

---

Subject: RP

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Thu, 10 Jan 2008 23:22:00 GMT

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

---

Lest anyone think I am singling out RP, let me say this:

Hillary - machine politics, angry, corrupt, unelectable

Edwards - Slimy kissup to Obama looking for a VP slot. Obama will run from him. Zillionaire trial lawyer phony.

Obama - Good guy, good heart. A bunch of scary ideas, and some good ones. If he can rise to the occasion when he has to face the real opponents (the GOP candidates) he could win. I don't think it will happen.

McCain - That man has a really bad temper. He scares me. All the idiots who have characterized Bush as a cowboy, when he is the most mild and cautious of men, are going to get a shock when they replace a "cowboy" with a really pissed-off ex POW and torture victim. I like him, but he has a serious temper, just watch him closely at the debates. Yes, he has a right to it, but I am not sure he has mastered it.

Mitt - Too much of a suit for me. Too calculating, too little moral center. McCain despises him and with good reason. nonetheless he did a good job in MA. May be a better pres. than public figure, but we really don't need another one of those after 8 years of Bush.

Rudi - Best man to have when the chips are down. Not really a conservative, but looks like one compared to the Dems. Why is he behind? Skeletons in his personal life? Trust?

Thompson - He doesn't care about the media or image management; cannot be bought. A true conservative. May not be electable.

Huck - No legs. Scares me. If he is the candidate, the GOP may lose.

I can only say one thing:

This is going to be one wild and wooly campaign.

DC

---

---

Subject: Re: RP

Posted by [Bill L](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 01:18:02 GMT

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

---

All 3 of the Dems are lawyers - Oy!

Lest you fall for Obama's youth and charm, be aware he twice voted for IDX or partial birth abortion. For more on this unlovely act you could read this if you have a strong stomach:  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Partial\\_birth\\_abortion](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Partial_birth_abortion)

I'm actually not totally opposed to early abortion, under certain circumstances, but from what I just read, I could never support partial birth abortion of viable babies. It sounds totally barbaric. That makes Obama a barbarian or just stupid (which is about the same thing) in my book.

In case anyone cares, my reasoning on this is that once the body has developed to the point of being potentially viable, the spiritual being has claimed or even occupied it and then you are essentially killing his or her body, which is murder, right? I don't think the same is true about a tiny egg that has just become fertilized. There's no spiritual or sentient being there to my way of thinking. I hope I don't start a whole thing here or upset anyone with this fairly gruesome subject.

DC wrote:

- > Lest anyone think I am singling out RP, let me say this:
- >
- > Hillary - machine politics, angry, corrupt, unelectable
- >
- > Edwards - Slimy kissup to Obama looking for a VP slot. Obama
- > will run from him. Zillionaire trial lawyer phony.
- >
- > Obama - Good guy, good heart. A bunch of scary ideas, and
- > some good ones. If he can rise to the occasion when he has
- > to face the real opponents (the GOP candidates) he could win.
- > I don't think it will happen.
- >
- > McCain - That man has a really bad temper. He scares me. All the
- > idiots who have characterized Bush as a cowboy, when he is
- > the most mild and cautious of men, are going to get a shock when
- > they replace a "cowboy" with a really pissed-off ex POW and
- > torture victim. I like him, but he has a serious temper, just watch
- > him closely at the debates. Yes, he has a right to it, but I am not
- > sure he has mastered it.
- >
- > Mitt - Too much of a suit for me. Too calculating, too little
- > moral center. McCain despises him and with good reason.
- > nonetheless he did a good job in MA. May be a better pres.
- > than public figure, but we really don't need another one of those

> after 8 years of Bush.  
>  
> Rudi - Best man to have when the chips are down. Not really  
> a conservative, but looks like one compared to the Dems.  
> Why is he behind? Skeletons in his personal life? Trust?  
>  
> Thompson - He doesn't care about the media or image  
> management; cannot be bought. A true conservative.  
> May not be electable.  
>  
> Huck - No legs. Scares me. If he is the candidate, the GOP may  
> lose.  
>  
>  
> I can only say one thing:  
>  
> This is going to be one wild and wooly campaign.  
>  
> DC  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: RP  
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 02:35:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'll take the charm over Edwards grease and Hillary's. well,  
Hillaryness..

Abortion is murder.

Roe v. Wade cannot stand the slightest constitutional inspection.  
Privacy rights trumping the lives of our children? All we need  
is judges who care about the constitution rather than a political  
agenda and it is finished. So, we don't strictly need a pro-life  
president. We need one that will not nominate activist judges.

Then Roe V. Wade can be dealt with legislatively as it should  
have been.

DC

Bill L <[bill@billlorentzen.com](mailto:bill@billlorentzen.com)> wrote:

>All 3 of the Dems are lawyers - Oy!

>

>Lest you fall for Obama's youth and charm, be aware he twice voted for

>IDX or partial birth abortion. For more on this unlovely act you could  
>read this if you have a strong stomach:  
>[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Partial\\_birth\\_abortion](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Partial_birth_abortion)  
>  
>I'm actually not totally opposed to early abortion, under certain  
>circumstances, but from what I just read, I could never support partial  
  
>birth abortion of viable babies. It sounds totally barbaric. That makes  
  
>Obama a barbarian or just stupid (which is about the same thing) in my book.  
>  
>In case anyone cares, my reasoning on this is that once the body has  
>developed to the point of being potentially viable, the spiritual being  
  
>has claimed or even occupied it and then you are essentially killing his  
  
>or her body, which is murder, right? I don't think the same is true  
>about a tiny egg that has just become fertilized. There's no spiritual  
>or sentient being there to my way of thinking. I hope I don't start a  
>whole thing here or upset anyone with this fairly gruesome subject.  
>  
>DC wrote:  
>> Lest anyone think I am singling out RP, let me say this:  
>>  
>> Hillary - machine politics, angry, corrupt, unelectable  
>>  
>> Edwards - Slimy kissup to Obama looking for a VP slot. Obama  
>> will run from him. Zillionaire trial lawyer phony.  
>>  
>> Obama - Good guy, good heart. A bunch of scary ideas, and  
>> some good ones. If he can rise to the occasion when he has  
>> to face the real opponents (the GOP candidates) he could win.  
>> I don't think it will happen.  
>>  
>> McCain - That man has a really bad temper. He scares me. All the  
>> idiots who have characterized Bush as a cowboy, when he is  
>> the most mild and cautious of men, are going to get a shock when  
>> they replace a "cowboy" with a really pissed-off ex POW and  
>> torture victim. I like him, but he has a serious temper, just watch  
>> him closely at the debates. Yes, he has a right to it, but I am not  
>> sure he has mastered it.  
>>  
>> Mitt - Too much of a suit for me. Too calculating, too little  
>> moral center. McCain despises him and with good reason.  
>> nonetheless he did a good job in MA. May be a better pres.  
>> than public figure, but we really don't need another one of those  
>> after 8 years of Bush.  
>>

>> Rudi - Best man to have when the chips are down. Not really  
>> a conservative, but looks like one compared to the Dems.  
>> Why is he behind? Skeletons in his personal life? Trust?  
>>  
>> Thompson - He doesn't care about the media or image  
>> management; cannot be bought. A true conservative.  
>> May not be electable.  
>>  
>> Huck - No legs. Scares me. If he is the candidate, the GOP may  
>> lose.  
>>  
>>  
>> I can only say one thing:  
>>  
>> This is going to be one wild and wooly campaign.  
>>  
>> DC  
>>  
>>

---

---

Subject: Re: RP  
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 02:39:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oh God, not Rudi, please. He seems to me to be running second only to Romney in the thickness of his phoney politician veneer and the shallowness underneath. "9/11, 9/11, 9/11, 9/11, 9/11, etc., etc. . . " - R. Giuliani in any public address. Definitely skeletons and trust issues.

I like Barack-O, but I'm afraid his inexperience might allow him to be led into some bad places, like war on Iran.

I don't really like any of the rest of them anymore, but I do think Edwards would be the least of the evils.

They're all phonies and hypocrites to one degree or another . . . I mean, come on . . . what kind of person strives for that kind of power anyway? The kind who gets used to people being afraid to say "no" to them?

Just my opinion. I hope whoever gets elected proves me wrong.

S

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:47869a88\$1@linux...

>

> Lest anyone think I am singling out RP, let me say this:

>  
> Hillary - machine politics, angry, corrupt, unelectable  
>  
> Edwards - Slimy kissup to Obama looking for a VP slot. Obama  
> will run from him. Zillionaire trial lawyer phony.  
>  
> Obama - Good guy, good heart. A bunch of scary ideas, and  
> some good ones. If he can rise to the occasion when he has  
> to face the real opponents (the GOP candidates) he could win.  
> I don't think it will happen.  
>  
> McCain - That man has a really bad temper. He scares me. All the  
> idiots who have characterized Bush as a cowboy, when he is  
> the most mild and cautious of men, are going to get a shock when  
> they replace a "cowboy" with a really pissed-off ex POW and  
> torture victim. I like him, but he has a serious temper, just watch  
> him closely at the debates. Yes, he has a right to it, but I am not  
> sure he has mastered it.  
>  
> Mitt - Too much of a suit for me. Too calculating, too little  
> moral center. McCain despises him and with good reason.  
> nonetheless he did a good job in MA. May be a better pres.  
> than public figure, but we really don't need another one of those  
> after 8 years of Bush.  
>  
> Rudi - Best man to have when the chips are down. Not really  
> a conservative, but looks like one compared to the Dems.  
> Why is he behind? Skeletons in his personal life? Trust?  
>  
> Thompson - He doesn't care about the media or image  
> management; cannot be bought. A true conservative.  
> May not be electable.  
>  
> Huck - No legs. Scares me. If he is the candidate, the GOP may  
> lose.  
>  
>  
> I can only say one thing:  
>  
> This is going to be one wild and wooly campaign.  
>  
> DC  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: RP

Posted by [Deej](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 03:38:03 GMT

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

---

I really like Barak too. I'm not really keen on some of his stated policies, but rhetoric is usually tempered by hard realities, especially when it comes to economics. Corporations are evil, etc., etc.....yeah, but small corporations employ the majority of people in this country, and with the exception of government and public education (pretty much the same thing), large corporations employ the rest. Tax them in a non-profit mode and you've shut the economy down. Barak is smart. Real smart. What I'm really, really afraid of is that some racially motivated white whacko maniac will kill him or some foriegn power will kill him and stage it to look like some racially motivated white whacko maniac killed him....and as totally surreal and incredibly evil that scenario is, it's a credible one.

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:4786d77d@linux...

> Oh God, not Rudi, please. He seems to me to be running second only to  
> Romney in the thickness of his phoney politician veneer and the  
> shallowness underneath. "9/11, 9/11, 9/11, 9/11, 9/11, etc., etc. . . " -  
> R. Giuliani in any public address. Definitely skeletons and trust issues.  
>  
> I like Barack-O, but I'm afraid his inexperience might allow him to be led  
> into some bad places, like war on Iran.

> I don't really like any of the rest of them anymore, but I do think  
> Edwards would be the least of the evils.

> They're all phonies and hypocrites to one degree or another . . . I mean,  
> come on . . . what kind of person strives for that kind of power anyway?  
> The kind who gets used to people being afraid to say "no" to them?

> Just my opinion. I hope whoever gets elected proves me wrong.

> S

> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:47869a88\$1@linux...

>> Lest anyone think I am singling out RP, let me say this:

>> Hillary - machine politics, angry, corrupt, unelectable

>> Edwards - Slimy kissup to Obama looking for a VP slot. Obama  
>> will run from him. Zillionaire trial lawyer phony.

>> Obama - Good guy, good heart. A bunch of scary ideas, and  
>> some good ones. If he can rise to the occasion when he has  
>> to face the real opponents (the GOP candidates) he could win.  
>> I don't think it will happen.

>>  
>> McCain - That man has a really bad temper. He scares me. All the  
>> idiots who have characterized Bush as a cowboy, when he is  
>> the most mild and cautious of men, are going to get a shock when  
>> they replace a "cowboy" with a really pissed-off ex POW and  
>> torture victim. I like him, but he has a serious temper, just watch  
>> him closely at the debates. Yes, he has a right to it, but I am not  
>> sure he has mastered it.  
>>  
>> Mitt - Too much of a suit for me. Too calculating, too little  
>> moral center. McCain despises him and with good reason.  
>> nonetheless he did a good job in MA. May be a better pres.  
>> than public figure, but we really don't need another one of those  
>> after 8 years of Bush.  
>>  
>> Rudi - Best man to have when the chips are down. Not really  
>> a conservative, but looks like one compared to the Dems.  
>> Why is he behind? Skeletons in his personal life? Trust?  
>>  
>> Thompson - He doesn't care about the media or image  
>> management; cannot be bought. A true conservative.  
>> May not be electable.  
>>  
>> Huck - No legs. Scares me. If he is the candidate, the GOP may  
>> lose.  
>>  
>>  
>> I can only say one thing:  
>>  
>> This is going to be one wild and wooly campaign.  
>>  
>> DC  
>>  
>>  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: RP  
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 06:36:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

"Deej" <noway@jose.org> wrote:  
>What I'm really, really  
>afraid of is that some racially motivated white whacko maniac will kill  
him  
>or some foriegn power will kill him and stage it to look like some racially



>motivated white whacko maniac killed him....and as totally surreal and  
>incredibly evil that scenario is, it's a credible one.

There is a significant number of African Americans who think he will be killed. God, that's scary. Both the fact that so many people think it will happen and the possibility that it could. It would be a very very bad day in America if that happens. I don't think it will.

DC

---

---

Subject: Re: RP

Posted by [Bill L](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 12:50:56 GMT

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

---

Every time I hear people talk about Barak Obama, they say they think he doesn't have much experience and they don't really agree with all his stated intentions or policies, but they like him. The inherent problem with democracy is it usually turns into a popularity contest.

On the other hand most people when talking about Ron Paul say (with some surprise) that they agree with his stated intentions and like that he seems to have high integrity.

I will vote for someone who has shown they can stick by their guns and consistently vote for sane, logical, future thinking legislation and policy. Ron Paul has shown that in spades. He's my man!

Deej wrote:

> I really like Barak too. I'm not really keen on some of his stated policies,  
> but rhetoric is usually tempered by hard realities, especially when it comes  
> to economics. Corporations are evil, etc., etc.....yeah, but small  
> corporations employ the majority of people in this country, and with the  
> exception of government and public education (pretty much the same thing),  
> large corporations employ the rest. Tax them in a non-profit mode and you've  
> shut the economy down. Barak is smart. Real smart. What I'm really, really  
> afraid of is that some racially motivated white whacko maniac will kill him  
> or some foreign power will kill him and stage it to look like some racially  
> motivated white whacko maniac killed him....and as totally surreal and  
> incredibly evil that scenario is, it's a credible one.

>

> "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:4786d77d@linux...

>> Oh God, not Rudi, please. He seems to me to be running second only to

>> Romney in the thickness of his phoney politician veneer and the

>> shallowness underneath. "9/11, 9/11, 9/11, 9/11, 9/11, etc., etc. . . " -

>> R. Giuliani in any public address. Definitely skeletons and trust issues.

>>  
>> I like Barack-O, but I'm afraid his inexperience might allow him to be led  
>> into some bad places, like war on Iran.  
>>  
>> I don't really like any of the rest of them anymore, but I do think  
>> Edwards would be the least of the evils.  
>>  
>> They're all phonies and hypocrites to one degree or another . . . I mean,  
>> come on . . . what kind of person strives for that kind of power anyway?  
>> The kind who gets used to people being afraid to say "no" to them?  
>>  
>> Just my opinion. I hope whoever gets elected proves me wrong.  
>>  
>> S  
>>  
>>  
>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:47869a88\$1@linux...  
>>> Lest anyone think I am singling out RP, let me say this:  
>>>  
>>> Hillary - machine politics, angry, corrupt, unelectable  
>>>  
>>> Edwards - Slimy kissup to Obama looking for a VP slot. Obama  
>>> will run from him. Zillionaire trial lawyer phony.  
>>>  
>>> Obama - Good guy, good heart. A bunch of scary ideas, and  
>>> some good ones. If he can rise to the occasion when he has  
>>> to face the real opponents (the GOP candidates) he could win.  
>>> I don't think it will happen.  
>>>  
>>> McCain - That man has a really bad temper. He scares me. All the  
>>> idiots who have characterized Bush as a cowboy, when he is  
>>> the most mild and cautious of men, are going to get a shock when  
>>> they replace a "cowboy" with a really pissed-off ex POW and  
>>> torture victim. I like him, but he has a serious temper, just watch  
>>> him closely at the debates. Yes, he has a right to it, but I am not  
>>> sure he has mastered it.  
>>>  
>>> Mitt - Too much of a suit for me. Too calculating, too little  
>>> moral center. McCain despises him and with good reason.  
>>> nonetheless he did a good job in MA. May be a better pres.  
>>> than public figure, but we really don't need another one of those  
>>> after 8 years of Bush.  
>>>  
>>> Rudi - Best man to have when the chips are down. Not really  
>>> a conservative, but looks like one compared to the Dems.  
>>> Why is he behind? Skeletons in his personal life? Trust?  
>>>  
>>> Thompson - He doesn't care about the media or image

>>> management; cannot be bought. A true conservative.  
>>> May not be electable.  
>>>  
>>> Huck - No legs. Scares me. If he is the candidate, the GOP may  
>>> lose.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> I can only say one thing:  
>>>  
>>> This is going to be one wild and wooly campaign.  
>>>  
>>> DC  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: RP  
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 15:55:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Rudi is a New Yorker, deathly afraid of acting like one and pissing off a bunch of people in what New Yorkers call (offensively, to be sure) flyover states. The one thing he knows those flyover people fret about that he knows anything about is terrorism, so he hacks on about 9/11. There is no way for a mayor of New York to be an ideologue. Ya just can't. When mayor Rudi had an unfortunate tendency to legislate lifestyles (most famously when he decided to enforce an age old rule that a bar had to have a particular kind of license to have dancing, yes, there were bars with DJs where the bouncers would stop you from dancing), but by and large was a pragmatic conservative administrator. He also caved on some municipal union issues, but it's a little tricky beating up on the fire department right after 9/11. I think he would make a fine president during four years that are probably going to demand a lot of shaking and baking on the domestic front, and I think he'd be fearless taking on congress. One other reason I like Rudi, I think the only job he ever wanted was mayor of New York, and if he could have kept that job I bet he would have. That would make him the only president in our history for whom the office was a consolation prize, and as one who thinks as dimly about politics as I do I like that.

I have no idea what Obama actually believes in. He harps (eloquently, though emptily) about 'Change.' Well hos, you don't need to agitate for change, it'll be here soon enough. What the hell are you going to DO about it? That said, the rest of the Democrats are so completely contemptible I couldn't think of voting for them. Additionally, Obama seems very, very smart, and perhaps most importantly very willing to learn from other people. Let's face

it, 95% of being president is picking the right people and the right advice.

Lastly, and I might get in trouble here, I like the fact that he is black. Dark skinned people have an intuitive, visceral understanding of what it's like getting screwed over by white people. I can't imagine that a black president would view situations like the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the war in Afghanistan, Chechnya and the rest of the former Soviet states, etc. and so forth in the same way as a white president. This isn't a policy thing, it's an issue of perspective.

Lastly, what I really wish would happen during a debate is for a reporter to say, 'We have somewhere between 200 billion and half a trillion dollars of underwater mortgage backed debt as of today. Will you prop up the holders of those mortgages to avoid default? If Citibank become insolvent, will you prop them up? Will you do nothing and let the market decide? If you plan to bail out the lenders, borrowers, or both, what funds will you use?' It would be pretty tricky to start jabbering about 9/11 or CHANGE when answering that question.

TCB

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

>Oh God, not Rudi, please. He seems to me to be running second only to  
>Romney in the thickness of his phoney politician veneer and the shallowness

>underneath. "9/11, 9/11, 9/11, 9/11, 9/11, etc., etc. . . " - R. Giuliani

>in any public address. Definitely skeletons and trust issues.

>

>I like Barack-O, but I'm afraid his inexperience might allow him to be led

>into some bad places, like war on Iran.

>

>I don't really like any of the rest of them anymore, but I do think Edwards

>would be the least of the evils.

>

>They're all phonies and hypocrites to one degree or another . . . I mean,

>come on . . . what kind of person strives for that kind of power anyway?

>The kind who gets used to people being afraid to say "no" to them?

>

>Just my opinion. I hope whoever gets elected proves me wrong.

>

>S

>

>

>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:47869a88\$1@linux...

>>

>> Lest anyone think I am singling out RP, let me say this:

>>

>> Hillary - machine politics, angry, corrupt, unelectable

>>

>> Edwards - Slimy kissup to Obama looking for a VP slot. Obama

>> will run from him. Zillionaire trial lawyer phony.

>>

>> Obama - Good guy, good heart. A bunch of scary ideas, and

>> some good ones. If he can rise to the occasion when he has

>> to face the real opponents (the GOP candidates) he could win.

>> I don't think it will happen.

>>

>> McCain - That man has a really bad temper. He scares me. All the

>> idiots who have characterized Bush as a cowboy, when he is

>> the most mild and cautious of men, are going to get a shock when

>> they replace a "cowboy" with a really pissed-off ex POW and

>> torture victim. I like him, but he has a serious temper, just watch

>> him closely at the debates. Yes, he has a right to it, but I am not

>> sure he has mastered it.

>>

>> Mitt - Too much of a suit for me. Too calculating, too little

>> moral center. McCain despises him and with good reason.

>> nonetheless he did a good job in MA. May be a better pres.

>> than public figure, but we really don't need another one of those

>> after 8 years of Bush.

>>

>> Rudi - Best man to have when the chips are down. Not really

>> a conservative, but looks like one compared to the Dems.

>> Why is he behind? Skeletons in his personal life? Trust?

>>

>> Thompson - He doesn't care about the media or image

>> management; cannot be bought. A true conservative.

>> May not be electable.

>>

>> Huck - No legs. Scares me. If he is the candidate, the GOP may

>> lose.

>>

>>

>> I can only say one thing:

>>

>> This is going to be one wild and wooly campaign.

>>

>> DC

>>

>>

>

>

---

Subject: Re: RP

Posted by [Bill L](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 17:01:30 GMT

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

---

No shit, my man! The biggest problem this country faces today is not terrorism and it really never was. It may sound cold-hearted, but we only lost a few thousand people and some tall buildings. In the big picture that's fairly small potatoes. We lose that many every 4 days from mis-prescribed pharmaceuticals and every month in highway deaths. If we really want to save lives there ought to be "wars against" those mistakes.

Our biggest problem right now is we are spending way more than we have, both individually and in the government. The dollar is crashing hard because the rest of the world now has an alternative in the Euro and they know our Fed Reserve just keeps on printing new dollars every time they feel like having an extra juicy profit. The citizens won't take the government to task for overspending because they are doing the same damn thing! Getting a new credit card is equivalent to the Fed printing up more money.

We have to fix this, but the majority of candidates don't dare bring it up because it is sure to be poorly received by the electorate. Fox News was evidently afraid to have Ron Paul in the last debate because he was likely to shove his take-action-now fiscal viewpoint into the other candidates faces, and they wouldn't know what to say - they think the public is way too stupid to put future survival above their immediate desires.

We gotta wake up NOW.

TCB wrote:

> Rudi is a New Yorker, deathly afraid of acting like one and pissing off a  
> bunch of people in what New Yorkers call (offensively, to be sure) flyover  
> states. The one thing he knows those flyover people fret about that he knows  
> anything about is terrorism, so he hacks on about 9/11. There is no way  
> for a mayor of New York to be an ideologue. Ya just can't. When mayor Rudi  
> had an unfortunate tendency to legislate lifestyles (most famously when he  
> decided to enforce an age old rule that a bar had to have a particular kind  
> of license to have dancing, yes, there were bars with DJs where the bouncers  
> would stop you from dancing), but by and large was a pragmatic conservative  
> administrator. He also caved on some municipal union issues, but it's a little  
> tricky beating up on the fire department right after 9/11. I think he would  
> make a fine president during four years that are probably going to demand  
> a lot of shaking and baking on the domestic front, and I think he'd be fearless

> taking on congress. One other reason I like Rudi, I think the only job he  
> ever wanted was mayor of New York, and if he could have kept that job I bet  
> he would have. That would make him the only president in our history for  
> whom the office was a consolation prize, and as one who thinks as dimly about  
> politics as I do I like that.

>

> I have no idea what Obama actually believes in. He harps (eloquently, though  
> emptily) about 'Change.' Well hos, you don't need to agitate for change,  
> it'll be here soon enough. What the hell are you going to DO about it? That  
> said, the rest of the Democrats are so completely contemptible I couldn't  
> think of voting for them. Additionally, Obama seems very, very smart, and  
> perhaps most importantly very willing to learn from other people. Let's face  
> it, 95% of being president is picking the right people and the right advice.

>

> Lastly, and I might get in trouble here, I like the fact that he is black.  
> Dark skinned people have an intuitive, visceral understanding of what it's  
> like getting screwed over by white people. I can't imagine that a black president  
> would view situations like the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the war in Afghanistan,  
> Chechnya an the rest of the former Soviet states, etc. and so forth in the  
> same way as a white president. This isn't a policy thing, it's an issue of  
> perspective.

>

> Lastly, what I really wish would happen during a debate is for a reporter  
> to say, 'We have somewhere between 200 billion and half a trillion dollars  
> of underwater mortgage backed debt as of today. Will you prop up the holders  
> of those mortgages to avoid default? If Citibank become insolvent, will you  
> prop them up? Will you do nothing and let the market decide? If you plan  
> to bail out the lenders, borrowers, or both, what funds will you use?' It  
> would be pretty tricky to start jabbering about 9/11 or CHANGE when answering  
> that question.

>

> TCB

>

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

>> Oh God, not Rudi, please. He seems to me to be running second only to  
>> Romney in the thickness of his phoney politician veneer and the shallowness

>

>> underneath. "9/11, 9/11, 9/11, 9/11, 9/11, etc., etc. . ." - R. Giuliani

>

>> in any public address. Definitely skeletons and trust issues.

>>

>> I like Barack-O, but I'm afraid his inexperience might allow him to be led

>

>> into some bad places, like war on Iran.

>>

>> I don't really like any of the rest of them anymore, but I do think Edwards

>

>> would be the least of the evils.

>>  
>> They're all phonies and hypocrites to one degree or another . . . I mean,  
>  
>> come on . . . what kind of person strives for that kind of power anyway?  
>  
>> The kind who gets used to people being afraid to say "no" to them?  
>>  
>> Just my opinion. I hope whoever gets elected proves me wrong.  
>>  
>> S  
>>  
>>  
>> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:47869a88\$1@linux...  
>>> Lest anyone think I am singling out RP, let me say this:  
>>>  
>>> Hillary - machine politics, angry, corrupt, unelectable  
>>>  
>>> Edwards - Slimy kissup to Obama looking for a VP slot. Obama  
>>> will run from him. Zillionaire trial lawyer phony.  
>>>  
>>> Obama - Good guy, good heart. A bunch of scary ideas, and  
>>> some good ones. If he can rise to the occasion when he has  
>>> to face the real opponents (the GOP candidates) he could win.  
>>> I don't think it will happen.  
>>>  
>>> McCain - That man has a really bad temper. He scares me. All the  
>>> idiots who have characterized Bush as a cowboy, when he is  
>>> the most mild and cautious of men, are going to get a shock when  
>>> they replace a "cowboy" with a really pissed-off ex POW and  
>>> torture victim. I like him, but he has a serious temper, just watch  
>>> him closely at the debates. Yes, he has a right to it, but I am not  
>>> sure he has mastered it.  
>>>  
>>> Mitt - Too much of a suit for me. Too calculating, too little  
>>> moral center. McCain despises him and with good reason.  
>>> nonetheless he did a good job in MA. May be a better pres.  
>>> than public figure, but we really don't need another one of those  
>>> after 8 years of Bush.  
>>>  
>>> Rudi - Best man to have when the chips are down. Not really  
>>> a conservative, but looks like one compared to the Dems.  
>>> Why is he behind? Skeletons in his personal life? Trust?  
>>>  
>>> Thompson - He doesn't care about the media or image  
>>> management; cannot be bought. A true conservative.  
>>> May not be electable.  
>>>  
>>> Huck - No legs. Scares me. If he is the candidate, the GOP may



>>> lose.  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> I can only say one thing:  
>>>  
>>> This is going to be one wild and wooly campaign.  
>>>  
>>> DC  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: RP  
Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:20:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Not like there's any precedent for killing black leaders...

Chuck

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

>  
>"Deej" <noway@jose.org> wrote:  
>>What I'm really, really  
>>afraid of is that some racially motivated white whacko maniac will kill  
>him  
>>or some foriegn power will kill him and stage it to look like some racially  
>  
>>motivated white whacko maniac killed him....and as totally surreal and

>>incredibly evil that scenario is, it's a credible one.

>  
>There is a significant number of African Americans who think he will  
>be killed. God, that's scary. Both the fact that so many people think  
>it  
>will happen and the possibility that it could. It would be a very very  
>bad  
>day in America if that happens. I don't think it will.

>  
>DC  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: RP  
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Sat, 12 Jan 2008 02:52:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Scary stuff. I would like to think that there will be adequate protection... There are always crazies out there.

DC

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

>

>Not like there's any precedent for killing black leaders...

>

>Chuck

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

>>

>>"Deej" <noway@jose.org> wrote:

>>>What I'm really, really

>>>afraid of is that some racially motivated white whacko maniac will kill

>>him

>>>or some foreign power will kill him and stage it to look like some racially

>>

>>>motivated white whacko maniac killed him....and as totally surreal and

>

>>>incredibly evil that scenario is, it's a credible one.

>>

>>There is a significant number of African Americans who think he will

>>be killed. God, that's scary. Both the fact that so many people think

>>it

>>will happen and the possibility that it could. It would be a very very

>>bad

>>day in America if that happens. I don't think it will.

>>

>>DC

>>

>

---

Subject: Re: RP

Posted by [Deej \[5\]](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 18:47:11 GMT

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

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>No shit, my man! The biggest problem this country faces today is not

>terrorism and it really never was. It may sound cold-hearted, but we

>only lost a few thousand people and some tall buildings. In the big

>picture that's fairly small potatoes. We lose that many every 4 days

>from mis-prescribed pharmaceuticals and every month in highway deaths.

>If we really want to save lives there ought to be "wars against" those

>mistakes.

>

>Our biggest problem right now is we are spending way more than we have,

>both individually and in the government. The dollar is crashing hard  
>because the rest of the world now has an alternative in the Euro and  
>they know our Fed Reserve just keeps on printing new dollars every time  
  
>they feel like having an extra juicy profit. The citizens won't take the  
  
>government to task for overspending because they are doing the same damn  
  
>thing! Getting a new credit card is equivalent to the Fed printing up  
>more money.  
>  
>We have to fix this, but the majority of candidates don't dare bring it  
  
>up because it is sure to be poorly received by the electorate. Fox News  
  
>was evidently afraid to have Ron Paul in the last debate because he was  
  
>likely to shove his take-action-now fiscal viewpoint into the other  
>candidates faces, and they wouldn't know what to say - they think the  
>public is way too stupid to put future survival above their immediate  
>desires.  
>  
>We gotta wake up NOW.  
>  
Bill,

I think there is a lot of truth to what you say. We are headed to a third world educational level which in turn will bring about third world capabilities. Perhaps we should start preparing for the role in this world that we have created for ourselves.

Deej

---

Subject: Re: RP  
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Sun, 13 Jan 2008 23:27:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 14/1/08 5:47 AM, in article 478a4e9f\$1@linux, "Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>  
> Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:  
>> No shit, my man! The biggest problem this country faces today is not  
>> terrorism and it really never was. It may sound cold-hearted, but we  
>> only lost a few thousand people and some tall buildings. In the big  
>> picture that's fairly small potatoes. We lose that many every 4 days

>> from mis-prescribed pharmaceuticals and every month in highway deaths.  
>> If we really want to save lives there ought to be "wars against" those  
>> mistakes.  
>>  
>> Our biggest problem right now is we are spending way more than we have,  
>  
>> both individually and in the government. The dollar is crashing hard  
>> because the rest of the world now has an alternative in the Euro and  
>> they know our Fed Reserve just keeps on printing new dollars every time  
>  
>> they feel like having an extra juicy profit. The citizens won't take the  
>  
>> government to task for overspending because they are doing the same damn  
>  
>> thing! Getting a new credit card is equivalent to the Fed printing up  
>> more money.  
>>  
>> We have to fix this, but the majority of candidates don't dare bring it  
>  
>> up because it is sure to be poorly received by the electorate. Fox News  
>  
>> was evidently afraid to have Ron Paul in the last debate because he was  
>  
>> likely to shove his take-action-now fiscal viewpoint into the other  
>> candidates faces, and they wouldn't know what to say - they think the  
>> public is way too stupid to put future survival above their immediate  
>> desires.  
>>  
>> We gotta wake up NOW.  
>>  
> Bill,  
>  
> I think there is a lot of truth to what you say. We are headed to a third  
> world educational level which in turn will bring about third world  
> capabilities.  
> Perhaps we should start preparing for the role in this world that we have  
> created for ourselves.  
>  
> Deej  
>  
>  
Hay Guys/gals.  
Is this an open free for all discussion group, (if you call US politics free  
for all,) or a dedicated audio related group?  
If it's the former, I'm outa here.

Martin Harrington

---

---

Subject: Re: RP

Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Mon, 14 Jan 2008 00:14:15 GMT

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

---

You don't have to read the thread. Just like I don't have to read the Aussie based threads when those come up (though I chose to do so for the most part). You started complaining in the middle of Dedic's accurately labelled OT thread, and have again here when the subject clearly says RP. That's kinda rude man.

However, I want to learn more about the people around here and maybe that's our difference in outlook? I think it's an interesting topic, even though I'm not participating actively with this one. I don't understand your mindset, but if you feel it's necessary to leave then there's probably nothing more to say dude, and I'll miss your input. Come back when you can.

AA

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message  
news:C3B0E980.3514%lendan@bigpond.net.au...

> On 14/1/08 5:47 AM, in article 478a4e9f\$1@linux, "Deej" <noway@jose.net>  
> wrote:

> Hay Guys/gals.

> Is this an open free for all discussion group, (if you call US politics

> free

> for all,) or a dedicated audio related group?

> If it's the former, I'm outa here.

>

> Martin Harrington

>

---

Subject: Re: RP

Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Mon, 14 Jan 2008 00:26:54 GMT

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

---

On 14/1/08 11:14 AM, in article 478aa9ec\$1@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
<know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:

> You don't have to read the thread. Just like I don't have to read the Aussie  
> based threads when those come up (though I chose to do so for the most  
> part). You started complaining in the middle of Dedic's accurately labelled  
> OT thread, and have again here when the subject clearly says RP. That's  
> kinda rude man.

>

> However, I want to learn more about the people around here and maybe that's  
> our difference in outlook? I think it's an interesting topic, even though

> I'm not participating actively with this one. I don't understand your  
> mindset, but if you feel it's necessary to leave then there's probably  
> nothing more to say dude, and I'll miss your input. Come back when you can.  
>  
> AA  
>  
> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message  
> news:C3B0E980.3514%lendan@bigpond.net.au...  
>> On 14/1/08 5:47 AM, in article 478a4e9f\$1@linux, "Deej" <noway@jose.net>  
>> wrote:  
>  
>> Hay Guys/gals.  
>> Is this an open free for all discussion group, (if you call US politics  
>> free  
>> for all,) or a dedicated audio related group?  
>> If it's the former, I'm outa here.  
>>  
>> Martin Harrington  
>>  
>  
>

Usually, the "Aussie based threads" have zero to do with politics, (well the  
odd one or two), but our lifestyle, and that's OK, but wall to wall days of  
US politics is too much, even for Americans, I would have thought.  
Why not put it in a general discussion folder or something.  
I don't want to leave, but I'm certainly not interested in "fringe", (to  
outsiders), political aspirations.  
Matin H

---

Subject: Re: RP

Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Mon, 14 Jan 2008 00:31:09 GMT

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

---

Martin, what kind of newsgroup reader are you using? I'm just wondering if  
it's more difficult to bounce a thread/topic at your end, thus increasing  
the PITA factor. I've been using OE so long I'm not sure I'm not behind the  
curve, but it's comfortable to me and I can 'manhandle' thread topics pretty  
easily with it.

AA

"Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message  
news:C3B0F77E.351B%lendan@bigpond.net.au...  
> On 14/1/08 11:14 AM, in article 478aa9ec\$1@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
> <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:  
>

>> You don't have to read the thread. Just like I don't have to read the  
>> Aussie  
>> based threads when those come up (though I chose to do so for the most  
>> part). You started complaining in the middle of Dedic's accurately  
>> labelled  
>> OT thread, and have again here when the subject clearly says RP. That's  
>> kinda rude man.  
>>  
>> However, I want to learn more about the people around here and maybe  
>> that's  
>> our difference in outlook? I think it's an interesting topic, even  
>> though  
>> I'm not participating actively with this one. I don't understand your  
>> mindset, but if you feel it's necessary to leave then there's probably  
>> nothing more to say dude, and I'll miss your input. Come back when you  
>> can.  
>>  
>> AA  
>>  
>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message  
>> news:C3B0E980.3514%lendan@bigpond.net.au...  
>>> On 14/1/08 5:47 AM, in article 478a4e9f\$1@linux, "Deej" <noway@jose.net>  
>>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Hay Guys/gals.  
>>> Is this an open free for all discussion group, (if you call US politics  
>>> free  
>>> for all,) or a dedicated audio related group?  
>>> If it's the former, I'm outa here.  
>>>  
>>> Martin Harrington  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
> Usually, the "Aussie based threads" have zero to do with politics, (well  
> the  
> odd one or two), but our lifestyle, and that's OK, but wall to wall days  
> of  
> US politics is too much, even for Americans, I would have thought.  
> Why not put it in a general discussion folder or something.  
> I don't want to leave, but I'm certainly not interested in "fringe", (to  
> outsiders), political aspirations.  
> Matin H  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: RP

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Mon, 14 Jan 2008 01:43:38 GMT

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

---

General is fine with me. Everyone has been very cool so far, but it would be probably good to keep politics to General.

opinions?

DC

Martin Harrington <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

>Why not put it in a general discussion folder or something.  
>I don't want to leave, but I'm certainly not interested in "fringe", (to  
>outsiders), political aspirations.  
>Matin H

---

Subject: Re: RP

Posted by [Erling](#) on Mon, 14 Jan 2008 08:46:52 GMT

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

---

As said many times before here the last years and as we did some years ago: Political stuff lived very well in General. It's all up to us to again let it get a good place in General. Kim, isn't it again time to say some wise words to get political stuff back where it belongs for years? We're all good here to practice some selfjustice with these kind of stuff, so let us again get Genera to live political good.

Erling

On Mon, 14 Jan 2008 11:26:54 +1100, Martin Harrington <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote:

>On 14/1/08 11:14 AM, in article 478aa9ec\$1@linux, "Aaron Allen"  
><know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote:

>

>> You don't have to read the thread. Just like I don't have to read the Aussie  
>> based threads when those come up (though I chose to do so for the most  
>> part).You started complaining in the middle of Detric's accurately labelled  
>> OT thread, and have again here when the subject clearly says RP. That's  
>> kinda rude man.

>>

>> However, I want to learn more about the people around here and maybe that's  
>> our difference in outlook? I think it's an interesting topic, even though  
>> I'm not participating actively with this one. I don't understand your



>> mindset, but if you feel it's necessary to leave then there's probably  
>> nothing more to say dude, and I'll miss your input. Come back when you can.  
>>  
>> AA  
>>  
>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message  
>> news:C3B0E980.3514%lendan@bigpond.net.au...  
>>> On 14/1/08 5:47 AM, in article 478a4e9f\$1@linux, "Deej" <noway@jose.net>  
>>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Hay Guys/gals.  
>>> Is this an open free for all discussion group, (if you call US politics  
>>> free  
>>> for all,) or a dedicated audio related group?  
>>> If it's the former, I'm outa here.  
>>>  
>>> Martin Harrington  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>Usually, the "Aussie based threads" have zero to do with politics, (well the  
>odd one or two), but our lifestyle, and that's OK, but wall to wall days of  
>US politics is too much, even for Americans, I would have thought.  
>Why not put it in a general discussion folder or something.  
>I don't want to leave, but I'm certainly not interested in "fringe", (to  
>outsiders), political aspirations.  
>Matin H  
>

---

Subject: Re: RP  
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Thu, 17 Jan 2008 09:32:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

While it's true that we are free to skip any OT threads, it's also true that we agreed some time ago to keep the political debates in the general area. I think the truth is that we just like talking to each other and getting quick feedback on our opinions, and some of us probably feel that the general area doesn't get read as often.

So yay us for liking to talk about stuff with each other, but perhaps we should respect the desires of those would like to see this area a bit less cluttered with political stuff.

Eh?

S

PS: Don't leave us Martin, we like you. :)

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
news:478aa9ec\$1@linux...

> You don't have to read the thread. Just like I don't have to read the  
> Aussie based threads when those come up (though I chose to do so for the  
> most part). You started complaining in the middle of Detric's accurately  
> labelled OT thread, and have again here when the subject clearly says RP.  
> That's kinda rude man.

>  
> However, I want to learn more about the people around here and maybe  
> that's our difference in outlook? I think it's an interesting topic, even  
> though I'm not participating actively with this one. I don't understand  
> your mindset, but if you feel it's necessary to leave then there's  
> probably nothing more to say dude, and I'll miss your input. Come back  
> when you can.

>  
> AA

>  
> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message  
> news:C3B0E980.3514%lendan@bigpond.net.au...  
>> On 14/1/08 5:47 AM, in article 478a4e9f\$1@linux, "Deej" <noway@jose.net>  
>> wrote:

>  
>> Hay Guys/gals.  
>> Is this an open free for all discussion group, (if you call US politics  
>> free  
>> for all,) or a dedicated audio related group?  
>> If it's the former, I'm outa here.

>>  
>> Martin Harrington

>>  
>  
>

---

Subject: Re: RP  
Posted by [IOUOI](#) on Thu, 17 Jan 2008 17:43:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, Martin, don't leave... just take a break for a week like I did... most of the threads are gone or almost gone by that time (OK, well, it helped that I was out of town anyway, but it was still 'taking a break' from the NG).

Neil

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

>While it's true that we are free to skip any OT threads, it's also true that  
>we agreed some time ago to keep the political debates in the general area.

>I think the truth is that we just like talking to each other and getting

>quick feedback on our opinions, and some of us probably feel that the  
>general area doesn't get read as often.

>  
>So yay us for liking to talk about stuff with each other, but perhaps we

>should respect the desires of those would like to see this area a bit less

>cluttered with political stuff.

>  
>Eh?

>  
>S

>  
>PS: Don't leave us Martin, we like you. :)

>  
>

>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
>news:478aa9ec\$1@linux...

>> You don't have to read the thread. Just like I don't have to read the

>> Aussie based threads when those come up (though I chose to do so for the

>> most part).You started complaining in the middle of Dedic's accurately

>> labelled OT thread, and have again here when the subject clearly says  
RP.

>> That's kinda rude man.

>>  
>> However, I want to learn more about the people around here and maybe  
>> that's our difference in outlook? I think it's an interesting topic,  
even

>> though I'm not participating.actively with this one. I don't understand

>> your mindset, but if you feel it's necessary to leave then there's

>> probably nothing more to say dude, and I'll miss your input. Come back

>> when you can.

>>  
>> AA

>>  
>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message  
>> news:C3B0E980.3514%lendan@bigpond.net.au...  
>>> On 14/1/08 5:47 AM, in article 478a4e9f\$1@linux, "Deej" <noway@jose.net>  
>>> wrote:  
>>  
>>> Hay Guys/gals.  
>>> Is this an open free for all discussion group, (if you call US politics  
  
>>> free  
>>> for all,) or a dedicated audio related group?  
>>> If it's the former, I'm outa here.  
>>>  
>>> Martin Harrington  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>  
>

---

---

Subject: Re: RP  
Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Sat, 19 Jan 2008 00:51:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 18/1/08 4:43 AM, in article 478f85a8\$1@linux, "Neil" <IOUOI@OIU.com>  
wrote:

>  
> Yeah, Martin, don't leave... just take a break for a week like  
> I did... most of the threads are gone or almost gone by that  
> time (OK, well, it helped that I was out of town anyway, but it  
> was still 'taking a break' from the NG).  
>  
> Neil  
>  
>  
>  
> "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:  
>> While it's true that we are free to skip any OT threads, it's also true  
> that  
>> we agreed some time ago to keep the political debates in the general area.  
>  
>> I think the truth is that we just like talking to each other and getting  
>  
>> quick feedback on our opinions, and some of us probably feel that the  
>> general area doesn't get read as often.  
>>

>> So yay us for liking to talk about stuff with each other, but perhaps we  
>  
>> should respect the desires of those would like to see this area a bit less  
>  
>> cluttered with political stuff.  
>>  
>> Eh?  
>>  
>> S  
>>  
>> PS: Don't leave us Martin, we like you. :)  
>>  
>>  
>> "Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not\_here.dude> wrote in message  
>> news:478aa9ec\$1@linux...  
>>> You don't have to read the thread. Just like I don't have to read the  
>  
>>> Aussie based threads when those come up (though I chose to do so for the  
>  
>>> most part).You started complaining in the middle of Dedric's accurately  
>  
>>> labelled OT thread, and have again here when the subject clearly says  
> RP.  
>>> That's kinda rude man.  
>>>  
>>> However, I want to learn more about the people around here and maybe  
>>> that's our difference in outlook? I think it's an interesting topic,  
> even  
>>> though I'm not participating.actively with this one. I don't understand  
>  
>>> your mindset, but if you feel it's necessary to leave then there's  
>>> probably nothing more to say dude, and I'll miss your input. Come back  
>  
>>> when you can.  
>>>  
>>> AA  
>>>  
>>> "Martin Harrington" <lendan@bigpond.net.au> wrote in message  
>>> news:C3B0E980.3514%lendan@bigpond.net.au...  
>>>> On 14/1/08 5:47 AM, in article 478a4e9f\$1@linux, "Deej" <noway@jose.net>  
>>>> wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>> Hay Guys/gals.  
>>>> Is this an open free for all discussion group, (if you call US politics  
>  
>>>> free  
>>>> for all,) or a dedicated audio related group?  
>>>> If it's the former, I'm outa here.

>>>>  
>>>> Martin Harrington  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>  
Still here...  
Martin

---