alone. It's vintage Duke of Wellington.

>>

>>By this logic, in fact, your OWN amateur pronouncements on politics must
>>be considered utterly without merit. Yet, if you had Tim Robbins's platform,
>>considering how strongly held and sophisticated your viewpoint is, and
how

>>avidly you promote it even to this tiny audience here, would you decline

>>such an opportunity to promote it to the world at large? I can't see it,

>>and I wouldn't fault you. Do you feel that Tim Robbins is less politically

>>sophisticated than yourself?

>>

>>

>>

>>Venceremos!

>>bunuel

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 03:12:32 GMT

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

Nonsense. I don't use my skills in any one area to try to convince anyone of my knowledge in any other. I'm a very good IT guy, a decent amateur historian, and fairly widely read. However, I don't expect that because I know my way around the XP registry that anyone should take my opinions about anything else seriously. They're welcome to take it or leave it. Artists are explicitly or implicitly (usually explicitly) claiming that their status as an artist allows them some greater degree of insight into the world than the rest of us. They might even have that, insight into the world or the self. But politics, current events, environmental damage, and so forth have precious little to do with acting or playing guitar.

I tend to take seriously people who have unique or at least unusual backgrounds that give them additional gravitas when covering a particular subject. Tim Robbins to me has borderline zero gravitas, I happen to agree with a good bit of what he says but I don't take his opinion all that seriously.

In addition, most of what I talk about regarding US history, system architecture, and so forth can be checked against quality records as matters of fact. The god stuff not so much, although I think we're getting closer and closer to that all the time.

Finally, in my personal experience 'artists,' particularly actors and musicians, tend not to be terribly well informed people. It's rare that I get anything out of them but pretty vanilla American leftism. Writers are often, though certainly not always, another breed. I mean, I remember reading an article in Rolling Stone where an interviewer asked Duane Allman what he was doing for 'the revolution,' and Duane responded, 'Well, I'm striking a chord for peace.' I think it was then that I adopted the Wayne Coyne attitude of listening to my favorite musicians about music and not much else.

TCB

"Napolean Blownapart" <nb@elba.net> wrote:

>
>Eh, Thad, if your logic isn't flawed, then you need to either quit the sponge
>monkeys or stop talking about god, the founding fathers, and systems architecture.
> If you still reserve the right to make music, be passionate about religion/sociology,
>history, and IT, then you've just shot your own argument in the ass. By
>your own admission, you are not an expert in all (if any) of these fields.
>
>And for my next obiter dictum, since when does one need to be an expert
to
>make a valid observation or have a good idea? That's rather elitist, no?
>
>NB
>
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>>I don't think my logic is flawed. It's very difficult for one human being
>>to become an expert in one field, much less two or three. I know, as I
have
>>failed at a half dozen. Would you listen to Tim Robbins' opinions about
>maritime
>>archeology? Habermas? Cambodian architecture? Politics is as difficult
to
>>master as those, but somehow because someone is a good actor we are supposed
>>to take their opinions seriously.
>>
>>This all stems, in my opinion, in the greatly overstated role that 'artists'
>>played in various movements of the baby boomer's youth.
>>
>>TCB
>>
>>"bunuel" <bunuel@conar.fr> wrote:
>>>
>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist.
I
>>don't
>>>>like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at paintings
>>>>by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current
>>>>affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he
should
>>>>volunteer.
>>>
>>>
>>>Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you
>will
>>>forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not sing,

>>>but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no, according
>>to
>>>you.
>>>
>>>Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and
that's
>>>all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not
>only
>>>legitimate but essential.It may be opportunism, but so what? From your
>perspective,
>>>nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken seriously
>>>on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on policy?),
>>>not editors/writers(the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military people,
>>nor
>>>economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is
a
>>streak
>>>of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core: governing
>>>is the province of the elite alone. It's vintage Duke of Wellington.
>>>
>>>By this logic, in fact, your OWN amateur pronouncements on politics must
>>>be considered utterly without merit. Yet, if you had Tim Robbins's platform,
>>>considering how strongly held and sophisticated your viewpoint is, and
>how
>>>avidly you promote it even to this tiny audience here, would you decline
>>>such an opportunity to promote it to the world at large? I can't see
it,
>>>and I wouldn't fault you. Do you feel that Tim Robbins is less politically
>>>sophisticated than yourself?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Venceremos!
>>>bunuel
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>

>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Neil](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 04:59:55 GMT

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

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>I mean, I remember reading an article
>in Rolling Stone where an interviewer asked Duane Allman what
>he was doing for 'the revolution,' and Duane responded, 'Well,
>I'm striking a chord for peace.'

And frankly, that's probably the smartest thing any armchair
historian/activist/opinionist can do or say... do what they
can within their area of expertise, and then shut the fuck up.
"Here's a DMaj7 chord - let it bring peace."
Good... let's hope it does. NEXT!!!

At least that does no harm.

Neil

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 08:20:31 GMT

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

is that a with or without a sunlight tilt? ;o)

On Mon, 21 Apr 2008 11:04:55 -0400, Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com>
wrote:

>Oh yeah and Mr. No Spin (Bill O'Reilly) is the biggest spinner of them
>all. In fact any time he makes the no spin point, you know he just spun
>the crap out of something.

>
>I reckon it's just entertainment. If you take it seriously you WILL end
>up with your head tilting hard to the right.

>
>rick wrote:

>> what i love are the radio jocks who slam anyone of note for expressing
>> an opinion because of thier celebrity while they do the same daily.
>> and what really boggles the mind is that there are those who agree and

>> do not see the irony.

>>

>> On Sun, 20 Apr 2008 02:13:48 -0700, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>

>> wrote:

>>

>>> I respectfully disagree very much about artists speaking out, and am
>>> reminded of heated arguments with my parents on this very subject. I think
>>> if talent and good luck grant somebody a communication line that powerful,
>>> they definitely should speak out on important issues. My parents saw this
>>> kind of thing as arrogant biting of the hand that feeds you, but I just see
>>> it as being a responsible human being. To suggest that artists should just
>>> do their art and keep their mouths shut seems uncomfortably similar to
>>> suggesting that women should do the same, their "art" being the cookin' and
>>> cleanin' and raisin' the kids.

>>>

>>> Also, I think a lot of outspoken artists do volunteer, join campaigns,
>>> and/or run for office. But if they don't, if they just want to take
>>> advantage of their fame to flap their yaps, I'm fine with that. Flap away.

>>>

>>> S

>>>

>>>

>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4809089c\$1@linux...

>>>> On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I

>>>> don't

>>>> like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at

>>>> paintings

>>>> by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current

>>>> affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he

>>>> should

>>>> volunteer.

>>>>

>>>> As far as John Adams, it's hard to hear his take on Hamilton and not wind
>>>> up hating the guy. Nobody, not even Thomas Jefferson, hated Hamilton more
>>>> than Adams. Hamilton was also far from a 'pawn' of bunch of nefarious
>>>> bankers.

>>>> Pawn implied control by others. Hamilton was keenly aware of how finance

>>>> worked, often to a greater degree than the bankers he was dealing with,

>>>> and

>>>> turned out to be right more often than not. His vision of America, as a

>>>> dominant

>>>> power in the Western hemisphere built on a powerful manufacturing economy

>>>> and a strong currency backed by a central bank, was more or less right.

>>>> Jefferson's

>>>> yeomen farmers reaping the fruits of their own labor and the labor of

>>>> their

>>>> dark hued indentured help, while reading Gibbon in the library at night,

>>>> was winsome and romantic. Hell, even Jefferson, with his sizzling gifts

>>>> and
>>>> endless energy, couldn't manage to get out of debt in his life.
>>>>
>>>> Of the 'big four' Adams is probably the most likable, and the second
>>>> easiest
>>>> to understand. His appetites and vices were modest, his opinions were
>>>> fairly
>>>> straightforward and honest. It's good to see him getting a day in the sun,
>>>> it's richly deserved.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>> Kerry, I don't think Thad has a problem with his being an artist.
>>>>>
>>>>> Actually I do think we all have a responsibility to say what we believe
>>>>> and what we think will be of value to others. Great artists have
>>>>> powerful voices and they absolutely should communicate for the
>>>>> betterment of society and the future of the civilization. Frankly I
>>>>> would much rather hear heart felt opinions from an intelligent actor
>>>>> like Tim Robbins (Erik the Viking!) than the compromised party line we
>>>>> hear from most pragmatic politicians.
>>>>>
>>>>> Has anyone been watching the John Adams HBO series? Even at the birth of
>>>>> our Republic we had bankers' pawns like Hamilton scheming to put the
>>>>> country into debt with an expensive army and war.
>>>>>
>>>>> Kerry Galloway wrote:
>>>>>> Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too,
>>>>>> pretty
>>>>>> much by definition?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> :D
>>>>>>
>>>>>> - Kerry
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1@linux, "TCB"
>>>>>> <nobody@ishere.com>
>>>>>> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going
>>>> on about
>>>>>>> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a
>>>>>>> campaign
>>>>>>> or run for office.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> TCB

>>>>>>
>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>> http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Right on.
>>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 12:45:45 GMT

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

Guys, what you're overlooking (surprisingly, for such usually insightful dudes) is that he was addressing the N-A-B. That stands for National Association of Broadcasters. They are the ones who broadcast his and other's art as well as news, documentaries, etc. He had a perfect right and indeed a responsibility to urge the broadcasters to take a higher road in their broadcasting choices for the well being of the people who listen/watch.

The idea is this: if you give people some good news, some positive messages they will be uplifted and more sanguine in their approach to life and the world around them. Is that such a bad thing? Should we decry this message because we don't agree with his other messages? That is the kind of illogical, logger headed thinking that has gotten us to the point where our government can't agree on anything but going to war and raising taxes. You guys are smarter than that.

Neil wrote:

> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>
>> I mean, I remember reading an article
>> in Rolling Stone where an interviewer asked Duane Allman what
>> he was doing for 'the revolution,' and Duane responded, 'Well,
>> I'm striking a chord for peace.'
>
> And frankly, that's probably the smartest thing any armchair
> historian/activist/opinionist can do or say... do what they
> can within their area of expertise, and then shut the fuck up.
> "Here's a DMaj7 chord - let it bring peace."

> Good... let's hope it does. NEXT!!!
>
> At least that does no harm.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 12:46:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Rick, I did not get that one.

rick wrote:

> is that a with or without a sunlight tilt? ;o)

>

> On Mon, 21 Apr 2008 11:04:55 -0400, Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com>

> wrote:

>

>> Oh yeah and Mr. No Spin (Bill O'Reilly) is the biggest spinner of them
>> all. In fact any time he makes the no spin point, you know he just spun
>> the crap out of something.

>>

>> I reckon it's just entertainment. If you take it seriously you WILL end
>> up with your head tilting hard to the right.

>>

>> rick wrote:

>>> what i love are the radio jocks who slam anyone of note for expressing
>>> an opinion because of thier celebrity while they do the same daily.
>>> and what really boggles the mind is that there are those who agree and
>>> do not see the irony.

>>>

>>> On Sun, 20 Apr 2008 02:13:48 -0700, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>

>>> wrote:

>>>

>>>> I respectfully disagree very much about artists speaking out, and am
>>>> reminded of heated arguments with my parents on this very subject. I think
>>>> if talent and good luck grant somebody a communication line that powerful,
>>>> they definitely should speak out on important issues. My parents saw this
>>>> kind of thing as arrogant biting of the hand that feeds you, but I just see
>>>> it as being a responsible human being. To suggest that artists should just
>>>> do their art and keep their mouths shut seems uncomfortably similar to
>>>> suggesting that women should do the same, their "art" being the cookin' and
>>>> cleanin' and raisin' the kids.

>>>>

>>>> Also, I think a lot of outspoken artists do volunteer, join campaigns,
>>>> and/or run for office. But if they don't, if they just want to take
>>>> advantage of their fame to flap their yaps, I'm fine with that. Flap away.

>>>>
>>>> S
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4809089c\$1@linux...
>>>>> On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I
>>>>> don't
>>>>> like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at
>>>>> paintings
>>>>> by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current
>>>>> affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he
>>>>> should
>>>>> volunteer.
>>>>>
>>>>> As far as John Adams, it's hard to hear his take on Hamilton and not wind
>>>>> up hating the guy. Nobody, not even Thomas Jefferson, hated Hamilton more
>>>>> than Adams. Hamilton was also far from a 'pawn' of bunch of nefarious
>>>>> bankers.
>>>>> Pawn implied control by others. Hamilton was keenly aware of how finance
>>>>> worked, often to a greater degree than the bankers he was dealing with,
>>>>> and
>>>>> turned out to be right more often than not. His vision of America, as a
>>>>> dominant
>>>>> power in the Western hemisphere built on a powerful manufacturing economy
>>>>> and a strong currency backed by a central bank, was more or less right.
>>>>> Jefferson's
>>>>> yeomen farmers reaping the fruits of their own labor and the labor of
>>>>> their
>>>>> dark hued indentured help, while reading Gibbon in the library at night,
>>>>> was winsome and romantic. Hell, even Jefferson, with his sizzling gifts
>>>>> and
>>>>> endless energy, couldn't manage to get out of debt in his life.
>>>>>
>>>>> Of the 'big four' Adams is probably the most likable, and the second
>>>>> easiest
>>>>> to understand. His appetites and vices were modest, his opinions were
>>>>> fairly
>>>>> straightforward and honest. It's good to see him getting a day in the sun,
>>>>> it's richly deserved.
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Kerry, I don't think Thad has a problem with his being an artist.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Actually I do think we all have a responsibility to say what we believe
>>>>>> and what we think will be of value to others. Great artists have
>>>>>> powerful voices and they absolutely should communicate for the

>>>>> betterment of society and the future of the civilization. Frankly I
>>>>> would much rather hear heart felt opinions from an intelligent actor
>>>>> like Tim Robbins (Erik the Viking!) than the compromised party line we
>>>>> hear from most pragmatic politicians.
>>>>>
>>>>> Has anyone been watching the John Adams HBO series? Even at the birth of
>>>>> our Republic we had bankers' pawns like Hamilton scheming to put the
>>>>> country into debt with an expensive army and war.
>>>>>
>>>>> Kerry Galloway wrote:
>>>>>> Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too,
>>>>>> pretty
>>>>>> much by definition?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> :D
>>>>>>
>>>>>> - Kerry
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1@linux, "TCB"
>>>>>> <nobody@ishere.com>
>>>>>> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going
>>>>>>> on about
>>>>>>> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a
>>>>>>> campaign
>>>>>>> or run for office.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>> http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Right on.
>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 13:25:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree completely, Neil, my point was asking Duane what he was doing 'for the revolution' was moronic in the extreme.

"Neil" <OIOI@OIU.com> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>>I mean, I remember reading an article

>>in Rolling Stone where an interviewer asked Duane Allman what

>>he was doing for 'the revolution,' and Duane responded, 'Well,

>>I'm striking a chord for peace.'

>

>And frankly, that's probably the smartest thing any armchair

>historian/activist/opinionist can do or say... do what they

>can within their area of expertise, and then shut the fuck up.

>"Here's a DMaj7 chord - let it bring peace."

>Good... let's hope it does. NEXT!!!

>

>At least that does no harm.

>

>Neil

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 18:03:57 GMT

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

I remember Richard Gere going all holier-than-thou-because-I-am-a-pacifist on the "Concert for NYC" stage after 911...

The crowd of cops, firepeople, widows and the general bereaved booed him right off the stage. It was a great moment.

Now, no matter how you come down on the issue of violence and the concept of "just war", Gere was using his fame as a platform to jam his views down the throats of the proles.

I am here to tell you that millions of us won't put up with that anymore.

I don't care what my doctor thinks of Jessica Simpson, and I don't care what Jessica thinks of socialized medicine.

DC

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 21:00:16 GMT

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

Nice idea, Neil. If we put your rule into effect it would totally shut down the blathersphere. Talk radio would switch to 24 hour polka music and all the armchair pundits would have to get real jobs. Cable news channels would have to drop the talking head shouting matches and do some actual reporting. One-sided political apologist sites would go out of business, or maybe they could discuss their favorite polka artists instead.

You may be on to something there. :^)

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Neil wrote:

> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>
>> I mean, I remember reading an article
>> in Rolling Stone where an interviewer asked Duane Allman what
>> he was doing for 'the revolution,' and Duane responded, 'Well,
>> I'm striking a chord for peace.'
>
> And frankly, that's probably the smartest thing any armchair
> historian/activist/opinionist can do or say... do what they
> can within their area of expertise, and then shut the fuck up.
> "Here's a DMaj7 chord - let it bring peace."
> Good... let's hope it does. NEXT!!!
>
> At least that does no harm.
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Tue, 22 Apr 2008 23:49:37 GMT

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

Yes, but the real question at hand is whether or not there is chicken in that tuna can.

AA

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:480e288d\$1@linux...

>
> I remember Richard Gere going all holier-than-thou-because-I-am-
> a-pacifist on the "Concert for NYC" stage after 911...
> The crowd of cops, firepeople, widows and the general bereaved

> booed him right off the stage. It was a great moment.
>
> Now, no matter how you come down on the issue of violence
> and the concept of "just war", Gere was using his fame as a
> platform to jam his views down the throats of the proles.
> I am here to tell you that millions of us won't put up with that
> anymore.
>
> I don't care what my doctor thinks of Jessica Simpson, and
> I don't care what Jessica thinks of socialized medicine.
>
> DC

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 00:53:23 GMT

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

According to Mr Amercian Heritage, politics is "the art or science of governing . . . " and to govern is "To make and administer the public policy and affairs of; exercise sovereign authority in." Hmm, OK, who should we be listening to on this subject? Who are the "experts" and how did they get that way? Masters of Political Science? I don't think you'll find many of those among our leaders. There are lot of lawyers in the ranks, but I'm not sure that makes anyone an expert in governing. Is it time spent in the halls of congress that makes one an "expert"? So we should listen to the really old guys? . . . Ted Stevens leaps to mind. Or Ted Kennedy for that matter.

Have you ever watched C-Span, or other examples of our government at work? Some of those people just don't strike me as our best and brightest. I can only watch that stuff for about five minutes before I scream and change the channel. It's just so intolerably slow and painfully dispassionate. If those are our experts, I can see why we're in serious trouble.

Are there really any experts in politics/governing? Who are they, and what are their credentials? In our system of government, aren't WE essentially the government? Doesn't that mean give every one of us the "expertise," possibly even the duty to speak up?

It's possible, of course, "that government of the people, by the people, for the people" has long since perished "from the earth." But maybe it's not dead, only sleeping.

I'm going to go out on a limb here and suggest that most of the politically outspoken actors and rock stars express liberal points of view, which is understandably annoying to those of a conservative bent, and may be seen as an unfair advantage in the "culture war."

It would be nice if we could end the "culture war" and calmly, rationally, simply seek out the truth, but that just may go against human nature. We're far more invested in what we choose to believe.

S

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:480d57a0\$1@linux...

>
> Nonsense. I don't use my skills in any one area to try to convince anyone
> of my knowledge in any other. I'm a very good IT guy, a decent amateur
> historian,
> and fairly widely read. However, I don't expect that because I know my way
> around the XP registry that anyone should take my opinions about anything
> else seriously. They're welcome to take it or leave it. Artists are
> explicitly
> or implicitly (usually explicitly) claiming that their status as an artist
> allows them some greater degree of insight into the world than the rest of
> us. They might even have that, insight into the world or the self. But
> politics,
> current events, environmental damage, and so forth have precious little to
> do with acting or playing guitar.
>
> I tend to take seriously people who have unique or at least unusual
> backgrounds
> that give them additional gravitas when covering a particular subject. Tim
> Robbins to me has borderline zero gravitas, I happen to agree with a good
> bit of what he says but I don't take his opinion all that seriously.
>
> In addition, most of what I talk about regarding US history, system
> architecture,
> and so forth can be checked against quality records as matters of fact.
> The
> god stuff not so much, although I think we're getting closer and closer to
> that all the time.
>
> Finally, in my personal experience 'artists,' particularly actors and
> musicians,
> tend not to be terribly well informed people. It's rare that I get
> anything
> out of them but pretty vanilla American leftism. Writers are often, though
> certainly not always, another breed. I mean, I remember reading an article
> in Rolling Stone where an interviewer asked Duane Allman what he was doing
> for 'the revolution,' and Duane responded, 'Well, I'm striking a chord for
> peace.' I think it was then that I adopted the Wayne Coyne attitude of
> listening
> to my favorite musicians about music and not much else.

>
> TCB
>
> "Napolean Blownapart" <nb@elba.net> wrote:
>>
>>Eh, Thad, if your logic isn't flawed, then you need to either quit the
>>sponge
>>monkeys or stop talking about god, the founding fathers, and systems
>>architecture.
>> If you still reserve the right to make music, be passionate about
>> religion/sociology,
>>history, and IT, then you've just shot your own argument in the ass. By
>>your own admission, you are not an expert in all (if any) of these fields.
>>
>>And for my next obiter dictum, since when does one need to be an expert
> to
>>make a valid observation or have a good idea? That's rather elitist, no?
>>
>>NB
>>
>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>I don't think my logic is flawed. It's very difficult for one human being
>>>to become an expert in one field, much less two or three. I know, as I
> have
>>>failed at a half dozen. Would you listen to Tim Robbins' opinions about
>>maritime
>>>archeology? Habermas? Cambodian architecture? Politics is as difficult
> to
>>>master as those, but somehow because someone is a good actor we are
>>>supposed
>>>to take their opinions seriously.
>>>
>>>This all stems, in my opinion, in the greatly overstated role that
>>>'artists'
>>>played in various movements of the baby boomer's youth.
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>
>>>"bunuel" <bunuel@conar.fr> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist.
> I
>>>don't
>>>>>like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at

>>>>paintings
>>>>by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on
>>>>current
>>>>affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he
> should
>>>>volunteer.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you
>>will
>>>>forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not
>>>>sing,
>>>>but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no, according
>>>>to
>>>>you.
>>>>
>>>>Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and
> that's
>>>>all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not
>>only
>>>>legitimate but essential.It may be opportunism, but so what? From your
>>perspective,
>>>>nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken
>>>>seriously
>>>>on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on
>>>>policy?),
>>>>not editors/writers(the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military people,
>>>>nor
>>>>economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is
> a
>>>>streak
>>>>of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core:
>>>>governing
>>>>is the province of the elite alone. It's vintage Duke of Wellington.
>>>>
>>>>By this logic, in fact, your OWN amateur pronouncements on politics must
>>>>be considered utterly without merit. Yet, if you had Tim Robbins's
>>>>platform,
>>>>considering how strongly held and sophisticated your viewpoint is, and
>>how
>>>>avidly you promote it even to this tiny audience here, would you decline
>>>>such an opportunity to promote it to the world at large? I can't see
> it,
>>>>and I wouldn't fault you. Do you feel that Tim Robbins is less
>>>>politically
>>>>sophisticated than yourself?
>>>>
>>>>

>>>> what i love are the radio jocks who slam anyone of note for expressing
>>>> an opinion because of thier celebrity while they do the same daily.
>>>> and what really boggles the mind is that there are those who agree and
>>>> do not see the irony.

>>>>

>>>> On Sun, 20 Apr 2008 02:13:48 -0700, "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com>
>>>> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>> I respectfully disagree very much about artists speaking out, and am
>>>>> reminded of heated arguments with my parents on this very subject. I think
>>>>> if talent and good luck grant somebody a communication line that powerful,
>>>>> they definitely should speak out on important issues. My parents saw this
>>>>> kind of thing as arrogant biting of the hand that feeds you, but I just see
>>>>> it as being a responsible human being. To suggest that artists should just
>>>>> do their art and keep their mouths shut seems uncomfortably similar to
>>>>> suggesting that women should do the same, their "art" being the cookin' and
>>>>> cleanin' and raisin' the kids.

>>>>>

>>>>> Also, I think a lot of outspoken artists do volunteer, join campaigns,
>>>>> and/or run for office. But if they don't, if they just want to take
>>>>> advantage of their fame to flap their yaps, I'm fine with that. Flap away.

>>>>>

>>>>> S

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4809089c\$1@linux...

>>>>>> On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I
>>>>>> don't

>>>>>> like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at
>>>>>> paintings

>>>>>> by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current
>>>>>> affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he
>>>>>> should

>>>>>> volunteer.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> As far as John Adams, it's hard to hear his take on Hamilton and not wind
>>>>>>> up hating the guy. Nobody, not even Thomas Jefferson, hated Hamilton more
>>>>>>> than Adams. Hamilton was also far from a 'pawn' of bunch of nefarious
>>>>>>> bankers.

>>>>>>> Pawn implied control by others. Hamilton was keenly aware of how finance
>>>>>>> worked, often to a greater degree than the bankers he was dealing with,
>>>>>>> and

>>>>>>> turned out to be right more often than not. His vision of America, as a
>>>>>>> dominant

>>>>>>> power in the Western hemisphere built on a powerful manufacturing economy
>>>>>>> and a strong currency backed by a central bank, was more or less right.

>>>>>>> Jefferson's

>>>>>>> yeomen farmers reaping the fruits of their own labor and the labor of

>>>>> their
>>>>> dark hued indentured help, while reading Gibbon in the library at night,
>>>>> was winsome and romantic. Hell, even Jefferson, with his sizzling gifts
>>>>> and
>>>>> endless energy, couldn't manage to get out of debt in his life.
>>>>>
>>>>> Of the 'big four' Adams is probably the most likable, and the second
>>>>> easiest
>>>>> to understand. His appetites and vices were modest, his opinions were
>>>>> fairly
>>>>> straightforward and honest. It's good to see him getting a day in the sun,
>>>>> it's richly deserved.
>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>> Kerry, I don't think Thad has a problem with his being an artist.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Actually I do think we all have a responsibility to say what we believe
>>>>>>> and what we think will be of value to others. Great artists have
>>>>>>> powerful voices and they absolutely should communicate for the
>>>>>>> betterment of society and the future of the civilization. Frankly I
>>>>>>> would much rather hear heart felt opinions from an intelligent actor
>>>>>>> like Tim Robbins (Erik the Viking!) than the compromised party line we
>>>>>>> hear from most pragmatic politicians.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Has anyone been watching the John Adams HBO series? Even at the birth of
>>>>>>> our Republic we had bankers' pawns like Hamilton scheming to put the
>>>>>>> country into debt with an expensive army and war.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Kerry Galloway wrote:
>>>>>>>> Wait a sec. Aren't the bulk of PARIS NG contributors "artists" too,
>>>>>>>> pretty
>>>>>>>> much by definition?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> :D
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> - Kerry
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> On 4/17/08 1:49 PM, in article 4807b7be\$1@linux, "TCB"
>>>>>>>>> <nobody@ishere.com>
>>>>>>>>> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> I agree with a fair bit of the NAB speech, but I find 'artists' going
>>>>>>>>>> on about
>>>>>>>>>>> politics insufferable. If they really care about this stuff join a
>>>>>>>>>>>> campaign

>>>>>>>> or run for office.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> TCB
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>> Thad, I think he blew the right notes this time. Did you listen?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> TCB wrote:
>>>>>>>> Hollywood blowhard.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>> http://adage.com/brightcove/single.php?title=1506582278
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Right on.
>>

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 12:26:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don, I sure wish some people had listened to Richard Gere. Today, 7 years later, we might not be fighting a wrong headed war - we might be spreading civilization through the same area with the far more powerful, profitable and welcome means of helping our fellow human beings.

Gere is a Buddhist. Buddha spread civilization throughout Asia with a loving message of help and hope. In the words of the poet, "What's so funny about love, peace and understanding?"

The unfortunate reaction of "an eye for an eye" is the knee jerk of the insane. A sane person knows nothing is gained by putting out your brother's eye. We fell hook, line and sinker for the terrorists' ploy and did precisely what they wanted, spreading chaos to the millions who they could not possibly themselves affect with their small numbers and meager resources. What idiocy our country showed. Hindsight is supposed to be 20/20. Have we not learned a thing from it?

DC wrote:

> I remember Richard Gere going all holier-than-thou-because-I-am-
> a-pacifist on the "Concert for NYC" stage after 911...
> The crowd of cops, firepeople, widows and the general bereaved
> booed him right off the stage. It was a great moment.
>
> Now, no matter how you come down on the issue of violence
> and the concept of "just war", Gere was using his fame as a
> platform to jam his views down the throats of the proles.

> I am here to tell you that millions of us won't put up with that
> anymore.
>
> I don't care what my doctor thinks of Jessica Simpson, and
> I don't care what Jessica thinks of socialized medicine.
>
> DC

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 13:03:47 GMT

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

But that's not the point, Don. You didn't agree with the message. Calling him an elitist is a convenient way to dismiss it. My point is that even though I agree with a lot of what Robbins said I don't take him seriously as an authority on anything. Had Richard Gere snarled out a call for a crusade against the muslim hordes I'm guessing you would have been fine with that.

TCB

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>
>I remember Richard Gere going all holier-than-thou-because-I-am-
>a-pacifist on the "Concert for NYC" stage after 911...
>The crowd of cops, firepeople, widows and the general bereaved
>booed him right off the stage. It was a great moment.
>
>Now, no matter how you come down on the issue of violence
>and the concept of "just war", Gere was using his fame as a
>platform to jam his views down the throats of the proles.
>I am here to tell you that millions of us won't put up with that
>anymore.
>
>I don't care what my doctor thinks of Jessica Simpson, and
>I don't care what Jessica thinks of socialized medicine.
>
>DC

Subject: Re: Maybe a little OT - The Six Best Minutes of Tim Robbins Controversial
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 23 Apr 2008 15:51:37 GMT

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

Why would you think I would pay attention to politicians when reading and thinking about politics and current affairs?

OK, to give only a few examples. I read William S. Lind religiously. He is a hidebound cultural conservative (which I abhor) but he's deeply read in European military history and has done groundbreaking work on current war fighting theory. I read Brian Clough and Stan Goff (both very much liberals) about counter insurgency because in addition to being highly educated they actually fought in counter insurgencies for the US and Australia respectively. I read everything I can by Robert Fisk and Patrick Cockburn because they speak good Arabic and have been reporting from the middle east for over 20 years each. They're generally 'left' though both are truly reporters, they try to report what's happening. I read everything I can by Mike Whitney because he's so damn funny, his bits about the Iranian oil borse still bring tears to my eyes. At the more macro level I read Pat Buchanan (again, not into the catholic cultural conservatism, but he's a genuine anti-empire conservative), Gore Vidal, William Blum, and Matt Taibbi as much as I can.

So, those are the KINDS of people I read. I would be thrilled if Robert Fisk talked to the NAB. But Tim Robbins? It's just a 'who cares' kind of thing.

TCB

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:

>According to Mr Amercian Heritage, politics is "the art or science of governing . . ." and to govern is "To make and administer the public policy

>and affairs of; exercise sovereign authority in." Hmm, OK, who should we be

>listening to on this subject? Who are the "experts" and how did they get

>that way? Masters of Political Science? I don't think you'll find many of

>those among our leaders. There are lot of lawyers in the ranks, but I'm not

>sure that makes anyone an expert in governing. Is it time spent in the

>halls of congress that makes one an "expert"? So we should listen to the

>really old guys? . . . Ted Stevens leaps to mind. Or Ted Kennedy for that

>matter.

>

>Have you ever watched C-Span, or other examples of our government at work?

>Some of those people just don't strike me as our best and brightest. I can

>only watch that stuff for about five minutes before I scream and change the

>channel. It's just so intolerably slow and painfully dispassionate. If

>those are our experts, I can see why we're in serious trouble.

>

>Are there really any experts in politics/governing? Who are they, and what

>are their credentials? In our system of government, aren't WE essentially

>the government? Doesn't that mean give every one of us the "expertise,"

>possibly even the duty to speak up?

>

>It's possible, of course, "that government of the people, by the people,

for

>the people" has long since perished "from the earth." But maybe it's not

>dead, only sleeping.

>

>I'm going to go out on a limb here and suggest that most of the politically

>outspoken actors and rock stars express liberal points of view, which is

>understandably annoying to those of a conservative bent, and may be seen

as

>an unfair advantage in the "culture war."

>

>It would be nice if we could end the "culture war" and calmly, rationally,

>simply seek out the truth, but that just may go against human nature. We're

>far more invested in what we choose to believe.

>

>S

>

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:480d57a0\$1@linux...

>>

>> Nonsense. I don't use my skills in any one area to try to convince anyone

>> of my knowledge in any other. I'm a very good IT guy, a decent amateur

>> historian,

>> and fairly widely read. However, I don't expect that because I know my

way

>> around the XP registry that anyone should take my opinions about anything

>> else seriously. They're welcome to take it or leave it. Artists are

>> explicitly

>> or implicitly (usually explicitly) claiming that their status as an artist

>> allows them some greater degree of insight into the world than the rest

of

>> us. They might even have that, insight into the world or the self. But

>> politics,

>> current events, environmental damage, and so forth have precious little to

>> do with acting or playing guitar.

>>

>> I tend to take seriously people who have unique or at least unusual

>> backgrounds

>> that give them additional gravitas when covering a particular subject.

Tim

>> Robbins to me has borderline zero gravitas, I happen to agree with a good

>> bit of what he says but I don't take his opinion all that seriously.

>>

>> In addition, most of what I talk about regarding US history, system

>> architecture,

>> and so forth can be checked against quality records as matters of fact.

>> The

>> god stuff not so much, although I think we're getting closer and closer

to

>> that all the time.

>>

>> Finally, in my personal experience 'artists,' particularly actors and

>> musicians,

>> tend not to be terribly well informed people. It's rare that I get

>> anything

>> out of them but pretty vanilla American leftism. Writers are often, though

>> certainly not always, another breed. I mean, I remember reading an article

>> in Rolling Stone where an interviewer asked Duane Allman what he was doing

>> for 'the revolution,' and Duane responded, 'Well, I'm striking a chord

for

>> peace.' I think it was then that I adopted the Wayne Coyne attitude of

>> listening

>> to my favorite musicians about music and not much else.

>>

>> TCB

>>

>> "Napolean Blownapart" <nb@elba.net> wrote:

>>>

>>>Eh, Thad, if your logic isn't flawed, then you need to either quit the

>>>sponge

>>>monkeys or stop talking about god, the founding fathers, and systems

>>>architecture.

>>> If you still reserve the right to make music, be passionate about
>>> religion/sociology,
>>> history, and IT, then you've just shot your own argument in the ass.
By
>>> your own admission, you are not an expert in all (if any) of these fields.
>>>
>>> And for my next obiter dictum, since when does one need to be an expert
>> to
>>> make a valid observation or have a good idea? That's rather elitist,
no?
>>>
>>> NB
>>>
>>>
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> I don't think my logic is flawed. It's very difficult for one human being
>>>> to become an expert in one field, much less two or three. I know, as
I
>> have
>>>> failed at a half dozen. Would you listen to Tim Robbins' opinions about
>>>> maritime
>>>> archeology? Habermas? Cambodian architecture? Politics is as difficult
>> to
>>>> master as those, but somehow because someone is a good actor we are
>>>> supposed
>>>> to take their opinions seriously.
>>>>
>>>> This all stems, in my opinion, in the greatly overstated role that
>>>> 'artists'
>>>> played in various movements of the baby boomer's youth.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> "bunuel" <bunuel@conar.fr> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist.
>> I
>>>> don't
>>>>> like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at
>>>>>> paintings
>>>>>> by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on
>>>>>> current
>>>>>> affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he
>> should
>>>>>> volunteer.

>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you
>>>>will
>>>>>forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not

>>>>>sing,
>>>>>but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no, according
>>>>to
>>>>>you.
>>>>>
>>>>>Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and
>> that's
>>>>>all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not
>>>>only
>>>>>legitimate but essential. It may be opportunism, but so what? From your
>>>>perspective,
>>>>>nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken
>>>>>seriously
>>>>>on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on

>>>>>policy?),
>>>>>not editors/writers(the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military people,
>>>>nor
>>>>>economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is
>> a
>>>>>streak
>>>>>of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core:
>>>>>governing
>>>>>is the province of the elite alone. It's vintage Duke of Wellington.
>>>>>
>>>>>>By this logic, in fact, your OWN amateur pronouncements on politics
must
>>>>>>be considered utterly without merit. Yet, if you had Tim Robbins's
>>>>>>platform,
>>>>>>considering how strongly held and sophisticated your viewpoint is, and
>>>>how
>>>>>>avidly you promote it even to this tiny audience here, would you decline
>>>>>>such an opportunity to promote it to the world at large? I can't see
>> it,
>>>>>>and I wouldn't fault you. Do you feel that Tim Robbins is less
>>>>>>politically
>>>>>>sophisticated than yourself?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Venceremos!
>>>>>>bunuel

> OK, to give only a few examples. I read William S. Lind religiously. He is
> a hidebound cultural conservative (which I abhor) but he's deeply read in
> European military history and has done groundbreaking work on current war
> fighting theory. I read Brian Clough and Stan Goff (both very much
> liberals)
> about counter insurgency because in addition to being highly educated they
> actually fought in counter insurgencies for the US and Australia
> respectively.
> I read everything I can by Robert Fisk and Patrick Cockburn because they
> speak good Arabic and have been reporting from the middle east for over 20
> years each. They're generally 'left' though both are truly reporters, they
> try to report what's happening. I read everything I can by Mike Whitney
> because
> he's so damn funny, his bits about the Iranian oil borse still bring tears
> to my eyes. At the more macro level I read Pat Buchanan (again, not into
> the catholic cultural conservatism, but he's a genuine anti-empire
> conservative),
> Gore Vidal, William Blum, and Matt Taibbi as much as I can.
>
> So, those are the KINDS of people I read. I would be thrilled if Robert
> Fisk
> talked to the NAB. But Tim Robbins? It's just a 'who cares' kind of thing.
>
>
> TCB
>
> "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>>According to Mr Americian Heritage, politics is "the art or science of
>>governing . . . " and to govern is "To make and administer the public
>>policy
>
>>and affairs of; exercise sovereign authority in." Hmm, OK, who should we
> be
>>listening to on this subject? Who are the "experts" and how did they get
>
>>that way? Masters of Political Science? I don't think you'll find many
> of
>>those among our leaders. There are lot of lawyers in the ranks, but I'm
> not
>>sure that makes anyone an expert in governing. Is it time spent in the
>
>>halls of congress that makes one an "expert"? So we should listen to the
>
>>really old guys? . . . Ted Stevens leaps to mind. Or Ted Kennedy for that
>
>>matter.
>>
>>Have you ever watched C-Span, or other examples of our government at work?

>
>>Some of those people just don't strike me as our best and brightest. I
> can
>>only watch that stuff for about five minutes before I scream and change
> the
>>channel. It's just so intolerably slow and painfully dispassionate. If
>
>>those are our experts, I can see why we're in serious trouble.
>>
>>Are there really any experts in politics/governing? Who are they, and
>>what
>
>>are their credentials? In our system of government, aren't WE essentially
>
>>the government? Doesn't that mean give every one of us the "expertise,"
>
>>possibly even the duty to speak up?
>>
>>It's possible, of course, "that government of the people, by the people,
> for
>>the people" has long since perished "from the earth." But maybe it's not
>
>>dead, only sleeping.
>>
>>I'm going to go out on a limb here and suggest that most of the
>>politically
>
>>outspoken actors and rock stars express liberal points of view, which is
>
>>understandably annoying to those of a conservative bent, and may be seen
> as
>>an unfair advantage in the "culture war."
>>
>>It would be nice if we could end the "culture war" and calmly, rationally,
>
>>simply seek out the truth, but that just may go against human nature.
>>We're
>
>>far more invested in what we choose to believe.
>>
>>S
>>
>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:480d57a0\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> Nonsense. I don't use my skills in any one area to try to convince
>>> anyone
>>> of my knowledge in any other. I'm a very good IT guy, a decent amateur

>
>>> historian,
>>> and fairly widely read. However, I don't expect that because I know my
> way
>>> around the XP registry that anyone should take my opinions about
>>> anything
>>> else seriously. They're welcome to take it or leave it. Artists are
>>> explicitly
>>> or implicitly (usually explicitly) claiming that their status as an
>>> artist
>>> allows them some greater degree of insight into the world than the rest
> of
>>> us. They might even have that, insight into the world or the self. But
>
>>> politics,
>>> current events, environmental damage, and so forth have precious little
> to
>>> do with acting or playing guitar.
>>>
>>> I tend to take seriously people who have unique or at least unusual
>>> backgrounds
>>> that give them additional gravitas when covering a particular subject.
> Tim
>>> Robbins to me has borderline zero gravitas, I happen to agree with a
>>> good
>>> bit of what he says but I don't take his opinion all that seriously.
>>>
>>> In addition, most of what I talk about regarding US history, system
>>> architecture,
>>> and so forth can be checked against quality records as matters of fact.
>
>>> The
>>> god stuff not so much, although I think we're getting closer and closer
> to
>>> that all the time.
>>>
>>> Finally, in my personal experience 'artists,' particularly actors and
>
>>> musicians,
>>> tend not to be terribly well informed people. It's rare that I get
>>> anything
>>> out of them but pretty vanilla American leftism. Writers are often,
>>> though
>>> certainly not always, another breed. I mean, I remember reading an
>>> article
>>> in Rolling Stone where an interviewer asked Duane Allman what he was
>>> doing
>>> for 'the revolution,' and Duane responded, 'Well, I'm striking a chord

> for
>>> peace.' I think it was then that I adopted the Wayne Coyne attitude of
>
>>> listening
>>> to my favorite musicians about music and not much else.
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> "Napolean Blownapart" <nb@elba.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Eh, Thad, if your logic isn't flawed, then you need to either quit the
>
>>>>sponge
>>>>monkeys or stop talking about god, the founding fathers, and systems
>>>>architecture.
>>>> If you still reserve the right to make music, be passionate about
>>>> religion/sociology,
>>>>history, and IT, then you've just shot your own argument in the ass.
> By
>>>>your own admission, you are not an expert in all (if any) of these
>>>>fields.
>>>>
>>>>And for my next obiter dictum, since when does one need to be an expert
>>> to
>>>>make a valid observation or have a good idea? That's rather elitist,
> no?
>>>>
>>>>NB
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>I don't think my logic is flawed. It's very difficult for one human
>>>>>being
>>>>>to become an expert in one field, much less two or three. I know, as
> I
>>> have
>>>>>failed at a half dozen. Would you listen to Tim Robbins' opinions about
>>>>>maritime
>>>>>archeology? Habermas? Cambodian architecture? Politics is as difficult
>>> to
>>>>>master as those, but somehow because someone is a good actor we are
>>>>>supposed
>>>>>to take their opinions seriously.
>>>>>
>>>>>This all stems, in my opinion, in the greatly overstated role that
>>>>>'artists'
>>>>>played in various movements of the baby boomer's youth.

>>>>
>>>>TCB
>>>>
>>>>"bunuel" <bunuel@conar.fr> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist.
>>> I
>>>>don't
>>>>>>like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at
>>>>>>paintings
>>>>>>by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on
>>>>>>current
>>>>>>affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he
>>> should
>>>>>>volunteer.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you
>>>>will
>>>>>>forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not
>
>>>>>>sing,
>>>>>>but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no,
>>>>>>according
>>>>>to
>>>>>>you.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and
>>> that's
>>>>>>all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not
>>>>only
>>>>>>legitimate but essential.It may be opportunism, but so what? From your
>>>>perspective,
>>>>>>nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken
>>>>>>seriously
>>>>>>on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on
>
>>>>>>policy?),
>>>>>>not editors/writers(the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military
>>>>>>people,
>>>>>nor
>>>>>>economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is
>>> a
>>>>>streak
>>>>>>of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core:
>>>>>>governing

...I might tell her some intricate plot details of "Little Dorit".

Sarah wrote:

> OK, thank you. That really does clear up your point of view for me. I
> admire that you do that much reading . . . I haven't the time or the
> attention span, otherwise I would, too.
>
> But still, how do you know what Tim Robbins knows? And how much does he
> need to know before making valid observations about the sleazy state of our
> media?
>
> I don't know. I respect and value any observant person's point of view. I
> learn a lot just here on the newsgroup, even from people I tend to
> vehemently agree with.
>
> But keep up the good work . . . I do admire a reader.
>
> S
>
>
> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:480f5b09\$1@linux...
>> Why would you think I would pay attention to politicians when reading and
>> thinking about politics and current affairs?
>>
>> OK, to give only a few examples. I read William S. Lind religiously. He is
>> a hidebound cultural conservative (which I abhor) but he's deeply read in
>> European military history and has done groundbreaking work on current war
>> fighting theory. I read Brian Clough and Stan Goff (both very much
>> liberals)
>> about counter insurgency because in addition to being highly educated they
>> actually fought in counter insurgencies for the US and Australia
>> respectively.
>> I read everything I can by Robert Fisk and Patrick Cockburn because they
>> speak good Arabic and have been reporting from the middle east for over 20
>> years each. They're generally 'left' though both are truly reporters, they
>> try to report what's happening. I read everything I can by Mike Whitney
>> because
>> he's so damn funny, his bits about the Iranian oil borse still bring tears
>> to my eyes. At the more macro level I read Pat Buchanan (again, not into
>> the catholic cultural conservatism, but he's a genuine anti-empire
>> conservative),
>> Gore Vidal, William Blum, and Matt Taibbi as much as I can.
>>
>> So, those are the KINDS of people I read. I would be thrilled if Robert
>> Fisk
>> talked to the NAB. But Tim Robbins? It's just a 'who cares' kind of thing.
>>

>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:
>>> According to Mr American Heritage, politics is "the art or science of
>>> governing . . ." and to govern is "To make and administer the public
>>> policy
>>> and affairs of; exercise sovereign authority in." Hmm, OK, who should we
>> be
>>> listening to on this subject? Who are the "experts" and how did they get
>>> that way? Masters of Political Science? I don't think you'll find many
>> of
>>> those among our leaders. There are lot of lawyers in the ranks, but I'm
>> not
>>> sure that makes anyone an expert in governing. Is it time spent in the
>>> halls of congress that makes one an "expert"? So we should listen to the
>>> really old guys? . . . Ted Stevens leaps to mind. Or Ted Kennedy for that
>>> matter.
>>>
>>> Have you ever watched C-Span, or other examples of our government at work?
>>> Some of those people just don't strike me as our best and brightest. I
>> can
>>> only watch that stuff for about five minutes before I scream and change
>> the
>>> channel. It's just so intolerably slow and painfully dispassionate. If
>>> those are our experts, I can see why we're in serious trouble.
>>>
>>> Are there really any experts in politics/governing? Who are they, and
>>> what
>>> are their credentials? In our system of government, aren't WE essentially
>>> the government? Doesn't that mean give every one of us the "expertise,"
>>> possibly even the duty to speak up?
>>>
>>> It's possible, of course, "that government of the people, by the people,
>> for
>>> the people" has long since perished "from the earth." But maybe it's not
>>> dead, only sleeping.
>>>
>>> I'm going to go out on a limb here and suggest that most of the
>>> politically
>>> outspoken actors and rock stars express liberal points of view, which is
>>> understandably annoying to those of a conservative bent, and may be seen
>> as
>>> an unfair advantage in the "culture war."
>>>
>>> It would be nice if we could end the "culture war" and calmly, rationally,
>>> simply seek out the truth, but that just may go against human nature.
>>> We're

>>> far more invested in what we choose to believe.
>>>
>>> S
>>>
>>>
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:480d57a0\$1@linux...
>>>> Nonsense. I don't use my skills in any one area to try to convince
>>>> anyone
>>>> of my knowledge in any other. I'm a very good IT guy, a decent amateur
>>>> historian,
>>>> and fairly widely read. However, I don't expect that because I know my
>> way
>>>> around the XP registry that anyone should take my opinions about
>>>> anything
>>>> else seriously. They're welcome to take it or leave it. Artists are
>>>> explicitly
>>>> or implicitly (usually explicitly) claiming that their status as an
>>>> artist
>>>> allows them some greater degree of insight into the world than the rest
>> of
>>>> us. They might even have that, insight into the world or the self. But
>>>> politics,
>>>> current events, environmental damage, and so forth have precious little
>> to
>>>> do with acting or playing guitar.
>>>>
>>>> I tend to take seriously people who have unique or at least unusual
>>>> backgrounds
>>>> that give them additional gravitas when covering a particular subject.
>> Tim
>>>> Robbins to me has borderline zero gravitas, I happen to agree with a
>>>> good
>>>> bit of what he says but I don't take his opinion all that seriously.
>>>>
>>>> In addition, most of what I talk about regarding US history, system
>>>> architecture,
>>>> and so forth can be checked against quality records as matters of fact.
>>>> The
>>>> god stuff not so much, although I think we're getting closer and closer
>> to
>>>> that all the time.
>>>>
>>>> Finally, in my personal experience 'artists,' particularly actors and
>>>> musicians,
>>>> tend not to be terribly well informed people. It's rare that I get
>>>> anything
>>>> out of them but pretty vanilla American leftism. Writers are often,
>>>> though

>>>> certainly not always, another breed. I mean, I remember reading an
>>>> article
>>>> in Rolling Stone where an interviewer asked Duane Allman what he was
>>>> doing
>>>> for 'the revolution,' and Duane responded, 'Well, I'm striking a chord
>> for
>>>> peace.' I think it was then that I adopted the Wayne Coyne attitude of
>>>> listening
>>>> to my favorite musicians about music and not much else.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> "Napolean Blownapart" <nb@elba.net> wrote:
>>>>> Eh, Thad, if your logic isn't flawed, then you need to either quit the
>>>>> sponge
>>>>> monkeys or stop talking about god, the founding fathers, and systems
>>>>> architecture.
>>>>> If you still reserve the right to make music, be passionate about
>>>>> religion/sociology,
>>>>> history, and IT, then you've just shot your own argument in the ass.
>> By
>>>>> your own admission, you are not an expert in all (if any) of these
>>>>> fields.
>>>>>
>>>>> And for my next obiter dictum, since when does one need to be an expert
>>>> to
>>>>> make a valid observation or have a good idea? That's rather elitist,
>> no?
>>>>> NB
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>> I don't think my logic is flawed. It's very difficult for one human
>>>>>> being
>>>>>> to become an expert in one field, much less two or three. I know, as
>> I
>>>> have
>>>>>> failed at a half dozen. Would you listen to Tim Robbins' opinions about
>>>>>> maritime
>>>>>> archeology? Habermas? Cambodian architecture? Politics is as difficult
>>>> to
>>>>>> master as those, but somehow because someone is a good actor we are
>>>>>> supposed
>>>>>> to take their opinions seriously.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> This all stems, in my opinion, in the greatly overstated role that
>>>>>> 'artists'
>>>>>> played in various movements of the baby boomer's youth.

>>>>>
>>>>> TCB
>>>>>
>>>>> "bunuel" <bunuel@conar.fr> wrote:
>>>>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>>> On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist.
>>>> I
>>>>> don't
>>>>>>> like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at
>>>>>>> paintings
>>>>>>> by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on
>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>> affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he
>>>> should
>>>>>>> volunteer.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you
>>>>> will
>>>>>>> forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not
>>>>>>> sing,
>>>>>>> but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no,
>>>>>>> according
>>>>>>> to
>>>>>>> you.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and
>>>>> that's
>>>>>>> all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not
>>>>> only
>>>>>>> legitimate but essential. It may be opportunism, but so what? From your
>>>>> perspective,
>>>>>>> nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken
>>>>>>> seriously
>>>>>>> on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on
>>>>>>> policy?),
>>>>>>> not editors/writers (the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military
>>>>>>> people,
>>>>>>> nor
>>>>>>> economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is
>>>>> a
>>>>>>> streak
>>>>>>> of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core:
>>>>>>> governing
>>>>>>> is the province of the elite alone. It's vintage Duke of Wellington.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> By this logic, in fact, your OWN amateur pronouncements on politics
>> must
>>>>>>> be considered utterly without merit. Yet, if you had Tim Robbins's

>>volunteer.

>

>

>Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you will
>forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not sing,
>but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no, according
to
>you.

>

>Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and that's
>all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not only
>legitimate but essential.It may be opportunism, but so what? From your perspective,
>nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken seriously
>on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on policy?),
>not editors/writers(the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military people,
nor

>economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is a
streak

>of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core: governing
>is the province of the elite alone. It's vintage Duke of Wellington.

>

>By this logic, in fact, your OWN amateur pronouncements on politics must
>be considered utterly without merit. Yet, if you had Tim Robbins's platform,
>considering how strongly held and sophisticated your viewpoint is, and how
>avidly you promote it even to this tiny audience here, would you decline
>such an opportunity to promote it to the world at large? I can't see it,
>and I wouldn't fault you. Do you feel that Tim Robbins is less politically
>sophisticated than yourself?

>

>

>

>Venceremos!

>bunuel

>

>

>

>

HOW DARE YOU SAY THAD'S REASONING IS FLAWED! HOW DARE YOU SAY THAT
ANYTHING
THE GREAT AND ALL KNOWING THAD HAS SAID IS BOTCHED! THE ALL KNOWING THAD
IS SUPERIOR TO YOU. WHAT EVERY THE GREAT THAD SAYS IS FACT. YOU SHOULD
NEVER QUESTION THE ALL KNOWING THAD, HE KNOWS MORE THAN ANYBODY ON THIS
NEWS
GROUP, HE KNOWS MORE THAN ANYBODY ON THIS PLANET. YOU SHOULD SUCK UP
TO
HIS SUPERIOR INTELLIGENCE.

HOW DARE YOU SAY THAD IS AN AMATEUR!!! THE GREAT THAD IS AN EXPERT AT EVERYTHING!!!!!!
DON'T FORGET IT!!!

DO NOT QUESTION THE GREAT AND ALL KNOWING THAD ON POLITICS, HE IS AN EXPERT!

THAD KNOWS EVERYTHING ABOUT AMERICAN HISTORY AND POLITICS, HE IS NOT TO BE QUESTIONED! WHERE DO YOU GET OFF COMPARING ANYONE TO THE GREAT, ALL MIGHTY AND POLITICALLY SOPHISTICATED THAD, HE IS SUPERIOR TO ALL!

WHEN IT COMES TO ALL SUBJECTS THAD IS SUPERIOR TO YOU, KNOWS MORE THAN YOU
AND DON'T FORGET IT!

ALL SHOULD BOW DOWN AND WORSHIP THE GREAT, THE ALMIGHTY, ALL KNOWING THAD!!!!!!

THAD IS THE KNOW IT ALL OF THE NEWS GROUP!!

JUST ASK HIM

Subject: Re: The Six Best Minutes of Thad Controversial
Posted by [suckup worshiper](#) on Fri, 02 May 2008 17:12:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Napolean Blownapart" <nb@elba.net> wrote:

>
>Eh, Thad, if your logic isn't flawed, then you need to either quit the sponge
>monkeys or stop talking about god, the founding fathers, and systems architecture.
> If you still reserve the right to make music, be passionate about religion/sociology,
>history, and IT, then you've just shot your own argument in the ass. By
>your own admission, you are not an expert in all (if any) of these fields.
>
>And for my next obiter dictum, since when does one need to be an expert
to
>make a valid observation or have a good idea? That's rather elitist, no?
>
>NB
>

HOW DARE YOU SAY THAD'S LOGIC IS FLAWED! HOW DARE YOU MENTION THE WORD LOGIC
IN THE PRESENCE OF THE ALMIGHTY, ALL KNOWING THAD! LOGIC IS AN APPLE PRODUCT,
LOGIC IS INFERIOR TO ANYTHING THAD HAS WRITTEN A PICTURE BOOK ABOUT!!!
DON'T
YOU FORGET HIS BOOKS HAVE AT LEAST NINETY THOUSAND WORDS TOO! THE ALL

GREAT,
AND MIGHTY THAD IS A LEGEND!

HOW DARE YOU SAY THAD IS NOT AN EXPERT!!!! THAD IS AN EXPERT ON
EVERYTHING!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
AND DON'T FORGET IT!!!!!!!! THADS THINKING IS SUPERIOR TO YOUR INFERIOR
THINKING, YOU PEA BRAIN! YOU SHOULD NEVER QUESTION THE GREAT AND
ALMIGHTY
THAD!!!

ELITIST, ELITIST? HOW DARE YOU CALL THAD ELITIST? THAD IS THE ALL GREAT,
ALL KNOWING ELITIST TO YOU MR.!!!

ALL YOU NEOPHYTES SHOULD SUCK UP TO THE ALL KNOWING THAD!!!! HE IS THE
GREAT
AND ALL KNOWING INTELLECTUAL AND IS SUPERIOR TO ALL OF YOU, JUST ASK HIM!

>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>>I don't think my logic is flawed. It's very difficult for one human being
>>to become an expert in one field, much less two or three. I know, as I
have
>>failed at a half dozen. Would you listen to Tim Robbins' opinions about
>maritime
>>archeology? Habermas? Cambodian architecture? Politics is as difficult
to
>>master as those, but somehow because someone is a good actor we are supposed
>>to take their opinions seriously.
>>
>>This all stems, in my opinion, in the greatly overstated role that 'artists'
>>played in various movements of the baby boomer's youth.
>>
>>TCB
>>
>>"bunuel" <bunuel@conar.fr> wrote:
>>>
>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist.
I
>>don't
>>>>like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at paintings
>>>>by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current
>>>>affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he
should
>>>>volunteer.

>>>
>>>
>>>Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you
>will
>>>forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not sing,
>>>but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no, according
>>to
>>>you.
>>>
>>>Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and
that's
>>>all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not
>only
>>>legitimate but essential.It may be opportunism, but so what? From your
>perspective,
>>>nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken seriously
>>>on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on policy?),
>>>not editors/writers(the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military people,
>>nor
>>>economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is
a
>>streak
>>>of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core: governing
>>>is the province of the elite alone. It's vintage Duke of Wellington.
>>>
>>>By this logic, in fact, your OWN amateur pronouncements on politics must
>>>be considered utterly without merit. Yet, if you had Tim Robbins's platform,
>>>considering how strongly held and sophisticated your viewpoint is, and
>how
>>>avidly you promote it even to this tiny audience here, would you decline
>>>such an opportunity to promote it to the world at large? I can't see
it,
>>>and I wouldn't fault you. Do you feel that Tim Robbins is less politically
>>>sophisticated than yourself?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Venceremos!
>>>bunuel
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>

>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: The Six Best Minutes of Thad Controversial

Posted by [kerryg](#) on Fri, 02 May 2008 17:20:51 GMT

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

Um... Kim, I think the craft material bins in "General" are empty again.
Could you maybe send someone to refill the crayon dispensers and fingerpaint tubes?

- Kerry

On 5/2/08 10:12 AM, in article 481b4b7c\$1@linux, "suckup worshiper"
<guesswho@no.com> wrote:

> HOW DARE YOU SAY THAD'S LOGIC IS FLAWED! HOW DARE YOU MENTION THE WORD
LOGIC
> IN THE PRESENCE OF THE ALMIGHTY, ALL KNOWING THAD! LOGIC IS AN APPLE
PRODUCT,
> LOGIC IS INFERIOR TO ANYTHING THAD HAS WRITTEN A PICTURE BOOK ABOUT!!!
DON'T
> YOU FORGET HIS BOOKS HAVE AT LEAST NINETY THOUSAND WORDS TOO! THE ALL
GREAT,
> AND MIGHTY THAD IS A LEGEND!
>
> HOW DARE YOU SAY THAD IS NOT AN EXPERT!!!! THAD IS AN EXPERT ON
> EVERYTHING!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
> AND DON'T FORGET IT!!!!!!!! THADS THINKING IS SUPERIOR TO YOUR INFERIOR
> THINKING, YOU PEA BRAIN! YOU SHOULD NEVER QUESTION THE GREAT AND
ALMIGHTY
> THAD!!!
>
> ELITIST, ELITIST? HOW DARE YOU CALL THAD ELITIST? THAD IS THE ALL GREAT,
> ALL KNOWING ELITIST TO YOU MR.!!!
>
> ALL YOU NEOPHYTES SHOULD SUCK UP TO THE ALL KNOWING THAD!!!! HE IS THE
GREAT
> AND ALL KNOWING INTELLECTUAL AND IS SUPERIOR TO ALL OF YOU, JUST ASK HIM!

Subject: Re: The Six Best Minutes of Thad Controversial
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 02 May 2008 17:41:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You forgot to mention how handsome I am.

TCB

"suckup worshiper" <guesswho@no.com> wrote:

>

>"bunuel" <bunuel@conar.fr> wrote:

>>

>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist. I

>don't

>>>like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at paintings

>>>by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current

>>>affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he should

>>>volunteer.

>>

>>

>>Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you will

>>forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not sing,

>>but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no, according

>to

>>you.

>>

>>Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and that's

>>all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not only

>>legitimate but essential.It may be opportunism, but so what? From your perspective,

>>nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken seriously

>>on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on policy?),

>>not editors/writers(the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military people,

>nor

>>economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is a

>streak

>>of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core: governing

>>is the province of the elite alone. It's vintage Duke of Wellington.

>>

>>By this logic, in fact, your OWN amateur pronouncements on politics must

>>be considered utterly without merit. Yet, if you had Tim Robbins's platform,

>>considering how strongly held and sophisticated your viewpoint is, and

how

>>avidly you promote it even to this tiny audience here, would you decline

>>such an opportunity to promote it to the world at large? I can't see it,

>>and I wouldn't fault you. Do you feel that Tim Robbins is less politically
>>sophisticated than yourself?
>>
>>
>>
>>Venceremos!
>>bunuel
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>HOW DARE YOU SAY THAD'S REASONING IS FLAWED! HOW DARE YOU SAY THAT
ANYTHING
>THE GREAT AND ALL KNOWING THAD HAS SAID IS BOTCHED! THE ALL KNOWING THAD
>IS SUPERIOR TO YOU. WHAT EVERY THE GREAT THAD SAYS IS FACT. YOU SHOULD
>NEVER QUESTION THE ALL KNOWING THAD, HE KNOWS MORE THAN ANYBODY ON
THIS
NEWS
>GROUP, HE KNOWS MORE THAN ANYBODY ON THIS PLANET. YOU SHOULD SUCK UP
TO
>HIS SUPERIOR INTELLIGENCE.
>
>HOW DARE YOU SAY THAD IS AN AMATEUR!!! THE GREAT THAD IS AN EXPERT AT
EVERYTHING!!!!!!!
> DON'T FORGET IT!!!
>
>DO NOT QUESTION THE GREAT AND ALL KNOWING THAD ON POLITICS, HE IS AN
EXPERT!
> THAD KNOWS EVERYTHING ABOUT AMERICAN HISTORY AND POLITICS, HE IS NOT TO
>BE QUESTIONED! WHERE DO YOU GET OFF COMPARING ANYONE TO THE GREAT, ALL
>MIGHTY AND POLITICALLY SOPHISTICATED THAD, HE IS SUPERIOR TO ALL!
>
>WHEN IT COMES TO ALL SUBJECTS THAD IS SUPERIOR TO YOU, KNOWS MORE THAN
YOU
>AND DON'T FORGET IT!
>
>ALL SHOULD BOW DOWN AND WORSHIP THE GREAT, THE ALMIGHTY, ALL KNOWING
THAD!!!!!!
>
>THAD IS THE KNOW IT ALL OF THE NEWS GROUP!!
>
>JUST ASK HIM

Subject: Re: The Six Best Minutes of Thad Controversial
Posted by [suckup worshiper](#) on Fri, 02 May 2008 17:56:53 GMT

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>You forgot to mention how handsome I am.
>
>TCB

AND HOW YOU ARE SUCH A PLAYER WITH ALL THE WOMEN!!! YOU ARE SO MIGHTY, OH GREAT THAD!!!

ALL SHOULD BOW-DOWN TO THE KNOW IT ALL OF THE NEWS GROUP!

>
>"suckup worshiper" <guesswho@no.com> wrote:
>>
>>"bunuel" <bunuel@conar.fr> wrote:
>>>
>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist.
I
>>don't
>>>>like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at paintings
>>>>by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current
>>>>affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he
should
>>>>volunteer.
>>>
>>>
>>>Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you
>will
>>>forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not sing,
>>>but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no, according
>>to
>>>you.
>>>
>>>Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and
that's
>>>all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not
>only
>>>legitimate but essential.It may be opportunism, but so what? From your
>perspective,
>>>nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken seriously
>>>on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on policy?),
>>>not editors/writers(the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military people,
>>nor
>>>economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is
a

>>streak

>>>of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core: governing
>>>is the province of the elite alone. It's vintage Duke of Wellington.

>>>

>>>By this logic, in fact, your OWN amateur pronouncements on politics must
>>>be considered utterly without merit. Yet, if you had Tim Robbins's platform,
>>>considering how strongly held and sophisticated your viewpoint is, and
>how

>>>avidly you promote it even to this tiny audience here, would you decline
>>>such an opportunity to promote it to the world at large? I can't see
it,

>>>and I wouldn't fault you. Do you feel that Tim Robbins is less politically
>>>sophisticated than yourself?

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>Venceremos!

>>>bunuel

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>

>>HOW DARE YOU SAY THAD'S REASONING IS FLAWED! HOW DARE YOU SAY THAT
ANYTHING

>>THE GREAT AND ALL KNOWING THAD HAS SAID IS BOTCHED! THE ALL KNOWING
THAD

>>IS SUPERIOR TO YOU. WHAT EVERY THE GREAT THAD SAYS IS FACT. YOU SHOULD
>>NEVER QUESTION THE ALL KNOWING THAD, HE KNOWS MORE THAN ANYBODY ON
THIS

>NEWS

>>GROUP, HE KNOWS MORE THAN ANYBODY ON THIS PLANET. YOU SHOULD SUCK UP
TO

>>HIS SUPERIOR INTELLIGENCE.

>>

>>HOW DARE YOU SAY THAD IS AN AMATEUR!!! THE GREAT THAD IS AN EXPERT AT
EVERYTHING!!!!!!!

>> DON'T FORGET IT!!!

>>

>>DO NOT QUESTION THE GREAT AND ALL KNOWING THAD ON POLITICS, HE IS AN
EXPERT!

>> THAD KNOWS EVERYTHING ABOUT AMERICAN HISTORY AND POLITICS, HE IS NOT
TO

>>BE QUESTIONED! WHERE DO YOU GET OFF COMPARING ANYONE TO THE GREAT,
ALL

>>MIGHTY AND POLITICALLY SOPHISTICATED THAD, HE IS SUPERIOR TO ALL!

>>

>>WHEN IT COMES TO ALL SUBJECTS THAD IS SUPERIOR TO YOU, KNOWS MORE THAN

YOU

>>AND DON'T FORGET IT!

>>

>>ALL SHOULD BOW DOWN AND WORSHIP THE GREAT, THE ALMIGHTY, ALL KNOWING THAD!!!!

>>

>>THAD IS THE KNOW IT ALL OF THE NEWS GROUP!!

>>

>>JUST ASK HIM

>

Subject: Re: The Six Best Minutes of Thad Controversial

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 02 May 2008 18:03:37 GMT

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

That's better. Thanks.

TCB

"suckup worshiper" <guesswho@no.com> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>You forgot to mention how handsome I am.

>>

>>TCB

>

>AND HOW YOU ARE SUCH A PLAYER WITH ALL THE WOMEN!!! YOU ARE SO MIGHTY, OH

>GREAT THAD!!!

>

>ALL SHOULD BOW-DOWN TO THE KNOW IT ALL OF THE NEWS GROUP!

>

>>

>>"suckup worshiper" <guesswho@no.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>"bunuel" <bunuel@conar.fr> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>>On the contrary, Bill, I DO have a problem with him being an artist.

>|

>>>don't

>>>>like to listen to CEOs sing or watch accountants dance or look at paintings

>>>>>by politicians. There are plenty of well-informed commentators on current

>>>>>affairs who specialize on that, if Tim wants to make a difference he

>should

>>>>>volunteer.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>Your reasoning seems flawed on this. The comparison is botched, if you

>>will

>>>>forgive me. The question ought to be: Do you want to hear a CEO, not sing,

>>>>but make political pronouncements? And the answer must be no, according

>>>to

>>>>you.

>>>>

>>>>Tim Robbins's occupation is irrelevant. He is an informed citizen and

>that's

>>>>all the qualification he needs to make stating his views in public not

>>only

>>>>legitimate but essential.It may be opportunism, but so what? From your

>>perspective,

>>>>nobody apart from the professional politician ought to be taken seriously

>>>>on matters of policy, not CEOs (does Michael Bloomberg pronounce on policy?),

>>>>not editors/writers(the Kristols, Buckley, et al), not military people,

>>>nor

>>>>economists, religionists, nor ordinary people of any stripe. There is

>a

>>>streak

>>>>of tory paternalism in this that is anti democratic to its core: governing

>>>>is the province of the elite alone. It's vintage Duke of Wellington.

>>>>

>>>>By this logic, in fact, your OWN amateur pronouncements on politics must

>>>>be considered utterly without merit. Yet, if you had Tim Robbins's platform,

>>>>considering how strongly held and sophisticated your viewpoint is, and

>>how

>>>>avidly you promote it even to this tiny audience here, would you decline

>>>>such an opportunity to promote it to the world at large? I can't see

>it,

>>>>and I wouldn't fault you. Do you feel that Tim Robbins is less politically

>>>>sophisticated than yourself?

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>Venceremos!

>>>>bunuel

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>

>>>HOW DARE YOU SAY THAD'S REASONING IS FLAWED! HOW DARE YOU SAY THAT

ANYTHING

>>>THE GREAT AND ALL KNOWING THAD HAS SAID IS BOTCHED! THE ALL KNOWING
THAD
>>>IS SUPERIOR TO YOU. WHAT EVERY THE GREAT THAD SAYS IS FACT. YOU SHOULD
>>>NEVER QUESTION THE ALL KNOWING THAD, HE KNOWS MORE THAN ANYBODY ON
THIS
>>NEWS
>>>GROUP, HE KNOWS MORE THAN ANYBODY ON THIS PLANET. YOU SHOULD SUCK
UP
>TO
>>>HIS SUPERIOR INTELLIGENCE.
>>>
>>>HOW DARE YOU SAY THAD IS AN AMATEUR!!! THE GREAT THAD IS AN EXPERT AT
>EVERYTHING!!!!!!!
>>> DON'T FORGET IT!!!
>>>
>>>DO NOT QUESTION THE GREAT AND ALL KNOWING THAD ON POLITICS, HE IS AN
EXPERT!
>>> THAD KNOWS EVERYTHING ABOUT AMERICAN HISTORY AND POLITICS, HE IS NOT
>TO
>>>BE QUESTIONED! WHERE DO YOU GET OFF COMPARING ANYONE TO THE GREAT,
ALL
>>>MIGHTY AND POLITICALLY SOPHISTICATED THAD, HE IS SUPERIOR TO ALL!
>>>
>>>WHEN IT COMES TO ALL SUBJECTS THAD IS SUPERIOR TO YOU, KNOWS MORE
THAN
>YOU
>>>AND DON'T FORGET IT!
>>>
>>>ALL SHOULD BOW DOWN AND WORSHIP THE GREAT, THE ALMIGHTY, ALL KNOWING
THAD!!!!!!
>>>
>>>THAD IS THE KNOW IT ALL OF THE NEWS GROUP!!
>>>
>>>JUST ASK HIM
>>
>

Subject: Re: The Six Best Minutes of Thad Controversial
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 02 May 2008 19:29:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You all ever notice how when some of us act like morons and
go anonymous and prance around like drag queens in our
new little personas, how we work HARD on changing
our grammar and syntax?

and others?

well

do not?

Yeah, me too...

DC

Subject: Re: The Six Best Minutes of Thad Controversial
Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Tue, 06 May 2008 01:03:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

....Sounds like somebody summoning the 'Wizard'

...."the ogres and the elves are always chatting me up"

El Miguel (an apple a day keeps ubuntu away :-:p)

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:481b6b95\$1@linux...

>
> You all ever notice how when some of us act like morons and
> go anonymous and prance around like drag queens in our
> new little personas, how we work HARD on changing
> our grammar and syntax?
>
> and others?
>
>
>
> well
>
>
> do not?

>
>
> Yeah, me too...
>
>
> DC
>

Subject: Re: The Six Best Minutes of Thad Controversial
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 06 May 2008 01:26:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Miguel,

Nice to see you still around. I should have kept out of all that, but I always think we can do better.

I foresee a brighter future though!

How you been?

DC

"Miguel Vigil" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:

>...Sounds like somebody summoning the 'Wizard'

>
>
>
>..."the ogres and the elves are always chatting me up"

>
>
>
>
>El Miguel (an apple a day keeps ubuntu away :-:p)

>
>
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:481b6b95\$1@linux...

>>
>> You all ever notice how when some of us act like morons and
>> go anonymous and prance around like drag queens in our
>> new little personas, how we work HARD on changing
>> our grammar and syntax?
>>
>> and others?
>>

>>
>>
>> well
>>
>>
>> do not?
>>
>>
>> Yeah, me too...
>>
>>
>> DC
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: The Six Best Minutes of Thad Controversial
Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Tue, 06 May 2008 13:07:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Fighting the fight

:)

El Miguel

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:481fb3b3\$1@linux...

>
> Hey Miguel,
>
> Nice to see you still around. I should have kept out of all
> that, but I always think we can do better.
>
> I foresee a brighter future though!
>
> How you been?
>
> DC
>
>
> "Miguel Vigil" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
>>...Sounds like somebody summoning the 'Wizard'
>>
>>
>>
>>... "the ogres and the elves are always chatting me up"

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>El Miguel (an apple a day keeps ubuntu away :-:p)
>>
>>
>>
>>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:481b6b95\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> You all ever notice how when some of us act like morons and
>>> go anonymous and prance around like drag queens in our
>>> new little personas, how we work HARD on changing
>>> our grammar and syntax?
>>>
>>> and others?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> well
>>>
>>>
>>> do not?
>>>
>>>
>>> Yeah, me too...
>>>
>>>
>>> DC
>>>
>>
>>
>
