

---

Subject: message from democrats  
Posted by [j-cron](#) on Wed, 08 Nov 2006 21:54:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear dismayed conservatives:

I hereby make these promises to you.

We will protect your lives and livelihoods.

We will listen to and respect your beliefs.

We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual orientation, or first language.

We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our country.

We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our own party.

ESPECIALLY in our own party.

We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.

We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.

We will never waste your lives for power.

We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they succumb to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.

If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.

We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
Let's go.

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Wed, 08 Nov 2006 22:32:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm not a Republican, but I'll be ecstatic if that what you say holds true Justin. You'll have to forgive me if don't have much hope anything will change though. Check back with me in 2008 and we'll see how them Dems did.

(ecstatic, boy dat's a pritty big word. I don't know whether I'm ecstatic, or ludicrous!) ;>)

Tony

"j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message news:45524f64\$1@linux...

> Dear dismayed conservatives:

>

> I hereby make these promises to you.

>

> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.

>

> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.

>

> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
> orientation, or first language.

>

> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our country.

>

> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our  
> own party.

>

>

> ESPECIALLY in our own party.

>

> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.

>

> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.

>

> We will never waste your lives for power.

>

> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they succumb  
> to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.

>

> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.

>

> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.

> Let's go.

>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats

Posted by [Colonel Panic](#) on Wed, 08 Nov 2006 22:51:45 GMT

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

---

Meet the new boss, Same as the old boss.

"j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote:

> Dear dismayed conservatives:

>

> I hereby make these promises to you.

>

> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.

>

> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.

>

> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>orientation, or first language.

>

> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our country.

>

> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our  
own  
>party.

>

>

>ESPECIALLY in our own party.

>

>We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.

>

>We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.

>

>We will never waste your lives for power.

>

>We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they succumb  
to

>lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.

>

>If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.

>

>We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.

>Let's go.

>

>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats

Posted by [j-cron](#) on Wed, 08 Nov 2006 23:44:36 GMT

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

yeah exactly. I figured it was a nice uplifting message anyway, but yeah we know the reality. Both parties suck.

I dont even know what party I am anymore. I mostly vote Green because its not the status quo, not that they have a great plan or organization.

I'm sure we'll need to kick the dems out of congress in 12 years too, but maybe for now theres a little light at the end of the tunnel.

"Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message news:455258ee@linux...

> I'm not a Republican, but I'll be ecstatic if that what you say holds true  
> Justin. You'll have to forgive me if don't have much hope anything will  
> change though. Check back with me in 2008 and we'll see how them Dems did.

>  
> (ecstatic, boy dat's a pritty big word. I don't know whether I'm ecstatic,  
> or ludicrous!) ;>)

>  
> Tony

>  
>  
> "j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message  
> news:45524f64\$1@linux...

>> Dear dismayed conservatives:

>>  
>> I hereby make these promises to you.

>>  
>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.

>>  
>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.

>>  
>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>> orientation, or first language.

>>  
>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our  
>> country.

>>  
>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our  
>> own party.

>>  
>>  
>> ESPECIALLY in our own party.

>>  
>> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.

>>  
>> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.

>>  
>> We will never waste your lives for power.

>>  
>> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they succumb  
>> to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.

>>  
>> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.

>>  
>> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
>> Let's go.  
>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [DJ](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 00:34:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

1. It was sort of interesting to see that the Democratic party won by running many conservative candidates. It will be even more interesting to see if they were really conservatives or if they will now show their true colors and march in lockstep with the left wing power structure.
2. The democratic leadership will need to actually be expected to show some leadership instead of just carping about how they don't like what the republicans are doing. They will be held accountable finally, just as the republicans have been.
3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed, and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good economy, the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge. They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not effective, the responsibility will fall in their lap.

Having this party in charge of the House intelligence committee (again) is a scary thought. Alcee Hastings may be heading the House Intelligence Committee. He was once a Fed. judge in Florida who was impeached by a then Democratic (!) Congress in the 80's for leaking secrets about a Fed. trial involving a big-time drug ring and accepting a \$150,000 bribe. He is one of a very few federal judges ever to be removed from office. Is Pelosi going to drain the swamp only to repopulate it with \*convicted\* vermin?

I think the good thing about this is that they are now going to be in a "put up or shut up" situation and there is at least the possibility that they will be called on their whining by the independent voters who put them over the top.

If they are truly as clueless as they appear to be and if they do things like appoint Hastings, start wrecking the economy (a la Rangel), try for a presidential impeachment and cut funding for Iraq, it will be quickly obvious that they are the same old tired socialist flotsam that we swept out in the 90's and they will be tossed out on their respective arses in two years rather than 4 years (as would happen if they won the presidency in 2008). This may be the best of two evils as far as conservatives are

concerned.

I'll hold my breath for a little while and give them the benefit of the doubt. They haven't had one constructive (realistic) idea as of yet but they keep hinting around that they do. It's now time to see if it's all hat, no cowboy and it seems that now, when they are questioned about what they're gonna do, they can't scoot backwards on their asses fast enough now that they will be expected to come up with \*the plan\* that they never had.  
;o)

"j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message news:45524f64\$1@linux...

> Dear dismayed conservatives:

>

> I hereby make these promises to you.

>

> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.

>

> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.

>

> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
> orientation, or first language.

>

> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our country.

>

> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our  
> own party.

>

>

> ESPECIALLY in our own party.

>

> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.

>

> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.

>

> We will never waste your lives for power.

>

> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they succumb  
> to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.

>

> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.

>

> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.

> Let's go.

>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 00:43:04 GMT

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

---

So why didn't they say they would get along before the 7th? Why haven't they done this for the last 40+ years? Why have they been so divisive?

When Abramoff got busted they all got in line and gave money back, but yet they pointed at the Republicans and screamed "Scandal". So typical! "Look at them, they're dirtier than us". When it comes to our interest, both parties are the same. The truth is they are both a bunch of dirty greasy slimy rats.

They are eating our lunch, they sell us out by the second.

They weaken us by them both pointing at each other and saying "look at how dirty those bastards are" They keep us divided on the issues, and they stay in power! They get fat and rich, while the middle class dies. That's how the two party system works, they keep us divided and weak, they stay in power, and we lose!

People we need more than a two party system. We need to take back our government.

We need a government for the people and by the people. We do need change, but the answer is not the Democrats! We need to get rid of all the fat bloated lying lawyer career politicians! WE need to get rid of ALL the lobby groups.

WE need a new justice system. We need a new tax system, We need a complete over haul of the government, it is way too corrupt! Easy to do? NO! Necessary to do yes! Will it happen? Only if you and I decide to come together, be honest, and do it together. We'd have to put our issues aside for ever.

That means we have to stop looking back and playing the blame game! The entitlement mentality is going to break and kill this country.

The powers that be, (Politicians, world banks, etc.) are shifting the wealth of The United States (WE the People) to third world countries. They are selling America off wholesale, right under our noses. They want to rule the world economically. THE NEW WORLD ORDER! WE better wake up fast.

The other issue facing the US is China. If we are not careful we will have Chinese boots on American soil in the next 30 years. Make no mistake, they are planning on it, just do some research on it. They plan to take over the world.

The first step is to see the truth. The second is to stop listening to the politicians and the media. The third is to be honest and come together.

The forth is to take massive action. That means you!

We need change. I hope the Democrats make the right changes, and get the country going in the right direction. Unfortunately I believe they will try to destroy and damage the Republican party, with more scandals and criminal prosecutions so they can stay in power for years and years to come. This will not help the country. They need to focus on getting us back on track,

but they are already talking war with the republicans. That's just dirty politics as usual, not what we need. Lip service is nice, I want to see action. Also prepare for tax increases, they need to buy votes for 2008 with your money.

I hope I'm wrong. I hope this is a new start. We'll see.

political post should be in the general news group section!!!

"j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote:

> Dear dismayed conservatives:

>

> I hereby make these promises to you.

>

> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.

>

> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.

>

> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>orientation, or first language.

>

> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our country.

>

> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our  
own

>party.

>

>

>ESPECIALLY in our own party.

>

>We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.

>

>We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.

>

>We will never waste your lives for power.

>

>We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they succumb  
to

>lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.

>

>If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.

>

>We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.

>Let's go.

>



>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 01:18:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yeah but we like sound bites and these are good ones ! Plus blue is a purty color.

no wrote:

> So why didn't they say they would get along before the 7th? Why haven't they  
> done this for the last 40+ years? Why have they been so divisive?  
>  
> When Abramoff got busted they all got in line and gave money back, but yet  
> they pointed at the Republicans and screamed "Scandal". So typical! "Look  
> at them, they're dirtier than us". When it comes to our interest, both parties  
> are the same. The truth is they are both a bunch of dirty greasy slimy rats.  
> They are eating our lunch, they sell us out by the second.  
>  
> They weaken us by them both pointing at each other and saying "look at how  
> dirty those bastards are" They keep us divided on the issues, and they stay  
> in power! They get fat and rich, while the middle class dies. That's how  
> the two party system works, they keep us divided and weak, they stay in power,  
> and we lose!  
>  
> People we need more than a two party system. We need to take back our government.  
> We need a government for the people and by the people. We do need change,  
> but the answer is not the Democrats! We need to get rid of all the fat bloated  
> lying lawyer career politicians! WE need to get rid of ALL the lobby groups.  
> WE need a new justice system. We need a new tax system, We need a complete  
> over haul of the government, it is way too corrupt! Easy to do? NO! Necessary  
> to do yes! Will it happen? Only if you and I decide to come together, be  
> honest, and do it together. We'd have to put our issues aside for ever.  
> That means we have to stop looking back and playing the blame game! The  
> entitlement mentality is going to break and kill this country.  
>  
> The powers that be, (Politicians, world banks, etc.) are shifting the wealth  
> of The United States (WE the People) to third world countries. They are  
> selling America off wholesale, right under our noses. They want to rule  
> the world economically. THE NEW WORLD ORDER! WE better wake up fast.  
>  
>  
> The other issue facing the US is China. If we are not careful we will have  
> Chinese boots on American soil in the next 30 years. Make no mistake, they  
> are planning on it, just do some research on it. They plan to take over  
> the world.  
>

> The first step is to see the truth. The second is to stop listening to the  
> politicians and the media. The third is to be honest and come together.  
> The fourth is to take massive action. That means you!  
>  
> We need change. I hope the Democrats make the right changes, and get the  
> country going in the right direction. Unfortunately I believe they will  
> try to destroy and damage the Republican party, with more scandals and criminal  
> prosecutions so they can stay in power for years and years to come. This  
> will not help the country. They need to focus on getting us back on track,  
> but they are already talking war with the republicans. That's just dirty  
> politics as usual, not what we need. Lip service is nice, I want to see  
> action. Also prepare for tax increases, they need to buy votes for 2008  
> with your money.  
>  
> I hope I'm wrong. I hope this is a new start. We'll see.  
>  
> political post should be in the general news group section!!!  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> "j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote:  
>> Dear dismayed conservatives:  
>>  
>> I hereby make these promises to you.  
>>  
>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.  
>>  
>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.  
>>  
>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>> orientation, or first language.  
>>  
>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our country.  
>>  
>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our  
> own  
>> party.  
>>  
>>  
>> ESPECIALLY in our own party.  
>>  
>> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.  
>>  
>> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.  
>>  
>> We will never waste your lives for power.  
>>

>> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they succumb  
> to  
>> lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.  
>>  
>> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.  
>>  
>> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
>> Let's go.  
>>  
>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [j-cron](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 02:10:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote in message news:45527532\$1@linux...  
> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,

cool response deej, but can you explain that a bit? There was the internet boom and bust but I dont think Clinton can take credit for that... lol.

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [j-cron](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 02:11:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

you can use some semblance of a real name... dont worry about the domestic spying stuff...

"no" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:45526b88\$1@linux...

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [j-cron](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 02:13:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote in message news:45527532\$1@linux...

> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
> economy,

Thats not really fair or insightful Deej. You need to factor in the fact that Clinton balanced the budget and Bush spends your great grandchildrens money every day.

Somethin to think about.

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 03:40:28 GMT

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

---

You sound a bit grumpy, Deej. Interesting version of events and harsh conjecture. When does that benefit of the doubt actually kick in?

Cheers,

-Jamie

[www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

DJ wrote:

- > 1. It was sort of interesting to see that the Democratic party won by
- > running many conservative candidates. It will be even more interesting to
- > see if they were really conservatives or if they will now show their true
- > colors and march in lockstep with the left wing power structure.
- >
- > 2. The democratic leadership will need to actually be expected to show some
- > leadership instead of just carping about how they don't like what the
- > republicans are doing. They will be held accountable finally, just as the
- > republicans have been.
- >
- > 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,
- > and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good economy,
- > the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.
- > They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not effective,
- > the responsibility will fall in their lap.
- >
- > Having this party in charge of the House intelligence committee (again) is a
- > scary thought. Alcee Hastings may be heading the House Intelligence
- > Committee. He was once a Fed. judge in Florida who was impeached by a then
- > Democratic (!) Congress in the 80's for leaking secrets about a Fed. trial
- > involving a big-time drug ring and accepting a \$150,000 bribe. He is one of
- > a very few federal judges ever to be removed from office. Is Pelosi going
- > to drain the swamp only to repopulate it with \*convicted\* vermin?
- >
- > I think the good thing about this is that they are now going to be in a "put
- > up or shut up" situation and there is at least the possibility that they
- > will be called on their whining by the independent voters who put them over
- > the top.
- >
- > If they are truly as clueless as they appear to be and if they do things
- > like appoint Hastings, start wrecking the economy (a la Rangel), try for a

> presidential impeachment and cut funding for Iraq, it will be quickly  
> obvious that they are the same old tired socialist flotsam that we swept out  
> in the 90's and they will be tossed out on their respective arses in two  
> years rather than 4 years (as would happen if they won the presidency in  
> 2008). This may be the best of two evils as far as conservatives are  
> concerned.

>  
> I'll hold my breath for a little while and give them the benefit of the  
> doubt. They haven't had one constructive (realistic) idea as of yet but they  
> keep hinting around that they do. It's now time to see if it's all hat, no  
> cowboy and it seems that now, when they are questioned about what they're  
> gonna do, they can't scoot backwards on their asses fast enough now that  
> they will be expected to come up with \*the plan\* that they never had.

> ;o)

>

> "j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message news:45524f64\$1@linux...

>> Dear dismayed conservatives:

>>

>> I hereby make these promises to you.

>>

>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.

>>

>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.

>>

>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>> orientation, or first language.

>>

>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our country.

>>

>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our  
>> own party.

>>

>>

>> ESPECIALLY in our own party.

>>

>> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.

>>

>> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.

>>

>> We will never waste your lives for power.

>>

>> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they succumb  
>> to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.

>>

>> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.

>>

>> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.

>> Let's go.

>>  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [DJ](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 04:15:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4552a0da@linux...

>  
> You sound a bit grumpy, DeeJ. Interesting version of events and harsh  
> conjecture. When does that benefit of the doubt actually kick in?  
>  
> Cheers,

The democrats have taken control of the house (at least right now) with no agenda whatsoever.

They actually don't have a mandate from the voters to do ANYTHING. They managed to manipulate the voters with a constant drumbeat of hatred against Bush and turned that into a win. And now they think don't have to do ANYTHING. They didn't promise to do anything, they offered no solutions, no plans, nothing.. just used hatred for bush to get back into power.

I find that more than a little scary..but I sure applaud the democrats for pulling it off.

Reality is that these \*conservative\* Democrats \*owe\* the liberal leadership already. Pelosi orchestrated this and these freshman congressfolk are in the bag....mere window dressing to put a moderate face on. Unless they tow the liberal line, they will get nowhere as \*career politicians\* and will not be supported next election by the Dem power structure so the real winners were the manipulative leftist power structure. It's diabolically clever. They make guys like Carl Rove seem like rank amateurs when they put their minds to it.

;o)

> -Jamie  
> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)  
>  
>  
> DJ wrote:

>> 1. It was sort of interesting to see that the Democratic party won by  
>> running many conservative candidates. It will be even more interesting to

>> see if they were really conservatives or if they will now show their true  
>> colors and march in lockstep with the left wing power structure.  
>>  
>> 2. The democratic leadership will need to actually be expected to show  
>> some leadership instead of just carping about how they don't like what  
>> the republicans are doing. They will be held accountable finally, just as  
>> the republicans have been.  
>>  
>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>> economy, the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>> challenge. They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is  
>> not effective, the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>  
>> Having this party in charge of the House intelligence committee (again)  
>> is a scary thought. Alcee Hastings may be heading the House Intelligence  
>> Committee. He was once a Fed. judge in Florida who was impeached by a  
>> then Democratic (!) Congress in the 80's for leaking secrets about a Fed.  
>> trial involving a big-time drug ring and accepting a \$150,000 bribe. He  
>> is one of a very few federal judges ever to be removed from office. Is  
>> Pelosi going to drain the swamp only to repopulate it with \*convicted\*  
>> vermin?  
>>  
>> I think the good thing about this is that they are now going to be in a  
>> "put up or shut up" situation and there is at least the possibility that  
>> they will be called on their whining by the independent voters who put  
>> them over the top.  
>>  
>> If they are truly as clueless as they appear to be and if they do things  
>> like appoint Hastings, start wrecking the economy (a la Rangel), try for  
>> a presidential impeachment and cut funding for Iraq, it will be quickly  
>> obvious that they are the same old tired socialist flotsam that we swept  
>> out in the 90's and they will be tossed out on their respective arsses in  
>> two years rather than 4 years (as would happen if they won the presidency  
>> in 2008). This may be the best of two evils as far as conservatives are  
>> concerned.  
>>  
>> I'll hold my breath for a little while and give them the benefit of the  
>> doubt. They haven't had one constructive (realistic) idea as of yet but  
>> they keep hinting around that they do. It's now time to see if it's all  
>> hat, no cowboy and it seems that now, when they are questioned about what  
>> they're gonna do, they can't scoot backwards on their asses fast enough  
>> now that they will be expected to come up with \*the plan\* that they never  
>> had.  
>> ;o)  
>>  
>> "j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message  
>> news:45524f64\$1@linux...

>>> Dear dismayed conservatives:  
>>>  
>>> I hereby make these promises to you.  
>>>  
>>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.  
>>>  
>>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.  
>>>  
>>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>>> orientation, or first language.  
>>>  
>>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our  
>>> country.  
>>>  
>>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our  
>>> own party.  
>>>  
>>> ESPECIALLY in our own party.  
>>>  
>>> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.  
>>>  
>>> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.  
>>>  
>>> We will never waste your lives for power.  
>>>  
>>> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they  
>>> succumb to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.  
>>>  
>>> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.  
>>>  
>>> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
>>> Let's go.  
>>>  
>>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 04:59:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DJ, I thought you were a Democrat??

Here in the midwest, the economy is not as good as we bring told. I's very bad. Wages have not increase in years. Massive lay-offs are everywhere here in the rust belt. That's Why we voted he way we did. Tax breaks for the rich, no break for the workign class??? What gives..??



And, the current administration has not had a plan for Iraq as well. I for one and glad that there is a change called BALANCE.. Now, they can repeal that "eavesdropping act, kill the Patriot act..Get back to a right to decent, without being called an American..

"DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:

>1. It was sort of interesting to see that the Democratic party won by  
>running many conservative candidates. It will be even more interesting to  
  
>see if they were really conservatives or if they will now show their true  
  
>colors and march in lockstep with the left wing power structure.  
>  
>2. The democratic leadership will need to actually be expected to show some  
  
>leadership instead of just carping about how they don't like what the  
>republicans are doing. They will be held accountable finally, just as the  
  
>republicans have been.  
>  
>3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
  
>and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good economy,  
  
>the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.  
  
>They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not effective,  
  
>the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>  
>Having this party in charge of the House intelligence committee (again)  
is a  
>scary thought. Alcee Hastings may be heading the House Intelligence  
>Committee. He was once a Fed. judge in Florida who was impeached by a then  
  
>Democratic (!) Congress in the 80's for leaking secrets about a Fed. trial  
  
>involving a big-time drug ring and accepting a \$150,000 bribe. He is one  
of  
>a very few federal judges ever to be removed from office. Is Pelosi going  
  
>to drain the swamp only to repopulate it with \*convicted\* vermin?  
>  
>I think the good thing about this is that they are now going to be in a  
"put  
>up or shut up" situation and there is at least the possibility that they

>will be called on their whining by the independent voters who put them over  
>the top.  
>  
>If they are truly as clueless as they appear to be and if they do things  
  
>like appoint Hastings, start wrecking the economy (a la Rangel), try for  
a  
>presidential impeachment and cut funding for Iraq, it will be quickly  
>obvious that they are the same old tired socialist flotsam that we swept  
out  
>in the 90's and they will be tossed out on their respective arsses in two  
  
>years rather than 4 years (as would happen if they won the presidency in  
  
>2008). This may be the best of two evils as far as conservatives are  
>concerned.  
>  
> I'll hold my breath for a little while and give them the benefit of the  
  
>doubt. They haven't had one constructive (realistic) idea as of yet but  
they  
>keep hinting around that they do. It's now time to see if it's all hat,  
no  
>cowboy and it seems that now, when they are questioned about what they're  
  
>gonna do, they can't scoot backwards on their asses fast enough now that  
  
>they will be expected to come up with \*the plan\* that they never had.  
>:o)  
>  
>"j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message news:45524f64\$1@linux...  
>> Dear dismayed conservatives:  
>>  
>> I hereby make these promises to you.  
>>  
>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.  
>>  
>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.  
>>  
>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>> orientation, or first language.  
>>  
>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our country.  
>>  
>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our

>> own party.  
>>  
>>  
>> ESPECIALLY in our own party.  
>>  
>> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.  
>>  
>> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.  
>>  
>> We will never waste your lives for power.  
>>  
>> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they succumb  
  
>> to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.  
>>  
>> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.  
>>  
>> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
>> Let's go.  
>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [LAD](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 05:07:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Good post...Whoever you are..

"no" <no@no.com> wrote:

>  
>>So why didn't they say they would get along before the 7th? Why haven't they  
>>done this for the last 40+ years? Why have they been so divisive?  
>  
>>When Abramoff got busted they all got in line and gave money back, but yet  
>>they pointed at the Republicans and screamed "Scandal". So typical! "Look  
>>at them, they're dirtier than us". When it comes to our interest, both  
parties  
>>are the same. The truth is they are both a bunch of dirty greasy slimy  
rats.  
> They are eating our lunch, they sell us out by the second.  
>  
>>They weaken us by them both pointing at each other and saying "look at how  
>>dirty those bastards are" They keep us divided on the issues, and they  
stay  
>>in power! They get fat and rich, while the middle class dies. That's how

>the two party system works, they keep us divided and weak, they stay in power,  
>and we lose!  
>  
>People we need more than a two party system. We need to take back our government.  
> We need a government for the people and by the people. We do need change,  
>but the answer is not the Democrats! We need to get rid of all the fat bloated  
>lying lawyer career politicians! WE need to get rid of ALL the lobby groups.  
> WE need a new justice system. We need a new tax system, We need a complete  
>over haul of the government, it is way too corrupt! Easy to do? NO! Necessary  
>to do yes! Will it happen? Only if you and I decide to come together,  
be  
>honest, and do it together. We'd have to put our issues aside for ever.  
> That means we have to stop looking back and playing the blame game! The  
>entitlement mentality is going to break and kill this country.  
>  
>The powers that be, (Politicians, world banks, etc.) are shifting the wealth  
>of The United States (WE the People) to third world countries. They are  
>selling America off wholesale, right under our noses. They want to rule  
>the world economically. THE NEW WORLD ORDER! WE better wake up fast.

>  
>  
>The other issue facing the US is China. If we are not careful we will have  
>Chinese boots on American soil in the next 30 years. Make no mistake, they  
>are planning on it, just do some research on it. They plan to take over  
>the world.

>  
>The first step is to see the truth. The second is to stop listening to  
the  
>politicians and the media. The third is to be honest and come together.  
> The forth is to take massive action. That means you!

>  
>We need change. I hope the Democrats make the right changes, and get the  
>country going in the right direction. Unfortunately I believe they will  
>try to destroy and damage the Republican party, with more scandals and criminal  
>prosecutions so they can stay in power for years and years to come. This  
>will not help the country. They need to focus on getting us back on track,  
>but they are already talking war with the republicans. That's just dirty  
>politics as usual, not what we need. Lip service is nice, I want to see  
>action. Also prepare for tax increases, they need to buy votes for 2008  
>with your money.

>  
>I hope I'm wrong. I hope this is a new start. We'll see.

>  
>political post should be in the general news group section!!!  
>

>  
>  
>  
>"j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote:  
>> Dear dismayed conservatives:  
>>  
>> I hereby make these promises to you.  
>>  
>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.  
>>  
>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.  
>>  
>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>>orientation, or first language.  
>>  
>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our country.  
>>  
>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our  
>own  
>>party.  
>>  
>>  
>>ESPECIALLY in our own party.  
>>  
>>We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.  
>>  
>>We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.  
>>  
>>We will never waste your lives for power.  
>>  
>>We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they succumb  
>to  
>>lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.  
>>  
>>If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.  
>>  
>>We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
>>Let's go.  
>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 05:10:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:

>  
>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4552a0da@linux...  
>>  
>> You sound a bit grumpy, DeeJ. Interesting version of events and harsh  
  
>> conjecture. When does that benefit of the doubt actually kick in?  
>>  
>> Cheers,  
>  
>The democrats have taken control of the house (at least right now) with  
no  
>agenda whatsoever.  
>  
> They actually don't have a mandate from the voters to do ANYTHING. They  
  
>managed to manipulate the voters with a constant drumbeat of hatred against  
  
>Bush and turned that into a win. And now they think don't have to do  
>ANYTHING. They didn't promise to do anything, they offered no solutions,  
no  
>plans, nothing.. just used hatred for bush to get back into power.  
>  
>I find that more than a little scary..but I sure applaud the democrats for  
  
>pulling it off.  
>  
>Reality is that these \*conservative\* Democrats \*owe\* the liberal leadership  
  
>already. Pelosi orchestrated this and these freshman congressfolk are in  
the  
>bag....mere window dressing to put a moderate face on. Unless they tow the  
  
>liberal line, they will get nowhere as \*career politicians\* and will not  
be  
>supported next election by the Dem power structure so the real winners were  
  
>the manipulative leftist power structure. It's diabolically clever. They  
  
>make guys like Carl Rove seem like rank amateurs when they put their minds  
  
>to it.  
>  
>;o)  
>  
  
Look at what they did to Lieberman when he didn't tow the line.  
>  
>

>> -Jamie  
>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>  
>>  
>> DJ wrote:  
>>> 1. It was sort of interesting to see that the Democratic party won by  
  
>>> running many conservative candidates. It will be even more interesting  
to  
>>> see if they were really conservatives or if they will now show their  
true  
>>> colors and march in lockstep with the left wing power structure.  
>>>  
>>> 2. The democratic leadership will need to actually be expected to show  
  
>>> some leadership instead of just carping about how they don't like what  
  
>>> the republicans are doing. They will be held accountable finally, just  
as  
>>> the republicans have been.  
>>>  
>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
  
>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>> economy, the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
  
>>> challenge. They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it  
is  
>>> not effective, the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>  
>>> Having this party in charge of the House intelligence committee (again)  
  
>>> is a scary thought. Alcee Hastings may be heading the House Intelligence  
  
>>> Committee. He was once a Fed. judge in Florida who was impeached by a  
  
>>> then Democratic (!) Congress in the 80's for leaking secrets about a  
Fed.  
>>> trial involving a big-time drug ring and accepting a \$150,000 bribe.  
He  
>>> is one of a very few federal judges ever to be removed from office.  
Is  
>>> Pelosi going to drain the swamp only to repopulate it with \*convicted\*  
  
>>> vermin?  
>>>  
>>> I think the good thing about this is that they are now going to be in  
a

>>> "put up or shut up" situation and there is at least the possibility that  
>>> they will be called on their whining by the independent voters who put  
>>> them over the top.  
>>>  
>>> If they are truly as clueless as they appear to be and if they do things  
>>> like appoint Hastings, start wrecking the economy (a la Rangel), try  
for  
>>> a presidential impeachment and cut funding for Iraq, it will be quickly  
>>> obvious that they are the same old tired socialist flotsam that we swept  
>>> out in the 90's and they will be tossed out on their respective arsses  
in  
>>> two years rather than 4 years (as would happen if they won the presidency  
>>> in 2008). This may be the best of two evils as far as conservatives are  
>>> concerned.  
>>>  
>>> I'll hold my breath for a little while and give them the benefit of  
the  
>>> doubt. They haven't had one constructive (realistic) idea as of yet but  
>>> they keep hinting around that they do. It's now time to see if it's all  
>>> hat, no cowboy and it seems that now, when they are questioned about  
what  
>>> they're gonna do, they can't scoot backwards on their asses fast enough  
>>> now that they will be expected to come up with \*the plan\* that they never  
>>> had.  
>>> ;o)  
>>>  
>>> "j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message  
>>> news:45524f64\$1@linux...  
>>>> Dear dismayed conservatives:  
>>>>  
>>>> I hereby make these promises to you.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual



>>>> orientation, or first language.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our  
>>>> country.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in  
our  
>>>> own party.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> ESPECIALLY in our own party.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never waste your lives for power.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they  
>>>> succumb to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.  
>>>>  
>>>> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.  
>>>>  
>>>> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
>>>> Let's go.  
>>>>  
>>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 05:14:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oh no you don't my friend.. Roves use of Gay marriages in the 2004 election to drum up the evangelicals was geinus..

P.S.

The dem do have an agenda and that is to make Bush's las 2 years a Lame-Duck living hell AND stop the use of FEAR (Foxnews) to control the electorate.. More power to them !!

"DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:

>  
>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4552a0da@linux...  
>>  
>> You sound a bit grumpy, Deej. Interesting version of events and harsh

>> conjecture. When does that benefit of the doubt actually kick in?  
>>  
>> Cheers,  
>  
>The democrats have taken control of the house (at least right now) with  
no  
>agenda whatsoever.  
>  
> They actually don't have a mandate from the voters to do ANYTHING. They  
  
>managed to manipulate the voters with a constant drumbeat of hatred against  
  
>Bush and turned that into a win. And now they think don't have to do  
>ANYTHING. They didn't promise to do anything, they offered no solutions,  
no  
>plans, nothing.. just used hatred for bush to get back into power.  
>  
>I find that more than a little scary..but I sure applaud the democrats for  
  
>pulling it off.  
>  
>Reality is that these \*conservative\* Democrats \*owe\* the liberal leadership  
  
>already. Pelosi orchestrated this and these freshman congressfolk are in  
the  
>bag....mere window dressing to put a moderate face on. Unless they tow the  
  
>liberal line, they will get nowhere as \*career politicians\* and will not  
be  
>supported next election by the Dem power structure so the real winners were  
  
>the manipulative leftist power structure. It's diabolically clever. They  
  
>make guys like Carl Rove seem like rank amateurs when they put their minds  
  
>to it.  
>  
>;o)  
>  
>  
>  
>> -Jamie  
>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>>  
>>  
>> DJ wrote:  
>>> 1. It was sort of interesting to see that the Democratic party won by

>>> running many conservative candidates. It will be even more interesting to  
>>> see if they were really conservatives or if they will now show their true  
>>> colors and march in lockstep with the left wing power structure.  
>>>  
>>> 2. The democratic leadership will need to actually be expected to show  
>>> some leadership instead of just carping about how they don't like what  
>>> the republicans are doing. They will be held accountable finally, just as  
>>> the republicans have been.  
>>>  
>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>> economy, the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>> challenge. They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is  
>>> not effective, the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>  
>>> Having this party in charge of the House intelligence committee (again)  
>>> is a scary thought. Alcee Hastings may be heading the House Intelligence  
>>> Committee. He was once a Fed. judge in Florida who was impeached by a  
>>> then Democratic (!) Congress in the 80's for leaking secrets about a  
>>> Fed.  
>>> trial involving a big-time drug ring and accepting a \$150,000 bribe.  
>>> He  
>>> is one of a very few federal judges ever to be removed from office.  
>>> Is  
>>> Pelosi going to drain the swamp only to repopulate it with \*convicted\*  
>>> vermin?  
>>>  
>>> I think the good thing about this is that they are now going to be in  
>>> a  
>>> "put up or shut up" situation and there is at least the possibility that  
>>> they will be called on their whining by the independent voters who put  
>>> them over the top.  
>>>

>>> If they are truly as clueless as they appear to be and if they do things  
>>> like appoint Hastings, start wrecking the economy (a la Rangel), try  
for  
>>> a presidential impeachment and cut funding for Iraq, it will be quickly  
>>> obvious that they are the same old tired socialist flotsam that we swept  
>>> out in the 90's and they will be tossed out on their respective arses  
in  
>>> two years rather than 4 years (as would happen if they won the presidency  
>>> in 2008). This may be the best of two evils as far as conservatives are  
>>> concerned.  
>>>  
>>> I'll hold my breath for a little while and give them the benefit of  
the  
>>> doubt. They haven't had one constructive (realistic) idea as of yet but  
>>> they keep hinting around that they do. It's now time to see if it's all  
>>> hat, no cowboy and it seems that now, when they are questioned about  
what  
>>> they're gonna do, they can't scoot backwards on their asses fast enough  
>>> now that they will be expected to come up with \*the plan\* that they never  
>>> had.  
>>> ;o)  
>>>  
>>> "j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message  
>>> news:45524f64\$1@linux...  
>>>> Dear dismayed conservatives:  
>>>>  
>>>> I hereby make these promises to you.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>>>> orientation, or first language.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our  
>>>> country.  
>>>>

>>>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in  
our  
>>>> own party.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> ESPECIALLY in our own party.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never waste your lives for power.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they  
>>>> succumb to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.  
>>>>  
>>>> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.  
>>>>  
>>>> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
>>>> Let's go.  
>>>>  
>>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Neil](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 06:07:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:  
>P.S.  
>The dem do have an agenda and that is to make Bush's las 2 >years a Lame-Duck  
>living hell

Oh yeah, that's REAL productive. That'll get us EVERYWHERE!  
(not)

>AND stop the use of FEAR (Foxnews) to control the electorate..

How? By using CNN & Chris Matthews to control the electorate?

>More power to them !!

And to their "tax everything that moves & when it stops moving  
tax it's offspring" economic strategy... thanks, LaMont - you  
make me want to go back to earning no more than \$10k a year  
again just so I can have all the social welfare advantages that  
I'll now start paying even more for, starting - oh, probably

tomorrow.

Neil

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Neil](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 06:12:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:

>The democrats have taken control of the house (at least right now) with  
>no  
>agenda whatsoever.  
>  
> They actually don't have a mandate from the voters to do ANYTHING.

Well, in all fairness to the Dems, they DO have a mandate...  
a mandate for "change", even if that change isn't very  
well-defined at all. So we sell all our stocks & mutual funds,  
stuff our money in a mattress somewhere & watch the economy  
plunge into the shitter, and wait a few years 'til the  
Republicans get back in power on the next cycle of "change",  
and then maybe we can start all over again.

Neil

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 16:16:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I think that's a good assessment Thad - I agree with you. We are much more  
directly impacted and influenced by the market/economy than political  
leadership. After all, money pays the bills, not political platforms (in  
overly simplistic terms at least).

Dedric

On 11/9/06 9:38 AM, in article 45534b87\$1 @linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com>  
wrote:

>  
> I don't think presidents can wreck economies. A Fed chairman can, but I don't  
> think a president can. And say what you will about bubba, but at the end  
> of his reign of terror we had a budget surplus and a much smaller trade  
> deficit.  
>

>  
> Now then, in the eighties the Japanese equivalent of the fed was terrified  
> of unemployment so it made credit absurdly easy to get. Eventually, if enough  
> cheap money is sloshing around it will smash up against something that is  
> truly finite like, oh, say, land. So small chunks of downtown Tokyo were  
> worth more than Delaware. Then, for various reasons interest rates had to  
> go up and there was a massive bloodletting in the real estate markets. Sound  
> familiar? Unky Greenspan did it, under the watch of both parties.  
>  
> TCB  
>  
> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>> 1. It was sort of interesting to see that the Democratic party won by  
>> running many conservative candidates. It will be even more interesting to  
>  
>> see if they were really conservatives or if they will now show their true  
>  
>> colors and march in lockstep with the left wing power structure.  
>>  
>> 2. The democratic leadership will need to actually be expected to show some  
>  
>> leadership instead of just carping about how they don't like what the  
>> republicans are doing. They will be held accountable finally, just as the  
>  
>> republicans have been.  
>>  
>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>  
>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good economy,  
>  
>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.  
>  
>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not effective,  
>  
>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>  
>> Having this party in charge of the House intelligence committee (again)  
> is a  
>> scary thought. Alcee Hastings may be heading the House Intelligence  
>> Committee. He was once a Fed. judge in Florida who was impeached by a then  
>  
>> Democratic (!) Congress in the 80's for leaking secrets about a Fed. trial  
>  
>> involving a big-time drug ring and accepting a \$150,000 bribe. He is one  
> of  
>> a very few federal judges ever to be removed from office. Is Pelosi going  
>  
>> to drain the swamp only to repopulate it with \*convicted\* vermin?

>>  
>> I think the good thing about this is that they are now going to be in a  
> "put  
>> up or shut up" situation and there is at least the possibility that they  
>  
>> will be called on their whining by the independent voters who put them over  
>  
>> the top.  
>>  
>> If they are truly as clueless as they appear to be and if they do things  
>  
>> like appoint Hastings, start wrecking the economy (a la Rangel), try for  
> a  
>> presidential impeachment and cut funding for Iraq, it will be quickly  
>> obvious that they are the same old tired socialist flotsam that we swept  
> out  
>> in the 90's and they will be tossed out on their respective asses in two  
>  
>> years rather than 4 years (as would happen if they won the presidency in  
>  
>> 2008). This may be the best of two evils as far as conservatives are  
>> concerned.  
>>  
>> I'll hold my breath for a little while and give them the benefit of the  
>  
>> doubt. They haven't had one constructive (realistic) idea as of yet but  
> they  
>> keep hinting around that they do. It's now time to see if it's all hat,  
> no  
>> cowboy and it seems that now, when they are questioned about what they're  
>  
>> gonna do, they can't scoot backwards on their asses fast enough now that  
>  
>> they will be expected to come up with \*the plan\* that they never had.  
>> ;o)  
>>  
>> "j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message news:45524f64\$1@linux...  
>>> Dear dismayed conservatives:  
>>>  
>>> I hereby make these promises to you.  
>>>  
>>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.  
>>>  
>>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.  
>>>  
>>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>>> orientation, or first language.  
>>>



>>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our country.  
>>>  
>>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our  
>  
>>> own party.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> ESPECIALLY in our own party.  
>>>  
>>> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.  
>>>  
>>> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.  
>>>  
>>> We will never waste your lives for power.  
>>>  
>>> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they succumb  
>  
>>> to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.  
>>>  
>>> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.  
>>>  
>>> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
>>> Let's go.  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 16:38:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't think presidents can wreck economies. A Fed chairman can, but I don't think a president can. And say what you will about bubba, but at the end of his reign of terror we had a budget surplus and a much smaller trade deficit.

Now then, in the eighties the Japanese equivalent of the fed was terrified of unemployment so it made credit absurdly easy to get. Eventually, if enough cheap money is sloshing around it will smash up against something that is truly finite like, oh, say, land. So small chunks of downtown Tokyo were worth more than Delaware. Then, for various reasons interest rates had to go up and there was a massive bloodletting in the real estate markets. Sound familiar? Unky Greenspan did it, under the watch of both parties.

TCB

"DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:

>1. It was sort of interesting to see that the Democratic party won by  
>running many conservative candidates. It will be even more interesting to

>see if they were really conservatives or if they will now show their true

>colors and march in lockstep with the left wing power structure.

>

>2. The democratic leadership will need to actually be expected to show some

>leadership instead of just carping about how they don't like what the

>republicans are doing. They will be held accountable finally, just as the

>republicans have been.

>

>3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,

>and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good economy,

>the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.

>They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not effective,

>the responsibility will fall in their lap.

>

>Having this party in charge of the House intelligence committee (again)  
is a

>scary thought. Alcee Hastings may be heading the House Intelligence

>Committee. He was once a Fed. judge in Florida who was impeached by a then

>Democratic (!) Congress in the 80's for leaking secrets about a Fed. trial

>involving a big-time drug ring and accepting a \$150,000 bribe. He is one  
of

>a very few federal judges ever to be removed from office. Is Pelosi going

>to drain the swamp only to repopulate it with \*convicted\* vermin?

>

>I think the good thing about this is that they are now going to be in a

"put

>up or shut up" situation and there is at least the possibility that they

>will be called on their whining by the independent voters who put them over

>the top.

>

>If they are truly as clueless as they appear to be and if they do things

>like appoint Hastings, start wrecking the economy (a la Rangel), try for  
a  
>presidential impeachment and cut funding for Iraq, it will be quickly  
>obvious that they are the same old tired socialist flotsam that we swept  
out  
>in the 90's and they will be tossed out on their respective arsses in two  
  
>years rather than 4 years (as would happen if they won the presidency in  
  
>2008). This may be the best of two evils as far as conservatives are  
>concerned.  
>  
> I'll hold my breath for a little while and give them the benefit of the  
  
>doubt. They haven't had one constructive (realistic) idea as of yet but  
they  
>keep hinting around that they do. It's now time to see if it's all hat,  
no  
>cowboy and it seems that now, when they are questioned about what they're  
  
>gonna do, they can't scoot backwards on their asses fast enough now that  
  
>they will be expected to come up with \*the plan\* that they never had.  
>;o)  
>  
>"j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message news:45524f64\$1@linux...  
>> Dear dismayed conservatives:  
>>  
>> I hereby make these promises to you.  
>>  
>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.  
>>  
>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.  
>>  
>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>> orientation, or first language.  
>>  
>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our country.  
>>  
>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our  
  
>> own party.  
>>  
>>  
>> ESPECIALLY in our own party.  
>>  
>> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.  
>>

>> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.  
>>  
>> We will never waste your lives for power.  
>>  
>> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they succumb  
  
>> to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.  
>>  
>> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.  
>>  
>> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
>> Let's go.  
>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [DJ](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 17:19:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with trillions of dollars borrowed from countries like China?

Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?

>It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that we need  
>a constant flow of mideast  
oil to keep our economy going.<

I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this back when we had the time to do something about it, especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going to solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy independent \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all domestic energy options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil and gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that \*are proven\* could bring this about within the next 5 years are off the table?

I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t'lour economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15 years...especially with a party in power that is willing to negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness. They will be encouraged by this.

Regards,

DJ

"Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
news:4553565b\$1@linux...

>

> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:

>>

>>3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,

>

>>and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good

>>economy,

>

>>the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.

>

>>They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not

>>effective,

>

>>the responsibility will fall in their lap.

>>

>

> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a half

> old. The numbers are much worse now.

> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with

> trillions

> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we

> have

> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of mideast

> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the danger of

> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (

> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).

> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL influence on

> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush

> years.

> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.

>

>

> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion dollars

> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively

> taking

> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United States.

> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with

> savings,

> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even though

> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More

> than

> any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically, on

> the kindness of strangers."  
>  
> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk__surowiecki)  
>  
> Gene  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 17:24:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"DJ" <[no@way.jack](mailto:no@way.jack)> wrote:

>  
>3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good economy,  
>the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.  
>They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not effective,  
>the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>

This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a half old. The numbers are much worse now. Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with trillions of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of mideast oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the danger of working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. ( <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).

our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush years. Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.

in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively taking most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United States. The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with savings, bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even though the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More than any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically, on

[http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk__surowiecki)

Gene

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 17:27:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Bad link

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [j-cron](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 17:40:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"no" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:45536434\$1@linux...  
> This is true. Bush is responsible for many things. What you are missing  
> is, that there are two parties running our government, not just Bush!

now we know you're full of shit.

> The two parties are both bad!

yep.

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 18:24:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>  
>"DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>  
>>3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>  
>>and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good economy,  
>  
>>the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.  
>  
>>They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not effective,  
>  
>>the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>  
>  
>This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a half

>old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with trillions  
>of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we have  
>placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of mideast  
>oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the danger  
of  
>working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. ( <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).

>our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush years.  
>Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.  
>  
>

>in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively taking  
>most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United States.  
>The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with savings,  
>bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even though  
>the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More than  
>any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically, on

>  
> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>  
>Gene  
>

This is true. Bush is responsible for many things. What you are missing is, that there are two parties running our government, not just Bush! The two parties are both bad! We have things like this because of both parties. You are falling right in to what they want, what they create and perpetuate, the finger pointing. They are both corrupt, they both made back room dirty deals and sold US out! Both Parties are responsible for where are country is. The day the people of this country stop the blame game and realize the truth and fire all of these career politician rat bastards, the better off this country will be.

The 527s and the lobby groups have to go first. The electoral college is second. We need to count the exact vote of the people some how, and I don't care if it takes a month.

The system is broken, and patching it with the same kind of people (Democrats) is not going to fix it. We need real change, and that can only be done by WE THE PEOPLE!!!

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 18:34:45 GMT



Really? That sounds like no benefit of the doubt whatsoever.

What I'm hearing from you, DeeJ, seems like an echo of the constant drumbeat of Democrat hating and bashing put forth by special interest influenced and poorly researched (but cheap to produce) talk radio and TV blather that are to journalism as shit is to caviar.

Now, some of your repeated Democrat bashing may well be deserved, but it sounds like rehashed propoganda because there is almost nothing positive in what you say about the Democrats, almost nothing negative about the Republicans, and especially because the same talking points keep coming up.

-Hiding behind "Bush Bashing" and "Bush Hating" Bush-as-victim accusations as if there are no reasonable areas to disagree with the policies and performance of the current government, (which by the way includes three branches, not just the executive). This is a very slanted interpretation of events and of the actions of the electorate in this election.

-Meanwhile bashing Clinton, blaming Clinton and Clinton hate in ironic amounts. While ignoring all Republican components to government during his 8 years in office, and ignoring all that came before and since. This is also a very slanted interpretation of current events.

-Projecting every mistake and misstep of the Republicans onto the Democrats. As if the Republicans can do no wrong and Democrats can do no right.

-For that matter, making this about the political parties instead of the individuals involved.

Personally, I think there are competent/trustworthy and incompetent/corrupt people in both parties. And unethical people running the propoganda machines whose talking points you seem to be repeating.

It might help to turn off the TV and radio for a couple of months (at least the one-winged variety), write a long letter to your congressfolk about your concerns, and see if you can truly give the next congress the benefit of the doubt while they get to work. There's a lot that needs to be done.

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

DJ wrote:

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4552a0da@linux...

>> You sound a bit grumpy, DeeJ. Interesting version of events and harsh

>> conjecture. When does that benefit of the doubt actually kick in?

>>

>> Cheers,

>

> The democrats have taken control of the house (at least right now) with no

> agenda whatsoever.

>

> They actually don't have a mandate from the voters to do ANYTHING. They

> managed to manipulate the voters with a constant drumbeat of hatred against

> Bush and turned that into a win. And now they think don't have to do

> ANYTHING. They didn't promise to do anything, they offered no solutions, no

> plans, nothing.. just used hatred for bush to get back into power.

>

> I find that more than a little scary..but I sure applaud the democrats for

> pulling it off.

>

> Reality is that these \*conservative\* Democrats \*owe\* the liberal leadership

> already. Pelosi orchestrated this and these freshman congressfolk are in the

> bag....mere window dressing to put a moderate face on. Unless they tow the

> liberal line, they will get nowhere as \*career politicians\* and will not be

> supported next election by the Dem power structure so the real winners were

> the manipulative leftist power structure. It's diabolically clever. They

> make guys like Carl Rove seem like rank amateurs when they put their minds

> to it.

>

> ;o)

>

>

>

>> -Jamie

>> www.JamieKruz.com

>>

>>

>> DJ wrote:

>>> 1. It was sort of interesting to see that the Democratic party won by

>>> running many conservative candidates. It will be even more interesting to

>>> see if they were really conservatives or if they will now show their true

>>> colors and march in lockstep with the left wing power structure.

>>>

>>> 2. The democratic leadership will need to actually be expected to show

>>> some leadership instead of just carping about how they don't like what

>>> the republicans are doing. They will be held accountable finally, just as

>>> the republicans have been.

>>>

>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,

>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>> economy, the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>> challenge. They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is  
>>> not effective, the responsibility will fall in their lap.

>>>  
>>> Having this party in charge of the House intelligence committee (again)  
>>> is a scary thought. Alcee Hastings may be heading the House Intelligence  
>>> Committee. He was once a Fed. judge in Florida who was impeached by a  
>>> then Democratic (!) Congress in the 80's for leaking secrets about a Fed.  
>>> trial involving a big-time drug ring and accepting a \$150,000 bribe. He  
>>> is one of a very few federal judges ever to be removed from office. Is  
>>> Pelosi going to drain the swamp only to repopulate it with \*convicted\*  
>>> vermin?

>>>  
>>> I think the good thing about this is that they are now going to be in a  
>>> "put up or shut up" situation and there is at least the possibility that  
>>> they will be called on their whining by the independent voters who put  
>>> them over the top.

>>>  
>>> If they are truly as clueless as they appear to be and if they do things  
>>> like appoint Hastings, start wrecking the economy (a la Rangel), try for  
>>> a presidential impeachment and cut funding for Iraq, it will be quickly  
>>> obvious that they are the same old tired socialist flotsam that we swept  
>>> out in the 90's and they will be tossed out on their respective arses in  
>>> two years rather than 4 years (as would happen if they won the presidency  
>>> in 2008). This may be the best of two evils as far as conservatives are  
>>> concerned.

>>>  
>>> I'll hold my breath for a little while and give them the benefit of the  
>>> doubt. They haven't had one constructive (realistic) idea as of yet but  
>>> they keep hinting around that they do. It's now time to see if it's all  
>>> hat, no cowboy and it seems that now, when they are questioned about what  
>>> they're gonna do, they can't scoot backwards on their asses fast enough  
>>> now that they will be expected to come up with \*the plan\* that they never  
>>> had.

>>> ;o)

>>>  
>>> "j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message  
>>> news:45524f64\$1@linux...

>>>> Dear dismayed conservatives:

>>>>

>>>> I hereby make these promises to you.

>>>>

>>>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.

>>>>

>>>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.

>>>>

>>>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual

>>>> orientation, or first language.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our  
>>>> country.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in our  
>>>> own party.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> ESPECIALLY in our own party.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never waste your lives for power.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they  
>>>> succumb to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.  
>>>>  
>>>> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.  
>>>>  
>>>> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
>>>> Let's go.  
>>>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 18:40:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I've spent the last few years working in one of the most successful money managing organizations in history, so I follow markets (willingly or not) on a daily basis. The petrodollar thing is just nonsense. The rest of what you say, about foreigners holding massive amounts of US debt, is true. I don't necessarily think it's all that much worse to have Japanese banks hold that debt instead of US banks, and those banks are so internationalized it might not make any difference. The real problem, though, is that we have that massive debt in the first place, no matter who holds it. And that debt is just our governmental debt, no the personal debt and interest only loans that have been written. But if tomorrow the Euro is used for some percentage of oil transactions the world won't end, and the US won't be massively changed.

TCB

"Gene Lennon" <[glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com](mailto:glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com)> wrote:

>  
>"DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>  
>>3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>  
>>and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good economy,  
>  
>>the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.  
>  
>>They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not effective,  
>  
>>the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>  
>  
>This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a half  
>old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with trillions  
>of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we have  
>placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of mideast  
>oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the danger  
>of  
>working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. ( <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
  
>our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush years.  
>Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.  
>  
>  
  
>in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively taking  
>most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United States.  
>The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with savings,  
>bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even though  
>the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More than  
>any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically, on  
  
>  
> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>  
>Gene  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 18:44:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DJ wrote:  
> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with

> trillions  
> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>  
> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that vaulted  
> them into the position they are in nowadays?

Nixon.

>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that we need  
>> a constant flow of mideast  
> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>  
> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this back  
> when we had the time to di something about it,

Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there was no  
problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years (Reagan, Bush1,  
Clinton, Bush2).

Gore probably would have tried to do something.

> especially upon having had  
> ward publicly declared on this country by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to  
> do? Are the Democrats going to solve this? In order to do so, we need to  
> become energy independent \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when  
> all domestic energy options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil  
> and gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that \*are  
> proven\* could bring this about within the next 5 years are off the table?  
>  
> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our economy is 15  
> years away, at least. We don't have 15 years...especially with a party in  
> power that is willing to negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign  
> of weakness. They will be encouraged by this.

Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time for  
better policies to help, as you say.

We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

> Regards,

>  
> DJ  
>  
>  
> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>> economy,  
>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.  
>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>> effective,  
>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>  
>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a half  
>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
>> trillions  
>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we  
>> have  
>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of mideast  
>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the danger of  
>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL influence on  
>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush  
>> years.  
>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.  
>>  
>>  
>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion dollars  
>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively  
>> taking  
>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United States.  
>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>> savings,  
>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even though  
>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More  
>> than  
>> any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically, on  
>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>  
>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk__surowiecki)  
>>  
>> Gene  
>>  
>

>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 18:46:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I have a good mattress, I'll happily store your excess cash and stuff. :^)

Historically, the investment climate has been good and bad under the leadership of both major parties, so I can probably come up with an investment strategy better than a mattress no matter who's in power...

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)

Neil wrote:

> "DJ" <[no@way.jack](mailto:no@way.jack)> wrote:  
>> The democrats have taken control of the house (at least right now) with  
> no  
>> agenda whatsoever.  
>>  
>> They actually don't have a mandate from the voters to do ANYTHING.  
>  
> Well, in all fairness to the Dems, they DO have a mandate...  
> a mandate for "change", even if that change isn't very  
> well-defined at all. So we sell all our stocks & mutual funds,  
> stuff our money in a mattress somewhere & watch the economy  
> plunge into the shitter, and wait a few years 'til the  
> Republicans get back in power on the next cycle of "change",  
> and then maybe we can start all over again.  
>  
> Neil

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 18:56:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Democrats have been responsible for some questionable spending decisions. However Republicans have done little to provide a better example. Republicans have to take a hard look at their own government spending because they have managed to break all the records. The deficit is more than it has ever been. If taxes go up it will be most likely because of the need to pay the bill due on that.



Taxes are one element of living expenses but not the major piece. For example, I don't know about your neck o' the woods, but here we're paying more for gas the day after the election than we did for the few stable weeks before the election, and not because of taxes or sudden government policy change.

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
www.JamieKrutz.com

Neil wrote:

> "LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:  
>> P.S.  
>> The dem do have an agenda and that is to make Bush's las 2 >years a Lame-Duck  
>> living hell  
>  
> Oh yeah, that's REAL productive. That'll get us EVERYWHERE!  
> (not)  
>  
>> AND stop the use of FEAR (Foxnews) to control the electorate..  
>  
> How? By using CNN & Chris Matthews to control the electorate?  
>  
>> More power to them !!  
>  
> And to their "tax everything that moves & when it stops moving  
> tax it's offspring" economic strategy... thanks, LaMont - you  
> make me want to go back to earning no more than \$10k a year  
> again just so I can have all the social welfare advantages that  
> I'll now start paying even more for, starting - oh, probably  
> tomorrow.  
>  
> Neil

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 19:00:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

no wrote:

> Look at what they did to Lieberman when he didn't tow the line.

The "they" in that case was the Democratic voters voting in their own state primary. Local voters have the right to choose their candidate and Lieberman did not win the primary.

However, Lieberman won as an independent in the election. So overall the state's voters still chose him over the candidate the state's Democrats preferred. Lieberman is in a very good position now, as a potential tie breaker vote in a close Senate.

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
www.JamieKruz.com

> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4552a0da@linux...  
>>> You sound a bit grumpy, DeeJ. Interesting version of events and harsh  
>  
>>> conjecture. When does that benefit of the doubt actually kick in?  
>>>  
>>> Cheers,  
>> The democrats have taken control of the house (at least right now) with  
> no  
>> agenda whatsoever.  
>>  
>> They actually don't have a mandate from the voters to do ANYTHING. They  
>  
>> managed to manipulate the voters with a constant drumbeat of hatred against  
>  
>> Bush and turned that into a win. And now they think don't have to do  
>> ANYTHING. They didn't promise to do anything, they offered no solutions,  
> no  
>> plans, nothing.. just used hatred for bush to get back into power.  
>>  
>> I find that more than a little scary..but I sure applaud the democrats for  
>  
>> pulling it off.  
>>  
>> Reality is that these \*conservative\* Democrats \*owe\* the liberal leadership  
>  
>> already. Pelosi orchestrated this and these freshman congressfolk are in  
> the  
>> bag....mere window dressing to put a moderate face on. Unless they tow the  
>  
>> liberal line, they will get nowhere as \*career politicians\* and will not  
> be  
>> supported next election by the Dem power structure so the real winners were  
>  
>> the manipulative leftist power structure. It's diabolically clever. They  
>  
>> make guys like Carl Rove seem like rank amateurs when they put their minds  
>

>> to it.  
>>  
>> ;o)  
>>  
>  
> Look at what they did to Lieberman when he didn't tow the line.  
>>  
>>> -Jamie  
>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>> 1. It was sort of interesting to see that the Democratic party won by  
>  
>>>> running many conservative candidates. It will be even more interesting  
> to  
>>>> see if they were really conservatives or if they will now show their  
> true  
>>>> colors and march in lockstep with the left wing power structure.  
>>>>  
>>>> 2. The democratic leadership will need to actually be expected to show  
>  
>>>> some leadership instead of just carping about how they don't like what  
>  
>>>> the republicans are doing. They will be held accountable finally, just  
> as  
>>>> the republicans have been.  
>>>>  
>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>  
>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>>> economy, the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>  
>>>> challenge. They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it  
> is  
>>>> not effective, the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>  
>>>> Having this party in charge of the House intelligence committee (again)  
>  
>>>> is a scary thought. Alcee Hastings may be heading the House Intelligence  
>  
>>>> Committee. He was once a Fed. judge in Florida who was impeached by a  
>  
>>>> then Democratic (!) Congress in the 80's for leaking secrets about a  
> Fed.  
>>>> trial involving a big-time drug ring and accepting a \$150,000 bribe.  
> He  
>>>> is one of a very few federal judges ever to be removed from office.

> ls  
>>>> Pelosi going to drain the swamp only to repopulate it with \*convicted\*  
>  
>>>> vermin?  
>>>>  
>>>> I think the good thing about this is that they are now going to be in  
> a  
>>>> "put up or shut up" situation and there is at least the possibility that  
>  
>>>> they will be called on their whining by the independent voters who put  
>  
>>>> them over the top.  
>>>>  
>>>> If they are truly as clueless as they appear to be and if they do things  
>  
>>>> like appoint Hastings, start wrecking the economy (a la Rangel), try  
> for  
>>>> a presidential impeachment and cut funding for Iraq, it will be quickly  
>  
>>>> obvious that they are the same old tired socialist flotsam that we swept  
>  
>>>> out in the 90's and they will be tossed out on their respective arses  
> in  
>>>> two years rather than 4 years (as would happen if they won the presidency  
>  
>>>> in 2008). This may be the best of two evils as far as conservatives are  
>  
>>>> concerned.  
>>>>  
>>>> I'll hold my breath for a little while and give them the benefit of  
> the  
>>>> doubt. They haven't had one constructive (realistic) idea as of yet but  
>  
>>>> they keep hinting around that they do. It's now time to see if it's all  
>  
>>>> hat, no cowboy and it seems that now, when they are questioned about  
> what  
>>>> they're gonna do, they can't scoot backwards on their asses fast enough  
>  
>>>> now that they will be expected to come up with \*the plan\* that they never  
>  
>>>> had.  
>>>> ;o)  
>>>>  
>>>> "j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message  
>>>> news:45524f64\$1@linux...  
>>>>> Dear dismayed conservatives:  
>>>>>

>>>> I hereby make these promises to you.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>  
>>>> orientation, or first language.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our  
>>>> country.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in  
> our  
>>>> own party.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> ESPECIALLY in our own party.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will never waste your lives for power.  
>>>>  
>>>> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they  
>>>> succumb to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.  
>>>>  
>>>> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.  
>>>>  
>>>> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
>>>> Let's go.  
>>>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 19:28:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:455374c4@linux...

> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).

Jamie,

Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over 3,000 innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo jet into our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some passengers, almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital Building? Those wacky terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president over in Iran who wants to "wipe Isreal from the face of the planet". You know, the one enriching all the uranium. I disagree with plenty of the Republicans and the Presidents actions, policies, etc., but being tough with terrorists is one area we can't waiver. These people want to kill us. I'm affraid nothing short of a few smuggled in soviet nukes going off is going to make this clear to people. Too bad it'll be too late at that point. Sorry for the drama, but this one thing more than any other scares me sick.

Tony

> DJ wrote:

>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
>> trillions  
>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?

>>

>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that vaulted  
>> them into the position they are in nowadays?

>

> Nixon.

>

>

>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that we  
>>> need a constant flow of mideast  
>> oil to keep our economy going.<

>>

>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this back  
>> when we had the time to di something about it,

>

> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there was no  
> problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years (Reagan, Bush1,  
> Clinton, Bush2).

>

> Gore probably would have tried to do something.

>

>

>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country by Al  
>> Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going to solve this?  
>> In order to do so, we need to become energy independent \*as  
>> in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all domestic energy options  
>> other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil and gas reservoirs here  
>> are off the table whereas solutions that \*are proven\* could bring this  
>> about within the next 5 years are off the table?

>>

>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our economy is  
>> 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15 years...especially with a party  
>> in power that is willing to negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a  
>> sign of weakness. They will be encouraged by this.  
>  
> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time for  
> better policies to help, as you say.  
>  
> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>  
> Cheers,  
> -Jamie  
> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>  
>  
>> Regards,  
>>  
>> DJ  
>>  
>>  
>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>> destroyed,  
>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>>> economy,  
>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>> challenge.  
>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>>> effective,  
>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>  
>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a  
>>> half  
>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
>>> trillions  
>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we  
>>> have  
>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the danger  
>>> of  
>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL influence on  
>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush

>>> years.  
>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion dollars  
>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively  
>>> taking  
>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United States.  
>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>>> savings,  
>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even  
>>> though  
>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More  
>>> than  
>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically, on  
>>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>>  
>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>>  
>>> Gene  
>>>  
>>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 20:01:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Bolton is as good as gone. Wait till you see the wormy grease ball they will replace him with. The world sees everything stupid we do as weakness. We need somebody with a backbone that is strong. If we want respect, we need to have the right people in place. In other words, people like Rice needs to go.

"DJ" <[no@way.jack](mailto:no@way.jack)> wrote:

>Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
>trillions  
>of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>  
>Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that vaulted  
  
>them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>  
>>It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that we need  
  
>>a constant flow of mideast  
>oil to keep our economy going.<



>  
>I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this back  
>when we had the time to do something about it, especially upon having had  
>ward publicly declared on this country by Al Qaeda. So what are we going  
to  
>do? Are the Democrats going to solve this? In order to do so, we need to  
>become energy independent \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when  
>all domestic energy options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted  
oil  
>and gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that \*are  
>proven\* could bring this about within the next 5 years are off the table?  
>  
>I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain our economy is  
15  
>years away, at least. We don't have 15 years...especially with a party in  
>power that is willing to negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign  
>of weakness. They will be encouraged by this.  
>  
>  
>Regards,  
>  
>DJ  
>  
>  
>"Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>  
>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>>  
>>>and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>>economy,  
>>  
>>>the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.  
>>  
>>>They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>>effective,  
>>  
>>>the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>

>>  
>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a half  
>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
  
>> trillions  
>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we  
  
>> have  
>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of mideast  
>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the danger of  
>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL influence  
on  
>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush  
  
>> years.  
>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.  
>>  
>>  
>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion dollars  
>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively  
  
>> taking  
>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United States.  
>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>> savings,  
>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even though  
>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More  
  
>> than  
>> any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically,  
on  
>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>  
>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>  
>> Gene  
>>  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 20:15:59 GMT

I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or not pleasing terrorists.

IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not smart enough to be running foreign policy.

In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy and negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who lets themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)

Tony Benson wrote:

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:455374c4@linux...

>

>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).

>

> Jamie,

>

> Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over 3,000  
> innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo jet into our  
> Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some passengers, almost flew a  
> jumbo jet into our White House or Capital Building? Those wacky terrorists?  
> Maybe it's that wacky president over in Iran who wants to "wipe Israel from  
> the face of the planet". You know, the one enriching all the uranium. I  
> disagree with plenty of the Republicans and the Presidents actions,  
> policies, etc., but being tough with terrorists is one area we can't waiver.  
> These people want to kill us. I'm afraid nothing short of a few smuggled in  
> soviet nukes going off is going to make this clear to people. Too bad it'll  
> be too late at that point. Sorry for the drama, but this one thing more than  
> any other scares me sick.

>

> Tony

>

>> DJ wrote:

>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with

>>> trillions

>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?

>>>

>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that vaulted

>>> them into the position they are in nowadays?

>> Nixon.  
>>  
>>  
>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that we  
>>>> need a constant flow of mideast  
>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>>>  
>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this back  
>>> when we had the time to di something about it,  
>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there was no  
>> problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years (Reagan, Bush1,  
>> Clinton, Bush2).  
>>  
>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
>>  
>>  
>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country by Al  
>>> Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going to solve this?  
>>> In order to do so, we need to become energy independent \*as  
>>> in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all domestic energy options  
>>> other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil and gas reservoirs here  
>>> are off the table whereas solutions that \*are proven\* could bring this  
>>> about within the next 5 years are off the table?  
>>>  
>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our economy is  
>>> 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15 years...especially with a party  
>>> in power that is willing to negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a  
>>> sign of weakness. They will be encouraged by this.  
>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time for  
>> better policies to help, as you say.  
>>  
>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>  
>> Cheers,  
>> -Jamie  
>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)  
>>  
>>  
>>> Regards,  
>>>  
>>> DJ  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> "Gene Lennon" <[glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com](mailto:glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com)> wrote in message  
>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>> "DJ" <[no@way.jack](mailto:no@way.jack)> wrote:  
>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton

>>>> destroyed,  
>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>>> economy,  
>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>> challenge.  
>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>>> effective,  
>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>  
>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a  
>>>> half  
>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
>>>> trillions  
>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we  
>>>> have  
>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the danger  
>>>> of  
>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL influence on  
>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush  
>>>> years.  
>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion dollars  
>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively  
>>>> taking  
>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United States.  
>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>>>> savings,  
>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even  
>>>> though  
>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More  
>>>> than  
>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically, on  
>>>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>>>  
>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>>>  
>>>> Gene  
>>>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 20:20:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Neil are you rich\$\$\$.Are you a millionair or a hundred thousand air?? Bush gave a tax break to the wealthy a nd not the lower or middle class, which where I sit.

I made much more money under Clinton than Bush 43..The economy in my neck of the woods stinks!!

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

>  
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:  
>>P.S.  
>>The dem do have an agenda and that is to make Bush's las 2 >years a Lame-Duck  
>>living hell  
>  
>Oh yeah, that's REAL productive. That'll get us EVERYWHERE!  
> (not)  
>  
>>AND stop the use of FEAR (Foxnews) to control the electorate..  
>  
>How? By using CNN & Chris Matthews to control the electorate?  
>  
>>More power to them !!  
>  
>And to their "tax everything that moves & when it stops moving  
>tax it's offspring" economic strategy... thanks, LaMont - you  
>make me want to go back to earning no more than \$10k a year  
>again just so I can have all the social welfare advantages that  
>I'll now start paying even more for, starting - oh, probably  
>tomorrow.  
>  
>Neil

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 20:27:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>no wrote:  
> > Look at what they did to Lieberman when he didn't tow the line.  
>  
>The "they" in that case was the Democratic voters voting in their own  
>state primary. Local voters have the right to choose their candidate and

>Lieberman did not win the primary.  
>  
>However, Lieberman won as an independent in the election. So overall the  
>state's voters still chose him over the candidate the state's Democrats  
>preferred. Lieberman is in a very good position now, as a potential tie  
>breaker vote in a close Senate.  
>  
>Cheers,  
> -Jamie  
> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>  
>

Lieberman was an incumbent, the Democratic party allowed and supported people running against him.

Lieberman was looking out for Israel by supporting the Iraq war. He doesn't want it spilling over in to Israel. Insurgents (terrorists) with nothing to do pouring in to Israel wouldn't be good for Israel.

The truth is, the US needs to stop supporting Israel. They have the bomb, and they have God on their side, they don't need US. This would clear up a lot of our Middle East problems.

>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4552a0da@linux...  
>>>> You sound a bit grumpy, DeeJ. Interesting version of events and harsh  
>>  
>>>> conjecture. When does that benefit of the doubt actually kick in?  
>>>>  
>>>> Cheers,  
>>> The Democrats have taken control of the House (at least right now) with  
>> no  
>>> agenda whatsoever.  
>>>  
>>> They actually don't have a mandate from the voters to do ANYTHING. They  
>>  
>>> managed to manipulate the voters with a constant drumbeat of hatred against  
>>  
>>> Bush and turned that into a win. And now they think don't have to do  
  
>>> ANYTHING. They didn't promise to do anything, they offered no solutions,  
>> no  
>>> plans, nothing.. just used hatred for Bush to get back into power.  
>>>

>>> I find that more than a little scary..but I sure applaud the democrats  
for  
>>  
>>> pulling it off.  
>>>  
>>> Reality is that these \*conservative\* Democrats \*owe\* the liberal leadership  
>>  
>>> already. Pelosi orchestrated this and these freshman congressfolk are  
in  
>> the  
>>> bag....mere window dressing to put a moderate face on. Unless they tow  
the  
>>  
>>> liberal line, they will get nowhere as \*career politicians\* and will  
not  
>> be  
>>> supported next election by the Dem power structure so the real winners  
were  
>>  
>>> the manipulative leftist power structure. It's diabolically clever.  
They  
>>  
>>> make guys like Carl Rove seem like rank amateurs when they put their  
minds  
>>  
>>> to it.  
>>>  
>>> ;o)  
>>>  
>>  
>> Look at what they did to Lieberman when he didn't tow the line.  
>>>  
>>>> -Jamie  
>>>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>> 1. It was sort of interesting to see that the Democratic party won  
by  
>>  
>>>>> running many conservative candidates. It will be even more interesting  
>> to  
>>>>> see if they were really conservatives or if they will now show their  
>> true  
>>>>> colors and march in lockstep with the left wing power structure.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> 2. The democratic leadership will need to actually be expected to show  
>>



>>>> some leadership instead of just carping about how they don't like what  
>>  
>>>> the republicans are doing. They will be held accountable finally, just  
>> as  
>>>> the republicans have been.  
>>>>  
>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>>  
>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
  
>>>> economy, the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>  
>>>> challenge. They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if  
it  
>> is  
>>>> not effective, the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>  
>>>> Having this party in charge of the House intelligence committee (again)  
>>  
>>>> is a scary thought. Alcee Hastings may be heading the House Intelligence  
>>  
>>>> Committee. He was once a Fed. judge in Florida who was impeached by  
a  
>>  
>>>> then Democratic (!) Congress in the 80's for leaking secrets about  
a  
>> Fed.  
>>>> trial involving a big-time drug ring and accepting a \$150,000 bribe.  
>> He  
>>>> is one of a very few federal judges ever to be removed from office.  
  
>> Is  
>>>> Pelosi going to drain the swamp only to repopulate it with \*convicted\*  
>>  
>>>> vermin?  
>>>>  
>>>> I think the good thing about this is that they are now going to be  
in  
>> a  
>>>> "put up or shut up" situation and there is at least the possibility  
that  
>>  
>>>> they will be called on their whining by the independent voters who  
put  
>>  
>>>> them over the top.  
>>>>  
>>>> If they are truly as clueless as they appear to be and if they do things

>>  
>>>> like appoint Hastings, start wrecking the economy (a la Rangel), try  
>> for  
>>>> a presidential impeachment and cut funding for Iraq, it will be quickly  
>>  
>>>> obvious that they are the same old tired socialist flotsam that we  
swept  
>>  
>>>> out in the 90's and they will be tossed out on their respective arsses  
>> in  
>>>> two years rather than 4 years (as would happen if they won the presidency  
>>  
>>>> in 2008). This may be the best of two evils as far as conservatives  
are  
>>  
>>>> concerned.  
>>>>  
>>>> I'll hold my breath for a little while and give them the benefit of  
>> the  
>>>> doubt. They haven't had one constructive (realistic) idea as of yet  
but  
>>  
>>>> they keep hinting around that they do. It's now time to see if it's  
all  
>>  
>>>> hat, no cowboy and it seems that now, when they are questioned about  
>> what  
>>>> they're gonna do, they can't scoot backwards on their asses fast enough  
>>  
>>>> now that they will be expected to come up with \*the plan\* that they  
never  
>>  
>>>> had.  
>>>> ;o)  
>>>>  
>>>> "j-cron" <jcron@hydrorecords.com> wrote in message  
>>>> news:45524f64\$1@linux...  
>>>>> Dear dismayed conservatives:  
>>>>>  
>>>>> I hereby make these promises to you.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We will protect your lives and livelihoods.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We will listen to and respect your beliefs.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We will never try to force you to change your religion, sexual  
>>  
>>>>> orientation, or first language.

>>>>>  
>>>>> We will do our best to reduce the number of abortions in our  
  
>>>>> country.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We will have no tolerance for corruption and cronyism, even in  
>> our  
>>>>> own party.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> ESPECIALLY in our own party.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We will never tell you that you are unpatriotic.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We will never tell you that your opinion doesn't count.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We will never waste your lives for power.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We will hold our leaders to a high ethical standard and when they  
  
>>>>> succumb to lust for power, WE WILL HOLD THEM ACCOUNTABLE.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> If we forget this, please, please, please, remind us.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We need you to do this. You are America as much as we are.  
>>>>> Let's go.  
>>>>>  
>>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [steve the artguy](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 20:32:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"no" <no@no.com> wrote:

>The 527s and the lobby groups have to go first.  
>  
>  
>The system is broken, and patching it with the same kind of people (Democrats)  
>is not going to fix it. We need real change, and that can only be done  
by  
>WE THE PEOPLE!!!

we tried to start the ball rolling with prop 89 here in CA. Got smashed badly.

It takes money to fight money.

-steve

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 20:50:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>

>Neil are you rich\$\$\$.Are you a millionair or a hundred thousand air?? Bush  
>gave a tax break to the wealthy a nd not the lower or middle class, which  
>where I sit.

That's pure bullshit! With the tax cuts, if you have children you are getting a lot more money back than you did in the former administration. Most Americans got more money back because of the tax cuts, including you LaMont! The rich will always be able to get out of paying a lot of taxes by percentage. Both parties have seen to that. Quit kidding your self. Your stuck in the blame game, you need to see the truth. WE have the best government MONEY CAN BUY!

There should be no income taxes! There is no true representation. It was a war time thing that the politicians wouldn't let go of once the greedy bastards got their hands on the money. Let stop paying for IRS agents!!!!

If there is an income tax really needed, it should be a strait fair flat tax. What is currently considered poverty levels should be raised to realistic levels. People that are at a poverty level should not have to pay any taxes.

>

>I made much more money under Clinton than Bush 43..The economy in my neck  
>of the woods stinks!!

>

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

>>

>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>>>P.S.

>>>The dem do have an agenda and that is to make Bush's las 2 >years a Lame-Duck  
>>>living hell

>>

>>Oh yeah, that's REAL productive. That'll get us EVERYWHERE!

>> (not)

>>

>>>AND stop the use of FEAR (Foxnews) to control the electorate..

>>

>>How? By using CNN & Chris Matthews to control the electorate?

>>

>>>More power to them !!  
>>  
>>And to their "tax everything that moves & when it stops moving  
>>tax it's offspring" economic strategy... thanks, LaMont - you  
>>make me want to go back to earning no more than \$10k a year  
>>again just so I can have all the social welfare advantages that  
>>I'll now start paying even more for, starting - oh, probably  
>>tomorrow.  
>>  
>>Neil  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [steve the artguy](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 20:57:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

---=\_linux45538841  
Content-Type: text/plain  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

"no" <no@no.com> wrote:

>  
>Bolton is as good as gone. Wait till you see the wormy grease ball they  
will  
>replace him with.

I shall not miss him or his mustache. A real lover of democracy.

-steve

"Im with the Bush-Cheney team, and I'm here to stop the count."

Those were the words John Bolton yelled as he burst into a Tallahassee library on Saturday, Dec. 9, 2000, where local election workers were recounting ballots cast in Florida's disputed presidential race between George W. Bush and Al Gore.

---=\_linux45538841  
Content-Type: image/jpeg; name="Bolton chads Florida 2000.jpg"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64  
Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="Bolton chads Florida 2000.jpg"

/9j/4AAQSkZJRgABAQEASABIAAD/4RYcRXhpZgAATU0AKgAAAQgABwESAAMA  
AAABAAEAAAEaAAUAAAABAAAAYgEBAAUAAAABAAAAGagEoAAMAAAABAAIAAAEx  
AAIAAAAdAAAAcGyAAIAAAAUAAAj4dpAAQAAAABAAAAPAAAANAAAABIAAAA  
AQAAAEgAAAABQWRvYmUgUGhvdG9zaG9wIEVsZW1lbnRzIDluMAAyMDA2OjEx  
OjA5IDEyOjA0OjU1AAAAA6ABAAMAAAAB//8AAKACAAQAAAABAAAABAKADAAQA  
AAABAAAjQAAAAAAAAGAQAAMAAwAAAAEABgAAARoABQAAAAEAAAEeARsABQAA  
AAEAAAEmASgAAwAAAAEAAgAAAgEABAAAAEAAAEuAgIABAAAAEAAABTmAAAA  
AAAAAEgAAAABAAAASAAAAAH/2P/gABBKRkIGAAECAQBIAEgAAP/tAAxBZG9i  
ZV9DTQAC/+4ADKfkb2JlAGSAAAAAf/bAIQADAgICAKIDAKJDBELCgsRFQ8M

DA8VGBMTFRMTGBEMDAwMDAwRDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAw  
M

DAENCwsNDg0QDg4QFA4ODhQUdG4ODhQRDAwMDAwREQwMDAwMDBEMDAwMDAwM  
DAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwM/8AAEQgARwCAAwEiAAIRAQMRAF/dAAQA  
CP/EAT8AAAEFAQEBAQEBAAAAAAAAAAAQIEBQYHCAkKCwEAAQUBAQEBAQEAA  
AAAAAAAAQACAwQFBgcICQoLEAABBAEDAgQCBCqGCAUDDDMBAAIRAwQhEjEF  
QVFhEyJxgTIGFJGhsUijJBVSwWlZNHKCC0UMHJZJT8OHxY3M1FqKygyZEK1Rk  
RcKjdDYX0iXiZfKzhMPTdePzRieUpIW0lcTU5PSltcXV5fVWZnaGlqa2xtbm  
9jdHV2d3h5ent8fX5/cRAAICAQIEBAMEBQYHBwYFNQEAhEDITESBEFRYXEi  
EwUygZEUobFCI8FS0fAzJGLhcoKSQ1MVY3M08SUGFqKygwcmNcLSRJNUoxdk  
RVU2dGXi8rOEw9N14/NGIKSFtJXE1OT0pbXF1eX1VmZ2hpamtsbW5vYnN0dX  
Z3eHI6e3x//aAAwDAQACEQMRAD8A3ByYQ6wBZeP+Gd/1NZRO5lQr/nsj/jvy  
spRWs6+X/wBd/wDesL66Uvf0qi1oIIgU71QdRF7HV1ud+9tsp9L/AK6t6vI4  
P75/I1BycfFzq8np+S/bVdVFzmj6rc51mLkNZ+9XdT6tL8L6ViUhYIZMU+  
DJGX7pt5fovVX5lVeBZrditmlxJLrahHtd+/bifzf/hX0P8AuL+k3vq5i5F1  
+UzGZvy3OpyHguDDsYLSmXsu27menZU/wBH/gvUXB3M6j0jqRa+cbPwrC0g  
fmvb/wCfKr6nf8XbjWrtfj1nGt+PSjjMLGZuFfi217t3p3Ne/OdU7X/BNx  
v0T3fzIVqjB2bXMYt5Q+SY4tNv3mx0z6lfWgk5TG04tFNmXbkUA3HRIu1zGB  
tFFn8zs2fSrXHG5vSutV9QxGluOx1WdVWNN1GQ1t1uL7fzPTtysVe6GxrGuf  
YQxjBL3kgNAGrp19vt9y8f8ArB0PI9avLwaH3Y9lupeKxuHoVX2fYLGvZ6i1  
LsN/s+zssYympKdAdkcrkvJU/lkOGT1zGhuR7HB7H7H1vbEOYd3pWN2k7W2V  
tY9A6YP0I8rru3/DWKI9VMp2Z0rGJPqWYpdimNSW1OZZjv8A/YXlPq3f8Er/  
AE6PSPIfE8rrJUgNgHzauSJhKUDvE8KGrFszMKzCpvsW7Mi64Ny6CW2VCvl  
dkW21uZ7/wCbqdV7P9Js/wCLodB6dZ0/l6ox1tt7ci+uwWXnddvaLWZVWW7/  
ALIVufTdv/7UY2Tj5Xp/zldQuq5OXjGs41r6tteba4syHYzSWZTgz1W1uYzM  
+n/M2ez3+mp/VvKsy6nvtyX5jzVS/wBWy2y9wL9xfX61/t/RXetU+mj9Gz99  
Gjw30YuMGRjR03OIOWR+nr863D7nNTx+ks4+kPP81icj9NV5sel+bCIH6Szv  
7h/1DEly35zvgzU/2kJn85f/AMb+WulGIhZvg38rkNg/SX/8b/6LpSS//9Dc  
7z/qVBh/TZH/ABre/jTQiDn7ITyuo4HTX325+QzHa97DWwy61/6Gnd6OPWH3  
WNb/AKX+Z/4VErW6z6Vn9f8AK1izxmCr6y5eHaNrcvFx7sZ/ALsZtxtrP8p3  
rZn/ALDKpX9dPq16rmuyL62ulltfjuFYhrG+81vstb9H/QrN+uRceo4OZjWh  
7H40499Lg4b6LrrG3U2V7mP2+tXY3a799lv83amzlpd9Wbl8fHk4DpxRIR/r  
RHE2frX0oZelOo1D9ZxWD1YmbcYTaf5PrYPuvZ/hLcV99f8A2nx1h/VK+3E6  
70rJrEepnV1T2lea8S4T/Jr11nTurM6pjMyg4V5ldm7NaHRFgHtfTp/MXN/  
mfb/AMH7/SsWR1DpNNX1evzcOaL8P0tzcdtcgMre3GZIUUwfb9mfj052M7/B  
0Y/plEWbHmzY8hgJYZit4Wf0OL/uf031Tq/T29R6dfh6B1jf0bnbobY0i2iz  
9E6u39HdXW/9FZXd/orK15lldVf0XP8A2N1HHy67GPZ+lodR6QdYdtN7Wenl

ZN3qu/PzM67N/wCKsWHk/WD6zZmPj5Lep5tl1lltN1dN1jQXF5tpijENbfe1  
76ttX0GM/qK/wBJ6rk2Otu6qbn5NBrofY9uyxnoh1nTjZtay17m/rO++318  
n9FX+I/0TMlb1siOOURqRqdv0hJ3cftXUeqZeBhXMwXFjMrqF7Wutba8l+N  
QwUY97dlrHvfdZkVZP8APMq/n/0lte5g9DzsWltT86nLc1xcb3YI7HO3O32e  
2vJ9Ldr7fT/7bXA9Y67113pea3O6Vkih11Yx7rgxj5YJvxq3Mvbbs/wALs2Kn  
/wA+/rx7T1UjcJn0KB+lpUfIAHAY1/WMv/AEJjyRjmdH0L7FhMtuxclIGV  
ZW4Xj16GkVjMfkPpYz7Tvdv247/V9L02exiGzDbW9z8ellDVVRN4oYyprQ57  
Nlno0NrbY1vo2/rGz9D/AMVYvPKPrP8AWJtl9rs4uuyfT9Z/p1EltTfSqHur  
d/Ntc76H03/8lmf9Y+sOe+39pZIZcfeKsh9LJP7IVD2U1V/ya2bGKWOWgBLW  
XXh2tYMZ7vo1llQsxyXNBlsAJ0BMMPP0U7X1G633tPubwR3rrXAsyvrXZqOp  
dTrlj22Zr2O1G6dj3vc3/rnpqbfrP9aMYT+08xwboS6yq4T9H3fo7vU4TveH  
ijg8Q95oXGDMtbP/AEKlENsvJlaPVGp0/wAHSuMp+unXGGx1t1OY6x0izMx6  
7S0NHuZQa/s7Kadv6Sxn83/OX+zfz7ovVvrngZfTcDAZjuO52dZiehVEOZ  
6nqHIZfkbPT2fqWQiMsT3+wqMCN6+1//9Hcc+mtr7byW0UsddeW/SFdtXXX  
bP5fpVv2rzaz3Xuo3597mUfaLT6x2l20BvsxqaR+ZjU7KqG2vYz9EvSmVV3  
u+z2/wA3kNdRZp+ba11Dvb/1xeb9Apvbk203u2vpaNtZeNrntPoEi1vs2/ov  
5xjn1/8AXEzMSI2N12IAyAlt3sH6udlxbmZTn3ZrmgBnqBrKm2aBrmspcW+p  
/om/56nmY6y7plpht1TrcOlrmPdTdj12/bW5z6KlK7rnurds/7X+h6duUl  
TT1erlqzesZllmNqAL8N7mir3Odu+zXUurqbRXjfpPV21/zFn/af0vUh0vpe  
DRn124mQ2wX2uwnWss9VnqPa+p+U+xpd7/5mx7aX11Xep/NU+xVpxMomj6hr  
H+980P8AnNo6RBjHhr1el4f0nAwsjK6VnHJtY4Gouqvo8W/4al38pv06v/IP  
XYm8P6Q847mRabHVueQ1gZdWlt99jvoU14b/AFL/AOR/LXO/WHDfftcWOZdi  
baLqIB7WBvtdZY32OfS7dX/w1X8z+iqpVbpHULKen5OOWtvY8A11v4bY4WY1  
b3Q3c9rWV1sqp3qXDl4oXsdpD92Q3TnEckPdGkogcfjq7fT8HEcWVU3Oxqth  
Zi4Vd1dN9lZDd119ntznvyG/p/s1NdP0/p2fpamBy8Kum1tXTcj7RkVhlTME  
3i2xgB3VUYtrQ30Ht/wVD/Xq/nP5u/8ASqV+DXisbmguz8qp4dXQ6w1NLC47  
3ZD/AFfs9ePtZY5npV+vZb+nyvUQ6cXGyarchxdhWWudc+qt+9m0OD2PxrhY  
6pzKm/Txn++qyj9DZ6uJZ6Tel72sGMVXD6v3v/Qv33Swvq7b1Zgszq3Y3Tht  
stL/AG2WAFr6/sVbyy2jf7t997KfTrt9LGqtu/muT6t0j16TnXYV0udXrXeG  
lrbarP6PIMb7mtbdWfoNf+juZdT/AlNegfV7qhvoOTbVZlCqwjqDa2vf6V1E  
1/bMdnptbe30rKsi3G/nL6bWXU/rtP2blu/WH6uVfWGljS9gul3V5ga71WMI  
9b9XvBa7lrZ6vrW0X1fZsr1Psp/Zl/p2pRAqtbYTM3Z8nyUwHfHdH5Qnod+  
kfaSDschNETL/e1nt/O2+63/AK2j9U6PndJznYWcbK72kHcx7nMe18ivlx7D  
/OUX7f0b/p/Tpt/TUvUOnYoLW330uysel2x9Qqc6wMLmNbd6x9H6RrKMa9t/  
td/pLLK7GU+miAO+y4nTzdnfSX9Wa3MtuOHjCBW2pxdZZusdbd+iqZ/L9P  
9J/Pf8YuvdDwMQ1OxiXAs3OfdZvtkOa3dvcKvZ7/AKDPS/R2/wDXFtOf1wXj  
ErtOJjsZWKsWmttvoOeK311ZeK00fq7KfX9a677Rgfo/0Fd1z/RQOr9NrysE  
1ZWQyvKxy+yo01bQHkxZZ6z3fznt/Qv/wAL/N/8Gr+i4wHCQBqOrz/ScvEw  
8+nly6K86qXB1FzX2gNef0WS+tljPtX2ZzfUZjXezJqf/gciz16eybk9Q6vl  
0dWbWcr7Ef1ytzw3FYWlvU+I9WxLMq/Lxch1sOuqnqtnr2Z+DRd+r4/qW12L  
i8/odnTsW3LtsDLKcivH9FwLXj1R636emz3fpmeo/Gt9T0/SxbqbP0v8zs15  
vq9A6ZVmu9etiRdi9OpqaWBjXW1/bb6HWV4t9t7mO35Wf+ksyLbGYmF9o+0Z  
CsYYcchGwL2kQf8AuGCY4dZHhoak//S3amXOlUxztke9gJg/1mrh/rE7Bw  
esWswC1zg42Wel721WP/AEuViSz2MdVkfpgV0WWfo/0duzlxlSyszKzHNfl3  
3ZLmMNdZseXEMdLvTGrWfpHe57XfTVFobWdsBrdHEHRsta5z2l37rq/b/wCq  
1oZfhR4DcxKQFxA9I4u3FL97/qa2GUxl+b0FHUq8jF+zNqruZaYNdjXWMaPp  
PsNdYd6r22fzX9f+cq/nERmW7A6lhWZU4+I3lZY9po9MsFbg+25tNeTn3W7q  
2fR/8gucLGH/qVPfVJlrpLe35/8Ao37Xfnod1xJYXOc5znP97iTMsdS1jNPz



t1nvWThgJ5YQN8JkL7iNtvJkPBI9aoPcdRyukZrbsrCy8e681lltDnOrNtYq  
DK3Cm9tTn5GHd9Bn6Syyv/i1zH2A0Z9mK0vayqkZINbh7rGtrGZXXvaf9DkP  
/sVfPfS/wdF10vceWtOp5k9/81SGSx1D6XOIa5rmwJ0Ng2b2if3rP0i05/Cc  
PFOePKYmY+WDXDM5Db1ehr4+YMQYmPFGQrf/AAgXemjKaxxeGfZyTU5/vrMi  
W2vx43Puq3enT+5/P/ziThRSHW13MyL7gWOtbladw977GQ3fc1rnfp7P03+D  
WWxhc0Gle4AkjgOcJds/N27v5tTf7axiLL/YwDUlXhuxgjc9/wDIZ7/9GsYy  
kPTrvX2NoHrQut3qfq4/f0VuS2WNx825vqBwZYx1gryKMltjg9tFrt767H/z  
FtPp15dV2Lcun6PkY1FlrsDazQRyX1MLdxdXUKLnOrofXY/0fs/qXs/ol9dt  
tXprn/qmy/peL1DD61UcWniNGYxlpAf6NzX4Th6TfU9O3Gtx6f0T/wBJRv8A  
1j0lo7bsHlBQAMlrm7sUgBxtqgudXTP0nNbv/Ut36Wv1qK/8GnEEeADWO58  
2r/jG6YMvpDMzGDrbenudlOgvcPs1npV5e30w9rvSvbj5dv/AAAdWRd9P+c86  
6fkux8itr3ltBtY60OgtBDkRkaslzD+j9TG9f6X+j9Sn+ZXr2D1Pplnqw03DI  
Y5rsZ1ZLltdb6T2u/QN3+/7Sz6f6Sqr/AAK8t+tHQz9X+pOoDbLMG4b8C5wA  
FIPsLq9zXPY+/F/o2R+/+iyPQ/TJ49Q0+zwTE1p9Xf8AtLG3WWV39Q6n1bHf  
dVb1lVv+z1ua50Y5wKQ77N0+57fTyq9nq+p+t438wmvzAGG53ulHtBh0O+lt  
773Nc5YHSuv4dVNYyarL8iuWhosclj+b9lb/AE9j/wDDf8J6liezOfmWOC5o  
ZWTuFYM6/H2/5qEwb2Z4EcPzcXF+DH6w5HUMjDqD3A4GI5x9Oskw+4nfk2Ps  
d6uTkXPc71Hvd6dVt1voVfzj1PExy7Ba4Zh9OsNZkV11tscbXH9Xr9Wq9zst  
72s+y43pf9p/Xxv1T9ZRczHNn1byM65s1+rTTRHtmzeH5GQ3+RUxv2b/AI3K  
v/0Va5trWtdv4lkOI0GuimxmUQDZi2/dYZnHxHigMg7Suhk7+l//9PhjIXt  
qDxjulc4saRBcC0NJd6P85t/Sex72+nZ/wBbsQn5PqNAtqcwXo9g445rs9rm  
bv5SyElr/wBOo8fBwV14eFj9Dq4zmepY6kOGO4ncxstAJ3OoDXfrjva/2e/f  
Z/w3+GqCGu9SbSGullXGpDR+bW0H6KoJKn+r9zTh49NuLg+q/WutOsG2VBt  
TCXjeNwiTJ/O/rIZc1teoJJJgNBPb/yKzUIPL3uvDx0K4fl8OGImni96x/1f  
u+r9ORhfacbqNdNdLqy0mp1rK3fbch9ZOV6jHvpf6X2X7J6mTkY9d/8A2otr  
6jo7OjUfZR02vH/aOXQy5ouudflj9Gy+6rJNfpNxcWne9lzK34Hrej6P2XI/  
o1njSSx5cF/1ul8X731/qsx9zh68P4cL7rkVY7XOvzLqn5GySGN2k44f6WTX  
iUw7bj05V/2jIusb6ufnV/zOLRVgenk35GR0/FLK2DM6e54+zPYx9n6WW+m/  
E9L9LVI8GzFwvIEkyW+u/8AU4a4fBA2/i+m2fWC17m2Owc1lznbdjMZ+4OB  
hznNe3b6jnf6N/8AOLL+tnVOoXdeqwr8fLGMmWXC/loexhcaHMbV697W/wCC  
duqpYxn6L/rfp8MkpMfBel/VRbBcG6iJBkaA6jUaOH0VvV/suvqdDSbX4Lms  
syji/SZ6g3PpwHXMc57Kt/vbkfpv+0/85X61nMpKQ1pdpbjfj9H0f651Yx6D  
XdS9goryKW4NbHP9lVfptwq9Vlf2rLt/R35mQ+v9BV9mxaP8luEkQl57CNZ+  
UKmknz302pYnN//Z/+05QIBob3Rvc2hvcCAzLjAAOEJJTQQIAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADhCSU0D6gAAAAAdrTw/eG1sHZlcnNpb249IjEuMCliG  
ZW5jb2Rpbmc9IIlVURi04Ij8+CjwhRE9DVFIQRSBwbGlzdCBQVUJMSUMgli0v  
L0FwcGxlIENvbXB1dGVyLy9EVEQgUEXJU1QgMS4wLy9FTiIglmhdHA6Ly93  
d3cuYXBwbGUuY29tL0RURHMvUHJvcGVydHlMaXN0LTEuMC5kdGQiPgo8cGxp  
c3QgdMvY29tL0RURHMvUHJvcGVydHlMaXN0LTEuMC5kdGQiPgo8cGxp  
dC5QYWdlRm9ybWF0LlBNSG9yaXpbnRhbFJlczwva2V5PgoJPGRpY3Q+CgkJ  
PGtleT5jb20uYXBwbGUuY29tL0RURHMvUHJvcGVydHlMaXN0LTEuMC5kdGQiPgo8cGxp  
c3RyaW5nPmNvbS5hcHBsZS5wcmVudGluZ21hbmFnZXI8L3N0cmVudGluZ21hbmFnZXI8  
a2V5PmNvbS5hcHBsZS5wcmVudC50aWNrZXQuaXRlUfycmF5PC9rZXk+CgkJ  
PGFycmF5PgoJCQk8ZGldD4KCQkJCTxrZXk+Y29tLmFwcGxlLnByaW50LIBh  
Z2VGb3JtYXQuUE1lb3Jpem9udGFsUmVzPC9rZXk+CgkJCQk8cmVhbD43MjJvcmVh  
bD43MjJvcmVhD43MjJvcmVhD43MjJvcmVhD43MjJvcmVhD43MjJvcmVhD43MjJvcmVh  
L2tleT4KCQkJCTxzZDhJpbmc+Y29tLmFwcGxlLnByaW50aW5nbWFuYWdlcjv  
c3RyaW5nPgogJCQkJPGtleT5jb20uYXBwbGUuY29tL0RURHMvUHJvcGVydHlMaXN0Lm1vZERh











PC9pbnRIZ2VyPgoJCQkJPC9kaWN0PgoJCQk8L2FycmF5PgoJCTwwZGljdD4K  
CQk8a2V5PmNvbS5hcHBsZS5wcmludC50aWNRZXQuQVBJVmVyc2lvbjwva2V5  
PgoJCTxzdHJpbmc+MDAuMjA8L3N0cmluZz4KCQk8a2V5PmNvbS5hcHBsZS5w  
cmludC50aWNRZXQuHJpdmF0ZUxvY2s8L2tleT4KCQk8ZmFsc2UvPgoJCTxr  
ZXk+Y29tLmFwcGxlLnByaW50LnRyY2tldC50eXBIPC9rZXk+CgkJPHN0cmlu  
Zz5jb20uYXBwG0UucHJpbnQuUGFwZXJJbmZvVGJja2V0PC9zdHJpbmc+Cgk8  
L2RpY3Q+Cgk8a2V5PmNvbS5hcHBsZS5wcmludC50aWNRZXQuQVBJVmVyc2lv  
bjwva2V5PgoJPHN0cmluZz4wMC4yMDwvc3RyaW5nPgoJPGtleT5jb20uYXBw  
bGUucHJpbnQuUGFwZXJJbmZvVGJja2V0LnR5cGU8L2tleT4KCTxzdHJp  
bmc+Y29tLmFwcGxlLnByaW50LlBhZ2VGb3JtYXRUaWNRZXQ8L3N0cmluZz4K  
PC9kaWN0Pgo8L3BsaXN0PgoAOEJJTQPpAAAAAAB4AAMAAABIAEgAAAAAA4t4C  
QP/u/+4DBgJSA2cFKAP8AAIAABIAEgAAAAAAtgCKAABAAAAZAAAAEAAwMD  
AAAAAX//AAEAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGgIABkBAAAAAAAAAIAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOEJJTQPtAAAAAAAAQAEgAAAABAAEASAAAAEAATHC  
SU0EJgAAAAADgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/gAAAOEJJTQQNAAAAAAAAEAAAAHjhCSU0E  
GQAAAAAABAAAAB44QkINA/MAAAAAAAAAkAAAAAAAAAAAAEAOEJJTQQKAAAAAAB  
AAA4QkINJxAAAAAAAAoAAQAAAAAAAAABOEJJTQP1AAAAAABIAC9mZgABAGxm  
ZgAGAAAAAABAC9mZgABAKGZmgAGAAAAAABADIAAAABAFoAAAAGAAAAAAB  
ADUAAAABAC0AAAAGAAAAAABOEJJTQP4AAAAAABwAAD/////////  
/////////A+gAAAAA//////////wPoAAAAP//  
//////////8D6AAAAAD//////////  
////A+gAADhCSU0ECAAAAAAAEAAAAEAAAJAAAACQAAAAAA4QkINBB4AAAA  
AAQAAAAAOEJJTQQaAAAAAAN5AAAABgAAAAAAAAAAAAAjqAAAQAAAAAiAEIA  
bwBsAHQAbwBuACAAaQBuAHMAcABIAGMAdABzACAAYwBoAGEAZABzACAARgBs  
AG8AcgBpAGQAYQAgADIAMAawADAAAAABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEA  
AAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAACNAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA  
AAAAAAAAEAAAAEAAAAAABudWxsAAAAAgAAAAZib3VuZHNPYmpjAAAAAQAA  
AAAAAFJjdEAAAAEAAAAAFRvcCBsb25nAAAAAAAAABMZwZ0bG9uZwAAAAAA  
AAAAQnRvbWxvbmCAAACNAAAAAFJnaHRsb25nAAABAAAAAAZzbGljZXNWbExz  
AAAAAU9iamMAAABAAAAAAAFc2xpY2UAAAASAAAAB3NsaWNISURsb25nAAAA  
AAAAAdncm91cEIEbG9uZwAAAAAAAGb3JpZ2luZW51bQAAAXFU2xpY2VP  
cmlnaW4AAAANYXV0b0dlbmVyYXRIZAAAAABUeXBIZW51bQAAApFU2xpY2VU  
eXBIAAAAAEltZyAAAAAGYm91bmRzT2JqYwAAAAEAAAAAABSy3QxAAAABAAA  
AABUb3AgbG9uZwAAAAAAATGVmdGxvbmCAAACNAAAAAEJ0b21sb25nAAAA  
jQAAAABSZ2h0bG9uZwAAAQAAAAADdXJsVEVYVAAAAAEAAAAAABudWxsVEVY  
VAAAAEAAAAAABNc2diVEVYVAAAAAEAAAAAAZhbHRUYWdURVhUAAAAAQAA  
AAAADmNlbGxUZXh0SXNIVE1MYm9vbAEEAAAIY2VsbFRleHRURVhUAAAAAQAA  
AAAACWhvcnpBbGlubmVudW0AAAAPRVNsaWNISG9yekFsaWduAAAAB2RIZmF1  
bHQAAAAJdmVydEFsaWduZW51bQAAAA9FU2xpY2VWZXJ0QWxpZ24AAAAHZGVm  
YXVsdAAAAAtiZ0NvbG9yVHlwZWVudW0AAAARRVNsaWNlQkdDb2xvclR5cGUAA  
AAAATm9uZQAAAAI0b3BPdXRzZXRs25nAAAAAAAAAApsZWZ0T3V0c2V0bG9u  
ZwAAAAAAAMy90dG9tT3V0c2V0bG9uZwAAAAAAALcmlnaHRPdXRzZXRs  
b25nAAAAAAAA4QkINBBEAAAAAAEBA DhCSU0EFAAAAAAABAAAAAE4QkINBAwA  
AAAAFQIAAAABAAAAGAAAAEcAAAGAAABqgAAAFQYAGAAB/9j/4AAQSkZJRgAB  
AgEASABIAAD/7QAMQWRvYmVfQ00AAv/uAA5BZG9iZQBkgAAAAAH/2wCEAAwl  
CAgJCAwJCQwRCwoLERUPDAwPFRgTExUTEgRDAwMDAwMEQwMDAwMDAwMDAwM  
DAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwBDQsLDQ4NEA4OEBQODg4UFA4ODg4UEQwMDAwM

EREMDAwMDAwRDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDAwMDP/AABEIAEcA  
gAMBlgACEQEDEQH/3QAEAAj/xAE/AAABBQEBaqEBAQAAAAAADAECBAUG  
BwgJCgsBAAEFAQEBAQEBAAAAAAAAAAAEAAgMEBQYHCAkKCxAAAQQBawIEAgUH  
BggFAwwzAQACEQMEIRlxBUFRYRMicYEyBhSRobFClyQVUsFiMzRygtFDBYWS  
U/Dh8WNzNRaisoMmRJNUZEXCo3Q2F9JV4mXys4TD03Xj80YnIKSFtJXE1OT0  
pbXF1eX1VmZ2hpamtsbW5vY3R1dnd4eXp7fH1+f3EQACAgECBAQDBAUGBwCG  
BTUBAAIRAYExEgRBuWFxlhMFMoGRFKGxQipBUtHwMyRi4XKCKkNTFWNzNPEI  
BhaisoMHJjXC0kSTVKMXZEVVnRI4vKzhMPTdePzRpSkhbSVxNTk9KW1xdXI  
9VZmdoaWprbG1ub2JzdHV2d3h5ent8f/2gAMAwEAAhEDEQA/ANwcmEOsAWXj  
/hnf9TWUTuZUK/57I/478rKUVrOvl/8AXf8A3rC+uL39KotaJZRIO9UHURe  
x1dbnfvbbKfS/wCurer5eD++fyNQcnHxc6vJ6fkv21XVRc5o3Oq3OdZi5DWf  
vV3U+rS3/C+IYIIWCGTFPgyRI+6beX6L1V+ZVXgWa3YrZpcSS62oR7Xfv24n  
83/4V9D/ALi/pN76uYuRdfIMxmb8tzqch4Lgw7GC7EpsbLtu5np2VP8AR/4L  
1FwdzOo9l6kWvnGz8KwtlH5r2/8Anyq+p3/F241q7X6o9ZxrfrT0o4zCxmbh  
X4tte7d6dzXvznVO1/wTcb9E9385Vaowdm1zGLEUPkmOLtb95sdM+pX1hpOU  
xtOLRTZI25FANx0ZbtcxgbRRZ/M7Nn0q1xsub0rrVfUMRpbjsdVnVVjTdRkN  
bdbi+38z07crFXuhsaxrn2EMYwS95IDQBq6dfb7fcvH/AKwdDyPWry8Gh92P  
SLqXisbh6FV9n2CxlcpdS7Df7Ps7LGMpqSnQHZHK5LyVP5ZDhk9cxobkexw  
ex+x9b2xDmHd6VjdpO1tlbWPQOmD9CPK67t/w1ipfVTKdmdKxiT6ImKXYpjU  
ltTmWY7/AP2FyKat3/BK/wBOj0j5X3g/K6yVIDYB82rkiYsIA7xPChqxbMzC  
swqb7MOzluuDcugltlQryHZFttbme/8Am6nVez/SbP8Ai6HQenWdPyOqMdbb  
e3lvrsFI53Xb2i1mVVlu/wC5Vbn03b/+1GNk4+V6f85XULquTI4xrONa+rbX  
m2uLMh2M0ImU4M9VtbmMzPp/zNns9/pqf1byrMup77cl+Y81Uv8AVstsvcC/  
cX1+tf7f0V3rVPpo/Rs/fRo8N9GLjBkY0dNzpTsEfp6/Otw+5zU8fpLOPpDz  
/NYnl/TVebHiPmwpR+ks7+4f9QxJct+c74M1P9pCZ/OX/wDG/lrpRilc74N/  
K5DYP0I//G/+i6Ukv//Q3O8/6lQYf02R/wAa3v400lg5+5U8rqOB0199ufkM  
x2vew1sMutf+hp3ejj1h91jW/wCl/mf+FRK1us+lZ/X/ACTys8Zgq+suXh2j  
a3Lxce7GfwC7Gbcbaz/Kd62Z/wCwyqV/XT6teq5rsi+triCLX47hWlaxvvNb  
7LW/R/0KzfrkXHqODmY1oex+NOPfS4OG+i66xt1Nle5j9vrV2N2u/fZb/N2p  
s5aXfVm5fHx5OA6cUZUf60RxnN619KGXiDqNQ/WcVg9WJm3GE2n+T62D7r2f  
4S3FffX/ANp8dYf1SvtxOu9KyaxHqZ1dU9iHmvEuE/ya89dZ07qzOqYzMoOF  
eZXZuzWh0RYB7X06fzFzf5n2/wDB+/0rFkdQ6TTV9Xr83Dmi/Dzrc3HbXIDK  
3txmZVFMH2/Zn49OdjO/wdGP6SBFmx5s2PIYCWGYreFn9Di/7n9N9U6v09vU  
enX4egdY39G526G2Nltos/ROrt/R3V1v/RWV3f6KyteZZXVX9Fz/ANjdRx8u  
uxj2fpaHUekHWHbTe1np5WTd6rvz8zOuzf8AirFh5P1g+s2Zj4+S3qebZdZZ  
bTdXTdY0FxebaYoxDW33te+rbXV9BjP6iv8ASeq5Njrbuqm5+TQa6H2PbssZ  
6ldZ042bWste5v6zvvt9fJ/RV/pf9EzJW9bljllEakanb9ISd3H6bV1HqmXg  
YVzMFxYzK6he1rrW2vJfjUMFGPe3Zax733WZFWT/ADzKv5/9JbXuYPQ87Fpb  
U/Opy3NcXG92Jexztzt9ntryfS3a+30/+21wPWOU9d6XmtzulZloddWMe64M  
Y+WCB8atzL227P8AC7Nip/8APv68W+09Vl3CZ9CgfiKVHxZQBwGNf1jL/wBC  
Y8kSZnR9C+xYTLbsXJZRIWVuF49ehpFYzH5D6WM+073b9uO/1fS9NnsYhsw2  
1vc/HpZXVVUTeKGMqa0OezZZ6NDa22Nb6Nv6xs/Q/wDFWLzyj6z/AFibZfa7  
OLrsn0/Wf6dRjB0U30qh7q3fzbXO+h9N//CJn/WPrDnvt/aWZWXH3irlfSyT+  
5VQ9INVf8mtmxiljloAS1i14drWDGe76NZZULMclzWyLACdATDDz9FO19Rut  
97T7m8Ed661wLMr612ajqXU6yI9tma9jtRunY973N/656am36z/WjGE/tPmC  
G6EusquE/R936O71OE73h4o4PEPeaFxyzLWz/wBJCBDbLySGj1RqdP8AB0rj  
Kfrp1xhsdbdTmOsdlszMeu0tDR7mUGv7Oymnb+ksZ/N/zl/s32re6L1b6754  
GX03AwGY7judnWYnoVRDmep6hyGX5Gz09n6pVkljLE9/sKjAjevtf//R3HPp

ra+28ltFLHXXlv0hXU1112z+X6Vb9q82rGd17qN+fe5lH2i0+sdpdtAb7Mam  
kfmY1Oyqhtr2M/RL0pIVd7vs9v8AN5DXUWafm2tdQ72/9cXm/QKb25NtN7tr  
6WjbWXja57T6Bltb7Nv6L+cY59f/AFxMzEiNjddiAMgCLd7B+rnSMW5mU592  
a5oAZ6gayptmga5rKXFvqf6Jv+ep5mLusu6ZaYbdU63Dpa5j3U3Y5ddv21uc  
+iiyu657q3bP+1/oenblJU09XqyKs3rGZZZjUAC/De5oq9znbsv11Lq6m0V4  
36T1dtf8xZ/2n9L1ldL6Xg0Z9duJkNsF9rsJ1rLPVZ6j2vqflPsaXe/+Zse2  
l9dV3qfzVPsVacTKJo+oax/vfND/AJzaOkQYx4a9XiOH9JwMLlyulZxybWOB  
qLqr6PFv+Gpd/Kb9Or/yD12JvD+kPOO5kWmx1bnkNYGXVi7ffY76FNeG/wBS  
/wDkfy1zv1hw37X3FjmXYm2i6oge1gb7XWWN9jn0u3V/8NV/M/oqqVW6R1Cy  
np+TjlrB2PANdb+G2OFmNW90N3Pa1ldbKqd6lw5eKF7HaQ/dkN05xHJD3RpK  
IHH46u30/BxHFIVNzsarYWYuFXdXTfZWQ3ddfZ7c578hv6f7NTXT9P6dn6Wp  
gcvCrptbV03l+0ZFYZUzBN4tsYAd1VGLa0N9B7f8FQ/16v5z+bv/AEqf14  
rG5oLs/KqeHV0OsNTSwuO92Q/wBX7PXj7WWOZ6Vfr2W/p8r1EOnFxsmaq3lcX  
YVlrnXPqrfvZtDg9j8a4WOqcyv08Z/vqso/Q2eriWek3iO9rBjFVw+r97/0  
L990sL6u29WYLM6t2N04bbLS/wBtlgBa+v7FW8sto3+7ffeyn067fSxqrbv5  
rk+rdlyOk512FdLnV613hpa22qz+j5TG+5rW3Vn6DX/o7mXU/wCDXoH1e6ob  
6Dk21WZQqsl6g2tr3+ldRNf2zHZ6bW3t9KyrItxv5y+m1l1P67T9myLv1h+r  
IX1hpY0vYLiN1eYGu9VjCPW/V7wWuyK2er61tF9X2bK9T0qf2Zf6dqUQKrbW  
2EzN2fJ8IMB3x3R+UJ6HfpH2kg7HBzREy/3tZ7fztvut/wCto/VOj53Sc52F  
nGyu9pB3Me5zHfIryMew/zlF+39G/6f06bf01L1Dp2KC1t99LsrHtsfUKnO  
sDC5jW3XOsfR+kayjGvbf7Xf6SyyuxlPpogDvsuJ083Z6X0l/VmtzLbjh4wg  
VtqcXWWdrrHW3foqmfy/T/Sfz3/GLr3Q8DENTsYlwLNzn3Wb7ZDmt3b3Cr2e  
/wCgz0v0dv8A1xbTn9cF4xK7TiY7GVirFprbb6Dnit9dWXitNH6uyn1/Wuu+  
0YH6P9BXdc/0UDq/Ta8rBNWV/kMryscvsqNNW0B5lcWWes93857f0L/8AC/zf  
/Bq/ouMBwkAajq8/0nLxMPPpyMuivOqlwdRc19oDXn9FkvrZYz7V9mc31GY1  
3syan/4Hls9ensm5PUOr5dHVm1nK+xH9crc8NxWFpb1PpfVsSzKvy8XB9bDr  
qp6rZ69mfg0Xfq+P6ltdi4vP6HZ07Fty7bAaynlrx/RcC149Uet+nps936Zn  
qPxfU9P0sW6mz9L/M7Neb6vQOmVZrvXrZUXYvTqamlgY11tf22+h1leLbe  
5jt+Vn/pLmi2xmJhfaPtGQRGGHHIRsC9pEH/ALhgmOHWR4aGpJf/0t2plziH  
1Mc7ZHvYCYp9Zq4f6xOwcHrFrMAtc4ONInpe9tVj/wBLIYks9jHVZH6RldFI  
n6P9HbsyMZUsrMysxzX5d92S5jDXWbHlxDHS70xq1n6R3ue1301RaG1nbAa3  
RxB0bLWuc9pd+66v2/8AqtaGX4UeA3MSkBCQPSOLtxS/e/6mthIMZfm9BR1K  
vlxfsaq7mWmDXY11jGj6T7DXWHeq9tn81/X/nKv5xEZluwOpYVmVOPiNyGW  
PaaPTLBW4PtubTXk591u6tn0f/ILnCxof6IT31SZa6S3t+f/AKN+1356HdcS  
WFznOc5z/e4kzLHUtYzT87dZ71k4YCeWEDfCZC+4jbbYZDwSPWqD3HUcrpGa  
27KwsvHuvNZZbQ5zqzbWKgytwpvbU5+Rh3fQZ+kssr/4tcx9gNGfZitL2sqp  
GZTW4e6xraxmV172n/Q5D/7FX6X0v8HRddL3HirTqeZPf/NUhksdQ+lziGua  
5sCdDYNm9on96z9lOfwnDxTnjymJmPllwyjOQ29Xoa+PmDEGJjxRkK3/wAl  
F3poymscXhn2ck1Of76zlltr8eNz7qt3p0/ufz/84k4UUh1tdzMi+4FjrWyG  
ncPe+xkN33Na536ez9N/g1lsYXNBiHuAJI4DnCXbPzdu7+bU3+2sSCC/2MA1  
JcYbsYI3P8AyGe//RrGMpD06719jaB60Lrd6n6uP39FbktljcfNub6gcGWM  
dYK8ijJbY4PbRa7e+ux/8xbT6deXVdi3Lp+j5GNRSK7A2s0Ecl9TC3cXV1Ci  
5zq6H12P9H7P6l7P6JfXbbV6a5/6psv6Xi9Qw+tVHFpyDRmMZaQH+jc1+E4e  
k31PTtxrcen9E/8ASub/ANY9JaO27ByG0ADJa5u7FIacbaoLnV0z9JzW7/1L  
d+lR9aiv/BpxBBHgA1jufNq/4xumDL6QzMXg623p7nZToL3D7NZ6VeXt9MPa  
70r24+Xb/wAHVkXfT/nPOun5LsfIra95bQbWOtDoLQQ6ymrJcw/o/UxvX+/  
o/Up/mV69g9T6ZZ6sNNwyGOa7GdWSyHbW+k9rv0Dd/v+0s+n+kqq/wACvLfr  
R0M/V/qTqA2yzBuG/AucABZT7C6vc1z2Pvxf6Nkfv/osj0P0yePUNPs8ExNa



fV3/ALSxt1Ild/UOp9Wx33VW9SFb/s9bmudGOcCkO+zdPue308qvZ6vqfreN  
/Mjr8wBhud7iB7QYdDvpbe+9zXOWB0rr+HVTWMMmqy/IrloaLHCl/m/SG/wBP  
Y/8Aw3/CepYnszn5ljnOaGVk7hWDOvx9v+ahMG9meBHD83Fxfgx+sOR1DIw6  
g9wOBiOcfTrJMPuJ35Nj7Herk5Fz3O9R73enVbdb6FX849TxMcuwWuGYfTrD  
WZFddbbHG1x/V6/Vqvc7Le9rPsuN6X/af18b9U/WUXMxzZ9W8jOubNfq000R  
7Zs3h+RkN/kVMb9m/wcNyr/9FWuba1rXb+CJDiNBropsZIEA2Yk9v3WGZx8R  
4oDIO0roZO/pf//T4Y5V7ag8Y7iHOLGkQXAtDSXeJ/Obf0nse9vp2f8AW7EJ  
+T6jQLanMMaPYOOOa7Pa5m7+UshJa/8ATqPHwcFdeHhY/Q6uM5nqWOpDhjuJ  
3MbLQCdzqA136472v9nv32f8N/hqghrvUm0hriJcRqQ0fm1tB+iqCSp/q/c0  
4ePTbi4Pqv1rrTrGxtlQbUwsY3jclkyfzv6yGXNbXqCSSYDQT2/8is1JTy97  
rw8dCuH5fDhpZp4vesf9X7vq/TkYX2nG6jXTXS6stJqdayt323lfWTleox76  
X+I9l+yepk5GPXf/ANqLa+o6Ozo1H2UdNrx/2jl0MuaLrnX5Y/RsvuqyTX6T  
cXFP3vZcyt+B63o+j9lyP6NZ40kseXBf9biPF+99f6rMfc4evD+HC+65FWO1  
zr8y6p+RskhjdpOOH+lK14IMO249OVf9oyLrG+rn51f8zi0VYHp5N+RkdPxS  
ytgzOnuePsz2MfZ+llvpxPS/S1ZX/Bs31ryBJMlvrv/AFOGuHwQNV4vptn1  
gte5tjsHNZc523YzGfuDgYc5zXt2+o53+jf/ADiy/rZ1TqF3RKsK/HyxjDMF  
wvyKHsYXGhzG1eve1v8AgnbqqWMZ+i/636fDJKTHwXpf1UWwXBuoiQZGgOo1  
Gjh9Fb1f7Lr6nQ0m1+C5rLMO4v0meoNz6cB1zHOeyrf725H6b/tP/OV+tZzK  
SkNaXW6Y34/R9H+udWMeg13UvYKK8iluDWxz/SFX6bcKvVZX9qy7f0d+ZkPr  
/QVfZsWj/CLhJECOewjWflCpPj899NqWDZ//2ThCSU0EIQAAAAAAEAAAAAEB  
AAAAGABBAGQAbwBiAGUAIABQAGgAbwB0AG8AcwBoAG8AcAAgAEUAbABIAG0A  
ZQBuAHQAacwAAABwAQQBkAG8AYgBIACAAUABoAG8AdABvAHMAaABvAHAIAIBF  
AGwAZQBtAGUAbgB0AHMAIAAaYAC4AMAAAAEAEOEJTTQQGAAAAAAHAAYAAQAB  
AQD/4RPNaHR0cDovL25zLmFkb2JlLmNvbS94YXAvMS4wLWwA8P3hwYWNrZXQg  
YmVnaW49J++7vycgaWQ9J1c1TTBNcENlaGllemlU3pOVGN6a2M5ZCc/Pgo8  
P2Fkb2JlLXhhcC1maWx0ZXJzIGVzYz0iQ1liPz4KPHg6eGFwZWV0YSB4bWxu  
czp4PSdhZG9iZTpuZcZptZXRhLycgeDp4YXB0az0nWE1QIHRvb2xraXQgMi44  
LjltMzMslGZyYW1ld29yayAxLjUnPgo8cmRmOIJERiB4bWxuczpyZGY9J2h0  
dHA6Ly93d3cudzMub3JnLzE5OTkvdMdivMjltcmRmLXN5bnRheC1ucyMnIHht  
bG5zOmlYPSdodHRwOi8vb3N5bnRvYmUuY29tL2IYLzEuMC8nPgoKIDxyZGY6  
RGVzY3JpcHRpb24gYWJvdXQ9J3V1aWQ6YmE0YmRjMDctNzE3Yy0xMWRiLWJk  
MjltOTYxYTdjZTlMNTg5JwogIHhtbG5zOnBkZj0naHR0cDovL25zLmFkb2Jl  
LmNvbS9wZGYvMS4zLyc+CIAgPCEtLSBwZGY6Q3JlYXRvciBpcyBhbGlhc2Vh  
IC0tPggogPC9yZGY6RGVzY3JpcHRpb24+CgogPHJkZj0EZXNjcmlwdGlubiBh  
Ym91dD0ndXVpZDpiYTRiZGMwNy03MTdjLTExZGltYmQyMy05NjFhN2NIOWY1  
ODknCiAgeG1sbnM6eGFwPSdodHRwOi8vb3N5bnRvYmUuY29tL3hhcC8xLjAv  
Jz4KICA8eGFwOkNyZWF0b3JUb29sPkFkb2JlIFBob3Rvc2hvcCBFbGVtZW50  
cyBmb3JlTWFjaW50b3NoLCB2ZXJzaW9uIDluMDwveGFwOkNyZWF0b3JUb29s  
PgogPC9yZGY6RGVzY3JpcHRpb24+CgogPHJkZj0EZXNjcmlwdGlubiBhYm91  
dD0ndXVpZDpiYTRiZGMwNy03MTdjLTExZGltYmQyMy05NjFhN2NIOWY1ODkn  
CiAgeG1sbnM6eGFwTU09J2h0dHA6Ly9ucy5hZG9iZS5jb20veGFwLzEuMC9t  
bS8nPggogIDx4YXBNTTtPeb2N1bWVudEIEPmFkb2JlOmRvY2lkOnBob3Rvc2hv  
cDpiM2RIYTJmYi03MTdjLTExZGltYmQyMy05NjFhN2NIOWY1ODk8L3hhcE1N  
OkRvY3VtZW50SUQ+CIA8L3JkZj0EZXNjcmlwdGlubj4KCjwvcmlwcmRmOIJERj4K  
PC94OnhhcG1ldGE+CIAgICAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAg  
ICAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAg  
ICAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAg  
ICAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAglCAg







gTlJFaKyB+JDRJLC0qMkFv/aAAwDAQACEQMRAD8AJ1aeePy+ZhmouKheZq/1  
sSpCGv0f0va9DWRZNZ/vGNTJLxI9/gSmBBpyd+L9lyH9JjZpCQCRzc+CoQSJ  
T7e6z8/Z4GicCmzmVRFMY+Kq1/8Ac3iEtyvIcl0SpC9p9dJjnpU4z27ZV17e  
ieoJ3w8cS0HjHdkzxhEkWaCHtJ8v/Yusb1avVbTWdX8DDMFwxc5m2hWLXHvL  
NO9Qd1WQbOgiCUsmHq6zIgpIQRKStxtDf72A/WhDV9a9yxz5q5paxY99b7yM  
pezpj1fwcAndxDzJOAObXTdrzrGsm1Jhpf0IFJJxmZHdbC2vE/cAUIQBplb7  
JNRI2ftjer/GCLxWofVx2zLtHMCKKIL0XTWBZOTRh56VaUclHPAH4sWb9kr/  
AJFAQoHGzn8pMCI1Y0VtqMXyn7LCKcLaHf8Alu7R2RdPhGvLubib9m3hlojb  
wa7oUub9lCMhW3ylPOP4yMSxdy3VBeZrJZ80x2mlkpoCrdTBRkQ3Wppp1mLd  
qnkiqSBurln1eGmqDczUVda+T7W3p/1HW/N4ThBlSAt5mGVVICJR9sr0/8A  
ejlL5vCcaZhHFZeIec4uwKLEXwoW4AdweRJKFbCqasIx7traoS9YXmYfYoJx  
m7dTq/18drLkuJbkpLqcPY4ntNPeFtwuNVV1pvP2hMb38+pxk2Va9FH97Cjn  
UaQcnXPjX3qCYKjicC3sio1r7/JgyKZFEIpr3IHZ8vQJSwA3qd0aEe8xCVEk  
I9VBn0/pQ8Y1morVkz/fxNZCIS/9aIdmfor383jJkf0/q4hD/9AoFaOgvLTR  
gmoXO6EL95iaiEVI0Zdscv8A+LcVfnB43MkoBgSmBHp/nvn9Yy/OY2aQfEdH  
BUIJTrXVdejR+bxIE4FNmPrDXHSZUeJ+0I2vxVIX6PqN2IHLCF7wmycj+cGs  
nxkY56VONT1vypcK+0RAcEv3jMrRyzMti7bnGcRPeEDicnSp08rG3sSquPcH  
xwvuhtxDgRv2a/bh+ySjb3jgNOR8nh6BTyzcoEglVB/dLNb7WYUuH60SDauH9  
Rez1I6uE5XcYoxvAalWXwBtu9LYhrk+1snkk2vu7shvzCblu1rdYPFm3NiFH  
I3iIRJf2dvBiduyNvOWum9DS0Q30tRUnjMAFDqELrE6GPu7T9fApLZNSKNQ3  
bkbkWK58I/Bylt+aSxhJF5J7k43F05IHqsrjSPTTXoElohcuhfo8EkSjQCXi  
6jCrxBMG0IZFIXhk1kflkjSk/wCpDq/8P+NitueF1DuPK0q6gdI2WcwLqKml  
1Ht0W6G7aIXs6gSDKL6PC107Itqh6VPAkczaaGImd1Waxu1m5qNJhk3ftRU  
qeSsOri7ap4FdQ6SYtecj4g8NNUQjKkVtrm3lenM/TvzeAQmhbYkczml9Vhl  
SFxw39d705mzdD+Jq8ARoRxbtpwfe5TzBmaHQ2b2OaMBuadBBHj0esc9pVGN  
Y/jYKignAY8XOFQbtmWLN/u4Lji3o7o4fPW20CMz0hSRRfMLTqD95mETAJOJ  
xsEhHZ1NwLyZOZrRr8jDL4+EwPhkZmrtHmEwNFINVrp9gB1nMwRFIKpFKN/i  
u01mMGNQR8DEJqEMknM1R7nXjxjQbirLI/8uJoIRGZR/SaAXk6hx+bxkyP6  
flQhGIQ//9Eo15FLHgwA7iTiEiIM/wBbYf8A6c41nyg8avMEqap8jtMRhBlv  
+eR8+n7ET6TBCD4IOf8A8mIQQuum79ymPIPKxhraEVKpUF7xQcN3N78PPtPD  
tq85ZayO6n/x1Me8/NU0H+KvFZdwalOt8vXyQrnjsMrXWqStGTIser6OAnqs  
jUR1UJrwj4hueHVw7znWiOmPZJ5t7xv2IL34vo8+IUW82y3DaB/XGgJeGV8T  
CDV2pLeekE51dPXDJ+T1mMSHA28ate1PWaR/2e9/Kv3w4wrhyVRZK1ZeRg5c  
q/LMKm5qfKjclJ8bDdt0C/mCJW3ifh8A6EKSpOdHPRhgqVU6adHLiGqpU/PT  
4juHK28RxTfNghdCx5eRfwzXJ1bN6Qov4P8AssKXDnHS7NpbKhNZepzI2Qc/  
OzerxWKqnsto5zokoaS+FO9wy1g3BZjk2eStt7/JY9p7PJVCjH84MuG7F1FP  
L/Olmv3SSer4IF4wT7K1X2gMXv6kOAlk/cqVzbif6a3rn6e+j+jwlcaltgRn  
Rkw0ZKTKsRav+K5grWB03i3p2rIHkEDHasMAl/ufkYwKTFVAZWWhfjjNa8IOY  
ecS3rpiOLqCblhoMDhZN39m9p3A1QYiawnvxpwzDHq5f5nH3O+yRPVEx2Cq3  
OKfF28Ejc3JdU27hnGybRUXHgjTdtSfCY1R9nq+f8ng27K5HArDeZpFzT3d  
wZEXzmrQ3P1iB+s2eFlrhyNOxt3rIIVJJIRQOjzCYMEGa2v5uHn9X934mIQU  
yn85RfymNSHdKEYhDjJI9I+XH9JiEPfR8vEIRWX/AKywHP6hxiEJBI/vYhD/  
0imVzFD+7JgwA6IV0OfiElrN8y5YDn7Rq9H9HjV5gk4OaoelwgnL/OzVf71I  
P8pghB9EroYhCJXbcLC3Go3j9dADx7HRoi/viSejai+kwLmBbRNbR/jimAw5  
4UHO41m5GTUHS8Y/UGjVY3GRPiO4UL4W31kCFC7fuhG9wzkOzbdoy+S/YZMV  
Z6r5f3Fb1ueOxAvp8jP+NiF65tHF42JxPMixLt4dST9aA91uCQRDF6er+rf  
sqfmYxlcd7ckdwxE9Oos1h/sobqM4YcZbKMbUsjw080b/rFeDctXP8AFBYa  
tim86QJHcs/DuNdC8mnQsO8aQkMhdHLkqJ9Xhk4hFqNVyXJF2IFGmJlzQYs6

dZxlzr90gxcv+NeIeRkMw3EADG/L74izEE1cdz3YimJyUVTJWjhtSkpirauo  
NeKq4vm0L2KyfbSlqmaFy+F29rNAt5FXJH32serdMmCSNHaB9pSdbT5PFWt+  
3HyPSNt3xlo0Rcdh08NI0fZfi4xjX9VqC6GriNdCy6xBA+1db1mrWP42HLZ1  
FAeboUdaLJ1mqUbnUyaLQhdPJjp7biQ8YazVHqK6t/8Ar1eqP30P6PCUJgto  
HNTnRrMNGSkpxNV1xeQPIsjile//AK4mAP6ZPyASlqMwOAMzbltsLBHJb46Q  
+JFjG1IFwMg6m760IKli92+PVyvyzOGupGJJmleFspAyluRTNhCR8/OWw17pf  
yzzfHerM9l6qEEVqzbdYunUc5x9pTxZ75E1FOrgSGuSe81FgdFeOjidoAZPy  
eOXVzUQs0e1OglSU5AL+ATGxkYLZ+qkR55MQgtlPr8PzPLJ9HjUgqShelQ8P  
/qpPhjxCHy8mlQiszzLhtz1D3EIPiU/D+JiEP//TKZfOyYMKHQXS/wAGIQis  
9/Wa1eftAPfzeMXC8RuSoXSyZ8EcvChDgf8AnKOWjrAExmRTQeEoxl1IC54u  
5nuawYowV03Ti6lo7X/c6jr6RujFdfScR0Hly0+6vkd6EX3U9QSwJIMy3Yzb  
BaNYlGo37UiOzNrRYag4mlfK1VVGr6yr+JtiwPFC0pi2Jvl0O8RXi5vWE3Ny  
HZEf9GTzM+NbmPIY264+3IRTGK5YOSyfcW3MBW1koc5G7/90F6Mu0GvzsVa  
u0qeuWl427iREx7hjixlVlJyZVCVBY2rwhGRaGGqv8AZg3KKP4+XNbZCpAm  
6LOcLEPR98riOeNyDR/gGUunG1i7iU5rzxHqs2+p3cb9ciuXTzvv4fToPOF6  
AG/GfAUbBi7pTcLq3SW270t9NwBURe7NniB1BFFsYlKsHTJ0F5MU97ErlLda  
5Ea4z8sWXlcyDQ8PJXU+lun9qbtOSMjO1qNmOp5nn0/IMVMsOlX18jUUtB61  
vNxaeOQ2+7APalZleN8nqu0wSWOrQTw0KiuvgzaszNxV5hM7h5yHdDd78im3  
rUe1paonzaCYC1iWj8se8PK3nRqRu6r+fnDsrNExDse64vclYq1vCE9Lu1IR  
hDPU8smTyNZ08dC3cnvalMdhwn5HypFJVwm4pRUILSrm55iMgFuGo0Unj0fP  
IHVbUvo8GjvVcueOwWooULW9LHK4aMA3nb53zxYxtWwZRMqhIdUMQquH2PjX  
p+JKERZNwlvY7QmyHA4WNBWY09MZh0ijLgTdDgbkHx/wR4OOG5DG4b2PXzjq  
k+y4yEX62kl1T4Hl4YbG0EqDALhZwria64rhjZUOQiCbrLBgWbfdiVNUTWiq  
k7TIPGt7JVwYcbQS5+z0HvK67vdR70XLTzKp63E1UaQn7dCFiz4LUwhFbXTq  
j+jOT6QmJUK0XTOjLJQfpFk+jwJymmghI95gsak0CSRTnar+GP6TGyuMnvL  
nwJTJFZIP9ILc9Q9+jxgg+JXzh4hD//UKPLnSjJq8GFDulfkYhCI3F/WG0f9  
9+jwG5XiNyVi+GvBHLwmTg6/nGK9lgmMvUGPgl87EYpAV/GBEriOGQ36F6y3  
5tk7+GM1Rr/xCMV+7t00Ov8AJUnL3RI/Si/2qpHPDdxORI2Ue0phYgTFrroN  
SLXrDR36NteyqKH817/GLSajR3zRtyWUbZU61XHSoSyuczDzOe4xY6tSHElq  
uSoFXiv4cmuARL8h2y+/Lba05lsHro4l/wDhfo8+Ky4jzOr8ubk5jtK47ADr  
Dhnlx3GiNbiWcnd0y/E2R5fdu8f0/4PgCrwnoctxwIFx4G5nRDeKvgu8lXK  
N5lPWBizun3IHPRD/KERjNkvEV3mdnMsUP0+Zvd0e7i0XI8pToGeVYMZhm6i  
5JqJ60doyFbOR1Ar5f19GBrHqNIJFa4w88e3h6l+GbSKvazulculpdE9pYNb  
b3qnR0lbc6afmez/jYpL7hcX9tuKyLjuAB4WzPF+B4l25GuZWYEsZyQoOm2  
eoSnT2gyl+cwFX1aXDZFVA3OLl1mFbWQMw7rk1Dp6tNP1o9l/p4rrx6q7MYd  
Jyo1NQfD2RhE8DOEjZtBRuipakc4dFWLpuDNxlKQvnlIRRPjYl3eWWzc8dhx  
dy7nPUtlUzm5iLdi1/IYVXekdkmOwX/lbHT94VB8klyQMikYhoaj5nymAruE  
juj4dxigOnGaeXY1oMZUMoyaPrguu3YJrJIA33hG+Sl6ut2v1cZeswxtV6+R  
3Tj2A1QZnD8NcAXKHA6Zxg1wng/pRY7uBjnNBOQjj09Jq73MLumRqQnszV4T  
rPVav5TGXtq4yOr2yA21FtXMO836GHq+ftA1sNSR0aQ7xrN+6ShbZm4dlH2K  
SE+iwKphpEoFuZuV2F42W1IN0TVmRTxKhUO899ft/Jz9eT6PAnKaax0RnRgs  
ak1iV/ybmvOv8fGqOqbHtC/LwRCERmUZrgtz+6hx9HjBB/R7zrMQh//VKNa+  
aP0mDABUn/PiElfdGRM9Zy8/XvR/k8aTrxlaayWt1YZVE0kqcHWnTv8AD9Dr  
B/k8C0oZzHkXLiaUJmUL4nRlPwZvTmbNqyJ8zlt8LbhGjbbHpLvyxLp3GH1L  
8FMurXuCStK4466mDmgeHXU3bP8AWR9aMvmFHinj+Xj0ntG92f3Gun1U+Br  
RY11NuKEbG3OwMgjEaKnS6HoyiFs9Zi6ZKiniW9W7rCTTj4iCSb71lnQhdMZ  
NWUno8STMWmXTGjgRuGXDdtZXistxzDs0Ls6UBPHYDWioMP8nOBFZerpk1fo  
8V8janTTbqjbRG/h7/wKBvZpcHh142aSxBkre2LcLO4LOfGSTQBy2E43pjUH

o6aKY0jJ8ceBMbQ7CylS92zR6qdtfUE4z/tDfFNxEjbxC1uyKtJ83A20Q2mC  
iW+nSEhqn6rvfezw01xyE+zW+v594Kr/AMyXinl0I3/j1eSNJNrub/uzJ/8A  
a0cCkUulfl9q5qePeWwz8S1/8X7fY8NLtZx8y1t9bKSYXI/3h3PG7t1RSFv  
dZVGRdSoOpT6zFc60RSrn2p1pnj3qEtbkSzWtjczZTO3AOk5XT64espVdpq  
yfi4WdbNaSBzn5EH4yTwZS2nzA2VYxo1WSp9EXC00dXBZE4FK4tn+05vqxrX  
t+yY7h9HumNpxzaGG+NlkqGGzHSGT6rq6tPoYJLsjZ29PZ49RycrF1qOa/7V  
viKpPP4asqnmTcgMf5IWE3eU9X/J/o/1GqDU9/tQuJDzoWHQPkpichnnH/4u  
FXeTa/8AJ/8AX/qDIVZc3jZvviM/tVtL2yJqxxg55IO+zPCLIZyzJq6tUvL3/  
AFfilXbWWyM27NFx7VNUtkUuxHjNksiAgs9ugY6ZBDRKEGRHqtVq8WM27O6E  
x2Bm7ei48Snel3iD4nXVJsZG2LmcWlxG1yd1IW3kwLcVPrHtTYJB/j43Te1x  
8jf+Nbj5keD4hfEkDQNAOODpNJeceaGiCDT/AI22Cpvi4+RP41MfMk4vF34x  
hIRR8QDogx6un3NDkH/FcRN7XHyB/wAY3HzHwHje8ZgBc/jGykR9m8tyHJ/w  
uCJvi4+RP4xuPmfK8bPiecLAR+bh/MnbrqCI5tVnU9ZqqONv59Ux4Gn2Ncel  
+M/Hb4h2qc7y0uGUkgnv4aQb/wAVfhn/wDQYwhj+PxrR/gfHbxRf3HDLvCw  
7P8AsqM/8vREC3IG7hy39EV0/NTX6vG38uiY8CNsFx8wpf8A+4+A61EQjHXd  
YybMuvGTJ/CsT+dRMeAKSwxhTurxt+G/egOXnCi5SHZ1N1KZlyZP4ViN32wT  
oTtd3EWwxhSaw3j84ENSoCwse6o4jjViG2YM6i/4VUwdvmW0b0N7V7ga2WMK  
f/WKZXQ5+DADun/AD4hCs+JM9CWuW0pi4ZJvFRTN093p652aPZ/nCE8weF7  
xdKmjGZgqX14zWbJZ21gQlilbr1s3N6wax+ibCKGn8oT5PCst4rUGmxFFyXj  
K4tPCgMzeRXs+satgxzc+26zW7PE+7C8geLP8dHEuLIGKLqgWI1RWem/G2bj  
aO0D9EUWqJ83rPMxPuzHIDPLxLszjrwjuqSt4zju6QjiMJRi/ERudm5qD1Ze  
02iNnnRge7XX/wAwS0Tkb6n06e1EMt3DB40evoqSbKjZWLdbpKMjasgXAdU  
QdLFPav1QY9J75aT8xlq9aL2IXRwR4pL4bzg4pyahbkov2rPT1L2nSqa3Z1e  
YMn+pi1t5KnOeZNibeMWX0Y9KGGYpyHkWC37ZaDredVn6Ho8WaZnkzo9b1i9  
Az2CJCrtWvJnlMDiIn8jVkwBrakfCr2UB98bNtlm4uHvAKElFWejdH5EbRcc  
Ymr+aIT8ovA5G0LzYNzWF3Kx7glODbpbW45XJ/stQRPSBIPAmqdDuqwxu+Z7  
Pwtud/dEqGEjd6YuHW8NS5x88Ztb+SwKRQMG6wtbTv7h1hrSvOyLqipV5G5A  
jdbo6c7QaBm1RcatiVTfct4bcJjuC2YT0rb6yRTZe/MSIGTdkbT0tKlisvGO  
RSrtrlrVPvclmYsBnmQhHCPwMVI5caHoNOTgM5LvtJdvXHKsF5DjrZ2pEJH  
zxmxWW4lrEx8DnnM41GMUchaOghHP8AR4O59OvsNUgHxhFtlClisyEatetwq  
+5p9XYFSFD2gAW+ReTJTRUwGad0hEtnlPglAyF88aKYvymFkc1vSFRioJTy  
LxB8iXK6eT1nWY2SFDXUp3K6crelChfkd1WQe0qYIkKE1KWbDWBK0mJrkmBQ  
5ylqFiaTeuHs6per+BTXjKwtQS5zifjsK1SiWZEKUiBo+shOMms9VuocCWND  
POcV5LQ0UyKdAbhUgY9kN4zHUX2o9UX4ONuQhht4Q8+dqeizeMnRBrHVbIRr  
0D9V+BichBpt1U/ml4YqvIX1nWDwnoVRlsqHcT1airzoEgbf605Xq8ms2no8  
Z+1VQckiBJ8KPDtxU4rsgTDOBFbNsuEZxXbcNRo0MPtGLb6y7+bQj0+HotpV  
map2+lJdHzWH4P+GNpKB9pLnnb7mHjHHTJbokKwM2CQdWkxjy1SlqZPrDI  
Y+hUxZxNYxM29og+9xhD/9cqlc1Hx8HAH9TnWoaEI2mBKYMd/FZxiXxE4gki  
o1+s9nWeskbDUS6szioPfnvypBoH8VGKvcJfuXVHoGg7xR3Mo6lwZtlyLsmr  
ajbCp4WfMkbKD32yvLYZ8DuJE21YmDbb2NauNkTKMefC6XFRlu3rXHeFBwv8  
M7O3GaJi5zIRME1YhLRT+5eFpn1Lm2s1ahKrqW/sNg+RHIK+hiaueierMy6x  
wL04toP3+VY8VD056Pb6ceo0u7WiVKo43WbpfSGPE5mtPPQ3b3Q9R+mEMP2a  
R1u03oer/AxU+Vd35bnWTsZqtOj0+svvLW4JbrRcdglr16sq1hQtfx8eiRxl  
5p1znctvLTrDA8PHEFykRLPnnKxo/wCVkMXpj7T5L9tg1qvLced77s6wuWT0  
49IZ9kLC3u11k6A2pNZ8nhly8RxTIVCK8ZFhdW/Ps3mRDSYZEjXXOGPvmHS2  
uCXD+ELGuoEm37BbcNIZi2C2Fc9xyjXWtmCRkclRdXrRej6vmc34eKiWREDr  
uEI8tF+HchNinhzxRuaGI2kpiPsdi81YmQUkcO6fpSiLq/l5gyeThVLmg1Dt  
C9K47RtmeFV+W5EbhDzDKYg266ndrMpGhHPrapTVPnElwVt2MptlWY7yJt7g



QyeAjTF7uml+mN1EPKgDh9Hre19ZkJ1ZMCkdrEYGfZvx4loIXv7cFE2ffP0Z  
COh2uOcvl1qXEEylhCheH+5OPs8xZ2qHdXTcDjvmfNT3RnqybtvP/unA0DH6  
zzF4a2x2kRvZUVQOX8DJQkzOQM2zcRU5BviMJSINqyBcB1RRI+UxbzPF4nHP  
ZNSZPcqLp4VSQK4/mTXkRz+hTxsbnzVeoZr6teT5nEINb8+Z5nyVOYPySYK  
zl0QmtpvQ1eHIXK0atAwRZTJ1aCdp8lUxHt1C0rqFizlxw8PCIMiboHH1QRV  
CL/O/HITEawVY1XnS0LL4qXUVr3PFSaGLzWby8ptB0w0y1Oup/OeVgyRjTbR  
VLTlVdjsbCOOn9zzbR2DP9SZiIT0utql/Hxh0ekl2xVrMd4M0pbRmawLQErR  
pW9q5lQgdYQVQXqqiMFimoVjU0uG5qt4h+7C8XvSNWNqXIPn6vafOZPx8bLb  
tDJIG/4WEeHtvCO7t4kTzcd3Wm9JStueB7l2l1JsRs21xZJ3U1es1g82rAja  
YahiaKyuC6meLbrjVwiv64fDbeTiNvC0ND0BI1/DDW/M4Zt6o2YmzrYLKPPT  
XTXrOrRgToXc1FFyh/DTc0bdrhixUiuGlyyMizjpmJ408bJKbl4/IHcqtOk  
V9VO11dQiCNsg1qFT1iOfZ7grnRlhk//0CnXzEYOAKz403K5s3hFxCudhn7x  
i4VxuGTalcvKbURPkiEqfFwJTBhxAWiJK6GjBytdDRTq9Zn+6p+NiicnLjVS  
4gbmHBw0gYe3CnRFRrcDsa/rqNoseOXW8WWRUOrsbZHIFrFvZlRVAQmQhZEZ  
KbkRPousw7CqqOxMRTmpw5Zn3ByZdQiyVSoEMY6eGIZUM5dJWd+TPDqJQtEx  
eAgPif8ALdYTOT1QsLSwci3SROvvEpH62KQixq15WHPsAvAkjYR69gmBOrNH  
Gbt34hl8wQ3eT0eXHC73Zrtty25T6vf0ev8AHOkJkixvyBTu3h99kp7u1a1n  
auNewL1aB9mX0gtnjudh3VbhPyx1Ho+0TrecA49xB3T95DuBv2ZqDtmvO1Lt  
MmOicudRvcmpdJox8DRTgixDYTjCzni3lt7nHRlwudfWBZuHXyi/Z6eGZF4j  
yjcLPlkm4lvr+UX02uvHQYBkFGoTU3l6YmqH82OpgN0+jSmjWilO2/LQ8Ws  
91XnKig3cgCmJsbWbs3D+jiEL8p6TFI+Wpf2r44ly+JellX5Yd7gzwkrLEOO  
ptkUBr9ILGGR1L1j+amRH704n2NbhRxS42bnHzhdAo2aahKnqsDc3SCurhIn  
UKTnrXiuJsixZhC4gJgaCHA98AG3d7uHWl63Vvkq7PITrFlwWJxT7izmNqhe  
HDfgPPS+6rm7hjLcA4XrWTBZJM6B+t1Lap59ReK5YtQlzlQ0QtyBtuw4SOgb  
eYd1AluoJtkqEXW2rgpesJT8v5vs8NQxARceVVM6PHpwKWJUbx1gY1YBvEN4  
3iCx951TF7+wAT5Lz8PSsDwOqZkZF+y5+sPhVlx/pQSLyKL6QgKn5TGxsJRF  
WtDtGTy9lq8QgzlKgrk686VoGgflkwVcjVSbv5FDUQGbMyEIZ88pV+WTrSf  
sR4ahbUq7h2Ze/Afhui9HSJV5GrPHM/qo10yZyavWF7QmFUeXFpbJU0baRzO  
LboWuN3EA9WUiKnP1fqsFR5ZviRqDbdEiwdQMq2chybw1cUhe81eJI+oWVEO  
KZvXq4gd4aLCagd59aHnPKQTViL9GL7kYE1KnHypxqVX3uzSh8/WuouQdb+1  
5uxlbaftMMSNcDjaLrfu2eibmirzt5e6Po90OSYPg7MLioMpfk6g/wAbEYrk  
l+MN2zXTyWuLhJe3BTixcElxavm+dM74geGaKbeJC3N/OTxyaipAAIaMjdb  
gi8+aoPWY6FZ20qJl0l8PnD7hM14t3NxK4svrd4X8QLhcy7rh2zkSQsCgrSE  
psylEXeXa6ZMhUNylz8wdNeRGFPvUetMe4h//9Eo1c8a8MILkH4oQn2l4b35  
A9NchAyIxCR2IMhRflBowKQyYNM54wnkc5CumNvrPh6urTxVNZRillC7MMqw  
XD9vFsZV+ugdwiwSX5DfHKXcVXnTWTsjpdHH3jA3iZxzbFJpAQ5xgf7m1buC  
Nq2yGVyXrC0+rz/sMWttE3SCdducWbwYdXDfm9s7nM9jjuEEI1I52hiU8CbE  
3UWdpO4oy5eEtwqOivNd+4z6HpBljaTjdN26qkWir11PlxFSsPMx0lfeWaq4  
lzhZEvlm1Z9vK0mj72aWfNgi6bcxBtXJPYyvwvMxx3mPbHXNvzE6sekUITIN  
l/xDhly1tHgDISt6OocTIH6M5DqqnwC7Mn+pih2O9+3lSdSxspkhkRQDplm8  
YFdNpJGR03XQdDX5BMeywXKXMaTod0t2l1GiJ3Eq4ZXpJWbMx0qEO/NbfbW  
0yKJX/tASfnRkWP42CuXiEpYefbuDtu+ehHVtSUxJLqPiSm9tWX6QsdOq2Ht  
Tawv7VeMXL00nlbYeRcL+JUCIm8H7l2HvKVtyKGumXuQXt79x2e89WAWz9Zn  
xTMWpfMt1IJXZVpNrGmSubwuGQBHSjr2UTxQ3BNnV1tLrMR6VHo3/bINV0Wh  
D3ldEq5th+7lY2PX/NrZwMBNnrRiL1e0QTWYxA3SLPbz3CRlatyQzhrJRRpV  
pHMz1GrZ4cb8jByHrBOddq+0RjMzzF1actoaXD675W5mEbMMJVvvcWSo6GgT  
eoZ6EntLarqfV+rVhVU5JzEzKOD64fMYm4xEvJhSmDiQRo6jkK57BwLWkbOd  
JeggX4+Gon8wk2bRRd9vNr5BK2IJMET7SYaul2ZZIT7IhuYdlo6vq9XjZW5g

0yMYPEn4Om0Syd3VwLcTA3dpo/p5wlfJcDk2wgjq94xu9OnhHYO0QNyftB6v  
OhDcU1AiOM3dwm1UF99KXUpoqL1m2HV7L0eNkVuKj2nUcEinkVMkqpGzq5xD  
/cvR4Kjm4qTl0Gr+Va5Pb01B7XUDxsjkU1mCM4fWRbFwOBmvO8GkOd4sZGEI  
jaLHtahS0qfxKnk1MKzBLcOMV/NuEbCNgbSh0bAZxNlq3cjntCCKXabNeEkS  
heOnq0amvHi5H7NjPPAuJyKID7o6bIYEHGNnH6S3K+qhprFzNmNfSR0MFRal  
RG6rya29d8bPLkXLa3np1kRTdMsoyazsxFKUO1/08atfUt0fqQCnjDwyvCEk  
RzEbDuDxTw+qbGTrAkMOI1RTC1tPtMNNSpT3lsrIB7LEudLhaFoWfvRf8lly  
aupUHhvWhWstVUSOGb+13nc8whCz5Bn0PUbAzc36QL5zrMmRaVj5hM6MZVkk  
kZoD/wDDZxznR4Rzln2faTd9fbiecnDXI8RTjGblzdvScOaWtdkFz6YMXWx  
7czcX0lx7FQRRrpVqd5S3zXK/dT1/uXfEK45Bruj+Xm0jINDc3VsW1LdmiPM  
Hj2ba/LNnasSi/3d6jiW+tKH/9loFLXl5+GEFzslX/q9ngUhwM4I2DG25e9  
4toF+mVioebkWhWyAOBnYe0EEldlu01fljxVK+jFLeKLML3h89gZ23lqNeZ9  
0l1HqkeXq8c85avU6ezjyLwgeG8JDA3a3pJe4uNY6jVnIOsTtC4NbxO0jDbd  
ohve5bb4YljTOXPdzGHQOrkQSoYnZiF1mNGxO1DLVawaobivZ923o+h4dtJ0  
JRHeVQwCDBU63WYcjZx8jHRqMRrzFLU4ZOEH4pOmxkIOB5bz1pT9/rG9X8nn  
xLSFJ7IbVcZVxmUO/JoTlIjPE+BNZs8xCha3THIQjBytesWMxNmWrtF6xePNv  
Me1pZScIMdqlDazrKIQMOOtoP0n+0jnWE3UerCLV7tT1XxxfsMdB5Y3BXMS3  
XHZ8Tp9nu1atAfolejD5H2avUQMYsdtKvEdai8q3d+AS28BeSMcwW21byRZH  
E2RUphHqyuSVfu6WFLt66TyqVebcR+IY9tTzCNjySw72saBoasl9obVC/aY  
QhU6iFEiBz4wtbbu+ZavLku0UaCP1jURI0wb52g+07PDS+oFcR80YLBFBfQs  
x5i27qbyT5Y6c8VmXWVNqJxS6+i7/odpgkralZVvlcELKXG2eQi5JYUlkmer  
flZ6tubsnAusyF95isleMTu5rSD8GZyea8Urttg23qKuOO76prVTG2cs6Yn  
JNr1o6Xx8mDlnOQ4/cG0caG2+i87cV9trMmlcEqMlwSjZC67R+31mrc0tbUF  
z9nz0Zvlz4Umf9uKuzarErFXfpu+lh3KGjKPPQ4R7UySUhN2cB+s+lupn956z  
DkUmsGo+FglqcbtXLmNRvceQhltiyamRwiiTVazDStBK6hjR41vC0/s6cmOK1  
hs61pS70ctdFrtgUyQ5DUxFcCGLaNamchOwzdn0MLA4sraTUZqpUZJ8mfaA+  
/wCpwFYnDUjqEg4cwLa5b5ti3n4UbrP3Cys1IUx+2OBiFV8ypkqeZhyNwCY  
tey42bLdD1g51ALblKkpCGXTI52IKOpdZs6ZPyesh4W3DVuDHZb1r2RbLa6  
gi3VmyG0fz+dwQ7YhqlVuUourFqqZye9XU8jOG4ShdpBVp34ZWfJBWxDb0qy  
+xTNq53DdmtPed8IPeSUtqT6ujn+dgMS1NLa0RFXfQSR20CXnthLfDJU3IAuh  
8r+Txvo0jEUdCsrtme/mC4pyhY1uNkUKtjrNpic7SDuGoVe6sMMTf1uSs3CN  
bqAzpkmSMD038UR5TEOq269BSDVUQT3yMHifUza2qKglXiTfxsRxQ+z0OhBA  
QbGm6KFOsqPHDh/T2vZuE4s4kqUW8M5all8Cb2iLLse5rpl94HpcvhtwxKB5  
1uS/ozdsPaLWXFjbPfK6kWPALMkbHCrvUd5a6ullzuNMk5nS2YPVra25Cpb0  
wj/flkojV1/iY73bNtvHNzXsb3nml35zSCdWpnnj6T//0yZzarBddQFRQBSM  
StSVAQ4+8JY2Gvll5h9IY3ZKNnZSfv0P1kZfW88mrz9FeOb3Lb2tdqTHadLs  
10ix0UGaEIG1uONxC2W1QzOQdNGsyDqfR4q5nOc2haWcqRSVCStW5AtaC0G+  
sefgkTtJfMkRBRf03w9cNWN2hW3XlJ+quVqIMiNXsxUtp8DBXTiF1OikAcXC  
ziUjlbes+6lk2m/GiSDboH6LrMbKjWRgWsopbXAK40TfEiDMhC87yOekpej3  
fE2ZdcmRT709EQKTiXajO8msVFGXQPncbg5X1JKf0eH9/tYLMJUbH/UpzVvO  
tQNboi0fZyfhJ5C+8ot0MDWsrV9kUfwMeQMtn2U1dHX6fmdFbvVUAcuS13Nq  
vHzYyFrYyHPhizs+r1mrq9oLZ49O2y+W4Zn6DvNpu33VurV/DHQTy3G7+SmR  
zxmxQMd6GQRc2rX9cEKI5mJOtux3F8Ti5du5Nwrl9OosJyLOju59GoNQOPxs  
M6qefrRYroX0UchdUqWJtybtWefXJJGXMxG4MMjWSZs492NgMOyGLvUTwW02  
mr8ns8+e5huKAbi21i6Ut9/e6W/euh1vw6ZGFyOSw43bOiMYhU9wYs+ZTAge  
QmfG9zdLQLHZ6SaOt2t+BdRpnK3z5xTQJyhNPP8A+pimdOoVyaSY+HtAS8Rr  
gDnySri3no2pc3TouGZSj+VGOp8mjG1k+rShvlsgwGRXm/okoQyl64B6t1z9  
3BKj7Nz2Z/PxnRVxTpHmWhwtRGyJ5mKRMFgz1+8u7XKajhDkxB78MutqE1ms

1ZOfmwvaw6FGHKFRAtQ7wD2wqwUPZRmRu4wjNrdI7+oToE1mL2NchVyHxYZm  
Wba95NhOmLwD2NdNjIGQbls8HsyfR/AUvBEgoRx+XnjdYaOG3FW9LJCFwCOg  
5dyiBrbRcc81rH1mrlgf4eFpW0LO0dQp3nrTJl6FNdSpmHzMbMyDSZhEcObv  
furinLheNm8rdRGreWLJGFUcP3oamsc+k1nTHkz5tZn5+ByLUatnaQtrIYce  
+OL2RQa4V8NYBnqJSNW3bjG5IbVU+1Jq9YT9vgjEG575q48CVMrSmOCjAjyK  
fqkbL3ojGUzrHUZkCSkMhfMKTApEJBuDUx4HuRuAzqvnzk3jrV4Grh9pGH7x  
s1FvK0CWfJT6unUwJwKQraR43Rtl33c4V3PdUxr5Qa0jABn1QiOXItaSkMa  
NR8CphmBaKDMfy0M3rjlH9yzMrMP3K3UrMOq7ouUfXeq8jF7CtUOYvF5qj2  
leVaxTqQBa0hcZ4xDhvBORDWtmHrS+7S1a/x/lxd7VuCWqVXHYpUXmwTb4mi  
BdLW9WS9qq1eoliH9+vmVuuDWzLlshHjc85SYnG4cEyEKJAm1L3UCpp5/nJx  
cJ5qTVTH9ojbeSZc3xM0ub11Rfzorj//1CV5ihLyYK1gnUSuJeKjWC5J/MNG  
sc31ZZlxxjAgNz1cMtiqSoDHig49WHccSDh1AtvtiRw6ruprNu7RsSntGxaV  
UhBe/wBn8PHS2/k908epcf1GqXS2rqY+IBbBU23ERb94t8+GcgyuV9ds8cLu  
m2pZyK3HvU6ixmWZtSxrcvdQlbtN6LOvHOTx6ULRLtVLXtd65fzhJtmt0l  
XGrayRtY4bD1ey7PCOahU4yYy7B4JTpxK3tvx9CNmioQiCfK4K+Bz20GZX0K  
otDivJcO7xlZ63FtHz5gju1v4t41ZiDKX4+rRs/2+PUP8feU/ulquP6kOI8  
wXSoEs18YBnRWK56zG6zx6yEqM3pAZ/kiiN9Jj0C58gQycLJOxf/ACKRb5GL  
juEt/cWrA4gMN/YMHsPcerG6bOVD3ddllXai/c8eaeaf8N3b+OKT+IPjIW9n  
uyUx3FA8TYZEpbInSUJKonJefelJSNbbRsP2fdvnefjnLD/H95YMVX/9vwep  
2/l7f2lmlMdg22g/QXhbMnNkKb625QZyiWqmRA6mrHS9LvC/wV4rLyzhY6j/  
Al/APur+ctUHmLmwuisTbNbNeqyLxUpHQqWO0ImCvRg1FnQwE+dZBk1ydZgi  
LQfjkyFf/cuKdCQHucTXaDKVGzwee5QL9xkVrNziHTo7leTI3BqhYQ+4aohP  
LmTHwz3GFlxus7fF6+cORowGte2H+k/k8MWTKNELx2RojekOi3pRa1hL3a4X  
U5mrljGddHFOjszswiZVS2Lky2748eupDTa0U8/73cl9Lzx42euk1rUvthxA  
ihMgZ84zuKfQ1IH0ZS7IGs1ZKmJHcEoT/wC1DOSYA7tMje269mZWsRR+kxbs  
nqCkMxf7QHgGt/wstLjxCIXv1v8AsHEFshPTZPHtVi4/3VwRYPIEe8xHtqM2  
zjHGksW9r5+fZ8/AJMIX6SwrDuP7K3VatwrXkAzdDG65v6NUq/m8CbmTVpC8  
keMN+T133BDwka9BHN0N/bYp03ABZDDIUTgj4uz2idmNfq+ZhtqZC8Vm9+PE  
VxcTxdEm40PJWKP3RFkYP4RciSWIshIvdqUQerycwf16z3+AyohaRbO5Ux3  
j4J+gFNmZaxkboplzq+7s8ViOqW7SAXVcub2bPtEVOI6PBUBSEKK1ZyyCIQj  
aU96yl6ZKeCVooONnPFQTjDbLG1ZtqGKMsfecCL3ZGsyUcXtitUKLcYuQpN+  
G3EmItlcfEsXDg0Kc/8AKjJ+IYztiG/SRORbQfalJixu7bS3IY8v+YP4udFa  
3W12SrWnZRS9rsvECStbftCRaSU1IB0HNLZxnAzb6eUVTVbRdTRq0fKYHtOO  
LO7HedX5o892m0QUi4nO6uJPzqrVP//VFKZ4z8S5aJdQkrdjhbSQBTdCQluP  
V+tEKqPH0va+VbW3WrPj8XFCshTakUHL3bUbuDWiRs1/JYeeyeHKP4fEEryD  
vBLWob9evJkHVL8oOr+3xT3VojZUb1Bm5lOKUoK91y9W8XQKXq0EDSifd5mP  
Mv8AJOWu5SOgzXHpUudpu9C0EspDZC8xa6g16rIrHiSSKh0r2VEjMs3Flzhf  
IAvZI7PBUlqSNNJICzE3LFAFzJVB9qjy8aJ+4oVXUQhQC6VS10rQvVvHrcYs  
noaYvzePbPILdClcfu3EpKjukJRWmvmBtp49XIVCr0nhq8Wjnryery9DAmy6  
TGkf2sovmc9Y1k8/DfMR8qAl6Thdu8y1ryqGxl72OmcQkF6ZGZNn/qY5Lz5t  
P3cWXUmOtC5s5t15RKEPGrGSRoptXjVuel1euHVx8t38XJuaHYWi6mjqpSBC  
WkKkINflqwgqUnrjoDRpRw6s+r6BKaNbs+ZjWVTMTKnN4he6oRzNZrC9pgTU  
CugqNfDd73H4huC8u8XQjo+UbA5/aPCDEX+MY6WwdWOHS3kFD9AkpCBuaLlw  
X9eGio1z4Vmhq4rG5KDYkTy3JE7B4hFAi6ZWK/IJhWNtAhb1r3MFOPwGuD/m  
kRmGMZuqET0g/M9/grsyFh90mlJSNDG1YreFjJVQofMbh+7p0/K+Bg8clTCI  
oFt6Hu3ha+t6YRvcBdFvPY1+NaOm2eDIL8PrMWcWaAIPzHcfOBtycA+ILuxJ  
03eoyMhyVuXihvu45JkYf1ilVNTXUGsZEVF5FpwBzKlnFLzIoW60JRHLWumP  
JULnUOngKwKoV0nJLp4UTbadUth3wsA4env2IG0WOnqqXpNWr8HGdEnWhYbd



cJMoY9vR1qs2q3KJs2Qf1psZQyZPIRCdQ8Y5LV6S9e9I0KZvy8o1q9Otg5QR  
HVCRUwsjBC5mRxVCni5c+/m6zmU8FRBaJSXRd8LgVZaKaMhCOvu9XjDHqx6R  
+kKx6RsUqTxHWv3S8sAz8KgTk5HPHz9qZBBkC2qDE2GQfv8Aa/HzY6dlotqz  
X6ces5S7uNb8gbNyQXXIzgO32uReNQA9sCmQKiZddGf1eIQ//9bOpDveEkWt  
fKtxj6wWRifpKFYzmfOcRw1qdTakQjAlfMv6fgCVhHHbdCAUc+cGQgy4Ru1  
cLOsPHxNGR3OgjmMiWQSp5yhFTbi+8UnrdGOUvb9u2rWfNMehFC2raOPbG4m  
0jpZDcvwgfO2oztqa6mhfoycl6voEHj55vdrY7zqbe61qO29bv9cRq+qy  
C1mKdG0UtESqEcdSmVbtyFaAIHzxesxY7fDVRWV1ElbEyiEuTs0ZDsRkGssl  
78mPV/LUnJOZvM1Jap0h+6QgPPA31hS+kx3UV8rseBX0O5XC2v6wi8FdKpK  
CvEysWTlVJ5ict3JWurj3BVgHVdwGzARW5msl6w9LuPPbRcdgJeEsmBEhU  
axC22Ax02o8nQo+I/Dx81eclUhv6ld1ta1aStLA1XOvp56dRaqmObnSj6lgq  
UU7NWHN5+zz7XWEwq5QzU0jrblh3bf8AMohLSh3c++Giu6G2TTG2H2jkdUB  
HnkJgkSApJtlQXEnwZyUNwUn7qZzyX3Ea02pLw3lsom4BiodsTeW7btCVNZv  
ROmsaBjGjOta7qwWjSmvJqoG4nivucdb8wFn3r3ggZHUlvFAdSnV1QtqTtNZ  
5GFprijrbmTSXawPFCE71h1hJMM0a1t1ix4LK3SEKkbMHMkU8Vn7tuqPqd1  
uc22H2dLrMCbmQVw3EC5Le3qKW2bjkiah05M4ITJ6oRSmEPGzW6TCIrfwE64  
J4DRhJTYibugYxMQtRtx0w+iw0yfSCUgniZ8O0V4mOHZVzDuURvEmy0SLeyH  
y/q7mtDfjnPmFp6tfVk1mzzoxYRtqSOTkn50LlaysNKSUJMBLFTEG6lWlI1  
zqyNnASUijL54iYfjqFdkSwWw/cslbT9b6OckGhwGg6Hm5ix7X/AEcSV7XZ  
UM29wtupZjXiDJSIRt3qsFTajz08Vctk5/RjtLRNwWVMdw6sngz65a8/WVcD  
VgRs2osJgVBxaEIN+54CqDTCVJ4H8PHI5TzVbxsuOPWMj8TmnTWTa0y1flp  
jKQiOzTT2i0Yf2izS6fzPRj1FZf3StYUf4zH4ZHiRBrQVZxulTey1tp7ZluP  
3PHTbi/WxI/Qc9ZrzXgmZkeQvIPtcVQ4fJLk8/tRo8jElf/XzEFLNkZM5kfh  
4+mWX0LOv39xRco9urhYA54TCWv4el/d4E6/f3E5SiQVwRTmLMgHw8bwblF  
llk+/uNXWytI5KRxstZn7UDqho1hEYot1s2TqqhYuEgMtEtmEmdcOh3uoqZB  
EcipnRq+y9ZmxwFztDITHeWEU1FJbFyxpKLfLM/ZMe5wVylcuBjlyf72H1hP  
MHjitw2N6rjvLSO6yK9knS5YoZ17q3Xsvf+kwxBbvcoq+eqDiyBVPuzBBcm  
emLP5A8dZY2LqY7xF7izWldtGt1rMtCz9bzcegbbDHBCqV94trqRmRdVXBD  
NA9InxzFzcOZKqoTlqokApCj+rwOOQ6uOjrm/KbXEKvdOPACppTWF8PcVe/  
A2zrtQ/ew8zOOpWrLtmvabAwwvSNRDctqoSj+r9MfVq2ePG/NjdUIUOhsbrQ  
qDbxc4N3VwbbxXfEIDzH2ggHhmUaVxvaxhIMVQrYrUNNFQIB/D1eKBlgtxHT  
HvL7+XREx3BWcOfC7w9TCQF1cQr5FcbG4I9s/i42HQ8GwQN4Or9Z1JTr1noE  
ejwlcW6W/QKu3VXJ+1j2oFPFuuF1qxbWGYNqkHFo9gs6Ea0AGJ2j4ohBET7q  
hF4HEr5Ogp7I7JV/fx7BquN1PcV2E5asax+zlnTgNw4jXabd9THU6XdTbqqI  
MIPIPP0tYRHPQvrZLCG2TJff3IzZnTqMEtZsal7Kw8U2FGsd1H3CyMknPjg6  
oVlvaavWfBxQ3VJFyH4HOhQpIlLSXD6ZzhMto6br+rL7P6ImBxuSMJoJjPcU  
rMngDIVsFxVxj5mpXTAv1uCuuWqTQQiUvuHfiRRc0H2zKXIOmvGutSaVlz9q  
HLNXsaxLqdYhfQxNak0qO9ocX5K1bgayUqYsqxGb6sgur7ItlWyzIH5eLCxV  
UUEZDeJ64VXRx94tTZUCHpkJ4nKNCehpC3GKn8PV6xeL2mpCA++Vn5EY25ZD  
5ufc3oHIBBEM1jPTXs1j7MmJyyBMOLIX3ci6rb9utx4138VUtMgW3ZkKX85z  
/h4rJoFjG23btRZnAPhzMcWrIXG228aDAzBvcoUx29RA/VVapNYTp9AfaYJb  
2PPx4hLy5dpNlPkgbWLAG4dWGtElc0o13R/LZPZ42O/SdaLWkq7Qi+szL6tC  
EY620seXjxKCSXUZS+KWibW9xXGzC5M+qW9HHLJGqe0/WBFJ6NFTZ/BwjuK6  
VoNWyZA18xHvKnmYrgh4UpCOfzx4hD//OMTWQGriZpXVJykPE6RadLh7FMRS  
ThKsqdOIOhud2xSrn+4vToLo0/f08nJzcdRkt9incl8BH1aH+hy4SxW4WLQQ  
9EhEpSXSLLQjTy6VIGpWjRyp5M2jQrTo0acuXlwkV3vX8DPAPLXf82nQbQRQH  
RpVo0EXp0aeVXJ9/Jo0aF6NGTk9xatOj+7i8sVva5IntTuMS0HBr3rm0bjvG  
hXoamnF25b6nQntTuF00DgTRctVG/LfaFelSn/Swyq3VM0T2+BINIvRSoSvWg



u5aV6WvI4W5y6HOj+6BOjl0aTdP3OX/DisnV/Wie3wCDBo7pyc7SrSHqs+jk  
/wAnLgUWj6TQcB6XlIndaBaXXkadKtPLo+DzcNotz9CJ7fAzkNAvtTvKtLrP  
7i/cHoy5NOirozcik+7o5/J95OnFdCu4ehKfincaJy+ok+nS3/S0orVPvq06  
eWp/iw4iy/UiV/HwCJQ8tNr7JoRpV5PLp/8Apjd6z06E9vgaJpInL6Z+oTSh  
CdAs5M6Ur5dOXz9JE6NHJ+t7mKK7W4r0J7fAlmkOzwj6fEpoBFaLNS+VYmkh  
M5BqdJ0p0VNbQSjRpTp5/Ls9OjHEbpT/AHQyU6i6ePS+Iq7punRLN2jd53db  
32bU7M4MPctBFJHpa6DCEHJpJXU4qad40Hqo0cunRoXpxtun6SKHj4UNMMng  
Dwu0XOMpVojn2hZFrINJRd4u9KdJEpSvQNWTI0cg1L5mXTy8unTo0c1dJF9S  
r7PEdua0/Yx/1F0CU0WRwe6RQzW2iElmMi7dlc8WFekSqq5V4IAX5eTTnzJG  
3Rp0p6StAtJeR3btFOH4+JRydP7+PYWZKKBvUZVFH6be0t+S3NDQnJEaG1Pp  
adlkUtOjL+p0f7uK+4R31KvsTvLa00/SQHiSuXrW5pYN2W/6COdzSky6elpT  
Bn0K06RcuhP3v1MbWyR4+Y5NXrBy4pqjVCR3wJsJ35WgJFE01vN0qQj/ACYW  
uEj9K+zxBZgF8VtN9JjuSz0NCI0o05VulaBr0Jqc7MkaV6NP+PEt0g+pV9ni  
TMGy2lcfUu3OI8BoVHO5EmKUenl5vS0hGvT/AH6mj32LteR1VNMxvdafETpl  
U6Rj0oTpliqNa1qToT7mflURKUaedy9BOjn9DE/Yp1kzH24Vcc1NG+6iYiec  
ia2gazkXVp6PcVpUhA82XI5dOG4eXXIGCRM99/aCb03Do5JvvBx3wlenLW3  
hdXPp06NGnpcv39GLFIKEEK81X7wuX+/p/8ADG2ZBAfNr/cXS8rRy6cuJmQL  
niLpubTwatGghshroj7b780tVEVo0t9yRudTISnk06U0+Xk5caXVK8QRn6hs  
4HaeKmi8bW/7PJ0Kvfv9GhIhVp0ad25T7xoNyaNOo0gqaD6fv6BfqafvYZ2+  
v0DI1TSbGiJPKhJFT1rDhk1BGqaExcEK6Ro0j91ClkCNaxJJ95S0pWry0px0  
n7IDnm6amWnj0t9PFaA3UbRlvsfG1NCV6dK82+PMmnTzdHu5eTHPbhWuY/F  
OZAbir9Vo5/6/Lpq/wCTCRDgXesg+TQrQH0WnlxCH//Z

---=\_linux45538841--

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 21:31:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You know more about energy than I ever will, but from what I read clean energy is way, way, way off as a viable replacement for hydrocarbons. Obviously it's a great idea to get the ball rolling, for political and environmental reasons, but it's going to be a long time. I'm also personally all for exploiting domestic energy stores AS LONG AS THEY ARE TIED TO CONSERVATION PROGRAMS. And they should be paid for by gas taxes so all the soccer moms I see driving a Ford Explorer 'Osama Special' on I-95 will be footing the bill for their largess.

As far as negotiating with terrorists, the US has not only negotiated with terrorists before we have trained, paid, and provisioned terrorists all over the world. Sometimes we trained actual insurgents (Nicaragua), sometimes irregular state supported terrorists (El Salvador, Iran), sometimes actual open state terror (Dominican Republic). Ironically, or tragically depending on your opinion, Saddam was one of the bloodthirsty state mass murderers we funded for a very long time and Osama (along with nearly every thug in Afghanistan at one point or another) was greatly helped by US and US approved Pakistani money and training. So we're fine with terrorists on a moral and

practical level, and have treated with them constantly since at least WW II, we just don't like being the recipient of the terror.

TCB

"DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:

>Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
>trillions

>of dollars borrowed from countries like China?

>

>Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that vaulted

>them into the position they are in nowadays?

>

>>It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that we need

>>a constant flow of mideast

>oil to keep our economy going.<

>

>I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this back

>when we had the time to do something about it, especially upon having had

>ward publicly declared on this country by Al Qaeda. So what are we going  
to

>do? Are the Democrats going to solve this? In order to do so, we need to

>become energy independent \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when

>all domestic energy options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted  
oil

>and gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that \*are

>proven\* could bring this about within the next 5 years are off the table?

>

>I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain flour economy is  
15

>years away, at least. We don't have 15 years...especially with a party in

>power that is willing to negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign

>of weakness. They will be encouraged by this.

>

>

>Regards,

>

>DJ

>

>  
>"Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>  
>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>>  
>>>and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>>economy,  
>>  
>>>the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.  
>>  
>>>They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>>effective,  
>>  
>>>the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>  
>>  
>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a half  
>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
  
>> trillions  
>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we  
  
>> have  
>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of mideast  
>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the danger  
>> of  
>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL influence  
>> on  
>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush  
  
>> years.  
>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.  
>>  
>>  
>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion dollars  
>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively  
  
>> taking  
>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United States.  
>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>> savings,  
>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even though

>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More

>> than

>> any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically,  
on

>> the kindness of strangers."

>>

>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)

>>

>> Gene

>>

>

>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats

Posted by [gene Lennon\[3\]](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 21:42:51 GMT

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

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

>

>I've spent the last few years working in one of the most successful money  
>managing organizations in history, so I follow markets (willingly or not)  
>on a daily basis. The petrodollar thing is just nonsense.

Then you should know...

You think the United States does not derive economic benefit from having  
its currency serve as the dominant international reserve currency?

You think the big oil companies are in favor of the switch to euro based

of millions in PAC funds. It may only effect 0.5% - 8% of GDP but it will  
have a far greater effect on major oil. Have you noticed that whatever is  
good for major oil seems to be what good for America.

This is not just about Dems vs Repubs. Since Clinton's Marc Rich pardon,  
Clinton has also found a place on my shit list.

Oil and money, money and oil.

Gene

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats

Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 22:00:39 GMT

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

It's a double edged sword. A stronger dollar makes imports cheaper for the

US and makes anything we export more expensive to other countries. The US government right now would like nothing more than to see the yuan stronger v. the dollar to do \_something\_ to rectify the account deficit we have with China. So it's not a one way deal.

Nobody can quantify what, if any, difference the 'petrodollar' makes in the relative strength of the dollar. I can say this, when markets get scared and capital 'flight to quality' starts nobody loads up on assets in Nigeria and Bolivia. I think that's because, as screwed up as our economy is sometimes, we're still \_by far\_ the largest and most stable economy in the world. Here's a fed chart for the dollar vs. G-10 currencies.

<http://minneapolisfed.org/Research/data/us/charts/exc1.cfm>

which shows the dollar losing over 20% of its value over four years. No food riots, no mass unemployment, nothing of the sort. Even if one assumes 10% of the value of the dollar is from being a reserve currency (which is absurdly high) that would put us back to being roughly where we were against G-10 currencies in 1997, which that chart uses as its 100 value.

TCB

"Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSP.com> wrote:

>

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

>>

>>I've spent the last few years working in one of the most successful money

>>managing organizations in history, so I follow markets (willingly or not)

>>on a daily basis. The petrodollar thing is just nonsense.

>

>Then you should know...

>

>You think the United States does not derive economic benefit from having

>its currency serve as the dominant international reserve currency?

>

>You think the big oil companies are in favor of the switch to euro based

>of millions in PAC funds. It may only effect 0.5% - 8% of GDP but it will

>have a far greater effect on major oil. Have you noticed that whatever is

>good for major oil seems to be what good for America.

>This is not just about Dems vs Repubs. Since Clinton's Marc Rich pardon,

>Clinton has also found a place on my shit list.

>

>Oil and money, money and oil.

>Gene

>

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Jim\[3\]](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 22:05:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm no economist, but what happens when the Chinese and/or Japanese decide to cash in their bonds? Other than influence in our government, isn't the only reason they don't now is because their economies depend on our fat ass consumption of their products.

Doesn't it make sense that the day the US consumer is so in dept and broke that they can no longer buy Asian products by the gazillion, they will no longer have a reason to keep they're \$\$ here. Won't they just go prop someone else's economy up. Then what?

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

>  
>I've spent the last few years working in one of the most successful money  
>managing organizations in history, so I follow markets (willingly or not)  
>on a daily basis. The petrodollar thing is just nonsense. The rest of what  
>you say, about foreigners holding massive amounts of US debt, is true. I  
>don't necessarily think it's all that much worse to have Japanese banks  
hold  
>that debt instead of US banks, and those banks are so internationalized  
it  
>might not make any difference. The real problem, though, is that we have  
>that massive debt in the first place, no matter who holds it. And that debt  
>is just our governmental debt, no the personal debt and interest only loans  
>that have been written. But if tomorrow the Euro is used for some percentage  
>of oil transactions the world won't end, and the US won't be massively changed.

>  
>  
>TCB

>  
>"Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:

>>  
>>"DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>>  
>>>and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good economy,  
>>  
>>>the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.  
>>  
>>>They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not effective,  
>>  
>>>the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>  
>>

>>This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a half  
>>old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with trillions  
>>of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we  
have  
>>placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the danger  
>of  
>>working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. ( <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).

on  
>>our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush  
years.  
>>Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.  
>>  
>>

>>in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively  
taking  
>>most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United States.  
>>The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with savings,  
>>bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even though  
>>the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More  
than  
>>any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically, on

>>  
>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>  
>>Gene  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [j-cron](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 22:13:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:45539b7c\$1@linux...  
'I bang Maria Sharapova.'

thats great

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 22:19:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Remember, I agreed that all of the debt is bad. Whenever I hear republicans complaining about how democrats tax everything too much I always think that's preferable to running up trillions of dollars of debt. Which is what Bush II has done masterfully.

In the 'good old days' the idea of national debt was that it was held by the public. So in essence the government borrowed from it's own citizens. That hasn't been true for a long time, and yes, there is always more risk with foreign ownership of that debt. Right now it's in the interests of all parties to keep the US afloat. I think that will be true for a very, very long time, so I file 'China shows up and demands cash of California' in the same risk folder as 'I get hit by meteor' and 'I bang Maria Sharapova.' But yes, there is always some risk when so much national debt is held overseas, but to me by far the greater problem is the debt itself, regardless of who owns it.

And, by the way, whenever someone starts to tell you that the freemasons or the trilateral commission or AIPAC really run the US government, keep in mind that the house of Saud has close to a trillion of US treasuries they keep here. That's just treasuries, not other investments and properties, and so forth. I'd guess that gets some phone calls answered.

TCB

"Jim" <jp@nospam.com> wrote:

>  
>I'm no economist, but what happens when the Chinese and/or Japanese decide  
>to cash in their bonds? Other than influence in our government, isn't the  
>only reason they don't now is because their economies depend on our fat  
ass

>consumption of their products.

>  
>Doesn't it make sense that the day the US consumer is so in dept and broke  
>that they can no longer buy Asian products by the gazillion, they will  
no

>longer have a reason to keep they're \$\$ here. Won't they just go prop someone  
>else's economy up. Then what?

>

>

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

>>

>>I've spent the last few years working in one of the most successful money  
>>managing organizations in history, so I follow markets (willingly or not)  
>>on a daily basis. The petrodollar thing is just nonsense. The rest of what  
>>you say, about foreigners holding massive amounts of US debt, is true.

|

>>don't necessarily think it's all that much worse to have Japanese banks  
>hold



>>that debt instead of US banks, and those banks are so internationalized  
>it  
>>might not make any difference. The real problem, though, is that we have  
>>that massive debt in the first place, no matter who holds it. And that  
debt  
>>is just our governmental debt, no the personal debt and interest only loans  
>>that have been written. But if tomorrow the Euro is used for some percentage  
>>of oil transactions the world won't end, and the US won't be massively  
changed.  
>>  
>>  
>>TCB  
>>  
>>"Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>"DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton destroyed,  
>>>>  
>>>>and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good economy,  
>>>>  
>>>>the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic challenge.  
>>>>  
>>>>They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not effective,  
>>>>  
>>>>the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a half  
>>>old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
trillions  
>>>of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we  
>have  
>>>placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the danger  
>>of  
>>>working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. ( <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).

>on  
>>>our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush  
>years.  
>>>Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.  
>>>  
>>>

>>>in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively  
>taking

>>>most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United States.  
>>>The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with savings,  
>>>bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even though  
>>>the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More  
>than  
>>>any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically,  
>on

>>>  
>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk__surowiecki)  
>>>  
>>>Gene  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [steve the artguy](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 23:39:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

>  
>Remember, I agreed that all of the debt is bad. Whenever I hear republicans  
>complaining about how democrats tax everything too much I always think that's  
>preferable to running up trillions of dollars of debt. Which is what Bush  
>Il has done masterfully.

>  
>In the 'good old days' the idea of national debt was that it was held by  
>the public. So in essence the government borrowed from it's own citizens.  
>That hasn't been true for a long time, and yes, there is always more risk  
>with foreign ownership of that debt. Right now it's in the interests of  
>all

>parties to keep the US afloat. I think that will be true for a very, very  
>long time, so I file 'China shows up and demands cash of California' in  
>the

>same risk folder as 'I get hit by meteor' and 'I bang Maria Sharapova.'

But

>yes, there is always some risk when so much national debt is held overseas,  
>but to me by far the greater problem is the debt itself, regardless of who  
>owns it.

>  
>And, by the way, whenever someone starts to tell you that the freemasons  
>or the trilateral commission or AIPAC really run the US government, keep  
>in mind that the house of Saud has close to a trillion of US treasuries  
>they

>keep here. That's just treasuries, not other investments and properties,  
>and so forth. I'd guess that gets some phone calls answered.

>  
>TCB  
>

Thad-

What would you say to this? I don't know who Mike Whitney is, but this seems worth considering.

-steve

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article15440.htm>

The Dollar's Full-System Meltdown

By Mike Whitney

10/30/06 "Information Clearing House" -- -- The U.S. Dollar is kaput. Confidence in the currency is eroding by the day.

banks in China, Japan, Taiwan, South Korea, and Hong Kong have channeled immense foreign reserves into American government bonds, helping to prop

Indeed, the strategy has changed. The world has come to its senses and is moving away from the green slip of paper that is currently mired in \$8.3 trillion of debt."

[. . .]

"According to the Wall Street Journal the Chinese Central-bank governor Zhou

presently have nearly \$1 trillion in USD and US Treasuries."

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats

Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 09 Nov 2006 23:49:55 GMT

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

---

Mike Whitney is, how you say in eenglish? Blithering eejjit. I think he's the source of a lot of this nonsense. He was pushing the Iranian oil exchange as the end of the world as we know it a while back. Look at the Mpls. fed chart. Our economy, and the world economy, have problems, but if we're going down it won't be because some people start buying oil using euros.

TCB

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

>

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

>>

>>Remember, I agreed that all of the debt is bad. Whenever I hear republicans  
>>complaining about how democrats tax everything too much I always think  
>>that's

>>preferable to running up trillions of dollars of debt. Which is what Bush

>>Il has done masterfully.

>>

>>In the 'good old days' the idea of national debt was that it was held by  
>>the public. So in essence the government borrowed from it's own citizens.

>>That hasn't been true for a long time, and yes, there is always more risk  
>>with foreign ownership of that debt. Right now it's in the interests of

>all

>>parties to keep the US afloat. I think that will be true for a very, very

>>long time, so I file 'China shows up and demands cash of California' in

>the

>>same risk folder as 'I get hit by meteor' and 'I bang Maria Sharapova.'

>But

>>yes, there is always some risk when so much national debt is held overseas,

>>but to me by far the greater problem is the debt itself, regardless of  
>>who

>>owns it.

>>

>>And, by the way, whenever someone starts to tell you that the freemasons

>>or the trilateral commission or AIPAC really run the US government, keep

>>in mind that the house of Saud has close to a trillion of US treasuries

>they

>>keep here. That's just treasuries, not other investments and properties,

>>and so forth. I'd guess that gets some phone calls answered.

>>

>>TCB

>>

>

>

>Thad-

>

>What would you say to this? I don't know who Mike Whitney is, but this seems

>worth considering.

>

>-steve

>

>

><http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article15440.htm>

>  
>The Dollar's Full-System Meltdown  
>  
>By Mike Whitney  
>  
>10/30/06 "Information Clearing House" -- -- The U.S. Dollar is kaput. Confidence  
>in the currency is eroding by the day.  
>

intentions

>banks in China, Japan, Taiwan, South Korea, and Hong Kong have channeled  
>immense foreign reserves into American government bonds, helping to prop

strategy

>  
>Indeed, the strategy has changed. The world has come to its senses and is  
>moving away from the green slip of paper that is currently mired in \$8.3  
>trillion of debt."

>[. . .]

>"According to the Wall Street Journal the Chinese Central-bank governor  
Zhou

>presently have nearly \$1 trillion in USD and US Treasuries."  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [DJ](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 02:16:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a perception  
>that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not smart enough  
to be running foreign policy.<

perception of weakness is invitation to attack, plain and simple and we are  
now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm predicting that we  
are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and that it will come as a  
result of an intelligence failure due to democrats restricting the ability  
of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm wrong.

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45538a31@linux...

>  
> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or not  
> pleasing terrorists.

>  
> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a perception  
> that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not smart enough to  
> be running foreign policy.  
>  
> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy and  
> negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who lets  
> themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.  
>  
> Cheers,  
> -Jamie  
> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>  
>  
>  
> Tony Benson wrote:  
>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:455374c4@linux...  
>>  
>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>  
>> Jamie,  
>>  
>> Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over 3,000  
>> innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo jet into our  
>> Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some passengers, almost  
>> flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital Building? Those wacky  
>> terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president over in Iran who wants to  
>> "wipe Israel from the face of the planet". You know, the one enriching  
>> all the uranium. I disagree with plenty of the Republicans and the  
>> Presidents actions, policies, etc., but being tough with terrorists is one  
>> area we can't waiver. These people want to kill us. I'm afraid nothing  
>> short of a few smuggled in soviet nukes going off is going to make this  
>> clear to people. Too bad it'll be too late at that point. Sorry for the  
>> drama, but this one thing more than any other scares me sick.  
>>  
>> Tony  
>>  
>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
>>>> trillions  
>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>>>>  
>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that  
>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>>> Nixon.  
>>>  
>>>

>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that we  
>>>> need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>>>>  
>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this  
>>>> back when we had the time to do something about it,  
>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there was no  
>>> problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years (Reagan, Bush1,  
>>> Clinton, Bush2).  
>>>  
>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country by Al  
>>>> Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going to solve  
>>>> this? In order to do so, we need to become energy independent \*as  
>>>> in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all domestic energy  
>>>> options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil and gas  
>>>> reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that \*are proven\*  
>>>> could bring this about within the next 5 years are off the table?  
>>>>  
>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our economy  
>>>> is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15 years...especially with a  
>>>> party in power that is willing to negotiate with terrorists, which to  
>>>> them is a sign of weakness. They will be encouraged by this.  
>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time for  
>>> better policies to help, as you say.  
>>>  
>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>  
>>> Cheers,  
>>> -Jamie  
>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>> Regards,  
>>>>  
>>>> DJ  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>>>>> economy,



>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>>>> effective,  
>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a  
>>>>> half  
>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
>>>>> trillions  
>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we  
>>>>> have  
>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of  
>>>>> mideast  
>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the  
>>>>> danger of  
>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL influence  
>>>>> on  
>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush  
>>>>> years.  
>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion  
>>>>> dollars  
>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively  
>>>>> taking  
>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United  
>>>>> States.  
>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>>>>> savings,  
>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even  
>>>>> though  
>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More  
>>>>> than  
>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically,  
>>>>> on  
>>>>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>>>>  
>>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk__surowiecki)  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Gene  
>>>>>  
>>

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 06:29:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, Deej. Like me, you've been wrong before so there's reason to hope. ;^)

The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many times before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will probably have been planned before this election.

But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell you it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still logic and there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't want to face the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered policy and action by whoever's not being scapegoated.

We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame BOTH the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes you feel better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.

Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of blame to go around through many administrations in both major parties - for those times we're in a blaming mood.

For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in BOTH major parties AND the minor parties.

There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the threat and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll get some further options on the table now to meet this threat, and maybe, just maybe, they'll work better than the current approach which has hardly been flawless.

Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by terrorists into strutting around acting like overcompensating insecure spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just maybe, we're better than that.

The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and choose from the widest array of effective options.

Cheers,  
-Jamie

DJ wrote:

>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a perception  
>> that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not smart enough  
> to be running foreign policy.<

>  
> perception of weakness is invitation to attack, plain and simple and we are  
> now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm predicting that we  
> are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and that it will come as a  
> result of an intelligence failure due to democrats restricting the ability  
> of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm wrong.

>  
>  
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45538a31@linux...  
>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or not  
>> pleasing terrorists.

>>  
>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a perception  
>> that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not smart enough to  
>> be running foreign policy.

>>  
>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy and  
>> negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who lets  
>> themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.

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

>>  
>>  
>>  
>> Tony Benson wrote:

>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>

>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).

>>> Jamie,  
>>>

>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over 3,000  
>>> innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo jet into our  
>>> Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some passengers, almost  
>>> flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital Building? Those wacky  
>>> terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president over in Iran who wants to  
>>> "wipe Israel from the face of the planet". You know, the one enriching  
>>> all the uranium. I disagree with plenty of the Republicans and the  
>>> Presidents actions, policies, etc., but being tough with terrorists is one

>>> area we can't waiver. These people want to kill us. I'm affraid nothing  
>>> short of a few smuggled in soviet nukes going off is going to make this  
>>> clear to people. Too bad it'll be too late at that point. Sorry for the  
>>> drama, but this one thing more than any other scares me sick.  
>>>  
>>> Tony  
>>>  
>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
>>>>> trillions  
>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that  
>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>>>> Nixon.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that we  
>>>>>> need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>>>>>  
>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this  
>>>>> back when we had the time to di something about it,  
>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there was no  
>>>> problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years (Reagan, Bush1,  
>>>> Clinton, Bush2).  
>>>>  
>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country by Al  
>>>>>> Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going to solve  
>>>>>> this? In order to do so, we need to become energy independent \*as  
>>>>>> in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all domestic energy  
>>>>>> options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil and gas  
>>>>>> reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that \*are proven\*  
>>>>>> could bring this about within the next 5 years are off the table?  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our economy  
>>>>>> is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15 years...especially with a  
>>>>>> party in power that is willing to negotiate with terrorists, which to  
>>>>>> them is a sign of weakness. They will be encouraged by this.  
>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time for  
>>>> better policies to help, as you say.  
>>>>  
>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>

>>>> Cheers,  
>>>> -Jamie  
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>> Regards,  
>>>>>  
>>>>> DJ  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>>>>>> economy,  
>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>>>>>> effective,  
>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a  
>>>>>>> half  
>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
>>>>>>> trillions  
>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that we  
>>>>>>> have  
>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of  
>>>>>>> mideast  
>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the  
>>>>>>> danger of  
>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL influence  
>>>>>>> on  
>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the Bush  
>>>>>>> years.  
>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and Halliburton.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion  
>>>>>>> dollars  
>>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is effectively  
>>>>>>> taking  
>>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United

>>>>> States.  
>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>>>>> savings,  
>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even  
>>>>> though  
>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value. More  
>>>>> than  
>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends, economically,  
>>>>> on  
>>>>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>>>>  
>>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Gene  
>>>>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [DJ](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 08:41:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

> like overcompensating insecure  
spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed  
abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just maybe,  
we're better than that.

and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you can die  
by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism, or you can face  
reality, deal with it for the time being and have something left to argue  
over once the dust clears.

"Jamie K" <[Meta@Dimensional.com](mailto:Meta@Dimensional.com)> wrote in message <news:45541a10@linux...>

>  
> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, DeeJ. Like me, you've been wrong before so  
> there's reason to hope. ;^)  
>  
> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many times  
> before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will probably  
> have been planned before this election.  
>  
> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell you  
> it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still logic and  
> there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't want to face  
> the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered policy and action  
> by whoever's not being scapegoated.

>  
> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame BOTH  
> the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes you feel  
> better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.  
>  
> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of  
> blame to go around through many administrations in both major parties -  
> for those times we're in a blaming mood.  
>  
> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in BOTH  
> major parties AND the minor parties.  
>  
> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the threat  
> and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll get some  
> further options on the table now to meet this threat, and maybe, just  
> maybe, they'll work better than the current approach which has hardly been  
> flawless.  
>  
> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by terrorists  
> into strutting around acting like overcompensating insecure spendthrift  
> fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed abject fear -  
> IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just maybe, we're better  
> than that.  
>  
> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and choose  
> from the widest array of effective options.  
>  
> Cheers,  
> -Jamie  
> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>  
>  
> DJ wrote:  
>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a perception  
>>> that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not smart enough  
>> to be running foreign policy.<  
>>  
>> perception of weakness is invitation to attack, plain and simple and we  
>> are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm predicting  
>> that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and that it will  
>> come as a result of an intelligence failure due to democrats restricting  
>> the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm wrong.  
>>  
>>



>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45538a31@linux...  
>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or not  
>>> pleasing terrorists.  
>>>  
>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a perception  
>>> that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not smart enough  
>>> to be running foreign policy.  
>>>  
>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy and  
>>> negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who lets  
>>> themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.  
>>>  
>>> Cheers,  
>>> -Jamie  
>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> Tony Benson wrote:  
>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>>  
>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over 3,000  
>>>>> innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo jet into  
>>>>> our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some passengers,  
>>>>> almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital Building? Those  
>>>>> wacky terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president over in Iran who wants  
>>>>> to "wipe Isreal from the face of the planet". You know, the one  
>>>>> enriching all the uranium. I disagree with plenty of the Republicans  
>>>>> and the Presidents actions, policies, etc., but being tough with  
>>>>> terrorists is one area we can't waiver. These people want to kill us.  
>>>>> I'm affraid nothing short of a few smuggled in soviet nukes going off  
>>>>> is going to make this clear to people. Too bad it'll be too late at  
>>>>> that point. Sorry for the drama, but this one thing more than any other  
>>>>> scares me sick.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Tony  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
>>>>>>> trillions  
>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that

>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>>>> Nixon.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that  
>>>>> we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>>>>>  
>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this  
>>>>> back when we had the time to di something about it,  
>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there was  
>>>>> no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years (Reagan,  
>>>>> Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country by  
>>>>> Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going to  
>>>>> solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy independent  
>>>>> \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all domestic energy  
>>>>> options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil and gas  
>>>>> reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that \*are  
>>>>> proven\* could bring this about within the next 5 years are off the  
>>>>> table?  
>>>>>  
>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our  
>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15  
>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to negotiate  
>>>>> with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness. They will be  
>>>>> encouraged by this.  
>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time for  
>>>>> better policies to help, as you say.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> Regards,  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> DJ  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message

>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>>>>> economy,  
>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>>>>> effective,  
>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a  
>>>>>> half  
>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that  
>>>>>> we have  
>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of  
>>>>>> mideast  
>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the  
>>>>>> danger of  
>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
>>>>>> influence on  
>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the  
>>>>>> Bush years.  
>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
>>>>>> Halliburton.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion  
>>>>>> dollars  
>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is  
>>>>>> effectively taking  
>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United  
>>>>>> States.  
>>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>>>>>> savings,  
>>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even  
>>>>>> though  
>>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value.  
>>>>>> More than  
>>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends,  
>>>>>> economically, on  
>>>>>> the kindness of strangers."

>>>>>>  
>>>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Gene  
>>>>>>  
>>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 10:02:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DJ wrote:

>>Jamie wrote:  
>> like overcompensating insecure  
> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed  
> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just maybe,  
> we're better than that.  
>  
> and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you can die  
> by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism, or you can face  
> reality, deal with it for the time being and have something left to argue  
> over once the dust clears.

Those are two of many choices. Black and white in a multi-colored world.

Concern and awareness are useful when focused to motivate planning and forethought that translates into appropriate action, no dispute from me on that. You can call that "healthy fear" if you like, at the risk of confusing it with unhealthy fear.

It's dangerously possible, through fear, to react with insufficient thought and understanding, and make a bad situation worse.

Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to enslave.

"...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another context.

At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't agree with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to potential threats. Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.

It's important to recognize what hasn't worked, to be open to better ideas. So we can, together, find solutions that help our country and our planet achieve peace.

The first step toward getting out of a hole is to stop digging. That may be one message of this election.

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
www.JamieKrutz.com

>  
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45541a10@linux...  
>> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, DeeJ. Like me, you've been wrong before so  
>> there's reason to hope. ;^)  
>>  
>> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many times  
>> before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will probably  
>> have been planned before this election.  
>>  
>> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell you  
>> it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still logic and  
>> there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't want to face  
>> the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered policy and action  
>> by whoever's not being scapegoated.  
>>  
>> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
>> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame BOTH  
>> the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes you feel  
>> better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.  
>>  
>> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
>> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of  
>> blame to go around through many administrations in both major parties -  
>> for those times we're in a blaming mood.  
>>  
>> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
>> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
>> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in BOTH  
>> major parties AND the minor parties.  
>>  
>> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the threat  
>> and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll get some  
>> further options on the table now to meet this threat, and maybe, just  
>> maybe, they'll work better than the current approach which has hardly been  
>> flawless.  
>>  
>> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by terrorists  
>> into strutting around acting like overcompensating insecure spendthrift

>> fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed abject fear -  
>> IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just maybe, we're better  
>> than that.  
>>  
>> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and choose  
>> from the widest array of effective options.  
>>  
>> Cheers,  
>> -Jamie  
>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>  
>>  
>> DJ wrote:  
>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a perception  
>>>> that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not smart enough  
>>>> to be running foreign policy.<  
>>>>  
>>>> perception of weakenss is invitation to attack, plain and simple and we  
>>>> are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm predicting  
>>>> that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and that it will  
>>>> come as a result iof an intelligence failure due to democrats restricting  
>>>> the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm wrong.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45538a31@linux...  
>>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or not  
>>>> pleasing terrorists.  
>>>>  
>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a perception  
>>>> that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not smart enough  
>>>> to be running foreign policy.  
>>>>  
>>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy and  
>>>> negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who lets  
>>>> themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.  
>>>>  
>>>> Cheers,  
>>>> -Jamie  
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Tony Benson wrote:  
>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).

>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over 3,000  
>>>>> innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo jet into  
>>>>> our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some passengers,  
>>>>> almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital Building? Those  
>>>>> wacky terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president over in Iran who wants  
>>>>> to "wipe Isreal from the face of the planet". You know, the one  
>>>>> enriching all the uranium. I disagree with plenty of the Republicans  
>>>>> and the Presidents actions, policies, etc., but being tough with  
>>>>> terrorists is one area we can't waiver. These people want to kill us.  
>>>>> I'm affraid nothing short of a few smuggled in soviet nukes going off  
>>>>> is going to make this clear to people. Too bad it'll be too late at  
>>>>> that point. Sorry for the drama, but this one thing more than any other  
>>>>> scares me sick.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Tony  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up with  
>>>>>>> trillions  
>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that  
>>>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>>>>>>> Nixon.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that  
>>>>>>>> we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this  
>>>>>>>> back when we had the time to di something about it,  
>>>>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there was  
>>>>>>>> no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years (Reagan,  
>>>>>>>> Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country by  
>>>>>>>>>>> Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going to  
>>>>>>>>>>> solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy independent  
>>>>>>>>>>> \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all domestic energy  
>>>>>>>>>>> options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil and gas  
>>>>>>>>>>> reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that \*are  
>>>>>>>>>>> proven\* could bring this about within the next 5 years are off the



>>>>>> table?  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our  
>>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15  
>>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to negotiate  
>>>>>> with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness. They will be  
>>>>>> encouraged by this.  
>>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time for  
>>>>>> better policies to help, as you say.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Regards,  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> DJ  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a good  
>>>>>>>> economy,  
>>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>>>>>>> effective,  
>>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and a  
>>>>>>>> half  
>>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough that  
>>>>>>>> we have  
>>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of  
>>>>>>>> mideast  
>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the  
>>>>>>>> danger of  
>>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (

>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
>>>>>>> influence on  
>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the  
>>>>>>> Bush years.  
>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
>>>>>>> Halliburton.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion  
>>>>>>> dollars  
>>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is  
>>>>>>> effectively taking  
>>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United  
>>>>>>> States.  
>>>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>>>>>>> savings,  
>>>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even  
>>>>>>> though  
>>>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value.  
>>>>>>> More than  
>>>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends,  
>>>>>>> economically, on  
>>>>>>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Gene  
>>>>>>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [DJ](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 15:42:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

>Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for  
sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to  
enslave.<

Ask any military planner and he will tell you that without the weapons to do  
the job he will not be able to do it.

"...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another context.

This was from Roosevelts first inagural and referred to an economic  
depression. He was trying to keep people from withdrawing their money from  
the banks. He certainly wasn't talking about a shooting war/spies and

sabatoeurs.

>At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't agree  
>with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to potential  
>threats. <

It would be inaccurate to imply that wars have not \*always\* required great sacrifices from the citizenry of the respective combatants.

>Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.<

I agree 100%. It seems that half the folks in this country believe we are in a war, the other half don't. This is a sure recipe for disaster, especially in a war with an enemy who uses our own laws against us. To ignore this in an era where one person with a bomb can wipe out an entire city is a recipe for disaster on an unimaginable scale.

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45544bcc@linux...

>

> DJ wrote:

> >>Jamie wrote:

>>> like overcompensating insecure

>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed

>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just

>> maybe, we're better than that.

>>

>> and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you can

>> die by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism, or you

>> can face reality, deal with it for the time being and have something left

>> to argue over once the dust clears.

>

> Those are two of many choices. Black and white in a multi-colored world.

>

> Concern and awareness are useful when focused to motivate planning and

> forethought that translates into appropriate action, no dispute from me on

> that. You can call that "healthy fear" if you like, at the risk of

> confusing it with unhealthy fear.

>

> It's dangerously possible, through fear, to react with insufficient

> thought and understanding, and make a bad situation worse.

>

> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for sound

> policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to enslave.

>

> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another context.

>  
> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't agree  
> with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to potential  
> threats. Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at best. And  
> dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.  
>  
> It's important to recognize what hasn't worked, to be open to better  
> ideas. So we can, together, find solutions that help our country and our  
> planet achieve peace.  
>  
> The first step toward getting out of a hole is to stop digging. That may  
> be one message of this election.  
>  
> Cheers,  
> -Jamie  
> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>  
>  
>  
>>  
>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45541a10@linux...  
>>> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, DeeJ. Like me, you've been wrong before  
>>> so there's reason to hope. ;^)  
>>>  
>>> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many times  
>>> before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will probably  
>>> have been planned before this election.  
>>>  
>>> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell you  
>>> it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still logic and  
>>> there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't want to face  
>>> the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered policy and  
>>> action by whoever's not being scapegoated.  
>>>  
>>> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
>>> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame  
>>> BOTH the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes you  
>>> feel better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.  
>>>  
>>> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
>>> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of  
>>> blame to go around through many administrations in both major parties -  
>>> for those times we're in a blaming mood.  
>>>  
>>> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
>>> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
>>> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in BOTH  
>>> major parties AND the minor parties.

>>>

>>> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the  
>>> threat and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll  
>>> get some further options on the table now to meet this threat, and  
>>> maybe, just maybe, they'll work better than the current approach which  
>>> has hardly been flawless.

>>>

>>> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by  
>>> terrorists into strutting around acting like overcompensating insecure  
>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed  
>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just  
>>> maybe, we're better than that.

>>>

>>> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and choose  
>>> from the widest array of effective options.

>>>

>>> Cheers,  
>>> -Jamie  
>>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)

>>>

>>>

>>> DJ wrote:

>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not  
>>>> smart enough  
>>>> to be running foreign policy.<

>>>>

>>>> perception of weakenss is invitation to attack, plain and simple and we  
>>>> are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm  
>>>> predicting that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and  
>>>> that it will come as a result iof an intelligence failure due to  
>>>> democrats restricting the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm  
>>>> wrong.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> "Jamie K" <[Meta@Dimensional.com](mailto:Meta@Dimensional.com)> wrote in message  
>>>> [news:45538a31@linux...](mailto:news:45538a31@linux...)

>>>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or  
>>>>> not pleasing terrorists.

>>>>>

>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not  
>>>>> smart enough to be running foreign policy.

>>>>>

>>>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy  
>>>>> and negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who  
>>>>> lets themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.

>>>>>

>>>> Cheers,  
>>>> -Jamie  
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Tony Benson wrote:  
>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over 3,000  
>>>>>> innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo jet into  
>>>>>> our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some passengers,  
>>>>>> almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital Building?  
>>>>>> Those wacky terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president over in Iran  
>>>>>> who wants to "wipe Isreal from the face of the planet". You know, the  
>>>>>> one enriching all the uranium. I disagree with plenty of the  
>>>>>> Republicans and the Presidents actions, policies, etc., but being  
>>>>>> tough with terrorists is one area we can't waiver. These people want  
>>>>>> to kill us. I'm affraid nothing short of a few smuggled in soviet  
>>>>>> nukes going off is going to make this clear to people. Too bad it'll  
>>>>>> be too late at that point. Sorry for the drama, but this one thing  
>>>>>> more than any other scares me sick.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Tony  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that  
>>>>>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>>>>>>>>> Nixon.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that  
>>>>>>>>>>> we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this  
>>>>>>>>>>> back when we had the time to di something about it,  
>>>>>>>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there was  
>>>>>>>>>>> no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years (Reagan,

>>>>>> Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country  
>>>>>> by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going to  
>>>>>> solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy independent  
>>>>>> \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all domestic  
>>>>>> energy options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil and  
>>>>>> gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that \*are  
>>>>>> proven\* could bring this about within the next 5 years are off the  
>>>>>> table?  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our  
>>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15  
>>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to  
>>>>>> negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness.  
>>>>>> They will be encouraged by this.  
>>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time for  
>>>>>> better policies to help, as you say.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Regards,  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> DJ  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a  
>>>>>>>> good economy,  
>>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>>>>>>> effective,  
>>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>>>>>



>>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and  
>>>>>>>> a half  
>>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough  
>>>>>>>> that we have  
>>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of  
>>>>>>>> mideast  
>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the  
>>>>>>>> danger of  
>>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
>>>>>>>> influence on  
>>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the  
>>>>>>>> Bush years.  
>>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
>>>>>>>> Halliburton.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion  
>>>>>>>> dollars  
>>>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is  
>>>>>>>> effectively taking  
>>>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United  
>>>>>>>> States.  
>>>>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>>>>>>>> savings,  
>>>>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even  
>>>>>>>> though  
>>>>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value.  
>>>>>>>> More than  
>>>>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends,  
>>>>>>>> economically, on  
>>>>>>>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Gene  
>>>>>>>>  
>>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 17:27:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DJ wrote:

- >> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for
- > sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to
- > enslave.<
- >
- > Ask any military planner and he will tell you that without the weapons to do
- > the job he will not be able to do it.

No one has advocated military disarmament in this thread.

My point is that it's important to operate from a position of strength derived from rational planning, rather than fear-based, panicked, knee-jerk responses, the latter being open to direct manipulation by terrorists (and by self-serving politicians, for that matter). Can we not agree on that?

- > "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another context.
- >
- > This was from Roosevelt's first inaugural and referred to an economic
- > depression. He was trying to keep people from withdrawing their money from
- > the banks. He certainly wasn't talking about a shooting war/spies and
- > saboteurs.

Exactly, and I noted the different context. However the quote is germane.

Speaking of ex-presidents and war, Eisenhower said this:

"This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence-economic, political, even spiritual-is felt in every city, every state house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together."

>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't agree  
>> with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to potential  
>> threats. <

OK, we agree on that, right?

> It would be inaccurate to imply that wars have not \*always\* required great  
> sacrifices from the citizenry of the respective combatants.

Right, no one has advocated a sacrifice-free response in this thread.  
Although our current president and congress have actively worked to make  
it seem like little sacrifice has been required by, for the first time  
in history (correct me if I'm wrong), cutting taxes in time of war. Of  
course this only delays the sacrifice a generation or two.

We should, however, be very aware and careful to not sacrifice the  
essence of American freedom and human rights to the altar of terrorism.

>> Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at  
> best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.<  
>  
> I agree 100%. It seems that half the folks in this country believe we are in

Then we can be united despite our differences. Like a composite material  
with fibers in different layers running in different directions we can  
be bonded together, stronger for our union. :^)

IOW, it's OK that we sometimes think differently, as long as we listen  
to each other, respect each other and can consider each other's  
viewpoints. We can draw on all of our strengths to innovate workable  
solutions.

> a war, the other half don't. This is a sure recipe for disaster, especially  
> in a war with an enemy who uses our own laws against us. To ignore this in  
> an era where one person with a bomb can wipe out an entire city is a recipe  
> for disaster on an unimaginable scale.

The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. We must defend BOTH against a  
crafty enemy AND against those who would sacrifice the ideals and  
freedoms of our country. We must not lose the war in order to win the  
battle. And we must not lose that battle.

We must choose paths that serve both our citizens and the people of the

world, not those that best serve the military industrial complexes of the world's nations, nor the short term interests of short-sighted international corporations, nor the power ambitions of a any obsessive wannabe despots. This will take leadership in a style not seen for quite a while in these parts.

Fear-based thinking on either side of a conflict props up illegitimate power.

This is among the top dangers of major aspects of our current course. While trying to appear "not weak" we run the risk of making it easy for those against us to use our missteps, missed opportunities and overreactions to literally scare up more and more followers.

As part of a well considered and comprehensive defense, we must interrupt this dynamic. To not do so would be to fight with one arm tied behind our back.

We need to think very long term, we need to look at alleviating root causes of conflict and we need to consider the best interests of the nations and citizens involved. As long as we don't, we are fighting without a complete defense and we are in danger of blundering into trap after trap, draining our resources and weakening our position.

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45544bcc@linux...

>> DJ wrote:

>>>> Jamie wrote:

>>>> like overcompensating insecure

>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed

>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just

>>> maybe, we're better than that.

>>>

>>> and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you can

>>> die by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism, or you

>>> can face reality, deal with it for the time being and have something left

>>> to argue over once the dust clears.

>> Those are two of many choices. Black and white in a multi-colored world.

>>

>> Concern and awareness are useful when focused to motivate planning and

>> forethought that translates into appropriate action, no dispute from me on

>> that. You can call that "healthy fear" if you like, at the risk of  
>> confusing it with unhealthy fear.  
>>  
>> It's dangerously possible, through fear, to react with insufficient  
>> thought and understanding, and make a bad situation worse.  
>>  
>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for sound  
>> policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to enslave.  
>>  
>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another context.  
>>  
>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't agree  
>> with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to potential  
>> threats. Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at best. And  
>> dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.  
>>  
>> It's important to recognize what hasn't worked, to be open to better  
>> ideas. So we can, together, find solutions that help our country and our  
>> planet achieve peace.  
>>  
>> The first step toward getting out of a hole is to stop digging. That may  
>> be one message of this election.  
>>  
>> Cheers,  
>> -Jamie  
>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45541a10@linux...  
>>>> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, DeeJ. Like me, you've been wrong before  
>>>> so there's reason to hope. ;^)  
>>>>  
>>>> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many times  
>>>> before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will probably  
>>>> have been planned before this election.  
>>>>  
>>>> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell you  
>>>> it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still logic and  
>>>> there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't want to face  
>>>> the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered policy and  
>>>> action by whoever's not being scapegoated.  
>>>>  
>>>> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
>>>> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame  
>>>> BOTH the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes you  
>>>> feel better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.  
>>>>

>>>> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
>>>> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of  
>>>> blame to go around through many administrations in both major parties -  
>>>> for those times we're in a blaming mood.

>>>>

>>>> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
>>>> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
>>>> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in BOTH  
>>>> major parties AND the minor parties.

>>>>

>>>> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the  
>>>> threat and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll  
>>>> get some further options on the table now to meet this threat, and  
>>>> maybe, just maybe, they'll work better than the current approach which  
>>>> has hardly been flawless.

>>>>

>>>> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by  
>>>> terrorists into strutting around acting like overcompensating insecure  
>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed  
>>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just  
>>>> maybe, we're better than that.

>>>>

>>>> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and choose  
>>>> from the widest array of effective options.

>>>>

>>>> Cheers,

>>>> -Jamie

>>>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> DJ wrote:

>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not  
>>>>> smart enough  
>>>>> to be running foreign policy.<

>>>>>

>>>>> perception of weakness is invitation to attack, plain and simple and we  
>>>>> are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm  
>>>>> predicting that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and  
>>>>> that it will come as a result of an intelligence failure due to  
>>>>> democrats restricting the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm  
>>>>> wrong.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message

>>>>> news:45538a31@linux...

>>>>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or  
>>>>>> not pleasing terrorists.

>>>>>  
>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not  
>>>>> smart enough to be running foreign policy.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy  
>>>>> and negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who  
>>>>> lets themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:  
>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over 3,000  
>>>>>>> innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo jet into  
>>>>>>> our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some passengers,  
>>>>>>> almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital Building?  
>>>>>>> Those wacky terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president over in Iran  
>>>>>>> who wants to "wipe Israel from the face of the planet". You know, the  
>>>>>>> one enriching all the uranium. I disagree with plenty of the  
>>>>>>> Republicans and the Presidents actions, policies, etc., but being  
>>>>>>> tough with terrorists is one area we can't waiver. These people want  
>>>>>>> to kill us. I'm afraid nothing short of a few smuggled in soviet  
>>>>>>> nukes going off is going to make this clear to people. Too bad it'll  
>>>>>>> be too late at that point. Sorry for the drama, but this one thing  
>>>>>>> more than any other scares me sick.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Tony  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that  
>>>>>>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>>>>>>>>>> Nixon.  
>>>>>>>>>>



>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that  
>>>>>>>> we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this  
>>>>>>>> back when we had the time to di something about it,  
>>>>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there was  
>>>>>>>> no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years (Reagan,  
>>>>>>>> Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country  
>>>>>>>>> by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going to  
>>>>>>>>> solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy independent  
>>>>>>>>> \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all domestic  
>>>>>>>>> energy options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil and  
>>>>>>>>> gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that \*are  
>>>>>>>>> proven\* could bring this about within the next 5 years are off the  
>>>>>>>>> table?

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our  
>>>>>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15  
>>>>>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to  
>>>>>>>>> negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness.  
>>>>>>>>> They will be encouraged by this.  
>>>>>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time for  
>>>>>>>>> better policies to help, as you say.

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).

>>>>>>>>>

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

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Regards,

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> DJ

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...

>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:

>>>>>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton

>>>>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a  
>>>>>>>>> good economy,  
>>>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>>>>>>>> effective,  
>>>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and  
>>>>>>>>> a half  
>>>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough  
>>>>>>>>> that we have  
>>>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of  
>>>>>>>>> mideast  
>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the  
>>>>>>>>> danger of  
>>>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
>>>>>>>>> influence on  
>>>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the  
>>>>>>>>> Bush years.  
>>>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
>>>>>>>>> Halliburton.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion  
>>>>>>>>> dollars  
>>>>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is  
>>>>>>>>> effectively taking  
>>>>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United  
>>>>>>>>> States.  
>>>>>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>>>>>>>>> savings,  
>>>>>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even  
>>>>>>>>> though  
>>>>>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value.  
>>>>>>>>> More than  
>>>>>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends,  
>>>>>>>>> economically, on  
>>>>>>>>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk__surowiecki)  
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Gene  
>>>>>>>>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [DJ](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 17:36:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

this is the 800lb gorilla to be sure, but as far as Franklin oes, would he have advocated exercisingone's freedom to walk into a plague infested area, simply because it is ones' right to travel freely? Sure, you can do it.and you will likely die. What we are facing is much more akin to a plague than any conventional threat and it should be treated like one. In order to do this it must be detected and prevented. the only way to do this is by forensic means..but this particular plague has intelligence so letting it know what you are doing to prevent it will cause it to mutate much faster and more effectively than any microbe could ever do.

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4554d628@linux...

>  
> DJ wrote:  
> >> No one has advocated military disarmament in this thread.  
> >  
> > <snip>  
> >> We should, however, be very aware and careful to not sacrifice the essence  
> >> of American freedom and human rights to the altar of terrorism.  
> >>  
> >  
> >  
> > The patriot act and NSA wiretaps (immediate-no \*\*\*ing around trying to get a  
> > warrant when you don't even know what you're really looking to find) are the  
> > weapons I'm talking about here. It'sd a shame but our laws in this respect  
> > have become our enemy's weapon. In order to deprive him of it, we must  
> > sacrifice it.  
>  
> There are elements of the Patriot act; our move toward justifying  
> torture; and aspects to wholesale wiretapping of American citizens that  
> are very unamerican IMO.  
>  
> We must be extremely careful that we do not permanently lose our place  
> in history as a great step forward in personal freedom and opportunity.  
> Either by some nutcase reducing St. Louis to a nuclear wasteland or by

> some other nutcase legislating away our core ideals. I don't care how  
> sincere the nutcase, those are both extremely damaging actions to America.  
>  
> This is not an easy problem, so we need every viable idea on the table  
> and we need to come together with respect. And we need to remember:  
>  
> "Those who would give up Essential Liberty to purchase a little  
> Temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety." -Ben Franklin.  
>  
> Cheers,  
> -Jamie  
> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)  
>  
>  
> >  
> > "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4554b420@linux...  
> >> DJ wrote:  
> >>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for  
> >>> sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way  
> to  
> >>> enslave.<  
> >>>  
> >>> Ask any military planner and he will tell you that without the weapons  
> to  
> >>> do the job he will not be able to do it.  
> >> No one has advocated military disarmament in this thread.  
> >>  
> >> My point is that it's important to operate from a position of strength  
> >> derived from rational planning, rather than fear-based, panicked,  
> >> knee-jerk responses, the latter being open to direct manipulation by  
> >> terrorists (and by self-serving politicians, for that matter). Can we  
> not  
> >> agree on that?  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another  
> >>> context.  
> >>>  
> >>> This was from Roosevelts first inagural and referred to an economic  
> >>> depression. He was trying to keep people from withdrawing their money  
> >>> from the banks. He certainly wasn't talking about a shooting war/spies  
> >>> and sabatoeurs.  
> >> Exactly, and I noted the different context. However the quote is  
> germane.  
> >>  
> >> Speaking of ex-presidents and war, Eisenhower said this:  
> >>

> >> "This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms  
> >> industry is new in the American experience. The total  
influence-economic,  
> >> political, even spiritual-is felt in every city, every state house,  
every  
> >> office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for  
> >> this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave  
> >> implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so  
is  
> >> the very structure of our society.  
> >>  
> >> In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of  
> >> unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the  
> >> military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of  
> >> misplaced power exists and will persist.  
> >>  
> >> We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties  
or  
> >> democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted only an alert  
and  
> >> knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of huge  
industrial  
> >> and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals,  
so  
> >> that security and liberty may prosper together."  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't  
> >>>> agree with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to  
> >>>> potential threats. <  
> >> OK, we agree on that, right?  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>> It would be inaccurate to imply that wars have not \*always\* required  
> >>> great sacrifices from the citizenry of the respective combatants.  
> >> Right, no one has advocated a sacrifice-free response in this thread.  
> >> Although our current president and congress have actively worked to  
make  
> >> it seem like little sacrifice has been required by, for the first time  
in  
> >> history (correct me if I'm wrong), cutting taxes in time of war. Of  
course  
> >> this only delays the sacrifice a generation or two.  
> >>  
> >> We should, however, be very aware and careful to not sacrifice the  
essence  
> >> of American freedom and human rights to the altar of terrorism.

> >>  
> >>  
> >>>> Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at  
> >>> best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.<  
> >>>  
> >>> I agree 100%. It seems that half the folks in this country believe we  
are  
> >>> in  
> >> Then we can be united despite our differences. Like a composite  
material  
> >> with fibers in different layers running in different directions we can  
be  
> >> bonded together, stronger for our union. :^)  
> >>  
> >> IOW, it's OK that we sometimes think differently, as long as we listen  
to  
> >> each other, respect each other and can consider each other's  
viewpoints.  
> >> We can draw on all of our strengths to innovate workable solutions.  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>> a war, the other half don't. This is a sure recipe for disaster,  
> >>> especially in a war with an enemy who uses our own laws against us. To  
> >>> ignore this in an era where one person with a bomb can wipe out an  
entire  
> >>> city is a recipe for disaster on an unimaginable scale.  
> >> The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. We must defend BOTH against  
a  
> >> crafty enemy AND against those who would sacrifice the ideals and  
freedoms  
> >> of our country. We must not lose the war in order to win the battle.  
And  
> >> we must not lose that battle.  
> >>  
> >> We must choose paths that serve both our citizens and the people of the  
> >> world, not those that best serve the military industrial complexes of  
the  
> >> world's nations, nor the short term interests of short-sighted  
> >> international corporations, nor the power ambitions of a any obsessive  
> >> wannabe despots. This will take leadership in a style not seen for  
quite a  
> >> while in these parts.  
> >>  
> >> Fear-based thinking on either side of a conflict props up illegitimate  
> >> power.  
> >>  
> >> This is among the top dangers of major aspects of our current course.  
> >> While trying to appear "not weak" we run the risk of making it easy for

> >> those against us to use our missteps, missed opportunities and  
> >> overreactions to literally scare up more and more followers.  
> >>  
> >> As part of a well considered and comprehensive defense, we must  
interrupt  
> >> this dynamic. To not do so would be to fight with one arm tied behind  
our  
> >> back.  
> >>  
> >> We need to think very long term, we need to look at alleviating root  
> >> causes of conflict and we need to consider the best interests of the  
> >> nations and citizens involved. As long as we don't, we are fighting  
> >> without a complete defense and we are in danger of blundering into trap  
> >> after trap, draining our resources and weakening our position.  
> >>  
> >> Cheers,  
> >> -Jamie  
> >> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>  
> >>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
news:45544bcc@linux...  
> >>>> DJ wrote:  
> >>>>> Jamie wrote:  
> >>>>> like overcompensating insecure  
> >>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty  
eyed  
> >>>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just  
> >>>>> maybe, we're better than that.  
> >>>>>  
> >>>>> and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you  
can  
> >>>>> die by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism, or  
you  
> >>>>> can face reality, deal with it for the time being and have something  
> >>>>> left to argue over once the dust clears.  
> >>>> Those are two of many choices. Black and white in a multi-colored  
world.  
> >>>>  
> >>>> Concern and awareness are useful when focused to motivate planning  
and  
> >>>> forethought that translates into appropriate action, no dispute from  
me  
> >>>> on that. You can call that "healthy fear" if you like, at the risk of  
> >>>> confusing it with unhealthy fear.



> >>>>  
> >>>> It's dangerously possible, through fear, to react with insufficient  
> >>>> thought and understanding, and make a bad situation worse.  
> >>>>  
> >>>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for  
> >>>> sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way  
to  
> >>>> enslave.  
> >>>>  
> >>>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another  
> >>>> context.  
> >>>>  
> >>>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't  
> >>>> agree with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to  
> >>>> potential threats. Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive  
at  
> >>>> best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.  
> >>>>  
> >>>> It's important to recognize what hasn't worked, to be open to better  
> >>>> ideas. So we can, together, find solutions that help our country and  
our  
> >>>> planet achieve peace.  
> >>>>  
> >>>> The first step toward getting out of a hole is to stop digging. That  
may  
> >>>> be one message of this election.  
> >>>>  
> >>>> Cheers,  
> >>>> -Jamie  
> >>>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)  
> >>>>  
> >>>>  
> >>>>  
> >>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
> >>>>> news:45541a10@linux...  
> >>>>>> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, DeeJ. Like me, you've been wrong  
> >>>>>> before so there's reason to hope. ;^)  
> >>>>>>  
> >>>>>>> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many  
times  
> >>>>>>> before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will  
> >>>>>>> probably have been planned before this election.  
> >>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will  
tell  
> >>>>>>>> you it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still  
> >>>>>>>> logic and there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers  
don't

> >>>>> want to face the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered  
> >>>>> policy and action by whoever's not being scapegoated.  
> >>>>>  
> >>>>> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
> >>>>> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame  
> >>>>> BOTH the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes  
> >>>>> you feel better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.  
> >>>>>  
> >>>>> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
> >>>>> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of  
> >>>>> blame to go around through many administrations in both major  
> >>>>> parties - for those times we're in a blaming mood.  
> >>>>>  
> >>>>> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
> >>>>> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
> >>>>> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in  
> >>>>> BOTH major parties AND the minor parties.  
> >>>>>  
> >>>>> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the  
> >>>>> threat and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe,  
we'll  
> >>>>> get some further options on the table now to meet this threat, and  
> >>>>> maybe, just maybe, they'll work better than the current approach  
which  
> >>>>> has hardly been flawless.  
> >>>>>  
> >>>>> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by  
> >>>>> terrorists into strutting around acting like overcompensating  
insecure  
> >>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty  
> >>>>> eyed abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe,  
> >>>>> just maybe, we're better than that.  
> >>>>>  
> >>>>> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and  
> >>>>> choose from the widest array of effective options.  
> >>>>>  
> >>>>> Cheers,  
> >>>>> -Jamie  
> >>>>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)  
> >>>>>  
> >>>>>  
> >>>>> DJ wrote:  
> >>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a

> >>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is  
> >>>>>> not smart enough  
> >>>>>> to be running foreign policy.<  
> >>>>>>  
> >>>>>> perception of weakenss is invitation to attack, plain and simple  
and  
> >>>>>> we are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm  
> >>>>>> predicting that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon  
and  
> >>>>>> that it will come as a result iof an intelligence failure due to  
> >>>>>> democrats restricting the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope  
I'm  
> >>>>>> wrong.  
> >>>>>>  
> >>>>>>  
> >>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
> >>>>>> news:45538a31@linux...  
> >>>>>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing  
or  
> >>>>>>> not pleasing terrorists.  
> >>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
> >>>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is  
> >>>>>>> not smart enough to be running foreign policy.  
> >>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ  
diplomacy  
> >>>>>>> and negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone  
who  
> >>>>>>> lets themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.  
> >>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>> Cheers,  
> >>>>>>> -Jamie  
> >>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
> >>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:  
> >>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
> >>>>>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
> >>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a  
few  
> >>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or  
inaction).  
> >>>>>>>>> Jamie,  
> >>>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terroists who killed over

> >>>>>>>> 3,000 innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo  
> >>>>>>>> jet into our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some  
> >>>>>>>> passengers, almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or  
Capital  
> >>>>>>>> Building? Those wacky terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president  
> >>>>>>>> over in Iran who wants to "wipe Isreal from the face of the  
> >>>>>>>> planet". You know, the one enriching all the uranium. I disagree  
> >>>>>>>> with plenty of the Republicans and the Presidents actions,  
> >>>>>>>> policies, etc., but being tough with terrorists is one area we  
can't  
> >>>>>>>> waiver. These people want to kill us. I'm affraid nothing short  
of  
> >>>>>>>> a few smuggled in soviet nukes going off is going to make this  
> >>>>>>>> clear to people. Too bad it'll be too late at that point. Sorry  
for  
> >>>>>>>> the drama, but this one thing more than any other scares me  
sick.  
> >>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>> Tony  
> >>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>> DJ wrote:  
> >>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped  
up  
> >>>>>>>>> with trillions  
> >>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
> >>>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart  
that  
> >>>>>>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
> >>>>>>>>>> Nixon.  
> >>>>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position  
> >>>>>>>>>>>> that we need a constant flow of mideast  
> >>>>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> this back when we had the time to di something about it,  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended  
there  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> was no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> (Reagan, Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>  
> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this

country

> >>>>>>>>>> by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going

> >>>>>>>>>> to solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy

> >>>>>>>>>> independent \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all

> >>>>>>>>>> domestic energy options other than drilling for oil in old,

> >>>>>>>>>> depleted oil and gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas

> >>>>>>>>>> solutions that \*are proven\* could bring this about within the

> >>>>>>>>>> next 5 years are off the table?

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our

> >>>>>>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15

> >>>>>>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to

> >>>>>>>>>> negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign of

weakness.

> >>>>>>>>>> They will be encouraged by this.

> >>>>>>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time

> >>>>>>>>>> for better policies to help, as you say.

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few

> >>>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> Cheers,

> >>>>>>>>>> -Jamie

> >>>>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> Regards,

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> DJ

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message

> >>>>>>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...

> >>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that

Clinton

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> destroyed,

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck

a

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> good economy,

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest

domestic

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> challenge.

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it  
 is  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> not effective,  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a  
 year  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> and a half  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped  
 up  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad  
 enough  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> that we have  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow  
 of  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> mideast  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand  
 the  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> danger of  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> influence on  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the Bush years.  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Halliburton.  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred  
 billion  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> dollars  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> effectively taking  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the  
 United  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> States.  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> with savings,  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year,  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> even though  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> value. More than  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends,  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> economically, on  
 > >>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the kindness of strangers."

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

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

http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\_talk\_\_surowiecki

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

> >>>>>>>>>>>>>> Gene

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

> >

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [DJ](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 18:18:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

> No one has advocated military disarmament in this thread.

<snip>

> We should, however, be very aware and careful to not sacrifice the essence  
> of American freedom and human rights to the altar of terrorism.

>

The patriot act and NSA wiretaps (immediate-no \*\*\*ing around trying to get a warrant when you don't even know what you're really looking to find) are the weapons I'm talking about here. It's a shame but our laws in this respect have become our enemy's weapon. In order to deprive him of it, we must sacrifice it.

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4554b420@linux...

> DJ wrote:

>>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for  
>> sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to  
>> enslave.<

>>

>> Ask any military planner and he will tell you that without the weapons to  
>> do the job he will not be able to do it.

>

> No one has advocated military disarmament in this thread.

>

> My point is that it's important to operate from a position of strength  
> derived from rational planning, rather than fear-based, panicked,  
> knee-jerk responses, the latter being open to direct manipulation by  
> terrorists (and by self-serving politicians, for that matter). Can we not  
> agree on that?

>

>

>

>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another  
>> context.



>>  
>> This was from Roosevelt's first inaugural and referred to an economic  
>> depression. He was trying to keep people from withdrawing their money  
>> from the banks. He certainly wasn't talking about a shooting war/spies  
>> and saboteurs.

>  
> Exactly, and I noted the different context. However the quote is germane.

>  
> Speaking of ex-presidents and war, Eisenhower said this:

>  
> "This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms  
> industry is new in the American experience. The total influence-economic,  
> political, even spiritual-is felt in every city, every state house, every  
> office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for  
> this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave  
> implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is  
> the very structure of our society.

>  
> In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of  
> unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the  
> military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of  
> misplaced power exists and will persist.

>  
> We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or  
> democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted only an alert and  
> knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of huge industrial  
> and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so  
> that security and liberty may prosper together."

>  
>  
>  
>>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't  
>>> agree with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to  
>>> potential threats. <

>  
> OK, we agree on that, right?

>  
>  
>> It would be inaccurate to imply that wars have not \*always\* required  
>> great sacrifices from the citizenry of the respective combatants.

>  
> Right, no one has advocated a sacrifice-free response in this thread.  
> Although our current president and congress have actively worked to make  
> it seem like little sacrifice has been required by, for the first time in  
> history (correct me if I'm wrong), cutting taxes in time of war. Of course  
> this only delays the sacrifice a generation or two.

>  
> We should, however, be very aware and careful to not sacrifice the essence

> of American freedom and human rights to the altar of terrorism.  
>  
>  
>>> Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at  
>> best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.<  
>>  
>> I agree 100%. It seems that half the folks in this country believe we are  
>> in  
>  
> Then we can be united despite our differences. Like a composite material  
> with fibers in different layers running in different directions we can be  
> bonded together, stronger for our union. :^)  
>  
> IOW, it's OK that we sometimes think differently, as long as we listen to  
> each other, respect each other and can consider each other's viewpoints.  
> We can draw on all of our strengths to innovate workable solutions.  
>  
>  
>> a war, the other half don't. This is a sure recipe for disaster,  
>> especially in a war with an enemy who uses our own laws against us. To  
>> ignore this in an era where one person with a bomb can wipe out an entire  
>> city is a recipe for disaster on an unimaginable scale.  
>  
> The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. We must defend BOTH against a  
> crafty enemy AND against those who would sacrifice the ideals and freedoms  
> of our country. We must not lose the war in order to win the battle. And  
> we must not lose that battle.  
>  
> We must choose paths that serve both our citizens and the people of the  
> world, not those that best serve the military industrial complexes of the  
> world's nations, nor the short term interests of short-sighted  
> international corporations, nor the power ambitions of a any obsessive  
> wannabe despots. This will take leadership in a style not seen for quite a  
> while in these parts.  
>  
> Fear-based thinking on either side of a conflict props up illegitimate  
> power.  
>  
> This is among the top dangers of major aspects of our current course.  
> While trying to appear "not weak" we run the risk of making it easy for  
> those against us to use our missteps, missed opportunities and  
> overreactions to literally scare up more and more followers.  
>  
> As part of a well considered and comprehensive defense, we must interrupt  
> this dynamic. To not do so would be to fight with one arm tied behind our  
> back.  
>  
> We need to think very long term, we need to look at alleviating root

> causes of conflict and we need to consider the best interests of the  
> nations and citizens involved. As long as we don't, we are fighting  
> without a complete defense and we are in danger of blundering into trap  
> after trap, draining our resources and weakening our position.

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

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45544bcc@linux...

>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>> Jamie wrote:  
>>>> like overcompensating insecure  
>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed  
>>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just  
>>>> maybe, we're better than that.

>>>>  
>>>> and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you can  
>>>> die by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism, or you  
>>>> can face reality, deal with it for the time being and have something  
>>>> left to argue over once the dust clears.  
>>> Those are two of many choices. Black and white in a multi-colored world.

>>>  
>>> Concern and awareness are useful when focused to motivate planning and  
>>> forethought that translates into appropriate action, no dispute from me  
>>> on that. You can call that "healthy fear" if you like, at the risk of  
>>> confusing it with unhealthy fear.

>>>  
>>> It's dangerously possible, through fear, to react with insufficient  
>>> thought and understanding, and make a bad situation worse.

>>>  
>>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for  
>>> sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to  
>>> enslave.

>>>  
>>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another  
>>> context.

>>>  
>>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't  
>>> agree with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to  
>>> potential threats. Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at  
>>> best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.

>>>  
>>> It's important to recognize what hasn't worked, to be open to better

>>> ideas. So we can, together, find solutions that help our country and our  
>>> planet achieve peace.  
>>>  
>>> The first step toward getting out of a hole is to stop digging. That may  
>>> be one message of this election.  
>>>  
>>> Cheers,  
>>> -Jamie  
>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>> news:45541a10@linux...  
>>>>> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, DeeJ. Like me, you've been wrong  
>>>>> before so there's reason to hope. ;^)  
>>>>>  
>>>>> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many times  
>>>>> before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will  
>>>>> probably have been planned before this election.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell  
>>>>> you it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still  
>>>>> logic and there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't  
>>>>> want to face the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered  
>>>>> policy and action by whoever's not being scapegoated.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
>>>>> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame  
>>>>> BOTH the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes  
>>>>> you feel better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
>>>>> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of  
>>>>> blame to go around through many administrations in both major  
>>>>> parties - for those times we're in a blaming mood.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
>>>>> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
>>>>> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in  
>>>>> BOTH major parties AND the minor parties.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the  
>>>>> threat and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll  
>>>>> get some further options on the table now to meet this threat, and  
>>>>> maybe, just maybe, they'll work better than the current approach which  
>>>>> has hardly been flawless.  
>>>>>

>>>>> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by  
>>>>> terrorists into strutting around acting like overcompensating insecure  
>>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty  
>>>>> eyed abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe,  
>>>>> just maybe, we're better than that.

>>>>>

>>>>> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and  
>>>>> choose from the widest array of effective options.

>>>>>

>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>> -Jamie

>>>>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> DJ wrote:

>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is  
>>>>>> not smart enough  
>>>>>> to be running foreign policy.<

>>>>>>

>>>>>> perception of weakness is invitation to attack, plain and simple and  
>>>>>> we are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm  
>>>>>> predicting that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and  
>>>>>> that it will come as a result of an intelligence failure due to  
>>>>>> democrats restricting the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm  
>>>>>> wrong.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message

>>>>>> news:45538a31@linux...

>>>>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or  
>>>>>> not pleasing terrorists.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is  
>>>>>>> not smart enough to be running foreign policy.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy  
>>>>>>> and negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who  
>>>>>>> lets themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>>>> -Jamie

>>>>>>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:

>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over  
>>>>>>> 3,000 innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo  
>>>>>>> jet into our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some  
>>>>>>> passengers, almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital  
>>>>>>> Building? Those wacky terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president  
>>>>>>> over in Iran who wants to "wipe Israel from the face of the  
>>>>>>> planet". You know, the one enriching all the uranium. I disagree  
>>>>>>> with plenty of the Republicans and the Presidents actions,  
>>>>>>> policies, etc., but being tough with terrorists is one area we can't  
>>>>>>> waiver. These people want to kill us. I'm afraid nothing short of  
>>>>>>> a few smuggled in soviet nukes going off is going to make this  
>>>>>>> clear to people. Too bad it'll be too late at that point. Sorry for  
>>>>>>> the drama, but this one thing more than any other scares me sick.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Tony  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that  
>>>>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>>>>>>>> Nixon.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position  
>>>>>>>>> that we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized  
>>>>>>>>> this back when we had the time to do something about it,  
>>>>>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there  
>>>>>>>>> was no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years  
>>>>>>>>> (Reagan, Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country  
>>>>>>>>>> by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going

>>>>>>>>> to solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy  
>>>>>>>>> independent \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all  
>>>>>>>>> domestic energy options other than drilling for oil in old,  
>>>>>>>>> depleted oil and gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas  
>>>>>>>>> solutions that \*are proven\* could bring this about within the  
>>>>>>>>> next 5 years are off the table?

>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our  
>>>>>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15  
>>>>>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to  
>>>>>>>>> negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness.  
>>>>>>>>> They will be encouraged by this.  
>>>>>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time  
>>>>>>>>> for better policies to help, as you say.

>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).

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

>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Regards,  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> DJ

>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>>>>>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a  
>>>>>>>>>>>> good economy,  
>>>>>>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>>>>>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>>>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is  
>>>>>>>>>>>> not effective,  
>>>>>>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.

>>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year  
>>>>>>>>>>>> and a half  
>>>>>>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough  
>>>>>>>>>>>> that we have



>>>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of  
>>>>>>>>> mideast  
>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the  
>>>>>>>>> danger of  
>>>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
>>>>>>>>> influence on  
>>>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of  
>>>>>>>>> the Bush years.  
>>>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
>>>>>>>>> Halliburton.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion  
>>>>>>>>> dollars  
>>>>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is  
>>>>>>>>> effectively taking  
>>>>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United  
>>>>>>>>> States.  
>>>>>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush  
>>>>>>>>> with savings,  
>>>>>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year,  
>>>>>>>>> even though  
>>>>>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing  
>>>>>>>>> value. More than  
>>>>>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends,  
>>>>>>>>> economically, on  
>>>>>>>>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Gene  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 18:41:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Jamie,

I didn't imply that you were "blind, deaf and dumb". I respect your discourse, and strong defense of your views. I just feel the current situation involves more than "a few wacky terrorists". Also, just because I recognize there is a real, and likely threat of more attacks here in the US, doesn't mean I'm an "overcompensating insecure spendthrift fool"

undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed abject fear". I do understand though that this isn't some war between two countries, where we can "negotiate" an end to hostilities, or simply drop our support for Israel, or change our policy and make everything better. Whether it was decades of failed U.S. policy or not, these people want us dead right now, and we have to be proactive. Once we do something significant about our borders and make sure we have the absolute best intelligence, defense, and law enforcement agencies money can buy, then we can talk about long term programs to make everyone "like us". Sorry, gotta go. It's lower body workout day. I have to be in shape for all that "knee jerking"! ;>)

Tony

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45544bcc@linux...

>

> DJ wrote:

> >> Jamie wrote:

>>> like overcompensating insecure

>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed

>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just

>> maybe, we're better than that.

>>

>> and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you can

>> die by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism, or you

>> can face reality, deal with it for the time being and have something left

>> to argue over once the dust clears.

>

> Those are two of many choices. Black and white in a multi-colored world.

>

> Concern and awareness are useful when focused to motivate planning and

> forethought that translates into appropriate action, no dispute from me on

> that. You can call that "healthy fear" if you like, at the risk of

> confusing it with unhealthy fear.

>

> It's dangerously possible, through fear, to react with insufficient

> thought and understanding, and make a bad situation worse.

>

> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for sound

> policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to enslave.

>

> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another context.

>

> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't agree

> with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to potential

> threats. Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at best. And

> dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.

>

> It's important to recognize what hasn't worked, to be open to better  
> ideas. So we can, together, find solutions that help our country and our  
> planet achieve peace.

>

> The first step toward getting out of a hole is to stop digging. That may  
> be one message of this election.

>

> Cheers,

> -Jamie

> www.JamieKruz.com

>

>

>

>>

>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45541a10@linux...

>>> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, Deej. Like me, you've been wrong before

>>> so there's reason to hope. ;^)

>>>

>>> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many times  
>>> before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will probably  
>>> have been planned before this election.

>>>

>>> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell you  
>>> it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still logic and  
>>> there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't want to face  
>>> the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered policy and  
>>> action by whoever's not being scapegoated.

>>>

>>> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
>>> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame  
>>> BOTH the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes you  
>>> feel better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.

>>>

>>> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
>>> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of  
>>> blame to go around through many administrations in both major parties -  
>>> for those times we're in a blaming mood.

>>>

>>> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
>>> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
>>> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in BOTH  
>>> major parties AND the minor parties.

>>>

>>> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the  
>>> threat and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll  
>>> get some further options on the table now to meet this threat, and  
>>> maybe, just maybe, they'll work better than the current approach which  
>>> has hardly been flawless.

>>>  
>>> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by  
>>> terrorists into strutting around acting like overcompensating insecure  
>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed  
>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just  
>>> maybe, we're better than that.  
>>>  
>>> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and choose  
>>> from the widest array of effective options.  
>>>  
>>> Cheers,  
>>> -Jamie  
>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not  
>>>>> smart enough  
>>>>> to be running foreign policy.<  
>>>>>  
>>>>> perception of weakenss is invitation to attack, plain and simple and we  
>>>>> are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm  
>>>>> predicting that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and  
>>>>> that it will come as a result iof an intelligence failure due to  
>>>>> democrats restricting the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm  
>>>>> wrong.  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:45538a31@linux...  
>>>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or  
>>>>> not pleasing terrorists.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not  
>>>>> smart enough to be running foreign policy.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy  
>>>>> and negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who  
>>>>> lets themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>

>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:  
>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over 3,000  
>>>>>> innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo jet into  
>>>>>> our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some passengers,  
>>>>>> almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital Building?  
>>>>>> Those wacky terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president over in Iran  
>>>>>> who wants to "wipe Israel from the face of the planet". You know, the  
>>>>>> one enriching all the uranium. I disagree with plenty of the  
>>>>>> Republicans and the Presidents actions, policies, etc., but being  
>>>>>> tough with terrorists is one area we can't waiver. These people want  
>>>>>> to kill us. I'm afraid nothing short of a few smuggled in soviet  
>>>>>> nukes going off is going to make this clear to people. Too bad it'll  
>>>>>> be too late at that point. Sorry for the drama, but this one thing  
>>>>>> more than any other scares me sick.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Tony  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that  
>>>>>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>>>>>>>>> Nixon.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that  
>>>>>>>>>> we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this  
>>>>>>>>>>> back when we had the time to do something about it,  
>>>>>>>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there was  
>>>>>>>>>>> no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years (Reagan,  
>>>>>>>>>>> Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
>>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country

>>>>>>> by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going to  
>>>>>>> solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy independent  
>>>>>>> \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all domestic  
>>>>>>> energy options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil and  
>>>>>>> gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that \*are  
>>>>>>> proven\* could bring this about within the next 5 years are off the  
>>>>>>> table?

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our  
>>>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15  
>>>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to  
>>>>>>> negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness.  
>>>>>>> They will be encouraged by this.  
>>>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time for  
>>>>>>> better policies to help, as you say.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Regards,

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> DJ

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <[glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com](mailto:glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com)> wrote in message  
>>>>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...

>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <[no@way.jack](mailto:no@way.jack)> wrote:

>>>>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>>>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a  
>>>>>>>>>> good economy,  
>>>>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>>>>>>> challenge.

>>>>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>>>>>>>>> effective,  
>>>>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and  
>>>>>>>>>> a half

>>>>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.

>>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>>> with trillions

>>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough

>>>>>>> that we have  
>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of  
>>>>>>> mideast  
>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the  
>>>>>>> danger of  
>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
>>>>>>> influence on  
>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the  
>>>>>>> Bush years.  
>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
>>>>>>> Halliburton.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion  
>>>>>>> dollars  
>>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is  
>>>>>>> effectively taking  
>>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United  
>>>>>>> States.  
>>>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>>>>>>> savings,  
>>>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even  
>>>>>>> though  
>>>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value.  
>>>>>>> More than  
>>>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends,  
>>>>>>> economically, on  
>>>>>>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Gene  
>>>>>>>  
>>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 19:10:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ike is a fascinating one. The most recent (and likely last) president who kinda sorta fit the classical model of a politician. He was a general, a political moderate, a reader, writer, and even a painter. He respected the constitution and the separation of powers, and was thus personally opposed to McCarthy but did little to stop what was a Congressional matter. What's odd was that he helped oversee the transformation of our state from a flawed



but generally improving republic into the empire it became by the time he left office. Then, in that last speech, he suddenly felt something. Remorse? Regret? Concern? And gave us the 'military-industrial complex.' Interestingly, the original drafts had the phrase as 'military-industrial-congressional complex' which is quite more accurate as we see our congress funding Navy installations in home district in Nebraska while transport vehicles in Iraq are not armored. But I guess even Ike wasn't feeling \_that\_ guilty, or he was talked down from including our noble representatives in his thoughtful complex.

But nevertheless Ike has always fascinated me, far more than other 20th century presidents like Kennedy or Truman or even Roosevelt. As we learn more about just how reckless JFK was, politically as well as personally, the mild mannered moderate conservatism of Eisenhower seems compelling. But one also has to wonder why, if he knew what was happening, he didn't warn of that military-industrial complex earlier and actually do something to fight it. By the time he retired, the goose was pretty much cooked, to all of our neverending detriment.

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>DJ wrote:

>>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for  
>> sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to  
>> enslave.<

>>

>> Ask any military planner and he will tell you that without the weapons  
to do

>> the job he will not be able to do it.

>

>No one has advocated military disarmament in this thread.

>

>My point is that it's important to operate from a position of strength  
>derived from rational planning, rather than fear-based, panicked,  
>knee-jerk responses, the latter being open to direct manipulation by  
>terrorists (and by self-serving politicians, for that matter). Can we  
>not agree on that?

>

>

>

>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another context.

>>

>> This was from Roosevelt's first inaugural and referred to an economic  
>> depression. He was trying to keep people from withdrawing their money  
from

>> the banks. He certainly wasn't talking about a shooting war/spies and

>> saboteurs.

>  
>Exactly, and I noted the different context. However the quote is germane.  
>  
>Speaking of ex-presidents and war, Eisenhower said this:  
>  
>"This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms  
  
>industry is new in the American experience. The total  
>influence-economic, political, even spiritual-is felt in every city,  
>every state house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize  
  
>the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to  
>comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood  
>are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.  
>  
>In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of  
  
>unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the  
>military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of  
>misplaced power exists and will persist.  
>  
>We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties  
  
>or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted only an  
>alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of huge  
  
>industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods  
>and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together."  
>  
>  
>  
>>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't  
agree  
>>> with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to potential  
  
>>> threats. <  
>  
>OK, we agree on that, right?  
>  
>  
>> It would be inaccurate to imply that wars have not \*always\* required great  
  
>> sacrifices from the citizenry of the respective combatants.  
>  
>Right, no one has advocated a sacrifice-free response in this thread.  
>Although our current president and congress have actively worked to make  
  
>it seem like little sacrifice has been required by, for the first time

>in history (correct me if I'm wrong), cutting taxes in time of war. Of  
>course this only delays the sacrifice a generation or two.  
>  
>We should, however, be very aware and careful to not sacrifice the  
>essence of American freedom and human rights to the altar of terrorism.  
>  
>  
>>> Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at  
>> best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.<  
>>  
>> I agree 100%. It seems that half the folks in this country believe we  
are in  
>  
>Then we can be united despite our differences. Like a composite material  
  
>with fibers in different layers running in different directions we can  
>be bonded together, stronger for our union. :^)  
>  
>IOW, it's OK that we sometimes think differently, as long as we listen  
>to each other, respect each other and can consider each other's  
>viewpoints. We can draw on all of our strengths to innovate workable  
>solutions.  
>  
>  
>> a war, the other half don't. This is a sure recipe for disaster, especially  
  
>> in a war with an enemy who uses our own laws against us. To ignore this  
in  
>> an era where one person with a bomb can wipe out an entire city is a recipe  
  
>> for disaster on an unimaginable scale.  
>  
>The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. We must defend BOTH against a  
  
>crafty enemy AND against those who would sacrifice the ideals and  
>freedoms of our country. We must not lose the war in order to win the  
>battle. And we must not lose that battle.  
>  
>We must choose paths that serve both our citizens and the people of the  
  
>world, not those that best serve the military industrial complexes of  
>the world's nations, nor the short term interests of short-sighted  
>international corporations, nor the power ambitions of a any obsessive  
>>wannabe despots. This will take leadership in a style not seen for quite  
  
>a while in these parts.  
>  
>Fear-based thinking on either side of a conflict props up illegitimate

>power.

>

>This is among the top dangers of major aspects of our current course.

>While trying to appear "not weak" we run the risk of making it easy for

>those against us to use our missteps, missed opportunities and

>overreactions to literally scare up more and more followers.

>

>As part of a well considered and comprehensive defense, we must

>interrupt this dynamic. To not do so would be to fight with one arm tied

>behind our back.

>

>We need to think very long term, we need to look at alleviating root

>causes of conflict and we need to consider the best interests of the

>nations and citizens involved. As long as we don't, we are fighting

>without a complete defense and we are in danger of blundering into trap

>after trap, draining our resources and weakening our position.

>

>Cheers,

> -Jamie

> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

>

>

>

>

>

>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45544bcc@linux...

>>> DJ wrote:

>>>> Jamie wrote:

>>>> like overcompensating insecure

>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed

>>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just

>>>> maybe, we're better than that.

>>>>

>>>> and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you  
can

>>>> die by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism, or  
you

>>>> can face reality, deal with it for the time being and have something  
left

>>>> to argue over once the dust clears.

>>> Those are two of many choices. Black and white in a multi-colored world.

>>>

>>> Concern and awareness are useful when focused to motivate planning and

>>> forethought that translates into appropriate action, no dispute from me on  
>>> that. You can call that "healthy fear" if you like, at the risk of  
>>> confusing it with unhealthy fear.  
>>>  
>>> It's dangerously possible, through fear, to react with insufficient  
>>> thought and understanding, and make a bad situation worse.  
>>>  
>>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for  
sound  
>>> policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to enslave.  
>>>  
>>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another context.  
>>>  
>>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't  
agree  
>>> with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to potential  
  
>>> threats. Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at best. And  
  
>>> dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.  
>>>  
>>> It's important to recognize what hasn't worked, to be open to better  
  
>>> ideas. So we can, together, find solutions that help our country and  
our  
>>> planet achieve peace.  
>>>  
>>> The first step toward getting out of a hole is to stop digging. That  
may  
>>> be one message of this election.  
>>>  
>>> Cheers,  
>>> -Jamie  
>>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45541a10@linux...  
>>>>> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, Deej. Like me, you've been wrong before  
  
>>>>> so there's reason to hope. ;^)  
>>>>>  
>>>>> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many times  
  
>>>>> before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will probably

>>>> have been planned before this election.  
>>>>  
>>>> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell  
you  
>>>> it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still logic  
and  
>>>> there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't want to  
face  
>>>> the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered policy and  
  
>>>> action by whoever's not being scapegoated.  
>>>>  
>>>> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
  
>>>> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame  
  
>>>> BOTH the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes  
you  
>>>> feel better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.  
>>>>  
>>>> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
>>>> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty  
of  
>>>> blame to go around through many administrations in both major parties  
-  
>>>> for those times we're in a blaming mood.  
>>>>  
>>>> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
  
>>>> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
>>>> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in  
BOTH  
>>>> major parties AND the minor parties.  
>>>>  
>>>> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the  
  
>>>> threat and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll  
  
>>>> get some further options on the table now to meet this threat, and  
  
>>>> maybe, just maybe, they'll work better than the current approach which  
  
>>>> has hardly been flawless.  
>>>>  
>>>> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by  
>>>> terrorists into strutting around acting like overcompensating insecure  
  
>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty

eyed

>>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just

>>>> maybe, we're better than that.

>>>>

>>>> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and choose

>>>> from the widest array of effective options.

>>>>

>>>> Cheers,

>>>> -Jamie

>>>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> DJ wrote:

>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a

>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not

>>>>> smart enough

>>>>> to be running foreign policy.<

>>>>>

>>>>> perception of weakenss is invitation to attack, plain and simple and we

>>>>> are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm

>>>>> predicting that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and

>>>>> that it will come as a result iof an intelligence failure due to

>>>>> democrats restricting the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm

>>>>> wrong.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> "Jamie K" <[Meta@Dimensional.com](mailto:Meta@Dimensional.com)> wrote in message

>>>>> [news:45538a31@linux...](mailto:news:45538a31@linux...)

>>>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or

>>>>> not pleasing terrorists.

>>>>>

>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a

>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not

>>>>> smart enough to be running foreign policy.

>>>>>

>>>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy

>>>>> and negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who

>>>>> lets themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.



>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:  
>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
  
>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terroists who killed over 3,000  
  
>>>>>>>> innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo jet  
into  
>>>>>>>> our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some passengers,  
  
>>>>>>>> almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital Building?  
  
>>>>>>>> Those wacky terroists? Maybe it's that wacky president over in Iran  
  
>>>>>>>> who wants to "wipe Isreal from the face of the planet". You know,  
the  
>>>>>>>> one enriching all the uranium. I disagree with plenty of the  
>>>>>>>> Republicans and the Presidents actions, policies, etc., but being  
  
>>>>>>>> tough with terroists is one area we can't waiver. These people want  
  
>>>>>>>> to kill us. I'm affraid nothing short of a few smuggled in soviet  
  
>>>>>>>> nukes going off is going to make this clear to people. Too bad it'll  
  
>>>>>>>> be too late at that point. Sorry for the drama, but this one thing  
  
>>>>>>>> more than any other scares me sick.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Tony  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped  
up  
>>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?

>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that  
  
>>>>>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>>>>>>>>> Nixon.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position  
that  
>>>>>>>>>> we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized  
this  
>>>>>>>>>> back when we had the time to di something about it,  
>>>>>>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there  
was  
>>>>>>>>>> no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years (Reagan,  
  
>>>>>>>>>> Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country  
  
>>>>>>>>>>> by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going  
to  
>>>>>>>>>>> solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy independent  
  
>>>>>>>>>>> \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all domestic  
  
>>>>>>>>>>>> energy options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil  
and  
>>>>>>>>>>>> gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that  
\*are  
>>>>>>>>>>>> proven\* could bring this about within the next 5 years are off  
the  
>>>>>>>>>>>> table?  
>>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our  
  
>>>>>>>>>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15  
>>>>>>>>>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to  
>>>>>>>>>>>>> negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness.  
  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> They will be encouraged by this.  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time

for  
>>>>>>> better policies to help, as you say.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
  
>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Regards,  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> DJ  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
  
>>>>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck  
a  
>>>>>>>>> good economy,  
>>>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
  
>>>>>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is  
not  
>>>>>>>>> effective,  
>>>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year  
and  
>>>>>>>>> a half  
>>>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped  
up  
>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough  
  
>>>>>>>>> that we have  
>>>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow  
of  
>>>>>>>>> mideast  
>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand

the  
>>>>>>>>> danger of  
>>>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
>>>>>>>>> influence on  
>>>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of  
the  
>>>>>>>>> Bush years.  
>>>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
>>>>>>>>> Halliburton.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion  
  
>>>>>>>>> dollars  
>>>>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is  
>>>>>>>>> effectively taking  
>>>>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United  
  
>>>>>>>>> States.  
>>>>>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush  
with  
>>>>>>>>> savings,  
>>>>>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year,  
even  
>>>>>>>>> though  
>>>>>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value.  
  
>>>>>>>>> More than  
>>>>>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends,  
>>>>>>>>> economically, on  
>>>>>>>>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Gene  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>  
>>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 19:39:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hey Tony,

I never said anything about "a few wacky terrorists."

I was speaking of the wacky beliefs of a few terrorists, a very different concept.

If we act in our best interest and the leadership of al-Qaeda happens think we're being "weak" in so doing, it would be stupid for us to be thusly manipulated to act to our detriment just to impress those few terrorists.

We should act out of strength of purpose, clear vision and as much wisdom as we can gather, being true to our ideals, regardless of the wacky beliefs of a few terrorists.

More than one expert on the region has criticized our lack of long term preplanning in Iraq before going in. We're now in a situation that the current (for the moment) policy architects did not anticipate nor prepare for, and it's not a great situation. Many lives lost and \$300 billion tax dollars later, more lives and dollars every day, significant tax money unaccounted for, Iran gaining influence in Iraq, these sorts of consequences have been a significant factor in this election. Voters are asking hard questions, as well they should.

Our various policies directly affect the region and so we must carefully consider their effect. We will never have perfect intelligence systems, a perfectly impenetrable border, flawless law enforcement and a blanket defense against everything nor can we afford that. We can work in that direction within what we can afford but we must also work in other directions to help create peace. There is a balance. Anyone who preaches that there is only ONE avenue of action is probably making money on that avenue or listening to someone who does.

Yes you can recognize the possibility of additional attacks on the US without subscribing to the notion that we have to behave shortsightedly and predictably in order to impress a few terrorists with our "non-weakness."

Consider that that kind of stubbornness and inability to see creative solutions can actually make us miss opportunities to become stronger and more successful, and to help create a better situation for ourselves and for people who live in the region.

Am I being more clear?

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

Tony Benson wrote:

> Jamie,

>

> I didn't imply that you were "blind, deaf and dumb". I respect your  
> discourse, and strong defense of your views. I just feel the current  
> situation involves more than "a few wacky terrorists". Also, just because I  
> recognize there is a real, and likely threat of more attacks here in the US,  
> doesn't mean I'm an "overcompensating insecure spendthrift fool  
> undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed abject fear". I do  
> understand though that this isn't some war between two countries, where we  
> can "negotiate" an end to hostilities, or simply drop our support for  
> Israel, or change our policy and make everything better. Whether it was  
> decades of failed U.S. policy or not, these people want us dead right now,  
> and we have to be proactive. Once we do something significant about our  
> borders and make sure we have the absolute best intelligence, defense, and  
> law enforcement agencies money can buy, then we can talk about long term  
> programs to make everyone "like us". Sorry, gotta go. It's lower body  
> workout day. I have to be in shape for all that "knee jerking"! ;>)

>

> Tony

>

>

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45544bcc@linux...

>> DJ wrote:

>>>> Jamie wrote:

>>>> like overcompensating insecure  
>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed  
>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just  
>>> maybe, we're better than that.

>>>

>>> and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you can  
>>> die by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism, or you  
>>> can face reality, deal with it for the time being and have something left  
>>> to argue over once the dust clears.

>> Those are two of many choices. Black and white in a multi-colored world.

>>

>> Concern and awareness are useful when focused to motivate planning and  
>> forethought that translates into appropriate action, no dispute from me on  
>> that. You can call that "healthy fear" if you like, at the risk of  
>> confusing it with unhealthy fear.

>>

>> It's dangerously possible, through fear, to react with insufficient  
>> thought and understanding, and make a bad situation worse.

>>

>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for sound  
>> policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to enslave.

>>

>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another context.  
>>  
>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't agree  
>> with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to potential  
>> threats. Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at best. And  
>> dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.  
>>  
>> It's important to recognize what hasn't worked, to be open to better  
>> ideas. So we can, together, find solutions that help our country and our  
>> planet achieve peace.  
>>  
>> The first step toward getting out of a hole is to stop digging. That may  
>> be one message of this election.  
>>  
>> Cheers,  
>> -Jamie  
>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45541a10@linux...  
>>>> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, DeeJ. Like me, you've been wrong before  
>>>> so there's reason to hope. ;^)  
>>>>  
>>>> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many times  
>>>> before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will probably  
>>>> have been planned before this election.  
>>>>  
>>>> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell you  
>>>> it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still logic and  
>>>> there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't want to face  
>>>> the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered policy and  
>>>> action by whoever's not being scapegoated.  
>>>>  
>>>> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
>>>> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame  
>>>> BOTH the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes you  
>>>> feel better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.  
>>>>  
>>>> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
>>>> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of  
>>>> blame to go around through many administrations in both major parties -  
>>>> for those times we're in a blaming mood.  
>>>>  
>>>> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
>>>> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
>>>> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in BOTH  
>>>> major parties AND the minor parties.



>>>>  
>>>> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the  
>>>> threat and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll  
>>>> get some further options on the table now to meet this threat, and  
>>>> maybe, just maybe, they'll work better than the current approach which  
>>>> has hardly been flawless.

>>>>  
>>>> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by  
>>>> terrorists into strutting around acting like overcompensating insecure  
>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed  
>>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just  
>>>> maybe, we're better than that.

>>>>  
>>>> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and choose  
>>>> from the widest array of effective options.

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

>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not  
>>>>> smart enough  
>>>>> to be running foreign policy.<

>>>>>  
>>>>> perception of weakenss is invitation to attack, plain and simple and we  
>>>>> are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm  
>>>>> predicting that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and  
>>>>> that it will come as a result iof an intelligence failure due to  
>>>>> democrats restricting the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm  
>>>>> wrong.

>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:45538a31@linux...  
>>>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or  
>>>>> not pleasing terrorists.

>>>>>>  
>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is not  
>>>>>> smart enough to be running foreign policy.

>>>>>>  
>>>>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy  
>>>>>> and negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who  
>>>>>> lets themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.

>>>>>>

>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:  
>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terroists who killed over 3,000  
>>>>>>> innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo jet into  
>>>>>>> our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some passengers,  
>>>>>>> almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital Building?  
>>>>>>> Those wacky terroists? Maybe it's that wacky president over in Iran  
>>>>>>> who wants to "wipe Isreal from the face of the planet". You know, the  
>>>>>>> one enriching all the uranium. I disagree with plenty of the  
>>>>>>> Republicans and the Presidents actions, policies, etc., but being  
>>>>>>> tough with terroists is one area we can't waiver. These people want  
>>>>>>> to kill us. I'm affraid nothing short of a few smuggled in soviet  
>>>>>>> nukes going off is going to make this clear to people. Too bad it'll  
>>>>>>> be too late at that point. Sorry for the drama, but this one thing  
>>>>>>> more than any other scares me sick.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Tony  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that  
>>>>>>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>>>>>>>>>> Nixon.  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position that  
>>>>>>>>>>>> we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized this  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> back when we had the time to di something about it,  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there was  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years (Reagan,

>>>>>>> Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country  
>>>>>>> by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going to  
>>>>>>> solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy independent  
>>>>>>> \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all domestic  
>>>>>>> energy options other than drilling for oil in old, depleted oil and  
>>>>>>> gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas solutions that \*are  
>>>>>>> proven\* could bring this about within the next 5 years are off the  
>>>>>>> table?  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t'our  
>>>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15  
>>>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to  
>>>>>>> negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness.  
>>>>>>> They will be encouraged by this.  
>>>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time for  
>>>>>>> better policies to help, as you say.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Regards,  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> DJ  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a  
>>>>>>>>> good economy,  
>>>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is not  
>>>>>>>>> effective,  
>>>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year and  
>>>>>>>>> a half  
>>>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough  
>>>>>>>>> that we have  
>>>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of  
>>>>>>>>> mideast  
>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the  
>>>>>>>>> danger of  
>>>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
>>>>>>>>> influence on  
>>>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of the  
>>>>>>>>> Bush years.  
>>>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
>>>>>>>>> Halliburton.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion  
>>>>>>>>> dollars  
>>>>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is  
>>>>>>>>> effectively taking  
>>>>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United  
>>>>>>>>> States.  
>>>>>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush with  
>>>>>>>>> savings,  
>>>>>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year, even  
>>>>>>>>> though  
>>>>>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing value.  
>>>>>>>>> More than  
>>>>>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends,  
>>>>>>>>> economically, on  
>>>>>>>>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Gene  
>>>>>>>>>  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 19:52:27 GMT

DJ wrote:

>> No one has advocated military disarmament in this thread.

>

> <snip>

>> We should, however, be very aware and careful to not sacrifice the essence  
>> of American freedom and human rights to the altar of terrorism.

>>

>

>

> The patriot act and NSA wiretaps (immediate-no \*\*\*ing around trying to get a  
> warrant when you don't even know what you're really looking to find) are the  
> weapons I'm talking about here. It'sd a shame but our laws in this respect  
> have become our enemy's weapon. In order to deprive him of it, we must  
> sacrifice it.

There are elements of the Patriot act; our move toward justifying  
torture; and aspects to wholesale wiretapping of American citizens that  
are very unamerican IMO.

We must be extremely careful that we do not permanently lose our place  
in history as a great step forward in personal freedom and opportunity.  
Either by some nutcase reducing St. Louis to a nuclear wasteland or by  
some other nutcase legislating away our core ideals. I don't care how  
sincere the nutcase, those are both extremely damaging actions to America.

This is not an easy problem, so we need every viable idea on the table  
and we need to come together with respect. And we need to remember:

"Those who would give up Essential Liberty to purchase a little  
Temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety." -Ben Franklin.

Cheers,

-Jamie

[www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)

>

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4554b420@linux...

>> DJ wrote:

>>>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for  
>>> sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to  
>>> enslave.<

>>>

>>> Ask any military planner and he will tell you that without the weapons to  
>>> do the job he will not be able to do it.

>> No one has advocated military disarmament in this thread.

>>

>> My point is that it's important to operate from a position of strength  
>> derived from rational planning, rather than fear-based, panicked,  
>> knee-jerk responses, the latter being open to direct manipulation by  
>> terrorists (and by self-serving politicians, for that matter). Can we not  
>> agree on that?  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another  
>>> context.  
>>>  
>>> This was from Roosevelt's first inaugural and referred to an economic  
>>> depression. He was trying to keep people from withdrawing their money  
>>> from the banks. He certainly wasn't talking about a shooting war/spies  
>>> and saboteurs.  
>> Exactly, and I noted the different context. However the quote is germane.  
>>  
>> Speaking of ex-presidents and war, Eisenhower said this:  
>>  
>> "This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms  
>> industry is new in the American experience. The total influence-economic,  
>> political, even spiritual-is felt in every city, every state house, every  
>> office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for  
>> this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave  
>> implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is  
>> the very structure of our society.  
>>  
>> In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of  
>> unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the  
>> military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of  
>> misplaced power exists and will persist.  
>>  
>> We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or  
>> democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted only an alert and  
>> knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of huge industrial  
>> and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so  
>> that security and liberty may prosper together."  
>>  
>>  
>>>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't  
>>>> agree with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to  
>>>> potential threats. <  
>> OK, we agree on that, right?  
>>  
>>  
>>> It would be inaccurate to imply that wars have not \*always\* required  
>>> great sacrifices from the citizenry of the respective combatants.

>> Right, no one has advocated a sacrifice-free response in this thread.  
>> Although our current president and congress have actively worked to make  
>> it seem like little sacrifice has been required by, for the first time in  
>> history (correct me if I'm wrong), cutting taxes in time of war. Of course  
>> this only delays the sacrifice a generation or two.  
>>  
>> We should, however, be very aware and careful to not sacrifice the essence  
>> of American freedom and human rights to the altar of terrorism.  
>>  
>>  
>>>> Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at  
>>> best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.<  
>>>  
>>> I agree 100%. It seems that half the folks in this country believe we are  
>>> in  
>> Then we can be united despite our differences. Like a composite material  
>> with fibers in different layers running in different directions we can be  
>> bonded together, stronger for our union. :^)  
>>  
>> IOW, it's OK that we sometimes think differently, as long as we listen to  
>> each other, respect each other and can consider each other's viewpoints.  
>> We can draw on all of our strengths to innovate workable solutions.  
>>  
>>  
>>> a war, the other half don't. This is a sure recipe for disaster,  
>>> especially in a war with an enemy who uses our own laws against us. To  
>>> ignore this in an era where one person with a bomb can wipe out an entire  
>>> city is a recipe for disaster on an unimaginable scale.  
>> The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. We must defend BOTH against a  
>> crafty enemy AND against those who would sacrifice the ideals and freedoms  
>> of our country. We must not lose the war in order to win the battle. And  
>> we must not lose that battle.  
>>  
>> We must choose paths that serve both our citizens and the people of the  
>> world, not those that best serve the military industrial complexes of the  
>> world's nations, nor the short term interests of short-sighted  
>> international corporations, nor the power ambitions of a any obsessive  
>> wannabe despots. This will take leadership in a style not seen for quite a  
>> while in these parts.  
>>  
>> Fear-based thinking on either side of a conflict props up illegitimate  
>> power.  
>>  
>> This is among the top dangers of major aspects of our current course.  
>> While trying to appear "not weak" we run the risk of making it easy for  
>> those against us to use our missteps, missed opportunities and  
>> overreactions to literally scare up more and more followers.  
>>



>> As part of a well considered and comprehensive defense, we must interrupt  
>> this dynamic. To not do so would be to fight with one arm tied behind our  
>> back.  
>>  
>> We need to think very long term, we need to look at alleviating root  
>> causes of conflict and we need to consider the best interests of the  
>> nations and citizens involved. As long as we don't, we are fighting  
>> without a complete defense and we are in danger of blundering into trap  
>> after trap, draining our resources and weakening our position.  
>>  
>> Cheers,  
>> -Jamie  
>> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45544bcc@linux...  
>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>> Jamie wrote:  
>>>>>> like overcompensating insecure  
>>>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed  
>>>>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just  
>>>>>> maybe, we're better than that.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you can  
>>>>> die by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism, or you  
>>>>> can face reality, deal with it for the time being and have something  
>>>>> left to argue over once the dust clears.  
>>>> Those are two of many choices. Black and white in a multi-colored world.  
>>>>  
>>>> Concern and awareness are useful when focused to motivate planning and  
>>>> forethought that translates into appropriate action, no dispute from me  
>>>> on that. You can call that "healthy fear" if you like, at the risk of  
>>>> confusing it with unhealthy fear.  
>>>>  
>>>> It's dangerously possible, through fear, to react with insufficient  
>>>> thought and understanding, and make a bad situation worse.  
>>>>  
>>>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for  
>>>> sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to  
>>>> enslave.  
>>>>  
>>>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another  
>>>> context.  
>>>>  
>>>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't

>>>> agree with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to  
>>>> potential threats. Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at  
>>>> best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.  
>>>>  
>>>> It's important to recognize what hasn't worked, to be open to better  
>>>> ideas. So we can, together, find solutions that help our country and our  
>>>> planet achieve peace.  
>>>>  
>>>> The first step toward getting out of a hole is to stop digging. That may  
>>>> be one message of this election.  
>>>>  
>>>> Cheers,  
>>>> -Jamie  
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:45541a10@linux...  
>>>>>> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, DeeJ. Like me, you've been wrong  
>>>>>> before so there's reason to hope. ;^)  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many times  
>>>>>> before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will  
>>>>>> probably have been planned before this election.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell  
>>>>>> you it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still  
>>>>>> logic and there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't  
>>>>>> want to face the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered  
>>>>>> policy and action by whoever's not being scapegoated.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
>>>>>> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame  
>>>>>> BOTH the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes  
>>>>>> you feel better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
>>>>>> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of  
>>>>>> blame to go around through many administrations in both major  
>>>>>> parties - for those times we're in a blaming mood.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
>>>>>> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
>>>>>> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in  
>>>>>> BOTH major parties AND the minor parties.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the

>>>>> threat and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll  
>>>>> get some further options on the table now to meet this threat, and  
>>>>> maybe, just maybe, they'll work better than the current approach which  
>>>>> has hardly been flawless.

>>>>>

>>>>> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by  
>>>>> terrorists into strutting around acting like overcompensating insecure  
>>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty  
>>>>> eyed abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe,  
>>>>> just maybe, we're better than that.

>>>>>

>>>>> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and  
>>>>> choose from the widest array of effective options.

>>>>>

>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>> -Jamie

>>>>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> DJ wrote:

>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is  
>>>>>> not smart enough  
>>>>>> to be running foreign policy.<

>>>>>>

>>>>>> perception of weakness is invitation to attack, plain and simple and  
>>>>>> we are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm  
>>>>>> predicting that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and  
>>>>>> that it will come as a result of an intelligence failure due to  
>>>>>> democrats restricting the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm  
>>>>>> wrong.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message

>>>>>> news:45538a31@linux...

>>>>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or  
>>>>>> not pleasing terrorists.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is  
>>>>>>> not smart enough to be running foreign policy.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy  
>>>>>>> and negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who  
>>>>>>> lets themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Cheers,

>>>>>>> -Jamie

>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:  
>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over  
>>>>>>>> 3,000 innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo  
>>>>>>>> jet into our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some  
>>>>>>>> passengers, almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital  
>>>>>>>> Building? Those wacky terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president  
>>>>>>>> over in Iran who wants to "wipe Israel from the face of the  
>>>>>>>> planet". You know, the one enriching all the uranium. I disagree  
>>>>>>>> with plenty of the Republicans and the Presidents actions,  
>>>>>>>> policies, etc., but being tough with terrorists is one area we can't  
>>>>>>>> waiver. These people want to kill us. I'm afraid nothing short of  
>>>>>>>> a few smuggled in soviet nukes going off is going to make this  
>>>>>>>> clear to people. Too bad it'll be too late at that point. Sorry for  
>>>>>>>> the drama, but this one thing more than any other scares me sick.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Tony  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that  
>>>>>>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>>>>>>>>>> Nixon.  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position  
>>>>>>>>>>>> that we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> this back when we had the time to do something about it,  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> was no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> (Reagan, Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country  
>>>>>>>>> by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going  
>>>>>>>>> to solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy  
>>>>>>>>> independent \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all  
>>>>>>>>> domestic energy options other than drilling for oil in old,  
>>>>>>>>> depleted oil and gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas  
>>>>>>>>> solutions that \*are proven\* could bring this about within the  
>>>>>>>>> next 5 years are off the table?  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our  
>>>>>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15  
>>>>>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to  
>>>>>>>>> negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness.  
>>>>>>>>> They will be encouraged by this.  
>>>>>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time  
>>>>>>>>> for better policies to help, as you say.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Regards,  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> DJ  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>>>>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a  
>>>>>>>>>>>> good economy,  
>>>>>>>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> not effective,  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> and a half

>>>>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough  
>>>>>>>>>> that we have  
>>>>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of  
>>>>>>>>>> mideast  
>>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the  
>>>>>>>>>> danger of  
>>>>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
>>>>>>>>>> influence on  
>>>>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of  
>>>>>>>>>> the Bush years.  
>>>>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
>>>>>>>>>> Halliburton.  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion  
>>>>>>>>>> dollars  
>>>>>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is  
>>>>>>>>>> effectively taking  
>>>>>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United  
>>>>>>>>>> States.  
>>>>>>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush  
>>>>>>>>>> with savings,  
>>>>>>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year,  
>>>>>>>>>> even though  
>>>>>>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing  
>>>>>>>>>> value. More than  
>>>>>>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends,  
>>>>>>>>>> economically, on  
>>>>>>>>>> the kindness of strangers."  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> Gene  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 20:57:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Like I said Jamie, once we get a handle on at least fixing the big holes in our homeland security we can then work on long term solutions to why they

hate us so. Hell, I don't even care if we work on the long term at the same time, just get to work on the immediate security stuff now.

Yes, we should act in our best interest. I believe appearing weak to terrorists will not be in our best interest. I'm sorry, I'll have to agree to disagree with you on this point.

Iraq has been a dismal abyss. Saddam ruled with a genocidal iron fist, and it appears that was the only thing keeping the Sunnis, Shiites, and Kurds from tearing each other up. Now it looks like that will happen anyway. The problem there is so huge and complicated, that I don't have hope anyone can "fix" it. We didn't create the "real" problem though. We just removed Hussein so the various divisions in Iraq could get back to their centuries old civil war unimpeded.

I don't believe being tough with terrorists should be our only course of action. We need to explore all avenues to work toward better relations in the Middle East, and all around the world. Take care of protecting ourselves right now, and I'm all over the making friends thing.

I must have mis-interpreted your "wacky beliefs of a few terrorists" statement. I thought you were implying that our risk from terrorists is not real, or something we need not aggressively address.

I have a hypothetical question for you Jamie. If by some miracle we could reverse all the failed policy and all of our mis-steps, Israel went away, basically remove any and all reasons for the terrorists to hate us, what if after all that, they still hate us and want us dead? What if it really is a war of ideology? What if the "infidels" really must convert or die? What then? I don't wish anyone to die by war, aggression or violence, but at what point do we decide to either fight or lay down and wait to die. I pray to God that this isn't the case. I hope somehow we can find common ground and live in peace with everyone. I haven't heard the terrorists ever express this option though.

I anticipate your response, but will refrain from replying back. You have much greater debating skills than I, and besides, I've already broken my promise not to get involved in political threads. I'm such an opinionated ass! ;>)

With Respect,

Tony

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4554d313@linux...  
>



> Hey Tony,  
>  
> I never said anything about "a few wacky terrorists."  
>  
> I was speaking of the wacky beliefs of a few terrorists, a very different  
> concept.  
>  
> If we act in our best interest and the leadership of al-Qaeda happens  
> think we're being "weak" in so doing, it would be stupid for us to be  
> thusly manipulated to act to our detriment just to impress those few  
> terrorists.  
>  
> We should act out of strength of purpose, clear vision and as much wisdom  
> as we can gather, being true to our ideals, regardless of the wacky  
> beliefs of a few terrorists.  
>  
> More than one expert on the region has criticized our lack of long term  
> preplanning in Iraq before going in. We're now in a situation that the  
> current (for the moment) policy architects did not anticipate nor prepare  
> for, and it's not a great situation. Many lives lost and \$300 billion tax  
> dollars later, more lives and dollars every day, significant tax money  
> unaccounted for, Iran gaining influence in Iraq, these sorts of  
> consequences have been a significant factor in this election. Voters are  
> asking hard questions, as well they should.  
>  
> Our various policies directly affect the region and so we must carefully  
> consider their effect. We will never have perfect intelligence systems, a  
> perfectly impenetrable border, flawless law enforcement and a blanket  
> defense against everything nor can we afford that. We can work in that  
> direction within what we can afford but we must also work in other  
> directions to help create peace. There is a balance. Anyone who preaches  
> that there is only ONE avenue of action is probably making money on that  
> avenue or listening to someone who does.  
>  
> Yes you can recognize the possibility of additional attacks on the US  
> without subscribing to the notion that we have to behave shortsightedly  
> and predictably in order to impress a few terrorists with our  
> "non-weakness."  
>  
> Consider that that kind of stubbornness and inability to see creative  
> solutions can actually make us miss opportunities to become stronger and  
> more successful, and to help create a better situation for ourselves and  
> for people who live in the region.  
>  
> Am I being more clear?  
>  
> Cheers,  
> -Jamie

> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>  
>  
> Tony Benson wrote:  
>> Jamie,  
>>  
>> I didn't imply that you were "blind, deaf and dumb". I respect your  
>> discourse, and strong defense of your views. I just feel the current  
>> situation involves more than "a few wacky terrorists". Also, just  
>> because I recognize there is a real, and likely threat of more attacks  
>> here in the US, doesn't mean I'm an "overcompensating insecure  
>> spendthrift fool undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed abject  
>> fear". I do understand though that this isn't some war between two  
>> countries, where we can "negotiate" an end to hostilities, or simply drop  
>> our support for Israel, or change our policy and make everything better.  
>> Whether it was decades of failed U.S. policy or not, these people want us  
>> dead right now, and we have to be proactive. Once we do something  
>> significant about our borders and make sure we have the absolute best  
>> intelligence, defense, and law enforcement agencies money can buy, then  
>> we can talk about long term programs to make everyone "like us". Sorry,  
>> gotta go. It's lower body workout day. I have to be in shape for all that  
>> "knee jerking"! ;>)  
>>  
>> Tony  
>>  
>>  
>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45544bcc@linux...  
>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>> Jamie wrote:  
>>>> like overcompensating insecure  
>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed  
>>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just  
>>>> maybe, we're better than that.  
>>>>  
>>>> and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you can  
>>>> die by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism, or you  
>>>> can face reality, deal with it for the time being and have something  
>>>> left to argue over once the dust clears.  
>>> Those are two of many choices. Black and white in a multi-colored world.  
>>>  
>>> Concern and awareness are useful when focused to motivate planning and  
>>> forethought that translates into appropriate action, no dispute from me  
>>> on that. You can call that "healthy fear" if you like, at the risk of  
>>> confusing it with unhealthy fear.  
>>>  
>>> It's dangerously possible, through fear, to react with insufficient  
>>> thought and understanding, and make a bad situation worse.  
>>>

>>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for  
>>> sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to  
>>> enslave.  
>>>  
>>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another  
>>> context.  
>>>  
>>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't  
>>> agree with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to  
>>> potential threats. Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at  
>>> best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.  
>>>  
>>> It's important to recognize what hasn't worked, to be open to better  
>>> ideas. So we can, together, find solutions that help our country and our  
>>> planet achieve peace.  
>>>  
>>> The first step toward getting out of a hole is to stop digging. That may  
>>> be one message of this election.  
>>>  
>>> Cheers,  
>>> -Jamie  
>>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>> news:45541a10@linux...  
>>>>> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, Deej. Like me, you've been wrong  
>>>>> before so there's reason to hope. ;^)  
>>>>>  
>>>>> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many times  
>>>>> before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will  
>>>>> probably have been planned before this election.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell  
>>>>> you it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still  
>>>>> logic and there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't  
>>>>> want to face the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered  
>>>>> policy and action by whoever's not being scapegoated.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
>>>>> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame  
>>>>> BOTH the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes  
>>>>> you feel better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
>>>>> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of  
>>>>> blame to go around through many administrations in both major

>>>> parties - for those times we're in a blaming mood.  
>>>>  
>>>> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
>>>> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
>>>> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in  
>>>> BOTH major parties AND the minor parties.  
>>>>  
>>>> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the  
>>>> threat and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll  
>>>> get some further options on the table now to meet this threat, and  
>>>> maybe, just maybe, they'll work better than the current approach which  
>>>> has hardly been flawless.  
>>>>  
>>>> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by  
>>>> terrorists into strutting around acting like overcompensating insecure  
>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty  
>>>> eyed abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe,  
>>>> just maybe, we're better than that.  
>>>>  
>>>> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and  
>>>> choose from the widest array of effective options.  
>>>>  
>>>> Cheers,  
>>>> -Jamie  
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is  
>>>>>> not smart enough  
>>>>>> to be running foreign policy.<  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> perception of weakenss is invitation to attack, plain and simple and  
>>>>>> we are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm  
>>>>>> predicting that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and  
>>>>>> that it will come as a result iof an intelligence failure due to  
>>>>>> democrats restricting the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm  
>>>>>> wrong.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>> news:45538a31@linux...  
>>>>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or  
>>>>>> not pleasing terrorists.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is

>>>>>> not smart enough to be running foreign policy.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy  
>>>>>> and negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who  
>>>>>> lets themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:  
>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over  
>>>>>>>> 3,000 innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo  
>>>>>>>> jet into our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some  
>>>>>>>> passengers, almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital  
>>>>>>>> Building? Those wacky terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president  
>>>>>>>> over in Iran who wants to "wipe Israel from the face of the  
>>>>>>>> planet". You know, the one enriching all the uranium. I disagree  
>>>>>>>> with plenty of the Republicans and the Presidents actions,  
>>>>>>>> policies, etc., but being tough with terrorists is one area we can't  
>>>>>>>> waiver. These people want to kill us. I'm afraid nothing short of  
>>>>>>>> a few smuggled in soviet nukes going off is going to make this  
>>>>>>>> clear to people. Too bad it'll be too late at that point. Sorry for  
>>>>>>>> the drama, but this one thing more than any other scares me sick.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Tony  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>> Absolutely not....and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that  
>>>>>>>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?  
>>>>>>>>>>> Nixon.  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> that we need a constant flow of mideast

>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized  
>>>>>>>>> this back when we had the time to do something about it,  
>>>>>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there  
>>>>>>>>> was no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years  
>>>>>>>>> (Reagan, Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> especially upon having had war publicly declared on this country  
>>>>>>>>> by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going  
>>>>>>>>> to solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy  
>>>>>>>>> independent \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all  
>>>>>>>>> domestic energy options other than drilling for oil in old,  
>>>>>>>>> depleted oil and gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas  
>>>>>>>>> solutions that \*are proven\* could bring this about within the  
>>>>>>>>> next 5 years are off the table?  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain the  
>>>>>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15  
>>>>>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to  
>>>>>>>>> negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness.  
>>>>>>>>> They will be encouraged by this.  
>>>>>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time  
>>>>>>>>> for better policies to help, as you say.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Regards,  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> DJ  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>>>>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a  
>>>>>>>>>>> good economy,

>>>>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>>>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is  
>>>>>>>>>> not effective,  
>>>>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.

>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year  
>>>>>>>>>> and a half  
>>>>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough  
>>>>>>>>>> that we have  
>>>>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of  
>>>>>>>>>> mideast  
>>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the  
>>>>>>>>>> danger of  
>>>>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
>>>>>>>>>> influence on  
>>>>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of  
>>>>>>>>>> the Bush years.  
>>>>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
>>>>>>>>>> Halliburton.

>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion  
>>>>>>>>>> dollars  
>>>>>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is  
>>>>>>>>>> effectively taking  
>>>>>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United  
>>>>>>>>>> States.  
>>>>>>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush  
>>>>>>>>>> with savings,  
>>>>>>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year,  
>>>>>>>>>> even though  
>>>>>>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing  
>>>>>>>>>> value. More than  
>>>>>>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends,  
>>>>>>>>>> economically, on  
>>>>>>>>>> the kindness of strangers."

>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> [http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta\\_talk\\_surowiecki](http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki)

>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> Gene

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





Subject: Re: message from democrats

Posted by [Tony Benson](#) on Fri, 10 Nov 2006 21:10:30 GMT

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

---

Now look, I'm replying to my own damn post when I said I was done. What a dork! ;>)

See my insert below.

"Tony Benson" <[tony@standinghampton.com](mailto:tony@standinghampton.com)> wrote in message  
news:4554e5a5@linux...

> Like I said Jamie, once we get a handle on at least fixing the big holes  
> in our homeland security we can then work on long term solutions to why  
> they hate us so. Hell, I don't even care if we work on the long term at  
> the same time, just get to work on the immediate security stuff now.

>  
> Yes, we should act in our best interest. I believe appearing weak to  
> terrorists will not be in our best interest. I'm sorry, I'll have to agree  
> to disagree with you on this point.

>  
> Iraq has been a dismal abyss. Saddam ruled with a genocidal iron fist, and  
> it appears that was the only thing keeping the Sunnis, Shiites, and Kurds  
> from tearing each other up. Now it looks like that will happen anyway. The  
> problem there is so huge and complicated, that I don't have hope anyone  
> can "fix" it. We didn't create the "real" problem though. We just removed  
> Hussein so the various divisions in Iraq could get back to their centuries  
> old civil war unimpeded.

We actually did create Hussein, but I referring to the "real" problem right  
at this vary moment, which is more about Iraqies killing Iraqies, than about  
them not wanting us there. They want us out, so the real slughter can begin.  
Sorry, I was affraid I didn't make that vary clear.

>  
> I don't believe being tough with terrorists should be our only course of  
> action. We need to explore all avenues to work toward better relations in  
> the Middle East, and all around the world. Take care of protecting  
> ourselves right now, and I'm all over the making friends thing.

>  
> I must have mis-interpreted your "wacky beliefs of a few terrorists"  
> statement. I thought you were implying that our risk from terrorists is  
> not real, or something we need not aggressively address.

>  
> I have a hypothetical question for you Jamie. If by some miracle we could  
> reverse all the failed policy and all of our mis-steps, Israel went away,  
> basically remove any and all reasons for the terrorists to hate us, what  
> if after all that, they still hate us and want us dead? What if it really

> is a war of ideology? What if the "infidels" really must convert or die?  
> What then? I don't wish anyone to die by war, aggression or violence, but  
> at what point do we decide to either fight or lay down and wait to die. I  
> pray to God that this isn't the case. I hope somehow we can find common  
> ground and live in peace with everyone. I haven't heard the terrorists  
> ever express this option though.

>  
> I anticipate your response, but will refrain from replying back. You have  
> much greater debating skills than I, and besides, I've already broken my  
> promise not to get involved in political threads. I'm such an opinionated  
> ass! ;>)

>  
> With Respect,

>  
> Tony

>  
>  
>  
>  
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4554d313@linux...

>>  
>> Hey Tony,  
>>  
>> I never said anything about "a few wacky terrorists."

>>  
>> I was speaking of the wacky beliefs of a few terrorists, a very different  
>> concept.

>>  
>> If we act in our best interest and the leadership of al-Qaeda happens  
>> think we're being "weak" in so doing, it would be stupid for us to be  
>> thusly manipulated to act to our detriment just to impress those few  
>> terrorists.

>>  
>> We should act out of strength of purpose, clear vision and as much wisdom  
>> as we can gather, being true to our ideals, regardless of the wacky  
>> beliefs of a few terrorists.

>>  
>> More than one expert on the region has criticized our lack of long term  
>> preplanning in Iraq before going in. We're now in a situation that the  
>> current (for the moment) policy architects did not anticipate nor prepare  
>> for, and it's not a great situation. Many lives lost and \$300 billion tax  
>> dollars later, more lives and dollars every day, significant tax money  
>> unaccounted for, Iran gaining influence in Iraq, these sorts of  
>> consequences have been a significant factor in this election. Voters are  
>> asking hard questions, as well they should.

>>  
>> Our various policies directly affect the region and so we must carefully  
>> consider their effect. We will never have perfect intelligence systems, a  
>> perfectly impenetrable border, flawless law enforcement and a blanket

>> defense against everything nor can we afford that. We can work in that  
>> direction within what we can afford but we must also work in other  
>> directions to help create peace. There is a balance. Anyone who preaches  
>> that there is only ONE avenue of action is probably making money on that  
>> avenue or listening to someone who does.

>>  
>> Yes you can recognize the possibility of additional attacks on the US  
>> without subscribing to the notion that we have to behave shortsightedly  
>> and predictably in order to impress a few terrorists with our  
>> "non-weakness."

>>  
>> Consider that that kind of stubbornness and inability to see creative  
>> solutions can actually make us miss opportunities to become stronger and  
>> more successful, and to help create a better situation for ourselves and  
>> for people who live in the region.

>>  
>> Am I being more clear?

>>  
>> Cheers,  
>> -Jamie  
>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)

>>  
>>  
>> Tony Benson wrote:

>>> Jamie,  
>>>

>>> I didn't imply that you were "blind, deaf and dumb". I respect your  
>>> discourse, and strong defense of your views. I just feel the current  
>>> situation involves more than "a few wacky terrorists". Also, just  
>>> because I recognize there is a real, and likely threat of more attacks  
>>> here in the US, doesn't mean I'm an "overcompensating insecure  
>>> spendthrift fool undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed abject  
>>> fear". I do understand though that this isn't some war between two  
>>> countries, where we can "negotiate" an end to hostilities, or simply  
>>> drop our support for Israel, or change our policy and make everything  
>>> better. Whether it was decades of failed U.S. policy or not, these  
>>> people want us dead right now, and we have to be proactive. Once we do  
>>> something significant about our borders and make sure we have the  
>>> absolute best intelligence, defense, and law enforcement agencies money  
>>> can buy, then we can talk about long term programs to make everyone  
>>> "like us". Sorry, gotta go. It's lower body workout day. I have to be in  
>>> shape for all that "knee jerking"! ;>)

>>>  
>>> Tony

>>>  
>>>  
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45544bcc@linux...  
>>>> DJ wrote:

>>>>> Jamie wrote:  
>>>>> like overcompensating insecure  
>>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty  
>>>>> eyed abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe,  
>>>>> just maybe, we're better than that.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you  
>>>>> can die by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism,  
>>>>> or you can face reality, deal with it for the time being and have  
>>>>> something left to argue over once the dust clears.  
>>>> Those are two of many choices. Black and white in a multi-colored  
>>>> world.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Concern and awareness are useful when focused to motivate planning and  
>>>>> forethought that translates into appropriate action, no dispute from me  
>>>>> on that. You can call that "healthy fear" if you like, at the risk of  
>>>>> confusing it with unhealthy fear.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> It's dangerously possible, through fear, to react with insufficient  
>>>>> thought and understanding, and make a bad situation worse.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for  
>>>>> sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to  
>>>>> enslave.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another  
>>>>> context.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't  
>>>>> agree with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to  
>>>>> potential threats. Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at  
>>>>> best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> It's important to recognize what hasn't worked, to be open to better  
>>>>> ideas. So we can, together, find solutions that help our country and  
>>>>> our planet achieve peace.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> The first step toward getting out of a hole is to stop digging. That  
>>>>> may be one message of this election.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>> news:45541a10@linux...

>>>>> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, Deej. Like me, you've been wrong  
>>>>> before so there's reason to hope. ;^)  
>>>>>  
>>>>> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many  
>>>>> times before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will  
>>>>> probably have been planned before this election.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell  
>>>>> you it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still  
>>>>> logic and there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't  
>>>>> want to face the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered  
>>>>> policy and action by whoever's not being scapegoated.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
>>>>> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame  
>>>>> BOTH the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes  
>>>>> you feel better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
>>>>> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of  
>>>>> blame to go around through many administrations in both major  
>>>>> parties - for those times we're in a blaming mood.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
>>>>> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
>>>>> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in  
>>>>> BOTH major parties AND the minor parties.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the  
>>>>> threat and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll  
>>>>> get some further options on the table now to meet this threat, and  
>>>>> maybe, just maybe, they'll work better than the current approach  
>>>>> which has hardly been flawless.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by  
>>>>> terrorists into strutting around acting like overcompensating  
>>>>> insecure spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with  
>>>>> shifty eyed abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but  
>>>>> maybe, just maybe, we're better than that.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and  
>>>>> choose from the widest array of effective options.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>> [www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)  
>>>>>  
>>>>>

>>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is  
>>>>>> not smart enough  
>>>>>> to be running foreign policy.<  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> perception of weakenss is invitation to attack, plain and simple and  
>>>>>> we are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm  
>>>>>> predicting that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon  
>>>>>> and that it will come as a result iof an intelligence failure due to  
>>>>>> democrats restricting the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm  
>>>>>> wrong.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>> news:45538a31@linux...  
>>>>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing  
>>>>>> or not pleasing terrorists.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is  
>>>>>> not smart enough to be running foreign policy.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ  
>>>>>> diplomacy and negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by  
>>>>>> anyone who lets themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:  
>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terroists who killed over  
>>>>>>>> 3,000 innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo  
>>>>>>>> jet into our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some  
>>>>>>>> passengers, almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or  
>>>>>>>> Capital Building? Those wacky terroists? Maybe it's that wacky  
>>>>>>>> president over in Iran who wants to "wipe Isreal from the face of  
>>>>>>>> the planet". You know, the one enriching all the uranium. I

>>>>>>>> disagree with plenty of the Republicans and the Presidents  
>>>>>>>> actions, policies, etc., but being tough with terrorists is one  
>>>>>>>> area we can't waiver. These people want to kill us. I'm afraid  
>>>>>>>> nothing short of a few smuggled in soviet nukes going off is going  
>>>>>>>> to make this clear to people. Too bad it'll be too late at that  
>>>>>>>> point. Sorry for the drama, but this one thing more than any other  
>>>>>>>> scares me sick.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Tony

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:

>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>> with trillions

>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Absolutely not...and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart

>>>>>>>>> that vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?

>>>>>>>>> Nixon.

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position

>>>>>>>>>> that we need a constant flow of mideast

>>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<

>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized

>>>>>>>>>> this back when we had the time to do something about it,

>>>>>>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there

>>>>>>>>>> was no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years

>>>>>>>>>> (Reagan, Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).

>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.

>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this

>>>>>>>>>>> country by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the

>>>>>>>>>>> Democrats going to solve this? In order to do so, we need to

>>>>>>>>>>> become energy independent \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go

>>>>>>>>>>> about that when all domestic energy options other than drilling

>>>>>>>>>>> for oil in old, depleted oil and gas reservoirs here are off the

>>>>>>>>>>> table whereas solutions that \*are proven\* could bring this

>>>>>>>>>>> about within the next 5 years are off the table?

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our

>>>>>>>>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15

>>>>>>>>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to

>>>>>>>>>>>> negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness.

>>>>>>>>>>>> They will be encouraged by this.

>>>>>>>>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time



>>>>>>>> for better policies to help, as you say.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Regards,  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> DJ  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a  
>>>>>>>>> good economy,  
>>>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is  
>>>>>>>>> not effective,  
>>>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year  
>>>>>>>>> and a half  
>>>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped  
>>>>>>>>> up with trillions  
>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough  
>>>>>>>>> that we have  
>>>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow  
>>>>>>>>> of mideast  
>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand  
>>>>>>>>> the danger of  
>>>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
>>>>>>>>> influence on  
>>>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of  
>>>>>>>>> the Bush years.  
>>>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
>>>>>>>>> Halliburton.  
>>>>>>>>>



> from tearing each other up. Now it looks like that will happen anyway. The  
> problem there is so huge and complicated, that I don't have hope anyone can  
> "fix" it. We didn't create the "real" problem though. We just removed  
> Hussein so the various divisions in Iraq could get back to their centuries  
> old civil war unimpeded.

Kinda, but don't forget that modern day Iraq was imposed from the  
outside by others:

"Iraq was carved out of the Ottoman Empire by the French and British as  
agreed in the Sykes-Picot Agreement. On 11 November 1920 it became a  
League of Nations mandate under British control with the name "State of  
Iraq".

The British government laid out the political and constitutional

Iraq and defined the territorial limits of Iraq without taking into  
account the aspirations of the different ethnic and religious groups in  
the country, in particular those of the Kurds to the north. Britain had  
to put down a major revolt against its policies between 1920 and 1922."

More: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History\\_of\\_Iraq](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Iraq)

And don't forget that Saddam came to power with our help and assistance,  
as part of our cold war policies:

"In 1958, a year after Saddam had joined the Ba'ath party, army officers  
led by General Abdul Karim Qassim overthrew Faisal II of Iraq. The  
Ba'athists opposed the new government, and in 1959, Saddam was involved  
in the attempted United States-backed plot to assassinate Qassim.[12]  
Saddam was shot in the leg, but escaped to Tikrit with the help of CIA  
and Egyptian intelligence agents. Saddam then crossed into Syria and was  
transferred to Beirut for a brief CIA training course. From there he  
moved to Cairo where he made frequent visits to the American embassy.  
During this time the CIA placed him in a upper-class apartment observed  
by CIA and Egyptian operatives. (UPI 'analysis' article)  
He was sentenced to death in absentia. Saddam studied law at the Cairo  
University during his exile.

Rise to power

Concerned about Qassim's growing ties to Communists, the CIA gave  
assistance to the Ba'ath Party and other regime opponents.[5] Army  
officers with ties to the Ba'ath Party overthrew Qassim in a coup in  
1963. Ba'athist leaders were appointed to the cabinet and Abdul Salam  
Arif became president. Arif dismissed and arrested the Ba'athist leaders  
later that year. Saddam returned to Iraq, but was imprisoned in 1964. He  
escaped prison in 1967 and quickly became a leading member of the party.  
In 1968, Saddam participated in a bloodless coup led by Ahmad Hassan

al-Bakr that overthrew Abdul Rahman Arif. al-Bakr was named president and Saddam was named his deputy. Saddam soon became the regime's strongman. According to biographers, Saddam never forgot the tensions within the first Ba'athist government, which informed his measures to promote Ba'ath party unity as well as his ruthless resolve to maintain power and programs to ensure social stability."

More: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saddam\\_Hussein](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saddam_Hussein)

> I don't believe being tough with terrorists should be our only course of  
> action. We need to explore all avenues to work toward better relations in  
> the Middle East, and all around the world. Take care of protecting ourselves  
> right now, and I'm all over the making friends thing.  
>  
> I must have mis-interpreted your "wacky beliefs of a few terrorists"  
> statement. I thought you were implying that our risk from terrorists is not  
> real, or something we need not aggressively address.

Sure it's real. And it's intertwined with Western involvement in the region as mentioned above. Forget that and you lose sight of reality and end up in a blind boogiemans fight. The danger there is the boogiemans becomes this unknown terror that can grow in your head. This way lies madness. If both sides do that, and they have to some extent, it becomes an escalating hatfield mccoys thing, as in Israel - with no end in sight and the whole world eventually in the balance.

> I have a hypothetical question for you Jamie. If by some miracle we could  
> reverse all the failed policy and all of our mis-steps, Israel went away,  
> basically remove any and all reasons for the terrorists to hate us, what if  
> after all that, they still hate us and want us dead? What if it really is a  
> war of ideology? What if the "infidels" really must convert or die? What  
> then? I don't wish anyone to die by war, aggression or violence, but at what  
> point do we decide to either fight or lay down and wait to die. I pray to  
> God that this isn't the case. I hope somehow we can find common ground and  
> live in peace with everyone. I haven't heard the terrorists ever express  
> this option though.

There have been statements but it's hard to put much stake in them. However you can likely read them for yourself on the net, it's at least interesting to see what Osama's stated reasons are for using terrorist actions, and what he says it would take to make them stop. Keeping in mind that he has lied before.

However it is important to understand the needs of people in the region so we don't inadvertently walk into the trap of setting ourselves up as the perceived bad guys, thus encouraging what we don't want, which is

more people being convinced to join al-Qaeda.

Have you ever seen the sorcerer's apprentice bit in Fantasia? Good intentions and amazing power isn't enough, we have to be smart about our policies. We have to understand the power we wield and be as aware and as proactive as possible about unintended consequences.

There are interesting tidbits here, including rumors of Osama's death:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Osama\\_bin\\_Laden](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Osama_bin_Laden)

As to your question, I am not interested in reliving the crusades now, in the year 2006. I think very few people are, unless whipped up into self righteous fervor by ardent nationalism to the point of jingoism, (in place of patriotism). Whipped up for the benefit of some wannabe despot or someone's short term financial gain at great expense to the world. I think we may finally be getting to the point where such intentions can be seen through. The challenge is to recognize and head that stuff off. Be aware of the tools of dictatorship anywhere such manipulations appear.

But since you asked, I will not convert forcibly to anyone else's religion. Not Osama's take on it nor Bob Jone's take on it. And I'd thank any corrupt or ignorant politicians, wannabe despots, wannabe afterlife virgin collectors and ill-informed uberfundamentalists everywhere to quit fighting and killing each other over matters of God. How absurd, ironic and pathetic. Live with integrity, find your potential, walk your spiritual path and respect the rights of others to do the same.

I believe in freedom of religion, which is guaranteed by our constitution and is our right in any case. Believe what you feel is true, but respect the right of others to do so as well.

Be free to talk and listen, communication is essential and freedom of speech is another basic human right. But remember that your right to swing your fist ends before my face begins. Don't tread on me, bucko.

I also believe in personal responsibility. Mine and that of every citizen that wants our great experiment to continue. We face threats to our system both external and internal and must be ever vigilant. We must be proactive, intelligent and constantly educate ourselves using multiple sources. We must not be manipulated into betraying our rights.

Yep I believe in freedom. Don't even think of taking that away. If you agree, let's stand together.

> I anticipate your response, but will refrain from replying back. You have  
> much greater debating skills than I, and besides, I've already broken my  
> promise not to get involved in political threads. I'm such an opinionated  
> ass! ;>)

Opinions are great, thanks for sharing. And listening. I appreciate the conversation.

United we stand. We have work to do.

Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

> With Respect,

>

> Tony

>

>

>

> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4554d313@linux...

>> Hey Tony,

>>

>> I never said anything about "a few wacky terrorists."

>>

>> I was speaking of the wacky beliefs of a few terrorists, a very different  
>> concept.

>>

>> If we act in our best interest and the leadership of al-Qaeda happens  
>> think we're being "weak" in so doing, it would be stupid for us to be  
>> thusly manipulated to act to our detriment just to impress those few  
>> terrorists.

>>

>> We should act out of strength of purpose, clear vision and as much wisdom  
>> as we can gather, being true to our ideals, regardless of the wacky  
>> beliefs of a few terrorists.

>>

>> More than one expert on the region has criticized our lack of long term  
>> preplanning in Iraq before going in. We're now in a situation that the  
>> current (for the moment) policy architects did not anticipate nor prepare  
>> for, and it's not a great situation. Many lives lost and \$300 billion tax  
>> dollars later, more lives and dollars every day, significant tax money  
>> unaccounted for, Iran gaining influence in Iraq, these sorts of  
>> consequences have been a significant factor in this election. Voters are  
>> asking hard questions, as well they should.

>>

>> Our various policies directly affect the region and so we must carefully  
>> consider their effect. We will never have perfect intelligence systems, a  
>> perfectly impenetrable border, flawless law enforcement and a blanket  
>> defense against everything nor can we afford that. We can work in that  
>> direction within what we can afford but we must also work in other  
>> directions to help create peace. There is a balance. Anyone who preaches  
>> that there is only ONE avenue of action is probably making money on that  
>> avenue or listening to someone who does.

>>

>> Yes you can recognize the possibility of additional attacks on the US  
>> without subscribing to the notion that we have to behave shortsightedly  
>> and predictably in order to impress a few terrorists with our  
>> "non-weakness."

>>

>> Consider that that kind of stubbornness and inability to see creative  
>> solutions can actually make us miss opportunities to become stronger and  
>> more successful, and to help create a better situation for ourselves and  
>> for people who live in the region.

>>

>> Am I being more clear?

>>

>> Cheers,  
>> -Jamie  
>> [www.JamieKruz.com](http://www.JamieKruz.com)

>>

>>

>> Tony Benson wrote:

>>> Jamie,

>>>

>>> I didn't imply that you were "blind, deaf and dumb". I respect your  
>>> discourse, and strong defense of your views. I just feel the current  
>>> situation involves more than "a few wacky terrorists". Also, just  
>>> because I recognize there is a real, and likely threat of more attacks  
>>> here in the US, doesn't mean I'm an "overcompensating insecure  
>>> spendthrift fool undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed abject  
>>> fear". I do understand though that this isn't some war between two  
>>> countries, where we can "negotiate" an end to hostilities, or simply drop  
>>> our support for Israel, or change our policy and make everything better.  
>>> Whether it was decades of failed U.S. policy or not, these people want us  
>>> dead right now, and we have to be proactive. Once we do something  
>>> significant about our borders and make sure we have the absolute best  
>>> intelligence, defense, and law enforcement agencies money can buy, then  
>>> we can talk about long term programs to make everyone "like us". Sorry,  
>>> gotta go. It's lower body workout day. I have to be in shape for all that  
>>> "knee jerking"! ;>)

>>>

>>> Tony

>>>



>>>  
>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:45544bcc@linux...  
>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>> Jamie wrote:  
>>>>> like overcompensating insecure  
>>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty eyed  
>>>>> abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe, just  
>>>>> maybe, we're better than that.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> and a healthy fear of a real threat will keep you alive whereas you can  
>>>>> die by living in the fantasy world of an idealistic anachronism, or you  
>>>>> can face reality, deal with it for the time being and have something  
>>>>> left to argue over once the dust clears.  
>>>> Those are two of many choices. Black and white in a multi-colored world.  
>>>>  
>>>> Concern and awareness are useful when focused to motivate planning and  
>>>> forethought that translates into appropriate action, no dispute from me  
>>>> on that. You can call that "healthy fear" if you like, at the risk of  
>>>> confusing it with unhealthy fear.  
>>>>  
>>>> It's dangerously possible, through fear, to react with insufficient  
>>>> thought and understanding, and make a bad situation worse.  
>>>>  
>>>> Ask a military planner. Fear is the path to panic, not the basis for  
>>>> sound policy or strategy. Ask any dictator, fear is an effective way to  
>>>> enslave.  
>>>>  
>>>> "...the only thing we have to fear is fear itself" FDR in another  
>>>> context.  
>>>>  
>>>> At any rate, it would be inaccurate to imply that anyone who doesn't  
>>>> agree with a particular course of action is blind, deaf and dumb to  
>>>> potential threats. Not a true nor useful characterization. Divisive at  
>>>> best. And dividing ourselves IS one road to defeat.  
>>>>  
>>>> It's important to recognize what hasn't worked, to be open to better  
>>>> ideas. So we can, together, find solutions that help our country and our  
>>>> planet achieve peace.  
>>>>  
>>>> The first step toward getting out of a hole is to stop digging. That may  
>>>> be one message of this election.  
>>>>  
>>>> Cheers,  
>>>> -Jamie  
>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>

>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:45541a10@linux...  
>>>>> Sure, I hope you're wrong, too, DeeJ. Like me, you've been wrong  
>>>>> before so there's reason to hope. ;^)  
>>>>>  
>>>>> The prediction that we will be attacked again has been made many times  
>>>>> before this election. And if/when we are attacked next it will  
>>>>> probably have been planned before this election.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> But should it happen I'm sure a lot of cable TV blatherers will tell  
>>>>> you it's the fault of this election anyway. Flawed logic is still  
>>>>> logic and there's no goat like a scapegoat when the blatherers don't  
>>>>> want to face the possibility of other causes, like poorly considered  
>>>>> policy and action by whoever's not being scapegoated.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> We've suffered al-Qaeda attacks under both Democratic and Republican  
>>>>> presidents. Worse under Republicans with 9/11, but go ahead and blame  
>>>>> BOTH the Clinton and Bush Jr. administrations, or if it really makes  
>>>>> you feel better, just blame Clinton and give Bush a pass.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Personally I can blame foreign policy back at least to WWI for  
>>>>> contributing to the setup of this situation. So IMO there's plenty of  
>>>>> blame to go around through many administrations in both major  
>>>>> parties - for those times we're in a blaming mood.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> For those times when we can get BEYOND being in a blaming mood, the  
>>>>> assumption that one party or another is eager to invite attack is  
>>>>> presumptuous. Surely there are at least a few real patriots left in  
>>>>> BOTH major parties AND the minor parties.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> There are different ways to attempt to meet any threat, diffuse the  
>>>>> threat and find solutions for any situation. Maybe, just maybe, we'll  
>>>>> get some further options on the table now to meet this threat, and  
>>>>> maybe, just maybe, they'll work better than the current approach which  
>>>>> has hardly been flawless.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Whatever we do, let's not allow ourselves to be manipulated by  
>>>>> terrorists into strutting around acting like overcompensating insecure  
>>>>> spendthrift fools while undercutting our own democracy with shifty  
>>>>> eyed abject fear - IOW, becoming terrorized. Fear sells, but maybe,  
>>>>> just maybe, we're better than that.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> The best way to be strong is to come together, work together and  
>>>>> choose from the widest array of effective options.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com

>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> DJ wrote:  
>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is  
>>>>>> not smart enough  
>>>>>> to be running foreign policy.<  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> perception of weakens is invitation to attack, plain and simple and  
>>>>>> we are now (especially now) perceived as weak and undecided. I'm  
>>>>>> predicting that we are going to be catastrophically attacked soon and  
>>>>>> that it will come as a result of an intelligence failure due to  
>>>>>> democrats restricting the ability of the NSA to wiretap. I hope I'm  
>>>>>> wrong.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>> news:45538a31@linux...  
>>>>>> I'm referring to any US leader who bases their policy on pleasing or  
>>>>>> not pleasing terrorists.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> IOW, anyone who fails to take worthwhile action because of a  
>>>>>>> perception that it will make them "seem weak" to someone else, is  
>>>>>>> not smart enough to be running foreign policy.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> In individual cases it may or may not make sense to employ diplomacy  
>>>>>>> and negotiation. That judgment cannot be wisely made by anyone who  
>>>>>>> lets themselves be controlled by knee-jerk thinking.  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>>> www.JamieKruz.com  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> Tony Benson wrote:  
>>>>>>>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>>> news:455374c4@linux...  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>>>> Jamie,  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> Are you referring to those few wacky terrorists who killed over  
>>>>>>>>>> 3,000 innocent people in the World Trade Centers, crashed a jumbo  
>>>>>>>>>> jet into our Pentagon, and, but for the extreme courage of some  
>>>>>>>>>> passengers, almost flew a jumbo jet into our White House or Capital  
>>>>>>>>>> Building? Those wacky terrorists? Maybe it's that wacky president

>>>>>>>> over in Iran who wants to "wipe Isreal from the face of the  
>>>>>>>> planet". You know, the one enriching all the uranium. I disagree  
>>>>>>>> with plenty of the Republicans and the Presidents actions,  
>>>>>>>> policies, etc., but being tough with terrorists is one area we can't  
>>>>>>>> waiver. These people want to kill us. I'm afraid nothing short of  
>>>>>>>> a few smuggled in soviet nukes going off is going to make this  
>>>>>>>> clear to people. Too bad it'll be too late at that point. Sorry for  
>>>>>>>> the drama, but this one thing more than any other scares me sick.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Tony

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> DJ wrote:

>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China?

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Absolutely not...and who praytell, gave China the jumpstart that  
>>>>>>>>> vaulted them into the position they are in nowadays?

>>>>>>>>> Nixon.

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> It's bad enough that we have placed ourselves in the position  
>>>>>>>>>>> that we need a constant flow of mideast  
>>>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going.<

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> I agree. A president with some foresight would have recognized  
>>>>>>>>>>> this back when we had the time to do something about it,  
>>>>>>>>>>> Carter did, but we voted him out and effectively pretended there  
>>>>>>>>>>> was no problem with our oil dependency for the next 22 years  
>>>>>>>>>>> (Reagan, Bush1, Clinton, Bush2).

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> Gore probably would have tried to do something.

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>> especially upon having had ward publicly declared on this country  
>>>>>>>>>>>> by Al Qaeda. So what are we going to do? Are the Democrats going  
>>>>>>>>>>>> to solve this? In order to do so, we need to become energy  
>>>>>>>>>>>> independent \*as in..yesterday\*. Now how to go about that when all  
>>>>>>>>>>>> domestic energy options other than drilling for oil in old,  
>>>>>>>>>>>> depleted oil and gas reservoirs here are off the table whereas  
>>>>>>>>>>>> solutions that \*are proven\* could bring this about within the  
>>>>>>>>>>>> next 5 years are off the table?

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

>>>>>>>>>>>>> I'm all for clean energy. enough clean energy to sustain t\our  
>>>>>>>>>>>>> economy is 15 years away, at least. We don't have 15  
>>>>>>>>>>>>> years...especially with a party in power that is willing to  
>>>>>>>>>>>>> negotiate with terrorists, which to them is a sign of weakness.  
>>>>>>>>>>>>> They will be encouraged by this.

>>>>>>>> Energy policy needs immediate attention. And some amount of time  
>>>>>>>> for better policies to help, as you say.  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> We also need leadership that won't let the wacky beliefs of a few  
>>>>>>>> terrorists directly control their course of action (or inaction).  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> Cheers,  
>>>>>>>> -Jamie  
>>>>>>>> www.JamieKrutz.com  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> Regards,  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> DJ  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> "Gene Lennon" <glennon@NOSPmyrealbox.com> wrote in message  
>>>>>>>>> news:4553565b\$1@linux...  
>>>>>>>>> "DJ" <no@way.jack> wrote:  
>>>>>>>>>> 3. Since the republicans have rebuilt the economy that Clinton  
>>>>>>>>>>> destroyed,  
>>>>>>>>>>>> and it usually takes the democrats at least 4 years to wreck a  
>>>>>>>>>>>> good economy,  
>>>>>>>>>>>> the border control issue is going to be their biggest domestic  
>>>>>>>>>>>> challenge.  
>>>>>>>>>>>> They are going to have to carry the ball on this and if it is  
>>>>>>>>>>>> not effective,  
>>>>>>>>>>>> the responsibility will fall in their lap.  
>>>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>>> This is from an article in the New Yorker that is about a year  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> and a half  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> old. The numbers are much worse now.  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Are you really happy that our economy is artificially propped up  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> with trillions  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> of dollars borrowed from countries like China? It's bad enough  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> that we have  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> placed ourselves in the position that we need a constant flow of  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> mideast  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> oil to keep our economy going. Very few Americans understand the  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> danger of  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> working under the threat of petrodollar conversion. (  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Petrodollar>).  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> But. To also be so far in debt to China that they have REAL  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> influence on  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> our policies is unconscionable. This is the hidden economy of  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the Bush years.  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Funny but it has been very good for The Carlyle Group and  
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Halliburton.

```
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> "Last year, Asian countries invested almost four hundred billion
>>>>>>>>>> dollars
>>>>>>>>>> in the United States, mostly in government bonds. China is
>>>>>>>>>> effectively taking
>>>>>>>>>> most of its excess national savings and lending it to the United
>>>>>>>>>> States.
>>>>>>>>>> The Japanese, who despite their creaking economy remain flush
>>>>>>>>>> with savings,
>>>>>>>>>> bought a quarter trillion dollars of American debt last year,
>>>>>>>>>> even though
>>>>>>>>>> the interest is lousy and the assets themselves are losing
>>>>>>>>>> value. More than
>>>>>>>>>> any other nation in history, the United States depends,
>>>>>>>>>> economically, on
>>>>>>>>>> the kindness of strangers."
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/050418ta_talk_surowiecki
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Gene
>>>>>>>>>>
>
```

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [DC](#) on Sat, 11 Nov 2006 01:50:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Tony,

This is simple.

Either you believe that the terror threat is real, and is a part of a larger movement to impose sharia on the west, and grows from the ideology of hate enclosed within that belief system.

(seen this?)

<http://www.obsessionthemovie.com/>

Or you think that it is somehow the things we do, or that we did years ago that have made people hate us, and if we just dialogue with the mullahs and dump Israel, they will leave us alone.

Being that they kill other muslims simply for believing a slightly different strain of islam, this is a risky proposition, but there are

millions who believe it.

I've said it before, but there is nothing more dangerous than someone who refuses to take people at their word. Appeasers do not gain peace; rather they end up in a corner with no option other than the big red button...

What do you think will happen to the democrats if another major attack happens on our soil?

Will they morph into uber-hawks? Will they give away Israel?

The next few years will be interesting to say the least.

DC

---

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Sat, 11 Nov 2006 02:55:42 GMT

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

---

Simple. Yeah...

It would be great to get beyond black and white thinking. Beyond characterizations that rely on false dichotomies. No amount of straw men will protect us.

Sure, such simplisiticity fits in with the views of those itching to revisit the crusades. But does that seem like a really, really smart strategy in 2006? The crusades created piles of dead bodies and we have such better weapons now. Can't we be just a little bit smarter almost a thousand years later?

Using the Hitler appeasement argument is like fitting Cinderella's sister's bloated foot into Cinderella's petite shoes. The shoe doesn't really fit. There are some similarities between these situations, but many differences. It would be limiting to cling to that one point of view, pretending that some straw man is the only other point of view, and sadly actively avoid considering the vaster spectrum of perspectives available. From which may come other, more viable solutions. With potentially better results than we are currently experiencing.

I hope we will have the benefit of a wider range of views on these and other problems for the next couple of years. There's at least a chance of that now, but it's by no means certain. I wonder what the switch at sec of defense really means. I'm guardedly hopeful.

The last few years have, unfortunately, been more than "interesting."



Cheers,  
-Jamie  
[www.JamieKrutz.com](http://www.JamieKrutz.com)

DC wrote:

- > Tony,
- >
- > This is simple.
- >
- > Either you believe that the terror threat is real, and is a part of a
- > larger movement to impose sharia on the west, and grows from the
- > ideology of hate enclosed within that belief system.
- >
- >
- > (seen this?)
- > <http://www.obsessionthemovie.com/>
- >
- > Or you think that it is somehow the things we do, or that we did
- > years ago that have made people hate us, and if we just dialogue
- > with the mullahs and dump Israel, they will leave us alone.
- >
- >
- > Being that they kill other muslims simply for believing a slightly
- > different strain of islam, this is a risky proposition, but there are
- > millions who believe it.
- >
- > I've said it before, but there is nothing more dangerous than
- > someone who refuses to take people at their word. Appeasers do
- > not gain peace; rather they end up in a corner with no option other
- > than the big red button...
- >
- > What do you think will happen to the democrats if another major
- > attack happens on our soil?
- >
- > Will they morph into uber-hawks? Will they give away Israel?
- >
- > The next few years will be interesting to say the least.
- >
- > DC
- >
- >

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats

Posted by [TCB](#) on Sat, 11 Nov 2006 20:37:04 GMT

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

---

You know Don, I really wish I could live in your world instead of the actual world. As you note, things are simple there, even something as complex as 'terrorism' and its motivations/manifestations. Not that I expect this to make much of a dent to DonWelt, but the most flamboyant kind of terrorism, suicide bombing, has been shown to be far more political than religious in motivation. I've read this superb book, but here's a story about it that you can read for free.

[http://www.boston.com/ae/books/articles/2005/07/03/why\\_do\\_suicide\\_bombers\\_do\\_it/](http://www.boston.com/ae/books/articles/2005/07/03/why_do_suicide_bombers_do_it/)

The only part that religion plays is that civil wars that involve different religions tend to have more suicide bombers, or suicide bombers at all. This isn't unique to any one religion, and in the Lebanese civil war that started modern suicide attacks 70% of the suicide bombers were--take a seat please--Christians, though most of them came from secular groups.

So yes, the 'threat of terror' is real, and I'm sure the next big attack against the US is well into the R&D stages. But it's anything but simple to pull off a major terrorist operation, and anything but simple to stop one, and in the larger picture applying simple answers to complex questions gets us into stupid wars with countries that, until we attacked them, had no history of producing anti-American terrorists.

Some lefties (and paleo-conservatives like me) argue that Bush 43 is the worst president ever. I don't happen to think so, I'd say he's probably one of the five worst but he can't compare to some of the real stinkers. Martin van Buren (though a superb secretary of state) was a disaster, McKinley our first taster of imperium, but for me by far the worst president ever was Woodrow Wilson, who discarded the Monroe Doctrine, manipulated us into WW I, and helped fashion the stupendously idiotic treaty at Versailles that all but demanded another great European war. It shows what a bastard he was that I didn't even get around to his support for the KKK and anti-semitism in one sentence. Nevertheless, the worst thing he did was create the language and thought processes that have been used ever since to make Americans think our country is somehow more than just another country in the world, prone to the same kinds of mistakes and missteps that the rest of history is littered with. European writers call it 'American exceptionalism' and Wilson provided the crucial vocabulary to make it possible. GW Bush's speeches these days sound like Wilson carefully rewritten for someone with major problems speaking in public. All of which is a warmup to another article by a Wilson hating paleo-conservative. This from Bill Lind, who puts the paleo in paleo-conservative and openly refers to himself as a monarchist. Just a little 'outside the box' thinking on Iraq.

[http://www.d-n-i.net/lind/lind\\_11\\_06\\_06.htm](http://www.d-n-i.net/lind/lind_11_06_06.htm)

TCB

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

>  
>Tony,  
>  
>This is simple.  
>  
>Either you believe that the terror threat is real, and is a part of a  
>larger movement to impose sharia on the west, and grows from the  
>ideology of hate enclosed within that belief system.  
>  
>  
>(seen this?)  
><http://www.obsessionthemovie.com/>  
>  
>Or you think that it is somehow the things we do, or that we did  
>years ago that have made people hate us, and if we just dialogue  
>with the mullahs and dump Israel, they will leave us alone.  
>  
>  
>Being that they kill other muslims simply for believing a slightly  
>different strain of islam, this is a risky proposition, but there are  
>millions who believe it.  
>  
>I've said it before, but there is nothing more dangerous than  
>someone who refuses to take people at their word. Appeasers do  
>not gain peace; rather they end up in a corner with no option other  
>than the big red button...  
>  
>What do you think will happen to the democrats if another major  
>attack happens on our soil?  
>  
>Will they morph into uber-hawks? Will they give away Israel?  
>  
>The next few years will be interesting to say the least.  
>  
>  
>DC  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: message from democrats  
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Sat, 11 Nov 2006 23:51:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

>

>You know Don, I really wish I could live in your world instead of the actual  
>world.

Start by ending all drug use. Your version of "actual" may get revised.

Just a thought.

>As you note, things are simple there, even something as complex as  
>'terrorism' and its motivations/manifestations. Not that I expect this to  
>make much of a dent to DonWelt, but the most flamboyant kind of terrorism,  
>suicide bombing, has been shown to be far more political than religious  
in  
>motivation.

There is absolutely no difference between the two in the minds of  
those committing the acts.

Just watch the trailer for Obsession.

Terrorism is indeed complex. The choice as to the magnitude of  
the threat, and the likely success of various approaches to it, is  
quite simple really. You either take the assertions of the leaders  
of terrorism seriously or you do not.

>I've read this superb book, but here's a story about it that  
>you can read for free.

>

> [http://www.boston.com/ae/books/articles/2005/07/03/why\\_do\\_suicide\\_bombers\\_do\\_it/](http://www.boston.com/ae/books/articles/2005/07/03/why_do_suicide_bombers_do_it/)

Read it. Not very impressed.

Now you read "Because They Hate"

<http://www.americancongressfortruth.com/>

And tell me what she did to bring on the wrath of her persecutors.

>The only part that religion plays is that civil wars that involve different  
>religions tend to have more suicide bombers, or suicide bombers at all.  
This  
>isn't unique to any one religion, and in the Lebanese civil war that started  
>modern suicide attacks 70% of the suicide bombers were--take a seat please--Christians,  
>though most of them came from secular groups.

As most of the Irish terrorists have been. Now compare those attacks to these in number and scope:

<http://www.thereligionofpeace.com/>

Make sure you check out the stats page.

>So yes, the 'threat of terror' is real, and I'm sure the next big attack  
>against the US is well into the R&D stages. But it's anything but simple  
>to pull off a major terrorist operation, and anything but simple to stop  
>one, and in the larger picture applying simple answers to complex questions  
>gets us into stupid wars with countries that, until we attacked them, had  
>no history of producing anti-American terrorists.

Ok, so what is your plan? Obviously, the other side has failed in your mind, so I would love to hear an alternative. Remember that americans and millions of others around the world expect a plan that reflects your view, stated above, that

----

So yes, the 'threat of terror' is real, and I'm sure the next big attack  
>against the US is well into the R&D stages.

----

>Americans think  
>our country is somehow more than just another country in the world, prone  
>to the same kinds of mistakes and missteps that the rest of history is littered  
>with. European writers call it 'American exceptionalism'

And what if Europe is a lost cause already?

<http://www.victorhanson.com/articles/hanson021906.html>

<http://frontpagemag.com/Articles/Printable.asp?ID=25256>

<http://www.victorhanson.com/articles/hanson021106.html>

Give me a reason to care what European writers think.

Tell me why you care in particular.

The last election went the way it did, not because Bush was wrong, stupid, or evil, but because

he does not know how to lead, and there may be no solution in the Middle East at any rate. Years ago, we could have started a crash program to get our own oil resources and develop alternatives but no, we blew it just like we blew all the chances to get OBL.

Now we will pay for ALL the stupidity of both sides.

I know you have little faith in the left or the Dems, so you must feel about as cheery as I do concerning the next few years...

DC

---