
Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 05:00:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry to rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch into the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover from it, ever. I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>

AA

"Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
news:471ec45e@linux...

> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....

>

> Sorry, couldn't resist.

> Rich

>

>

>

>

Subject: OT: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Rich Lamanna](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 05:02:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....

Sorry, couldn't resist.

Rich

File Attachments

1) [Message.jpg](#), downloaded 63 times



Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 05:42:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
news:471ed2be@linux...

> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry to
> rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch into
> the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover from it,
> ever.

> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God
> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.

>
> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>

>
> AA
>

The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty. She's as
smart as she is diabolical.

>
> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
> news:471ec45e@linux...
>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
>>
>> Sorry, couldn't resist.
>> Rich
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 05:56:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Anything's an improvement over what we have now.

OTOH, it's way too early to pick winners. I'm really disappointed to see people dropping out already.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:

> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
> news:471ed2be@linux...
>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry to
>> rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch into
>> the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover from it,
>> ever.
>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God
>> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>>
>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>
>>
>> AA
>>
>
> The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty. She's as
> smart as she is diabolical.
>
>

>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
>> news:471ec45e@linux...
>>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
>>>
>>> Sorry, couldn't resist.
>>> Rich
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 06:25:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hillary is NOT an improvment. Sorry, we're gonna tangle about that Jamie.

AA

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:471edff6\$1@linux...
>
> Anything's an improvement over what we have now.
>
> OTOH, it's way too early to pick winners. I'm really disappointed to see
> people dropping out already.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKruz.com
>
>
> DJ wrote:
>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>> news:471ed2be@linux...
>>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry
>>> to rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch
>>> into the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover
>>> from it, ever.
>>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God
>>> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>>>
>>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>
>>>

>>> AA
>>>
>>
>> The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty. She's
>> as smart as she is diabolical.
>>
>>
>>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
>>> news:471ec45e@linux...
>>>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
>>>>
>>>> Sorry, couldn't resist.
>>>> Rich
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 08:59:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Aaron Allen wrote:

> Hillary is NOT an improvment. Sorry, we're gonna tangle about that Jamie.

Feel free to differ. But you're just speculating about what she MIGHT do whereas I can talk about what our current pres did do. She could hardly do worse than our recent track record, and I can prove it over less than three beers. So come on over, I'll buy the beer! :^)

But in any case I am not ready to choose a candidate yet, it's far too early.

BTW, Hillary spoke today a couple miles from here and I was too busy to make it over there to hear her speak. Since the Dems are having their convention here next year I'll likely have more chances to hear a bunch of Dems, and hopefully some Repubs, too. I wonder if we'll see any independents or contending 3rd party candidates this time around...

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

> AA

Funny, but I can't help picturing Ron Paul behind giving them both a shove onto the tracks.

S

"Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message news:471ec45e@linux...

> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....

>

> Sorry, couldn't resist.

> Rich

>

>

>

>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!

Posted by [Sarah](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 10:04:31 GMT

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

Yechh, that's pretty disgusting. Well, I've said before I don't trust Hillary, so perhaps my intuition will be validated. Not that I'm happy about that prospect, but . . . the truth is the truth.

I'm just so tired of government of the people, by the rich, for the rich. If money keeps people above the law then there is no law, just the haves vs the have-nots.

So, how does this change? I mean seriously . . . anybody? How does it change?

Sincerely,
Pessimistic in Portland

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message news:471ed2be@linux...

> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry to
> rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch into
> the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover from it,
> ever.

> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God
> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.

>

> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>

>

> AA

>
>
> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
> news:471ec45e@linux...
>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
>>
>> Sorry, couldn't resist.
>> Rich
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 12:10:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sarah, it doesn't change, it's more of the same. You see how pathetic the Dems have been in congress. They are both the same problem. Repubs and Dems are both the same party, the big business party.

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 12:11:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I would help him.

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 12:12:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dude, thanks for cheering me up. I was startin' t' get bummed there. :)

S

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:471f3635\$1@linux...

>
> Sarah, it doesn't change, it's more of the same. You see how pathetic
> the
> Dems have been in congress. They are both the same problem. Repubs and
> Dems

> are both the same party, the big business party.

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 13:25:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K wrote:

>
> Anything's an improvement over what we have now.

First of all that's obviously not true.

More importantly, why must we continue to pick the lesser of two evils?
Let's vote for someone who is actually a great man and has great ideas,
ethics and a track record that PROVES it. Ron Paul.

>
> OTOH, it's way too early to pick winners. I'm really disappointed to see
> people dropping out already.

>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com

>
>
> DJ wrote:
>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>> news:471ed2be@linux...
>>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size.
>>> Sorry to rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed
>>> crooked b**ch into the white house again she'll so train wreck us we
>>> may not recover from it, ever.
>>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but
>>> God help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.

>>>
>>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>

>>>
>>> AA

>>>
>>
>> The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty.
>> She's as smart as she is diabolical.

>>
>>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
>>> news:471ec45e@linux...

> Let's vote for someone who is actually a great man and has great ideas,
> ethics and a track record that PROVES it. Ron Paul.
>
>
>>
>> OTOH, it's way too early to pick winners. I'm really disappointed to see
>> people dropping out already.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>>> news:471ed2be@linux...
>>>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry
>>>> to rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch
>>>> into the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover
>>>> from it, ever.
>>>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God
>>>> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>>>>
>>>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>
>>>>
>>>> AA
>>>>
>>>
>>> The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty.
>>> She's as smart as she is diabolical.
>>>
>>>
>>>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:471ec45e@linux...
>>>>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
>>>>>
>>>>> Sorry, couldn't resist.
>>>>> Rich
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 15:09:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Deej,

You can respond off list if you like, but I've never been able to understand the vitriol that some types of conservatives (remember, I consider myself a conservative) for the Clintons. I eventually figured it out with Bill, I think it was personal. So many 'social conservatives' spend their lives doing what they're supposed to do, staying out of trouble, denying themselves things they would like to enjoy, all in the belief that it's the right thing to do for themselves and society. Then Bill shows up, a draft dodging, pot smoking, wife cheating hick from the STICKS of Arkansas who by rights should have been a city council member in Little Rock driving a 12 year old El Dorado. He never denied himself a damn thing, from Biggie Fries to fancy cigars to hummers from interns, and he got to be president fer effs sake. So, he's a personal affront, which I get.

However, Hillary seems to me to be deeply, deeply vanilla. She was rabidly pro Iraq war, is saber rattling against Iran and Syria, wants to expand NATO to Russia's doorstep, is probably the most pro-Israel candidate imaginable, and more than any other leading Democrat appears like she might actually be a teensy bit Christian. Not a Bible thumper of course, but her occasional statements about god and family sound at least potentially sincere. So, and I'm asking this sincerely, why is she diabolical? Not annoying (she is), power hungry (comes with wanting the job), unwilling to answer questions straight (so are they all), or maybe a dyke (who cares). But what is diabolical about here, and what will she DO if elected that is so awful and radical and dangerous?

Lastly, I've been telling my lefty academic friends for years that they're going to find religion at some point about states rights. From gay marriage to medical pot nearly every pet issue for lefties will get squashed by federal lawmakers and the federal judiciary. The lefties are going to have to fight for the right of (their own) states to legislate on those issues. They scream and yell and hem and haw and tell me I'm nuts but they have yet to come up with a compelling argument to counter mine. Conservatives (not the ones like me, the other kinds) are going to get their comeuppance probably after the next election for executive power. Seems like a great idea to decide the president is above the law when you're guy is president, but the history of this country is the gradual erosion of judicial and legislative power, i.e. the executive branch rarely gives anything back. I suspect any Democrat who runs against any of the current Republicans will win, and then all of that executive power wrenched away from Congress will be in the hands of the other party. Law of unintended consequences, but I for one will have a hearty belly laugh when the Rush Limbaugh set starts howling about some abuse of executive power when a Democrat is the abuser.

Anyway, enlighten me about Hillary.

TCB

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:

>

>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message

>news:471ed2be@linux...

>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry

to

>> rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch into

>> the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover from

it,

>> ever.

>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God

>> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.

>>

>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>

>>

>> AA

>>

>

>The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty. She's

as

>smart as she is diabolical.

>

>

>>

>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message

>> news:471ec45e@linux...

>>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....

>>>

>>> Sorry, couldn't resist.

>>> Rich

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>

>>

>

>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!

Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 15:20:37 GMT

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

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:471f0ad0\$1@linux...

> Aaron Allen wrote:

>> Hillary is NOT an improvment. Sorry, we're gonna tangle about that

>> Jamie.

>

> Feel free to differ. But you're just speculating about what she MIGHT do

> whereas I can talk about what our current pres did do. She could hardly do

> worse than our recent track record, and I can prove it over less than

> three beers. So come on over, I'll buy the beer! :^)

She could neglect our national security interests and pony up to the chinese and "our allies" at the UN like her husband did. That would be enough to be considered a disaster that makes Bush's policies seem trivial since that the reason the Iraq war never ended.

>

> But in any case I am not ready to choose a candidate yet, it's far too

> early.

>

Me either.

> BTW, Hillary spoke today a couple miles from here and I was too busy to

> make it over there to hear her speak. Since the Dems are having their

> convention here next year I'll likely have more chances to hear a bunch of

> Dems, and hopefully some Repubs, too. I wonder if we'll see any

> independents or contending 3rd party candidates this time around...

I wonder if Howard Hunt and Gordon Liddy are gonna hire some Cubans to bug their hotel rooms.

;oD

>

> Cheers,

> -Jamie

> www.JamieKruz.com

Back

At'cha.....

;o)

Deej

>

>

>> AA

Bill L wrote:

>
>
> Jamie K wrote:
>>
>> Anything's an improvement over what we have now.
>
> First of all that's obviously not true.

Heh, true. But you get my point.

> More importantly, why must we continue to pick the lesser of two evils?
> Let's vote for someone who is actually a great man and has great ideas,
> ethics and a track record that PROVES it. Ron Paul.

Instant runoff voting or some other preferential voting system would help avoid "lesser of two evils" voting.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Instant-runoff_voting

<http://www.fairvote.org/irv/>

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

>
>>
>> OTOH, it's way too early to pick winners. I'm really disappointed to
>> see people dropping out already.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> DJ wrote:
>>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>>> news:471ed2be@linux...
>>>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size.
>>>> Sorry to rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed
>>>> crooked b**ch into the white house again she'll so train wreck us we
>>>> may not recover from it, ever.
>>>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but

>
>
> "Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:471f4928@linux...
>>
>> Jamie K wrote:
>>> Anything's an improvement over what we have now.
>> First of all that's obviously not true.
>>
>> More importantly, why must we continue to pick the lesser of two evils?
>> Let's vote for someone who is actually a great man and has great ideas,
>> ethics and a track record that PROVES it. Ron Paul.
>>
>>
>>> OTOH, it's way too early to pick winners. I'm really disappointed to see
>>> people dropping out already.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>>
>>>
>>> DJ wrote:
>>>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>>>> news:471ed2be@linux...
>>>>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry
>>>>> to rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch
>>>>> into the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover
>>>>> from it, ever.
>>>>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God
>>>>> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>
>>>>>
>>>>> AA
>>>>>
>>>> The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty.
>>>> She's as smart as she is diabolical.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
>>>>> news:471ec45e@linux...
>>>>>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Sorry, couldn't resist.
>>>>>> Rich
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>

>>>>>
>>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 15:33:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sarah, honey, don't get bummed - get busy supporting Ron Paul!

Realistically, the system will not change unless people, individuals, change. Then individual people will change the system.

Ron Paul seems to me like he wants to make a real change, not just pander to the power elite, so I like him.

Sarah wrote:

> Yechh, that's pretty disgusting. Well, I've said before I don't trust
> Hillary, so perhaps my intuition will be validated. Not that I'm happy about
> that prospect, but . . . the truth is the truth.
>
> I'm just so tired of government of the people, by the rich, for the rich.
> If money keeps people above the law then there is no law, just the haves vs
> the have-nots.
>
> So, how does this change? I mean seriously . . . anybody? How does it
> change?
>
> Sincerely,
> Pessimistic in Portland
>
>
> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
> news:471ed2be@linux...
>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry to
>> rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch into
>> the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover from it,
>> ever.
>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God
>> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>>
>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>
>>
>> AA

>>
>>
>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
>> news:471ec45e@linux...
>>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
>>>
>>> Sorry, couldn't resist.
>>> Rich
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 16:01:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>Bill L wrote:
>>
>>
>> Jamie K wrote:
>>>
>>> Anything's an improvement over what we have now.
>>
>> First of all that's obviously not true.
>
>Heh, true. But you get my point.
>
>
>> More importantly, why must we continue to pick the lesser of two evils?

>> Let's vote for someone who is actually a great man and has great ideas,

>> ethics and a track record that PROVES it. Ron Paul.
>
>Instant runoff voting or some other preferential voting system would
>help avoid "lesser of two evils" voting.
>
>http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Instant-runoff_voting
>
><http://www.fairvote.org/irv/>
>
>Cheers,

> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com

As I always say, that might a great idea, but so is me banging Scarlett Johansson.
Neither are going to happen.

TCB

>
>
>>
>>>
>>> OTOH, it's way too early to pick winners. I'm really disappointed to

>>> see people dropping out already.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>> DJ wrote:
>>>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>>>> news:471ed2be@linux...
>>>>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size.
>>>>> Sorry to rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed
>>>>> crooked b**ch into the white house again she'll so train wreck us we

>>>>> may not recover from it, ever.
>>>>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but

>>>>> God help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>
>>>>>
>>>>> AA
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty.

>>>>> She's as smart as she is diabolical.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
>>>>> news:471ec45e@linux...
>>>>>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Sorry, couldn't resist.

>>>>> Rich
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Graham Duncan](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 16:03:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

TCB wrote:
> Conservatives (not the ones like
> me, the other kinds) are going to get their comeuppance probably after the
> next election for executive power. Seems like a great idea to decide the
> president is above the law when you're guy is president, but the history
> of this country is the gradual erosion of judicial and legislative power,
> i.e. the executive branch rarely gives anything back. I suspect any Democrat
> who runs against any of the current Republicans will win, and then all of
> that executive power wrenched away from Congress will be in the hands of
> the other party. Law of unintended consequences, but I for one will have
> a hearty belly laugh when the Rush Limbaugh set starts howling about some
> abuse of executive power when a Democrat is the abuser.

Indeed. Check out "Cheney's Law" on Frontline:

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/cheney/>

Nothing you don't know, but it's still pretty impressive.

Graham

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 16:07:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ron Paul is the real deal but no chance if he's not a big business butt sniffer.

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 16:20:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:471f602a\$1@linux...

>

> Hey Deej,

>

> You can respond off list if you like, but I've never been able to

> understand

> the vitriol that some types of conservatives (remember, I consider myself

> a conservative) for the Clintons. I eventually figured it out with Bill,

> I think it was personal. So many 'social conservatives' spend their lives

> doing what they're supposed to do, staying out of trouble, denying

> themselves

> things they would like to enjoy, all in the belief that it's the right

> thing

> to do for themselves and society. Then Bill shows up, a draft dodging, pot

> smoking, wife cheating hick from the STICKS of Arkansas who by rights

> should

> have been a city council member in Little Rock driving a 12 year old El

> Dorado.

> He never denied himself a damn thing, from Biggie Fries to fancy cigars to

> hummers from interns, and he got to be president fer effs sake. So, he's

> a personal affront, which I get.

I "dodged" the draft by staying in school. I've never cheated on my wife, but before I married I did cheat "with" certain of others' wives (and somethimes I was even aware that they "were" wives). I "did" inhale (among other more radical and destructive behaviours) and now the world is a better place (trust me on this) because I no longer do this, but I don't really have a problem with others partaking of their substance of choice, up to the point that it infringes on my safety.....and back during my salad days, I had no problem lying through my teeth so stay out of trouble regarding possible repercussions from various entities who took issue with my philandering and recreational hobbies. My SAT scores in 1968 could have easily landed me a spot at an ivy league institution but, being a Texas hick, and all, I stayed in the south where I felt I could do the most damage. :). I really had no problem with Bills history and behavioural propensities. Hell, I could really relate to the guy. He and I had some things in common and I would be the ultimate hypocrite to judge him on moral grounds. OTOH, I certainly had no business being president.

Problem with Bill was that he was supposed o be watching the store and thinking in terms of our national security and energy policy (which are synonymous and completely interrelated) instead of running a popularity contest based on global opinion polls. I don't have the time right now to rehash all of his disastrous energy and foriegn policy decisions, but first and foremost, IMO, was to make sure that our "allies" didn't play us and do exactly what they did with turning the sanctions on Sadaam to his advantage and "balancing the budget" on the back of cheap oil while ignoring the declaration of war that was publicly broadcast by Bin Ladin and discouraging

domestic energy production while simultaneously ramping up petrochemical imports as a quick fix to create the illusion of a healthy economy propped up on the fantasy that OPEC would be "our buddies".

- >
- > However, Hillary seems to me to be deeply, deeply vanilla. She was rabidly
- > pro Iraq war, is saber rattling against Iran and Syria, wants to expand
- > NATO
- > to Russia's doorstep, is probably the most pro-Israel candidate
- > imaginable,
- > and more than any other leading Democrat appears like she might actually
- > be a teensy bit Christian. Not a Bible thumper of course, but her
- > occasional
- > statements about god and family sound at least potentially sincere. So,
- > and
- > I'm asking this sincerely, why is she diabolical? Not annoying (she is),
- > power hungry (comes with wanting the job), unwilling to answer questions
- > straight (so are they all), or maybe a dyke (who cares). But what is
- > diabolical
- > about here, and what will she DO if elected that is so awful and radical
- > and dangerous?

.....I get your point. I just don't trust her because she was 1/2 of the disaster that was Biliary. She's the epitome of a calculating opportunist.....which, come to think of it, may be exactly what we might need as Secretary of State, or Secretary of War.....but at the same time, there something very Talleyrand'esque about both Biliary/Hilbilly which, in the end, serves their personal interests at the expense of the national interest. Just look at how popular Bill Clinton is after the incredible damage (by omission and incompetence, if nothing else) he did to our national security by allowing the situation in Iraq to fester under the watchful eye of the UN. I think that the enduring "cult of Bill", says more about the idiocy of the American public than it does about the Clinton's though. The Clinton's, being smartn'all, recognize it and feed off it like catfish in a pond full of blood bait.

- >
- > Lastly, I've been telling my lefty academic friends for years that they're
- > going to find religion at some point about states rights. From gay
- > marriage
- > to medical pot nearly every pet issue for lefties will get squashed by
- > federal
- > lawmakers and the federal judiciary. The lefties are going to have to
- > fight
- > for the right of (their own) states to legislate on those issues. They
- > scream
- > and yell and hem and haw and tell me I'm nuts but they have yet to come up
- > with a compelling argument to counter mine. Conservatives (not the ones

> like
> me, the other kinds) are going to get their comeuppance probably after the
> next election for executive power. Seems like a great idea to decide the
> president is above the law when you're guy is president, but the history
> of this country is the gradual erosion of judicial and legislative power,
> i.e. the executive branch rarely gives anything back. I suspect any
> Democrat
> who runs against any of the current Republicans will win, and then all of
> that executive power wrenched away from Congress will be in the hands of
> the other party. Law of unintended consequences, but I for one will have
> a hearty belly laugh when the Rush Limbaugh set starts howling about some
> abuse of executive power when a Democrat is the abuser.
>
> Anyway, enlighten me about Hillary.

I think those who are howling about how Bush ignores/circumvents/reinterprets the law are going to be in for more of the same old same old, but it's going to be less about a national security agenda and more about a "Hilary" agenda, which will be determined by popularity polls and their uberleftist buddies in Hollywood.

;o)

>
> TCB
>
> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>>
>>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>>news:471ed2be@linux...
>>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry
> to
>>> rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch into
>
>>> the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover from
> it,
>>> ever.
>>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God
>
>>> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>>>
>>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>
>>>
>>> AA
>>>
>>
>>The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty. She's
> as

>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
> As I always say, that might a great idea, but so is me banging Scarlett Johansson.
> Neither are going to happen.

Never say never. You may meet her in the old folks home and have a grand old time.

Preferential voting is already being used in a variety of elections. As it continues to be successful, it continues to be adopted.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

> TCB
>
>>
>>>> OTOH, it's way too early to pick winners. I'm really disappointed to
>
>>>> see people dropping out already.
>>>>
>>>> Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> DJ wrote:
>>>>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>>>>> news:471ed2be@linux...
>>>>>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size.
>>>>>> Sorry to rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed
>>>>>> crooked b**ch into the white house again she'll so train wreck us we
>
>>>>>> may not recover from it, ever.
>>>>>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but
>
>>>>>> God help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> AA
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty.
>

I remember when the Juanita Broderick case came up. Someone in Slate (as I remember) not at all a conservative, said: "well we don't know that Bill raped her, but it sounds like our guy".

This was earlier in the culture war, when the left was willing to occasionally be honest about one of their own. Those days are gone, and now the Bill Maher crowd wants to make this all about BJ's and Mr. Zigzag so they can pretend that Bill's very nature did not cause huge problems in the world as it did in his own household.

But we know it did. We know that OBL seized upon the lack of resolve, wisdom and discipline Bill showed in Somalia as evidence that we are not to be feared and that error and many, many others helped bring about 911.

These things are the result of having a leader with no moral center. It's not about doing bad things, it's about being a bad guy.

Remember during the Lewiniski biz, when Bill got several "spiritual advisors" to help him through his troubles?

One of them was Tony Campolo. Tony is a bigtime lefty Christian who I heard actually say "you don't give a shit" in the pulpit when speaking of helping the poor. Tony cannot be purchased or influence by politics. He is also the friend of a good friend of mine.

Know why Tony dropped out of the "spiritual advisor" group after a couple weeks? (and yes this is insider info) Because Bill is a phony and likely a damn sociopath and has NO intention of ever changing anything other than his lines; for more effective ones. Other pastors stayed in, and later called in their favors and got Bill to speak at their megachurch. At which point I lost all respect for them. Tony walked. He walked because Bill is scum. But we knew that.

So now, it ain't resentment cuz he got to do fun/naughty stuff. Not even close...

DC

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 19:13:22 GMT

Two things, Don. First, none of this explains why the Clintons IN PARTICULAR generate the visceral hatred they do. Nobody seems to hate Russ Feingold or Barney Frank PERSONALLY. I explain the PERSONAL hatred of the Clintons the way I do for those reasons.

As far as being a lying, cheating, showboating asshole, well he's a politician. That's what they are, that's what they do. I think it was HL Menken who said the definition of an honest politician is that once he's bought he stays bought. If in a single generation we have a handful of actual decent people in national politics we're lucky, and those handful are almost universally demonized. For example, I think Ron Paul is tells us what he believes and would act on it. Jimmy Carter was the same way. I think Pat Buchanan is another, and so is Ralph Nader. I don't agree with everything they believe, but I believe they are honest and if ever in public office would do their best to advance what they honestly thought were those ideas.

Second, and a point of order, OBL might have drawn some conclusions from Somalia but he specifically said that it was Lebanon where he turned on the USA. Remember (or more likely don't, since it's problematic for your binary world) that OBL was a happy recipient of US military and logistical support when we were bankrolling the muj against the Soviets. He even asked Prince Bandar to thank the US for their support. But in Lebanon he saw US warships shelling Sunni neighborhoods in Beirut and that one lethally effective suicide bomber could drive the Americans out of that war. That was when Cowboy Ronnie was in charge, not the Clintons. Was Bill a craven coward in the face of gulf potentates who were in essence buying protection from OBL? Yes. Was he, and the Democrats, unique in such cowardice? Not by a long shot.

TCB

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

>

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

>>

>>Hey DeeJ,

>>

>>You can respond off list if you like, but I've never been able to understand

>>the vitriol that some types of conservatives (remember, I consider myself

>>a conservative) for the Clintons. I eventually figured it out with Bill,

>>I think it was personal. So many 'social conservatives' spend their lives

>>doing what they're supposed to do, staying out of trouble, denying themselves

>>things they would like to enjoy, all in the belief that it's the right

thing

>>to do for themselves and society. Then Bill shows up, a draft dodging,

pot

>>smoking, wife cheating hick from the STICKS of Arkansas who by rights should

>>have been a city council member in Little Rock driving a 12 year old El

>Dorado.
>>He never denied himself a damn thing, from Biggie Fries to fancy cigars
>to
>>hummers from interns, and he got to be president fer effs sake. So, he's
>>a personal affront, which I get.
>
>
>Well, you're way off base here. This is an atheist caricature of
>many people's problems with Bill.
>
>It is and was his compelling and striking inability to tell the
>truth. The sense that you could believe nothing that came
>out of his mouth.
>
>I remember when the Juanita Broderick case came up. Someone
>in Slate (as I remember) not at all a conservative, said:
>"well we don't know that Bill raped her, but it sounds like
>our guy".
>
>This was earlier in the culture war, when the left
>was willing to occasionally be honest about one of their own.
>Those days are gone, and now the Bill Maher crowd wants to
>make this all about BJ's and Mr. Zigzag so they can pretend
>that Bill's very nature did not cause huge problems in the
>world as it did in his own household.
>
>But we know it did. We know that OBL seized upon the lack of
>resolve, wisdom and discipline Bill showed in Somalia as
>evidence that we are not to be feared and that error and many,
>many others helped bring about 911.
>
>These things are the result of having a leader with no moral
>center. It's not about doing bad things, it's about being
>a bad guy.
>
>Remember during the Lewiniski biz, when Bill got several
>"spiritual advisors" to help him through his troubles?
>
>One of them was Tony Campolo. Tony is a bigtime lefty
>Christian who I heard actually say "you don't give a shit" in
>the pulpit when speaking of helping the poor. Tony cannot be
>purchased or influence by politics. He is also the friend of a
>good friend of mine.
>
>Know why Tony dropped out of the "spiritual advisor" group
>after a couple weeks? (and yes this is insider info) Because
>Bill is a phony and likely a damn sociopath and has NO intention
>of ever changing anything other than his lines; for more effective

>ones. Other pastors stayed in, and later called in their favors
>and got Bill to speak at their megachurch. At which point I
>lost all respect for them. Tony walked. He walked because
>Bill is scum. But we knew that.

>

>So now, it ain't resentment cuz he got to do fun/naughty stuff.

>Not even close...

>

>DC

>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 19:14:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OK, DeeJ, I think I get your point. We disagree on the timeline (it's extent mostly) on the terrorism/energy stuff. But I get your point.

TCB

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:471f602a\$1@linux...

>>

>> Hey DeeJ,

>>

>> You can respond off list if you like, but I've never been able to

>> understand

>> the vitriol that some types of conservatives (remember, I consider myself

>> a conservative) for the Clintons. I eventually figured it out with Bill,

>> I think it was personal. So many 'social conservatives' spend their lives

>> doing what they're supposed to do, staying out of trouble, denying

>> themselves

>> things they would like to enjoy, all in the belief that it's the right

>> thing

>> to do for themselves and society. Then Bill shows up, a draft dodging,

pot

>> smoking, wife cheating hick from the STICKS of Arkansas who by rights

>> should

>> have been a city council member in Little Rock driving a 12 year old El

>> Dorado.

>> He never denied himself a damn thing, from Biggie Fries to fancy cigars

to

>> hummers from interns, and he got to be president fer effs sake. So, he's

>> a personal affront, which I get.
>
>I "dodged" the draft by staying in school. I've never cheated on my wife,

>but before I married I did cheat "with" certain of others' wives (and
>somethimes I was even aware that they "were" wives). I "did" inhale (among

>other more radical and destructive behaviours) and now the world is a better

>place (trust me on this) because I no longer do this, but I don't really

>have a problem with others partaking of their substance of choice, up to
the
>point that it infringes on my safety.....and back during my salad

>days, I had no problem lying through my teeth so stay out of trouble
>regarding possible repercussions from various entities who took issue with

>my philandering and recreational hobbies. My SAT scores in 1968 could have

>easily landed me a spot at an ivy league institution but, being a Texas

>hick, and all, I stayed in the south where I felt I could do the most
>damage. :). I really had no problem with Bills history and behavioural
>propensities. Hell, I could really relate to the guy. He and I had some

>things in common and I would be the ultimate hypocrite to judge him on moral

>grounds. OTOH, I certainly had no business being president.
>
>Problem with Bill was that he was supposed o be watching the store and
>thinking in terms of our national security and energy policy (which are

>synonymous and completely interrelated) instead of running a popularity

>contest based on global opinion polls. I don't have the time right now to

>rehash all of his disastrous energy and foriegn policy decisions, but first

>and foremost, IMO, was to make sure that our "allies" didn't play us and
do
>exactly what they did with turning the sanctions on Sadaam to his advantage

>and "balancing the budget" on the back of cheap oil while ignoring the
>declaration of war that was publicly broadcast by Bin Ladin and discouraging

>domestic energy production while simultaneously ramping up petrochemical

>imports as a quick fix to create the illusion of a healthy economy propped
up
>on the fantasy that OPEC would be "our buddies".
>
>>
>> However, Hillary seems to me to be deeply, deeply vanilla. She was rabidly
>> pro Iraq war, is saber rattling against Iran and Syria, wants to expand

>> NATO
>> to Russia's doorstep, is probably the most pro-Israel candidate
>> imaginable,
>> and more than any other leading Democrat appears like she might actually
>> be a teensy bit Christian. Not a Bible thumper of course, but her
>> occasional
>> statements about god and family sound at least potentially sincere. So,

>> and
>> I'm asking this sincerely, why is she diabolical? Not annoying (she is),
>> power hungry (comes with wanting the job), unwilling to answer questions
>> straight (so are they all), or maybe a dyke (who cares). But what is
>> diabolical
>> about here, and what will she DO if elected that is so awful and radical
>> and dangerous?
>
>.....I get your point. I just don't trust her because she was 1/2 of

>the disaster that was Biliary. She's the epitome of a calculating
>opportunist.....which, come to think of it, may be exactly what we might

>need as Secretary of State, or Secretary of War.....but at the same time,

>there something very Talleyrand'esque about both Biliary/Hilbilly which,
in
>the end, serves their personal interests at the expense of the national

>interest. Just look at how popular Bill Clinton is after the incredible

>damage (by omission and incompetence, if nothing else) he did to our
>national security by allowing the situation in Iraq to fester under the

>watchful eye of the UN. I think that the enduring "cult of Bill", says more

>about the idiocy of the American public than it does about the Clinton's

>though. The Clinton's, being smartn'all, recognize it and feed off it like

>catfish in a pond full of blood bait.
>

>>
>> Lastly, I've been telling my lefty academic friends for years that they're
>> going to find religion at some point about states rights. From gay
>> marriage
>> to medical pot nearly every pet issue for lefties will get squashed by

>> federal
>> lawmakers and the federal judiciary. The lefties are going to have to

>> fight
>> for the right of (their own) states to legislate on those issues. They

>> scream
>> and yell and hem and haw and tell me I'm nuts but they have yet to come
up
>> with a compelling argument to counter mine. Conservatives (not the ones

>> like
>> me, the other kinds) are going to get their comeuppance probably after
the
>> next election for executive power. Seems like a great idea to decide the
>> president is above the law when you're guy is president, but the history
>> of this country is the gradual erosion of judicial and legislative power,
>> i.e. the executive branch rarely gives anything back. I suspect any
>> Democrat
>> who runs against any of the current Republicans will win, and then all
of
>> that executive power wrenched away from Congress will be in the hands
of
>> the other party. Law of unintended consequences, but I for one will have
>> a hearty belly laugh when the Rush Limbaugh set starts howling about some
>> abuse of executive power when a Democrat is the abuser.
>>
>> Anyway, enlighten me about Hillary.
>
>I think those who are howling about how Bush
>ignores/circumvents/reinterprets the law are going to be in for more of
the
>same old same old, but it's going to be less about a national security
>agenda and more about a "Hilary" agenda, which will be determined by
>popularity polls and their uberleftist buddies in Hollyweed.
>
>;o)
>
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:

>>>
>>>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>>>news:471ed2be@linux...
>>>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry
>> to
>>>> rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch
into
>>
>>>> the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover from
>> it,
>>>> ever.
>>>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but
God
>>
>>>> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>>>>
>>>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>
>>>>
>>>> AA
>>>>
>>>
>>>The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty. She's
>> as
>>>smart as she is diabolical.
>>>
>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:471ec45e@linux...
>>>>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
>>>>>
>>>>> Sorry, couldn't resist.
>>>>> Rich
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!

Posted by [DC](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 19:29:46 GMT

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

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

>

>Two things, Don. First, none of this explains why the Clintons IN PARTICULAR
>generate the visceral hatred they do. Nobody seems to hate Russ Feingold
>or Barney Frank PERSONALLY. I explain the PERSONAL hatred of the Clintons
>the way I do for those reasons.

Neither had the power of the Clintons. Put Barney Frank in the White House and watch what happens...

>As far as being a lying, cheating, showboating asshole, well he's a politician.
>That's what they are, that's what they do.

Not true. Not the case with Gerald Ford, nor Jimmy Carter, in just recent memory.

>If in a single generation we have a handful of actual decent people
>in national politics we're lucky, and those handful are almost universally
>demonized. For example, I think Ron Paul is tells us what he believes and
>would act on it. Jimmy Carter was the same way. I think Pat Buchanan is
another,
>and so is Ralph Nader.

Nader is a jerk and a self-promoter, but we agree on the point.

The problem with Ron Paul is not that he wouldn't tell the truth, but as with Carter, would his version of truth be wise?

>Second, and a point of order, OBL might have drawn some conclusions from
>Somalia but he specifically said that it was Lebanon where he turned on
the
>USA.

There is a direct quote from him basing his view about the USA specifically on Somalia. Lebanon was certainly an issue as well, but exactly how does that excuse Bill??

>Remember (or more likely don't, since it's problematic for your binary
>world) that OBL was a happy recipient of US military and logistical support

>when we were bankrolling the muj against the Soviets.

Well, this might be difficult for your postmodern delusions to coexist with, but all of it adds up, and no one gets a pass....

The hate for Reagan, from the left, was pretty virulent if you remember.

>Was

>he, and the Democrats, unique in such cowardice? Not by a long shot.

Unique is not the issue, nor will it matter at all to history. I am glad you agree about Clinton though.

Now, the hard part. Who to elect?

hmmmm...

We always say that "big business" is the problem, or the religious right, or the secular left, or the Soros crowd, but really, suppose the country has simply gotten too big to govern from a central point? Suppose the damn office of the president is simply a rockstar contest with the winner getting to hang with Bono? Suppose there is no one to save us? then what?

DC

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 20:54:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DJ, those things you did do not make it OK for the f/ing President to do them.

Are you acting like that now? I hope you're wiser. Well, Bill Clinton never got wiser.

I wouldn't cheat on my wife, and I wouldn't lie about it. I DO hold the President to the same standard of ethics to which i hold myself. Shouldn't I? When you get elected president you better crank it up a notch and keep your nose clean and your eyes on the ball. It's a big responsibility and since you asked for it you better live up to it.

DJ wrote:

> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:471f602a\$1@linux...
>> Hey Deej,
>>
>> You can respond off list if you like, but I've never been able to
>> understand
>> the vitriol that some types of conservatives (remember, I consider myself
>> a conservative) for the Clintons. I eventually figured it out with Bill,
>> I think it was personal. So many 'social conservatives' spend their lives
>> doing what they're supposed to do, staying out of trouble, denying
>> themselves
>> things they would like to enjoy, all in the belief that it's the right
>> thing
>> to do for themselves and society. Then Bill shows up, a draft dodging, pot
>> smoking, wife cheating hick from the STICKS of Arkansas who by rights
>> should
>> have been a city council member in Little Rock driving a 12 year old El
>> Dorado.
>> He never denied himself a damn thing, from Biggie Fries to fancy cigars to
>> hummers from interns, and he got to be president fer effs sake. So, he's
>> a personal affront, which I get.
>
> I "dodged" the draft by staying in school. I've never cheated on my wife,
> but before I married I did cheat "with" certain of others' wives (and
> somethimes I was even aware that they "were" wives). I "did" inhale (among
> other more radical and destructive behaviours) and now the world is a better
> place (trust me on this) because I no longer do this, but I don't really
> have a problem with others partaking of their substance of choice, up to the
> point that it infringes on my safety.....and back during my salad
> days, I had no problem lying through my teeth so stay out of trouble
> regarding possible repercussions from various entities who took issue with
> my philandering and recreational hobbies. My SAT scores in 1968 could have
> easily landed me a spot at an ivy league institution but, being a Texas
> hick, and all, I stayed in the south where I felt I could do the most
> damage. :). I really had no problem with Bills history and behavioural
> propensities. Hell, I could really relate to the guy. He and I had some
> things in common and I would be the ultimate hypocrite to judge him on moral
> grounds. OTOH, I certainly had no business being president.
>
> Problem with Bill was that he was supposed o be watching the store and
> thinking in terms of our national security and energy policy (which are
> synonymous and completely interrelated) instead of running a popularity
> contest based on global opinion polls. I don't have the time right now to
> rehash all of his disastrous energy and foriegn policy decisions, but first
> and foremost, IMO, was to make sure that our "allies" didn't play us and do
> exactly what they did with turning the sanctions on Sadaam to his advantage
> and "balancing the budget" on the back of cheap oil while ignoring the
> declaration of war that was publicly broadcast by Bin Ladin and discouraging
> domestic energy production while simultaneously ramping up petrochemical

> imports as a quick fix to create the illusion of a healthy economy propped up
> on the fantasy that OPEC would be "our buddies".
>
>> However, Hillary seems to me to be deeply, deeply vanilla. She was rabidly
>> pro Iraq war, is saber rattling against Iran and Syria, wants to expand
>> NATO
>> to Russia's doorstep, is probably the most pro-Israel candidate
>> imaginable,
>> and more than any other leading Democrat appears like she might actually
>> be a teensy bit Christian. Not a Bible thumper of course, but her
>> occasional
>> statements about god and family sound at least potentially sincere. So,
>> and
>> I'm asking this sincerely, why is she diabolical? Not annoying (she is),
>> power hungry (comes with wanting the job), unwilling to answer questions
>> straight (so are they all), or maybe a dyke (who cares). But what is
>> diabolical
>> about here, and what will she DO if elected that is so awful and radical
>> and dangerous?
>
>I get your point. I just don't trust her because she was 1/2 of
> the disaster that was Biliary. She's the epitome of a calculating
> opportunist.....which, come to think of it, may be exactly what we might
> need as Secretary of State, or Secretary of War.....but at the same time,
> there something very Talleyrand'esque about both Biliary/Hilbilly which, in
> the end, serves their personal interests at the expense of the national
> interest. Just look at how popular Bill Clinton is after the incredible
> damage (by omission and incompetence, if nothing else) he did to our
> national security by allowing the situation in Iraq to fester under the
> watchful eye of the UN. I think that the enduring "cult of Bill", says more
> about the idiocy of the American public than it does about the Clinton's
> though. The Clinton's, being smartn'all, recognize it and feed off it like
> catfish in a pond full of blood bait.
>
>> Lastly, I've been telling my lefty academic friends for years that they're
>> going to find religion at some point about states rights. From gay
>> marriage
>> to medical pot nearly every pet issue for lefties will get squashed by
>> federal
>> lawmakers and the federal judiciary. The lefties are going to have to
>> fight
>> for the right of (their own) states to legislate on those issues. They
>> scream
>> and yell and hem and haw and tell me I'm nuts but they have yet to come up
>> with a compelling argument to counter mine. Conservatives (not the ones
>> like
>> me, the other kinds) are going to get their comeuppance probably after the
>> next election for executive power. Seems like a great idea to decide the

>> president is above the law when you're guy is president, but the history
>> of this country is the gradual erosion of judicial and legislative power,
>> i.e. the executive branch rarely gives anything back. I suspect any
>> Democrat
>> who runs against any of the current Republicans will win, and then all of
>> that executive power wrenched away from Congress will be in the hands of
>> the other party. Law of unintended consequences, but I for one will have
>> a hearty belly laugh when the Rush Limbaugh set starts howling about some
>> abuse of executive power when a Democrat is the abuser.
>>
>> Anyway, enlighten me about Hillary.
>
> I think those who are howling about how Bush
> ignores/circumvents/reinterprets the law are going to be in for more of the
> same old same old, but it's going to be less about a national security
> agenda and more about a "Hilary" agenda, which will be determined by
> popularity polls and their uberleftist buddies in Hollyweed.
>
> ;o)
>
>> TCB
>>
>> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>>>> news:471ed2be@linux...
>>>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry
>> to
>>>> rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch into
>>>> the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover from
>> it,
>>>> ever.
>>>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God
>>>> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>>>>
>>>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>
>>>>
>>>> AA
>>>>
>>> The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty. She's
>> as
>>> smart as she is diabolical.
>>>
>>>
>>>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:471ec45e@linux...
>>>>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
>>>>>
>>>>> Sorry, couldn't resist.

>>>> Rich
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [steve the artguy](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 20:59:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Puts this whole discussion in a somewhat meta-light:

going with yer gut predicts actual election results

<http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?chanID=sa003&articleID=CE4CD4FE-E7F2-99DF-350A53757475700D&ref=rss>

-steve

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

>

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

>>

>>Two things, Don. First, non of this explains why the Clintons IN PARTICULAR
>>generate the visceral hatred they do. Nobody seems to hate Russ Feingold
>>or Barney Frank PERSONALLY. I explain the PERSONAL hatred of the Clintons
>>the way I do for those reasons.

>

>Neither had the power of the Clintons. Put Barney Frank in the
>White House and watch what happens...

>

>

>

>

>>As far as being a lying, cheating, showboating asshole, well he's a politician.
>>That's what they are, that's what they do.

>

>Not true. Not the case with Gerald Ford, nor Jimmy Carter,
>in just recent memory.

>

>

>

>>If in a single generation we have a handful of actual decent people
>>in national politics we're lucky, and those handful are almost universally
>>demonized. For example, I think Ron Paul is tells us what he believes and
>>would act on it. Jimmy Carter was the same way. I think Pat Buchanan is
>another,
>>and so is Ralph Nader.
>
>Nader is a jerk and a self-promoter, but we agree on the point.
>
>The problem with Ron Paul is not that he wouldn't tell the
>truth, but as with Carter, would his version of truth be wise?
>
>
>>Second, and a point of order, OBL might have drawn some conclusions from
>>Somalia but he specifically said that it was Lebanon where he turned on
>the
>>USA.
>
>There is a direct quote from him basing his view about the USA
>specifically on Somalia. Lebanon was certainly an issue as
>well, but exactly how does that excuse Bill??
>
>
>>Remember (or more likely don't, since it's problematic for your binary
>>world) that OBL was a happy recipient of US military and logistical support
>>when we were bankrolling the muj against the Soviets.
>
>
>Well, this might be difficult for your postmodern delusions to
>coexist with, but all of it adds up, and no one gets a pass....
>
>The hate for Reagan, from the left, was pretty virulent if you
>remember.
>
>
>>Was
>>he, and the Democrats, unique in such cowardice? Not by a long shot.
>
>Unique is not the issue, nor will it matter at all to history.
>I am glad you agree about Clinton though.
>
>Now, the hard part. Who to elect?
>
>hmmmm...
>
>We always say that "big business" is the problem, or the
>religious right, or the secular left, or the Soros crowd, but
>really, suppose the country has simply gotten too big

>to govern from a central point? Suppose the damn office of
>the president is simply a rockstar contest with the winner
>getting to hang with Bono? Suppose there is no one to
>save us? then what?
>
>DC

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 21:06:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's pretty alarming...

DC

"steve the artguy" <artguy@somethingrother.net> wrote:

>
>Puts this whole discussion in a somewhat meta-light:
>
>going with yer gut predicts actual election results
>
> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?chanID=sa003&articleID=CE4CD4FE-E7F2-99DF-350A53757475700D&ref=rss>
>
>-steve

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

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

>>>Two things, Don. First, non of this explains why the Clintons IN PARTICULAR
>>>generate the visceral hatred they do. Nobody seems to hate Russ Feingold
>>>or Barney Frank PERSONALLY. I explain the PERSONAL hatred of the Clintons
>>>the way I do for those reasons.

>>
>>Neither had the power of the Clintons. Put Barney Frank in the
>>White House and watch what happens...

>>
>>
>>
>>

>>>As far as being a lying, cheating, showboating asshole, well he's a politician.
>>>That's what they are, that's what they do.

>>
>>Not true. Not the case with Gerald Ford, nor Jimmy Carter,

>>in just recent memory.

>>

>>

>>

>>>If in a single generation we have a handful of actual decent people
>>>in national politics we're lucky, and those handful are almost universally
>>>demonized. For example, I think Ron Paul is tells us what he believes
and

>>>would act on it. Jimmy Carter was the same way. I think Pat Buchanan is

>>another,

>>>and so is Ralph Nader.

>>

>>Nader is a jerk and a self-promoter, but we agree on the point.

>>

>>The problem with Ron Paul is not that he wouldn't tell the
>>truth, but as with Carter, would his version of truth be wise?

>>

>>

>>>Second, and a point of order, OBL might have drawn some conclusions from
>>>Somalia but he specifically said that it was Lebanon where he turned on
>>the

>>>USA.

>>

>>There is a direct quote from him basing his view about the USA
>>specifically on Somalia. Lebanon was certainly an issue as
>>well, but exactly how does that excuse Bill??

>>

>>

>>>Remember (or more likely don't, since it's problematic for your binary
>>>world) that OBL was a happy recipient of US military and logistical support
>>>when we were bankrolling the muj against the Soviets.

>>

>>

>>Well, this might be difficult for your postmodern delusions to
>>coexist with, but all of it adds up, and no one gets a pass....

>>

>>The hate for Reagan, from the left, was pretty virulent if you
>>remember.

>>

>>

>>>Was

>>>he, and the Democrats, unique in such cowardice? Not by a long shot.

>>

>>Unique is not the issue, nor will it matter at all to history.

>>I am glad you agree about Clinton though.

>>

>>Now, the hard part. Who to elect?

>>

>>hmmmm...
>>
>>We always say that "big business" is the problem, or the
>>religious right, or the secular left, or the Soros crowd, but
>>really, suppose the country has simply gotten too big
>>to govern from a central point? Suppose the damn office of
>>the president is simply a rockstar contest with the winner
>>getting to hang with Bono? Suppose there is no one to
>>save us? then what?
>>
>>DC
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 21:31:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Makes perfect sense, he who figures out fastest if what he sees is a hostile member of another tribe/predatory animal or, on the other hand, a friendly member of his own group has the best chance of surviving to have a/nother kid on the African plain. Thus we were made.

TCB

"steve the artguy" <artguy@somethingrother.net> wrote:

>
>Puts this whole discussion in a somewhat meta-light:
>
>going with yer gut predicts actual election results
>
> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?chanID=sa003&articleID=CE4CD4FE-E7F2-99DF-350A53757475700D&ref=rss>

>
>-steve

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

>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Two things, Don. First, non of this explains why the Clintons IN PARTICULAR
>>>generate the visceral hatred they do. Nobody seems to hate Russ Feingold
>>>or Barney Frank PERSONALLY. I explain the PERSONAL hatred of the Clintons
>>>the way I do for those reasons.

>>
>>Neither had the power of the Clintons. Put Barney Frank in the
>>White House and watch what happens...

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>>As far as being a lying, cheating, showboating asshole, well he's a politician.
>>>That's what they are, that's what they do.
>>
>>Not true. Not the case with Gerald Ford, nor Jimmy Carter,
>>in just recent memory.
>>
>>
>>
>>>If in a single generation we have a handful of actual decent people
>>>in national politics we're lucky, and those handful are almost universally
>>>demonized. For example, I think Ron Paul is tells us what he believes
and
>>>would act on it. Jimmy Carter was the same way. I think Pat Buchanan is
>>another,
>>>and so is Ralph Nader.
>>
>>Nader is a jerk and a self-promoter, but we agree on the point.
>>
>>The problem with Ron Paul is not that he wouldn't tell the
>>truth, but as with Carter, would his version of truth be wise?
>>
>>
>>>Second, and a point of order, OBL might have drawn some conclusions from
>>>Somalia but he specifically said that it was Lebanon where he turned on
>>the
>>>USA.
>>
>>There is a direct quote from him basing his view about the USA
>>specifically on Somalia. Lebanon was certainly an issue as
>>well, but exactly how does that excuse Bill??
>>
>>
>>>Remember (or more likely don't, since it's problematic for your binary
>>>world) that OBL was a happy recipient of US military and logistical support
>>>when we were bankrolling the muj against the Soviets.
>>
>>
>>Well, this might be difficult for your postmodern delusions to
>>coexist with, but all of it adds up, and no one gets a pass....
>>
>>The hate for Reagan, from the left, was pretty virulent if you
>>remember.
>>
>>

>>>Was
>>>he, and the Democrats, unique in such cowardice? Not by a long shot.
>>
>>Unique is not the issue, nor will it matter at all to history.
>>I am glad you agree about Clinton though.
>>
>>Now, the hard part. Who to elect?
>>
>>hmmmm...
>>
>>We always say that "big business" is the problem, or the
>>religious right, or the secular left, or the Soros crowd, but
>>really, suppose the country has simply gotten too big
>>to govern from a central point? Suppose the damn office of
>>the president is simply a rockstar contest with the winner
>>getting to hang with Bono? Suppose there is no one to
>>save us? then what?
>>
>>DC
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Kim](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2007 21:31:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>Instant runoff voting or some other preferential voting system would
>help avoid "lesser of two evils" voting.

I do like your thinking, but I believe there are some issues with it.

IMHO...

Firstly, the implementation paradox. Neither of the major parties are likely to bring in something to diminish their duopoly as "THE major parties". Hence it seems likely you'd need a minor party/candidate to win in order to get it happening. In other words, to change the system so that a minor candidate can win, a minor candidate has to win. Catch 22.

Secondly, we have preferential voting here in Australia, and while I do think it's, well, preferable, it's not some wondrous solution to the faults of democracy. Our federal election is in a month, and a recent poll just showed that the leading party has 47% of the primary vote (ie 47% of Australians are going to choose them as no.1 option). In other words, while we are perfectly able to do otherwise, for some reason the general population votes for the major parties as first preference regardless of the fact that you can, effectively, vote for both the majors as the last two options, and in effect, your vote ends up with one of them and has the same strength as it would have if you'd

voted them as no.1 if you get my drift. In some ways it makes things worse. I don't think it's "the problem" as such.

The problem, fundamentally, in both the U.S. and here, is that the public think there are only two options and vote accordingly because they don't want some "weirdo" getting in (ironic really). One would suggest that a massive education campaign is required to explain to the common man why this line of thinking is flawed, but who is going to do it? The major parties obviously won't. Nobody reads books (well, not enough). The media? The media would argue, and disappointingly they have a point, that their role is to report the status quo, not alter it. I realize they are far from doing this well in many cases, but they actually do it reasonably in this case. The media would simply say that:

- (*) It's not our job to enforce deliberate change.
- (*) The major parties are currently most likely to win.
- (*) Because the majors will win, we should focus reporting on them.

And you and I would say:

- (*) It's because you focus reporting on them that they win.

And they would point out that:

- (*) Even if we adjusted our reporting, the public is so set in the idea of voting for a major party that most will do so anyhow.
- (*) The only way to change this mindset would be for the media to deliberately re-educate the public for a decade, perhaps several. At what point are they pushing their ideals, when their role should be to simply report what goes on.

See my point? It's an unfortunate collaboration of catch 22's.

The only way around it that I can say is to have some amazingly intelligent, charismatic, ethical, and powerful individual take leadership of one of the existing major parties in order to enforce some major changes and help educate the public. Unfortunately I've got other things on at the moment. ;o)

Cheers,
Kim.

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Kim](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 00:02:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Inside my head there's a chicken and an egg who are asking questions about this.

One is saying that it's concerning that perceived visual competence appears

to play such a role. The 60+% accuracy figure may even be higher if the "judges" actually had access to ALL the images that the voters saw, rather than one presumes, just a single, possibly randomly selected image.

The other is saying that it is usually accurate in society to wander the streets saying "Ah. Man in suit." and make a judgement about his role. "Ah, man in overalls" etc. It is actually not altogether impossible that the person who IS most competent may also LOOK most competent, as is reflected by the fact that men in overalls generally look more competent than men in suits. ;o) I mean you don't generally look at a man in a suit and think "Gee, what a slimy looking ladder climbing snake he is". ;o)

Just a thought, or two. ;o)

Cheers,
Kim.

"steve the artguy" <artguy@somethingorother.net> wrote:

>

>Puts this whole discussion in a somewhat meta-light:

>

>going with yer gut predicts actual election results

>

> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?chanID=sa003&articleID=CE4CD4FE-E7F2-99DF-350A53757475700D&ref=rss>

>

>-steve

>

>

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

>>

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

>>>

>>>Two things, Don. First, non of this explains why the Clintons IN PARTICULAR
>>>generate the visceral hatred they do. Nobody seems to hate Russ Feingold
>>>or Barney Frank PERSONALLY. I explain the PERSONAL hatred of the Clintons
>>>the way I do for those reasons.

>>

>>Neither had the power of the Clintons. Put Barney Frank in the
>>White House and watch what happens...

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>>As far as being a lying, cheating, showboating asshole, well he's a politician.
>>>That's what they are, that's what they do.

>>

>>Not true. Not the case with Gerald Ford, nor Jimmy Carter,

>>in just recent memory.

>>

>>

>>

>>>If in a single generation we have a handful of actual decent people
>>>in national politics we're lucky, and those handful are almost universally
>>>demonized. For example, I think Ron Paul is tells us what he believes
and

>>>would act on it. Jimmy Carter was the same way. I think Pat Buchanan is

>>another,

>>>and so is Ralph Nader.

>>

>>Nader is a jerk and a self-promoter, but we agree on the point.

>>

>>The problem with Ron Paul is not that he wouldn't tell the
>>truth, but as with Carter, would his version of truth be wise?

>>

>>

>>>Second, and a point of order, OBL might have drawn some conclusions from
>>>Somalia but he specifically said that it was Lebanon where he turned on
>>the

>>>USA.

>>

>>There is a direct quote from him basing his view about the USA
>>specifically on Somalia. Lebanon was certainly an issue as
>>well, but exactly how does that excuse Bill??

>>

>>

>>>Remember (or more likely don't, since it's problematic for your binary
>>>world) that OBL was a happy recipient of US military and logistical support
>>>when we were bankrolling the muj against the Soviets.

>>

>>

>>Well, this might be difficult for your postmodern delusions to
>>coexist with, but all of it adds up, and no one gets a pass....

>>

>>The hate for Reagan, from the left, was pretty virulent if you
>>remember.

>>

>>

>>>Was

>>>he, and the Democrats, unique in such cowardice? Not by a long shot.

>>

>>Unique is not the issue, nor will it matter at all to history.

>>I am glad you agree about Clinton though.

>>

>>Now, the hard part. Who to elect?

>>

>>hmmmm...
>>
>>We always say that "big business" is the problem, or the
>>religious right, or the secular left, or the Soros crowd, but
>>really, suppose the country has simply gotten too big
>>to govern from a central point? Suppose the damn office of
>>the president is simply a rockstar contest with the winner
>>getting to hang with Bono? Suppose there is no one to
>>save us? then what?
>>
>>DC
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [DJ](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 00:21:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:471fb26a@linux...
> DJ, those things you did do not make it OK for the f/ing President to do
> them.
>
> Are you acting like that now?

Nope.....I cleaned up my act considerably about 20 years ago.

I hope you're wiser.

there's some debate about that ;o)

Well, Bill Clinton > never got wiser.

Untreated codependency and sexual addiction is a bad recipe for presidential candidates.

>
> I wouldn't cheat on my wife, and I wouldn't lie about it. I DO hold the
> President to the same standard of ethics to which i hold myself. Shouldn't
> I?

Everyone loves JFK. He gets a moral pass and Clinton doesn't?.....probably because he assassinated. If someone would have blown Clinton's head off.....well.....hmmmmn.....OK, nevermind.

When you get elected president you better crank it up a
> notch and keep your nose clean and your eyes on the ball. It's a big
> responsibility and since you asked for it you better live up to it.

If I was gonna be president, I'd probably be something along the lines of hybrid between Bush, Ron Paul and Al Gore....and everybody would hate my guts.

;o)

> DJ wrote:

>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:471f602a\$1@linux...

>>> Hey Deej,

>>>

>>> You can respond off list if you like, but I've never been able to
>>> understand

>>> the vitriol that some types of conservatives (remember, I consider
>>> myself

>>> a conservative) for the Clintons. I eventually figured it out with Bill,

>>> I think it was personal. So many 'social conservatives' spend their
>>> lives

>>> doing what they're supposed to do, staying out of trouble, denying
>>> themselves

>>> things they would like to enjoy, all in the belief that it's the right
>>> thing

>>> to do for themselves and society. Then Bill shows up, a draft dodging,
>>> pot

>>> smoking, wife cheating hick from the STICKS of Arkansas who by rights
>>> should

>>> have been a city council member in Little Rock driving a 12 year old El
>>> Dorado.

>>> He never denied himself a damn thing, from Biggie Fries to fancy cigars
>>> to

>>> hummers from interns, and he got to be president fer effs sake. So, he's
>>> a personal affront, which I get.

>>

>> I "dodged" the draft by staying in school. I've never cheated on my wife,

>> but before I married I did cheat "with" certain of others' wives (and

>> somethimes I was even aware that they "were" wives). I "did" inhale

>> (among other more radical and destructive behaviours) and now the world

>> is a better place (trust me on this) because I no longer do this, but I

>> don't really have a problem with others partaking of their substance of

>> choice, up to the point that it infringes on my safety.....and

>> back during my salad days, I had no problem lying through my teeth so

>> stay out of trouble regarding possible repercussions from various

>> entities who took issue with my philandering and recreational hobbies.

>> My SAT scores in 1968 could have easily landed me a spot at an ivy league

>> institution but, being a Texas hick, and all, I stayed in the south where

>> I felt I could do the most damage. :). I really had no problem with Bills

>> history and behavioural propensities. Hell, I could really relate to the

>> guy. He and I had some things in common and I would be the ultimate

>> hypocrite to judge him on moral grounds. OTOH, I certainly had no
>> business being president.
>>
>> Problem with Bill was that he was supposed to be watching the store and
>> thinking in terms of our national security and energy policy (which are
>> synonymous and completely interrelated) instead of running a popularity
>> contest based on global opinion polls. I don't have the time right now to
>> rehash all of his disastrous energy and foreign policy decisions, but
>> first and foremost, IMO, was to make sure that our "allies" didn't play
>> us and do exactly what they did with turning the sanctions on Sadaam to
>> his advantage and "balancing the budget" on the back of cheap oil while
>> ignoring the declaration of war that was publicly broadcast by Bin Ladin
>> and discouraging domestic energy production while simultaneously ramping
>> up petrochemical imports as a quick fix to create the illusion of a
>> healthy economy propped up on the fantasy that OPEC would be "our
>> buddies".
>>
>>> However, Hillary seems to me to be deeply, deeply vanilla. She was
>>> rabidly
>>> pro Iraq war, is saber rattling against Iran and Syria, wants to expand
>>> NATO
>>> to Russia's doorstep, is probably the most pro-Israel candidate
>>> imaginable,
>>> and more than any other leading Democrat appears like she might actually
>>> be a teensy bit Christian. Not a Bible thumper of course, but her
>>> occasional
>>> statements about god and family sound at least potentially sincere. So,
>>> and
>>> I'm asking this sincerely, why is she diabolical? Not annoying (she is),
>>> power hungry (comes with wanting the job), unwilling to answer questions
>>> straight (so are they all), or maybe a dyke (who cares). But what is
>>> diabolical
>>> about here, and what will she DO if elected that is so awful and radical
>>> and dangerous?
>>
>>I get your point. I just don't trust her because she was 1/2 of
>> the disaster that was Bilary. She's the epitome of a calculating
>> opportunist.....which, come to think of it, may be exactly what we
>> might need as Secretary of State, or Secretary of War.....but at the
>> same time, there something very Talleyrand'esque about both
>> Bilary/Hilbilly which, in the end, serves their personal interests at the
>> expense of the national interest. Just look at how popular Bill Clinton
>> is after the incredible damage (by omission and incompetence, if nothing
>> else) he did to our national security by allowing the situation in Iraq
>> to fester under the watchful eye of the UN. I think that the enduring
>> "cult of Bill", says more about the idiocy of the American public than it
>> does about the Clinton's though. The Clinton's, being smartn'all,
>> recognize it and feed off it like catfish in a pond full of blood bait.

>>
>>> Lastly, I've been telling my lefty academic friends for years that
>>> they're
>>> going to find religion at some point about states rights. From gay
>>> marriage
>>> to medical pot nearly every pet issue for lefties will get squashed by
>>> federal
>>> lawmakers and the federal judiciary. The lefties are going to have to
>>> fight
>>> for the right of (their own) states to legislate on those issues. They
>>> scream
>>> and yell and hem and haw and tell me I'm nuts but they have yet to come
>>> up
>>> with a compelling argument to counter mine. Conservatives (not the ones
>>> like
>>> me, the other kinds) are going to get their comeuppance probably after
>>> the
>>> next election for executive power. Seems like a great idea to decide the
>>> president is above the law when you're guy is president, but the history
>>> of this country is the gradual erosion of judicial and legislative
>>> power,
>>> i.e. the executive branch rarely gives anything back. I suspect any
>>> Democrat
>>> who runs against any of the current Republicans will win, and then all
>>> of
>>> that executive power wrenched away from Congress will be in the hands of
>>> the other party. Law of unintended consequences, but I for one will have
>>> a hearty belly laugh when the Rush Limbaugh set starts howling about
>>> some
>>> abuse of executive power when a Democrat is the abuser.
>>>
>>> Anyway, enlighten me about Hillary.
>>
>> I think those who are howling about how Bush
>> ignores/circumvents/reinterprets the law are going to be in for more of
>> the
>> same old same old, but it's going to be less about a national security
>> agenda and more about a "Hilary" agenda, which will be determined by
>> popularity polls and their uberleftist buddies in Hollywood.
>>
>> ;o)
>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>>>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>>>> news:471ed2be@linux...
>>>>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry

>>> to
>>>> rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch
>>>> into
>>>> the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover from
>>> it,
>>>> ever.
>>>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but
>>>> God
>>>> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>>>>
>>>> http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303
>>>>
>>>> AA
>>>>
>>>> The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty.
>>>> She's
>>> as
>>>> smart as she is diabolical.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
>>>>> news:471ec45e@linux...
>>>>>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Sorry, couldn't resist.
>>>>>>> Rich
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 01:41:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kim wrote:
>> Instant runoff voting or some other preferential voting system would
>> help avoid "lesser of two evils" voting.
>
> I do like your thinking, but I believe there are some issues with it.

Thanks for sharing your perspective.

> IMHO...

>

> Firstly, the implementation paradox. Neither of the major parties are likely
> to bring in something to diminish their duopoly as "THE major parties". Hence
> it seems likely you'd need a minor party/candidate to win in order to get
> it happening. In other words, to change the system so that a minor candidate
> can win, a minor candidate has to win. Catch 22.

Maybe. Right now, preferential voting is not widely known in the USA.
But what's happening here, despite that, is that it is catching on in
smaller elections. Over time the more that works out, the more it can
become known and the more it can catch on further. It won't happen over
night.

> Secondly, we have preferential voting here in Australia, and while I do think
> it's, well, preferable, it's not some wondrous solution to the faults of
> democracy. Our federal election is in a month, and a recent poll just showed

My only claim is that it would help, not that it would be a panacea.

How does your preferential system work?

> that the leading party has 47% of the primary vote (ie 47% of Australians
> are going to choose them as no.1 option). In other words, while we are perfectly
> able to do otherwise, for some reason the general population votes for the
> major parties as first preference regardless of the fact that you can, effectively,
> vote for both the majors as the last two options, and in effect, your vote
> ends up with one of them and has the same strength as it would have if you'd
> voted them as no.1 if you get my drift. In some ways it makes things worse.
> I don't think it's "the problem" as such.

>

> The problem, fundamentally, in both the U.S. and here, is that the public
> think there are only two options and vote accordingly because they don't
> want some "weirdo" getting in (ironic really). One would suggest that a massive
> education campaign is required to explain to the common man why this line
> of thinking is flawed, but who is going to do it? The major parties obviously
> won't. Nobody reads books (well, not enough). The media? The media would
> argue, and disappointingly they have a point, that their role is to report
> the status quo, not alter it. I realize they are far from doing this well
> in many cases, but they actually do it reasonably in this case. The media
> would simply say that:

> (*) It's not our job to enforce deliberate change.
> (*) The major parties are currently most likely to win.
> (*) Because the majors will win, we should focus reporting on them.

>

> And you and I would say:
> (*) It's because you focus reporting on them that they win.
>
> And they would point out that:
> (*) Even if we adjusted our reporting, the public is so set in the idea of
> voting for a major party that most will do so anyhow.
> (*) The only way to change this mindset would be for the media to deliberately
> re-educate the public for a decade, perhaps several. At what point are they
> pushing their ideals, when their role should be to simply report what goes
> on.
>
> See my point? It's an unfortunate collaboration of catch 22's.

Of course in the USA we are smarter than that (ducking).

> The only way around it that I can say is to have some amazingly intelligent,
> charismatic, ethical, and powerful individual take leadership of one of the
> existing major parties in order to enforce some major changes and help educate
> the public. Unfortunately I've got other things on at the moment. ;o)

We all have our priorities. :^)

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

> Cheers,
> Kim.
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Kim](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 02:29:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>How does your preferential system work?

It's pretty basic, but effective for mine. Imagine you have 4 candidates.
You get four boxes. I am paraphrasing here, but the paraphrase will be "conceptually
accurate" if you get my drift:

"You must place a number in every box. The numbers must start from one, and
be sequential".

That is basically it. So, for example, you can (and I have many times) give

a 1 and 2 to a couple of people who are highly unlikely to win, and give 3 and 4 to the major parties. Assuming a major party victory, your vote ends up, in full strength, being counted as a vote for whoever you put 3rd, just as if you voted them as 1. As they count the votes, once it is established that a given candidate cannot possibly win, their preferences are distributed to other candidates, if you get my drift. At the end of the count, every single valid vote will be in one of two piles, being the victor, or the runner up.

Additionally, if you read my legal paraphrase above, there is a little quirk in the system. It was found in a court of law that placing " 1 2 3 3 " in your boxes counted as being sequential. As a result, for example, you can deliberately vote for one person, or another, but refuse to allow your vote to go to any of your non-preferences. As you can see, this quirk is an amazingly powerful little tool for democracy. Of course the "powers that be" didn't like that at all. Unfortunately for them, fortunately for us, changing the voting system requires a referendum, so the whole country would have to be informed of the issue and would then vote on it. The powers that be would have known that such an event would serve only to educate the public on how powerful this tool could be, and the vote would likely not go in their favour, so the "quirk" still exists. The bad news is that they actually made it illegal to publicise it. A couple of years back somebody was actually put in prison for a couple of years for informing the public of a perfectly legal way to vote.

Go figure.

But that's the system. Basically if you number each candidate sequentially in order of preference, until you run out of people you like, at which point you put the same number in each box. Assuming you haven't used the quirk to avoid your vote ending up with somebody you dislike, you will always end up with a full strength vote against one of the two most popular candidates.

I actually think our system is really good. If the Australian public knew how to use it, and, for that matter, who to vote for for their own best interests, it would work pretty well methinks.

Cheers,
Kim.

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [DJ](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 04:34:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Kim" <hiddenounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:471fff80\$1@linux...
>
>>How does your preferential system work?

>
> It's pretty basic, but effective for mine. Imagine you have 4 candidates.
> You get four boxes. I am paraphrasing here, but the paraphrase will be
> "conceptually
> accurate" if you get my drift:
>
> "You must place a number in every box. The numbers must start from one,
> and
> be sequential".
>
> That is basically it. So, for example, you can (and I have many times)
> give
> a 1 and 2 to a couple of people who are highly unlikely to win, and give
> 3 and 4 to the major parties. Assuming a major party victory, your vote
> ends
> up, in full strength, being counted as a vote for whoever you put 3rd,
> just
> as if you voted them as 1. As they count the votes, once it is established
> that a given candidate cannot possibly win, their preferences are
> distributed
> to other candidates, if you get my drift. At the end of the count, every
> single valid vote will be in one of two piles, being the victor, or the
> runner
> up.
>
> Additionally, if you read my legal paraphrase above, there is a little
> quirk
> in the system. It was found in a court of law that placing " 1 2 3 3
> " in your boxes counted as being sequential. As a result, for example, you
> can deliberately vote for one person, or another, but refuse to allow your
> vote to go to any of your non-preferences. As you can see, this quirk is
> an amazingly powerful little tool for democracy. Of course the "powers
> that
> be" didn't like that at all. Unfortunately for them, fortunately for us,
> changing the voting system requires a referendum, so the whole country
> would
> have to be informed of the issue and would then vote on it. The powers
> that
> be would have known that such an event would serve only to educate the
> public
> on how powerful this tool could be, and the vote would likely not go in
> their
> favour, so the "quirk" still exists. The bad news is that they actually
> made
> it illegal to publicise it. A couple of years back somebody was actually
> put in prison for a couple of years for informing the public of a
> perfectly
> legal way to vote.

>
> Go figure.
>
> But that's the system. Basically if you number each candidate sequentially
> in order of preference, until you run out of people you like, at which
> point
> you put the same number in each box. Assuming you haven't used the quirk
> to avoid your vote ending up with somebody you dislike, you will always
> end
> up with a full strength vote against one of the two most popular
> candidates.
>
> I actually think our system is really good. If the Australian public knew
> how to use it, and, for that matter, who to vote for for their own best
> interests,
> it would work pretty well methinks.
>
> Cheers,
> Kim.

Well.....if we had such a system here, then the liberals could get all of the fraudulent votes from the undocumented alien residents, and a bunch of dead people that they trot out to pad the rolls with every election cycle, not publicize this (about as likely as the sun exploding at noon tomorrow) and use as a "no confidence" bludgeon to grind every ballot to a halt here.

Cool!!!

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Rich Lamanna](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 04:40:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I can't take any more of these people. Make it stop!

Rich

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
news:471ed2be@linux...

> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry to
> rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch into
the
> white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover from it,
ever.
> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God
help
> us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>

> http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303
>
> AA
>
>
> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
> news:471ec45e@linux...
> > Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
> >
> > Sorry, couldn't resist.
> > Rich
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Kim](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 05:53:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>Well.....if we had such a system here, then the liberals could get all
>of
>the fraudulent votes from the undocumented alien residents,and a bunch of

>dead people that they trot out to pad the rolls with every election cycle,

>not publicize this (about as likely as the sun exploding at noon tomorrow)

>and use as a "no confidence" bludgeon to grind every ballot to a halt here.

In that case, the best thing to do would be to throw your hands up in the
air and say "Why bother?". ;o)

Cheers,
Kim.

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 06:13:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dead people and actual aliens have been trending Republican...

Cheers,

-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:

- > Well.....if we had such a system here, then the liberals could get all of
- > the fraudulent votes from the undocumented alien residents, and a bunch of
- > dead people that they trot out to pad the rolls with every election cycle,
- > not publicize this (about as likely as the sun exploding at noon tomorrow)
- > and use as a "no confidence" bludgeon to grind every ballot to a halt here.
- >
- > Cool!!!
- >
- >

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 06:17:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So your "quirk" is almost like having a ballot space for "none of the above?"

Because that's another improvement I wouldn't mind seeing.

It sounds like your preferential voting system is leading the way, and we in the USA could learn a thing or two from Australia.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Kim wrote:

- >> How does your preferential system work?
- >
- > It's pretty basic, but effective for mine. Imagine you have 4 candidates.
- > You get four boxes. I am paraphrasing here, but the paraphrase will be "conceptually accurate" if you get my drift:
- >
- > "You must place a number in every box. The numbers must start from one, and
- > be sequential".
- >
- > That is basically it. So, for example, you can (and I have many times) give
- > a 1 and 2 to a couple of people who are highly unlikely to win, and give
- > 3 and 4 to the major parties. Assuming a major party victory, your vote ends
- > up, in full strength, being counted as a vote for whoever you put 3rd, just

> as if you voted them as 1. As they count the votes, once it is established
> that a given candidate cannot possibly win, their preferences are distributed
> to other candidates, if you get my drift. At the end of the count, every
> single valid vote will be in one of two piles, being the victor, or the runner
> up.
>
> Additionally, if you read my legal paraphrase above, there is a little quirk
> in the system. It was found in a court of law that placing " 1 2 3 3
> " in your boxes counted as being sequential. As a result, for example, you
> can deliberately vote for one person, or another, but refuse to allow your
> vote to go to any of your non-preferences. As you can see, this quirk is
> an amazingly powerful little tool for democracy. Of course the "powers that
> be" didn't like that at all. Unfortunately for them, fortunately for us,
> changing the voting system requires a referendum, so the whole country would
> have to be informed of the issue and would then vote on it. The powers that
> be would have known that such an event would serve only to educate the public
> on how powerful this tool could be, and the vote would likely not go in their
> favour, so the "quirk" still exists. The bad news is that they actually made
> it illegal to publicise it. A couple of years back somebody was actually
> put in prison for a couple of years for informing the public of a perfectly
> legal way to vote.
>
> Go figure.
>
> But that's the system. Basically if you number each candidate sequentially
> in order of preference, until you run out of people you like, at which point
> you put the same number in each box. Assuming you haven't used the quirk
> to avoid your vote ending up with somebody you dislike, you will always end
> up with a full strength vote against one of the two most popular candidates.
>
> I actually think our system is really good. If the Australian public knew
> how to use it, and, for that matter, who to vote for for their own best interests,
> it would work pretty well methinks.
>
> Cheers,
> Kim.

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Kim](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 06:59:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeh, I actually think it's pretty close to ideal. I have given it thought over the years and can't really work out anything I could justifiably change and say "That would make it better". Any other modifications risk things like votes not ending up equal, or incorrect votes being included which don't reflect the voters intention, etc.

Clearly it should be legal to publicise it, but aside from that, I reckon it's a very nice system. Rare in political land...

Cheers,
Kim.

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
>So your "quirk" is almost like having a ballot space for "none of the
>above?"
>
>Because that's another improvement I wouldn't mind seeing.
>
>It sounds like your preferential voting system is leading the way, and
>we in the USA could learn a thing or two from Australia.

>
>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKruz.com

>
>

>Kim wrote:

>>> How does your preferential system work?

>>

>> It's pretty basic, but effective for mine. Imagine you have 4 candidates.

>> You get four boxes. I am paraphrasing here, but the paraphrase will be
"conceptually

>> accurate" if you get my drift:

>>

>> "You must place a number in every box. The numbers must start from one,
and

>> be sequential".

>>

>> That is basically it. So, for example, you can (and I have many times)
give

>> a 1 and 2 to a couple of people who are highly unlikely to win, and give

>> 3 and 4 to the major parties. Assuming a major party victory, your vote
ends

>> up, in full strength, being counted as a vote for whoever you put 3rd,
just

>> as if you voted them as 1. As they count the votes, once it is established

>> that a given candidate cannot possibly win, their preferences are distributed

>> to other candidates, if you get my drift. At the end of the count, every

>> single valid vote will be in one of two piles, being the victor, or the
runner

>> up.

>>

>> Additionally, if you read my legal paraphrase above, there is a little

quirk

>> in the system. It was found in a court of law that placing " 1 2 3
3

>> " in your boxes counted as being sequential. As a result, for example,
you

>> can deliberately vote for one person, or another, but refuse to allow
your

>> vote to go to any of your non-preferences. As you can see, this quirk
is

>> an amazingly powerful little tool for democracy. Of course the "powers
that

>> be" didn't like that at all. Unfortunately for them, fortunately for us,

>> changing the voting system requires a referendum, so the whole country
would

>> have to be informed of the issue and would then vote on it. The powers
that

>> be would have known that such an event would serve only to educate the
public

>> on how powerful this tool could be, and the vote would likely not go in
their

>> favour, so the "quirk" still exists. The bad new is that they actually
made

>> it illegal to publicise it. A couple of years back somebody was actually

>> put in prison for a couple of years for informing the public of a perfectly

>> legal way to vote.

>>

>> Go figure.

>>

>> But that's the system. Basically if you number each candidate sequentially

>> in order of preference, until you run out of people you like, at which
point

>> you put the same number in each box. Assuming you haven't used the quirk

>> to avoid your vote ending up with somebody you dislike, you will always
end

>> up with a full strength vote against one of the two most popular candidates.

>>

>> I actually think our system is really good. If the Australian public knew

>> how to use it, and, for that matter, who to vote for for their own best
interests,

>> it would work pretty well methinks.

>>

>> Cheers,

>> Kim.

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!

Posted by [Sarah](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 10:10:54 GMT

DJ,

You really, really need to read Richard Clarke 's "Against All Enemies" before you insist that Clinton ignored Bin Laden. It's a bit of a dry read at times, but it makes pretty clear who ignored the Al Qaeda threat.

Of course, you're free to buy into some party line BS discrediting Richard Clarke, but I haven't actually heard any, and I have no reason to doubt his story, especially considering that before Clinton, he worked for Reagan and King George's dad. That's a total of three republican presidents. :)

S

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote in message news:471f7235@linux...

>

> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:471f602a\$1 @linux...

>>

>> Hey Deej,

>>

>> You can respond off list if you like, but I've never been able to

>> understand

>> the vitriol that some types of conservatives (remember, I consider myself

>> a conservative) for the Clintons. I eventually figured it out with Bill,

>> I think it was personal. So many 'social conservatives' spend their lives

>> doing what they're supposed to do, staying out of trouble, denying

>> themselves

>> things they would like to enjoy, all in the belief that it's the right

>> thing

>> to do for themselves and society. Then Bill shows up, a draft dodging,

>> pot

>> smoking, wife cheating hick from the STICKS of Arkansas who by rights

>> should

>> have been a city council member in Little Rock driving a 12 year old El

>> Dorado.

>> He never denied himself a damn thing, from Biggie Fries to fancy cigars

>> to

>> hummers from interns, and he got to be president fer effs sake. So, he's

>> a personal affront, which I get.

>

> I "dodged" the draft by staying in school. I've never cheated on my wife,

> but before I married I did cheat "with" certain of others' wives (and

> somethimes I was even aware that they "were" wives). I "did" inhale

> (among other more radical and destructive behaviours) and now the world is

> a better place (trust me on this) because I no longer do this, but I don't

> really have a problem with others partaking of their substance of choice,
> up to the point that it infringes on my safety.....and back
> during my salad days, I had no problem lying through my teeth so stay out
> of trouble regarding possible repercussions from various entities who took
> issue with my philandering and recreational hobbies. My SAT scores in
> 1968 could have easily landed me a spot at an ivy league institution but,
> being a Texas hick, and all, I stayed in the south where I felt I could do
> the most damage. :). I really had no problem with Bills history and
> behavioural propensities. Hell, I could really relate to the guy. He and I
> had some things in common and I would be the ultimate hypocrite to judge
> him on moral grounds. OTOH, I certainly had no business being president.
>
> Problem with Bill was that he was supposed o be watching the store and
> thinking in terms of our national security and energy policy (which are
> synonymous and completely interrelated) instead of running a popularity
> contest based on global opinion polls. I don't have the time right now to
> rehash all of his disastrous energy and foriegn policy decisions, but
> first and foremost, IMO, was to make sure that our "allies" didn't play us
> and do exactly what they did with turning the sanctions on Sadaam to his
> advantage and "balancing the budget" on the back of cheap oil while
> ignoring the declaration of war that was publicly broadcast by Bin Ladin
> and discouraging domestic energy production while simultaneously ramping
> up petrochemical imports as a quick fix to create the illusion of a healty
> economy propped up on the fantasy that OPEC would be "our buddies".
>
>>
>> However, Hillary seems to me to be deeply, deeply vanilla. She was
>> rabidly
>> pro Iraq war, is saber rattling against Iran and Syria, wants to expand
>> NATO
>> to Russia's doorstep, is probably the most pro-Israel candidate
>> imaginable,
>> and more than any other leading Democrat appears like she might actually
>> be a teensy bit Christian. Not a Bible thumper of course, but her
>> occasional
>> statements about god and family sound at least potentially sincere. So,
>> and
>> I'm asking this sincerely, why is she diabolical? Not annoying (she is),
>> power hungry (comes with wanting the job), unwilling to answer questions
>> straight (so are they all), or maybe a dyke (who cares). But what is
>> diabolical
>> about here, and what will she DO if elected that is so awful and radical
>> and dangerous?
>
>I get your point. I just don't trust her because she was 1/2 of
> the disaster that was Biliary. She's the epitome of a calculating
> opportunist.....which, come to think of it, may be exactly what we might
> need as Secretary of State, or Secretary of War.....but at the same

> time, there something very Talleyrand'esque about both Biliary/Hilbilly
> which, in the end, serves their personal interests at the expense of the
> national interest. Just look at how popular Bill Clinton is after the
> incredible damage (by omission and incompetence, if nothing else) he did
> to our national security by allowing the situation in Iraq to fester under
> the watchful eye of the UN. I think that the enduring "cult of Bill", says
> more about the idiocy of the American public than it does about the
> Clinton's though. The Clinton's, being smartn'all, recognize it and feed
> off it like catfish in a pond full of blood bait.
>
>>
>> Lastly, I've been telling my lefty academic friends for years that
>> they're
>> going to find religion at some point about states rights. From gay
>> marriage
>> to medical pot nearly every pet issue for lefties will get squashed by
>> federal
>> lawmakers and the federal judiciary. The lefties are going to have to
>> fight
>> for the right of (their own) states to legislate on those issues. They
>> scream
>> and yell and hem and haw and tell me I'm nuts but they have yet to come
>> up
>> with a compelling argument to counter mine. Conservatives (not the ones
>> like
>> me, the other kinds) are going to get their comeuppance probably after
>> the
>> next election for executive power. Seems like a great idea to decide the
>> president is above the law when you're guy is president, but the history
>> of this country is the gradual erosion of judicial and legislative power,
>> i.e. the executive branch rarely gives anything back. I suspect any
>> Democrat
>> who runs against any of the current Republicans will win, and then all of
>> that executive power wrenched away from Congress will be in the hands of
>> the other party. Law of unintended consequences, but I for one will have
>> a hearty belly laugh when the Rush Limbaugh set starts howling about some
>> abuse of executive power when a Democrat is the abuser.
>>
>> Anyway, enlighten me about Hillary.
>
> I think those who are howling about how Bush
> ignores/circumvents/reinterprets the law are going to be in for more of
> the
> same old same old, but it's going to be less about a national security
> agenda and more about a "Hillary" agenda, which will be determined by
> popularity polls and their uberleftist buddies in Hollywood.
>
> ;o)

>
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>>>
>>>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>>>news:471ed2be@linux...
>>>> I'm really starting to like Rudi..... try this one out for size. Sorry
>> to
>>>> rant about political stuff, but if we let this crazed crooked b**ch
>>>> into
>>
>>>> the white house again she'll so train wreck us we may not recover from
>> it,
>>>> ever.
>>>> I'm not opposed to a woman in the white house in the slightest, but God
>>
>>>> help us all if her broom gets parked out on the lawn.
>>>>
>>>> <http://youtube.com/watch?v=xq8aopATYyw&feature=bz303>
>>>>
>>>> AA
>>>>
>>>
>>>The era of Hilbilly is fast approaching. It ain't gonna' be pretty. She's
>> as
>>>smart as she is diabolical.
>>>
>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:471ec45e@linux...
>>>>> Rudi Giuliani's push to save America.....
>>>>>
>>>>> Sorry, couldn't resist.
>>>>> Rich
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 12:13:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kim, that's a very smart system.

Kim wrote:

>> How does your preferential system work?

>
> It's pretty basic, but effective for mine. Imagine you have 4 candidates.
> You get four boxes. I am paraphrasing here, but the paraphrase will be "conceptually
> accurate" if you get my drift:
>
> "You must place a number in every box. The numbers must start from one, and
> be sequential".
>
> That is basically it. So, for example, you can (and I have many times) give
> a 1 and 2 to a couple of people who are highly unlikely to win, and give
> 3 and 4 to the major parties. Assuming a major party victory, your vote ends
> up, in full strength, being counted as a vote for whoever you put 3rd, just
> as if you voted them as 1. As they count the votes, once it is established
> that a given candidate cannot possibly win, their preferences are distributed
> to other candidates, if you get my drift. At the end of the count, every
> single valid vote will be in one of two piles, being the victor, or the runner
> up.
>
> Additionally, if you read my legal paraphrase above, there is a little quirk
> in the system. It was found in a court of law that placing " 1 2 3 3
> " in your boxes counted as being sequential. As a result, for example, you
> can deliberately vote for one person, or another, but refuse to allow your
> vote to go to any of your non-preferences. As you can see, this quirk is
> an amazingly powerful little tool for democracy. Of course the "powers that
> be" didn't like that at all. Unfortunately for them, fortunately for us,
> changing the voting system requires a referendum, so the whole country would
> have to be informed of the issue and would then vote on it. The powers that
> be would have known that such an event would serve only to educate the public
> on how powerful this tool could be, and the vote would likely not go in their
> favour, so the "quirk" still exists. The bad news is that they actually made
> it illegal to publicise it. A couple of years back somebody was actually
> put in prison for a couple of years for informing the public of a perfectly
> legal way to vote.
>
> Go figure.
>
> But that's the system. Basically if you number each candidate sequentially
> in order of preference, until you run out of people you like, at which point
> you put the same number in each box. Assuming you haven't used the quirk
> to avoid your vote ending up with somebody you dislike, you will always end
> up with a full strength vote against one of the two most popular candidates.

>
> I actually think our system is really good. If the Australian public knew
> how to use it, and, for that matter, who to vote for for their own best interests,
> it would work pretty well methinks.
>
> Cheers,
> Kim.

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 12:42:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Not surprising. Even if presented with all the facts, a large percent of the population are not actually bright enough to judge who is better able to lead anyway, so looks is what they use.

That's precisely why democracy does not work.

A better system is a meritocracy, in which the person's past proven production record determines on a clear analytical level who should be promoted up the ladder. This would apply throughout the government, from the bottom to the top.

Any job can be measured statistically if you know what the valuable final product of the job is. Some jobs, like in sales or sports are obvious. When I do marketing, my performance is measured by the number of leads I generate (among other things). A band's performance can be measured by the amount of applause they get - standing O makes double points - that kind of thing. Teachers can be measured by test scores (that's why the tests keep getting easier).

Even personal betterment can be measured. In Scientology, when people receive counseling, they take 3 tests after every 12.5 hours of counseling: the Oxford Capacity Analysis (a personality test), an IQ test and an aptitude test. If their scores are not getting better there is something wrong and gets corrected so they do get better, smarter and more able.

Anything worthwhile has a product that can be measured.

So, with a system that measures actual valuable production instead of looks, personality, promises, race, sex, etc, the most able, who are most valuable to society are promoted up the ladder, and the less able can be corrected, retrained, encouraged, etc. Everybody wins.

Had we a system like that, Bush would never have been elected, nor Clinton, nor just about any of the failures we have endured of late.

Meritocracy works in sports, in business. Why not use it in government.

steve the artguy wrote:

> Puts this whole discussion in a somewhat meta-light:

>

> going with yer gut predicts actual election results

>

> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?chanID=sa003&articleID=CE4CD4FE-E7F2-99DF-350A53757475700D&ref=rss>

>

> -steve

>

>

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

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

>>> Two things, Don. First, non of this explains why the Clintons IN PARTICULAR
>>> generate the visceral hatred they do. Nobody seems to hate Russ Feingold
>>> or Barney Frank PERSONALLY. I explain the PERSONAL hatred of the Clintons
>>> the way I do for those reasons.

>> Neither had the power of the Clintons. Put Barney Frank in the
>> White House and watch what happens...

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>> As far as being a lying, cheating, showboating asshole, well he's a politician.
>>> That's what they are, that's what they do.

>> Not true. Not the case with Gerald Ford, nor Jimmy Carter,
>> in just recent memory.

>>

>>

>>

>>> If in a single generation we have a handful of actual decent people
>>> in national politics we're lucky, and those handful are almost universally
>>> demonized. For example, I think Ron Paul is tells us what he believes and
>>> would act on it. Jimmy Carter was the same way. I think Pat Buchanan is

>> another,

>>> and so is Ralph Nader.

>> Nader is a jerk and a self-promoter, but we agree on the point.

>>

>> The problem with Ron Paul is not that he wouldn't tell the
>> truth, but as with Carter, would his version of truth be wise?

>>

>>

>>> Second, and a point of order, OBL might have drawn some conclusions from
>>> Somalia but he specifically said that it was Lebanon where he turned on

>> the

>>> USA.
>> There is a direct quote from him basing his view about the USA
>> specifically on Somalia. Lebenon was certainly an issue as
>> well, but exactly how does that excuse Bill??
>>
>>
>>> Remember (or more likely don't, since it's problematic for your binary
>>> world) that OBL was a happy recipient of US military and logistical support
>>> when we were bankrolling the muj against the Soviets.
>>
>> Well, this might be difficult for your postmodern delusions to
>> coexist with, but all of it adds up, and no one gets a pass....
>>
>> The hate for Reagan, from the left, was pretty virulent if you
>> remember.
>>
>>
>>> Was
>>> he, and the Democrats, unique in such cowardice? Not by a long shot.
>> Unique is not the issue, nor will it matter at all to history.
>> I am glad you agree about Clinton though.
>>
>> Now, the hard part. Who to elect?
>>
>> hmmm...
>>
>> We always say that "big business" is the problem, or the
>> religious right, or the secular left, or the Soros crowd, but
>> really, suppose the country has simply gotten too big
>> to govern from a central point? Suppose the damn office of
>> the president is simply a rockstar contest with the winner
>> getting to hang with Bono? Suppose there is no one to
>> save us? then what?
>>
>> DC
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 00:09:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> Why not use it in government.

Frankly, because lobbying would die and the super rich will never have that.
AA

"Bill L" <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote in message news:4720908d@linux...
> Not surprising. Even if presented with all the facts, a large percent of
> the population are not actually bright enough to judge who is better able
> to lead anyway, so looks is what they use.
>
> That's precisely why democracy does not work.
>
> A better system is a meritocracy, in which the person's past proven
> production record determines on a clear analytical level who should be
> promoted up the ladder. This would apply throughout the government, from
> the bottom to the top.
>
> Any job can be measured statistically if you know what the valuable final
> product of the job is. Some jobs, like in sales or sports are obvious.
> When I do marketing, my performance is measured by the number of leads I
> generate (among other things). A band's performance can be measured by the
> amount of applause they get - standing O makes double points - that kind
> of thing. Teachers can be measured by test scores (that's why the tests
> keep getting easier).
>
> Even personal betterment can be measured. In Scientology, when people
> receive counseling, they take 3 tests after every 12.5 hours of
> counseling: the Oxford Capacity Analysis (a personality test), an IQ test
> and an aptitude test. If their scores are not getting better there is
> something wrong and gets corrected so they do get better, smarter and more
> able.
>
> Anything worthwhile has a product that can be measured.
>
> So, with a system that measures actual valuable production instead of
> looks, personality, promises, race, sex, etc, the most able, who are most
> valuable to society are promoted up the ladder, and the less able can be
> corrected, retrained, encouraged, etc. Everybody wins.
>
> Had we a system like that, Bush would never have been elected, nor
> Clinton, nor just about any of the failures we have endured of late.
>
> Meritocracy works in sports, in business. Why not use it in government.
>
> steve the artguy wrote:
>> Puts this whole discussion in a somewhat meta-light:
>>
>> going with yer gut predicts actual election results
>>
>> <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?chanID=sa003&articleID=CE4CD4FE-E7F2-99DF-350A53757475700D&ref=rss>
>>
>> -steve

>>
>>
>> "DC" <dc@spammersintheovaloffice.com> wrote:
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>> Two things, Don. First, non of this explains why the Clintons IN
>>>> PARTICULAR
>>>> generate the visceral hatred they do. Nobody seems to hate Russ
>>>> Feingold
>>>> or Barney Frank PERSONALLY. I explain the PERSONAL hatred of the
>>>> Clintons
>>>> the way I do for those reasons.
>>> Neither had the power of the Clintons. Put Barney Frank in the
>>> White House and watch what happens...
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> As far as being a lying, cheating, showboating asshole, well he's a
>>>> politician.
>>>> That's what they are, that's what they do.
>>> Not true. Not the case with Gerald Ford, nor Jimmy Carter,
>>> in just recent memory.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> If in a single generation we have a handful of actual decent people
>>>> in national politics we're lucky, and those handful are almost
>>>> universally
>>>> demonized. For example, I think Ron Paul is tells us what he believes
>>>> and
>>>> would act on it. Jimmy Carter was the same way. I think Pat Buchanan is
>>> another,
>>>> and so is Ralph Nader.
>>> Nader is a jerk and a self-promoter, but we agree on the point.
>>>
>>> The problem with Ron Paul is not that he wouldn't tell the
>>> truth, but as with Carter, would his version of truth be wise?
>>>
>>>
>>>> Second, and a point of order, OBL might have drawn some conclusions
>>>> from
>>>> Somalia but he specifically said that it was Lebanon where he turned on
>>> the
>>>> USA.
>>> There is a direct quote from him basing his view about the USA
>>> specifically on Somalia. Lebenon was certainly an issue as
>>> well, but exactly how does that excuse Bill??
>>>

>>>
>>>> Remember (or more likely don't, since it's problematic for your binary
>>>> world) that OBL was a happy recipient of US military and logistical
>>>> support
>>>> when we were bankrolling the muj against the Soviets.
>>>
>>> Well, this might be difficult for your postmodern delusions to
>>> coexist with, but all of it adds up, and no one gets a pass....
>>>
>>> The hate for Reagan, from the left, was pretty virulent if you
>>> remember.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Was
>>>> he, and the Democrats, unique in such cowardice? Not by a long shot.
>>> Unique is not the issue, nor will it matter at all to history.
>>> I am glad you agree about Clinton though.
>>>
>>> Now, the hard part. Who to elect?
>>>
>>> hmmm...
>>>
>>> We always say that "big business" is the problem, or the
>>> religious right, or the secular left, or the Soros crowd, but
>>> really, suppose the country has simply gotten too big
>>> to govern from a central point? Suppose the damn office of
>>> the president is simply a rockstar contest with the winner
>>> getting to hang with Bono? Suppose there is no one to save us? then
>>> what?
>>>
>>> DC
>>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 00:29:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Bill,

You clearly need medication. With that kind of logic America would end up with an electoral college instead of a true democracy.

Chuck

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>Not surprising. Even if presented with all the facts, a large percent of

>the population are not actually bright enough to judge who is better

>able to lead anyway, so looks is what they use.

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 02:31:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Medication? Never touch the stuff. As I like to say, "You'd have to be crazy to go to a psychiatrist!"

chuck duffy wrote:

> Bill,
>
> You clearly need medication. With that kind of logic America would end up
> with an electoral college instead of a true democracy.
>
> Chuck
> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>> Not surprising. Even if presented with all the facts, a large percent of
>
>> the population are not actually bright enough to judge who is better
>> able to lead anyway, so looks is what they use.
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Kim](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 06:46:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I actually agree with both of you here. ;o)

What Bill is expressing, I think, is an actual problem, but for the reason Chuck has clearly stated, you can't run a "democracy" that way.

The harsh truth however is that it can be extremely difficult for even the most intelligent to:

(*) Accurately guess what a leader will be like exactly once in power and:
(*) Even ignoring the last point, find a candidate in the list who fits the bill for them

There is a third point which can make this problem worse of course, being that the U.S. has no preferential voting and hence everybody wants to vote for somebody who at least has a chance of winning in case their vote counts for nothing, making the problem worse. Furthermore, in Australia we have preferential voting, but people don't seem to appreciate the idea that you can vote for anybody you like and your vote will still have full impact even

if you end up on your 3rd preference. You still get heard.

I think both of you have very real points though. They are both valid, in a sense. Bill is being a little harsh perhaps in basically stating it's because people are stupid, but I think he's trying to express frustration at the fact that a lot of people really do vote for "the wrong person for them", and in that, he's right. I think we've all done it, though some do it more than others.

Cheers,
Kim.

"chuck duffy " <c@c.com> wrote:

>
>Bill,
>
>You clearly need medication. With that kind of logic America would end up
>with an electoral college instead of a true democracy.
>
>Chuck
>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:
>>Not surprising. Even if presented with all the facts, a large percent of
>
>>the population are not actually bright enough to judge who is better
>>able to lead anyway, so looks is what they use.
>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 07:42:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Kim" <hiddenounds@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
>
>I actually agree with both of you here. ;o)
>
>What Bill is expressing, I think, is an actual problem, but
>for the reason Chuck has clearly stated, you can't run
> a "democracy" that way.

And one other reason... to run a Meritocracy to the extreme extent of what Bill suggests, borders on Eugenics. Once you discovered what you "could" do, you'd be fine-tuning fetuses, ferpetes'sakes.

Bill, I love ya man, but Clearwater's a whole 'nother planet

from the rest of the world and i'm sure you of all people know that!

Neil

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 13:32:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Neil,

It seems like you're trying to paint what I wrote as a "crazy Scientology" idea. That's kind of a cheap shot, IMHO. Why not address what I wrote? Address the idea. Think it through and see if it doesn't make sense.

If you are running a sales department, don't you reward the top producers with the most pay, or do you reward the guy with the best hair or the woman with the finest breasts?

If you are coaching a sports team, don't you play the best athletes the most and pay them most?

In a meritocracy, everybody gets the same chance to succeed, but the fact is not everybody can do as well as everybody else. Rewarding people with seniority, popularity or "pull" is a sure way to make your group fail.

I wouldn't touch genetics unless I were only trying for big and strong or good looking, or some physical thing that is actually a body trait. Intelligence comes from the spiritual being, coupled with education and knowledge, and one's mental abilities are one's own, not from brains.

Neil, what makes you talented at music? You do! Not your brain.

Look at any technology aimed at improving people's behavior or mental faculties by addressing the brain or the physical aspects of man. They don't work. You have such things as: the wide range of "medications" that only make people stupider or apathetic toward life; electric shock (still practiced widely); lobotomy.

These things universally make man worse, because they are addressing the wrong source. Historically when the spiritual aspects of man are addressed, as in religions (Christianity, Buddhism, Scientology, etc), people get better and societies improve.

Neil wrote:

> "Kim" <hidensounds@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>
>> I actually agree with both of you here. ;o)
>>
>> What Bill is expressing, I think, is an actual problem, but
>> for the reason Chuck has clearly stated, you can't run
>> a "democracy" that way.
>
> And one other reason... to run a Meritocracy to the extreme
> extent of what Bill suggests, borders on Eugenics. Once you
> discovered what you "could" do, you'd be fine-tuning fetuses,
> ferpetes'sakes.
>
> Bill, I love ya man, but Clearwater's a whole 'nother planet
> from the rest of the world and i'm sure you of all people know
> that!
>
> Neil

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 14:29:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Bill,

I know, I was making a very small joke, probably in poor taste :-) Hope you weren't offended.

Chuck

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>Medication? Never touch the stuff. As I like to say, "You'd have to be
>crazy to go to a psychiatrist!"

>

>chuck duffy wrote:

>> Bill,

>>

>> You clearly need medication. With that kind of logic America would end
up

>> with an electoral college instead of a true democracy.

>>

>> Chuck

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

>>> Not surprising. Even if presented with all the facts, a large percent
of

>>

>>> the population are not actually bright enough to judge who is better

>>> able to lead anyway, so looks is what they use.

>>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!

Posted by [steve the artguy](#) on Fri, 26 Oct 2007 22:07:17 GMT

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

Chuck-

of course, Bill can speak for himself, but the fact that he answered your joke with a joke tells me he gets your joke.

-steve

"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>

>Bill,

>

>I know, I was making a very small joke, probably in poor taste :-) Hope you

>weren't offended.

>

>Chuck

>

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

>>Medication? Never touch the stuff. As I like to say, "You'd have to be

>>crazy to go to a psychiatrist!"

>>

>>chuck duffy wrote:

>>> Bill,

>>>

>>> You clearly need medication. With that kind of logic America would end

>up

>>> with an electoral college instead of a true democracy.

>>>

>>> Chuck

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

>>>> Not surprising. Even if presented with all the facts, a large percent

>of

>>>

>>>> the population are not actually bright enough to judge who is better

>

>>>> able to lead anyway, so looks is what they use.

>>>

>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Neil](#) on Sat, 27 Oct 2007 02:06:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>Neil,

>

>It seems like you're trying to paint what I wrote as a "crazy
>Scientology" idea. That's kind of a cheap shot, IMHO.

Ok , sorry if you feel that way - it wasn't intended as a cheap shot - you know I've never given you grief about your Scientology before, even when you've alluded to some it's beliefs... I only brought it up because you came right out & "said the word". Here's the thing... I just think that you live in a pretty insular world down there - I mean, you've got more Scientologists per square inch in Clearwater than if John Travolta & Tom Cruise threw a party together in an elevator & all their friends showed up - so your views as to what really should or could "work" are tempered by being constantly surrounded by a couple hundred thousand people who all share the same views. IOW, you get validation on damn near everything you think or say down there!

So, what I meant by getting into eugenics is that you can't just fine-tune politicians to be a certain way, because the reason they get into that field is due to certain predispositions they have to begin with (lust for power, narcissism, etc), that make it impossible for them to perform for the betterment of others, it's really all about what's best for them - I'm really now quite convinced of this - so you'd ultimately have to start literally breeding people to be better politicians if you wanted to truly run that system as a meritocracy.

BTW, meritocracies don't really exist... let's take your sports analogy... you think Barry Bonds got signed again this past year because he'd help the Giants win? No, he got signed because they knew he'd put butts in seats as he pursued his narcissistic chase for the home run record - did he EVER lay down an easy sacrifice bunt when that might have been the best way to make to help the team win? No, he swung for the fences every time. Granted, sometimes that DID help the team win, but other times maybe a sacrifice bunt woulda been the ticket. Sales departments? you think ALL of those are meritocracies? Geez, i've seen more that are crony-ocracies; where one guy sucks up to the boss so he gets more accounts thrown at him, gets all the new leads, etc. C'mon - in a perfect world meritocracies would exist, but they really hardly ever do right now, so why do you think that the most corrupt & self-serving

group of all - politicians - wouldn't find a way to corrupt that, as well, were it implemented?

Neil

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Sat, 27 Oct 2007 03:50:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

All cool, amigo.

steve the artguy wrote:

> Chuck-

>

> of course, Bill can speak for himself, but the fact that he answered your
> joke with a joke tells me he gets your joke.

>

> -steve

>

>

> "chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>> Bill,

>>

>> I know, I was making a very small joke, probably in poor taste :-) Hope
> you

>> weren't offended.

>>

>> Chuck

>>

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

>>> Medication? Never touch the stuff. As I like to say, "You'd have to be

>

>>> crazy to go to a psychiatrist!"

>>>

>>> chuck duffy wrote:

>>>> Bill,

>>>>

>>>> You clearly need medication. With that kind of logic America would end
>> up

>>>> with an electoral college instead of a true democracy.

>>>>

>>>> Chuck

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

>>>>> Not surprising. Even if presented with all the facts, a large percent

>> of

>>>>> the population are not actually bright enough to judge who is better

>>>> able to lead anyway, so looks is what they use.

>

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Bill L](#) on Sat, 27 Oct 2007 04:21:17 GMT

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

Neil wrote:

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

>> Neil,

>>

>> It seems like you're trying to paint what I wrote as a "crazy

>> Scientology" idea. That's kind of a cheap shot, IMHO.

>

> Ok , sorry if you feel that way - it wasn't intended as a cheap

> shot - you know I've never given you grief about your

> Scientology before, even when you've alluded to some it's

> beliefs... I only brought it up because you came right out

> & "said the word". Here's the thing... I just think that you

> live in a pretty insular world down there - I mean, you've got

> more Scientologists per square inch in Clearwater than if John

> Travolta & Tom Cruise threw a party together in an elevator &

> all their friends showed up - so you're views as to what really

> should or could "work" are tempered by being constantly

> surrounded by a couple hundred thousand people who all share

> the same views. IOW, you get validation on damn near everything

> you think or say down there!

Neil, you gotta be kidding. We are about .03% of the population of Clearwater, seriously. You want to know how insular my world is? I spent the last year as COO of a telemarketing call center. You ever been in a call center? Put it this way: if we ran drug testing or checked criminal records, there would be NO ONE left in the place. My 2 top sales guys were actual crack addicts, until one of them got arrested right in our lobby, for check forgery. I managed them the same way i would manage anyone else - show me the numbers and you get the prizes; fuck up and you're fired. If rewarding people for production works with crack heads, don't you think it could work with government employees?

Listen man, I've been a professional musician my whole life. How insular can my life be?

>

> So, what I meant be getting into eugenics is that you can't just

> fine-tune politicians to be a certain way, because the reason

> they get into that field is due to certain predispositions

> they have to begin with (lust for power, narcissism, etc), that

- > make it impossible for them to perform for the betterment of
- > others, it's really all about what's best for them - I'm really
- > now quite convinced of this - so you'd ultimately have to start
- > literally breeding people to be better politicians if you
- > wanted to truly run that system as a meritocracy.

First we need to define the purpose of government, then name its valuable products, than put skilled managers in charge of coordinating the communication lines, resources and workers to efficiently produce those products. It does not require "politicians" it requires managers, executives.

- >
- > BTW, meritocracies don't really exist... let's take your sports
- > analogy... you think Barry Bonds got signed again this past year
- > because he'd help the Giants win? No, he got signed because
- > they knew he'd put butts in seats as he pursued his
- > narcissistic chase for the hoem run record - did he EVER lay
- > down an easy sacrifice bunt when that might have been the best
- > way to make to help the team win? No, he swung for the fences
- > every time. Granted, sometimes that DID help the team win, but
- > other times maybe a sacrifice bunt woulda been the ticket.
- > Sales deartments? you think ALL of those are meritocracies?
- > Geez, i've seen more that are crony-ocracies; where one guy
- > sucks up to the boss so he gets more accounts thrown at him,
- > gets all the new leads, etc. C'mon - in a perfect world
- > meritocracies would exist, but they really hardly ever do right
- > now, so why do you think that the most corrupt & self-serving
- > group of all - politicians - wouldn't find a way to corrupt
- > that, as well, were it implemented?

Your example is a perfect one. The professional sports business is about making money (and having fun - let's be real). If Barry Bonds makes the team more money, then he is just as valuable to the team as a great salesman is to a sales organization.

If you know what the product of a group is you can judge the production stats of the members. It's only when you don't understand what the product of a group is that you can't imagine how it can be run better as a meritocracy.

- >
- >
- > Neil
- >

Subject: Re: Rudi's push to save America!!!
Posted by [Neil](#) on Sat, 27 Oct 2007 21:55:08 GMT

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>If you know what the product of a group is you can judge the production

>stats of the members. It's only when you don't understand what the

>product of a group is that you can't imagine how it can be run better as

>a meritocracy.

Good point - so how do we measure the product of that particular group (politicians)? I just think it would be too complicated to measure, because EVERYBODY's their own little special-interest group.

Neil
